THE ROLE OF THE LAND-GRANT INSTITUTION IN RESPONDING TO YOUTH AT RISK ISSUES AS PERCEIVED BY SELECTED UNIVERSITY AND COOPERATIVE EXTENSION FACULTY, STAFF, AND ADMINISTRATORS OF OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

By

JAMES ANDREW RUTLEDGE

Bachelor of Science
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, Wisconsin
1969

Master of Science
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, Wisconsin
1975

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
December 1989

THE ROLE OF THE LAND-GRANT INSTITUTION IN RESPONDING TO YOUTH AT RISK ISSUES AS PERCEIVED BY SELECTED UNIVERSITY AND COOPERATIVE EXTENSION FACULTY, STAFF, AND ADMINISTRATORS OF OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Thesis Approved:

James P. Key
Thesis Advisor

Paul Garwicki

James D. Fotherton

Robert Terry

Ronald M. Hirschein

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to each one of the Oklahoma State University faculty, staff and administrators who cooperated and participated in this study. Without their interest in the children and youth of Oklahoma, this study would not have been possible.

I am very appreciative of my graduate committee, for their guidance, encouragement, and support. Thank you Dr. Key, Dr. Terry, Dr. Czarniecki, Dr. Netherton, and Dr. Hirschlein. Jim, I appreciate all the hours you put into being my committee chairman and thesis advisor. Bob, I appreciate your admonition that I would survive like many before me. Your encouragement to look at a bigger picture was appreciated, Jim. Beulah, I appreciate your attention to detail. Paul, thanks for reminding me daily that this was all for a good reason.

The encouragement and support of my 4-H colleagues, in Oklahoma and throughout the rest of the country, has meant a great deal to me. It was great to know that others believed I could do it, and that they expected me to finish it. Special thanks naturally goes to all my office colleagues and the support staff in Stillwater, Oklahoma. Your understanding, cooperation and support will long be remembered.

I also want to express my appreciation to the many 4-H volunteers, Extension staff, Extension administrators, friends at First Christian Church, and other graduate students that provided encouragement during the six years that I have labored in this process.

Thank you to Mom and Dad, brothers and sister, and all the rest of the family that have offered encouragement. The power of the love of one's family cannot be underestimated.

Most important of all, to my wife, Kathy, and to my sons, Ken, Scott, and Paul, I can only say, I'm sorry this has taken so much of my time for so long. I love you for the patience you have had and the support and encouragement you have shown. Without you there would be no reason for me to want to better myself or to strive to be a better youth development professional. This work is dedicated to you in the belief that through education, we can make the world a better place to live.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	5
	Purpose of the Study	6
	Objectives of the Study	6
	Assumptions of the Study	7
	Scope and Limitations of the Study	7
	Definitions	8
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
	The Land-grant Mission and Its Meaning	12
	Cooperative Extension/4-H & Youth Development Programs	16
	Youth At Risk	21
	Related Studies	29
	Research Methodology	32
	Case Study	32
	Descriptive Research	34
	Data Collection Methods	35
	Mixed Design	38
	Summary	39
III.	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	41
	Research Methodology	42
	Selection of the Population and Sample	42
	University Administrators	43
	Extension Administrators	44
	Campus Faculty and Staff	45
	Extension 4-H Staff	46
	Developing Data Collection Procedures	49
	Analysis of the Data	54
IV.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	58
	Introduction	58
	Characteristics of the Respondents	59
	Responses to Specific Questions	64
	Seriousness of Youth At Risk Issues	65
	Appropriateness of Higher Education Involvement in Youth At Risk Issues	85

Chapter Page

Funding Options for Youth At Risk Programs 105
Responses to Open-ended Questions 115
Leadership for Program Development . . 117
Current Programs 119
What Should the Land-grant University Do 120
What Challenges Will the Land-grant University Face 125
Other Remarks 128
Summary 131
Awareness of the 4-H Program 131
Respondent's Reactions to Data Collection . 136

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 139

Summary of the Study 139
Purpose of the Study 139
Objectives of the Study 140
Design of the Study 141
Major Findings of the Study 143
Conclusions 153
Recommendations 156
Recommendations for Additional Research 158

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 160

APPENDIXES 166

APPENDIX A - THIS IS 4-H 167

APPENDIX B - IDENTIFYING YOUTH AT RISK CONTACTS . 169

APPENDIX C - LISTS OF FACULTY, STAFF AND ADMINISTRATORS INCLUDED IN POPULATIONS AND SAMPLES 172

APPENDIX D - ADVANCE LETTER AND TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SCHEDULES 176

APPENDIX E - SUMMARY OF CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR YEARS OF INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATION OR ASSOCIATION WITH OSU AND RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS RELATED TO YOUTH AT RISK 194

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Distribution of Counties with 4-H Agents by Population Categories	47
2.	Calculation of Proportionate Sets for 4-H Staff Sample	48
3.	Distribution of Participants by Professional Position	60
4.	Distribution of Participants by College Affiliation or Assignment	61
5.	Years of Involvement in Education by Professional Position	62
6.	Years of Assocation with Oklahoma State University by Professional Posisiton	63
7.	Ranks, Means and Standard Deviations for Seriousness of Youth At Risk Issues by Professional Position	66
8.	Perceived Seriousness of Youth At Risk Issue of "Teenage Sexuality and Pregnancy" by Professional Position	68
9.	Perceived Seriousness of Youth At Risk Issue of "Abuse of Drugs and Alcohol" by Professional Position	70
10.	Perceived Seriousness of Youth At Risk Issue of "School Dropouts and Illiteracy" by Professional Position	71
11.	Perceived Seriousness of Youth At Risk Issue of "Lack of Personal Values and Self Esteem" by Professional Position	73
12.	Percieved Seriousness of Youth At Risk Issue of "Poor Job Preparation" by Professional Position	75

Table Page

13. Perceived Seriousness of Youth At Risk Issue of "Lack of Citizenship and Leadership Skills" by Professional Position 76

14. Percieved Seriousness of Youth At Risk Issue of "Poor Nutrition and Fitness" by Professional Position 78

15. Perceived Seriousness of Youth At Risk Issue of "Juvenile Delinquency" by Professional Position 79

16. Percieved Seriousness of Youth At Risk Issue of "Depression and Suicide" by Professional Position 81

17. Additional Youth At Risk Factors Listed by Respondents 83

18. Perceptions of the Appropriateness of Higher Education's Involvement with Youth At Risk Issues 86

19. Ranks, Means and Standard Deviations for Appropriateness of Actions in Response To Youth At Risk Issues by Professional Position 88

20. Perceived Appropriateness of Actions in Response to Youth At Risk: "Coalitions to Develop Programs" by Professional Position 90

21. Perceived Appropriateness of Actions in Response to Youth At Risk: "Develop Instructional Programs" by Professional Position 92

22. Perceived Appropriateness of Actions in Response to Youth At Risk: "Develop Research" by Professional Position 93

23. Perceived Appropriateness of Actions in Response to Youth At Risk: "Develop Short Tern Task Forces" by Professional Position 95

24. Perceived Appropriateness of Actions in Response to Youth At Risk: "Develop Public Service Network" by Professional Position 96

25. Perceived Appropriateness of Actions in Response to Youth At Risk: "Respondent to be Personally Involved" by Professional Position 98

Table Page

26. Perceived Appropriateness of Actions in Response to Youth At Risk: "Develop Degree Programs for Youth Development by Professional Position . . 99

27. Perceived Appropriateness of Actions in Response to Youth At Risk: "Designate One Department to Coordinate Progrms" by Professional Position . 101

28. Perceived Appropriateness of Actions in Response to Youth At Risk: "Create a Center for Youth Development" by Professional Position 103

29. Ranks, Means and Standard Deviations for Perceived Likelihood of Youth At Risk Funding Sources by Professional Position . . . 106

30. Percieved Likelihood of Youth At Risk Funding Source: "Private Foundation Grants Made to the University" by Professional Position . . . 107

31. Percieved Likelihood of Youth At Risk Funding Source: "Federal Government Appropriations or Grants" by Professional Position 109

32. Percieved Likelihood of Youth At Risk Funding Source: "State Government Appropriations or Grants" by Professional Position 110

33. Percieved Likelihood of Youth At Risk Funding Source: "User Fees Paid by Organizations or Individuals" by Professional Position 111

34. Percieved Likelihood of Youth At Risk Funding Source: "Reallocation of Existing Funds" by Professional Position 113

35. Percieved Likelihood of Youth At Risk Funding Source: "Existing Budgets" by Professional Position 114

36. Percieved Likelihood that Youth At Risk Programs Will Be Developed Without New Funds by Professional Position 116

37. Administrative and Faculty Awareness of 4-H Programs: "Have You Heard of the 4-H Program?" 132

38. Administrative and Faculty Awareness of 4-H Programs: "Is 4-H Affiliated With OSU?" . . . 133

Table Page

39. Administrative and Faculty Awareness of 4-H Programs: Correctly Identified Where 4-H Is Affiliated at OSU 134

40. Administrative and Faculty Awareness of 4-H Programs: "Aware of 4-H Youth At Risk Programs" 135

41. Numbers of Calls and Lengths of Calls by Professional Position 138

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The land-grant institutions were originally conceived to give the American people an opportunity for a better life through access to the research and resources of universities. As the institutions matured, the Experiment Stations and Extension Services were added to the formal structure of the land-grant system. The ultimate mission of land-grant institutions was three fold: instruction, research, and service. Caldwell (1976), in Heritage Horizons, Extension's Commitment To People, summarizes the essence of the land-grant universities this way.

> The land-grant universities are knowledge centers - generating, testing, analyzing, transmitting, packaging, and dreaming of new possibilities for knowledge, pure and applied, scientific and humanistic - all of it, to advance the human condition. (p. 14-15)

This view emphasized that the end goal of the land-grant system was the improvement of the quality of life for mankind. Since 1914, when the Smith-Lever Act created it, the Cooperative Extension Service has been viewed as providing the primary service function to "extend" the research and knowledge of land-grant institutions to the people.

Up to the beginning of the United States involvement in World War I, it was the rural areas that were considered to be most economically depressed and the rural people were the one's considered to need the most help. At the time of the Smith-Lever Act, it was appropriate for the USDA and the land-grant colleges to design a program to continue focusing on the needs of the rural communities. As the Cooperative Extension Service was created to perform the primary service function of the land-grant university, it seemed appropriate to focus on agricultural and home-related programs.

Prior to 1914, agricultural educators had already learned that one good way to influence farm families' practices in crop production and home canning was through educational programs and contests for boys and girls. Thus, youth work was one of the original programs of the Cooperative Extension Service (Wessels & Wessels, 1982).

As the 4-H and Youth Development Program evolved as part of the Cooperative Extension Service within the land-grant system, it remained close to its agricultural roots. Many new programs were developed to meet the needs of non-rural boys and girls, but the resource base of the program remained almost entirely within the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics. As society became more urban, the needs of local communities changed. The ability of the land-grant system and its Cooperative Extension 4-H Program to meet the contemporary needs of youth and families was challenged.

Norman Brown (1987), President of W. K. Kellogg Foundation raised this question: "are ... land-grant universities today willing to make the commitment necessary to help the people of this nation solve their problems?" (p. 2). He went on to say that he believed the land-grant universities could "make a significant and lasting contribution to solving this nation's youth crisis" (p. 2). Further he said: "I happen to believe that there is no more important problem that we as a society need to solve" (p. 2).

In addition, the leaders of land-grant institutions and Cooperative Extension expressed similar concerns related to whether or not their institutions had the capability or the desire to respond to the contemporary needs of youth and families. Land-grant university presidents expressed concern that the 4-H program was too limited in its program delivery modes and further that it was no longer accessing the most needed resources within the land-grant system (G. A. Shrum, personal interview, July 7, 1988). However, at most land-grant universities, the Cooperative Extension's youth development program is still the primary delivery mode for programs designed for pre-college age youth.

Leaders within Extension and 4-H were torn between their traditional program, and what were perceived to be the critical needs of society. In 1987, when the Cooperative Extension System developed a list of "National Initiatives" (Cooperative Extension, 1988), there were eight initiatives,

not including anything that focused directly on "youth at risk." It was several months later when the ninth initiative on "Youth At Risk" was added to the list.

Even among Extension personnel, there remain many questions about the definition of "youth at risk", and how Extension should respond. The September 1988 "Update" for "Youth At Risk" programs made it clear why the Cooperative Extension Service should be involved when it made the following statement: "All youth are at risk of not growing into productive adulthood;...Extension education programs ... are called upon to examine efforts in light of the trends." (Irby & O'Brien, 1988) This official Extension document clearly stated that it was the responsibility of the Extension system to become involved in "youth at risk" programs because all youth are at-risk.

A 1988 study, which was commissioned by the Oklahoma State Legislature, pointed out that neither Oklahoma State University nor Cooperative Extension were perceived as being involved in dealing with children and families in Oklahoma. In the final report on "A Comprehensive Study of State and State-Supported Services To Children and Families in Oklahoma" (Price Waterhouse, 1988), there was only one brief mention of either OSU or Extension. In the section describing children and family services in Oklahoma, under "Other Organizations" the following statement was included:

> Through the Department of Agriculture, Federal funds are provided to State land grant

> institutions. Oklahoma State University is one such recipient. A combination of Federal, State and local funding is used via its Extension Services Division to provide various kinds of community services throughout the 77 Oklahoma Counties including home visiting for at-risk families (III-12).

Throughout the remainder of the several hundred pages of the two volume report, there was no other mention of the Extension Program or the services it provides for children and families in Oklahoma. The report was compiled after six months of study and visitations with citizens and agency personnel from all over Oklahoma. The fact that a number of excellent University and Extension programs which provide services to children and families were not cited anywhere in the study points out that Oklahoma State University was not perceived to be involved in dealing with "youth at risk" issues.

Statement of the Problem

For the land-grant university and the 4-H Youth Development Program to move ahead with a more contemporary youth development program, it will be necessary to learn how the faculty, staff, and administration of the land-grant university perceive youth development and how they perceive their institution being involved in responding to contemporary needs of youth and families. Until the institution understands its own perceptions, it will be difficult to impact on the general public's perceptions, or to provide viable services through the resources of the University.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to develop an understanding of faculty, staff, and administration perceptions related to youth development programs and how the University might provide services to respond to "youth at risk" issues. That understanding would provide valuable insight to those faculty and staff who are expected to conduct 4-H and Youth Development Programs to meet the contemporary needs of Oklahoma youth.

Objectives of the Study

In order to give more direction to the study, the following specific objectives were developed:

1. To identify and compare the perceptions of University administrators, Extension administrators, campus faculty and staff, and Extension 4-H staff with regard to:
    a. the seriousness of current youth related issues.
    b. whether "youth at risk" issues should be a concern of the University.
    c. how the University might respond to the need for "youth at risk" programs.
    d. ways youth development programs might be funded.
2. To identify faculty, staff, and administration perceptions of specific actions that might be taken to develop a land-grant youth development program that would meet the contemporary needs of youth.

3. To identify faculty, staff, and administration perceptions of specific problems or challenges that might be faced in the development of a land-grant youth development program that would meet the contemporary needs of youth.

4. To determine levels of awareness of 4-H as a youth development program by University administrators and campus faculty and staff.

Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions were made in conducting this study:

1. That the telephone interview method provided sufficiently objective data for the study.

2. That the responses of faculty and staff indicated their honest expressions of their perceptions and ideas.

3. That espoused perceptions and ideas were directly and positively related to the way respondents would act when opportunities arise.

4. That the results of the study would apply to the situation at Oklahoma State University for the near future.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The researcher realized and recognized the following limits to the scope of the study.

1. Because the study was conducted entirely at Oklahoma State University, the results of the study should not be generalized to apply to other land-grant institutions

or universities without further study.

2. Because of the limited number of individuals involved in the study, it is possible for the average perceptions of any group to change rapidly as the individuals assigned to the group change.

3. Because the survey methodology did not include a large sample, there was a greater possibility for error in generalizing from the data.

4. Because of the interview method, there was more possibility of researcher bias from the interpretation of the open-ended question portion of the interview schedule. This was further compounded by the use of a single interviewer rather than a pool of interviewers.

Definitions

The following definitions are furnished to provide clear and concise meanings to the terms used in this study.

1. Cooperative Extension Service: The organization was created by the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. Extension is cooperatively supported by a partnership between the United States Department of Agriculture, the land-grant institutions of each state, and local county governments. The Cooperative Extension Service exists nation-wide, but the scope of this study is limited to Oklahoma, unless otherwise noted. The terms "Extension Service", "Extension" and "CES" will also be used and are to be thought of as synonymous with the defined term. Some campus faculty and

staff may be associated with University Extension, but these programs are not included in this definition of Extension.

2. 4-H and Youth Development Programs: The term relates to those programs conducted by the Cooperative Extension Service for youth ages 9 through 19. The terms "Extension 4-H", "Extension youth work", and "4-H" will also be used and are to be thought of as synonymous with the defined term.

3. Youth At Risk Issues and Youth Development: "Youth At Risk" is a phrase that is in popular use by many who want to focus attention on current youth problems which may affect a young person's ability to grow into productive adulthood. Youth development programs are developmental programs which are intended to help young people develop to their own fullest potential. Some people will argue that not all youth programming is related to "youth at risk" issues. However, others argue that "All youth are at risk of not growing into productive adulthood" (Irby & O'Brien, 1988, p. 1) and therefore, any developmental program for youth is aimed in some way at "youth at risk" issues. For the purpose of this paper, "youth at risk" programs and youth development programs are considered to be the same thing.

4. Faculty: The term faculty includes teaching, research, and Extension employees who are on campus, regardless of their academic rank.

5. Staff: The term staff is used to describe

professional staff that are not on the "faculty" or "rank and tenure" track. The staff group in this study is made up primarily of county and district Extension staff, and a limited number of campus professional staff. University clerical and support staff are not included in the study; they are, therefore, not included in this definition.

6. Administration: The term administration includes those individuals who have administrative responsibility for personnel or budgets, plus the Oklahoma State University Board of Regents. While it is recognized that regents do not function as administrative officers of the university, their role in setting policy is used to justify their inclusion in this category of respondents.

7. Perception: The term related to becoming aware of objects or conditions around us. For the purpose of this study, the term includes a certain level of comprehension and understanding of the ideas or concepts being discussed.

8. Awareness: The term implies having knowledge of something through alertness to observing or interpreting what one sees, hears, feels or does.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter presents a review of some of the background information that was studied in preparation for research and led to the question: Should a land-grant university be concerned about youth development for boys and girls that are younger than college age? The review looks at background information related to the history of land-grant institutions, Cooperative Extension, and 4-H and Youth Development Programs. It also looks at the contemporary situation regarding "youth at risk." Finally, this review looks at related studies and background for the mixed study design which was employed.

There are plenty of materials available on the history, mission and philosophy of the land-grant institution. Unfortunately, in the area of this study, there were very few references related to the land-grant institution's capacity for, or interest in, conducting youth development or "youth at risk" programs. Library searches were conducted with the aid of card catalogs, OSU Library "Infotrac", ERIC CD Rom, and AGRICOLA CD Rom programs.

The review of literature was broken down into the following sections:

1. The Land-grant Mission and Its Meaning
2. Cooperative Extension/4-H & Youth Development Programs
3. Youth At Risk
4. Related Studies
5. Case Study and Survey Research Design
6. Summary

The Land-grant Mission and Its Meaning

The Morrill Land-grant College Act of 1862 is considered by many to be one of the most important contributions to the current prosperity of the United States. The Land-grant Act created a system of colleges in every state, with the purpose of providing education to the common man (Bliss, 1952; Sanders 1966). Each state that accepted the grant of land was required to meet certain conditions set forth here:

> ..the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and learning in military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and mechanical arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life. (Caldwell, 1976 p. 12)

The focus of the early land-grant college was on "the practical view that knowledge should be applied to improve the human condition" (Caldwell p. 13).

Caldwell (1976) explained how the land-grant philosophy

matured into what is now known as the three-part mission of the land-grant system of institutions.

> In due course and inevitably, their faculties undertook research, which was given a great new thrust by the 1887 Hatch Act establishing the agricultural experiment stations. Also inevitably, the philosophy that knowledge should be made available for useful purposes required that it be deliberately transmitted to people who needed it in their current lives. Hence, "extension". (p. 14)

Thus as the land-grant philosophy matured, it was natural for the Hatch Act to create the Experiment Stations and eventually, the Smith-Lever Act to create the Cooperative Extension Service.

Caul and Miller (1976) in Heritage Horizons - Extension's Commitment to People, said:

> The Extension Service became the third and youngest partner in the land-grant university triad of teaching, research, and extension. It remains. It has grown. It has taken on new dimensions. But it's firmly established as an integral member of the interdependent team in all 50 states. (p. 26.)

At many land-grant colleges and universities, the extension effort remained almost entirely within the Cooperative Extension Service as created by the Smith-Lever Act. In other institutions, other extension services were developed to extend the resources of colleges and departments outside of agricultural and home economics programs. In a few institutions, the efforts of all extension-type programs were combined, thus providing the citizens of the particular state with access to a broad spectrum of the university's resources. Shannon and

Schoenfeld (1965) in their book University Extension, talk about University Extension as:

> ...an institutional state of mind which views the university not as a place but as an instrument. Translated into an operational philosophy, extension asks a community of scholars to make itself as useful as possible to the whole of society, or at least to the community from which the institution draws its inspiration and support (p. 2)

Down through history, some of our most well-known Presidents have also been the champions of the movements which have become the land-grant institutions. Thomas Jefferson is well known to have promoted the idea of agricultural training schools, and education for the common man as a way to preserve the young democracy. Abraham Lincoln supported and signed into law the original land-grant act. Theodore Roosevelt encouraged the development of the "Wisconsin Idea" of University Extension which pre-dated the Smith-Lever Act by several years (Shannon and Schoenfeld, p. 13-14).

It is clear that from the beginning, the land-grant system was intended to provide for the needs of the society, in relation to their daily lives. Not at the expense of a liberal education, but to the enrichment of the quality of life throughout the country.

Some leaders of the land-grant system have continued to be concerned about how their institutions could meet the contemporary needs of youth and families. In 1987, University of Nebraska President, Dr. Ronald W. Roskens

addressed a National Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) Staff Development workshop for State 4-H Program Leaders and challenged them to expand their thinking. He suggested that the entire land-grant philosophy be revisited and that the universities' outreach program might need to be redesigned in order to meet the needs of today's youth and their communities. He suggested that "pressure has to be brought to bear within all of our land-grant institutions to engage faculties in all fields to think external" (p. 3).

Frank H. T. Rhodes, President of Cornell University and Chairman of the American Council on Education, in an address to the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges encouraged the re-evaluation of the land grant mission and addressed three challenges: "the recruitment and retention of minority students; the responsiveness of higher education to pressing national needs; and, finally, the substance and style of undergraduate education, which I fear may have fallen away from the ideal of balanced liberal and practical education" (1987, p. 2)

Both of these land-grant presidents have raised questions about how the land-grant system will continue to fulfill its original mission of serving the general society with practical information to meet their contemporary needs.

Cooperative Extension/4-H and Youth Development Programs

Even before the formal Cooperative Extension program, there were numerous programs for boys and girls to learn the practical arts of agriculture and home economics. In 1914, the growing interest in boys and girls club work came under the official support of the Cooperative Extension Service. Debate of the Smith-Lever Act made it clear that "the law was intended to benefit boys and girl's club work" (Bliss, 1952 p. 6.). From the very beginning, the purpose of the boys and girl's club program was to improve the quality of life in the rural communities by teaching young people skills that would help their families, specifically crop production and home canning (Boyce, 1988; Reck, 1951).

Down through the years, the actual projects changed as technology and interests changed, but the purpose of the program continued to be improvement in the quality of life in the family and community. Over the years there have been many struggles as 4-H and Extension youth development programs have faced ever changing situations. The year that Extension youth programs came under the formal organizational structure of the Cooperative Extension Service was the same year that America joined World War I. Rather than being defeated by the nation's pre-occupation with the war effort, 4-H joined the effort and prospered. Through World War II, the Extension and 4-H programs were

instrumental in improving the quality of life in rural America. However, after World War II, the American society changed, and 4-H was faced with major decisions about its future. By the early 1960's, there was growing pressure for 4-H to move into urban programming. Many traditional clientele and leaders thought urban 4-H would be the end of the program. It was not. In 1982, over half the total membership of 4-H was from urban and suburban populations (Wessel & Wessel).

In the concluding paragraph of the latest 4-H history to be published, the authors of 4-H: An American Idea 1900 - 1980, summarized the ongoing challenge of the 4-H program this way:

> Throughout its eighty years, 4-H has defined itself to each new generation. The dynamics of the organization have been maintained by change and by a sense of continuity. But as professionals and volunteers have discovered and undoubtedly will need to rediscover in the future, it is not the structure, but the sense of educational purpose that creates the essence of the 4-H experience. (Wessel & Wessel, 1982 p. 320)

Over the years the 4-H mission has remained basically the same. The style and wording have changed to reflect the changing times, but the goals of the organization have remained constant. In June of 1981, Eugene "Pete" Williams, then Deputy Administrator for Cooperative Extension 4-H Programs gained ECOP approval for a statement that would accurately represent the consensus about 4-H. The full text of the statement is included in Appendix A. The condensed mission statement most commonly quoted today is:

> The mission of 4-H is to assist youth in acquiring knowledge, developing life skills, and forming attitudes that will enable them to become self-directing, productive and contributing members of society. (Wessel & Wessel, 1982 p. 331)

4-H has remained alive and has grown throughout its history of over 80 years. However, critics from within and outside alike have challenged Extension youth programs and 4-H to progress even farther towards meeting the contemporary needs of youth and families. For over twenty years, official Extension reports have encouraged the 4-H and Youth Development Program to progress towards a broader mission.

Following are excerpts from several of these reports and documents. Each of these publications in one form or another, encouraged the 4-H organization to get more contemporary; to look at the needs of youth today; and to make better use of university resources, even if they were outside of the traditional departments in agriculture and home economics.

A People and a Spirit (USDA/NASULGC, 1968) said:

> ...additional strength is needed in social and behavioral sciences. Specialists in subject matter fields such as sociology, psychology, health education, and educational media are required. (p. 64.)
>
> University-wide Support. To achieve the objectives outlined, Extension will need to be organized at the university level to obtain use of needed competencies in many disciplines (p. 65)
>
> The Joint Study Committee recommends that a goal of Cooperative Extension be to achieve the role of the local point of contact between the public and the entire land-grant university. (p. 81)

4-H in Century III (ECOP, 1976) said:

> All staff responsible for the 4-H program should make increased efforts to inform and solicit assistance from administrative and supervisory staff, subject matter specialists and other university personnel where appropriate inputs can be made by them to strengthen the 4-H program. (p. 6)

In 1983, the 4-H National Needs Assessment, said:

> The 4-H program must receive subject-matter educational support from disciplines that are a part of all Cooperative Extension programs and from some disciplines in other parts of the university. (p. 11)

Extension In The 80's, A perspective for the Future of the Cooperative Extension Service, continued to express concerns about the 4-H program's audience, university-wide support, and visibility. The report called for "increased program support from disciplines within the land-grant universities" (ECOP, 1983 p. 13). Among the formal recommendations were these two:

> ...that youth in rural and urban areas have access to Extension 4-H programs, regardless of the economic status of such youth. (p. 13)

> ...4-H must become more visible to a larger segment of the population. Traditionally, Cooperative Extension has not taken enough credit for the impact the 40 million 4-H alumni have had on our society. (p. 14)

In 1986, the language related to drawing on the entire resources of the university became more direct. In 4-H: Future Focus, four building blocks were outlined. The third block was to "Strengthen and expand relationships in the land grant system" (1986, p. 3).

Extension In Transition: Bridging the Gap Between

Vision and Reality (ECOP, 1987), one of the latest documents prepared for the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy,(ECOP) continued to challenge the system to gain broader access to the total land-grant universities' resources in order to provide better service to a broader clientele. One of the youth related recommendations was as follows:

> The youth emphasis in Extension should include and go beyond the traditional 4-H club and activity groups.
>
> The Extension System should:
>
> - Design program development and research-utilization structures in an anticipatory/strategic planning framework that places a major emphasis on developmental needs and issues facing the youth population and their care givers.
> - Actively contract for delivery of issue-oriented educational programs with other agencies within federal, state, and local governments (e.g., Extension youth programs are now and could be even more highly effective in addressing adolescent health, nutrition, pregnancy, suicide, and juvenile justice issues). (ECOP, 1987 p. 19)

It is clear that for over twenty years, Extension and its 4-H and Youth Development Programs have been encouraged to move towards the use of greater university resources to serve a broader base of clientele in order to fulfill their mission to improve the quality of life in America. However, during the time that many sources were saying that 4-H should be expanding its mission and its resource base, the 4-H program's share of Extension's public support was getting smaller (Warner & Christenson, 1984).

During recent years, the contemporary needs of youth

were addressed by the National Extension Initiatives and several speakers at National 4-H Staff Development and Training Workshops (Cooperative Extension System, 1988; Jarratt, 1987; Morrison, 1987). The 1987 national workshop for State 4-H Leaders was "Youth Development Education: A Societal Issue" and the 1988 workshop was "Cooperative Extension Service and The Land Grant University System: New Dimensions in Youth Development Education"

Cooperative Extension and 4-H faculty and staff were aware of the growing concern over current youth problems. The topic was being discussed at a variety of levels within the land-grant system and the Cooperative Extension System. However, up to this point there have been few changes in the way land-grant institutions are dealing with the contemporary needs of youth.

Youth At Risk

With the publishing of A Nation At Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1984), a variety of agencies and organizations intensified efforts to look at the future and how it would be impacted by the current issues affecting children and youth. Through the wide spread publicity from A Nation At Risk, the American public became aware that serious problems existed in the educational system. Indicators of risk included such facts as "23 million American adults are functionally illiterate" and "average achievement of high school students on most

standardized tests is now lower than 26 years ago when Sputnik was launched" (p. 8).

In 1986, the National Alliance of Business hosted a conference to focus on the issues facing today's youth. The National Alliance of Business's interest in "youth at risk" was explained in the preface to their report, Youth: 2000, A Call to Action.

> While it may appear that many issues discussed in the meeting - among them illiteracy, school dropouts, teen pregnancy, substance abuse, - are outside the preview of the National Alliance of Business - they are, in fact, central to the issue of youth employment and overall employability. The Alliance is vitally interested in economic, social, and educational issues which affect employability, workforce preparation, and national productivity. We believe that a failure to confront these issues will ultimately threaten our world leadership, our economic competitiveness, even our national security. (p. 1)

For the past twenty years a Gallup poll has been conducted to determine the public's attitudes towards public schools. In the 1988 poll (Gallup & Elam), when people were asked about the biggest problems with which public schools must deal, the highest percentage said "use of drugs" and the second highest percentage said "lack of discipline." When respondents were asked "How much confidence do you have in your local public schools to deal with drug abuse?", 47 percent said either "not very much" or "none at all." When asked a similar question about alcohol abuse, the percent responding with the same two answers was again 47. Public schools were clearly not perceived to be prepared to deal with what the public felt were the most serious problems.

In a May 1988 article, in the NASSP Bulletin, "Hard Times for American Youth" pointed out that there have been many programs developed to help solve the problems of "youth at risk." They state that:

> These programs deal with recreation, drug and alcohol abuse, job training, delinquency and juvenile justice services, nutrition, runaway assistance, public health, pregnancy prevention, among others. By one count, there are now more than 260 programs administered by 20 federal government agencies whose primary mission is to benefit youngsters. Furthermore, money available to research the problems of youth expanded at an unprecedented rate between 1960 and 1980. (Uhlenberg and Eggenbeen, p. 49)

However, the existence of a multitude of programs does not always mean progress. Reingold, in "An Insider's Look at Federal Youth Programs", paints a different picture. She asserted that the efforts of the five cabinet level departments which conducted most of the youth related programs lacked coordination. After studying the federal youth programs in the Departments of Health and Human Services, Education, Justice, Labor, and Defense, she offered this observation: "There is a lack of real coordination within agencies regarding programs that relate to youth." (1987, p. 34) She went on to say that within many of the agencies it was hard to find people who were knowledgeable about their own agencies' programs for youth. The situation was similar with regard to coordination between federal agencies as noted in this statement: "The total amount of interagency coordination and cooperation, in terms of resources, is extremely small" (p. 34). In her

final observation she said, "there is no coordinated, comprehensive, long term, national action agenda consolidating and devoting federal resources toward youth." (p. 35)

Upon reviewing some of Reingold's findings, Anne C. Lewis (1987), wrote in the Phi Delta Kappan, that the Department of Education should be renamed and reorganized into the Department of Children, Youth, and Education. This would allow for more coordination of resources and program development.

It should be noted that the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Extension Service were not mentioned in any of the articles, and apparently were not considered major contributors to services for youth.

As for the federal government itself, the 100th Congress's Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families has addressed some of the issues. Under the chairmanship of Representative George Miller of California, the committee became extremely active in holding hearings all over the country to assess the current situation related to many problems included in discussions of youth at risk. The proceedings of various hearings provided volumes of documentation that many institutions, organizations, and individuals are deeply concerned with the declining state of affairs where children and youth are concerned. At the hearing on "Infancy to Adolescence: Opportunities For Success", referring to upcoming testimony, Miller

summarized the challenge this way:

> Their testimony will add measurably to what we know from research about the type of preventive interventions that are most successful. But there are other questions that research alone cannot answer - questions of resources, of implementation, of access and of equity. These are questions that reflect how much we are willing to apply our knowledge to benefit all children and families - questions that we as policymakers must answer ourselves. (p. 2)

It was clear that as the problems of youth became the economic problems of the nation, it was not only the youth who were at risk, but the nation that was at risk. A variety of organizations and institutions expressed concerns about "youth at risk" issues. So far as this researcher can determine, the land-grant university system has not developed any type of system response.

As one reviewed the literature, there were many examples of individual research efforts aimed at specific problems such as drug abuse, AIDS, teen pregnancy, and drop-outs. However, there were very few indications that any coordinated efforts had been developed to encourage or support campus or system coalitions for the purpose of making a concerted effort to solve some of the contemporary problems of youth. Just as the multitude of federal agency programs lacked coordination, so the state and land-grant institution's efforts lacked coordination.

Even though the Cooperative Extension Service, as part of the USDA was not highlighted in the previous discussion of federal agencies which provide services for children and

youth, a number of efforts were discovered.

During the period from 1986 to 1988, the federal level of Extension developed a set of national priority initiatives. The Cooperative Extension System National Initiatives, Focus on Issues, publication outlined eight areas for Extension priority efforts for the future. The eight areas included:

-Alternative Agricultural Opportunities

-Building Human Capital

-Competitiveness and Profitability of American Agriculture

-Conservation and Management of Natural Resources

-Family and Economic Well Being

-Improving Nutrition, Diet and Health

-Revitalizing Rural America

-Water Quality

Several of the eight initiatives included issues related to the welfare of children and youth. "Building Human Capital" included concerns for preparing youth for adult responsibilities and the world of work. "Family and Economic Well Being" included the areas of children at risk, vulnerable youth, and family disruption. "Improving Nutrition, Diet and Health" included the areas of substance abuse, health, prenatal care, and fitness. However, there was no single focal point for the concerns related to "youth at risk." In 1988, a ninth initiative called "Youth at Risk" was added to the list to focus on many of the issues

that were included in the other initiatives.

The September 1988 "Update", from the Cooperative Extension's Youth At Risk Task Force, the following quote provided insight into the group's definition of "youth at risk".

> The disturbing statistics and trends about poverty, education, health, child care, teenage pregnancy, substance abuse, depression, and suicide among the nation's' young bombard us in newspapers, magazines, and scholarly journals. All youth are at risk of not growing into productive adulthood; some are more vulnerable than others. ... Extension education programs in family and youth development are part of the existing support network and are called upon to examine efforts in light of the trends. These problems affecting youth have been lumped under the title "Youth at Risk" in the popular press, as well as in the name of our task force. Youth at risk is no longer a topic for only social workers and educators, it is discussed in board rooms of major corporations and national political debate. (Irby & O'Brien, 1988 p. 1)

Extension has always been concerned about the current needs of youth and families. As stated earlier, the mission of the 4-H program is to assist youth in becoming capable and contributing members of society. It would appear that forces in contemporary society are making it harder for the average youth to achieve that goal. The Extension Task Force on Youth At Risk says their work is not the first to address the issues. They point out the recommendations that have been made in such documents as 4-H in Century III, and other documents that were already referred to in the previous section of this literature review. The task force was supportive of the recommendations of previous reports in

calling for the further development of the profession of youth development with a strong research base. According to Youth, The American Agenda (1989), a report of Extension's National Initiative Task Force on Youth at Risk, Extension nationally was committed to the following actions.

> The Cooperative Extension System is committed to developing and delivering 'Youth At Risk' programs as part of its educational mission within the land-grant university system. ... The Extension focus will be on prevention and intervention programs rather than treatment.
>
> Extension will:
>
> - Expand the youth outreach mission and resources of the total land-grant university system to meet the needs of youth at risk.
> - Develop and deliver programs for the most susceptible youth that build strengths and treat causes rather than symptoms.
> - Provide leadership and employment skills training for America's future leaders and workers.
> - Train youth professionals and volunteers to work with young people, families, neighborhoods, and the larger community to identify and prevent potential problems. (p. 4-5)

In order for the Extension programs in individual states to carry out this initiative, many will have to establish new partnerships with individuals and departments outside of the traditional resource base of Cooperative Extension. Achievement of the goals established through the "youth at risk" initiative will require that some of the recommendations made over the past twenty years are actually implemented.

Evidence of Extension's growing involvement in "youth at risk" issues can be found in a review of recent articles in the Journal of Extension. The Journal of Extension, is the professional journal for Extension workers at all

levels. The Summer 1989 issue includes several articles that relate to the youth at risk issues. "Youth Self Protection" (Wright) tells about the Minnesota 4-H program's response to a 1987 Adolescent Health Survey of over 36,000 students that showed problems in the areas of sexuality, drinking, drug abuse, depression, and fitness. Their program was based on prevention theory and youth participation as both recipients and providers of information and skills.

In the "Ideas at Work" section in the same issue, there was a short article by Ruth M. Conone titled: "Preventing Child Abuse" which told about how Extension was cooperating to deliver programs and services to help prevent child abuse in Ohio.

Though not related specifically to the youth at risk issues, the editorial section of the Summer 1989 issue of the Journal of Extension discussed the likelihood that the Cooperative Extension System will change in order to remain viable in today's society. According to Boyle, Cooperative Extension's future vitality will likely depend on the adoption of issues programming, which includes efforts such as the national initiatives, including "youth at risk"

Related Studies

There have been a number of studies conducted to determine the awareness or image of 4-H or Extension programs with internal and external audiences. This

research case study was not an image study as such, but to the extent that it looked at university staff and faculty perceptions of the Cooperative Extension 4-H Program, it was related to some image studies that have been conducted.

Gerhard (1984) conducted a study of the image of the 4-H professional for the National Association of Extension 4-H Agents. He studied the perceptions of Cooperative Extension professional staff at the local, district, area, and state levels. Six groups were included in the study. The groups included: staff with 100% 4-H responsibility, staff with more than one program responsibility including 4-H, staff with no 4-H responsibility, administrators in the 4-H program, administrators outside the 4-H program, and Extension subject matter specialists. The focus of the study was on each group's perception's of the 4-H professional. The study showed that many perceptions were related to the individual's involvement with 4-H, which was related to job responsibilities. The more directly the individuals were associated with the 4-H program, the more likely they were to have positive perceptions of the 4-H professional.

The National 4-H Alumni study "Assessing the Impact of 4-H on Former Members" (Ladewig and Thomas, 1987) dealt with a national random sample of the general public. While the study provided valuable information for 4-H program administrators, it did not relate well to the objectives of this study.

In 1980, Cosner completed a study to determine the perceptions of Oklahoma residents toward the Cooperative Extension Service in Oklahoma. Conser's study included questions with potential implications related to this study. Cosner found that younger residents, and those from non-agricultural occupations, along with some minorities, were less familiar with the Cooperative Extension Service than others. He further determined that those less familiar with Extension were less likely to favor funding increases for Extension.

Colorado State University conducted a similar study, "The Citizen's Viewpoint". Their study was also a random sample to determine the public's view of the Cooperative Extension Service and its programs. Data related to awareness of the 4-H Youth Program showed that females, individuals between 26 and 60, and those located in rural areas, were more aware of the 4-H program. (Colorado State University Cooperative Extension, 1986)

In 1982, Hackett completed a 4-H awareness study in Canadian County, Oklahoma. His study was limited to perceptions about the 4-H program. He found that in Canadian County, most residents were familiar with the 4-H program, but like the other studies showed, there were differences. Only half of the respondents saw the 4-H program as being for both rural and urban youth. Only half the residents knew where to find the county 4-H headquarters, and only 6.3 percent of the respondents knew

that 4-H was funded through the cooperative efforts of federal, state, and local governments.

The findings in these studies have implications to the Extension program's potential efforts to address "youth at risk" issues in Oklahoma. The groups most often affected by "youth at risk" issues were those shown to be least familiar with Extension. The groups that need the programs are less likely to support that funding for Extension because of their lack of knowledge about Extension programs.

Research Methodology

This study was conducted as a mixed design with aspects of both case study and descriptive methodology. Each of these methodologies is briefly described along with some of their advantages and disadvantages.

Case Study

Issac and Michael (1984) stated the purpose of a case study as "To study intensively the background, current status, and environmental interactions of a given social unit: an individual, group, institution, or community" (p. 48). Case studies are characterized as in-depth investigations which result in well organized pictures of the unit being studied.

As a qualitative research strategy the case study method is inductive rather than deductive. According to Patton (1982) qualitative research "aims at understanding of

social phenomena" (p. 5) rather than prediction of social phenomena. "The point of using qualitative methods is to understand naturally occurring phenomena in their naturally occurring states." (p. 7). The qualitative methodology allows the researcher to get close to the phenomenon under study (Patton, 1980). This allows the researcher to alternately use the discovery mode and the verification mode that are discusses by Guba (1978) and Patton (1982). This approach allows researchers to develop more focused observations as their studies progress. This can be an advantage when conducting pioneering research such as a case study.

Strengths of the case study method include: the ability to provide useful background for further study; the ability to identify important variables, processes or interactions for further study; and the ability to provide anecdotal information to illustrate conclusions or findings (Issac and Michael, 1984).

The case study method also has weaknesses. Case studies are limited in their representativeness, and their findings should not be applied to other situations or larger populations. Case studies are also vulnerable to subjective biases. Biases may come from the dramatic rather than the typical nature of the study topic, or from the subjective judgments made about the data that are collected by the researcher (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975; Borg, 1963; Issac & Michaels, 1984; Zelditch, 1970)

Best (1981) advised certain precautions be taken when using the case study method. Best advised the researcher to be thoroughly familiar with the field of inquiry and "skillful in isolating the significant variables from many that are irrelevant." (p.111) He also advised caution in making subjective judgments about the use of data, and finally cautioned that cause and effect may be attributed to factors that are merely associated, but cannot be tested with the case study method.

Descriptive Research

Issac and Michael (1984, p. 46) stated the purpose of descriptive research as "to describe systematically the facts and characteristics of a given population or area of interest, factually and accurately."

Kerlinger (1986, p. 386) said, "Survey research is probably best adapted to obtaining personal and social facts, beliefs, and attitudes." He went on to list some of the advantages and disadvantages. Survey research normally has the advantage of wide scope, and gathering a great deal of information from a large population, at an economical cost. When properly drawn random samples are used, they are accurate, within sampling error (p. 387). However, Kerlinger said, there are also disadvantages. These normally include lack of depth of information, higher costs associated with larger samples, sampling error associated with random sampling, and potential for the survey to

temporarily lift the respondent out of his own social context(p. 387).

Data Collection Methods

A key component of descriptive research is the design of the data collection instrument. Because of the mixed design, three data collection methods were considered: face-to-face interviews, telephone interviews, and mailed questionnaires. The advantages and disadvantages of each were evaluated. Denzin identified several specific deficiencies of all interview situations (1970). Three problems include potential language barriers and the meanings of words and symbols; people's resistance to "telling all"; and groups tendencies to create their own rules and respond based on their own perceptions of truth.

Face-to-Face Interviews. Advantages of the face-to-face interview method of gathering data include the adaptability and flexibility; probing with appropriate follow-up questions is more natural, and greater clarity and depth can be achieved by effective interviewers (Borg, 1963).

Dexter, in his book Elite and Specialized Interviewing, (1970) points out that some times the only way to gain access to prominent individuals such as university administrators is through the interview technique.

Disadvantages of personal interviews include the time

required to conduct the interviews and then to interpret the results of the interviews; the total cost of conducting personal interviews face-to-face, and the likelihood of bias from personal contact with the interviewer (Dillman, 1978).

Telephone Interviews. Telephone interviews have some of the same advantages while also eliminating some of the disadvantages of face-to-face interviews. Advantages include lower costs, less time required, high rates of return, high rate of completion due to telephone etiquette, opportunity for open ended and probing questions, and good interviewer control (Dillman, 1978; Frey, 1983; Groves & Kahn, 1979; Key, 1985).

The disadvantages of telephone interviews include: time requirements, personnel requirements, likelihood of bias from socially acceptable responses, and problems associated with complex questions (Frey, 1983; Dillman, 1978).

Mail Questionnaire. Because of the extent to which the study was designed as a case study, a mail questionnaire would have seriously limitations. The mail questionnaire's lower return rates, problems with open-ended questions, lack of opportunity to probe or clarify, and longer implementation times would all be considered serious disadvantages (Frey, 1983; Dillman, 1978).

Interview Schedules. Based on the advantages and

disadvantages as outlined here, a telephone interview schedule method would be most desirable for data gathering. Further review of the literature aided in identifying techniques for the development and administration of telephone interview schedules. Dillman's text, Mail and Telephone Surveys, The Total Design Method (1978), provided valuable insights into the development of a schedule. The "total design method" was based on two factors. Understanding that responding to a telephone interview is a form of social exchange with costs and rewards is part of getting people to respond. Dillman pointed out that the researcher tries to achieve three goals: minimizing the cost of responding; maximizing the rewards for responding; and establishing trust that the rewards will be delivered. Administration of the interview is also very important. However, since all interviews were conducted by the primary researcher, concerns about training interviewers, differences in subjective biases, etc. were eliminated in this study.

Actual design of the interview schedule was intended to compliment the mixed study design to allow for the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data. Kerlinger (1986) described three types of items that may be used in telephone interview schedules. These included: fixed-alternative items, open-ended items, and scale items. The fixed-alternative items, also called closed questions are used to get greater uniformity of responses by forcing

the respondent to choose one of the pre-determined answers. These are commonly yes-no, agree-disagree, or limited multiple choice answers. The open-ended questions are flexible and allow the respondent to freely choose the form and content of the answer. The open-ended questions usually lead to a wider variety of responses that are much harder to quantify, but may lead to more in-depth or qualitative data than the fixed-alternative items. The final type of item is the scale item. This type of item allows the respondent to choose the degree of agreement or disagreement or some other value related to a question by using either words or numbers to describe values on a scale. This allows more freedom of response, but yields easily quantifiable data for the researcher. The inherent characteristics of each type of question were taken into consideration as the interview schedules for this research were developed.

Mixed Design

The mixed design and use of the telephone interview schedule could help counteract some of the disadvantages of using either one of the research designs by themselves. The case study methodology of the personal interview with the option for probing questions would allow for more depth than the descriptive or survey method. At the same time, the interview schedule, with quantitative questions would allow more data to be gathered to eliminate some of the subjective bias that would be inherent in the case study method. The

descriptive part of the study design would allow a larger sample or population, and yielded more objective data that could be quantified through mathematical calculations.

Summary

Since the very early days of this nation, we have valued the education of the masses as a key to a healthy democracy. Over the years various institutions have been developed to maintain a strong educational program and enhance the quality of life for all citizens. For many years the Cooperative Extension Service and the 4-H Program provided a vital link between the knowledge base of land-grant universities and the people throughout the country. In recent years as the society changed, the 4-H Program has changed, too. However, the changes in the 4-H Program have not kept pace with the critical needs of communities. Much of this may be due to 4-H's limited access to the total resources of the land-grant university. While Extension personnel have continued to do an excellent job of providing enriching experiences for youth through an increasing variety of 4-H projects and activities, they have nonetheless drifted farther away from the critical needs of their communities. In recent years, as substance abuse, suicide, teen pregnancy, and other distress signals have increased, the 4-H Program has attempted to design new contemporary programs. The 4-H Program has for years professed to be more about youth development than about

cattle or cooking. However, most of its resources and staff were primarily related to the agricultural and home economics disciplines.

As "youth at risk" issues became more evident in society, many educators, including university presidents began asking: how can the university respond? That was the key question involved in this study. Many people inside and outside land-grant universities were saying that the land-grant system, either with or without Cooperative Extension and 4-H, should respond to the contemporary needs of youth. They said its part of the charge that was given to the states at the time the various legislative acts created the institution. The question remains, can the institution respond, and if so, how?

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The design of the study was developed to achieve the following objectives:

1. To identify and compare the perceptions of University administrators, Extension administrators, campus faculty and staff, and Extension 4-H staff with regard to:
   a. the seriousness of current youth related issues.
   b. whether "youth at risk" issues should be a concern of the University.
   c. how the University might respond to the need for "youth at risk" programs.
   d. ways youth development programs might be funded.
2. To identify faculty, staff, and administration perceptions of specific actions that might be taken to develop a land-grant youth development program that would meet the contemporary needs of youth.
3. To identify faculty, staff, and administration perceptions of specific problems or challenges that might be faced in the development of a land-grant youth development program that would meet the contemporary needs of youth.
4. To determine levels of awareness of 4-H as a youth development program by University administrators and campus

faculty and staff.

Research Methodology

To meet the objectives as stated for this study, four groups of faculty, staff, and administrators at OSU were identified to complete an interview schedule related to the specific objectives outlined above.

Selection of the Population and Sample

The study related to the potentially different perceptions of various land-grant university faculty, staff, and administrators from Oklahoma State University. (Refer to the Definitions section of Chapter I for detailed descriptions of the terms used to describe the respondents.)

Those individuals who participated in the study were selected through purposive methods. Kerlinger (1986, p. 120) defined purposive sampling as "characterized by the use of judgment and a deliberate effort to obtain representative samples by including presumably typical areas or groups in the sample." This non-probability sampling method was justified on the basis that logic could be used to identify those individuals that possessed the information needed to achieve the objectives of the study. Probability sampling was not considered essential because no attempt to generalize to a larger population was intended. Further, as will be shown later, three of the four study groups were essentially populations in and of themselves, so sampling as

such did not occur.

The research sample was selected to represent four groups of faculty, staff, and administrators at Oklahoma State University. The study groups included: University administrators, Extension administrators, campus faculty and staff, and Extension 4-H staff. Because of the small numbers of individuals in some types of positions, the selection procedures were varied to achieve a reasonable sample or population size in each of the four groups. Selection procedures were designed to achieve four groups with approximately 25 individuals in each group. To achieve this goal, from 26 to 28 individuals were selected for each group. Since none of the planned statistical tests were sensitive to uniformity of group size, this was not a requirement. However, it was deemed appropriate to select similar size groups to achieve fairness in the comparisons, and characterizations.

University Administrators

Among the University administrators, the President and all Vice Presidents, deans of five colleges, OSU Board of Regents, and department heads for selected related departments were included. Three of the eight college deans were not included in this study population. The Dean of the Graduate College was not interviewed because almost all of his students and faculty were included in one of the other colleges. The Dean of Veterinary Medicine was not

interviewed because his student enrollments account for only one percent of the student body. The Dean of the Division of Agriculture is also the Director of Cooperative Extension, and thus he was included in the Extension administration group. Department heads for departments with two or more individual faculty on the campus faculty and staff list were included in the University administration group.

Extension Administrators

The Extension administration group included the Director, Associate Director, and Assistant Directors of Cooperative Extension, except for the Assistant Director for 4-H, who was involved in the design of the study. In addition, this group included four District Extension Directors, and the County Extension Directors in the counties which were represented in the Extension 4-H staff group. County Extension Directors were placed in the administrative group rather than in the group with the Extension 4-H Staff because of their role as administrator of the county unit. In no case was a County Extension Director included in the pool for the Extension 4-H Staff, even though in some cases the County Extension Director also has some 4-H programmatic responsibilities.

Campus Faculty and Staff

Campus faculty and staff were identified through a modified delphi technique. A copy of the request form is provided in Appendix B. State 4-H Program Specialists and Home Economics Cooperative Extension Specialists with responsibility for 4-H "youth at risk" programs were surveyed to determine the names of individuals and departments that either were or might be involved in youth at risk programs. After the initial results were summarized, the list included approximately the desired number for the surveys. The list was reviewed by State 4-H Staff, and the 28 campus faculty and staff were identified to be included in the faculty group. In each case, specific individuals were identified for telephone interviews. This technique was used to try to identify those departments and individuals that would be most likely to be involved or interested in "youth at risk" programs. No effort was made to make the campus faculty sample representative of the total University population. This was deemed inappropriate because of the great diversity present on the University campus. It was considered more appropriate to interview individuals who might through some logic have an interest in youth development programs, or who might already be involved in youth development programs.

Extension 4-H Staff

Extension 4-H staff were selected through another system that was designed to achieve an appropriate sample for the objectives of this study. Since all Extension field staff have either direct or indirect responsibility for some type of 4-H program, it was possible to select a random sample. However, because of the small size of the desired sample, it was considered more important to achieve a representative sample through a purposive sampling method. To clearly distinguish 4-H staff from other county Extension staff, only those staff with a "4-H Agent" title were included in the population from which the county staff participants were selected. Each of the four District 4-H Program Specialists were included in the sample because of their full time involvement in the 4-H program. Two State 4-H Program Specialists and two Family Relations and Child Development Extension Specialists who worked directly with 4-H "youth at risk" type programming were included in the 4-H staff group.

To achieve a representative sample, all county Extension personnel who carried 4-H titles on May 1st, 1989, were put in one of three categories according to county population. Table 1 shows the counties that were placed in each of the three categories. The three categories were "urban", "suburban", and "rural". Counties with over 500,000 were considered "urban"; counties with 50,000 to 499,000 were considered "suburban" and counties with less than 50,000

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF COUNTIES WITH 4-H AGENTS BY POPULATION CATEGORIES[1]

---

2 Urban Counties (populations over 500,000)
- Oklahoma (3)
- Tulsa (4)

Total 4-H staff 7

10 Suburban Counties (populations between 50,000 and 499,000)
- Canadian (2)
- Cleveland (2)
- Commanche
- Creek
- Garfield (2)
- Kay
- Payne (2)
- Pottawatomie
- Rogers (2)
- Wagoner

Total 4-H staff 15

23 Rural Counties (populations under 50,000)
- Beckham
- Blaine
- Caddo
- Carter
- Cherokee
- Choctaw
- Coal
- Custer
- Garvin
- Grady
- Jackson
- Kingfisher
- Lincoln
- Love
- McIntosh
- Muskogee
- Osage
- Pittsburg
- Pontotoc
- Seminole
- Stephens
- Washita
- Washington

Total 4-H staff 23

---

[1] The number in () after each county indicates the number of 4-H Agent positions in that county, if greater than 1.

were considered "rural". County population figures were taken from the U.S. Bureau of the Census book, County and City Data Book, 1988. Since full census data were almost ten years old at the time of the study, it was deemed more appropriate to use the estimated data that were provided by the 1988 publication. On May 1st, 1989, the Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service had begun assigning 4-H Agents to some two county units. These individuals were included in the pool in the county of their personal residence, rather than including them in two counties and doubling their chances of being selected.

To get a group size of 28, a total of 20 county 4-H staff was needed. The percentage of staff in each population group was calculated and multiplied by the number twenty to determine the number to draw from that group. Table 2 shows how the group sizes were determined.

TABLE 2

CALCULATION OF PROPORTIONATE SETS FOR 4-H STAFF SAMPLE

Population	No. of staff	% of total	No. drawn
Urban	7	16%	3
Suburban	15	33%	7
Rural	23	51%	10
Totals	45	100	20

This method of selecting the county Extension 4-H staff assured that proportionate numbers of staff from each size of county were used in the original sample. For each of the three population groups, the names were actually placed in a hat and the appropriate number for that group was drawn out of the hat.

The methods used resulted in the selection of three population groups and one sample group for the study. The OSU administration, campus faculty and staff, and Extension administration groups are defined as population groups. The Extension 4-H staff group was a mixture of populations and samples. The state and district staff in the group represented specific populations based on assignments, but the county Extension 4-H Agents in the group were drawn as a proportionate random sample. Lists of each of the selected groups are included in Appendix C.

Developing Data Collection Procedures

As stated in the review of literature, three potential data collection methods were considered. To achieve the purpose of the study, it would have been desirable to conduct face to face interviews with each individual. However, because of the time and expense, only the mailed questionnaire and telephone interview were evaluated as potential methods. In the end, the telephone interview was considered the desired method of collecting data.

The review of literature turned up no other telephone interview schedule of a suitable type. Therefore the interview schedule had to be constructed to meet the specific objectives of the study. Dillman's text Mail and Telephone Surveys (1978) was written to give social science researchers alternatives to the face-to-face interview. Techniques for writing questions for clarity were used to get more accurate answers with less follow-up or probing. All three types of items outlined by Kerlinger (1986) were included in the interview schedule. Fixed-alternative and scale items were used to gather quantitative data related to some objectives while open-ended questions were used to gather qualitative data to gain greater insight related to the research objectives.

Advance letters to potential respondents were designed utilizing the guidelines provided by Dillman's text (1978). According to Dillman, the advance letter helps build rapport and trust with the respondent and reduces the element of surprise of a telephone call and the likelihood of rejection.

Five separate advance letters were designed to be sent approximately one week prior to telephone calls to each group. Each letter was designed to note the uniqueness of the potential respondent, and efforts were made to adjust the language to fit the specific group. Two separate letters were used for the Extension administration group so that County Extension Directors could be addressed

accordingly. Each potential respondent received a letter addressed to them and signed personally by the researcher.

Dillman also stressed the importance of the first few questions. This part of the interview schedule must build trust and rapport between the interviewer and the respondent. The interview schedule was revised numerous times to shorten the introduction and to get into the first series of questions as soon as possible. The first series of questions was also designed to set the stage for the remainder of the interview. Respondents were asked to rate the seriousness of each of nine "youth at risk" issues. This was an important part of the study, but it also helped to get respondents involved in the content of the study at the beginning of the interview.

The selection of nine statements of "youth at risk" issues was made after several potential lists were studied. Consideration was given to items listed by the Extension 4-H Youth At Risk Task Force, the Youth 2000 list from the National Alliance of Business, and from items included in the review of literature. To avoid the potential bias created by the order of items on a long list, a rotated sequence of asking was used (Dillman, 1978). The order of questions for the nine issues was rotated so each issue had the same chance of being in each position on the list, approximately the same number of times. The final list of nine issues included the following: school dropouts and illiteracy, poor job preparation, abuse of drugs and

alcohol, teenage sexuality and pregnancy, poor nutrition and fitness, lack of personal values and self esteem, depression and suicide, juvenile delinquency, and lack of citizenship and leadership skills.

Because of the differences between the four groups, especially between the Extension and the non-Extension groups, two separate interview schedules were developed. Minor changes were made in the introductions and several of the questions in order to make the questions fit the responding group. The Extension interviews started with the mention of "youth at risk" as one of the national Extension initiatives. The non-Extension groups led into the identification of the "youth at risk" label after the nine issues had been introduced. Other minor changes were made to keep the language in line with the individual's professional position. When visiting with faculty about appropriate actions, the term "department" was normally used. However, when the same questions were asked of the dean's, the term "college" was used. These minor modifications were made to insure better rapport through more personal communications with each individual.

The major differences between the Extension and non-Extension schedules were in the 4-H awareness questions. Since every Extension employee is aware of or involved with 4-H, it was deemed inappropriate to ask them the 4-H awareness questions. Therefore, the 4-H awareness questions were asked only of the OSU administration and the campus

faculty and staff groups. The Extension groups were also asked one additional open ended question at the end of the interview schedule. This question related to their attitudes regarding the 4-H Program's involvement with "youth at risk" issues.

To aid in the administration of the telephone interviews, a "call record" was developed. The call record was designed to provide a temporary identification record for each respondent and allow the researcher to keep track of vital information needed to complete an interview. The call record included space for notes on unsuccessful calls and appointment times for return calls. The call record was designed to be removed from the interview schedule as soon as an interview was completed. This was essential to protect the confidentiality of the respondents.

The Survey Research Center's Interviewer's Manual (1976) suggested techniques for asking questions, and using probes to clarify answers. Since all interviews were conducted by the primary researcher, several practice sessions were used to develop the interview schedule and refine the researcher's interview skills prior to the beginning of actual data collection.

The instrument was tested with a pilot sample made up of 10 faculty and staff who were not in the final sample. The final interview schedule and research proposal were submitted to the Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board. The exempt status was requested and approved.

Copies of the final Extension and non-Extension interview schedules are included in Appendix D Also included in Appendix D are copies of the call record and a sample of one of the advance letters.

Telephone interviews were completed during May, June and July of 1989. All interviews were conducted with employees of Oklahoma State University, headquartered at Stillwater, Oklahoma, United States of America.

Analysis of the Data

Interviews resulted in the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data. The survey gathered information from employees of Oklahoma State University. The information gathered was related to (1) faculty, staff, and administration perceptions of the seriousness of selected youth problems (2) whether or not the university should be concerned with issues relating to pre-college age youth (3) perceptions of the appropriateness of specific actions related to how the University might respond to youth at risk issues (4) perceptions about how youth development programs might be funded (5) ideas about concerns and opportunities related to youth development programming and (6) awareness of Extension 4-H programs.

Since some of the study groups were actually populations and none of the samples were fully randomly drawn, it was deemed inappropriate to run statistical tests for comparisons between the four groups. Descriptive frequency

data including distribution tables, means, standard deviations, and ranges were calculated for each of the professional positions for each of the quantitative questions. The same calculations were completed for the composite of the total group of respondents.

Demographic data were collected to determine the length of time each respondent was involved in education as a professional, and to determine how long they had been associated with Oklahoma State University. Data were also recorded to indicate the college or Extension program affiliation of each respondent. The OSU Regents and University administration were put into a special administrative category and the Extension staff were all included in the Extension category.

To compare the groups, the mean scores and standard deviations for each group were calculated. Because the selection of the study populations and samples were made on a logical basis rather than a statistical basis, the analyses were designed for logical comparison rather than statistical testing. As stated earlier, the respondents for the study were selected to logically represent four different groups of individuals within the land-grant university system. Because of these factors, and the small group sizes, it was deemed inappropriate to use statistical tests to determine whether or not specific relationships existed.

Because the OSU administration, campus faculty and

staff, and part of the Extension administration groups were considered populations, it would have been too tempting to note every difference in group mean or standard deviations. To avoid this temptation, specific ranges were selected to determine which differences should be considered notable. For a difference to be considered "notable", the difference in mean scores had to be more than one half of a scale width, or 0.50 between two groups.

When the study was designed, the effect of years of professional educational experience and years of association with OSU were considered as potential confounding variables. Therefore data were gathered and calculations were made to determine if there was any association between years of professional experience or years at OSU and responses to interview questions. The chi-square test was considered the most appropriate test for the frequency data that were gathered.

In order to achieve a reasonable expectation that the chi-square tables would yield adequate expected frequencies, the values for the scale questions were collapsed and the years of experience and OSU service were combined to develop 2 x 3 tables for the chi-square analysis. The five point scale items were combined so that values of "1" and "2" became the lowest value, the values of "4" and "5" became the highest value, and the value of "3" was left in the middle. The years of professional educational experience and years of service at OSU were combined to form somewhat

equal groups for those with less than 15 years and those with 15 or more years.

Frequencies, means, standard deviations, and chi-square values were calculated by the SAS program at the Oklahoma State University Computer Center.

Qualitative responses related to actions that might be taken by the University, and challenges or problems that might be faced were also summarized. For some questions, it was possible to develop a list of standard answers that could be tabulated by the computer. This process was supplemented by a complete visual review of all the responses to the open-ended questions.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to determine how Oklahoma State University faculty, staff, and administrators perceived the seriousness of "youth at risk" issues, and how they perceived their land-grant university responding to those contemporary issues as related to the youth of Oklahoma. A secondary objective was to determine whether or not non-Extension faculty, staff, and administrators were aware of Extension 4-H and Youth Development programs.

Data were collected through interviews with 107 individual faculty, staff, and administrators from four categories. The four groups of respondents included: University administrators, Extension administrators, campus faculty and staff, and Extension 4-H Staff. The first section of this chapter reports the general characteristics of the respondents. In the second section of the chapter, the responses to specific questions are reported in frequency tables. In the third section, are summaries of the responses to the open ended qualitative questions that were included in the survey. In the fourth section of this

chapter are reports of the frequency responses related to non-Extension faculty, staff, and administrator awareness of the 4-H program. The final section includes a brief review of how respondents reacted to the data collection process.

Characteristics of the Respondents

The participants for this study were selected in a variety of purposive methods as outlined in Chapter III. Because of the purposive selection methods, it was deemed inappropriate to collect or analyze data related to age, sex, or other demographic information other than years of professional educational experience and years affiliated with Oklahoma State University. These two factors were considered to have a potential confounding influence on the respondent's replies to interview questions.

A total of 109 individuals were selected to be interviewed. Of that number, 107 were contacted by telephone. One faculty member was out of state with a spouse on sabbatical leave, and one Extension 4-H Agent was on maternity leave. No attempt was made to contact either of these individuals, so the final potential research population was 107. Of that number, all 107 individuals were contacted and consented to be interviewed to some degree. Because of the qualitative nature of some of the questions, partial interviews which included responses to some of the questions were considered to be successful interviews. The resulting 100 percent completion rate was

more than hoped for, but the high completion rate was one of the factors taken into consideration in the selection of the telephone interview methodology. Table 3 shows the numbers of participants that were contacted and the numbers that participated in each category.

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Group	Contacted	Participating	
	No.	No.	%
OSU Administration	27	27	100.00
Campus Faculty/Staff	27	27	100.00
Extension Administration	26	26	100.00
Extension 4-H Staff	27	27	100.00
Total	107	107	100.00

Table 4 presents the distribution of the respondents by college, or assignment in the Cooperative Extension Service. Faculty and staff in the Cooperative Extension Service are academically affiliated with either the Division of Agriculture or the College of Home Economics, but administratively all are assigned to the Division of Agriculture under the Director of Cooperative Extension.

Those individuals who were assigned to central administration or who were not adjunct to some other department were included in the administrative category. These included individuals with assignments such as student health, student services, counseling, and personnel services.

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY COLLEGE AFFILIATION OR ASSIGNMENT

Assignment	Number	% of Total
Agriculture[1]	1	0.93
Arts & Science	12	11.21
Business Administration	1	0.93
Education	15	14.02
Engineering	1	0.93
Home Economics	7	6.54
Administration	17	15.89
Cooperative Extension	53	49.53
Total	107	100.00

[1] Exclusive of Cooperative Extension respondents

Years of involvement in education or association with OSU were considered to be possible confounding variables with regard to some questions that were being asked as part of the survey, so demographic information was obtained for

each of these variables. Involvement in education was defined as professional involvement as teacher, administrator, Extension agent, trainer, or university regent. Each respondent was allowed to indicate the approximate number of years they had been involved or associated, based on their own interpretation of the questions. Table 5 indicates how the respondents answered the question about educational experience.

TABLE 5

YEARS OF INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATION
BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Group	Years of Involvement in Education										Not Answered		Total	
	0-1		2-3		4-7		8-14		15 & Over					
	No	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
University Administration	2	7.41	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	11.11	20	74.07	2	7.41	27	25.23
Campus Faculty and Staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.70	4	14.81	22	81.48	0	0.00	27	25.23
Extension Administration	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	11.54	2	7.69	21	80.77	0	0.00	26	24.30
Extension 4-H Staff	2	7.41	3	11.11	9	33.33	6	22.22	7	25.93	0	0.00	27	25.23
Totals	4	3.74	3	2.80	13	12.15	15	14.02	70	65.42	2	1.87	107	100.00

Table 6 shows the distribution of respondents by the years of their association with Oklahoma State University.

TABLE 6

YEARS OF ASSOCIATION WITH OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Group	Years of Association with OSU										Not Answered		Total	
	0-1		2-3		4-7		8-14		15 & Over					
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No.	%	No	%	No	%
University Administration	4	14.81	3	11.11	1	3.70	8	29.63	10	37.04	1	3.70	27	25.23
Campus Faculty and Staff	0	0.00	1	3.70	3	11.11	4	14.81	19	70.37	0	0.00	27	25.23
Extension Administration	1	3.85	0	0.00	6	23.08	4	15.38	15	57.69	0	0.00	26	24.30
Extension 4-H Staff	6	22.22	1	3.70	8	29.63	7	25.93	5	18.52	0	0.00	27	25.23
Totals	11	10.28	5	4.67	18	16.82	23	21.50	49	45.79	1	0.93	107	100.00

The demographic data related to years of professional experience, and years of association with OSU were gathered to determine whether any of those factors would be associated with responses to the specific questions on the interview schedule. Chi-square tables were calculated as described in Chapter III. There were no valid tests which yielded probability scores of less than .05. Because of the

uniformity of some sets of data, there were some tables with up to 66 percent of the cells with expected frequency counts less than 5. Therefore the factors of professional educational experience and years of affiliation with OSU were not considered to be associated with respondent's answers to the questions on the interview schedule. Summary tables of the calculated values and probabilities for each test are included in Appendix E.

Responses To Specific Questions

Three sets of questions were asked to determine faculty, staff, and administrator's perceptions about the seriousness of each of nine issues; about how the University might respond to "youth at risk" issues; and about how "youth at risk" programs might be funded. This section of Chapter IV presents the frequency and percentage distributions and rankings for each of the four group's responses to each of these questions.

To give structure to the discussion of each question, the "notability" test described in Chapter III was used to determine those comparisons which should receive attention in this discussion. In summary, the differences between two mean scores were considered "notable" if they were 0.50 apart.

The following discussion will highlight differences among the groups means and standard deviations. Means are understood to be the mathematical average which is achieved

by adding all the numbers in a group together and dividing by the number of numbers in the group. Standard deviation is a measure of the deviation of individual numbers from the mean of the group of numbers, and is used to show the uniformity or difference within a group of numbers. Within the data for this study, smaller standard deviation scores indicate less difference between the numbers in the group, while larger standard deviation scores mean more difference or variability between the numbers in the group.

All of the means calculated for this study were based on only the whole numbers from "1" to "5". Non-responses and "I don't know" responses are shown on the distribution tables, but are not included in the calculation of means and standard deviations.

Seriousness of Youth At Risk Issues

The first series of nine questions dealt with the perceived seriousness of each of the nine "youth at risk" issues. Each respondent was asked to respond to the question: "On a scale of from 1 to 5 with 1 being NOT SERIOUS and 5 being VERY SERIOUS, what do you consider to be the seriousness of each of these problems which face pre-college age youth?"

Table 7 provides an overall summary of the mean scores, standard deviations, and ranking of the items within each group. The table also shows these scores for the total of all respondents and is organized according to the overall

TABLE 7

RANKS, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SERIOUSNESS OF YOUTH AT RISK ISSUES BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

	Total			University Administration			Campus Faculty & Staff			Extension Administration			Extension 4-H Staff		
Issue	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
Teenage Sexuality Pregnancy	1	4.45	0.77	1	4.40	1.00	2	4.52	0.64	1	4.31	0.79	1	4.56	0.64
Abuse of Drugs & Alcohol	2	4.38	0.79	2	4.33	0.96	1	4.56	0.75	2	4.19	0.80	2	4.41	0.64
School Dropouts & Illiteracy	3	3.96	0.94	3	3.92	0.98	3	4.22	0.85	4T	3.69	1.05	4T	4.00	0.83
Lack of Values & Self Esteem	4	3.88	0.92	5	3.46	0.83	4	4.07	0.96	6	3.62	0.98	3	4.33	0.62
Poor Job Preparation	5	3.76	0.82	4	3.58	0.90	8	3.59	0.97	3	3.88	0.77	4T	4.00	0.55
Lack of Citizenship and Leadership	6	3.61	0.89	8	3.21	1.02	9	3.52	0.85	4T	3.69	0.74	6	3.96	0.81
Poor Nutrition and Fitness	7	3.54	0.85	6	3.30	1.06	5	4.00	0.63	8	3.35	0.69	9	3.48	0.85
Juvenile Delinquency	8	3.51	0.86	7	3.27	0.92	6	3.85	0.82	7	3.38	0.94	8	3.52	0.70
Depression & Suicide	9	3.40	1.10	9	2.95	1.16	7	3.78	0.93	9	2.96	1.04	7	3.78	1.01

ranking of the items, beginning with the item with the highest overall mean score for seriousness. A review of the table shows that six of the nine items included notable differences between at least two groups and there were several differences in the rank orders of items within different groups.

Discussion of the questions related to the seriousness of "youth at risk" issues is organized in the order of the highest level of seriousness first, based on the means for all respondents.

Teenage Sexuality and Pregnancy. The issue of "teenage sexuality and pregnancy" received the highest overall mean score for the total of all four groups. The distribution of scores, and the calculated means and standard deviations for the total of all respondents and for each group are shown in Table 8. The overall mean of 4.45 with a standard deviation of 0.77 indicates how uniformly concerned all respondents were on this issue. The total difference between high and low means was only 0.25. When comparing the rankings of the four groups, only the campus faculty and staff group did not rank this issue as the most serious by virtue of the highest mean. Based on the mean scores, the campus faculty and staff group ranked "teenage sexuality and pregnancy" second. However, their mean score was greater than for either of the administrative groups. The differences in standard deviation scores show that the staff groups were more

TABLE 8

PERCEIVED SERIOUSNESS OF YOUTH AT RISK ISSUE OF
"TEENAGE SEXUALITY AND PREGNANCY"
BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Serious		2		3		4		(5) Very Serious		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	1	3.70	0	0.00	3	11.11	5	18.52	16	59.26	2	7.41	27	25.23	4.40	1.00
Campus Faculty & Staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	7.41	9	33.33	16	59.26	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.52	0.64
Extension Administration	0	0.00	1	3.85	2	7.69	11	42.31	12	46.15	0	0.00	26	24.30	4.31	0.79
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	7.41	8	29.63	17	62.96	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.56	0.64
Totals	1	0.93	1	0.93	9	8.41	33	30.84	61	57.01	2	1.87	107	100.00	4.45	0.77

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

similar in their perceptions while the administrative groups were more varied in their perceptions related to the issue of "teenage sexuality and pregnancy." Based on the data in Table 8, there were no notable differences between the perceptions of the four groups.

Abuse of Drugs and Alcohol. The "abuse of drugs and alcohol" issue ranked second overall among the nine issues. Table 9 provides the data related to this issue. The average mean of 4.38 with a standard deviation of 0.79, shows that most respondents were in agreement in their perception that the "abuse of drugs and alcohol" was a serious problem among pre-college age youth. This issue was ranked first by campus faculty and staff, and second by each of the other three groups. Only one respondent, from the OSU administration, ranked this issue less than a three on the five point scale for seriousness. There were no notable differences between the means of the four groups where the issue of "abuse of drugs and alcohol" was concerned. All four groups perceived this to be a very serious issue.

School Dropouts and Illiteracy. The third ranked issue based on the mean's for the total of all respondents was the issue of "school dropouts and illiteracy". While this issue ranked third, Table 10 shows that the overall mean was 3.96, or .42 below the average mean for the second ranked issue of "abuse of drugs and alcohol" and .49 below the highest ranked issue of "teenage sexuality and pregnancy". While

TABLE 9

PERCEIVED SERIOUSNESS OF YOUTH AT RISK ISSUE OF "ABUSE OF DRUGS AND ALCOHOL" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Serious		2		3		4		(5) Very Serious		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	1	3.70	0	0.00	2	7.41	8	29.63	13	48.15	3	11.11	27	25.23	4.33	0.96
Campus Faculty & Staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	14.81	4	14.81	19	70.37	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.56	0.75
Extension Administration	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	23.08	9	34.62	11	42.31	0	0.00	26	24.30	4.19	0.80
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	7.41	12	44.44	13	48.15	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.41	0.64
Totals	1	0.93	0	0.00	14	13.08	33	30.84	56	52.34	3	2.80	107	100.00	4.38	0.79

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

TABLE 10

PERCEIVED SERIOUSNESS OF YOUTH AT RISK ISSUE OF "SCHOOL DROPOUTS AND ILLITERACY" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Serious		2		3		4		(5) Very Serious		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean [b]	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	1	3.70	0	0.00	7	25.93	10	37.04	8	29.63	1	3.70	27	25.23	3.92	0.98
Campus Faculty & Staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	25.93	7	25.93	13	48.15	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.22	0.85
Extension Administration	0	0.00	5	19.23	4	15.38	11	42.31	6	23.08	0	0.00	26	24.30	3.69	1.05
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	1	3.70	6	22.22	12	44.44	8	29.63	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.00	0.83
Totals	1	0.93	6	5.61	24	22.43	40	37.38	35	32.71	1	0.93	107	100.00	3.96	0.94

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

[b] On basis of difference equal to or greater than .50 between group means, notable differences exist between the means for two or more groups.

there were no notable differences for the first two ranked issues, there were two groups that were notably different in their perceptions of the seriousness of this issue. The campus faculty and staff perceived the issue to be notably more serious than the Extension administration with mean scores of 4.22 and 3.69 respectively. Both the OSU administration and the campus faculty and staff ranked this issue 3rd, while both Extension groups ranked it tied for 4th with another issue. However, as Table 10 shows, both the campus and Extension faculty and staff groups' means were actually higher than the administrative groups' means.

Lack of Personal Values and Self Esteem. With a mean score of 3.88, as shown in Table 11, "lack of personal values and self esteem" followed closely behind the third ranked issue. However, there were notable differences in the perceptions of seriousness between two pairs of the groups. The Extension 4-H staff and the campus faculty and staff groups, with mean scores of 4.33 and 4.07 respectively, perceived this issue to be more serious than the two administrative groups with scores of 3.62 and 3.46. It is interesting however, to note that this was the only one of the nine issues not to receive at least one "not serious" score, or a 1, on the 5 point scale.

Poor Job Preparation. "Poor job preparation" ranked right in the middle of the overall rankings, in fifth place. However, among the four groups it ranged from third in the

TABLE 11

PERCEIVED SERIOUSNESS OF YOUTH AT RISK ISSUE OF "LACK OF PERSONAL VALUES AND SELF ESTEEM" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Serious		2		3		4		(5) Very Serious		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean [b]	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	0	0.00	2	7.41	12	44.44	7	25.93	3	11.11	3	11.11	27	25.23	3.46	0.83
Campus Faculty & Staff	0	0.00	2	7.41	5	18.52	9	33.33	11	40.74	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.07	0.96
Extension Administration	0	0.00	3	11.54	10	38.46	7	26.92	6	23.08	0	0.00	26	24.30	3.62	0.98
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	7.41	14	51.85	11	40.74	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.33	0.62
Totals	0	0.00	7	6.54	29	27.10	37	34.58	31	28.97	3	2.80	107	100.00	3.88	0.92

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

[b] On basis of difference equal to or greater than .50 between group means, notable differences exist between the means for two or more groups.

Extension Administration group to eighth in the campus faculty and staff group. Data in Table 12 show that the average mean for all four groups was 3.76, and no group was more than 0.24 away from the mean for the total. With a standard deviation of 0.55 for the Extension 4-H staff, this was one of the most uniformly answered questions within any group. However, the total group mean is 0.79 and 0.72 less than the overall mean scores for the first two ranked issues. If the same test for notability was used, all the items on the lower half of the list would be perceived as notably less serious.

Lack of Citizenship and Leadership Skills. The issue of "lack of citizenship and leadership" was ranked 6th overall, but like job preparation, the individual rankings varied greatly. The Extension administration group ranked it tied for fourth, while the campus faculty and staff ranked it 9th. However, as Table 13 shows, there were no notable difference between their actual scores with Extension administration and campus faculty and staff mean's being 3.69 and 3.52 respectively. Table 13 shows that there was a notable difference between the mean score for the Extension 4-H staff with 3.96 and the OSU administration with 3.21. Four-H staff perceived the problem to be notably more serious. However, it should also be noted that the OSU administration group was not uniformly in agreement, as the standard deviation of 1.02 shows.

TABLE 12

PERCEIVED SERIOUSNESS OF YOUTH AT RISK ISSUE OF "POOR JOB PREPARATION" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Serious		2		3		4		(5) Very Serious		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	1	3.70	0	0.00	12	44.44	9	33.33	4	14.81	1	3.70	27	25.23	3.58	0.90
Campus Faculty & Staff	0	0.00	4	14.81	8	29.63	10	37.04	5	18.52	0	0.00	27	25.23	3.59	0.97
Extension Administration	0	0.00	1	3.85	6	23.08	14	53.85	5	19.23	0	0.00	26	24.30	3.88	0.77
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	14.81	19	70.37	4	14.81	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.00	0.55
Totals	1	0.93	5	4.67	30	28.04	52	48.60	18	16.82	1	0.93	107	100.00	3.76	0.82

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

TABLE 13

PERCEIVED SERIOUSNESS OF YOUTH AT RISK ISSUE OF "LACK OF CITIZENSHIP AND LEADERSHIP SKILLS" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Serious		2		3		4		(5) Very Serious		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean [b]	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	2	7.41	2	7.41	11	40.74	7	25.93	2	7.41	3	11.11	27	25.23	3.21	1.02
Campus Faculty & Staff	0	0.00	3	11.11	10	37.04	11	40.74	3	11.11	0	0.00	27	25.23	3.52	0.85
Extension Administration	0	0.00	1	3.85	9	34.62	13	50.00	3	11.54	0	0.00	26	24.30	3.69	0.74
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	9	33.33	10	37.04	8	29.63	0	0.00	27	25.23	3.96	0.81
Totals	2	1.87	6	5.61	39	36.45	41	38.32	16	14.95	3	2.80	107	100.00	3.61	0.89

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

[b] On basis of difference equal to or greater than .50 between group means, notable differences exist between the means for two or more groups.

Poor Nutrition and Fitness. The seventh ranked youth at risk issue was "poor nutrition and fitness". With an average score of 3.54, as shown in Table 14, this issue began to approach the middle ground on the five point scale, and clearly lacked the perception of seriousness that was evident in the first three ranked issues. Table 14 shows that the campus faculty and staff group perceived "poor nutrition and fitness" to be notably more serious than any of the other three groups. The differences between mean scores range from 0.52 with the Extension 4-H staff up to 0.65 and 0.70 with the Extension administration and the OSU administration respectively. Looking at the individuals who were included in the campus faculty and staff group could explain some of this notable difference. Several individuals from the specific disciplines related to nutrition and fitness were included in this population group, whereas the individuals in other groups represent a more diverse group of disciplines. The OSU administrative group had the lowest mean score, of 3.30, but also had the highest standard deviation, with a score of 1.06.

Juvenile Delinquency. The issue of "juvenile delinquency" ranked eighth overall among the nine issue categories. Individual groups ranked this issue from 6th to 8th. As shown in Table 15, the average mean score for the perceived seriousness of this issue was 3.51 with a standard deviation of 0.86. The data in Table 15 reveal only one

TABLE 14

PERCEIVED SERIOUSNESS OF YOUTH AT RISK ISSUE OF "POOR NUTRITION AND FITNESS" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Serious		2		3		4		(5) Very Serious		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean [b]	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	1	3.70	4	14.81	8	29.63	7	25.93	3	11.11	4	14.81	27	25.23	3.30	1.06
Campus Faculty & Staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	18.52	16	59.26	5	18.52	1	3.70	27	25.23	4.00	0.63
Extension Administration	0	0.00	2	7.69	14	53.85	9	34.62	1	3.85	0	0.00	26	24.30	3.35	0.69
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	3	11.11	11	40.74	10	37.04	3	11.11	0	0.00	27	25.23	3.48	0.85
Totals	1	0.93	9	8.41	38	35.51	42	39.25	12	11.21	5	4.67	107	100.00	3.54	0.85

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

[b] On basis of difference equal to or greater than .50 between group means, notable differences exist between the means for two or more groups.

TABLE 15

PERCEIVED SERIOUSNESS OF YOUTH AT RISK ISSUE OF "JUVENILE DELINQUENCY" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Serious		2		3		4		(5) Very Serious		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean [b]	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	1	3.70	3	11.11	12	44.44	8	29.63	2	7.41	1	3.70	27	25.23	3.27	0.92
Campus Faculty & Staff	0	0.00	1	3.70	8	29.63	12	44.44	6	22.22	0	0.00	27	25.23	3.85	0.82
Extension Administration	0	0.00	6	23.08	6	23.08	12	46.15	2	7.69	0	0.00	26	24.30	3.38	0.94
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	2	7.41	10	37.04	14	51.85	1	3.70	0	0.00	27	25.23	3.52	0.70
Totals	1	0.93	12	11.21	36	33.64	46	42.99	11	10.28	1	0.93	107	100.00	3.51	0.86

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

[b] On basis of difference equal to or greater than .50 between group means, notable differences exist between the means for two or more groups.

notable difference between the four groups. Campus faculty and staff perceived the issue to be notably more serious than did the OSU administration as evidenced by the mean scores of 3.85 and 3.27. However, as different as these scores were from each other, neither one was within 0.50 of the means of the top two highest ranking issues. From comments made by the respondents during the interviews, it was clear that "juvenile delinquency" was a term that had lost its meaning or become less clear in the midst of other more serious issues. A number of the respondents asked for the term to be defined into specific behaviors in order for them to respond.

Depression and Suicide. "Depression and suicide" was clearly the last ranked issue in terms of the perceived seriousness for pre-college age youth in Oklahoma. Table 16 shows that the overall average mean for the ninth ranked issue was 3.40. This is 1.05 less than the average mean for the first ranked issue of "teenage sexuality and pregnancy." Of the four groups, both administrative groups ranked the issue of "depression and suicide" 9th, while the other two groups ranked it 7th. Table 16 clearly shows, however, that each of the four groups was less uniform on this issue than most of the other issues. Standard deviation scores on this issue range from 0.93 to 1.16 for an overall average standard deviation of 1.10. This shows that there was a great deal of disagreement about the perceived seriousness

TABLE 16

PERCEIVED SERIOUSNESS OF YOUTH AT RISK ISSUE OF "DEPRESSION AND SUICIDE" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Serious		2		3		4		(5) Very Serious		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean [b]	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	2	7.41	6	22.22	6	22.22	5	18.52	2	7.41	6	22.22	27	25.23	2.95	1.16
Campus Faculty & Staff	0	0.00	2	7.41	9	33.33	9	33.33	7	25.93	0	0.00	27	25.23	3.78	0.93
Extension Administration	1	3.85	8	30.77	11	42.31	3	11.54	3	11.54	0	0.00	26	24.30	2.96	1.04
Extension 4-H Staff	1	3.70	1	3.70	8	29.63	10	37.04	7	25.93	0	0.00	27	25.23	3.78	1.01
Totals	4	3.74	17	15.89	34	31.78	27	25.23	19	17.76	6	5.61	107	100.00	3.40	1.10

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

[b] On basis of difference equal to or greater than .50 between group means, notable differences exist between the means for two or more groups.

of this issue. This issue was avoided or not answered more than any other issue on the list. This was also the only issue with individual group means less than 3.00 on the scale. The administrative group means for this issue were 2.96 and 2.95 for the Extension and OSU administrative groups respectively. At the same time, both faculty and staff groups achieved average means of 3.78. Thus, the two faculty and staff groups rated "depression and suicide" as notably more serious than the other two groups.

Additional Issues. In addition to the nine issue areas that were included in the scale, each respondent had the opportunity to indicate other issues or concerns that they thought should be on the list. Twenty-one individuals or 19 percent of the respondents asked that other items be added to the list of "youth at risk" issues. A total of twenty-eight additional items were suggested to be included as "youth at risk" issues.

The most common items added to the list included child abuse, dysfunctional family situations, and lack of desire for education or lack of recognition of value of education. Comments related to youth's desires for education included general comments, but also included specific comments about youth's attitudes towards math and science. Other factors that were mentioned more than once included lack of parenting skills, smoking/chewing/dipping tobacco, child care, and lack of appropriate role models. See Table 17

for a complete summary of the items that were added to the list of "youth at risk" issues. Because of the lack of numbers and because some individuals did not give scale values to the added items, the scores for these items were not reported. Nine campus faculty suggested additional issues or concerns. Of the other groups, six administrators, and three each in the two Extension groups made additional suggestions of concerns or issues to be included.

TABLE 17

ADDITIONAL YOUTH AT RISK FACTORS
LISTED BY RESPONDENTS

Issue	Number of Responses
Child Abuse	5
Lack of Desire To Prepare for Future (Poor educational preparation, poor math science preparation)	5
Dysfunctional Family Situation (single parenting, addicted parents, financial stress, lack of close ties)	5
Lack of Parenting Skills	2
Smoking/Chewing/Dipping Tobacco	2
Child Care	2
Lack of Appropriate Role Models	2
Lack of Career Exploration Opportunities	1
Homeless Youth	1
Alienation	1
Poor Discipline	1
Lack of Spiritual Values	1
Total Added Issues or Concerns	28

To determine if there were differences in the perceptions of seriousness of "youth at risk" issues between individuals with different professional positions at OSU, the mean scores for each of the nine issues were compared. Tables 7 through 16 have provided the frequency distributions, means and standard deviations for the total group as well as for each of the four groups. There were no notable differences for three of the nine categories of "youth at risk" issues. All four groups were in general agreement in their perception of seriousness of the issues of "teen sexuality and pregnancy", "abuse of drugs and alcohol", and "poor job preparation". While the first two of these were the first two ranked overall, "poor job preparation" was fifth of the nine issues ranked. For the issues of "teenage sexuality and pregnancy" and "abuse of drugs and alcohol", it would seem to indicate that there was general agreement on the perception of these as the most serious issues which face the youth of the state.

As described in the preceding sections, each of six issues of "school dropouts and illiteracy", "lack of personal values and self-esteem", "lack of citizenship and leadership skills", "poor nutrition and fitness", "juvenile delinquency", and "depression and suicide" showed notable differences between two or more groups.

In summary, it would appear that all groups were in agreement on the more serious issues such as teen pregnancy, and substance abuse. While on most of the other issues,

there was more difference of opinion regarding which issues were more serious.

Appropriateness of Higher Education Involvement in Youth At Risk Issues

When asked the question: "Do you think its appropriate for higher education in Oklahoma to be concerned with these problems as they affect pre-college age youth?", 95.33 percent said "yes". Four individuals responded either "maybe" or "unsure" to this question, representing 3.74 percent of the total. In the OSU administrative group, one individual said "no". Comments made at the time indicated that this individual viewed "youth at risk" issues as moral or value laden issues, which were therefore not appropriate for university consideration.

Table 18 shows that of the total group of respondents, only 0.93 percent responded negatively to the question, while 99.07 percent responded with either a positive or neutral answer.

TABLE 18

PERCEPTIONS OF THE APPROPRIATENESS OF HIGHER EDUCATION'S INVOLVEMENT WITH YOUTH AT RISK ISSUES

Group	Responses							
	Yes		Maybe		No		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
OSU Administration	24	88.89	2	7.41	1	3.70	27	25.23
Faculty & Staff	26	96.30	1	3.70	0	0.00	27	25.23
Extension Administration	25	96.15	1	3.85	0	0.00	26	24.30
Extension 4-H Staff	27	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	27	25.23
Totals	102	95.33	4	3.74	1	0.93	107	100.00

With the exception of one OSU administrator, the respondents generally felt it was appropriate for the University to be involved with "youth at risk" issues.

Except for the one respondent that indicated it was not appropriate for Oklahoma State University to be involved in "youth at risk" issues programs for pre-college age youth, all other respondents were given the opportunity to answer nine additional questions related to specific ways the issues might be addressed.

Each interview schedule was constructed to solicit responses based on the individual's perceptions related to

their current professional position with Oklahoma State University. In this case, for the first series of questions, the respondents were asked to consider their own department or college. In the case of the Extension respondents, the terms Extension or 4-H were used to put their focus on their own situations. The questions related to broader university involvement such as those on coalitions and task forces were directed at the total university.

The following section includes the discussions of the four group's responses to those specific questions. These questions are addressed in the order of the ranking of appropriateness for the total of all respondents.

Table 19 shows that the top three highest ranked specific actions were the development of coalitions, development of instructional programs, and the development of research. These had average mean scores of 4.60, 4.59 and 4.57 respectively. These three items were separated by only 0.03 on the 5.00 scale, showing that all three of the top ranked actions were viewed as being very appropriate. Close inspection of the summary table shows that the extremely close average mean scores may be misleading to some degree because the ranking of these three items within each of the four groups varied widely. Building coalitions was the highest ranked action for both of the Extension groups, but ranked 3rd and 5th among the OSU administration and campus faculty and staff groups

TABLE 19

RANKS, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO YOUTH AT RISK ISSUES BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

	Total			University Administration			Campus Faculty & Staff			Extension Administration			Extension 4-H Staff		
Issue	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
Coalitions to Develop Programs	1	4.60	0.76	3	4.58	0.78	5	4.46	1.07	1	4.69	0.55	1	4.67	0.55
Instructional Programs	2	4.59	0.71	2	4.64	0.57	2	4.58	0.81	2	4.54	0.81	2	4.59	0.64
Develop Research	3	4.57	0.79	1	4.78	0.58	1	4.74	0.59	7	4.15	1.05	3	4.59	0.75
Short Term Task Forces	4	4.40	0.76	5	4.35	1.03	4	4.48	0.70	3	4.38	0.64	6	4.37	0.69
Public Service Network	5	4.40	0.77	4	4.36	0.81	3	4.52	0.70	4	4.31	0.79	5	4.41	0.80
Personal Involvement	6	4.30	0.84	6	4.32	0.78	7	4.33	1.04	5	4.23	0.82	7	4.33	0.73
Degree Programs	7	4.29	1.00	7	4.00	1.26	6	4.44	1.05	6	4.19	0.90	4	4.44	0.80
One Department to Coordinate	8	3.55	1.29	9	3.04	1.36	9	2.96	1.28	8	4.00	1.20	8	4.11	0.93
Center for Youth Development	9	3.51	1.34	8	3.19	1.40	8	3.96	1.25	9	3.12	1.27	9	3.67	1.33

respectively. On the other hand, the development of instructional programs was ranked second by all of the groups, with a group standard deviation of 0.71. This would seen to indicate that there was uniformity in the high ranking of this specific action. The development of research to address "youth at risk" issues was ranked first by both the OSU administration and the campus faculty and staff, while the Extension 4-H staff ranked it third and the Extension administration ranked it seventh. If not for the seventh place ranking among the Extension Administration, it would have clearly been the highest ranked item on the list. While reviewing each of the specific actions in the following sections, it should be remembered that the top three actions had similar means, but two of the three varied greatly between group rankings.

Developing Coalitions to Address the Issues. As shown in Table 20, there were no notable differences in the mean scores for the four groups regarding the questions about the appropriateness of developing coalitions to address "youth at risk" issues. With the Extension administration mean of 4.69 and the campus faculty and staff mean of 4.46, only 0.23 separated the highest and lowest mean scores for this question. However, it should be noted that while all the mean scores were very similar, the variability as shown by the standard deviations were very different. Both Extension groups had very similar scores with identical standard

TABLE 20

PERCEIVED APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO YOUTH AT RISK: "COALITIONS TO DEVELOP PROGRAMS" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Appropriate		2		3		4		(5) Very Appropriate		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	0	0.00	1	3.70	1	3.70	5	18.52	17	62.96	3	11.11	27	25.23	4.58	0.78
Campus Faculty & Staff	1	3.70	1	3.70	2	7.41	3	11.11	19	70.37	1	3.70	27	25.23	4.46	1.07
Extension Administration	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.70	6	23.08	19	73.08	0	0.00	26	24.30	4.69	0.55
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.70	7	25.93	19	70.37	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.67	0.55
Totals	1	0.93	2	1.87	5	4.67	21	19.63	74	69.16	4	3.74	107	100.00	4.60	0.76

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

deviations of 0.55. In contrast, the campus faculty and staff group had a standard deviation of 1.07. This shows that campus faculty and staff were much less unified in their support for the concept of developing coalitions to address the "youth at risk" issues.

Developing Instructional Programs. As the second ranked overall specific action to address "youth at risk" issues, the development of instructional programs was the most uniformly answered question of all the scaled questions. As shown in Table 21, no respondent indicated this was "not appropriate" and only two individuals ranked it as a "2" on the negative end of the scale. All other responses were either in the middle of the scale or the positive end of the scale. By comparing the mean scores and standard deviations for each of the groups, it was clear that uniformity was present on this response. The range of mean scores from 4.54 to 4.64 was extremely close, and the standard deviation scores likewise do not vary greatly.

Developing Research. As the third ranked overall specific action to address youth at risk issues, the overall mean for developing research was only 0.03 less than for the first ranked item of building coalitions. As Table 19 showed earlier, developing research was the first ranked item for both of the campus groups. As Table 22 shows, the mean scores of 4.78 and 4.74 for the University administration and the campus faculty and staff groups

TABLE 21

PERCEIVED APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO YOUTH AT RISK: "DEVELOP INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Appropriate		2		3		4		(5) Very Appropriate		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.70	7	25.93	17	62.96	2	7.41	27	25.23	4.64	0.57
Campus Faculty & Staff	0	0.00	1	3.70	2	7.41	4	14.81	19	70.37	1	3.70	27	25.23	4.58	0.81
Extension Administration	0	0.00	1	3.85	2	7.69	5	19.23	18	69.23	0	0.00	26	24.30	4.54	0.81
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	7.41	7	25.93	18	66.67	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.59	0.64
Totals	0	0.00	2	1.87	7	6.54	23	21.50	72	67.29	3	2.80	107	100.00	4.59	0.71

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

TABLE 22

PERCEIVED APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO YOUTH AT RISK: "DEVELOP RESEARCH" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Appropriate		2		3		4		(5) Very Appropriate		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean [b]	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	7.41	2	7.41	23	85.19	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.78	0.58
Campus Faculty & Staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	7.41	3	11.11	22	81.48	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.74	0.59
Extension Administration	0	0.00	3	11.54	3	11.54	7	26.92	13	50.00	0	0.00	26	24.30	4.15	1.05
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	1	3.70	1	3.70	6	22.22	19	70.37	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.59	0.75
Totals	0	0.00	4	3.74	8	7.48	18	16.82	77	71.96	0	0.00	107	100.00	4.57	0.79

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

[b] On basis of difference equal to or greater than .50 between group means, notable differences exist between the means for two or more groups.

respectively were the two highest means for the entire group of questions about the appropriateness of specific actions. The scores of the two campus groups were notably higher than for the Extension administration, but not for the Extension 4-H staff. Among the four groups, the Extension administration had the lowest mean with a score of 4.15, and the highest standard deviation with a score of 1.05.

Discussion associated with this question provided a clue to the notable difference in the Extension administration scores. Extension administrators were more aware of the Agricultural Experiment Station's role in conducting research for use by instruction and Extension faculty and staff. This awareness may have affected their perceptions of the appropriateness of conducting research.

Develop Short Term Task Forces. Table 23 shows that perceptions of the appropriateness of developing short term task forces were not notably different for the four groups. Further, the four groups all placed this option near the middle of their respective rankings of the nine actions. The University administration standard deviation score was the highest of the four group's scores. Their score of 1.03 was strongly influenced by the one "not appropriate" response and the fact that their group included four individuals who choose not to answer or indicated they "didn't know" how to answer the question.

Public Service Networks. Table 24 shows the results of

TABLE 23

PERCEIVED APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO YOUTH AT RISK:
"DEVELOP SHORT TERM TASK FORCES"
BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Appropriate		2		3		4		(5) Very Appropriate		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	1	3.70	0	0.00	3	11.11	5	18.52	14	51.85	4	14.81	27	25.23	4.35	1.03
Campus Faculty & Staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	11.11	8	29.63	16	59.26	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.48	0.70
Extension Administration	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	7.69	12	46.15	12	46.15	0	0.00	26	24.30	4.38	0.64
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	11.11	11	40.74	13	48.15	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.37	0.69
Totals	1	0.93	0	0.00	11	10.28	36	33.64	55	51.40	4	3.74	107	100.00	4.40	0.76

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

TABLE 24

PERCEIVED APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO YOUTH AT RISK: "DEVELOP PUBLIC SERVICE NETWORK" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Appropriate		2		3		4		(5) Very Appropriate		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	0	0.00	1	3.70	2	7.41	9	33.33	13	48.15	2	7.41	27	25.23	4.36	0.81
Campus Faculty & Staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	11.11	7	25.93	17	62.96	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.52	0.70
Extension Administration	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	19.23	8	30.77	13	50.00	0	0.00	26	24.30	4.31	0.79
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	1	3.70	2	7.41	9	33.33	15	55.56	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.41	0.80
Totals	0	0.00	2	1.87	12	11.21	33	30.84	58	54.21	2	1.87	107	100.00	4.40	0.77

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

data collected on the appropriateness of developing a public service network to deliver programs related to "youth at risk". The overall raw score mean was only slightly below the mean for task forces, which placed the public service networks fifth in the overall ranking. Table 24 shows that there were no notable differences in means, and very little difference between rankings or standard deviations. It is interesting however, that since the Extension program is one of the University's public service programs, that the campus faculty and staff mean and ranking were both higher than for either one of the Extension groups.

Personal Involvement in Youth At Risk . Table 25 shows that perception of the appropriateness of personal involvement did not vary notably among the four groups by professional position. The range of mean scores were from 4.23 by Extension administrators to 4.33 by both the faculty and staff groups, with the University administration in between with a mean score of 4.32. It might be noted, however, that in the University administration group, 18.52 percent of the group were in the non-respondent category, which would seem to indicate some uncertainty about the appropriateness of their personal involvement.

Degree Programs for Youth Development. The seventh ranked action in response to "youth at risk" issues was the development of special career or degree programs for youth development professionals. Table 26 shows that there were

TABLE 25

PERCEIVED APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO YOUTH AT RISK: "RESPONDENT TO BE PERSONALLY INVOLVED" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Appropriate		2		3		4		(5) Very Appropriate		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	14.81	7	25.93	11	40.74	5	18.52	27	25.23	4.32	0.78
Campus Faculty & Staff	1	3.70	1	3.70	2	7.41	7	25.93	16	59.26	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.33	1.04
Extension Administration	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	23.08	8	30.77	12	46.15	0	0.00	26	24.30	4.23	0.82
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	1	3.70	1	3.70	13	48.15	12	44.44	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.33	0.73
Totals	1	0.93	2	1.87	13	12.15	35	32.71	51	47.66	5	4.67	107	100.00	4.30	0.84

[a] All non-responses and thosa not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

TABLE 26

PERCEIVED APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO YOUTH AT RISK:
"DEGREE PROGRAMS FOR YOUTH DEVELOPMENT"
BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Appropriate		2		3		4		(5) Very Appropriate		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	2	7.41	1	3.70	1	3.70	8	29.63	9	33.33	6	22.22	27	25.23	4.00	1.26
Campus Faculty & Staff	1	3.70	1	3.70	2	7.41	4	14.81	19	70.37	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.44	1.05
Extension Administration	0	0.00	1	3.85	5	19.23	8	30.77	12	46.15	0	0.00	26	24.30	4.19	0.90
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	18.52	5	18.52	17	62.96	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.44	0.80
Totals	3	2.80	3	2.80	13	12.15	25	23.36	57	53.27	6	5.61	107	100.00	4.29	1.00

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

no notable differences between the perceptions of the four groups. The rank orders for the four groups varied more widely than for the previous three actions. The Extension 4-H staff ranked this item 4th, while the OSU administration ranked the item 7th. The standard deviation for the total group was 1.00, thus signifying that more diverse views existed on this question. The University administration's standard deviation of 1.26 might be explained by the comments of some who were aware of the time and detail involved in getting approval for any new degree program.

Designation of One Department to Coordinate Programs. The most notable differences among the appropriateness questions were related to this action. As noted in Table 27, there were notable differences between groups. The two Extension groups were more likely to perceive the designation of one department to coordinate youth at risk programs as appropriate than the other two groups of OSU administration and campus faculty and staff. In addition to the notable differences between the two groups of scores, the standard deviations were all much higher than normal. The OSU administration group score of 1.36 showed that there was little agreement among the individuals in the group. The campus faculty and staff mean score of 2.96 was the only mean score on summary Table 19 that fell below the mid point of the scale, thus indicating an overall negative perception of the action. Again this could be explained by individual

TABLE 27

PERCEIVED APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO YOUTH AT RISK: "DESIGNATE ONE DEPARTMENT TO COORDINATE PROGRAMS" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Appropriate		2		3		4		(5) Very Appropriate		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean [b]	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	5	18.52	3	11.11	3	11.11	10	37.04	2	7.41	4	14.81	27	25.23	3.04	1.36
Campus Faculty & Staff	5	18.52	3	11.11	9	33.33	6	22.22	3	11.11	1	3.70	27	25.23	2.96	1.28
Extension Administration	1	3.85	3	11.54	3	11.54	7	26.92	12	46.15	0	0.00	26	24.30	4.00	1.20
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	2	7.41	4	14.81	10	37.04	11	40.74	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.11	0.93
Totals	11	10.28	11	10.28	19	17.76	33	30.84	28	26.17	5	4.67	107	100.00	3.55	1.29

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

[b] On basis of difference equal to or greater than .50 between group means, notable differences exist between the means for two or more groups.

comments that were made at the time of the interviews. A number of campus based faculty and staff indicated that they felt there would be too many "turf battles" for this action to be appropriate at this time.

Center for Youth Development. The ninth ranked item on the list of action responses to "youth at risk" issues was the development of a Center for Youth Development. Table 28 shows that notable differences also existed for this item. Both the campus faculty and staff and the Extension 4-H staff were notably more positive in their responses about the appropriateness of a Center for Youth Development. It should be noted however, that the overall mean score of 3.51 was over 1.00 less than the overall mean scores for each of the first three ranked items on the list. Therefore care should be taken in assigning value to the notable differences. It should also be noted that a total of 8 individuals or 7.48 percent of the total of all groups were in the "not answered" category on this question. Further, the highest average standard deviation for the study was the 1.40 achieved on this question.

Summary. Looking back at the summary of all the mean scores, standard deviations, and rankings for the questions related to the appropriateness of specific actions, it was clear that there were three groups of rankings. The top three actions of developing coalitions, developing instructional programs, and developing research, were

TABLE 28

PERCEIVED APPROPRIATENESS OF ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO YOUTH AT RISK: "CREATE A CENTER FOR YOUTH DEVELOPMENT" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Appropriate		2		3		4		(5) Very Appropriate		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean [b]	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	4	14.81	2	7.41	5	18.52	6	22.22	4	14.81	6	22.22	27	25.23	3.19	1.40
Campus Faculty & Staff	2	7.41	1	3.70	5	18.52	6	22.22	12	44.44	1	3.70	27	25.23	3.96	1.25
Extension Administration	3	11.54	5	19.23	7	26.92	6	23.08	4	15.38	1	3.85	26	24.30	3.12	1.27
Extension 4-H Staff	2	7.41	4	14.81	5	18.52	6	22.22	10	37.04	0	0.00	27	25.23	3.67	1.33
Totals	11	10.28	12	11.21	22	20.56	24	22.43	30	28.04	8	7.48	107	100.00	3.51	1.34

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

[b] On basis of difference equal to or greater than .50 between group means, notable differences exist between the means for two or more groups.

clearly perceived by all four groups as being very appropriate. Standard deviation scores for these questions show that there was general agreement among the groups. The only notable differences were for the appropriateness of developing research. There was great diversity in the rankings of two of the three top overall items. Developing coalitions was ranked first by both of the Extension groups while developing research was first with both the OSU administration and the campus faculty and staff. Developing instructional programs was the only item in this segment of questions which was ranked the same by all four groups.

The second set of three actions: short term task forces, public service network, and personal involvement, were generally ranked in the middle of the list of actions. Although there were some minor differences in the rankings for these items, there were few differences between rankings, mean scores, or standard deviations. There were no notable differences between scores.

The final set of three actions included the development of degree programs, designation of one department to coordinate the development of programs, and the idea of a new center for youth development. Scores for these three items were more diverse than for other items, and the average mean scores were notable in their difference from the overall mean scores of the first three ranked items.

Funding Options for Youth At Risk Programs

The final series of scale questions related to the likelihood of funds for "youth at risk" programs coming from each of several sources. Six sources of funds were investigated as summarized in Table 29. This table shows that except for one tie in the rankings for the Extension 4-H Agents, all four groups ranked all the the items the same. This did not happen on either of the other sets of questions. The table shows that the campus faculty and staff group has both the highest mean score for funding from private foundation grants and the lowest mean score for funding from existing departments. Generally all of the mean scores were lower while the standard deviation scores were higher for this set of questions than for the other two sets of questions.

In the following sections are discussions of each of the questions in the order of their overall ranking.

Private Foundation Grants. When asked how likely it would be for "youth at risk" funds to come from private foundation grants made to the University, all four groups responded positively. Table 30 shows the distribution of responses, along with the group means and standard deviations. On the five point scale, this was the only one of the funding question to average 4.00 or more. There were no notable differences between the group means.

TABLE 29

RANKS, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR PERCEIVED LIKELIHOOD OF YOUTH AT RISK FUNDING SOURCES BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

	Total			University Administration			Campus Faculty & Staff			Extension Administration			Extension 4-H Staff		
Issue	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD
Private Foundation Grants	1	4.00	0.78	1	3.80	0.96	1	4.19	0.79	1	4.04	0.60	1	3.96	0.76
Federal Government Appropriations	2	3.60	0.98	2	3.67	0.92	2	3.65	1.23	2	3.69	.088	2	3.41	0.89
State Government Appropriations	3	2.95	1.09	3	2.71	0.91	3	2.96	1.29	3	3.12	1.14	3T	3.00	1.00
User Fees	4	2.76	0.97	4	2.52	1.12	4	2.93	1.00	4	2.54	0.81	3T	3.00	0.92
Reallocation of Existing Funds	5	2.13	1.02	5	1.79	1.10	5	1.85	0.82	5	2.27	0.87	5	2.59	1.12
Existing Depart Funds	6	1.85	0.92	6	1.71	0.91	6	1.59	0.93	6	2.04	0.96	6	2.04	0.85

TABLE 30

PERCEIVED LIKELIHOOD OF YOUTH AT RISK PROGRAM FUNDING SOURCES:
"PRIVATE FOUNDATION GRANTS MADE TO THE UNIVERSITY"
BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(How likely that funds will come from this source) (1) Not Likely		2		3		4		(5) Very Likely		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	0	0.00	2	7.41	8	29.63	8	29.63	7	25.93	2	7.41	27	25.23	3.80	0.96
Campus Faculty & Staff	0	0.00	1	3.70	3	11.11	13	48.15	10	37.04	0	0.00	27	25.23	4.19	0.79
Extension Administration	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	15.38	17	65.38	5	19.23	0	0.00	26	24.30	4.04	0.60
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	1	3.70	5	18.52	15	55.56	6	22.22	0	0.00	27	25.23	3.96	0.76
Totals	0	0.00	4	3.74	20	18.69	53	49.53	28	26.17	2	1.87	107	100.00	4.00	0.78

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

Federal Government Appropriations. Table 31 shows that all four groups were in general agreement as to the likelihood that funding would come from federal government appropriations. Along with private foundation grants, this funding option was one of the two funding options with positive average mean scores for all four groups. The overall mean and the four group means were all above the neutral "three" on the five point scale. The standard deviation score of 1.23 for the campus faculty and staff group reflects the result of three individuals responding with "not likely" scores.

State Government Appropriations. The overall average mean for state government appropriations was very near the "three" mid point on the five point scale. Table 32 shows that there were no notable differences between the four groups, this would seem to indicate that the total group was very neutral regarding the likelihood of funding coming from state government. However, the standard deviation for the total group was 1.09 which indicates a general lack of uniformity in the views of respondents.

User Fees. Table 33 shows that there were no notable differences between the mean scores of the four groups when asked about the likelihood of funds for "youth at risk" programs coming from user fees paid by organizations or individuals. The overall mean score of 2.76 would seem to

TABLE 31

PERCEIVED LIKELIHOOD OF YOUTH AT RISK PROGRAM FUNDING SOURCES:
"FEDERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS OR GRANTS"
BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(How likely that funds will come from this source) (1) Not Likely		2		3		4		(5) Very Likely		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	0	0.00	3	11.11	6	22.22	11	40.74	4	14.81	3	11.11	27	25.23	3.67	0.92
Campus Faculty & Staff	3	11.11	0	0.00	7	25.93	9	33.33	7	25.93	1	3.70	27	25.23	3.65	1.23
Extension Administration	0	0.00	2	7.69	9	34.62	10	38.46	5	19.23	0	0.00	26	24.30	3.69	0.88
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	4	14.81	11	40.74	9	33.33	3	11.11	0	0.00	27	25.23	3.41	0.89
Totals	3	2.80	9	8.41	33	30.84	39	36.45	19	17.76	4	3.74	107	100.00	3.60	0.98

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

TABLE 32

PERCEIVED LIKELIHOOD OF YOUTH AT RISK PROGRAM FUNDING SOURCES:
"STATE GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS OR GRANTS"
BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(How likely that funds will come from this source) (1) Not Likely		2		3		4		(5) Very Likely		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	2	7.41	7	25.93	12	44.44	2	7.41	1	3.70	3	11.11	27	25.23	2.71	0.91
Campus Faculty & Staff	5	18.52	4	14.81	8	29.63	7	25.93	3	11.11	0	0.00	27	25.23	2.96	1.29
Extension Administration	1	3.85	10	38.46	2	7.69	11	42.31	2	7.69	0	0.00	26	24.30	3.12	1.14
Extension 4-H Staff	2	7.41	5	18.52	13	48.15	5	18.52	2	7.41	0	0.00	27	25.23	3.00	1.00
Totals	10	9.35	26	24.30	35	32.71	25	23.36	8	7.48	3	2.80	107	100.00	2.95	1.09

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

TABLE 33

PERCEIVED LIKELIHOOD OF YOUTH AT RISK PROGRAM FUNDING SOURCES: "USER FEES PAID BY ORGANIZATIONS OR INDIVIDUALS" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(How likely that funds will come from this source) (1) Not Likely		2		3		4		(5) Very Likely		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	4	14.81	8	29.63	8	29.63	1	3.70	2	7.41	4	14.81	27	25.23	2.52	1.12
Campus Faculty & Staff	3	11.11	4	14.81	13	48.15	6	22.22	1	3.70	0	0.00	27	25.23	2.93	1.00
Extension Administration	3	11.54	8	30.77	13	50.00	2	7.69	0	0.00	0	0.00	26	24.30	2.54	0.81
Extension 4-H Staff	0	0.00	9	33.33	11	40.74	5	18.52	2	7.41	0	0.00	27	25.23	3.00	0.92
Totals	10	9.35	29	27.10	45	42.06	14	13.08	5	4.67	4	3.74	107	100.00	2.76	0.97

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

indicate that this option was viewed as less likely than other sources of funds.

Reallocation of Existing Funds. Table 34 shows that this potential funding source was generally viewed as an unlikely source of funds with an overall mean score of 2.13. However, there were notable differences between the groups. The Extension 4-H staff were notably more positive about the likelihood of funds coming from reallocation than were the OSU administration or the campus faculty and staff.

Existing Department Funds. The lowest ranked of the potential funding sources was existing department funds. With an overall mean score of 1.85 and a standard deviation of 0.92, this funding source was obviously not perceived to be very likely to generate funds for "youth at risk" programs. Table 35 shows that for the total of all respondents, 42.06 percent indicated they felt it was "not likely" for funds to come from this source. It was clear that faculty, staff and administrators at Oklahoma State University felt that further stretching existing funds was not a viable option. In fact, several individual reactions to the question were more negative than could be recorded on the scale. This was one of several scale questions that generated additional comments. Generally those comments characterized individuals pessimism regarding the use of existing funds to do more.

TABLE 34

PERCEIVED LIKELIHOOD OF YOUTH AT RISK PROGRAM FUNDING SOURCES: "REALLOCATION OF EXISTING FUNDS" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(How likely that funds will come from this source) (1) Not Likely		2		3		4		(5) Very Likely		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean [b]	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	13	48.15	6	22.22	3	11.11	1	3.70	1	3.70	3	11.11	27	25.23	1.79	1.10
Campus Faculty & Staff	10	37.04	12	44.44	4	14.81	1	3.70	0	0.00	0	0.00	27	25.23	1.85	0.82
Extension Administration	4	15.38	14	53.85	5	19.23	3	11.54	0	0.00	0	0.00	26	24.30	2.27	0.87
Extension 4-H Staff	4	14.81	11	40.74	5	18.52	6	22.22	1	3.70	0	0.00	27	25.23	2.59	1.12
Totals	31	28.97	43	40.19	17	15.89	11	10.28	2	1.87	3	2.80	107	100.00	2.13	1.02

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

[b] On basis of difference equal to or greater than .50 between group means, notable differences exist between the means for two or more groups.

TABLE 35

PERCEIVED LIKELIHOOD OF YOUTH AT RISK PROGRAM FUNDING SOURCES: "EXISTING BUDGETS" BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(How likely that funds will come from this source) (1) Not Likely		2		3		4		(5) Very Likely		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	13	48.15	6	22.22	4	14.81	1	3.70	0	0.00	3	11.11	27	25.23	1.71	0.91
Campus Faculty & Staff	16	59.26	8	29.63	2	7.41	0	0.00	1	3.70	0	0.00	27	25.23	1.59	0.93
Extension Administration	8	30.77	12	46.15	3	11.54	3	11.54	0	0.00	0	0.00	26	24.30	2.04	0.96
Extension 4-H Staff	8	29.63	11	40.74	7	25.93	1	3.70	0	0.00	0	0.00	27	25.23	2.04	0.85
Totals	45	42.06	37	34.58	16	14.95	5	4.67	1	0.93	3	2.80	107	100.00	1.85	0.92

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

Youth at Risk Programs Without New Funds. The final scale question in the funding section was not intended to measure the perceptions of likelihood of sources of funds, but rather to determine respondents perceptions regarding the likelihood that new or expanded programs would be developed even if new funds were not provided. The question was intended to determine how optimistic the faculty, staff, and administration were about the future development of programs to address "youth at risk," even if new funds were not provided. Table 36 shows that notable differences existed among the groups. The Extension administration score of 2.77 is 1.14 more than the 1.63 mean score for the campus faculty and staff. Both of the Extension group means were above the total group mean while both of the non-Extension group means were below the total group mean.

Summary. It should be remembered that for the six funding sources, all four groups ranked them the same, except for one tie in the Extension 4-H staff group. No criteria were developed to compare the ranked orders for the four groups, so the researcher could not say this was "notable" or "significant". However, it should be considered along with other findings.

Responses To Open-Ended Questions

In addition to the scaled questions related to "youth at risk" issues; appropriate actions; and funding options,

TABLE 36

PERCEIVED LIKELIHOOD THAT YOUTH AT RISK PROGRAMS WILL BE DEVELOPED WITHOUT NEW FUNDS, BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Professional Position	(1) Not Likely		2		3		4		(5) Very Likely		Not Answered [a]		Total		Mean [b]	SD
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
OSU Administration	10	37.04	7	25.93	4	14.81	2	7.41	1	3.70	3	11.11	27	25.23	2.04	1.16
Campus Faculty & Staff	13	48.15	11	40.74	3	11.11	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	27	25.23	1.63	0.69
Extension Administration	3	11.54	7	26.92	9	34.62	7	26.92	0	0.00	0	0.00	26	24.30	2.77	0.99
Extension 4-H Staff	9	33.33	7	25.93	7	25.93	3	11.11	1	3.70	0	0.00	27	25.23	2.26	1.16
Totals	35	32.71	32	29.91	23	21.50	12	11.21	2	1.87	3	2.80	107	100.00	2.17	1.08

[a] All non-responses and those not included in the five point scale are included in the not answered category on this table. Responses in the not answered category are not included in the calculation of means or standard deviations.

[b] On basis of difference equal to or greater than .50 between group means, notable differences exist between the means for two or more groups.

there were several open-ended questions which were included to allow the researcher to gather qualitative data related to the study objectives. Through the use of the open-ended questions and probing follow-up questions, valuable insights were gained into the perceptions of each of the four groups.

Open-ended questions were asked to determine who the respondents felt should provide the leadership for "youth at risk" program development at Oklahoma State University; to identify some of the currently existing programs that were designed to address "youth at risk" issues; to find out what respondents felt the University should be doing to respond to the issues; and to identify the challenges that would be faced in responding to the issues. Further, with the Extension respondents, a line of questioning was also developed to determine how Extension personnel felt about 4-H becoming involved with "youth at risk" issues. In the next section, each of the open ended questions is discussed with regard to the consensus of each group and the total group. Significant individual responses are also noted, but not identified with the actual respondent.

Leadership for Program Development

Responses to this question were categorized to develop a consensus from the total of the four groups. By far the largest number of respondents indicated that a variety of departments and personnel from across the campus should be involved. About 70 percent of the respondents gave answers

that indicated their feeling that a multi-college coalition should provide the leadership for these programs.

The next largest group of responses related to the Cooperative Extension being involved in providing the leadership to respond. Approximately 60 percent of the respondents mentioned Extension in their response to the question about leadership. This was expected since half of the respondents represented the Extension Service. If this had not been a popular response it would have been particularly note worthy.

About twenty percent of the non-Extension respondents mentioned the Cooperative Extension or 4-H Programs as specifically providing leadership to these programs. It should be noted however, that there were some Extension administrators and staff that did not include Extension or 4-H in their response to this answer.

Approximately fifteen percent of the respondents indicated they felt the leadership should come from their own department or college. About ten percent felt the leadership should come from "anyone that is interested in these problems."

There were five individuals who felt that leadership for "youth at risk" programs should come from departments other than their own. This was an interesting response because all of the respondents were considered to be in departments and programs that would be or could be involved in "youth at risk" programs. One 4-H staff respondent

specifically stated that this was not something that 4-H should try to take the leadership for, but rather that it should be left to those that were better prepared, such as psychology or health.

There were also five individuals who either had no ideas on this question, or choose not to respond.

Between the four groups there were no distinctive differences in the types of responses except for the fact that Extension groups consistently indicated that Extension and or 4-H should be involved since 4-H and some Extension Home Economics programs were already dealing with many of these issues.

The fact that most of the interviewees responded with a list of departments representing two or more colleges would seem to indicate that in order to address the variety of youth at risk issues it will take an effort by more than any one college or department. When probing regarding why the respondents were listing more than one or two departments to provide "leadership", the responses were typically the same: "no one department has the resources or the expertise to address all of these issues."

Current Programs

Except for some respondents who indicated they had very limited time, each respondent was given the opportunity to identify programs, faculty, staff, or departments that related to the youth at risk issues that had already been

discussed. Generally speaking, administrators, especially the members of the board of regents, were less aware of programs than the other groups. This was expected because of the nature of their involvement with the University and the less frequent exposure they would have to programs.

Campus faculty were generally familiar with a variety of programs. However, some were more aware of programs outside their own department while others knew only of programs conducted by their own department. Extension administrators and 4-H staff were generally unaware of programs that were generated on the campus or by departments for use with special audiences. When asked about programs in or out of Extension, most Extension personnel failed to mention their current work as relating to the "youth at risk" issues. Once asked about the relationship, most indicated that they thought their traditional 4-H Program did have some affect on self concept, decision making and other skills related to the at-risk situation. Extension administrators were more likely to mention 4-H programs as being related to "youth at risk" programs than the Extension 4-H staff.

The responses to the question resulted in a list of programs and courses that could be developed into a catalog of campus and Extension efforts.

<u>What Should the Land-grant University Do</u>

When respondents were asked the open-ended question:

"What do you feel Oklahoma State University should be doing about "youth at risk" issues?", a great variety of responses were received, but there were also some patterns that emerged.

The most common responses were identified and tabulated by the computer. Less common responses and unique replies were evaluated on an individual basis. Following are the responses that best represent the views of each group and the total of all four groups.

The most common response across all four groups related to developing coalitions, networks, or teamwork throughout the university system. About 40 percent of the respondents mentioned something that fit into this concept, and the numbers were very similar across all four groups. The frequency of this response was in agreement with the responses to the leadership question. It was clear from the responses to these two questions that a majority of the respondents felt the best way, or as some said, the only way to respond would be to develop multi-disciplinary coalitions or networks.

The next most common response involved incorporating "youth at risk" related programs into ongoing programs. About one third of the respondents mentioned some type of action that fit into this concept. Because different respondents related this approach more frequently to their own discipline, in some cases this meant teacher training, in other cases it meant Extension courses, while in others

it meant including new material in ongoing courses that were part of already available degree programs. This response was made more frequently by the campus faculty and administration than by the two Extension groups, but all four groups were represented.

The third most common response was that OSU should take the leadership and develop some type of response to these important societal problems. About thirty percent of the respondents mentioned something related to this idea. Some made reference to the service mission of land-grant universities, while others just thought it was important for the university to use its expertise to help solve the real problems of the state and country. About half of the Extension administration group responded in this general category, while other groups were less well represented. Campus faculty made the fewest responses of this type.

Following the three most common responses, there were three more responses that were all mentioned about the same number of times, each being mentioned by about 25 percent of the total group. Each of these less frequent responses was dominated by different groups or combinations of groups. OSU administrators, faculty, and staff suggested additional research, while this was rarely mentioned by the two Extension groups. The Extension groups dominated the response of putting Extension in charge or getting Extension involved to provide programs at the local level. Only two of the faculty and five of the University administrators

specifically mentioned getting Extension involved. The third idea, that of starting pilot programs in order to get something started was mentioned primarily by the two faculty and staff groups, and less frequently mentioned by the two administrative groups. Several times, the idea of the pilot program was tied to the idea of getting a small success so research or grant funds could be generated to build a bigger program.

Other responses that were mentioned by more than ten percent of the respondents included allocating additional funds to get something started; building awareness and clarifying the issues; and convincing administrators that it should be a higher priority.

In addition to some of the responses that were summarized, a variety of feelings and attitudes were conveyed by the respondents. Not to report some of these observations would be to ignore an important segment of information that came from the study. It was the opportunity to gather such data that led this researcher to conduct the lengthy personal interviews rather than send out a questionnaire.

Although many of the same categories of responses emerged from the summaries of responses, there were some distinct differences in the responses of the four groups. The University administration saw a more global view, but very objectively pictured the problems. One administrator said doing something about "youth at risk" was "as high a

priority as we could have." Several administrators mentioned the relationship between a well educated and motivated youth population and the future of the University. A number of the administrative group questioned how much of this type of activity could be attempted in light of what they perceived to be a new "research agenda". Others saw this effort fitting in well with future research projects as new funds become available for "youth at risk" programs. Several of the department and college administrators mentioned the desire to make a positive response but indicated their resources were just too limited at the current time.

Among the faculty group, the responses were well represented by the general comments made above. The faculty group was the one that mentioned the idea of a center for youth development most frequently. This group also mentioned the idea of collaboration with other state and federal agencies.

Among the Extension administration there were several diverse views. Some administrators expressed concerns about how "youth at risk" fit into the total picture of Extension and 4-H work. However, several County Extension Directors stated that responding to these issues was very important, and more than one indicated that if additional funds were available, they would be spent to hire staff to work on "youth at risk" issues.

The Extension 4-H staff tended to interpret the

question in terms of their own programs. Their orientation was directly related to Extension and 4-H, and their responses were often related to specific programmatic responses such as "get this to the kids that need it", rather than to think in terms of how the institution might respond. Another common response was that the University needed to develop the materials that Extension could deliver. Many county staff indicated that through the Extension delivery network, the "youth at risk" issues could be addressed if "someone" would develop the research and instructional programs for Extension staff to use.

What Challenges Will the Land-grant University Face

When asked the question: "what are the biggest challenges to creating programs to address youth at risk issues at Oklahoma State University?", some responses were predictable. About 70 percent of the respondents made some reference to funding as a potential challenge to be overcome. The number of responses of this type were almost evenly distributed among the four groups, indicating that this was a general concern of a majority of the respondents and not just any one or two groups.

The second most common response was that it would be hard to get commitment of personnel and time to address the issues. About 45 percent of the respondents made a comment related to commitment with all groups being fairly evenly

represented.

The third and fourth most commonly mentioned items may be related, which would make them the second most popular response. About 25 percent of the total mentioned "turf protection", ownership of the program, or getting cooperation from others. Another 25 percent mentioned resistance or slowness to change as the barrier. Turf protection was most commonly mentioned by the two faculty or staff groups, while resistance to change was more often mentioned by one of the two administration groups.

Another 25 percent responded that lack of administrative support or lack of recognition of "youth at risk" issues was a problem. All four groups were represented by this type of response.

The challenge that was most uniformly limited to only one or two groups was one mentioned by both Extension groups, but not mentioned by the other two groups. That was the challenge or problem of adequate training. This was a big concern for the Extension groups because very few Extension agents were trained to work with "youth at risk" problems.

Another problem that was limited to a single group was one raised by the campus faculty and staff group. That problem was one of getting rewarded for activity in this area. Some faculty perceived that they would not be rewarded through rank and tenure or salary adjustments, for their efforts to develop a response to "youth at risk" issues.

Specific Differences in Responses. While a majority of the total, including the administrative group indicated funding was a problem, several key administrators indicated that funding was not really the problem. One said "we'll get farther on the commitment of people than on funding" and asserted that if the faculty and staff made the commitment, that funding would become available. Others in the administrative group encouraged that the State Board of Higher Regents be contacted because they weren't allocating enough money to these types of programs. A couple of the administrative group indicated that one problem was the attitudes of society about the protection of family rights.

Again, the faculty group was more completely represented by the major issues of the total group. However, there were a few unique views expressed. Faculty were more likely to indicate that it was lack of administrative support that kept programs from being developed. Others felt the problems would have to have economic impact before the total university would respond.

Extension administrators, felt that faculty, staff, and clientele needed to change their attitudes about "youth at risk." Some referred to changing the attitudes of traditional clientele that would not understand a new direction. One said it would cause some problems for Extension, but he felt the problems were serious enough that "we will have to take a look at it." Others refereed to

changing attitudes of Extension employees, so they would have a more positive outlook on "youth at risk" programs. One County Extension Director offered the comment: "a year ago I would not have been in favor of this type of program, but today I am." Another stressed the need for evidence that Extension can deliver quality programs to the local communities.

Extension 4-H staff responses varied greatly between individuals. Some thought primarily of programmatic concerns such as what materials to use, how to find the youth, etc. Others were concerned with problems of getting the University to understand that Extension already has a network that reaches into every county. Comments made by some Extension 4-H staff indicated that their view of "youth at risk" was limited primarily to youth that were already in need of remedial or special counseling services.

Other Remarks

At the close of the interview, respondents were given an opportunity to make any other comment related to the University's response to "youth at risk." In the case of the Extension 4-H staff and Extension administration, a more specific follow-up question evolved after the first couple Extension interviews. Extension respondents were asked to indicate their feelings about 4-H being involved with "youth at risk" issues programs. Because of the personal interview technique, many respondents added comments to other

questions throughout the interview. This final section on the responses to open-ended questions includes a synopsis of all the other comments made during the interview process.

It should be reported that regardless of professional position, the general response to the idea that a land-grant university should respond to current societal problems of youth was quite acceptable. Throughout each group, there were many individuals who were genuinely interested in the problems and in seeking better solutions. Evidence of this was found in the fact that 100 percent of the individuals who were contacted agreed to an interview. In most cases, the willingness to be interviewed was accompanied by a willingness to freely discuss the issues and possible solutions, to the extent that the average interview went ten minutes beyond what was considered necessary for the basic interview. Only one individual out of 107 indicated that it was not appropriate for the University to be concerned with "youth at risk" issues, and his concern was based on the belief that the issues were inherently value laden and the University should not be involved in trying to teach values. During conversation, even this individual revealed that research, instruction, and public service in "youth at risk" related areas were all being conducted by his department.

In spite of the fact that the list of nine issues related to basic life skills such as building self esteem, citizenship, health, and preparation for work, it was obvious that most individuals "mind set" was on the more

extreme cases of substance abuse, teen pregnancy, and illiteracy. Conversations revealed that this mind set led many individuals who were already involved in youth development type programs not to mention their own efforts when they were asked to cite examples of programs that were currently addressing "youth at risk" issues. This was especially true of the Extension 4-H staff. Only a very small number of the Extension 4-H staff included their ongoing 4-H program. Follow-up probing questions resulted in staff recognizing and commenting on the relationships between ongoing programs and specific issues such as self esteem, citizenship, leadership, nutrition, health, and others.

The campus faculty group and some campus department administrators shared a concern about the University's ability to take the issues seriously. While commenting that they felt it was important, they noted that they were not very optimistic about the issues becoming a priority on campus.

The Extension administration was extremely supportive of efforts which would give Extension a bigger role in responding to the issues. This was especially true of the County Extension Directors as a group. One County Extension Director called the researcher back the day after the interview to add some comments he felt he had forgotten the day before.

Among the Extension 4-H staff, the biggest concern was

over how new "youth at risk" programs could be added to their already full work loads. Many county staff were still trying to evaluate the definition of the new "youth at risk" initiative. Some were genuinely concerned about the impact that working on "youth at risk" programs would have on their traditional clientele. Some felt their existing clientele were very opposed to working with "youth at risk," while others felt it would be one sure way to keep the Extension youth program alive. The variety of responses really pointed out the lack of a common acknowledgment that all youth were "at-risk" to some degree.

Summary

It must be noted that the comments offered here do not convey all of the feelings of the 107 respondents. It is recognized that the subjective judgment of the researcher has played a role in selecting those items and individual comments to be included here. It is hoped that these selections have fairly portrayed both the views of the majority, but also the diversity of views within the groups.

Awareness of the 4-H Program

The final objective of the study was to determine to what extent university faculty and administrators were familiar with the 4-H Program. This question was studied with only one half of the groups. It was assumed that all Extension 4-H Staff and all Extension administrators were

familiar with the 4-H program. Therefore, the four interview questions addressing awareness of the 4-H Program were included only in the interviews with OSU administrators and campus faculty and staff.

Of the 54 individuals in the non-Extension groups, two did not answer the awareness questions. Therefore only 52 individuals were included in this section. Of the 52 who completed that part of the interview, only one individual indicated that he had not heard of the 4-H Program. Table 37 shows the frequency and percentages of each response. Because of the small total number of negative responses in this area, it was deemed inappropriate to attempt to analyze the differences between the responses of the administrative and faculty groups.

TABLE 37

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FACULTY AWARENESS OF 4-H PROGRAMS: "HAVE YOU HEARD OF THE 4-H PROGRAM?"

Group	Yes		No.		Maybe		Total
	No.	%	No	%	No.	%	No.
University Administration	25	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	25
Campus Faculty and Staff	26	96.3	1	3.7	0	0.0	27
Totals	51	98.1	1	1.9	0	0.0	52

When asked if 4-H was affiliated with the university in any way, three said "no". Another 4 were unsure or thought maybe it was but they did not know that for a fact. One replied they didn't know. The one individual who indicated he had not heard of 4-H was not asked the remaining questions about 4-H. Therefore the number of total respondents considered for the remaining 4-H awareness questions was only 51. Table 38 shows the frequencies of each response for each of two groups.

TABLE 38

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FACULTY AWARENESS OF 4-H PROGRAMS: "IS 4-H AFFILIATED WITH OSU?"

Group	Yes		No		Maybe		Don't Know		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
University Administration	22	88.0	2	8.0	1	4.0	0	0.0	25
Campus Faculty and Staff	21	80.8	1	3.8	3	11.5	1	3.8	26
Totals	43	84.3	3	5.9	4	7.8	1	1.9	51

Only those who indicated yes or maybe to the affiliation question were asked which college or program 4-H was in. One individual who previously responded he didn't

know if 4-H was affiliated with OSU had indicated that 4-H was part of Cooperative Extension. In this case, the individual was unsure whether Cooperative Extension was affiliated with OSU. Of the 48 included included in the question, 45 correctly placed 4-H in either the Cooperative Extension or Division of Agriculture. Since Cooperative Extension is within the Division of Agriculture, this was considered a correct answer as well. Table 39 shows the frequency of correct responses for each group.

TABLE 39

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FACULTY AWARENESS OF 4-H PROGRAMS: CORRECTLY IDENTIFIED WHERE 4-H IS AFFILIATED AT OSU

Group	Correct		Incorrect		Unsure		Not Answered		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
University Administration	23	95.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.2	24
Campus Faculty and Staff	22	91.7	0	0.0	2	8.3	0	0.0	24
Total	45	93.8	0	0.0	2	4.2	1	2.1	48

The number of respondents who were aware that 4-H had programs and activities which were intended to address "youth at risk" issues was slightly less than those that

were familiar with or knew where 4-H fit into the University. Only 75.00% of the respondents were aware that 4-H had programs to address "youth at risk" issues. Five said "no" and five said "maybe or unsure" in response to this question. One individual did not answer the question. Table 40 shows the frequencies for the responses by each group that answered this question.

TABLE 40

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FACULTY AWARENESS OF 4-H PROGRAMS: "AWARE OF 4-H YOUTH AT RISK PROGRAMS"

Group	Yes		No		Maybe/ No Answer		Not Answered		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
University Administration	17	70.8	2	8.3	4	16.6	1	4.2	24
Campus Faculty and Staff	19	79.2	3	12.5	1	4.2	1	4.2	24
Totals	36	75.0	5	10.4	5	10.4	2	4.2	48

The results of the 4-H awareness questions would seem to indicate that Oklahoma State University campus faculty, staff, and administrators were generally aware of 4-H and were knowledgeable about its affiliation. There was less knowledge of the 4-H programs' involvement with programs and

activities that are intended to address "youth at risk" issues.

Respondent's Reactions To Data Collection

Because of the mixed design of the study, which combined the case study and descriptive research methods, it was deemed appropriate to include results related to the actual data collection process.

As stated earlier, all 107 of the respondents who were contacted, consented to some form of interview. However, it should be noted that contacting all of the respondents was not an easy task.

From one to nine calls were needed to contact respondents. The average number of calls ranged from just under 2 calls for each Extension 4-H staff respondent to almost 4 calls on the average to contact University administrators. A total of 297 separate phone calls were placed in order to complete 107 interviews for a total average of 2.78 call attempts for a completed interview.

One of the concerns related to telephone survey research was the maximum allowable length of a call. Frey (1983) reported that on some specialized telephone interviews, the calls lasted as long as 50 minutes. However, most researchers recommended keeping the time for telephone calls to less than 15 minutes. After 10 trial runs with the interview schedule it was determined that the minimum for a full interview would be 15 minutes and this

was the time stated in the advance letter and in the introduction of the schedule.

When the interviews were actually conducted, the lengths of the calls ranged from nine to fifty-two minutes. The nine minute call was with an individual who stated initially that he did not have time and did not think he had anything to contribute to the study. The fact that he took nine minutes to answer some of the open-ended questions pointed out one of the advantages of the personal telephone interview. It was clear that normal telephone etiquette made it possible to gather some information in that situation. There were several exceptionally long calls, including calls to Extension administrators and University administrators. As noted in the Table 41, the administrative groups had both the longest and the shortest interviews, while the two faculty groups tended to have the most homogeneous time ranges. The average length for all calls was almost 26 minutes.

TABLE 41

NUMBERS OF CALLS AND LENGTHS OF CALLS
BY PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Group	N	No of Calls		Length of Calls in Minutes	
		Range	Mean	Range	Mean
University Administration	27	1-9	3.74	9-42	23.64
Campus Faculty and Staff	27	1-8	2.29	18-37	26.19
Extension Administration	26	1-7	3.12	16-52	28.19
Extension 4-H Staff	27	1-6	1.96	20-34	25.78
Totals	107	1-9	2.78	9-52	25.93

An unexpected phenomenon was the response to the advance letters. The day after the advance letters were mailed, the researcher received two calls from campus faculty and staff who wanted to participate in the research before they left for extended trips. One individual called to provide the out of town phone number at which he could be reached during the summer. Knowing the negative reactions some individuals have to questionnaires and telephone interviews, this was deemed unusual. It was however, a good indication of the sincere interest that many respondents had in the "youth at risk" issues.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present a summary of the study which was conducted to determine the perceptions of Oklahoma State University faculty, staff, and administrators regarding how their university might respond to current youth related problems. The conclusions and recommendations presented are based on the thorough analysis of personal interviews with 107 faculty, staff, and administrators of Oklahoma State University.

Summary of the Study

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine how faculty, staff and administrators of Oklahoma State University perceived their land-grant university responding to contemporary youth related problems, called "youth at risk" issues. The secondary purpose of the study was to determine the awareness of the Extension 4-H & Youth Development Program by non-Extension faculty, staff, and administrators of the University. The goal of the study was to develop an understanding of the perceptions of University faculty, staff, and administrators in order to more effectively

design programs to address the contemporary needs of youth and families through University and Extension 4-H Programs.

Objectives of the Study

In order to give more direction to the study, the following specific objectives were developed:

1. To identify and compare the perceptions of University administrators, Extension administrators, campus faculty and staff, and Extension 4-H staff with regard to:
   a. the seriousness of current youth related issues.
   b. whether "youth at risk" issues should be a concern of the University.
   c. how the University might respond to the need for "youth at risk" programs.
   d. ways youth development programs might be funded.
2. To identify faculty, staff, and administration perceptions of specific actions that might be taken to develop a land-grant youth development program that would meet the contemporary needs of youth.
3. To identify faculty, staff, and administration perceptions of specific problems or challenges that might be faced in the development of a land-grant youth development program that would meet the contemporary needs of youth.
4. To determine levels of awareness of 4-H as a youth development program by University administrators and campus faculty and staff.

Design of the Study

Following a review of literature and research indirectly related to the study, procedures were developed to achieve the purpose and objectives of the study.

Four groups of respondents were selected to represent the views of those individuals and groups that would logically be involved either administratively or programatically in the University's response to youth related problems. The four groups were purposively selected through four different methods, according to the characteristics of each group. The groups included: University administrators, campus faculty and staff, Extension administrators, and Extension 4-H staff.

University administrators included the President, all Vice Presidents, deans, selected department heads, and all members of the OSU Board of Regents.

Campus faculty and staff were selected through a modified delphi technique. Extension 4-H and home economics specialists who were involved in youth at risk programming were invited to identify individuals and departments that they felt either were or should be involved with the "youth at risk" issues. The population of individuals identified through this procedure were included in the campus group of respondents.

The Extension 4-H group was selected through two procedures. Because of their direct involvement and

geographic assignments, all four District 4-H Program Specialists were included. In addition, two 4-H and two home economics specialists from the campus were included because of their direct involvement with "youth at risk" programs. The remainder of the 4-H staff group were selected through proportionate random sampling methods to provide a random sample of 4-H staff from each of three population based county groups, including urban, suburban, and rural.

The Extension administrative group included Assistant Directors, Associate Director and Director of Extension, all four District Extension Directors, and the County Extension Directors from the counties that were included in the random sampling of county Extension 4-H staff.

The data for the study were collected primarily through telephone interviews with each of the respondents. Four respondents answered the questions during visits to the researcher's office on campus. The other 103 respondents participated in telephone interviews.

The telephone interview schedule included three sets of scaled questions related to the seriousness of youth at risk issues, the appropriateness of selected responses that might be made, and the likelihood that funds for youth development programs would come from selected sources. The schedule also included several open-ended questions to elicit qualitative responses regarding current youth at risk programs, sources of leadership for program development,

opportunities for program development, and challenges that would be faced in developing programs.

The data collected from the 107 respondents was coded and keypunched by the data entry staff at Oklahoma State University. The OSU SAS computer program was used to tabulate the data to provide frequency distribution tables, means, standard deviations, and chi-square analyses. The quantitative questions were analyzed through comparisons of means and standard deviations. Qualitative data were analyzed and tabulated by the researcher to determine overall patterns of responses from each of the four groups and some selected sup-groups where appropriate.

The researcher personally conducted all of the interviews. The interviews averaged approximately 26 minutes in length each. During most of the interviews, rapport was well established. This allowed the researcher to gather some qualitative data of the type normally only achieved through face-to-face interviews. Insights gained through the length and depth of some interviews were taken into account in developing the conclusions and recommendations for this study.

Major Findings of the Research

The findings of the research were reported in five sections as included in the presentation and analysis of the data, in Chapter IV. The major findings related to the study objectives are reported here. Reactions to the data

collection procedures are reported only in Chapter IV. The major findings are reported in the following four sections:

1. Characteristics of the respondents
2. Responses to specific questions
3. Responses to open ended questions
4. Awareness of Extension 4-H Programs

Characteristics of Respondents. The respondents represented four groups of faculty, staff and administrators at Oklahoma State University. The four groups included: University administrators, campus faculty and staff, Extension administrators, and Extension 4-H staff. Of the 109 individuals who were originally selected to participate in the study, 107 were available in Oklahoma during the time of the interviews. All 107 available respondents participated in the interview schedule to some degree. A 100 percent response rate was achieved with the final respondents including: 27 University administrators, 27 campus faculty and staff, 26 Extension administrators, and 27 Extension 4-H staff.

At least one respondent was included from each of six colleges. The College of Veterinary Medicine was excluded because it includes only one percent of the student body, and the Graduate College was excluded because all of their faculty are included in one of the other colleges.

Involvement in education was considered to be a potentially confounding variable, so data were gathered on

the number of years each respondent had been involved in education and how many years they had been associated with Oklahoma State University. Of the 107 respondents, 65.42 percent had been involved in education for 15 or more years. When looking at years of association with OSU, the number shifted, and only 45.79 percent had been associated with OSU for 15 or more years.

Responses to Specific Questions. Perceptions of the seriousness of youth related problems; how the university might respond; and how "youth at risk" programs might be funded, were calculated from specific questions in each of the three areas.

For six of the nine youth at risk issues, there were "notable" differences between the means for at least two of the four groups. When comparing the rank orders of the means within each of the four groups, there were also noticeable differences. See Table 7 in chapter IV for the summary of means, standard deviations, and rankings for each group. All four groups had the same two issues ranked either first or second, and ranked them both as very serious. The issues of "teenage sexuality and pregnancy" and "abuse of drugs and alcohol" were the only two issues to achieve overall scores above 4.00 on the 1.00 to 5.00 scale. Overall scores for the two were 4.45 with a standard deviation of 0.77 for "teenage sexuality and pregnancy" and 4.38 with a standard deviation of 0.79 for "abuse of drugs

and alcohol." The only other issue that produced no notable differences was ranked fifth overall, and that was "poor job preparation", with an overall mean score of 3.76 and standard deviation of 0.82. It should also be noted that among all the groups and all nine issues, there were only two group means that fell below the mid point of the five point scale. The OSU administration and the Extension administration groups scored 2.95 and 2.96 respectively on the perceived seriousness of "depression and suicide" as a youth related issue for Oklahoma youth. All other scores for the four groups and the nine issues were over 3.00 on the 1.00 to 5.00 scale.

Of all respondents ,only one responded negatively to the question about the appropriateness of higher education being concerned with problems that affect pre-college age youth. Four respondents said "maybe" or indicated that they were unsure, but 95.33 percent said "yes" in response to the question. It would appear that there was general agreement about the appropriateness of the land-grant university responding to the contemporary problems of youth.

Of the nine specific actions that were evaluated, "notable" differences were shown for three questions. However, more striking than the numerical differences in their mean's were the differences among the rankings of the four groups. Unlike the uniformity shown on the highest ranked issues, the four groups were very dissimilar in their rankings of perceived appropriate actions for responding to

"youth at risk" issues.

The two Extension groups each ranked development of coalitions first, while the OSU administration and campus faculty and staff each ranked research development as their highest mean score. However, all four groups ranked developing instructional programs second. This was the only item on all the scales that was ranked the same by all four groups, and it was only .01 point out of first ranking overall, and had only a 0.10 range from highest to lowest mean among the four groups.

All of the overall group means were above the 3.00 level, with the concept of the center for youth development at 3.51 as the ninth ranked item. However, the campus faculty and staff did have one item below the neutral point on the scale. They ranked the idea of designating one department to coordinate the development of "youth at risk" programs ninth with a score of 2.96, a full 1.00 from their eighth ranked item of a center for youth development at 3.96.

The notable differences among the appropriate action questions included the questions regarding research, the single department to coordinate, and the center for youth development. OSU administration and campus faculty and staff perceived research development to be more appropriate than the the two Extension groups. The two Extension groups perceived the idea of one department to coordinate programs as more appropriate than the campus and OSU administration

groups. The two administrative groups perceived the idea of a center for youth development to be less appropriate than the two faculty and staff groups.

Although there was total agreement on the ranking of potential funding sources among the four groups, there were some notable differences in the mean scores for specific items.

The Extension 4-H staff felt it was more likely for "youth at risk" funding to come from reallocation of existing funds than did either the campus faculty and staff or the University administration.

One of the most notable differences in the entire study also showed up in the comparisons related to the likelihood of new programs being developed even if new funds were not provided. Extension administrators were much more likely to expect new or expanded programs to be developed without new funds than the campus faculty and staff group.

Open-Ended Questions. Open-ended questions were designed to elicit responses related to current programs for "youth at risk"; potential leadership to develop "youth at risk" programs at OSU; ideas about what the University should do about "youth at risk" issues; and challenges or problems that would be encountered while attempting to respond.

In responding to the question about program leadership, about 70 percent of the respondents indicated they felt it

would take a combination or coalition of departments and staff to provide the leadership to develop "youth at risk" programs at Oklahoma State University. Sixty percent of the total group indicated they felt Cooperative Extension should be involved in making a response. While not all of the Extension respondents were included in this group, there were some outside of Extension that specifically mentioned that Extension should provide some leadership. Other than the expected frequency of Extension mentioning itself, there were no obvious differences between the groups responses to this question.

Respondents were given the opportunity to identify programs that related to "youth at risk" issues. Generally speaking, administrators were less aware of programs than the other groups. Campus faculty were generally familiar with a variety of programs. However, some were aware of programs outside their own department while others knew only of programs conducted by their own department. Extension administrators and 4-H staff were generally unaware of programs that were generated on the campus or by departments for use with special audiences. When asked about programs in or out of Extension, most Extension personnel failed to mention their current work as relating to the "youth at risk" issues. Once asked about the relationship, most indicated that they thought their traditional 4-H Program did have some affect on self concept, decision making and other skills related to the at risk situation.

When respondents were asked: "What do you feel Oklahoma State University should be doing about youth at risk issues?", a great variety of responses were received, but there were also some patterns that emerged.

The most common response across all four groups related to developing coalitions, networks, or teamwork throughout the university system. About 40 percent of the respondents mentioned something that fit into this concept, and the numbers were very similar across all four groups. The next most common response involved incorporating "youth at risk" related programs into ongoing efforts. This response was made more frequently by the campus faculty and administration than by the two Extension groups, but all four groups were represented.

The third most common remark was that OSU should take the leadership and develop some type of response to these important societal problems. About thirty percent of the respondents mentioned something related to this idea. Following the three most common responses, there were three more responses that were each mentioned about the same number of times, by about 25 percent of the total group. Each of these less frequent responses was dominated by different groups or combinations of groups. OSU administrators, faculty, and staff suggested that additional research be conducted. The Extension groups dominated the response of putting Extension in charge or getting Extension involved to provide programs at the local level. The third

idea, that of pilot programs in order to get something started was mentioned primarily by the two faculty and staff groups, and less frequently mentioned by the two administrative groups.

Other responses that were mentioned by more than ten percent of the respondents included allocating additional funds to get something started; building awareness and clarifying the issues; and convincing administrators that it should be a higher priority.

When asked about the biggest challenges to creating programs to address youth at risk issues at Oklahoma State University, some responses were predictable. About 70 percent of the respondents made some reference to funding as a potential challenge to be overcome. The number of responses of this type were almost evenly split between the four groups.

About 45 percent said to get commitment of personnel and time to address the issues. About 25 percent of the total mentioned "turf protection", ownership of the program, or getting cooperation from others. Another 25 percent mentioned resistance or slowness to change as the barrier. Turf protection was most commonly mentioned by one of the faculty or staff groups, while resistance to change was more often mentioned by one of the administration groups.

Another 25 percent responded that lack of administrative support or lack of recognition of "youth at risk" issues was a problem.

The two Extension groups frequently mentioned the need for more training, as a challenge. Most current Extension staff have their training in traditional agriculture or home economics related areas. There is a perception that they will need additional training in other areas to be able to respond to some of the "youth at risk" issues.

The campus faculty group was singularly responsible for the inclusion of problems related to rank and tenure. Campus faculty perceived that they would have trouble getting recognition for "youth at risk" efforts, especially if they were multi-disciplinary efforts.

Awareness of 4-H. The final objective of the study was to determine to what extent University faculty and administrators were familiar with the 4-H Program. This question was studied with only one half of the groups. It was assumed that all Extension 4-H Staff and all Extension administrators were familiar with the 4-H program. Therefore, the four interview questions addressing awareness of the 4-H program were included only in the interviews with OSU administrators and campus faculty and staff.

Of the 52 administrative and campus staff that answered the awareness questions, 98.1 percent said they had heard of the 4-H program. Only 84.3 percent felt sure about the affiliation of 4-H with the land-grant university. Of those that thought 4-H was or might be affiliated, 93.8 percent correctly placed Extension 4-H Programs in either the

Cooperative Extension Service or Division of Agriculture. A total of 75.0 percent of the non-Extension respondents indicated "yes" when asked if they were aware that 4-H had programs intended to address "youth at risk" issues.

The results of the 4-H awareness questions would seem to indicate that Oklahoma State University campus faculty, staff, and administrators are generally aware of 4-H and are knowledgeable about its affiliation. There is less knowledge of the 4-H Program's involvement with programs and activities that are intended to address "youth at risk" issues.

Conclusions

Based on interpretation of the findings for this study, the following conclusions are made:

1. Faculty, staff, and administrators at Oklahoma State University believe that it is appropriate for their land-grant university to respond to the contemporary needs of youth and families in Oklahoma.

2. While there are some differences in perceptions of the seriousness of some problems, there is agreement that teen pregnancy and substance abuse are the two most serious problems facing youth in Oklahoma.

3. University faculty, staff and administrators perceive the most appropriate action to be additional research into "youth at risk" issues.

4. Extension faculty, staff and administrators

perceive the development of coalitions to be the most appropriate response to "youth at risk" issues.

5. Faculty, staff, and administrators at Oklahoma State University perceive the development of instructional programs to address the "youth at risk" issues as a very appropriate action.

6. Faculty, staff, and administration at Oklahoma State University perceive the development of coalitions, and the incorporation of "youth at risk" issues programs into ongoing programs as two of the most viable actions the University might take.

7. Extension faculty, staff, and administrators perceive the designation of one department to coordinate "youth at risk" programming to be more appropriate than do campus faculty, staff, or administrators.

8. Extension and campus faculty and staff perceive the creation of a center for youth development to be more appropriate than do University or Extension administrators.

9. Many faculty, staff, and administrators perceive that the University should use its resources to take leadership in developing a response to the current "youth at risk" issues, including the utilization of the Extension System for delivery of programs to local communities.

10. Faculty, staff, and administrators at Oklahoma State University agree on the ranking of potential sources of funds for "youth at risk" programs. The most likely sources of funds are private foundations and the federal

government. Other sources are perceived not to be likely sources of funds for "youth at risk" programs.

11. Extension faculty and staff were more likely to expect funds for "youth at risk" to come from reallocation of existing funds than either the University administration or the campus faculty and staff.

12. Lack of funding and commitment are perceived to be the two biggest challenges affecting the University's ability to respond to the "youth at risk" issues.

13. Extension faculty, staff, and administrators are concerned about the need for Extension staff to have more training in areas relevant to the "youth at risk" issues.

14. Campus faculty are concerned about the lack of recognition for rank and tenure considerations as related to their potential efforts to respond to "youth at risk" issues.

15. Many Extension staff do not perceive their ongoing program as addressing "youth at risk" issues, or do not understand the current direction of the Extension "Youth at Risk" national initiative as preventive rather than remedial.

16. Campus faculty, staff, and administration are aware of the Extension 4-H Program, and know that it is affiliated with the Division of Agriculture or the Cooperative Extension Service. However, some are not as aware of the Extension 4-H Program's efforts in the areas related to "youth at risk."

Recommendations

As a result of the analysis of the data and major findings of this research, the following recommendations are provided.

1. Extension and 4-H Program administrators should meet with key University administrators to determine what type of university-wide response might be developed to address "youth at risk" issues.

2. A summary of this research study should be prepared and distributed to all respondents and other interested parties. Because of the nature of the respondents, this effort would provide all levels of leadership at Oklahoma State University with the results of this study.

3. An interdisciplinary University Task Force on Youth At Risk should be organized to review the current efforts which are already addressing "youth at risk" issues. The task force should complete the preliminary lists of current activities and make the catalogue of activities available to faculty and staff throughout the campus so that better communication could result in stronger coordination of similar efforts.

4. The Extension 4-H Program administration and staff should meet with the faculty and staff of the new Wellness Center to determine areas where their objectives may be similar to those involved in Extension "youth at risk" initiative.

5. The faculty council should be notified that campus faculty perceive inter-disciplinary efforts such as "youth at risk" programming to lack appropriate recognition value for rank and tenure considerations.

6. The Cooperative Extension Service should work more closely with the Agricultural Experiment Station to establish research priorities in areas related to "youth at risk" issues.

7. The University Task Force on Youth At Risk should investigate potential sources of funds for competitive research grants in areas related to "youth at risk."

8. The Extension 4-H Program should develop a more clear definition of "youth at risk" and youth at risk programming for use by Extension faculty, staff and administration.

9. The Extension 4-H Program should focus its attention on priorities as set forth in the National Youth At Risk Initiatives guidelines. As stated in those guidelines, the focus should be on the development of programs for prevention and intervention rather than remediation.

10. The Extension 4-H Program should develop new training programs to help Extension staff become more familiar with the "youth at risk" issues and how to incorporate "youth at risk" programming into both ongoing and new program efforts.

11. The Extension 4-H Program should develop a program

to inform other campus departments and officials about existing programs related to youth development and efforts to address "youth at risk" issues.

12. The Cooperative Extension Service and the 4-H Program should develop a program specifically to inform other state and state supported agencies of Extension efforts to provide services to the youth and families of Oklahoma.

13. Those individuals and departments with concerns for the well-being of Oklahoma children and youth should never give up trying to develop programs that can improve the quality of life for all citizens. The future is too important to leave to chance. Our society's future is in the hands of today's youth.

Recommendations for Additional Research

Following are recommendations for additional research which would compliment or supplement what was done through this study.

1. Additional research should be conducted to learn more about the nature and the causes of the more serious issues that put youth "at-risk."

2. Additional research should be developed to determine the most effective ways for educational programs to address the "youth at risk" issues.

3. Similar studies should be conducted with other youth and family agencies and with the general public to

determine their perceptions related to the land-grant university's role in responding to "youth at risk."

4. Research should be developed to determine what other land-grant universities are doing to respond to "youth at risk" issues.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, S. B., Ball, S., Murphy, R. T., & Associates. (1975). Encyclopedia of educational evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Best, J. W. (1981). Research in education (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Bliss, R. K. (Ed.). (1952). The spirit and philosophy of Extension work. Washington, DC: Graduate School, United States Department of Agriculture and Epsilon Sigma Phi, National Honorary Extension Fraternity.

Bogdan, R., & Taylor, S. J (1975). Introduction to qualitative research methods. New York: Wiley.

Borg, W. R. (1963). Educational research an introduction. New York: McKay.

Boyce, V. M. (1988). Experiential education and legal justification for Cooperative Extension, 4-H. Washington, DC: Extension Service.

Boyle, P. G. (1989). Extension system change: Fact or fiction? Journal of Extension, 27, 3-5.

Brown, N. A. (1987, October). Youth development in the Land-grant University [McDowell Lecture]. Paper presented at the Penn State Annual Extension Conference, University Park, PA.

Buford, J. A., Jr., & Bedeian, A. G. (1988). Management in Extension, (2nd Ed.) Auburn University: Alabama Cooperative Extension Service.

Caldwell, J. T. (1976). What a document...that Land Grant Act!. In C. A. Vines & M. A. Anderson (Eds.), Heritage horizons: Extension's commitment to people. (pp. 12-16). Madison: Extension Journal.

Caul, D. A., & Miller, H. L. (1976). Where the action is. In C. A. Vines & M. A. Anderson (Eds.), Heritage horizons: Extension's commitment to people. (pp. 25-31). Madison: Extension Journal.

Challenge and change... A blueprint for the future - Extension Service, USDA. (1983). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Colorado State University Cooperative Extension. "The citizens viewpoint". A statewide survey of Coloradans - Final report. (1986). Fort Collins: Colorado Cooperative Extension Service.

Conone, R. M. (1989). Preventing child abuse. Journal of Extension, 27, 20.

Cooperative Extension System national initiatives: Focus on issues. (1988, January). Washington, DC: United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service.

Cosner, B. L. (1980). Perceptions of Oklahoma residents toward the Cooperative Extension function of the Oklahoma State University division of agriculture. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

Denzin, N. K. (1970). The research act. Chicago: Aldine.

Dexter, L. A. (1970). Elite and specialized interviewing. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys. New York: Wiley.

Extension Committee on Organization and Policy. (1983). Extension in the '80s: A perspective for the future of the Cooperative Extension Service: Executive summary. Washington, DC: United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service.

Extension Committee on Organization and Policy Futures Task Force. (1987). Extension in transition: Bridging the gap between vision and reality. Blacksburg: Virginia Cooperative Extension Service.

Extension Committee on Organization and Policy Subcommittee on 4-H. Extension's 4-H: Toward the '90s. Washington, DC: United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service.

Extension Committee on Organization and Policy. Youth development education: A societal issue. (1987, September). Washington, DC: United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service, 4-H and Youth Development.

Extension Committee on Organization and Policy. (1976). 4-H in century III. East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Four-H future focus: 1986-1996. (1986)). Columbus: Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

Four-H in the 70's. (1971, April). Washington DC: United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service.

Four-H national needs assessment: Analysis and recommendations. (1983, July). Washington DC: United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service.

Four-H Youth Development Subcommittee - ECOP. (1988, August). Cooperative Extension Service and the Land Grant University System: New dimensions in youth development education. Paper presented at Extension 4-H Staff Development Seminar, Chevy Chase, MD.

Frey, J. H. (1983). Survey research by telephone. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Gallup, A. M. & Elam, S. M. (1988). The 20th annual gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(1), 33-46.

Gerhard, G. W. (1984). The image of the 4-H professional. Report prepared for the National Association of Extension 4-H Agents.

Groves, R. M. & Kahn, R. L. (1979). Surveys by telephone: A national comparison with personal interviews. New York: Academic Press.

Guba, E. G. (1978). Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation. Los Angeles: University of California.

Hackett, K. R. (1982). The perceived awareness of 4-H youth programs by the adult population of Canadian County, Oklahoma. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

Infancy to adolescence: Opportunities for success. April 28, 1987. (Hearing before the select committee on children, youth, and families, house of representatives, one hundredth congress, 1st session). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Irby, J. E. & O'Brien, S. (1988). Youth at risk task force update. Washington, DC: United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service.

Issac, S. & Michael, W. B. (1984). Handbook in research and evaluation (2nd ed.). San Diego: EdITS.

Jarratt, A. F. (1987, September). Self-esteem: A significant variable. In J. E. Irby (Ed.), Proceedings of Youth development education: A societal issue (pp. 20-42). Washington, DC: United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Key, J. P. (1985, December). The telephone as a data collection technique. In G.E. Moore (Ed.), Data collection techniques in vocational education research: A comparative analysis. Symposium conducted for the American Vocational Education Research Association, Atlanta.

Ladewig, H., & Thomas, J. K. (1987). Assessing the impacts of 4-H on former members. College Station: Texas A&M University System.

Lewis, A. C. (1987). Coming attractions: A federal policy for youth. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 100-101.

Lifer, Charles. (1986). 4-H Future Focus: 1986-1996. (ES-USDA Publication No. 96). Columbus: Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

Linton, M., & Gallo, P.S., Jr. (1975). The practical statistician: Simplified handbook of statistics. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Morrison, J. L. (1987, September). The future of youth development education. In J. E. Irby (Ed.), Proceedings of youth development education: A societal issue (pp. 6-19). Washington, DC: United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service.

National Alliance of Business. (1986). Youth 2000: A call to action: Report on a national leadership meeting held June 10, 1986, Washington, D.C. Washington, DC: Author

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1984). A nation at risk: The full account. Cambridge, MA: USA Research.

Patton, M. Q. (1982). Qualitative methods and approaches: What are they? In E. Kuhns & S. V. Martorana (Eds.), Qualitative methods for institutional research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Price Waterhouse. (1988, November). Final report to the HJR 1021 task force on a comprehensive study of state and state-supported services to children and families in Oklahoma, Volume I: Final report. Oklahoma City: The Center for the Study of Social Policy and Chapin Hall Center for Children.

Rasmussen, W. D. (1989). Taking the university to the people: Seventy-five years of Cooperative Extension. Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Reck, F. M. (1951). The 4-H story: A history of 4-H club work. Ames: The Iowa State University Press.

Reingold, J. R. (1987). An insider's look at federal youth programs. The Education Digest, 53(3), 34-35.

Rhodes, F. H. T. (1987, November). Recasting american education for the 21st century. [NASULGC Centennial Morrill Lecture]. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

Roskens, R. W. (1987, September). The university's role in youth development education. In J. E. Irby (Ed.), Proceedings of youth development education: A societal issue (pp. 1-5). Washington, DC: United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service.

Sanders, H. C. (ed.). (1966). The Cooperative Extension Service. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Shannon, T. J., & Schoenfeld, C. A. (1965). University Extension. New York: The Center For Applied Research in Education.

Survey Research Center. (1976). Interviewer's manual (revised edition). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Tipton, B. L. (1984). A feasibility study of a 4-H health program of sex education in Tulsa County, Oklahoma. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

Uhlenberg, P., & Eggebeen, D. (1988). Hard times for american youth: A look at the reasons. NASSP Bulletin, 72(508), 47-51.

USDA/NASULGC Extension Study Committee. (1968). A people and a spirit. Fort Collins: Colorado State University.

USDA/NASULGC Committee on the Future of Cooperative Extension. (1983). Extension in the 80's: A perspective for the future of the Cooperative Extension Service. Madison: University of Wisconsin-Extension.

Warner, P. D., & Christenson, J. A. (1984). The Cooperative Extension Service: A national assessment (Rural Studies Series). Boulder: Westview Press.

Wessel, T., & Wessel, M. (1982). 4-H: An american idea 1900 - 1980 a history of 4-H. Chevy Chase: National 4-H Council.

Wright, S. K. B. (1989). Youth self-protection. Journal of Extension, 27, 16-18.

Youth: The american agenda. (1989, May). A report of the Cooperative Extension System national initiative task force on youth at risk. Washington, DC: United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service.

Zelditch, M. Jr. (1970). Some methodological problems of field studies. In W. J. Filstead (Ed.), Qualitative methodology: Firsthand involvement with the social world (pp. 217-231). Chicago: Markham.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

THIS IS 4-H

THIS IS 4-H [1]

4-H is the youth education program of the Cooperative Extension Service. this informal educational program is conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, State Land-Grant Universities, County Governments and combines the work of Federal, State and local Extension staff and volunteer leaders. Participation in the 4-H program is open to all interested youth, regardless of race, color, sex, creed, national origin, or handicap. Participants are primarily between the ages of 9 and 19 and reside in every demographic area; farm, city and in between. The success of the 4-H program is attributed to the nearly 600,000 volunteer leaders who are backed by the strong educational base of the Land-Grant University staff in every county in the nation.

4-H participants are youth taking part in programs provided as the result of action planned and initiated by Extension personnel in cooperation with volunteer leadership at the local level. This includes youth participating in programs conducted through the 1890 colleges and universities and those involved in the Expanded Food Nutrition Education Program.

Youth may participate in 4-H through a variety of program delivery modes. These include organized 4-H clubs, 4-H special interest or short-term groups, 4-H school enrichment programs, 4-H instructional TV, 4-H Camping or as individual 4-H members.

The mission of 4-H is to assist youth in acquiring knowledge, developing life skills, and forming attitudes that will enable them to become self-directing, productive and contributing members of society. This mission is carried out through the involvement of parents, volunteer leaders and other adults who organize and conduct educational subject/project experience in community and family settings. These learn by doing experiences are supported by research and Extension functions represented by the Land-Grant Universities, 1890 Institutions and Tuskegee Institute, USDA, and cooperating counties with support from the National 4-H Council and other private support.

These youth contribute to energy conservation, environmental improvement, community service and food production, and participate in programs that aid youth employment and career decisions, health, nutrition, home improvement, and family relationships. As a result of international cooperation with many counties, 4-H is also contributing to world understanding. In the process, 4-H youth apply leadership skills, acquire a positive self-concept and learn to respect and get along with people.

A dynamic growing organization, 4-H has expanded steadily for the past 25 years. The most recent statistics indicate that there are approximately 5 million boys and girls involved in this youth education program of Extension. Since 1914 over 40 million youth from all States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and Guam have participated in 4-H.

[1] Wessel, T. & Wessel, M. (1982). 4-H: An american idea 1900 - 1980 a history of 4-H. Chevy Chase: National 4-H Council.

APPENDIX B

IDENTIFYING YOUTH AT RISK CONTACTS

Identifying Youth At Risk Contacts

For several years, the Cooperative Extension System has stated that it needed access to the total University in order to develop and conduct appropriate youth development programs. This has been based primarily on the idea that some of the needed expertise was not available in the traditional Extension program areas. Toward that end, I am attempting as part of my dissertation to identify departments and individuals that might be able to provide some of the expertise we need to conduct contemporary youth development programs, especially in the current initiative area of "youth at risk".

I'd like your help in identifying departments, colleges, or individuals that are conducting programs or that might be interested in conducting programs related to youth at risk. To aid you in this process, here is a list of the youth at risk issues that we are focusing on in this study.

Youth At Risk Problems (Issues)

A.	Illiteracy or dropping out of school
B.	Poor job preparation
C.	Abuse of drugs or alcohol
D.	Teenage sexuality or pregnancy
E.	Poor Nutrition or Fitness
F.	Depression or Suicide
G.	Lack of personal values or self esteem
H.	Juvenile Delinquency
I.	Lack of citizenship or leadership skills

Please use the next page to record your ideas.

For programs you know about, please indicate the specific or general interest of the individual or department as you understand it. For departments that you "think" should be involved, indicate the department and the issues you think they would relate to, and if you are aware of individuals who might be involved, please indicate their names too. If you are aware of specific programs, please include the description or title where indicated.

Identifying Individuals and Departments Involved or Interested in Youth at Risk

Issue (letter) General (blank)	Program Description	Department	Individual

Thank You for Your Help!

This reply made by: _____

APPENDIX C

LIST OF FACULTY, STAFF AND ADMINISTRATORS INCLUDED IN POPULATIONS AND SAMPLES

LIST OF FACULTY, STAFF AND ADMINISTRATORS INCLUDED IN POPULATIONS AND SAMPLES

University Administrators

John R. Campbell, President
James Boggs, Vice President, Academic Affairs
Jerry Farley, Vice President, Business and Finance
Ronald Beer, Vice President, Student Services
Smith Holt, Dean, Arts and Sciences
Robert Sandmeyer, Dean, Business Administration
Kenneth King, Dean, Education
Karl Reid, Dean, Engineering
Elaine Jorgenson, Interim Dean, Home Economics
James Moran, Head, FRCD
Lea Ebro, Head, FNIA
Geroge Oberle, Director, HPEL
Charles Edgely, Head, Sociology
Melvin Miller, Head, OAED
Vicki Green, Head, Psychology
Douglas Aichele, Head, CIED
Dale Fuqua, Head, ABSED
Thomas Karman, Head, EAHED
Carolyn Savage, Chairman, OSU Board of Regents
Dean Stringer, Vice Chairman, OSU Board of Regents
Bill Braum, OSU Board of Regents
Jack Craig, OSU Board of Regents
Austin Kenyon, OSU Board of Regents
Ed Malzahn, OSU Board of Regents
John Montgomery, OSU Board of Regents
Robert Robbins, OSU Board of Regents
Jimmie Thomas, OSU Board of Regents

Campus Faculty and Staff

Kay Murphy, FRCD
Lois Mickle, FRCD
Andrea Arquitt, FNIA
Bernice Kopel, FNIA
Mac McCrory, Wellness Program Director
Betty Edgley, HPEL
Milton Rhoades, HPEL
Kirk Wimberley, HPEL
Jack Bynum, Sociology
Harjit Sandhu, Sociology
Sandy Barth, Personnel Services
William Venable, Human Resource Development Center
Clyde Knight, OAED
Robert Huss, Residential Life

Pat Murphy, Counseling Services
Don Cooper, University Hospital
Marilon Morgan, Student Program Coordinator
Jeff Fair, Athletics
Bob Helm, Psychology
William Rambo, Psychology
Russ Dobson, CIED
Darrell Ray, CIED
Barbara Wilkinson, ABSED
Judy Dobson, ABSED
Deke Johnson, EAHED
Adrienne Hyle, EAHED
Jack Pritchard, Agricultural Education

Extension Administration

Charles Browning, Dean and Director, Division of Agricluture
T. Roy Bogle, Associate Director, Cooperative Extension
Lynda Harriman, Assistant Director, Home Economics Programs
Raymond Campbell, Assistant Director, Agriculture and RD
James Mosley, Assistant Director, Staff Development
Ronald George, Northeast District Director
Jan Montgomery, Southeast District Director
Willis Johnson, Northwest District Director
Ladd Hudgins, Southwest District Director
Ron Robinson, CED, Garfield County
Joann Brannan, CED, Oklahoma County
Jimmy Biles, CED, Tulsa County
Duane McVey, CED, Payne County
L. D. Allison, CED, Rogers County
Wayne Smith, CED, Wagoner County
Richard Sestak, CED, Canadian County
Don Britton, CED, Pottawatomie County
Martha Sauter, CED, Blaine County
Mary Jackson, CED, Caddo County
Randy McKinley, CED, Custer County
Don Proctor, CED, Jackson County
Basil Myers, CED, Muskogee County
Duane Lester, CED, Osage County
Claude Bess, III, CED, Pontotoc County
Carole Wood, Intermim CED, Seminole County
Robert Ledford, CED, Garvin County

Extension 4-H Staff

Charlotte Richert, Tulsa County 4-H Agent
Rene Moore, Tulsa County Urban 4-H Agent
Lisa Vawter, Oklahoma County Urban 4-H Agent
Jean Branscum, Garvin County 4-H Agent
Karla Knoepfli, Garfield County 4-H Agent
Nancy Thomason, Payne County 4-H Agent
Roy Ball, Rogers County 4-H Agent
Diana Sayler, Wagoner County 4-H Agent
Becky Larkin, Canadian County 4-H Agent

Susan Meitl, Canadian County 4-H Agent
Jimmie Rhodes, Pottawatomie County 4-H Agent
Diane Bedwell, Blaine County 4-H Agent
Roger Moore, Caddo County 4-H Agent
Randy Hall, Custer County 4-H Agent
Jeff Lorah, Jackson County 4-H Agent
Stan Fimple, Muskogee County 4-H Agent
Monty Oller, Osage County 4-H Agent
James Arnold, Pontotoc County 4-H Agent
Joe Benton, Seminole County 4-H Agent
Ora Lee Kirk, Northeast District 4-H Specialist
Derald Suffridge, Southeast District 4-H Specialist
Guy Harlow, Southwest District 4-H Specialist
Kevin Hackett, Northwest District 4-H Specialist
Joe Weber, Extension Human Development Specialist
Elaine Wilson, Extension Parenting Specialist
Sheila Forbes, 4-H Program Specialist
Billie Chambers, 4-H Program Specialist

APPENDIX D

ADVANCE LETTER AND TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

James A. Rutledge
Route Three, Box 710
Stillwater, OK 74074

(date)

{TITLE} {FIRST} {LAST}
{POSITION}
{ADDRESS}
{CITY}, {STATE} {ZIP}

Dear {TITLE} {LAST}:

Do you have concerns about how Oklahoma State University might respond to help solve some of our most pressing societal problems? According to recent surveys: One of every four ninth graders will not graduate from high school, teenage pregnancies cost American taxpayers over 16 billion dollars a year in welfare costs, and Oklahoma ranks 6th in teenage pregnancy.

If you're concerned about the future of America; about how youth are coping with today's stresses; or about how youth are affected by substance abuse, teen pregnancy, illiteracy, unemployment, juvenile delinquency, or dropping out of school, I'd like your help. Within a week or so, I will be calling you as part of a research project that we are conducting to find out how Oklahoma State University might respond to some of these critical youth issues.

I am writing in advance of my telephone call because I understand that many people appreciate knowing that a research project is in progress and they will be called. You have been selected because of your administrative leadership position at OSU. You are part of a very select group that is being interviewed, so I will really appreciate your participation. I expect the actual interview to take about 15 minutes. If I call at an inconvenient time, please let me know so that I can arrange a more convenient time. I will be happy to call back later.

Your help and that of the others being asked to participate in this study will be essential to the success of our effort to determine how OSU might respond to current "youth at risk" issues. Thank you in advance for your cooperation. I am looking forward to visiting with you in the near future.

Sincerely,

James A. Rutledge

Call Record
Youth At Risk

Name : _____

Phone Number: _____

Category:

OSU ADM	_____	buff form
FACULTY	_____	pink form
EXT ADM	_____	blue form
EXT 4-H	_____	green form

College: _____ Department: _____

Call Record:

Date	Time	Result	Recall Appt's

Abbreviations:

WN = Wrong Number
NN = Given New Number to Call
NA = No Answer
REF = Refused Call
BT = Bad Time for Call
SA = Scheduled Appointment Call
DISC = Disconnected during call
* (Star) Completed Interview
INC = Partial but incomplete interview

Note: This sheet will be removed from the interview schedule once the interview has been completed.

Youth At Risk Interview Schedule by James A. Rutledge, (5/16/89)

Category:	OSU ADM	____	buff form 1	
	FACULTY	____	pink form 2	_____
	EXT ADM	____	blue form 3	2,3,4
**	EXT 4-H	____	green form 4	

College: _____ Department: _____ ____ 5

____ 6,7

Good (morning, afternoon), This is Jim Rutledge, and I'm calling about the letter I sent last week about my youth at risk interviews. Do you recall the letter?

(If Yes): Good

(If NO): It was a brief letter sent to let you know I would be calling. Basically the letter says we are conducting a survey related to youth at risk issues.

As you know, problems like illiteracy, substance abuse, teen pregnancy and others are what we call "Youth at Risk Issues". I'd like to ask how you think OSU and Extension 4-H might be involved in solving some of these problems.

Can you spare about 15 minutes right now? ...Or..can I make an appointment to call you back at a more convenient time.

Response:

YES - CONTINUE
YES - MAKE APPOINTMENT
NO - Thank You

I'm sure you know this, but I want to remind you that when I say youth I mean boys and girls younger than college age. Also, when I talk about programs for youth at risk, I'm NOT talking about bringing young people to Stillwater. I'm talking about programs provided by OSU that would train adults to help solve some of these problems back in your communities.

Also, I want you to know that your responses will be kept confidential, and you will have the option not to answer a question if you prefer not to. Do you have any questions?

I know you're aware of many of the problems we'll be discussing. I've already mentioned a couple. Now I'd like ask how you feel about each of nine issues. On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being NOT SERIOUS and 5 being VERY SERIOUS, what do you consider to be the seriousness of each of these problems which face pre-college age youth:

(Start with item which is underlined and move through the list from that point to the bottom and back to the top)

8. School drop outs and illiteracy

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

9. Poor job preparation

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

10. Abuse of drugs and alcohol

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

11. Teenage sexuality and pregnancy

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

12. Poor nutrition and fitness

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

13. Lack of personal values and self esteem

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

14. Depression and suicide

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

15. Juvenile delinquency

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

16. Lack of citizenship and leadership skills

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

(8= I don't know; 9= refused to answer)

Are there any other concerns or issues that you feel should be on the list? If so what are they?

17. Issue _____ 1 2 3 4 5 8 9

18. Issue _____ 1 2 3 4 5 8 9

19. Issue _____ 1 2 3 4 5 8 9

How serious do you feel each of these issues is, using the same 1 to 5 scale?

20. Do you think its appropriate for higher education in Oklahoma to be concerned with these problems as they affect pre-college age youth?

NO 1
YES.....2
MAYBE.....3
DON'T KNOW.....8
REFUSED TO ANSWER.....9

IF NO - Ask this question:

21. If its not appropriate for higher education to address these problems, then who do you feel should be addressing them?

RECORD RESPONSE:

Using another scale, I'd like to ask HOW APPROPRIATE you feel it is for Oklahoma State University to be addressing some of the "youth at risk" issues through Extension 4-H Programs.

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being not appropriate to 5 being very appropriate, please give me your reaction to the following:

How appropriate is it for:

22. OSU Extension to participate in research programs to address youth at risk issues.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

23. OSU Extension and 4-H to develop instructional programs to address "youth at risk" issues.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

24. OSU Extension to provide a public service network to deliver these programs to organizations, agencies, or the public.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

25. You to be personally involved in some programs which address youth at risk issues.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

Now I want to change the focus of the scale to reflect how appropriate it WOULD BE for OSU or Extension to take certain actions. Do you understand this slight change in focus? (if so, go ahead, if not clarify)

How appropriate WOULD IT BE for:

26. Extension and 4-H to be part of a coalition to develop programs to address youth at risk issues.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

27. OSU to develop special career and degree programs for youth development professionals.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

28. Short term interdisciplinary task forces to be organized to develop youth at risk programs.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

29. One existing department to be designated to coordinate the development "youth at risk" programs.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

30. A new Center for Youth Development, like other campus centers such as the Center for International Trade or Center for Wellness to be created at OSU to develop programs to address youth at risk issues.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

IF OSU were to respond to these youth at risk issues, what individuals or departments do you feel should provide the leadership for these programs.

RECORD RESPONSES:
31.

32.

33.

Lets discuss funding options for possible youth at risk programs at OSU. I will indicate a possible source of funds for youth at risk programs, and ask you to indicate how likely you think it is for funds to actually come from that source. Please respond on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being NOT AT ALL LIKELY and 5 being VERY LIKELY.

How likely is it that funds would come:

34. from the existing budgets of individual departments which would conduct youth at risk programs.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

35. from reallocation of existing funds to departments which would conduct youth at risk programs.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

36. from user fees paid by organizations and individuals.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

37. from private foundation grants made to the University.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

38. from federal government appropriations or grants, not currently included in University funds.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

39. How likely would it be for the state legislature to establish new appropriations for youth at risk programs.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

40. In your judgment, how likely is it that youth at risk programs will be developed or expanded if new funds are not provided through reallocation or new appropriations.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

Now I'd like to ask a couple open ended questions about your ideas related to how OSU might develop programs to solve some of the problems we've discussed.

Can you think of any staff, faculty, or departments that are conducting programs which might be related to these youth at risk issues, in Extension or outside Extension?

ISSUE: PROGRAM: DEPT./ PERSON RESPONSIBLE:

In your judgment, what do you feel Oklahoma State University SHOULD be doing about the youth at risk issues.

RECORD RESPONSE:

41.

42.

43.

In your judgement, what are the biggest challenges to creating programs to address youth at risk issues at Oklahoma State University?

RECORD RESPONSES:

44.

45.

46.

Do you have any other thoughts related to how the University might respond to youth at risk issues? How do you feel about 4-H being involved with youth at risk issues or programs?

RECORD RESPONSES

47.

48.

Just three more questions and we'll be through.

I understand that you are an Extension 4-H Staff member in _____ county, Is that right? If not, what county?

_____

53. How long have you been involved in education, through teaching or Extension? _____YEARS

0 - 1 YEARS 1
2 - 3 YEARS 2
4 - 7 YEARS 3
8 - 15 YEARS 4
15 OR MORE YEARS 5
DON'T KNOW 8
REFUSED TO ANSWER.....9

54. How long have you been employed by OSU? _____YEARS.

0 - 1 YEARS 1
2 - 3 YEARS 2
4 - 7 YEARS 3
8 - 15 YEARS 4
15 OR MORE YEARS 5
DON'T KNOW 8
REFUSED TO ANSWER.....9

Thank you. I really appreciate your help. If you would be interested in more information about youth at risk programs, or the results of this study, I would be glad to provide you with the information. Now that we have finished the survey, do you have any questions? Thank you.

Youth At Risk Interview Schedule by James A. Rutledge, (5/16/89)

Category:				
	OSU ADM	____	buff form 1	
**	FACULTY	____	pink form 2	
	EXT ADM	____	blue form 3	2,3,4
	EXT 4-H	____	green form 4	

College: _____ Department: _____ 5

6,7

Good (morning, afternoon), my name is Jim Rutledge. I would like your help in conducting a survey related to youth problems such as illiteracy, teen pregnancy, substance abuse and others.

I sent you a letter earlier, do you recall receiving it?

(If Yes): Good

(If NO): It was a brief letter sent to inform you that I would be calling. Basically the letter says we are conducting a survey about youth related problems, and would appreciate your help.

Can you spare about 15 minutes right now? ...Or..can I make an appointment to call you back at a more convenient time.

Response: YES - CONTINUE
YES - MAKE APPOINTMENT
NO - Thank You

Before we begin, I want you to know that when I say youth I mean boys and girls younger than college age. Also, when I talk about programs to address youth problems, I'm NOT talking about bringing young people to Stillwater. I'm talking about programs here at OSU that would train adults to help solve some of these problems back in their own communities.

Also, I want you to know that your responses will be kept confidential, and you will have the option not to answer a question if you prefer not to. Do you have any questions?

I know you're aware of many of the problems we'll be discussing. I've already mentioned a couple. Now I'd like ask how you feel about each of nine issues. On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being NOT SERIOUS and 5 being VERY SERIOUS, what do you consider to be the seriousness of each of these problems which face pre-college age youth:

(Start with item which is underlined and move through the list from that point to the bottom and back to the top)

8. School drop outs and illiteracy

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

9. Poor job preparation

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

10. Abuse of drugs and alcohol

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

11. Teenage sexuality and pregnancy

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

12. Poor nutrition and fitness

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

13. Lack of personal values and self esteem

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

14. Depression and suicide

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

15. Juvenile delinquency

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

16. Lack of citizenship and leadership skills

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

(8= I don't know; 9= refused to answer)

For the rest of the survey, I'll refer to these problems collectively as youth at risk issues. Are there any other concerns or issues that you feel should be on the list? If so what are they?

17. Issue _____ 1 2 3 4 5 8 9

18. Issue _____ 1 2 3 4 5 8 9

19. Issue _____ 1 2 3 4 5 8 9

How serious do you feel each of these issues is, using the same 1 to 5 scale?

20. Do you think its appropriate for higher education in Oklahoma to be concerned with these problems as they affect pre-college age youth?

NO 1
YES.....2
MAYBE.....3
DON'T KNOW.....8
REFUSED TO ANSWER.....9

IF NO - Ask this question:

21. If its not appropriate for higher education to address these problems, then who do you feel should be addressing them?

RECORD RESPONSE:

Using another scale, I'd like to ask HOW APPROPRIATE you feel it would be for Oklahoma State University to be addressing some of the "youth at risk" issues.

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being not appropriate to 5 being very appropriate, please give me your reaction to the following:

How appropriate would it be for:

22. OSU to develop research to address youth at risk issues.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

23. Your (department/college) to develop instructional programs to address "youth at risk" issues.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

24. OSU to develop a public service network to deliver these programs to organizations, agencies, or the public.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

25. You to be personally involved in some programs which address youth at risk issues.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

26. Your (department/college) to be part of a coalition to develop programs to address youth at risk issues.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

27. OSU to develop special career and degree programs for youth development professionals.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

28. Short term interdisciplinary task forces to be organized to develop youth at risk programs.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

29. One existing department to be designated to coordinate the development "youth at risk" programs.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

30. A new Center for Youth Development, like other campus centers such as the Center for International Trade or Center for Wellness to be created at OSU to develop programs to address youth at risk issues.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

IF OSU were to respond to these youth at risk issues, what individuals or departments do you feel should provide the leadership for these programs.

RECORD RESPONSES:
31.

32.

33.
Let's discuss funding options for possible youth at risk programs at OSU. I will indicate a possible source of funds for youth at risk programs, and ask you to indicate how likely you think it is for funds to actually come from that source. Please respond on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being NOT AT ALL LIKELY and 5 being VERY LIKELY.

How likely is it that funds would come:

34. from the existing budgets of individual departments which would conduct youth at risk programs.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

35. from reallocation of existing funds to departments which would conduct youth at risk programs.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

36. from user fees paid by organizations and individuals.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

37. from private foundation grants made to the University

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

38. from federal government appropriations or grants, not currently included in University funds.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

39. How likely would it be for the state legislature to establish new appropriations for youth at risk programs.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

40. In your judgment, how likely is it that youth at risk programs will be developed or expanded if new funds are not provided through reallocation or new appropriations.

1 2 3 4 5 8 9

Now I'd like to ask a couple open ended questions about your ideas related to how OSU might develop programs to solve some of the problems we've discussed.

Can you think of any staff, faculty, or departments that are conducting programs which might be related to these youth at risk issues?

ISSUE: PROGRAM: DEPT./ PERSON RESPONSIBLE:

In your judgment, what do you feel Oklahoma State University SHOULD be doing about the youth at risk issues.

RECORD RESPONSE:

41.
42.
43.

In your judgment, what would be the biggest challenges to creating programs to address youth at risk issues at Oklahoma State University?

RECORD RESPONSE:

44.
45.
46.

Do you have any other thoughts related to how the University might respond to youth at risk issues?

RECORD RESPONSE:

47.
48.

As we conclude, I would like to find out if you are familiar with one youth development program which already exists.

49. Have you heard of the 4-H Program?

NO 1
YES 2
UNSURE/MAYBE.....3
DON'T KNOW.....8
REFUSED TO ANSWER.....9

If No..Skip to **

50. Is 4-H affiliated with Oklahoma State University in any way?

NO.....1
YES.....2
UNSURE/MAYBE.....3
DON'T KNOW.....8
REFUSED TO ANSWER.....9

IF NO..Skip to **

51. Which college or program is it in:

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION	_____	1
AGRICULTURE	_____	2
ARTS & SCIENCES	_____	3
BUSINESS	_____	4
EDUCATION	_____	5
ENGINEERING	_____	6
HOME ECONOMICS	_____	7
NO IDEA	_____	8
REFUSED TO ANSWER	_____	9
OTHER	_____	0

52. Are you aware that 4-H has programs and activities which are intended to address youth at risk issues.

NO 1
YES....2
UNSURE/MAYBE.....3
DON'T KNOW.....8
REFUSED TO ANSWER.....9

We're almost finished, just three short background questions for the data base, and we'll be through.

**. I understand that you are a faculty/staff member in the _____(college/department), Is that right? If not, what (college/department)? _____

53. How long have you been involved in education?
_____YEARS

0 - 1 YEARS 1
2 - 3 YEARS 2
4 - 7 YEARS 3
8 - 15 YEARS 4
15 OR MORE YEARS 5
DON'T KNOW 8
REFUSED TO ANSWER.....9

54. How long have you been at OSU? _____YEARS.

0 - 1 YEARS 1
2 - 3 YEARS 2
4 - 7 YEARS 3
8 - 15 YEARS 4
15 OR MORE YEARS 5
DON'T KNOW 8
REFUSED TO ANSWER.....9

Thank you. I really appreciate your help. If you would be interested in more information about youth at risk programs, or the results of this study, I would be glad to provide you with the information. Now that we have finished the survey, do you have any questions? Thank you.

APPENDIX E

SUMMARY OF CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR YEARS OF INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATION OR ASSOCIATION WITH OSU AND RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS RELATED TO YOUTH AT RISK

SUMMARY OF CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR SPECIFIC QUESTIONS
BY YEARS OF EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

Questions	df	value	Probability [1]
Seriousness of Issues			
School Drop Outs and Illiteracy	2	0.476	0.788 *
Poor Job Preparation	2	0.901	0.637 *
Abuse of Drugs and Alcohol	2	0.982	0.612 *
Teenage Sexuality and Pregnancy	2	1.458	0.482 *
Poor Nutrition and fitness	2	1.331	0.514
Lack of Personal Values & Self Esteem	2	3.468	0.177 *
Depression and Suicide	2	2.391	0.303
Juvenile Delinquency	2	1.086	0.581
Lack of Citizenship & Leadership Skills	2	0.063	0.969
Appropriateness of Specific Actions			
Develop Research	2	0.548	0.760 *
Develop Instructional Programs	2	2.665	0.264 *
Develop Public Service Network	2	4.295	0.117 *
Personal Involvement	2	2.169	0.338 *
Building Coalitions	2	1.587	0.452 *
Develop Youth Development Degrees	2	0.815	0.665 *
Short Term Task Forces	2	0.543	0.762 *
Designate One Department	2	0.858	0.651
Center for Youth Development	2	0.470	0.791
Funding Options			
Existing Funds	2	1.524	0.467 *
Reallocation of Funds	2	1.691	0.429
User Fees	2	2.045	0.360
Foundation Grants	2	1.191	0.551 *
Federal Appropriations	2	0.566	0.754
State Appropriations	2	0.061	0.970
Programs with No New Funds	2	0.491	0.782

[1] * Invalid test with 33% or more cells with expected frequency less than 5.

SUMMARY OF CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR SPECIFIC QUESTIONS BY YEARS OF AFFILIATION WITH OSU

Questions	df	value	Probability [1]
Seriousness of Issues			
School Drop Outs and Illiteracy	2	0.623	0.732 *
Poor Job Preparation	2	1.117	0.572 *
Abuse of Drugs and Alcohol	2	1.228	0.541 *
Teenage Sexuality and Pregnancy	2	2.336	0.311 *
Poor Nutrition and fitness	2	5.578	0.061
Lack of Personal Values & Self Esteem	2	0.166	0.920 *
Depression and Suicide	2	0.848	0.655
Juvenile Delinquency	2	1.536	0.464
Lack of Citizenship & Leadership Skills	2	1.165	0.558 *
Appropriateness of Specific Actions			
Develop Research	2	1.607	0.448 *
Develop Instructional Programs	2	0.034	0.983 *
Develop Public Service Network	2	6.131	0.047 *
Personal Involvement	2	0.530	0.767 *
Building Coalitions	2	3.001	0.223 *
Develop Youth Development Degrees	2	0.456	0.796 *
Short Term Task Forces	2	1.159	0.560 *
Designate One Department	2	0.230	0.891
Center for Youth Development	2	0.627	0.731
Funding Options			
Existing Funds	2	0.583	0.747 *
Reallocation of Funds	2	2.337	0.311
User Fees	2	4.469	0.107
Foundation Grants	2	2.534	0.282 *
Federal Appropriations	2	0.096	0.953
State Appropriations	2	4.071	0.131
Programs with No New Funds	2	1.660	0.436

[1] * Invalid test with 33% or more cells with expected frequency less than 5.

VITA

James Andrew Rutledge

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE ROLE OF THE LAND-GRANT INSTITUTION IN RESPONDING TO YOUTH AT RISK ISSUES AS PERCEIVED BY SELECTED UNIVERSITY AND COOPERATIVE EXTENSION FACULTY, STAFF AND ADMINISTRATORS OF OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Major Field: Agricultural Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Springfield, Illinois, October 8, 1947, the first son of Richard K. and Shirley L. Rutledge. Married to Kathleen L. Bradley, July 5, 1969. Father of three sons, Ken, Scott and Paul.

Education: Graduated from Hustisford High School, Hustisford, Wisconsin, June 1965; received Bachelor of Science Degree in Agriculture from University of Wisconsin-Madison, June 1969, with a major in Agriculture and Extension Education and a minor in Animal Science; completed the requirements for the Master of Science Degree at University of Wisconsin-Madison, August 1975, with a major in Continuing and Vocational Education, with an emphasis in Youth Development Education; completed the requirements for the Doctor of Education Degree at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, December 1989, with a major in Agricultural Education, with an emphasis in Extension Administration.

Professional Experience: Extension Summer Specialist, University of Wisconsin-Extension, Summer 1969; U. S. Army Chaplain's Assistant, November 1969 to August 1971; 4-H & Youth Agent, Walworth County, University of Wisconsin-Extension, August 1971 to August 1978; Area 4-H Agent, Cheyenne, Agricultural Extension Service, University of Wyoming,

August 1978 to October 1983; 4-H & Youth Development Specialist, Cooperative Extension Service, Oklahoma State University, October 1983 to present.

Organizations: National Association of Extension 4-H Agents, Oklahoma Association of Extension 4-H Agents, Epsilon Sigma Phi, Phi Delta Kappa, Gamma Sigma Delta, Alpha Zeta, Wisconsin Alumni Association, Charter Member of Wisconsin Agricultural and Life Sciences Alumni, Association for Volunteer Administration, and First Christian Church of Stillwater.