

ASSESSMENT OF JOB SATISFACTION OF PARAPROFESSIONALS
IN RELATION TO SELECTED PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS
AND WORKING ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

by

Julie Patricia Camp

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
In the Graduate College
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 7 8

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department of the Dean of the Graduate College when in his judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED:

Julie Patricia Camp

APPROVAL BY THESIS DIRECTOR

This thesis has been approved on the date shown below:

Floyd G. McCormick
FLOYD G. MCCORMICK

Professor of Agricultural Education

March 31, 1978
Date

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to express her appreciation to her major professor, Dr. Floyd G. McCormick, for his extreme patience, invaluable advice and generous assistance given throughout the duration of her graduate program and the writing of this thesis.

The author also wishes to thank Beryl Burt, State EFNEP Coordinator and other administrators of the Arizona Extension Service for their support and assistance in conducting this study.

Special thanks go to the faculty and staff members of the Pima County Extension Service for their patience and moral support while the author was completing this study.

Further thanks are due all of the EFNEP Program Aides who participated in this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ABSTRACT	x
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Need for the Study	5
Statement of the Problem	7
Specific Objectives	7
Assumptions	7
Limitations	8
Delimitations	8
Method of Investigation	8
Population	9
Instrumentation and Collection of Data	9
Data Analysis	10
Definition of Terms	11
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	12
Theory and History of Job Satisfaction Survey	12
Job Factors	14
Personal Factors	16
Job Satisfaction Surveys in Extension	16
Summary of Related Literature	19
III. METHOD OF INVESTIGATION	21
Population	21
Collection of Data and Instrumentation	21
Data Analysis	25
IV. PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA	27
Selected Personal Characteristics of Paraprofessionals	27
County Assignments of EFNEP Paraprofessionals	27
Location of Residence of EFNEP Paraprofessionals	28
Length of Residence by EFNEP Paraprofessionals	28
Racial-Ethnic Composition of the Neighborhoods of the EFNEP Paraprofessionals	29
Length of Service in Extension by EFNEP Paraprofessionals	29

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
Previous Work Experience of EFNEP Paraprofessionals	30
Membership of EFNEP Paraprofessionals in	
Community Organizations	31
Marital Status of EFNEP Paraprofessionals	32
Type of Work Done by Husbands of EFNEP	
Paraprofessionals	32
Number of Children of EFNEP Paraprofessionals	33
Age of EFNEP Paraprofessionals	34
Racial Characteristics of EFNEP Paraprofessionals	35
Number of Years of School Completed by EFNEP	
Paraprofessionals	35
Number of Program Families Enrolled by EFNEP	
Paraprofessionals	36
Number of Groups (4-H and Homemakers) Enrolled by	
EFNEP Paraprofessionals	37
Approximate Combined Family Income of EFNEP	
Professionals	38
Distances EFNEP Paraprofessionals Must Travel	
to Visit Program Families	39
Other Characteristics of EFNEP Paraprofessionals	40
Job Satisfaction Factors	40
Personnel Benefits	41
Working Conditions	50
Pay	50
Co-Workers	51
Security and Advancement	51
Supervision	52
Communications	53
The Work Itself	53
Mean Scores for Job Factor Statements	54
Other Statements about Work	56
Relationships of Selected Personal Characteristics to	
Identified Job Satisfaction Factors	58
Location of Residence/Feelings about Pay	61
Length of Residence/Feelings about Pay	61
Previous Work Experience/Feelings about Working	
Conditions	62
Marital Status/Feelings about Working Conditions	63
Marital Status/Feelings about Supervision	63
Age of Paraprofessionals/Feelings about Pay	64
Years of Schooling/Feelings about Pay	65
Number of Program Groups/Feelings about Co-Workers	66
Racial-Ethnic Composition of Neighborhood/	
Feelings about Pay	67
Racial-Ethnic Composition of Neighborhood/	
Feelings about the Work Itself	68

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	70
Statement of the Problem	70
Specific Objectives	70
Summary of Findings	71
Selected Personal Characteristics	71
Job Satisfaction Factors	73
Relationships of Selected Personal Characteristics to Identified Job Satisfaction Factors	75
Conclusions	77
Recommendations	78
APPENDIX A: EFNEP AIDE INVENTORY	80
APPENDIX B: ORAL INSTRUCTIONS	91
APPENDIX C: EFNEP AIDE INVENTORY RESULTS	92
APPENDIX D: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	101
LIST OF REFERENCES	103

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. County Assignments of EFNEP Paraprofessionals	28
2. Location of Residence of EFNEP Paraprofessionals	29
3. Length of Residence by EFNEP Paraprofessionals	29
4. Racial-Ethnic Composition of the Neighborhoods of the EFNEP Paraprofessionals	30
5. Length of Service in Extension by EFNEP Paraprofessionals . .	30
6. Previous Work Experience of EFNEP Paraprofessionals	31
7. Membership of EFNEP Paraprofessionals in Community Organizations	32
8. Marital Status of EFNEP Paraprofessionals	33
9. Type of Work Done by Husbands of EFNEP Paraprofessionals . .	33
10. Number of Children of EFNEP Paraprofessionals	34
11. Age of EFNEP Paraprofessionals	34
12. Racial Characteristics of EFNEP Paraprofessionals	35
13. Number of Years of School Completed by EFNEP Paraprofessionals	36
14. Number of Program Families Currently Enrolled by EFNEP Paraprofessionals	37
15. Number of Program Groups (4-H and Homemakers) Enrolled by EFNEP Paraprofessionals	38
16. Approximate Combined Family Income of EFNEP Paraprofessionals	39

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
17. Distances EFNEP Paraprofessionals Must Travel to Visit Program Families	39
18. Other Characteristics of EFNEP Paraprofessionals	40
19. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Statements about Personnel Benefits	42
20. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Statements about Working Conditions	43
21. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Statements about Pay	44
22. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Statements about Co-Workers	45
23. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Statements about Security and Advancement	46
24. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Statements about Supervision	47
25. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Statements about Communications	48
26. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Statements about the Work Itself	49
27. Mean Scores for Job Factor Statements	55
28. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Other Statements about Work	57
29. F Values Interpreted in Terms of Probability Correlations between Personal Characteristics and Job Satisfaction Factors	59
30. Analysis of Subsets: Location of Residence/ Feelings about Pay	61
31. Analysis of Subsets: Length of Residence/ Feelings about Pay	62

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
32. Analysis of Subsets: Previous Work Experience/ Feelings about Working Conditions	63
33. Analysis of Subsets: Marital Status/ Feelings about Working Conditions	64
34. Analysis of Subsets: Marital Status Feelings about Supervision	64
35. Analysis of Subsets: Age of Paraprofessionals/ Feelings about Pay	65
36. Analysis of Subsets: Years of Schooling Completed/ Feelings about Pay	66
37. Analysis of Subsets: Number of Program Groups/ Feelings about Co-Workers	66
38. Analysis of Subsets: Racial-Ethnic Composition of Neighborhood/Feelings about Pay	67
39. Analysis of Subsets: Racial-Ethnic Composition of Neighborhood/Feelings about the Work Itself	68

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to appraise the job satisfaction of paraprofessionals employed in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program of the Arizona Cooperative Extension Service in the light of selected personal characteristics. The data analyzed were collected by means of a job satisfaction inventory administered to 40 EFNEP paraprofessionals present at the State EFNEP Workshop, October 5, 1977.

Major findings indicate in the aggregate, EFNEP paraprofessionals like their jobs. The job factors offering the paraprofessionals the greatest satisfaction are the intrinsic rewards of the job itself and the communications established between the paraprofessional and the various layers of administration. The job factors offering the least satisfaction were pay and the way in which pay matters are handled and relationships with co-workers. Also defined as needs were greater direction and more training to be given by supervising home economists.

The community in which the paraprofessional lives and works, and the time the paraprofessional has lived there have the greatest effects on job satisfaction. Paraprofessionals whose previous work experience was either as a homemaker or in some service field were more likely to be satisfied by the working conditions encountered in the EFNEP program.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The enabling legislation for the Cooperative Extension Service, the 1914 Smith-Lever Act, charges the organization with the responsibility to disseminate useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics to the people of the United States, and to use and apply that information. Prior to the Smith-Lever Act, there were certain professionals using Extension methods to spread important research in agriculture to rural audiences. In 1904, Dr. Seaman A. Knapp organized successful farmers without college degrees to spread information about protecting their cotton crops from the boll weevil (Boyce 1968).

After the Smith-Lever Act, the Extension Service chose to dispense information through the one-to-one contact of the professional college-educated agent with the individual farmer, homemaker or 4-H leader. As the demands of the audience increased, more information was given through small group meetings and through appropriate mass media methods as they developed and became available to the Extension Service (Sanders 1966).

The Extension Service has had special assignments during periods of national need or crisis. During World War I, the Extension Service

was designated as the chief food production agency. When the Federal Farm Loan Act began, it was the Extension Service which educated the farmers in the provisions of the Act (Sanders 1966).

World War II brought on shortages of both food and manpower. The Extension Service employed non-college educated personnel (paraprofessionals) to help conduct the farm labor program. The County Extension Home Economist trained and supervised non-college trained homemakers to teach canning and food preservation to other homemakers. When the War was over and the increased needs for food production and preservation were over, the Extension Service resumed its policy of employing only professional agents (Boyce 1968).

The paraprofessional farmers that Seaman A. Knapp organized, the professional agents and homemakers who worked during World War II, all had a great deal in common. Their success was based on the common experiences they shared with their clientele. This increased the acceptance of their information by the farmers and homemakers they taught in their programs. They were all supervised and trained by professional (college-educated) Extension personnel who maintained the important "pipeline" with the land-grant college that provided the necessary and accurate information.

A new crisis was outlined in the "Ten State Nutrition Survey 1978-1970". This survey reported malnutrition in endemic proportions in the United States. Despite an extensive and expensive Commodity Food Distribution System of the United States Department of Agriculture, the people with the lowest income were also those with the

greatest nutritional deficiencies. One of the problems reported was that many of the commodity (or "donated") foods were not used by the people who received them due to ignorance or the lack of cultural relevance of the food (United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare 1970).

The Congress authorized the Extension Service in 1968 to develop and implement the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program. Based on pilot projects in various states, the scope of the Extension Program was broadened to include a focus on hard-to-reach families in poverty, usually minority groups in urban areas, teaching them sound nutritional practices as well as how to use the commodity foods available (United States Department of Agriculture [USDA] 1976).

The Guidelines define the clientele as hard-to-reach homemakers with young children whose educational levels are low and whose family income levels are below federally established poverty levels. They tend to be distrustful of government and especially governmental programs. Many do not speak or understand English. Because of these factors, the target audience participation in the traditional Extension methods or workshops or meetings, listening to English language radio programs or reading newspaper articles is limited.

Paraprofessional homemakers are hired, trained, and supervised by professional Extension Home Economists. These paraprofessionals thus extend the work of the professionals through one-to-one or small group meetings basis, providing information to improve the food and nutrition knowledge, food consumption practices and utilization of commodity foods. Because they share similar backgrounds, including

language, with the clientele, they find acceptance easier than would be experienced by a professional home economist. Salary savings from hiring paraprofessionals compared to professional home economists allow for hiring more paraprofessionals who can reach many more homemakers than could a professional.

EFNEP Guidelines (USDA 1976) specify that the paraprofessionals come from the community in which they are to work and represent the clientele in terms of education, income, age and experience.

The role of the EFNEP paraprofessional is to take the training they receive from the supervising home economist and to teach it to the low-income homemaker and to help him/her apply it to the family's food consumption practices. A report published in 1972 by the USDA Economic Research Service points to the success of the EFNEP program and credits the paraprofessional aide for the program success.

Extension is not the only agency employing paraprofessionals. Health, Education, Welfare and Community Action Programs all employ paraprofessionals in some capacity. The future seems to present even more possibilities in the development of more paraprofessional jobs in many fields, especially Extension. Frank Reissman (1967) pointed to the challenge of employing paraprofessionals, training, them, utilizing their skills and providing for counseling and career guidance and job advancements. Since the inception of the EFNEP program, funding has become available to hire paraprofessionals in 4-H, Agriculture, Senior Citizen and other Extension programs.

Need for the Study

The Arizona Extension Service has many years experience in working with paraprofessionals. There are currently eighty paraprofessionals employed throughout the Arizona Extension Service, sixty of them are employed in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program. This provided for 44.1 full time equivalents (FTE) to the total Extension Home Economics programs each year. Each paraprofessional is required to record the time spent on the job. All of these records are coded into a computer and totals are calculated. During fiscal year 1977, only 31.8 full time equivalents were reported (White 1977). This accounts for a loss of 12.3 FTE due to attrition and all the other factors in filling vacant positions.

Each year there are a certain number of aides who quit their jobs due to family pressures, dissatisfaction with the job and opportunities for advancement. Supervising home economists in the Arizona EFNEP program reported an estimated twelve vacancies have occurred in their units during the past fiscal year. The costs of hiring and retraining new paraprofessionals for each of these vacancies are estimated to be quite large. It also accounts for a loss in effectiveness in the program because with each new aide it is expected to take nearly six months before she can enroll an acceptable number of program families.

Some of the employee terminations could be accounted for in the demands families make on a newly employed homemaker, making her feel guilty for leaving the home for a new job. Many aides find better jobs after they have gained experience in Extension. Extension

administrators and supervising home economists ask questions concerning what can be done to make the paraprofessional in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program more successful and more satisfied with her job. Another question seems to be whether or not to keep the paraprofessional in the same program, expanding career ladders to allow for upward mobility or to allow paraprofessionals to leave one system and enter another field that has more opportunities for advancement (Burt 1977).

Many businesses and agencies have utilized a job satisfaction survey to determine if morale problems exist and if they do where they occur. These surveys have helped reduce turnover, increase productivity, reduce friction between employees, improve the quality of employees, increase communication between employees and management, develop confidence in management and reduce absenteeism (Science Research Associates [SRA] 1970).

The Arizona Extension Service has never used an attitude survey with either paraprofessionals or professionals. A job satisfaction survey could help measure the morale of the EFNEP paraprofessionals and identify problem areas. The information gained from such a study would be valuable to supervising home economists in improving supervision practices and to Extension Administrators in evaluating personnel practices. Implications could also be made to the employment of paraprofessionals in other Extension Program areas.

This study was undertaken to appraise the job satisfaction and personal characteristics of paraprofessionals in the EFNEP program in order to identify recommendations for program changes or hiring procedures.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to appraise job satisfaction of the paraprofessional employed in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program in Arizona in the light of certain personal characteristics.

Specific Objectives

In order to make the foregoing appraisal, the following questions were identified:

1. What are selected personal characteristics of paraprofessionals employed in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program of the Cooperative Extension Service in Arizona?
2. What are the feelings of the paraprofessionals towards job benefits (both real and fringe), working satisfaction factors such as conditions, pay, co-workers, security and advancement, supervision, communications, the work itself and other factors?
3. Are the selected personal characteristics of the paraprofessional related to the identified job satisfaction factors?

Assumptions

This study was based on the following assumption:

1. Paraprofessionals employed in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program could understand and fill out honestly and accurately an employee inventory that would measure their job satisfaction.

Limitations

The recognized limitations of this study were as follows:

1. Paraprofessionals (Program Aides) are supervised in eight different units (counties) in a variety of cultures and environments by different supervisory home economists. This may account for variations in response to the questions asked.
2. The instrument was administered to the paraprofessionals at the end of a State EFNEP Workshop. This could have affected their overall feelings of job satisfaction.

Delimitations

The findings of this study were subject to the following delimitations:

1. Only the aides who were employed in the Arizona Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program and present at a State EFNEP Workshop were surveyed. At the time of the study, all of the paraprofessionals employed were female.

Method of Investigation

The procedures used in conducting this study were designed to acquire the information necessary to meet the stated objectives of the problem. To aid in the presentation of materials, the following sections were identified: (1) Study populations, (2) Instrumentation and collection of data and (3) Data analysis.

Population

The target population of this study included paraprofessionals (Program Aides) employed in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program in Arizona. The entire population of EFNEP paraprofessionals was selected. In order to reduce non-response and the effects of external forces, it was decided to administer the questionnaire to all the aides attending a State EFNEP Workshop.

Instrumentation and Collection of Data

The initial step in the collection of the data was the formation of a job satisfaction inventory. The author reviewed various research instruments used by others. These included the Hoppock Job Satisfaction Blank (Worden 1973), Brayfield-Rothe (1951) scale, Likert-type Scales (Carroll 1973), and the Science Research Associates (SRA) Attitude Survey (1970). The SRA survey was selected because of the variety of factors measured, and the simple framing of statements, which reduced the chances of reactive arrangements. Test-retest procedures used in the SRA have indicated high reliability. Statements were reworded to reduce the reading level to eighth grade or below, because many of the paraprofessionals have not finished high school.

The personal data questionnaire was developed after research and consultation with State Extension Specialists. The preliminary drafts of the instruments were critiqued by members of the Department of Agricultural Education faculty and State Extension Specialists and Administration. Suggested revisions were made.

The instrument was field tested with paraprofessionals employed by the WIC (Women, Infant and Children) Nutrition Program in the Pima County Health Department. Paraprofessionals in this program were determined to have backgrounds and responsibilities similar to EFNEP paraprofessionals. The instrument was then submitted to the University of Arizona Committee for Human Subjects for approval. A copy of this instrument can be found in Appendix A. Oral instructions can be found in Appendix B.

Data Analysis

Data collected for this study were coded and key punched on electronic computer cards for computer compilation and analysis. These data were then reported in terms of frequency, distribution percentages and mean scores.

Individual statements in the Job Attitude Inventory were assigned to one of nine possible job satisfaction factors. Data were also reported in units of these factors.

Individual respondent mean scores for each job satisfaction factor were calculated. Minimum and maximum individual scores were reported as well as the average mean score for each factor.

Correlations were then drawn between job factors and personal characteristics and subjected to the LSD test at a .050 probability level. Further analysis of the subsets was made to determine significance.

Definition of Terms

In order to provide greater clarity for the reader of this study, the following terms were defined:

1. Paraprofessional or non-professional: a person who usually does not hold at least a baccalaureate degree and works under the supervision of a professional.
2. Program Aide: the title given to paraprofessional positions in the Arizona Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program.
3. Professional: a person who does hold at least a baccalaureate degree. Those professionals employed in the Arizona Extension Service usually hold faculty status at The University of Arizona.
4. Homemaker: the woman (or man) who usually prepares the food and keeps the home for the family. Program homemakers are persons enrolled in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program and are those to whom the lessons are taught.
5. Supervising Home Economist: the professional (usually graduate home economist) responsible for hiring, training, and supervising Program Aides in a given EFNEP unit or county.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents findings of selected studies which provided background information and insights to the author for the design and conduct of this study. To benefit the reader, these findings have been broken down into these categories: Theory and History of Job Satisfaction Surveys; Job Factors; Personal Factors and Surveys of Job Satisfaction in Extension.

Theory and History of Job Satisfaction Survey

Bonnie Carroll (1973) surveyed recent theories about job satisfaction and outlined four basic ideas about job satisfaction:

1. Traditional approach: the presence of a condition leads to satisfaction; its absence leads to dissatisfaction. This theory has been largely ignored in recent years because of the findings that after a certain point factors such as pay no longer increase job satisfaction.
2. Two factor theory: first theorized by Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959). This theory proposes two sets of factors: motivators or satisfiers (achievements, responsibility, recognition, the work itself, advancement or promotion opportunities and opportunities for personal growth) and higenes or dissatisfiers (working conditions, supervision, policies, status, salary, inter-personal relationships, job security and interference with home life). Herzberg et al. postulated

that the presence of the hygienes or dissatisfiers could not make a worker happier or increase job satisfaction beyond a certain point. Their absence would, however, make a worker dissatisfied. On the other hand, the motivators could make a worker happier but could not compensate for the lack of the hygienes factors.

3. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory is somewhat similar to the two factor theory. It theorized that the basic physical needs must be met before satisfaction could be reached in the other levels of the hierarchy (i.e., social, ego, self-actualization) needs.

4. "Cognitive Dissonance": this theory says that job satisfaction is a dynamic and changing process, rather than a static state. Simply stated, that means that a worker will do whatever is necessary to achieve consistency between elements. This is achieved by adjusting the worker's attitude toward the job to find better aspects of the work, or by lowering productivity, longer coffee breaks, or more frequent absences.

One of the first instruments developed to measure job satisfaction was developed by Robert Hoppock in 1935. His instrument was quite simple, only four questions were asked the worker subjectively measuring his own feeling or job satisfaction (Carroll 1973).

Since 1960, there has been a great deal of research concerning job satisfaction and many more theories have been developed. None of them seems to be universally accepted. Each has its own problems (Wanous and Lawler 1972).

Jack Barbash (1976) surveyed the wealth of information about job satisfaction surveys made throughout the world. In fact, Barbash

quoted the United States Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Poverty which reported in 1972 that 20 percent of the work force always dislikes their jobs. He compared that figure to a 5 percent figure in the United Kingdom (General Household Survey) and to a 1971 survey in Japan that reported a 15 percent dissatisfaction rate.

Barbash reported job satisfaction surveys are good barometers of the feelings of employees and if administered frequently, can measure trends in feelings. Unfortunately, most of the studies conducted only measured the feelings of the middle-class. Barbash pointed out that insufficient research has been made on the lower wage positions.

Job Factors

A 1973 United States Quality of Employment Survey reported that the job factors that affect job satisfaction are: comfort; financial rewards; relations with co-workers; resource adequacy and the challenge of the job (Barbash 1976).

In 1971, a Japanese survey of workers defined these job factors as important to job satisfaction: content of work; working conditions; working environment and the the opportunity to develop skill or ability (Barbash 1976).

Organizational size can be a factor. Carroll (1973) cited several surveys reporting a curvilinear relationship between organizational size and job satisfaction, however, there may be other intervening variables affecting these results. A large organization does not have to reduce job satisfaction so long as the intra-organizational units are small.

Salary affects job satisfaction in a relative manner. The worker seems to measure his salary against the salaries others receive. In fact, personnel policies and practices have more influence on job satisfaction than salary (Carroll 1973).

Organizational structure is also a component of job satisfaction. It appears that increased sharing in the goals of an organization is positively related to job satisfaction. The structure is also affected by supervisor-subordinate relationship. The more an employee feels that he and his supervisor agree on how the work should be done, the better the job satisfaction. The employee also wants to feel that he can take his complaints to a manager directly and be answered immediately. Competence, experience and technical expertise of the supervisor also are directly related to job satisfaction (Barbash 1976).

In the booklet, Supervising Paraprofessionals, Browne (1972) outlined other job factors affecting job satisfaction: supervision; benefits; opportunities for advancement; security; the organization; social aspects and communication. Intrinsic aspects such as challenge, variety, mobility, recognition, personal contacts, opportunities for self-expression and participation in decision-making also influence job satisfaction.

One private company, Scientific Research Associates (1970) has developed a survey instrument used on employees in both the private and public sectors. It classifies employee responses in these job factors: job demands; working conditions; pay; benefits; friendliness and cooperation of fellow employees; supervisory relationship; confidence

in management; technical competence of supervision; effectiveness of administration; communication; job security; status and recognition; identification with organization and opportunity for growth and advancement.

Personal Factors

Various surveys have shown the reactions of employees to these job factors can be affected by these variables:

Age of the employee--older people seem to be more satisfied, probably because they accept more (Barbash 1976).

Tenure of the employee--the longer someone works, the higher his job satisfaction (Carroll 1973).

I.Q.--morale increases as I.Q. decreases (Carroll 1973).

Education--very little effect except for those with "some" college. This seems to decrease job satisfaction (Barbash 1976).

Personality--lower morale seems to be evident with employees who are rigid, inflexible and unrealistic in goals (Browne 1972).

Marital Status--the employee who is married is happier. Employees are probably happier with two children although there may be other factors involved (Carroll 1973).

Job Satisfaction Surveys in Extension

The author could not find many surveys of job satisfaction in Extension. These findings are based only on the populations of the professional agents. They seem to bear out the same conclusions found in surveys of other professionals.

Paul Johnson and J. C. Bledsoe (1974) reported on their survey of 201 Georgia Extension Agents that measured individual morale and the individual assessment of the competency of the county director. It was found agents with 0-5 years of tenure had the lowest morale. Those with 15 or more years had the highest morale. They also found that individual morale and the behavior of the supervisor (county director) were positively and significantly correlated. Another factor that seemed to be significant was the subjective measure of the organizational ability of the county director. They did not find sex, education or race as significantly related to the overall morale of the agents.

William C. Giegold and William E. Skelton (1976) did a survey in the Virginia Extension Service. They measured the agents' reactions to the fourteen job factors Herzberg felt affected job satisfaction. Giegold and Skelton asked the agents to rank certain factors as important and others as lacking or deficient. They found the agents felt pleasant co-workers, sound management and good supervision, opportunities for growth as well as intrinsic work factors such as interesting work and opportunity to see results ranked as most important. However, it was found that three of the most important factors also were reported as the most deficient: pleasant co-workers; sound management; and good supervision. They also felt opportunities for promotion, pleasant working conditions and getting credit for good work done also ranked as most deficient.

Phyllis Worden (1973) conducted a longitudinal survey of the professional commitment and job satisfaction of Extension home economists in Kansas. Worden used the Hoppock Job Satisfaction Blank to

measure the home economists' subjective feeling of overall job satisfaction. The MOPC (Measure of Professional Commitment) questionnaire was used to measure seven personal characteristics: self-understanding; social relations; autonomy; creativity; ambition; rationality and non-fanaticism. Worden then classified the agents into groups: "high"; "some" and "low" as based on their commitment scores.

Job satisfaction and professional commitment were significantly related. Worden found a satisfied worker is a more flexible, better-adjusted person who either has had a superior home background, or who has overcome an inferior background. The findings seem most significant when viewed in the light of the fact that paraprofessionals are expected to work as extensions of the professional home economists.

In his doctoral dissertation, Clyde Triplett (1972) surveyed 50 Program Aides (paraprofessionals) in the EFNEP program in thirteen Kansas counties. He attempted to measure five biographical variables (age, race, tenure, place of residence and education), to measure personality traits (temperament, attitudes, self-esteem and self-acceptance) and to correlate these with role success.

Triplett developed a three-predictor multiple regression equation that could predict role performance, which was moderately successful at least in predicting the extremes. The correlations were not significant in any other than education and emotional stability.

Shirley E. Myers (1970) surveyed seven Extension home economists who had EFNEP responsibilities and correlated these findings with the survey of each of the paraprofessionals responsible to them.

The paraprofessionals identified certain role strains in their work: not knowing how they are evaluated by the professional; lack of ability to develop satisfactory relationships with program families; not feeling qualified for the job; lack of sufficient knowledge in foods and nutrition; and not enough voice in decision making. Myers found strong correlations that supported the premise that supervisory home economists who are the most satisfied with their job usually supervise paraprofessionals who are the most satisfied with their jobs.

Myers theorized that the characteristics of a successful EFNEP professional are: prior experience with or strong commitment to the EFNEP program; acceptance and enthusiasm for EFNEP and rearrangement of other program responsibilities to integrate the EFNEP program into total Extension plan of work; awareness that involvement of clientele leads to increased learning; concentration on the stated objectives of the program; direct interaction with aides and careful selection of target areas.

Summary of Related Literature

Research has shown that while there is continuing disagreement about the best approach to measure job satisfaction there are certain factors that influence job satisfaction to some degree: comfort; pay and financial rewards; co-workers; supervision; the challenge of the job; the work itself; opportunities to develop skill; opportunities to have a voice in decisions and recognition.

Research has shown that personal characteristics of employees which affect job satisfaction are: age; tenure; education; personality and marital status.

The Extension Service has not used Job Satisfaction Surveys extensively yet. The surveys that have been done have been directed at professional positions. Therefore, there are not data to compare with the findings of this study.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

The procedure used to accomplish the objectives identified for this study was divided into the following sections: (1) study population; (2) collection of data and instrumentation; and (3) data analysis.

Population

The target population of this study included 60 EFNEP paraprofessionals (Program Aides) employed in the Arizona Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program as of October 3, 1977. Only those participating in the three day State EFNEP workshop held October 3-5, 1977 at Apache Junction, Arizona were surveyed.

Some of the paraprofessionals were not able to attend the workshop due to illness and family responsibilities. A total of 40 paraprofessionals were in attendance at the meeting and comprised the sample population.

Collection of Data and Instrumentation

The initial step involved in the collection of the data was the formulation of the Job Satisfaction Inventory. The author researched the current philosophies and questionnaires from similar studies: Hop-pock Job Satisfaction Blank (Worden 1973); Brayfield-Rothe (1951) scales;

Likert-type scales (Carroll 1973) and the Science Research Association (SRA) Job Attitude Survey.

The SRA Job Attitude Survey was first used in 1952. The 1970 survey reports its findings by these Job Satisfaction factors: (1) job demands; (2) working conditions; (3) pay; (4) employee benefits; (5) co-workers; (6) supervisor-employee relations; (7) confidence in management; (8) technical competence of supervision; (9) effectiveness of administration; (10) adequacy of communication; (11) job security; (12) status and recognition; (13) identification with organization; (14) opportunity for growth and advancement and (15) reaction to the inventory. The instrument has been tested on thousands of persons in hundreds of organizations. Results show the instrument has a good reliability score exceeding .85, based on test-retest estimates over a one-week period. Its validity has been substantiated in non-directive interviews (Robinson, Athasiou and Head 1969).

Based on recommendations by Browne (1972) of factors that influence job satisfaction of paraprofessionals and the author's experience, these fifteen factors were reduced to the following nine areas: (1) personnel benefits which include: insurance; vacation and sick leave policies and other non-monetary compensation by the organization; (2) working conditions covers: clean, orderly work space; adequate equipment and supplies; geographic location; (3) pay which includes: the amount received; fairness or equality of compensation and manner in which pay matters are handled; (4) co-workers: competent, congenial co-workers; size, function of work groups; interpersonal relationships and

prejudices; (5) security and advancement which includes: opportunities to develop and use new skills; steadiness of employment; seniority benefits; sense of value to organization; promotion opportunities; and advancement in social position; (6) supervision which includes: consideration and fairness; courtesy and tact; recognition and praise; evaluation and information on status and progress; sincerity; cooperation; encouragement; availability for assistance; loyalty to workers; consistency; and technical competence; (7) communications covers: being kept informed about new developments; employee input into decision-making process and instructions; (8) the work itself includes such items as: well-defined work projects; opportunities for learning; personal contacts with clientele and other outsiders; opportunities for creativity; variety; freedom from tension and pressure; self-respect; responsibility and altruism; and (9) miscellaneous statements which include: reactions to the inventory; working with program homemakers in groups or individually; or work with youth or adults.

The author chose to adapt the SRA Inventory rather than use any of the other instruments surveyed. This decision was based on the high reliability and validity reported and the simple wording of the statements. The survey also allows for appraising separately various job factors. The three choices of responses to the statements, (agree, disagree, don't know) would also be easier for respondents of low-reading levels to select.

The author rewrote many of the statements to reduce confusion and also lower the reading level. Also developed was a personal data

questionnaire which included questions about characteristics research has shown could affect job satisfaction.

Based on research and personal observation, the author chose to measure the following personal characteristics of the paraprofessionals: (1) county assignments; (2) location of residence; (3) length of residence; (4) racial-ethnic composition of neighborhoods; (5) length of service in Extension; (6) previous work experience; (7) membership in community organizations; (8) marital status; (9) type of work done by husbands; (10) number of children; (11) age of the paraprofessionals; (12) racial-ethnic classification; (13) number of years of schooling completed; (14) number of program families worked with; (15) number of program groups worked with; (16) approximate combined family incomes of paraprofessionals; (17) distances between paraprofessionals' homes and assigned work area and (18) number of paraprofessionals whose mothers worked outside the home.

The preliminary drafts of the instrument were critiqued by State Extension Specialists and Administrators and by members of the Department of Agricultural Education Faculty. Suggested revisions were made and incorporated in the final instrument.

Permission was obtained from Beryl Burt, State EFNEP Coordinator, to administer the inventory during the State EFNEP Training Meeting, October 5, 1977.

The instrument was field-tested with paraprofessionals employed in the WIC (Women, Infant, and Children) Nutrition Program in the Pima County Health Department. It was determined that these paraprofessionals were similar in background and job description to the EFNEP

paraprofessionals to be surveyed. The WIC paraprofessionals gave attention to readability and understanding of questions and statements and indicated that no problems were evident in the inventory.

A copy of the instrument was submitted with appropriate forms and a copy of the oral instructions to The University of Arizona Committee for Human Subjects which gave approval for its use.

A final inventory used in the study was printed on one side of 8 1/2 x 11 inch pages. A copy of the inventory is included in Appendix A of this study.

The inventory instrument was administered to the EFNEP paraprofessionals on October 5, 1977. Oral and written instructions were given to those present. A copy of the oral instructions is included in Appendix B. Questions were asked by the respondents when they had difficulty. After completion of all the questions and statements, paraprofessionals turned in their inventories to the author.

Data Analysis

The data collected for this study were recorded on code sheets, and key punched on electronic computer cards for compilation and summary. The version 6.5.1 of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie et al. 1970) was used to analyze and compile the data by the computer center at The University of Arizona.

Data were reported for both the personal data and job satisfaction statements in terms of frequency distribution and percentages. Results of these tabulations can be found in Appendix C.

The responses to the eighty statements about job satisfaction were separated into nine job satisfaction factors: (1) supervision; (2) security and advancement; (3) pay; (4) relations with co-workers; (5) personnel benefits; (6) working conditions; (7) communications; (8) the work itself and (9) responses to miscellaneous statements about the job.

Means, maximum and minimum scores were reported for each of these areas. A summary of maximum and minimum individual mean scores was also reported.

Correlations were established between selected personal characteristics and the first eight job satisfaction areas listed above. These factors were converted to an F-probability. Those which were significant at a .050 level or lower were further analyzed by means scores of subsets of personal characteristics.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The data for this study were obtained by use of a job attitude inventory administered to forty paraprofessionals employed in the Arizona Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program of the Cooperative Extension Service of The University of Arizona. The inventory was administered on October 5, 1977. All calculations used in this study were based on the forty completed inventories. This chapter is devoted to the presentation of the data and findings in light of the objectives identified in Chapter I.

Selected Personal Characteristics of Paraprofessionals

Objective I of this study was to answer the question: What are selected personal characteristics of paraprofessionals employed in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program in the Cooperative Extension Service in Arizona?

County Assignments of EFNEP Paraprofessionals

The data presented in Table 1 show a summary of the county assignments of EFNEP paraprofessionals.

Paraprofessionals queried were employed in one-half of the fourteen Arizona Counties. Paraprofessionals assigned to Navajo County were not represented. Twenty-five or 62.5 percent of the paraprofessionals are assigned to the counties with the largest populations, Pima and Maricopa.

Table 1. County Assignments of EFNEP Paraprofessionals

N=40

County Assignment	Frequency	Percentage of Total
Maricopa	13	32.5
Pima	12	30.0
Pinal	4	10.0
Coconino	3	7.5
Santa Cruz	3	7.5
Yuma	3	7.5
Apache	2	5.0

Location of Residence of EFNEP Paraprofessionals

A question was included in the inventory to determine the size of the communities the paraprofessionals lived in. The data in Table 2 reveal the results of this question.

The largest percentage (37.5 percent) of paraprofessionals live in small towns. Thirty-five percent live in a central city. Only 12.5 percent live in isolated areas such as farms or reservations.

Length of Residence by EFNEP Paraprofessionals

The Extension Service (USDA 1976) recommends that EFNEP paraprofessionals live in the area in which they work and have a knowledge of the community. The length of time EFNEP paraprofessionals have lived in their communities is shown in Table 3.

Thirty-one or 77.5 percent of the paraprofessionals have lived in their communities for seven or more years.

Table 2. Location of Residence of EFNEP Paraprofessionals

N=40

Type of Location	Frequency	Percentage of Total
Small Town	15	37.5
Central City	14	35.0
Large Town	6	15.0
Farm	3	7.5
Reservation	2	5.0

Table 3. Length of Residence by EFNEP Paraprofessionals

N=40

Length of Residence	Frequency	Percentage of Total
Under 1 year	1	2.5
1-3 years	4	10.0
4-6 years	3	7.5
7+ years	31	77.5
No response	1	2.5

Racial-Ethnic Composition of the Neighborhoods of the EFNEP Paraprofessionals

The paraprofessionals were asked to describe their neighborhoods, using racial-ethnic classifications standardly used in the EFNEP program. Table 4 shows the responses of the paraprofessionals.

Length of Service in Extension by EFNEP Paraprofessionals

The paraprofessionals were asked to report the number of years they had worked for Extension. Table 5 displays their responses.

Table 4. Racial-Ethnic Composition of the Neighborhoods of
the EFNEP Paraprofessionals
N=40

Racial-Ethnic Composition	Frequency	Percentage of Total
Integrated	25	60.0
Mexican-American	8	20.0
Anglo	5	12.5
Indian	2	5.0
Black	0	0.0
No response	1	2.5

Table 5. Length of Service in Extension by EFNEP Paraprofessionals
N=40

Length of Service	Frequency	Percentage of Total
Less than 1 year	9	22.5
1-3 years	8	20.0
4-6 years	12	30.0
7+ years	11	27.5

The EFNEP Program has been established in Arizona for over eight years. Eleven or 27.5 percent of the paraprofessionals have worked in the program seven or more years. The number of paraprofessionals (9) who have worked in the program for less than one year represents 22.5 percent of those responding.

Previous Work Experience of EFNEP Paraprofessionals

One of the benefits of the EFNEP program is its effect to bring more people into the work force. Table 6 gives the previous work experience of the EFNEP paraprofessionals.

✓ Table 6. Previous Work Experience of EFNEP Paraprofessionals
N=40

Type of Work Experience	Frequency	Percentage of Total
Homemaker	22	55.0
Service	10	25.0
Industry	5	12.5
Secretarial	2	5.0
Student	1	2.5

Twenty-two or 55 percent of those responding had not worked outside the home before their employment in Extension. The next largest group of respondents (ten or 25 percent) reported previous work experience fields (nurses' aide, teachers' aide, maid, etc.).

Membership of EFNEP Paraprofessionals in Community Organizations

The author's experience has shown that paraprofessionals with experience in voluntary groups are more successful in organizing groups than those who have not had that experience. The number of respondents who reported membership in various community organizations is shown in Table 7.

Church membership accounts for the largest (67.5 percent) group of aides. Many paraprofessionals reported memberships in two or more organizations. Thirteen or 32.5 percent of the respondents are active in school groups (PTA, etc.). It was not possible to determine how many paraprofessionals belong to more than one group or none.

Table 7. Membership of EFNEP Paraprofessionals
in Community Organizations

N=40

Type of Organization	Frequency	Percentage of Total
Church	27	67.5
Other	16	40.0
School	12	32.5
Social	4	10.0

Marital Status of EFNEP Paraprofessionals

The success of the EFNEP paraprofessional is dependent on her sharing a background similar to her clientele. Because the program is directed at the homemaker with young children, the paraprofessionals were asked to report their marital status. The results of this question are reported in Table 8.

Only three or 7.5 percent of the paraprofessionals reported that they have never been married. Twenty-eight or 70 percent of the respondents are married. Nine or 22.5 percent of them reported they have been widowed, divorced or separated.

Type of Work Done by Husbands of EFNEP Paraprofessionals

The paraprofessionals were asked to describe the work done by their husbands. This included former or late husbands, as well as those who were currently married. Data in Table 9 report the results of this question.

Physical labor accounted for the work performed by the largest number of husbands (42.5 percent). Only five or 12.5 percent of the

Table 8. Marital Status of EFNEP Paraprofessionals
N=40

Marital Status	Frequency	Percentage of Total
Married	28	70.0
Divorced	7	17.5
Single	3	7.5
Widowed	1	2.5
Separated	1	2.5

Table 9. Type of Work Done by Husbands of EFNEP Paraprofessionals
N=40

Type of Work	Frequency	Percentage of Total
Physical Labor	17	42.5
Other	12	30.0
Office Work	5	12.5
Unemployed	2	5.0
Military	1	2.5
No response	1	2.5

paraprofessionals' husbands worked in an office. Two of the EFNEP paraprofessionals reported husbands who were unemployed.

Number of Children of EFNEP Paraprofessionals

The paraprofessionals are expected to work with homemakers who have young children. The responses of the paraprofessionals to a question about the number of children they have can be found in Table 10.

Table 10. Number of Children of EFNEP Paraprofessionals

N=40

Number of Children	Frequency	Percentage of Total
None	3	7.5
1-3	19	47.5
4-6	14	35.0
7+	4	10.0

Nineteen or 47.5 percent of the paraprofessionals have from 1-3 children, fourteen or 35 percent have slightly larger families of 4-6 children. The three aides who reported no children could be accounted for in the three single paraprofessionals who responded.

Age of EFNEP Paraprofessionals

The author's experience in Pima County indicates that the most successful paraprofessionals are 30 years of age and above because most of the program homemakers they work with are the same age. Paraprofessionals were asked to give their ages within ranges. Their responses are shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Age of EFNEP Paraprofessionals

N=40

Age	Frequency	Percentage of Total
20 and under	6	15.0
21-30	5	12.5
31-50	23	57.5
51-60	6	15.0
61+	0	0.0

None of the paraprofessionals reported that they were 61 and over. Eleven or 37.5 percent reported they were 30 years or below, six of those 20 or under. The largest group (23 or 57.5 percent) is between the ages of 31-50 years of age.

Racial Characteristics of EFNEP Paraprofessionals

Table 12 reveals the racial characteristics of Arizona EFNEP paraprofessionals.

Fifty percent or 20 of the paraprofessionals are Mexican-American. Only five or 12.5 percent are Anglo. Minority racial groups account for 87.5 percent of the EFNEP paraprofessionals. Minority racial groups account for 20-85 percent of the populations of the EFNEP target counties, according to the Statistical Abstract of Arizona, (deGennaro 1976).

Table 12. Racial Characteristics of EFNEP Paraprofessionals
N=40

Race	Frequency	Percentage of Total
Mexican-American	20	50.0
Negro	11	27.5
Anglo	5	12.5
Indian	3	7.5
Other	1	2.5

Number of Years of School Completed by EFNEP Paraprofessionals

EFNEP paraprofessionals were asked to report the number of years of school they had completed. The target audience of the EFNEP program

is low-income homemakers who usually have not had a great deal of schooling. Table 13 indicates the responses of the paraprofessionals.

Table 13. Number of Years of School Completed by
EFNEP Paraprofessionals

N=40

Number of Years Completed	Frequency	Percentage of Total
8 and under	6	15.0
9-11	11	27.5
12	7	17.5
12+	16	40.0

Seventeen or 42.5 percent of the paraprofessionals have not completed high school. Another seven or 17.5 percent had completed high school, either through classroom or GED training. It was not clear whether some of the paraprofessionals had completed college or had furthered their education through continuing educations. Sixteen or 40 percent reported taking some classes beyond the secondary level.

Number of Program Families Enrolled by EFNEP Paraprofessionals

Beryl Burt, State EFNEP Coordinator indicated that national average for program families worked with during a one-month period for a paraprofessional working full time was 40-50. Most of the EFNEP paraprofessionals in Arizona work 30 hours a week or the equivalent of 3/4 time equivalent.

The responses of Arizona paraprofessionals to a question about the number of program families are shown in Table 14.

Table 14. Number of Program Families Currently Enrolled by EFNEP Paraprofessionals.

N=40

Number of Program Families	Frequency	Percentage of Total
20 and under	14	35.0
21-30	10	25.0
31-35	8	20.0
36+	6	15.0
No response	2	5.0

Six of the paraprofessionals reported they worked with 36 or more program families every month. Twenty-four or 60 percent of the paraprofessionals work with thirty or fewer program families each month.

Number of Groups (4-H and Homemakers) Enrolled by EFNEP Paraprofessionals

As program homemakers progress in the application of new nutrition information to their diet and food buying habits, Guidelines (1976) encourage paraprofessionals to form groups of program homemakers to extend the paraprofessionals' time and allow for interchange among homemakers. Program homemakers and others are also encouraged to work with boys and girls in the 4-H EFNEP phase of the program (USDA 1976).

The number of groups (4-H and Homemakers) currently enrolled by EFNEP paraprofessionals is shown in Table 15. Seventeen or 42.5 percent of the paraprofessionals have not formed any groups.

Table 15. Number of Groups (4-H and Homemakers) Enrolled
by EFNEP Paraprofessionals

N=40

Number	Frequency	Percentage of Total
None	17	42.5
1-2	13	32.5
3-4	7	17.5
5+	2	5.0
No response	1	2.5

Twenty-two or 55 percent have formed at least one group. Two of the paraprofessionals are working with five or more groups each month.

Approximate Combined Family Income of EFNEP Paraprofessionals

The Statistical Abstract of Arizona (de Gennaro 1976) reports the average income for a family of four in Arizona is \$9187. Current legislation (U. S. Congress 1977) reports the poverty level for a family of four is \$5850 per year. The Arizona EFNEP paraprofessionals were asked to indicate their approximate combined yearly income. Their answers are revealed in Table 16.

Ten or 25 percent of the paraprofessionals reported incomes under \$5000 per year. Another fifteen or a total of twenty-five (62.5 percent) indicated incomes of less than \$10,000 a year. Only five or 12.5 percent showed incomes of \$15,000 or more a year.

Distances EFNEP Paraprofessionals Must Travel to Visit Program Families

EFNEP Guidelines recommend that paraprofessionals be hired to work in the communities in which they live. The Arizona

Table 16. Approximate Combined Family Income of
EFNEP Paraprofessionals

N=40

Income Level/Per Year	Frequency	Percentage of Total
Under \$5000	10	25.0
\$5-10,000	15	37.5
\$10-15,000	8	20.0
\$15,000 or above	5	12.5
No response	2	5.0

paraprofessionals were asked to indicate the number of miles they must travel to visit their families. Table 17 reveals their answers.

Twenty-two or 55 percent of the paraprofessionals must travel ten or more miles from their homes to the homes of their program homemakers. Seven or 17.5 percent travel 5 or fewer miles to do their work.

Table 17. Distances EFNEP Paraprofessionals Must Travel
to Visit Program Families

N=40

Distances (one way)	Frequency	Percentage of Total
Under one mile	2	2.5
1-3 miles	2	2.5
4-5 miles	4	10.0
6-10 miles	10	25.0
10+ miles	22	55.0

Other Characteristics of EFNEP Paraprofessionals

Other questions were asked of the EFNEP paraprofessionals:

Did your mother work outside the home; and Do you feel you must work to help support your family financially? The answers to these questions are reported in Table 18.

Table 18. Other Characteristics of EFNEP Paraprofessionals

N=40

Characteristic	Frequency		Percentage of Total		N/A
	YES	%	NO	%	
Mother worked outside home	13	32.5	24	60.0	3
Must work to help support family financially	24	60.0	16	40.0	0

It is interesting to note that sixty percent of the paraprofessionals reported that their own mothers had not worked outside the home. Sixty percent also reported they feel it is a necessity for them to work to support their families financially. These findings seem to indicate the paraprofessionals are breaking some family traditions by working outside the home, even though this seems to be brought about by need.

It is not clear whether the same paraprofessionals who indicated their mothers had not worked outside the home were also those who felt they must work.

Job Satisfaction Factors

Objectives of this study sought to answer this question: What are the feelings of the paraprofessionals towards job satisfaction

factors such as: personnel benefits; working conditions; pay; co-workers; security and advancement; supervision; communications; the work itself; and other factors?

For the purpose of this study, each of the job satisfaction factors mentioned in Objective 2 will be examined separately. During data manipulation some statements which were negatively stated were assigned a score of 3 for "disagree" responses. Statements which were positively worded were assigned a score of 3 for "agree" responses. Tables 19-26 display the responses of the paraprofessionals to statements included in each job factor. Their responses are classified into "supportive" (agreement with the statement) "neutral" and "non-supportive" (disagreement with the statement).

The mean scores of each job factor displayed in Table 27 (p. 55) were determined from the scores (1, 2, or 3) established for each statement in each job factor. Means were computed for each respondent by each job factor as well as a mean for all factors together.

Personnel Benefits

Six statements were included in the personnel benefits factor. These statements included knowledge of benefits available, leave and other benefits as well as comparison with other agencies. Table 19 reveals the responses of the EFNEP paraprofessionals to statements about personnel benefits.

At least 62.5 percent of the paraprofessionals were supportive of The University of Arizona personnel benefits program. It must be

Table 19. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Statements about Personnel Benefits

Statements	Frequency and Percentages of Total Response					
	F	Supportive Percentage	F	Neutral Percentage	F	Non-Supportive Percentage
50. The University has good employee benefits	31	77.5	6	15.0	3	7.5
74. I understand what benefits are available to employees	31		8	20.0	1	2.5
66. I am satisfied with our leave and employee benefits.	29	72.5	7	17.5	4	10.0
41. We get enough vacation time	28	70.0	7	17.5	5	12.5
52. We have a good personnel policy	27	67.5	12	30.0	1	2.5
58. Compared to other agencies in my community, we have good benefits	25	62.5	12	30.0	3	7.5

Table 20. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Statements about Working Conditions

Statements	Frequency and Percentages of Total Response					
	Supportive		Neutral		Non-Supportive	
	F	Percentage	F	Percentage	F	Percentage
31. For my kind of job, the working conditions are OK	27	67.5	8	20.0	5	12.5
80. Extension does everything possible to prevent accidents on the job	25	62.5	11	27.5	4	10.0
13. I often feel worn out and tired on the job	10	25.0	7	17.5	23	57.5
62. I'd rather work in an office than in the field	7	17.5	10	25.0	23	57.5
22. Poor working conditions keep me from doing my best	9	22.5	9	22.5	22	55.0
40. I have all the things I need to do my job	15	37.5	12	30.0	13	32.5

Table 21. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Statements about Pay

Statements	Frequency and Percentages of Total Response					
	F	Supportive Percentage	F	Neutral Percentage	F	Non-Supportive Percentage
14. I am paid fairly compared with other Extension employees	15	37.5	9	22.5	16	40.0
32. I am underpaid for the work I do	22	55.0	8	20.0	10	25.0
23. My pay is enough to live on comfortably	9	22.5	5	12.5	26	65.0
81. In my opinion, the pay in Extension is lower than in other agencies in my community	19	47.5	12	30.0	9	22.5
5. Extension should do a better job of handling pay matters	32	80.0	4	10.0	4	10.0

Table 22. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Statements about Co-Workers

Statements	Frequency and Percentages of Total Response					
	Supportive		Neutral		Non-Supportive	
	F	Percentage	F	Percentage	F	Percentage
8. The people I work with think they run the program.	8	20.0	4	10.0	28	70.0
60. The people I work with get along well together.	28	70.0	7	17.5	5	12.5
76. The people I work with help each other out if someone is sick or gets behind in her work.	22	55.0	7	17.5	11	27.5
84. A few of the people I work with think they run the program.	19	47.5	5	12.5	16	40.0

Table 23. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Statements about Security and Advancement

Statements	Frequency and Percentages of Total Response					
	Supportive		Neutral		Non-Supportive	
	F	Percentage	F	Percentage	F	Percentage
82. The longer you work for Extension the more you feel you belong	31	77.5	8	20.0	1	2.5
43. I can be sure of my job as long as I do a good job	31	77.5	6	15.0	3	7.5
34. You can get fired from Extension without much reason	1	2.5	13	32.5	26	65.0
72. I always know how I'm doing in my work	25	62.5	6	15.0	9	22.5
42. When personnel changes are necessary, they are handled fairly	20	50.0	14	35.0	6	15.0
24. I have a dead-end job	9	22.5	13	32.5	18	45.0
33. The people who get promotions usually deserve them	17	42.5	8	20.0	15	37.5
51. I plan on staying in Extension until I retire	17	42.5	17	42.5	6	15.0
15. Seniority really means something in EFNEP	17	42.5	8	20.0	15	37.5
6. There are plenty of good jobs in Extension for those who want to get ahead	14	35.0	18	45.0	8	20.0
59. Changes are made in the program with little regard for the welfare of employees	9	22.5	17	42.5	14	35.0

Table 24. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Statements about Supervision

Statements	Frequency and Percentages of Total Response					
	Supportive		Neutral		Non-Supportive	
	F	Percentage	F	Percentage	F	Percentage
56. Personnel evaluations help me improve my work	34	85.0	2	5.0	4	10.0
61. Personnel evaluations help me do my job	34	85.0	3	7.5	3	7.5
4. My boss sees that we have the things we need to do our job.	32	80.0	4	10.0	4	10.0
25. Most of the higher ups are friendly toward employees	31	77.5	5	12.5	4	10.0
11. I am supervised too closely, someone is always breathing down my neck	6	15.0	4	10.0	30	75.0
48. I have confidence in the fairness and honesty of the people in charge	30	75.0	5	12.5	5	12.5
2. My boss knows what he/she is doing	29	72.5	8	20.0	3	7.5
55. My boss lets me know how I'm doing on the job	29	72.5	6	15.0	5	12.5
7. My boss doesn't allow us to be creative in our programs	10	20.0	2	5.0	28	70.0
26. My boss lets us know exactly what is expected of us	27	67.5	5	12.5	4	10.0
67. Compared with other employees we get very little attention	7	12.5	6	15.0	27	67.5
79. My boss evaluates me fairly	27	67.5	10	25.0	3	7.5
30. My boss has always been fair in dealings with me	26	65.0	7	17.5	7	17.5
53. Personnel evaluations are worthless.	6	15.0	9	22.5	25	62.5
28. My boss is too interested in other things to care about our needs	9	22.5	7	17.5	24	60.0
12. I feel I have been adequately trained to do my job	22	55.0	8	20.0	10	25.0
63. They expect too much work from us	11	27.5	6	15.0	22	55.0
21. Extension does everything it can to see that employees get a fair break on the job	22	55.0	13	32.5	5	12.5
16. I wish my boss would give us more direction	16	40.0	5	12.5	19	47.5
64. My boss has the work well organized	19	47.5	10	25.0	11	27.5
39. My boss gets us to work together as a team	18	45.0	8	20.0	14	35.0

Table 25. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Statements about Communications

Statements	Frequency and Percentages of Total Response					
	F	Supportive Percentage	F	Neutral Percentage	F	Non-Supportive Percentage
3. If I have a complaint to make, I feel free to talk to someone above me about it.	35	87.5	2	5.0	3	7.5
69. I know what is expected of me	34	85.0	3	7.5	3	7.5
35. I know how my job fits in with other work in the program.	33	82.5	5	12.5	2	5.0
37. I understand what the goals of EFNEP and Extension are.	33	82.5	4	10.0	3	7.5
71. My boss(es) listen to our suggestions.	31	77.5	6	15.0	3	7.5
47. I am encouraged to make suggestions for improvements in the program.	30	75.0	5	12.5	5	12.5
17. We are kept informed about plans and developments in EFNEP.	28	70.0	5	12.5	7	17.5
20. I am given credit and praise for work well done.	25	62.5	7	17.5	8	20.0
44. We are kept in the dark about things we ought to know.	7	17.5	10	25.0	23	57.5
10. Extension ignores our suggestions and complaints.	8	20.0	10	25.0	22	55.0

Table 26. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Statements about the Work Itself

Statements	Frequency and Percentages of Total Response					
	F	Supportive Percentage	F	Neutral Percentage	F	Non-Supportive Percentage
78. I can learn a great deal on my job.	40	100.0	-	-	-	-
57. I wish I could do more for my program families	39	97.5	-	-	1	2.5
46. I feel I am really doing something worthwhile	38	95.0	2	5.0	-	-
1. I really like the contact I have with program families	37	92.5	3	7.5	-	-
68. I am proud to work in Extension.	36	90.0	3	7.5	1	2.5
19. My job is often dull and monotonous.	2	5.0	5	12.5	33	82.5
49. The reports we fill out are needed.	30	75.0	6	15.0	4	10.0
70. I have plenty of freedom on the job to use my own judgement.	30	75.0	3	7.5	7	17.5
38. I am often bothered by the pressures of slack periods of work.	9	22.5	6	15.0	25	62.5
29. I don't like going door to door	11	27.5	7	17.5	22	55.0
75. I have little opportunity to use my abilities in the program.	9	22.5	9	22.5	22	55.0
54. The Program operates efficiently and smoothly	14	35.0	14	35.0	12	30.0
65. I wasn't hired to handle the problems of my program families	19	47.5	8	20.0	13	32.5
73. There are too many unnecessary reports	16	40.0	11	27.5	13	32.5

pointed out that nine or 22.5 percent of the paraprofessionals indicated that they are not sure or do not know what benefits were available to them.

Working Conditions

EFNEP paraprofessionals were asked to respond to six statements about working conditions, i.e., equipment, location or work and freedom from accidents on the job. Their responses to these statements about working conditions are shown in Table 20.

Twenty-seven or 67.5 percent of the paraprofessionals indicated that the working conditions were acceptable. Twenty-five or 62.5 percent of the paraprofessionals responded that Extension tries to prevent on the job accidents. To a statement about feeling worn out and tired on the job, ten or 25 percent of the respondents agreed. Seven of the paraprofessionals would rather work in an office. Nine felt that poor working conditions kept them from doing their best. One statement about having all the things necessary to do a job elicited the most non-conclusive responses: 37.5 percent supportive; 30 percent neutral and 32.5 percent non-supportive.

Pay

Five statements about pay matters were included in the pay factor. Paraprofessionals were asked to respond to statements about the amount of pay, the way pay is handled, their pay compared to others in Extension and others in similar agencies. The responses to these statements about pay are shown in Table 21.

Fifteen of the paraprofessionals felt they were paid fairly compared to other Extension employees, but only nine felt that Extension paid fairly compared with other agencies. Fifty-five percent of those who responded felt that they were underpaid for the work they do. Sixty-five percent did not feel their pay was enough to live on comfortably. Eighty percent of the paraprofessionals felt Extension should do a better job of handling pay matters.

Co-Workers

EFNEP paraprofessionals indicated the quality of relationship between them and their co-workers (other paraprofessionals in their unit) when they responded to the four statements included in the inventory. Table 22 reveals their responses about co-workers.

Twenty percent of the paraprofessionals indicated that the people they work with think they run the program. When asked if a few of the people they work with think they run the program, nineteen or 47.5 percent answered affirmatively. Seventy percent thought their co-workers got along well and 55 percent indicated that the people they work with help each other out when needed.

Security and Advancement

There were eleven statements included in the job factor of security and advancement. The EFNEP paraprofessionals' responses to these statements are displayed in Table 23.

Five statements received at least 50 percent supportive responses, indicating the paraprofessionals do not feel they could lose their jobs as long as they were performing adequately. It was

indicated the paraprofessionals were kept aware of how they are doing on the job. Thirty-one felt they came to feel more a part of the organization with longevity. Fifty percent felt personnel changes were handled fairly.

Nine paraprofessionals felt they had dead end jobs. Fifteen indicated some feeling of partiality in promotions. Six definitely did not plan to stay in Extension until they retire. Eight felt there were not enough chances for advancement in Extension. Seventeen respondents felt seniority means something in the program, while fifteen did not. The statement about changes being made without regard for employee welfare brought about the most equal responses: fourteen supportive; seventeen neutral and nine non-supportive.

Supervision

Responses to 21 statements about supervision are reported in Table 24. All but three of the statements about supervision received twenty or more supportive responses. The three statements that were least supported indicated 47.5 percent of the paraprofessionals wished their bosses would give more direction, 47.5 percent of the respondents felt the work was well-organized by their bosses. Forty-five percent felt their bosses encouraged them to work together as a team.

Thirty-four of the paraprofessionals felt personnel evaluations helped. Thirty-two felt their bosses saw to it they were well-equipped for the job. Six of the forty felt they were supervised too closely. Five revealed a lack of confidence in their leadership. Eleven either felt that their boss didn't know what he/she is doing or weren't sure.

Eighteen respondents expressed a need for more training. Eleven felt too much work is expected of them. Twenty-eight felt they were allowed to be creative in their jobs. Twenty-six felt they had been treated fairly.

Communications

Research has shown the importance of communications in job satisfaction, i.e., knowing what is expected, being able to make suggestions, voice complaints, knowing what the goals of the organization are and being involved in the decision-making process. The responses of the EFNEP paraprofessionals are shown in Table 25.

At least twenty-two of the EFNEP paraprofessionals indicated supportive responses to each of the ten statements composing the communication factor as related to job satisfaction. The maximum high score of 35 supportive responses indicated that the paraprofessionals felt they could make complaints known to superiors.

The Work Itself

The intrinsic rewards of the work itself rank high in the research done on job satisfaction levels of Extension professionals (Worden 1973). The reactions of EFNEP paraprofessionals to the work itself are displayed in Table 26.

The only statement in the entire inventory to receive 100 percent supportive responses was statement number 78: I can learn a great deal on my job.

Five other statements, numbers 57, 40, 46, 1 and 68 received at least 90 percent supportive responses; 97.5, 95, 95, 92.5 and 90 percents, respectively.

Four of these statements are associated with the contact with program families. The statement receiving 90 percent of the supportive responses was the one that dealt with pride in working in Extension.

The author has heard many complaints about reports required in the EFNEP program. It is interesting to note that thirty or 75 percent of the paraprofessionals felt reports are needed (#49) but only 13 were supportive of reports in statement #73.

Only two paraprofessionals felt their jobs are dull and monotonous. Nine felt they had little opportunity to use their abilities. Nine revealed they disliked going door to door recruiting program homemakers. Nine indicated they were bothered by pressures or slack periods of work. Twelve paraprofessionals questioned the efficiency of the program.

Mean Scores for Job Factor Statements

Table 27 displays the minimum and maximum mean scores for individual respondents classified according to the eight job factors analyzed above. These factors are ranked according to means calculated for each factor.

When evaluating Table 27, it must be pointed out that the lowest or least supportive mean score possible is 1.000. The highest or most supportive mean score possible is 3.000. A mean score of 2.000 is neutral. To receive a minimum individual mean score of 1.000, at least

Table 27. Mean Scores for Job Factor Statements

Ranked Job Factors	Minimum Individual Mean	Maximum Individual Mean	Mean of Job Factor
Communications	1.800	3.000	2.613
Personnel Benefits	1.714	3.000	2.611
The Work Itself	2.000	3.000	2.540
Supervision	1.571	2.952	2.474
Working Conditions	1.500	3.000	2.363
Co-Workers	1.000	3.000	2.319
Security and Advancement	1.300	3.000	2.317
Pay	1.000	2.800	1.660
Average mean for all factors			2.362

one paraprofessional would have to have responded non-supportively to each statement in any factor. To receive a maximum individual score of 3.000 in any factor, at least one respondent would have to have checked supportive boxes for every statement in any factor.

The job satisfaction factors that received the lowest minimum individual mean score were: co-workers and pay. The highest minimum went to the work itself. Supervision and pay were the only job factors to receive maximum individual mean scores of less than a perfect 3.000.

Mean scores for each individual job factor ranged between the low of 1.660 for pay to 2.613 for communication. The average mean for all factors was 2.362. Only three factors had means of less than the average mean; co-workers, security and advancement and pay.

The largest range for any job factors was 1.000 to 3.000 for co-workers. The highest range for any factor was 2.000 to 3.000 for the work itself.

Other Statements about Work

Eight statements were included in the inventory to question the paraprofessionals about their feelings about the job attitude inventory, EFNEP policies and their ability to handle problems. Their responses to these statements are detailed in Table 28.

The answers to these eight statements were not converted to supportive or non-supportive responses because they do not affect job satisfaction. They are displayed as agreement or disagreement with each statement. Thirty-six paraprofessionals felt the job attitude

Table 28. Responses of EFNEP Paraprofessionals to Other Statements about Work

Statements	Frequency and Percentage of Total Response					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	F	Percentage	F	Percentage	F	Percentage
9. Filling in this inventory is a good way to let the program know what employees think.	36	90.0	3	7.5	1	2.5
18. I think some good may come out of filling in this form	29	72.5	9	22.5	2	5.0
45. I'd rather work with youth than with homemakers	6	15.0	8	20.0	26	65.0
83. It's more challenging to work with homemakers than with youth.	20	50.0	12	30.0	8	20.0
27. I'd rather work with groups than individually with homemakers.	16	40.0	9	22.5	15	37.5
36. I'd rather work individually with homemakers than with groups of homemakers.	13	32.5	10	25.0	17	42.5
77. I feel I cope with problems easily	27	67.5	6	15.0	7	17.5
85. I can't deal with many problems at once.	12	30.0	6	15.0	22	55.0

inventory is a good way to let the program know what employees are thinking. Also, twenty-nine felt some good would come out of the inventory.

Only six paraprofessionals indicated they would rather work with youth than homemakers. Twenty responded that it was more rewarding to work with youth than homemakers. The group seemed to be split evenly into segments that would rather work with groups of homemakers or individually. Twenty-seven indicated they felt they could handle problems easily, but twenty-two felt they couldn't handle many problems at once.

Relationships of Selected Personal Characteristics to Identified Job Satisfaction Factors

Objective 3 of this study sought to answer this question: Are the selected personal characteristics of the paraprofessionals related to the identified job satisfaction factors?

In order to answer the above objective, one way analyses of variance were calculated between eight job satisfaction factors and seventeen personal characteristics. Table 29 reveals the F probability values for each of the correlations.

Only ten correlations received an F value interpreted in terms of probability of .050 or less. These correlations are:

Location of Residence/Feelings about Pay

Length of Residence/Feelings about Pay

Previous Work Experience/Feelings about Working Conditions

Marital Status/Feelings about Supervision

Marital Status/Feelings about Working Conditions

Table 29. F Values Interpreted in Terms of Probability Correlations between Personal Characteristics and Job Satisfaction Factors

	Location of Residence	Length of Residence	Tenure in Extension	Must Work to Support Family	Racial-Ethnic Description of Neighborhood	Previous Work Experience	Marital Status	Husbands' Occupation	Number of Children	Age	Race	Years of Schooling Completed	Number of Program Families	Number of Program Groups	Family Income	Distance to Travel	Did Mother Work Outside Home
Personnel Benefits	.408	.060	.099	.452	.362	.875	.249	.739	.598	.980	.693	.195	.752	.408	.416	.343	.278
Security and Advancement	.210	.664	.066	.245	.493	.700	.516	.432	.499	.886	.813	.125	.562	.422	.899	.922	.546
Communication	.265	.818	.442	.773	.802	.159	.160	.969	.608	.942	.743	.124	.640	.101	.636	.623	.940
Co-Workers	.234	.589	.450	.842	.790	.910	.335	.881	.754	.786	.498	.680	.543	.006	.472	.656	.975
Working Conditions	.223	.542	.338	.908	.707	.055	.044	.558	.869	.625	.871	.633	.756	.147	.698	.681	.057
Pay	.003	.035	.048	.840	.743	.790	.650	.820	.287	.029	.885	.010	.956	.263	.410	.444	.475
The Work Itself	.208	.065	.043	.902	.900	.080	.546	.948	.534	.813	.680	.179	.910	.539	.349	.171	.101
Supervision	.314	.777	.342	.521	.759	.187	.020	.609	.303	.785	.250	.884	.967	.142	.819	.304	.857

Significant Correlation: .050 or Lower F Value

Age/Feelings about Pay

Years of Schooling Completed/Feelings about Pay

Number of Program Groups/Feelings about Co-Workers

Racial-Ethnic Composition of Neighborhood/Feelings about Pay

Racial-Ethnic Composition of Neighborhood/Feelings about the
Work Itself

Those personal characteristics in this study which did not reflect any effect on job satisfaction factors were: husband's occupation; number of children; race of the paraprofessional; tenure in Extension; number of program families; family income; distance of travel to work; occupation of the paraprofessional's mother and a feeling of necessity to work in order to support the family financially.

Further analysis of the homogenous subsets indicates the relationships between selected personal characteristics and identified job satisfaction factors. This was accomplished by evaluation of the mean scores of satisfaction with each of the job factors identified by the F values. These job factor mean scores were established for each subgroup of personal characteristics. A mean score of 3 as a maximum indicates high satisfaction. A score of 1 is lowest, indicating greatest dissatisfaction.

Many subgroups of personal characteristics are so small that firm conclusions cannot be drawn between the characteristic and the job factor regardless of the F value established.

Each of these correlations will be discussed separately with the means calculated for each group of responses to the personal characteristics.

Location of Residence/Feelings about Pay

Table 30 reveals the mean scores of responses relating pay calculated for each group of responses to location of residence.

Table 30. Analysis of Subsets: Location of Residence/
Feelings about Pay

N=40

Location of Residence	Frequency	Mean Scores of: Responses about Pay
Small Town	15	2.5333
Central City	14	2.3000
Large Town	6	1.8333
Farm	3	2.5333
Reservation	2	2.3000

Those paraprofessionals living on farms or reservations had mean scores of 2.5333 and 2.3000 respectively to statements about pay. These are compared to mean scores of 1.5867, 1.833, and 1.3867 for those living in small towns, large towns and central cities, respectively. These findings could be attributed to a lower cost of living on farms and reservations.

Length of Residence/Feelings about Pay

Table 31 indicates the mean scores of responses about pay computed for each group of responses by paraprofessionals in relation to length of residence in the community.

These means do not indicate a tendency towards satisfaction as length of residence increases. The three paraprofessionals who responded that they lived in their communities for four to six years

Table 31. Analysis of Subsets: Length of Residence/Feelings about Pay
N=40

Length of Residence	Frequency	Mean Scores of: Responses about Pay
7+ years	31	1.6065
1-3 years	4	1.3000
4-6 years	3	2.4667
Under 1 year	1	1.6000

had a mean score of 2.4667 to statements about pay. The mean score for the thirty-one paraprofessionals (1.6065) who lived in their communities longest is roughly equivalent to the mean for those who have lived in their communities less than one year (1.6000). It must be pointed out that only one paraprofessional had lived in her community less than one year.

Previous Work Experience/Feelings about Working Conditions

The mean scores for responses about working conditions were calculated for groups of responses about the previous work experience of EFNEP paraprofessionals. These results are revealed in Table 32.

Paraprofessionals whose experience was in the secretarial field had the lowest mean score for working conditions of 1.6667. Those who had done other service work previously had a mean score of 2.4167 for feelings about working conditions. Paraprofessionals who had not worked outside the home had a mean score of 2.4242. The former student had a mean score of 2.5000.

Table 32. Analysis of Subsets: Previous Work Experience/
Feelings about Working Conditions

N=40

Previous Work Experience	Frequency	Mean Scores of: Responses about Working Conditions
Homemaker	22	2.4242
Service Work	10	2.4167
Industry	5	2.2333
Secretarial Work	2	1.6667
Student	1	2.5000

Marital Status/Feelings about Working Conditions

In an effort to evaluate the effect of the marital status of paraprofessionals on feelings about working conditions, the mean scores for each division established for marital status. Table 33 indicates the relationships between marital status and feelings about working conditions.

The paraprofessional who reported marital separation had a mean response of 1.500 to statements about working conditions. Those paraprofessionals who were single had a mean of 2.500 to the same statements. The one respondent who was a widow had a score of 2.6667, compared to the mean of 2.4167 for those who were married.

Marital Status/Feelings about Supervision

Another job factor that correlated significantly with marital status was feelings about supervision. Mean scores of responses about supervision are compared with marital status in Table 34.

Table 33. Analysis of Subsets: Marital Status/Feelings about Working Conditions

N=40		
Marital Status	Frequency	Mean Scores of: Responses about Working Conditions
Married	28	2.4167
Divorced	7	2.1667
Single	3	2.5000
Widowed	1	2.6667
Separated	1	1.5000

Table 34. Analysis of Subsets: Marital Status/Feelings about Supervision

N=40		
Marital Status	Frequency	Mean Scores of: Responses about Supervision
Married	28	2.5119
Divorced	7	2.3061
Single	3	2.7460
Widowed	1	2.6667
Separated	1	1.5714

The respondent who was separated from her husband had a mean score to statements about supervision of 1.5714. Those who were single had scores of 2.7460 and the widowed paraprofessional had a mean score of 2.3061 compared to the mean of 2.5119 for those who were married.

Age of Paraprofessionals/Feelings about Pay

Each EFNEP paraprofessional was asked to indicate the group of ages her own age would fall into. The analysis of subsets revealed in these groups of ages and responses to statements about pay is shown in Table 35.

The six paraprofessionals who are 20 years of age and under had a mean score to statements about pay of 2.133. The six respondents at the other end of the spectrum had a mean score to those same statements of 1.9667.

Table 35. Analysis of Subsets: Age of Paraprofessionals/Feelings about Pay

N=40		
Age	Frequency	Mean Scores of: Responses about Pay
31-50	23	1.4783
51-60	6	1.9667
20 and under	6	2.1333
21-30	5	1.5600

Years of Schooling Completed/Feelings about Pay

Research has shown that persons with "some" college courses were least satisfied with their job (Barbash 1976). Table 36 indicates the responses of paraprofessionals to feelings about pay analyzed in terms of schooling completed. There was not enough data available to further evaluate those with "some" college. Personal experience indicates the range from one class after high school to a college degree.

Table 36. Analysis of Subsets: Years of Schooling Completed/
Feelings about Pay

N=40		
Years of Schooling Completed	Frequency	Mean Scores of: Responses about Pay
12+	16	1.4875
9-11	11	1.9091
12	7	1.2857
8 and under	6	2.1000

Those who have not completed high school had mean scores about pay of 2.100 and 1.9091. Those who had completed high school had a mean score of 1.2857 while those who had taken some courses beyond high school had a mean of 1.4875.

Number of Program Groups/Feelings about Co-Workers

The new EFNEP program emphasis of organizing program groups led the author to calculate whether the number of program groups had any effect on any job satisfaction factors. One-way analysis of variance identified only one possible effect; feelings about co-workers (Table 37).

Table 37. Analysis of Subsets: Number of Program Groups/Feelings
about Co-Workers

N=40		
Number of Program Groups	Frequency	Mean Scores of: Responses about Co-Workers
None	17	2.3824
1-2	13	2.4615
3-4	7	1.7500
5+	2	3.0000

The two paraprofessionals who had five or more groups had a mean of 3.000, which is extremely supportive. The seven respondents who reported three or four groups had a lower mean of 1.7500.

Racial-Ethnic Composition of Neighborhood/Feelings about Pay

In an effort to determine whether the racial-ethnic composition of the EFNEP paraprofessionals' neighborhoods had any effect of feelings about pay, the mean scores of responses about pay were divided into groups based on the type of neighborhood. The results are displayed in Table 38.

Two paraprofessionals who reported being in Indian neighborhoods responded with a mean of 2.300 to statements about pay. Those living in integrated neighborhoods responded with a mean of 1.4833 to those same statements. A mean score of 1.9750 was attributed to those who lived in Mexican-American communities, a score of 1.600 to those in Anglo communities.

Table 38. Analysis of Subsets: Racial-Ethnic Composition of Neighborhood/Feelings about Pay
N=40

Racial-Ethnic Composition of Neighborhood	Frequency	Mean Scores of: Responses about Pay
Integrated	24	1.4833
Mexican American	8	1.9750
Anglo	5	1.6000
Indian	2	2.3000
Black	0	---

Racial-Ethnic Composition of Neighborhoods/Feelings about the Work Itself

The same responses about the racial-ethnic composition of the EFNEP paraprofessionals' neighborhoods were correlated to the responses of the paraprofessionals about the work itself. The analysis of these subsets is shown in Table 39.

The highest mean scores of responses (2.7083) about the work itself were attributed to the eight respondents who reported to living in Mexican American communities. The lowest scores were attributed to the twenty-four paraprofessionals living in integrated communities.

Table 39. Analysis of Subsets: Racial-Ethnic Composition of
Neighborhood/Feelings about the Work Itself
N=40

Racial-Ethnic Composition of Neighborhood	Frequency	Mean Scores of: Responses about the Work Itself
Integrated	24	2.4556
Mexican American	8	2.7083
Anglo	5	2.6133
Indian	2	2.6667
Black	0	---

The findings are generally non-conclusive in view of the limited number in the study population and the even smaller sub-groups indicated by analysis of the personal characteristics. No attempt was made to control for the effects of the specific county situation each paraprofessional works in; supervisors, home situation, or other external factors.

No attempt was made to evaluate the additional comments made by the paraprofessionals during the survey. They do not contradict the findings of this study. They can be found in Appendix D of this study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In keeping with the purpose of this study, this chapter deals with the summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations based upon the findings of the study.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to appraise job satisfaction of the paraprofessional employed in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program in Arizona in the light of certain personal characteristics.

Specific Objectives

In order to accomplish the foregoing problem, the following questions were identified:

1. What are selected personal characteristics of paraprofessionals employed in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program of the Cooperative Extension Service in Arizona?
2. What are the feelings of the paraprofessionals towards job benefits (both real and fringe), working satisfaction factors such as conditions, pay, co-workers, security and advancement, supervision, communications, the work itself and other factors?
3. Are the selected personal characteristics of the paraprofessional related to the identified job satisfaction factors?

Summary of Findings

The summary of findings from this study is reported in terms of the objectives of the study and is organized under the same major headings as in the presentation and interpretation of data.

Selected Personal Characteristics

1. EFNEP paraprofessionals are employed in eight Arizona Counties. Paraprofessionals from seven of those counties responded to the job satisfaction inventory.
2. Most of the EFNEP paraprofessionals are employed in the large urban counties, Maricopa and Pima. These are also the counties with the largest population.
3. Paraprofessionals living in small towns account for 37.5 percent of the EFNEP paraprofessionals responding to the inventory. Another 35 percent reported living in central cities.
4. A majority of the paraprofessionals reported living in their communities seven or more years.
5. Twenty-five paraprofessionals or sixty percent of those responding reported living in integrated communities.
6. Nearly thirty percent of the paraprofessionals have worked in the EFNEP program seven or more years. Another thirty percent have been employed in the EFNEP program from four to six years. Only nine persons have worked less than one year.
7. The majority of paraprofessionals had not worked outside the home prior to employment in the EFNEP program.

8. Most of the paraprofessionals who had worked outside the home prior to EFNEP employment worked in service occupations (nurses' aides, teachers' aides, etc.)

9. A majority of the EFNEP paraprofessionals were involved in community organizations. Most of those were involved in church organizations.

10. A majority of the paraprofessionals are married. Only three of those queried had never been married.

11. The largest number of paraprofessionals reported that their husbands were employed in blue collar positions.

12. All but three of the paraprofessionals reported having children of their own. The largest number of aides reported having from one to three children, while the next largest number of paraprofessionals reported slightly larger families of four to six children.

13. EFNEP paraprofessionals range in age from approximately 20 to 60 years of age. Over half of the paraprofessionals reported being between the ages of 31-50 years.

14. Over half of the paraprofessionals reported being of Mexican American descent. Only five reported being Anglo.

15. Nearly fifty percent of the paraprofessionals have not finished high school. Of those having finished high school, sixteen have taken courses beyond the high school level.

16. The paraprofessionals reported working with numbers of program homemakers ranging from 20 to 50 each month.

17. The largest number of paraprofessionals were not working with any program groups of either homemakers or 4-H members.

18. One quarter of the EFNEP paraprofessionals reported combined family incomes of less than the poverty level. Another fifteen or a total of twenty-five paraprofessionals had combined family incomes of less than the average income of Arizona.

19. The largest number of EFNEP paraprofessionals travel more than ten miles to visit their program families.

20. A majority of the EFNEP paraprofessionals reported their mothers had not worked outside the home.

21. Sixty percent of the paraprofessionals felt they must work to support their families financially.

In summary, EFNEP paraprofessionals employed in Arizona tend to be married, usually to blue-collar workers, rearing or having reared their own children. They tend to be between the ages of 31-50. and had not worked outside the home prior to employment in the Extension Service.

Job Satisfaction Factors

1. In the aggregate, EFNEP paraprofessionals are supportive of The University of Arizona personnel benefits programs.

2. Most of the paraprofessionals find the working conditions found in the Arizona EFNEP program acceptable.

3. Responses of the EFNEP paraprofessionals to statements about pay matters were not supportive of University policies. Feelings about pay received one of the lowest minimum mean scores indicating the most dissatisfaction about pay policies.

4. A majority of the EFNEP paraprofessionals have positive feelings about their co-workers; however, examination of minimum and maximum mean scores shows variations in responses from completely positive responses of some individuals to the lowest possible score for others. Feelings about co-workers had one of the lowest means, indicating problems with co-workers.

5. Most of the EFNEP paraprofessionals felt they could not lose their jobs as long as they were performing adequately. Most felt supportive of policies involving security and advancement.

6. EFNEP paraprofessionals indicated a need for more direction given by their supervisors. Nearly half of those responding expressed a need for more training. No one paraprofessional was totally supportive of supervision practices.

7. The highest mean score was achieved in responses to statements about communications. This indicates that the paraprofessionals feel relatively secure about making suggestions and knowing what is being done in the program.

8. The one job satisfaction factor that received the most positive responses was the intrinsic rewards of the work itself.

9. Most of the EFNEP paraprofessionals felt positive about filling in the job satisfaction inventory. Most prefer working with homemakers, especially individually.

In summary, the job factors that were the most satisfying to the EFNEP paraprofessionals were the intrinsic rewards of the job itself. Pay and relationships with co-workers were the areas of least satisfaction.

Relationships of Selected Personal Characteristics to Identified Job Satisfaction Factors

1. Those paraprofessionals living in smaller communities, farms and reservations, were the most satisfied about their pay. Those living in central cities were the most dissatisfied about pay. No analysis was made concerning the respective costs of living in each of the communities.

2. Paraprofessionals living in their respective communities from four to six years are more satisfied with their pay than those who have lived in their communities less time or more time.

3. If paraprofessionals had prior work experience in an office, they are less likely to find acceptable the working conditions found in EFNEP when compared to those who had work experience outside the controlled environment of an office.

4. The paraprofessionals whose marital status indicated a voluntary dissolution of their marriage (separated or divorced) seemed to be the most dissatisfied with working conditions.

5. The same paraprofessionals who indicated a voluntary dissolution of their marriage also indicated greatest dissatisfaction with supervision.

6. Most of the paraprofessionals indicated some dissatisfaction with their pay. Those who were the most satisfied with their pay seemed to be those who were 20 years of age and under and those who were between 51-60 years of age.

7. Satisfaction with the pay of a paraprofessional seems to diminish with education, especially with completion of high school.

8. The paraprofessionals who worked with five or more program groups had the highest mean score for satisfactory relationships with co-workers. The lowest score for feelings about co-workers was achieved by those EFNEP paraprofessionals who had three or four program groups.

9. It was not clear if the determining factor for satisfaction with pay was: cost of living in a community; size; location or racial-ethnic composition of the community. EFNEP paraprofessionals living in racially segregated communities were more satisfied with their pay than those living in integrated communities.

10. The same findings are evident in feelings about the work itself. Paraprofessionals living in integrated communities were less satisfied with the intrinsic rewards of the job itself than those who lived in racially segregated communities.

11. Those personal characteristics that did not seem to affect job satisfaction were: husband's occupation; number of children; race; tenure in Extension; number of program families; family income; distance of travel; did the paraprofessional's mother work outside the home; and the feeling of necessity to work in order to support the family financially.

In summary, those personal characteristics that tend to affect job satisfaction are: size of communities; racial-ethnic composition of the paraprofessional's community, as well as the length of time the paraprofessional has lived in that community; previous work experience; marital status; age of paraprofessionals; educational level and

and the number of program groups worked with. Those job satisfaction factors that were most affected by personal characteristics were: pay; working conditions; relationships with co-workers; supervision and intrinsic rewards of the work itself.

Conclusions

Based upon the findings as presented in this chapter, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. It was possible to devise an instrument to identify selected personal characteristics of EFNEP paraprofessionals.
2. EFNEP paraprofessionals employed in Arizona tend to be married, usually to blue-collar workers, rearing or having reared their own children. They are between the ages of 31-50 and had not worked outside the home prior to employment in the Extension Service.
3. Paraprofessionals were able to respond to statements included in a job satisfaction inventory similar to one used in industry.
4. Paraprofessionals were generally satisfied with their jobs in the EFNEP program, especially the intrinsic rewards of the job itself and communications with administration and supervision. Pay and relationships with co-workers were the job factors that caused the most dissatisfaction among EFNEP paraprofessionals.
5. Paraprofessionals would like to see more direction from their supervising agents and need more training.

6. Some personal characteristics were related to certain job satisfaction factors. These were:

- a. Location of Residence/Feelings about Pay
- b. Length of Residence/Feelings about Pay
- c. Racial-Ethnic Composition of Paraprofessionals' Neighborhoods/Feelings about Pay
- d. Age/Feelings about Pay
- e. Years of Schooling Completed/Feelings about Pay
- f. Previous Work Experience/Feelings about Working Conditions
- g. Marital Status/Feelings about Working Conditions
- h. Marital Status/Feelings about Supervision
- i. Racial-Ethnic Composition of Paraprofessionals' Neighborhoods/Feelings about the Work Itself

7. Many relationships between personal characteristics and job satisfaction factors were not very clear due to possible interaction between personal characteristics and other non-identified factors.

Recommendations

Based upon the findings and conclusions of this study, the author recommends to the Program Coordinator of The Arizona Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program and Administration of The Arizona Cooperative Extension Service that:

1. A case study of personal characteristics and job satisfaction of the paraprofessionals in the EFNEP program be conducted in selected counties. The purpose of this study should be to further analyze interrelationships among personal characteristics and their

effect on job satisfaction factors. Special emphasis should be placed on further analysis of education, number of program groups, marital status and neighborhood. Specific analysis of the effect of the supervisor should also be made.

2. Follow-up studies of the entire population of EFNEP paraprofessionals be conducted at five-year intervals to evaluate trends in personal characteristics and job satisfaction.

3. The Personnel Office of The University of Arizona re-evaluate job classifications for paraprofessionals and upgrade pay status, also improve the manner in which pay matters are handled.

4. Help be given supervising Extension agents to provide better direction and training for EFNEP paraprofessionals.

5. Assistance be provided supervising Extension agents to improve relationships between paraprofessionals.

6. The information obtained from this study be made available to supervising agents and shared with EFNEP paraprofessionals.

APPENDIX A

EFNEP AIDE INVENTORY

Instructions

PURPOSE OF THE INVENTORY

We would like to know what you think about your job as a nutrition aide, your pay, your boss, EFNEP and Extension in general. This inventory should tell us your ideas and opinions quickly and easily without signing your name. There are a number of statements on these pages. Just mark an "X" by each statement to show how you feel. It is easy to do and you can be completely honest in your answer.

HOW TO FILL IN THE INVENTORY

Read each statement carefully and decide how you feel about it. You will agree with some statements, and you will disagree with others. You may not be sure about some. To help express your opinion, there are three possible answers placed beside each statement.

Example

I would rather work in a large city than
in a small town.

AGREE	?	DISAGREE
.....

Choose the answer most like your own opinion and mark an "X" in the box under it.

THIS IS NOT A TEST

There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. We want your own honest opinion.

WORK RAPIDLY BUT ANSWER ALL STATEMENTS

Do not spend too much time on one statement. If you cannot decide about a statement, mark the "?" box and go on to the next statement. If you make a mistake, erase your mark or fill in the box completely. Then mark an "X" in the correct box.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Do not sign your name. Be sure to check the line above the answer that is the closest to your own situation. This information will be used only to make the results more meaningful. It will not be used to identify you in any way, nor will it be used to evaluate your county's program or your supervising home economist.

WHEN YOU HAVE FINISHED

When you have finished the inventory, check to see that you have marked every statement. Then turn to the space where you will write your comments. In this space we would like you to write anything about your job or Extension that is important to you. If you think something is good, please comment on that, too. If you have a suggestion, write that in also. When you finish, raise your hand and we will pick up your form.

Your help in this study is strictly voluntary. If you do not want to answer any particular question, do not feel you have to do so. The information you give us will be combined with that from other aides and reported as totals.

Thank you,

Julie Camp

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. To what county are you assigned to work? _____.

Circle the letter next to the most correct answer.

2. Where do you live?

- A. Farm
- B. Reservation
- C. Small town
- D. Large town
- E. Central city

3. How long have you lived there?

- A. Under 1 year
- B. 1-3 years
- C. 4-6 years
- D. 7+ years

4. Describe your neighborhood.

- A. Integrated
- B. Black
- C. Indian
- D. Mexican-American
- E. Anglo

5. How long have you worked for Extension?

- A. Less than 1 year
- B. 1-3 years
- C. 4-6 years
- D. 7+ years

6. What kind of work did you do before you joined Extension?

- A. Homemaker
- B. Secretarial work
- C. Service work
- D. Industry

7. What kind of organizations do you belong to?

- A. Church
- B. School
- C. Social
- D. Other

8. Are you . . .
- A. Single
 - B. Married
 - C. Widowed
 - D. Divorced
 - E. Separated
9. What kind of work does (did) your husband do?
- A. Physical labor
 - B. Office work
 - C. Military
 - D. Unemployed
 - E. Other
10. How many children do you have?
- A. None
 - B. 1-3
 - C. 4-6
 - D. 7+
11. How old are you?
- A. 20 and under
 - B. 21-30
 - C. 31-50
 - D. 51-60
 - E. 61+
12. What is your race?
- A. Anglo
 - B. Negro
 - C. Mexican-American
 - D. Indian
 - E. Other
13. How many years of school did you complete?
- A. 8 and under
 - B. 9-11
 - C. 12
 - D. 12+

14. How many families do you carry on your list?
- A. 20 and under
 - B. 21-30
 - C. 31-35
 - D. 36+
15. How many groups (4-H and Homemaker) do you work with?
- A. None
 - B. 1-2
 - C. 3-4
 - D. 5+
16. What is your approximate combined family income per year?
- A. Under \$5000
 - B. \$5-10,000
 - C. \$10-15,000
 - D. \$15,000+
17. How far must you travel to visit your program families?
- A. Under 1 mile
 - B. 1-3 miles
 - C. 4-5 miles
 - D. 6-10 miles
 - E. 10+
18. Did your mother work outside the home?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
19. Do you feel you must work to support your family financially?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
20. Does your husband want you to work?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. N/A

INVENTORY

	AGREE	?	DISAGREE
1. I really like the contact I have with program families.			
2. My boss knows what he/she is doing.			
3. If I have a complaint to make, I feel free to talk to someone above me about it.			
4. My boss sees that we have the things we need to do our job.			
5. Extension should do a better job of handling pay matters.			
6. There are plenty of good jobs in Extension for those who want to get ahead.			
7. My boss doesn't allow us to be creative in our programs.			
8. The people I work with think they run the program.			
9. Filling in this inventory is a good way to let the program know what employees think.			
10. Extension ignores our suggestions and complaints.			
11. I am supervised too closely, someone is always breathing down my neck.			
12. I feel I have been adequately trained to do my job.			
13. I often feel worn out and tired on the job.			
14. I am paid fairly compared with other Extension employees.			
15. Seniority really means something in EFNEP.			
16. I wish my boss would give us more direction.			

AGREE ? DISAGREE

53. Personnel evaluations are worthless.
54. The program operates efficiently and smoothly.
55. My boss lets me know how I'm doing on the job.
56. Personnel evaluations help me improve my work.
57. I wish I could do more for my program families.
58. Compared to other agencies in my community, we have good benefits.
59. Changes are made in the program with little regard for the welfare of employees.
60. The people I work with get along well together.
61. Personnel evaluations help me do my job.
62. I'd rather work in an office than in the field.
63. They expect too much work from us.
64. My boss has the work well organized.
65. I wasn't hired to handle the problems of my program families.
66. I am satisfied with our leave and employee benefits.
67. Compared with other employees, we get very little attention.
68. I am proud to work in Extension.
69. I know what is expected of me.
70. I have plenty of freedom on the job to use my own judgement.
71. My boss(es) listen to our suggestions.

[illegible]

	AGREE	?	DISAGREE
72. I always know how I'm doing in my work.			
73. There are too many unnecessary reports.			
74. I understand what benefits are available to employees.			
75. I have little opportunity to use my abilities in the program.			
76. The people I work with help each other out if someone is sick or gets behind in her work.			
77. I feel I cope with problems easily.			
78. I can learn a great deal on my job.			
79. My boss evaluates me fairly.			
80. Extension does everything possible to prevent accidents on the job.			
81. In my opinion, the pay in Extension is lower than in other agencies in my community.			
82. The longer you work for Extension the more you feel you belong.			
83. It's more challenging to work with homemakers than with youth.			
84. A few of the people I work with think they run the program.			
85. I can't deal with many problems at once.			

Make any additional comments here:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

APPENDIX B

ORAL INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out some things about all of the paraprofessionals in the EFNEP program. This questionnaire asks some personal questions about you and your family. It also asks some questions about how you feel about your job. The results of all the questionnaires filled out today will be totaled together and summarized. The individual aide filling out the questionnaire will not be identified. The results by county will not be reported to your home economist nor to the State EFNEP Coordinator. The results will only be reported as statewide totals.

You do not have to fill out this questionnaire. If you do fill it out it means that you give your consent for your results to be totaled in with the results of the others and reported as totals. We do hope that with your help we can find out some facts that will help us improve the EFNEP program.

We estimate that this questionnaire will take approximately 10-30 minutes to complete. Ask any questions that you may have. Please do not talk to each other.

APPENDIX C

EFNEP AIDE INVENTORY RESULTS

	AGREE	?	DISAGREE
1. I really like the contact I have with program families.	37	3	0
2. My boss knows what he/she is doing.	29	8	3
3. If I have a complaint to make, I feel free to talk to someone above me about it.	35	2	3
4. My boss sees that we have the things we need to do our job.	32	4	4
5. Extension should do a better job of handling pay matters.	4	4	32
6. There are plenty of good jobs in Extension for those who want to get ahead.	14	18	8
7. My boss doesn't allow us to be creative in our programs.	10	2	28
8. The people I work with think they run the program.	8	4	28
9. Filling in this inventory is a good way to let the program know what employees think.	36	3	1
10. Extension ignores our suggestions and complaints.	8	10	22
11. I am supervised too closely, someone is always breathing down my neck.	6	4	30
12. I feel I have been adequately trained to do my job.	22	8	10
13. I often feel worn out and tired on the job.	10	7	23
14. I am paid fairly compared with other Extension employees.	15	9	16
15. Seniority really means something in EFNEP.	17	8	15

	AGREE	?	DISAGREE
16. I wish my boss would give us more direction.	16	5	19
17. We are kept informed about plans and developments in EFNEP.	28	5	7
18. I think some good may come out of filling in this form.	29	9	2
19. My job is often dull and monotonous.	2	5	33
20. I am given credit and praise for work well done.	25	7	8
21. Extension does everything it can to see that employees get a fair break on the job.	22	13	5
22. Poor working conditions keep me from doing my best.	9	9	22
23. My pay is enough to live on comfortably.	9	5	26
24. I have a dead-end job.	9	13	18
25. Most of the higher ups are friendly toward employees.	31	5	4
26. My boss lets us know exactly what is expected of us.	27	5	8
27. I'd rather work with groups than individually with homemakers.	16	9	15
28. My boss is too interested in other things to care about our needs.	9	7	24
29. I don't like going door to door.	11	7	22
30. My boss has always been fair in dealings with me.	26	7	7
31. For my kind of job, the working conditions are OK.	27	8	5
32. I am underpaid for the work I do.	22	8	10
33. The people who get promotions usually deserve them.	17	17	6
34. You can get fired from Extension without much reason.	1	13	26

	AGREE	?	DISAGREE
35. I know how my job fits in with other work in the program.	33	5	2
36. I'd rather work individually with homemakers than with groups of homemakers.	13	10	17
37. I understand what the goals of EFNEP and Extension are.	33	4	3
38. I am often bothered by the pressures of slack periods of work.	9	6	25
39. My boss gets us to work together as a team.	18	8	14
40. I have all the things I need to do my job.	15	12	13
41. We get enough vacation time.	28	7	5
42. When personnel changes are necessary, they are handled fairly.	20	14	6
43. I can be sure of my job as long as I do a good job.	31	6	3
44. We are kept in the dark about things we ought to know.	7	10	23
45. I'd rather work with youth than with homemakers.	6	8	26
46. I feel I am really doing something worthwhile.	28	2	0
47. I am encouraged to make suggestions for improvements in the program.	30	5	5
48. I have confidence in the fairness and honesty of the people in charge.	27	9	4
49. The reports we fill out are needed.	30	6	4
50. The University has good employee benefits.	31	6	3
51. I plan on staying in Extension until I retire.	17	17	6
52. We have a good personnel policy.	27	12	1

	AGREE	?	DISAGREE
53. Personnel evaluations are worthless.	6	9	25
54. The program operates efficiently and smoothly.	14	14	12
55. My boss lets me know how I'm doing on the job.	29	6	5
56. Personnel evaluations help me improve my work.	34	2	4
57. I wish I could do more for my program families.	39	0	1
58. Compared to other agencies in my community, we have good benefits.	25	12	3
59. Changes are made in the program with little regard for the welfare of employees.	9	17	14
60. The people I work with get along well together.	28	7	5
61. Personnel evaluations help me do my job.	34	3	3
62. I'd rather work in an office than in the field.	7	10	23
63. They expect too much work from us.	12	6	22
64. My boss has the work well organized.	19	10	11
65. I wasn't hired to handle the problems of my program families.	19	8	13
66. I am satisfied with our leave and employee benefits.	29	7	4
67. Compared with other employees, we get very little attention.	7	6	27
68. I am proud to work in Extension.	36	3	1
69. I know what is expected of me.	34	3	3
70. I have plenty of freedom on the job to use my own judgement.	30	3	7
71. My boss(es) listen to our suggestions.	31	6	3

	AGREE	?	DISAGREE
72. I always know how I'm doing in my work.	25	6	9
73. There are too many unnecessary reports.	16	11	13
74. I understand what benefits are available to employees.	31	8	1
75. I have little opportunity to use my abilities in the program.	9	9	22
76. The people I work with help each other out if someone is sick or gets behind in her work.	22	7	11
77. I feel I cope with problems easily.	27	6	7
78. I can learn a great deal on my job.	40	-	--
79. My boss evaluates me fairly.	27	10	3
80. Extension does everything possible to prevent accidents on the job.	25	11	4
81. In my opinion, the pay in Extension is lower than in other agencies in my community.	19	12	9
82. The longer you work for Extension the more you feel you belong.	31	8	1
83. It's more challenging to work with homemakers than with youth.	20	12	8
84. A few of the people I work with think they run the program.	19	5	16
85. I can't deal with many problems at once.	12	6	22

The results of this questionnaire are given in parentheses.

1. To what county are you assigned to work?

Apache	(2)
Coconino	(3)
Maricopa	(13)
Pima	(12)
Pinal	(4)
Santa Cruz	(3)
Yuma	(3)

Circle the letter next to the most correct answer.

2. Where do you live?

A. Farm	(3)
B. Reservation	(2)
C. Small Town	(15)
D. Large Town	(6)
E. Central City	(14)

3. How long have you lived there?

A. Under 1 year	(1)
B. 1-3 years	(4)
C. 4-6 years	(3)
D. 7+ years	(31)

4. Describe your neighborhood.

A. Integrated	(24)
B. Black	
C. Indian	(2)
D. Mexican-American	(8)
E. Anglo	(5)

5. How long have you worked for Extension?

A. Less than 1 year	(9)
B. 1-3 years	(8)
C. 4-6 years	(12)
D. 7+ years	(11)

6. What kind of work did you do before you joined Extension?
- A. Homemaker (22)
 - B. Secretarial work (2)
 - C. Service work (10)
 - D. Industry (5)
 - E. Student (1)
7. What kind of organizations do you belong to?
- A. Church (27)
 - B. School (13)
 - C. Social (4)
 - D. Other (16)
8. Are you . . .
- A. Single (3)
 - B. Married (28)
 - C. Widowed (1)
 - D. Divorced (7)
 - E. Separated (1)
9. What kind of work does (did) your husband do?
- A. Physical labor (17)
 - B. Office work (5)
 - C. Military (1)
 - D. Unemployed (2)
 - E. Other (12)
10. How many children do you have?
- A. None (3)
 - B. 1-3 (19)
 - C. 4-6 (14)
 - D. 7+ (4)
11. How old are you?
- A. 20 and under (6)
 - B. 21-30 (5)
 - C. 31-50 (23)
 - D. 51-60 (6)
 - E. 61+ (0)

12. What is your race?

- A. Anglo (5)
- B. Negro (11)
- C. Mexican-American (20)
- D. Indian (3)
- E. Other (1)

13. How many years of school did you complete?

- A. 8 and under (6)
- B. 9-11 (11)
- C. 12 (7)
- D. 12+ (16)

14. How many families do you carry on your list?

- A. 20 and under (14)
- B. 21-30 (10)
- C. 31-35 (8)
- D. 36+ (6)

15. How many groups (4-H and Homemaker) do you work with?

- A. None (17)
- B. 1-2 (13)
- C. 3-4 (7)
- D. 5+ (2)

16. What is your approximate combined family income per year?

- A. Under \$5000 (10)
- B. \$5-10,000 (15)
- C. \$10-15,000 (8)
- D. \$15,000+ (5)

17. How far must you travel to visit your program families?

- A. Under 1 mile (1)
- B. 1-3 miles (2)
- C. 4-5 miles (4)
- D. 6-10 miles (10)
- E. 10+ (22)

18. Did your mother work outside the home?

- A. Yes (13)
- B. No (24)

19. Do you feel you must work to support your family financially?

A. Yes (24)

B. No (16)

20. Does your husband want you to work?

A. Yes (22)

B. No (3)

C. N/A (15)

APPENDIX D

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

1. I feel now what we need are ideas for new programs to present [to] our homemakers - also a way (besides food behavior sheets) to find out where new homemakers are, what they know and where to begin working with them. Some sort of pre-test or something SUBTLE.
2. I don't think I can coment [sic] a lot because I'm a new worker.
3. I hope you get your degree but these evaluations never give us feedback or show us if they acomplish [sic] what they set [out] to do.
4. I like [to] work with the homemaker and office. I real[ly] like my job.
5. I would like an evaluation of the percentage of non-English reading and speaking Spanish people on the program made. The adequate materials need to be made available for them. We cannot get volunteer homemakers into 4-H or to volunteer if the information is not made available to them in their language. We spend too much time trying to translate.
6. I do wish that our boss would get behind us when we need her. Changes are made in the program without regard to welfare of the aide. Boss(es) need to be more friendly toward the employee(s).
7. Haven't been in the program and haven't real experience, many of the questions asked [sic].

8. Every time a new H.E. [Home Economics] agent takes over it's like you have to start from the ground up to prove you know what your [sic] doing and can do the work.

9. I think we are in desperate need of training. Please try to fix it to get our expense checks on time.

10. Many of food recall and graph records are not always accurate because of up and downs of people's eating habits, because of illness, depression, weight control, etc. So I feel it is a waste of time.

Yes, Home Economists listen to your problems, but listen is all they do. Extension ideas or policies come first before the welfare of [the] worker (aide).

11. On employee pay for EFNEP aides: I can only emphasize that the demands of the job are above average for dedication, on the job training, intelligence, personal integrity and flexibility. The salary does not reflect these kinds of competencies that are required of aides to be successful in their work.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Barbash, Jack. Job Satisfaction Attitudes Surveys. Paris: Organization for Co-operation and Development, 1976.
- Boyce, V. Milton. "A Study of the Need for Non-College Degree Personnel in the Kentucky Cooperative Extension Service," Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Kentucky, 1968.
- Brayfield, Arthur H. and Rothe, Harold F. "An Index of Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology 35 (October 1951) 307-311.
- Browne, Margaret. Supervising Paraprofessionals. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Extension Service, ESC-574. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.
- Burt, Beryl. EFNEP Coordinator, Cooperative Extension Service, Tucson, Arizona. Interview, October 24, 1977.
- Carroll, Bonnie. Job Satisfaction. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, 1973.
- de Gennaro, Nat, ed. Statistical Abstract of Arizona, 1976. Tucson, Arizona, University of Arizona, 1976.
- Giegold, William C., and Skelton, William E. "Pinpointing Morale Problems," Journal of Extension 14 (May-June 1976) 6-9.
- Herzberg, Frederick; Mauser, Bernard; and Snyderman, Barbara Bloch. The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959.
- Johnson, Paul D. and Bledsoe, J. C. "Mr. Chairman, Your Behavior Affects Morale," Journal of Extension 12 (Spring 1974) 12-19.
- Myers, Shirley E. "The Impact of Paraprofessionals on Home Economics Extension Personnel and Programs," Unpublished Master's Thesis, Iowa State University, 1970.
- Nie, Norman H.; Hull, C. Hadlie; Jenkins, Jean G.; Steinbrenner, Karin, and Bert, Dale H. SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Second Edition. McGraw-Hill: New York, 1970.

- Reissman, Frank. "Issues in Training the New Non-Professional," Paper prepared for Subcommittee on Training, the National Manpower Advisement Committee, New York University, March 1967.
- Robinson, John P.; Athanasiou, Robert; and Head, Kendra B. Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1969.
- Sanders, H. C. The Cooperative Extension Service. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Science Research Associates. SRA Attitude Survey. Chicago, Ill. 1970.
- Triplett, C. M. "The Relationship of Selected Characteristics of Aides in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service to Their Role Success," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Kansas State University, 1972.
- U. S. Congress. Food and Agricultural Act of 1977, Title XIII, Food Stamp and Commodity Food Distribution Programs. Public Law 95-113, 95th Congress, 1st session, 1977.
- U. S. Department of Agriculture. Economic Research Service. Impact of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program on Low-Income Families. Report No. 220. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.
- U. S. Department of Agriculture. Extension Service. Revised Policy Guidelines and Suggestions for Conducting the Extension Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program. HE--100 Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Ten State Nutrition Survey, 1968-1970. Publication No. (HSM) 72-8134, 1970.
- Wanous, John P. and Lawler, Edward E. III. "Measurement and Meaning of Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology 56. (April 1972) 95-105.
- White, Linda, Extension Specialist, Cooperative Extension Service, Tucson, Arizona. Interview, September 23, 1977.
- Worden, Phyllis. "Professional Commitment and Job Satisfaction: A Longitudinal Perspective," Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Minnesota, 1973.

