

JOB SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION OF
COUNTY COOPERATIVE EXTENSION 4-H
AGENTS IN OKLAHOMA

By

RICK LEE BLACK
"

Bachelor of Science in Agriculture

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1985

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate college of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1987

THESIS
1987
B627j
cop. 2



JOB SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION OF
COUNTY COOPERATIVE EXTENSION 4-H
AGENTS IN OKLAHOMA

Thesis Approved:

Eddy Finley

Thesis Advisor

James P. Key

Robert King

Norman N. Duckham

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his gratitude to the County Extension 4-H agents in Oklahoma who completed the survey and helped make this study complete.

Sincere appreciation is expressed to the staff members of the Payne County Extension office for their patience and support during completion of this study. In particular, thanks go to the writer's committee chairman and friend Dr. Eddie Finley for his advice and encouragement which made this study possible. Also to his family who allowed us to work after the normal working day. To all committee members whose counsel was greatly appreciated.

Special recognition is given to Mr. Wallace Smith, State Director of 4-H, whose support enabled such a large return on the survey.

Recognition is given to Mr. Hugh Merrill for his efficient typing of this thesis.

To the writer's mother, Mrs. Helen Ward, whose sacrifices and love enabled her "son" to complete his academic studies, this study is dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|---|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Statement of the Problem | 2 |
| Purpose of the Study | 2 |
| Objectives of the Study | 3 |
| Assumptions of the Study | 4 |
| Size and Scope of Study | 4 |
| Definitions | 4 |
| II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE | 6 |
| Official Beginning | 6 |
| Where and How Did 4-H Start? | 7 |
| 4-H Enrollment | 7 |
| Extension Programs Change to Meet Needs | 8 |
| Different Work for Extension Agents | 8 |
| Extension Agents' Responsibilities | 10 |
| The 4-H Agent Finds His Role in Democracy | 11 |
| Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction | 12 |
| Summary of Review of Literature | 14 |
| III. METHODOLOGY | 16 |
| Introduction | 16 |
| The Population | 16 |
| Selection and Development of the Instrument | 17 |
| The Instrument | 19 |
| Analysis of Data | 21 |
| IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA | 23 |
| V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS | 63 |
| Introduction | 63 |
| Purpose | 63 |
| Summary of Population | 63 |
| Findings | 64 |
| Conclusions | 69 |
| Recommendations | 70 |
| Recommendations for Additional Research | 72 |
| SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY | 74 |

| Chapter | Page |
|-----------------------------------|------|
| APPENDIXES | 76 |
| APPENDIX A - INSTRUMENT | 77 |
| APPENDIX B - LETTERS | 80 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| I. Population By District | 17 |
| II. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with the Number of Hours in Their Work Week | 24 |
| III. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with Their Opportunity to Structure Their Own Program | 26 |
| IV. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with the Freedom Allowed in Their Career | 27 |
| V. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with Their Social Status in Respective Community | 29 |
| VI. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with the Variety of Their Job Responsibilities | 30 |
| VII. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with the Amount of Responsibilities Indirectly Related to the Job | 32 |
| VIII. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with the Education Level Required | 33 |
| IX. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with the Opportunity to Return to School | 34 |
| X. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with the People in Their County, Their Sin- cerity and awareness of the Respon- dents' Efforts to Serve Them | 36 |
| XI. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with Their Co-Workers | 38 |
| XII. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with the Social Constraints of Their Job | 39 |
| XIII. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with Their Enthusiasm Toward Their Job | 40 |

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| XIV. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with the Stress of Working With a Variety of Public Affairs | 42 |
| XV. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with of Working with Committees that Concern Their Program | 43 |
| XVI. Respondents' Perceived Dissatisfaction with the Procedures Used By Administration to Govern Employees | 45 |
| XVII. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with Their Competency Level Associated to Their Job | 46 |
| XVIII. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with the In-Service Training They Receive | 48 |
| XIX. Respondents' Perceived Dissatisfaction with the Pressure to do Assignments Unrelated to Their Job | 49 |
| XX. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with the Level of Their Satisfaction After Programs are Completed. | 51 |
| XXI. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction Concerning The Full Support of Agent's Family | 52 |
| XXII. Respondents' Perceived Dissatisfaction with the Salary They Receive | 54 |
| XXIII. Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction with Their Job in General | 55 |
| XXIV. Respondents' Perception Pertaining to Whether or not They Would Choose Another Career if They Could Start Over Again | 56 |
| XXV. Respondents' Perception Pertaining to Whether or not Efforts are Being Duplicated in the County | 57 |
| XXVI. Respondents' Perception Pertaining to Whether or not They are Bothered by Possibly Losing Their Job from Budget Cuts | 58 |
| XXVII. Respondents' Perception Pertaining to Whether or not They Plan on Making Cooperative Extension a Life-Long Profession | 59 |

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| XXVIII. Summary of Respondents' Perceived Satisfaction Relative to Their Present Job | 66 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The experiences and minds of men have always ventured beyond the beaten trails of scientifically proven facts. The perimeter of experimentation must be expanded rapidly to maintain a balance between what can be done to protect the future of the human race (Scarseth 1962, p.3).

The history of the Cooperative Extension Service is a story of growth in progress offered to rural America - a testimony to the mental growth of the people who till the soil. Its goal has always been to help rural people achieve a better life. To do this, it must take to these families not only the science of agriculture but that of homemaking as well.

On the other hand, if too much time is spent in working with organized rural and urban groups, cooperative extension agents may lack the close touch they need with rural and urban families in their own homes. The cooperative extension agents, therefore, must plan their work so that they reach the largest number of people in the smallest amount of time. In doing this, cooperative extension agents have performed well within the complexities of today's society, however the longevity of cooperative extension agents may be affected by their job dissatisfaction/satisfaction.

Job satisfaction/dissatisfaction is recognized as one of the nation's most serious concerns. Therefore, this study is primarily concerned with cooperative extension agents perception of the job satisfaction/ dissatisfaction criteria pertaining to their job.

"The stakes are high. The issues are a matter of happiness or woe" (Scarseth 1962, p.12).

Statement of the Problem

The study was concerned with the lack of current information relative to the degree of job satisfaction/ dissatisfaction with county extension agents responsible for 4-H programs in Oklahoma. Achieving information should be beneficial to those administrating programs within Cooperative Extension Service of Oklahoma and the College of Agriculture at Oklahoma State University, Cameron University, and Panhandle State University, especially since none of those institutions have current research findings which will assist them in guidance, counseling, etc. of current and prospective county extension 4-H agents.

Purpose of the Study

The intent of this study was to determine perceived job satisfaction/dissatisfaction of county cooperative extension 4-H agents in Oklahoma based upon selected criteria. A secondary purpose of this study was to determine additional

perceptions the cooperative extension 4-H agents have pertaining to their jobs.

Objectives of the Study

1. To determine the degree of perceived satisfaction/dissatisfaction of cooperative extension agents (responsible for 4-H programs) based upon selected questions.
2. To determine whether or not the cooperative extension agents (responsible for 4-H programs) would choose another job if given the opportunity.
3. To determine whether or not the efforts of cooperative extension agents (4-H programs) are being duplicated by another professional in the county.
4. To determine whether or not the cooperative extension agent (4-H programs) are concerned about losing their job as a result of budget cuts.
5. To determine whether or not the cooperative extension agent (4-H programs) plan on making cooperative extension a lifelong profession.
6. To determine the one item leading to the greatest satisfaction of cooperative extension agents' (4-H program) job.
7. To determine the one item leading to the greatest dissatisfaction of the cooperative extension agents' (4-H program) job.

Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions were made about the study:

1. That the respondents indicated honest expressions of their opinions.
2. The instrument administered would solicit accurate responses.

Size and Scope of Study

This study included all 116 cooperative extension agents with 4-H responsibility in the seventy-seven counties in Oklahoma.

Definitions

The definitions used are as they apply to this study.

Extension Agents, 4-H (4-H Agent). He or she is responsible for 4-H programs in the county of location. They are also accountable to the County Extension Director.

County Extension Director (County Director). Is the administrative head of a county staff. Has the responsibility for total programs covering 4-H, Agriculture, Home Economics, and Rural Development in the area of jurisdiction.

Position. The duties and tasks established as the work requirement for one individual. A position exists whether occupied or vacant.

Job Satisfaction. Qualities of employment that bring pleasure or contentment to any individual or group.

Job Dissatisfaction. Qualities of employment that bring displeasure or discontentment to any individual or group.

Cooperative Extension Service. The mission of the extension service is to assure that information gained through research at Land Grant Colleges is distributed, free of charge, to all citizens in useful and practical ways that help to achieve quality life for all.

4-H Programs. Is the branch of extension that has goals and objectives established to provide informed educational programs for urban and rural youth.

4-H Member. Is a young person, age nine to nineteen, regardless of sex, creed, or national origin who has formally completed a 4-H enrollment card and has met any other enrollment criteria required by the cooperative extension 4-H agent.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter was to present a review of selected literature which was related to this study. The intent of this study was to determine perceived job satisfaction/dissatisfaction of county cooperative extension 4-H agents in Oklahoma based upon selected criteria. A secondary purpose of this study was to determine additional perceptions the cooperative extension 4-H agent have pertaining to their job.

The major areas included in this review were: (1) official beginning, (2) where and how did it start, (3) 4-H enrollment, (4) extension programs change to meet the needs, (5) different work for extension agents, (6) extension agents' responsibilities, (7) the 4-H agent finds his role in democracy, (8) job satisfaction/ dissatisfaction, (9) summary of the review of literature.

Official Beginning

Since its official beginning in 1914, Extension has continued to function in a cooperative arrangement between the United States Department of Agriculture, the land-grant university of each state, and local governments.

The original thrusts were in the areas of agriculture and home economics, primarily aimed at rural audiences. 4-H Clubs, too were essentially rural oriented.

Where and How Did 4-H Start?

If someone were to ask where 4-H started, they'd probably get as many answers as there are states-- and that would be about right. We know of boys' corn clubs and girls' canning clubs that sprang up between 1902 and 1909 in Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Texas. Probably many others weren't recorded. The yearly program in one of those early clubs consisted of growing corn, planting a garden, testing soil, club meetings, and visits to club members' plots and exhibits.

The early youth clubs grew out of an effort not only to take agricultural information to young people to interest them in rural life, but to teach them something to take home to Mom and Dad because the parents might be hesitant in going out to learn themselves (Anderson, 1976, p.156).

4-H Enrollment

The growth and accomplishments of a program can't be measured in numbers alone. Many of the real accomplishments of 4-H can be measured only in terms of the individual growth and development of a girl or boy or a volunteer man or woman.

A current Georgia 4-er, 12-year-old Wesley Taylor, had visions of banking a sizable profit at harvest time. Even though he patterned himself after today's successful farmers by practicing modern agricultural techniques, Mother Nature didn't cooperate and he made a mere \$15. However, he's quick to report, "The important thing I learned is that a farmer doesn't always make a big profit. But you don't let that disturb you. Like me, I'm already making plans for next year's bean patch (Anderson, 1976, p.161).

Extension Programs Change to Meet Needs

Cooperative Extension Service has always been able to adjust its ability to any emergency. It has always been an agency that can quickly adapt programs to changing times and emergency.

This was shown during World War I by helping produce for the war. It was shown in the depression days and in the drought areas of the late thirties. Then as the second World War unfolded it adjusted itself to that situation.

The very nature of the Extension Service Agency has been excellent in communications. Quick communication has always been possible from Washington, D.C., direct to the state, from the state direct to all the counties and from the counties direct to the leaders of the county and from the leaders direct to the people at the grass roots. This is what one of the greatest humanitarian agencies of the United States is doing for people (Roberts, 1902-1970, p.98).

Different Work for Extension Agents

At the close of World War II in 1945 the Extension Service clients needed new programs for the changing needs. It was not a matter anymore of high production but decreased farm income. Before the war county agents were faced with post war agriculture depression in which the agent found his support vanishing in some states. The prestige involved with the profession was diminishing, financial support rapidly decreasing, and the work at times discredited by nervous taxpayers. U. A. Floyd of the federal Extension

Office described the effect of the depression on extension work and the agents in this address:

The past year has been a hectic one for all extension workers. We have undergone our first major and organized attack. The deplorable condition of the Nation's business, particularly as it affects agriculture, with mounting tax burdens and mortgage foreclosures, has lent fuel to the fire for the reduction of governmental expenses and the lessening of the tax burden. Everyone must agree to the general desirability of such consummation. Selfish opposition outside the farm people has seized upon the unrest and discontent to foment opposition to extension work in state Legislatures, in the National Congress, and among the people. This attack had strong, even if at times, sinister backing. While serious reductions in extension funds have been made in many of the States, the effort to bring about an abandonment of extension work failed whenever it was proposed. For the entire country our extension budget is less by approximately \$3,500,000 for the current fiscal year in comparison with the last, while the total extension personnel is decreased by less than 400 for all classes of workers.... It is a fine tribute to the quality of extension workers that in the face of bitter, unwarranted and sinister attack, with salaries reduced and insufficient expense accounts, they have carried on and maintained the morale (Annual Address of Grand Director of Epsilon Sigma Phi Yearbook, 1933, p.9).

The severity of the problem (within the nation) affected county agents throughout the United States. Traditional support from the rural families was indeed important. Efforts of county agents were being questioned by county appropriation boards as to whether they were necessary.

Iowa farmers' holiday organizations urged county supervisors to discontinue county appropriations and to evict the county agent from the courthouse. In some counties large members of holiday members descended upon the courthouse forcibly to remove the county agent. They usually found the county agent well supported by sympathetic farmers who were occasionally reinforced by deputy sheriffs.

Opposition in other states and sections was less spectacular. The county agent's work was undermined more often by economy measures of county appropriating boards and by indifference and lethargy on the part of the farmers. A number of counties in states providing for voluntary county appropriations discontinued the work. The dismissal of the county agent resulted. The number of counties discontinuing the work ranged from a small number in the northeastern states to an alarming number in South Dakota, North Dakota, and some other states severely affected by the depression (Baker, 1939, p.58).

Extension Agents' Responsibilities

Extension work often requires long hours, including night and weekend meetings. Because of this, Extension staff find themselves torn between family commitments, expectations of clientele and administrators, and their own personal work goals.

These increased demands quite naturally lead to even more than the usual amount of stress and time management difficulties for Extension personnel. Hawkins cited the disruptive, harmful effects on families of Extension staff because of jobs that absorb almost all of an individual's time (Hawkins, 1982, p.39).

Massachusetts pioneer Mac Dougall writes of his extension work:

Almost every night I slept in a different farm home bed, eating heartily at the farmer's kitchen table, making farm visits in the morning, giving demonstrations in the afternoon, lectures in the evening. I lived and worked as close to farm families as possible (Reeder, 1979, p.139).

The 4-H Agent Finds His Role in Democracy

When Hanchey E. Loque prepared this portion of his paper during his office as State 4-H Club Leader, it was his understanding that a good 4-H agent will find his role if he is to be successful.

When the young, inexperienced agent first went on the job as an assistant county agent or assistant home agent to do mainly 4-H Club work, he was shocked and baffled by the enormity of his job. A whole county to cover! Over eighteen-hundred-fifty members and scores of leaders, parents and friends of 4-H to work with. He was lost because he could not conceive of his doing all of the jobs and carrying out the mechanics of his work. After working, and after seasoning, and after his little schooner has fought the calms and the raging winds of time and place, he has discovered the resources both natural and human in his contiguous territory, his county. He has learned to put himself in the other fellow's shoes. He has learned empathy. He has learned the value of the individual and the dignity of being an individual in a democracy. He has learned about democracy. He has learned where he will work and with whom he will work. He sees the need of sociological education in his job. He has applied the basic objectives of education. He has learned first-hand that an extension agent must know the facts. He has used wisely resource people and has made adequate preparation for the visits of specialists. He has taught boys and girls that freedom is earned and that with every freedom goes a responsibility. He has taught the rights and duties in democracy to 4-H members and leaders. He has learned why he teaches what he teaches. He has taught the useful purposes of life. He has learned and taught the three D's of democracy. He has observed human growth and development. He has planned and learned to think better. He has used the seven cardinal principles. He has taught the six basic urges or institutions. He has learned about the practices role playing or playing at role playing--socio-drama. He has learned about empathy and has practiced it by trying to put himself in the other fellow's shoes. He has learned what democracy is:

Democracy is a way of life in which each individual has the responsibility to discover, develop, and direct his talents, innate abilities, or potentialities, develop them to the optimum and direct those talents, innate abilities, or potentialities to service or useful world service, or to his fair share of useful work.

The extension service agent doing mainly 4-H Club work has at last found his own ROLE in democracy. He is working mainly with boys and girls and, in doing, so, with leaders and parents, but he has found that his role is to help as many boys and girls as he can to discover, develop to the optimum their own talents, abilities and potentialities so that they will be prepared to direct those talents, abilities and potentialities into service and their fair share of the world's useful work (Loque, State 4-H Club Leader).

Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

People involved in the field of teaching, such as 4-H agents have little or no research to validate the factors associated with job satisfaction/ dissatisfaction. However, researchers who have studied job satisfaction seemed to have focused upon persons employed in the industry sector of our society or, in some instances persons employed as teachers of vocational agriculture.

The adequacy of the compensation plus the advancement an individual makes in a job or in a hierarchy of related jobs often govern that individual's level (Bowen, 1980).

Work is one of the most absorbing things men can think and talk about. It fills the greater part of the working day for most of us. For the fortunate it is the source of great satisfactions; for many others it is the cause of grief (Herzberg, 1959, p.3).

In the field of teaching vocational agriculture, teachers are being asked to respond their level of satisfaction.

Educators are being questioned about their competency level in the classrooms. However, in a report by Orville Thompson (1986, p.42) teachers responded positively about their respective career choice.

Despite the problems of some female vocational agriculture teachers and the discouraging news concerning the length of tenure of both male and female teachers, the level of satisfaction among these credential holders still teaching was extremely high. In fact, almost 90% of them reported they were satisfied or very satisfied with their career choice. To further confirm this finding, 80% affirmed that if they had the choice to make over again, they would still choose agriculture teaching. Women's satisfaction level was as high, or a bit higher, than men's. Many researchers and educators alike contend that particular personalities are attracted to teaching. Among the personality characteristics ideal for a teacher would be a love or desire to work with young people (Eaker, 1986, p.42).

A recent study by Tillberg (1986) of Ohio State University reported:

In Extension, because of the importance and complexity of the field faculty positions, the assurance of satisfaction of individuals comes through personnel development activities and an appropriate, equitable reward system. The better the Extension Service can perform these management tasks, the more continuity Extension programming should possess.

Tillberg (1986) further stated:

Employee satisfaction has long been a major concern of organizations like the Extension Service. Turnover and absenteeism are two major consequences of dissatisfaction among employees and both have proven disruptive to the continuity and quality of Extension programming. When high level performers are being affected, the negative results of dissatisfaction are even more pronounced within the organizations. Thus, administrators of labor-intensive organizations like Extension would benefit from a better understanding of the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. Increased

knowledge of the individual processes involved in employee performance and satisfaction would be an important step in the management of absenteeism, turnover and other detrimental behaviors associated with organizational productivity and ultimate success.

Summary of Review of Literature

It was determined, based upon the review of literature, that work (itself) can be one of the most rewarding things people can think and talk about. However, it was further determined that work can cause great grief. Therefore, as reflected in the review of literature, people who work in business or industry, or who teach vocational agriculture, and too, those who are Cooperative Extension Service agents can be either satisfied or dissatisfied with their work.

Additionally, it was discovered that being a Cooperative Extension Service agent is not easy, especially if he assumes all of his duties and responsibilities. None the less, it was determined that many Cooperative Extension Service agents have indicated a great satisfaction of their work and that the work was very rewarding (even though there was no specific research discovered which supported this conclusion). And as was suspected, the review of literature did lead the writer to conclude (as well) that many Cooperative Extension Service agents were dissatisfied with their work, basically because of the unusual amount of stress and time management difficulties for Extension personnel. Also, there seemed to be some harmful disruptive effects on families of Extension staff.

In conclusion, there was no research discovered which would decisively convince the author that most Cooperative Extension Service agents were either satisfied or dissatisfied with their job. Therefore, it is the hope of this writer that this specific research will provide some conclusive evidence one way or the other.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to describe the methods and procedures used to conduct this study. The intent of this study was to determine perceived job satisfaction/dissatisfaction of county cooperative extension 4-H agents in Oklahoma based upon selected criteria. A secondary purpose of this study was to determine additional perceptions the cooperative extension 4-H agents have pertaining to their job.

In order to accomplish the purpose and objectives of this study, it was necessary to determine the population and develop an instrument which would provide the necessary information. A procedure for the collection of data was established and the methods to be used to analyze the data were chosen. The data for this study was collected during the Annual Conference, January, 1987.

The Population

The population of this study consisted of all county extension agents who have 4-H responsibilities in Oklahoma that are presently employed. The population was determined

by the author and Dr. James Netherton, Director of Personnel for the Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service. The 116 county agents comprising the population represented all 77 counties in Oklahoma's Cooperative Extension Service.

Table I reflects the total population of this study by District in Oklahoma.

TABLE I
POPULATION BY DISTRICT

| District | Number of Agents | Percentage |
|----------|------------------|------------|
| NW | 27 | 23% |
| NE | 31 | 27% |
| SW | 34 | 29% |
| SE | 24 | 21% |
| TOTAL | 116 | 100% |

Selection and Development of the Instrument

In the preparation of the instrument (see Appendix A) to meet the objectives of the study, the first step was to review and evaluate the instruments used in related studies.

In analyzing various methods of data gathering, the questionnaire method was determined the most appropriate to meet the study objectives. Despite the most diligent effort in respondent preparation and questionnaire design, a considerable number of respondents will fail to respond to

the initial mailing. However, hand delivered questionnaires are conducted by administering a structured set of questions to each member of the population. Due to the expense and time required, personal interviews, mailing questionnaires and conducting telephone surveys, were deleted from consideration.

Again considering time and expense along with the consideration of response from mailing, it was decided upon hand delivery of the questionnaire to agents at annual conference would be most desirable. Also, concern of agents not responding was bothersome. To possibly avoid such incidents it was decided that no codes would be used. And, only agents present and willing to participate in the survey at annual conference would be included in the study.

The instrument was patterned after the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, 1977), and the Purdue Teacher Questionnaire (Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire, 1980). After reviewing these two examples of satisfaction questionnaires the foundation was developed for the instrument to be used. Questions were compiled and reviewed by the writer and major advisor until a satisfactory list was completed. There was no other input regarding the questions to be used in the questionnaire. The list of questions were related to job factors only.

After completion of the list of questions used in the questionnaire to answer the objectives of the study, the next step was to make necessary revisions and then test the

applicability and continuity of the questions to be used. The instrument was then given to the director of cooperative extension to review to allow for permission to hand deliver the instrument by state 4-H staff.

Throughout the process of developing the questionnaire, the length of the instrument was of concern. Some individuals felt that if the instrument was too long, agents would be hesitant to complete it. The length of the questionnaire was carefully considered along with the types of questions to be asked in the preparation of the instrument. The instrument was designed to require about ten minutes of the agent's time and yet provide the needed information.

The Instrument

To gather data concerning factors which influence the job satisfaction/dissatisfaction of county extension 4-H agents in Oklahoma, two open ended question of qualitative nature were included, the remaining questions were forced choice responses. The questions were divided into two sections; first, one which determined job satisfaction/dissatisfaction of county extension agents; and secondly, forced responses to related questions.

The questions were developed from specific factors that are related to the county extension agents' profession, more specifically, those factors associated with job satisfaction/dissatisfaction. The author's major advisor

reviewed each draft of the instrument and upon completion of each review, revisions were made. Once the questions were fully developed and implemented as the survey instrument, the drafted instrument was tested by Occupational and Agriculture Education research and design class on November 15, 1986. Based upon several valid comments and questions raised by the persons cooperating in the testing of the instrument, the investigator was able to strengthen several areas within the instrument.

After ample time of reviewing, permission was granted by Dr. T. Roy Bogle, Director of the Cooperative Extension Service, to administer the instrument (see Appendix B). It was pertinent that he be informed of the study and involved in the delivery of the instrument; primarily so agents would know that this instrument had been thoroughly checked.

After these considerations and revisions, the instrument was ready for delivery by the state 4-H staff to agents at annual conference. The instrument was hand delivered by the state 4-H staff at each of the four district meetings of annual conference. Also the instrument was picked up the same day of delivery by state 4-H staff and returned to the writer. It is important to note that it was left to the discretion of the respondents whether or not to respond to any or all of the questions asked. The responses were totally voluntary.

The information obtained from the instrument provided a means for identifying those selected factors which were

either a source of job satisfaction/ dissatisfaction to the Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Agents. The questionnaire contained a scale of categories for the cooperative extension agents to rate their satisfaction/dissatisfaction with variables in four major areas of influence: very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied. Also provided by the questionnaire was a demographic question concerning the agent's respective working district.

A four point "Likert-type" scale of categories was used to allow the agents to rate their satisfaction/ dissatisfaction with each of the selected variables on the questionnaire. The response categories were assigned the following numerical values: very dissatisfied=1, dissatisfied=2, satisfied=3, very satisfied=4. Real limits were set at 1.0 to 1.49 for very dissatisfied; 1.50 to 2.49 for dissatisfied; 2.50 to 3.49 for satisfied, 3.50 to 4.00 for very satisfied.

Analysis of Data

Data from the questionnaire were analyzed utilizing descriptive statistics. It is important to point out that frequency distribution includes numbers and percent. In addition, mean scores were used to interpret the data.

The primary use of descriptive statistics is to describe information or data through the use of numbers. The characteristics of groups of numbers representing information or data are called descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics

are used to describe groups of numerical data such as test scores, number or hours of instruction, or the number of students enrolled in a particular course (Key, 1981, p.126).

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter was to report the results from the questionnaires used to conduct this study. The intent of this study was to determine perceived job satisfaction/dissatisfaction of county cooperative extension 4-H agents in Oklahoma based upon selected criteria. A secondary purpose of this study was to determine additional perceptions the cooperative extension 4-H agents have pertaining to their job.

The scope of this study included a total of 116 Cooperative Extension 4-H agents in Oklahoma. The questionnaire was administered to the 116 cooperative extension 4-H agents and of the 116 included in this study, 116, or 100.00 percent responded to the questionnaire. Their responses are reported in the following tables.

The respondents' perceptions with the number of hours in a work week is reported in TABLE II. It should be pointed out that 74 (64.91%) of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the hours in a work week. Additionally, 34 (29.82%) of the respondents were dissatisfied and 5 (4.39%) of the respondents were very dissatisfied. However, the mean response of all respondents

TABLE II
 RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH THE NUMBER OF
 HOURS IN THEIR WORK WEEK

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total* | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|-------------------|------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------|----------------|------|--------|--------|---------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | N | % | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | | | |
| NW | 0 | 0.00 | 7 | 6.14 | 20 | 17.54 | 0 | 0.00 | 27 | 23.68 | 2.74 | Satisfied |
| NE | 1 | 0.88 | 9 | 7.89 | 21 | 18.42 | 0 | 0.00 | 31 | 27.19 | 2.65 | Satisfied |
| SW | 2 | 1.75 | 12 | 10.53 | 18 | 15.79 | 0 | 0.00 | 32 | 28.07 | 2.50 | Satisfied |
| SE | 2 | 1.75 | 6 | 5.26 | 15 | 13.16 | 1 | 0.88 | 24 | 21.05 | 2.63 | Satisfied |
| Total | 5 | 4.39 | 34 | 29.82 | 74 | 64.91 | 1 | 0.88 | 114 | 100.00 | 2.63 | Satisfied |

* N varies because not all respondents chose to respond to all questions.

(114) was 2.63 which indicated that they were satisfied with the number of hours in a work week. It further appeared that there seemed to be no distinguishable difference in numbers and percentages between respondents from each district. It should be further stated that two (2) respondents chose not to respond to this question.

The respondents' perceptions with their opportunity to structure their own program is reported in TABLE III. It should be pointed out that 69 (59.48%) of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the opportunity to structure their own program. The Southwest district was satisfied with the opportunity to structure their own program. Additionally 42 (36.21%) of the respondents were very satisfied and 4 (3.45%) of the respondents were dissatisfied. However, the mean response of respondents (116) was 3.32 which indicated that they were satisfied with the opportunity to structure their own program.

The respondents' perceptions with the freedom allowed in their career is reported in TABLE IV. It should be pointed out that 77 (66.69%) of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the freedom allowed in their career. Additionally 32 (27.83%) of the respondents were very satisfied and 6 (5.22%) were dissatisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (115) was 3.22 which indicated that they were satisfied with the freedom allowed in their career. The respondents indicated that no one was very dissatisfied with the freedom allowed in their career.

TABLE III

RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH THEIR OPPORTUNITY TO
STRUCTURE THEIR OWN PROGRAM

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|----------------------|------|--------------|------|-----------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------|--------|------------------|-------------------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | N | % | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | | | |
| NW | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.86 | 18 | 15.52 | 8 | 6.90 | 27 | 23.28 | 3.30 | Satisfied |
| NE | 1 | 0.86 | 0 | 0.00 | 21 | 18.10 | 10 | 8.62 | 32 | 27.59 | 3.30 | Satisfied |
| SW | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.59 | 18 | 15.52 | 12 | 10.34 | 33 | 28.45 | 3.30 | Satisfied |
| SE | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 12 | 10.34 | 12 | 10.34 | 24 | 20.69 | 3.50 | Very Satisfied |
| Total | 1 | 0.86 | 4 | 3.45 | 69 | 59.48 | 42 | 36.21 | 116 | 100.00 | 3.32 | Satisfied |

TABLE IV
 RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH THE FREEDOM
 ALLOWED IN THEIR CAREER

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total* | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|-------------------|------|--------------|------|-----------|-------|----------------|-------|--------|--------|---------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | N | % | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | | | |
| NW | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.61 | 20 | 17.39 | 4 | 3.48 | 27 | 23.48 | 3.03 | Satisfied |
| NE | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.87 | 25 | 21.74 | 5 | 4.35 | 31 | 26.96 | 3.12 | Satisfied |
| SW | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 1.74 | 18 | 15.65 | 13 | 11.30 | 33 | 28.70 | 3.33 | Satisfied |
| SE | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 14 | 12.17 | 10 | 8.70 | 24 | 20.87 | 3.41 | Satisfied |
| Total | 0 | 0.00 | 6 | 5.22 | 77 | 66.96 | 32 | 27.83 | 115 | 100.00 | 3.22 | Satisfied |

* N varies because not all respondents chose to respond to all questions.

It should be further noted that one (1) respondent chose not to respond to this question.

The respondents' perceptions with their social status in their respective community is reported in TABLE V. It should be pointed out that 82 (70.69%) of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the social status in their community. Additionally 28 (24.14%) of the respondents were very satisfied and 6 (5.17%) were dissatisfied. The respondents from the Southeast district had no response in the dissatisfied column. However the mean response of all respondents (116) was 3.20 which indicated that they were satisfied with the freedom allowed in their career. The respondents indicated that no one was very dissatisfied with the social status in respective community.

The respondents' perceptions with the variety of job responsibilities is reported in TABLE VI. It should be pointed out that 64 (55.65%) of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the variety of job responsibilities. Additionally 35 (30.44%) of the respondents were very satisfied and 13 (11.30%) of the respondents were dissatisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (115) was 3.14 which indicated that they were satisfied with the variety of job responsibilities. It further appeared that there seems to be no distinguishable difference in numbers and percentages between respondents from each district. It should be further noted that one (1)

TABLE V
 RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH THEIR SOCIAL
 STATUS IN RESPECTIVE COMMUNITY

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|-------------------|------|--------------|------|-----------|-------|----------------|-------|-------|--------|---------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | | | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | |
| NW | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.86 | 23 | 19.83 | 3 | 2.59 | 27 | 23.28 | 3.10 | Satisfied |
| NE | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 1.72 | 23 | 19.83 | 7 | 6.03 | 32 | 27.59 | 3.20 | Satisfied |
| SW | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.59 | 19 | 16.38 | 11 | 9.48 | 33 | 28.45 | 3.24 | Satisfied |
| SE | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 17 | 14.66 | 7 | 6.03 | 24 | 20.69 | 3.30 | Satisfied |
| Total | 0 | 0.00 | 6 | 5.17 | 82 | 70.69 | 28 | 24.14 | 116 | 100.00 | 3.20 | Satisfied |

TABLE VI
 RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH THE VARIETY
 OF THEIR JOB RESPONSIBILITIES

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total* | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|-------------------|------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------|----------------|-------|--------|--------|---------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | | | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | |
| NW | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.61 | 15 | 13.04 | 8 | 6.96 | 26 | 22.60 | 3.20 | Satisfied |
| NE | 1 | 0.87 | 6 | 5.22 | 19 | 16.52 | 6 | 5.22 | 32 | 27.83 | 2.93 | Satisfied |
| SW | 1 | 0.87 | 2 | 1.74 | 17 | 14.78 | 13 | 11.30 | 33 | 28.70 | 3.30 | Satisfied |
| SE | 1 | 0.87 | 2 | 1.74 | 13 | 11.30 | 8 | 6.96 | 24 | 20.87 | 3.20 | Satisfied |
| Total | 3 | 2.61 | 13 | 11.30 | 64 | 55.65 | 35 | 30.44 | 115 | 100.00 | 3.14 | Satisfied |

* N varies because not all respondents chose to respond to all questions.

respondent chose not to respond to this question.

The respondents' perception with the amount of responsibilities indirectly related to the job is reported in TABLE VII. It should be pointed out that 73 (62.93%) of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the amount of responsibilities indirectly related to their job. Additionally 32 (27.59%) of the respondents were dissatisfied and 6 (5.17%) of the respondents were very satisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (116) was 2.70 which indicated that they were satisfied with the amount of responsibilities indirectly related to the job. It further appeared that there seems to be no distinguishable difference in numbers and percentages between respondents from each district.

The respondents' perceptions with the education level required are reported in TABLE VIII. It should be pointed out that 77 (66.38%) of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the education level required. Additionally 21 (18.10%) of the respondents were dissatisfied and 10 (8.62%) of the respondents were very dissatisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (116) was 2.72 which indicated that they were satisfied with the education level required. It further appeared that there seems to be no distinguishable difference in numbers and percentages between respondents from each district.

The respondents' perceptions with the opportunity to return to school is reported in TABLE IX. It should be

TABLE VII

RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH THE AMOUNT OF
RESPONSIBILITIES INDIRECTLY RELATED TO THE JOB

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|----------------------|------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------------------|------|-------|--------|------------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | N | % | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | | | |
| NW | 2 | 1.72 | 6 | 5.17 | 19 | 16.38 | 0 | 0.00 | 27 | 23.28 | 2.62 | Satisfied |
| NE | 1 | 0.86 | 5 | 4.31 | 24 | 20.69 | 2 | 1.72 | 32 | 27.59 | 2.84 | Satisfied |
| SW | 0 | 0.00 | 14 | 12.07 | 15 | 12.93 | 4 | 3.45 | 33 | 28.45 | 2.70 | Satisfied |
| SE | 2 | 1.72 | 7 | 6.03 | 15 | 12.93 | 0 | 0.00 | 24 | 20.68 | 2.54 | Satisfied |
| Total | 5 | 4.31 | 32 | 27.59 | 73 | 62.93 | 6 | 5.17 | 116 | 100.00 | 2.70 | Satisfied |

TABLE VIII

RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH THE
EDUCATION LEVEL REQUIRED

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|----------------------|------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------------------|------|-------|--------|------------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | | | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | |
| NW | 3 | 2.59 | 8 | 6.90 | 14 | 12.07 | 2 | 1.72 | 27 | 23.28 | 2.60 | Satisfied |
| NE | 2 | 1.72 | 5 | 4.31 | 23 | 19.83 | 2 | 1.72 | 27 | 27.58 | 3.00 | Satisfied |
| SW | 5 | 4.31 | 7 | 6.03 | 18 | 15.52 | 3 | 2.59 | 33 | 28.45 | 2.60 | Satisfied |
| SE | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.86 | 22 | 18.97 | 1 | 0.86 | 24 | 20.69 | 3.00 | Satisfied |
| Total | 10 | 8.62 | 21 | 18.10 | 77 | 66.38 | 8 | 6.90 | 116 | 100.00 | 2.72 | Satisfied |

TABLE IX

RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH THE OPPORTUNITY
TO RETURN TO SCHOOL

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|----------------------|------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------|--------|------------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | N | % | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | | | |
| NW | 2 | 1.72 | 10 | 8.62 | 13 | 11.21 | 2 | 1.72 | 27 | 23.28 | 2.60 | Satisfied |
| NE | 1 | 0.86 | 4 | 3.45 | 21 | 18.10 | 6 | 5.17 | 32 | 27.58 | 3.00 | Satisfied |
| SW | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.59 | 21 | 18.10 | 9 | 7.76 | 33 | 28.45 | 3.20 | Satisfied |
| SE | 0 | 0.00 | 5 | 4.31 | 15 | 12.93 | 4 | 3.45 | 24 | 20.69 | 3.00 | Satisfied |
| Total | 3 | 2.59 | 22 | 18.97 | 70 | 60.34 | 21 | 18.10 | 116 | 100.00 | 2.92 | Satisfied |

pointed out that 70 (60.34%) of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the opportunity to return to school. Additionally 22 (18.97%) of the respondents were dissatisfied and 21 (18.10%) of the respondents were very satisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (116) was 2.92 which indicated that they were satisfied with the opportunity to return to school. It further appeared that there seems to be no distinguishable difference in numbers and percentages between respondents from each district.

The respondents' perceptions with the people in their county is reported in TABLE X. It should be pointed out that 69 (60.00%) of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the perceptions of the people in their county, their sincerity and awareness of the respondents efforts to serve them. Additionally 32 (27.83%) of the respondents were very satisfied and 14 (12.17%) were dissatisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (115) was 3.14 which indicated that they were satisfied with the perceptions of the people in their county. The respondents indicated that no one was very dissatisfied with the people in their county. This would reveal a distinguishable difference in numbers and percentages between respondents from each district. It should be further noted that one (1) respondent chose not to respond to this question.

The respondents' satisfaction with their co-workers is

TABLE X

RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH THE PEOPLE IN THEIR COUNTY, THEIR
SINCERITY AND AWARENESS OF THE RESPONDENTS' EFFORTS TO SERVE THEM

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total* | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|----------------------|------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------------------|-------|--------|--------|------------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | | | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | |
| NW | 0 | 0.00 | 5 | 4.35 | 19 | 16.52 | 2 | 1.74 | 26 | 22.61 | 2.90 | Satisfied |
| NE | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.61 | 21 | 18.62 | 8 | 6.96 | 32 | 27.83 | 3.20 | Satisfied |
| SW | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.61 | 16 | 13.91 | 14 | 12.17 | 33 | 28.69 | 3.33 | Satisfied |
| SE | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.61 | 13 | 11.30 | 8 | 6.96 | 24 | 20.87 | 3.20 | Satisfied |
| Total | 0 | 0.00 | 14 | 12.17 | 69 | 60.00 | 32 | 27.83 | 115 | 100.00 | 3.14 | Satisfied |

* N Varies because not all respondents chose to respond to all questions.

reported in TABLE XI. It should be pointed out that 77 (66.96%) of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with their co-workers. Additionally 22 (19.13%) of the respondents were very satisfied and 14 (12.17%) of the respondents were dissatisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (115) was 3.02 which indicated that they were satisfied with their co-workers. It further appeared that there seems to be no distinguishable difference in numbers and percentages between respondents from each district. It should be further noted that one (1) respondent chose not to respond to this question.

The respondents' perceptions with the social constraints of their job is reported in TABLE XII. It should be pointed out that 94 (81.74%) of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the perceptions of the social constraints of their job. Additionally 16 (13.91%) of the respondents were dissatisfied and 3 (2.61%) of the respondents were very dissatisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (115) was 2.83 which indicated that they were satisfied with the social constraints of their job. It further appeared that there seems to be no distinguishable difference in numbers and percentages between respondents from each district. It should be further noted that one (1) respondent chose not to respond to their question.

The respondents' perceptions with their enthusiasm toward their job is reported in TABLE XIII. It should be

TABLE XI
 RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH
 THEIR CO-WORKERS

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total* | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|-------------------|------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------|----------------|-------|--------|--------|---------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | N | % | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | | | |
| NW | 1 | 0.87 | 0 | 0.00 | 21 | 18.26 | 4 | 3.48 | 26 | 22.61 | 3.10 | Satisfied |
| NE | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.61 | 21 | 18.62 | 8 | 6.96 | 32 | 27.83 | 3.20 | Satisfied |
| SW | 0 | 0.00 | 7 | 6.09 | 19 | 16.52 | 7 | 6.09 | 33 | 28.70 | 3.00 | Satisfied |
| SE | 1 | 0.87 | 4 | 3.48 | 16 | 13.91 | 3 | 2.61 | 24 | 20.87 | 2.90 | Satisfied |
| Total | 2 | 1.74 | 14 | 12.17 | 77 | 66.96 | 22 | 19.13 | 115 | 100.00 | 3.02 | Satisfied |

* N Varies because not all respondents chose to respond to all questions.

TABLE XII

RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH THE
SOCIAL CONSTRAINTS OF THEIR JOB

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total* | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|----------------------|------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------------------|------|--------|--------|------------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | | | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | |
| NW | 2 | 1.74 | 3 | 2.61 | 22 | 19.13 | 0 | 0.00 | 27 | 23.48 | 2.74 | Satisfied |
| NE | 0 | 0.00 | 6 | 5.22 | 26 | 22.61 | 0 | 0.00 | 32 | 27.82 | 2.81 | Satisfied |
| SW | 1 | 0.87 | 6 | 5.22 | 25 | 21.74 | 1 | 0.87 | 33 | 28.70 | 2.80 | Satisfied |
| SE | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.87 | 21 | 18.26 | 1 | 0.87 | 23 | 20.00 | 3.00 | Satisfied |
| Total | 3 | 2.61 | 16 | 13.91 | 94 | 81.74 | 2 | 1.74 | 115 | 100.00 | 2.83 | Satisfied |

* N Varies because not all respondents chose to respond to all questions.

TABLE XIII

RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH THEIR
ENTHUSIASM TOWARD THEIR JOB

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|----------------------|------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------|--------|------------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | N | % | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | | | |
| NW | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.59 | 22 | 18.97 | 2 | 1.72 | 27 | 23.28 | 3.00 | Satisfied |
| NE | 1 | 0.86 | 4 | 3.45 | 23 | 19.83 | 4 | 3.45 | 32 | 27.59 | 2.93 | Satisfied |
| SW | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.59 | 21 | 18.10 | 9 | 7.76 | 33 | 28.45 | 3.20 | Satisfied |
| SE | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 1.72 | 17 | 14.66 | 5 | 4.31 | 24 | 20.68 | 3.12 | Satisfied |
| Total | 1 | 0.86 | 12 | 10.34 | 83 | 71.55 | 20 | 17.25 | 116 | 100.00 | 3.05 | Satisfied |

pointed out that 83 (71.55%) of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the enthusiasm toward their job. Additionally 20 (17.25%) of the respondents were very satisfied and 12 (10.34) of the respondents were dissatisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (116) was 3.05 which indicated that there seems to be no distinguishable difference in numbers and percentages between respondents from each district.

The respondents' perceptions with the stress of working with a variety of public affairs is reported in TABLE XIV. It should be pointed out that 66 (57%) of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the stress of working with a variety of public affairs. Additionally 46 (40.00%) of the respondents were satisfied and 2 (1.74%) of the respondents were very satisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (115) was 2.61 which indicated that there seems to be no distinguishable difference in numbers and percentages between respondents from each district. It should be further noted that one (1) respondent chose not to respond to this question.

The respondents' perceptions of working with committees that concern their program is reported in TABLE XV. It should be pointed out that 85 (74.57%) of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied working with committees that concern their program. Additionally 17 (14.91%) of the respondents were dissatisfied and 10 (8.77%) of the respondents were very satisfied. However the mean response

TABLE XIV

RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH THE STRESS OF
WORKING WITH A VARIETY OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total* | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|----------------------|------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------------------|------|--------|--------|------------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | | | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | |
| NW | 0 | 0.00 | 11 | 9.57 | 14 | 12.17 | 1 | 0.87 | 26 | 22.61 | 2.61 | Satisfied |
| NE | 1 | 0.87 | 13 | 11.30 | 17 | 14.78 | 1 | 0.87 | 32 | 27.83 | 2.60 | Satisfied |
| SW | 0 | 0.00 | 13 | 11.30 | 20 | 17.39 | 0 | 0.00 | 33 | 28.69 | 2.60 | Satisfied |
| SE | 0 | 0.00 | 9 | 7.83 | 15 | 13.04 | 0 | 0.00 | 24 | 20.87 | 2.62 | Satisfied |
| Total | 1 | 0.87 | 46 | 40.00 | 66 | 57.39 | 2 | 1.74 | 115 | 100.00 | 2.61 | Satisfied |

* N Varies because not all respondents chose to respond to all questions.

TABLE XV

RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION OF WORKING WITH
COMMITTEES THAT CONCERN THEIR PROGRAM

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total* | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|----------------------|------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------------------|------|--------|--------|------------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | | | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | |
| NW | 1 | 0.88 | 4 | 3.51 | 18 | 15.79 | 2 | 1.75 | 25 | 21.93 | 2.84 | Satisfied |
| NE | 0 | 0.00 | 4 | 3.51 | 25 | 21.93 | 3 | 2.63 | 32 | 28.07 | 3.00 | Satisfied |
| SW | 0 | 0.00 | 7 | 6.14 | 22 | 19.30 | 4 | 3.51 | 33 | 28.95 | 2.90 | Satisfied |
| SE | 1 | 0.88 | 2 | 1.75 | 20 | 17.54 | 1 | 0.88 | 24 | 21.05 | 2.90 | Satisfied |
| Total | 2 | 1.75 | 17 | 14.91 | 85 | 74.57 | 10 | 8.77 | 114 | 100.00 | 3.00 | Satisfied |

* N Varies because not all respondents chose to respond to all questions.

of all respondents (114) was 3.00 which indicated that there seems to be no distinguishable difference in numbers and percentages between respondents from each district. It should be further noted that two (2) respondents chose not to respond to this question.

The respondents' perceptions with the procedures used by administration to govern employees is reported in TABLE XVI. It should be pointed out that 54 (46.96%) of the respondents indicated that they were dissatisfied with the procedures of administration to govern employees. Additionally 44 (38.26%) of the respondents were satisfied and 16 (13.91%) of the respondents were very dissatisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (115) was 2.27 which indicated that they were dissatisfied with the procedure of administration to govern employees. It further appeared that the southeast district was satisfied with administration's procedures to govern employees.

The respondents' perceptions with their competency level associated with their job is reported in TABLE XVII. It should be pointed out that 88 (75.86%) of the respondents' perception indicated that they were satisfied with the competency level associated to the job. Additionally 24 (20.69%) were dissatisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (116) was 3.20 which indicated that they were satisfied with the competency level associated to the job. The respondents indicated that no one was very dissatisfied with the competency level associated to the

TABLE XVI

RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED DISSATISFACTION WITH THE PROCEDURES
USED BY ADMINISTRATION TO GOVERN EMPLOYEES

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total* | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|----------------------|-------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------------------|------|--------|--------|------------------|--------------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | N | % | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | | | |
| NW | 4 | 3.48 | 14 | 12.17 | 8 | 6.96 | 0 | 0.00 | 26 | 22.60 | 2.20 | Dissatisfied |
| NE | 3 | 2.61 | 16 | 13.91 | 13 | 11.30 | 0 | 0.00 | 32 | 27.83 | 2.31 | Dissatisfied |
| SW | 6 | 5.22 | 17 | 14.78 | 10 | 8.70 | 0 | 0.00 | 33 | 28.70 | 2.12 | Dissatisfied |
| SE | 3 | 2.61 | 7 | 6.09 | 13 | 11.30 | 1 | 0.87 | 24 | 20.87 | 2.50 | Satisfied |
| Total | 16 | 13.91 | 54 | 46.96 | 44 | 38.26 | 1 | 0.87 | 115 | 100.00 | 2.27 | Dissatisfied |

* N Varies because not all respondents chose to respond to all questions.

TABLE XVII

RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH THEIR COMPETENCY
LEVEL ASSOCIATED TO THEIR JOB

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|----------------------|------|--------------|------|-----------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------|--------|------------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | | | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | |
| NW | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 1.72 | 21 | 18.10 | 4 | 3.45 | 27 | 23.28 | 3.10 | Satisfied |
| NE | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 27 | 23.28 | 5 | 4.31 | 32 | 27.59 | 3.20 | Satisfied |
| SW | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 1.72 | 20 | 17.24 | 11 | 9.48 | 33 | 28.45 | 3.30 | Satisfied |
| SE | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 20 | 17.24 | 4 | 3.45 | 24 | 20.69 | 3.20 | Satisfied |
| Total | 0 | 0.00 | 4 | 3.45 | 88 | 75.86 | 24 | 20.69 | 116 | 100.00 | 3.20 | Satisfied |

job. This would reveal a distinguishable difference in numbers and percentages between respondents from each district.

The respondents' perceptions with the in-service training they receive is reported in TABLE XVIII. It should be pointed out that 78 (69.64%) of the respondents' perception of the in-service training they receive were satisfied. Additionally 26 (23.21%) of the respondents were dissatisfied and 5 (4.47%) were very satisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (112) was 2.74 which indicated that there seems to be no distinguishable difference between respondents from each district. It should be further noted that four (4) respondents chose not to respond to this question.

The respondents' perceptions with the pressure to do assignments unrelated to their job is reported in TABLE XIX. It should be pointed out that 54 (47.80%) of the respondents indicated they were dissatisfied with pressure to do assignments unrelated to their job. Additionally 51 (45.13%) of the respondents were satisfied and 7 (6.19%) of the respondents were very satisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (113) was 2.41 which indicated that there seems to be no distinguishable difference in numbers and percentages between respondents from each district. It is interesting to note that the respondents are almost equally divided in their responses between being satisfied or dissatisfied as evidenced by 61 of the

TABLE XVIII

RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH THE
IN-SERVICE TRAINING THEY RECEIVE

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total* | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|----------------------|------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------------------|------|--------|--------|------------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | | | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | |
| NW | 0 | 0.00 | 12 | 10.71 | 12 | 10.71 | 0 | 0.00 | 24 | 21.43 | 2.50 | Satisfied |
| NE | 1 | 0.89 | 8 | 7.14 | 22 | 19.64 | 0 | 0.00 | 31 | 27.68 | 2.70 | Satisfied |
| SW | 1 | 0.89 | 3 | 2.68 | 24 | 21.43 | 5 | 4.46 | 33 | 29.46 | 3.00 | Satisfied |
| SE | 1 | 0.89 | 3 | 2.68 | 20 | 17.86 | 0 | 0.00 | 24 | 21.43 | 2.80 | Satisfied |
| Total | 3 | 2.68 | 26 | 23.21 | 78 | 69.64 | 5 | 4.47 | 112 | 100.00 | 2.74 | Satisfied |

* N Varies because not all respondents chose to respond to all questions.

TABLE XIX

RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED DISSATISFACTION WITH THE PRESSURE TO
DO ASSIGNMENTS UNRELATED TO THEIR JOB

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total* | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|----------------------|------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------------------|------|--------|--------|------------------|--------------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | N | % | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | | | |
| NW | 1 | 0.88 | 12 | 10.62 | 12 | 10.62 | 0 | 0.00 | 25 | 22.12 | 2.44 | Dissatisfied |
| NE | 3 | 2.65 | 13 | 11.50 | 16 | 14.16 | 0 | 0.00 | 32 | 28.32 | 2.40 | Dissatisfied |
| SW | 1 | 0.88 | 20 | 17.70 | 11 | 9.73 | 1 | 0.88 | 33 | 29.21 | 2.40 | Dissatisfied |
| SE | 2 | 1.77 | 9 | 7.96 | 12 | 10.62 | 0 | 0.00 | 23 | 20.35 | 2.43 | Dissatisfied |
| Total | 7 | 6.91 | 54 | 47.80 | 51 | 45.13 | 1 | 0.88 | 113 | 100.00 | 2.41 | Dissatisfied |

* N Varies because not all respondents chose to respond to all questions.

respondents being dissatisfied and 52 of the respondents being satisfied. It should be further noted that two (2) respondents chose not to respond to this question.

The respondents' perceptions with the level of satisfaction with completed programs is reported in TABLE XX. It should be pointed out that 88 (76.52%) of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the level of satisfaction with completed programs. Additionally 21 (18.26%) of the respondents were very satisfied and 6 (5.22%) were dissatisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (115) was 3.12 which indicated that they were satisfied with the level of satisfaction with completed programs. The respondents indicated that no one was very dissatisfied with the level of satisfaction with completed programs. It should be further noted that one (1) respondent chose not to respond to this question.

The respondents' perception with the full support of the agent's family is reported in TABLE XXI. It should be pointed out that 76 (65.52%) of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the full support of their family. Additionally 28 (24.14%) of the respondents were very satisfied and 10 (8.62%) of the respondents were dissatisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (116) was 3.11 which indicated that they were satisfied with the full support of their family. It further appeared that there seems to be no distinguishable difference in numbers and percentages between respondents from each district.

TABLE XX

RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH THE LEVEL OF
THEIR SATISFACTION AFTER PROGRAMS ARE COMPLETED

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total* | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|----------------------|------|--------------|------|-----------|-------|-------------------|-------|--------|--------|------------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | N | % | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | | | |
| NW | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.87 | 22 | 19.13 | 4 | 3.48 | 27 | 23.47 | 3.11 | Satisfied |
| NE | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 1.74 | 26 | 22.61 | 4 | 3.48 | 32 | 27.83 | 3.10 | Satisfied |
| SW | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 25 | 21.74 | 8 | 6.96 | 33 | 28.70 | 3.24 | Satisfied |
| SE | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 2.61 | 15 | 13.04 | 5 | 4.35 | 23 | 20.00 | 3.10 | Satisfied |
| Total | 0 | 0.00 | 6 | 5.22 | 88 | 76.52 | 21 | 18.26 | 115 | 100.00 | 3.12 | Satisfied |

* N Varies because not all respondents chose to respond to all questions.

TABLE XXI

RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION CONCERNING THE FULL
SUPPORT OF AGENT'S FAMILY

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|----------------------|------|--------------|------|-----------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------|--------|------------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | | | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | |
| NW | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.86 | 19 | 16.38 | 7 | 6.03 | 27 | 23.28 | 3.22 | Satisfied |
| NE | 1 | 0.86 | 3 | 2.59 | 22 | 18.97 | 6 | 5.17 | 32 | 27.59 | 3.03 | Satisfied |
| SW | 1 | 0.86 | 2 | 1.72 | 19 | 16.38 | 11 | 9.48 | 33 | 28.44 | 3.21 | Satisfied |
| SE | 0 | 0.00 | 4 | 3.45 | 16 | 13.79 | 4 | 3.45 | 24 | 20.69 | 3.00 | Satisfied |
| Total | 2 | 1.72 | 10 | 8.62 | 76 | 65.52 | 28 | 24.14 | 116 | 100.00 | 3.11 | Satisfied |

The respondents' perceptions with the salary they receive is reported in TABLE XXII. It should be pointed out that 55 (48.25%) of the respondents indicated that they were dissatisfied with the salary they receive. Additionally 41 (35.96%) of the respondents were satisfied and 16 (14.04%) of the respondents were very dissatisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (114) was 2.30 which indicated that they were dissatisfied with the salary they receive. It further appeared that the southeast district was the only district which showed that the respondents were satisfied with the pay they receive. It should be further noted that two (2) respondents chose not to respond to this question.

The respondents' perception with their job in general is reported in TABLE XXIII. It should be pointed out that 83 (74.11%) of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with their job in general. Additionally 22 (19.64%) of the respondents were very satisfied and 5 (4.46%) of the respondents were dissatisfied. However the mean response of all respondents (112) was 3.11 which indicated that they were satisfied with their job in general. It further appeared that there seems to be no distinguishable difference in number and percentages between respondents from each district. It should be further noted that four (4) respondents chose not to respond to this question.

The respondents' perceptions of whether or not they would choose another career if they could start over again

TABLE XXII
 RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED DISSATISFACTION
 WITH THE SALARY THEY RECEIVE

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total* | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------|----------------|------|--------|--------|---------------|--------------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | | | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | |
| NW | 5 | 4.39 | 12 | 10.53 | 9 | 7.89 | 0 | 0.00 | 26 | 22.81 | 2.20 | Dissatisfied |
| NE | 4 | 3.51 | 17 | 14.91 | 10 | 8.77 | 0 | 0.00 | 31 | 27.19 | 2.20 | Dissatisfied |
| SW | 5 | 4.39 | 19 | 16.57 | 8 | 7.02 | 1 | 0.88 | 33 | 28.95 | 2.20 | Dissatisfied |
| SE | 2 | 1.75 | 7 | 6.14 | 14 | 12.28 | 1 | 0.88 | 24 | 21.05 | 2.60 | Satisfied |
| Total | 16 | 14.04 | 55 | 48.25 | 41 | 35.96 | 2 | 1.75 | 114 | 100.00 | 2.30 | Dissatisfied |

* N Varies because not all respondents chose to respond to all questions.

TABLE XXIII;
 RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH
 THEIR JOB IN GENERAL

| District | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total* | | Mean Response | Category |
|----------|----------------------|------|--------------|------|-----------|-------|-------------------|-------|--------|--------|------------------|-----------|
| | Very Dissatisfied | | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | | Very Satisfied | | | | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | |
| NW | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.89 | 21 | 18.75 | 3 | 2.68 | 25 | 22.32 | 3.10 | Satisfied |
| NE | 2 | 1.79 | 0 | 0.00 | 25 | 22.32 | 4 | 3.57 | 31 | 27.68 | 3.00 | Satisfied |
| SW | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 1.79 | 20 | 17.86 | 10 | 8.93 | 32 | 28.57 | 3.30 | Satisfied |
| SE | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 1.79 | 17 | 15.18 | 5 | 4.46 | 24 | 21.43 | 3.12 | Satisfied |
| Total | 2 | 1.79 | 5 | 4.46 | 83 | 74.11 | 22 | 19.64 | 112 | 100.00 | 3.11 | Satisfied |

* N Varies because not all respondents chose to respond to all questions.

is reported in TABLE XXIV. It should be pointed out that 77 (70.00%) of the respondents indicated that they would not choose another career if they were to start over again. Additionally 33 (30.00%) of the respondents indicated they would choose another career if given the opportunity to start over again.

TABLE XXIV

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION PERTAINING TO WHETHER OR NOT THEY WOULD CHOOSE ANOTHER CAREER IF THEY COULD START OVER AGAIN

| DISTRICT | YES | | NO | | TOTAL* | |
|----------|-----|-------|----|-------|--------|--------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| NW | 8 | 7.27 | 16 | 14.55 | 24 | 21.82 |
| NE | 11 | 10.00 | 21 | 19.09 | 32 | 29.09 |
| SW | 6 | 5.45 | 24 | 21.82 | 30 | 27.17 |
| SE | 8 | 7.27 | 16 | 14.55 | 24 | 21.82 |
| TOTAL | 33 | 30.00 | 77 | 70.00 | 110 | 100.00 |

* N varies because not all respondents chose to respond to all questions

The respondents' perceptions of whether or not efforts are being duplicated in the county is reported in TABLE XXV. It should be pointed out that 84 (72.41%) of the respondents indicated that their efforts are not being duplicated. Additionally 32 (27.59%) of the respondents

indicated they felt efforts were being duplicated in the county.

TABLE XXV

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION PERTAINING TO WHETHER OR
NOT EFFORTS ARE BEING DUPLICATED IN THE COUNTY

| DISTRICT | YES | | NO | | TOTAL | |
|----------|-----|-------|----|-------|-------|--------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| NW | 6 | 5.17 | 21 | 18.10 | 27 | 23.28 |
| NE | 9 | 7.76 | 23 | 19.83 | 32 | 27.59 |
| SW | 12 | 10.34 | 21 | 18.10 | 33 | 28.44 |
| SE | 5 | 4.31 | 19 | 16.38 | 24 | 20.69 |
| TOTAL | 32 | 27.59 | 84 | 72.41 | 116 | 100.00 |

The respondents' perceptions of possibly losing their job from budget cuts is reported in TABLE XXVI. It should be pointed out that 96 (82.76%) of the respondents indicated that they are bothered by possibly losing their job by budget cuts. Additionally 20 (17.24%) of the respondents indicated they were not bothered by possibly losing their job by budget cuts.

TABLE XXVI

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION PERTAINING TO WHETHER OR
NOT THEY ARE BOTHERED BY POSSIBLY LOSING
THEIR JOB FROM BUDGET CUTS

| DISTRICT | YES | | NO | | TOTAL | |
|----------|-----|-------|----|-------|-------|--------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| NW | 22 | 18.97 | 5 | 4.31 | 27 | 23.28 |
| NE | 25 | 21.55 | 7 | 6.03 | 32 | 27.59 |
| SW | 28 | 24.14 | 5 | 4.31 | 33 | 28.44 |
| SE | 21 | 18.10 | 3 | 2.59 | 24 | 20.69 |
| TOTAL | 96 | 82.76 | 20 | 17.24 | 116 | 100.00 |

The respondents' perceptions of Cooperative Extension as a life-long profession is reported in TABLE XXVII. It should be pointed out that 78 (75.00%) of the respondents indicated that they would remain in Cooperative Extension as a life-long profession. Additionally 26 (25.00%) of the respondents indicated they do not plan on making Cooperative Extension a life-long profession.

TABLE XXVII

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION PERTAINING TO WHETHER OR
NOT THEY PLAN ON MAKING COOPERATIVE EXTENSION
A LIFE-LONG PROFESSION

| DISTRICT | YES | | NO | | TOTAL* | |
|----------|-----|-------|----|-------|--------|--------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| NW | 17 | 16.35 | 8 | 7.69 | 25 | 24.04 |
| NE | 23 | 22.19 | 7 | 6.73 | 30 | 28.85 |
| SW | 21 | 20.19 | 7 | 6.73 | 28 | 26.92 |
| SE | 17 | 16.35 | 4 | 3.85 | 21 | 20.19 |
| TOTAL | 78 | 75.00 | 26 | 25.00 | 104 | 100.00 |

* N varies because not all respondents chose to respond to all questions

The last two questions asked on the survey instrument were open-ended questions which pertained to the respondents' greatest single reason which led to their job satisfaction and greatest single reason which led to their job dissatisfaction.

When asked, "Please list the one item leading to the greatest satisfaction in your job", the respondents indicated the following: (1) 42 of the respondents indicated seeing youth improve and mature; (2) 25 of the respondents indicated working with people; (3) 16 of the respondents indicated job freedom; (4) 5 of the respondents indicated accomplishment in various programs; (5) 3 of the respondents indicated the Oklahoma Cooperative Extension, with whom I work; (6) 3 of the respondents indicated time flexibility; (7) 1 of the respondents indicated the retirement system; (8) 1 of the respondents indicated working with extension homemakers; (9) 1 of the respondents indicated self satisfaction of a good job, considering what their is to work with; (10) 1 of the respondents indicated clientele support; (11) 1 of the respondents indicated the variety of job experiences.

When asked, "Please list the one item leading to the greatest dissatisfaction in your job", the respondents indicated the following: (1) 19 of the respondents indicated budget problems; (2) 15 of the respondents indicated programs by the state administration; (3) 11 of the respondents indicated paper work and documentation; (4)

10 of the respondents indicated salary received; (5) 9 of the respondents indicated the amount of work time with no comp time to adjust; (6) 9 of the respondents indicated long hours and night meetings; (7) 5 of the respondents indicated upset parents; (8) 4 of the respondents indicated my secretary and co-workers do not have a professional attitude; (9) 3 of the respondents indicated working with multiple program areas; (10) 1 of the respondents indicated needs 4-H agent in county; (11) 1 of the respondents indicated conflict with co-workers; (12) 1 of the respondents indicated morale of extension employees; (13) 1 of the respondents indicated selfish interest groups; (14) 1 of the respondents indicated lower 4-H enrollment; (15) 1 of the respondents indicated short turn around on deadlines; (16) 1 of the respondents indicated the way women are treated in cooperative extension; (17) 1 of the respondents indicated the size of county office; (18) 1 of the respondents indicated duplicated efforts by other agencies (Vo Tech); (19) 1 of the respondents indicated pressure from the county director to spend more time with livestock instead of getting youth to be independent; (20) 1 of the respondents indicated what really is job priority; (21) 1 of the respondents indicated public relation with public officials; (22) 1 of the respondents indicated "current depressed agriculture economy; (23) 1 of the respondents

indicated need more training to compare to; (24) 1 of the respondents indicated people that don't fully utilize the extension service.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to present concise summaries of the following topics: purpose of the study, and the major findings of the research. Also, through a detailed inspection of these topics, conclusions and recommendations were presented based on the analysis of the data.

Purpose

The intent of this study was to determine perceived job satisfaction/dissatisfaction of county cooperative extension 4-H agents in Oklahoma based upon selected criteria. A secondary purpose of this study was to determine additional perceptions of the cooperative extension 4-H agent pertaining to their job.

Summary of Population

The number of 4-H agents within the four districts of the Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service was 116. This represented all seventy-seven counties within the state. The population of agents with 4-H responsibilities were as

follows: The largest district was the Southwest having 34 agents which comprised 29% of the population; The Northeast district had 31 agents and comprised 27% of the population; The Northwest district had 27 agents which comprised 23% of the population; and finally the Southeast district had the smallest of the four districts and consisted of 24 agents or 21% of the population.

Findings

A summary of the respondents' perceived satisfaction relative to their job, (question numbers 1 through 22) is reported in TABLE XXVIII. The respondents revealed that they were generally satisfied with their job. Although 3 areas of dissatisfaction were found by the writer from the data collected. The three areas of dissatisfaction were: (1) the procedures used by the administration to govern employees with a mean response of 2.27; (2) being pressured to do assignments that do not relate to their job with a mean response of 2.41; and (3) the salary that they receive with a mean response of 2.30.

The questions with which the respondents indicated a response of "satisfaction" is reported as follows: number of hours in work week (mean response 2.63); the opportunity to structure their own program (mean response 3.32); the freedom allowed in their career (mean response 3.22); the social status in respective community (mean response 3.20); the variety of job responsibility (mean response 3.14); the

education level required (mean response 3.14); the opportunities to return to school (mean response 2.92); the people in their county (mean response 3.14); the co-workers (mean response 3.02); the social constraints of their job (mean response 2.83); enthusiasm towards their job (mean response 3.05); stress (mean response 2.61); working with committees (mean response 3.00); competencies (mean response 3.20); in service training (mean response 2.74); programs (mean response 3.12); family support (mean response 3.11); and their job in general (mean response of 3.11).

TABLE XXVIII

SUMMARY OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED SATISFACTION
RELATIVE TO THEIR PRESENT JOB

| On my present job, this is how I feel about ... | Mean Response | Category |
|--|------------------|-----------|
| 1. ...the number of hours in a work week | 2.63 | Satisfied |
| 2. ...the opportunity to structure my own program | 3.32 | Satisfied |
| 3. ...the freedom my career allows | 3.22 | Satisfied |
| 4. ...the social status in my community | 3.20 | Satisfied |
| 5. ...the variety of job responsibilities | 3.14 | Satisfied |
| 6. ...the amount of responsibilities indirectly related to my job | 2.70 | Satisfied |
| 7. ...the education level required | 2.72 | Satisfied |
| 8. ...the opportunity to return to school | 2.92 | Satisfied |
| 9. ...the people in this county, their sincerity, and awareness of my efforts to serve them | 3.14 | Satisfied |
| 10. ...my co-workers | 3.02 | Satisfied |
| 11. ...the social status of my job | 2.83 | Satisfied |
| 12. ...my enthusiasm toward my job | 3.05 | Satisfied |
| 13. ...the stress from working with a variety of public affairs | 2.61 | Satisfied |

TABLE XXVIII (Continued)

| On my present job, this is how I feel about ... | Mean Response | Category |
|---|------------------|--------------|
| 14. ...working with committees that concern my program | 3.00 | Satisfied |
| 15. ...the procedures used by administration to govern employees | 2.27 | Dissatisfied |
| 16. ...my competency level | 3.20 | Satisfied |
| 17. ...the in-service training I receive | 2.74 | Satisfied |
| 18. ...being pressured to do assignments that do not relate to my job | 2.41 | Dissatisfied |
| 19. ...the level of satisfaction after programs are completed | 3.12 | Satisfied |
| 20. ...the full support of my family | 3.11 | Satisfied |
| 21. ...the salary I receive | 2.30 | Dissatisfied |
| 22. ...my job, in general | 3.11 | Satisfied |

The respondents were asked four forced choice "Yes" "No" questions. The following narrative summarizes their responses.

When asked, "If I could start over again, I would choose another career," the respondents indicated "Yes" 33 (30.00%) and 77 (70.00%) indicated "No".

When asked, "I sometimes wonder if my efforts are being duplicated by another professional in the county," the respondents indicated "Yes" 32 (27.59%) and 84 (72.41%) indicated "No".

When asked "It bothers me that I could lose my job from budget cuts, even though my competency level is high," the respondents indicated "Yes" 96 (82.76%) and 20 (17.24%) indicated "No".

When asked, "Do you plan on making Cooperative Extension a lifelong profession," the respondents indicated "Yes" 78 (75.00%) and 26 (25.00%) indicated "No".

Finally, the respondents were asked two open-ended questions pertaining to their one greatest job satisfaction (each respondent was asked to indicate one response per question).

When asked to list the one item leading to the greatest satisfaction in their job, the most frequently listed response was "Seeing youth improve and mature". The next most frequently listed response was "working with people" followed by "job freedom".

When asked to list the one item leading to the greatest dissatisfaction in their job, the most frequently listed response was "budget problems". The next most frequently listed response was "programs by the state administration to weaken and destroy the county personnel" followed by "paper work and documentation".

Conclusions

Due to a majority of the respondents indicating that they were basically satisfied with the number of hours in their work week, the opportunity to structure their own program, the freedom allowed in their career, the social status in respective community, the variety of job responsibilities, the education level required, the opportunities to return to school, the people in their county, the co-workers, the social constraints of their job, enthusiasm towards their job, stress, working with committees, competencies, in service training, programs, family support, their job in general, the author concluded the cooperative extension 4-H agents are generally satisfied in their present position.

Although the writer concluded that the respondents were generally satisfied, the writer concluded there were three areas of dissatisfaction: (1) the salary they receive; (2) assignments not related to their job; and, (3) dissatisfaction with cooperative extension administration.

Based upon a large majority (70 percent) of the respondents indicating that they would not choose another career if given the opportunity, it is concluded by the writer that the respondents are predominately satisfied as Cooperative Extension 4-H agents.

It was further concluded by the writer that the one most frequently listed item leading to the greatest dissatisfaction of being a cooperative extension 4-H agent was concern with budget problems.

Recommendations

As a result of the conclusions drawn from the analysis and interpretation of data, the following recommendations are made:

1. It was apparent in the findings and conclusions that Oklahoma State University Cooperative Extension Administration, in cooperation with cooperative extension agents, should develop better communication lines within the organization so that negative attitudes are eased.
2. Although respondents indicated they were generally satisfied with their job (with exception of being pressured to do assignments that do not relate to their job) it is further recommended the Cooperative Extension Service Administration survey agents in order to identify areas of concern associated with job responsibilities of the agents.
3. Since it was concluded that the salary received by cooperative extension 4-H agents leads to job dissatisfaction, it is recommended that the administration

of Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service strive to increase salaries received by extension 4-H agents of Oklahoma.

4. Based upon the conclusion that Oklahoma Cooperative extension 4-H agents are generally satisfied with their job in general, it is therefore recommended that the Cooperative Extension Service administration concentrate efforts and address the areas of concern which lead to job dissatisfaction. More specifically, "the procedures used by administration to govern employees" and "being pressured to do assignments that do not relate to my job" and finally "the salary that they receive.

5. Based upon the data from Cooperative Extension 4-H agents responsible for the 4-H programs revealing they would not chose another career if given the opportunity, it is recommended that more information concerning extension careers be developed for release to prospective employees.

6. It was apparent that Cooperative Extension 4-H agents do not feel that their efforts are being duplicated by another professional in the county. It is therefore recommended that county extension 4-H agents continue to receive additional training to further improve the quality of lives with whom they are reaching.

7. It was determined that county extension 4-H agents are concerned about losing their jobs even though their competency level is high due to budget cuts. Therefore, it is recommended that the Cooperative Extension administration adopt a new policy regarding awareness of Cooperative

Extension Service to the politicians whose votes can effect the Extension Service.

Recommendations for Additional Research

The following recommendations are made in regard to additional research. The recommendations are judgments based on having conducted the study and on the examination of the findings of the study. The recommendations are in two parts: (1) methodology and (2) additional research.

Methodology

1. It should be emphasized that some respondents (who were questioned) preferred hand delivered instruments rather than mailed questionnaires.
2. As further research is developed, consideration should be given by the cooperative extension administration to provide funding for studies which will enhance the Cooperative Extension Service and provide meaningful data.

Additional Research

1. There should be a study conducted with elected officials by cooperative extension service to gain information concerning politicians' understanding of the extension service and their knowledge of the programs offered to the people by Cooperative Extension Service.
2. Similar research should be conducted that would involve agents that do not have 4-H responsibilities and the results compared with the findings of this study.

3. A more comprehensive study involving cooperative extension agents from across the United States should be conducted and the results compared with the findings of this study.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Marvin A. and C. Austin Vines. Heritage Horizons-Extensions Commitment to People. Madison Wisconsin: Extension Journal, Inc., 1976, pp. 156-161.
- "Annual Address of Grand Director". Epsilon Sigma Phi Yearbook. Washington: Epsilon Sigma Phi, 1933, p. 9.
- Baker, Gladys. The County Agent. Chicago: University Press, 1939, p. 58.
- Bentley, Ralph R. and Averno M. Rempel. "Manual for the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire". University Book Store, Purdue Research Foundation, West Lafayette, Indiana, 1980.
- Bliss, R. K. Iowa Extension Service Bulletin. Ames: Cooperative Extension Service Miscellaneous Publication, 1965.
- Bowen, Blannie E. "Job Satisfaction of Teacher Educators in Agriculture". (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1980).
- Eaker, Rhonda, I. D. Gwynn, V. Palmer and D. E. Thompson Profile of Vocational Agriculture Teachers: Trends in Numbers, Sex Preparation, and Satisfaction of Credited Recipients. Davis: Department of Applied Behavior Sciences, University of California, 1986, p. 42.
- Graduate College. Thesis Writing Manual. Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State University, Revised, 1979.
- Hawkins, Leo F. "The Delicate Balance: Work and Family" Journal of Extension, Vol. 19-20 (September/ October, 1982), pp. 38-42.
- Herzberg, Frederick, B. Mausner and B. L. Snyderman. The Motivation to Work. 2nd. ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959, p. 3.
- History of Oklahoma State University Extension. Ed. Edd Roberts, Omicron Chapter, Epsilon Sigma Phi, 1965, pp. 98-107.

- Key, James P. "Module on Descriptive Statistics". Research and Design in Occupational Education. Stillwater: Agriculture Education Department, Okla-homa State University, 1981, Section 51, p. 126.
- Loque, Hanchey E. The Extension Agents' Role in Democracy. Formal Report by State 4-H Club Leader. (No place - No date).
- "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire", (Short Term), Vocational Psychology Research, University of Minnesota, 1977.
- Reeder, R. L. The People and the Profession. National Board of Epsilon Sigma Phi, 1979, p. 24.
- Scarseth, George P. Man and His Earth. Iowa State University, 1962, p. 3.
- Tillburg, Emmalou V. "Performance - Reward Contingencies: The Role and Relationships of Percieved Equity in the Job Performance - Job Satisfaction Question". (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1986).

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENT

Please indicate the district in which you have County Extension 4-H responsibilities.

NW SW NE SE

DIRECTIONS:

Please check the appropriate response pertaining to the degree of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction you have regarding each of the following statements. (Check only one response per item.)

| On my present job, this is how I feel about | Very | Dissatisfied | Satisfied | Very |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Dissatisfied (1) | (2) | (3) | Satisfied (4) |
| 1. ...the number of hours in a workweek | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. ...the opportunity to structure my own program | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. ...the freedom my career allows | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. ...the social status in my community | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. ...the variety of job responsibilities | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. ...the amount of responsibilities indirectly related to my job | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. ...the education level required | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. ...the opportunity to return to school | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. ...the people in this county, their sincerity, and awareness of my efforts to serve them | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. ...my co-workers | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. ...the social constraints of my job | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12. ...my enthusiasm toward my job | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 13. ...the stress from working with a variety of public affairs | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 14. ...working with committees that concern my program | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 15. ...the procedures used by administration to govern employees | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 16. ...my competency level | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 17. ...the in-service training I receive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| On my present job, this is how I feel about | Very Dissatisfied (1) | Dissatisfied (2) | Satisfied (3) | Very Satisfied (4) |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 18. ...being pressured to do assignments that do not relate to my job | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 19. ...the level of satisfaction after programs are completed | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 20. ...the full support of my family | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 21. ...the salary that I receive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 22. ...my job, in general | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Please answer the following questions.

23. If I could start over again, I would choose another career. Yes ___ No ___
24. I sometimes wonder if my efforts are being duplicated by
another professional in the county. Yes ___ No ___
25. It bothers me that I could lose my job from budget cuts,
even though my competency level is high. Yes ___ No ___
26. Do you plan on making Cooperative Extension a lifelong profession? Yes ___ No ___
27. Please list the one item leading to the greatest satisfaction in your job.
28. Please list the one item leading to the greatest dissatisfaction in your job.

APPENDIX B

LETTERS

October 21, 1986

T. Roy Bogle
Prof. Assoc. Dir., OCES
139 Ag Hall
Stillwater, OK 74078

Dear Dr. Bogle,

I am requesting permission to attend district meetings so that I may hand deliver survey instruments pertaining to my study which will fulfill my requirements of a Master Science degree with emphasis in Agricultural Extension. This will only include agents with 4-H responsibility. Only a few short minutes will be needed (ten minutes) for the agents to complete.

This study is titled: Perceived Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction of County Cooperative Extension 4-H Agents in Oklahoma.

If district agents prefer, I could provide them with sufficient copies to administer themselves. Whatever fits the schedule to the best of all concerned is my intent. Your cooperation and understanding with this effort is appreciated.

Should you require additional information, please feel free to ask.

Sincerely,

Mr. Rick Black

Mr. Rick Black
Graduate Student
Agricultural Education

Eddy Finley
Dr. Eddy Finley
Assistant Professor
Agricultural Education
Thesis Advisor

dgh

November 24, 1986

TO: Cooperative Extension Agents

In an effort to complete my graduate degree, your help is needed. The questionnaire relates to my study: Perceived Factors of Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction of County Cooperative Extension 4-H Agents in Oklahoma.

The study is concerned with the lack of information to the degree of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction with county extension agents responsible for 4-H programs in Oklahoma. Your input will provide me with valuable information which will assist our organization. Complete anonymity will be assured and you will notice no codes are being used.

To complete this questionnaire, please follow directions at the top of next page. Only mark one response per question. The last question elicits any other comment you would like to make.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.



Dr. T. Roy Bogle
Assoc. Dir., OCES

Sincerely,



Mr. Rick Black
Graduate Student
OSU

VITA

Rick Lee Black

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: JOB SATISFACTION/DISSATISFACTION OF COUNTY
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION 4-H AGENTS IN OKLAHOMA

Major Field: Agricultural Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Nowata, Oklahoma, March 1,
1963, the son of Rodney and Helen Black.

Education: Graduated from Nowata High School, Nowata,
Oklahoma, May, 1981; received the Associate Degree from
Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College, Miami, Oklahoma,
December, 1983; received the Bachelor of Science Degree from
Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, December,
1985, with a major in Agriculture Education; Completed
requirements for the Master of Science Degree at Oklahoma
State University in May, 1987.

Current Position: 4-H Program Assistant, Payne County
Cooperative Extension Office.