



JOURNAL OF THE NACAA

ISSN 2158-9459

VOLUME 19, ISSUE 1 – JUNE, 2026

Editor: Bindu Poudel-Ward

McCoy, T.¹, Mashburn, D.², Beers, L.³, Morrison, J.⁴

¹Director, Learning and Organizational Development, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 43210

²Learning and Development Specialist, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 43210

³Assistant Professor, Extension Educator, The Ohio State University, Cortland, Ohio, 44410

⁴Citywide Training and Development, City of Columbus, Columbus, Ohio, 43205

Why Extension Educators Stay or Not: Factors that Keep Them and Factors that Make Them Want to Leave

Abstract

There is a lack of literature on the use of stay interviews as a retention tool within the Extension organizations. Retention of Extension employees is a persistent issue that has been studied and discussed for decades and continues into the present (Safrit and Owen, 2010). It is imperative for Extension to explore all tools available to curb employee turnover because these employee relationships help to develop and retain strong relationships with the local stakeholder community. Using stay interviews, this qualitative exploratory study aimed to describe the factors that keep Ohio State University Extension county educators with the organization for five or more years and the factors that may lead to employee turnover.

Abbreviations: The Ohio State University (OSU), Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR), Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS), Community Development (CD), 4-H (4-H Youth Development)

Keywords: retention, stay interviews, employee satisfaction

Introduction

In the *2025 Retention Report* conducted by the Work Institute, researchers found 63% of the reasons given by workers for leaving their jobs were deemed “preventable” (Nelms, et al., 2025). The themes designated as preventable in their study included careers, job, work-life balance, total rewards, management, environment, and general employment. Adding complexity to the issue of preventable turnover is employee engagement. According to the *2025 Gallup State of the Global Workforce Report*, employee engagement fell in 2024 from 23% to 21%, which is equal to the fall seen during the pandemic lockdowns in 2020 and bringing the United States to an 11-year low (Gallup, 2025; Wigert and Pendell, 2024). Within the United States and Canada, 69% of employees are not engaged or are actively disengaged.

Land-grant Extension organizations have not been immune to the issue of employee retention. In 2005, the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy identified retention as an area that deserved attention by all Extension organizations. Safrit and Owen, in 2010, discussed concerns about employee retention, citing studies that had been conducted and written about as early as 1982. A study by Vines, et al in 2018, pointed out that the loss of employees not only impacts the organization inwardly but can have an impact on the trust local stakeholders have in Extension (Vines et al., 2018).

Employee loss comes at a high cost for all employers. Some estimates on the cost of employee loss range from \$16,500 for a \$50,000 annual salaried employee (Nelms et al., 2025) to at least six months’ worth of pay and benefits (Fitz-enz, 2009). In the context of Extension, little research has been done to calculate the exact cost of onboarding a new employee following employee loss, though estimated formulas have been created. In a cost formula outlined by Harder et al. (2017), average cohort salary and pre-then-post assessments of competencies gained through a cohort onboarding process were utilized in calculating estimated onboarding costs. This calculation showed the cost of losing one county Extension agent at approximately \$17,000. These

costs, along with the knowledge that 51% of employees within the United States are either watching for or actively seeking a new job, demonstrate that all aspects of retention need to be examined to find methods for assessing and preventing employee turnover (Gallup, 2025).

Employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment have been found to be the best indicators for employee retention in Extension (Martin and Kaufman, 2013; Strong and Harder, 2009; Windon, 2017). Martin and Kaufman (2013) recommended the use of formal assessments to measure these two indicators. Extension, however, has historically used assessments such as performance appraisals, engagement surveys, and exit surveys that are mainly reactive, rather than proactive, strategies.

Stay interviews are a retention strategy that is both proactive and uses the key indicators of organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Stay interviews are structured meetings held with employees to discuss the positive and negative aspects of their job so that action strategies can take place before an employee decides to leave the organization or become disengaged (Finnegan, 2015). By using stay interviews, Vignesh and Babu (2014) found this method allowed employers to take a closer look at both the reasons employees may leave the organization, as well as why they stay.

This study aimed to describe the factors keeping Ohio State University Extension county educators with the organization for five or more years and negative factors which may lead to employee turnover. Exploring these factors may assist Ohio State University Extension (and other Extension organizations) in addressing the issue of employee retention through strengthening the motivating factors and finding ways to mitigate the negative factors. Within the context of this study, motivating factors are referred to as attractors and negative factors as detractors.

Methods

This qualitative, exploratory study focused on Ohio State University Extension and used key informant interviews with a semi-structured format. A grounded theory approach was employed to explore factors impacting county educators' desire to continue working for OSU Extension. Grounded theory creates an explanation of a "process, action or interaction grounded in the views of participants" (Creswell and Creswell, 2018) without preconceived ideas of what will be found (Harding, 2013).

Purposive sampling was used to identify 25 individuals to be included in the one-on-one interviews (Patton, 2014). Characteristics used in selection to ensure participants had the desired experiences and knowledge included: five or more years of service with Ohio State University Extension as a county educator; high performance ratings in formal annual reviews, and proportional representation of the four Extension program areas (Agriculture and Natural Resources, Family & Consumer Science, 4-H Youth Development, and Community Development). In addition, because OSU Extension has positions with split funding between two program areas, two participants were included who have this type of position. Of the 25 county educators originally selected and contacted, 21 agreed to participate and carried through with the interview (three participants from CD; six from 4-H, five from FCS, five from ANR, and two split-appointment participants). Of the 21 who were interviewed, 17 were female and four were male. By ensuring maximum variation in the experiences of the participants, researchers achieved data saturation over the course of the interviews. The study was reviewed and approved by the Ohio State University Institutional Research Board.

Data Collection and Analysis

An interview protocol was developed, including an introduction to the purpose of the study, instructions about how the data will be recorded, how data will be handled to ensure confidentiality, an overview of consent to be part of the study, and the questions. Survey questions were developed from the work of Finnegan (2015) and Raison (2022) and are included in the Appendix. The interview protocol was pilot tested with four

Extension employees and initial basic coding led to the addition of two probe questions for further clarification on the main questions.

One-on-one semi-structured interviews were conducted between October and November 2022. To ensure internal validity, the researchers worked to achieve saturation and thick description from the interviews. The interviews lasted, on average, 45 minutes. The original codebook framework was based on question themes. Major categories or themes were developed during primary coding, which were then broken into subcategories during pattern coding, along with a narrative description (Miles et al., 2020).

Finally, the researchers used Miles, Huberman, and Saldana's (2020) example of magnitude coding with the categorical levels of major, minor, and no mention to gauge the importance of both attractors and detractors. Miles, et al. calls this type of coding "quantitizing," and it seeks to "translate qualitative data into numeric representations of some kind." Using the participants' own words, both motivator and barrier factors were classified according to the three levels as shown in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Attractor Magnitude Categories

Magnitude	Phrases Used by Participants
2 = Major	I'm energized, I'm excited, look forward to, keeps me coming back, I value, values alignment, I love, I love working..., the main reason, a great deal
1 = Minor	I enjoy, I like
0 = Not Present	No mention

Table 2. Detractor Magnitude Categories

Magnitude	Phrases Used by Participants
2 = Major	It's frustrating, it's a problem, it's challenging, it's difficult, I really dislike, it's terrible, the hardest thing
1 = Minor	I would rather, I don't like, I like least, I don't care for, I am struggling with
0 = Not Present	No mention

Results

The five major themes found across all four program areas that help to explain why educators stay (attractors) with OSU Extension included:

- people and relationships,
- organizational program impacts,
- intrinsic rewards,
- flexibility (both in scheduling and in programming), and
- benefits.

The six major themes found that discourage (detractors) educators from staying with OSU Extension include:

- pay and compensation,
- trust and leadership,
- bureaucracy,
- organizational capacity and workload,
- lack of connection, and
- clientele.

Attractors and detractors were then summarized across all four program areas and are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Attractors and Detractors to Stay with Extension by Program Area.

ANR Attractors	ANR Detractors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prior connection with Extension. ● Passion for helping people using their content knowledge. ● Not working in a traditional, structured classroom. ● Serving and supporting their local communities. ● Helping each other through team teaching, being successful together, and being a good colleague. ● Enjoy teaching and learning new knowledge. ● Paid/compensated benefits packages such as health care, retirement, vacation, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Inability of pay to keep pace with inflation and the cost of living. ● Stress of the demands from clientele who want services provided immediately and at their convenience. ● Bureaucracy impedes the ability to perform their job. ● Administrative work has been pushed to the educator level of the organization.
CD Attractors	CD Detractors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Engaging with people and communities in meaningful work. ● Giving back to the community in some way. ● Educational benefits, especially for family members. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Compensation. ● Lack of trust in leadership and lack of transparency. ● Organizational culture that promotes from within an established peer network.
FCS Attractors	FCS Detractors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prior connection with Extension ● Serving and supporting their local communities. ● Paid/compensated benefits package such as health care, retirement, vacation, etc. ● Seeing people obtain knowledge and successfully use it in their lives. ● Ability to have statewide reach and impact. ● Flexibility in the job, especially with flexing around family schedules. ● Variety in the job and meeting new people. ● Direct teaching and learning new knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Workload makes it difficult to have work/life balance and to keep a 40-hour work week. ● Not enough people to handle the workload. ● Inefficiencies in the organization, including red tape and bureaucracy. ● Working with difficult parents. ● Low starting salaries and salary compression. ● Not feeling appreciated. ● Belief that performance evaluations are subjective.

4-H Attractors	4-H Detractors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prior connection with Extension ● Being part of an organization that has huge impact on youth. ● Pride in work and satisfaction of a job well done. ● Community connections. ● Having great colleagues. ● Flexibility in both their individual schedules and in their programming to the needs of the community. ● Variety in the job. ● Love of teaching among various age groups. ● Professional development is valued. ● Paid/compensated benefits package such as health care, retirement, vacation, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mandates from Extension and/or from the university without support (i.e., new volunteer management training, Workday, and other systems). ● Additional administrative responsibilities and bureaucracy. ● Increase in workload due to the addition of new programs (which require additional training), clientele expectations, “constant pressure to do more.” ● Lack of clarity about expectations, especially in performance reviews and the promotion process. ● Conflict with 4-H parents; they feel as if they get “beat up all the time” through verbal abuse. ● Compensation.

Major themes were then examined and sorted by program area using the magnitude codes about level of importance (major, minor, not present). Figure 1 shows the themes and magnitude across program areas for attractors. Through this coding, the themes of people and relationships, organizational impact, and intrinsic rewards hold the most importance, followed by flexibility and then benefits. One of the major differences, however, is that flexibility was not seen as great of a concern by ANR educators compared to the other three program areas.

	Attractors				
	People & Relationships	Organizational Program Impacts	Intrinsic Rewards	Flexibility	Benefits
CD	Major	Major	Major	Major	Major
CD	Major	Not	Not	Not	Not
CD	Major	Major	Major	Major	Major
Split	Major	Major	Major	Major	Not
Split	Major	Not	Not	Major	Not
4-H	Major	Major	Minor	Major	Major
4-H	Major	Major	Major	Major	Not
4-H	Major	Not	Minor	Major	Not
4-H	Major	Minor	Not	Major	Major
4-H	Not	Major	Not	Major	Major
4-H	Major	Major	Major	Not	Not
ANR	Major	Major	Major	Not	Major
ANR	Major	Major	Major	Not	Not
ANR	Not	Major	Major	Not	Not
ANR	Major	Major	Major	Not	Not
ANR	Not	Major	Major	Major	Not
FCS	Major	Major	Major	Not	Major
FCS	Major	Major	Not	Major	Not
FCS	Major	Major	Not	Not	Not
FCS	Major	Major	Not	Major	Not
FCS	Major	Major	Major	Major	Major

Key

Major	Major Factor
Minor	Minor Factor
Not a Factor	Not a Factor

Figure 1. Magnitude of Attractors.

Detractors						
	Pay & Compensation	Bureaucracy	Capacity-Workload-Expectations	Trust-Leadership	Not Connected-Unappreciated	Adult Clientele
CD	Major	Major	Major	Not a Factor	Minor	Not a Factor
CD	Major	Major	Not a Factor	Major	Major	Not a Factor
CD	Major	Major	Minor	Major	Minor	Not a Factor
Split	Not a Factor	Not a Factor	Major	Major	Minor	Not a Factor
Split	Not a Factor	Minor	Not a Factor	Not a Factor	Minor	Minor
4-H	Major	Major	Major	Major	Not a Factor	Not a Factor
4-H	Major	Major	Major	Major	Major	Major
4-H	Major	Not a Factor	Major	Minor	Major	Major
4-H	Major	Not a Factor	Major	Not a Factor	Major	Major
4-H	Major	Not a Factor	Major	Not a Factor	Major	Major
4-H	Major	Not a Factor	Major	Not a Factor	Major	Major
4-H	Major	Not a Factor	Major	Not a Factor	Major	Major
ANR	Major	Minor	Major	Not a Factor	Major	Not a Factor
ANR	Major	Major	Not a Factor	Not a Factor	Major	Major
ANR	Not a Factor	Major	Not a Factor	Not a Factor	Not a Factor	Not a Factor
ANR	Not a Factor	Major	Major	Major	Not a Factor	Not a Factor
ANR	Not a Factor	Minor	Not a Factor	Not a Factor	Not a Factor	Not a Factor
FCS	Minor	Major	Major	Major	Not a Factor	Not a Factor
FCS	Not a Factor	Major	Major	Not a Factor	Major	Not a Factor
FCS	Not a Factor	Major	Major	Not a Factor	Not a Factor	Not a Factor
FCS	Minor	Major	Major	Minor	Not a Factor	Not a Factor
FCS	Not a Factor	Major	Not a Factor	Not a Factor	Not a Factor	Not a Factor

Key

Major Factor	Major Factor
Minor Factor	Minor Factor
Not a Factor	Not a Factor

Figure 2. Magnitude of Detractors.

Figure 2 shows the themes and magnitude across program areas for detractors. Bureaucracy, organizational capacity, and workload are of most importance, followed by compensation, then trust, and leadership, a lack of connection and feeling unappreciated, and clientele. A major difference in detractors is that 4-H educators consider adult clientele a major detractor compared to the other program areas.

Discussion

Community involvement has served as a recruitment tool for Extension as many staff had prior experience with Extension through a previous job, as a volunteer, or as a youth engaged in 4-H. This is a common theme among all program areas.

Educators find value in the mission of Extension by working with their clientele and colleagues to solve issues through local community education. This connection with community attracts educators to the organization and motivates them to serve, especially when they collaborate with colleagues.

Intrinsic motivators to stay in their jobs were mentioned by educators across all programs, such as personal satisfaction in a job well done, the love of teaching and learning, and giving back to people and communities. They often spoke of the link to Extension's mission and the ability to have impact.

Beyond these intrinsic motivators to stay, non-wage compensation was frequently mentioned by surveyed educators as an attractor to working with OSU Extension. Flexibility (both in their schedule and programming) is appreciated by educators. The ability to set their own schedule allows for a healthier life/work balance. For example, a participant shared that having the ability to set their schedule allowed them to exercise each morning; therefore, they start the day with a clearer mind. Access to health insurance, retirement, and other benefits were a common theme among participants in the interviews. These attractors keep OSU Extension employees in the organization and

serve as a recruitment tool for new staff, especially those who find OSU Extension as a second career.

When detractors arise that lead to work dissatisfaction, frustration decreases motivation to stay. Not surprising, low starting salaries and lack of pay increases that do not sufficiently address inflation and the cost of living were cited across the Educators in this study. In addition, these Educators mentioned salary compression as an issue of unfairness when comparing experienced Educators to newer Educators.

Organizational bureaucracy and administrative burden greatly increases frustration with the job because educators feel as if they cannot get the job done with the quality they want to see. Often mentioned by the educators was that there are not enough people to get the job done. Bureaucracy and administrative burden were also described as red tape, mandates, and inefficiencies in the organization. They also expressed disappointment in organizational culture, such as leadership, lack of transparency, lack of clarity about expectations, lack of trust, and lack of appreciation.

The overall environment of working with clients can also be detractors for Extension educators, especially for 4-H professionals. While most bureaucracy is seen as a detractor, 4-H professionals seek more administrative support in the form of policies and procedures for conflict management and resolution with parents/volunteers. There is a perceived lack of support from state leadership to provide consistent and predictable assistance to county-based staff to resolve conflicts. While existing policies are in place to protect employees, county 4-H professionals feel ill-equipped to handle situations themselves and often seek assistance from administration.

Recommendations

To retain and build a veteran workforce of Extension educators, we recommend the following actions be implemented:

1. Promote collegiality with peers through the ability to interact with each other through team or staff retreats, professional development and in-service training, and other occasions when connections can be made.
2. Create opportunities and experiences meaningful to educators for them to be recognized and feel appreciated. Emphasize the importance of the mission and vision of Extension work in the local community.
3. Advocate for increased pay and other types of compensation (such as benefit packages) through on-going equity reviews, salary compression adjustments, and benchmarking salary scales with other organizations.
4. Manage and reduce administrative burdens and job expectations on Extension educators by identifying the tasks that can be transferred to others. Ensure that there are enough resources for people to do the job. Evaluate present capacity and resources before adding new programs or responsibilities.
5. Build a culture that does not tolerate rude and abusive behaviors from parents, volunteers, and any other community members through setting clear expectations and protocols in county offices. Leadership at all levels of the organization must support and enforce the expectations and consequences for uncivil behavior.
6. Promote flexibility in scheduling that allows remote work opportunities as appropriate and day-to-day scheduling that allows educators to balance professional and personal lives.

Conclusions

The researchers believe that stay interviews can be used as a retention tool of high-performance Educators and of a veteran workforce because managers and supervisors

can use these one-on-one conversations to build trust, clarify expectations, and address detractors that prevent meaningful engagement. While this study targeted only Extension educators, we believe that the next step is apply stay interviews across all staff members. For large organizations, such as OSU Extension, a suggested approach is to create a schedule in which employee groups are stratified by like characteristics, such as program assistants with five or more years of experience with performance reviews of meet expectations. Depending on resources, these sub-groups could be sampled on multi-year cycles. This approach allows a constant view of attractors and detractors for staying with an organization and to highlight those areas where the most effort should be placed on employee satisfaction. With limited resources, we suggest that managers and supervisors develop a strategy to incorporate specific stay interview questions into employee conversations during the year. Stay interviews scheduled at the mid-point of the performance cycle, rather than during performance reviews, should be focused on what supervisors can do to support employees (Finnegan, 2023). With some guided facilitation, these questions could become a part of staff meetings and/or retreats.

In addition, retention of a veteran workforce has implications beyond reducing employee turnover. Experienced employees provide stability, mentor newer employees, and enhance the leadership pipeline (Fuller, et al., 2026). Enhancing attractors and reducing detractors within the organization can lead to long-term employment, reducing employee turnover, and building a pool of potential leaders for the future.

Literature Cited

Creswell, J. and J. Creswell. 2018. *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publishing, Thousand Oaks.

Finnegan, R. 2015. *The stay interview* (1st ed.). Finnegan Institute. AMACOM-Harper Collins Leadership, Laporte, IN.

Finnegan, R. 2023. *How to Conduct Stay Interviews: Core Features and Advantages*. Society for Human Resource Management. <https://www.shrm.org/topics-tools/news/employee-relations/how-to-conduct-stay-interviews-core-features-advantages>.

Fuller, J., M. Sigelman, K. Tan, and E. Levy. 2026. *Policies aren't enough to retain top talent: You need systems*. Harvard Business Review. <https://hbr.org/2026/01/policies-arent-enough-to-retain-top-talent-you-need-systems>.

Gallup. 2025. *State of the global workplace 2025*. <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/349484/state-of-the-global-workplace.aspx>

Ghandi, V., & J. Robison. 2021. *The great resignation is really the great discontent*. <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/351545/great-resignation-really-great-discontent.aspx>

Fitz-enz, J. 2009. Predicting people: from metrics to analytics. *Employment Relations Today* 36(3), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ert.20255>

Harder, A., A. Hodges, & P. Zelaya. 2017. What is professional development worth? Calculating the value of onboarding programs in Extension. *Journal of Extension*, 55(1). <https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/joe/vol55/iss1/9>

Harding, J. 2013. *Qualitative data analysis from start to finish*. Sage, Thousand Oaks.

Martin, M., and E. Kaufman. 2013. Do job satisfaction and commitment to the organization matter when it comes to retaining employees? *The Journal of Extension*, 51(4), 9. <https://doi.org/10.34068/joe.51.04.28>

Miles, H., A. Huberman, and J. Saldaña. 2020. *Qualitative data analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (4th ed.). Sage, Thousand Oaks.

Nelms, D., S. Tucker, G. Spinner, and W. Mahan. 2025. *2025 retention report: Employee retention trusts in today's workplace*. <https://info.workinstitute.com/2025-retention-report>

Patton, M. 2014. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage, Thousand Oaks.

Raison, B. 2022. The stay interview: reduce volunteer turnover and maintain motivation. *Lead Read Today*. <https://fisher.osu.edu/blogs/leadreadtoday/stay-interview-reduce-volunteer-turnover-and-maintain-motivation>

Safrit, R. and M. Owen. 2010. A conceptual model for retaining county Extension program professionals. *The Journal of Extension*, 48(2). <https://doi.org/10.34068/joe.48.02.02>

Strong, R. and A. Harder. 2009. Implications of maintenance and motivation factors on extension agent turnover. *The Journal of Extension*, 47(1): <https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/joe/vol47/iss1/1>

Vignesh, A., and M. Babu. 2014. Stay interviews: a missing facet of employee retention strategy. *Indian Journal of Research* 3(1).
<https://www.indianjournals.com/ijor.aspx?target=ijor:ijmss&volume=4&issue=8&article=026>

Vines, K., D. Cletzer, D. Westfall-Rudd, M. Lambur, J. Hunnings, and N. Vines. 2018. Identifying needs and implementing organizational change to improve retention of early-career agents. *The Journal of Extension* 56(1). <https://doi.org/10.34068/joe.56.01.23>

Wigert, B., and R. Pendell. 2024. Seven workplace challenges for 2025. *Gallup Workplace*. <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/654329/workplace-challenges-2025.aspx>

Windon, S. 2017. *Examining Ohio State University Extension program assistants' turnover intention through job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervisor, and organizational commitment* [Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University].
https://etd.ohiolink.edu/apexprod/rws_olink/r/1501/10?clear=10&p10_accession_num=osu1500468741625219

Appendix 1

Organizational Conditions in OSU Extension Conducive to Retaining Employees Key Informant Interview Protocol

Introduction

Hello, my name is (interviewer) and I am with (position). I would like to thank you for agreeing to this interview today and agreeing to speak with me about your experiences of being a person who has stayed with OSU Extension for five or more years.

By the end of this interview, I hope to gain a better understanding of what factors or conditions have been most important to you as an Ohio State University Extension Educator who has chosen to stay with the organization for five or more years.

You received a copy of the questions. However, to review, we are going to talk about what motivates you to keep working for Extension. We will probably spend about 45 minutes or so discussing the questions. The information you share with me today will be used to help our organization understand what keeps employees with the Extension organization for more than five years and to help us improve employee satisfaction.

Please take a minute to read the consent form on the screen. When you have finished reading it, I would like for you to give your verbal consent to be part of this research.

Only I and a transcriptionist will have access to the notes and to the recording of this session. Your information is kept in my password protected computer that is accessed only by me.

Please feel free to ask me any questions during the interview if something does not make sense to you. I am going to record our interview.

The information you provide will be shared in an aggregated format. That means your name will not be linked to your individual responses. All information will be kept confidential. Your participation is voluntary and you may choose to stop at any time. If you have any questions or do not understand what I am asking, please let me know.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

—pause for questions—

As a reminder, I am recording the session and the recording will start now.

Ice Breaker Question

1. Tell me a little bit about why you chose to come to work for OSU Extension.

Main Questions

2. What do you look forward to when you come to work each day?
3. What do you like most about working here?
4. What do you like least about working here?
5. What keeps you working here?

[Probe: What would it take to increase job satisfaction in your current position?]

6. What might tempt you to leave?

[Probe: What are some detractors or obstacles to employee satisfaction?]

7. If you could change something about your job, what would that be?
8. What motivates to do your best every day?
9. What discourages you about your work?
10. How do you like to be recognized?
11. What talents are not being used in your current role?
12. What can your supervisor/manager do to best support you?
13. Based on your employment experiences so far, would you recommend OSU Extension as an employer to a friend or family member?

Scale: Definitely would, Probably would, Not sure, Probably would not, Definitely would not

What is your main reason for giving that rating?

14. Finally, on a scale of 1 as very dissatisfied to 5 as very satisfied, what is your level of job satisfaction?

What is your main reason for giving that rating?

