

**Importance of various roles and evaluation methods of extension economists as viewed by  
extension administrators, department heads, and specialists**

By Ruby Ward, DeeVon Bailey and E. Bruce Godfrey\*

*Presented at the AAEA Annual Conference August 5-8, 2001 Chicago, Illinois.*

A survey of extension administrators, department heads, and extension specialists was conducted to determine the best methods for evaluating the performance of extension economists. The results demonstrate how different groups view the relative importance of the various roles played by extension economists and how important the specific attributes of extension economists are within each role. In general all three groups agree on the most important roles and attributes. However, important differences among the groups do exist about the relative importance of certain activities.

**Introduction**

Evaluating the performance of extension specialists is a fundamental role played by both extension administrators and department heads. Performance evaluation is a difficult task compounded by the various roles played by extension specialists as well as the numerous metrics that could be used to measure the specialist's qualitative and quantitative outputs. While developing good evaluation methods for all extension specialists is important, this study focuses on evaluating extension economists.

---

\* Ruby A. Ward, DeeVon Bailey, and E. Bruce Godfrey are respectively an assistant professor, full professor, and full professor all of Utah State University.

*Special thanks is given to Kristian Mortensen a graduate student at Utah State University for preparing the mailings and tabulating the results.*

Copyright 2001 by Ruby Ward. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

The study compares and contrasts the views of extension administrators, department heads, and specialists concerning the importance of the various roles played by extension economists. The different views about the relative importance of specific professional attributes of extension economists within each of these roles and the best methods of evaluating those attributes are also identified by surveys of extension economists, department heads and extension administrators.

Differences among the various levels of extension administration could send mixed signals to extension specialists about the relative importance of the different activities in which they are engaged. Our findings suggest that extension administrators, department heads, and extension specialists generally agree on the importance of some facets of extension specialist activities. However, some important differences exist between extension administrators, department heads and specialists regarding the importance of specific activities carried out by extension economists.

Our results suggest that extension administrators view the role of specialists as that of a facilitator who works with groups and communities and who trains others to teach (e.g. county agents), in other words in a proactive role. In general, specialists view themselves as responders or reactors to the needs of different groups. Department heads appear to understand the importance of extension specialists as educators, but are less clear (compared to extension administrators and specialists) about what specific activities are important for extension economists. Below a brief review of the literature is presented followed by methodology, results and conclusions.

## **Literature Review**

Little was found in the literature dealing with either evaluating extension activities or evaluating extension employees. The management and marketing literature includes various models of evaluation

and control of employees. A particularly apt model discussing marketing control theory was found in the marketing literature.

Marketing control theory relates to companies that are primarily engaged in service activities and where it is difficult to observe the interaction of customers with the employees. In service firms it is particularly important that contact with customers be inline with the company policy and objectives. It is important therefore that such firms have employees who are inspired to provide the desired level of service (Kelly 1992 as cited in Hartline, Maxham and McKee 2000). Marketing control theory deals with how management attempts to influence employees to carry out the desired objectives (see Hartline, Maxham, and McKee 2000 for an overview of this theory).

In situations where employees perform a diverse set of non-routine and highly customized tasks, it is difficult for management to set and measure formal output controls in an objective manner (Hartline, Maxham, and McKee 2000). Extension economists by nature perform many non-routine and highly customized tasks meeting the needs of different and often unique situations as they arise. This may be one reason that few formal evaluation standards exist for extension economists. In this case it becomes important to rely on informal controls such as personal and departmental expectations. It is also important that controls set have input by the employees. However, even with highly motivated employees there is a need for expectations and controls that come from management. (Hartline, Maxham, and McKee 2000). This suggests that there is a need for the extension specialists to have input into formal evaluation methods that are established to judge the quality and level of their activities. Extension specialists must also be inspired and have personal expectations beyond what is formally evaluated. However, extension administrators and department heads must also provide direction and

vision to the activities performed by extension economists if specialists are to remain effective.

## **Methodology**

The primary data for this study come from a survey mailed to extension administrators, department heads, and specialists at all of the 1862 and 1890 land grant colleges and universities asking them to rank the relative importance of what the respondents considered the five key roles played by extension economists. Respondents were also asked to indicate the relative importance of different specialist professional attributes or activities within each role and to specify the “best” methods to evaluate the performance of extension economists in performing these various activities. Eighty-four surveys were sent to extension administrators and 35 usable surveys were returned yielding a 42% response rate. Department heads had the smallest response rate with 72 surveys sent out and only 17 usable surveys returned (24% response rate). Approximately 160 surveys were sent to extension economists and 97 usable surveys were returned giving a response rate of about 61% percent.

The five key roles of extension economists we consider are: 1) as an educator, 2) as an applied researcher, 3) as an informed objective source of information, 4) as a team builder, and 5) as a colleague. We define these roles as follows: An extension educator is an educator of adults on a non-credit or informal basis. An applied researcher conducts applied research to address current issues facing clientele or stakeholder groups. An extension economist is a person available to answer questions and provide objective and informed information to the public. A team builder is defined as a liaison between the university and communities, government, consumers, county agents, and other stakeholders. A team builder encourages joint action and joint use of public resources to address the economic problems people face. Finally, a good colleague is one who mentors others, serves on

committees, and acts as a good citizen of a university department. Survey respondents were asked to rank the relative importance of these five roles and then to rank the importance of professional attributes and/or activities within each role and finally to indicate the best methods for evaluating each attribute within a role.

The survey responses are analyzed using descriptive statistics and other statistical methods. Various hypotheses about different perceptions of the relative importance of the five roles played by extension economists and the preferred professional attributes individual extension economists need to perform those roles will be tested. Significant differences between the views of the three levels (administrators, department heads, and specialists) will identify areas where communication among groups could improve and more agreement regarding the methods for evaluating extension economists' performance could be achieved.

## **Results**

Below are results our results based on the responses provided by the three different groups (administrators, department heads, and specialists) regarding their own perceptions of the importance of various roles and professional attributes related to those roles of extension economists.

### *Assignment and Professional Advancement*

Administrators, department heads, and extension economists were asked questions about their assignments and how they believe salaries, promotion, and tenure decisions for extension specialists are made. Table 1 reports the current typical "split" in assignments for extension economists and indicates that most (approximately 60%) have two-way splits. These splits are about 2/3 in extension activities and 1/3 in either teaching or research activities. Fewer than 20% of extension economists are given a

100% extension assignment and over 1/3 of them have three-way splits. Administrators and department heads believe “ideal” assignment splits should include fewer three-way splits while more specialists wanted three-way splits that currently have them (Table 2). Extension administrators appear to be the most opposed of the three groups to three-way splits since only about 21% indicated a preference for three-way splits as an ideal assignment for specialist (Table 2) compared to the almost 30% of extension administrators who indicated that the typical extension economist currently has a three-way split (Table 1). Ideal two-way splits appear to be 2/3 extension with the remaining 1/3 of the assignment slanted more to research than what exists in current splits. This suggests that all three categories of respondents see for-credit teaching as a less vital role than research in an ideal assignment.

Extension specialists view the department head as having a stronger role in salary and promotion and tenure decisions than do extension administrators and department heads. Extension administrators and department head view these decisions as being made by a combination of people within the chain of command above the specialist level (Tables 3 and 4). Few of the respondents believed that promotion and tenure committees played a central role in these decisions, a somewhat surprising result especially for decisions relating to promotion and tenure (Table 4). The results suggest that these decisions about salary and professional advancement are made mostly by persons in administrative capacities at the department head level and beyond and supports the notion that effective communication is essential between different administrators if extension economists are to be evaluated fairly and accurately.

In general, there is consensus among the respondents that an extension assignment should take

about 2/3 of an extension economist's time. All three groups would prefer more two-way splits and believe that two-way splits should primarily be between extension and research. Extension economists view the department head as having a large role in decision influencing their professional advancement and salary. Indeed this perception is much stronger with extension economists than it is with department heads themselves who see a collaborative role with other administrators in these decisions. This suggests that many extension economists are unaware of precisely how these decisions are made. It also suggests that some confusion among extension administrators and department heads exists regarding who plays the most critical role in these decisions.

### *Importance of Extension Roles*

A three respondent types see the most important role for extension economists as that of being an excellent educator. However, extension economists and extension administrators are somewhat more intense in their feelings about the importance of the educator role than department heads as measured by the percentage of "1" responses given by each respondent group (Table 5). All three groups rate being an applied researcher as the second most important role for an extension economists with a slightly stronger positive response for the applied research category from department heads than from economists and extension administrators.

Extension administrators ranked being a team builder as the third most important role for extension economists while department heads and the extension economists believed being an informed source of information was the third most important role. As with several of the findings reported in this paper, extension administrators desire extension economists to have a strong facilitative role between stakeholders and the university while extension economists see their role as more reactive to the current

needs of stakeholders. This may be because extension administrators are issue-oriented and see a greater need to pool resources to address relatively broad issues while extension economists are more discipline-oriented and see the need to address specific issues from a disciplinary point of view.

Collegial activities are viewed as the least important of the five principal roles we defined for extension economists. This suggests that while citizenship within a department and the university are important, that other activities are much more highly valued.

#### *Important Professional Attributes within Extension Roles*

Table 6 presents the survey responses about the professional attributes an extension economist should have to be a good educator. The results given in Table 6 are especially relevant to the evaluation of extension economists since being a good educator was identified by all three respondent groups as being the most important role an extension economist plays (Table 5). Extension administrators, department heads, and extension economists all agreed that the ability to develop and deliver educational materials effectively are the most important professional attributes an extension economist can have (Table 6).

Department heads clearly feel less strongly about the need to effectively train others to teach than do extension administrators and extension economists (Table 6). This may exhibit a need to inform department heads about the role the extension economists play in training county agents and other professionals in how to examine and address economic problems.

Extension economists place somewhat less emphasis on being current with existing research than do extension administrators and department heads (Table 6). This is surprising since the role of extension has traditionally been to disseminate new, research-based information to the public. This may



reflect extension economists relying on existing “tried and proven” information. However, one finds it hard to imagine that current research shouldn’t be a lynch pin in the material extension economists are presenting. This suggests some effort at retraining through attendance at professional meetings, sabbatical leaves, and subscriptions to academic journals should be reemphasized for some extension economists.

The extension model has usually been one of personal, face-to-face contact with stakeholders. Extension economists have effectively used this method in the past and it will likely remain an important method for disseminating information in the future. However, there exists an apparent ambivalent attitude on the part of extension economists about the use of new technology to disseminate information (last question in Table 6 and results reported later). This may be because extension economists believe electronic technology is currently a less effective means of disseminating information than personal contact.

All three types of respondents believe that the most important professional attributes that characterize an extension economist as an effective applied researcher are the ability to conduct applied research and to recognize relevant research topics (Table 7). Conducting basic or pure research is not seen as an important asset for extension economists by any of the three groups.

The ability to obtain contracts and grants is seen as more important by extension administrators and department heads than by extension economists. This reflects the movement of many universities to greater reliance on “soft” money. However, the majority of extension economists still see obtaining contracts and grants as being a relatively unimportant part of their research assignment (Table 7).

Department heads see a more important role for extension economists in working with other

researchers and in graduate student advisement that do extension economists themselves or extension administrators (Table 7). This may reflect a desire on the part of department heads for greater involvement on the part of extension economists in joint research and graduate programs than currently exists. This may also reflect a movement away from the original extension model of extension economists working with researchers to generate research results addressing current economic problems faced by stakeholders towards a greater reliance on the extension economist himself/herself in generating the necessary research to address these issues. This is consistent with the movement away from 100% extension appointments and the desire for two-way splits to be between extension and research.

All three groups of respondents believe that responding to the requests of county agents and other extension personnel is the most important activity for an extension economist in his/her role as a source of informed information (Table 8). Consequently, extension economists are viewed primarily as a source of information within the extension organization itself. This may suggest an increasingly important role of county agents on the “front line” with extension economists and other specialists viewed as support people within the extension organization. Extension administrators and department heads see a more important role for extension economists working with interest groups and communities than extension economists do themselves (Table 8).

A somewhat surprising result was the disparity of emphasis or importance perceived between extension administrators and specialists in the use of new technology, including the Internet, to disseminate information (Table 8). It is unclear why many extension economists see a less central role for the Internet in their activities than their administrators do. This may point out a need for training

extension economists in how to use the Internet to extend their information to a broader public.

The results presented in Tables 9 illustrate that all three respondent groups view the principal role of the extension economist as a team builder to be mostly within their own state with groups off campus (i.e., agricultural producers, interest groups, etc.). Extension administrators see a stronger role for extension economists in assisting in the development of partnerships between groups, individuals, and agencies than do department heads and extension economists themselves. This again illustrates the desire on the part of extension administrators to place specialists in the role of facilitators.

An interesting result regarding the role of extension economists as colleagues (Table 10) is that extension economists and department heads appear to see a somewhat greater role in mentoring other specialists than they do in mentoring county agents. However, extension administrators appear to place a greater emphasis on mentoring county agents than they do on mentoring other specialists (Table 10). This suggests some disagreement among the groups relating to where the primary need for mentoring in the system is. This may lead to some frustrations as extension administrators desire more mentoring of off-campus staff while specialists and department heads see the principal mentoring role as being on campus.

## Conclusions

In most cases all three respondent groups agree on the most important roles and professional attributes of extension economists. For example, each agrees that the most important role of an extension economist is that of an educator and that the most important professional attributes an extension economist should have as an educator are the ability to develop and deliver educational

materials effectively. However, important differences among the groups do exist about the relative importance of certain activities. Extension administrators see specialists in a strong support function for county agents and as facilitators in pooling resources on and off-campus to address economic issues. In this respect, specialists are seen by extension administrators in more of a supporting role and county agents as the front line of extension programming. Extension economists see themselves more as reacting to the needs of stakeholder groups and also see a closer tie to campus-based activities than do extension administrators. Department heads, as expected, see a greater role within the department for extension economists doing traditional department activities like joint research and faculty mentoring than the extension specialists themselves. This suggests that department heads are not as familiar with the activities extension economists perform as they should be, or that department heads place slightly less importance on these activities than do extension administrators and extension economists.

The responses from extension economists exhibited some resistance to adopting electronic technologies in their programming, at least relative to the desires of extension administrators. This may be because specialists view current electronic technology as being less effective than personal contact or may indicate a need for training specialists in the use of electronic technologies.

## References

- Hartline, M. D., J.G. Maxham III, and D. O. McKee. "Corridors of Influence in the Dissemination of Customer-Oriented Strategy to Customer Contact Service Employees". *Journal of Marketing*. 64(April 2000):35-50.
- Kelly, S. W. "Developing Customer Orientation Among Service Employees." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. 20(Winter 1992):27-36.

**Table 1: The current average “typical” split for extension economist appointments as viewed by various groups.**

Response	Respondent Type			
	Department			
	Pooled	Administrators	Heads	Specialists
	%	%	%	%
Extension	65.1	59.0	65.1	67.5
Teaching	11.3	7.8	12.7	12.4
Research	21.3	26.0	21.7	19.5
Service	1.4	2.7	0.2	1.1
Total*	99.2	95.5	99.8	100.5
<p>% indicating that extension economists currently have:</p>				
100 % extension role	9.4	2.9	0.0	13.4
3-way split role	27.5	31.4	35.3	24.7

\* note: percentages may not add to 100 % because partial answers are included in the averages.

**Table 2. The ideal split for extension economists appointments as viewed by administrators, department heads, and extension specialists.**

Response	Respondent Type			
	Pooled	Administrators	Heads	Specialists
	%	%	%	%
Extension	66.7	66.6	64.0	67.2
Teaching	6.1	5.2	6.7	6.4
Research	23.9	25.1	27.7	22.9
Service	2.2	2.7	1.7	2.1
Total*	98.9	99.5	100.0	98.5
<p>% indicating that extension economist ideal role would be:</p>				
100% extension	11.4	2.9	5.9	15.5
3-way split	27.5	20.0	29.4	29.9

\* note: percentages may not add to 100 % because partial answers are included in the averages.

**Table 3. Percent of responses from various groups about the primary person making decisions about extension economists salary increases.**

Responses	Respondent Type		
	Administrators	Department Heads	Specialists
	%	%	%
Department Heads	25.7	29.4	45.4
P & T committee	0.0	11.8	1.0
Dean	2.9	0.0	4.1
Director of Research	2.9	11.8	6.2
Combination	62.9	41.2	39.2
Other	2.9	0.0	3.1
No Response	2.9	5.9	1.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0



**Table 4. Percent of responses from various groups about the primary person making decisions about extension economists promotion.**

Responses	Respondent Type		
	Administrators	Department Heads	Specialists
	%	%	%
Department Heads	17.1	11.8	26.8
P & T committee	5.7	11.8	8.2
Dean	2.9	0.0	3.1
Director of Research	2.9	11.8	6.2
Combination	65.7	58.8	50.5
Other	2.9	0.0	3.1
No Response	2.9	5.9	2.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 5. The relative importance of various roles of extension economists as viewed by administrators, department heads, and specialists.**

Role	Administrator					Department Head					Specialist				
	1*	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Educator	74.2	9.7	6.5	3.2	6.5	53.3	6.7	33.3	0.0	6.7	69.7	14.6	135.	1.1	1.1
Applied Researcher	10.0	43.3	23.3	13.3	10.0	6.7	53.3	13.3	20.0	6.7	15.7	38.2	25.8	13.5	6.7
Source of Information	6.7	13.3	30.0	26.7	23.3	33.3	20.0	33.3	0.0	13.3	12.4	32.6	25.8	21.3	7.9
Team Builder	10.3	20.7	31.0	27.6	10.3	6.7	13.3	6.7	53.3	20.0	3.4	12.4	23.6	38.2	22.5
Colleague	6.9	10.3	24.1	24.1	34.5	0.0	6.7	13.3	26.7	53.3	2.2	2.2	10.1	24.7	60.7

\* note: Respondents were asked to rank the relative importance of the above five roles of extension economists with 1 being most important and 5 being unimportant.

**Table 6. Importance of specialists exhibiting various attributes within the role of educator as viewed by administrators, department heads and specialists.**

Attributes	Administrator					Department Head					Specialist				
	1*	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Ability to develop good educational material	61.8	26.5	2.9	2.9	5.9	62.5	18.8	0.0	6.3	12.5	61.7	21.3	8.5	5.3	3.2
Ability to deliver educational materials effectively	73.5	14.7	2.9	0.0	8.8	56.3	25.0	6.3	0.0	12.5	58.1	26.9	3.2	3.2	8.6
Ability to train others to teach	44.1	32.4	11.8	5.9	5.9	6.7	33.3	40.0	20.0	0.0	20.2	29.8	28.7	14.9	6.4
Ability to determine the educational needs of clientele	52.9	35.3	2.9	2.9	5.9	18.8	68.8	0.0	0.0	12.5	48.9	30.9	8.5	4.3	7.4
Being current with existing research	58.8	26.5	8.8	0.0	5.9	37.5	43.8	12.5	0.0	6.3	28.7	27.7	28.7	9.6	5.3
Effectiveness as an electronic distance educator	11.8	26.5	47.1	11.8	2.9	0.0	20.0	60.0	6.7	13.3	4.4	24.2	33.0	23.1	15.4

\* note: 1 is extremely important and 5 is unimportant.

**Table 7. Importance of specialists exhibiting various attributes within the role of applied researcher as viewed by administrators, department heads and specialists.**

Attributes	Administrator					Department Head					Specialist				
	1*	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Ability to conduct applied research	72.7	15.2	3.0	0.0	9.1	68.8	12.5	12.5	0.0	6.3	64.1	20.7	6.5	3.3	5.4
Ability to conduct basic/pure research	3.0	6.1	39.4	30.3	21.2	6.7	13.3	33.3	26.7	20.0	4.4	8.8	17.6	36.3	33.0
Ability to obtain contracts and grants	27.3	54.5	9.1	6.1	3.0	18.8	50.0	18.8	12.5	0.0	8.7	38.0	34.8	15.2	3.3
Ability to work with other researchers	40.6	43.8	6.3	0.0	9.4	62.5	18.8	6.3	6.3	6.3	36.3	40.7	13.2	6.6	3.3
Ability to recognize a relevant research topic	59.4	21.9	9.4	0.0	9.4	68.8	18.8	0.0	0.0	12.5	56.0	25.3	7.7	3.3	7.7
Graduate student advisement	3.1	21.9	40.6	21.9	12.5	6.3	31.3	31.3	18.8	12.5	8.9	14.4	37.8	23.3	15.6

\* note: 1 is extremely important and 5 is unimportant.

**Table 8. Importance of specialists exhibiting various attributes related to being a source of objective and informed information for the public as viewed by administrators, department heads and specialists.**

Attribute	Administrator					Department Head					Specialist				
	1*	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
One-to-one work with public	29.4	11.8	38.2	17.6	2.9	25.0	31.3	12.5	12.5	18.8	25.0	30.4	21.7	13.0	9.8
Addresses specific issues as they arise (brush fire)	18.2	48.5	21.2	12.1	0.0	33.3	26.7	26.7	0.0	13.3	28.3	37.0	21.7	8.7	4.3
Ability to work as a liaison with interest groups	42.4	30.3	15.2	3.0	9.1	46.7	20.0	20.0	6.7	6.7	22.8	46.7	18.5	7.6	4.3
Ability to work as a liaison with communities	32.4	32.4	14.7	11.8	8.8	43.8	31.3	12.5	12.5	0.0	17.6	39.6	29.7	9.9	3.3
Accepts invitations to speak or testify	11.8	47.1	23.5	11.8	5.9	18.8	50.0	18.8	12.5	0.0	27.8	35.6	22.2	11.1	3.3
Ability to conduct interviews with the media	6.1	63.6	18.2	6.1	6.1	12.5	43.8	25.0	12.5	6.3	25.3	47.3	20.9	4.4	2.2
Responds to the requests of agents and other extension personnel	75.8	15.2	0.0	0.0	9.1	56.3	18.8	6.3	6.3	12.5	64.1	23.9	3.3	2.2	6.5
Effectively uses new technology such as world wide web	42.4	42.4	6.1	6.1	3.0	13.3	53.3	20.0	6.7	6.7	17.8	37.8	25.6	11.1	7.8

\* note: 1 is extremely important and 5 is unimportant.

**Table 9. Percentage of administrators, department heads and specialists rating the importance of extension economists exhibiting various attributes of a team builder.**

Attribute	Administrator					Department Head					Specialist				
	1*	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Building partnerships with other specialists															
In state	64.7	26.5	0.0	0.0	8.8	68.8	18.8	0.0	0.0	12.5	62.2	24.4	5.6	2.2	5.6
Regionally	32.4	50.0	8.8	5.9	2.9	12.5	68.8	6.3	6.3	6.3	30.0	52.2	7.8	7.8	2.2
Nationally	17.6	32.4	29.4	20.6	0.0	0.0	46.7	40.0	13.3	0.0	15.6	27.8	37.8	14.4	4.4
Building partnerships with county agents	79.4	8.8	2.9	0.0	8.8	60.0	20.0	6.7	0.0	13.3	64.4	22.2	4.4	3.3	5.6
Building partnerships between the university and ...															
Agricultural producers	54.5	27.3	6.1	6.1	6.1	37.5	37.5	12.5	0.0	12.5	52.8	25.8	12.4	3.4	5.6
Interest groups	42.4	42.4	6.1	6.1	3.0	43.8	37.5	0.0	12.5	6.3	34.4	33.3	24.4	3.3	4.4
Government agencies	30.3	51.5	9.1	3.0	6.1	31.3	43.8	6.3	0.0	18.8	30.3	39.3	22.5	3.4	4.5
Communities	27.3	48.5	9.1	6.1	9.1	33.3	46.7	6.7	0.0	13.3	23.9	31.8	30.7	9.1	4.5
Other universities or colleges	15.2	54.5	18.2	9.1	3.0	6.7	46.7	33.3	13.3	0.0	10.1	37.1	31.5	19.1	2.2
Assisting the development of partnerships between groups, individuals, agencies, etc.	41.2	38.2	11.8	0.0	8.8	13.3	46.7	20.0	13.3	6.7	27.3	29.5	26.1	13.6	3.4
Build private partnerships with business	21.2	48.5	15.2	12.1	3.0	6.7	40.0	26.7	26.7	0.0	17.2	24.1	36.8	12.6	9.2

\* note: 1 is extremely important and 5 is unimportant.

**Table 10. Percentage of administrators, department heads and specialists ranking of different attributes associated with being a good colleague and providing general service to the community.**

Activity	Administrator					Department Head					Specialist				
	1*	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Ability to mentor other specialists	29.4	47.1	14.7	2.9	5.9	28.6	50.0	14.3	0.0	7.1	33.3	36.7	17.8	10.0	2.2
Ability to mentor county agents	48.5	21.2	15.2	9.1	6.1	7.1	35.7	35.7	21.4	0.0	28.4	19.3	33.0	19.3	0.0
Collaborate with or teach agents to write	6.5	35.5	38.7	9.7	9.7	0.0	28.6	42.9	14.3	14.3	11.8	24.7	28.2	21.2	14.1
Serve on extension committees	11.8	50.0	26.5	8.8	2.9	14.3	21.4	28.6	35.7	0.0	17.8	23.3	37.8	14.4	6.7
Serve on department and university committees	15.6	43.8	31.3	6.3	3.1	7.7	46.2	38.5	0.0	7.7	15.6	23.3	41.1	12.2	7.8
Perform community service	3.4	27.6	34.5	20.7	13.8	7.7	38.5	30.8	15.4	7.7	2.3	19.8	39.5	23.3	15.1
Serve as a professional reviewer	9.7	41.9	32.3	12.9	3.2	6.7	33.3	33.3	13.3	13.3	14.0	34.9	34.9	15.1	1.2

\* note: 1 is extremely important and 5 is unimportant.