

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Richard W. Noland for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Education presented on June 7, 1982

Title: An Assessment of Middle-Management Volunteers in Oregon's
4-H Program

Redacted for Privacy

Abstract approved: _____

Tom E. Grigsby 1 0

The central purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the participation rate of young people in 4-H programs utilizing middle-management volunteers and selected organizational and descriptive variables. The population of this study was the 1979-1980 community coordinator population (middle-management volunteers) in Oregon's 4-H programs.

Several variables related to the role of middle-manager were analyzed: activities, attitude toward role, management by paid staff, quality of communication in programs, and general program and volunteer characteristics. Pearson product moment correlation of coefficient, Spearman rank correlation and Kendall tau were utilized for statistical analyses of relationships between productivity (defined as recruitment effectiveness) and each variable.

Selected conclusions of the study were: 1) Volunteers from programs with higher participation rates were less satisfied with their role, 2) Volunteers from lower income families were generally more effective in recruiting than higher income individuals, 3) Volunteers whose role was carefully delineated by paid staff were gen-

erally more productive, 4) Volunteers receiving higher levels of direct paid staff leadership were generally less productive.

Selected recommendations were: 1) Paid staff must be sensitive to the need for role definition by volunteers, 2) Paid staff must limit the scope of responsibilities of volunteers to increase the satisfaction of volunteers with their role, 3) Research should be conducted that includes qualitative measures of the productivity of the middle-manager as well as the quantitative measures utilized in this study.

An Assessment of Middle-Management
Volunteers in Oregon's
4-H Programs

by

Richard W. Noland

A THESIS

Submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Completed June 7, 1982

Commencement June 1983

APPROVED

Redacted for Privacy

Professor in Charge of Major _____

Redacted for Privacy

Department Head in Charge of Major _____

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School _____

Date thesis is presented June 7, 1982

Typed by Jeanne Werner for Richard W. Noland

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank members of my doctoral committee, Dr. Tom Grigsby, Dr. Alan Snider, Dr. Gary Tiedeman, Dr. Lafayette G. Harter, and Dr. Royal Jackson, all of whom assisted me in the completion of this project. I am particularly indebted to Dr. Tom Grigsby for the extra efforts and time spent in assisting me through my graduate program.

I would also like to thank the Oregon State University Extension Service for their assistance in conducting the survey. I am particularly indebted to Dr. Alan Snider who was always willing to make time for me and this project and who's assistance contributed greatly to the completion of the research.

Additionally, I am grateful for the 195 people in the 4-H program who took time out from their busy schedules to complete the questionnaire. I sincerely hope that they will realize some benefits from this study.

I am indebted to my Mother-in-law, Jeanne Werner and my wife, Peggy for the many hours, which stretched into days, spent correcting and typing this thesis. I also thank my good friends and neighbors, Ken and Eva Salter for their special support over the last year.

Finally, I want to thank, above all, my wife, Peggy and our three children for their support through the last few years of my graduate program. Their patience, love and understanding made it possible to spend the extra hours necessary to finish this program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	INTRODUCTION	1
	General Background	1
	Statement of Problem	3
	Rationale of the Study	4
	Limitations	7
	Definition of Terms	7
II	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	9
	Volunteerism	9
	Effectiveness in Management	15
	Variables Relating to Effectiveness	20
	Identifying the Variables Relating to Effectiveness	24
	Conclusion	27
III	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	29
	Problem Restatement	29
	Hypotheses	29
	The Research Design	30
	The Survey Instrument	31
	The Population	33
	The Procedures	35
	Method of Analysis	35
IV	REPORT AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	37
	Hypothesis 1	39
	Hypothesis 2	45
	Hypothesis 3	53
	Hypothesis 4	56
	Hypothesis 5	61
	Hypothesis 6	63
	Hypothesis 7	66
	Summary of Statistical Findings	71
V	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	78
	Summary	78
	Conclusions	83
	Recommendations	89
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	90
	APPENDICES	94

LIST OF TABLES

		<u>Page</u>
I	Oregon Counties Using Community Coordinators in 1979-1980	34
II	County Ranking by Participation Rate	38
III	County Ranking by Community Coordinators	40
IV	Measurement of Participation Rate and the Number of Community Coordinators in Each County	41
V	County Comparisons of Rankings For Number of Coordinators and Participation Rate	43
VI	Measurement of Participation Rate and the Amount of Time Spent in Specific Activities	47
VII	Measurement of Participation Rate and Attitude Toward Specific Activities (All 19 Counties)	49
VIII	Measurement of Participation Rate and Attitude Toward Specific Activities (Urban and Rural Counties).	52
IX	Measurement of Productivity Rate and Opinion of Role of Community Coordinator	56
X	Measurement of Participation Rate and Opinion of Organizational Management of Community Coordinators by Paid Staff	58
XI	Measurement of Participation Rate and Opinion of Support for Community Coordinators	62
XII	Measurement of Participation Rate and Opinion of Quality of Communication Among Leaders	64
XIII	County Ranking by Participation Rate and Corresponding Median of Descriptive Data (Part I) (Median of Number Assigned to Cells)	68
XIV	County Ranking by Participation Rate and Corresponding Median of Descriptive Data (Part II) (Median of Number Assigned to Cells)	69
XV	Measurement of Participation Rate and Descriptive Analysis	70

AN EVALUATION OF PRODUCTIVITY AND
RELATED VARIABLES FOR MIDDLE-MANAGEMENT VOLUNTEERS
IN OREGON 4-H PROGRAMS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

General Background

Tocqueville once said, "I have often admired the extreme skill with which the inhabitants of the United States succeed in proposing a common objective to the exertions of a great many men, and in getting them voluntarily to pursue it" (Tocqueville, 1961:128). Many observers of this country have agreed that from the inception of the government, volunteerism has made a fundamental contribution to the establishment and promotion of its culture and institutions.

Today millions of Americans unite as volunteers to participate in the support of youth organizations, charities, educational endeavors and political causes. One of these organizations which is found in states and counties all across America is the 4-H program, which is guided by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Over 5-1/2 million young people in the United States belong to the 4-H. The size of this organization is due primarily to the active role of volunteers, who have served in the 4-H since its inception in the early 1900's. These volunteers are men and women who function as club leaders, key leaders, project leaders, resource leaders, district leaders, activity leaders, and community coordinators. Volunteers also participate in overseeing 4-H programs by

serving on program development committees, advisory committees, leader association councils, and state development committees.

In Oregon, 4-H programs rely heavily on volunteers for the implementation of their objectives. There are over five thousand volunteers who serve as project leaders or community coordinators of such varied activities as sewing, horseback riding, and building and repairing small engines.

One study of Oregon's 4-H programs found that the majority of the work done with club members was performed by volunteers. These volunteers collectively gave an annual total of 340 working years of their time which is five days of unpaid time for every one day of paid time given by all the professional staff in Oregon in a given year. (Sawer, 1980:iv).

The professional staff in Oregon's 4-H programs is limited to the extension agent and sometimes a program assistant. The extension agent is employed by the Oregon State University Extension Service, and works in the county to which he is assigned. In larger counties there will be several extensions agents, only some of whom specialize in youth programs, which include 4-H.

For a number of years the professional leadership of the 4-H programs in Oregon has been concerned about the use of the volunteer in middle-management roles and the factors which make programs in which they serve successful. In nineteen counties in Oregon selected volunteers have been designated as community coordinators, which are middle-management positions. These community coordinators have been assigned by the extension agent to take charge of recruiting young

people and leaders into the 4-H program.

The concern about measuring the productivity of volunteer middle-managers and the variables which contribute to productivity led to a request by the Oregon State University Extension Service to study the use of community coordinators in county 4-H programs. The "effectiveness measure" already in use by the Extension Service was the participation rate of school age children in the 4-H program in the different counties. For the purpose of continuity and expediency the present study used program participation as the measure of productivity of the 4-H county programs. This is a purely quantitative measure and cannot necessarily be used for any statement regarding the quality of the county 4-H programs.

Statement of Problem

The central problem of this study was to examine the relationship between the productivity of middle-management volunteers and selected organizational variables. The major objectives of the study were:

1. to review existing research related to productivity of volunteers in organizations;
2. to develop a methodology for research in middle-management volunteer productivity;
3. to administer this instrumentation to a population consisting of 271 community coordinators;
4. to determine if there is a relationship between selected organizational variables and volunteer productivity;
5. to utilize findings to suggest modifications in training and/or organizational structure designed to improve the productivity of middle-management volunteers in 4-H programs.

Rationale of the Study

The concern about measuring the impact of volunteers has been expressed by many leaders in the field of volunteerism and 4-H programs. There has also been some discussion in the literature about the difficulty of measuring effectiveness and those factors that contribute to it.

According to Virgil Peterson, an active member of the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars and the Society of Field Experience Education, volunteerism needs must continue to be fostered in our society, and we must spend more of our time looking for those variables that are important to the effectiveness of volunteers (Peterson, 1979:14).

These variables, once identified and quantified, can become the key to a successful volunteer program. Marlene Wilson, in her book, The Effective Management of Volunteer Programs, points out the importance of the relationship between assessing the right variables in a volunteer program and its success in meeting its stated objectives (Wilson, 1976:88). Without a knowledge of which variables contribute to the effectiveness of a volunteer program's stated objectives it would be very difficult to assess the causes of program deficiencies. It is one thing to say a program is or is not effective; it is quite another thing to state why.

Knowing which variables need to be analyzed in a program evaluation is also a problem in the private sector. Harry Levinson, writing in the Harvard Business Review, believes that "...some results [of evaluation] are not worth the means some take to achieve them." He

goes on to say that "...the major fault in performance appraisal... [is] namely, a fundamental misconception of what is to be appraised." He concludes that both behavior and outcome are important, and neither should be overlooked (Levinson, 1979:280).

Harriet H. Naylor, speaking to the National Conference on Social Welfare, challenged her audience with the statement that, "Evaluation of voluntary action is a major concern to administrators and to volunteers" (Naylor, 1974).

The National Task Force on 4-H in Century III made several recommendations to strengthen 4-H and keep it strong and growing in the years to come. Among those recommendations was to:

Develop a more effective and systematic program of evaluation, reporting and accountability to demonstrate how time, talent, money, and other resources entrusted to 4-H were invested and what results were obtained (Brown, 1976:7).

Roger L. Lawrence, who served as Chairman of Program Development Ad Hoc Committee for the Cooperative Extension Service in Iowa in 1973, emphasised a need for some accountability on the impact of extension programs. This need is a reflection of the concern over the effectiveness of educational institutions (Lawrence, 1973:4).

Herbert Herman, while writing about the difficulties in appraising managers in any organization, calls the performance appraisal the "Achilles Heel" of the management profession (Herman, 1975:61). At the same time, G. T. Berkwitt, writing for Dun's, reported that "...top management simply does not know very much about measuring the performance of middle-management" (Berkwitt, 1971:61).

The literature on management, volunteerism, and on 4-H organiza-

tions is in accord on both the importance of identifying the variables that contribute to a manager's effectiveness in reaching a stated objective and the difficulty in evaluating (I.E., measuring) those variables.

The difficulty of evaluating the variables that lead to effectiveness in the organization is a result of the difference between measuring what Amitai Etzioni calls "effectiveness" and "efficiency". Effectiveness, he states, is not difficult to measure when there is a limited, concrete goal. Efficiency, on the other hand, is difficult to measure in service organizations because of the vagueness of the meaning of efficiency and the problem of the presence of "sameness" in the service organization's functions (Etzioni, 1964:10).

Another problem that makes it difficult to evaluate volunteer organizations is that of the volunteer agencies being so busy doing things in the little time allotted that there isn't time left over for serious evaluation (O'Connell, 1976:177).

The difficulty in evaluating the variables that contribute to effectiveness and the lack of time available to do this evaluation has resulted in a need for more research in this area. Ivan H. Scheier, a leading authority in managing volunteers, has said, "Much of the existing research on the effectiveness of volunteers as clients is inadequate and ambiguous" (Scheier, 1979:67).

The net result of a deficiency in the research in identifying variables that contribute to effectiveness of volunteers is the difficulty for staff to properly supervise the volunteer. Vanda Williamson, writing in Voluntary Action Leadership, said that:

"When inappropriate behavior continues, the supervisor finds it awkward or impossible to comment or make corrections because there is no formal evaluation procedure" (Williamson, 1979:29).

This study will contribute to the evaluation of information, volunteerism, and program and personnel evaluations by quantifying the relationship of variables within a voluntary organization with its effectiveness in meeting a specifically stated objective.

Limitations

The ability to generalize the findings of this study may be limited by the following factors:

1. The study was limited to 4-H programs which used middle-management volunteers (community coordinators) in the state of Oregon in the school year of 1979-1980.
2. The study was limited to those members of the population (see limitation #1) which responded to a questionnaire sent to all members of that population identified by the county staff in Oregon in the school year of 1980-1981.
3. The study was limited in that it only used the published statistics given by the Oregon Department of Education for the population of young people in the different counties in Oregon.
4. The analysis of the effectiveness of community coordinators was limited to the ratio of 4-H club members to young people enrolled in public schools.

Definition of Terms

Volunteer: Anyone who freely provides goods or services without any financial gain or remuneration.

Direct Service Volunteers: People who have direct contact with clients.

Indirect Service Volunteers: People who have no direct contact with a client but still provide a service.

Material Donors: Those who provide tangible goods such as food, clothing, or money.

Advisory Volunteers: People who provide advice and counsel on various matters pertaining to operation or clients.

Regular Service Volunteer: Anyone who engages in a specific ongoing service on a continuous basis, like driving a bus.

Occasional Service Volunteer: Anyone who performs only occasionally or does a one-time service.

Client: The beneficiary of the volunteer's service; that is, the one who is directly benefitted from the volunteer's work.

Middle-Management: Those positions or job descriptions which fall between top management, who are responsible for overall program direction and progress, and workers and helpers who carry on the week-to-week work with club members.

Community Coordinators: A middle-management volunteer position in 4-H club work that is to help the agent in securing club leaders and members and help them in their assigned roles.

Community Club Leader: A volunteer responsible for organizing and supervising a 4-H club and a contact person for the community coordinator or extension office.

Project Club Leader: A volunteer who works with a small group (around ten) on a specific project and meets regularly with them.

Assistant Leader: A volunteer who shares leadership and program responsibilities with the club leader.

Resource Leader: A specialist in an area in which he shares his expertise when needed.

Activity Leader: A volunteer who helps identify and plan activities.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The role of the volunteer in American society has been the subject of numerous studies and journal articles. Some of these studies show the impact that volunteers have had on our society, while others attempt to explain why people volunteer. There have also been numerous studies dealing with the variables that relate to effective management, productivity, and measuring effectiveness.

Literature related to this research is presented in four sections. The first segment deals with the general field of volunteerism, its history and importance in our society. Section two deals with effectiveness in management, how it is defined and ways it is determined. Section three discusses the variables that relate to effectiveness, while the final segment deals with how the variables might be identified and measured.

Volunteerism

Susan J. Ellis and Katherine H. Noyes, after extensive research into the history of volunteerism in the United States, observed that "citizen volunteering has always been so integral to American life that it is often taken for granted" (Ellis, 1980:2).

In answering the question, "Exactly what is a volunteer?" many experts have provided definitions that combine not only to identify the volunteer, but also his role in society. For example, Leo Perlis, writing in the Voluntary Action News, said, "The traditional

role, of course, is one of *giving* - the *giving* of one's self to one's fellowmen" (Perlis, 1974:5). Eugene Shenfield wrote, "...in a sense (volunteers) were the keepers of the public conscience, dedicated to the amelioration of human suffering and the righting of human wrong" (Shenfield, 1960:157).

The link between the volunteer and democracy is also a common theme in the literature on volunteerism. A book published by the Center for a Voluntary Society begins with a chapter, "Democracy and Volunteerism," in which the authors make a strong case for volunteerism being an essential ingredient to a democratic society. Edward C. Lindeman is quoted as saying that volunteers "keep democracy alive." "They epitomize freedom and are to our society what the Bill of Rights is to the Constitution which governs us. The health of a democratic society may be measured in terms of the quality of services rendered by citizens who act in obedience to the unenforceable" (Schindler, 1971:5). This may be seen in the volunteer fireman or soldier who renders assistance, not due to coercion, but from a heartfelt obligation to voluntarily assist in the protection of his society.

Volunteerism is expanding in this country. This trend is not only in evidence now, as smaller budgets result in a cutback of the professional services which results in volunteers attempting to fill the gap, but was a trend before the economic downturn of the late seventies and eighties.

The 1974 edition of the American Volunteer reported that between 1967 and 1974 the proportion of the adult population involved in

volunteer activities increased 6 percent, or from 18 percent to 24 percent (O'Connell, 1974:xvi). In a study entitled American Volunteer, the U.S. Department of Labor claims that "A new consciousness of domestic deprivation, ...a rising affluence that permits increasing leisure have recently induced considerable growth... (of) ...the volunteer" (O'Connell, 1974:xvi).

Brian O'Connell identifies four stages in the development of volunteerism in America. The first stage was during the period of colonization when people worked together in churches, towns and government in order to survive. The second stage began in the 1860's as a response to the needs of the Civil War and continued through the "Gilded Age" as a result of the accumulated wealth and prosperity of the American industrial revolution. During this second stage the Red Cross, YMCA, Volunteers of America, Goodwill Industries, and the American Cancer Society were established. The third stage in the history of volunteerism took place starting in 1938 with the "March of Dimes," when volunteerism became part of the American middle class. During this period the philanthropy of the wealthy was enhanced by the contributions of the middle and lower classes through nickel and dime collections and payroll deductions. We are currently in the fourth stage, which began in the 1960's in what some call "participatory democracy," in which all parts of society are involved. This last stage has included the volunteer actions of minorities trying to change society, protestors marching for a "better world" and Peace Corps workers reaching outside our society to help people in other cultures, and it has also been seen

in the consumer movement as well as political organizations like Common Cause (O'Connell, 1974:xvi).

One of the characteristics of volunteerism throughout its history is the need for leadership to direct volunteers. Susan Ellis and Katherine Noyes of the organization "Energize," have traced the history of volunteer administration and have identified three sources of leadership for the volunteers:

1. "Select members of the volunteer group;
2. persons holding salaried positions, who supervise volunteers as a secondary responsibility;
3. persons paid for the primary purpose of coordinating volunteers" (Ellis, 1980:2).

If the leadership is being provided by a volunteer, then he becomes a decision-making volunteer who donates his time to leadership tasks, as opposed to service or program volunteers who give their time to activity tasks (Stenzel, 1976:4).

The 4-H is an organization that began in the United States in the early 1900's. It was originally a rural program geared to the farm children in the midwest. As the clubs began to grow and diversify, their activities began to appeal to suburban and city youngsters, with the result that today only about a fourth of the 4-H club members actually live on farms.

The 4-H clubs are composed of young people between the ages of nine and nineteen. Most of the neighborhood clubs have at least one adult volunteer leader who oversees the activities of the young people. There are also temporary special interest groups who form workshops or courses around activities such as sewing, horseback

riding, or working on automobiles. Today there are over 5,000,000 young people in 4-H clubs around the United States.

The modern day 4-H club is overseen by the County Extension Agent, who is employed by the Cooperative Extension Service, a joint project of Federal, State and County governments, administered through state land-grant universities. Today, most of the management of 4-H clubs is done by paid staff (agents or program assistants) with volunteers generally working directly with the young people in the clubs.

Because of the growing responsibilities of agents in some areas of the U.S., and because resources are scarce to hire extra help, some of the middle-management work is being done by volunteers. This has resulted in a call by paid staff to expand and develop a middle-management role model for volunteers to fill in the 4-H programs. In January of 1982 a workshop on "Middle-management Approach for County 4-H Staffing" was held by the Cooperative Extension Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the benefit of county agents and 4-H staff. This workshop was an attempt to help meet the growing need of managerial aid in the 4-H programs by promoting the use of volunteers in middle-management positions. This concern for volunteer leaders as middle managers was expressed in a program called "4-H in Century III" adopted by New York State, where it was suggested that "in-service programs for county 4-H staff be provided in management skills...including development, delegation and management of volunteer leader systems" (Sterling, 1971:1).

In Oregon the delegation of middle-management responsibilities in 4-H to volunteers has been going on in some counties for ten years. These volunteer positions are called "Community Coordinators" and are primarily responsible for developing new clubs by recruiting young people and leaders. In 1979-1980 out of thirty-six counties in Oregon, nineteen reported the use of community coordinators to recruit young people. In looking at the activities of community coordinators a past study found that 98% of community coordinators were involved with recruiting members and leaders, and that the second highest percent involved in a common activity was transporting self or others (only 5%) (Sawer, 1980:6). Although community coordinators are engaged in many middle-management activities in their counties, their major responsibility is the recruiting of members and leaders.

Trying to assess or evaluate which variables are related to productivity has always been of interest to managers. In the area of the volunteer, almost every discussion in the literature includes something about the need for constant evaluation, but very few studies attempt to define evaluation or how to go about it.

In an article for the National Information Center on Volunteers, Evan M. Scheier gives three reasons why evaluation of the volunteer needs to be done:

1. "Increasingly, program sponsors and funders require it, whether they be local, state, or national - private or government."
2. "Evaluation is the only way we're going to preserve what is good in our program and improve what is not."

3. "It is important for staff/volunteer morale - someone cares enough to look at what they are doing" (Scheier, 1977:10).

Rita L. Katzman, writing in Voluntary Action Leadership, has stated that when trying to develop standards by which local welfare offices could implement a volunteer service program, officials have had to include some way to measure and monitor production of personnel (volunteers) (Katzman, 1980:38).

In an article entitled Should Volunteers be Fired, Diane M. Disney, a management consultant, writes:

"When inappropriate behavior continues, the supervisor finds it awkward or impossible to comment or make corrections because there is no formal evaluation procedure" (Williamson, 1979:29).

The lack of an evaluation process makes it difficult for the volunteer to know how well he is doing or what criteria the supervisor can utilize to measure behavior. She goes on to say that there should be regular evaluation sessions (Williamson, 1979:30).

In conclusion, volunteerism is and always has been an important part of the American scene. Volunteers need to be engaged in productive activities for their own satisfaction and for the program's success. There is little doubt that most writers in the area of volunteerism believe that an ongoing evaluation of the volunteer is important. There is also very little information available as to which variables are related to volunteer effectiveness.

Effectiveness in Management

Determining the effectiveness of managers is the focus of many articles and books in the business field. The concern for an effec-

tive administration has become more and more apparent as productivity in the United States has declined in recent years. The result has been a surge in the demand for performance appraisals. Daniel E. Lupton, a principal at Towers, Perrin, Forster and Crosby, Inc., said: "Over the last three years I've done nearly seventy (assignments to set up) performance appraisals, where I used to do no more than six a year" (Business Week, 1980:153).

Along with the growing concern of managerial effectiveness is the growing controversy over how to go about appraising managers. In the same Business Week article quoted above, it was stated that "The experts agree only on what a performance appraisal should not be... [and]...there is no unanimity over what constitutes 20th Century state-of-the-art" (Business Week, 1980:153).

Traditionally, managers have been appraised on the basis of personality traits; however, the emphasis in this area has become the subject of some criticism in recent years. According to Robert Lahti, "Early runners in the field of employee evaluations tended to rate personality traits, which has proven to be a rather fruitless exercise" (Lahti, 1973:490). Harold Koontz, in the preface of his book Appraising Managers as Managers, states: "Traditional appraisal of managers on the elusive standards of personal traits...has been both ineffective and illusory" (Koontz, 1971:ix).

The result of dissatisfaction with looking at personalities in evaluating managers has resulted in a shift toward evaluation of how well they do their jobs. One of the contributors to Policies and Practices in Public Personnel Administration states:

"Largely because of dissatisfaction with the person-centered approach, American managers have turned to results-oriented procedures, particularly in evaluating executive performance. The results-oriented approach is based upon the assumption that the employee's performance, rather than the employee himself, is the proper subject of evaluation" (Lopez, 1968:213).

Measuring success by what the manager accomplishes has resulted in a move toward goal-oriented appraisals. Robert Lahti says that now the "emphasis is on goal-oriented appraisals (and that) they focus on measurable accomplishments arising from specific goals" (Lahti, 1973:490).

Peter F. Drucker states in his book Management: Tasks • Responsibilities • Practices:

"A productivity measurement is the best yardstick for comparing managements of different units within an enterprise, and for comparing managements of different enterprises. Productivity is the first test of management competence" (Drucker, 1974:111).

Despite this move toward evaluating managers on the basis of productivity, there still remains a lot of confusion and controversy on how to measure productivity. Richard Henderson, in his book Performance Appraisal: Theory to Practice states: "It has always been difficult to judge performance, which basically has two parts -- quantity of output and quality of output." He then goes on to say that as you move from manufacturing to services "...the quality issue becomes more important and also more difficult to resolve as it becomes harder to pinpoint" (Koontz, 1971:X).

The problem of defining both quantity and quality has resulted in shifting the assessment of effectiveness toward quantifiable goals, which means diminishing the importance of quality. According to

Harold Koontz:

"The current widespread interest in management by objectives owes much of its origin to a search for means of appraising managers. Disillusioned by the subjectivity traits and work qualities, intelligent practitioners have understandably looked at what the purpose of organized activity is...it therefore became natural and logical to appraise managers against the standard of their most important criteria of performance--the setting and achievement of objectives" (Koontz, 1971:X).

To define measurable behavior in management is no easy task. Because of this, "goal-setting" as a way to reduce ambiguity in expectations has become a common practice. Richard Henderson states that "goal setting can improve organizational productivity (and that) ambiguity must be minimized concerning what is desired, what is done..."(Henderson, 1980:88).

Paul H. Thompson and Gene W. Dalton of Harvard Business School have stated that, "One method used to ensure that subordinates are evaluated...differently according to performance is to use some form of performance ranking, an approach which has been gaining in popularity in recent years" (Thompson,1970:83).

Measuring performance based upon stated objectives has also become an important part of the process of evaluating volunteers. Mike Haines, writing in Volunteers: How to Find Them...How to Keep Them, says,"...the job description in many ways acts as the agreement or 'contract' between the volunteer and the organization or group." He then states that the existence of this agreement "...gives the organization or group a basis for approaching a volunteer who is not living up to his/her responsibilities" (Haines, 1977:14).

Stated goals are necessary, according to some researchers, for any evaluation of the effectiveness of a voluntary organization.

Nancy Pierce and Donald Higgins said, after surveying 39 volunteer agencies, that "evaluation is only possible if there are goals and objectives to measure." This means that the goals and objectives become the standard or measurement by which success or failure is measured (Pierce, 1976:45).

In the 4-H program in Oregon, decisions in the staffing of County Extension have been influenced directly by the ability of agents to meet agreed-upon goals. An in-house memo from H. Joe Myers, Assistant Director, 4-H Youth, relies almost totally on enrollment figures in the discussion of the staff needs, and projects these needs based upon the number of members recruited or to be recruited. In other words, the quantifiable goal which is the basis of decisions on hiring managers in Oregon's 4-H program is the number of recruited 4-H members (Myers, 1979).

The literature on measuring effectiveness in management shows that assessing effectiveness is difficult and certainly controversial. The easiest and least subjective or ambiguous way to assess managers is on the basis of quantifiable objectives. Because this is the easiest does not mean, however, that it is conclusive. The goal of the community coordinator may be to recruit club members. But to say that community coordinator A is a more successful middle-manager than community coordinator B because he recruits more members is misleading. Quality cannot always be defined in terms of quantity, and community coordinator A may simply be coercing young people into a program they will drop out of

at the earliest opportunity, while community coordinator B is searching for those young people who will actually enjoy and benefit from being club members.

Variables Relating to Effectiveness

As one reads the literature dealing with evaluating managers, it becomes apparent that identifying variables which influence effectiveness is as controversial as defining effectiveness. G.J. Berkwitz, writing in Dun's, stated that, "In the painful ensuing cutback, one thing has become clear; top management simply does not know very much about measuring the performance of middle management." He goes on to say that this has also become one of the major frustrations of middle managers (Berkwitz, 1971:61). This inability to "measure performance" has resulted in a lack of understanding of what contributes to "good performance". If we cannot measure the performance of managers, we certainly will have a difficult time in determining what contributes to differences in effectiveness. What information is available on variables relating to effectiveness may be categorized under three general areas: management style, attitude toward job, and activities required to be performed.

Dr. Ivan H. Scheier and the Operations Analysis Unit of the National Information Center on Volunteerism have developed what they call the Basic Feedback System, which is designed to assess the effectiveness of volunteer programs and pinpoint variables which may be creating problems for a program. An examination of the questionnaires used in this feedback system reveals that most of the questions (other

than demographic data) can be categorized under the following three groupings:

1. Management style (how the program is managed).
2. Attitude of volunteer (how he feels about the program).
3. Activities (what is being done) (Reigel, 1977).

Another way of looking at variables relating to effectiveness is from the viewpoint of motivational theory. There are three basic areas which are important in motivating managers to be more effective:

1. Organizational climate--psychological atmosphere--directly related to supervision or top management.
2. Extrinsic incentives--working conditions or job descriptions and how one feels about them.
3. Task an employee performs--what the person actually does (Chung, 1977:10).

The Manual for a Volunteer Service System takes a closer look at organizational climate and, in particular, management's concern for staff-volunteer relationship and management style. The two following questions are asked under the heading dealing with the volunteer-staff relationship:

- a. Do they work well with staff?
- b. Do they know who to report a problem to?

Along with questions dealing with volunteers and staff, there are concerns about job descriptions and other supportive functions of staff (Helgerson, 1974:22).

Paul H. Thompson and Gene W. Dalton of Harvard Business School relate the motivation of managers directly to how the supervisory staff makes them work. In other words, what is the managerial atmosphere that top management compels middle-management to work in? (Thompson, 1970:156).

Marlene Wilson, in the Effective Management of Volunteer Programs, spends time discussing the effect of management style and relationships to volunteers and points out that it has a direct bearing on motivation and achievement (Wilson, 1976:80).

Courtney Schwartz, writing in the Journal of Extension, places a lot of the responsibility for the effectiveness of volunteer middle managers upon the supervision they get from paid staff. He states that "the person who receives good supervision will usually find many job satisfactions and do a good job" (Schwartz, 1978:28).

After doing a study of criminal justice volunteer program managers, Robert T. Sigler and Keith J. Leenhouts believe "the most crucial element in this setting (volunteer program) is the volunteer program manager." This link between manager and success was stressed throughout their report (Sigler, 1980:13).

The second grouping of variables deals with extrinsic conditions and resulting attitudes. The importance of this group to volunteer effectiveness is demonstrated in the Manual for a Volunteer Service System by the presence of questions dealing with things like "willingness," "morale," and "rate of turnover" (Helgerson, 1974:22).

Nancy Fierce and Donal Higgins stress that an attitude of interest in activity was extremely important to the success of the program. They also claimed that "the hallmark of a successful volunteer program is retention of volunteers" (Fierce, 1976:44).

Al Snider, an Extension Specialist working with 4-H youth programs in Oregon, stated that volunteers want meaningful work. He believes that job satisfaction and self motivation are directly related

to the volunteer's attitude about his job and his need to feel that it is meaningful (Snider, 1979).

Writing in the Volunteer Administration, Robert T. Sigler and Keith J. Leenhouts state that "there is widespread agreement that satisfaction is a key ingredient in retaining volunteers" (Sigler, 1980:14). They also state that their research supports the position the "program climate" is crucial to the success of a program (Sigler, 1980:14).

What the person will be doing is another important variable relating to effectiveness. Al Snider stated that "one of the most significant factors in effectively managing volunteers seems to be effectively designing work that is meaningful for the volunteer." He goes on to quote the president of NICOV, Ivan Scheier's, statement that "90% of the work of the management of volunteers is accomplished when meaningful work is effectively designed for volunteers (Snider, 1979).

Courteny Schwartz attempts to identify the type of activities volunteer middle-managers want to do in his article in the Journal of Extension. He states, "The manager...isn't so interested in the minute supervisory tasks or particularly how the task is going to be done, but is interested in whether it is done" (Schwartz, 1978:27). What he implies is that middle-manager volunteers are more effective if they stay away from the "particulars."

Hope M. Martin, discussing a 4-H interim report, stated that "as a volunteer is recruited his first interest is in what kind of job he will be doing and what the benefits of his time and help will be"

(Martin, 1973:6). The relationship to what a volunteer will be doing and his effectiveness is again implied.

Richard H. Hall reported that effectiveness depends on communication. A system operating on the premise that inputs are largely information must rely on the quality of information to influence the effectiveness of the organization. The more comprehensive the information, the better the decision-making, power utilization, leadership, and effectiveness (Hall, 1972:292).

When there is a discussion in the literature about the variables which contribute to effectiveness, the variables can normally be categorized under the general headings of management style, support and communication, attitude of the assessed person, and activities engaged in by the assessed person. All four of these areas appear to be relevant to a study of the contributing factors of a successful volunteer program using volunteers as middle managers.

Identifying the Variables Relating to Effectiveness

Though identifying the variables relating to effectiveness is both difficult and controversial, it is still important enough to be attempted in both the professional world and with volunteers. This section of the review of literature will focus on the general category of variables which professionals in the field of management have accepted or rejected as being critical in an analysis of effectiveness or productivity.

Amitai Etzioni, in an article in the Administrative Science Quarterly, emphasized the need for analyzing work conditions when

looking at variables relating to effectiveness:

"A major interest of the student of organizations is to determine the conditions under which attainment of (organizational)...goals is promoted or hindered" (Etzioni, 1959:53).

This means it is important to take a close look at conditions within the organization which may both promote or hinder effectiveness of the organization.

Amitai Etzioni, in A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, talks of two models which emphasize the components of an organizational set-up, components which, when identified, will become the variables that contribute to effectiveness. These two models are:

1. Survival Model--variables that allow a system to exist.
2. Effectiveness Model--pattern of interactions among the elements of the system which make it most effective in the service of a given goal (Etzioni, 1961).

Looking at variables in an organization with the "Survival Model" in mind may help in pinpointing which of the variables may be more crucial than others. This could be done by simply asking "What would happen if variables ceased to exist?".

Harry Levinson, writing in the Harvard Business Review on Human Relations, discusses the difficulty in getting an adequate performance of managers. He emphasized that when looking at variables contributing to the manager's effectiveness, "both behavior and outcome are important and neither should be overlooked" (Levinson, 1979:292).

In an article that appeared in the May 19, 1980 issue of Business Week entitled "Appraising the Performance Appraisal," the Corning Glass Works was said to use a 76 point appraisal form when evaluating personnel. This form was the result of an attempt to pinpoint beha-

avior which contributed to the employee's effectiveness in the job (Business Week, 1980:292).

In addition to looking at the conditions under which a person is working and what it is that they do (behavior), another important group of variables in traditional performance appraisal methods has been personal qualities. This area of traits, however, has been criticized because of its subjective nature. M.R. Williams, in Performance Appraisal in Management, claims that looking at personal qualities "provides a manager with little more than superficial and often inappropriate 'judgments' about his subordinate" (Williams, 1972:9). The White House in July of 1979 attempted to evaluate subordinates on personal traits such as "stability" and "brightness," and the critics generally were reported to have regarded this as so subjective and weighted toward personality as to be useless at best and damaging at worst (Business Week, 1980: 153).

The organizational environment, which is to a large degree determined by the person in charge, has a great deal to do with the effectiveness of those within the organization. Amitai Etzioni states in Modern Organizations that the three important correlations in an organizational environment are control, selection and socialization (Etzioni, 1964:68). Since responsibility for this is usually left to the top management of an organization, it would follow that top management's style of leadership would be an important variable to measure in terms of impact on effectiveness.

To evaluate the effectiveness of volunteers and volunteer pro-

grams, Bobette W. Riegel and Ruth D. Miller have written a book called Basic Feedback System: A Self-Assessment Process for Volunteer Programs.

The three main groups of variables they identify as being related to effectiveness are:

1. How do you spend your time?
2. How do you feel about what you are doing?
3. How does the management run the program (Riegel, 1977:24).

Marlene Wilson in her book, The Effective Management of Volunteer Programs, believes there are two particular areas of importance in contributing to the effectiveness of the volunteer. These two areas are:

1. Climate of the organization (how it is managed).
2. Attitude of the volunteer (Wilson, 1976:44).

This section has identified literature that is representative of what experts believe are important and unimportant variables in job effectiveness. Though there is no clear consensus about what is or is not important in analyzing effectiveness, it appears that personality traits are not regarded as important, while the person's attitude and activity, and his superior's style of leadership are important variables to be analyzed by any formal attempt to study the effectiveness of an organization or personnel within an organization.

Conclusion

The literature in the field of volunteerism indicates the importance of the volunteer in our society. Because of the long tradition of volunteerism in America, it has been the subject of countless debates and studies in education and the social sciences.

The literature on measuring effectiveness in management and the variables that contribute to it shows that there is still controversy

and therefore need for further study in this area. Though consensus does not dominate the field, there has been some agreement on the advantages of measuring productivity in quantitative terms and/or the significance of attitudes, activity and managerial style in a person's effectiveness in being productive.

The literature also shows that it is legitimate to use questions dealing with the areas of attitudes, activities, and management style to pinpoint those variables that contribute to effectiveness of the personnel. The literature also rejects the traditional belief that personality traits should be included in an analysis of the effectiveness of personnel.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Included in this chapter is a restatement of the problem, hypothesis to be tested, the research design, a description of the instrument used to collect the data, a description of the sample, the steps taken in implementing the research project, and the procedures used in analyzing the data.

Problem restatement

The central purpose of the study was to identify the relationship of selected variables to the participation rate of young people in 4-H programs utilizing community coordinators as middle-management volunteers.

Hypotheses

Based on the literature and feedback from extension agents and community coordinators, it seemed reasonable to formulate and test the following hypotheses in this investigation.

1. There is a significant relationship between the number of middle-manager volunteers and program participation rate.
2. There is a relationship between what activities the middle-manager volunteer engages in, as well as his attitude toward those activities, and program participation rate.
3. There is a relationship between the middle-manager volunteer's attitude toward his role in the organization and program participation rate.
4. There is a relationship between the way middle-management volunteers perceive the managing of their role by paid staff and program participation rate.

5. There is a relationship between middle-management volunteers' perception of support by others and program participation rate.
6. There is a relationship between the middle-management volunteers' perception of the quality of communication among coordinators and paid staff and program participation rate.
7. There is a relationship between the descriptive data on the middle-manager volunteers and program participation rate.

The Research Design

The research was designed to measure the relationship between the dependent variable of program participation rate and the independent variables such as job satisfaction and management style.

The Dependent Variable - Program participation rate was defined in terms of the percent of public school enrollment recruited into the 4-H programs in the 1979-1980 school year. The ratio of club members to the enrollment in public schools was used to minimize the differences in county populations. Though the use of percent of public school enrollees that were club members is not a total reflection of whether a 4-H program is effective, its use is justified, to a limited extent, for the following reasons:

1. The community coordinators in all twenty-one counties had one common task assigned to them: to recruit 4-H club members.
2. The number of young people recruited into the 4-H clubs is one of the major quantifiable variables used by the Oregon State University Extension Service to evaluate extension agents working with county 4-H programs.

The Independent Variables - The independent variables selected were compiled by the author from several sources. Robette W. Reigel's Basic Feedback System: A Self-assessment Process for Volunteer Programs

was a major source of information dealing with important variables that may contribute to the effectiveness of middle managers in carrying out their responsibilities for recruitment. The three groups of variables Reigel identified deal with:

1. How the volunteer spends his time,
2. How the volunteer feels about his work,
3. How the management runs the organization.

Specific questions in these areas were also developed with the help of extension agents and community coordinators responding to a presentation on the survey instrument. The researcher also was interested in variables dealing with how the number of community coordinators affected productivity.

Another group of variables dealt with basic demographic data. Questions were asked that would give information on the community coordinator's age, level of education, marital status, gender, family size, income, and length of time he had lived in the community. The independent variables selected for this research were limited to the aforementioned areas because of limited time and questionnaire length.

Survey Instrument

"Measurement is the assignment of numerals to events or objects according to rule" (Stevens, 1959:25). The survey instrument was developed in a way that would make it possible to measure attitudes and opinions of the community coordinator as well as to summarize demographic data and the amount of time spent in specific activities.

An attitudinal and opinion scale was used in order to quantify the information which, in turn, would allow the data to be summarized for each county. The attitudinal and opinion scales were modified

from Julian L. Simon's book, Basic Research Methods in Social Service: The Art of Empirical Investigation (p. 300).

The areas of inquiry and specific questions were adapted from Bobette W. Reigel's Basic Feedback Systems: A Self-assessment Process for Volunteer programs.

After the survey instrument was developed it was field tested by a group of extension agents and community coordinators. Their suggestions were then used to produce a final version of the survey instrument that was then sent to the community coordinators.

In its final form the survey instrument included coverage of twelve specific areas of responsibility that community coordinators spend some time in, according to agents and a panel of community coordinators. The questionnaire first asked the community coordinator to summarize the percent of his time spent on each activity on a likert-type scale ranging from extremely important to extremely unimportant. The survey instrument next had twenty questions which dealt with the management of the program by paid staff and how the community coordinator felt about the program. These twenty questions were adapted from Bobette W. Reigel's assessment instrument because of their relevance to a voluntary position such as community coordinator.

The demographic data were collected primarily for their value to the Oregon State University Extension Service. Since the data were already collected the researcher believed that it would be of interest to this research to at least see if there were any correlation between

any of the demographic variables and program participation rate.¹

The Population

Questionnaires were sent to all community coordinators who were identified in the counties in Oregon which had the middle-management volunteer position in their 4-H program in the school year of 1979-1980. These people were identified by the Acting Assistant Director of 4-H youth and the area supervisor of Oregon State University Extension Service by contacting all the extension agents in Oregon and asking them to send in the names of the community coordinators in their 1979-1980 program.

A total of 271 community coordinators were identified in twenty-one counties in Oregon (Table I). A questionnaire was mailed to them on January 20, 1981, with a cover letter asking the volunteer to fill it out and return it in an enclosed, stamped envelope as soon as possible. By March 16, 1981, 174 completed surveys had been returned. This time a second mailing of the questionnaire was made to all the 1979-1980 community coordinators who had not responded to the initial request. Again, a cover letter was enclosed that requested a prompt reply to the survey. After receiving twenty-one additional completed surveys over the next few weeks, an analysis of the data on the 195 completed questionnaires which had been returned began (Table I). The percentage of community coordinators who responded to the survey by filling out and mailing back the questionnaire was approximately seventy-two percent.

1. For a detailed look at the questionnaire, see Appendix C.

TABLE I. OREGON COUNTIES USING COMMUNITY COORDINATORS
IN 1979-1980

County	Number of Community Coordinators	Number who Responded
1	3	2
2	1	0
3	30	15
4	5	5
5	9	7
6	24	20
7	6	6
8	3	2
9	2	0
10	12	12
11	23	17
12	4	<u>5</u>
13	8	6
14	1	1
15	46	23
16	32	32
17	9	5
18	20	12
19	12	9
20	5	4
21	16	11

(No explanation for this discrepancy)

The Procedures

The following is a summary of the procedures utilized in this study:

1. Developed an instrument based largely upon Bobette W. Reigel's Basic Feedback System: A Self-assessment Process for Volunteer Programs and the expert advice of Dr. Alan Snider and Dr. Tom Grigsby.
2. Submitted this instrument to a group of extension agents and community coordinators for opinions on readability and comprehensiveness.
3. Revised instrument based on feedback from group of extension agents and community coordinators (Appendix C).
4. Mailed out final version of instrument on January 20, 1981, to 221 community coordinators in twenty-one counties in Oregon with a cover letter (Appendix C and D respectively).
5. Second mailing made in March, 1981, to 97 who had not returned the questionnaire at that time, with a different cover letter (Appendix B).

Method of Analysis

Three statistical tools were used to analyze the data in this study. They were the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient (Spearman rho), Kendall's rank correlation coefficient (Kendall's tau), and the Pearson Product moment coefficient of correlation (Pearson's r).

Because the central purpose of this study was to identify the relationship between a dependent variable and several independent variables, the method of analysis chosen had to be able to measure the interaction between the variables in order to identify a relationship.

Spearman rho was used because of its mathematical simplicity and reliability in exploring the relationship between two ranked variables (Mason, p. 136). Kendall's tau was used in part of the analysis because it is probably the most used ordinal measure of association

(Bowen and Weisberg, p. 75). Pearson's r was used because it is the most commonly used measure of linear correlation in statistics (Mendenhall, p. 271).

The use of the Spearman rho, Kendall's tau and Pearson's r to explore the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables in this study are in order to identify whether a quantitative relationship is present.

For the purpose of this study a correlation value of $+ .40$ or higher, or $- .40$ or lower was selected as the range of statistical significance. Some researchers believe that these values are considered to be the minimum values for any demonstration of correlation between variables (Guilford, p. 145). Acceptance of the hypothesis was based upon the presence of a significant correlation between participation rate and at least one of the related questions on the survey instrument being analyzed.

CHAPTER IV

REPORT AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This chapter is devoted to reporting and analyzing the results of the survey discussed in Chapter III. Tables with accompanying analyses of the data will be presented as discussion of the findings proceeds.

The central purpose of this study dealt with the relationship of selected variables to the participation rate of 4-H programs utilizing community coordinators as middle-management volunteers.

The dependent variable was productivity, defined as participation rate. A measure of productivity was developed by compiling a list of all the counties that had community coordinators respond to the questionnaires sent to them and then dividing the number of pupils enrolled in the public schools in the county into the number of young people recruited into the 4-H clubs of that county. The counties were then coded to protect their identity and ranked according to productivity (see Table II).

The use of one variable (percent of pupils enrolled in 4-H clubs and groups) as the criteria of productivity restricted the research to a limited area of inquiry. Though Amitai Etzioni has stated that limiting effectiveness to a concrete goal makes measurement easier, when dealing with a service organization (in this case the 4-H) there are other ways to measure effectiveness (Etzioni, 1964:10). However, because recruitment of group and club members is the stated objective of community coordinators and because the information available in

TABLE II. COUNTY RANKING BY PARTICIPATION RATE (1979-1980)

Rank	Pupil Population in Public Schools*	Young People Re- cruited in 4-H**	<u>4-H</u> Public Schools	County by Code
1	1777	1392	.7833	7
2	4748	3291	.6931	26
3	5369	1476	.2650	31
4	1589	314	.1976	8
5	3205	457	.1426	10
6	5472	759	.1389	34
7	3187	421	.1320	17
8	4152	532	.1281	24
9	18982	2319	.1222	30
10	85430	9490	.1111	37
11	10739	1131	.1053	27
12	36116	3359	.0930	32
13	11794	1054	.0894	18
14	18267	1438	.0787	19
15	12046	812	.0674	2
16	44653	2602	.0583	28
17	5222	290	.0555	29
18	47543	2501	.0526	12
19	44608	2344	.0525	23

*"1979-1980 Summary of Organization, Pupils and Staff in Oregon Public Schools.", Oregon Department of Education, Management Services Division, Salem, Oregon

** 1979-1980 Record of Boys and Girls Enrolled in Clubs and Special Groups, Oregon State University Extension Service, Corvallis, Oregon

program effectiveness is limited to those statistics, the dependent variable was percent of pupils enrolled in 4-H clubs and groups.

After ranking the counties according to percentage of public school children who were enrolled in a 4-H club or group it was found that the nineteen counties which were studied varied in participation rate from seventy-eight percent of those in public school enrolled in the 4-H to only five percent of those in public school enrolled.

Hypothesis 1

There is a relationship between the number of middle-management volunteers and program participation rate.

To test this hypothesis the counties were first ranked according to their participation rate (Table I). They were then ranked according to the number of community coordinators they had in the organization during the 1979-1980 school year (Table III).

The two rankings were then analyzed through the use of the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient. The results of the Spearman rho analysis is a $r_s = .4456$. The coefficient of non-determination is $1 - (.4456)^2$, which is equal to $1 - .1986$ or $.8014$. This would indicate that about eighty percent of the variation in participation rate can not be explained by the differences in the number of community coordinators in the different counties.

A follow-up analysis was then done by dividing up the nineteen counties into two groups, one composed of counties with an average pupil population of 36,763 (eight larger counties), and the other group with an average pupil population of 6,432 (eleven smaller coun-

TABLE III. COUNTY RANKING BY COMMUNITY COORDINATORS

Rank	Number of Co-ordinators*	Population of Public School Children**	$\frac{\text{Coordinators}}{\text{Children}} \times 100$	County by Code
1	6	1589	.37759	8
2	12	4748	.25273	26
3	20	10739	.18623	27
4	3	1777	.16882	7
5	9	5472	.16447	34
6	5	3187	.15688	17
7	24	18267	.13138	19
8	46	36116	.12736	32
9	5	4152	.12042	24
10	12	12046	.09961	2
11	5	5222	.09574	29
12	3	3205	.0936	10
13	9	11794	.0763	18
14	30	47543	.0631	12
15	23	44653	.0515	28
16	8	18982	.04214	30
17	30	85430	.03745	37
18	16	44608	.03586	23
19	1	5569	.01795	31

* Compiled from responses to a 1981 inquiry initiated by Oregon State University Extension Service, Corvallis, Oregon (See Appendix D)

** "1979-1980 Summary of Organization, Pupils and Staff in Oregon Public Schools.", Oregon Department of Education, Management Services Division, Salem, Oregon

ties). This was done in order to see if the number of community coordinators was significantly related to participation rate in either smaller counties or larger counties. It appeared reasonable to assume the importance of the the number of coordinators was related in some manner to the size of the county.

The two groups were then analyzed through the use of the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient. The results of the Spearman rho analysis for the first group (the large counties) is a $r_s = .0714$ and a coefficient of non-determination of .995, which means that there is no significant relationship between participation rate and the differences in the number of community coordinators in the different counties.

The results of the Spearman rho analysis for the second group (the smaller counties) is a $r_s = .2818$. The coefficient of non-determination is .921 which would indicate again that there is no significant relationship between the differences in the participation rate of the different counties and the differences in the number of community coordinators.

TABLE IV. MEASUREMENT OF PARTICIPATION RATE AND THE NUMBER OF COMMUNITY COORDINATORS IN EACH COUNTY

Counties	r_s	$(r_s)^2$	Coefficient of Non-determination $1 - (r_s)^2$
All 19	.4456	.1986	.8014
8 larger counties	.0714	.005	.995
11 smaller counties	.2818	.0794	.921

Another way of analyzing the relationship between participation rate and the number of community coordinators is to look at the ratio of coordinators to the percent of the student population that were recruited into the 4-H. By simply dividing the number of coordinators into the participation rate we can get a ratio of coordinators to 4-H participants. For example, if a program enrolls seventy-five percent of the student population into the 4-H and there are three community coordinators, the ratio would be $.75/3$ or $.25$.

Table V lists the counties by code and shows the participation rate, how many coordinators they have and the ratio of coordinators to the percent of student population recruited. There is also a listing of their rank according to number of coordinators and rank according to the ratio between participation rate and coordinators.

The top five in the ratio of participation rate to number of coordinators in the program (Table V), which means the five programs which have the best ratios for coordinator effectiveness in recruitment also have the lower number of coordinators in the programs.

The top five in the number of coordinators in the program ranked 18, 19, 14, 15 and 17 in the ratio of effectiveness in recruitment to number of coordinators (Table V), which means the five programs with the greatest number of coordinators have a lower effectiveness per coordinator. This would further strengthen the conclusions of the statistical analysis of the ranking of the number of coordinators (Table III) and effectiveness in recruiting (Table II) in that there is no significant relationship between the number of community coordinators in the program and program participation rate.

TABLE V. COUNTY COMPARISONS OF RANKINGS FOR NUMBER OF
COORDINATORS AND PARTICIPATION RATE

County by Code	Effective- ness	Number of Coordinators	Rank	<u>Effectiveness</u> Coordinators	Rank
2	.0674	12	8	.0056	12
7	.7833	3	17	.2611	2
8	.1476	6	13	.0329	5
10	.1426	3	17	.0475	4
12	.0526	30	2	.0018	19
17	.1320	5	14	.0264	6
18	.0894	9	10	.0099	11
19	.0787	24	4	.0033	15
23	.0525	16	7	.0033	15
24	.1281	5	14	.0256	7
26	.6931	12	8	.0578	3
27	.1053	20	6	.0053	13
28	.0583	23	5	.0025	17
29	.0555	5	14	.0111	10
30	.1222	8	12	.0153	9
31	.2650	1	19	.2650	1
32	.0930	46	1	.0020	18
34	.1387	9	10	.0154	8
37	.1111	30	2	.0037	14

Discussion

There appears to be little discussion in literature on the relationship between the number of middle-managers in a program and participation rate. In terms of productivity, economists will instead talk about economies of scale (when an organization is so large it is no longer efficient). In terms of size of an organization or a group, sociologists may discuss things like interaction, power structures, durability, centralization, conflict settlement, and other related topics. Businessmen, when discussing middle-management, will look at hiring practices, job descriptions, and evaluations.

In the 4-H program the number of middle-management volunteers a county had in relation to population had some intuitive merit for study. Some members of the extension staff expressed a desire to know if a relationship existed between effectiveness in recruitment and the ratio of coordinators to potential 4-H members when this question was examined.

There appeared to be no significant relationship between the number of community coordinators and participation rate when analyzing all nineteen counties. Though the range of the number of community coordinators in the nineteen counties varies from one coordinator for every 264, to one coordinator for every 5,569, there is no significant relationship between the rankings for efficiency and the ranking for ratio of coordinators to pupil population.

Based on these findings the hypothesis tested is rejected. No significant relationship could be verified between the number of

middle-manager volunteers and program participation rate.

Hypothesis 2

There is a relationship between what activity the middle-manager volunteer engages in, his attitude toward these activities and program participation rate.

The research into this hypothesis was done in two parts. The first section examines the community coordinators' use of time. The second section presents the degree of importance assigned by community coordinators to their activities.

Section I: Twelve specific activities of community coordinators were identified by a panel of extension agents and community coordinators. Section I of the survey instrument asked the respondents to indicate the time they spent engaged in each of the activities (Appendix C).

The results were tabulated for each individual county and then summarized for the individual counties by multiplying the median percent of time spent by the number of community coordinators. For example, if ten coordinators marked that they spent one to ten percent of their time on transporting young people, then ten was multiplied by 5.5. The formula was:

$$(t) \cdot (C_n) - M$$

With "t" equaling median time, "C_n" equaling number of coordinators and "N" equaling summarized measurement, this procedure makes it possible to have one quantitative measure with which to compare the different counties.

The independent variable of total time spent in each county in twelve different activities was correlated with the dependent variable of program participation rate by the use of the Pearson product moment coefficient of correlation (Pearson's r). A Pearson's r correlation value $>.40$ or $<-.40$ would indicate a moderate correlation. An analysis of the data in Section I of the survey instrument did not demonstrate even a moderate relationship between effectiveness in recruitment and any specific activity the community coordinator engaged in when all nineteen counties were analyzed.

The Pearson r correlations for all nineteen counties are presented in Table VI. A positive correlation indicates that as participation rate increases the time spent in that specific activity increases. For example, a $+ 1.0$ would indicate a perfect correlation between the two variables.

When the five large urban counties were analyzed, seven different activities showed some correlation to program participation rate. A significant positive relationship between effectiveness in recruitment and time spent recruiting 4-H club members, organizing 4-H clubs, and providing transportation was identified. A significant negative relationship was identified between participation rate and time spent providing ongoing support for 4-H club leaders, serving on 4-H committees, participating in statewide activities, and organizing community 4-H events (Table VI).

When the fourteen rural counties were analyzed there were no significant relationships identified between participation rate and time spent in any of the twelve specific activities (Table VI).

TABLE VI. MEASUREMENT OF PARTICIPATION RATE AND THE AMOUNT OF TIME
SPENT IN SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES

Activity	Pearson's r (Urban Counties)	Pearson's r (Rural Counties)	Pearson's r (Combined Counties)
1. Recruiting 4-H leaders	.0688	-.3324	-.3217
2. Recruiting 4-H club members	.5203	.1638	.2790
3. Organizing 4-H clubs	.4073	.2216	.2104
4. Providing ongoing support for 4-H club leaders	-.6102	-.2795	-.22404
5. Providing transportation	.5224	.0877	.1482
6. Providing leader orientation or training	-.3382	-.1759	-.1582
7. Receiving orientation or training	-.1148	-.3101	-.1338
8. Serving on 4-H committees	-.4034	-.3874	-.2737
9. Filling out reports or read- ing 4-H related materials	.1922	-.3663	-.3385
10. Participating in statewide activities	-.4699	-.3909	-.3889
11. Organizing community 4-H events	-.8884	-.3239	-.2468
12. 4-H promotion (other than recruitment)	-.2901	-.3584	-.3281

Section II: The same twelve specific activities of community coordinators were listed in the survey instrument under the heading of "Section II" (Appendix C). Respondents were asked to rate the importance of specific activities. A five point Likert type scale was used, ranging from one for extremely unimportant through four for extremely important.

The results of the survey were tabulated for each county. The frequency for which a cell representing an attitude was chosen was multiplied by the assigned weight of the attitude (1-4). The summarization of the data for each activity was arrived at by adding the tabulations (assigned weight x frequency) together and dividing by the total number of respondents to the activity. The formula was:

$$\frac{\sum (\text{Assigned weight} \times \text{frequency})}{\text{Total number of responses}} = \text{Summary of data}$$

This resulted in a summary of the data from each county for each question. Reducing the data to one representative number made it possible to perform a statistical analysis of the data.

The independent variable of attitude about different activities was correlated with the dependent variable of participation rate by the use of Pearson's r. The results of the correlation study of all nineteen counties are presented in Table VII. There was a significant level of correlation between attitude and two variables (organizing 4-H clubs, $-.5679$ and 4-H promoting, $-.5362$).

When the five urban counties were analyzed there were five variables identified as having a significant "r." Providing transportation and participating in statewide activities were both positively

TABLE VII. MEASUREMENT OF PARTICIPATION RATE AND ATTITUDE TOWARD
SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES (ALL 19 COUNTIES)

Activity	Pearson's r
1. Recruiting 4-H leaders	-.1763
2. Recruiting 4-H club members	.0850
3. Organizing 4-H clubs	-.5679
4. Providing ongoing support for 4-H club leaders	-.1191
5. Providing transportation	-.1729
6. Providing leader orientation or training	-.3658
7. Receiving orientation or training	-.1065
8. Serving on 4-H committees	-.1121
9. Filling out reports or reading 4-H related materials	-.3159
10. Participating in statewide activities	-.1457
11. Organizing community 4-H events	-.1265
12. 4-H promotion (other than recruitment)	-.5362

related to effectiveness in recruitment, while serving on 4-H committees, organizing community 4-H events and 4-H promotion were negatively related to the dependent variable of participation rate.

Table VIII lists the Pearson's r for the five urban counties.

When the fourteen rural counties were analyzed with the Pearson r correlation, two activities were identified as having a significant "r" - organizing clubs and 4-H promotion. As with the analysis of all nineteen counties and the analysis of the five urban counties, the attitude about importance of organizing clubs and 4-H promotion, both had a negative relationship to program participation rate (Table VIII).

The only indication of a significant relationship between participation rate and time spent in specific activities was found in the five larger urban counties. The high occurrence of significance (seven out of twelve) and the higher degree of significance would seem to indicate the time spent in different activities is a factor in program participation rate. An analysis of the fourteen rural counties and an analysis of both the urban and rural counties combined identified no significant relationship between the amount of time spent in certain activities and program participation rate (Table V, VI).

Time spent recruiting 4-H club members, organizing 4-H clubs, and providing transportation all appear to have close to the same positive relationship to program participation rate, and time spent in these three areas may help the urban programs to have a higher participation rate. On the other hand, urban counties that had community coordinators spending more time in providing ongoing support for 4-H club

leaders, serving on 4-H committees, participating in statewide activities, and organizing 4-H events had lower participation rates (Table VI). This last group of activities may detract from the participation rate of the 4-H program in the five urban counties.

When the value placed on the different activities was analyzed in relationship to participation rate, the only consistently significant variable in all three analyses was 4-H promotion (other than recruitment). In all three analyses (19 counties: 5 urban counties, 14 rural counties) the participation rate in the 4-H program appeared to decline as more importance was placed on 4-H promotion.

When the urban counties were analyzed, four other variables were identified as having a significant relationship to participation rate. The first one was serving on 4-H committees. It has a Pearson $r = -.5233$. This would appear to indicate a negative correlation between attitude toward serving on 4-H committees and participation rate.

The second variable with a significant "r" was attitude toward organizing community 4-H events. This variable, when analyzed with Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient had an "r" value of $-.8639$ which would indicate a negative relationship between variables.

The third and fourth variable showed a positive correlation with participation rate. These two variables were providing transportation (.5982) and participating in statewide activities (.4745).

When the rural counties were analyzed another variable, in addition to 4-H promotion, was identified as having a significant correlation related to participation rate ($-.5738$).

TABLE VIII. MEASUREMENT OF PARTICIPATION RATE AND ATTITUDE TOWARD
SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES (URBAN AND RURAL COUNTIES)

Activity	Pearson's r (Urban Counties)	Pearson's r (Rural Counties)
1. Recruiting 4-H leaders	.3488	-.1899
2. Recruiting 4-H club leaders	.2007	-.0195
3. Organizing 4-H clubs	-.2024	-.5738
4. Providing ongoing support for 4-H club leaders	-.2115	-.0746
5. Providing transportation	.5982	-.2079
6. Providing leader orientation or training	.1760	-.3599
7. Receiving orientation or training	.2663	-.1254
8. Serving on 4-H committees	-.5233	-.0742
9. Filling out reports or reading 4-H related materials	-.3941	-.2569
10. Participating in statewide activities	.4745	-.0993
11. Organizing community 4-H events	-.8639	-.1899
12. 4-H promotion (other than re- cruitment)	-.6814	-.5080

Based on these findings, it would appear that there is a relationship between the activities of the middle-manager volunteer and program participation rate, particularly in the urban counties. There were more variables identified as relating to participation rate when the degree of importance of what the middle-manager volunteer did was analyzed. Hypothesis two is accepted based on the findings of this analysis.

Hypothesis 3

There is a relationship between the middle-manager volunteers' attitude toward their role in the organization and program participation rate.

In Section III of the survey instrument questions 1, 2, and 13 were designed to reveal the attitude of the volunteer toward the role of community coordinator (Appendix C). Three separate statements were made relating to his attitude, and an opportunity to agree or disagree was given through the use of an opinion scale. Four choices as to opinion on statements were developed. The choices were weighted 1 to 4 as follows: strongly disagree = 1, disagree = 2, agree = 3, strongly agree = 4.

The responses were tabulated for each individual county by taking the frequency with which each cell was marked by coordinators in the county and multiplying that frequency times the weight of the opinion heading the column of cells. Those data were then summarized for each county by dividing the weighted frequencies by the total number of frequencies of response. The formula was:

$$\frac{\text{Assigned weight} \times \text{frequency}}{\text{Total number of responses}}$$

This allowed each county's responses to be summarized individually with one value. This value represented the independent variable to be compared with the dependent variable of participation rate.

The Pearson product moment correlation of coefficient was used to identify relationships that existed between the dependent variable of effectiveness in recruitment and the independent variables relating to attitude toward role of the community coordinator.

An analysis of the responses to the first statement, "Being a community coordinator is very rewarding," demonstrated that there is a significant relationship when the variance of the degrees of efficiency in all nineteen counties is correlated with the opinion of the community coordinators in all nineteen counties. A negative correlation exists between agreement with the statement and effectiveness in recruitment. Table IX shows that this was also the case when just the fourteen rural counties were analyzed and when the five urban counties were analyzed.

An analysis of the responses to the second statement, "The job of community coordinator is too big for a volunteer to handle properly," showed a significant relationship exists between opinions on that statement and effectiveness in recruitment in only the five urban counties. Table IX indicates a positive correlation between agreement with the statement and effectiveness, which means that in the urban counties the coordinators in the more productive programs

saw the job as being "too big."

An analysis of the responses to the third statement, "I would like to be a community coordinator again if possible," identified a significant relationship between that variable and participation rate in the urban counties, rural counties, and all nineteen counties combined. Table IX indicates a negative correlation between agreement with the statement and effectiveness in recruitment in all three instances.

Discussion

Nancy Pierce and Donald Higgins stress that an attitude of interest in activity is extremely important to the success of the program (Pierce, 1976:44). Alan Snider, an extension specialist, believes that job satisfaction is directly related to the volunteer's attitude and ultimate success of a 4-H program (1979).

This view of a relationship between a volunteer's attitude and program success in recruitment was analyzed by the use of Pearson's r . A significant relationship was established showing that the attitude about the community coordinator's role was correlated with effectiveness in recruitment. It would appear that community coordinators who have a higher degree of satisfaction are in county programs with a lower degree of success. This overwhelmingly negative relationship of role enjoyment and participation rate suggests that as 4-H programs get increasingly more effective in recruitment the community coordinator will find the job increasingly less satisfying.

TABLE IX. MEASUREMENT OF PRODUCTIVITY RATE AND OPINION OF
ROLE OF COMMUNITY COORDINATOR

Statement	Pearson "r" All 19 counties	Pearson "r" (urban)	Pearson "r" (rural)
1. Being a community co-ordinator is very rewarding.	-.6847	-.7527	-.6672
2. The job of community coordinator is too big for a volunteer to handle properly.	-.0291	.6131	-.1040
3. I would like to be a community coordinator again if possible.	-.5423	-.5186	-.4960

The hypothesis that there is a relationship between the middle-management volunteer's attitude toward his role in the organization and program participation rate appears to be sustained by this analysis, but in a direction opposite to that one might have anticipated.

Hypothesis 4

There is a relationship between the way middle-management volunteers perceive the managing of their role by paid staff and program participation rate.

In Section III of the survey instrument, questions 5, 6, 7, and 11 were designed to reveal the volunteer's opinion on the paid staff's management style over the coordinator's role in the program. Agreement with statements 5, 6, 7, and 11 would indicate the staff allowed the coordinator to work independently without a lot of pressure.

Agreement with statement 6 of Section III, as well as belief in the

excellence of three variables in Section IV (1, 2, and 7) would indicate the staff's management style included attempts to restrict the role of the community coordinator. The responses to these questions revealed to what extent the staff was actively engaged in the managing of the role of the coordinator (Appendix C).

In Section III four choices as to opinion on statements were weighted 1 to 4 as follows: strongly disagree = 1, disagree = 2, agree = 3, strongly agree = 4. In Section IV five choices as to the existence and rating of program characteristics were weighted 0 to 4 as follows: doesn't exist = 0, poor = 1, average = 2, above average = 3, excellent = 4.

The responses were tabulated for each individual county by taking the frequency with which each cell was marked by coordinators in the county and multiplying that frequency times the weight of the opinion heading the column of cells. The data were then summarized for each county by dividing the weighted frequencies by the total number of frequencies of response. The formula was:

$$\frac{\text{Assigned weight} \times \text{frequency}}{\text{Total number of responses}}$$

This allowed for each county's responses to be summarized with one value. This value that each county had for each question represented the independent variables to be analyzed with the dependent variable of effectiveness in recruitment.

The Pearson product moment correlation of coefficient was the statistical method used to identify any relationship that might exist between the dependent variable of participation rate and the indepen-

TABLE X. MEASUREMENT OF PARTICIPATION RATE AND OPINION OF ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT
OF COMMUNITY COORDINATORS BY PAID STAFF

Statement	Pearson's r (All 19 counties)	Pearson's r (Urban counties)	Pearson's r (Rural counties)
III, 5 The community coordinators are expected to perform their functions on their own	-.2087	-.2708	-.1381
III, 7 Independent decision making by community coordinators is generally encouraged	-.0986	.5884	-.0575
III, 6 The areas of the community coordinator's responsibility are well defined	-.3574	-.6816	-.3018
III, 11 There is little pressure put on people to fill the role of community coordinator	-.5818	.3657	-.6226
VI, 1 Training for community coordinator (rating)	-.1067	.1727	.0137
VI, 2 A clear understanding of the role of community coordinator (rating)	-.4121	-.7486	-.3625
VI, 7 A formal description or guide for community coordinators (rating)	-.2297	-.8125	-.1282

dent variables of perceived control over the organization by paid staff.

An analysis of the nineteen counties identified two variables with a significant relationship to participation rate (Table X). The response to the existence or quality of "a clear understanding of the role of community coordinator" has a negative correlation of .4121 with effectiveness in recruitment. The response to the statement, "There is little pressure put on people to fill the role of community coordinator," has a negative correlation of .5818.

An analysis of the urban counties identified four variables with a significant relationship to effectiveness in recruitment. A positive correlation exists between the statement, "Independent decision making by community coordinators is generally encouraged" and effectiveness. (.5884). The following had a negative correlation: well-defined areas of responsibility (-.6818), a clear understanding of the role of the coordinator (-.7486), and the existence of a formal description of guide (-.8125).

An analysis of the responses to the survey instrument from rural counties identified one significant relationship between effectiveness in recruitment and the independent variable. There was a negative correlation between effectiveness and agreement with the statement, "There is little pressure put on people to fill the role of community coordinator" (-.6226).

Discussion

Paul H. Thompson and Gene W. Dalton state that the motivation of managers is directly related to how the supervisory staff allows them

to work (Jan. Feb. 1970:83). Harlene Wilson believes that management style has a direct bearing on the motivation and achievement of volunteers (1976:80).

An analysis of the management exercised over the community coordinator by the top paid staff and its relationship to program participation rate was the stated purpose of this part of the research. It appears the data in this analysis identified a few significant relationships between management style and effectiveness in recruitment, and the majority of these were in urban counties.

The only variable in urban counties positively related to effectiveness at a significant level was, "Independent decision making by community coordinators is generally encouraged."

The other three variables in the urban counties with a significant level of relationship were negatively correlated. Counties with higher program participation rates appeared to have coordinators who thought their programs were more loosely run. They tended to disagree with the statement that the community coordinator's areas of responsibility are well defined. They also rated the training for community coordinators and the existence of a formal description or guide as being poorer. The consistency in all four of these correlations is that in urban counties, programs that are run in a looser manner tend to have a higher participation rate of young people.

A significant statistic when all nineteen counties were analyzed was a negative relationship between a clear understanding of the role of community coordinator and participation rate. The more effective

programs had coordinators who had a poorer understanding of their roles. There also was a negative relationship between the pressure put on volunteers to become community coordinators and participation rate in both "all nineteen" counties and rural counties. The greater the disagreement with the statement, "There is little pressure put on people to fill the role of community coordinator," the greater the effectiveness in recruitment.

The hypothesis that there is a relationship between how the middle-management volunteer perceives the management of his role and program participation rate appears to be valid, most particularly in the urban setting.

Hypothesis 5

There is a relationship between the middle-management volunteer's perception of support for his position and program participation rate.

This hypothesis was tested by the analysis of question 4 in Section III and question 3 in Section IV of the survey instrument (Appendix C). The responses for each county were tabulated and summarized in the same manner as the questions analyzed in the discussion of hypothesis 4.

Through the use of the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient, the dependent variable of effectiveness in recruitment and the two independent variables (the responses to questions) were analyzed. The responses to only one of the questions appeared to have a significant relationship to effectiveness. The significant Pearson's r

TABLE XI. MEASUREMENT OF PARTICIPATION RATE AND OPINION OF SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY COORDINATORS

Statement	Pearson's r (All 19 counties)	Pearson's r (Urban counties)	Pearson's r (Rural counties)
III, 4 The paid staff are very helpful and support the volunteers	-.0183	.6667	-.1123
IV, 3 Recognition of the work of com- munity coordinators (rating	-.2294	-.3699	-.1404

was identified when analyzing the five urban counties. There was a positive correlation of .6667 between effectiveness in recruitment and a feeling that "the paid staff are very helpful and support the volunteers" (Table XI).

Discussion

Courtney Schwartz placed much of the responsibility for the effectiveness of volunteer middle-managers upon the support they got from paid staff (Nov./Dec. 1978:28).

A significant relationship between the dependent variable (participation rate) and the independent variables (responses to questions dealing with support for the community coordinator) in this analysis would support Courtney Schwartz only if the relationship were positive.

Based on the findings, it would appear that there is a significant relationship between the dependent and independent variables in the analysis of the five urban counties. The significant correlation resulting from the statistical analysis shows a positive relationship. Therefore the data in this research do support Courtney Schwartz and establish a degree of relationship, at least in the urban counties.

The hypothesis that there is a relationship between the middle-management volunteer's perception of support for his position and program participation rate is supported by this research in urban counties.

Hypothesis 6

There is a relationship between the middle-management volunteer's perception of the quality of communication among the coordina-

TABLE XII. MEASUREMENT OF PARTICIPATION RATE AND OPINION OF QUALITY OF COMMUNICATION
AMONG LEADERS

Statement	Pearson's r (All 19 counties)	Pearson's r (Urban counties)	Pearson's r (Rural counties)
III, 12 I feel communication between community coordinators is good	-.2857	.2625	-.3311
IV, 5 Opportunity to express dissatisfaction or frustrations with program	-.3071	-.1124	-.2520
IV, 6 Communication among staff and volunteers	.0707	-.3256	.1063

tors and paid staff and program participation rate.

The hypothesis was tested by the analysis of question 12 in Section III and questions 5 and 6 in Section IV of the survey instrument (Appendix C). The responses for individual counties were tabulated and summarized in the same manner as the questions analyzed in the discussion of hypothesis 4.

Through the use of the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient the dependent variable of effectiveness in recruitment and three independent variables (the responses to the three questions) were analyzed. There was no significant relationship identified between variables and effectiveness (Table VII).

Discussion

Richard H. Hall reported that effectiveness depends on communication. The more comprehensive the information, the more effective the program (Hall, 1972:242).

When the responses from the counties were examined no significant relationship between the dependent variable of effectiveness in recruitment and the independent variables of responses to questions dealing with communication were found. This analysis does not support Hall's contention, since it showed no relationship between communication among coordinators and program participation rate.

The hypothesis that there is a relationship between the middle-management's perception of the quality of communication among leaders and program participation rate appears to have no support from the statistical analysis of urban counties, rural counties, or all nineteen counties combined.

Hypothesis 7

There is a relationship between the descriptive data on the middle-manager volunteer and program participation rate.

Descriptive data on the community coordinators were obtained by using Section V of the survey instrument (Appendix C). Some of the information is demographic (education level, age, marital status, number of children, occupation, income, type of community, and how long in the community). Additional information was obtained describing the community coordinator's involvement in 4-H (how long he has been involved in 4-H, positions held in 4-H, how long he has been a community coordinator, and how much contact he has had with staff). Hypothesis 7 was tested by examining seven variables taken from the descriptive data. These seven descriptors were the ones which could be analyzed in a manner consistent with the previous analysis of hypotheses one through six. A summary of the responses is in Appendix I.

Data were tabulated for each county individually and then an average for each question was derived (e.g., median age, median number of children, median number of years in 4-H program). For example, there were five categories for age and each category was assigned a weight (under 20 = 1, 21-30 = 2, 31-40 = 3, 41-50 = 4, over 50 = 5). The number of responses to each category and then the total number of respondents were divided into the sum of the weighted responses. The formula was:

$$\frac{\sum (\text{Assigned weight} \times \text{frequency})}{\text{Number of responses from county}}$$

To measure how the descriptive data may vary with the variable of

effectiveness the counties were ranked according to effectiveness in recruitment and then compared to ranking according to the median of response to each question (Table XIII, Table XIV).

The rankings were statistically analysed by the use of two common rank correlation coefficients, Spearman r_s and Kendall τ . The use of both rank correlation coefficients provides two measures of correlation (r_s , τ) which will give more complete information on the measurement of relationship.

Table XV gives the r_s and τ for the relationship between the nine descriptions of the community coordinator and effectiveness in recruitment of the program. The two variables that showed a significant level of correlation with effectiveness were the level of family income of the community coordinator ($r_s = -.5882$, $\tau = -.4133$) and the number of hours a month coordinators have contact with paid staff ($r_s = -.520$, $\tau = -.3870$).

Discussion

Descriptive data were included in the survey instrument for the benefit of the Oregon State University Extension Service, which financed the research.

An analysis of the data and their relationship to effectiveness in recruitment was accomplished by the use of the statistical tools Kendall τ and Spearman r_s . The two descriptors with the strongest correlation inverse to effectiveness were the family income level of the community coordinator and the number of contact hours per month the community coordinator had with paid staff.

TABLE XIII. COUNTY RANKING BY PARTICIPATION RATE AND CORRESPONDING
 MEDIAN OF DESCRIPTIVE DATA (Part 1)
 (MEDIAN OF NUMBER ASSIGNED TO CELLS)

County Ranked by Effectiveness	Age	Children	Income
7	3.0	2.50	2.50
26	2.917	1.667	2.125
31	4.0	4.0	2.0
8	3.50	2.0	1.750
10	4.0	5.0	2.0
34	3.750	3.167	3.167
17	4.0	1.750	2.0
24	2.883	2.0	2.5
30	4.0	3.667	3.250
37	3.278	2.433	2.944
27	3.30	2.750	3.375
32	3.00	2.50	2.40
18	3.625	3.0	2.0
19	3.250	2.786	2.563
2	3.250	2.50	2.667
28	3.438	3.20	2.563
29	3.250	2.750	3.5
12	3.333	2.875	3.40
23	3.10	2.50	3.0

TABLE XIV. COUNTY RANKING BY PARTICIPATION RATE AND CORRESPONDING
 MEDIAN OF DESCRIPTIVE DATA (PART II)
 (MEDIAN OF NUMBER ASSIGNED TO CELLS)

County Rank by Effectiveness	Years in Community	Years in 4-H	Years as Community Coordinator	Average Hours
7	2.50	4.0	2.0	1.0
26	3.70	3.0	2.50	1.214
31	4.0	3.0	0	0
8	3.667	3.667	2.750	1.250
10	4.0	4.0	3.0	1.0
34	4.0	3.0	3.0	1.125
17	3.667	4.0	2.667	1.667
24	4.0	3.833	2.50	1.167
30	4.0	4.0	3.667	1.667
37	3.725	2.929	2.577	1.222
27	3.875	3.0	2.0	1.40
32	3.636	3.591	2.929	1.067
18	2.50	3.50	3.167	1.750
19	3.636	3.357	2.650	1.750
2	3.0	2.50	2.0	1.250
28	3.792	3.893	2.90	1.071
29	3.667	4.0	2.750	2.0
12	3.750	3.818	3.0	1.250
23	3.889	3.583	2.0	1.80

TABLE XV. MEASUREMENT OF PARTICIPATION RATE AND DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Descriptive data	Spearman (r_s)	Kendall (τ)
1. Age of community coordinator	.1616	.1507
2. Number of children in community coordinator's family	-.1526	-.1138
3. Family income level of community coordinator	-.5882	-.4133
4. How long he has been a resident of the county	.1367	.0980
5. How long he has been involved in 4-H as a volunteer	.0391	.0307
6. How long he has been involved in 4-H as a community coordinator	-.1617	-.1088
7. How man hours per month he has contact with paid staff	-.520	-.3870

Participation rate in the county 4-H programs appears to be less as community coordinators with higher incomes are involved. This negative relationship between increase in effectiveness in recruitment and increase in incomes is slight but does appear to exist in the data.

Participation rate in the counties appears to be less as contact hours with staff increases. This negative relationship between increase in participation rate and increase in contact hours is not very strong but does exist in the data.

The hypothesis that there is a relationship between the descriptive data in the middle-manager volunteer and program participation rate appears to be valid to a limited extent.

Summary of Statistical Findings

A statistical analysis of nineteen counties in Oregon using community coordinators as middle-management volunteers gives support to five hypotheses tested in this research.

The first hypothesis - there is a relationship between the number of middle-manager volunteers and program participation rate - was not supported by a statistical analysis using Spearman rank order correlation between a ranking of counties by program participation rate and a ranking of counties by number of coordinators in the program (Table IV, V).

The second hypothesis - there is a relationship between what activities middle-manager volunteers engage in, as well as their attitude toward those activities and program participation rate - was supported

to a limited extent by a statistical analysis of response to Section I and II of the survey instrument (Appendix E, F, J, K). Table VI shows the results of the analysis using Pearson product moment correlation of coefficient.

The third hypothesis - there is a relationship between the middle-management volunteer's attitude toward his role in the organization and program participation rate - was supported by a statistical analysis of responses to Section III, questions 1, 2, and 13 of the survey instrument (Appendix G, H, L, M). Table IX shows the results of the analysis using Pearson product moment correlation of coefficient.

The fourth hypothesis - there is a relationship between the way middle-manager volunteers perceive the managing of their role by paid staff and program participation rate - was supported, particularly in the urban counties, by a statistical analysis of Section III, questions 5, 6, 7, and 11 and Section IV, questions 1, 2, and 7 of the survey instrument (Appendix L, N). Table X shows the results of the analysis of the questions using Pearson product moment correlation of coefficient.

The fifth hypothesis - there is a relationship between middle-management volunteer's perception of support by others and program participation rate - was supported, particularly in urban counties, by the statistical analysis of responses to Section III, question 4 and Section IV, question 3 of the survey instrument (Appendix G, H, L, N). Table XI summarizes the results of an analysis of the responses to the questions. The Pearson product moment correlation of coefficient

was used.

The sixth hypothesis - there is a relationship between the middle-management volunteer's perception of the quality of communication among leaders and program participation rate - was not supported in any grouping of the counties by the statistical analysis of the responses to Section III, question 12 and Section IV, questions 5 and 6 of the survey instrument (Appendix G, H, L, M). Table XII summarizes the analysis which was done by Pearson product moment correlation of coefficient.

The seventh hypothesis - there is a relationship between the descriptive data on middle-manager volunteers and program participation rate - was supported to a limited extent by a statistical analysis of responses to Section V, questions 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13, and 14 of the survey instrument (Appendix I, N). Both Kendall tau and Spearman rho were used to analyze the data. A summary of the results are in Table XV.

Summary of General Responses

The survey instrument was used to gather information for the Oregon State University Extension Service in order to determine not only how some variables may relate to program participation rate, but also to find out the general attitude of community coordinators toward their role.

This section presents a summary of the general responses to the survey instrument, with some discussion as to what those responses may imply. The data used for this summary is primarily taken from Appendix E through Appendix N.

Section I of Survey Instrument

This section was designed to determine the way community coordinators spent their time as volunteer middle-managers. An analysis of all the responses as measured by the number of coordinators spending at least ten percent of their time in an activity showed that the three activities which took up the most time for coordinators were recruiting 4-H leaders, recruiting 4-H club members and organizing 4-H clubs. The three activities which the respondents spent the least amount of time in were providing leader orientation or training, receiving orientation or training and participating in statewide activities.

The responses to this section were not surprising, since the main responsibility of the coordinators in this study was to recruit. It was surprising, however, to find that an insignificant percentage of the coordinators' time was spent in the training of the individuals that they had recruited. Although the emphasis of this study was confined to quantitative measures, it is obvious that qualitative concerns that might be represented in factors such as training and orientation should be given equal attention in future analyses of this kind.

Section II of Survey Instrument

This section was designed to determine the volunteers' attitude toward selected activities. An analysis of all the responses showed that recruiting 4-H leaders, recruiting 4-H club members, organizing 4-H clubs, and receiving orientation or training was felt to be the most important, while providing transportation and participating in statewide activities was the least important.

It is interesting that the respondents reported that receiving orientation or training was almost as important as recruitment activities, yet in Section I it was shown that very little time is spent in this area. Another interesting finding is that while the rankings of percent of time spent in most activities was correlated very closely to the importance assigned to each of the activities, serving on 4-H committees was assigned a level of importance that was much higher than the percentage of time actually invested.

Section III of Survey Instrument

This section was designed to examine attitudes toward various aspects of the program. Among the statements presented to respondents were: "Being a community coordinator is very rewarding," "Paid staff are very helpful and support volunteers," "Independent decision making by community coordinators is generally encouraged," "The role of the community coordinator in this county is very limited," and "The job of community coordinator is too big for a volunteer to handle properly."

Responses to this section indicate a general satisfaction with the role of the community coordinator and a good relationship between the paid staff and the volunteer. It was interesting to find strong agreement that independent decision making was encouraged and that the paid staff are perceived as being very helpful. This balance between helping and allowing the volunteer freedom to operate is an admirable achievement.

It was interesting to find that with the good will and feeling of adequacy and reward in the job there was still a high degree of uncertainty as to whether the volunteer would want to be a coordina-

tor again. Over half of the respondents disagreed with, or were uncertain about the statement: "I would like to be a community coordinator again."

Section IV of Survey Instrument

This section was designed to examine the respondents' perception of the existence and quality of seven variables which might be found in a service organization. These variables were rated on this scale: doesn't exist, poor, average, above average and excellent. Listed in order of their perceived quality by community coordinators, the variables are:

1. Communication among staff and volunteers.
2. Opportunity to express dissatisfaction or frustration with the program.
3. A formal description or guide for community coordinators.
4. Recognition of the work of community coordinators.
5. An overall philosophy of the 4-H program and the role of the community coordinator.
6. A clear understanding of the role of community coordinator.
7. Training for community coordinators.

It appears that though there is good communication among the staff and volunteers, it is primarily informal and the flow of communication is generally from coordinator to staff. Formal communication from staff to volunteer does not seem to be as prevalent, since responses to questions dealing with training sessions and the like showed a consistent lack in that area. Though the coordinator has access to the staff in most counties, the staff appears to wait until the coor-

dinator approaches them, thus leaving the initiative to learn what is expected of the community coordinator up to the coordinator.

Section V of Survey Instrument

A composite description of the typical coordinator is a woman, forty years old with a few years of college education, three children, a rural homemaker with a 20,000 dollar yearly household income level, a resident of the county for over ten years, three years' involvement in 4-H, two years' experience as community coordinator and with contact with the paid staff of the Extension Service a couple of hours a month.

The data gathered in this section were primarily demographic information. It was interesting that the profile of the urban coordinator was nearly identical with that of the rural person. It was also interesting to note that almost ninety percent of the coordinators were married, which is a higher percentage than the general population.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The effectiveness of middle-managers as volunteers is of concern to anyone working with an agency that is facing a decline in funding and a resulting cutback in staff. As managerial tasks are assigned to volunteers it is crucial to the program that variables relating to effectiveness are identified. If professional staff are unaware of the variables that relate to program effectiveness they risk the possibility of wasting the volunteer's time and client opportunity. Professional staff should be sensitive to the variables relating to program effectiveness so that the middle-manager volunteer can maximize his efforts in the organization.

The central purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the productivity (defined as effectiveness in recruitment) of programs utilizing middle management volunteers and selected organizational and other related variables. To this end, a survey instrument was developed through the adaptation of questions found in other assessment instruments and with the cooperation of selected extension agents and community coordinators.

Seven hypotheses were tested by analyzing the results of a survey of nineteen different service organizations (nineteen county 4-H programs). The seven areas tested dealt with the number of middle-manager volunteers in the program, how the middle-manager spent his time and what he thought about the program, what his attitude was

toward his role, how he was being managed by staff, how much support he had, what the quality of communication was, and what the community coordinator was like (descriptive).

The major objectives, procedures and findings of the study are summarized in the following section.

Objective #1: To review existing research related to productivity of volunteers in organizations.

The review of the literature on volunteerism, productivity in management, variables relating to productivity, and identifying the variables relating to productivity revealed much information. However, most of the information stressed the importance of productivity, what may or may not contribute to productivity, why it should be measured and why personnel performance appraisals were necessary. There were very few studies located that addressed the issue of how to specifically measure productivity or how to specifically appraise personnel performance in volunteer organizations. There were also very few studies that addressed the problem of which variables in service organizations contribute to program productivity.

No studies could be located that addressed the issue of middle-manager volunteers and program productivity. The only service organization discussed in the literature that appears to be using volunteers in middle-management positions is the 4-H.

Objective #2: To develop a methodology for research in middle-management volunteer productivity.

A major function of this study was to develop a survey instrument

that would accurately communicate to the researcher where the different programs varied in operation and which variables might be contributing to the differences in program effectiveness. To that end, an instrument was developed by adapting questions from Bobette W. Reigel's self-assessment instrument (Reigel, 1977) and by seeking expert opinions from extension agents and community coordinators.

The productivity measure in this study was limited to one variable - how effective were programs with middle-manager volunteers in recruiting club and group members into the 4-H?

The survey instrument was submitted to a panel composed of extension experts, extension agents and community coordinators. The amended questionnaire was then screened for final approval by an extension expert and an adult education expert, both of whom are employed by Oregon State University as professionals in their area.

Objective #3: To administer this instrument to a population consisting of community coordinators.

The population of this study consisted of all community coordinators in all the counties in Oregon. Since only twenty-two of the counties reported the use of community coordinators, questionnaires were sent only to volunteers who worked in their programs. A total of 195, or 72% of the population of 271, responded, from nineteen different counties (fourteen rural, five urban).

The counties were coded to protect their identity. The respondents' identities were also coded to encourage openness and honesty in their responses.

Objective #4: To determine if there is a relationship between selected organizational variables and volunteer productivity.

Both Pearson's product moment coefficient of correlation and Spearman rank correlation coefficient were used. Kendall's tau also was employed in one instance to substantiate the Spearman rho analysis. The statistical analysis of the data was done in order to test the following hypotheses:

1. There is a relationship between the number of middle-manager volunteers and program participation rate.
2. There is a relationship between what activities the middle-manager volunteer engages in, as well as his attitude toward those activities, and program participation rate.
3. There is a relationship between the middle-manager volunteer's attitude toward his role in the organization and program participation rate.
4. There is a relationship between the way middle-management volunteers perceive the managing of their role by paid staff and program participation rate.
5. There is a relationship between middle-management volunteers' perception of support by others and program participation rate.
6. There is a relationship between the middle-management volunteers' perception of the quality of communication among coordinators and paid staff and program participation rate.

Statistical analysis of the data revealed the following significant relationships among the dependent variable of program participation rate and selected independent variables relating back to the seven hypotheses.

When the data were combined and analyzed from the five urban counties and fourteen rural counties, a significant measure of relationship was found to exist between participation rate and:

1. The importance attached by community coordinators toward organizing clubs ($r = -.5679$).
2. The importance attached by community coordinators toward 4-H promotion (other than recruitment) ($r = -.5362$).
3. Agreement with the statement that being a community coordinator is very rewarding ($r = -.6847$).
4. Agreement with the statement that, "I would like to be a community coordinator again if possible" ($r = -.5423$).
5. Agreement with the statement that, "There is little pressure put on people to fill the role of community coordinator" ($r = -.5818$).
6. There is a clear understanding of the role of community coordinator ($r = -.4121$).
7. Family income of community coordinator ($r_s = -.5882$, $\tau = -.5133$).
8. Number of hours per month of coordinator contact with paid staff ($r_s = -.520$, $\tau = -.3870$).

When the data were analyzed from the five urban counties a significant measure of relationship was found to exist between participation rate and:

1. The amount of time spent recruiting 4-H club members ($r = .5203$), organizing 4-H clubs ($r = .4073$), providing transportation ($r = .5224$), serving on 4-H committees ($r = -.4034$), participating in statewide activities ($r = .4699$), and organizing community 4-H events ($r = -.8884$).
2. The importance attached by community coordinators toward providing transportation ($r = .5982$), serving on 4-H committees ($r = .5233$), organizing 4-H community events ($r = -.8639$), participating in statewide activities ($r = .4755$), and 4-H promotion ($r = .6814$).
3. The coordinators' agreement with the statement that, "The job of community coordinator is too big for a volunteer to handle properly" ($r = .6131$), "I would like to be a community coordinator again if possible" ($r = -.5186$), "The areas of the community coordinator's responsibility are well-defined" ($r = -.6816$), "The role of community coordinator turned out to be exactly what I thought it would be" ($r = -.7478$), "Being a community

coordinator is very rewarding" ($r = -.7527$), "The paid staff are very helpful and support the volunteers" ($r = .6667$), and "Independent decision making by community coordinators is generally encouraged" ($r = .5884$).

4. The community coordinator's opinion of the existence and quality of: A clear understanding of the role of community coordinator ($r = -.7486$), and a formal description or guide for community coordinators ($r = -.8125$).

When data from the fourteen rural counties were analyzed a significant measure of relationship was found to exist between participation rate and:

1. The importance attached by community coordinators to organizing 4-H clubs ($r = -.5738$) and 4-H promotion ($r = -.5080$).
2. The coordinator's agreement with the statement, "Being a community coordinator is very rewarding" ($r = -.6672$), "I would like to be a community coordinator again if possible" ($r = -.4960$), and "There is little pressure put on people to fill the role of community coordinator" ($r = -.6226$).

Conclusions

This study was done at the request of the Oregon State University Extension Service in order to determine what variables relate to the 4-H program participation rate by school age people. The study was conducted in those Oregon counties which use community coordinators as volunteer middle-managers. Because the study was based on quantitative data (participation rate), the conclusions cannot be interpreted to be relating to the quality of 4-H programs.

After an analysis of the existing data, the following conclusions were reached relative to volunteer organizations using middle-managers as volunteers.

1. The number of middle-management volunteers and program participation rate. According to the data generated by this study, in-

creased participation rate does not necessarily occur when more middle-management volunteers are present. Though there may be some evidence that a minimum number of middle-manager volunteers are necessary for a productive program, there is no reason to believe that the participation rate will necessarily improve as middle-manager volunteers are added.

2. The activities middle-manager volunteers engage in, as well as the importance placed on those activities, and program participation rate. Data produced by this study indicate that in urban settings there is a relationship between what the middle-manager volunteer does and effectiveness. The amount of time spent in some activities may detract from participation rate in the program. It appears that the middle-manager volunteer, in the urban setting, contributes to program participation when more of his time is engaged in activities directly related to program participation.

This variable may not be as critical in the rural setting because of the nature of the activities. It seems reasonable to assume that in the rural setting the 4-H clubs and groups have a closer tie to the environment of the community and more visibility as an organization. Because of the rural setting, particular functions of the community coordinator may not be as critical. The participation of young people in rural programs may be assumed because of a more limited choice in activities. In the urban setting young people may find a greater number of alternative activities and therefore the 4-H program must be more competitive in its visibility.

The importance that the middle-management volunteer places on an activity appears to have a relationship to program participation. Being sensitive to the volunteer's attitude about different activities is more crucial in the urban setting, according to the data. This may be due to the tendency of middle-manager volunteers to be more specialized in the larger programs found in urban settings.

3. The attitude the middle-manager volunteer has toward his role and program participation. The findings of this study indicate that there is a relationship between the middle-manager volunteer's opinion of his role and the participation rate of young people in the 4-H program. Generally, the more rewarding and pleasant the middle-managers feel about their role, the less participation there is in the program.

This conclusion runs counter to other research that indicates a positive correlation between a positive opinion about a job and productivity. It is possible that in this situation the volunteer is working from some altruistic motive or a feeling of duty which has little to do with job satisfaction. The result of a different set of motivations for the volunteer as opposed to paid positions may mean that the more successful a program is, in terms of numbers of participants, the more work it is for the volunteer and therefore the less satisfying the volunteer role becomes. If the volunteers are participating out of duty to their own children, then the large numbers of children that participate from other families may lead to a decline in satisfaction after the program grows beyond the stage of meeting just the needs of the volunteers' children.

It would be important to be aware, then, that just because a program is effective in recruiting participants doesn't necessarily mean the volunteers are enjoying their roles. Also, the data seem to indicate that the volunteer who is most content may work in the program with the least effective recruiting record. This may be due to the fact that the programs which are most effective in recruiting require the greatest amount of sacrifice from the coordinator, while those programs which are less effective in recruiting are less demanding of time and creative energy.

4. The relationship between the management of the role of the middle-manager volunteer and participation rate. From the results produced by this study, there appears to be a relationship between the management style of paid staff and the participation rate of school age young people in the volunteer program. The relationship between recruiting effectiveness and the variables relating to management style was generally negatively sloped for the rural counties. It was found that the more highly structured managers had the most effective recruiting programs.

There is no clear reason that could be determined as to why middle-managers in the rural setting were less effective in recruitment when staff allowed more freedom for the coordinator to operate. It may be that in the rural setting the middle-managers may be less specialized in their role due to a greater degree of involvement with the total program, and therefore may find themselves called upon to perform many functions unrelated to recruitment.

In the urban setting, the positive correlation between agreement

about the encouragement for independent decision-making and effectiveness is consistent with the negative correlation of a clear understanding of their role, presence of a formal description or guide and effectiveness. This indicates that in the urban setting the coordinators in the programs with higher participation rates are generally making their own decisions in a relatively unstructured manner (defined by lack of job description).

This finding is consistent with a study done at Oregon State University by Ellen West in which she studied the productivity of teachers in adult classes and found that there was a positive correlation between the degree of freedom from supervision and productivity (West, 1981). It may be that in the urban setting the size of the volunteer program requires the more efficient administrators (staff) to allow a higher degree of freedom and flexibility so that the volunteer middle-manager may be more productive.

5. The middle-manager's perception of support and program participation rate. According to the data generated by this study, support for the middle-manager volunteer is not significantly related to effectiveness in the rural setting, while in the urban setting there is a positive relationship between administrative support and effective recruitment. This might indicate that middle-manager volunteers in urban programs who feel they have support for their roles have a higher participation rate in their programs. The urban program is larger and more specialized, and therefore, because the coordinators must know what is expected of them by staff, they may sense greater support from the staff when their role is successful at recruiting.

6. The middle-manager volunteer's perception of communication among the leaders and program participation rate. There does not appear to be any relationship between participation rate and the variable relating to communication.

7. The descriptors of the middle-manager volunteer and program participation rate. From the results produced by this study it appears that the two descriptors relating to middle-manager volunteers and participation rate are family income level of community coordinator and amount of time spent with paid staff each month.

The program manager may be tempted to assume that appointing to middle-manager positions volunteers who have higher incomes will result in a more effective recruitment. This research indicates, however, that there is an inverse relationship of income to effectiveness. This would suggest that higher income people in middle-manager roles are not necessarily more effective recruiters, in fact, they may be less effective.

There is an inverse relationship between the amount of time staff spends with volunteers and program participation rate. It may be that the data are reflecting the fact that staff are trying to make their recruitment programs more effective, and feel that spending more time with volunteers may help. This correlation is supported by the findings in conclusion number four, where there did appear to be a relationship between freedom from specific directions and recruitment rates by middle-management volunteers. The difference in time in the raw scores is only a few hours per month; therefore, the significance of this variable may be questioned.

Recommendations

Several recommendations are proposed as a result of this study.

1. That paid staff in the urban areas be sensitive to the need of middle-manager volunteers to be engaged in activities that are directly related to the goals of their role.
2. That paid staff be aware that in the programs with a high participation rate the middle-manager volunteer will not necessarily have a positive attitude toward their role, and therefore, the paid staff need to be sensitive to the need of making the job of middle-management more rewarding.
3. That the paid staff be aware that support for the middle-manager volunteer and increasing time spent with the volunteer do not necessarily lead to increased program participation by young people. The recruitment of young people by the middle-manager does not necessarily require a great deal of direct contact with the volunteer.
4. That the paid staff should not assume that middle-manager volunteers from higher income households will produce more productive recruitment. Households with higher incomes do not necessarily produce better recruiters.
5. That the significant relationships between productivity (participation rate) and selected variables found in this study be further researched to identify causation.
6. That this study be replicated, with appropriate adaptations, within other organizations which use middle-manager volunteers, in order to determine whether findings can be generalized to other service organizations.
7. That a study of middle-manager volunteers be done that not only uses quantitative data as the basis of determining productivity but also includes data that reflects the quality of the work the middle-manager is engaged in.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berkwitt, G. J. 1971. "The Big Move to Measure Managers."
Dun's. 98:61, September.
- Bowen, Bruce D. and Herbert F. Weisberg. 1980. An Introduction to Data Analysis. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Brown, Norman A., Chairman. 1976. 4-H in Century III. Task Force on 4-H in Century III. Extension Committee on Organization and Polity. Washington, D. C.: Extension Service, United States Department of Agriculture.
- * Business Week. 1980. "Appraising the Performance Appraisal."
153, May, 19.
- Chung, Kae H. 1977. Motivational Theories and Practices.
Columbus, Ohio: Grid, Inc.
- Drucker, Peter F. 1974. Management: Task • Responsibilities • Practices. New York: Harper and Rowe.
- * Ellis, Susan J. and Katherine H. Noyes. 1980. "How Did We Get Here." Volunteer Administration. XIII:2.
- Etzioni, Amitai. 1959. "Authority Structure and Organizational Effectiveness." Administrative Science Quarterly. 53, June.
- Etzioni, Amitai. 1961. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organization. New York, New York: Press of Glencoe, Inc.
- Etzioni, Amitai. 1964. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentiss-Hall.
- Guilford, J. P. 1965. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw Hill.
- * Haines, Mike. 1977. Volunteers: How to Find Them...How to Keep Them!. Vancouver, B. C.: VARC, February.
- Hall, Richard H. 1972. Organization: Structure and Process. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentiss-Hall.

- Helgerson, Lin D. et al. 1974. A Manual For a Volunteer Services System. Boulder, Colorado: July.
- Henderson, Richard. 1980. Performance Appraisal: Theory to Practice. Reston, Virginia: Reston Publishing Company.
- Herman, Herbert. 1975. "Research Roundup." The Personnel Administrator. 61, June.
- Katzman, Rita L., MSW. 1980. "Justifying the Position of Volunteer Administrator." Voluntary Action Leadership. 38, Winter.
- Koontz, Harold. 1971. Appraising Managers as Managers. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Lahti, Robert H. 1973. "Goal-Oriented Evaluation for Educational Managers." Phi Delta Kappa.
- Lawrence, Roger L., Chairman. 1973. "Extension Program Development." Program Development Ad Hoc Committee. Ames, Iowa: Approved for Publication by the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy. Published for the Committee by the Cooperative Extension Service, Iowa State University.
- Levinson, Harry. 1979. "Appraisal of What Performance?" Harvard Business Review on Human Relations. New York: Harper and Row.
- Lopez, Felix M., Jr. 1968. Evaluating Employee Performance. Chicago: Public Personnel Association.
- Martin, Hope M. 1973. Managing 4-H Volunteer Staff. Corvallis, Oregon: A 4-H Interim Report, Dr. V. Milton Bryce, Advisor, September.
- Mason, Robert D. 1976. Essentials of Statistics. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentiss-Hall.
- Mendenhall, William. 1975. Introduction To Probability and Statistics. North Scituate, Massachusetts: Duxbury Press.
- Myers, H. Joe. 1979. "An Examination of Oregon 4-H Staffing Patterns." In House Memo for State 4-H Staff. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University.
- Naylor, Harriet H. 1974. "Mobilizing the Efforts of Volunteers for a Just Society - Are They Effective?" Cincinnati, Ohio: National Conference on Social Welfare.

- O'Connell, Brian. 1976. Effective Leadership in Voluntary Action. Chicago, Illinois: Follett Publishing Company.
- Perlis, Leo. 1974. "The Volunteer." Voluntary Action News. 5:5, September/October.
- Peterson, Virgil. 1979. "Measuring the Impact on the Volunteer." Synergist. pp. 14, 19, Spring.
- Pierce, Nancy and Donald Higgins. 1976. "An Assessment of Volunteer Needs in the Boerum Hill-Fort Green Area of Brooklyn," New York. September.
- * Reigel, Bobette W. 1977. Basic Feedback System. National Information Center on Volunteerism. Boulder, Colorado.
- Sawer, Barbara J. 1980. "Time and Money Spent by Adult Volunteer Leaders in the Oregon 4-H Programs." Report prepared for the Oregon State University Extension Service. Corvallis, Oregon, p. iv.
- Scheier, Ivan H. 1977. "Everyone Should Evaluate Their Current Volunteer and Everyone Can." National Information Center on Volunteerism. Boulder, Colorado, August
- Scheier, Ivan H. 1978. Winning With Staff, A New Look at Staff Support for Volunteers. National Information Center on Volunteerism. Boulder, Colorado, January.
- Schindler-Rainman, Eva and Ronald Lippit. 1971. "The Volunteer Community." NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science. Washington, D. C.
- Schumacher, E. F. 1973. Small is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered. New York: Perennial Library, Harper and Row.
- Schwartz, Courtney. 1978. "Volunteers as Middle Managers." Journal of Extension. p. 28, November/December.
- Shenfield, Eugene. 1960. "Citizens and Volunteer Participation." Russell H. Kurtz, ed. Social Work Yearbook. New York: National Association of Social Workers.
- Sigler, Robert T. and Keith J. Leenhauts. 1980. "Satisfaction and Perception of Needs of Volunteer Administrators." Volunteer Administration. XIII:13-15, Spring.

- Simon, Julian L. 1969. Basic Research Methods in Social Science: The Art of Empirical Investigation. New York: Random House.
- Snider, Alan. 1979. "Managing Volunteers - A Challenging and Rewarding Role." Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University.
- Snider, Alan. 1979. "Examination of Volunteerism in Today's Society." Specialist Outlook. Oregon Extension Program Development, May.
- Stenzel, Anne K. and Helen M. Feeney. 1976. Volunteer Training and Development, A Manual. New York: The Seabury Press.
- Sterling, John. 1979. "The Middle Management Approach for New York State 4-H and (TOTAL) Cooperative Extension Programs." New York: Cornell University, May.
- Stevens, S. S. 1959. "Measurement Psychophysics and Utility." Measurement: Definitions and Theories. New York: C. W. Churchman and Philburn Ratoosh, eds., Wiley.
- Thompson, Paul H. and Gene W. Dalton. 1970. "Performance Appraisal: Manager Beware." Harvard Business Review. 48:83, January/February.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de. 1961. Democracy in America. Vol. II. New York: Schocken.
- West, Ellen Louise. 1982. Productivity Analysis of Adult Basic Education Programs: An Analytic Model. Oregon State University.
- Williams, M. P. 1972. Performance Appraisal in Management. New York, New York: Crane, Russak and Company.
- Williamson, Vanda and Diane M. Disney. 1979. "Should Volunteers be Fired?" Voluntary Action Leadership. 29, Fall.
- * Wilson, Marlene, The Effective Mangement of Volunteer Programs. Boulder, Colorado: Volunteer Management Associates.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A



To Lead Agent in Each Oregon County:

As you may have heard, a study is being done by Extension Service on the role and effectiveness of Community Coordinators in Oregon. The research is being done to aid us in our evaluation of the use of community coordinators and help determine whether or not we should encourage the use of middle management volunteers in other programs.

Al Snider and researcher Rich Noland have developed a questionnaire that they will be sending to all the community coordinators who have served in the 1979-80 program year. It is important for the success and accuracy of this research project that we contact all of the people who were listed and performed as community coordinators last year.

This is where you come in on the project. We need your help in assisting Al and Rich by providing them with a list of last year's community coordinators as well as their addresses. We also need a list of program assistants who supervised community coordinators in your county and their addresses as well. Please send this information to the state 4-H - Youth office as soon as possible, and no later than January 15, because they want to conduct the survey in the last part of January.

Sincerely,

Area Supervisor

DUANE P. JOHNSON
Acting Assistant Director
4-H - Youth



Agriculture Home Economics 4-H Youth Forestry Community Development and Marine Advisory Programs
Oregon State University United States Department of Agriculture and Oregon Counties cooperating

APPENDIX B

EXTENSION SERVICE



Corvallis, Oregon 97331

March 16, 1981

Dear 4-H Community Coordinator:

You are receiving this letter because as of March 13 we have not received the questionnaire relating to the 4-H Community Coordinator study that was sent to you in January.

It is extremely important to us that you take the time to fill out the enclosed questionnaire. We realize that sometimes the relationship between these kinds of surveys and whether or not a program such as 4-H succeeds is difficult to see. We are, however, expecting to make an assessment of the use of community coordinators and the information you provide will be weighed in this analysis.

If for some reason you do not want to fill out the questionnaire, please send it back blank.

Thank you for your patience with us.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NOLAND
Project Researcher
4-H Community Coordinator Study

RN/clp
Encl.



Agriculture Home Economics 4-H Youth Forestry Community Development and Marine Advisory Program,
Oregon State University United States Department of Agriculture and Oregon Counties cooperating

APPENDIX C

Code _____

SECTION I

Would you please mark the closest estimation to the percent of your time spent as a community coordinator performing the following task?

	0%	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-100%
1. Recruiting 4-H leaders					
2. Recruiting 4-H club members					
3. Organizing 4-H clubs					
4. Providing ongoing support for 4-H club leaders					
5. Providing transportation					
6. Providing leader orientation or training					
7. Receiving orientation or training					
8. Serving on 4-H committees					
9. Filling out reports or reading 4-H related materials					
10. Participating in statewide activities					
11. Organizing community 4-H events					
12. 4-H promotion (other than recruitment)					
13. Other (please specify)					

SECTION II

Please rate the following as to how important you think the task is for the community coordinator to be involved in:

	Extremely Important	Important	Unimportant	Extremely Unimportant	Uncertain About Importance
1. Recruiting 4-H leaders					
2. Recruiting 4-H club members					
3. Organizing 4-H clubs					
4. Providing ongoing support for 4-H club leaders					
5. Providing transportation					
6. Providing leader orientation or training					
7. Receiving orientation or training					
8. Serving on 4-H committees					
9. Filling out reports or reading 4-H related materials					
10. Participating in state-wide activities					
11. Organizing community 4-H events					
12. 4-H promotion (other than recruitment)					
13. Other (please specify)					

SECTION III

For the following, please check the column that most closely represents your feelings about the question.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Certain
1. Being a community coordinator is very rewarding.					
2. I was well prepared for my job as a community coordinator.					
3. The job of community coordinator is too big for a volunteer to handle properly.					
4. The paid staff are very helpful and support the volunteers.					
5. The community coordinators are expected to perform their functions on their own.					
6. The areas of the community coordinator's responsibility are well defined.					
7. Independent decision making by community coordinators is generally encouraged.					
8. The role of community coordinator in this county is very limited.					
9. The role of community coordinator turned out to be exactly what I thought it was.					
10. An important part of the responsibility of the community coordinator is to work directly with the young people in the program.					
11. There is little pressure put on people to fill the role of community coordinator.					
12. I feel communication among community coordinators is good.					
13. I would like to be a community coordinator again if possible.					

SECTION IV

For this county's 4-H program, would you please rate each of the things below?

	Doesn't Exist	Poor	Average	Above Average	Excellent
1. Training for community coordination					
2. A clear understanding of the role of a community coordinator					
3. Recognition of the work of community coordinators					
4. An overall philosophy of the 4-H program and the role of the community coordinator					
5. Opportunity to express dissatisfaction or frustrations with program					
6. Communication among staff and volunteers					
7. A formal description or guide for community coordinators					

SECTION V

Please fill in or check the appropriate answer:

1. Last level of education completed:

Jr. High or less _____ High School _____ College (how many years) _____

2. Have you had any professional or other training that may relate to your work in 4-H in the role of a community coordinator? If yes, what kind?

3. Age: Under 20 _____ 21-30 _____ 31-40 _____ 41-50 _____ Over 50 _____

4. Marital status: Married _____ Separated _____ Divorced _____

Widow or widower _____ Single _____

5. Number of children you have: _____

6. Principal occupation:

Farmer or rancher _____

Homemaker _____

Education _____

Professional (type) _____

Office worker _____

Other (specify) _____

7. Family income level:

Under \$15,000 _____

\$15,000-\$20,000 _____

\$20,000-\$30,000 _____

Over \$30,000 _____

8. Type of community in which you worked as a community coordinator:

Farm _____

Town under 10,000 and open country _____

Town or city 10,000 to 50,000 _____

Suburb of city over 50,000 _____

Central city of over 50,000 _____

(over)

-2-

9. How long have you lived in the county?
 Less than 2 years _____ 3-5 years _____ 5-10 years _____ 11 or more years _____
10. How long have you been involved with 4-H as a volunteer?
 Less than 1 year _____ 1-2 years _____ 3-4 years _____ Over 5 years _____
11. Check the position(s) you held last year as a 4-H volunteer:
- Community club leader _____
- Project leader _____
- Community coordinator _____
- Member of advisory committee _____
- Resource leader _____
- Other (specify) _____
12. Which of the positions in question #11 did you perceive as your primary responsibility as a 4-H volunteer last year?

13. How long have you been involved with 4-H as a community coordinator?
 Less than 1 year _____ 1-2 years _____ 3-4 years _____ Over 5 years _____
14. How many hours a month have you had contact with the paid staff as a community coordinator (on the average)?
 1-2 hours _____ 3-4 hours _____ 5-6 hours _____ 7 hours or more _____
15. Give the name of your main contact (program assistant or agent) in the 4-H program last year:

APPENDIX D

EXTENSION SERVICE



Corvallis, Oregon 97331

January 15, 1981

Individually typed name and address:

You are receiving this letter and questionnaire because you have been identified as having worked in the 4-H program as a community coordinator or at least have performed many of the functions of that role. Because you have invested many hours in 4-H, we at Oregon State University hope you will be willing to take a little more time and answer a questionnaire that we feel will contribute to the future success of the 4-H program in meeting the needs of the young people we serve.

The enclosed questionnaire is designed to help us evaluate the role of the community coordinator and to show us the strong and weak areas of this position. Your candid and honest response to all the questions is necessary in order to give us an accurate picture of the community coordinator's role in your county.

The responses will be strictly confidential and all evidence as to which county the responses come from will be destroyed after the survey has been completed. It is necessary for us to group the questionnaires by county but to which county the group of responses belongs to is irrelevant to the study. Therefore, after the survey has been completed there will be no way of knowing whether your county's group of responses belongs to Marion, Grant, or any other county.

Thank you for your patience and help in making an even better 4-H program for our young people. Please return the questionnaire within five days.

Sincerely,

RICHARD W. NOLAND
Project Researcher

ALAN SNIDER
Extension Specialist
4-H - Youth

RWN/clp
Enclosure



Agriculture Home Economics 4-H Youth Forestry Community Development and Marine Advisory Programs
Oregon State University United States Department of Agriculture and Oregon Counties cooperating

APPENDIX E

Summary of all Responses on Section I of Survey Instrument

Instructions community coordinators responded to:

Would you please mark the closest estimation to the percent of your time spent as a community coordinator performing the following task?

	0%	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-100%
1. Recruiting 4-H leaders	10* 5.5**	85 46.4	40 21.9	36 19.7	12 6.6
2. Recruiting 4-H club members	12 6.6	79 43.4	45 24.7	33 18.1	13 7.1
3. Organizing 4-H clubs	19 10.7	81 55.5	45 25.3	27 15.2	6 3.4
4. Providing ongoing support for 4-H club leaders	17 9.8	82 47.4	46 26.6	15 8.7	13 7.5
5. Providing transportation	82 47.4	55 31.8	16 9.2	9 5.2	11 6.4
6. Providing leader orientation or training	67 39.2	81 47.4	18 10.5	4 2.3	1 .6
7. Receiving orientation or training	40 22.7	103 58.5	23 13.1	7 4.0	3 1.7
8. Serving on 4-H committees	53 30.3	60 34.3	35 20.0	17 9.7	10 5.7
9. Filling out reports or reading 4-H related materials	18 10.7	94 53.1	44 24.9	12 6.8	9 5.1
10. Participating in statewide activities	106 60.6	50 28.6	12 6.9	5 2.9	2 1.1
11. Organizing community 4-H events	48 27.6	78 44.8	30 17.2	14 8.0	4 2.3
12. 4-H promotion (other than recruitment)	41 24.1	80 47.1	31 18.2	11 6.5	7 4.1
13. Other (please specify)	13 48.1	2 7.4	3 11.1	4 14.8	5 18.5

* number of responses

** percent

Summary of all Responses on Section II

Instructions community coordinators responded to:

Please rate the following as to how important you think the task is for the community coordinator to be involved in:

	Un- certain	Very un- important	Unim- portant	Impor- tant	Very im- portant
1. Recruiting 4-H leaders	2* 1.1 **	-- --	-- --	81 43.8	102 55.1
2. Recruiting 4-H club members	5 2.8	-- --	6 3.3	100 55.6	69 38.3
3. Organizing 4-H clubs	4 2.3	1 .6	6 3.4	106 60.2	59 33.5
4. Providing ongoing support for 4-H club leaders	3 1.7	2 1.1	2 1.1	103 56.9	71 39.2
5. Providing transportation	18 10.0	25 13.9	87 48.3	40 22.2	10 5.6
6. Providing leader orientation or training	12 6.7	2 1.1	25 13.9	107 59.4	34 18.9
7. Receiving orientation or training	8 4.4	-- --	10 5.5	112 61.5	52 28.6
8. Serving on 4-H committees	19 10.6	2 1.1	26 14.4	111 61.7	22 12.2
9. Filling out reports or reading 4-H related materials	11 6.0	2 1.1	18 9.9	126 69.2	25 13.7
10. Participating in state-wide activities	35 19.9	3 1.7	52 29.5	79 44.9	7 4.0
11. Organizing community 4-H events	19 10.6	-- --	21 11.7	110 61.1	30 16.7
12. 4-H promotion (other than recruitment)	19 11.0	-- --	13 7.5	101 58.4	40 23.1
13. Other (please specify)	2 20.0	-- --	1 10.0	3 30.0	4 40.0

* number of responses

** percent

Summary of all Responses on Section III

Instructions community coordinators responded to: For the following, please check the column that most closely represents your feelings about the question.

	Un- certain	Strongly Disagree	Dis- agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Being a community coordinator is very rewarding	29* 16.5**	2 1.1	20 11.4	94 53.4	31 17.6
2. I was well prepared for my job as community coordinator	14 8.0	15 8.6	64 36.8	67 38.5	14 8.0
3. The job of community coordinator is too big for a volunteer to handle properly	19 10.6	19 10.6	99 55.3	30 16.8	12 6.7
4. Paid staff are very helpful and support volunteers	6 3.4	-- --	4 2.2	75 42.1	93 52.2
5. Community coordinators are expected to perform their functions on their own	9 5.0	17 9.4	77 42.8	58 32.2	19 10.6
6. Areas of community coordinator's responsibility are well defined	18 9.8	10 5.5	57 31.1	89 48.6	9 4.9
7. Independent decision making by community coordinators is generally encouraged	24 13.4	2 1.1	16 8.9	114 63.7	23 12.8
8. The role of the community coordinator in this county is very limited	28 15.8	19 10.7	102 57.6	22 12.4	6 3.4
9. The role of community coordinator turned out to be exactly what I thought	31 17.2	9 5.0	42 23.3	92 51.1	6 3.3
10. An important part of the community coordinator's responsibility is to work directly with young people	19 10.7	9 5.1	63 35.4	73 41.0	14 7.9
11. Little pressure is put on people to fill role of community coordinator	28 15.6	7 3.9	35 19.4	101 56.1	9 5.0
12. Communication among community coordinators is good	21 11.5	15 8.2	61 33.5	67 36.8	18 9.9
13. I would like to be a community coordinator again	58 32.8	12 6.8	25 14.1	68 38.4	14 7.9

*number of responses, **percent

APPENDIX H

Summary of all Responses on Section IV

Instructions community coordinators responded to:

For this county's 4-H program, would you please rate each of the items below.

	Doesn't		Above		
	Exist	Poor	Average	Average	Excellent
1. Training for community coordinators	22* 12.6**	25 14.3	75 42.9	35 20	18 10.3
2. A clear understanding of the role of community coordinator	5 2.8	35 19.6	82 45.8	44 24.6	13 7.3
3. Recognition of the work of community coordinator	10 5.6	19 10.6	76 42.5	44 24.6	30 16.8
4. An overall philosophy of 4-H program & the role of the community coordinator	2 1.1	24 13.6	79 44.6	52 29.4	20 11.3
5. Opportunity to express dissatisfaction or frustrations with program	3 1.7	10 5.6	69 38.8	57 32.0	39 21.9
6. Communication among staff and volunteers	2 1.1	12 6.9	56 32.0	57 32.6	48 27.4
7. A formal description or guide for community coordinators	27 15.6	22 12.7	47 27.2	56 32.4	21 12.1

* number of responses

** percent

Summary of all Responses to Section V

	<u>All</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1. Education Level	19	
Jr. High or less:	2	1.0
High School:	65	26.0
College:	122	63.0
2. Ages		
Under 20:	4	2.1
21-30:	15	7.7
31-40:	99	50.8
41-50:	51	26.2
Over 50:	23	11.8
3. Marital Status		
Married:	174	89.2
Separated:	2	1.0
Divorced:	7	3.6
Widow/Widower:	6	3.1
Single:	2	1.0
4. Number of Children		
None:	12	6.2
One:	19	9.7
Two:	61	31.3
Three:	55	28.2
Four:	23	11.8
Five:	15	7.7
Six:	5	2.6
Seven:	2	1.0
Eight:	3	1.5
5. Principal Occupation		
Farmer or Rancher:	28	14.4
Homemaker:	113	57.9
Educator:	16	8.2
Other Professional:	8	4.1
Office worker:	10	5.1
Other:	16	8.2

APPENDIX I (Cont'd.)

100

	<u>All 19</u>	<u>Percent</u>
6. Family Income Level		
Under \$15,000:	28	14.4
\$15-20,000:	49	25.1
\$20-30,000:	62	31.8
Over \$30,000:	40	20.5
7. How long they lived in the county		
Less than 2 yrs.:	4	2.1
3-5 years:	28	14.4
5-10 years:	30	15.4
11 or more years:	119	61.0
8. How long they have been involved with 4-H as a volunteer:		
Less than 1 year:	5	2.6
1-2 years:	33	16.9
3-4 years:	44	22.6
Over 5 years:	96	49.2
9. How long they have been involved with 4-H as a community coordinator		
Less than 1 year:	29	14.9
1-2 years:	51	26.2
3-4 years:	61	31.3
Over 5 years	33	16.9
10. Type of community they worked in as community coordinator:		
Farm	58	29.7
Town under 10,000 and open country	64	32.8
Town or city 10,000 to 50,000	24	12.3
Suburb of city over 50,000	24	12.3
Central city of over 50,000	20	10.3

APPENDIX I (Cont'd.)

	<u>All 19</u>	<u>Percent</u>
11. Average hours a month there was contact with paid staff		
1-2 hours:	108	55.4
3-4 hours:	27	13.8
5-6 hours	14	7.2
7 or more hours	8	4.1

APPENDIX J

Summary of Responses to Section I of Rural and Urban Counties

Instructions community coordinators responded to:

Would you please mark the closest estimation to the percent of your time spent as a community coordinator performing the following tasks.

	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-100%
1. Recruiting 4-H leaders	43* 42**	24 16	21 15	4 8
2. Recruiting 4-H club members	37 42	24 21	21 12	9 4
3. Organizing 4-H clubs	42 39	17 28	16 11	3 3
4. Providing ongoing support for 4-H club leaders	48 34	21 25	4 11	10 3
5. Providing transportation	25 30	9 7	4 5	7 4
6. Providing leader orientation or training	39 42	8 10	2 2	1 0
7. Receiving orientation or training	48 55	14 9	5 2	3 0
8. Serving on 4-H committees	32 28	19 16	6 11	9 1
9. Filling out reports or reading 4-H related materials	50 44	21 23	7 5	4 5
10. Participating in statewide activities	24 26	2 10	2 3	2 0
11. Organizing community 4-H events	44 34	13 17	7 7	4 0
12. 4-H promotion (other than recruitment)	46 34	16 15	3 8	4 3
13. Other (please specify)	2 0	0 3	3 1	1 4

* rural

** urban

APPENDIX K

Summary of Responses to Section II of Rural and Urban Counties

Instructions community coordinators responded to:

Please rate the following as to how important you think the task is for the community coordinator to be involved in:

	Un- certain	Very un- important	Unim- portant	Impor- tant	Very im- portant
1. Recruiting 4-H leaders	2* 0**	-- --	-- --	37 44	58 54
2. Recruiting 4-H club members	4 1	-- --	1 5	43 57	49 35
3. Organizing 4-H clubs	2 2	1 0	2 4	54 52	38 40
4. Providing ongoing support for 4-H club leaders	0 3	1 1	2 0	54 49	40 45
5. Providing transportation	9 9	13 12	43 44	21 19	11 14
6. Providing leader orientation or training	7 5	2 0	10 15	56 51	22 27
7. Receiving orientation or training	4 4	-- --	6 4	55 57	32 33
8. Serving on 4-H committees	5 14	1 1	15 11	54 57	22 15
9. Filling out reports or reading 4-H related materials	4 7	2 0	13 5	56 70	22 16
10. Participating in state-wide activities	12 23	3 0	28 24	43 36	11 15
11. Organizing community 4-H events	6 13	0 0	9 12	56 54	26 19
12. 4-H promotion (other than recruitment)	6 13	-- --	8 5	53 48	30 32
13. Other (please specify)	N o t c o m p u t e d				

* rural

** urban

Summary of Responses to Section III for Rural and Urban Counties

Instructions community coordinators responded to:

For the following, please check the column that most closely represents your feelings about the question.

	Strongly Agree		Strongly Disagree		Not Certain
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	
1. Being a community coordinator is very rewarding	24*	51	9	2	11
	26**	43	11	0	18
2. I was well prepared for job as community coord.	14	35	32	9	7
	21	32	32	6	7
3. The community coordinator job is too big for a volunteer to handle properly	7	11	58	10	11
	12	8	41	20	17
4. Paid staff is very helpful & support volunteer	58	36	1	0	2
	52	39	3	0	4
5. Community coordinators are expected to perform their functions on their own	16	27	41	10	3
	18	31	36	7	6
6. The community coordinators areas of responsibility are well defined	7	47	34	5	9
	14	42	23	5	14
7. Independent decision making by community coordinators is encouraged	18	56	11	1	11
	21	58	5	1	13
8. Role of community coordinator in county is very limited	11	10	54	10	12
	13	12	48	9	16
9. Community coordinator's role turned out to be exactly what I thought	7	49	17	7	17
	14	43	25	2	14
10. An important part of the community coordinator's responsibility is to work directly with young people	14	40	30	5	8
	17	33	33	4	11
11. Little pressure is put on people to fill the role of community coordinator	7	54	17	5	14
	17	47	18	2	14
12. Communication among community coordinators is good	19	33	25	10	10
	12	34	36	5	11

APPENDIX L (Cont'd.)

Summary of Responses to Section III for Rural and Urban Counties (Cont'd.)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Certain
13. I would like to be a community coordinator again	14 18	32 36	14 11	7 5	30 28

* rural, ** urban

Summary of Responses to Section IV for Rural and Urban Counties

Instructions community coordinators responded to:

For this count's 4-H program, would you please rate each of the items below.

	Doesn't		Above		
	Exist	Poor	Average	Average	Excellent
1. Training for community coordinator	18*	13	39	11	10
	4**	12	36	24	8
2. A clear understanding of the role of a community coordinator	2	22	41	19	8
	3	13	36	20	21
3. Recognition of the work of community coordinators	9	11	40	24	9
	1	8	36	20	21
4. Overall philosophy of 4-H program & the role of the community coordinator	2	11	46	23	7
	0	13	33	29	13
5. Opportunity to express dissatisfaction or frustrations with program	3	6	40	21	22
	0	4	29	36	17
6. Communication among staff and volunteers	1	7	30	28	26
	1	5	26	29	22
7. A formal description or guide for community coordinators	20	13	20	25	13
	7	9	27	31	8

* rural

** urban

APPENDIX N

Summary of Responses to Section V for Rural and Urban CountiesDescriptive Data of Survey Instrument

	<u>14 Rural</u>	<u>5 Urban</u>
1. Education level		
Jr. High or less:	0	2
High School:	39	26
College:	55	67
2. Ages		
Under 20:	2	2
21-30:	7	8
31-40:	47	52
41-50:	29	22
Over 50:	11	21
3. Marital Status		
Married:	86	88
Separated:	2	0
Divorced	4	3
Widow/Widower:	2	4
Single:	2	0
4. Number of Children		
None:	8	4
One:	8	11
Two:	30	31
Three:	29	26
Four:	12	11
Five:	6	9
Six:	2	3
Seven:	1	1
Eight:	1	2

APPENDIX N (Cont'd.)

	<u>14 Rural</u>	<u>5 Urban</u>
5. Principal Occupation		
Farmer or rancher:	18	10
Homemaker:	55	58
Educator:	9	7
Other professional:	2	6
Office worker:	5	5
Other:	7	9
6. Family Income Level		
Under \$15,000:	20	8
\$15-20,000:	22	27
\$20-30,000:	29	33
Over \$30,000	19	21
7. How long they lived in the County		
Less than 2 years:	1	3
3-5 years:	14	14
5-10 years:	15	15
11 or more years:	57	62
8. How long they have been involved with 4-H as a volunteer		
Less than 1 year:	3	2
1-2 years:	15	18
3-4 years:	20	24
Over five years:	47	49
9. How long they have been involved with 4-H as a community coordinator		
Less than 1 year:	14	15
1-2 years:	30	21
3-4 years:	29	32
Over 5 years:	13	20

APPENDIX N (Cont'd.)

	<u>14 Rural</u>	<u>5 Urban</u>
10. Type of community they worked in as community coordinator		
Farm:	34	24
Town under 10,000 and open country:	41	23
Town or city 10,000 to 50,000:	13	11
Suburb of city of over 50,000:	6	24
Central city of over 50,000:	1	19
11. Average hours a month there was contact with paid staff		
1-2 hours:	40	60
3-4 hours:	19	8
5-6 hours:	9	5
7 or more hours:	4	4