

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

75-14,830

SNIDER, Bernard Alan, 1936-
IDENTIFICATION OF ROLES AND RELATED
VARIABLES OF PARAPROFESSIONAL YOUTH
WORKERS IN THREE COUNTY 4-H STAFFING
MODELS IN THE MICHIGAN COOPERATIVE
EXTENSION SERVICE.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1974
Education, adult

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

IDENTIFICATION OF ROLES AND RELATED VARIABLES OF
PARAPROFESSIONAL YOUTH WORKERS IN THREE COUNTY
4-H STAFFING MODELS IN THE MICHIGAN
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

By

Bernard Alan Snider

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1974

ABSTRACT

IDENTIFICATION OF ROLES AND RELATED VARIABLES OF PARAPROFESSIONAL YOUTH WORKERS IN THREE COUNTY 4-H STAFFING MODELS IN THE MICHIGAN COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

By

Bernard Alan Snider

The purpose of this descriptive study was to identify the roles of 4-H paraprofessional youth workers in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service and to analyze variables related to these roles in three basic county models. The study employed Bowman and Klopff's concept that professional-paraprofessional role development is a product of dynamic interaction of a professional with a paraprofessional within a given structure responding to their shared situation.

Roles of the 4-H program assistant were identified by responsibilities assigned by the supervising agent to the program assistant and the self reported frequency with which 4-H program assistants performed 22 selected 4-H tasks. Data were collected by the use of a survey instrument developed from previous related studies. Each respondent indicated his or her frequency of performance on each 4-H task on a forced choice checklist as: Never, Very Seldom, Sometimes, or Often. The respondent also indicated frequency of his/her role mates' performance of each task.

The population was sixty-two 4-H program assistants, eighteen county extension directors and twenty-five 4-H agents in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service. This included all of 43 possible county role sets, 18 in counties without 4-H agents, and 13 in urban counties and 12 in rural counties with 4-H agents.

Paraprofessional youth workers were found to be performing a wide range of tasks in the 4-H program, including many of the same tasks performed generally by the professional 4-H agents. In counties without resident 4-H agents, they were found generally performing as acting 4-H agents, and county extension directors were found to be expecting such performance.

4-H program assistants in counties without 4-H agents were found performing fifteen 4-H tasks very similar to those of 4-H agents in rural counties.

Presence or absence of a resident 4-H agent in the role set was an influencing variable on the role of the 4-H program assistant. 4-H agents, when present, were performing the major 4-H leadership tasks. Though not as frequently, 4-H program assistants were found also performing major 4-H leadership tasks in these counties. In counties without 4-H agents, program assistants were found performing major 4-H leadership tasks more frequently than were 4-H program assistants in counties with resident 4-H agents.

The study indicates that 4-H program assistants can perform more of the 4-H tasks presently being performed by 4-H agents. It

was recommended that 4-H agents share more of the 4-H tasks with 4-H program assistants and that 4-H agents perform more functions relating to the overall program management of the 4-H program.

Program assistants in counties without 4-H agents were not performing all the 4-H professional leadership tasks at the Very High frequency level. It was recommended that additional 4-H leadership be provided to support the program assistants in these counties.

One of the roles 4-H program assistants were assigned was working closely with 4-H volunteers. High reported frequency with which they are visiting, recruiting and determining the needs of volunteer 4-H leaders revealed performance consistent with the assignment.

Level of formal schooling of program assistants was not found to correlate with the frequency with which 4-H program assistants perform 4-H tasks. Program assistants with more employment experience in the 4-H program were found doing more long range planning and working with other youth agencies and county boards. Previous experiences of program assistants generally were not found to correlate with the performance frequency of 4-H tasks.

Fewer than one-third of the 4-H program assistants aspire to be agents. Most of those were employed in urban counties, had attended college and were between the ages of 22 and 30 years old.

4-H agents have placed more emphasis upon supervisory functions and less emphasis on direct contact with volunteer leaders since 4-H program assistants have been employed in their counties.

The study recommended that efforts be continued to establish and appropriately recognize the 4-H program assistant as an important staff position in the Michigan Extension Service.

It was recommended that staff analyze the needs and interests in their role set situation to determine the role for each staff member in the 4-H program. Due to the difference of program assistants' roles in various county staffing models, it was recommended if future staffing models are developed, consideration continue to be given to the characteristics of the county staffing needs.

The study recommended that an area youth development specialist position be developed whose primary role would be to provide leadership to 4-H staff in counties. 4-H agents with these skills who "turn over" county 4-H coordination leadership to program assistants may be possible candidates for this position.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express sincere appreciation to those who have contributed to the development of this study:

To Professor Russell J. Kleis, and Dr. Melvin Buschman for their guidance and assistance in this research;

To other members of my doctoral committee for assistance, Drs. Margaret Bubolz and Mason E. Miller;

To the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service and my fellow colleagues for their understanding and support;

To my wife, Marty, and children, Julie, Tom and Janie, for their sacrifices and for the encouragement and assistance they provided; and

To Mr. Jim Mullin for his help in analyzing the data of the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem on Which This Study Will Primarily Focus	4
Objectives	5
Assumptions	6
Definition of Terms	6
Need for the Study	9
Limitations of the Study	10
Overview	10
II. BACKGROUND AND RELATED LITERATURE RELATING TO THE PARAPROFESSIONAL	12
Recent Emergence of the Paraprofessional	12
Roles of the Paraprofessional Youth Worker	14
Marginality	18
Role and Relationship of Paraprofessional and Professional	19
Role Theory Concepts	28
Position	28
Role Expectation	31
Role Conflict	32
Summary	34
Rationale	38
III. METHODOLOGY	39
Determination of Study Population	41
Development of Survey Instrument	41
Major Responsibilities	44
Scoring of Respondents Performance Frequency of 4-H Tasks	46
Design of the Questionnaire for Other Variables	47

Grouping of Counties	
Into Three Types	49
County 4-H Effectiveness	49
Role Change of Agent	50
Analysis of 4-H Professional	
Leadership Role	51
Summary of Variables Developed	
in the Questionnaire	52
Testing of Questionnaire	53
Collection of Data	53
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	56
Part I. Demographic Information on	
4-H Program Assistants	56
Age of Program Assistants	56
Sex of Program Assistants	57
Length of Employment of 4-H	
Program Assistants	57
Schooling of 4-H Youth Workers	58
Experience Working With Youth	
Prior to Employment	60
Most Helpful Entry Level Experience	61
Aspirations of 4-H Program Assistants	62
Satisfaction of 4-H Program	
Assistants	64
Part II. Identification of Assigned	
Roles of 4-H Program Assistants	65
Summary	69
Part III. Identification of 4-H Tasks as	
Performed by 4-H Program Assistants by	
Expected Roles	69
Summary	73
Part IV. Analysis of Roles and Role	
Relationships by Staffing Patterns	75
Urban Counties with 4-H Agents	75
Related Variables	76
Sex and Age of Program Assistants	76
Length of Employment	77
Formal Schooling	77
Previous Employment Experience	78
Employment Aspirations	78
Identification of Advisor	78
Role Expectation	79

Program Assistant's Performance of 4-H Tasks	81
Agent's Performance of 4-H Tasks	84
Role Relationship on 4-H Tasks	85
Role Change of the 4-H Agent	88
Rural Counties with 4-H Agents	89
Related Variables	89
Length of Employment	89
Formal Schooling	89
Age and Sex	90
Most Helpful Previous Experience	90
Employment Aspirations	90
Identification of Advisor	91
Role Expectation	92
Program Assistant's Performance of 4-H Tasks	94
Agent's Performance of 4-H Tasks	96
Role Relationship on 4-H Tasks	98
Role Change of the 4-H Agent	100
Counties Without 4-H Agents	100
Related Variables	101
Length of Employment	101
Formal Schooling	101
Sex and Age of Program Assistants	102
Previous Employment Experience	102
Employment Aspirations	103
Identification of Advisor	104
Role Expectation	104
Program Assistant's Performance of 4-H Tasks	106
Comparison of Program Assistant's and Rural Agent's Frequency Level on Twenty-One 4-H Tasks	108
Agent Performance of 4-H Tasks	109
Role Relationship on 4-H Tasks	112
Role Change of County Extension Director	114
Summary of Role Set Analysis	115
Performance of Professional Leadership Tasks	115
Part V. Correlation of Related Variables With Frequency of Performance of 4-H Tasks	119
Previous Experience	121
Length of Employment	121
Effectiveness of County 4-H Program	123

Chapter	Page
Aspirations of Program Assistants	124
Age of Program Assistants	125
Summary	126
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	129
Summary	129
Conclusions	140
Recommendations	143
BIBLIOGRAPHY	146
APPENDICES	
A-1. Cover Letter	149
A-2. 4-H Program Assistant Questionnaire	150
A-3. Agent Questionnaire	156
B-1. Frequency Count, Mean and Standard Deviation of 4-H Tasks as Self Reported by Program Assistants by Type of County, Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974	161
B-2. Frequency Count, Mean and Standard Deviation of 4-H Tasks as Self Reported by Supervising Agents by Type of County, Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974	164

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Distribution of 4-H Program Assistants by Age and Type of County in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974	57
2. Distribution of 4-H Program Assistants by Sex and by Type of County in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974	58
3. Distribution of 4-H Program Assistants by Length of Employment with 4-H Youth Programs and Type of County, Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974	58
4. Distribution of 4-H Program Assistants by Highest Level of Schooling Completed and Type of County in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974	59
5. Experience with Youth Before Employment as Reported by 4-H Program Assistants in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974	60
6. 4-H Leader Experience Prior to Employment by Type of County as Reported by 4-H Program Assistants in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974	61
7. Entry Level Experiences Identified as Most Helpful for Success as Reported by Program Assistants by Type of County in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974	62
8. 4-H Employment Aspirations Five Years From Now as Identified by Program Assistants by Type of County in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974	63
9. Program Assistant Satisfaction Levels by Type of County in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974	64

10.	Major Responsibilities of 4-H Program Assistants as Assigned by Supervising Agents by Type of County in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974	67
11.	Rank Order of Performance Frequency Scores (Range is 1-4) of 4-H Tasks by Role Type as Reported Performed by Sixty-two 4-H Program Assistants in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974	71
12.	Distribution of 4-H Program Assistants Employed in Urban Counties by Age and Sex in the Michigan Extension Service, 1974	77
13.	Major Responsibilities of 4-H Program Assistants Assigned by the Supervising Agents in Urban Counties with 4-H Agents in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974	80
14.	Major Responsibilities of 4-H Program Assistants as Assigned by the Supervising Agents in Rural Counties with 4-H Agents in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974	92
15.	Major Responsibilities of 4-H Program Assistants as Assigned by the Supervising Agents in Counties Without 4-H Agents in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974	105

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Like many other organizations designed to serve the needs of people, the Cooperative Extension Service faces many challenges created by rapid social change. Conspicuous among the attempts to respond creatively to changing needs is the development of new staffing patterns. A prominent and plausible alternative being tried by many of the human services agencies, including the Cooperative Extension Service, is the employment of paraprofessionals.

In the mid 1960's the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) appointed a Joint Study Committee on Cooperative Extension to study changing social needs and make recommendations for changes in program, structure and staffing patterns. That joint committee's report, A People and a Spirit¹ recommended that 46,960 subprofessional aides be employed by 1975 to meet the projected staffing needs for a proposed "Quality of Living Program" emphasis.

A professional agent, when employed by the Cooperative Extension Service, receives a joint appointment with the Federal

¹A People and a Spirit. A report of the Joint USDA-NASULGC Extension Study Committee, Printing and Publication Service, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, 1968, p. 63.

Extension Service and the State Extension Service at the Land Grant University.

The youth program of Cooperative Extension Service, called 4-H, is an informal educational program conducted largely through local community clubs. It is designed primarily for boys and girls from the ages of 9 to 19. The youth clubs are normally led by volunteer 4-H leaders (parents, other adults, or older youth) who are recruited and supported by an employed county extension field staff.

Until recently a typical county field staff consisted of professional agents, at least one of whom was a 4-H agent. The 4-H agent like his counterpart for agriculture, or family living, was required to have at least a baccalaureate degree and meet professional requirements of the Land Grant College and the Federal Extension Service. In 1966 the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service became one of the first extension services to hire 4-H paraprofessionals. Since that time, over 80 have been employed in Michigan.

In most cases, the 4-H paraprofessionals in the Michigan Extension Service (referred to in this study as 4-H program assistants) have been hired by county professionals to fit various county situations. They are not required to hold baccalaureate degrees or to meet requirements for appointment by Federal Extension Service. The 4-H program assistants possess a variety of skills and work experiences; their levels of formal schooling vary widely. From their first appearance, however, some program assistants have been performing tasks very similar to those performed by 4-H professionals (4-H Agents).

In the present county staffing models, employees in several different positions are seemingly performing somewhat similar functions. The county 4-H leadership is seemingly being provided by fully qualified federally appointed professional 4-H agents and by county and Michigan State University funded paraprofessional 4-H program assistants.

In the Michigan 4-H youth program, 4-H program assistants have been employed in county 4-H programs since 1966. A comparison of enrollment statistics indicates increased participation of the enrolled 4-H membership in counties which employ 4-H program assistants.

Membership, as reported in ES Form 237, increased 42 percent from 94,350 enrolled 4-H members in 1970 to 134,360 in 1973. During that same period, membership in the 48 counties which employed 4-H program assistants increased from 57,186 to 86,931, an increase of 29,745, or about 52 percent. During that same time period, 4-H membership in the 35 counties not employing 4-H paraprofessionals increased from 37,164 to 47,429, an increase of 10,265, or about 28 percent. Approximately 13 4-H paraprofessionals were working during 1970 as compared with about 65 in 1973.²

This comparison between increases in 4-H enrollment does not tell the whole story, for it does not measure the learning experiences or the behavior changes of the participants. But enrollment

²B. Alan Snider, "Eight Years of Becoming--The 4-H Program Assistant in Michigan," Paper presented at the 4-H Paraprofessional Seminar, National 4-H Center, Washington, D. C., April 4, 1974.

statistics can be one way of indicating trends.

This new staffing position, the 4-H program assistant, having been employed for about 8 years, has raised some challenging questions. What role is the 4-H program assistant performing? Does this role vary in different county situations, such as those with and those without 4-H agents, those in urban or in rural counties? Do the program assistants personal characteristics, such as level of formal schooling, tenure, and previous experiences working with youth and adults seem to influence his/her role? What staffing models utilizing the 4-H program assistant position are appropriate for the future? What rationale, if any, exists for wide variation in program assistant roles? This descriptive study will focus on identifying the roles of these relatively new staff members, the 4-H paraprofessional youth workers.

Statement of Problem on Which This
Study Will Primarily Focus

The purpose of this descriptive study is to identify the roles of 4-H paraprofessional youth workers in the Cooperative Extension Service and to analyze variables related to those roles in three basic county models. One model is that of a county with 100,000 people or more and where one or more program assistants work with a resident professional 4-H agent; the second model is that of a county which is predominantly rural (less than 100,000 population) and where one or more program assistants work with a resident professional 4-H agent; the third model is that of a county (most likely rural) in which one (usually) program assistant works without any

resident professional 4-H agent.

Objectives

The study will seek answers to the following questions:

1) What responsibilities are assigned and what tasks are performed in the roles of 4-H program assistants in those counties without a resident 4-H agent and in those urban and rural counties with a resident 4-H agent? In this study, roles of 4-H paraprofessional youth workers are identified as: Acting County 4-H Agent, County 4-H Specialist, Assistant County 4-H Agent, and County 4-H Generalist.

2) Are the following variables related to the frequency with which selected 4-H tasks are performed by 4-H program assistants:

- Amount of formal schooling of the program assistant?
- Previous experiences of the program assistant?
- Length of employment with the 4-H program?
- Effectiveness of county 4-H program?
- Employment aspirations of the program assistant?
- Age of program assistant?

3) How has the professional 4-H (or other supervising) agent's role changed with the addition of one or more 4-H program assistants to the county staff?

4) Who are performing the county 4-H professional leadership tasks in counties with 4-H program assistants?

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made to conducting the study:

- 1) Roles of 4-H program assistants can be defined by identifying the major responsibilities assigned and the selected 4-H tasks performed.
- 2) Tasks reported by 4-H program assistants and agents are representative of tasks performed.
- 3) Respondents in the study responded objectively to the questions asked in the survey instrument.
- 4) Some or all of the tasks of professional 4-H agents may be performed by paraprofessionals when the latter are appointed to 4-H staff positions.
- 5) In the absence of designated 4-H professional agents the tasks they would normally perform may be performed by county extension directors, by other professional extension workers or by paraprofessional workers, or by some combination of these.
- 6) The work role of the program assistant varies in urban and rural counties and with the presence or absence of a resident 4-H agent.
- 7) The work role of the professional 4-H agent changes with the appointment of one or more paraprofessional 4-H program assistants to his or her county's 4-H staff.

Definition of Terms

In order to enhance communication, the following concepts are defined as they are used in this study:

4-H--is an informal educational program for youth conducted by the Cooperative Extension Service which has voluntary participation and functions around clubs, and/or groups which are normally led by volunteer leaders.

4-H Program Assistant--is an employee of the Cooperative Extension Service who is not required to have a college degree, who does not have an appointment with the United States Department of Agriculture, who performs tasks and assumes responsibilities within a county 4-H youth program, and who normally functions under the supervision of a professional 4-H or other extension agent.

Extension Agent--is an employee of the Cooperative Extension Service with dual appointment with Michigan State University and the United States Department of Agriculture. For this study, the extension agents of primary interest are (1) the 4-H youth agent, who performs tasks and responsibilities primarily with the 4-H program and, (2) the county extension director, who provides leadership for the county extension program.

Supervising Agent--is the extension agent, employed in the same county as the 4-H program assistant, who assumes supervisory responsibilities for the 4-H program assistant. In counties with a resident 4-H youth agent, the 4-H youth agent serves as the 4-H supervising agent. In counties which employ a 4-H program assistant without a resident 4-H youth agent, the supervising agent is the county extension director.

Roles of the 4-H Program Assistant--There are four role types of 4-H paraprofessional youth workers to be considered in this

study. They are differentiated on three dimensions: institutional versus clientele work orientation, county wide versus local area orientation, and general versus specific program orientation:

Acting County 4-H Agent--A 4-H program assistant whose position involves a high degree of responsibility to the organization for coordinating the 4-H program generally throughout the county in all 4-H program areas.

Assistant County 4-H Agent--A 4-H program assistant whose position requires that he/she work closely with the 4-H agent in coordinating and carrying out the 4-H program generally throughout the county in all program areas.

County 4-H Specialist--A 4-H program assistant whose position requires working in a certain part of the county or in specific program areas.

County 4-H Generalist--A 4-H program assistant whose principle responsibility is to work with volunteer 4-H leaders and members throughout the county and in all program areas.

County type--Three groups of counties employ 4-H program assistants:

County Type A--Rural counties without a resident 4-H agent and with less than 100,000 population.

County Type B--Urban counties with a resident 4-H agent and a population over 100,000.

County Type C--Rural counties with a resident 4-H agent and with a population of less than 100,000.

County 4-H Professional Leadership Role--is that combination of tasks that is presumed to require advanced training, knowledge, and experience to manage and direct a county 4-H program.

County 4-H Program Effectiveness--is the assessment of the effectiveness of a county 4-H program on the rating scale of Very High, High, Average, and Low, by administrators of the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service. Criteria considered in rating were:

1. Scope of youth and adult participation in county 4-H program.
2. Involvement of volunteer leadership in decision making.
3. Support from county government and other support groups.
4. Involvement of participants in meaningful learning experiences.
5. Overall rating of effectiveness of county 4-H program.

Role Change of Supervising Agent--is the difference between the Supervising Agent's self-perception of the importance of ten 4-H functions to his role before hiring the first 4-H program assistant and after hiring one or more 4-H program assistants.

Congruence of 4-H Program Assistant's Role--is the degree of agreement between a 4-H program assistant and his/her supervising agent in reporting frequency of performing selected tasks by the 4-H program assistant.

Need for the Study

The 4-H program assistant's position is a relatively new one in the Cooperative Extension Service. The number of incumbents has

increased over the past eight years, with predictions being for continued growth. In an attempt to provide guidance for future staffing, this study will identify the roles the 4-H program assistant is presently performing in three different staffing patterns and analyze the variables related to those roles.

This study will help define and develop a clearer understanding of roles of 4-H program assistants, and roles of supervising agents and factors which influence those varying roles in the performance of 4-H tasks. It will also provide recommendations for utilizing 4-H program assistants and 4-H agents in the future.

Limitations of the Study

The population for the study included 4-H paraprofessional youth workers and supervising agents in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service. The population did not include Extension staff members from other states.

The assessment of the role of 4-H program assistant does not include data from the clientele of the 4-H program, the 4-H volunteer leaders or 4-H members.

The data employed in the analysis are limited to those obtained from a survey instrument completed by 4-H program assistants and supervisory agents.

Overview

The purpose of this study, its objectives, its assumptions and the limitations were stated in Chapter I. Terms to be used in

the study have been defined.

A review of the pertinent literature and an explanation of the theory for the study are presented in Chapter II.

Chapter III includes the study's design, explanation of the instruments used for the study, the organization of the data and analytical procedures used.

The findings are presented and analyzed in Chapter IV.

Chapter V contains a summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations for practice and future research.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND AND RELATED LITERATURE RELATING TO THE PARAPROFESSIONAL

It appears appropriate, since paraprofessionals are relatively new in the Extension Service, to review a sampling of appropriate literature for insight and understanding. The review focuses on a brief description of the setting and the emergence of paraprofessionals; roles of paraprofessionals and their influence; relationships between the roles of paraprofessionals and professionals; and role theory concepts of position, role expectation and role conflict.

Recent Emergence of the Paraprofessional

The decade of the 1960's saw a new concern for the quality of life, particularly as it was affected by educational, health, and welfare institutions. As the concern for increased and improved services grew, so too grew a dual realization that on the one hand existing professional manpower resources were inadequate and, on the other hand, opportunities for significant work and self-help were too few to meet newly acknowledged needs of the society and economically disadvantaged. Thus, along with the concern for new services came an interest in new manpower, particularly from among those with less

formal training.¹

National Extension Service publications entitled 4-H in the Seventies² and A People and a Spirit³ both recommend an expansion of 4-H participation within the decade of the 70's. This expansion, for the most part, is predicted to take place in the more urban areas of the country. The National 4-H Urban Program Development Committee presents in the report, A Plan for Action, the following challenge:

The Cooperative Extension Service has a rich background of service to rural America, and it has proven it can deliver educational programs that are vital to the growth and prosperity of this country. A new challenge is now before Extension--the challenge of providing meaningful educational programs for an urban audience. As a public youth program, 4-H is obligated to provide educational opportunities for all segments of society regardless of income, educational levels, race, color, national origin, sex, creed, or place of residence.⁴

As an approach for reaching this new audience for the Cooperative Extension Service, A People and a Spirit recommends employing subprofessional aides from the target population, thus providing both employment opportunities and more effective access. Further, the report recommends that program assistants and program

¹Alan Gartner, Paraprofessionals and Their Performance, (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971), p. 3.

²4-H in the 70's, Extension Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., n.d.

³A People and a Spirit, A report of the joint USDA-NASULGC Extension Study Committee, Printing and Publication Service, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, 1968, p. 63.

⁴A Plan for Action, Report by the National 4-H Urban Program Development Committee, Extension Service, USDA, Washington, D.C., 1973, p. 1.

aides be used extensively, with increased use of local residents as teachers of specific subjects.⁵

It has been noted that increased involvement of more people, and a broader scope of subject matter interests increase the demands on the professional staff. One plausible solution to this problem--advanced for many of the educational, medical, and social work fields--is the use of program aides (paraprofessionals, subprofessionals, program assistants).⁶

Riesman states in the foreword of Paraprofessionals and Their Performance

that the rapid acceptance of the paraprofessional by the professionals and the agencies is related to the crisis in professional practice produced by the highly vocal demands...expressed specifically in the community--control movement which calls for accountability, relevance, and revitalization of the services.⁷

Roles of the Paraprofessional Youth Worker

During 1965-70 the National Council of Boy Scouts of America invested 1.5 million dollars in selected rural and urban councils to experiment with new approaches for reaching audiences. The Research

⁵A People and a Spirit, op. cit., p. 75.

⁶John A. Kiesow, "Role Model for the Paraprofessional Youth Worker in the Extension Service," (Ph.D. dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, 1972), p. 3.

⁷Frank Reisman, Foreword, Paraprofessionals and Their Performance (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971), pp. 7-8.

Service of the Boy Scouts of America reported from analyzing the experimental programs that there were 51 distinct obstacles confronting scouting in this type of community. A further evaluation of the 51 obstacles indicated that 32 could be "spoken directly to" through the use of indigenous paraprofessionals. The Boy Scouts of America concluded that the paraprofessional can, in a sense, act as a two-way transceiver between the Boy Scouts and the resident of a low-income community--receiving information at one level, interpreting it, and transmitting it at the new level.⁸

A 4-H paraprofessional has been variously described by a number of authors. Parsons describes program assistants as full-time, trained, indigenous adults hired to work in their own neighborhoods.⁹ Banning differentiates between program assistants and program aides. According to him, program assistants are recognized community or county leaders with some professional training and/or other qualifying experience which enables them to function effectively as assistants to the professional Extension youth program leaders (Program Coordinators), on a part-time or full-time basis. The program assistant deals primarily with organization, leadership development, and public support. Banning describes program aides as recognized leaders in the neighborhoods, on

⁸Boy Scouts of America, "Paraprofessional Employment Program Training Plans and Procedures," North Brunswick (1973), pp. 28-29.

⁹Jerry Parsons, "Inner City Youth Programs: Guidelines," Journal of Extension, 9 (Summer, 1971), p. 34.

the city block, in the high-rise apartment building, or in other appropriate areas, who will arrange for youth participation and parental cooperation, and do much of the direct subject matter teaching. Program aides will supervise the young people in their various group activities and will normally serve on a part-time basis and be compensated at an hourly rate or a specified amount for a given job.¹⁰

As presented in A Plan for Action, the 4-H paraprofessional is an urban program assistant who is responsible to the urban 4-H youth agent. It is desirable for the program assistant to be indigenous to the community and to relate to and be accepted by the clientele. This staff person contributes to Extension efforts either as a full-time or a part-time employee.¹¹

While the title of this new position (i.e., Michigan 4-H Program Assistants, Wisconsin 4-H Staff Assistants, etc.) may not be clear, its incumbents have demonstrated their worth to the 4-H youth programs. They generally work under the supervision of a professional agent and they have demonstrated their ability to recruit leaders and members, to organize 4-H clubs, to teach leaders and members, and to

¹⁰John W. Banning, "New Dimensions for Cooperative Extension Youth Programs in the 70's," Paper presented at 1970 Annual Meeting of the National Association of Extension 4-H Agents, Purdue University, November, 1970, p. 19.

¹¹A Plan for Action, Report by the National 4-H Urban Program Development Committee, Extension Service, USDA, Washington, D.C., 1973, p. 12.

assist with 4-H events and many other tasks.¹² One of the apparent roles paraprofessional youth workers are providing is a rather close working relationship with clientele.

An often cited use of paraprofessionals is to increase the efficiency and adequacy of an agency's social services by overcoming the manpower shortage and by freeing the professional to do the tasks for which he has been trained.

In a report of a recent study evaluating an ideal role model for a paraprofessional youth worker, the following remarks concluded the report:

Perhaps the most important conclusion reached in this study is that from a costwise standpoint, 4-H paraprofessionals provide a means for efficient use of funds in terms of program expansion. The 4-H program assistants can definitely perform many of the routine roles normally performed by professional youth workers. The paraprofessional also brings many individual skills and competencies to the program, and they are effective in terms of communicating and building productive relationships with adult volunteer leaders and youth. As the paraprofessionals assume broader roles and become more competent, the professional youth worker can devote additional time to tasks which require utilization of skills which he has acquired through professional training. Thus, the paraprofessional as well as the professional adds efficiency to the youth program.¹³

Paraprofessionals have the potential to reduce the social distance between a change agency such as the Extension Service and

¹²John A. Kiesow, Charles E. Lewis, Susan Y. Lyday, "The Functional Development and Evaluation of a Youth Staffing Model Utilizing the Ideal Role of the Paraprofessional Youth Worker," (Extension Service Special Project Report, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, March, 1974), p. 57. Glen H. Krohn, "Aide Utilization in Voluntary Youth Educational Programs," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 1972), p. 109.

¹³Kiesow, Lewis and Lyday, op. cit., pp. 59-60.

its clientele. As it establishes programs for new audiences, the Extension Service appears to meet wider gaps which paraprofessionals can help narrow. The Expanded Nutrition Program is a case in point. To bridge the gap between the professional change agent and the low-income homemaker, it, like 4-H, used the strategy of hiring aides.

Marginality

Since the main function of most change agents is to link their clients and the change agency, two very unlike systems, the agent, and the agent's aide, face problems of marginality. Caught between the conflicting demands of these two systems the agency and clients, the change agent is marginal in both.¹⁴

One of the great problems experienced by the nonprofessional is role ambiguity or lack of role identity....He doesn't know who he is or who he is becoming. He is no longer a simple member of the community...nor is he a professional. Actually, he is a highly marginal person.¹⁵

But, while it causes social-psychological problems of identity and loyalty for the aide, his marginality is functional for linking purposes. Aides occupy an intermediate position in halving the gap between the professional change agency and the clients. Were they not in a marginal position, the aides could not effectively

¹⁴Everett M. Rogers, Communication Strategies for Family Planning, (New York: The Free Press, 1973), p. 129.

¹⁵Frank Riesman, "The Challenge: New Careers for the Poor," in Proceedings of the American Home Economist Workshop (Chicago: American Home Economics Association, 1966), p. 205.

perform their linking function. So while their marginality may be unpleasant, it is almost a necessary ingredient in the aide's role.¹⁶

Rogers raises an interesting question as to the possible complementary effect developed by professional and paraprofessional as they bridge the gap between the institution and the clients.

Role Relationship of Paraprofessional and Professional

When paraprofessionals were initially employed they were thought of as helping the professional. Some have expanded this concept to encompass a much broader approach. The Vice President of the College of Human Services, a college for paraprofessionals in New York, defined the New-Careers program as one which goes beyond helping professionals. Following is her list of five basic premises for the establishment of the college:

1. Different kinds of people should be able to enter the helping professions...
2. Traditional routes to professionalism should be reevaluated...
3. Experimentation and innovation in staffing patterns in the human services can give much needed new dimensions to the quality of the human services...
4. "New professionals" should be trained and challenged to develop their individual potentials to make their own contribution to service...

¹⁶Everett M. Rogers, op. cit., p. 129.

5. New Careers programs can contribute to the competence and resources of individuals and communities...¹⁷

As indicated by Houston, the role of paraprofessional is not merely a segment of a static role, only helping the professional, but it has the potential of expanding the scope of that role through a close relationship with the professional.

Paraprofessionals have affected professionals. Grosser provided evidence of the effect of paraprofessionals on the professionals with whom they worked in various federal manpower programs: "Not only is the presence of nonprofessionals very much felt by neighborhood populations but they also affect professional practices in these agencies."¹⁸ Grosser further suggested: "Professionals in these projects are more effective with the poor than their counterparts in ongoing agencies."¹⁹

Grosser remarked on the contrast between what may have been the agency's intent in instituting a paraprofessional program and the actual consequences.

The introduction of a program device as innovative as this one, even if the original intention is to improve service,

¹⁷Laura Pires Houston, "Black People, New Careers and Humane Human Services," *Social Casework*, LI, 5 (May, 1970), p. 292.

¹⁸Charles G. Grosser, The Role of the Nonprofessional in the Manpower Development Programs (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1966), p. 48.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 50.

must soon produce strains which alter the patterns of the agency's function.²⁰

Almost without exception, discussions involving the use of aides point to the fact that working with and through program aides introduces a whole new dimension in role relationship. Silverman paints the picture very clearly:

The great problem in the utilization of the subprofessional is just as much in the professional as it is in the subprofessional. It doesn't make any difference if we're talking about the professional county agent or home economist, professional social worker, a professional teacher of English, a nurse, or a director of mental health. There are certain problems that all professionals are facing: a certain level of threat-ability (i.e., that the professional will be out-competed and replaced; that many of the skills he possesses and identifies with professional pride are not that difficult to learn). We are in such a drastic social change that professionals in all helping services have to change--the professional has to learn to move over, to re-define his role. And he must give up his need for role identity in the part of the role that can be transmitted to the subprofessional.²¹

A wide range of literature alludes to or directly speaks to the problems of role and role relationships. Professional reactions to paraprofessionals vary extensively from acceptance through real anxiety and concern to outright hostility and rejection. Some professionals see paraprofessionals as a threat to job security and status, while others view them as handymen for all of the dirty jobs. Still

²⁰Charles G. Grosser, "Manpower Development Programs," in Charles G. Grosser, et al., (eds.), Nonprofessionals in the Human Services (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969), p. 130.

²¹Saul A. Silverman, "Subprofessionals in Extension," Journal of Cooperative Extension, 7 (Spring, 1969), p. 45.

others see the paraprofessional as an asset, but express anxiety as to what he should do.²²

Without a doubt there is considerable confusion and misunderstanding about professional and paraprofessional roles. This confusion can easily lead to role conflict. When roles are ambiguous and/or undefined, or when people consider them competitive rather than complementary, they can conflict. In a complementary relationship, people in both roles work together as a unit, a "role set," to fulfill the agency's objectives.²³

The professional's role changes as paraprofessionals become a part of the staffing model in a school system. From their study of fifteen paraprofessional programs, a Bank Street College of Education team reported that the introduction of the paraprofessional served as a catalytic force in developing new roles for all the parties in the school system. They found their participating teachers perceived new roles for themselves which included a higher level of professionalism with emphasis on diagnosis, planning, and coordination. Teachers, themselves, saw this new role as an addition to, rather than a substitute for teacher-pupil interaction.²⁴ The effects Bowman and

²²Christine S. Tennant and James W. Longest, "Professional and Paraprofessional Role Differentiation," (Agricultural Experiment Station, College Park, Maryland, 1973), p. 2.

²³Ibid., p. 5.

²⁴Garda W. Bowman and Gordon J. Klopff, New Careers and Roles in the American School: A Study of Auxiliary Personnel in Education (New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1968), p. 220.

Klopf uncovered went beyond the classroom situation to involve administrators and others in the new instructional system:

A salient outcome was that all concerned--administrators, supervisors, teachers, and auxiliary personnel--had to re-think their roles and relationships when aides were introduced into a school system.²⁵

Anderson adds the notion that very few teachers can do everything well and that judicious assignment of aides can help to fill natural gaps in the teacher's ability. For example, the teacher completely devoid of musical sense could utilize an aide for the musical portion of his class. This view suggests that paraprofessionals would be competent to take over the teaching function completely in certain kinds of situations.²⁶ This is an interesting variation on the theme and one with a great deal of logic behind it. But, as Bennett indicates, it also confuses the issue. Educational commentators state that a noncertified teacher can never assume actual teaching duties, but must always be supervised. In numerous confrontations in several states, teachers and other school people have been firm on this point.²⁷

Anderson points out one seldom admitted barrier to using aides creatively: many teachers and administrators, derive satisfaction

²⁵Ibid., p. 14.

²⁶Anderson, R.A., "Organizational Character of Education: Staff Utilization and Development; Subprofessional and Paraprofessional Personnel," Review of Educational Research, Volume 34 (October, 1964), pp. 458-459.

²⁷Bennett, William S., Jr., and Frank R. Folk, New Careers and Urban Schools, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., (1970) p. 31.

and comfort from clerical and housekeeping functions.

They (clerical tasks) are usually discharged with relative ease, and when they are carried out with accuracy and efficiency, they often bring disproportionate rewards...By contrast, to solve a real educational problem is usually far more difficult...²⁸

Bennett suggests that some teachers may resist the supervisory role in order to retain the chance to do menial tasks in which they can demonstrate real competence. To the extent that this form of resistance actually exists, rational discussion of the use of aides and the movement of teachers into supervisory positions is impossible.²⁹ This situation may exist in non-formal educational programs as well.

On the question of role of paraprofessionals in the school system, Tanner and Tanner observe "...the absence of a theoretical basis for determining the kinds of tasks they (aides) should and should not perform."³⁰ Matheny and Oslin cited as a major impediment in role definition for paraprofessionals the

inadequacy of current role definition for professional persons. (It should also be noted that) the insecurity of the supervisory professional often placed severe limitations upon the functioning of the subprofessional.³¹

²⁸Anderson, op. cit., pp. 458-459.

²⁹Bennett and Folk, op. cit., p. 31.

³⁰Daniel Tanner and Laurel N. Tanner, "Teacher Aides: A Job for Anyone in Ghetto Schools," The Record, LXIX, 8 (May, 1968), p. 744.

³¹Kenneth B. Matheny and Yvonne Oslin, "Utilization of Paraprofessionals in Education and the Helping Professions: A Review of the Literature," Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, Minneapolis: (March, 1970), pp. 19-20.

Esbensen has suggested that for aides to perform instructional tasks should not be threatening to the professional practice of teachers:

The distinguishing characteristic of the qualified teacher is his ability to analyze the instructional needs of his students, and to prescribe the elements of formal schooling that will best meet these needs.³²

A role model that has been constructed and tested for a new organizational worker can have many implications. Every organizational position exists in relationship to other organizational positions. Therefore, when it adds new positions, an organization must make appropriate adjustments. This is especially true when the new worker will change the traditional hierarchical structure, as the program assistant is doing by intervening between the youth agent and the volunteer in the 4-H youth program staffing model.

Agents and paraprofessionals do not completely agree on what aides are to do. In a study to determine appropriate tasks for aides, Krohn reported that aides felt there were more tasks in a voluntary youth educational program than they were capable of performing than did the professionals. Krohn also found the responsibilities of aides to be most acceptable in areas of recruitment, teaching, and activities, and/or recognition. The responsibilities of the professionals were found most acceptable in the major areas of administration and planning.³³

³²Thornwald Esbensen, "Should Teacher Aides Be More Than Clerks?", Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII, 5 (January, 1966), p. 237.

³³Glen H. Krohn, "Aide Utilization in Voluntary Youth Educational Programs," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 1972), pp. 116-117.

Kiesow found that youth agents did not agree with volunteers on tasks in which program assistants worked in direct relationship with volunteers. He concluded that youth agents desire to maintain direct relationship with the volunteers.³⁴

Keisow and others reported that the professional 4-H agent plays an important role in the performance of the 4-H paraprofessional. They state:

For the paraprofessional to function satisfactorily, the 4-H agent must learn to successfully carry out supervisory responsibilities and to become exceptionally qualified in performing planning functions.³⁵

Kiesow concluded from the analysis of tasks by functional category that the program assistant's role was seen as appropriate in all aspects of the organizational life of the youth program. However, agents were relatively more cautious than were volunteers about agreeing to allow program assistants to carry out execution tasks. This finding was supported in other functional categories. Kiesow noted that efforts will be needed to bring expectations of all position groups into greater congruence on the question of tasks that the program assistant can and should perform.³⁶

In their studies of auxiliary school personnel in 15 training programs as reported in New Careers and Roles in the American Schools, Bowman and Klopf state that the principal dilemma in the relationship between teachers and teacher-aides appeared to be the

³⁴Kiesow, op. cit., p. 109.

³⁵Kiesow, Lewis, and Lyday, op. cit., p. 58.

³⁶Kiesow, op. cit., p. 111.

conflict between role definition, which was recognized as necessary for institutionalization, and role development, which was a dynamic of each classroom situation which utilized auxiliaries. The degree of responsibilities assigned to an auxiliary depends upon the interaction of a particular teacher and a particular auxiliary operating within a given structure and responding to the special needs of individual pupils. A delicate balance seems to be required in order to provide the specificity that means security, along with the flexibility that promotes growth.

Bowman and Klopff indicate that the development of the role of the paraprofessional requires an understanding of the whole complex of roles, responsibilities, and relationships involved in the learning-teaching process. When aides and teachers participated together in training projects, role development was facilitated and understandings developed.³⁷

Bowman and Klopff's observations of the role set relationship between the teacher and teacher-aide suggests an important inquiry for this study of searching for factors of influence relating to role development. It also suggests developing an understanding of the dynamics of the role set which includes the professional and paraprofessional in the Cooperative Extension Service.

³⁷Bowman and Klopff, op. cit., p. 25.

Role Theory Concepts

From the previous discussion of the paraprofessional it becomes obvious that a review of pertinent concepts of role theory may be helpful in the development of a theoretical framework for understanding the dynamics involved with paraprofessional employment.

Three basic ideas which appear in most of the conceptualizations about role, if not in the definitions of roles themselves, are that individuals: (1) in social locations; (2) behave; (3) with reference to expectations.³⁸

Gross reports that almost all of the authors have used the role concept to embrace the normative element of social behavior. People do not behave in a random manner; their behavior is influenced to some extent by their own expectations and those of others in the groups or society in which they are participants. Some authors have included this idea in the concept of status or position, others in role, but nearly all include it somewhere.³⁹

Position

Biddle and Thomas report that the notion of position is among the most widely used concepts in role theory, and most writers in the field have followed the example set by Linton⁴⁰ of defining

³⁸Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendent Role (New York: Wiley, 1957), p. 17.

³⁹Ibid.

⁴⁰Ralph Linton, The Study of Man (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1936), pp. 115-116.

role in relationship to a position.⁴¹

Biddle and Thomas say that the key to understanding the idea of position is that it virtually always refers to a collectively recognized category of persons. The category must be distinct in the minds of most persons in the category (e.g., those who teach). But given that category of persons is recognized collectively, there is usually more than one basis upon which the members of the position are differentiated from others, and this may be one reason for definitional disagreements.⁴²

Gross has presented the concept of position in a useful manner which may have some implications in studying the role of the paraprofessional. Gross uses the term "position" to refer to the location of an actor or class of actors in a system of social relationships. The general idea of social location has been represented by some authors with the term status, and by others with position. The meaning of location in a system of social relationships is not, however, entirely self-evident. It is difficult to separate the idea of location from the relationships which define it, just as in geometry a point cannot be located without describing its relations to others; the points imply the relationships, and the relationships locate the points.⁴³

⁴¹Bruce J. Biddle and Edwin J. Thomas, Role Theory: Concepts and Research (New York: Wiley, 1966), pp. 28-29.

⁴²Ibid.

⁴³Gross, Mason and McEachern, op. cit., p. 48.

The labels assigned to positions, as distinguished from the bases for these positions, serve the cognitive function of differentiating among them. In the case of ascribed positions, the labels which refer to them are generally derived from the "presocial system" characteristics on which the patterns are based. Whatever the source of the labels which allow cognitive discriminations among actors, identities do not become positions until they are placed in a relationship system.⁴⁴

Nearly every role theorist, regardless of the frame of reference in which his analysis is couched, adopts the view that a position is an element or a part of a network or system of positions. In Newcomb's scheme this point is given special emphasis:

Thus the positions, which are the smallest element--the construction blocks--of societies and organized groups, are interrelated and consistent because they are organized to common ends. Since every position is a part of an inclusive system of positions, no one position has any meaning apart from the other positions to which it is related.⁴⁵

Gross relates Newcomb's conclusion to a practical problem in research in the area of role and position theory.

The last sentence in the statement from Newcomb suggests the nature of the present problem. (If a particular position has no meaning apart from other positions, it is necessary for an investigator focusing on one position, to specify the other positions which will concern his analysis. Some positions in our society seem at first glance to be associated with only one other position;

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 49.

⁴⁵Theodore M. Newcomb, Social Psychology (New York: Dryden Press, 1951), p. 277.

closer inspection usually reveals they are related to more than one. Whatever the implication of the label, a position cannot be completely described until all of the other positions to which it is related have been specified. Of course a complete specification of relations is a limiting case with which it would be impossible to deal empirically. For a given research problem it may be necessary to take into account only a limited number of counter positions.⁴⁶

Role Expectation

The concept of role expectations is described as the conceptual bridge between social structure and role behavior and as a cognitive concept, the content of which consists of beliefs, expectancies, subjective probabilities, and so on. The units of social structure are positions or statuses (in specialized contexts, jobs and offices). These units are defined in terms of actions and qualities expected of the persons who at any time occupy the position.⁴⁷

Role expectations are comprised of the rights and privileges, the duties and obligations, of any occupant of a social position in relation to persons occupying other positions in the social structure. Role expectations are collections of cognition--beliefs, subjective probabilities, and elements of knowledge--which specify in relation to complementary roles the rights and duties, the appropriate conduct, for persons occupying a particular position. Role expectations operate as imperatives pertaining to a person's conduct and cognitions while he enacts a role. These imperatives, by specifying "how," "should," and "is," ensure that the role enactment will be appropriate.⁴⁸

⁴⁶Gross, Mason and McEachern, op. cit., pp. 50-51.

⁴⁷Gardner Lindzey and Elliott Aronson (eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology, Sec. Ed., Vol. I (Reading, Mass.: Addison, Wesley, 1968), p. 497.

⁴⁸Ibid., pp. 497-498.

To assess role expectations, the same techniques that are used to measure cognitive structures in general are suggested: self reports, for example, with questionnaires and interviews, or inferences from overt behavior. The investigator can ask, for example, "How should a person behave who is a teacher (or father, or daughter, and so on)?" From such a question we may expect to obtain a consistent and integrated view of some respondent's description of the cluster of rights and duties of the social position.⁴⁹

Role Conflict

That an actor sometimes finds himself concurrently in two or more positions requiring contradictory role enactments is a fact well known to readers of comedy and tragedy. Role conflict is the term used to denote this condition.⁵⁰

Two types of role conflict are identified: inter-role conflict and intra-role conflict. The first is due to simultaneous occupancy of two or more positions having incompatible role expectations. This type of role conflict is like the paradigm of motor conflict in which one light signals "go" and another simultaneously signals "stop." Examples of inter-role conflict are numerous. A frequently cited illustration is the "man in the middle," such as the foreman in industry. Another example is the "marginal man" a person who simultaneously belongs to two subcultures but is not fully

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 500.

⁵⁰Lindzey and Aronson, op. cit., p. 540.

accepted by either.⁵¹

The second type of role conflict is called intra-role conflict, because it involves contradictory expectations held by two or more groups of relevant others regarding the same role.⁵² For example, Gross, Mason, and McEachern found for the role of school superintendent that expectations of school board members sometimes conflict with expectations held by teachers.⁵³ In this instance conflict is inherent in the occupancy of the social position of superintendent, because the role behavior expected of the incumbent by one group is contrary to behavior expected of him by another group.⁵⁴

The paraprofessional in service organizations is another example. Tennant and Longest indicated that the paraprofessional is a marginal worker who, as yet, has not been assigned any well-defined place on conventional occupational ladders. He lives, works and operates within a subculture and yet, at the same time, he works with and represents professionals who come from a different subculture. The paraprofessional worker is expected to operate smoothly and efficiently in both subcultures and yet he must be careful not to lean too much toward one of them. If he aligns himself too strongly

⁵¹Ibid.

⁵²Ibid.

⁵³Gross, Mason and McEachern, op. cit., pp. 258-260.

⁵⁴Lindzey and Aronson, op. cit., p. 540.

with the professional, he may do so at expense of rejecting his own subculture, in which case he may come to be viewed by his community as a sort of indigenous "cop out."⁵⁵ On the other hand, if the paraprofessional aligns himself too strongly with the subcommunity, he stands to do so at the risk of incurring hostility and estrangement on the part of professionals and the larger community.

Role ambiguity and conflict for the paraprofessional can also occur when the professional and paraprofessional fail to communicate and negotiate rights, responsibilities, and regulations for the paraprofessional and to make adequate distinctions between professional and paraprofessional positions.⁵⁶

Summary

This review of background information, related literature, and pertinent research consists of eight major sections relating to the study: 1) Recent emergence of the paraprofessional; 2) Roles of the paraprofessional youth worker; 3) Marginality; 4) Role relationship of paraprofessional and professional; 5) Role theory concepts; 6) Position; 7) Role expectation; and 8) Role conflict.

An analysis of the recent emergency of paraprofessionals reveals that during the 1960's a concern was expressed for human service agencies to serve the disadvantaged more adequately. In addition, a simultaneous concern for new manpower development and

⁵⁵Tennant and Longest, op. cit., p. 5.

⁵⁶Ibid., pp. 5-6.

for significant new employment opportunities emerged. The employing of paraprofessionals spoke to these expressed concerns. As reported, the Cooperative Extension Service was one agency challenged to improve services and offer new employment opportunities by employing paraprofessionals.

The reported roles of the paraprofessional youth worker included acting as a two-way transceiver between a human service agency and the client communities. Different types of 4-H paraprofessionals, as described, arranged for youth participation, performed direct subject matter teaching, and assisted in leadership development programs.

While the marginality of paraprofessionals causes social-psychological problems, it is functional for helping link change agencies and their clients. One of the paraprofessional's contributions to the role set is the sharing of marginality with the professional change agent.

New relationships emerge as a result of introducing paraprofessionals into human service agencies. Examples of professional role changes as paraprofessionals become a part of staffing models in a school system and the extension service were reported. Differentiating between the roles of paraprofessionals and professionals may be undertaken through formal job descriptions, but it finally hinges on the interaction between the role mates in a given situation.

An important problem in relationships between professionals and paraprofessionals appears to arise from the distinction between

role definition and role development. A delicate balance seems to be required to provide the specificity (in role definition) that means security along with the flexibility (for role development) that promotes growth. This delicate balance, it appears, must be internal to each role set rather than imposed for all paraprofessionals. Bowman and Klopff suggest that role development is a dynamic of each interaction of a particular professional with a particular paraprofessional within a given structure responding to special needs.

The literature indicates the importance of not only clarifying the roles of the professional and the paraprofessional, but of structuring role sets which can foster role development for both the professionals and the paraprofessionals. An inquiry raised by the literature is what are the factors that relate to the development of role in the various role sets of paraprofessionals and professionals in the Cooperative Extension Service?

Concepts of role theory were discussed to understand more fully the dynamics involved in paraprofessional employment. The basic concept of role is that individuals in social locations behave with reference to expectations. The inquiry suggested is what are the expectations of the 4-H program assistant and how do these expectations influence the role performed.

Position, as a concept of role theory, refers to the location of an actor or class of actors in a system of social relationships. When a researcher focuses on a position, he must realize that such a position has no meaning apart from other positions and that he must be concerned with the other positions related to the subject

of his investigation. As reported, however, a given research problem may require taking into account only a limited number of counter positions.

Role expectation is described as a cognitive concept consisting of beliefs, expectations, and subjective probabilities that bridge between social structure and role behavior. The same techniques used to measure cognitive structure, in general, may be used to assess role expectations. Some techniques suggested were self report techniques such as questionnaires and interviews by the individuals who do the cognitive defining, such as members of any role set. This suggests the importance of an assessment of the role expectation of the 4-H program assistant, at minimum, by the supervising agent.

Inter-role conflict, due to simultaneous occupancy of two or more positions which have incompatible role expectations, was one type of role conflict described; the marginal position of the paraprofessional is likely to afford examples. Another type, intra-role conflict, involves contradictory expectations held by two or more relevant others regarding the same role.

Role conflict and ambiguity for the paraprofessional can occur when there are inadequate distinctions between professional and paraprofessional positions, as when the professional and the paraprofessional fail to communicate and negotiate rights, responsibilities and regulations for the paraprofessional.

Rationale

The literature suggests the importance of analyzing the dynamics of role development involved in the role set of the para-professional and professional. A case for study of such development, and a case worthy of study in its own right, is the situation of the 4-H program assistant in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service. Program assistants have been employed there to fit the local county situation somewhat autonomous of an institutional role definition. The 4-H program assistant has been hired to work with the county 4-H program in various county situations throughout the state ranging from 4-H program assistants "replacing" the resident 4-H professional agent to others joining a multiple 4-H staff of agents and other program assistants.

The literature suggests that with a variety of expectations, responsibilities and settings, roles may develop in various ways in relation to the various circumstances surrounding the role set. What are the dynamics in the role set of the 4-H paraprofessional and professional that may have an influence on the present role of the 4-H program assistant?

To study that question the literature suggested an analysis of the situation along with the expectations and behaviors of the role mates. The following chapter explains the procedures used for the collection and analysis of data for a study which undertook such an analysis.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

As stated in Chapter I, this investigation has attempted to identify the roles of the 4-H paraprofessional youth worker in the Cooperative Extension Service and to analyze basic variables related to those roles in three county 4-H staffing models.

The study is based on the Bowman's and Klopff's theory of role development, its practical application to the utilization and development of paraprofessional youth workers, and the following assumptions: 1) Role can be defined by either one or the other role mate or a combination of the two in the role set. For this study it can be defined in terms of the major responsibilities assigned by the supervising agent, in terms of the tasks performed by the 4-H program assistant or, as is the case in practice, by both of them. 2) Tasks identified by the 4-H program assistants and agents are representative of tasks performed or expected to be performed. 3) Respondents in the study responded objectively to the questions asked in the survey instrument. 4) Some or all of the tasks of professional 4-H agents may be performed by paraprofessionals and this is especially likely to occur when, without a 4-H agent as a role mate, the latter are appointed to 4-H staff positions. 5) In the absence of designated county 4-H professional agents the tasks they would normally perform

may be performed by county extension directors, by other professional extension workers or by paraprofessionals or by some combination of these. 6) The work situation for the program assistant varies in urban and rural counties and with the presence or absence of a resident 4-H agent.

The operational problem in this descriptive study has been to gather data which would: 1) Identify the roles performed by 4-H program assistants and the role expectation for the 4-H program assistants in counties without a resident 4-H youth agent and in those counties with a resident 4-H youth agent. 2) Identify the relevant experiences 4-H program assistants had prior to entering into the Extension Service. 3) Identify selected personal characteristics of the 4-H program assistant. 4) Identify the change, if any, in the supervisor agent's role when one or more 4-H program assistants are added to his/her county extension staff. 5) Identify the 4-H tasks performed by the supervising agent in counties employing 4-H program assistants. 6) Determine the congruence of the role description of 4-H program assistant as identified by 4-H program assistant and supervising agent. 7) Identify who performs the county 4-H professional leadership roles in the various role sets. 8) Identify possible correlations between and with: role type, county type, previous employment experiences, formal schooling, age, employment aspirations, length of employment, and satisfactions related to employment.

Determination of Study Population

Understanding role theory makes it apparent that to assess the role of the paraprofessional youth worker, counter positions must be considered as well. The counter position which relates most directly to the 4-H program assistant's position is the incumbent's direct supervisor.

Data could be collected from the 4-H program assistant's supervisor agent in each of the counties employing 4-H program assistants. The apparent variety in role performance suggested obtaining assessments from as many direct supervisory positions as possible.

Because of the apparent variety of roles 4-H program assistants perform in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, a collection of data from the total population of program assistants would provide a more valid assessment than sampling. Considering the number of potential respondents, 65 program assistants and 50 supervising agents, the variety of data to collect, and the availability of financial support, an appropriate method for collecting data was judged to be a questionnaire.

Development of Survey Instrument

A major function of the survey instrument was to collect data that would indicate the roles 4-H program assistants were performing. After a review of several research techniques and much deliberation with agents and others to determine which technique would most accurately differentiate what a 4-H program assistant was doing in comparison to

agents, the following method was developed. Basically, the approach selected was a forced choice check-list of twenty-two 4-H tasks for each of which the respondents were to indicate the frequency of their own and their role mates' performance.

The selection of tasks was based on several factors:

1) indication from other studies as to tasks 4-H program assistants frequently perform, 2) that tasks selected be representative of a continuum of tasks possible or likely to be performed in a county 4-H program, 3) that tasks selected be representative of the types of roles which might be performed, 4) that list of tasks would contain an adequate number to be representative, but not overwhelming, so respondents would not be discouraged from completing the questionnaire.

A review of two studies¹ provided a preliminary list of tasks 4-H paraprofessionals could be performing. Interviewing 4-H program assistants and agents suggested additional tasks that could make up the job description of a 4-H program assistant. Raw data from a preliminary analysis by Artabasy² of the salary administration system

¹John A. Keisow, "Role Model for the Paraprofessional Youth Worker in the Extension Service," (Ph.D. dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, 1972), p. 3; and Glen H. Krohn, "Aide Utilization in Voluntary Youth Educational Programs," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 1972), pp. 116-117.

²James T. Artabasy, Preliminary Evaluation Analysis of 4-H Program Assistant Salary Administration System, an internal study by the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, Michigan State University, January, 1974.

for the 4-H program assistant in the Michigan Extension Service provided tasks identified by the respondents' own statements in that study.

Tasks were listed on cards and given to 4-H administrators. Administrators were asked to place each task into one of five following groups:

1. Which of these 4-H tasks do you consider to be done only by an agent?
2. Which of these 4-H tasks do you consider to be done more by agent than by 4-H program assistant?
3. Which of these 4-H tasks can be done by either 4-H program assistant or agent?
4. Which of these tasks do you consider to be done more by 4-H program assistant than agent?
5. Which of these tasks do you consider to be done only by a 4-H program assistant?

Tasks were then categorized and a listing made. Since one of the instrumental objectives of the study was to identify the roles the 4-H program assistants were performing, the goal was to provide a continuum of representative 4-H tasks for which respondents could indicate their frequency of performance.

To determine the roles the 4-H program assistant was performing, the questionnaire was designed for the incumbents to indicate how often they performed the selected 4-H tasks by choosing one of four frequencies: Never, Very Seldom, Sometimes, and Often. The questionnaire was further designed so the supervising agent would also indicate on the same four frequency levels his assessment of the frequency with which the 4-H program assistant performed the tasks.

In addition to an assessment of the 4-H program assistant's performance of tasks, a counter-role position, supervising agent, was also of interest in this study. Supervising agents were asked to indicate how often they performed the same selected tasks. The questionnaire was also designed so the 4-H program assistant could identify how often the agent performed the selected tasks. In addition to measuring the 4-H program assistant's understanding of the agent's roles, the program assistant's assessment of the agent's performance of 4-H tasks would also help place 4-H tasks on a continuum. The 4-H agents frequency performance would also help to identify county 4-H professional leadership roles.

Major Responsibilities

To identify roles of 4-H program assistants, role theory concepts suggest a careful examination of the expectations and situations in which the incumbent functions. To measure the institutions role expectation of the 4-H program assistant the questionnaire was designed for the supervising agent to identify the major responsibilities of the 4-H program assistant(s) employed in their county. The listing of representative responsibilities in the survey instrument were identified from 4-H program assistants job descriptions, discussion with program assistants, supervisory agents, and responses given in the Artabasy study. Supervisory agents were asked to indicate from the representative listing of 4-H program assistant responsibilities, the major (30% or more of the total) responsibility(s) they felt 4-H program assistants were assuming in their county.

The responsibilities identified indicated the type of role expected of the 4-H program assistant by the institution as identified by the supervising agent. Listed below are the four role types considered in this study with the appropriate identifying responsibility(s):

Role: Acting 4-H Agent

Responsibility: Coordinate and carry out the total county 4-H program.

Role: Assistant 4-H Agent

Responsibilities: Assist agent by carrying out ongoing tasks of the county 4-H programs; Assist agent in coordination and carrying out county 4-H program.

Role: 4-H Specialist

Responsibilities: Expand the 4-H program in urban areas; Expand 4-H program in certain geographic areas of the county; Expand 4-H program through special program effects.

Role: 4-H Generalist

Responsibilities: Provide more direct contact with people not involved in 4-H; Provide necessary personal contact with volunteers in the 4-H program.

The performance frequency of the 4-H tasks was then analyzed for each of the program assistants according to the expected role as identified by the supervising agent. A display of the findings is presented in Chapter IV. However, an explanation of how the performance frequency score on the 4-H tasks was computed for analysis may be helpful.

Scoring of Respondents
Performance Frequency
of 4-H Tasks

4-H program assistants were asked to indicate how often they perform certain selected 4-H tasks in comparison to all tasks they do. Each 4-H program assistant was asked to respond to a forced choice check list of 22 selected 4-H tasks by indicating their frequency of performance on a four-point scale: Never, Very Seldom, Sometimes, or Often.

Using the same performance frequency scale, agents were asked to indicate how frequently 4-H program assistants employed in the county performed the same 22 tasks.

By placing a number value on each frequency (Never = 1, Very Seldom = 2, Sometimes = 3, Often = 4) an average frequency score was computed for each task by dividing the total score for the task by the number responding.

The performance frequency scores were grouped into five levels on the basis of the following breakdown of scores:

Very High	- 3.50 to 4.00
High	- 3.00 to 3.49
Average	- 2.50 to 2.99
Low	- 2.00 to 2.49
Very Low	- 1.00 to 1.99

A score of 2.00 would indicate the respondents' interpretation of the frequency level in performing a 4-H task as Low. The score of 2.00 would correspond with the "Very Seldom" category on the survey instrument. A score of 4.00 would indicate the respondents' interpretation of the frequency level in performing a 4-H task as Very High.

The score of 4.00 would correspond with the "Often," the highest possible category on the questionnaire.

Design of the Questionnaire for Other Variables

In addition to the above mentioned data, the questionnaire was designed to collect information from the 4-H program assistants regarding their sex, age, length of employment, basis of employment, amount of formal schooling, previous experiences before employment as a 4-H program assistant, employment aspirations, and satisfactions related to employment as a 4-H program assistant.

A brief description of the method used to collect this data may be helpful. The demographic data on age, sex, length and basis of employment as a 4-H program assistant, and amount of formal schooling was obtained by checking the appropriate categories on the survey instrument. A more descriptive statement follows for data collection on previous experiences, employment aspirations and satisfaction.

On the survey instrument program assistants were presented a list of nine statements of experiences they may have had previous to being employed as a 4-H program assistant. The respondents were asked to mark 2 or 3 of those experiences that they thought have been most important to them for their success in working in the 4-H program.

The questionnaire was designed to measure the possible aspirations of the 4-H program assistant. Assessment of this variable was made by grouping responses made by 4-H program assistants to the

question, "What would you like to be doing 5 years from now in relation to employment in the 4-H program?" Responses were coded by their fitting one of the following seven groupings: Be an agent; Same as now; Go back to college; Not be employed in 4-H; Undecided or no response; Be a 4-H Volunteer; and Retired.

As an assessment of satisfaction related to employment as a 4-H program assistant, five questions were asked of respondents. The questions were developed from Taylor and Bowers.³ Assistants were asked to circle the number under the answer that indicated their degree of satisfaction.

	Very dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Fairly satisfied	Very satisfied
1. All in all, how satisfied are you with the Extension staff in your county?	1	2	3	4	5
2. All in all, how satisfied are you with your supervisor?	1	2	3	4	5
3. All in all, how satisfied are you with your job?	1	2	3	4	5
4. All in all, how satisfied are you with Extension as an employer compared to others?	1	2	3	4	5
5. All in all, how satisfied are you with your pay?	1	2	3	4	5

³James C. Taylor and David G. Bowers, Survey of Organizations: A Machine - Scored Standardized Questionnaire Instrument. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1972), p. 166.

Averages of these scores were computed for each item with a score as follows: Very dissatisfied = 1; Somewhat dissatisfied = 2; Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied = 3; Fairly satisfied = 4; Very satisfied = 5.

Grouping of Counties Into Three Types

As indicated before the county situation in which the role set of the paraprofessional and professional work vary which suggests the hypothesis that roles may have developed differently from county to county. Therefore, the forty-three counties in the study have been divided into three groups based on two variables: the 4-H program assistants' supervisor (County Extension Director or Extension 4-H - Youth Agent) and the population of the county. The 18 counties employing 4-H program assistants without a resident Extension 4-H - Youth Agent are county type A. The thirteen urban counties (population of 100,000 or more) which employ 4-H program assistants and have a resident Extension 4-H - Youth Agent are county type B. County type C represents a group of twelve non-urban counties that employ 4-H program assistants and have a resident Extension 4-H - Youth Agent.

County 4-H Effectiveness

As discussed in Chapter I, County 4-H program effectiveness is defined as the assessment of the effectiveness of the county 4-H program by administrators of the Cooperative Extension Service. Eight administrators with supervisory responsibilities for the Cooperative Extension Service program were asked to rate the effectiveness of the

county 4-H program of each of the 43 counties in this study in comparison with other county 4-H programs in the state on a 4-point scale: Superior, Good, Fair and Poor. They were asked to determine a rating for each county on the five following categories:

1. Scope of youth and adult participation in the county 4-H program.
2. Involvement of volunteer leadership in decision making.
3. Support from county government and other support groups.
4. Involvement of participants in meaningful learning experiences.
5. Overall rating of effectiveness of county 4-H program.

From the ratings of the administrators for each county, a score was assigned to each rating on the basis of Superior = 4, Good = 3, Fair = 2, and Poor = 1. On each of the five categories an average score was computed, and each county was placed in one of four ratings for each category as follows:

<u>Score</u>	<u>Rating</u>
4 to 3.5	Superior
3.4 to 2.5	Good
2.4 to 1.5	Fair
1.4 to 1	Poor

Role Change of Agent

As a measure of role change for the agent with the addition of a 4-H program assistant to the staff, agents were asked to indicate from a list of ten 4-H functions how vital each was to their role in

having an effective county 4-H program; 1) before a 4-H program assistant was hired in the county and 2) now, after a program assistant has been hired. Agents indicated how vital each function was to his role by checking one of three forced choice responses: Little, Some, or Very. If a program assistant had been employed in the county before the agent, the agent was instructed to complete only the now section and that data was not figured in the role change calculations.

Scoring of responses was based on assigned numerical values: Little = 1, Some = 2, Very = 3. Responses from each agent for each function were summed and averaged to compute an agent role score for each function for the Before and Now sections. The differences between the Before and Now score of each function is considered as an indication of the agent's role change.

Analysis of 4-H Professional Leadership Role

Who is providing the county's 4-H "professional leadership" role in counties with 4-H youth workers?

As stated in Chapter I, the county 4-H professional leadership role is defined as that combination of tasks that is presumed to require advanced training, knowledge, and experience to manage and direct a county 4-H program. The county 4-H professional leadership role will be identified by the performance frequency level of seven selected 4-H tasks designed to measure this variable.

Seven 4-H tasks were selected by having a panel of 4-H administrators identify from a list of 4-H tasks those they considered should be performed by 4-H agents. The seven tasks which the administrators rated highest were included in final listing of the 22 tasks in the survey instrument and are being considered as the professional leadership tasks of this study.

The seven tasks by task number are as follows:

- 5 - Provide leadership to develop long range plans (2-5 years) for county 4-H programs.
- 8 - Provide leadership to determine resources needed for county 4-H program.
- 16 - Provide overall direction to the county 4-H program.
- 18 - Represent 4-H program to governing boards for determining effectiveness of county program.
- 19 - Plan evaluation methods and procedures for determining effectiveness of county programs.
- 20 - Coordinate total county 4-H program.
- 21 - Administer total county 4-H program.

These seven tasks will be tested along with the other fifteen 4-H tasks considered in this study by analyzing the performance frequency of all the 4-H tasks by the 4-H agents responding in the study.

Summary of Variables Developed in the Questionnaire

The variables considered for this study as mentioned above are: 4-H tasks, major responsibilities, demographic information of program assistants, previous experience, employment aspirations,

employment satisfaction, type of county, county 4-H program effectiveness, role change of agent, and professional 4-H leadership role.

Testing of Questionnaire

The agent and youth workers questionnaires were initially tested with the 4-H Extension staff in Wisconsin. Fifteen Extension 4-H youth agents completed the agent questionnaire and made suggestions for improvement and clarification by responding to an evaluation form. Thirty 4-H staff assistants employed by the Wisconsin Extension Service also completed both the questionnaires and the evaluation forms. As a result of suggestions several questions were revised. In addition, a review of the data indicated several minor changes in wording and rearranging of several questions.

The questionnaires were then tested with three agents and two former 4-H program assistants in Michigan. Several more minor changes were made.

Collection of Data

The final forms of the survey instrument (Program Assistant) were mailed to the 65 employed 4-H program assistants located in 48 counties in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service with a cover letter from the State 4-H Program Director and the author on April 12, 1974. The agent questionnaire was sent on the same day with an accompanying cover letter to an Extension 4-H - youth agent in each of the 29 counties that employed 4-H program assistants and 4-H - youth agents. In 19 counties without a 4-H

agent the questionnaire was sent to the County Extension Director. A copy of both questionnaires and the cover letter appear in the appendix. On April 23, 1974, a reminder letter with a questionnaire was sent to 4-H program assistants and agents who had not yet responded. A reminder phone call was made to the program assistants and agents who had not responded at that time.

All questionnaires were returned by the program assistants and the agents. However, due to lack of complete role sets, the data for this study are taken from survey instruments completed by sixty-two 4-H program assistants, eighteen county extension directors, and twenty-five Extension 4-H - youth agents in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service. This accounted for a total of forty-three complete role sets of a supervisory agent and at least one 4-H program assistant.

The data collected from the questionnaires were coded and transferred to computer coding sheets for key punching. Some of the data were analyzed by inspection while other data were programmed into the CDC 6500 computer at Michigan State University for computation and presentation in Analysis of Contingency Tables and statistical analysis. CISSR DATA Analysis System ACT was the major analysis program used. The chi-square test of significance was used to compute the degree of association between variables at the .05 level of significance. These tables were analyzed to determine the information and knowledge sought for this study.

In this chapter, basic assumptions and the operational problem are outlined. The procedures used in gathering the data with explanations for analyzing the data was given.

The presentation and analysis of the data collected are presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data presented and analyzed in this chapter are organized into the following five parts: Demographic information on 4-H Program Assistants; Identification of Assigned Roles of 4-H Program Assistants; Identification of 4-H Tasks as Performed by 4-H Program Assistants by Expected Roles; Analysis of Roles and Role Relationship by Staffing Patterns; and Correlation of Related Variables with Frequency of Performance of 4-H Tasks.

Part I

Demographic Information on 4-H Program Assistants

Age of Program Assistants

Table 1 shows the age as reported by the incumbents of the 4-H program assistants employed in the Michigan Extension Service at the time of this study. The largest group, 40 percent or 25 program assistants, are in the 22-30 age range. Over 48 percent of the program assistants are 30 years old or younger. Thirty percent of the program assistants are 41 years old or over. In the urban counties, 15 program assistants, who represent 54 percent of the total in urban counties, are 22 to 30 years old.

Table 1. Distribution of 4-H Program Assistants by Age and Type of County in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974.

Age	<u>Type of County</u>				
	Without 4-H Agent N=21 Percent	<u>With 4-H Agent</u>		N	<u>Total</u> Percent
		Urban N=28	Rural N=13		
		Percent	Percent		
18-21 years	10	11	0	5	8
22-30 years	24	54	39	25	40
31-40 years	24	17	23	14	22
41-50 years	28	14	23	12	20
51 and over	14	4	15	6	10
Total	100	100	100	62	100

Sex of Program Assistants

A large majority, 46, or 74 percent of the program assistants are female, as Table 2 reports. In comparing types of counties, 12, or 92 percent females are employed in rural counties as compared to 61 percent in urban counties and 81 percent in counties without 4-H agents.

Length of Employment of 4-H Program Assistants

As Table 3 indicates, 25, or 41 percent of the program assistants have been employed one year or less at the time of this study. Ten, or 16 percent have been employed over three years. There seems to be a rather uniform distribution of the employment experience for program assistants in each of the county groupings, with program assistants in counties without 4-H agents having slightly more experience than the others.

Table 2. Distribution of 4-H Program Assistants by Sex and by Type of County in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974.

Sex	<u>Type of County</u>				<u>Total</u>	
	Without 4-H Agent N=21 Percent	<u>With 4-H Agent</u>				
		Urban N=28 Percent	Rural N=13 Percent			
		N	Percent			
Male	19	39	8	16	26	
Female	81	61	92	46	74	
Total	100	100	100	62	100	

Table 3. Distribution of 4-H Program Assistants by Length of Employment with 4-H Youth Programs and Type of County, Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974.

Experience as 4-H Program Assistants	<u>Type of County</u>		<u>With 4-H Agent</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	Without 4-H Agent N=21 Percent	Urban N=28 Percent	Rural N=13 Percent	N	Percent	
Under 6 mos.	10	7	15	6	10	
6 mos. to 1 year	24	32	39	19	31	
Over 1 year to 2 years	28	21	23	15	24	
Over 2 years to 3 years	19	21	15	12	19	
Over 3 years	19	19	8	10	16	
Total	100	100	100	62	100	

Schooling of 4-H Youth Workers

Four, or 6 percent of the program assistants have not graduated from high school, as reported in Table 4. Sixteen, or 26 percent have

graduated from high school but have not attended college. Three, or 5 percent have attended a vocational or technical school. Nine, or 15 percent of the program assistants have received a bachelor's degree from college, with four others having taken additional courses after receiving a degree. Thirty-nine percent, or 24 program assistants

Table 4. Distribution of 4-H Program Assistants by Highest Level of Schooling Completed and Type of County in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974.

Schooling	<u>Type of County</u>			<u>Total</u>	
	Without 4-H Agent N=21 Percent	<u>With 4-H Agent</u>			
		Urban N=28 Percent	Rural N=13 Percent	N	Percent
Attended high school but did not graduate	9	4	8	4	6
Graduated from high school	33	18	31	16	26
Attended college but did not receive bachelor's degree	33	50	23	24	39
Received bachelor's degree	10	18	15	9	15
Received bachelor's degree plus additional courses	5	6	8	4	6
Received master's degree	5	4	0	2	3
Attended a vocational or technical school	5	0	15	3	5
Total	100	100	100	62	100

have attended college but have not received a degree. Of those 24, 14, or 58 percent are employed in urban counties. This is 50 percent of all urban program assistants.

Experience Working with Youth
Prior to Employment

4-H program assistants were asked to indicate experience they had with youth before being employed as 4-H program assistants. Table 5 displays their responses. Being a 4-H leader and a Sunday School teacher were the most frequent experiences reported with 30, or 48 percent of the program assistants having been 4-H leaders and 28, or 45 percent Sunday School teachers.

Table 5. Experience with Youth Before Employment as Reported by 4-H Program Assistants in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974.

Type of Experience	Program Assistants N=62	
	N	Percent
4-H Leader	30	48
Sunday School Teacher	28	45
Teacher	11	18
Scout Leader	8	13
No experience with youth	2	3
YMCA Volunteer	2	3
YWCA Volunteer	1	2

Table 6 reports the number of 4-H program assistants who have been 4-H leaders in the three county types. In the rural counties without 4-H agents and with 4-H agents, over one-half of the youth

workers have been 4-H leaders; 57 and 77 percent, respectively. Eight, or 29 percent, have had 4-H leadership experience as volunteer 4-H leaders in the urban counties. Since the age of the program assistants in urban counties is lower, they may not have had the opportunity for 4-H volunteer leadership. However, even considering this factor, experience in volunteer 4-H leadership differs very noticeably between the urban and rural county groups.

Table 6. 4-H Leader Experience Prior to Employment by Type of County as Reported by 4-H Program Assistants in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974.

County Type	Number of 4-H Program Assistants		Percentage 4-H Leader Experience
	were 4-H Leaders	were not 4-H Leaders	
Without 4-H Agents	12	9	57
With 4-H Agents - Urban	8	20	29
With 4-H Agents - Rural	10	3	77
Total	30	32	48

Most Helpful Entry
Level Experience

4-H program assistants were asked to indicate from a representative list which of the experiences they had had previous to employment were the most important in helping them be successful. Table 7 displays their responses by type of county. "Worked with youth" was the most frequently marked and was recognized by 29, or 47 percent of the program assistants as most important. "Was a 4-H leader" was an

experience identified as most important for success by 19, or 31 percent of the program assistants. "Worked with groups" was important for 17 program assistants. "Established in the community," and "Recognized as 'leader' in community," were identified by 16 program assistants as important.

Table 7. Entry Level Experiences Identified as Most Helpful for Success as Reported by Program Assistants by Type of County in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974.

Experience	<u>Type of County</u>			<u>Total</u> N	<u>N=62</u> Percent
	Without 4-H Agent N=21 Percent	<u>With 4-H Agent</u>			
		Urban N=28 Percent	Rural N=13 Percent		
Worked with youth	57	46	31	29	47
Was a 4-H leader	33	18	54	19	31
Worked with groups	33	29	15	17	27
Established in community	24	21	38	16	26
Recognized as 'leader' in community	19	25	38	16	26
Worked with adults	29	21	15	14	23
Managed own time	14	21	38	14	23
Had college training	10	14	31	10	16
No preconceived experi- ences to block present performance	10	21	0	8	13

Aspirations of 4-H Program Assistants

When 4-H program assistants were asked what they would like to be doing five years from now in relation to employment in the 4-H program

they responded as reported in Table 8.

Fourteen of the 16 program assistants who would like to be agents, or 88 percent, are employed in urban counties. One-half of the program assistants employed in urban counties indicate they would like to be agents.

Fifteen out of the 21 4-H program assistants, or 71 percent, in counties without a 4-H agent indicate they would like to remain employed in the same way in five years. This compares to 9 of 28, or 32 percent in urban counties and 8 of 13, or 61 percent in rural counties with 4-H youth agents.

Table 8. 4-H Employment Aspirations Five Years From Now as Identified by Program Assistants by Type of County in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974.

Response	<u>Type of County</u>			<u>Total</u>	
	Without	<u>With 4-H Agent</u>			
	4-H Agent	Urban	Rural	N	Percent
	N=21	N=28	N=13		
	Percent	Percent	Percent		
Same as now	71	32	61	32	52
Be an agent	5	50	8	16	26
Undecided or no response	9	7	23	7	11
Be 4-H volunteer	5	4	0	2	3
Not be employed in 4-H	0	7	0	2	3
Retired	5	0	8	2	3
Go back to college	5	0	0	1	2
Total	100	100	100	62	100

Satisfaction of 4-H Program Assistants

An assessment of several items relating to the satisfaction with employment was identified by 4-H program assistants. Chapter III explains in more detail the method of analyzing responses. The range of satisfaction score is from 1, very dissatisfied to 5, very satisfied.

Table 9 shows the rating on each of the five items by type of county. A lower rating of satisfaction for pay at 3.03, is noted for all program assistants and especially for program assistants in counties without 4-H agents, with a rating of 2.62. The satisfaction with the other 4 items for all program assistants range from 4.11 for staff in their county to 4.42 for their supervisor.

Table 9. Program Assistant Satisfaction Levels by Type of County in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974.

Items of Satis- faction With:	<u>Satisfaction Level by Type of County</u>			All Program Assistants
	Without 4-H Agent	<u>With 4-H Agent</u>		
		Urban	Rural	
Extension staff in your county	4.24	3.74	4.56	4.11
Your supervisor	4.48	4.41	4.38	4.42
Your job	4.05	4.22	4.13	4.14
Extension service as an employer	4.15	4.35	4.56	4.34
Your pay	2.62	3.15	3.38	3.03

The program assistants identifying their satisfaction generally above the fairly satisfied level, seems to indicate a group of 4-H

program assistants satisfied with their employment. The literature suggests that the paraprofessionals are sometimes placed in a marginal role, which can generate some conflict and discomfort in their role. It appears that the 4-H program assistant in a marginal role between the professional and 4-H clientele is somewhat satisfied with this role at the cutting edge of the 4-H program.

Part II

Identification of Assigned Roles of 4-H Program Assistants

As indicated from the review of role theory and assumed in this study, roles can be defined in a role set by identifying one role mate's expectation of the other. Another assumption is that roles can be identified by the behavior performed by the individual.

For this study, roles of 4-H program assistants are being defined in terms of the major responsibilities assigned by their role mate, their supervising agent and also defined in terms of the tasks performed by the 4-H program assistant. This section of the findings will deal with the identification of the expected role of the 4-H program assistants by the assigned major responsibilities as reported by the supervising agent in the role set.

The cooperative extension has certain role expectations of the 4-H program assistant. To identify the expected role of the program assistant, supervising agents were asked to indicate the major (30% or more of the total) responsibilities of the 4-H program assistants employed in their county.

Displayed in Table 10 are the assigned major responsibilities of 4-H program assistants as reported by the 43 supervising agents with individual county types. The counties have been grouped as explained in Chapter III on the basis of the presence or absence of a 4-H agent and the population of the county. The two major responsibilities of 4-H program assistants most frequently identified by the supervising agents were "Provide necessary personal contact with volunteers in the program," and "Provide more direct contact with people not involved in 4-H." Twenty-two, or 51 percent and 18, or 42 percent of the agents identified the two responsibilities respectively.

As defined in this study, both of these responsibilities indicate a generalist role expectation to be performed by the program assistants as reported by supervising agents.

"Expand 4-H program through special program efforts," was indicated by 17, or 40 percent of the supervisory agents as a major responsibility for program assistants in their counties. "Expand 4-H program in certain geographic areas of the county," and "Expand 4-H program in urban areas," were identified by 12, or 28 percent and 11, or 26 percent of the agents respectively. These three above mentioned responsibilities indicate by definition of this study an expectation of the 4-H program assistant to perform a specialist role. Of the 11 agents identifying, "Expand 4-H in urban areas," seven are 4-H agents in urban counties.

"Expand 4-H program in all geographic areas in the county," was identified by 16, or 37 percent of the agents as a major

Table 10. Major Responsibilities of 4-H Program Assistants as Assigned by Supervising Agents by Type of County in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974.

Major Responsibility	Type of County							
	Without 4-H Agent. 18 County Extension Directors		Urban Counties 13 4-H Agents		Rural Counties 12 4-H Agents		Total 48 Supervising Agents	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Provide necessary personal contact with 4-H volunteers	13	72	3	23	6	50	22	51
Provide more direct contact with people not involved in 4-H	10	56	3	23	5	42	18	42
Expand 4-H program through special program efforts	8	44	3	23	6	50	17	40
Expand 4-H program in all geographic areas in the county	9	50	3	23	4	33	16	37
Expand 4-H program in certain geographic areas of the county	4	22	4	31	4	33	12	28
Expand 4-H program in urban areas	4	22	7	54	0	0	11	26
Coordinate and carry out the total county 4-H program	10	56	0	0	0	0	10	23
Assist agent in coordinating and carrying out of county 4-H program	4	22	3	23	2	17	9	21
Assist agent in carrying out of ongoing tasks of the county 4-H program	2	11	2	15	2	25	7	16

responsibility for 4-H program assistants in their county. Nine of the 16 supervisory agents are county extension directors in counties without 4-H agents.

Ten, or 23 percent of supervising agents indicate 4-H program assistants are to "Coordinate and carry out the total county 4-H program." All ten of those agents are county extension directors in counties without 4-H agents and as defined by the study they are expecting an acting 4-H agent role to be performed by the 4-H program assistants in their county.

"Assist agent in coordination and carrying out county 4-H program," and "Assist agent in carrying out ongoing tasks of the county 4-H program," were identified by 9, or 21 percent and seven, or 16 percent of the agents as a major responsibility of the program assistant. These two responsibilities indicate an expected role as defined in the study of an assistant agent role of the program assistants.

In counties without 4-H agents, the county extension directors identified on the average about 1 more major responsibility for the 4-H program assistants than did 4-H agents. An average of 3.6 responsibilities were identified by the county extension directors as compared to 2.2 by 4-H agents in urban counties and 2.5 in rural counties. More responsibilities expected by the county extension directors would seem to indicate that 4-H program assistants in counties without 4-H agents are expected to perform apparently more roles than program assistants in counties with 4-H agents.

Summary

In viewing the responsibilities assigned to 4-H program assistants by the supervising agents, there does appear to be indications of some role types emerging. The 4-H generalist role as defined in this study was especially found with 4-H program assistants in counties without 4-H agents. The assigned responsibility of coordinating and carrying out the total county 4-H program was reported by 10 county extension directors and interpreted as an expected acting agent role for program assistants in these counties without 4-H agents.

The 4-H specialist roles were expected to be performed by program assistants in urban counties with special programs and in certain geographic areas of the county. One-half of the 4-H agents in rural counties and 8, or 44 percent of the county extension directors in counties without 4-H agents are expecting 4-H program assistants in their counties to perform a 4-H specialist role with special program efforts.

The assistant agent role was found at the least frequent rate with assigned responsibilities by supervising agents. Less than one-fourth of the agents indicated, by reported major responsibilities, an expected role of the assistant agent role in their county.

Part III

Identification of 4-H Tasks as Performed by 4-H Program Assistants by Expected Roles

The institution has assigned 4-H program assistants various responsibilities with expected roles. What tasks do 4-H program

assistants perform who have been assigned the responsibilities and roles of 4-H specialist, 4-H acting agent, 4-H generalist and 4-H assistant agent? Data to analyze this question were computed as follows: The assigned responsibilities by the supervising agents for each 4-H program assistant were grouped into expected role types as described in Chapter III. The performance frequency of 4-H tasks by the 4-H program assistants were computed by calculating the performance frequency of tasks of program assistants who were assigned the responsibility. The frequency scores for each appropriate responsibility were combined for each role type as explained in a previous section.

In Table 11 are displayed in rank order by role type the performance frequency score and identifying number for each of the 22 4-H tasks as reported performed by the 4-H program assistant. Chapter III describes the procedure of computing performance frequency scores which has a range of 1 to 4, with 4 being highest.

In viewing the data in Table 11 there appears to be 4-H tasks which are reported being performed at different frequency levels with certain expected roles. 4-H program assistants assigned the acting 4-H agent role by supervising agents indicate they are performing task 20, "Coordinate total county 4-H program" at the frequency level of "often," with a frequency score of 4.00 which is the highest ranked task for the acting agent role. In contrast, the ranking of task 20 for the specialist role is nineteenth, assistant agent role, twentieth, and the generalist role, eleventh. Task 16,

Table 11. Rank Order of Performance Frequency Scores (Range is 1-4) of 4-H Tasks by Role Type* as Reported Performed by Sixty-two 4-H Program Assistants in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974.

Ranking	<u>Role Type</u>							
	<u>Specialist</u>		<u>Assistant Agent</u>		<u>Acting Agent</u>		<u>Generalist</u>	
	Task No.	Score	Task No.	Score	Task No.	Score	Task No.	Score
1st	2	3.59	17	3.45	20	4.00	2	3.55
2	3	3.49	2	3.36	14	3.91	15	3.51
3	10	3.44	14	3.30	15	3.82	3	3.43
4	1	3.26	3	3.25	17	3.73	14	3.38
5	11	3.20	15	3.16	16	3.64	1	3.34
6	14	3.16	1	3.14	21	3.64	10	3.34
7	7	3.10	7	3.11	1	3.64	17	3.13
8	6	3.04	10	3.10	2	3.60	22	3.12
9	8	3.04	6	3.09	3	3.55	16	3.05
10	15	3.00	11	3.00	10	3.50	11	3.02
11	17	2.99	22	2.87	22	3.38	20	2.98
12	9	2.95	8	2.70	7	3.36	7	2.96
13	12	2.95	12	2.59	19	3.36	8	2.94
14	13	2.95	19	2.50	8	3.18	12	2.87
15	19	2.66	13	2.49	9	3.18	18	2.85
16	22	2.66	4	2.48	5	3.10	6	2.81
17	4	2.65	5	2.44	12	3.09	9	2.68
18	5	2.64	9	2.41	6	3.00	19	2.68
19	20	2.55	16	2.41	18	2.90	13	2.57
20	16	2.51	20	2.35	11	2.84	21	2.53
21	18	2.44	18	2.21	4	2.55	5	2.47
22	21	2.12	21	2.12	13	1.91	4	2.38

*Role type is identified by the assigned responsibilities by the Program Assistant's Supervising Agent.

"Provide overall direction to the county 4-H program," has a ranking of fifth for the acting agent role as compared to twentieth, nineteenth, and ninth for the specialist, assistant and generalist roles respectively. Task 21, "Administer the total county 4-H program," has a ranking of sixth for the acting agent role as compared with twenty-second, or last, for the specialist and assistant role and twentieth for the generalist role. Task 13, "Work in certain geographical areas of the county rather than total county," was ranked lowest by 4-H program assistants assigned the acting agent role with a performance frequency score of 1.91. The ranking for task 13 for specialist, assistant and generalist roles were fourteenth, fifteenth and nineteenth respectively. An additional observation of the acting agent role is that 4-H program assistants are generally performing the 4-H tasks at a higher frequency performance level than program assistants in other roles.

Tasks performed by 4-H program assistants assigned the specialist role were at somewhat different frequency levels and rankings than with other roles, however, not to the degree of contrast as the acting agent role tasks. Task 11, "Use specific programs to introduce 4-H," was ranked fifth by program assistants in the specialist role as compared with twentieth for the acting agent role and tenth for both the assistant and generalist roles. Task 10, "Promote 4-H programs in low income areas," was ranked third in the specialist role as compared with tenth, eighth and sixth for the acting agent, assistant and generalist roles respectively. Task 17,

"Plan county 4-H activities with 4-H council and committees," is being performed at a lower frequency level, eleventh, by program assistants in the specialist role as compared with first, fourth and seventh for assistant, acting agent and generalist respectively. Task 15, "Work in all geographic areas of the county," was also ranked lower in the specialist role at tenth compared with second, third and fifth for generalist, acting agent and assistant respectively.

Comparing the performance frequency score ranking of tasks in the assistant agent role, indicates one task that seems to differentiate from the others. Task 17, "Plan county 4-H activities with 4-H council and committees," is ranked first by the 4-H program assistants assigned the assistant agent role which compares to a ranking of eleventh, seventh and fourth for specialist, generalist and acting agent roles respectively.

There does not seem to be any 4-H tasks as identified in this study which differentiate the role of generalist from the other three roles. Task 2, "Recruit new 4-H leaders," 3, "Organize new 4-H clubs" and 1, "Visit 4-H leaders in their homes," are ranked in the top five tasks by the 4-H program assistants assigned the generalist role. These three tasks which appear to be frequently performed by the program assistants indicate a close working orientation with clientele which was a differentiating dimension in the definition of the 4-H generalist role.

Summary

There does appear to be a correlation between the assigned responsibilities and expected roles of the 4-H program assistants by

supervising agents and the frequency of performing the 4-H tasks by 4-H program assistants. Most noticeable correlation was found with the acting agent role and 4-H tasks 20, 16, 21, and 13. Tasks 20, 16 and 21 were being performed as reported by the program assistants assigned the acting agent role, at a much higher performance frequency level than 4-H program assistants assigned the specialist, assistant or generalist role. Task 13 was being performed at a lower frequency level by program assistants in the acting agent role.

Program assistants assigned the specialist role ranked tasks 10 and 11 at a higher frequency level ranking than program assistants in the other three roles. The program assistants in the specialist role were performing Tasks 17 and 15 at a lower frequency level than the program assistants in the other three roles. Program assistants assigned the assistant agent role ranked Task 17 at a higher frequency level ranking than the other program assistants in the other three roles. The contrast of difference for the tasks with the specialist role and the assistant role were not as great when compared with the acting agent role.

From the data obtained, none of the frequency performance rankings of 4-H tasks for the generalist role appeared to differentiate from other roles.

There appeared to be generally overlapping of roles expected to be performed by the program assistants as identified by supervising agents. Also the tasks performed indicate an overlap of roles performed by 4-H program assistants. The acting 4-H role seems

to be the most clearly identified role of the four.

Part IV

Analysis of Roles and Role Relationships by Staffing Patterns

The three basic ideas which the review of role theory suggest is that individuals: (1) in social locations; (2) behave; (3) with reference to expectations. This section will focus on the three types of counties to analyze the expectation of the program assistants, the performance of 4-H tasks by program assistants and their supervising agent, and the role relationship between the program assistant and the supervising agent.

Urban Counties with 4-H Agents

Thirteen counties with a population range from approximately 120,000 to 2,700,000 people and with 4-H program assistants and 4-H agents employed, make up the urban county type group for this study. Twenty-eight 4-H program assistants were employed working with the 4-H program in the 13 counties at the time of the study.

For the purpose of this study, the 4-H agent in the county was identified as the program assistant's role mate and supervising agent. In eleven counties where there was only one 4-H agent employed, that person was the respondent. In the two counties employing more than one 4-H agent, the program assistant's supervising agent was identified as the 4-H agent providing county 4-H coordinating leadership. The 4-H activities in urban counties generally involve youth and adults in both urban and rural areas.

Related Variables

Sex and Age of Program Assistants

The distribution of the 4-H program assistants employed in urban counties by their age and sex are displayed in Table 12. Seventeen, or 61 percent of the program assistants employed in the urban counties are women. Nine, or 53 percent of the women identified their age between the range of 22 to 30 years old. Three, or 18 percent of the women reported their age between the range of 31 to 40 with four or 24 percent reported as between the ages of 41 to 50. The other women in the urban counties indicated their age as between 18 and 21 years old.

Eleven, or 39 percent of the program assistants employed in the urban counties were men. Of these eleven, six, or 55 percent reported being in the age range of 22 to 30 years old. Two, or 18 percent reported in the age range of 18 to 21 and 31 to 40 years old respectively. One, or nine percent of the men were over 51 years old.

It appears from the data the program assistants employed in the urban counties are a younger staff with 18 of the 28 program assistants, or 64 percent, 30 years old or less. Another finding of interest is the larger number of men employed in the urban counties with 11, or 39 percent as compared with program assistants employed in the other county types.

Table 12. Distribution of 4-H Program Assistants Employed in Urban Counties by Age and Sex in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974.

AGE	Sex				TOTAL	
	MALE		FEMALE			
	N	%	N	%	N	%
18-21 years old	2	7	1	4	3	11
22-30 years old	6	21	9	32	15	53
31-40 years old	2	7	3	11	5	18
41-50 years old	0	0	4	14	4	14
51 years old & over	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
TOTAL	11	39	17	61	28	100

Length of Employment

Length of employment data indicate that eleven, or 39 percent of program assistants in the urban counties were employed one year or less at the time of this study. Twelve, or 43 percent were employed for over one year and under three years. Five, or 19 percent were employed for over three years.

Formal Schooling

A rather high percentage of the program assistants employed in urban counties had college experience at the time of the study. Twenty-two or 79 percent of the 28 program assistants reported having attended college with seven of these 21 receiving a bachelor's degree and one receiving a master's degree. The other fourteen had attended college but had not received a degree. Five program assistants had graduated from high school and one had not.

Previous Employment Experience

Thirteen or 46 percent of the program assistants employed in urban counties reported that working with youth was most helpful before being employed as a 4-H program assistant in their experience as a 4-H program assistant. Eight, or 29 percent reported working with groups as a most help entry level experience. Only five of the 28, or 18 percent of the program assistants reported volunteer 4-H leader experience as being most helpful.

Employment Aspirations

When 4-H program assistants in urban counties were asked what they would like to be doing five years from now in relation to employment in the 4-H program, one-half of them indicated they would like to be employed in a position similar to a 4-H agent. Nine, or 32 percent indicated they would like to be employed similar to their present employment as a 4-H program assistant. Two, or seven percent indicated they would not want to be employed in 4-H. The large number of program assistants indicating an interest in becoming a 4-H agent is significant. This finding relates to the higher percentage, 79 percent, of program assistants in urban counties who have attended college.

Identification of Advisor

When 4-H program assistants in urban counties were asked to indicate with as many responses as appropriate who they go to for help when they are not sure how to handle a problem, 25, or 86 percent

indicated they go to the 4-H agent in the county. Sixteen, or 57 percent reported going to the county extension director, as did the same number reported going to other 4-H program assistants for advice. This finding seems to support the notion that for 86 percent of the program assistants in urban counties, the 4-H agent is viewed as a helpful role mate in the role set. It also indicates that the county extension directors and other program assistants in the county are a significant others for over one-half of the program assistants.

Role Expectation

Analyzing the role expectations by the institution for the program assistants employed in the urban counties was studied by identifying the responsibilities assigned to the 4-H program assistants. The thirteen 4-H agents have identified a total of 28 major responsibilities for the program assistants in their thirteen counties. The most frequent role as indicated by the responsibilities, appears to be a specialist role assigned to the 4-H program assistant. In Table 13 are listed the major responsibilities of 4-H program assistants as identified by 4-H agents in urban counties.

In the urban counties seven, or 54 percent of the 4-H agents have indicated a role expectation of program assistants to expand the 4-H program in urban areas. The second most frequent responsibilities identified by 4, or 31 percent of 4-H agents in urban counties was expanded 4-H program in certain geographic areas of the county. Both of these responsibilities indicate an expectation of these 4-H

Table 13. Major Responsibilities of 4-H Program Assistants Assigned by the Supervising Agents in Urban Counties with 4-H Agents in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974.

Major Responsibility	Number Identified by 4-H Agents	
	N	%
Expand 4-H program in urban areas	7	54
Expand 4-H program in certain geographic areas of the county	4	31
Provide necessary personal contact with 4-H volunteers	3	23
Provide more direct contact with people not involved in 4-H	3	23
Expand 4-H program through special program efforts	3	23
Expand 4-H program in all geographic areas in the county	3	23
Assist agent in coordination and carrying out county 4-H program	3	23
Assist agent in carrying out of ongoing tasks of the county 4-H program	2	15

program assistants to perform a 4-H specialist role. Also can be noticed a rather uniform distribution of major responsibilities identified in the urban counties. This rather uniformity of responsibilities assigned by 4-H agents of 4-H program assistants in urban areas may indicate more diverse role expectation of the program assistants employed.

Program Assistants' Performance of 4-H Tasks

As indicated earlier, one of the assumptions made in this study was that role can be defined by the identified behavior of an incumbent. The method used to identify behavior of 4-H program assistants in this study has been to collect performance frequency responses on 22 representative 4-H tasks normally performed by some or all 4-H staff in a county 4-H program.

In addition, an analysis of the dynamics in the role set of 4-H program assistants and 4-H agents in urban counties was made by studying the performance frequency levels of 4-H tasks by the 4-H program assistants as well as the supervisory agent. This was done by comparing the self-reported frequency levels of each, as well as a comparison of the identification of the performance frequency of 4-H tasks of the role mate.

As explained in Chapter III, the range of scores for tasks performed is 1 to 4, with 4 being highest.

To aid in communicating the frequency at which the various 4-H tasks were performed by respondents, the performance frequency scores were grouped into five levels of frequency on the basis of the following breakdown of scores:

Very High	- 3.50 to 4.00
High	- 3.00 to 3.49
Average	- 2.50 to 2.99
Low	- 2.00 to 2.49
Very Low	- 1.00 to 1.99

A performance frequency score of 4.00 would correspond with the "often" and highest category on the questionnaire and would be

described with the term Very High.

Listed below are the 22 4-H tasks grouped by the performance frequency levels with the performance frequency score as self reported as being performed by program assistants in urban counties.

Very High

- 3.61 Recruit new 4-H leaders.

High

- 3.43 Organize new 4-H Clubs.
- 3.39 Promote 4-H programs in low income areas.
- 3.21 Visit 4-H leaders in their homes.
- 3.14 Conduct training for 4-H leaders.
- 3.04 Determine training needs for 4-H leaders.
- 3.00 Provide leadership to determine resources needed for county 4-H program.
- 3.00 Use specific programs to introduce 4-H.
- 3.00 Make physical arrangements for major county 4-H activities.

Average

- 2.96 Work in certain geographic areas of the county rather than total county.
- 2.82 Work with other youth serving agencies to develop new programs.
- 2.82 Develop new programs in specific 4-H project area.
- 2.82 Work in all geographic areas of the county.
- 2.73 Free agent time for new program by carrying out traditional routine in 4-H program.
- 2.71 Lead group of 4-H members similar to volunteer leader.
- 2.71 Provide leadership to develop long range plans for county 4-H programs.
- 2.67 Plan county 4-H activities with 4-H council and committees.

Low

- 2.41 Plan evaluation methods and procedures for determining effectiveness of county program.
- 2.30 Represent 4-H program to governing boards.
- 2.26 Coordinate total county 4-H program.
- 2.11 Provide overall direction to the county 4-H program.

Very Low

- 1.70 Administer total county 4-H program.

Five of the six highest ranked 4-H tasks as reported being performed by program assistants are related to working with the primary clientele of the 4-H program, the 4-H leader. Program assistants in the urban counties indicate they are promoting 4-H programs in low income areas at the performance frequency level of High. Seventeen, or 61 percent of the 28 program assistants responded they were performing this task "often," indicating their performance of an urban specialist role.

When comparing the 4-H agents reporting of the performance frequency level of the same 4-H tasks with the program assistants' self reporting, a chi-square analysis found no significant differences at the .05 confidence level for any of the twenty-two 4-H tasks as being identified by the two groups indicating a rather congruent interpretation by the 4-H agents and program assistants. A closer examination of the data for the task, "Coordinate the total county 4-H program," reveals that none of the thirteen 4-H agents reported the program assistants in urban counties performing the "coordinating" task at "often" while five, or 19 percent of the program assistants indicated their performance as "often". This finding could indicate possible role conflict between some 4-H program assistants in urban counties and 4-H agents in the program assistants' involvement in coordinating the 4-H program. With the high percentage of program assistants indicating a desire to become 4-H agents, some may be trying to perform this agent task.

Agent Performance of 4-H Tasks

Listed below are the 4-H agents self-reporting of 21 tasks.

Task 22, "Free agent time for new programs..." was not rated by agents.

Very High

- 4.00 Provide overall direction to the county 4-H program.
- 4.00 Coordinate total county 4-H program.
- 4.00 Administer total county 4-H program.
- 3.92 Plan county 4-H activities with 4-H council and committees.
- 3.92 Work in all geographic areas of the county.
- 3.85 Provide leadership to develop long range plans for county 4-H programs.
- 3.85 Provide leadership to determine resources needed for county 4-H programs.
- 3.69 Determine training needs of 4-H leaders.
- 3.69 Represent 4-H program to governing boards.
- 3.58 Plan evaluation methods and procedures for determining effectiveness of county program.

High

- 3.38 Conduct training for 4-H leaders.
- 3.31 Develop new programs in specific 4-H project area.
- 3.23 Promote 4-H programs in low income areas.
- 3.15 Recruit new 4-H leaders.
- 3.08 Visit 4-H leaders in their homes.
- 3.08 Organize new 4-H clubs.
- 3.00 Work with other youth serving agencies to develop new programs
- 3.00 Use specific programs to introduce 4-H.

Average

- 2.77 Make physical arrangements for major county 4-H activities.

Low

- 2.08 Work in certain geographic areas of the county rather than total county.
- 1.54 Lead group of 4-H members similar to volunteer leader.

4-H agents in urban counties reported performing the group of 4-H tasks at a much higher rate generally than 4-H program assistants.

Included in the task performed at the Very High level by agents are the seven professional 4-H leadership tasks.

When comparing the program assistants reporting of the performance level of the 4-H tasks by 4-H agents with the 4-H agents self reporting, a chi square analysis found three 4-H tasks which were reported differently by the two groups. The three tasks with the calculated chi-square statistical value which is significant at the probability of less than .05 are listed as follows: "Make physical arrangements for major county 4-H activities," 9.00; "Develop new programs in specific 4-H project area," 5.30; and "Determine training needs of 4-H leaders," 4.25. Program assistants rated the first mentioned tasks above as being performed by agents at a higher frequency than did 4-H agents and the other two tasks as lower than 4-H agents. A closer examination of the data regarding the physical arrangement task, indicate that 17, or 63 percent of the program assistants responding indicated 4-H agents were performing the task at "often" as compared with three, or 23 percent of the agents. Possibly this task may not be considered a "proper" task for agents to perform and the agents indicated a lower frequency level of performance. However, their role mate may have reported on the behavior observed and indicated a performance which was at a higher level.

Role Relationship on 4-H Tasks

To compare the relationship between role mates in the role set in regards to performing the twenty-one 4-H tasks, the following procedure was developed.

Each task was designated in one of four categories on the basis of the performance level of the tasks by both the 4-H program assistants and the supervisory 4-H agent, and the difference between the performance frequency score of the agent and program assistants. When there was a difference between the two performance scores on a task of 1.00 or more and at least one of the scores was above 3.00, High, the task was designated either as an Agent Task or Program Assistant Task depending on which had the higher score. If the difference between the agent and program assistants score was less than 1.00 and one score was 3.00 or above, the task was labeled a Shared Task. A task not performed by the program assistant or agent at a level of 3.00 or above was labeled an Infrequent Task.

Using the above system, the tasks, as self-reported by 4-H agents and program assistants in urban counties, were labeled and in rank order by highest score as follows:

Agent Tasks

- Provide overall direction to the county 4-H program.
- Coordinate total county 4-H program.
- Administer total county 4-H program.
- Plan county 4-H activities with 4-H council and committees.
- Work in all geographic areas of the county.
- Provide leadership to develop long range plans for county 4-H programs.
- Represent 4-H program to governing boards.
- Plan evaluation methods and procedures for determining effectiveness of county program.

Program Assistant Tasks

None

Shared Tasks

- Provide leadership to determine resources needed for county 4-H program.
- Determine training needs of 4-H leaders.

- Recruit new 4-H leaders.
- Organize new 4-H clubs.
- Conduct training for 4-H leaders.
- Promote 4-H program in low income areas.
- Develop new program in specific 4-H project areas.
- Visit 4-H leaders in their homes.
- Work with other youth serving agencies to develop new programs.
- Use specific programs to introduce 4-H.
- Make physical arrangements for major county 4-H activities.

Infrequent

- Lead group of 4-H members similar to volunteer leader.
- Work in certain geographic areas of the county rather than total county.

As can be observed by the listings above, the 4-H agents have been identified as performing eight of the 21 tasks at a frequency at least one level of performance (1.00) higher than 4-H program assistants. This finding would seem to indicate that 4-H agents are performing the major 4-H roles between the 4-H agent and 4-H program assistants in urban county 4-H programs. No 4-H tasks were identified as being performed by the program assistant in urban counties at one level of performance higher than 4-H agents.

Eleven 4-H tasks were identified as being shared by the 4-H agents and program assistants. These shared tasks identify an area for potential opportunity for role development. These identified shared tasks also are an area of possible role conflict between the role mates and suggest an area for the development of clear understandings and acceptance of each other's role in the performance of these tasks.

Role Change of the 4-H Agent

As a measure of role change for the agent with the addition of a 4-H program assistant to the staff, agents were asked to indicate from a list of ten 4-H functions how vital each was to their role in having an effective county 4-H program: 1) before a 4-H program assistant was hired in the county, and 2) now, after a program assistant has been hired. Agents indicated how vital each function was to his role by checking one of three forced choice responses: Little, Some, or Very. More details of methodology are explained in Chapter III.

The nine 4-H agents who were employed in urban counties at the time program assistants were hired, indicated their roles had changed as measured by the self-reported importance on the ten selected 4-H functions. The function which changed most as reported by the 4-H agents was the function "Manage, develop and direct the work of employees." On a scale of 1 to 3, with 3 as the highest, 4-H agents indicated the importance of this function "Now" as 2.56 as compared to 1.44 before the first program assistant was hired in the county.

4-H agents in urban counties reported less importance to the function "Conduct educational activities for participants in the 4-H program," which was indicated by an agent role score of 2.78 "Before", and 2.22 "Now". The other eight 4-H functions were reported with less than a .5 difference, indicating little or no change for the other functions by the 4-H agents in urban counties as a group.

Rural Counties with 4-H Agents

Twelve counties with 12 resident 4-H agents employing thirteen 4-H program assistants have been grouped together to be considered for analysis in rural counties section. These twelve counties are located in the lower peninsula of Michigan with a range of county population of approximately 20,000 to 69,000. One 4-H agent resides in each of the twelve counties and that person was identified as the supervising agent in this study.

Related Variables

Length of Employment

Responses from the program assistants in these rural counties indicate that seven, or 54 percent of the 13 program assistants have been employed one year or less at the time of the study. Five, or 38 percent were employed over one year and under three years. One, or 8 percent has been employed over three years.

Formal Schooling

Four, or 31 percent of the program assistants have indicated graduating from high school as their highest level of formal schooling at the time of this study. Six, or 46 percent of the program assistants reported attending college with three receiving a bachelor's degree. Two, or 15 percent of the program assistants indicated attending a vocational or technical school. One program assistant reported not graduating from high school.

Age and Sex

Twelve of the thirteen program assistants employed in the rural counties with 4-H agents were women at the time of the study. The only man employed was in the age range of 22 to 30 years old. One-third of the women employed were in the age range of 22 to 30. One-fourth of the women employed were between the ages of 31-40, and an additional one-fourth between the ages of 41-50. Two were over 51 years old. Thirty-nine percent of the program assistants are 30 years old or younger.

Most Helpful Previous Experience

Ten of the thirteen 4-H program assistants, or 77 percent reported having been a 4-H leader before being employed as 4-H program assistant. When program assistants in these rural counties were asked what were their most helpful experiences prior to employment as a 4-H program assistant, seven, or 54 percent reported their experience as a 4-H leader. The experiences, "Established in the community," "Recognized as a leader in the community," and "Managed own time," were each reported as helpful by five, or 38 percent of the program assistants respectively. "Worked with youth" was reported by 31 percent of program assistants as most helpful.

Employment Aspirations

When 4-H program assistants in these rural counties were asked what they would like to be doing five years from now in relation to employment in the 4-H program, eight, or 61 percent reported they

would like to be employed similar to their present employment as a 4-H program assistant. Three, or 23 percent were undecided or did not respond. One program assistant indicated a desire to be a 4-H agent and one other program assistant indicated he would be retired. The above data on aspirations of the 4-H program assistants in these rural counties indicate an apparent difference in the aspirations of 4-H program assistants with urban counties, especially in regards to becoming a 4-H agent. One of thirteen rural program assistants indicated that interest, as compared to fourteen of twenty-eight employed in urban counties reporting an interest in becoming a 4-H agent.

Identification of Advisor

When 4-H program assistants in these rural counties were asked to indicate, with as many responses as appropriate, who they go to for help with a problem, all thirteen indicated going to the 4-H agent in the county. Eleven, or 85 percent of the program assistants also indicated going to the county extension director. The extension home economist was a person five, or 38 percent of the program assistants indicated going to. Three, or 23 percent of the program assistants indicated going to other program assistants. These findings indicate that for the thirteen program assistants in these counties, the 4-H agent is identified as a person for help and gives support to the notion that the 4-H agent is a close role mate in the role set. The data also indicates that the county extension director is looked upon by a large majority of the program assistants

as a helpful person in the role set.

Role Expectation

What role expectations does the institution have for the thirteen 4-H program assistants in the twelve rural counties with 4-H agents? Analysis of role expectation of program assistant by the institution was done by identifying the assigned responsibility of the 4-H program assistant by the representative of the institution, the supervising agent. The 4-H agent, as the institutional representative in the role set, assigned responsibilities as reported in Table 14.

Table 14. Major Responsibilities of 4-H Program Assistants as Assigned by the Supervising Agents in Rural Counties with 4-H Agents in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974.

Major Responsibility	<u>Number Identified by</u> <u>4-H Agents</u> <u>N=12</u>	
	N	%
Provide necessary personal contact with volunteers in the 4-H program	6	50
Expand 4-H program through special program efforts	6	50
Provide more direct contact with people not involved in 4-H	5	42
Expand 4-H program in all geographic areas in the county	4	33
Expand 4-H program in certain geographic areas of the county	4	33
Assist agent in carrying out ongoing tasks of county 4-H program	2	17
Assist agent in coordination and carrying out county 4-H program	2	17

In rural counties six, or 50 percent of 4-H agents have indicated that 4-H program assistants in their counties are to provide necessary contact with volunteers. "Expand the 4-H program through special program effort," was reported a major responsibility for program assistants in six of the counties. Five or 42 percent are expected to provide more direct contact with people not involved in 4-H. Four, or 33 percent of 4-H agents indicated the following two responsibilities: "Expand 4-H program in all geographic areas in the county," and "Expand 4-H program in certain geographic areas of the county."

The twelve 4-H agents in these counties identified a total of 29 major responsibilities for the 4-H program assistant employed in their counties which is an average of 2.5 major responsibilities per agent. The major responsibilities as reported by six 4-H agents indicate an expected generalist role to be performed by the 4-H program assistants in those counties. Program assistants employed in counties with the six 4-H agents who have identified the responsibility to expand 4-H programs through special program efforts are expected to perform a program specialist role.

With some of these expectations of the institution on the 4-H program assistants, the next question is what roles are they performing? To answer this question we will look at some of the representative 4-H tasks 4-H program assistants are performing.

In addition, an analysis of the role relationship of performing the various tasks in this role set will be conducted.

Program Assistant's Performance
of 4-H Tasks

As a means of communicating the performance frequency of the 4-H tasks, the twenty-two 4-H tasks are listed in rank order beginning with the highest performance frequency score. The frequency score with a possible range of 1 to 4, with 4 as highest, gives an indication of the average performance frequency by the respondents for each task. A 4.00 corresponds to an "often" as the highest frequency level marked by the respondents. Chapter III explains in more detail the score procedure.

Listed below are the twenty-two 4-H tasks as self-reported being performed by 4-H program assistants in rural counties with 4-H agents:

High

- 3.38 Recruit new 4-H leaders.
- 3.38 Work in all geographic areas of the county.
- 3.38 Plan county 4-H activities with 4-H council and committees.
- 3.23 Visit 4-H leaders in their homes.
- 3.15 Promote 4-H programs in low income areas.
- 3.08 Make physical arrangements for major county 4-H activities.
- 3.08 Organize new 4-H clubs.
- 3.00 Free agent time for new programs by carrying out traditional routine in 4-H programs.
- 3.00 Use specific programs to introduce 4-H.

Average

- 2.92 Determine training needs of 4-H leaders.
- 2.77 Lead group of 4-H members similar to volunteer leader.
- 2.77 Develop new programs in specific 4-H project areas.
- 2.69 Conduct training 4-H leaders.
- 2.69 Work in certain geographic areas of county rather than total county.
- 2.54 Provide leadership to determine resources needed for county programs.

- 2.54 Plan evaluation methods and procedures for determining effectiveness of county programs.

Low

- 2.46 Provide overall direction to county 4-H program.
 2.15 Work with other youth serving agencies to develop new programs.
 2.00 Provide leadership in developing long range plans for county 4-H program.
 2.00 Coordinate the total county 4-H program.

Very Low

- 1.92 Represent 4-H programs to governing boards.
 1.83 Administer the total county 4-H program.

It can be observed that there were no 4-H tasks performed at the Very High level as reported by the group of program assistants in rural counties with 4-H agents.

Two 4-H tasks, "Recruit new 4-H leaders," and "Visit 4-H leaders in their homes," have been ranked in the top four tasks in the performance frequency level of High by the self-reported frequency performance of the program assistants. Six, or 46 percent and 4, or 31 percent of the thirteen program assistants indicate they performed the two respective tasks at the level "often." This finding corresponds with the expected generalist role of the program assistants in these urban counties. The task, "Use specific programs to introduce 4-H," was reported by four, or 31 percent of the program assistants in these counties as being performed "often" indicating a specialist role being performed.

When comparing the 4-H agents reporting of the performance frequency level of the same 4-H tasks by the program assistants with the program assistants self-reporting, a chi-square analysis found

no significant differences at the .05 confidence level for any of the twenty-two 4-H tasks as being identified as performed differently between the two groups. This indicates an apparent congruent interpretation between the self-reported program assistants tasks and the 4-H agents reporting.

Agent's Performance of 4-H Tasks

The 4-H agents reported their own performance frequency level on twenty-one of the twenty-two tasks. One task, "Free agent time..." was not rated by agents. The twenty-one tasks are listed below by performance frequency score and grouping.

As is obviously noted by the listing of self-reported 4-H agent tasks, the 4-H agents in rural counties are performing as a group the 4-H tasks at a much higher frequency level than the 4-H program assistants.

Very High

- 4.00 Provide overall direction to the county 4-H programs.
- 4.00 Administer total county 4-H program.
- 3.92 Coordinate total county 4-H program.
- 3.92 Plan county 4-H activities with 4-H council and committees.
- 3.83 Provide leadership to determine resources needed for county 4-H program.
- 3.83 Work in all geographic areas of the county.
- 3.75 Represent 4-H program to governing boards.
- 3.75 Provide leadership to develop long range plans for county 4-H program.
- 3.58 Determine training needs of 4-H leaders.
- 3.50 Plan evaluation methods and procedures for determining effectiveness of county program.

High

- 3.45 Recruit new 4-H leaders.
- 3.42 Conduct training of 4-H leaders.

- 3.36 Organize new 4-H clubs.
- 3.25 Visit 4-H leaders in their home.
- 3.17 Develop new programs in specific 4-H project area.
- 3.09 Work with youth serving agencies to develop new programs.
- 3.08 Promote 4-H programs in low income areas.
- 3.08 Make physical arrangements for major county 4-H activities.
- 3.08 Use specific programs to introduce 4-H.

Average

- 2.55 Work in certain geographic areas of county rather than total county.

Low

- 2.00 Lead group of 4-H members similar to volunteer leader.

Ten of the 4-H tasks are reported as being performed by the 4-H agents at the Very High level and nine at the High level. All seven of the professional 4-H leadership tasks are being performed at the Very High level by 4-H agents in rural counties. In other words, all but two of the selected twenty-one 4-H tasks are being performed by the 4-H agents at a High or above frequency level, indicating the major 4-H role 4-H agents are performing.

When comparing the program assistants reporting of the performance level of the 4-H tasks by 4-H agents with the 4-H agents self-reporting, the chi-square analysis found two 4-H tasks which were reported differently by the two groups. The two tasks with the calculated chi-square statistical value which is significant at the probability level of less than .05 are listed as follows:

Provide leadership to determine resources needed for county 4-H program - 4.26.

Make physical arrangements for major county 4-H activities - 4.02.

Agents rated the former task higher and the latter task lower than program assistants. A closer examination of the data regarding the latter task of making arrangements for 4-H activities show that five 4-H agents reported performing the tasks "often" as compared to ten 4-H program assistants who reported the 4-H agent at the "often" level. This discrepancy of role description of the 4-H agent on this same task was found with 4-H staff in the urban counties also. As pointed out in that analysis, this task may be a task agents do not see as appropriate for themselves to perform and have indicated a lower frequency level. However, the program assistants may have reported what they see and, therefore, have indicated the 4-H agents do perform this task at a higher level than they have reported.

Role Relationship on 4-H Tasks

When comparing the performance frequencies of 4-H tasks as self reported by the 4-H agents and 4-H program assistants for each of the twenty-one tasks they perform with the system of differentiation of tasks as explained previously, the tasks in rural counties sort out into the following listing:

Agent Tasks

- 5 Provide leadership to develop long range plans (2-5 years) for county 4-H programs.
- 8 Provide leadership to determine resources needed for county 4-H program.
- 16 Provide overall program direction to the county 4-H program.
- 18 Represent 4-H program to governing boards.
- 20 Coordinate total county 4-H program.
- 21 Administer total county 4-H program.

Program Assistants Tasks

None

Shared Tasks

- 1 Visit 4-H leaders in their homes.
- 2 Recruit new 4-H leaders.
- 3 Organize new 4-H clubs.
- 7 Determine training needs of 4-H leaders.
- 10 Promote 4-H programs in low income areas.
- 14 Make physical arrangements for major county 4-H activities.
- 15 Work in all geographic areas of the county.
- 17 Plan county 4-H activities with 4-H council and committees.
- 6 Conduct training for 4-H leaders.
- 9 Work with other youth serving agencies to develop new programs.
- 11 Use specific programs to introduce 4-H.
- 12 Develop new program in specific 4-H project area.
- 19 Plan evaluation methods and procedures for determining effectiveness of the county program.

Infrequent Tasks

- 4 Lead group of 4-H members similar to volunteer leader.
- 13 Work in certain geographic areas of the county rather than total county.

As can be observed by referring to the listing of tasks above, the 4-H agents in rural counties have been identified as performing six of the twenty-one tasks at least one level of frequency higher (1.00) than the program assistants. No 4-H tasks were found to be performed by 4-H program assistants at a frequency level above the 4-H agents. These findings indicate that 4-H agents are performing the major 4-H roles between the 4-H agent and program assistant in rural counties.

Thirteen of the twenty-one tasks have shared performance between the 4-H agents and program assistants. Two of the tasks are reported by both the 4-H agents and the program assistants as a group

as being performed at below the 3.00 frequency score.

Role Change of the 4-H Agent

The eight 4-H agents in rural counties who were employed at the time of program assistants being hired indicated that their role, as measured by the self-reported importance on 10 selected 4-H functions, has changed. The function 4-H agents indicated the most changed since hiring 4-H program assistants was "Manage, develop and direct the work of employees." On a scale of 1 to 3, with 3 being high, agents indicated the importance of this function "Now" as 2.63 compared to 1.38 before the first program assistant was hired in the county.

4-H agents indicated less importance to their role to functions, "Identify and recruit volunteer 4-H leaders," and "Recruit new members" with an agent role score of 2.88 and 3.00 to 2.25 and 2.38 respectively. The other seven functions were reported with less than a .5 difference indicating little or slight change for these functions by the agents as a group.

Counties Without 4-H Agents

Eighteen counties employing twenty-one 4-H program assistants without a resident 4-H agent are grouped together for analysis in this section. Nine of these counties are located in the northern portion of the Lower Peninsula of Michigan and nine in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. The counties have generally rural populations with the range of population from approximately 5,700 to 36,000. The county

extension director in each of the eighteen counties was identified as the supervisory agent for the study.

Previous to 4-H program assistants being employed in these counties, 4-H agents were employed on an area basis with two to three counties in their area of responsibility. With the positive experiences of employment of 4-H program assistants in the southern part of Michigan, the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service decided to employ 4-H program assistants in these less populated counties. Starting in 1970 as 4-H agents left employment, funds previously used for agents' salaries were used to hire program assistants in the same counties. Since that time funds from other open 4-H positions have been used to hire 4-H program assistants in approximately eleven counties in Michigan at the time of the study.

Related Variables

Length of Employment

Responses from the program assistants in these rural counties indicate that seven, or 33 percent of the twenty-one program assistants have been employed one year or less at the time of the study. Ten, or 48 percent have been employed for over one year and up to three years. Four, or 19 percent of the program assistants in these counties without a resident 4-H agent have been employed over three years.

Formal Schooling

Eleven, or 53 percent of the program assistants in counties without 4-H agents indicated they had attended college at the time of

the study. Of these eleven program assistants, three reported receiving a bachelor's degree and one reported receiving a master's degree. Seven, or 33 percent of the program assistants in these counties reported graduating from high school as their highest level of formal education. Two indicated they had not graduated from high school.

Sex and Age of Program Assistants

Seventeen, or 81 percent of the twenty-one program assistants in counties with 4-H agents are female. Ten, or 59 percent of the 17 women report their age as being between the ages of 31 and 50 years old. Six, or 35 percent of the seventeen women reported their ages as 30 years old or under. Five, or 29 percent reported their age in the range of 41 to 50 years old. The four men which make up 19 percent of the program assistants population in these counties as a group are not as young as the women. Two, or 50 percent of the men reported their age as 51 years old or older and one other in the range of 41 to 50 years old. The fourth man reported his age in the range of 22 to 30. Seven, or 34 percent of the program assistants are under 31 years of age.

Previous Employment Experiences

Twelve, or 57 percent of the 4-H program assistants in counties without 4-H agents reported having been 4-H leaders prior to employment as a 4-H program assistant. When program assistants in these counties were asked what were their most helpful experiences

prior to employment in the 4-H program, seven, or 33 percent reported their experiences as a volunteer 4-H leader. Fifty-seven percent, or 12 of the program assistants in these counties reported working with youth as a most helpful experience. A third of the program assistants identified their previous working with groups as a most helpful experience for their role as a 4-H program assistant.

Employment Aspirations

When 4-H program assistants in the counties without 4-H agents were asked what they would like to be doing five years from now in relation to employment in the 4-H program, 15 of the 21, or 71 percent reported they would like to be employed similar to their present employment. Two were undecided or did not respond. One indicated wanting to be a 4-H agent, another indicated being a 4-H volunteer. Still one other indicated going back to college and one other planned to retire.

These findings seem to indicate that about three-fourths of program assistants in counties without 4-H agents are interested in continuing as a 4-H program assistant. Aspirations of program assistants in these counties correspond rather closely with program assistants in rural counties with 4-H agents. The most noticeable contrast in employment aspirations is found between the program assistants in urban counties and the program assistants in rural counties. One-half of the program assistants in urban counties report aspiring to be an agent.

Identification of Advisor

Program assistants who were employed in counties without 4-H agents were asked to indicate with as many responses as appropriate, who they go to for advice when they have a problem. Nineteen of the 21, or 90 percent indicated going to the county extension director. Nine, or 43 percent of the program assistants indicated going to other 4-H program assistants for help. The 4-H agents in the area were also called upon for assistance by nine, or 43 percent of the program assistants. Six, or 29 percent of program assistants indicated going to the district 4-H leader. The extension home economists were also contacted for help, as reported by 6 of the program assistants in counties without 4-H agents. The data seem to indicate that a high number of program assistants in the counties without 4-H agents, go to the county extension director for assistance and apparently more so than to any other staff. This could be due to the lack of potential opportunity to go to other staff as compared to counties which employ both a 4-H agent and program assistants.

Role Expectation

What role expectations does the institution have for the twenty-one 4-H program assistants in the nineteen counties without 4-H agents? As explained earlier, the supervising agent of 4-H program assistant in these counties, the county extension director was asked to identify the major responsibilities of the 4-H program assistants in the county. From these assigned responsibilities the expected role is identified.

Table 15. Major Responsibilities of 4-H Program Assistants as Assigned by the Supervising Agents in Counties Without 4-H Agents in Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974

Major Responsibilities	Number Identified by County Extension Director N=18	
	N	%
Provide necessary personal contact with volunteers in 4-H program	13	72
Provide more direct contact with people not involved in 4-H	10	56
Coordinate and carry out the total county 4-H program	10	56
Expand 4-H in all geographic areas in county	9	50
Expand 4-H program through special program efforts	8	44
Expand 4-H program in certain geographic areas of county	4	22
Expand 4-H program in urban areas	4	22
Assist agent in coordination and carrying out county 4-H program	4	22
Assist agent in carrying out ongoing tasks of county 4-H program	2	11

As shown in Table 15, thirteen county extension directors, or 72 percent have indicated 4-H program assistants in counties without 4-H agents are to provide necessary personal contact with volunteers in the 4-H program. Ten, or 56 percent of the agents also reported that 4-H program assistants have the responsibility to provide more direct contact with people not in 4-H. These 4-H program assistants as identified by the responsibilities assigned are expected to perform a county 4-H generalist role. Another major responsibility assigned to the 4-H

program assistants by the county extension director is "Coordinating and carrying out the total county 4-H program." Ten, or 56 percent of the county extension directors have indicated an expected role of acting 4-H agent for the program assistants in those ten counties without 4-H agents. One-half of the supervising agents expect 4-H program assistants to expand the 4-H program in all areas of the county. Eight, or 44 percent of the county extension directors are expecting 4-H program assistants to expand 4-H programs through special program efforts, which indicates an expected program specialist role for program assistants in these eight counties.

County extension directors have identified approximately 3.6 responsibilities for each county which is about one more responsibility per county than reported by 4-H agents in other counties. Without a 4-H agent in the county it appears the county extension directors in many of the counties are expecting 4-H program assistants to assume more 4-H responsibilities and some to assume an acting 4-H agent role.

Program Assistant's Performance of 4-H Tasks

With these expectations of the institution on the 4-H program assistant, what roles are they performing? To answer this question, we will look at the tasks the 4-H program assistants are performing. Listed below are the frequency levels of 4-H tasks as reported by the program assistants in counties without 4-H agents. The tasks are in rank order listed on the basis of the performance frequency scores and are grouped by frequency levels as follows:

Very High

- 3.80 Work in all geographic areas of county.
- 3.75 Coordinate total county 4-H program.
- 3.74 Make physical arrangements for major county 4-H activities.
- 3.60 Provide overall direction to the county 4-H program.
- 3.60 Plan county 4-H activities with 4-H council and committees.
- 3.53 Recruit new 4-H leaders.

High

- 3.47 Free agent time for new program by carrying out traditional routine in 4-H program.
- 3.43 Visit 4-H leaders in their homes.
- 3.43 Organize new 4-H clubs.
- 3.35 Administer total county 4-H program.
- 3.24 Provide leadership to determine resources needed for the county 4-H program.
- 3.20 Promote 4-H programs in low income areas.
- 3.15 Determine training needs of 4-H leaders.
- 3.15 Use specific programs to introduce 4-H.
- 3.15 Plan evaluation methods and procedures for determining effectiveness of the county program.

Average

- 2.95 Work with other youth serving agencies to develop new programs.
- 2.85 Conduct training for 4-H leaders.
- 2.85 Develop new program in specific 4-H project areas.
- 2.70 Provide leadership to develop long range plans (2-5 years) for the county 4-H programs.
- 2.68 Represent 4-H program to governing boards.

Low

- 2.32 Lead group of 4-H members similar to volunteer leader.
- 2.25 Work in certain geographic areas of the county rather than total county.

Program assistants without a resident 4-H agent in the role set, perform as indicated by the responses of the program assistants, many of the 4-H tasks at a higher level than program assistants in the counties with 4-H agents. Six tasks are being performed at the Very High frequency level with nine more tasks being performed at the High level.

The data indicate that many of the 4-H tasks which are being performed by the 4-H agents at a High or above level are likewise being performed by the program assistants in counties without 4-H agents.

When comparing the county extension directors reporting of the performance frequency level of the 4-H tasks by the program assistants self-reporting, a chi-square analysis found no significant differences between the two groups at the .05 confidence level for any of the twenty-two 4-H tasks.

On this basis there appears to be a high congruence between the role mates in the counties without 4-H agents in regards to the performance of 4-H tasks by 4-H program assistants just as was found in the other two role sets.

Comparison of Program Assistant's and
Rural 4-H Agent's Frequency Level on
Twenty-One 4-H Tasks

A comparison of the 4-H program assistants self-reported performance frequency scores employed in counties without 4-H agents was made with the 4-H agents self-reported performance frequency scores in rural counties.

A chi-square analysis found six of the 4-H tasks, as being performed significantly different by the two groups at the .05 confidence level.

The other 15 tasks were rated by both the 4-H program assistants in counties without 4-H agents and the 4-H agents in rural

counties as being performed very similar in level of performance. This comparison indicates that for these fifteen tasks, the program assistants in counties without 4-H agents are performing essentially the same tasks as frequently as the 4-H agent in rural counties. This finding would seem to indicate that the roles of the 4-H program assistants in counties without 4-H agents as a group are very similar to the 4-H agents in rural counties on the fifteen tasks.

The six tasks with the calculated chi-square statistical value which is significant at the probability of less than .05 are listed as follows:

- Represent 4-H program to governing boards. 11.10
- Provide leadership to develop long range plans for the county 4-H programs. 8.62
- Make physical arrangements for major county 4-H activities. 5.67
- Provide leadership to determine resources needed for county 4-H programs. 5.43
- Provide overall direction to the county 4-H programs. 5.17
- Administer the total county 4-H programs. 5.12

Five of the six tasks were found to be performed at a higher frequency by the rural 4-H agents than the program assistants employed in counties without 4-H agents. The task, "Make physical arrangements...", was found being performed at a higher level by the program assistants.

Agent's Performance of 4-H Tasks

The county extension directors self-reported performance frequency scores on the 4-H tasks are listed below by frequency levels as follows:

Very High

- 3.67 Represent 4-H programs to governing boards.

High

- 3.39 Provide leadership to determine resources needed for county 4-H program.
- 3.39 Provide overall direction to the county 4-H program.
- 3.28 Provide leadership to develop long range plans for county 4-H program.
- 3.28 Plan evaluation methods and procedures for determining effectiveness of county program.
- 3.22 Administer total county 4-H program.
- 3.11 Coordinate total county 4-H program.

Average

- 2.89 Work in all geographic areas of the county.
- 2.88 Determine training needs of 4-H leaders.
- 2.83 Promote 4-H programs in low income areas.
- 2.67 Plan county 4-H activities with 4-H council and committees.
- 2.61 Work with other youth serving agencies to develop new programs.
- 2.56 Conduct training for 4-H leaders.
- 2.50 Recruit new 4-H leaders.

Low

- 2.33 Make physical arrangements for major county 4-H activities.
- 2.22 Visit 4-H leaders in their homes.
- 2.22 Develop new programs in specific 4-H project area.
- 2.11 Use specific programs to introduce 4-H.
- 2.00 Work in certain geographic areas of county rather than total county.

Very Low

- 1.78 Organize new 4-H clubs.
- 1.28 Lead group of 4-H members similar to volunteer leader.

County extension directors are performing seven of the 4-H tasks at a level of High or above. The tasks the county extension directors are performing at this level appear to be more of the administration or organization type, rather than the tasks which involve direct contact with 4-H leaders and members. This finding

corresponds to the normal expected role of the county extension director whose major role is to provide the overall administration leadership of the County Extension Service program.

When comparing the 4-H program assistants' interpretation of the frequency with which the county directors report they perform the twenty-one tasks, the most noticeable lack of congruence was found for any two matched reportings of role mates. A chi-square analysis found significant differences at the .05 confidence level on five of the tasks as reported by the two groups.

The 4-H program assistants rated the five tasks lower as compared to agents self-reported rating. Interestingly, the five tasks were the five tasks the agents had rated the highest.

The five tasks with the calculated chi-square statistical value are listed as follows:

- Provide leadership to develop long range plans for the county 4-H program. 7.17
- Represent 4-H programs to governing boards. 7.50
- Plan evaluation methods and procedures for determining effectiveness of the county 4-H program. 6.04
- Provide leadership to determine resources needed for county 4-H program. 5.23
- Provide overall direction to the county 4-H program. 5.33

The data seem to indicate that 4-H program assistants see the county extension directors in these counties as performing a less active role in the 4-H program than what the county directors have reported. Several factors may be involved with this interaction. Expectation of the program assistants to perform the acting 4-H agent role may influence the program assistants perception of someone else's performing these same tasks, and therefore do not see or report the

county extension director as performing them. On the other hand, the county extension director, as the administrator of the county extension program, is somewhat responsible and has certain expectations to perform these tasks at a higher level. They then may have marked their frequency of performing these tasks with this in mind.

Role Relationship on 4-H Tasks

The relationship between the role mates in the role set regarding the performance of the twenty-one 4-H tasks, was identified by comparing the performance score for each task by the self-reported score of program assistants and county extension directors. Using the system previously described, the twenty-one tasks were placed in the four groupings as follows:

Agent Tasks

None

Program Assistant Tasks

- 1 Visit 4-H leaders in their home.
- 3 Organize new 4-H clubs.
- 14 Make physical arrangements for major county 4-H activities.
- 11 Use specific programs to introduce 4-H.

Shared Tasks

- 2 Recruit new 4-H leaders.
- 5 Provide leadership to develop long range plans (2-5 years) for the county 4-H programs.
- 7 Determine training needs of 4-H leaders.
- 8 Provide leadership to determine resources needed for county 4-H program.
- 10 Promote 4-H programs in low income areas.
- 15 Work in all geographic areas of the county.
- 16 Provide overall direction to the county 4-H program.
- 17 Plan county 4-H activities with 4-H council and committees.
- 18 Represent 4-H program to governing boards.

- 19 Plan evaluation methods and procedures for determining effectiveness of the county program.
- 20 Coordinate total county 4-H programs.
- 21 Administer total county 4-H programs.

Infrequent Tasks

- 4 Lead group of 4-H members similar to volunteer leader.
- 6 Conduct training for 4-H leaders.
- 9 Work with other youth serving agencies to develop new programs.
- 12 Develop new program in specific 4-H projects.
- 13 Work in certain geographic areas of the county rather than total county.

None of the tasks were designed as agent tasks. Four 4-H tasks were identified as performed primarily by 4-H program assistants in counties without 4-H agents. This is the only county situation where 4-H program assistants' tasks ever identified. This finding corresponds with the expected role of acting 4-H agent for program assistants in these counties.

Twelve of the 4-H tasks were identified as tasks shared by both the 4-H program assistants and the county extension directors. The five tasks indicated earlier that were reported by role mates as being performed differently by the county extension directors are included in the shared tasks. This finding could be an indication for potential conflict between the role mates.

Five tasks are indicated as being performed at an infrequent level in these counties without 4-H agents. A question raised by this data is, does the performance of these tasks have an influence on the effectiveness of the county 4-H program? "Conduct training for 4-H leaders" has been a task performed at a High level or above by 4-H staff in other counties.

Role Change of County
Extension Director

The fourteen county extension directors who were employed in counties without 4-H agents at the time of this study and were employed before 4-H program assistants were hired in the county, indicated some role change. However, it was found less than that found with 4-H agents.

County extension directors, as measured by the self reported importance of ten 4-H functions, indicated less importance to two functions, "Identify and recruit volunteer 4-H leaders," and "Recruit new members," with agent role scores of "Before" as 2.43 and 2.36 and scores of "Now" as 1.79 and 1.85 respectively.

The other eight 4-H functions were reported with less than a .5 difference in role score, indicating little or no change for these functions by the county extension directors as a group.

The function which county extension directors have reported as being least important to their role in having an effective county 4-H program since program assistants were hired is, "Train volunteer 4-H leaders." It has an agent role score of 1.54. This finding corresponds with the frequency with which the county extension directors have reported performing the 4-H tasks, "Conduct training for a 4-H leader." The lack of supervising agents giving leadership to conducting training for leaders, as well as 4-H program assistants, reported frequency at the average level for the training of 4-H leaders indicates a possible void area of 4-H staff leadership in counties without 4-H agents.

Summary of Role Set Analysis

As was observed in the preceding role set analysis, 4-H program assistants in the three role sets perform the 4-H tasks at different frequencies. A comparison of the self-reported frequencies of the 4-H tasks as reported by program assistants was made on the basis of the type of county employed. The chi-square analysis found eight of the twenty-two 4-H tasks reported differently performed by the three groups of program assistants.

The eight tasks with the calculated chi-square statistical value which is significant at the probability of less than .05 are listed as follows:

- Coordinate total county 4-H program. 24.92
- Provide overall direction to the county 4-H program. 21.93
- Administer total county 4-H program. 21.36
- Plan county 4-H activities with 4-H council and committees. 14.09
- Work in all geographic areas of the county. 13.92
- Make physical arrangements for major county 4-H activities. 12.34
- Plan evaluation methods and procedures for determining effectiveness of county program. 9.12
- Work with other youth serving agencies to develop new programs. 6.67

All of the eight tasks were found being performed at a higher level by the 4-H program assistants in counties without 4-H agents than program assistants in urban and rural counties with 4-H agents.

Performance of Professional Leadership Tasks

Seven 4-H tasks were identified by 4-H Administrators as 4-H professional leadership tasks, as explained in Chapter III. The seven tasks are:

- 5 - Provide leadership to develop long range plans (2-5 years) for county 4-H programs.
- 8 - Provide leadership to determine resources needed for county 4-H program.
- 16 - Provide overall direction to the county 4-H program.
- 18 - Represent 4-H program to governing boards.
- 19 - Plan evaluation methods and procedures for determining effectiveness of county programs.
- 20 - Coordinate total county 4-H program.
- 21 - Administer total county 4-H program.

Data from the study indicate that 4-H agents are performing all of these tasks at the Very High frequency level in the urban and rural counties in which they are employed. The 4-H program assistants, the data show, are not performing these tasks at the Very High level in these same counties with 4-H agents.

In counties without 4-H agents, the county extension directors are performing one of the tasks, task 18, at the Very High level and the other six at the High level. Of the seven professional 4-H leadership tasks, the program assistants in counties without 4-H agents are performing two of the tasks, tasks 16 and 20, at the Very High frequency level; three at the High level, tasks 8, 19, and 21; and two, tasks 5 and 18, at the Average level. The data indicate in counties without 4-H agents the 4-H professional leadership tasks are not being performed as frequently by the 4-H staff, which suggest a need for additional 4-H leadership.

The analysis of the three role set situations indicate that the roles of the program assistant have developed differently and that this development relates to the role situation. The expectations of the program assistants were found to be different as well as the role performed in the role set situation where there was not a 4-H

professional agent. The expected role of ten of the 4-H program assistants in counties without 4-H agents was an acting 4-H agent. The responses from the program assistants and their supervising agent, the county extension director, indicate that program assistants are performing that role in counties without 4-H agents. None of the program assistants in the counties with 4-H agents were expected to perform an acting agent role and none were found performing acting agent role tasks at a high frequency.

The presence or absence of a county-based 4-H agent was found to relate to the role the 4-H program assistant performed. In counties without 4-H agents the program assistants were found performing at a very similar frequency level, 15 of the twenty-one 4-H tasks being performed by the 4-H agents in rural counties. Several interpretations can be made regarding this finding. First, the program assistants who are performing the 4-H acting agent's role in counties without 4-H agents were in a role situation with an expectation of performing an acting agent role as indicated by the supervising agents assigned responsibilities. The role set situation did not present a conflict of roles between two role mates; the 4-H program assistant and the county extension director. The data indicate that the county extension directors perform seven 4-H tasks at the High frequency level or above as compared to fifteen tasks for the program assistant.

It appears the role set situation presented an opportunity for the program assistant in counties without 4-H agents to come into the situation and develop a role in relation to the expectation. The

4-H program assistants seem to have been flexible enough that with these expectations they responded and have developed a role pattern in relation to the role expected. This would indicate that the expected role in the role set with support of the role mate to perform that role, may be more important than developing a prescribed role or job description that may limit the potential performance of a 4-H program assistant.

An additional factor of influence found, in addition to the role expectation, was the role performed by the role mate, the supervising agent. The role performed by the role mate appears to have influenced the performance of the other role mate in the role set. Role theory suggests that role mates will influence each other in the role set and that the professional is more likely to be more influential in a role set with a paraprofessional.

It was found that the behavior of role mate of the paraprofessional, the supervising agent, was different in the counties with 4-H agents and counties without 4-H agents.

4-H agents performed more of the 4-H tasks at a higher frequency than the county extension director. In these role set situations with 4-H agents, the program assistants performed less 4-H tasks as identified by the study.

When realizing 4-H program assistants are performing some of these same tasks as 4-H agents, but in a different situation, it raises the question of the possibility of the program assistants in those counties with 4-H agents doing some of these same tasks rather than the 4-H agent. The data from this study seems to indicate that

the program assistants have the potential to perform many of these tasks. It seems that before this can happen the role mate professional in the role set must be willing to let it happen.

In counties without 4-H agents it was found that the 4-H program assistants were performing fifteen 4-H tasks similar to the 4-H agents in rural counties. It was also found that six other tasks were performed significantly different. One task, "Make physical arrangements for major county activities," was reported performed higher by 4-H program assistants. The other five of these six tasks were reported performed at a lower frequency level by program assistants. These five tasks were:

- Represent 4-H program to governing boards.
- Provide leadership to develop long range plans for the county 4-H programs.
- Administer the total county 4-H program.
- Provide leadership to determine resources needed for county 4-H program.
- Provide overall direction to the county 4-H program.

The lower performance of the 4-H tasks by the program assistants also suggest additional 4-H leadership in counties without 4-H agents.

Part V

Correlation of Related Variables With Frequency of Performance of 4-H Tasks

An attempt has been made to answer the question of the relationship between the amount of formal schooling of 4-H program assistants with their performance frequency of 4-H tasks by correlating schooling with 4-H tasks. For analysis the following five formal schooling groups were developed: Not graduated from high school;

Graduated from high school; Attended vocational school; Attended college, but no degree; and Received college degree. The contingency tables displaying the frequencies for each task and performance frequency scores by groups for each task vary on the performance frequencies by 4-H tasks.

However, only one 4-H task, "Organize new 4-H clubs," was found to be performed at a significantly different level among the five groups of 4-H program assistants on the basis of levels of formal schooling. The actual calculated chi-square statistical value was 9.56, which is significant at the probability of less than .05. Interestingly enough, the two groups of 4-H program assistants rating the task the highest are "Attended college, but no degree," at 3.60 and "Not graduated from high school," at 3.50. The program assistants with the lowest frequency score of 2.33 had attended vocational school. The data indicate that there was a difference among groups of program assistants by formal schooling. However, there was not a direct correlation found between the level of schooling and frequency of 4-H tasks performed.

The program assistants who had not graduated from high school as a group indicated a higher frequency level on the tasks than any other group. Their frequency scores placed seventeen tasks at 3.00 or above as compared to seven for the high school graduate, ten for each of the college groups, and ten for the vocational group.

As noted, there was variance between groups of 4-H program assistants with various levels of formal schooling on the performance

levels of 4-H tasks. However, except for task "Organize new 4-H clubs," the statistical analysis did not find any other differences in the performance level of 4-H tasks by groups with various levels of formal schooling. The data indicate that the level of formal schooling of 4-H program assistants in Michigan does not seem to associate with the frequency of performing twenty-one of the twenty-two selected 4-H tasks in the study.

Previous Experiences

Four previous experiences were used to group 4-H program assistants to correlate with the performance frequency of 4-H tasks. The four previous experiences reported by the program assistants as most helpful in their role which were used for grouping were: Worked with youth, Was a 4-H leader, Worked with groups, and Established in the community. The contingency tables displaying the frequencies for each task and the performance frequency scores by groups for each task indicated that the program assistants with these experiences performed the 4-H tasks at somewhat the same frequency.

Each group's frequency scores on each task placed from 10 to 14 tasks at the 3.00 level and above, indicating very little association with these previous experiences and the performance frequency of 4-H tasks.

Length of Employment

The length of employment as a 4-H program assistant was compared with the reported performance frequency of tasks by program

assistants. The five employment groupings used were: Under 6 months; 6 months to 1 year; Over 1 year, under 2; Over 2 years, under 3; and Over 3 years. Comparing the performance frequency scores for each of the tasks for each employment group, indicate that the more experienced program assistants reported performing the 4-H tasks at a higher frequency. In addition to the scores generally being higher for tasks, the more experienced groups had more tasks that scored 3.00 or above. 4-H program assistants with over three years of experience performed 18 tasks at the 3.00 score or higher. The 4-H program assistants employed between 2 to 3 years had fifteen tasks scoring 3.00 or above, between 1 to 2 years had ten tasks, between 6 months to 1 year had six tasks and the program assistants employed for less than 6 months had eight tasks with a frequency score of 3.00 or above. The program assistants with 6 months experience or less reported five tasks which had a frequency score of 1.83 or less.

When the chi-square analysis was computed with the five levels of employment as the independent variable and the twenty-two 4-H tasks as the dependent variable, three tasks were found to be performed by the more experienced 4-H program assistants at a higher level of frequency. The three tasks are listed with the actual calculated chi-square statistical values as follows:

- Provide leadership to develop long range plans for county 4-H program. 13.84
- Work with other youth serving agencies to develop new programs. 12.96
- Represent 4-H programs to governing boards. 10.82

It is not surprising that 4-H program assistants who have been employed for a longer period of time and gaining experience with

the 4-H programs would be more likely to perform these tasks than a person first starting. As factors are considered for role development, this finding suggests that the length of experience as a 4-H program assistant does appear to be an influence as to what 4-H program assistants are doing and can do in the future.

Effectiveness of County 4-H Program

The analysis of association of county 4-H program effectiveness with the performance of 4-H tasks by program assistants was found to have several serious limitations. This somewhat common method of program evaluation (Administrators evaluate county 4-H program on a rating scale) was used in an attempt to have a measure of effectiveness of the county 4-H program which would be related to 4-H program assistants' performance of 4-H tasks. However, two problems developed which reduced the validity of the analysis. First, as has been seen by the data, 65 percent of program assistants were employed two years or less at the time of the study and in this short time their influence on county 4-H programs may be negligible. Second, when effectiveness rating by administrators was summarized, a disproportionate number of counties by type were distributed. Of the sixteen counties which were rated fair by the administrators, ten, or 63 percent were counties without 4-H agents. Of the nine counties rated Superior, 22 percent were counties without 4-H agents.

When the analysis was computed comparing the county 4-H effectiveness level with the performance of tasks, five tasks were found by program assistants as self-reported being performed significantly

different at the .05 level. Program assistants employed in counties with the higher effectiveness ratings were found performing these three tasks at a higher level (with calculated chi-square statistical value):

- Develop new programs in specific 4-H project area. 12.88
- Conduct training for 4-H leaders. 11.63
- Determine training needs of 4-H leaders. 6.14

Program assistants employed in counties with lower effectiveness ratings were found to be performing these two tasks at a higher frequency level:

- Administer total county 4-H program. 10.84
- Coordinate total county 4-H program. 6.39

As previously mentioned, these findings appear to be biased, since 63 percent of the fair rating group is composed of counties from one role set. Also, since 65 percent of the program assistants were employed two years or less before the effectiveness rating was made, the relationship between the program assistant performance and the effectiveness of the overall county 4-H program may be negligible. Therefore, since these factors have reduced the validity of the findings, no future mention will be made of the effectiveness analysis. A longitudinal study measuring the change of overall county program effectiveness may be a more valid assessment of the influence of the 4-H program assistant.

Aspirations of Program Assistants

The aspirations as identified by the 4-H program assistants were compared with their reported performance frequency of the

twenty-two 4-H tasks. When a chi-square analysis was computed three tasks were found being performed by program assistants significantly different at the .05 confidence level. The tasks with the calculated statistical value are:

- Provide leadership to develop long range plans
for county 4-H programs. 20.34
- Recruit new 4-H leaders. 14.97
- Determine training needs of 4-H leaders. 14.27

The data indicate that the program assistants who had indicated an employment aspiration to "Be an agent," were performing these three tasks at a higher level than the other 4-H program assistants.

The data seems to indicate that program assistants who aspire to be agents, are performing three tasks at significantly different levels than other program assistants. One of the tasks which has been identified previously in this study as an agent type task, "Provide leadership to develop long range plans for county 4-H programs," indicates that these program assistants are practicing for an anticipated future role. Their frequency level for the task is 3.24 as compared to the average performance of the task by all program assistants at 2.63.

Age of Program Assistants

The age range levels of the 4-H program assistants were compared with the self-reported frequency on 4-H tasks by the program assistants in the study. When a chi-square analysis was computed, one task, "Develop new programs in specific 4-H project areas," was

found being performed by the older program assistants at a higher frequency level. The calculated chi-square statistical value was 12.56 which is significant at a probability level of less than .05.

It appears from the data that age of the program assistants associates very little with the performance of the selected 4-H tasks except for the one mentioned above.

Summary

When the five independent variables of formal schooling, previous experiences, length of employment, employment aspirations and age of program assistants were each compared with the performance frequency of the twenty-two selected 4-H tasks, a total of eight out of a possible 110 combinations were found to be significantly different at the probability level of less than .05. These eight combinations found were: amount of formal schooling and the task "Organize new 4-H clubs;" longer length of employment with higher frequency of tasks, "Provide leadership to develop long range plans for county 4-H program," "Work with other youth serving agencies to develop new programs," and "Represent 4-H program to governing boards;" employment aspirations of "Being an Agent" with higher frequency of tasks, "Provide leadership to develop long range plans for county 4-H programs," "Determine training needs of the 4-H leader," and "Recruit new 4-H leaders;" and older program assistants with higher frequency of task, "Develop new programs in specific 4-H project area."

The data indicate, except for the mentioned correlation above, that formal schooling of program assistants does not seem to associate with the performance level of 4-H tasks. It can be concluded, on the basis of this limited data, that the level of formal schooling need not be a limiting qualification for the employment of 4-H program assistants, for the data indicate that the selected 4-H tasks are being performed at somewhat the same level by the 4-H program assistants with various levels of formal schooling.

As program assistants become more experienced, the data indicate a change in the frequency level of tasks involving long range planning, working with other youth agencies and working with county boards. Realizing the possible changes in performance of tasks as program assistants become more experienced, suggests the need for considering new or different tasks that 4-H program assistants may perform. With experience and possible additional training and support, program assistants can perform a variety of 4-H tasks in a county 4-H program. Also, a large number of 4-H program assistants indicated wanting to stay employed as a program assistant which suggests a potential 4-H staff leadership for the county 4-H programs.

The 4-H program assistants who aspire to be an agent have indicated they do more long range planning, are recruiting leaders, and determine the leaders' training needs more of the time than other 4-H program assistants. The study identified about one-fourth of the program assistants as aspiring to become an agent.

It would seem appropriate to recognize the career hopes of the program assistants and that counsel should be provided to help assist the staff member in developing his/her career plans.

Program assistants with the various kinds of experience of working with youth, adults, groups and community were not found as significant factors with the performance frequency of 4-H tasks.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This chapter summarizes the study and presents its conclusions; it also presents recommendations for possible action and future study.

The primary purpose of this descriptive study was to identify roles of 4-H paraprofessional youth workers in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service and to analyze variables related to those roles in three county staffing models.

The 4-H program assistant is a rather new staffing position in the Cooperative Extension Service. Since 1966 Michigan Extension Service has employed 4-H paraprofessionals at an increasing rate. At the time of the study more program assistants were employed in the Michigan Extension Service than 4-H agents. A major question facing Extension administrators is what staffing models utilizing the 4-H program assistant position are appropriate for the future? What rationale, if any, exists for wide variations in program assistants' roles?

Identifying the roles of 4-H program assistants, along with an analysis of the related variables which may have influenced the development and the performance of those roles, was the aim of this study.

The concept suggested by Bowman and Klopff that role development is a dynamic of each interaction of a particular professional with a particular paraprofessional within a given structure responding to special needs, was the theoretical framework for the study. This framework is supported by the three basis ideas which Gross and others indicate appear in most of the conceptualizations about role, that individuals: (1) in social locations; (2) behave; (3) with reference to expectations.

The roles of the 4-H program assistants were identified using two methods: the major responsibilities assigned the 4-H program assistant as reported by the supervising agent (Role expectation) and the frequency with which 4-H program assistants perform twenty-two selected 4-H tasks (Role behavior).

Data were collected by the use of a survey instrument developed from several related studies and from interviews with program assistants and agents and refined by testing with 4-H staff members in another state. The survey instrument was designed so that the respondent indicated the frequency of his/her own performance of each of the selected 4-H tasks on a forced choice checklist with four levels of frequency: Never, Very Seldom, Sometimes, and Often. The respondents also indicated the frequency of his/her role mate's performance of each of the tasks.

The population for the study was sixty-two 4-H program assistants, eighteen county extension directors and twenty-five extension 4-H youth agents in the Michigan Cooperative Extension

Service. This accounted for a total of forty-three complete county role sets of a supervisory agent and at least one 4-H program assistant in each county. The forty-three role sets in the study represented all known complete role sets at the time of the collection of the data.

To analyze the dynamic within the role set, the population was divided into three different county groupings according to the presence or absence of a 4-H agent in the county and the county population. The three role-sets, with number of counties, number of program assistants, and number of supervising agents are: 18 rural counties without 4-H agents including 18 county extension directors and 21 program assistants; 13 urban counties with over 100,000 population including 13 4-H agents and 28 program assistants; 12 rural counties with 12 4-H agents and 13 program assistants.

Data from the study indicate that forty-eight percent, or 30 of all the program assistants are 30 years old or younger, with 15 of the program assistants in the 22 to 30 age group employed in urban counties. Forty-six program assistants, or 74 percent are female. Of the 16 males employed, 11 were in urban counties.

Twenty-five program assistants, a figure which makes up 41 percent of the total number of program assistants in the study, were employed for one year or less. Sixteen percent, or 10 of the program assistants have been employed over three years. No major difference in length of employment seem to appear when comparing the three types of counties.

The formal schooling of program assistants varies somewhat with the type of county in which they are employed. Program assistants in urban counties tend to have more college training. Of the 39 program assistants who attended college, 22, or 56 percent are employed in urban counties as compared to 11, or 28 percent in counties without 4-H agents and 6, or 15 percent in rural counties with 4-H agents. Fifteen of the 39 program assistants who attended college have received a degree. Four, or 6 percent of the program assistants in Michigan have not graduated from high school.

Thirty, or 48 percent of the program assistants have been volunteer 4-H leaders. A large majority of these work in the rural counties. Only eight, or 29 percent of the 28 program assistants employed in urban counties have been 4-H leaders, as compared to 12, or 57 percent and 10, or 77 percent in counties without 4-H agents and rural counties with 4-H agents.

"Worked with youth" was ranked as the most helpful entry level experience for being successful in the 4-H program, as identified by 29, or 47 percent of the program assistants. Nineteen, or 31 percent of the program assistants indicated that being a 4-H leader was the most helpful.

When 4-H program assistants were asked what they would like to be doing in five years, in relation to employment in the 4-H program, 32, or 53 percent indicated they would like to be employed in the same work they are doing now. Fifteen, or 71 percent of these were in counties without 4-H agents. Fourteen, or 50 percent of the

28 program assistants in urban counties indicated they would like to be 4-H agents. Two others in rural counties gave a similar response. Of the eighteen 4-H program assistants who have indicated an interest in being an agent, sixteen have attended college. Eight have attended college but have not received a degree, and eight others have received their college degree. Twelve, or 67 percent of the program assistants in urban counties are between the ages of 22 and 30.

The level of satisfaction program assistants reported as a group was above "fairly satisfied" with respect to other staff, their supervisor, their job, and the Extension Service. Their satisfaction with pay was lower, at a level of satisfaction near neutral.

The expected role of the 4-H program assistants was identified by the major (30% or more) responsibilities reported by supervising agents for program assistants in their respective counties. The acting 4-H agent role, with the responsibility of coordinating and carrying out the total county 4-H program, was identified by ten of the eighteen county extension directors in counties without 4-H agents. The paraprofessional specialist role in urban counties was identified by 4-H agents with two major responsibilities: Expand 4-H program in urban and other geographic areas of the county, and Expand 4-H program through special program efforts. In rural counties 4-H agents expected program assistants, as specialists, to expand 4-H programs through special program efforts.

The most frequent major responsibility for 4-H program assistants, as reported by supervisory agents, was to provide necessary direct or personal contact with volunteers in the 4-H program as well as people not involved in 4-H. As defined in this study, responsibilities with close relationship with clientele indicate an expected generalist role. Of the four roles in the study, the assistant agent role was identified least frequently by the supervisory agents.

The frequencies with which 4-H tasks were actually being performed by 4-H program assistants were compared with the four expected roles of specialist, acting 4-H agent, assistant agent and generalist. Program assistants whose assignments required them to perform the acting 4-H agent role reported performing three 4-H tasks at a much higher frequency level than other program assistants. These three tasks were: "Coordinate total county 4-H program," "Administer the total county 4-H program," and "Provide overall direction to the county 4-H program." These acting agents were performing the total group of 4-H tasks at a higher frequency than program assistants in other roles.

Program assistants who were assigned the specialist role reported performing two tasks at a higher frequency ranking than did program assistants assigned the other three roles. The tasks which were ranked higher were: "Use specific program to introduce 4-H," and "Promote 4-H programs in low income areas."

The 4-H program assistants assigned the assistant agent role ranked the task "Plan county 4-H activities with 4-H council and committees," higher than the program assistants in the other three roles. No tasks were found, as identified in this study, which differentiate the role of generalist from the other three roles. Three of the five highest ranked tasks performed by program assistants assigned generalist roles related closely to working with 4-H leaders.

In the urban counties, 4-H program assistants were found performing at a higher level those tasks which relate closely with the 4-H leaders, such as: "Recruit new 4-H leaders," "Organize new 4-H clubs," "Visit 4-H leaders in their homes," "Conduct training for 4-H leaders" and "Determine training for 4-H leaders." The program assistants in urban counties also indicated performing the task "Promoting 4-H programs in low income areas," at a high level.

The program assistants in rural counties with 4-H agents were also found performing tasks relating to 4-H leaders, as well as performing tasks relating to the county 4-H program operation, such as planning with the 4-H council and committees and making arrangements for county 4-H activities.

In counties without 4-H agents, program assistants were found performing the acting 4-H agent role and performing 4-H tasks at a higher frequency than the other program assistants. They also were performing more 4-H professional leadership tasks and county wide 4-H tasks.

Differences in the tasks 4-H program assistants perform were found in the study among the three role sets. The most clearly differentiated role identified was the acting 4-H agent role found to be performed by 4-H program assistants in the counties without 4-H agents. Significant differences were found in the frequency with which eight of the twenty-two selected 4-H tasks were being performed by program assistants in the three types of counties in the study. Program assistants in counties without 4-H agents were found to be performing the following eight tasks higher than other program assistants:

- Coordinate total county 4-H program.
- Provide overall direction to the county 4-H program.
- Administer total county 4-H program.
- Plan county 4-H activities with 4-H council and committees.
- Work in all geographic areas of the county.
- Make physical arrangements for major county 4-H activities.
- Plan evaluation methods and procedures for determining effectiveness of county program.
- Work with other youth serving agencies to develop new programs.

It was found that the program assistants and the supervising agents were congruent on the program assistants performance frequency on the 4-H tasks. No significant statistical differences were found at the .05 confidence level when comparing the self-reported frequency by the 4-H program assistants with the supervising agents identification of the program assistants performance in each of the three types of counties.

Differences in the frequency of performing 4-H tasks were found between 4-H agents and county extension directors. The 4-H

agents were performing the tasks at a higher frequency than county extension directors. Also, the 4-H agents were found performing the 4-H tasks at a much higher frequency than 4-H program assistants in their counties. The opposite was found in the counties without 4-H agents. In these counties it was found that generally the program assistants were performing the 4-H tasks at a higher frequency than the county extension director. Program assistants with the expectation of performing an acting 4-H agent role seem to be performing that role as indicated by this data.

It was found that fifteen tasks were rated as being performed very similarly by both the program assistant in counties without 4-H agents and the 4-H agents in rural counties. Six of the tasks were found to be performed at a significantly different level between the two groups at the .05 confidence level. The five tasks performed more frequently by the 4-H agents were: "Represent 4-H program to governing boards," "Provide leadership to develop long range plans for county 4-H program," "Provide leadership to determine resources needed for county 4-H programs," "Provide overall direction to the county 4-H program," and "Administer the total county 4-H program." The task "Make physical arrangements for major county 4-H activities," was reported being performed by the program assistants at a higher level than the 4-H agents in rural counties.

4-H agents were found performing all of seven 4-H professional leadership tasks at the Very High frequency level in the urban and rural counties. The 4-H program assistants were found not performing

these tasks at the Very High level in these same counties with 4-H agents.

In counties without 4-H agents, the county extension directors were found performing one of the 4-H professional leadership tasks at the Very High level and the other six at the High level. Of the seven professional 4-H leadership tasks, the program assistants in counties without 4-H agents were found performing two of the tasks at the Very High frequency level, three at the High level and two at the Average level.

The analysis of formal schooling, previous experiences, length of employment, employment aspirations and age of program assistants with the 4-H program assistants' frequency level for the twenty-two 4-H tasks found eight out of a possible 110 combinations significantly different at the .05 confidence level. These eight combinations found were: amount of formal schooling and the task "Organize new 4-H clubs;" longer length of employment with higher frequency of tasks, "Provide leadership to develop long range plans for county 4-H program," "Work with other youth serving agencies to develop new programs," and "Represent 4-H program to governing boards;" employment aspirations of "Being an Agent" with higher frequency of tasks, "Provide leadership to develop long range plans for county 4-H programs," "Determine training needs of the 4-H leader," and "Recruit new 4-H leaders;" and older program assistants with higher frequency of task, "Develop new programs in specific 4-H project area."

The data relating to level of formal schooling indicated that formal schooling of program assistants does not generally associate with the frequency level of 4-H tasks. The correlation mentioned above with task "Organize new 4-H clubs," found that program assistants who had not graduated from high school and program assistants who had attended college but had not received a degree were both performing the task at Very High level.

It was found that as program assistants became more experienced, they were more frequently doing more long range planning, working with other youth agencies and working with county boards.

The data indicate that 100 percent and 86 percent of 4-H program assistants in rural and urban counties with 4-H agents, respectively, go to the 4-H agents for help with a problem. Program assistants also indicate going to the county extension directors for help in these counties as well. Other program assistants were also identified as helpful. In counties without 4-H agents, the county extension director was identified by 90 percent of the program assistants as helpful.

It was found that 4-H agents have placed more importance on the 4-H function of managing, developing and directing the work of employees since hiring 4-H program assistants. With the employment of program assistants, 4-H agents in rural counties and county extension directors have indicated less importance to the 4-H functions "Identify and recruit volunteer 4-H leaders," and "Recruit new members."

Conclusions

The evidence from this study leads to the conclusion that 4-H paraprofessional youth workers are performing many tasks in the 4-H program, including many of the same tasks being performed generally by the professional 4-H agent. This conclusion supports other studies indicating paraprofessionals can perform many of the tasks normally performed by professional youth workers, providing the professional additional time to devote to functions which require generally the utilization of knowledge acquired through additional training.

The evidence from this study leads to the conclusion that the presence or absence of a resident 4-H agent in the role set was a major factor influencing the role of the 4-H paraprofessional youth worker in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service. Program assistants without a resident 4-H agent are generally performing an acting 4-H agent role by performing county-wide 4-H coordinating tasks. Program assistants in counties with 4-H agents are not performing the county-wide 4-H coordinating role. In these same counties the 4-H agents are performing this role.

The data from the study indicate the program assistants in counties without 4-H agents generally are not performing all the professional 4-H leadership tasks at the Very High frequency level. It can be concluded that additional 4-H professional leadership may be needed to support the program assistants as reported in this study.

It can be concluded that the dynamics in the role set, including the role expectations of the 4-H program assistant and the role performed by the 4-H program assistant's supervising agent have generally an influence on the development of the role of the 4-H program assistant.

The data from this study supports Bowman and Klopff's theory that role development is a dynamic of each interaction of a particular professional with a particular paraprofessional within a given structure responding to special needs.

The evidence from this study indicates that one of the major contributions of program assistants was their flexibility to do what was necessary to be done in the situation they are placed.

It appears that 4-H program assistants are expected to work closely with 4-H volunteers and that they are meeting that expectation generally by the 4-H tasks performed; more specifically, visiting, recruiting and determining the training needs of volunteer 4-H leaders.

It appears that some program assistants are expected to concentrate their efforts in certain geographic areas of the county and/or with specialized 4-H program activities. These program assistants are more likely to be found in the urban counties.

The evidence from this study indicates that the level of formal schooling of 4-H program assistants generally does not correlate with how frequent program assistants perform 4-H tasks. It can be concluded, on the basis of this limited data, that the level of formal schooling need not be a limiting qualification for the

employment of 4-H program assistants.

It is concluded that program assistants with more employment experience as a 4-H program assistant are generally doing more long range planning and working with other youth agencies and boards in the county than inexperienced program assistants. The evidence from this study leads to the conclusion that previous experiences generally do not correlate with the performance frequency of the 4-H tasks performed by 4-H program assistants.

The evidence from this study leads to the conclusion that about two-thirds of the 4-H program assistants do not aspire to move toward full professional status. Fewer than one-third of the program assistants aspire to be agents. Most of these were employed in urban counties, had attended college and were between the ages of 22 and 30 years old.

It appears that 4-H agents have generally changed their own roles with the addition of 4-H program assistants in regards to the increased importance of their supervisory functions with 4-H program assistants. 4-H agent's role change, as indicated by less importance to direct volunteer leader contact, has been generally assumed by the 4-H program assistants in the county. It appears that generally 4-H agents are performing the major 4-H roles in counties with 4-H program assistants. In counties without resident 4-H agents, the program assistants are generally performing the major 4-H roles with shared performance from the county extension directors.

Recommendations

It is recommended that efforts be continued to establish and appropriately recognize the 4-H program assistant staff position as an important position in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service.

It is recommended that staff be encouraged in the role set situation to analyze the needs and interests in their situation to determine the role for each staff member in the 4-H program. Due to the difference of program assistants' roles in various county staffing models, it is recommended if future staffing models are developed, consideration continue to be given to the characteristics of the county staffing needs.

4-H program assistants were found performing many of the 4-H tasks 4-H agents are presently performing. For more efficient use of both human and financial resources, it is recommended that 4-H agents share more of the 4-H tasks with 4-H program assistants and that 4-H agents perform more functions relating to overall program planning, management and evaluation.

It is recommended that a district or area youth and adult development specialist position be developed whose primary role would be providing youth and adult development resource leadership to 4-H staff in counties. 4-H agents with these skills who "turn over" county 4-H coordination leadership to program assistants may be possible candidates for this position.

It is recommended that additional 4-H leadership and support be provided by professional staff in counties without 4-H agents. The following alternatives are recommended for consideration:

1. The supervisory agent, county extension director, assume more responsibility for professional leadership for the county 4-H program.
2. District youth and adult development specialist provide additional 4-H professional leadership to county 4-H programs.
3. A combination of district leadership with the county extension director provide the 4-H professional leadership.

The data indicate differences in roles being performed by 4-H program assistants in the various county situations in the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service. An understanding of these role differences and the apparent relationships with county situations may decrease role conflict and role ambiguity of program assistants and agents. It is, therefore, recommended that the role differences found among youth workers in the Michigan Extension Service be communicated to develop better understanding of the 4-H program assistant role.

It is recommended that interested program assistants be provided appropriate counseling regarding qualifications and expectations on employment as an agent in the Cooperative Extension Service.

The following future research is recommended:

1. A longitudinal study be conducted to analyze the variables relating to impact of the 4-H program assistants.
2. An indepth study of the psychological factors of influence involved in the professional-paraprofessional relationship in a role set.

3. An indepth study to develop and analyze additional approaches to providing 4-H professional leadership in counties without resident 4-H agents.
4. An indepth study to more clearly define the professional leadership tasks necessary for an effective county 4-H program and identify capabilities needed to most effectively perform those tasks.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, R.A., "Organizational Character of Education: Staff Utilization and Development; Subprofessional and Paraprofessional Personnel." Review of Education Research, Vol. 34, October, 1964.
- Artabasy, James T., Preliminary Evaluation Analysis of 4-H Program Assistant Salary Administration System, an internal study by the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, Michigan State University, January, 1974.
- Banning, John W., "New Dimensions of Cooperative Extension Youth Programs in the 70's." Paper presented at the 1970 Annual Meeting of the National Association of Extension 4-H Agents, Purdue University, November, 1970.
- Bennett, William S., Jr. and Falk, Frank R., New Careers and Urban Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, Inc., 1970.
- Biddle, Bruce J. and Thomas, Edwin J., Role Theory: Concepts and Research. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Bowman, Garda W. and Klopff, Gordon J., New Careers and Roles in the American School: A Study of Auxiliary Personnel in Education. New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1968.
- Boy Scouts of America, "Paraprofessional Employment Program Training Plans and Procedures." North Brunswick, 1973.
- Brighton, Howard, Utilizing Teacher Aides in Differentiated Staffing. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1972.
- Esbensen, Thornwald, "Should Teacher Aides Be More Than Clerks?" Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII, 5, January.
- Gartner, Alan, Paraprofessionals and Their Performance. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971.
- Gibson, Oliver R. and Hunt, Herold C., The School Personnel Administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965.

- Godfrey, Lina Rowe, "Role Adaptation and Career Development: A Study of Role Definition and Role Interaction Among Teachers and Teacher-Aides in Adult Basic Education in the State of Michigan." A Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1971.
- Gross, Neal; Mason, Ward S.; and McEachern, Alexander W., Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendent Role. New York: Wiley, 1957.
- Grosser, Charles G., "Manpower Development Programs," in Charles G. Grosser, et al. (eds.) Nonprofessionals in the Human Services. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.
- Grosser, Charles G., The Role of the Nonprofessional in the Manpower Development Programs. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Labor, 1966.
- Houston, Laura Pires, "Black People, New Careers and Humane Human Services," Social Casework, LI 5, May, 1970.
- Kieson, John A.; Lewis, Charles E.; and Lyday, Susan Y., "The Functional Development and Evaluation of a Youth Staffing Model Utilizing the Ideal Role of the Paraprofessional Youth Worker." (Extension Service Special Project Report), North Carolina State University, Raleigh, March, 1974.
- Kiesow, John A., "Role Model for the Paraprofessional Youth Worker in the Extension Service." A Ph.D. dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, 1972.
- Krohn, Glen H., "Aide Utilization in Voluntary Youth Educational Programs." A Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 1972.
- Lindzey, Gardner and Aronson, Elliott (eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology, Sec. Ed., Vol. 1, Reading, Mass., Addison, Wesley, 1968.
- Linton, Ralph, The Study of Man. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1936.
- Matheny, Kenneth B. and Oslin, Yvonne, "Utilization of Paraprofessionals in Education and the Helping Professions: A Review of the Literature." Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, Minneapolis, March, 1970.
- Newcomb, Theodore M., Social Psychology. New York: Dryden Press, 1951.

- Parsons, Jerry, "Inner City Youth Programs: Guidelines," Journal of Extension, 9 (Summer, 1971).
- Pearl, Arthur and Riessman, Frank, New Careers for the Poor. New York: Free Press, 1965.
- Reisman, Frank, Foreward, Paraprofessionals and Their Performance. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971.
- Reisman, Frank, "The Challenge: New Careers for the Poor," in Proceedings of the American Home Economist Workshop. Chicago: American Home Economics Association, 1966.
- Rogers, Everett M., Communication Strategies for Family Planning. New York: The Free Press, 1973.
- Silverman, Saul A., "Subprofessionals in Extension," Journal of Cooperative Extension, 7 (Spring, 1969).
- Snider, B. Alan, "Eight Years of Becoming--The 4-H Program Assistant in Michigan." A paper presented at the 4-H Paraprofessional Seminar, National 4-H Center, Washington, D.C., April 4, 1974.
- Taylor, James C. and Bowers, David G., Survey of Organization: A Machine-Scored Standardized Questionnaire Instrument. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1972.
- Tanner, Daniel and Tanner, Laurel N., "Teacher Aides: A Job for Anyone in Ghetto Schools," The Record, LXIX.8. May, 1968.
- Tennant, Christine S. and Longest, James W., "Professional and Paraprofessional Role Differentiation." Agricultural Experiment Station, College Park, Maryland, 1973.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Extension Service, A Plan for Action. Report by the National 4-H Urban Program Development Committee. Washington, D.C., 1973.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Extension Service, 4-H in the 70's. Washington, D.C., n.d.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER AND SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Appendix A-1. Cover Letter

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

Michigan State University - East Lansing, Michigan 48823

AND U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE COOPERATING

4-H Youth Programs
175 South Anthony
Telephone (517) 355-0180

[This letter was mailed to individual program assistants, 4-H agents and county extension directors in Michigan counties]

April 12, 1974

Dear :

You are aware of the expressed interest and concern in the employing of 4-H Program Assistants in counties throughout Michigan. MEA4-HYS and the State 4-H Office have jointly identified a task force to study the situation. The attached questionnaire, completed by you and other Agents, CED's, and 4-H Program Assistants in counties employing 4-H PA's will provide valuable information to help understand the situation regarding the staffing of 4-H PA's.

The questionnaire, designed to obtain your responses with a minimum of your effort, was tested in March with 17 Agents and 35 4-H PA's in Wisconsin and Michigan. Many reported completing the questionnaire in 15-20 minutes and a willingness to complete the questionnaire because of the importance of obtaining the information.

You are asked to take the 15-20 minutes, now as you are reading this letter, to complete the questionnaire and drop it in the enclosed envelope. As the instructions indicate, do not visit with others as you fill out the questionnaire, for we want your individual response.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact one of us. We look forward to your response in the next few days.

Sincerely,

Norman A. Brown
Norman A. Brown
Program Director
4-H - Youth Programs

B. Alan Snider
B. Alan Snider
Program Assistant
4-H Youth Programs

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain your opinions and feelings about your role as a 4-H program assistant. (4-H PA) Please complete the questionnaire by answering all questions. Most questions have no right or wrong answers. We need your opinion so do not consult others in completing the questionnaire. You will find that each question can be completed rather quickly. (Many 4-H PA's in testing the questionnaire completed it in 15-20 minutes.) We want your spontaneous reactions. Your responses will be kept confidential and reported with others to avoid identification of individual responses. The questionnaire is only identified to assist in data collection. Please be honest and frank with your responses.

1. Sex Male Female

2. Age 18-21 31-40 51 and over
 22-30 41-50

3. Length of time on the job as 4-H PA

1. _____ under 6 months
2. _____ 6 months - 1 year
3. _____ over 1 year, under 2 years
4. _____ over 2 years, under 3 yrs
5. _____ over 3 years

4. I am employed as a 4-H PA on a basis of:

1/2 time full-time other (specify)

5. What level of formal schooling have you completed? (Mark just the highest category)

1. ☐ Some high school but did not graduate
2. ☐ Graduated from high school
3. ☐ Attended college but less than two years
4. ☐ Two or more years of college, but have not received bachelor's degree
5. ☐ Received a bachelor's degree
6. ☐ Received a bachelor's degree plus additional courses
7. ☐ Received a master's degree
8. ☐ Attended a vocational or technical school
9. ☐ Other (specify)

6. If you attended college, what was your major?

7. Before I was hired as 4-H PA I worked with youth as a:

1. ____ 4-H Leader
2. ____ Teacher
3. ____ Scout Leader
4. ____ Sunday School Teacher
5. ____ YMCA volunteer
6. ____ YWCA volunteer
7. ____ Others _____
8. ____ No experience with youth

8. Before I was hired as 4-H PA, I worked with adults as:

9. What would you like to be doing 5 years from now in relation to employment in the 4-H program?

10. What previous experiences before you were hired as a 4-H PA do you feel have been most helpful to you to be successful in working in the 4-H program? Check (✓) only those statements (one or more) below that apply to you. Space is available to list additional experiences.
1. ☐ Was established in the community before employed as 4-H PA
 2. ☐ Was a 4-H Leader
 3. ☐ Have had college training
 4. ☐ Have not had college training
 5. ☐ Was recognized as a "leader" in community by others before hired as 4-H PA
 6. ☐ Worked with youth before employment as 4-H PA
 7. ☐ Worked with groups before employment as 4-H PA
 8. ☐ Worked with adults before employment as 4-H PA
 9. ☐ Managed your own time
 10. ☐ Had no preconceived opinion or experiences that might block present performance.
-
11. From the list of experiences you have just checked above, put an (X) beside 2 or 3 which you think have been most important for your success.
12. 4-H PA's have been employed to work with county 4-H programs for various purposes. Listed below is a representative listing of responsibilities 4-H PA's may assume. Please read through the responsibilities and check (✓) the statement(s) that best describe the responsibilities you presently are assuming in your role as 4-H PA. If an important responsibility is not listed, please write it in the additional space.
1. ☐ Expand 4-H program in all geographic areas of county
 2. ☐ Expand 4-H program in urban areas
 3. ☐ Expand 4-H program in certain geographic areas of county, such as certain school districts, etc., rather than total county
 4. ☐ Expand 4-H program through special program efforts such as 4-H TV series, school conservation, etc.
 5. ☐ Assist agent by carrying out ongoing tasks of county 4-H program
 6. ☐ Assist agent in coordination and carrying out county 4-H program
 7. ☐ Coordinate and carry out the total county 4-H program
 8. ☐ Work towards more direct contact with people who have not been involved in 4-H
 9. ☐ Provide necessary personal contact with volunteers in 4-H program
-
13. From the list of responsibilities you have just checked in item 12 above, go through again and place an (X) for the major (30% or more) responsibility (s) you are assuming in your role as a 4-H PA.

14. Below and on the next page is a list of 4-H tasks that can be performed in a county 4-H Program. You are asked to make 2 responses to each task.

First, in comparison to all 4-H tasks you do, indicate how often you perform each task listed by checking one of the columns headed by: Never, Very Seldom, Sometimes or Often.

Second, indicate how often in your opinion the agent performs each task by checking in the column headed by: Never, Very Seldom, Sometimes or Often. An agent would be considered the 4-H Agent in counties with a 4-H Agent. In counties where there is not a 4-H Agent, agent is the CED. The following example illustrates the procedure:

	How often do <u>you</u> perform this task?				How often does <u>agent</u> perform this task?			
	Never	Very Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Never	Very Seldom	Sometimes	Often
EXAMPLE								
Visit 4-H members in their home			✓		✓			
Plans 4-H Camp	✓							✓

The above example would indicate that you visit 4-H members occasionally, but not to a large extent of your time, and that the agent does not visit members in their home. It also indicates that you do not plan camp and that the agent does spend a great deal of time planning camp.

4-H TASKS	How often do <u>you</u> perform this task?				How often does <u>agent</u> perform this task?			
	Never	Very Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Never	Very Seldom	Sometimes	Often
1. Visit 4-H leaders in their homes.								
2. Recruit new 4-H leaders.								
3. Organize new 4-H clubs.								
4. Lead group of 4-H members similar to volunteer leader.								
5. Provide leadership to develop long range plans (2-5 years) for county 4-H programs.								
6. Conduct training for 4-H leaders.								
7. Determine training needs of 4-H leaders.								

4-H TASKS (cont'd.)	How often do you perform this task?				How often does agent perform this task?			
	Never	Very Seldom	Some-times	Often	Never	Very Seldom	Some-times	Often
8. Provide leadership to determine resources needed for county 4-H program								
9. Work with other youth serving agencies to develop new programs								
10. Promote 4-H programs in low income areas.								
11. Use specific programs (sch. cons., TV series, etc.) to introduce 4-H								
12. Develop new program in specific 4-H project area (such as Home Ec)								
13. Work in certain geographic areas of county (twp., sch. dist., etc.) rather than total county.								
14. Make physical arrangements for major county 4-H activities.								
15. Work in all geographic areas of the county.								
16. Provide overall direction to the county 4-H program.								
17. Plan county 4-H activities with 4-H council & committees.								
18. Represent 4-H program to governing boards.								
19. Plan evaluation methods & procedures for determining effectiveness of county program.								
20. Coordinate total county 4-H program.								
21. Administer total county 4-H program.								
22. Free agent time for new program by carrying out traditional routine in 4-H program.					not	applicable		

15. How do you and the agent decide what each is going to do when you are planning together for an activity or program? An example might be planning a 4-H leader training program.

Listed below are several statements that may describe what is normally considered by you and the agent as you each accept tasks to complete an activity. Check those items(s) below that are most frequently considered by you in deciding who does what task. If additional considerations were given which are not listed, write them in the available space.

- 1 ☐ Ability to perform the task
 2 ☐ It was a task expected to be done by the 4-H PA or agent
 3 ☐ Interest in doing the task by each person
 4 ☐ The task was in the job description of 4-H PA or agent
 5 ☐ Availability of time
 6 ☐ Desire for experience (self-improvement)
-

16. When you have a problem which you are not sure how to handle who do you go to for help? Check appropriate person(s) you have gone to.

- 1 ☐ 4-H - Youth Agent in county 4 ☐ Other 4-H PA
 2 ☐ 4-H - Youth Agent in area 5 ☐ District 4-H Leader
 3 ☐ County Extension Director 6 ☐ EHE
 7 ☐ Other(specify) _____
-

17. Read these answer categories over carefully. Then answer each of the following questions by circling the number under the answer you want to give to indicate your degree of satisfaction.

	Very dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Fairly satisfied	Very satisfied
1 - All in all, how satisfied are you with the Extension staff in your county.	1	2	3	4	5
2 - All in all, how satisfied are you with your supervisor?	1	2	3	4	5
3 - All in all, how satisfied are you with your job?	1	2	3	4	5
4 - All in all, how satisfied are you with Extension as an employer compared to others?	1	2	3	4	5
5 - All in all, how satisfied are you with your pay?	1	2	3	4	5

18. What specific things do you like about your job? _____

19. What specific things do you dislike about your job? _____

20. If you were in a position of changing things about the role of 4-H PA's,
what suggestions would you make? _____

Place completed questionnaire in envelope provided and return to the
State 4-H Office.
Thanks!

Agent Questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS

Purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain your feelings and opinions regarding 4-H Program Assistants (4-H PA) and your role as their immediate supervisor. Please complete the questionnaire by answering all questions. Most questions have no right or wrong answers. We need your opinion so do not consult others in completing the questionnaire. You will find that each question can be completed rather quickly. During testing many agents completed it in 15-20 minutes. We want your spontaneous reactions. Your responses will be kept confidential and will be reported with others to avoid identification of individual responses. The questionnaire is only identified to assist in data collection. Please be honest and frank with your responses. If you are supervising more than one 4-H PA in the county, respond to an average for all PA's. If there are extremes among PA indicate with note to appropriate questions.

1. What is your present position? _____ CED _____ 4-H - Youth Agent
2. How many years have you held that position? _____ years
3. How many years in this county? _____ years
4. If you are not a 4-H - Youth Agent, have you ever held that position? yes no
If yes, for how many years? _____
5. When was the first 4-H PA hired in this county? _____
6. What was your role before a 4-H PA was employed in this county. Listed below are ten 4-H functions. How vital were these functions to your role in having an effective county 4-H program before 4-H PA was hired? How vital are they now? For each function indicate its importance to your role prior to 4-H PA being employed in the county and the importance of each function to your role now. (If 4-H PA was employed in the county before you came in, complete the now section only.)

4-H FUNCTIONS	Prior to hiring of 4-H PA, how vital was this function to your role?			How vital is this function now to your role?		
	Little	Some	Very	Little	Some	Very
1. Generate new members and leaders for 4-H program.						
2. Identify and recruit volunteer 4-H leaders.						
3. Train volunteer 4-H leaders.						
4. Manage, develop and direct the work of employees.						
5. Analyze the situation in the county to develop new 4-H programs.						
6. Work with local support groups in securing resources for 4-H program.						
7. Develop educational activities for participants in 4-H program.						
8. Conduct educational activities for participants in 4-H program.						
9. Analyze existing programs and activities.						
10. Determine and execute the objectives, budget and management procedures of the 4-H program.						

7. 4-H PA's have been employed to work with county 4-H Programs for various purposes. Listed below is a representative listing of responsibilities 4-H PA's may assume. Please read through the responsibilities and check (✓) the statement(s) that best describe the responsibilities presently assumed by the 4-H PA's employed under your supervision. If an important responsibility is not listed, please write it in the additional space.

1. ☐ Expand 4-H program in all geographic areas of county.
2. ☐ Expand 4-H program in urban areas.
3. ☐ Expand 4-H program in certain geographic areas of county, such as certain school districts, etc., rather than total county.
4. ☐ Expand 4-H program through special program efforts such as 4-H TV series, school conservation, etc.
5. ☐ Assist agent by carrying out ongoing tasks of county 4-H program.
6. ☐ Assist agent in coordination and carrying out county 4-H program.
7. ☐ Coordinate and carry out the total county 4-H program.
8. ☐ Work towards more direct contact with people who have not been involved in 4-H.
9. ☐ To provide necessary personal contact with volunteers in 4-H program.

8. From the list of responsibilities you have just checked in item 7 above, go through again and place an (X) for the major (30% or more) responsibility(s) assumed by 4-H PA's in this county.
9. On the next page and one half is a list of 4-H tasks that can be performed in a county 4-H program. You are asked to make two responses to each task.

First, in comparison to all 4-H tasks, indicate how often in your opinion the 4-H PA in this county performs each task by making a check in one of the columns headed: Never, Very Seldom, Sometimes, or Often.

Second, indicate how often you perform each task by making a check in one of the columns headed: Never, Very Seldom, Sometimes, or Often. The following example illustrates the procedure:

EXAMPLE	How often does <u>4-H PA</u> perform this task?				How often do <u>you</u> perform this task?			
	Never	Very Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Never	Very Seldom	Sometimes	Often
Visit 4-H members in their home			✓		✓			
Plans 4-H Camp	✓							✓

The above example would indicate that the 4-H PA visits 4-H members occasionally, but not to a large extent of the time; and that you do not visit 4-H members in their home. It also indicates that the 4-H PA does not plan camp and that you do spend a great deal of time planning camp.

4-H TASKS	How often does <u>4-H PA</u> perform this task?				How often do <u>you</u> perform this task?			
	Never	Very Seldom	Some- times	Often	Never	Very Seldom	Some- times	Often
1. Visit 4-H leaders in their homes.								
2. Recruit new 4-H leaders.								
3. Organize new 4-H clubs.								
4. Lead group of 4-H members similar to volunteer leader.								
5. Provide leadership to develop long range plans (2-5 years) for county 4-H programs.								
6. Conduct training for 4-H leaders.								
7. Determine training needs of 4-H leaders.								
8. Provide leadership to determine resources needed for county 4-H program.								
9. Work with other youth serving agencies to develop new programs.								
10. Promote 4-H programs in low income areas.								
11. Use specific programs (school cons., TV series, etc.) to introduce 4-H.								
12. Develop new programs in specific 4-H project area (i.e. Home Ec.)								
13. Work in certain geographic areas of county (twp., school dist., etc.) rather than total county.								
14. Make physical arrangements for major county 4-H activities.								
15. Work in all geographic areas of the county.								
16. Provide overall direction to the county 4-H program.								
17. Plan county 4-H activities with 4-H council and committees.								
18. Represent 4-H program to governing boards.								

(continued on next page)

4-H TASKS (Cont'd.)

	How often does 4-H PA perform this task?				How often do you perform this task?			
	Never	Very Seldom	Some-times	Often	Never	Very Seldom	Some-times	Often
19. Plan evaluation methods and procedures for determining effectiveness of county program.								
20. Coordinate total county 4-H program.								
21. Administer total county 4-H program.								
22. Free agent time for new programs by carrying out traditional routine in 4-H program.					not applicable			

10. How do you and the 4-H PA decide what each is going to do when you are planning together for an activity or program? An example might be planning a 4-H leader training program.

Listed below are several statements that may describe what is normally considered by you and the 4-H PA as you each accept tasks to complete an activity. Check those item(s) below that are most frequently considered by you in deciding who does what task. If additional consideration was given which are not listed, write them in available space.

1. ☐ Ability to perform the task
2. ☐ It was a task expected to be done by the 4-H PA or agent
3. ☐ Interest in doing that task by each person
4. ☐ The task was in the job description of 4-H PA or agent
5. ☐ Availability of time
6. ☐ Desire for experience (self-improvement)

11. What previous experiences did the 4-H PA have before employment as a 4-H PA that has helped the person to be successful in working in the 4-H program. Check only those statements (one or more) below that you feel apply to the PA or PA's in this county. Space is available to list additional experiences.

1. ☐ Was established in the community prior to employment.
2. ☐ Was a 4-H leader.
3. ☐ Had college training.
4. ☐ Had not had college training.
5. ☐ Was recognized as a "leader" in community by peers before employed as PA.
6. ☐ Worked with youth before employment.
7. ☐ Worked with groups before employment.
8. ☐ Worked with adults before employment.
9. ☐ Managed their own time.
10. ☐ Had no preconceived opinion or experiences that might block present performance.

12. From the list in item 11 you have just checked above, put an (X) beside the 2 or 3 experiences which you think have been most important in 4-H PA success.

13. Listed below are statements which describe personal characteristics 4-H PA's could have which could help that person be successful in their role with 4-H programs. You are asked to respond in two different ways to the list. First, indicate with a (✓) check which characteristics you feel the 4-H PA in this county possesses. Second, indicate with a check which characteristics you feel ideally the 4-H PA should possess. Space is available for additional characteristics.

<u>Characteristics</u>	<u>Characteristics 4-H PA has in County</u>	<u>Ideally, Characteristics 4-H PA Should have</u>
1. Has knowledge of client group's needs, attitudes, norms	_____	_____
2. Understands 4-H leaders' problems	_____	_____
3. Communicates very easily with clientele	_____	_____
4. Has a way of motivating others	_____	_____
5. Needs very little supervision	_____	_____
6. Likes to do tasks which require less training than an agent	_____	_____
7. Enjoys visiting with 4-H leaders and members	_____	_____
8. Enthusiastic	_____	_____
9. Has no racial/ethnic "hang-ups"	_____	_____
10. Sensitive to people	_____	_____
11. Has ability to adjust to different types of people	_____	_____
12. _____	_____	_____

14. From the list you have just checked above, put an (X) beside the 2 - 4 characteristics which you think have been the most important for 4-H PA success.

15. What have been the major results (advantage, costs, benefits, etc.) of employing 4-H PA's in this county? _____

16. What major problems or concerns do you have regarding the 4-H PA position? _____

17. What recommendations or suggestions would you make which would be an attempt to alleviate some of the problems or concerns regarding the 4-H PA position? _____

Place completed questionnaire in envelope provided and return to State 4-H Office.

Thanks!

APPENDIX B

TABLES OF FREQUENCY COUNT, MEAN AND STANDARD
DEVIATION OF 4-H TASKS AS SELF REPORTED BY
RESPONDENTS IN THE STUDY

Appendix Table B-1. Frequency Count, Mean and Standard Deviation of 4-H Tasks as Self Reported by Program Assistants by Type of County, Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974.

Task	Type of County	N	Responses				Mean	Std. Dev.
			N	VS	S	O		
1	A	21	1	0	9	11	3.43	.75
	B	28	1	3	13	11	3.21	.79
	C	13	0	1	8	4	3.23	.60
	Total	62	2	4	30	26	3.28	.72
2	A	19	0	2	5	12	3.53	.70
	B	28	0	4	3	21	3.61	.74
	C	13	0	1	6	6	3.38	.65
	Total	60	0	7	14	39	3.54	.69
3	A	21	0	3	6	12	3.43	.75
	B	28	0	3	10	15	3.43	.69
	C	13	1	1	7	4	3.08	.86
	Total	62	2	7	22	31	3.32	.79
4	A	19	5	6	5	3	2.32	1.06
	B	28	6	7	4	11	2.71	1.21
	C	13	2	3	4	2	2.77	1.09
	Total	60	12	16	13	19	2.63	1.14
5	A	20	4	3	8	5	2.70	1.08
	B	28	2	8	14	4	2.71	.81
	C	12	3	6	3	0	2.00	.74
	Total	60	9	17	25	9	2.63	.96
6	A	20	2	4	9	5	2.85	.93
	B	28	2	3	12	11	3.14	.89
	C	13	2	4	3	5	2.69	1.11
	Total	61	6	11	24	20	2.98	.95
7	A	20	2	2	7	9	3.15	.99
	B	28	1	8	8	11	3.04	.92
	C	13	1	3	5	4	2.92	.95
	Total	61	4	13	20	24	3.08	.93

Table B-1. Continued.

Task	Type of County	N	Responses				Mean	Std. Dev.
			N	VS	S	O		
8	A	21	0	4	8	9	3.24	.77
	B	28	2	4	14	8	3.00	.86
	C	13	1	5	6	1	2.54	.78
	Total	62	3	13	28	18	3.03	.85
9	A	20	1	4	10	5	2.95	.83
	B	28	4	5	11	8	2.82	1.02
	C	13	2	7	4	0	2.15	.69
	Total	62	7	15	27	13	2.72	.92
10	A	20	2	3	4	11	3.20	1.06
	B	28	2	2	7	17	3.39	.92
	C	13	1	0	8	4	3.15	.80
	Total	61	5	5	19	32	3.27	.91
11	A	20	2	3	5	10	3.15	1.04
	B	28	3	4	11	10	3.00	.98
	C	13	1	2	6	4	3.00	.91
	Total	61	6	9	22	24	3.03	.99
12	A	20	0	6	11	3	2.85	.67
	B	28	5	2	14	7	2.82	1.02
	C	13	1	4	5	3	2.77	.93
	Total	61	6	12	30	13	2.84	.88
13	A	20	9	1	6	4	2.25	1.25
	B	28	5	4	6	13	2.96	1.17
	C	13	2	2	7	2	2.69	.95
	Total	61	16	7	19	19	2.67	1.16
14	A	19	1	0	2	16	3.74	.73
	B	28	2	5	12	9	3.00	.90
	C	13	0	2	8	3	3.08	.64
	Total	60	3	7	22	28	3.27	.85
15	A	20	0	0	4	16	3.80	.41
	B	28	4	6	9	9	2.82	1.06
	C	13	0	1	6	6	3.38	.65
	Total	61	4	7	19	31	3.30	.90

Table B-1. Continued.

Task	Type of County	N	Responses				Mean	Std. Dev.
			N	VS	S	O		
16	A	20	0	1	6	13	3.60	.60
	B	27	11	6	6	4	2.11	1.12
	C	13	2	4	6	1	2.46	.88
	Total	60	13	11	18	18	2.70	1.10
17	A	20	2	1	0	17	3.60	.99
	B	27	4	8	8	7	2.67	1.04
	C	13	0	1	6	6	3.38	.65
	Total	60	6	10	14	30	3.17	1.02
18	A	19	3	3	10	3	2.68	.95
	B	27	7	8	9	3	2.30	.99
	C	13	4	6	3	0	1.92	.76
	Total	59	14	17	22	6	2.35	.94
19	A	20	0	4	9	7	3.15	.75
	B	27	3	12	10	2	2.41	.80
	C	13	1	4	8	0	2.54	.66
	Total	60	4	20	27	9	2.73	.83
20	A	20	1	0	2	17	3.75	.72
	B	27	9	7	6	5	2.26	1.13
	C	11	4	3	4	0	2.00	.89
	Total	58	14	10	12	22	2.72	1.19
21	A	20	2	2	3	13	3.35	1.04
	B	27	16	6	2	3	1.70	1.03
	C	12	4	6	2	0	1.83	.72
	Total	59	22	14	7	16	2.31	1.21
22	A	15	1	1	3	10	3.47	.92
	B	26	6	5	5	10	2.73	1.22
	C	13	1	1	8	3	3.00	.82
	Total	54	8	7	16	23	3.02	1.07

Appendix Table B-2. Frequency Count, Mean and Standard Deviation of 4-H Tasks as Self Reported by Supervising Agents by Type of County, Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, 1974.

Task	Type of County	N	Responses				Mean	Std. Dev.
			N	VS	S	O		
1	A	18	1	12	5	0	2.22	.55
	B	13	0	1	10	2	3.08	.49
	C	12	0	1	7	4	3.25	.62
	Total	43	1	14	22	6	2.81	.71
2	A	18	0	9	9	0	2.50	.51
	B	13	0	2	7	4	3.15	.69
	C	11	0	1	4	6	3.45	.69
	Total	42	0	12	20	10	2.96	.73
3	A	18	4	14	0	0	1.78	.43
	B	13	0	1	10	2	3.08	.49
	C	11	0	2	3	6	3.36	.81
	Total	42	4	17	13	8	2.63	.90
4	A	18	14	3	1	0	1.28	.57
	B	13	8	3	2	0	1.54	.78
	C	11	4	4	2	1	2.00	1.00
	Total	42	26	10	5	1	1.52	.78
5	A	18	0	2	9	7	3.28	.67
	B	13	0	0	2	11	3.85	.38
	C	12	0	0	3	9	3.75	.45
	Total	43	0	2	14	27	3.60	.58
6	A	18	0	9	8	1	2.56	.62
	B	13	0	1	6	6	3.38	.65
	C	12	0	0	7	5	3.42	.51
	Total	43	0	10	21	12	3.11	.73
7	A	17	0	5	9	3	2.88	.70
	B	13	0	0	4	9	3.69	.48
	C	12	0	0	5	7	3.58	.51
	Total	42	0	5	18	19	3.30	.66

Table B-2. Continued.

Task	Type of County	N	Responses				Mean	Std. Dev.
			N	VS	S	O		
8	A	18	0	2	7	9	3.39	.70
	B	13	0	0	2	11	3.85	.38
	C	12	0	0	2	10	3.83	.39
	Total	43	0	2	11	30	3.66	.56
9	A	18	1	7	8	2	2.61	.78
	B	13	0	4	5	4	3.00	.82
	C	11	0	1	8	2	3.09	.54
	Total	42	1	12	21	8	2.85	.73
10	A	18	0	5	11	2	2.83	.62
	B	13	0	2	6	5	3.23	.73
	C	12	0	2	7	3	3.08	.67
	Total	43	0	9	24	10	3.02	.68
11	A	18	3	10	5	0	2.11	.68
	B	13	1	3	4	5	3.00	1.00
	C	12	1	3	2	6	3.08	1.08
	Total	43	5	16	11	11	2.66	1.01
12	A	18	2	10	6	0	2.22	.65
	B	13	0	2	5	6	3.31	.75
	C	12	0	2	6	4	3.17	.72
	Total	43	2	14	17	10	2.85	.83
13	A	18	5	10	1	2	2.00	.91
	B	13	4	4	5	0	2.08	.86
	C	11	0	6	4	1	2.55	.69
	Total	42	9	20	10	3	2.15	.87
14	A	18	3	8	5	2	2.33	.91
	B	13	0	6	4	3	2.77	.83
	C	12	1	2	4	5	3.08	1.00
	Total	43	4	16	13	10	2.77	.96
15	A	18	2	5	4	7	2.89	1.08
	B	13	0	0	1	12	3.92	.28
	C	12	0	0	2	10	3.83	.39
	Total	43	2	5	7	29	3.51	.86

Table B-2. Continued.

Task	Type of County	N	Responses				Mean	Std. Dev.
			N	VS	S	0		
16	A	18	1	1	6	10	3.39	.85
	B	13	0	0	0	13	4.00	0.00
	C	12	0	0	0	12	4.00	0.00
	Total	43	1	1	6	35	3.77	.60
17	A	18	1	6	9	2	2.67	.77
	B	13	0	0	1	12	3.92	.28
	C	12	0	0	1	11	3.92	.29
	Total	43	1	6	11	25	3.43	.80
18	A	18	0	1	4	13	3.67	.59
	B	13	0	1	2	10	3.69	.63
	C	12	0	0	3	9	3.75	.45
	Total	43	0	2	9	32	3.72	.54
19	A	18	0	2	9	7	3.28	.67
	B	12	0	0	5	7	3.58	.51
	C	12	0	0	6	6	3.50	.52
	Total	42	0	2	20	20	3.43	.58
20	A	18	0	4	8	6	3.11	.76
	B	13	0	0	0	13	4.00	0.00
	C	12	0	0	1	11	3.92	.29
	Total	43	0	4	9	30	3.64	.64
21	A	18	0	5	4	9	3.22	.88
	B	12	0	0	0	12	4.00	0.00
	C	12	0	0	0	12	4.00	0.00
	Total	42	0	5	4	33	3.70	.66