Perceived Benefits and Costs for Clients from Extension's Community Resource Development Projects[1]

Gerald E. Klonglan*
Charles L. Mulford*
Brenda F. Thorbs*

*Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University of Science and Technology, Ames, Iowa, 50011.

This paper was prepared for presentation at the meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, August 19-23, 1981, at the University of Guelph; Guelph, Ontario, Canada.

Perceived Benefits and Costs for Clients from Extension's Community Resource Development Projects[1]

Gerald E. Klonglan*
Charles L. Mulford*
Brenda F. Thorbs*

*Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University of Science and Technology, Ames, Iowa, 50011.

This paper was prepared for presentation at the meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, August 19-23, 1981, at the University of Guelph; Guelph, Ontario, Canada.

Abstract

Data are used here to aid in the analysis of university extension's community resource development projects. Field staff provided evidence of community changes resulting in part from projects and also provided estimates of the likelihood of positive and negative consequences for client/audiences. Knowledgeable citizens also provided an evaluation of projects and of the extent to which citizens have been involved in co-producing projects. The use of internal and external evaluations provided complementary evidence of impact.

The United States Department of Agriculture and the Cooperative State Extension Service completed a comprehensive evaluation of all Extension programs to determine their socio-economic consequences and to identify strategies for improving program evaluation procedures in 1979. A mandate from Congress required an analysis of both positive and negative consequences that resulted in part from Extension's efforts. The Department of Sociology at Iowa State University, and the North Central Regional Center for Rural Development, Ames, Iowa participated in the national evaluation of Extension's Community Resource Development (CRD) projects.

Models of Development and Criteria for Evaluation

The criteria used to evaluate CRD projects must be consistent with the model or models of community development used. Two overarching models of community development exist. One model stresses a functional perspective; it emphasizes cooperation and consensus among participants with regard to goals and methods and assumes the existence of a single public interest. This model further assumes that the interest of the community as a whole does not conflict with any of its subsystems. The second model of community development, based partly upon a conflict perspective, stands in contrast to the functional model that emphasizes a single public interest. Warren has stated that it is clearly misleading to assume that a single public interest exists. Because of the presence of multiple interests, the results of efforts to change the

community will almost always be viewed as beneficial by some and disadvantageous by others (Warren, 1978:375-377). We assume, and know of no compelling evidence that violates our assumption, that university extension personnel are not in total agreement about whether a consensus or conflict model is best. Even if university extension personnel were in complete agreement, it has been observed (Tripodi and Fellin, 1971: 46) that unintended consequences frequently result from community development efforts. An evaluation of change, then, regardless of the development model should consider both desirable and undesirable consequences.

Federal evaluation statements call for eclectic and comprehensive evaluations. Wholey and colleagues (1975) have stated that consideration must be given to an estimation of side effects caused by projects. Comprehensive evaluation measures (United States General Accounting Office [GAO], 1976:14-16) should quantify: 1) the extent to which objectives are met, 2) quantify, to the extent possible, unintended consequences and side-effect measures, 3) quantify differences the projects make for beneficiaries and cost bearers, and 4) provide evidence of qualitative consequences. The GAO (1978:23-24) has defined evaluation as an appraisal that determines: 1) the extent to which project objectives are achieved, 2) the extent to which perceptions and expectations of public officials, interested groups and/or publics are satisfied, and 3) the extent to which projects result in desirable and undesirable effects.

Given the existence of more than one model of community development, and given the fact that comprehensive evaluations are desired, multiple criteria for assessing the impact of projects are clearly needed. The

call for multiple criteria is not new in the literature. Gross (1965: 198-199) has stated that the performance of any organization consists of activities that include the satisfaction of members and clientele. Bass (1952:159-160) has argued that the "ultimate criteria" for assessing organizational worth includes the degree to which it: 1) is productive, 2) is of value to its members, and 3) the degree to which it and its members are of value to society. Friedlander and Pickle (1968:298-299) have shared the view that multiple criteria of effectiveness are needed, and they completed one of the first relevant empirical studies. In their study of 97 small businesses, Friedlander and Pickle found that customer satisfaction, and other measures of external criteria, were positively correlated with internal criteria including the satisfaction of employees and owners.

Holzer (1976) has indicated that, while managers of government agencies have no general indicators of efficiency comparable to profit-loss statements, measures of "effectiveness of output" can be developed in terms of quality, utility, social benefit or client satisfaction that are analogous to the sales and profit data for the private sector. Holzer has also noted that ratios of client satisfaction to program cost or resources could be used. Winnie and Hatry (1972) have called for surveys to gauge consumer perceptions of local government services. Glennan (1972:177-180) points out that program benefits for clients often cannot, or should not, be solely expressed in monetary terms. He further notes that reliance upon economic benefits -- cost analysis of manpower programs -- have led to great variability that has discredited benefit-cost analyses. For example, different evaluations of

Job Corps using essentially the same economic data have led to estimates of benefit-cost ratios ranging from 0.3 to 5.0. Hence, Glennan advises that any analysis of benefits from some groups should also look into possible costs for others. Katz and colleagues (1975:185-186) also question the usefulness of economic benefit-cost analyses when evaluating public agencies. In their pioneering analysis of the satisfactions of adult Americans with public agencies they make a strong case for reliance upon client reactions and satisfactions, and state that these may be the ultimate criteria. Katz and his colleagues call for using samples of personnel at various levels and samples of clients to get at efficiency, fairness and adequacy of operations. They call for efforts to match agency personnel with clientele in order to relate responses of clients to the realities of programs being administered.

Pennings and Goodman (1976) conceptualize both internal and external constituencies that may differentially influence goal selection, goal restraints and frames of reference used when evaluating effectiveness. Pennings and Goodman's "dominant coalition" model, however, presupposes the existence of a single unit that has been able to exert influence on the organization. Recent conceptualizations, and the results of empirical research, suggest, however, that different constituencies may form different assessments of effectiveness, and there may be contradictions among assessments provided by internal and external constituencies (Connolly, Conlon, and Deutsch, 1980; Hall and Clark, 1980; and Schneider, Parkington, and Buxton, 1980).

In view of guidelines provided in professional liaterature, and in government documents, our main goal in this evaluation of CRD projects

was to obtain multiple indicators of project impact. We sought data from CRD field staff to determine the extent to which economic and noneconomic changes occured because of the CRD projects. We also sought to obtain from CRD field staff their estimate of the degree to which special client/audiences had shared in positive and negative consequences resulting in part from the CRD projects. Davis (1980:1, 5-6) states that the "co-production" of projects by professionals in organizations and by clients stands in contrast to the traditional view which sees professionals as "delivering services" to passive clients. When clients co-produce with professionals, clients are involved in planning, in the delivery of services, and in the evaluation of outcomes. Co-production requires mutually agreed upon goals and shared responsibility. It seems logical to assume that, when clients have been involved in the co-production of community development projects, they will be more likely to assess them favorably. Our second major goal in this evaluation of CRD projects was to obtain perceptions of costs and benefits for special client/audiences from knowledgeable persons outside of extension. We also hoped to obtain knowledgeables" estimates of the extent to which community support exists for CRD projects, and to determine the degree to which the measures of community support are correlated with assessments of CRD projects.

Sources of Data and Study Limitations

We developed and used two different questionnaires that were mailed to personnel in the extension system and to persons outside of extension to obtain the data used in this analysis. In July of 1979, state leaders

of CRD sent us a list of all university extension personnel who had completed or nearly completed a CRD project during the previous 18 months. During the month of August 1979, questionnaires were sent to a random sample of 120 university extension personnel, selected in proportion to the state's total of the 1,428 CRD personnel in the United States, and to 14 Black Land Grant (1890) college and university extension personnel who met the criteria. The number of CRD staff selected from each state was proportionate to the state's total of the 1,428 CRD personnel in the United States.

Each of the 134 extension workers who were selected in the random sample provided us with a list of ten persons outside of extension who were knowledgeable about CRD work. These extension workers were asked to include one person from banking, local government, local media, and the County Extension Council among the ten knowledgeables. We hoped that inclusion of the four persons from banking, government, media and the County Council would ensure having at least some citizens who were knowledgeable about the whole community and could, therefore, take a broad perspective when they evaluated CRD projects.

Reminder letters were sent twice to encourage the extension CRD workers, and knowledgeables, who had not yet done so, to fill out the questionnaires and return them to us. The number of questionnaires returned by the CRD worker was 113 and for knowledgeables was 726, with response rates of 84% and 54%, respectively. It is clear that the response rates were considerably greater than ordinarily experienced in survey research studies (see Kerlinger, 1973:414). These response rates add to the confidence that we can have in the representatives of units from which date were actually obtained.

Data from the knowledgeable citizens were aggregated for each project. The actual number of knowledgeables who returned the questionnaires ranged from 1 to 10 with a median of 7.239. The completed project is the unit of analysis in the research reported here. A total of 113 completed projects are used in this analysis. Linear transformations were completed for all variables before statistical tests were completed.

Two major limitations of this study should be kept in mind. Data were collected regarding completed or nearly completed CRD projects and therefore, limits the researchers to undertaking a summative rather than a formative evaluation. This means that any insights provided by the evaluation will only be useful to managers and others for application relative to future projects. Also restricting data collection to completed or nearly completed projects automatically excluded collection of information about projects that were not successful.

A second limitation is related to the fact that knowledgeable citizens, who served as respondents in this study, were named by Extension workers. This procedure of selecting knowledgeable respondents created chances for bias that were favorable to the extension system. Several factors were deliberated prior to the decision to use extension nominees. For example, the fact was considered that there is no official roster of all extension clientele in the nation. A random sample of all U.S. citizens would be inadvisable in that such a sample might result in too many persons who were not knowledgeable enough about CRD to adequately evaluate its program. Even if the populations of all knowledgeable persons were known for each extension worker's geographical area, the selection of random samples from these areas would have been extremely difficult, if not impossible, to develop within the time and budget constraints of

of this study. After deliberations such as these, it was decided the extension worker nomination system was the only practical means of collecting data from informants external to the extension system. In view of these limitations, readers, who are concerned about possible positive bias, should remember that positive results may not in actuality be as positive as presented while negative results may be somewhat more negative than the presented results.

Results

Each CRD field worker was first asked to describe his/her completed project and categorize it in terms of four program categories[2]: 1) family income, 2) community facilities, 3) public policies and issues, and 4) community problem solving capacity. Respondents indicated that some completed projects involved some aspects of more than one category. Projects most frequently were intended to increase community problem solving capacity, or to provide additional facilities or services. Only 16% of the projects were primarily intended to influence family incomes and only 30% were addressed primarily to public policies and issues.

(Table 1 about here)

Community changes reported by CRD staff

Now we turn to an analysis of CRD staff's perceptions of community changes that have occurred in part because of CRD's help. We pointed out in the questionnaire for CRD staff that we did not wish to ask them to claim "too much credit" for community changes. We did not ask them to state that their CRD project was the only cause of change. Instead, we asked them to indicate which changes occurred in part from CRD's help.

We report here the most frequent community changes indicated by the

CRD staff. A complete enumeration of changes indicated by CRD staff can be found in the base report (Mulford, et al., 1980). An inspection of the data in Table 4 indicates that changes relative to Community Problem Solving Capacity projects occurred more frequently than other changes. Seventy-seven (68%) of the 113 projects resulted in citizens being trained, with 160.1 citizens trained per project, according to the field staff. Seventy-six projects (67%) resulted in training for local officials. In addition, more than 65% of the projects assisted citizen action groups or helped to form citizen action groups. In terms of Community Facilities or Services projects, about 40% of the projects were seen as leading to increased numbers of families and firms served as well as changes in the number of bonds issued by local government. The field staff indicate that water systems were developed or changed to meet standards in 48 (42%) of the 113 projects.

Fewer projects were seen as leading to changes related to Public Policies and Issues or with Family Finance projects. Note, too, that the mean changes for these projects are relatively small. For example, only about one fourth of the 113 projects were seen as leading to changes related to family finance and the mean changes are relatively small, e.g., 27 (42%) of the projects resulted in an increase in jobs, and the mean increase in jobs for the projects was 3.8%. In summary, extension has emphasized Community Problem Solving Capacity Projects and Community Facilities and Services Projects. Field staff report that fewer Public Policies and Issues projects or Family Finance Projects have been completed and those that have been completed have led to changes in.

fewer communities and changes of less magnitude compared to other kinds of projects. How have these changes been received? How do citizens evaluate these projects? These issues will be discussed below.

(Table 2 about here)

The transformed community change items were aggregated to form four community change scores for each project (one for each category of programs) and a total change score. The reliabilities for the four scales and for the total scale were: 1) .7902 for changes involving problem solving capacity, 2) .8386 for community facilities and services, 3) .8384 for public policies and issues, 4) .7676 for family income, and 5) .8483 for the total scale.

Perceptions of positive and negative consequences were assessed for community audiences that are of special interest to the Congress, the extension services and to the public. The respondents were asked to rate the extent each of nine (9) special client/audiences were likely to have been affected by or shared differently in the positive and negative community consequences resulting from extension CRD's efforts to help communities reach their goals. Positive and negative consequences were assessed separately for each of the nine (9) client groups and rated on a scale of 0-10 (0=shared to no extent, 10=shared to a great extent).

The special client/audiences included managers and owners of small businesses, racial and ethnic minorities, small farmers, low income persons, youth, the geographically isolated, senior citizens, handicapped persons, and local government officials. The raw mean positive consequence scores for the nine client/audiences ranged from 4.8 to 7.5 for field staff and 5.1 to 7.3 for knowledgeables. The raw mean scores for negative consequences were much lower, and ranged from only 0.9 to 1.4 for field staff and 1.6 to 1.9 for knowlegeables.

Zero order correlations between the community changes reported by field staff and their perceptions of the extent to which the special client/audiences were likely to have been affected by or shared in positive and negative community consequences are shown in Tables 3-4. The question being asked is, "Does the magnitude of change resulting from projects necessarily mean that special client/audiences are any more or less likely to share in positive and negative consequences that follow?" Although a number of the correlations in Table 3 are positive, nearly all are non-significant. This means that there is no systematic relationship between the magnitude of the community changes reported by the field staff and the likelihood of special client/audiences sharing in positive consequences. The same result holds for the likelihood of sharing in any possible negative consequences. The correlations between community changes reported and the likelihood of sharing in negative consequences are quite low. With only one exception, the correlations are non-significant. These results indicate that there is no significant relationship between the kinds of changes, or magnitude of changes, and the likelihood of special client/audiences sharing in positive or negative consequences.

(Tables 3 and 4 about here)

The zero order correlations between the perceptions of CRD field staff and knowledgeables for likelihood of special client/audiences sharing in positive and negative consequences are presented in Tables 5-6. Keep in mind that the field staff were responding in terms of their completed projects, and the knowledgeables were responding in terms of CRD work in general, so we might expect moderate but not high correlations in Tables 5-6. Let's turn to a consideration of positive consequences

first. For 5 of the 9 client/audiences the correlations are significant but only moderate in magnitude. Most of the correlations in Table 5 are positive. These results can be interpreted to mean that there is at least modest agreement between field staff and knowledgeable citizens about which client/audiences are most likely to share in positive consequences. In terms of sharing in negative consequences, we can see from the correlations in Table 6 that the perceptions of field staff and knowledgeables are significantly similar for low income persons, youth, geographically isolated, and the handicapped. Most of the other correlations are positive. We can interpret these data also to mean that there is at least modest agreement between field staff and knowledgeables about which client/audiences will share in any negative consequences of change.

The zero order correlations between the community support variables[3] used and knowledgeables' evaluations of how well extension CRD personnel provide services for four program areas are presented in Table 7. The perception that CRD services, in comparison to other tax-supported services, are worthy is significantly correlated with a positive evaluation of CRD services provided for all four program categories. The degree to which people in the county have been involved in CRD program planning, and have participated in carrying out CRD programs, are significantly associated with positive evaluation of CRD services. In addition, persons having a clear understanding of the mission of CRD have a positive assessment of services provided; and when CRD programs are seen as consistent with the needs of county people, assessments of services are positive. Finally, we can see from the data in Table 7 that positive assessments of CRD services are associated with CRD staff coordinating the community

development activities of other agencies.

(Table 7 about here)

Finally, correlations are presented in Table 8 between the community support variables and summaries of positive and negative consequences for the 9 client/audiences. Aggregated positive consequence scores (POSCON), negative consequences (NEGCON), net positive consequence scores (NETCON), and average net positive consequence (AVENETCON) scroes across the nine client/audiences were computed. The community support variables are significantly correlated with positive consequences, net positive consequences, and average net positive consequences for the 9 client/audiences. Knowledgeables who think that citizens have been involved in program planning and development, and have a clear understanding of the CRD mission are most likely to think that positive consequences will result for clients. Also, when CRD programs are seen as consistent with local needs, and when CRD staff coordinate the activities of other agencies, knowledgeables think that positive consequences will result. Finally, when CRD services are seen as worthy, compared to other tax-supported services, knowledgeables think that positive consequences will result.

(Table 8 about here)

Summary

This research has provided at least modest support for the framework used to evaluate the national sample of completed CRD projects. We concur with those who call for a multiple variable approach to assessment. We found that the external data obtained from knowledgeable citizens clearly complemented the data obtained from CRD field staff.

More so than not, the internal and external data are consistent and do not conflict. We intend to continue to explore the utility of internal and external evaluation data and hope that others may be motivated to consider this possibility in a variety of settings.

Footnotes

1. Research was conducted under Project No. 416-30-08-73-7450 of the Iowa Cooperative Extension Service in Agriculture and Home Economics, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture.

2. The four categories of completed projects:

   A. Family Income - assisting leaders and rural citizens to recognize, pursue, and make available income producing opportunities for rural people.

   B. Community Facilities and Services - professional organizational, leadership, and management assistance to community leaders, citizens groups, local governing officials and planning and development organizations in acquiring needed community facilities and services.

   C. Public Policies and Issues - assisting rural citizens and governing officials in their efforts to understand relevant public issues and to influence the formulation of public policies affecting them.

   D. Community Problem Solving Capacity - enhancing the institutional, organizational, and leadership capacities of rural communities to involve citizens in development efforts; to define and meet their own needs; and make public programs and private initiatives meet their needs.

3. Items used to measure community support variables are presented below:

   A. In comparison to other tax-supported services in your county (area), are the services provided by Extension agents doing CRD work worthy of the public (tax monies) required to provide these services? (Circle one number)

Less Worthy Than Other Tax Supported Services			Equally Worthy					More Worthy Than Other Tax Supported Services
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

   B. To what extent do people in your county area:

Not at all										To a very great extent
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

(circle your answer)

1. Take an active part in planning CRD programs with Extension staff members? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

B. (Continued)

	Not at all										To a very great extent
	(circle your answer)										
2. Take an active part in carrying out CRD programs with Extension staff members?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3. Have a clear understanding regarding the mission of the Extension Service regarding CRD?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

C. To what extent are the programs of CRD consistent with your perception of the needs of the people in the county?

Not at all										To a very great extent
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

D. To what extent are other agencies' community development activities coordinated by Extension CRD efforts?

Not at all										To a very great extent
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

References

Bass, Bernard M.
1952 "Ultimate criteria of organizational worth." Personnel Psychology 5(Autumn):157-173.

Connolly, Terry, Edward J. Conlon, and Stuart Jay Deutsch
1980 "Organizational effectiveness: a multiple-constituency approach." Academy of Management Review 5(2):211-217.

Davies, Don
1980 "School councils: partners or watchdogs?" Citizen Action in Education 7(2)(November):1-16. Published by Institute for Responsive Education, 704 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215.

Friedlander, Frank, and Hal Pickle
1968 "Components of effectiveness in small organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly 13(2):289-304.

Glennen, Thomas
1972 "Evaluating federal manpower programs: notes and observations." Pp. 174-186 in Carol H. Weiss (ed.), Evaluating Action Programs, Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

Hall, Richard H., and John P. Clark
1980 "An ineffective effectiveness study and some implications for future research." The Sociological Quarterly 21(Winter):119-134.

Gross, Bertram M.
1965 "What are your organization's objectives?" Human Relations 18(August):195-216.

Holzer, Marc
1976 Productivity in Public Organization. Port Washington: Kennikat Press.

Katz, Daniel, Barbara A. Gutek, Robert A. Kahn, and Eugenia Barton
1975 Bureaucratic Encounters: A Pilot Study in the Evaluation of Government Services. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research.

Kerlinger, Fred N.
1973 Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Mulford, Charles L., R.D. Warren, G.E. Klonglan, W.D. Lawson, and P.C. Morrow
1977 Organizational Effectiveness and Impact: A Planning Guide. Sociology and Anthropology Report #136. Ames, Iowa: Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University.

Milford, Charles L., Gerald E. Klonglan, Richard D. Warren, Ronald C. Powers, Meridean L. Maas, and Lacey M. Tillotson
1980 Impact of Extension's Community Resource Development Projects. Sociology and Anthropology Report #146. Ames, Iowa: Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa State University.

Pennings, Johannes, and Paul S. Goodman
1977 "Toward a workable framework." Pp. 154-159 in Paul S. Goodman and Johannes M. Pennings (eds.), New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Schneider, Benjamin, John J. Parkington, and Verginia M. Buxton
1980 "Employee and customer perceptions of service in banks." Administrative Science Quarterly 25(June):252-267.

Tripodi, Tony, Phillip Fellin, and Irwin Epstein
1971 Social Program Evaluation. Itasca: F. E. Peacock.

United States General Acccounting Office
1976 Evaluation and Analysis to Support Decisionmaking. Revision of OPA-76-9 (December).

1978 Status and Issues: Federal Program Evaluation. PAD-78-83 (October).

Warren, Roland
1978 The Community in America. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally.

Wholey, Joseph S., John W. Scanlon, Hugh G. Duffy, James S. Fukumoto, and Leona M. Vogt
1975 Federal Evaluation Policy. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Winnie, Richard E., and Harry P. Hatry
1972 Measuring the Effectiveness of Local Government Services. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Table 1. Primary Focus of Projects Completed by CRD Staff

Kind of Projects:	Number*	Percent of 113
1. Community Problem Solving Capacity	55	49%
2. Community Facilities and Services	42	37%
3. Public Policies and Issues	34	30%
4. Family Income	18	16%

*Because some projects relate to more than one program category, the total number does not equal 113.

Table 2. Changes Reported Most Frequently From CRD Projects

	CRD Projects for which change is reported		Mean* Change
	No.	%	
A. Community Problem Solving Capacity Projects:			
1. Citizens in leadership training	77	68%	160.1**
2. Elected officials trained	76	67%	60.3
3. Citizen action groups formed or assisted	74	65%	11.1
4. Citizen action groups helped to improve operations	76	67%	22.3
B. Community Facilities and Services Projects:			
1. Change in number families served	44	39%	30.8%
2. Change in number firms served	45	40%	20.0%
3. Change in number bonds issued by local governments	49	43%	-0.8%
4. Change in water system developed or improved to meet standards	48	42%	9.2%
C. Public Policies and Issues Projects (increase in number of local governments assisted with):			
1. Finances or budgeting	43	38%	14.0%
2. Taxation practices	44	39%	9.6%
3. Personnel management	42	37%	5.6%
4. Adoption of land use control measures	43	38%	21.8%
D. Family Income Projects:			
1. Change in number businesses	28	25%	7.6%
2. Change in number jobs	27	24%	3.8%
3. Decrease in demand for marketable job skills	28	25%	-0.1%
4. Increase in number people with new job skills	25	22%	3.6%

*Numbers reported are means for the number of project for which change is reported.

**(160.1) was adjusted to exclude 5 extreme values.

Table 3. Zero Order Correlations Between Changes from Projects and Positive Consequences Perceived by Field Staff

Positive Consequences for:	Changes				
	Problem Solving	Facilities and Services	Public Policies and Issues	Family Income	Change Total
Managers/Owners Small Business	.0763	.1095	-.0641	.1152	.1045
Racial/Ethnic Minorities	-.0520	.2874**	-.1298	.1123	.1344
Small Farmers	.0553	.1243	.1104	.2498**	.2107*
Low Income Persons	-.0279	.1693	-.0796	.1150	.0956
Youth	.0287	.0747	.0080	.0073	.0576
Geographically Isolated	.0766	.0517	.0039	.0072	.0623
Senior Citizens	.0266	.1141	-.1416	.0263	.0363
Handicapped Persons	-.0413	.0703	-.0101	.1172	.0590
Local Government Officials	.1061	-.0067	.1436	.0240	.0096

* = Significant at the .05 level.
** = Significant at the .01 level.
n = 113

Table 4. Zero Order Correlations Between Changes from Projects and Negative Consequences Perceived by Field Staff

Negative Consequences for:	Changes: Problem Solving	Facilities and Services	Public Policies and Issues	Family Income	Change Total
Managers/Owners Small Business	.0286	.0779	.0187	.0018	.0610
Racial Ethnic Minorities	.0209	.0907	-.0727	.0562	.0537
Small Farmers	.0051	.0918	.0589	-.0117	.0680
Low Income Persons	-.0261	.0848	-.0160	.0263	.0404
Youth	-.0760	.1860*	-.0769	.0053	.0500
Geographically Isolated	-.0474	.0464	-.0909	.0396	-.0091
Senior Citizens	-.1196	.0248	.0121	.0025	-.0283
Handicapped Persons	-.0847	.1444	-.0433	-.0188	.0264
Local Government Officials	-.0410	.0960	-.0606	-.0701	-.0063

* = Significant at the .05 level.
** = Significant at the .01 level.
n = 113

Table 5. Zero Order Correlations Between Positive Consequences as Perceived by Field Staff and Knowledgeable Citizens

Knowledgeables Perceptions of Benefits for:	Field Staffs' Perceptions of Benefits for:								
	Managers/ Owners Small Business	Racial/ Ethnic Minorities	Small Farmers	Low Income Persons	Youth	Geographically Isolated	Senior Citizens	Mandicapped Persons	Local Government Officials
Managers/Owners Small Business	.2307**	-.0957	-.1805*	-.1259	-.0861	-.0815	.0577	.0544	.0387
Racial/Ethnic Minorities	.0141	.3689**	.0435	.2010*	.0618	-.0087	.0244	-.0101	.0144
Small Farmers	.1214	.0516	.0416	-.0045	-.0604	-.0323	.0218	-.0258	-.0326
Low Income Persons	.1404	.3201**	.1124	.3032**	.1450	.1248	.2121*	.1118	-.1603*
Youth	.2197*	.1066	.1099	.0956	-.0280	-.0264	.0733	.0538	-.0332
Geographically Isolated	.2393**	.2255*	.2163*	.2605**	.1345	-.0047	.1597*	.1395	-.0941
Senior Citizens	.1293	.1700*	-.0199	.1108	.1274	.1118	.2640**	.1129	-.0446
Mandicapped Persons	.1114	.2121*	-.0015	.1616*	.0909	.0708	.1985*	.0767	.0158
Local Government Officials	.1807*	.0328	.0356	-.0157	.0875	-.0567	-.0167	.0998	.2317**

* = Significant at the .05 level.
** = Significant at the .01 level.
n = 107

Table 6. Zero Order Correlations Between Negative Consequences as Perceived by Field Staff and Knowledgeable Citizens

Knowledgeables Perceptions of Negative Consequences for:	Field Staffs' Perceptions of Negative Consequences for:								
	Managers/ Owners Small Business	Racial/ Ethnic Minorities	Small Farmers	Low Income Persons	Youth	Geographically Isolated	Senior Citizen	Handicapped Persons	Local Government Officials
Managers/Owners Small Business	.0258	.0427	-.0615	.0858	.0644	.0577	-.0577	.0759	.0081
Racial/Ethnic Minorities	.0947	.0504	-.0232	.0895	.0640	.1080	-.0100	.0472	-.0407
Small Farmers	.0919	.0946	-.0072	.0924	.1394	.1109	.0162	.1081	.0095
Low Income Persons	.1382	.1370	.0457	.1893*	.1323	.1793*	.0627	.0648	.0204
Youth	.1324	.1486	.0066	.1775*	.2838**	.1169	.0544	.2295**	.0522
Geographically Isolated	.1704*	.1562	.0639	.1086*	.2456**	.2053*	.0775	.2249**	.0506
Senior Citizens	.0850	.1378	.0437	.1644*	.1215	.0982	.0174	.0790	.0441
Handicapped Persons	.1780*	.1840*	.1290	.2533**	.2801**	.1742*	.0940	.2355**	.0843
Local Government Officials	.0964	.0542	-.0705	.0682	.0675	.0297	-.0878	.0064	-.1155

* = Significant at the .05 level.
** = Significant at the .01 level.
n = 107

Table 7. Zero Order Correlations Between Knowledgeables' Evaluation of CRD Services and Community Support Variables

Community Support Variables	Knowledgeables' Evaluations of CRD Services for Program Areas			
	Family Income	Facilities & Services	Public Policies & Issues	Problem Solving
CRD Worthy of Tax Monies	.3988**	.4887**	.3838**	.5148**
People Participate in Extension Planning	.5101**	.4446**	.2866**	.4847**
People Participate in Extension Programs	.4632**	.4963**	.3874**	.5083**
People Have Understanding of CRD Mission	.5633**	.4726**	.4044**	.5654**
CRD Programs Consistent with Perceived Needs of People	.4386**	.6954**	.5809**	.6580**
Other Agencies' Community Development Activities Coordinated by CRD	.5288**	.6247**	.5058**	.5681**

* = Significant at .05 level.
** = Significant at .01 level.
n = 102

Table 8. Zero Order Correlations Between Knowledgeables' Perceptions of Positive/Negative Consequences and Community Support Variables

Community Support Variables	Positive/Negative Consequences			
	POSCON	NEGCON	NETCON	AVENETCON
CRD Worthy of Tax Monies	.4989**	-.0958	.3863**	.3863**
People Participate in Extension Planning	.6435**	-.1587	.5322**	.5322**
People Participate in Extension Programs	.6241**	-.1950*	.5470**	.5470**
People Have Understanding of CRD Mission	.6793**	.0285	.4148**	.4148**
CRD Programs Consistent with Perceived Needs of People	.5144**	-.1935*	.4754**	.4754**
Other Agencies' Community Development Activities Coordinated by CRD	.6115**	.1489	.2808**	.2808**

* = Significant at .05 level.
** = Significant at .01 level.
n = 102