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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this qualitative/descriptive study was to describe organizational change within Ohio State University Extension as it relates to staffing patterns and clientele served from 1970 to 1998. The study also described selected demographic characteristics of Ohio. The study sought to determine whether staff within OSU Extension and the clientele it served has changed as selected demographics in Ohio changed.

Two methods of gathering data were used in this study. The first method was secondary data. Data collected from this source were population by sex; population by race (white/non-white); population of rural and urban citizens; poverty level by state in selected rural and urban counties; number of single-parent families in Ohio; literacy rates; number of non-English speaking people in Ohio; and the number of agricultural farms within the state. OSU Extension data were collected from Extension annual reports and the OSU Archives.

Data were also gathered through the use of interviews from faculty representing each of the management levels of the Extension program (i.e., state administration, state specialists, Extension district directors, Extension county chairs, and a former Extension personnel leader).

In 1970, 75% of OSU Extension staff were male. This changed in 1998, as women became an integral part of OSU Extension comprising 44% of the total staff, reducing the male agents to 56%. Data show that in 1970 OSU Extension had three non-white agents, less
than 1% of its total. In 1998, 27 non-white agents representing 5% were a part of the Extension staff. However, during that same time period, Ohio's non-white population grew from 9% in 1970 to 12% by 1998. The rural/urban population remained basically at 25% and 75% respectfully, through 1970-1990.

Clientele who participated in OSU Extension educational programs changed. In 1980, 96% of OSU Extension participants were white and 4% non-white. By 1997 16% of OSU Extension clients were non-white reducing the white participation to 84%. The clientele to staff ratio varied greatly between rural and urban audiences. In the selected rural counties of Harrison, Monroe, and Noble, the combined population was 43,403 with a ratio of 3,339 county residents to 1 agent. The selected urban counties Cuyahoga, Franklin, and Hamilton had a combined population of 3,272,892 with a ratio of 163,645 county residents to 1 agent. Furthermore, while the rural population was decreasing, the number of farms was decreasing by 57% from 1970 to 1997. Land in agricultural production also decreased from 17 millions acres to 14 millions, which is a lost of 3 million acres of productive farmland.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Companies throughout the world have come under increasing pressure. Some organizations, such as IBM, General Motors, Xerox, Glaxo, and Philips, have experienced difficulty and some even fail after many years of long-term organizational success (Flamholtz, 1995). A number of large established organizations have downsized either substantially or actually failed. IBM reduced its worldwide work force from 406,000 at its peak in the late 1980s to approximately 260,000 in 1995 (Flamholtz, 1995). In spite of the success of many entrepreneurial organizations, they have not been immune to the effects of organizational change.

Some of the changes are slow and gradual, almost imperceptible, while others are lightening fast, shocking, and unending. Organizations will need to deal with both kinds of change, and because responding to change must be an organizational act, not just an individual one, the challenges ahead are great (Pasmore, 1994).

Change scholars face an enduring research problem, how to make models that are testable, yet reflect the complexity of real business environments. Typically, researchers of organizational innovation or change define their research by focusing on one dimension of change—type of change, radicalness of change, stage of change—at one time (Damanpour
& Gopalakrishnan, 1998). In reality, these dimensions overlap, which partly explains why past theories of the relationships between organizational structure and change have produced inconsistent results.

In recent years, management innovations, such as total quality management (TQM), continuous improvement methodologies, and activity-based management have been developed as responses to the changing nature of business operations and competition (Hamel & Prahalad, 1994). These management practices are not restricted to production processes, but also include innovative approaches to restructuring work practices and developing new planning and control systems. Many of the management innovations associated with these change programs rely on promoting a high degree of employee involvement, often using work-based teams. The result is that much of the responsibility for delivering change lies with the shop-floor employees (Hackman, 1987; Cohen, 1993).

The basic thrust of organizational change has begun an irreversible process of remaking how and where work is done and how work is organized. Underlying organizational change are two basic facts that are so pervasive as to have become premises about the nature of the next decade of change. The first of these premises is that the external business environment is likely to remain turbulent (Morton, 1995). There have, of course, been periods of turbulence in the past, such as the world wars or the aftermath of the oil shock. However, this time the rate of change appears to be faster and the breadth of impact greater (Morton, 1995). Secondly, the increased rate of change in the level of turbulence can be substantial across virtually the entire gamut of the external environment, namely, economic, social, political, and technical dimensions. One example is the collapse of the Soviet Union. There are countless other examples, from Yugoslavia to South Africa, and
there is a similarly impressive list on the social front. The decline of the traditional family structure and the growing number of two-income households have major implications for all sorts of business, as does the rapidly widening income gap between the ‘haves’ and ‘have nots’ in society. With these changes comes a shift from an agricultural and manufacturing economy to a service economy (Quinn, 1992). In 1995, the US, for example, had some 22% of its work force engaged in manufacturing and 78% in services (Morton, 1995). While the largest element of service is still manual (e.g., waiters, retail clerks, etc.) a growing number are information workers (e.g., design engineers, managers, etc.) for whom the new information technologies have major implications.

Today’s most important societal issues know no geographic boundaries. One concept that has emerged in the twentieth century is that of planned, controlled, and directed social change. Complex problems, such as environmental degradation, neighborhood revitalization, water quality, conservation, public safety, youth development, school reform, and economic growth are critical issues of both urban and rural areas. However, the specific issues differ greatly in urban and rural settings. Water quality and conservation programs in rural counties focus on agriculture, while in urban areas the focus is on industrial and homeowner usage. Waste management programs in rural areas focus on manure disposal at feed lots and dairies, while urban programs focus on lawn clippings, leaves, and home recycling (Fehlis, 1992). Each location is important, but requires different resources, technical support, and approaches to program delivery. Urban centers have increased greatly in size and scope and have urgent needs for educational opportunities and research-based information as they confront multifaceted issues. The issues of crime, poverty, water quality, nutrition and health, parenting, youth development, unwed births, unemployment, underemployment, and
a feeling of hopelessness are only some of the many complex issues faced by urban residents (Urban Extension: The National Agenda, 1996). Failing to deal with these problems leads to increased cost for all consumers and taxpayers. To deal with these complex issues facing urban communities, organizations will need to modify and expand their programs.

The words “urban” and “city” are used almost interchangeably, but there are some fundamental differences. The noun “city” incorporates the idea of government and administration, while the adjective “urban” carries the idea of a densely populated place and the lifestyles of those who live there (Bolland & Herson, 1990). An urban place implies four major criteria: (a) population density; (b) a focal point, or nodes that centralize and disperse goods, services, and communication; (c) complex and specialized relationships characterize social life; and (d) urban dwellers display particularly “urbane” habits and shared interests (Chudacoff, 1975). Former New York City Mayor David Dinkins stated in 1990:

Cities serve as our commercial and intellectual marketplaces, where economic and philosophy, entertainment and art, science and technology, ideas and emotions flourish and enrich the American experience. Like the mighty engine, urban America pulls all of America into the future: 77 million Americans, almost one-third of our population, live within the limits of our cities. As our cities go, so goes America and our unique civilization (p. 7).

The U.S. Bureau of Census is responsible for documenting population growth and growth of urban centers. An urban place, as defined by the U.S. Bureau of Census, is a geographic area with a population of at least 2,500. An urbanized area consists of a central city (or two central cities) with a population of at least 50,000 - plus densely settled adjacent areas (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1990). A metropolitan statistical area (MSA) contains a
central city (or two or more central cities) of at least 50,000 along with surrounding counties that are socially and economically dependent on the central city. Between 1993 and the year 2020, the U.S. population is expected to increase from 258 million to 326 million (Publow, 1995). This population growth will likely focus on a number of highly urbanized areas, exacerbating already difficult social problems. In addition, the U.S. Bureau of Census predicts that in the year 2010, the population of the United States will be 10% Asian, 17% African American, 28% Hispanic, and 46% Euro-American, most of whom will be living in urban areas (New York Times, July 20, 1988).

If educators are to create an atmosphere for change in urban centers, they must become familiar with and committed to the issue of diversity. The need for successful utilization of a pluralistic workforce is undisputed in today’s industry environment, yet conventional business wisdom views diversity as a potential deficit to productivity and competitive standing (Davies, 1998). An organization’s ability to manage change, including changing demographics, is predictive of competitive advantage. Diversity means differences: change, variety, and multiformity (Thomas, 1991). Diversity has particular significance to educational institutions and goes beyond race and gender notions so often associated with diversity and prescribes to all elements of programming. This commitment to diversity can be enriched by relevant and culturally appropriate program needs, as identified by the population to be served. The leaders of U.S. corporations must also recognize that the makeup of the overall work force today is vastly different from what it was when they started in business (Thomas, 1991).

Creating a learning organization is one method for organizations to manage change and approach the diversity issue. The learning organization can be a company, business,
professional association, a university, a school, a city, a nation or any group of people, large or small, with a need and a desire to improve performance through learning (Longworth & Davies, 1996). A learning organization establishes new lifelong-learning procedures to give a competitive edge. The essence of true learning organizations is that they change because they learn about themselves (Longworth & Davies, 1996). The learning organization understands the world in which to work and live, determines the needed skills, and how and where to acquire the skills so that its people will fulfill their human potential.

The problem of educating today's urban citizen is becoming more difficult. Educators focus on appropriate action in urban areas, but realize that problems are increasing, and that fundamentally, little change occurs (Isaacson & Bamburg, 1992). The urban schools' initiative report concluded:

"An urban school is not a school district or a school building. It is not a conglomeration of city blocks. It is not a ward or a precinct or a government bureaucracy. It is people united by a need and a desire for educational success" (pp. 13).

The scope and magnitude of problems confronting society in large urban areas have focused attention on the "crisis in the cities." Universities and colleges have been challenged to use education to help solve the array of complex urban problems. Within the academic setting, the urban universities and land-grant institutions should play a significant role in addressing the concerns of the urban centers. C. Peter Magrath, President, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges stated;

We, the land-grant institutions, belong in the city----with all of us truly working together for the greater common good rather than narrow institutional interests. I
believe it can be done and hope that you will join with those of us who see the future of the state and land-grant university as a future built around collaborative public service and extending the fruits of our knowledge in new and exciting ways to meeting the needs of our American people—wherever they live, in our rural, suburban, and urban communities. All of us are the "we" who belong in the city (Magrath, 1986).

The Cooperative Extension System is believed to be the world's largest adult and youth out-of-school, nonformal educational organization (Fiske, 1989). The educational system includes professionals that are located in each of the 51 1862 land-grant universities, Tuskegee University, and the 16 1890 land-grant universities. In 1994, 29 tribal-controlled community colleges and higher education institutes that have partial land-grant status under the Equity in Educational Land Grant Act of 1994 were added as public institutions involved in the Extension System (Seever, Graham, Gamon, & Conklin, 1997). The Cooperative Extension Service was established in 1914 as a security mechanism that used education to address society's problems. Specifically, the role and function of the Cooperative Extension Service were to use the university's research capabilities to generate research-based information relating to the problems and issues of society. Then, the research-based information would be extended, or carried from the university by professional people called Extension agents to citizens in local communities. The citizens would then become educated in ways that would help them solve the problems that would better their lives. In other words, the Smith-Lever Act of the U.S. Congress authorized the Cooperative Extension Service to improve the intellectual and social aspects of rural life (Campbell, 1998).
As illustrated in Figure 1.1, the current Cooperative Extension System’s leadership is provided from a national structure and is administered under the responsibilities of the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES). Extension programs are CSREES’ major educational emphasis: (a) agriculture, (b) community resources and economic development, (c) family development and resource management, (d) 4-H and youth development, (e) leadership and volunteer development, (f) natural resources and environmental management, and (g) nutrition, diet, and health (Framing the Future: Strategic Framework for a System of Partnership, 1995).
Figure 1.1  Hypothetical Organizational Chart of the Cooperative Extension Service-Adapted from Seevers, Graham, Gamon, & Conklin, 1997.
Since the beginning of Cooperative Extension, there have been significant changes in both the agricultural and nonagricultural segments of society, such as shifts in population, changes in farm production and marketing methods, and shifts in social structure. Such changes in society and the character of its customers have led Extension to change its structure and methods of operation in order to keep up with the changing times and provide those services that will be most likely beneficial to its customers. However, a tendency to continue long-established programs and activities beyond the point of their effectiveness exists in the organization (Senge, 1990).

The method and function of extending education to local citizens through professional agents were organized in a unique way involving federal, state, and county governments as partners. Agents were housed in county offices in every county or parish of every state. The county agents were instrumental in listening to the collective voices of the community’s people and communicating their issues and concerns to the state level. The state-level Extension agents, called state specialists, would research the problems of the local people and design educational programs to address local needs. The Extension process is “to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economic and to encourage the application of the same” (Campbell, 1998).

In its early inception Cooperative Extension included local experiments as a means of teaching, expository bulletins, itinerant horticultural schools, elementary instruction in nature study in rural schools, instruction by correspondence, and reading courses. Over time, society’s issues changed posing new and challenging problems for the citizens of the U.S. Among these challenges is that the workforce and society are aging, with fewer new workers
entering the workforce. These new workers are growing numbers of women and minorities. Of the people entering the workforce in the year 2000, 15% will be native white men, 67% women, 42% minority or immigrant, and 21% will be minority or immigrant women (Chesney, 1992).

Ohio State University Extension professionals are designing educational programs based on the needs of their customers. What is Extension's role in urban and rural areas today? What should the organization become as Ohio State University Extension enters the 21st century? In the United States, 192 cities have populations of 100,000 or more (U.S. Census, 1990). These cities have great needs Extension can address. Besides the programmatic and philosophical imperatives, Extension would be naive not to acknowledge the political ramifications for urban work in metropolitan centers (Krofka & Panshin, 1989).

Problem Statement

Societal demographics in the U.S. have changed: (a) 75% of the population lives in, what is described by the census, an urban area; (b) populations of minorities and immigrants have increased; (c) society has become an information-based economy; (d) the family and home have been redefined; (e) a global society exists; (f) society has aged and; (g) personal and environmental health issues are more complex (Bureau of Census, 1990). In OSU Extension, 4% of the faculty are black or minority and urban counties are disproportionately understaffed (OSU Strategic Plan for Diversity, 1995). A review of the three largest populated Ohio counties finds: Cuyahoga county with a population of 1,402,552 and a ratio of potential clientele to Extension agents of 175,194:1; Franklin county, population 1,013,724 and a ratio of 202,745:1 and; Hamilton county, population 857,616 and a ratio of 214,404:1. These ratios are compared to three rural Ohio counties; Noble county, population
12,134 and a ratio of 3,034:1; Monroe county, population 15,268 and a ratio of 3,817:1 and; Harrison county, population 16,001 and a ratio of 4,000:1 (OSU Urban Programs, 1997).

In its inception the Cooperative Extension Service had as its mission to improve rural communities by providing practical and useful information in agriculture (Seevers, Graham, & Conklin, 1997). Today, agricultural concerns are not the emerging issues facing U.S. society. Extension is still providing the majority of its educational programs to a rural, middle class, white clientele (Chester, 1992). Extension's organizational structure as it relates to staffing has not changed to effectively deliver its programs to meet the needs of a changing society. Extension struggles with structural issues of how to utilize an ever decreasing staff to cover program needs. Traditionally, Extension restructured to make up budget deficits, rather than in response to programming needs (Krofta & Panshin, 1989).

Rutledge (1964) gave a broad overview of change and suggested that Extension examine the basic nature of change, document the historical forces behind change, and analyze the social awareness and need to change. Management of organizational human resources is a vital component to a viable, energetic Cooperative Extension Service now and into the next century (ECOP, 1992).

Change is also occurring on the political front. Term limitation in the political arena is causing Extension to make necessary adjustments. With a shift from rural to urban legislators Extension will need to package and deliver its educational programs in different ways to attract large urban audiences.
Purpose of the Study

This study examined selected demographic changes in Ohio and compared and contrasted these societal changes with changes in staffing patterns and clientele served within Ohio State University Extension. The research consisted of two parts. First, an examination of the historical records for OSU Extension and the state to document patterns of change. Secondly, the researcher examined the oral history from professionals who have worked in OSU Extension during the past three decades and are still involved in Extension. The study focused on whether demographic changes in Ohio help shape growth and development in OSU Extension’s staffing and educational programs and to determine if OSU Extension’s educational programs benefit the entire states’ population as intended by the Smith-Lever Act, balancing the interest of various stakeholders, politicians, different social classes and ethnic groups, and income levels.

Objectives of the Study

The following objectives were developed to guide the study and to serve as the basis for the research design.

1. Describe OSU Extension staffing patterns in terms of: race (white/nonwhite), sex, Extension Staff-full time equivalents (FTEs) by state, district county and total, and the ratio of county Extension agents to the county population in selected Ohio rural and urban counties

2. Describe the number of OSU Extension clientele by sex reached in programs offered by Agriculture and Natural Resources, Family and Consumer Sciences, 4-H and Youth Development, and Community and Economic Development
3. Describe the number of OSU Extension clientele by race (White/nonwhite) reached in programs offered by Agriculture and Natural Resources, Family and Consumer Sciences, 4-H and Youth Development, and Community Development.

4. Describe demographic changes in Ohio in terms of:
   - State population by race and by selected rural and urban counties (number and percent of white/nonwhite)
   - Poverty level by state and by selected rural counties and urban counties in Ohio
   - Number of single-parent families in Ohio and by selected rural and urban counties
   - Ohio employment statistics
   - Ohio map by selected rural and urban counties in Ohio
   - Ohio non-English speaking people by selected rural and urban counties
   - Number of Ohio farms and average size
   - Ohio legislators by selected rural and urban counties in Ohio

For the purpose of this study, comparisons will be made between Ohio’s three largest urban counties, Cuyahoga, Franklin, and Hamilton, and Ohio’s three smallest counties in terms of population, Harrison, Monroe, and Noble. Staffing patterns, clientele served, and state demographic data, when available, were gathered between the years 1970-1998.
Significance of Study

The role of the Cooperative Extension Service is to educate clientele regarding various changes in society, technologies, and life styles. "The staff development component of the Cooperative Extension system must be strengthened and supported to achieve the necessary specialization in staff training as well as retooling" (ECOP, 1987). Cooperative Extension professionals must be continually updated, trained, and educated to accomplish this mission.

Ohio's population over the past five decades has shifted from an agriculture base in rural areas to an industry base in urban counties and as a consequence, the traditional Extension education model used in rural areas has not been as effective in developing a political support or reaching target audiences in urban areas (Seevers, Graham, & Conklin, 1997).

In today's global marketplace, change is inevitable. Amidst the whirlwind of change, only those businesses and organizations that make the evolutionary leap beyond traditional hierarchies and the "program of the month" approach to management have any hope of survival (Pasmore, 1994). Cooperative Extension has been delivering educational programs in urban areas since 1914. However, the demand from urban legislators, community leaders, and a declining pool of customers is challenging Extension to consider placing greater emphasis on programming for urban audiences. As shown in Table 1.1, the residents of Ohio's cities with populations greater than 225,000 account for 56% of the state's population (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1990). Extension must listen to its urban political representatives and community members who are demanding that their constituents' needs are served.
Societal trends likely to influence Extension programs are the aging population, changing family structures, environmental awareness, and the desire for customized services (Seevers, Graham, Gamon, & Conklin, 1997). Extension staffing, delivery systems, and program content must change to maintain momentum into the future. These changes will be toward structures independent of political boundaries, content based on matters of wide public concern, electronic delivery methods, and personnel who are highly educated and experienced (Seevers, Graham, Gamon, & Conklin, 1997).

Outdated programs and old organization and education models limit the evolution of a contemporary Extension Service in urban areas. Advisory structures and program-planning processes must be diverse and dynamic with programs being outcome driven (ECOP, 1995). By continuing to evolve, Extension can effectively address the changing needs and issues of individuals, groups, and institutions, wherever they reside. Extension’s capacity to respond to a broad range of issues is found within its people, who tailor creative problem-solving and research agendas to critical issues (ECOP, 1995).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Largest City</th>
<th>County Population</th>
<th>% of State Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>1,401,552</td>
<td>12.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>1,013,724</td>
<td>9.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>857,616</td>
<td>7.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>566,312</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>530,571</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>452,691</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>374,406</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>323,579</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>Lorain City</td>
<td>281,231</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoning</td>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>260,107</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>227,069</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,288,856</td>
<td>56.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 Population Estimates for Ohio Urban Counties

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, 1990
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In a world characterized by rapid change, an organization seeking to shore up traditional practices while increasing bureaucratic rigidity, tends to be viewed as unhealthy, emphasizing maintenance of the organization at the expense of the need for constant adaptability so as to keep pace with the change in demands and expectations of its external environment (Owens, 1987).

Since the inception of the Cooperative Extension Service, there have been many significant changes in both the rural and urban landscape of Ohio society. Shifts in population, changes in farm production and marketing, and shifts in Ohio's social structure are a few of the changes that are causing Extension to modify how it delivers programs. There is however, a natural tendency for well-established activities to continue beyond the point that they are needed, and failure to recognize some new areas where educational opportunities might be more profitable. Resistance to change is neither capricious nor mysterious, but almost always arises from threats to traditional norms and ways of doing thing (Senge, 1990). The review of literature will address two main issues of organizational change within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service: staffing patterns and programming efforts. These factors will be considered through the context of the scope of change,
Organizational learning, an overview of the Cooperative Extension Service, and clientele served and staffing.

Organizations of the future will be networks, clusters, cross-functional teams, temporary systems, ad hoc task forces, lattices, and modules, almost anything but pyramids (Bennis, 1993). Change implies a difference between a former organizational state, and the state of the organization presently or where the organization is projected to be in the future. This change could involve a quantitative shift—a shift along a particular dimension, or a qualitative shift—a shift to a different dimension (Ishiyama, 1996). An organizational state includes the structure and functioning of the organization’s social system (Zaltman, Duncan, & Hobek, 1973), the behavioral patterns of organization members (Gabris, 1983; Heffron, 1989), and its resources, programs, services, service delivery system, technology, or clientele (Frost-Kumpf, Welchslr, Ishiyama. & Backoff, 1993). The learning process in today’s private and public environments is not going to slow down. Information is doubling almost annually, and technology is ubiquitous and is indiscriminately changing the job duties of almost everyone, and information is now a currency in and of itself (Stacey, 1995). From telecommunications to toll booths, from finance to farming, job descriptions and essential tasks today are performed in profoundly differently ways compared to the past due to customer knowledge, the growth of world markets, and the speed of silicon chips (Griffin & Carol, 1995). With wide access to information available through electronic communication at every level of a company, and indeed throughout communities, decision making during times of change shifts from those well-placed in standard, top-down hierarchy to those people with relevant data located at an organizational strata (Janov, 1994; Senge, et al., 1994). Organizations are doomed to failure unless they are able to re-engineer themselves in
response to change, to adapt themselves to shifting demands and situations (Hames, 1994). Organizations must not only survive, but thrive, in a world where chaos is common and surprises are expected (Marquardt & Reynolds, 1994).

A dialogue about change discusses the process of organizational change by examining the why and how change takes place within organizations. Turbulent and complex environmental issues have created major concerns for many organizations that call for comprehensive methods and solutions. The irony is that;

Today, the primary threats to our survival, both of our organizations and of our societies, come not from sudden events but from slow, gradual processes; the arms race, environmental decay, the erosion of a society’s public educational system, increasingly obsolete physical capital, and decline in design or product quality (Senge, 1990) p.22.

There are four dimensions to change: scope, rate, flow, and direction, which can be distinguished by shifts in temporal and spatial coordinates (Ishiyama, 1994).

The scope of change refers to its magnitude and range which are characterized by three types of change, Alpha, Beta, and Gamma change, which refer to ascending levels of change scope (Golembiewski, 1996). An Alpha change is usually small in scope, involving a shift along some measure of a dimension, a quantitative shift such as an incremental change (Ishiyama, 1994).

Beta changes involve organizational turnaround and revitalization and these changes are considerably large and significant and the emphasis people in the organization attach to the intervals of change may vary significantly (Rainey, 1991).
Gamma changes are larger scope changes and refer to a transformative experience, a qualitative, discontinuous shift in some domain. Such changes, once they have occurred, eliminate the possibility of an entity returning to the condition it was before the change (Smith, 1987).

Examinations of organizational change, both theoretical and empirical, have led to inconclusive and contradictory views. Scholars in strategy and organization theory have found that organizational strategies must be matched with both environmental conditions and appropriate organizational structures and that failure to achieve this alignment will result in low performance levels and even organizational failure (Venkatraman & Prescott, 1990). As environmental conditions change or as new strategies are undertaken, organizational structures must be reconfigured in keeping with these new environmental strategic imperatives. Failure to configure appropriately may lead to the prospect of unacceptable performance and possible failure (Chandler, 1977). Change appears to be most smoothly undertaken through a team process where sharing of information, work load, and quality improvement can occur.

Berrien (1976), in his discussion of organizations, compared organizations to organisms in biology:

An organization is an integrated system of interdependent structures and functions. An organization is constituted of groups and groups consist of persons who must work in harmony. Each person must know what the others are doing. Each one must be capable of receiving messages and must be sufficiently disciplined to obey (p. 43).

Buford and Bedeian (1988) suggested that there are four methods that introduce change within an organization. The described methods include task change, staffing change,
technological change, and a cultural change. These four methods are interrelated and must be considered when change is introduced within an organization.

Hannan and Freeman (1984) stated that the interaction between prior performance and significant structural change is expected to be positively related to the probability of mortality. Where performance is high, a significant structural change is likely to prove risky. They also suggest that the high level of prior performance signals that existing structures are congruent with environmental imperatives.

Mintzburg (1990) suggests that significant strategic shift and structure changes are difficult to achieve. Existing organizational learning is embedded in existing routines, existing resources constitute the basis for both organizational strengths and weaknesses, as well as creating mobility barriers for the organization, and existing structure constrains as well as motivates emerging strategies (Mintzburg, 1991).

Parks (1991) points out that organizations invest enormous amounts of time, energy, and money involving employees in participatory decision making, believing that participation will help to increase employees' acceptance of change. Parks examined the relationships among participants of University of Maine Cooperative Extension in decision-making, acceptance of change, organizational commitment, and employee demographic factors and found that participation in decision-making did not significantly influence employees' acceptance of structural change. The findings however, support the concept of involving employees in decision making, even if participation fails to lead directly to acceptance of change. Shared incentives help people see the big picture in a world that is already far too oriented toward individualism (Pasmore, 1994).
Gunderson (1994) investigated how leaders lead through organizational change and transition. She examined 57 Extension leaders in four states and concluded that several themes emerged as a result of the study; (a) forces drive change, (b) crises present opportunities for change, (c) personal transformation fosters organizational transformation, and (d) a shared vision must be created and communicated.

Watts (1996) suggests that when organizations experience strong driving forces for or restraining forces against change, they tend to create organizational disequilibrium, which can deteriorate into chaos if the forces are strong enough. However, much of the contemporary literature suggests that an organization's disequilibrium can be brought into balance by timely transformational leadership and visionary strategic planning or improvisation (Gunderson, 1994). Watts (1996) concluded that effective leadership and management can help minimize the complexity of organizational change; strategic improvisation may be more appropriate than strategic planning in turbulent environments; organizational climate changes are more likely to occur in an organic paradigm; and effective communication processes are integral to organizational transformation.

Lant (1997) indicated that organizations that are accustomed to rapid incremental environmental change will gain competence at learning during such change. However, accurate learning for these organizations under conditions of major environmental change will continue to be problematic. It is essential to understand how an organization's past experience affects its future capabilities for change in order to understand this ability to respond to a dynamic environment (Lant & Mezias, 1990; 1992). Lant (1997) concluded that organizations in rapidly changing environments may become accustomed to organizational change on a regular basis, and that organizations in a fast-paced industry use both
performance and environmental feedback mechanisms in strategic decision making. Both types of feedback have a positive association with strategic change.

Managing major change is typically difficult because the old systems remain in place until the new systems are up and running. Favorable managerial attitude toward change, concentration of technical specialists, and the depth of the organization's knowledge resources facilitate radical innovation (Dewar & Dutton, 1986). However, many organizations experience difficulty when responding to change. Organizations attempt to resist change in the fundamental operating paradigm (Leventhal, 1991). Such inertia limits the capacity of some organizations to adapt new paradigms and survive in a period of rapid environmental change (Kloot, 1997).

Environmental change is a strong driver for organizational innovations. In this study, environmental change represents changes in the rural to urban composition and changes in the state's population, population location, legislature, poverty rates, literacy rates, family structure, and non-English speaking people. Organizational change in response to environmental change is also known as organizational learning (Argyris, 1990). When an organization must adapt to changes in goals, policies, strategies, structure, control systems, and personnel, a mechanistic structure is needed (Daft, 1982). Thus, low employee professionalism, high centralization in decision-making, and high formalization of behavior facilitate the top-down process of administrative innovations. On the other hand, when changes in the organizational products, services, and technology are necessary an organic structure is needed (Daft, 1982). Thus, high professionalism, low centralization, and low formalization facilitate the bottom-up process of technical innovation. Organizational
learning requires that structures and strategies are uncoupled from existing paradigms and recoupled to new ones (Dent, 1990).

Organizational learning is defined as the process whereby members of the organization respond to changes in the internal and external environments of the organization by detecting errors which they then correct so as to maintain central features of the organization (Argyris, 1977). Extension, because of environmental changes, must consistently change its staffing and program patterns to be effective. In its basic meaning, a learning organization is an organization that is continually expanding its capacity to create its future (Senge, 1990). When the process enables the organization to carry on its present policies or achieve its objectives, the process may be called single-loop learning, but when learning encompasses not only detecting errors, but also questioning underlying policies and goals it may be called double-loop learning (Argyris, 1977).

Senge (1990) defines organizational learning as a fundamental shift or movement of mind, enabling the environment to be perceived differently, and to realize that the organization’s actions create problems and solutions. Organizational learning requires people who practice generative learning at every level of the organization, to expand the organization’s capacity to create its future (Senge, 1990). Learning can happen only if the learner recognizes a problem (detects an error) and is motivated to learn (corrects the error or solves the problem) (Marquardt & Reynolds, 1994). But organizations are expected not only to be a vehicle for change, they are expected to preserve and transmit traditional values to members of society (Owens, 1987).

Hames (1994) defined learning as encompassing the acquisition and practice of new methodologies, new skills, new attitudes, and new values necessary to live in a world that is
changing. The purpose of learning is informed action and requires more than being told and being shown, it requires transforming experiences.

A learning organization is about acquiring and applying knowledge, skills, values, beliefs, and attitudes that enhance the maintenance, growth, and development of the organization (Guns, 1996). The emphasis is on the application of learning. Guns (1996) noted that learning is not complete until it is applied effectively. Organizational learning is somewhat related to formal schooling, but learning involves much more than studying, organizational learning is vastly more complex than individual learning. Most organizational learning takes place in a series of single moments that employees experience every day, contemplating activities quietly, interacting with people within and outside the organization, participating in small-group work, reading internal documents, performing tasks, watching work being done (Guns, 1996). To survive in the workplace and to help ensure the organization’s success, people must question themselves, gain different perspectives, and not be afraid to adopt new values and beliefs (O’Neill, 1993).

The organizational learning movement was initiated by business and industry in the 1980s as a result of facing three challenges according to Davies and Longworth;

1. The task of constantly retraining and redeploying the workforce in response to changing technology and new working requirements has become very expensive.
2. The need to respond quickly to the competitive marketplace and shorter production lead times means that hierarchical management structures were no longer efficient or effective.
3. The new corporate imperative to downsize and keep a core staff, bringing in expertise as required, demands a much higher level of education and operation in existing staff and suppliers (1996, p. 73).

Learning in an organization is a continuous process that is required by every employee. The essence of true learning organizations is that they change because they learn about themselves, there is always more learning to be done. There are 10 characteristics of a learning organization according to Davies and Longworth (1996):

1. A learning organization can be a company, a professional association, a university, a school, a city, a nation, or a group of people, large or small, with a need and a desire to improve performance through learning.

2. A learning organization invests in its own future through the education and training of its people.

3. A learning organization creates opportunities for, and encourages, all its people in all its functions to fulfill their human potential:
   - as employees, members, professional or students of the organization
   - as ambassadors of the organization to its customers, clients, audiences, and suppliers
   - as citizens of the wider society in which the organization exists
   - as human beings with the need to realize their own capabilities.

4. A learning organization shares its vision of tomorrow with its people and stimulates them to challenge, change, and contribute to the vision.

5. A learning organization integrates work and learning and inspires its people to seek quality, excellence, and continuous improvement in both.
6. A learning organization mobilizes all its human talents by putting the emphasis on learning and planning its education and training activities accordingly.

7. A learning organization empowers its people to broaden their horizons in harmony with their own preferred learning styles.

8. A learning organization applies up-to-date, open, and distance delivery technologies appropriately to create broader and more varied learning opportunities.

9. A learning organization responds proactively to the wider needs of the environment and the society in which it operates, and encourages its people to do likewise.

10. A learning organization learns and relearns constantly in order to remain innovative, inventive, invigorating, and in business (p. 75).

In the final analysis, the learning organization is a living organism, always full of ideas, full of vigor and vibrancy, but never believes it has learned enough. The managers who reject the notion of a learning organization would do well to consult the many studies which site inflexibility as one of the major causes of failure and bankruptcy (Davies & Longworth, 1996).

When organizations change, staffing and programming efforts also change (Senge, 1990). Successful organizations are flattening and utilizing integrated work teams in order to tap broad spectrums of knowledge and competence (Griffin, 1994). Resistance to change is rational for employees. Yet many organizations fail to see the hesitation on the part of the employees as a predictable and normal response to not understanding the proposed change or knowing how to integrate the new practice into their current responsibilities (Hammer & Champy, 1993).
Rebirth, renewal, and rightsizing describe organizational changes occurring in the Cooperative Extension System (Harrison & Daugherty, 1992). The Cooperative Extension Service is one such organization that is changing to meet the needs of a changing and demanding customer. These changes are especially true as Extension delivers educational programs to urban audiences. Dramatic changes in the role of Cooperative Extension Service were acknowledged in the late 1970s (Sappington et al, 1977). Since that time, computers, expanded clientele, and new programs have been added to existing programs. These changes have caused a diversification of subject matter, requiring Extension professionals to be acquainted with far more subject matter areas and greater levels of sophistication to deliver subject matter programs (Warner & Christenson, 1984). The challenge is to chart a course compatible with the changing environment and drop programs and activities that deal with obsolete situations (Pfeiffer, Goldstein, & Nolan, 1989).

The purpose of the Cooperative Extension Service, (USDA Bulletin No.285, 1946), is “to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economic and to encourage the application of the same ...” (p. 7). The bill passed under the assumption that the county agent system would continue to be the principal delivery system for Extension education (Kelsey & Hearne, 1963). The “Cooperative” in Cooperative Extension Service is a designed relationship between the federal partner (USDA), the state partner (the land-grant institution), and the local partner (committees with local authority, either elected or appointed) that gives three levels of perspective on the mission, vision, goals, and priorities for educational programs (Sanderson & Beard, 1994).
Extension is failing to keep up with societal changes. The primary problem of Extension appears to be its present, functioning mindset, a mindset that thrives on survival rather than on potential. Extension appears to be more concerned with management than leadership, that is, more concerned about doing things right, rather than doing the right thing. (The Futures Task Force, 1989)

Change is no longer an option; it is one of those wonderful non-negotiables that stop only when people die. The message gleaned from working with changing organizations and people, is that the future happens regardless of the attempts to slow its arrival, and that recognizing that change is a human activity helps people better prepare for the diversity of opinions, methods, and fears erupting from change (Griffin, 1996).

The Cooperative Extension Service did not develop fully from either the federal government or higher education (Fox, 1982). The Cooperative Extension Service was the result of two great forces in U.S. life: farming, and education. The Cooperative Extension Service, created by Congress in 1914 through the Smith-Lever Act, has its origins in the confluence of two historical factors: the social and economic needs of the rural U.S., and the political requirements of a largely agrarian democracy for an informed, vigorous citizenry (Sanderson & Beard, 1994).

The Cooperative Extension Service movement started in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Several factors played important roles in the early developmental stages of the birth of Cooperative Extension Service. During these early years U.S. farmers were experiencing difficult times; the labor force was moving from the farm to the cities; and farmers were required to produce more products for a rapidly growing nation. The influence of cheap private land and free public land, overproduction, high cost of transportation and taxation,
and the printing of paper currency caused prices and wages to decline (True, 1929).

While the industrial age was expanding, the agricultural community was experiencing depression. An unacceptable solution to the plight of the farmer was direct federal assistance in the form of subsidies. Rather than subsidies, better farming techniques emerged as the most prevalent need of the U.S. farmer (Eddy, 1957). Educating farmers became the accepted method for improving farming techniques.

The awareness for agricultural education continually increased during the late 1800s. The first attempt to bring education to farmers was a series of lectures known as Farmer Institutes (Fox, 1982). Agriculture societies were established in local communities for the purpose of improving U.S. agriculture. The land-grant college, established by the Morrill Act, began to offer lectures and pamphlets related to agriculture education (Eddy, 1957). Hard lobbying by the land-grant colleges, local farm organizations, and businesses brought about the passage of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which authorized the creation of the Cooperative Extension Service (Eddy, 1957).

The second Morrill Act extended benefits of land-grant institutions to the black population of 16 southern states by designating a traditional black institution in each of these state as a land-grant institution (Rasmussen, 1989). Funding was provided directly to the black institutions, but legislation built in guidelines to assure coordination among the 1862 institutions and the historical black institutions, for maintaining one coordinated Extension program in each state (Mayberry, 1989). Early Extension efforts for rural black families began under the leadership of Booker T. Washington, the founder of Tuskegee Institute (Seever, Graham, Gamon, & Conklin, 1997). By 1912, there were 32 black demonstration agents throughout the U.S. working with 3,500 black farmers and an additional 15,000 black
farmers being assisted by Seaman A. Knapp, a white Extension agent. This working relationship contributed to great improvement in race relations, and the economic, and social conditions of agriculture in the South (Bailey, 1945).

The Cooperative Extension Service has been effective because it derives its programming direction from the informational needs of the public it serves (Schaefer, Huegel, & Mazzotti, 1992). Boys’ and girls’ club work, now known as 4-H clubs, developed from the idea of education in the public schools and a desire to teach the latest agricultural practices through youth. In 1901, A.B. Graham established experimental corn clubs outside of school hours. Graham’s work was so successful that he later became the first superintendent of Extension at Ohio State University in 1905 (Seevers, Graham, Gamon, & Conklin, 1993). Marie Cromer of South Carolina was appointed home demonstration agent on June 3, 1910, as a result the first home demonstration club developed from the girls’ tomato clubs (Seevers, Graham, Gamon, & Conklin, 1993).

The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) was initiated in 1968 on a pilot basis in Alabama. Public response was so great that Congress mandated legislation that launched EFNEP nationwide in 1969. Funding totaling $28.56 million was made available under section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act. In 1978, Congress directed that 20% ($10 million) of EFNEP funds be used for 4-H work (Prawl, Medlin, & Gross, 1984). Despite Extension’s previous success and emphasis on nutrition, its efforts were more in the rural communities. In 1968, when started, EFNEP’s focus was nutrition education aimed at specific age groups, especially teenagers, and the elderly. By 1984, EFNEP had reached two million hard-to-reach low-income families, and nearly 5,000 EFNEP paraprofessionals were involved in Extension.
According to the Strategic Framework for the National Cooperative Extension System (ECOP, CSREES, 1995):

Extension’s history is strongly identified with farming and rural communities. Some legislators and other community leaders have recognized Extension’s success in rural America and are now insisting that Extension expertise and methods also focus on the critical issues in metropolitan districts. Extension must find ways to emphasize rural-metropolitan interdependence and serve audiences in both settings (pp. 8-9).

The Cooperative Extension System is a unique and sometimes complex entity, linking together education and research resources at the federal, state, and local levels. A reorganization of the USDA in 1994 placed the Cooperative Extension System in the sub-unit Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service (CSREES). The traditional organizational structure of Cooperative Extension is based on cooperation in funding and programming on all three levels. Although the federal, state, and local governments each contribute to funding Extension programs, the contributions are not equal proportions (Seever, Graham, Gamon, & Conklin, 1997). In 1993, the average county Extension program received more than a third of its funding from the state, less than a third from local sources, and less than a third from federal and the remainder from other sources such as grants, donors, etc. (PDEES-USDA, County Office Study, 1992). 

Increasingly complex and controversial issues are emerging for Extension educators, local leaders, and decision makers as the urbanization of rural and agricultural land expands (Adelaja, Deer, & Rose-Tank, 1989). The Cooperative Extension Service can help significantly in overcoming rural-urban polarization. Extension can convey the sense of shared concerns and mutual benefits derived from working together. The strength of rural
Extension, such as vitality of the community base and involvement, as well as attention to youth issues, enrich urban Extension programs (Panshin, 1989). In turn, urban Extension strengths, such as understanding and valuing diversity and addressing complex, pluralistic issues, enrich rural Extension programming (Panshin, 1989).

Population shifts from rural to urban areas challenge Extension to expand and redefine its traditional program’s emphases to be more meaningful to, and therefore supported by, a mostly urban public. With these changes in Extension clientele, rural and urban, and educational programs, came changes in the role of Extension agents. In Extension’s early years, method demonstrations, train exhibits, fairs, shows, and other informal methods became the keystone in the excepted patterns of Cooperative Extension teaching (Collings & Sanders, 1966).

Organizational Staffing in Extension

The Extension agent is a vital link to the success of the Cooperative Extension Service. The Extension agent’s importance was identified and reported as a fundamental strength of the Extension program in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Guide to Extension Training, (Oakley & Garforth, 1985), which stated;

“The whole Extension process is dependent upon the Extension agent, who is the critical element in all Extension activities. If the Extension agent is not able to respond to a given situation and function effectively, it does not matter how imaginative the Extension approach is or how impressive the supply of inputs and resources are, the agent is needed for the Extension work. Indeed, the effectiveness of the Extension agent can often determine the success or failure of programmes” (p. 19).
Extension's educational program delivery system is dependent upon a competent staff to carry out its mission, they are the backbone of the Extension Service. The single county pattern is the most commonly used approach to staffing within the Extension Service, however, many states are using multiple staffing patterns. The projection is that more staffs are likely to have multi-county positions (Agnew, 1991). The county office of the future will probably serve at least two counties. A focus on a more regional Extension structure and approach in the development and delivery of quality Extension education programs is needed (Meier, 1989). Most Extension directors indicate that the multi-county trend should be allowed to evolve locally rather than be imposed at the state level (Warner et al., 1996). There needs to be an experiment with a variety of staffing patterns, such as clustering of counties, program assistants, and field staff specialists (Bartholomew & Smith, 1990). These experiments will aid Extension to keep pace with environmental changes.

There are other issues and trends that will influence Extension staffing patterns in the future. Budget constraints will force creative use of resources. These budget and economic constraints will also require stronger skills in networking and collaborating with other agencies and organizations as well as development of a strong volunteer program that encourages delegation and empowerment. The futuristic/visionary approach assumes that in the face of a reduced resource base, Extension professionals will design a different yet viable 21st century organization. Contracting or hiring individuals with special skills for short-term appointments may become necessary to ensure that issues are being addressed (Seevers, Gamon, Graham, & Conklin, 1997). These outside individuals, with special skills, allow Extension professionals to remain generalists but able to utilize expert skills in accessing
resources. Ties to university specialists and other university resources will strengthen the Extension professional position.

Organizations need to increase the diversity of their staff in order to reach new and varied audiences and enrich educational programs. Cultural diversity affects organizations in several ways including the recruitment and retention of staff, management styles and decision-making processes, and relationships within organization (Ewert, Rice, & Lauderdale, 1995). Organizations become more inclusive by altering aspects of their culture within each of these categories.

Extension Clientele Served

The historic clientele base that accesses Cooperative Extension programs is changing. Population trends show an increase in the number of residents moving away from central cities while the number of farmers and ranchers continues to decline (Laughlin & Schmidt, 1995).

McLellan (1998) stated that little has changed in the kind of audiences that the Cooperative Extension Service has traditionally served. Ninety-four percent of Extension clients were Euro-Americans and 4% were African Americans, the remaining 2% consisted of Hispanics and Native Americans (Warner & Christenson, 1984). Today, African Americans comprise an estimated 12.4% of the U.S. population and in Ohio the African American population is 12% (Bureau of Census, 1998).

Bankston (1991) reported that barriers, such as a limited knowledge of Extension programs, the images Extension portrays, the absence of minority roles models involved in Extension programs, and the limited amount of advertising targeted at minority populations, determines the amount of minority participation in Extension programs. Underserved
audiences represent a wide diversity of potential users of Extension's educational programs. The traditional Extension program-planning model has dominated the development of Extension programs for more than 20 years. The traditional Extension program model addresses needs, goals, objectives, program design, implementation, evaluation, and accountability (Oregon State University, 1990). While adherence to this model has given Extension a systematic and logically defensible means of developing programs to meet society's needs, organizational success has been limited (Patterson, 1993). Extension must find a balance among programmatic offerings for various clientele groups who have a need for its programs and expertise.

The global economy will affect the way Extension does business. An era of tremendous opportunity exists for farmers, home-based business owners, and rural businesses to produce, process, and export value-added products (Harriman & Daugherty, 1992). Clientele need to know and understand how to participate in a world economy, including help in identifying markets and connecting with appropriate distribution channels. Program planning and delivery methods can assist clientele in these new markets.

Program development is a process of planning, implementing, and evaluating an educational effort. There are four basic points that guide the program development process (Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, 1973). They are as follows:

1. *Expressed needs of the people.* Audience or people-generated programs focus on the needs, interests, and concerns and are the result of local program development committees. The viewpoint of the clientele is the cornerstone of effective Extension programs.
2. *Analysis of environment and other conditions of society.* The careful analysis by professional such as agents, specialists, and special technical and industrial groups and by community groups of the environment and contemporary life broadens the program perspective and focuses programs on societal needs. Socio-economic trends are analyzed, and emergency problems are identified.

3. *Emerging research results.* As new knowledge becomes available or new technology is developed by research and interpreted by specialists, it is possible to incorporate this new knowledge into program determination, which then results in educational programs that are enhanced when they are built upon the framework.

4. *Administrative response to recommendations and pressures of Cooperative Extension support groups.* There are many educational institutions, legislative bodies, government agencies, organizations, advisory groups, and special interest groups who have interest and concern for Extension educational programs. Their viewpoints must be considered in program determination, especially where funding in the political process is involved.

During the 1980s, the Texas Agricultural Extension Service faced a rapid downswing in the agricultural and oil-based economy and a declining population growth rate. To ensure that programs were relevant under these conditions, Texas Extension initiated a new long-range program planning process. The objective was to reach outside the Extension structure to involve a wide populace in identifying priority issues as the basis for program delivery (Powell, 1990).
Pre-service and in-service education should be consistent with the trends in programming, such as teams or multi-disciplinary approaches or multi-county planning and administration. Alternative program delivery approaches involving variations in staff size, educational background, and technical knowledge should be studied to determine their economic benefit and relative effectiveness in meeting Extension program goals (Agnew, 1991).

Cultural and language differences, along with a growing ethnic population and changes in household compositions and employment patterns, have altered the way Americans live. This diversity is reflected in the way communities and individuals perceive their needs (Mallilo & Millar, 1992).

In a survey conducted in the Arkansas Extension service, the two most frequently identified program delivery changes were increased use of electronic communication and instructional devices and a shift from the single county office to multi-county agents or office (Agnew, 1991). The electronic changes could refer to increased use of telecommunications as a mode of delivery, access to electronic data sources, interactive instructional video, and increased use of computer technology. Today's fluctuating economy, extremely varied audiences, and limited resources' demand innovative program design and delivery methods to ensure successful transfer of technology for practical use.

A review of a model from adult and Extension education, as shown in Figure 2.1, identifies the three main components of the program development process: planning, implementation, and evaluation (Seevers, Graham, Gamon, & Conklin, 1997). Successful programming links these three components or processes together.
Figure 2.1 Basic Program Development Model

Source: Seevers, Graham, Gamon, & Conklin, 1997
The Cooperative Extension Service has a long history of commitment to community-based, leadership development education. In a 1990 national study on Extension leadership development, the average Extension professional spent seven hours per week developing leadership skills among clientele, 15% of their time (Michael, Paxson, & Howell, 1990, p.8). The study also found that Extension staff tended to teach skills associated with stable social order and similarity in social values, working within groups, and knowing how to do things right or, what is called transitional leadership (Michael, Paxson, & Howell, 1990).

A diverse population and workforce will have an impact on organizational change in the Extension System. The U.S. population has already shifted from rural to urban, family farms to commercial farms, and youth to older citizens (Harriman & Daugherty, 1992). The minority population is rapidly growing and is expected to become the majority within a few years. These changes in the population point to the need for a culturally diverse Extension staff and suggest a move away from a pattern dominated by those with expertise and skills in home economic and production agriculture. However, many Extension professionals may still view the needs of the agriculture industry as a vital link to its overall educational program efforts. Since in Ohio, the agricultural industry accounts for over half of the state’s revenue (Bureau of Census, 1990).

A study commissioned by the Committee on Personnel and Organizational Development (PODC) and endorsed by Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) in 1995, surveyed directors and administrators in Extension and suggested trends affecting future changes in the structure and function of Extension. These trends are:
- Funding - state, federal, local, extramural funds, user fees, revenue from natural resources, increased competition, block grants, anti-tax sentiment, increased labor cost

- Clientele Needs - changing demographics, economy, continuing to be locally responsive, need to be flexible, more mandated programs, more state and county influences

- Organizational Influences - becoming part of the university outreach, multi-county programming, restructuring university, mandated downsizing, combining CES with Agricultural Experiment Station, increase use of consultants, temporary workers and Extension associates, rigidity of tenure system, decreasing percentage of faculty FTE's devoted to Extension

- Delivery Methods - increased use of electronic delivery methods such as computers, satellite, compressed video, and other telecommunication methods, fees for services

- Support for CES and Higher Education - lack of public support for higher education, levels of knowledge and support within the land-grant university, declining support of traditional groups, shift of political power from rural to urban, lack of credibility, emphasis on primary and secondary education at the expense of higher education, a need to broaden the base of support

- Mission - A shift from agriculture, from rural to urban, a broadened mission, expanding role of Extension, a need for higher impact and a more highly visible programs

- Partnerships/Competition - more local involvement in programming and budgeting,
uncertainty about the role of CSREES, role of other education institutions and community colleges, need to collaborate with other agencies (p.24).

Urban Program Delivery

In the 1990s, urban characteristics common to cities and large metropolitan areas have not changed drastically, but the list of characteristics continues to grow, and includes: high density of population; high-energy, fast-paced lifestyle; many foreign-born residents (English as a second language); diversity of all kinds (racially, ethnically, socio-economic, other cultures, values, way of life, and religions); many poor, unemployed, and underemployed; mass transportation; homeless and street people; media centers (television, radio and newspapers); cultural centers; distinct and varied neighborhoods; many human service agencies; professional sports centers; and great complexity politically, socially, educationally, and economically (Panshin, 1990).

The presence of a large number of people living in close physical proximity, by logic is an urban lifestyle, with place of residence divorced from places of work. The United States was first described as an urban nation in the census enumeration in 1920, when more than half the population was reported to be living in urban areas. Today, the proportion of urban dwellers stands at more than 75% (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1996).

Ohio is home to 11 million residents with 74% living in urban areas. The overall population density in Ohio is 265 persons per square mile. However, this rate exceeds 2,673 persons per square mile in urban areas. Ohio racial and ethnic diversity is primarily due to the large African-American population. While 86% of Ohio population is white, 12% is African-American, 1% Hispanic, and Asians comprise less than 1% (Mora, 1997).
Ohio is one of the most urbanized states in the US, with three-quarters of the state's population and jobs located in metropolitan areas. As illustrated in Table 2.1, the population density of Ohio's largest cities—Columbus, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Akron, Dayton, Toledo, and Youngstown—plus several smaller urban regions such as Canton and Lorain comprise 68% of the total population (Bureau of Census, 1990).

Legislative redistricting based on the latest census figures has given urban dwellers more political clout than in the past (Lamm, 1992). The rationale for addressing the concerns of urban leaders could result in additional funding, collaboration with other agencies, and networking with new partners for urban development. Traditional funding could be restructured and a new collaborative could be developed to provide support to urban Extension resulting in more effective delivery of educational programs to urban audiences.

Urban areas have some constraints that govern the political and social aspects of urban living. The first constraint results from the legal status of cities. Cities are units of government, but not autonomous units. Any policy that a city may choose must conform to the policies of its state and also to the policies of the national government (Herson & Bolland, 1991). Thus, no city may borrow money, hold elections, if what it does is not in accordance with the general policies of its state or national government.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Areas</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>City Population</th>
<th>Percent in City</th>
<th>City Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>1,831,100</td>
<td>505,600</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>6,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>1,452,600</td>
<td>364,000</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>4,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>1,377,400</td>
<td>632,900</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>3,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>951,300</td>
<td>182,050</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>3,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>657,600</td>
<td>233,000</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>3,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>614,100</td>
<td>332,950</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>4,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>492,600</td>
<td>95,750</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>2,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,376,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,336,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,051</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1

Population Density of Ohio’s Largest Cities

A second set of constraints involves money. Cities are among the governmental poor; they depend for income largely upon property taxes and income tax to maintain their existence. However, property taxes are slow to adjust to inflation.

A third set of constraints is socioeconomic. Since the eighteenth century, people have moved freely in and out of U.S. cities, with the exception of African Americans, American Indians, and other minorities, and consider this freedom implicit in our constitution system (Herson, 1984).
A fourth set of urban policy constraints has to do with national economic conditions. The prosperity of every city is tied to the prosperity of the country. A few cities (mostly suburbs with expensive homes and high incomes) have revenues adequate to their policy desires. But normally, economic good times as well as economic bad times have a major impact on services provided by cities and metropolitan areas (Herson & Bolland, 1991). But over the years, more than either economic conditions or a feeling of helplessness from urban citizens have played a part in how the legislative interference with cities in the management of public revenues. Cultural rivalry is an important part of the interference. In the 19th century and half of the 20th century, rural areas dominated Ohio’s state legislatures (Herson & Bolland, 1991). Presently, those legislators from rural areas tend to see cities (especially big cities) as the vortex of foreigners, crime, and many domestic issues (Herson & Bolland, 1991). Thus, there is a present in the legislature, sometimes as undertone and sometimes overt, a rural-urban lifestyle conflict.

The urban crisis, the social and economic conditions of large cities, has continued to deteriorate since 1970 (Nelson, Schwirian, & Schwirian, 1998). The urban crisis began in the 1960s with race riots and was later associated with the out-migration of middle-class businesses and white residents from central cities, the subsequent isolation of poor minorities, the deconcentration of central city manufacturing, and fiscal disparity among city governments (Monkkonen, 1985). Despite accounts of urban improvements in physical redevelopment (Rybczynski, 1993), the effect of neighborhood organizations on improving community life (Mele, 1996), and the reform of city schools and government (Orr, 1996), the urban crisis both continues and worsens (Downs, 1985; Orfield, 1985; Weiher, 1989; & Wilson, 1996).
Public opinion polls and from the standpoint of the average citizen, crime is the most important urban problem (Covington & Taylor, 1991). Fear of crime, though often exaggerated, reflects the widespread concern among city dwellers of the threat of violent crime generated by the ongoing urban drug wars (Donnelly, 1989). Recent reduction in crime in the larger U.S. cities has had little impact on the perception of crime as a serious problem that reflects a breakdown in social order (Perkins & Taylor, 1996). Urban crime is complex. Crimes are more heavily concentrated in areas with high poverty rates, high unemployment, poor housing, and single-parent families (Miethe & Meier, 1994).

Education in cities has become increasingly problematic. High concentrations of comparatively fewer educated residents decrease a city’s ability to compete for the high-tech industries of the newly emerging economy (Kasarda & Irwin, 1991). Without these higher paying jobs, urban populations will be doomed to the low-wage hourly service positions that exist in many urban areas.

Another dimension to the decline of the urban structure is the relative large concentration of family headed by females. A high concentration of female-headed families in cities is usually considered by social researchers as an indicator of broken families, fractured local communities, and crumbled city social structure (Massey & Denton, 1993). The disadvantages for children of single-parent families spill over into above-average rates of health problems, poor school performance, and problems with crime and the criminal justice system (Moynihan, 1993). When children from two-parent families were compared to those from single-parent families, they were less likely to drop out of school, more likely to be enrolled in college, and less likely to be idle in their late teens (Mclanahan & Sandefur,
Daughters from single-parent families were more likely to become teen mothers than those from two-parent family (Farley, 1997).

The diversity of urban areas must be addressed. The presence of central cities, suburbs, and rural areas within a single county adds to the complexities of programming and staffing of organizations and agencies. Addressing critical issues becomes difficult because the problems associated with issues can vary tremendously from central cities to rural areas (Fehlis, 1992).

**Summary**

Ohio’s environment is continually changing. Extension will need to change its staffing patterns and delivery methods if the organization is to compete in the diverse marketplace. Since 1910, Ohio has become an urban state with 75% of its population living in an urban area (Ohio Bureau of Census, 1990). The criterion for an urban place was reviewed.

Organizations must change to keep pace with changes in the environment. Change implies a difference between a former organizational state, and the state of the organization presently or where the organization is projected to be in the future. The organizational state includes the structure and functioning of the organization’s social system (Zaltman, Duncan, & Hobek, 1973). For the purpose of this study, the organizational state refers to staffing patterns and programming methods in OSU Extension. Scholars in strategy and organization theory found that organizational strategies must be matched with both environmental conditions and appropriate organizational structures and that failure to achieve this alignment will result in low performance levels and even organizational failure (Vankatraman & Prescott, 1990).
Organizational learning is associated with organizational change, and is a process by which members of the organization respond to changes in the internal and external environment (Argyis, 1977). Extension is failing to keep up with societal changes (The Futures Task Force, 1989). Population shifts from rural to urban areas will challenge Extension to expand and redefine its traditional programs of Agriculture, Family and Consumer Sciences, 4-H and Youth Development, and Community Development to reflect issues, problems, and concerns of urban areas.

Extension educational program delivery is dependent upon a competent staff to carry out its mission, with the county agent as the backbone of the Extension Service. The single county pattern is the most widely used program delivery method. However, in the future Extension is likely to have more multi-county positions (Agnew, 1991). Reviewing demographics internally and externally will help Extension determine a course for change.
Chapter 3
Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a description of the procedures used to conduct the study. The chapter includes the following sections: a) research design, b) data sources, c) instrumentation, d) data collection, and e) data analysis.

Research Design

The design for this study was qualitative/descriptive research which employed longitudinal (modified trends study) methods. This study described how organizational change within Ohio State University Extension relates to staffing patterns and clientele served. The study also described characteristics of Ohio demographics within selected urban counties: Cuyahoga; Franklin; Hamilton and selected rural counties Harrison; Monroe; and Noble counties. In doing so, the study determined organizational changes in Extension staffing patterns and clientele served and whether OSU Extension changed as selected demographics in Ohio changed. Change was determined by the extent to which movement was made within OSU Extension staffing patterns and clientele served.
Data Sources

In order to supplement the information gathered from government documents, the researcher interviewed selected members of OSU Extension. Each interview schedule contained three open-ended questions with the following sections: a) selected demographic characteristics, b) selected questions regarding the interviewees' perceptions of organizational staffing patterns, program delivery methods (clientele served), and changes that have occurred in selected demographic factors in Ohio, and c) questions pertaining to recommendations for improving Ohio Extension staffing patterns and clientele served. Interviews were conducted with eight former and currently employed faculty at Ohio State University Extension (Appendix B). Selection was based on years of experience and programmatic area in Ohio State University Extension.

Secondly the study included the decades of the 1970, 1980, and 1990 Bureau of Census data for the total state and for selected Ohio counties: Cuyahoga, Franklin, Hamilton, Harrison, Monroe, and Noble. Data collected from the Bureau of Census were state population by race (white/non-white) and in selected rural and urban counties; poverty level by state in selected rural and urban counties; number of single-parent families by state and selected counties in Ohio; literacy rates by state and in selected Ohio counties; non-English speaking families by state and in selected Ohio counties; the number of agricultural farms within selected Ohio counties; and size of farms in selected Ohio counties.

Seventeen measures served to organize and guide the data collection process. The data for the Cooperative Extension Service was gathered from two main sources: government documents and interviews with people representing each level of Extension programming. Data sets that correspond with OSU Extension programming efforts in rural
counties and urban counties in terms of the number of clientele reached in each of the four major program areas (i.e., Agriculture, Family and Consumer Sciences, 4-H and Youth Development, and Community and Economic Development), the number of clientele by race reached in each of the four major program were found in published government documents, OSU Extension Annual Reports, OSU Extension USDA Civil Right Reports, OSU Extension Strategic Plan for Diversity, OSU Extension Urban reports, U.S. Department of Agriculture - Agricultural Research Services, Human Resource Division, Metropolitan Services Branch, OSU Archives, and Cooperative Extension Service (RG 22/0-6/1) Cooperative Extension Service Reports). The source of data for the Ohio legislature was found in the Ohio Library of Congress documents.

Instrumentation

The researcher developed two sets of instruments to collect the research data. The first instrument was used to gather secondary data from government documents. The Ohio State University Extension Data Center was used to guide the construction of the secondary data gathering instruments. A series of tables were designed for gathering data for the indicators with their corresponding measures. Section one consisted of five gathering sheets. These sheets focused on the demographics of the OSU Extension staff (Appendix C). Sheet #1 described the racial identity of OSU Extension staff. Sheet #2 described the sex of OSU Extension staff. Sheet #3 described the number of Full-Time Equivalent staff. Sheet #4 described the ratio of county Extension agents to the county population. Section two consisted of two sheets. Sheet #5 described OSU Extension clientele by sex. Sheet #6 described OSU Extension clientele by race. Section three consisted of nine sheets. These sheets focused on Ohio demographics. Sheet #7 described the state population by race and
by selected rural and urban counties in Ohio. Sheet #8 described the poverty level by state and by selected rural and urban counties in Ohio. Sheet #9 described the number of single-parent family in Ohio by state and selected rural and urban counties. Sheet #10 described the state population by location and by selected rural and urban counties in Ohio (number and percent). Sheet #11 described number and percent of non-English speaking people in Ohio and by selected rural and urban counties. Sheet #12 described the number of farms and acreage size in Ohio and by selected rural and urban counties. Sheet #13 described the Ohio employment sector.

The second instrument consisted of an interview schedule developed by the researcher. The interview schedule was administered to selected OSU Extension personnel. The main purpose of the interviews was to supplement and enrich the research data gathered from the secondary sources and to document the oral history of staffing patterns and clientele served for Ohio State University Extension. The interview schedule was intended to go beyond the measured data to address possible recommendations for improvement of OSU Extension in the areas of staffing patterns and clientele served. Each interview schedule contained the following section: a) selected demographic characteristics, b) selected questions regarding the interviewees’ perceptions of changing in OSU Extension staffing patterns in the decades of the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, and c) selected questions regarding the interviewees’ perceptions of changes in OSU Extension program delivery methods in the decades of the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s.
Data Collection

The research data were collected in two phases. Phase 1 involved the collection of secondary data from government documents gathered at the state and national levels. Phase 2 involved interviewing Extension administrators and Extension faculty at the state and local levels. A letter was individually addressed to each interviewee to elicit their permission to conduct the interview on September 15, 1999 (Appendix F). Follow-up phone calls were made to all respondents to increase the rate of participation. The interviews were conducted by the researcher from November 1, 1999 to December 30, 1999. Each interview lasted approximately 30 minutes and was audio taped. Each interviewee was assured of confidentiality of his or her responses.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the quantitative data related to the set of 17 measures. Percentages, frequencies, and ratios were calculated when appropriate. Particular attention was given to the examination of similarities and differences in the data gathered in the interview schedules. The interviews were used to provide anecdotal data to enrich the information collected through secondary sources. Data were arranged by patterns that emerged from the responses to the interview questions.
Chapter 4

FINDINGS

This chapter presents the findings of the research and reviews demographic trends in Ohio. The findings have been organized according to the objectives of the study.

Objective 1.

Describe OSU Extension staffing patterns in terms of:
- race (white/nonwhite), sex,
- Extension staff-full time equivalents (FTEs) by state, district county and total,
- and the ratio of county Extension agents to the county population in selected Ohio rural and urban counties.

Extension Staff Patterns by Race and Sex

Staffing represents those individuals in OSU Extension with a title of Extension Agent. Neither staff in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Educational Program (EFNEP) nor Extension Program Assistants are represented.

Extension staffing pattern of whites and nonwhite agents in 1998 have not changed substantially since the 1970s (Figure 4.1). Findings indicate that in 1970, three agents (less than 1%) were non-whites. In 1998, the number of non-white agents had grown to 27 representing approximately 5% of the total number of Extension agents. White agents percentage levels have diminished slightly in 30 years, with a high of 99% in 1970 and currently at 95% in 1990.
In 1970, 75% of Ohio's Extension agents were male. By 1998, females comprised 44% of the total number of Extension agents compared to 56% for males. While the percentage difference between white and non-whites in 1970 and 1998 has changed by 5%, the percentage difference between males and female representation in the OSU Extension agent population has changed by 42%.

Extension full-time equivalents (FTEs) represent the total Extension staff including EFNEP, Program Assistants, County Agents, District Specialists and Administrators, and State specialists and Administrators. As shown in Figure 4.2 the staff (FTEs) grew by 26% (179) FTEs from 1985-1998. In the 1990 decade, from 1990-1998 staff grew 29%, an increase of 206 FTEs. According to one interviewee, this growth “basically happened in the 90s where we added people through grants”.
Figure 4.1 All Ohio State University Extension Agent Staffing Patterns in Terms of Race and Sex

Source: "Personnel Budget Book" renamed "Faculty and Staff Salary Book": 1970-71, 1980-81, 1990-91
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Figure 4.2 All OSU Extension Program Staff Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) By State, District, County, and Total (support staff not included)

OSU Archive, Cooperative Extension Service (RG 22/0-6/1) Cooperative Extension Service Reports
Extension Staffing Patterns by Client Population to Agent Ratio

Table 4.1 compares the population change within the three most populated counties, Cuyahoga, Franklin, and Hamilton and the three least populated counties, Harrison, Monroe, and Noble with the number of Extension agents in these counties. The term Extension Agents refers to staff with agent title, not Program Assistants or EFNEP Educators. Cuyahoga, Franklin, and Hamilton counties have a combined population of 3,272,892 and 20 Extension agents in these counties for a ratio of 163,645:1. However, in the least populated counties, namely, Harrison, Monroe and Noble, the combined population is 43,403 with 13 Extension agents in these counties for a ratio of 3,339:1. A difference of 160,306 clients per agent exists between the larger urban counties and the least populated counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Ratio Per Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>1,401,552</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>200,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>1,013,724</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>126,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>857,616</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>171,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>16,001</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>15,268</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble</td>
<td>12,134</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 1998 Ratio of Agent to Population of Selected Ohio Rural and Urban Counties

Source: OSU Archives, Cooperative Extension Service (RG 22/0-6/1) Cooperative Extension Service Reports
Objective 2:

1. Describe the number of clientele by sex reached in programs offered by Agriculture and Natural Resources, Family and Consumer Sciences, 4-H and Youth Development, and Community Development.

2. Describe the number of clientele by race (White/nonwhite) reached in programs offered by Agriculture and Natural Resources, Family and Consumer Sciences, 4-H and Youth Development, and Community Development.

OSU Extension Clientele by Race

Figure 4.3 indicates that in 1980, the Extension audience consisted of 96% white compared to 4% of non-white clientele. By 1997, Extension audiences consisted of 84% white clientele and non-white clientele were 16%, an increase of 12 percentage points over the 30-year period. Agriculture and Natural Resources showed the lowest percent of non-white clients, 3% (1979) and Family and Consumer Sciences had the highest percent of non-white clients 32% (1995). Extension audiences are those individuals who directly benefited from OSU Extension educational programs and activities.
Figure 4.3  OSU Extension Clientele By Race

Source: OSU Archives, Cooperative Extension Service (RG 22/0-6/1) Cooperative Extension Service Reports
Objective 3, Describe demographic changes in Ohio in terms of:

- State population by race and by selected rural and urban counties (number and percent of white/nonwhite)
- Poverty level by state and by selected rural and urban counties in Ohio
- Number of single-parent families in Ohio and by selected rural and urban counties
- Ohio employment statistics
- State population by location and by selected rural and urban counties in Ohio (number and percent of rural/urban)
- Ohio non-English speaking people by selected rural and urban counties
- Number of Ohio farms and average size
- Ohio House of Representatives by selected rural and urban counties in Ohio
Ohio's population has changed from when the rural population was almost 54% in 1910, to less than 25% today. Figure 4.4 compares the demographics of Ohio populations by race, white and non-white. The state's population increased annually in each of the three decades. However, at the same time the white population decreased .05% from 1970 – 1980 and .07% from 1980 to 1990. Ohio's non-white population increased 19.6% from 1970 to 1980 and 10.4% from 1980 to 1990.

Single parent-families denote single female head of households and do not refer to single male head of households. A family household must have at least two persons: the householder, who is usually the person who owns or rents the living quarters, and at least one person who is related to the householder either by marriage or birth/adoption (DaVanzo & Rahman, 1993). The trend toward increases in single (female) head of households is accompanied by a decrease in the percent of growth of head of households in Ohio counties. Figure 4.5 shows that the urban counties increased in the total number of single head of households, 1970 (108,422), 1980 (185,289), and 1990 (231,663), which is an annual increase of 41% (76,867) from 1970 to 1980 and 20% (46,374) from 1980 to 1990. The single-parent head of households increased in the rural counties, 1970 (848), 1980 (1,424), and 1990 (1,675) an annual increase of 40% (576) from 1970 to 1980 and 15% (251) from 1980 to 1990.
Figure 4.4  State Population by Race

Figure 4.5 Number of single-parent families in Ohio and by selected rural and urban counties

Ohio poverty levels as shown in Figure 4.6 differ greatly among rural and urban counties. Poverty as defined for this study based on a set of money income thresholds used by the federal government for statistical purposes that vary by family size and composition and do not take into account non-cash benefits or taxes. The average poverty threshold for a family of four in 1995 was $15,569. A four-person family with cash income below the threshold would be counted as poor. The greatest incident of poverty exists in Ohio’s most urban populated counties. In 1970, Cuyahoga, Franklin, and Hamilton counties had 16%, 8%, and 10% poverty levels respectively. During the same period, Ohio’s most rural populated counties, Monroe, Harrison, and Noble had poverty levels of 3%, 3%, and 2% respectively. During the period from 1970-1990 the three largest Ohio urban counties had combined poverty levels of 34%, 41%, and 39% and the three rural counties had a combined poverty level of 8%, 5%, and 5% for the same period.

Figure 4.7 shows that selected urban counties maintain a higher number of non-English speaking residents than selected rural counties. In 1970, Cuyahoga (501,053), Franklin (95,079), and Hamilton (112,041) when combined, 20% of the county’s total population was represented by non-English speaking residents. Compared to the rural counties, Harrison (2,741), Monroe (1,374), and Noble (593), had combined non-English speaking populations of 11% of the total counties population within the three counties. By 1990, the non-English speaking populations in the selected urban counties dropped 34% (465,089) and the selected rural counties dropped 19% (911). Data show that the selected urban counties have a disproportional percentage of non-English speaking citizens than the selected rural counties.
Figure 4.6 Poverty level by selected Ohio rural counties and urban counties

Figure 4.7 Ohio non-English speaking citizens by selected rural and urban counties

Another indicator of the changing demographic in Ohio is the farming environment as reported in Figure 4.8. For this study, a farm is any establishment from which $1,000 or more of agricultural products were sold or would normally be sold during the year (Agricultural Statistics, 1998). The number of Ohio farms decreased from 120,380 to 68,591 a decrease of 51,789 farms from 1970-1990; the amount of agriculture land in production decreased from 17,619,167 acres to 14,103,185 a lost of 3,516,082 acres from 1970-1990; the average size of farms continued to increase over the same period from 146 acres per farm to 202 an increase of 56 acres in the average size farm.

The type and percent of persons employed in Ohio indicates how society demographics have changed. Agriculture is listed in the “other” category, representing less than 1% of the Ohio employment sector. Figure 4.9 indicates decreases in the categories of transportation and utilities from 6% in 1970 to 4% in 1990, a 33% loss and manufacturing 48% in 1997 to 24% in 1990 a 50% loss. The trend in Ohio employment is toward the service sector. In the service category employment increased from 9% in 1970 to 24% in 1990 an increase of 133%.

The political landscape is changing in Ohio. As the population shifts in Ohio and more of the population now resides in an urban place, more of the state politicians have urban constituency. For the purpose of this study, the Ohio Legislature represented both the Ohio House of Representative and the Ohio Senate. The legislative districts may overlap in several areas, at any point that a legislative district overlapped into parts of one of the selected urban or rural counties, it was counted as part of that political District. Figure 4.11 shows that in 1970, the urban counties, Cuyahoga, Franklin, and Hamilton had 22, 10, and

69
11 legislators respectively. While the rural counties Harrison, Monroe, and Noble had 2 legislators each. The three urban counties accounted for 33% of the state legislators in 1970, 1980, and 1990.
Figure 4.8  Number of Ohio farms and average size

Data Reported in Percentages

Figure 4.9 State of Ohio Employment Statistics
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Figure 4.10 Map of selected rural and urban counties in Ohio

Source: Ohio State University Urban Program
Figure 4.11 Ohio legislators by selected rural and urban counties

Source: U.S. Census Bureau Internet Release: October, 1995
http://www.census.gov/population/censusdata/urpop0090.txt
Summary of Open-Ended Questions

Eight Ohio State University Extension present and former employees were interviewed during the data collection process. Five of the interviewees were from OSU Extension administration and one from each of the following areas: State Specialist; County Director; County Agent; and a retired Extension administrator. A list of the people interviewed is presented in Appendix B.

The mean tenure of the interviewees was 25 years, with a range between 23 and 29 years. Four of the interviewees were female and four male. Five of the interviewees had a Ph.D., two had a Master's degree, and one had a high school diploma. The inquiry was meant to provide insight into the observable changes that the interviewees have seen in their tenure within the Ohio State University Extension Service. The method used in this study was a personal interview utilizing open-ended questions and obtaining biographical data on each interviewee.

Every detail of the reported results may not hold for significant change within the Extension Service, yet the patterns found in the analysis and reported are true to form. For an emerging theme to be reported, five of the eight participants must have voiced the idea during the interview. All participants did not need to express the emerging behavior or view Extension history in the same at the same level of intensity for the theme to be included. However, an attempt was made to capture the contextual richness through the words of the participants.
The interviewees were asked to respond to the following two questions:

*Question 1:* What changes have you observed in Ohio State University Extension relating to staffing patterns in the decades of the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s?

All of the respondents agreed that the basic fundamental staffing patterns in OSU Extension had not changed over the years. The basic OSU Extension staffing pattern of an Agricultural Agent, Home Economic Agent (Family and Consumer Sciences), and 4-H Agent is still the method of staffing county offices. Community Development (CD), added in the early sixties, is now one of the base program areas for OSU Extension. However, Community Development does not operate its programs with an agent in each county. “Most CD agents had a dual title, namely, 4-H and CD, Agriculture and CD or Home Economic and CD; CD now has 18 full-time equivalents.” In 1968, the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) became a part of Ohio Extension, a program funded through the federal partner, to address the needs of low-income citizens in the area of food and nutrition. EFNEP’s primary focus is minority citizens. EFNEP now conducts nutrition education programs in rural and urban areas with emphasis in the rural Extension East District. EFNEP ushered in another phase in OSU Extension staffing: paraprofessionals and later, program assistants.

The diversity of Ohio State University Extension staff needs improvement sited one of the interviewees. Most of the interviewees agree that diversity is an issue of concern. OSU Extension staff in the 1970s was male dominated. How does the Extension organization prepare its staff to embrace diversity, and have we really changed that much from the early 1970s?
"I am not sure that there has been a lot of dramatic changes, many counties still have
three Extension agents. Probably one of the bigger changes I would see is the focus
of the 4-H position. In the 1960s the 4-H agent was the junior Agriculture agent. I
mean they were the agriculture Associate, in fact I think they were called the
Associate agent. They were almost all male because you served your time as a 4-H
agent until you could move up to be an Agricultural agent. It was seen as an entry-
level position where you kind of learned the ropes and then became an Agricultural
agent. This started to change in the 1970's, 4-H is now a career position and not a
stepping stone position for an Agriculture agent position. In Ohio Extension we now
have career 4-H agents.

The reduced farm population is having an effect on Extension, because, historically, a
large portion of Extension professionals had farm backgrounds. The net effect of this trend is
that Extension clientele and the traditional pool of potential professionals will continue to
decrease into the next century. These changes in the population point to the need for a
culturally diverse Extension staff and a move away from a staffing pattern dominated by
expertise in production agriculture. Another factor that will have a drastic affect on the
potential pool for Extension professionals is the relatively good employment prospects for
students graduating from the College of Food, Agriculture, and Environmental Sciences
(formally the College of Agriculture).

The populations of people living in rural communities are much smaller as compared
to urban communities. How will Extension deliver it educational programs to benefit the
greatest number of people? As OSU Extension progressed in the 1980s and 1990s the
interviewees identified the three common OSU Extension staffing patterns as county, multi-county and county/multi-county.

As the focus of multi-county changed to clustering it was done for a purpose. I think we moved to clustering as we were dissolving multi-county. A few of the benefits that agents saw with multi-county was this collaboration with their peers in programming and sharing of specializations across county and state lines. Some saw the benefits to both the general public and to the agent professionally in their tenure tract. We found that the educational levels of the clientele served were greater than expected and demanded a higher level of specialization of our agents. So clustering came into affect with a lot of parameters. We are trying to encourage people to develop a specialization and share it. The local agents could decide on what cluster to form based on the people that they work with and where the specialization fits in terms of need rather than administration dictating that geographically.

“In the late 1980s and early 1990s when we were into multi-county situations we had around 900 full-time equivalents (FTE’s) in the Extension organization. Extension is now at 1,340 FTEs, and that’s quite a bit of growth from the late 1980s of 900 FTEs.”

**Question 1.2 Are the staffing patterns you addressed effective in urban and/or rural areas?**

The staffing patterns in OSU Extension were designed to be effective in a rural setting. However, Extension has utilized the traditional staffing pattern of an Agriculture
agent, Family and Consumer Sciences agent, and a 4-H agent in urban areas. The interviewees ponder whether these subject matter specialties were sufficient to address the growing demands of a changing society.

“We tend to hire a lot of the same type of people in both the urban and rural areas. I think for the most part we are not going out and successfully recruiting and hiring people who are more suited to an urban area and are better to relate to urban audiences. So we continue to put traditional programs that were traditionally rural oriented and try to make them fit into our urban communities.”

These staffing patterns have not been effective because the issues facing urban areas are more complex and need an array of Extension professionals to meet the growing demands of the urban areas.

Cultural diversity affects organizations in several ways including the recruitment and retention of staff, management styles, decision-making processes, and relationships within the organization (Ewert, Rice, & Lauderdale, 1995). Implications of the changing environment surrounding agriculture have profound consequences for Extension. Attracting and recruiting Extension professionals from a relatively small and shrinking pool of potential recruits is an altogether new challenge requiring major organizational, policy, and attitudinal changes for Extension.

Extension tried to bring in more minority professionals at the agent level rather than the paraprofessional level in an Internship programs and called them Assistant Agents. These Assistant Agents were brought in on a probationary basic and some were utilized in the urban areas.
Society is changing at an accelerated pace, Extension is also changing. Are the two, society and Extension, moving at the same pace and in the same direction? The participants understood that fast-changing environments play havoc with tradition and foster opportunities for the organizations equipped to channel its energy into the path of change. But most agreed that there are other forces that play a role determining future directions for Extension and is this contingency equipped to change.

"I'm not sure we're changing as much as society in changing. I'm not sure given our strong grassroot constituency base that we can change and survive, although we need to change enough that we don't become obsolete. Take the Grange for an example. When my parents and grandparents were growing up, I've read diaries of my mother, their lives revolved around Grange. That was the place they went to for community dances, that's where they played, that was their lives. They stayed in the Grange until they died and all their friends did too, and now they're all dead and so is the Grange essentially. And so the Grange didn't change significantly but the people involved were happy. If Grange would have changed the people may have changed too. On the other hand, if the Grange would have changed it would have lost my parents as members and perhaps no one else would have would have picked up the ball. That may be the dilemma we face in Extension. If we radically change our approach to what we do, will we pick up the support of new clientele or just alienate our friends".

The Cooperative Extension Service is changing and must change to keep up with our fast-paced society. Future Extension educators must be people who understand and can lead change (Patterson, 1991). The Extension educator is the linkage between citizen and policymaker, between academia and the real world, and between learners and leaders.
Question 2 What are the changes you have observed in Ohio State University Extension relating to program delivery methods (Program delivery methods refers to clientele served)?

The changes identified by the interviewees can be grouped into three categories: technology/multi-media approaches, multi-county agents, and teams. The concept of work teams evolved out of the need to improve overall performance in the workplace. "We have over 20-teams just in the Agriculture area, six in Family and Consumer Sciences, CD has six and 4-H has four or five; we are delivering Extension educational programs through the team process." We have specialization areas said one interviewee which is another shift in program delivery methods. Staff identified 25% of their time to a specialty subject matter area. Now if there's a problem, the individual professional has a team devoted to solving a problem or concern. Another change is the Extension professional is required to have a Master's degree before employment to allow the professionals to become experts in their field of study.

The information age and its supporting technologies such as the computer, Internet, and information centers have caused Extension, businesses and other organizations to change how they will educate the public. Several interviewees agreed that information centers may be in OSU Extension's future. Information centers may be located or co-located with public libraries, other educational institutions, or technology centers. Computer technology will enable OSU Extension to utilize the entire Ohio State University system, non-agricultural staff, and other colleges and universities in a collaborative approach to program delivery.
The role of the county agent will change, but the trend will be on multi-county agents. OSU Extension has used the multi-county approach for clientele served before with minimal success. The reason why OSU Extension was not as successful as Wisconsin or Michigan State in multi-county positions stated one interviewee “we analyzed the educational value for delivering programs for Extension, but failed to analyze the value the county placed on having its own individual Extension professional.”

There is no single right or wrong way of delivering Extension programs and services to clientele. These different delivery methods offer Extension a variety of methods for Extension professional to choose to meet the demands of it clientele.

SUMMARY

The historically familiar clientele base that accesses Ohio’s Cooperative Extension Programs is changing. Population trends show a decline in the farming community while the urban and suburban areas continue to expand and increase in population. Extension staffing patterns were designed for a mostly rural farming audience that is centered around agricultural issues and concerns. The issues facing society are far removed from production agriculture and rural concerns. Issues that confront a larger densely populated urban society
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present a summary of the major findings of the study, conclusions drawn, and recommendations for practice and future study. The conclusions are based on the secondary data and the personal interviews conducted with selected OSU Extension faculty.

SUMMARY

The historically familiar clientele base that accesses Ohio’s Cooperative Extension programs are changing. Population trends show a decline in the farming community while the urban and suburban areas continue to expand and increase in population. Extension staffing patterns were designed for a mostly rural white audience that was centered around agricultural issues and concerns. The issues facing society today are far removed from production agriculture and rural concerns. Issues that confront a larger densely populated urban society are more complex and diverse and will require a diverse Extension staff and unique ways to deliver educational programs. As Ohio demographic trends change OSU Extension staffing patterns and clientele served need to find ways to keep pace with the changing demographic trends.
Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of the study was to describe changes occurring in OSU Extension staffing patterns and clientele served by examining selected demographics in Ohio between 1970 and 1998.

The following objectives were developed to guide the study and to serve as the basis for the research design.

1. Describe OSU Extension staffing patterns in terms of: race (white/nonwhite), sex, Extension Staff-full time equivalents (FTEs) by state, district county and total, and the ratio of county Extension agents to the county population in selected Ohio rural and urban counties

2. Describe the number of OSU Extension clientele by sex reached in programs offered by Agriculture and Natural Resources, Family and Consumer Sciences, 4-H and Youth Development, and Community and Economic Development

3. Describe the number of OSU Extension clientele by race (White/nonwhite) reached in programs offered by Agriculture and Natural Resources, Family and Consumer Sciences, 4-H and Youth Development, and Community Development

4. Describe demographic changes in Ohio in terms of:
   - State population by race and by selected rural and urban counties (number and percent of white/nonwhite)
   - Poverty level by state and by selected rural counties and urban counties in Ohio
• Number of single-parent families in Ohio and by selected rural and urban counties
• Ohio employment statistics
• Ohio map by selected rural and urban counties in Ohio
• Ohio non-English speaking people by selected rural and urban counties
• Number of Ohio farms and average size
• Ohio legislators by selected rural and urban counties

Research Design

The design for this study was qualitative/descriptive research which employed longitudinal (modified trends study) research. This study described organizational change within OSU Extension as it relates to staffing patterns and clientele served between 1970-1998.

Data Sources

The main source of data for the state demographics was the Bureau of Census. The data collected from this source were population by sex; population by race (white/non-white); population of rural and urban citizens; poverty level by state in selected rural and urban counties; number of single-parent families in Ohio; non-English speaking; and the number of agricultural farms within the state.

The data for the Cooperative Extension Service were gathered from two main sources: government documents and interviews with people representing each level of Extension programming. Data sets that correspond with OSU Extension programming efforts
in rural counties and urban counties in terms of the number of clientele reached in each of the four major program areas (i.e., Agriculture, Family and Consumer Sciences, 4-H and Youth Development, and Community and Economic Development), the number of clientele by race reached in each of the four major program were found in published government documents, OSU Extension Annual Reports, OSU Extension USDA Civil Right Reports, OSU Extension Strategic Plan for Diversity, OSU Extension Urban reports, U.S. Department of Agriculture - Agricultural Research Services, Human Resource Division, Metropolitan Services Branch, OSU Archives, and Cooperative Extension Service (RG 22/0-6/1) Cooperative Extension Service Reports), and of data for the Ohio legislature were found in the Ohio Library of Congress Documents.

**Instrumentation**

The researcher developed two sets of instruments to collect the research data. The first instrument consisted of an interview schedule developed by the researcher. The main purpose of the interviews was to supplement and enrich the research data gathered from the secondary sources and to document the oral history of Ohio State University Extension from 1970-1998. Each interview schedule contained two open-ended questions with the following sections: a) selected demographic characteristics, and b) selected questions regarding the interviewees' perceptions of organizational staffing and programming patterns and changes that have occurred in selected demographic factors in Ohio. Interviews were conducted with former and employed faculty at Ohio State University Extension (Appendix B). Selection was based on years of experience and administrative position or programmatic area in Ohio State University Extension programs.
Secondary Data Sources

The second instrument was used to gather secondary data from government documents. A series of tables was developed for gathering data for the indicators with their responding measures (Appendix A). These tables focused on the demographics from Extension staffing patterns, clientele served and selected demographics’ characteristics from Ohio.

Data Analysis

Transcripts of the interviews were coded and recorded on a computer disk. Means, frequencies, and percentages were used to organize and summarize the quantitative data.

Conclusions

OSU Extension Agent Staffing

The study concludes that the current OSU Extension staffing pattern is based on a traditional system of one Agriculture, Family and Consumer Sciences, and 4-H agent per county. Although Extension has changed and added new specialized agents and Community Development the fundamental staffing pattern has remained the same for the past four decades.

Facing an environment of increased demands and accountability, OSU Extension is sharpening its focus on how to staff and deliver educational programs to today’s changing environment. The findings revealed OSU Extension staffing pattern for whites and nonwhite agents in 1998 has not changed substantially since the 1970s. In 1970, three agents (less than 1%) were non-whites. In 1998, the number of non-white agents had grown to 5%. The
non-white population in Ohio increased by 24% from 1970 to 1990, while the white population decreased 1%. If indeed Extension is to mirror society, more non-whites should be recruited and hired into the OSU Extension staff.

The percentage difference between male and female representation in OSU Extension has changed by 42%. The findings revealed the recruitment, hiring, and retention of females has doubled in the years from 24% in 1970 to 44% in 1998, yet OSU Extension remains behind the state’s population growth for females in terms of the number of female agents.

OSU Extension professionals interviewed agreed that Ohio’s population has shifted from a rural to an urban majority, yet the ratio of agents to clientele is much greater in the urban counties. Cuyahoga, a selected urban county has a client to agent ratio of 200,222:1, while another selected rural county, Monroe has a client to agent ratio of 3,817:1.

OSU Extension should shift its programmatic focus from its majority rural audience to include an urban/metropolitan audience and serve a greater portion of its population. OSU Extension should redistribute its staff to more densely populated areas, so that the agent-to-clientele ratio may improve in the urban community. Multi-county agents or agents may work in a cluster, where agents are specialized in a particular field of study working across county lines.

Clientele Served

Rebirth, renewal, and rightsizing describe organizational changes occurring in the Cooperative Extension System (Harriman & Daugherty, 1992). The philosophy that existed in the 1970s of one-on-one teaching can no longer, in itself, be effective in an ever-changing society of the 21st century. If Extension is to be effective as an informal educational
organization in a diverse, rapidly changing society, it will need to create educational programs that mirror the image of the state. Diversity of audience is one area that OSU Extension can show significant improvement. In 1980, 96% of the Extension audience was white and 4% non-white. By 1997, 84% was white and 16% non-white. This change came as a result of the increased numbers in the Family and Consumer Science area that showed 32% of its audience was non-white. EFNEP, a federal program started in 1968, whose staff is primarily non-white, has as its primary objective to conduct nutrition educational programs to low-income families. The percentage is high for Family and Consumer Sciences as a result of EFNEP and participation from a new program started in the early 1990s, Food and Nutrition Program (FNP). These percentages suggest a need to recommit to diversity in Extension educational programs.

Multi-county assignments and multi-state assignments are ways OSU Extension can deliver educational information to the citizens of Ohio, utilizing agents who specialize in specific subject matter areas. Self-directed work teams have emerged in OSU Extension out of the need to enhance organizational performance and to deliver quality educational programs. There are more than 37 work teams operating within the OSU Extension system. These work teams are beneficial to Extension as they enhance staff motivation and retention, develop the organization's credibility with stakeholders, provide a larger pool of skills from which to draw statewide, allow programming on current issues, supplement but do not replace the role of the specialists, increase networking among staff members, and increase organizational self-esteem (Leholm, Hamm, Suvedi, Gary, & Poston, 1999).
Ohio Demographics

Ohio’s population is becoming more diverse. The non-white population grew 16% from 1970 to 1980 and 9% from 1980 to 1990, while the white citizen population decreased during those same time periods. Today, almost one in three Americans are non-white (Seevers, Graham, Gamon, & Conklin, 1997).

Ohio’s rural/urban population changed slightly between decades. The rural population increased 9% from 1970 to 1980, while the urban population decreased 1% during the same period. The reverse was true in the decade from 1980 to 1990 that saw the rural population drop 3% and the urban population increase 2%. The interviewees agree that OSU Extension will need to expand its presence in urban communities if its educational programs are to reach the majority of the population.

Ohio’s urban areas have a disproportionate number of citizens who are poor. The selected urban counties combined for 34% of the state’s citizens living in poverty in 1970, 40% in 1980, and 38% in 1990, while the selected rural counties had poverty levels of 8%, 5%, and 5% during that same time period.

Ohio changing demographics give OSU Extension a look into the future of programming for this new and emerging clientele. The trend toward single female head of households shows that the three Ohio urban counties had a 41% increase in single-parent head of household, which may indicate a need for programs designed around single parenthood. Another emerging demographic change is the non-English population. In 1990, the three urban counties had 465,089 non-English speaking citizens and the three rural counties had a non-English speaking population of 4,817. OSU Extension will need to design new programs to meet the demands of this new and emerging audience.
The political environment of Extension funding and programming demands that OSU Extension take a closer look at how politics in Ohio is changing. With term limitations and re-districting in the Ohio political arena, more of the legislators are elected from urban communities. Data show that the three urban counties are represented by 33% of Ohio’s 132 legislators. Since funding for Extension programming is derived from the legislature, and the majority of legislators are elected from urban communities, Extension must be able to show these legislators that their constituents are being served through Extension’s educational programs.

Interviewees agree that Extension will need to provide learning centers that download a variety of information at a greater speed and are accessible to most clientele through home computers and from computers found at public facilities such as libraries and community colleges and universities. The professional expertise needed to run these Extension learning centers will require a different set of skills than the county Extension professionals of the past. The knowledge being developed by Ohio State University and Extension must be more available and relevant for a more diverse audience. How that knowledge is disseminated could determine the future for OSU Extension.

Recommendations

The review of literature, the findings of this study, and the subsequent conclusions and implications led this researcher to several recommendations for OSU Extension administration and for further study. The following are these recommendations:

Staffing Recommendations

- Results of this study indicate that barriers such as limited knowledge of Extension programs, the image Extension portrays, the absence of
minority role models involved in Extension, and the limited amount of advertising targeted at minority populated, determines the amount of minority participation in Extension programs (Bankston, 1991). Therefore, OSU Extension should take action to identify and recruit additional non-white agents and create a more diverse OSU Extension system. Embodied in this new staffing pattern is an opportunity to better serve Ohio and develop an organization that will mirror the state demographics. OSU Extension should:

1. Advertise it's educational programs in non-white communities
2. Recruit at the 1890 and 1994 land-grant institutions
3. By 2002, 12% of Ohio State University Extension agents should be non-white

Results of this study show that the message gleaned from working with changing organizations and people, is that the future happens regardless of the attempts to slow its arrival, and that recognizing that change is a human activity helps people better prepare for the diversity of opinions, methods, and fears erupting from change (Griffin, 1996). Therefore, OSU Extension should involve its non-white staff and women in all phases of the Extension operation such as: developmental practices; career development opportunities; international, national, regional, and state assignments; and all projects that aid in advancement within the organization. To continue the same patterns will only lead to the demoralization of women and non-white staff and to the concept of the revolving-door syndrome. The National and
North Central Leadership Development (NELD) training, Future Leaders in Extension (FLEX), and whites, non-whites, males and females develop working teams to enhance diversity in Extension. Others include:

1. Increase minority participation on OSU Extension Administrative Cabinet to provide role-models for current and potential agents
2. Hire more non-white agents in decision-making roles within OSU Extension

Programming Recommendations

- Indicators from this study and other research propose that little has changed in the kind of audiences that OSU Extension serves (McLellan, 1998). Therefore, OSU Extension should focus on a more regional Extension structure and approach in the development and delivery of quality educational programs to all segments of Ohio’s population, thus, increasing the potential to reach a broader clientele. Example include:

1. Metropolitan areas not county structure should be the focus
2. Specialization should be embraced as a method to deliver programs
3. Multi-county approaches may be used to strengthen diversity

- The demographics in this study show the rapid changes occurring in society and a need for organizations to address these needs. Therefore OSU Extension should utilize state demographics to access current trends
for program development. This can be accomplish by making better use of the OSU Extension data center.

Strategies as related to the finding signify that organizational strategies must be matched with both environmental conditions and appropriate organizational structures, and failure to achieve this alignment will result in low performance levels and even organizational failure (Venkatraman & Prescott, 1990). Therefore, OSU Extension should utilize trend studies when developing short and long-term strategic plans to determine educational opportunities as a result of changing Ohio demographics. Example include:

1. Trends in rural and urban populations
2. Single-parent households
3. Poverty levels
4. Number of person involved in farming

Data for this study on OSU Extension was difficult to find. Extension historical data was stored in several locations; Ohio State University Archive, US Department of Agriculture, OSU Agriculture Library, Ohio State University Human Resource office, and Extension Human Resource Office. Therefore, OSU Extension should actively seek an historian in order to keep Extension historical record in one location.
Recommendations for further study:

1. A study commissioned by the Committee on Personnel and Organization Development (PODC) showed the trends for clientele needs are changing demographics, economy, local responsiveness, program flexible, more mandated programs, and more programs with state and county influences. Therefore, this study should be replicated with other states’ Extension programs to make comparisons among states. These comparisons will enable OSU Extension to determine if programs and activities are on target for staffing agents and delivering educational programs to meet the needs of all Extension clientele and assess the readiness of OSU Extension to effectively manage changing demographics.

2. The Extension agent is a vital link to the success of the Cooperative Extension Service. The Extension process is dependent upon the Extension agent, who is the critical element in most Extension functions. Therefore, a comprehensive study of the entire OSU Extension Service to determine agents’ perception as to whether Extension has changed as society has changed should be conducted. This broader study should include a larger sample of counties, counties that are categorized as small, medium, and large to better predict if OSU Extension is changing as society change.

3. A study should be conducted to determine why non-white professionals who have the credentials may not consider OSU Extension as a possible career
option for an Extension position or why the organization has difficulty recruiting and retaining minority professionals. Such studies will help OSU Extension determine and remove barriers to non-white participation in administrative and agent roles.
APPENDIX A

LIST OF OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION PERSONNEL INTERVIEWED
List of Ohio State University Extension Personnel (Presence and Retired)

Interviewed

* Dr. Keith Smith, Director Ohio State University Extension
* Dr. Jo Jones, Learning and Leadership, Employee Development, Ohio State University Extension
* Dr. Nikki Conklin, Team Leader, Learning and Leadership, Employee Development, and Network Staff Development, Ohio State University Extension
* Dr. John Rohrer, Assistant Director, Ohio State University Extension
* Dr. Juanita Miller, State Specialist, Limited Resource Audience Ohio State University Extension
* Richard Martin, Northwest District Director, Ohio State University Extension
* June Ewing, EFNEP Supervisor, Ohio State University Extension, Mahoning County
* Norm Moll, County Chair, Ohio State University Extension, Lucas County
* John Stitzlein, Former State Leader of Personnel, Ohio State University Extension
APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE
September 15, 1999

Dear:

I am conducting a study entitled "Staffing and Programming Patterns in Ohio State University Extension: 1970s - 1990s." This is my dissertation research at Ohio State University.

This study is designed to describe changes in Extension staffing patterns and delivery methods and compare these changes with selected characteristics with Ohio demographic. The results should provide opportunities for Extension to better serve Ohio citizens and determine better utilization of staff and program delivery methods.

As a current member of Ohio State University Extension faculty I feel that conducting and utilizing research is essential for individual improvement and program development. Research will enable Extension to remain a vital Ohio Educational program.

To complete my study, I am soliciting information on the oral history of Extension in Ohio. I would like to conduct an interview with you on your knowledge of Ohio Extension staffing patterns and program delivery methods. Your input is essential to the success of this study.

I realize that this is a busy time for you in Extension. However, the interview will take you 20 minutes to complete.

Thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Calvin Walker

District Extension Specialist - Urban Programs
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