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INTRODUCTION

Since the establishment of the Cooperative Extension Service on May 8, 1914, and the sixty-five years that have followed, there has been tremendous change in farm living, agricultural practices, disease and insect control, consumer products, home making practices, public living styles, and youth activities. As stated by Barnett and Louderback:

Technological and social changes are accelerating the educational needs of the society. How to relate more effectively to those changing needs is an important question to the Extension Administrator. The Cooperative Extension Service came into existence to meet educational needs of early America. If Extension continues to fulfill this purpose it must change as the needs of its clientele change.¹

The Cooperative Extension Service has met many of these changes and while doing so has built a reputation of being called "the world's greatest educational institution".² The achievement of this reputation has been made possible in part through the foresight and projections of administrators, specialists and county extension agents of the same caliber as the drafters of the act that established the Extension Service, Representative A. Frank Lever of South Carolina and Senator Hoke Smith of

Georgia. Today, however, segments of the population are vocalizing their desires for the Cooperative Extension Service to become more accountable.

Durfee writes:

A new word is appearing in Extension lexicon these days. It's "accountability" and it's found sprinkled through recent addresses by administrators in sentences like these from a recent talk by a director of Extension: "More efficiency and certainly more accountability is upon us in a very real sense . . . . It is here to stay, . . . ."³

Durfee further stated, "It's also a word (accountability) that's heard more frequently in discussions among practitioners of Extension as they consider facts of life surrounding them. Sometimes it crops up in critical discussions by outsiders talking about Extension; for example, this, recently overheard comment: "No one in Extension is ever held accountable; plans are submitted, but there's no follow-up to see what the planner accomplished."⁴

"Like other words that spring into popular usage, 'accountability' probably has different meanings for different people—or in different contexts. For some, it may mean an agency has to file a report before it gets its next appropriation."⁵

Along with the stress of financing, comes the stress brought about by the age of accountability. This is a total societal phenomenon, affecting all social institutions--including universities--in all their functions. Basically, it's the result of two general factors. These are the increasing cost of operating

⁴Ibid., p. 20.
⁵Ibid., p. 20.
the institutions on the one hand and a sort of general lack of credibility on the other.6

Statements such as these are becoming more and more commonplace for supporters, practitioners, and beneficiaries of Extension programming. Thus, the continued success of the Cooperative Extension Service in its efforts to secure adequate funding and to present programs that will reflect a high degree of accuracy to those seeking accountability, will be dependent upon a sound projection of the future role of program and delivery methods of the Cooperative Extension Service.

DuVall, a recently appointed director who had the privilege of speaking to several Extension groups around the South on extension evaluation and accountability, gave the following account:

No longer is the supporting public going to blindly continue to shovel money into the gapping mouths of every public service agency, without requiring that agency to stand and be judged in the court of accountability. The citizenry we serve no longer supports us, trying to be everything to everybody--and I applaud that. On the positive side--the citizenry we serve does expect us to be good--and I like that. And, the citizenry we serve will support us if we keep their interests and their needs in focus as our reason for being--and we must accept that.7

One very critical request being made of the Cooperative Extension Service today is that of becoming more accountable. The crucial question faced by administrators, specialists and county extension agents alike today is "how can Extension Services become more accountable and yet


maintain its commitment to people of providing educational experiences in an ever changing society? In response to this question, this study will identify, describe, and analyze perceived current practices and future directions of the Cooperative Extension Service by those county extension agents, specialists and administrators in states that contain both 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions.

Statement of the Problem

The major purpose of this study was: 1) to describe Extension personnel (agents, specialists and administrators) employed by 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities in terms of personal characteristics; 2) to describe the amount of time presently devoted to Extension activities conducted in states containing both 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities; 3) to determine the perceptions of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators of present Extension work; 4) to determine the perceptions of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators of the future Extension work; and 5) to determine the relationship between the personal characteristics sex; age; background training; tenure in the Extension Service; area of responsibility; type of institution graduated and highest academic degree held and the perceptions of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators concerning the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service, future program areas and clientele audiences.

---

This study also investigated future programs and directions of the Cooperative Extension Service as seen by county extension agents, state specialists and administrators employed by these sixteen state Extension Services.

**Objectives of the Study**

The primary objective which gave direction to this study was to describe the present and projected role of the Cooperative Extension Service in those states containing both 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities. These states are primarily located in the South and Southeastern part of the United States.

To fulfill this general objective, the following specific objectives were set forth:

1. To describe Extension personnel (agents, state specialists and administrators) employed by 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities in terms of their:
   a. Sex
   b. Age
   c. Background training
   d. Tenure in the Extension Service
   e. Tenure in present position
   f. Area of major responsibility
   g. Type of institution graduated
   h. Highest academic degree held

2. To describe the amount of time presently devoted to Extension activities conducted in states containing both 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities:
   a. Extension program areas
b. Selected program audiences

c. Selected methods of program dissemination

d. Contact time devoted to meeting and working with ethnic groups

e. Present projections of working with selected audiences in the future

3. To determine the perceptions of county extension agents, state specialists, and administrators of present Extension work in the following role areas:

a. Selected characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service

b. Selected quality of living programs

c. Selected social and economic development programs

d. Selected agriculture and related industries programs

4. To determine the perceptions of county extension agents, state specialists, and administrators of the future Extension work in the following role areas:

a. Selected characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service

b. Selected quality of living programs

c. Selected social and economic development programs

d. Selected agriculture and related industries programs

e. Selected clientele audiences

5. To determine the relationships between the personal characteristics—sex; age; background training; tenure in the Extension Service; area of major responsibility; kind of institution graduated and highest academic degree held and the perceptions of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators concerning the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service, future program areas and clientele audiences.
**Hypotheses**

Based on the literature review, the following hypotheses were established:

**Research Hypothesis H₁:** There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service.

**Research Hypothesis H₂:** There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

**Research Hypothesis H₃:** There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on social and economic development programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

**Research Hypothesis H₄:** There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents
and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs of the Cooperative Extension Service.

Research Hypothesis H₅: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on farm operations clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Research Hypothesis H₆: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on rural non-farm families clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Research Hypothesis H₇: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on urban families clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Research Hypothesis H₈: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents
and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on industry personnel clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

**Research Hypothesis H9:** There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on organizations and institutions clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

**Need for the Study**

The need for this study is supported by the fact that there exists a unique group of states in this country that contain two land-grant institutions (1862 and 1890) charged with the responsibility of contributing to the overall function of one state Extension Service. These states have undergone major changes in their Extension programming during the last decade which has sought to bring them closer to the basic purpose of the Cooperative Extension Service:

... to aid in the diffusion among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects related to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the use of the same ... 9

---

With the passage of the USDA 1972 Appropriation Act, $4 million for fiscal year 1972, was included under the Smith-Lever 3(d) section of the bill as an initial appropriation to the 17 institutions in 16 states participating in land-grant Extension programs. Following this initial appropriation, guidelines were developed for administering the appropriation to the 1890 land-grant colleges and Tuskegee Institute. A Memorandum of Understanding between 1890 and 1862 land-grant institutions in 16 states was developed and approved. It defined the roles and responsibilities of two types of institutions in carrying out an Extension program in the states.¹⁰

The new funding procedure enabled the 1890 land-grant institutions and Tuskegee Institute to receive Extension funds to develop and carryout programs designed to reach some audiences that heretofore had not been successfully involved in Extension activities in the 16 states. For the first time, these appropriations permitted the use of the resources and talents of all land-grant institutions in the 16 states.¹¹

As an employee of the University of Georgia Cooperative Extension Service, a graduate of an 1890 college (The Fort Valley State College) and an 1862 university (The University of Georgia), the author has observed that there seemed to exist a feeling of two "separate" Extension Services in the 16 states where two or more land-grant institutions are located.


¹¹Ibid., p. 23.
According to Brooks, one set of these institutions, the 1890 land-grant institutions, have been a part of the land-grant system for better than 89 years but they had been historically excluded from receiving adequate financial support from the Cooperative Extension Service. The Joint USDA-NASULG Study Committee in 1968 made a special survey to determine the capabilities, activities, opportunities, interest, and potentialities the 1890 land-grant universities and Tuskegee Institute have which might contribute to Extension outreach goals and functions.

Vines and Anderson state:

The 1890 institution appropriation to the states since 1972 is a most effective way of involving the two land-grant institutions in the full use by both groups to alleviate basic and fundamental social and economic problems through education.

However, in order to place the Extension Services in these states containing both 1862 and 1890 institutions in their true perspective, Vine and Anderson follow with:

Extension employees of the 1890 land-grant institutions in the 16 states are operating under one Extension plan of work, the same as all other Extension workers in the nation. These Extension workers are feeding into one SEMIS (State Extension Management Information System). They are part of the National Extension reporting system.

---


13 Vines and Anderson, p. 23.

14 Ibid., p. 24.
Where there exists a memorandum of understanding between these institutions, no duplication of programs is carried out because of designations of potential target audiences. In this attempt to reach the lowest of the "grass roots" these states give rise to great outreach and have an overall group of professionals in a rather unique position that should enable them to predict with a high degree of accuracy the projected future role of the Cooperative Extension Service.

It should be noted that no empirical research was found that has investigated the perceptions of staff in these 16 unique state Extension Services of the future programs, directions and roles of the Cooperative Extension Service so that the crucial question of accountability can be addressed. Information obtained from this study could serve many purposes. Among them are:

1. Provide information to national, state, and local levels of the Extension Service concerning future program planning, staff, recruitment, staff training and development, and program emphasis.

2. Provide information useful in securing funding on the state, national, and local levels.

3. Provide agents, specialists and administrators with information necessary for understanding the directions taken by the Extension Service in the future.

4. Provide better planning for program (curriculum) development for educational programs in the land-grant institutions for the education of future personnel.
5. Provide guidelines for planning and implementing in-service training programs for Extension workers.

6. Provide assistance for supervisory staffs in guiding personnel under their supervision toward upgrading their professional competencies in areas which would enhance their view of organizational responsibilities.

7. Provide a broadening of Cooperative Extension workers' definition of the organization role.

8. Provide for improved "accountability" by instituting programs more representative of the clientele being served.

Scope of Study

This study was designed to be conducted in the 16 states in the United States that contain both 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities. These states were: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia (see Figure 1 on the following page). All states except South Carolina participated in the study. Data were collected by a stratified random sample of county extension agents and specialists in the 15 states and a census of the personnel with the title of assistant director, associate director and director in these states at the time of this study.

This study was not designed to evaluate the present Extension programs, the performance of Extension personnel or the current pre-service and in-service training programs for Cooperative Extension personnel.
Limitations of the Study

In conducting this study there was concern in the fact that certain limitations should be recognized.

1. This study was limited to the investigation of the projected role of the Cooperative Extension Service in states that contain both 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions as perceived by county extension agents, state specialists and administrators, therefore the findings should be generalized accordingly.

2. District and area extension personnel were not included in the stratification of the three groups surveyed.

Definition of Terms

In order to lend conceptual clarity, uniformity and provide a common understanding of terms used in this study, the following are defined in the sense they are used in this study:

1. Administrator--The persons who are responsible for the administration at the state level of part or the total Extension program conducted by the 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions and Tuskegee Institute. The title varies from state-to state, but including directors, associate/assistant directors, deans, assistant/associate deans, vice-presidents, coordinators, etc...

2. County Extension Agents--This term refers to employees of 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions and Tuskegee Institute responsible for carrying out program areas on the local (county) level.
3. **Future Role**--This term refers to the task, function, position or part to be played by Cooperative Extension in the years to come with reference to program areas, and the kind of involvement in each area.

4. **Land-Grant Institutions or Colleges**--Refers to universities or colleges endowed through the sale of public lands to the states and territories in accordance with the Morrill Acts.

5. **Program Areas**--This term is used to indicate the major areas of emphasis for the State Extension Services as defined in project agreements with the Federal Extension Service. They are:
   a. Agriculture and Natural Resources, including production, management, marketing and utilization
   b. Home Economics and Family Living
   c. 4-H and Youth
   d. Community Resource Development

6. **Program (Curriculum) Development**--A term used to define a process or series of activities wherein Extension Service personnel and the people they work with and serve join together to: 1) study the situation; 2) identify needs and problems; 3) inventory resources; 4) collect facts and information; 5) establish goals and objectives; 6) consider alternative means for servicing needs, solving problems, and attaining goals and objectives; 7) choose appropriate alternatives; 8) devise plans for implementing the chosen alternatives; 9) organize for action; 10) execute the plan; 11) maintain a good record of activities; 12) evaluate the outcomes of their actions in terms
of the established goals and objectives; and 13) replan.\textsuperscript{15}

7. State Specialist--A term that refers to an extension agent who has a particular expertise in one of the major program areas or sub-areas of the Extension Service where the majority of his/her time is spent interpreting research and providing support on a statewide basis.

8. Tenure--A term used to indicate the length of service as a cooperative extension agent, specialist or administrator in either of the State Extension Services referred to in this research. Tenure was not used to designate professional service in any other organization.


10. 1862 Institution (College or University)--This term refers to land-grant colleges or universities that were established as a result of the first Morrill Act signed into law July 2, 1862.

11. 1890 Institution (College or University)--Refers to those predominantly black land-grant institutions that were established as a result of the second Morrill Act signed into law in 1890.

\textsuperscript{15} J. J. Lancaster, "Extension Program Building", Syllabus for AET 707, Program Building in Extension (Athens), The University of Georgia, 1972, p. 3. (typewritten)
Methodology

Population and Sample

This study was concerned with the projected future role of Cooperative Extension Service in relation to programs and clientele in states containing 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions as viewed by county extension agents, state specialists and administrators.

Tuckman defines the population (or target population) used in a questionnaire or interview study as that group about which the researcher is interested in gaining information and drawing conclusions. Tuckman also states that the term defining the population refers to the establishment of boundary conditions which specify who shall be included or excluded from the population.16

According to Tuckman, randomness is the key to overcoming selection bias in sampling. Stratification adds precision in insuring that the sample contains the same proportional distribution of respondents on selected parameters as the population. Hence, a stratified random sample is one obtained by separating the population elements into non-overlapping groups, called strata, and then selecting a random sample from each stratum.17

Stratified random sampling was thought to be the best method in obtaining the sample size for this study. County extension agents and state specialists in each state formed the stratum.


17 Ibid., p. 204.
Personal contact was made with each dean, director or vice-president of extension in each of the 16 specified states. Permission and letters of endorsement (See Appendix B) were received from 15 of the 16 state leaders. South Carolina was the only state that did not respond at all to the correspondence.

The list of individuals in the population was obtained from the dean, director or vice-president of the Cooperative Extension Service in the 15 states where permission was granted. The target population of this study was county extension agents, state specialists and administrators from the 15 states that contain both 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions (as shown in the map of the United States in Figure 1) at the time of this study. A stratified random sample of county extension agents, specialists and a census of administrators comprised the sample.

Therefore, the sample population was comprised of 205 county extension agents, 185 state specialists and 96 or a census of extension administrators within the 15 states. A proportional allocation was used to determine the proportionate number of respondents in each stratum of county extension agents and state specialists. A census of administrators was used.

Table 1 shows the population and sample size and number of county extension agents and state specialists in each stratum along with a census of administrators in the 15 states participating in this study.

The agent sample and the specialists sample were randomly sub-divided into two sub-groups each--one to gather information pertinent to the present role and the second to gather information pertinent to the future role of the Cooperative Extension Service in the 15 where permission was granted, that contain both 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities.
The sample of agents and specialists were sub-divided for the two following reasons:

1. To eliminate the high degree of correlation exhibited when asking the same group to respond to "what is" and "what should be."

2. To cut down on the overall length of the questionnaire and the time required to complete it.

Design

Before much progress can be made in solving problems, men must possess descriptions of the phenomena with which they work.\(^2\) In view of the situation described in citing the purpose of this study, descriptive research is in order.

Also, ex post facto research may be defined as systematic empirical inquiry in which the scientist (researcher) does not have direct control of independent variables because their manifestations have already occurred or because they are inherently not manipulable. Inferences about relations among variables are made, without direct intervention, from concomitant variation of independent and dependent variables.\(^2\)


### TABLE 1

POPULATION AND SAMPLE SIZE OF COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS, STATE SPECIALISTS, AND ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Extension Agents Per State (#)</th>
<th>County Extension Agents N² = 5,424</th>
<th>State Specialists Per State (#)</th>
<th>State Specialists N² = 1,741</th>
<th>Administrators N = 96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 205 \quad n = 185 \quad n = 96 \]

\[ Z = \text{Population Size} \]

\[ Y_n = \text{Sample Size} \]
Therefore, the design for this study was descriptive survey—ex post facto. The dependent variables were:

1. Extension staff perceptions of the present role of Cooperative Extension Services in those states that contain both 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions.

2. Extension staff perceptions of the projected future role of Cooperative Extension Services as viewed by county extension agents, state specialists, assistant directors and directors.

3. Extension staff perceptions of the percentage of time presently placed in Extension activities conducted in states containing both 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities.

The independent variables in this study were the following characteristics of county extension agents, state specialists, and administrators:

a. Sex

b. Age

c. Background training

d. Tenure in the Extension Service

e. Tenure in present position

f. Area of major responsibility

g. Type of institution graduated

h. Highest academic degree held

Throughout this study the relationship between the perceptions of the future role of the Cooperative Extension Service and each independent variable for all three groups of respondents (county extension agents, state specialists and administrators) were investigated.
Instrumentation and Data Collection

A review of literature proved unsuccessful in locating an instrument that could be used to collect data for this study. However, several instruments had been developed to conduct somewhat similar studies on a much smaller basis. One guide that was used and modified extensively in the development of a suitable instrument was that of the joint USDA-NAULGC Study Committee on Cooperative Extension Service, A People and a Spirit.22

Tuckman reports that questionnaires and interviews are used by researchers to convert into data the information directly given by a person (subject). By providing access to what is "inside a person's head," these approaches make it possible to measure what a person knows (knowledge or information), what a person likes and dislikes (values and preferences), and what a person thinks (attitudes and beliefs). Questionnaires and interviews can also be used to discover what experiences have taken place (biography) and what is occurring at the present.23

The mail questionnaire was determined to be the most reasonable means of collecting data from county extension agents, state specialists, and administrators to fulfill the objectives of this study. Five distinct questionnaires were devised to collect data in accordance to the objectives set forth. Each questionnaire consisted of the same questions with the exception of the one designed for state specialist which asked one additional question. Because specialists sometime hold joint appointments,

22USDA-NASULGC Extension Study Committee, A People and a Spirit, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, November 1968.

23Tuckman, p. 173.
the added question dealt with the professional time devoted to Extension activities.

Part I of the questionnaire consisted of questions pertaining to personal and demographic data concerning: 1) age; 2) area of work responsibility; 3) background training; 4) kind of institution attended; 5) kind of institution employed; 6) tenure in the Extension Service; 7) sex; 8) tenure in present position; and 9) type of degree held.

In addition, Part I of the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate the percentage of time devoted to the following:

1. Working in Extension program areas
2. Working with selected Extension program audiences
3. Dissemination of Extension program activities through specific methods
4. Contact time devoted to meeting or working with ethnic groups
5. Present projections of working with selected audiences in the future (See Part I, Appendix A).

Part II of the questionnaire was designed to identify and describe the projected role of the Cooperative Extension Service in states that contain both 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions as perceived by county extension agents, state specialists and administrators.

A review of the related literature generated 76 statements related to the following five areas corresponding with the projected role of the Cooperative Extension Service:

1. Characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service
2. Quality of living programs
3. Social and economic development programs
4. Agriculture and related industry programs

5. Selected clientele audiences

During the development of the instrument for this study, one guide that was used extensively was that of the joint USDA-NAULGC Study Committee on the Cooperative Extension Service, *A People and a Spirit*. The instrument was reviewed by faculty members of the researcher's doctoral program at The Ohio State University. Also, seven graduate students with a combination of better than 50 years of prior service in the Cooperative Extension Service served as a jury of experts in finalizing the questionnaire before it was pilot tested.

**Pilot Test**

During the month of November 1978 the researcher mailed 38 questionnaires to county extension agents and specialists in the 15 states previously identified in this study. These persons were extension staff who were not a part of the sample for the study. A total of 29 or 76 percent of the questionnaires were properly completed with one questionnaire not adequately completed. Test results from pilot testing the instrument were subjected to the reliability analysis program Cronbach alpha (a most widely used reliability coefficient), which was designed to test the internal consistency of a questionnaire (scored on a Likert Scale) for scale reliability. Table 2 shows the reliability score for

24 USDA-NAULGC Extension Study Committee, *A People and a Spirit*.  
25 Ibid.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Cronback alpha Test Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of living programs</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and economic development programs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and related industry programs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected clientele audiences</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the five areas corresponding in this study with the projected role of the Cooperative Extension Service. As a result of the analysis, an overall reliability coefficient of .94 was obtained for the five areas of Part II of the questionnaire. Only one item was eliminated from the questionnaire as a result of the pilot test.

Data Collection Procedures

The data obtained for this study were collected by mail questionnaires during March and April of 1979. The research instrument was sent, along with a cover letter (See Appendix A) from the researcher to the dean, director or vice-president of extension for each particular state asking each agent, specialist and administrator's cooperation in recording his/her perceptions as to the projected future role of the Cooperative Extension in the 15 previously identified states. A total of 184 (178 usable) questionnaires were returned by the county extension agents which was 89.7 percent response. One hundred fifty-five or 83.7 percent (152 usable) of the questionnaires were returned by the state specialists and 81 or 84.3 percent (77 usable) of the questionnaires were returned by the extension administrators. An overall total of 420 or 86.4 percent of the questionnaires were returned. Data from 407 completed questionnaires were coded for computer application and computer analysis at the Instructional and Research Computer Center on the campus of The Ohio State University.

Analysis of Data

The data used and analyzed in this study was taken from 407 questionnaires returned to the researcher by the respondents. Responses to the questions in Part II of the questionnaire were recorded by using three
seven-point scales. For those questions pertaining to the "characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service" the following rating scale was used. A value of seven was assigned to "very strongly" agree, six was assigned to "strongly" agree, five was assigned to "agree", four was assigned to "undecided", three was assigned to "disagree", two was assigned to "strongly disagree" and one was assigned to "very strongly disagree". The highest possible score on an item was seven, and the lowest possible score on an item was one. For those questions pertaining to the areas of "quality of living programs", "social and economic development programs" and "agriculture and related industries programs" the following scale was used. A value of seven was assigned "very heavy emphasis", six was assigned "heavy emphasis", five was assigned "moderate emphasis", four was assigned "undecided", three was assigned "little emphasis", two was assigned "very little emphasis" and one was assigned "no emphasis". The highest possible score on these three groups of items was seven and the lowest possible score on an item was one. For those questions pertaining to the area of "selected clientele audiences" the following rating scale was used. The value of seven was assigned "very heavy emphasis", six was assigned "heavy emphasis", five was assigned "moderate emphasis", four was assigned "undecided", three was assigned "keep the same", two was assigned "little emphasis" and one was assigned "not at all important". The highest possible score on an item was seven and the lowest possible score on an item was one.

The analysis of the data in this study was made in relationship to the specific objectives of the study. The data were analyzed using measures of central tendencies, frequencies, measures of association and
measures of variations.

Mean weighted scores and rank orders were calculated for each projection item and for each of the five areas corresponding with the projected role of the Cooperative Extension Service.

The Kruskall-Wallis Test which is an alternative non-parametric test for one way analysis of variance for two or more groups was used to test the differences between the respondents perceived projected role of the Cooperative Extension Service in each of the five areas corresponding to the role with their sex, age, background training, area of work responsibility, kind of institution graduated and highest degree held.

The dependent variable was considered to be ordinal, therefore Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient and Kendall Coefficient of Concordance were used to determine the degree of relationship between the three groups of respondents.

An alpha level of .05 was set to test the significance of associations. The measurement scale for each independent variable in this study was considered to be ordinal.

Overall the Kruskall-Wallis Test; the Mann-Whitney U Test; SPSS (the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) and the subprogram for Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient and Kendall Coefficient of Concordance were used in the analysis of data in this study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present research and literature related to the topic under investigation. The investigator found a dearth of studies pertaining to the future role of the Cooperative Extension Service. However, the review did produce studies, publications, conference proceedings, and other research which was related in varying degrees to this researcher's endeavor.

The investigator utilized the Dialog Search at The Ohio State University, an on-line computer search of Comprehensive Dissertation Abstracts, which is a definitive subject, title, and author guide to virtually every American dissertation accepted at an accredited institution since 1861, when academic doctoral degrees were first granted in the United States.

The author strongly feels that in order to establish a projected future role of Cooperative Extension Services in relation to program emphasis in those states that contain both 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions, one needs to look briefly at its development. Therefore, this review is organized into the following subtopics.

1. Legislation creating the land-grant college complex.
2. Review of the past role of the Cooperative Extension Service as an organization.

Legislation Creating the Land-Grant College Complex

The role of an organization as subtle and complex as Extension is difficult to discuss. Extension is many different things to different people at different times. One of the most common ways of looking at the role of an organization, especially a public organization, is to examine the legislative basis for the agency. 27

Therefore, fundamental to understanding the land-grant university complex is a knowledge of the legislation initially creating such a complex. All land-grant institutions have three primary functions to perform namely, resident instruction, research, and extension (public service). 28

The major legislation creating the land-grant complex as it exists today is summarized below under the three functions of teaching, research and extension.

Education

The Morrill Act: Act of July 2, 1862 which provided for the original grant of land to the various states for the endowment, support and maintenance of agriculture and mechanical arts, and established the formulas


for appropriations. Public lands were granted to the states in a quantity equal to 30,000 acres for each senator and representative in Congress, determined under the census of 1860. There were restrictions placed on states' management of that land in order to ensure that the entire proceeds from the land-grants would be applied, without any diminution whatever to the purposes of the Act. In this regard, the state was to replace any of the capital of the fund should it be diminished or lost. The Act was amended in 1866 to allow for extension of time for states to comply with the provisions of the Morrill Act by either establishing new colleges with the donation of public lands, or to grant such benefits to existing colleges, and to clarify that when new states were admitted to the Union they would be entitled to the benefits of the Morrill Act by expressing their acceptance within three years from their date of admission into the Union.29

The Second Morrill Act: Act of August 30, 1890 with the stated purpose of providing future for the endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanical arts. The Act increased the appropriations to endow and support colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts, with the specific proviso:

That no money shall be paid out under this Act to any State or Territory for the support and maintenance of a college where a distinction of race or color is made in the admission of students shall be held to be a compliance with the provisions of this Act if the funds received in such State or Territory be equitably divided as hereinafter set forth.

That any State in which there has been one college established in pursuance of the Act of July 2, 1862 (first Morrill Act), and also in which an educational institution of like character has been established, and is now aided by such State from its own revenues, for the education of colored students in agriculture and mechanic arts, however named or styled, or whether or not it has received money heretofore under the act to which this act is an amendment, the legislature of such State may propose and report to the Secretary of the Interior a just and equitable division of the fund to be received under this act, between one college for white students and one institution for colored students, established as aforesaid, which shall be divided into two parts and paid accordingly, and thereupon such institution for colored students shall be entitled to the benefits of this act and subject to its provisions, as much as it would have been if it had been included under the act of 1862, and the fulfillment of the foregoing provisions shall be taken as a compliance with the provision in reference to separate colleges for white and colored students.\textsuperscript{30}

In response to the second Morrill Act, 12 states established land-grant institutions that came to be known as Colleges of 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Institutions. Four states had organized such institutions prior to the 1890 Act.\textsuperscript{31}

The Black land-grant colleges were governed by the same administration procedures as the 1862 colleges. The expressed creation of separate colleges for White and Black students has never been amended by Congress, although no such designations are adhered to today.

The Nelson Amendment: Amendment of March 4, 1907 granted a further appropriation for the endowment and maintenance of land-grant colleges with the proviso that a portion of this money could be spent in providing courses for the special preparation of instructor for teaching the

\textsuperscript{30}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{31}Benjamin W. Harris, p. 18
elements of agriculture and the mechanic arts.

The Purnell Act of 1925 authorized the more complete endowment of the agricultural experiment stations, and stated, "funds . . . shall be applied to . . . such economic and sociological investigations as have for their purpose the development and improvement of the rural home and rural life . . . ."

The Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935 (subsequently amended June, 1952 and July 14, 1960) provided additional funds for basic research into the laws and principles relating to agriculture, the further development of Cooperative Extension work and the more complete endowment and support of the land-grant colleges. In writing up the Act in 1950, USDA issued a monograph, which stated:

The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act may be said to have had its origin in a national tradition. That tradition is a brief in the economic and social values of owner operated family farms. To such farms in no small measure the great middle class in American society owes its origin. Upon such farms in no small measure the middle class must depend for continued influence in shaping the destinies of our democracy.

Among the founding fathers Thomas Jefferson was an outstanding exponent of The Virtues of Family Farms. He was expressing the prevailing views of his time when he said "the small land holders are the most precious part of a state."

A resolution adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation at its annual meeting in Chicago in December, 1935 contained the following statement: "We recognize the tremendous importance of home ownership in agriculture . . . ."  

The National Grange in 1943 stated, "The best interests of our Nation will be served if a higher percent of our farmers are owner operated."

In a report dated October 1944 a Committee of The Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities said: "The family type farm should remain the basis on which American Agriculture typically is organized."

---

32Hightower, p. 245.
Research

The Hatch Act 1887 authorized federal grant funds for direct payment to each state that would establish an agricultural experiment station in connection with the land-grant college established under the provisions of the First Morrill Act. Section two of the Hatch Act states the purpose of the Federal-Grant Research Program as follows:

It is the policy of Congress to promote the efficient production, marketing, distribution and utilization of farm products as essential to the health and welfare of our people. . . . It shall be the object and duty of the State agricultural experiment stations through the expenditure of the appropriations hereinafter authorized to conduct original and other researchers, investigation and experiments bearing directly on and contributing to the establishment and maintenance of a permanent and effective agriculture industry of the United States, including researches basic to the problems of agriculture in its broadest aspects, and such investigations as have for their purpose the development and improvement of the rural home and rural life and the maximum contribution by agriculture to the welfare of the consumer.33

With the passage of the Hatch Act and the act raising the Department of Agriculture to cabinet level, the organized system of agricultural research in the United States was put on a permanent and nationwide basis.

What developed was a movement for more funds to fulfill the goal of advanced research and experimentation in agriculture. In many states, so much of the Hatch Act funds were being used for administrative purposes, the preparation and distribution of publications, and the more superficial experiments that was left for thorough research. There were 52 experiment

33Ibid., p. 149.
stations in 1902 when the Adams Act was passed "to be applied only to paying the necessary expenses of conducting original researches or experiments bearing directly on the agricultural industry of the United States. . . ."

The Adams Act funds were always administered separately by the USDA. Each station was required to keep a separate account of Adams Act funds and a financial report of each investigation and problem studied to be made on a form provided by USDA. The work of experiment stations thus proceeded along the basis of explicity well defined projects to strengthen their scientific work with the following policy stated by the Office of Experiment Stations in its report for 1906.

In passing upon these projects the Office has undertaken to determine only their suitability and appropriateness under the terms of the Act. It has left to the individual initiative of the station workers the planning of the investigations and the selection of the topics most important to their localities. The Office has insisted only that the projects as outlined should be such as to characterize them as scientific investigations embracing some original features. . . . Research is worthy of its name only as it is directed to the answering of definite problems by scientific methods of procedure. This will involve a definite plan of operation and thorough consideration of what is known of the subject and its bearing, and should lead to a knowledge of the reasons for the results secured. Again, research presupposes a definite aim and a definite problem to be solved, a specific end to be attained rather than the mere accumulation of data. . . .

The 1955 Amendments further restated the policy of Congress with respect to the experiment stations, as follows (7 U.S.C. 361c):

34Ibid., p. 246.
It is further the policy of Congress to promote the efficient production, marketing, distribution, and utilization of products of the farm as essential to the health and welfare of our peoples and to promote a sound and prosperous agriculture and rural life as indispensable to the maintenance of maximum employment and national prosperity and security. . . . 35

The McIntyre-Stennis Bill passed October 10, 1962 and provided for the funding of forestry research through the land-grant colleges and experiment stations.

Extension

The Smith-Lever Act of May 1914 established the agricultural extension services for "aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information concerning agriculture and home economics, and to encourage application of the same" in connection with the First Morrill Act Colleges. As further defined in section two of the Act:

Cooperative extension work shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agricultural and home economics and subjects relating thereto to persons not attending or resident in said colleges in the several communities, and imparting information said subjects through demonstrations, publications and otherwise . . . and this work shall be carried on in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the State agricultural college or colleges receiving the benefits of the Act.36

Added to the Hatch Act with the 1955 amendments was the following "Special Needs" section, which authorizes up to 10% of the total appropriation for extension work to be allocated over and above the annual appropriation to the "Distadvantaged Agricultural Areas."

---
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Disadvantaged Agricultural Areas
Congressional Findings

(a) The Congress finds that there exist special circumstances in certain agricultural areas which causes such areas to be at a disadvantage insofar as agricultural development is concerned, which circumstances include the following: (1) There is concentration of farm families on farms either too small or too unproductive or both; (2) such farm operators because of limited productivity are unable to make adjustments and investments required to establish profitable operations; (3) the productive capacity of the existing farm unit does not permit profitable employment of available labor; (4) because of limited resources, many of these farm families are not able to make full use of current extension programs designed for families operating economic units nor are extension facilities adequate to provide the assistance needed to produce desirable results.37

(b) In determining that the area has such special need, the Secretary shall find that it has a substantial number of disadvantaged farms or farm families for one or more of the reasons heretofore enumerated. The Secretary shall make provisions for the assistance to be extended to include one or more of the following: (1) intensive on-the-farm educational assistance to the farm family in appraising and resolving its problems; (2) assistance and counselling to local groups in appraising resources for capability of improvements in agriculture or introduction of industry designed to supplement farm income; (3) cooperation with other agencies and groups in furnishing all possible information as to existing employment opportunities, particularly to farm families having under-employed workers; and (4) in cases where the farm family, after analysis of its opportunities and existing resources, finds it advisable to seek a new farm venture, the providing of information, advise and counsel in connection with making such

37Ibid., p. 247.
changes.\textsuperscript{38}

No funds have ever been allocated under this section. State extension directors are the only ones authorized to submit projects under this section and USDA has not revealed whether any plans have ever been submitted.\textsuperscript{39}

\textbf{Review of the Past Role of the Cooperative Extension Service as an Organization}

Extension work grew out of a situation. It has come to be an educational system designed to meet the needs of people. What was the situation which gave rise to this unique American development? It was a period of pioneering and change in agriculture and homemaking.\textsuperscript{40}

Many years before the passage of the Morrill Act and the Smith-Lever Act, many societies and institutions were organized for the purpose of acquainting people with what was being done to improve agriculture and to disseminate agricultural information.\textsuperscript{41} The majority of the U.S. population in the nineteenth century was engaged in agriculture and agricultural information during this period definitely was a need.

In 1862, when the Civil War emphasized the need for greater efficiency in agricultural production, the Land-Grant College Act introduced by Morrill was signed into law. Also in 1862, Congress created the

\begin{itemize}
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\item \textsuperscript{40}L. D. Kelsey and C. C. Hearne, Cooperative Extension Work (Ithaca, New York: Comstock Company, 1949), p. 3.
\item \textsuperscript{41}Eddy, p. 12.
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United States Department of Agriculture, whose function was to gain useful information about agricultural subjects and relay this knowledge throughout the land.

A brief analysis of the Cooperative Extension era from 1914 to 1945 has been described by Brunner and Yang as four phases: 1) World War I; 2) industrial prosperity and agrarian discontent and depression, the 1920's; 3) the "Great Depression" or dismal thirties; and 4) World War II. Since that time only the Guide Report and the joint USDA-NASULGC Extension Study Committee's report A People and a Spirit have given any direction as to future eras.

Hazlitt provides an additional account of Cooperative Extension during what he sees as three distinct periods. During the first period the most important problem was that of food production. All other lines of endeavor were secondary to this. Many war effort projects were also undertaken and Extension's prestige was greatly enhanced by the manner in which the employers performed their functions.

The second period was the agricultural depression of the twenties. During the war when high prices prevailed many farmers went deeply into debt for the equipment and land. Many farmers faced bankruptcy and foreclosure. Government agencies used Extension agents to carry out recommendations. Emphasis was placed on efficient production rather than on

---
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production alone. The demonstration method was revived, more attention was placed on community programs and the development of local leaders.

During the 30's, Extension in addition to working on efficiency of agricultural production worked as organizers and with organizations. It conducted educational phases of the AAA and helped organize soil conservation associations and districts. Extension personnel also worked closely with Rural Rehabilitation Programs and had discussion groups in public affairs.\(^45\)

Extension during World War II reverted to its similar role of World War I, except with greater emphasis, and continued its role with organizations. Over the same period, Miller states that it is his contention "Extension work emerged through two dominant chapters; the first was the chapter of itinerant agricultural philosophy and demonstration. The second found its focus in the 30's as the chapter on organizational custodianship. The current debate is shaping what the third chapter will become.\(^46\) What that third chapter was or is has yet to be documented.

According to Freeh:

> We have built an outstanding Extension organization in America in less than 70 years-- and all in Extension can be proud. But, it's only a passing moment in terms of the future. None of us afford to rest on past accomplishments. In the years ahead, we'll need to do even better than we have in the past or we stand the risk of losing all.

---


Each past success, and each facet of our current support, needs to be used to build an even better organization and more effective and responsive Extension educational programs in the years ahead. 47

Hazlitt in his "Study Indicating the Future Direction of the Cooperative Extension Service in Order to Meet the Problems and Needs of the People" postulated that in the opinion of others with regard to the future role of the Cooperative Extension Service it might be described in three categories, recognizing some overlapping of each. These are:

1) continuing as at present with emphasis on specialty action and technical proficiency; 2) continuing much as at present, but broadening the scope of responsibilities; and 3) complete change of present policies in regard to being mainly agricultural service workers to one of liberal adult education. 48 These categories correspond somewhat with those prescribed by Warren Rovetch in Table 2 (see page 43).

Hazlitt also noted that from a limited number of personal contacts he had with other agents and specialists, that a considerable number agreed that Extension personnel should continue much as they had in the past, but with increased emphasis on technical efficiency. 49

John Caren stated:

The Extension Service is in danger of becoming client-oriented instead of subjected matter-oriented . . . . There is a tendency to confuse the professional responsibilities of Extension workers with their civic responsibilities. A new hospital or an improved Boy Scout Camp may be monument to the civic mindedness of the


49Ibid., p. 15.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Relation to Other Agencies*</th>
<th>Relation to Cooperative Extension Tradition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Agriculture</td>
<td>Technological services designed for individual farm units, with increasing emphasis on management rather than &quot;demonstration&quot; communication.</td>
<td>Virtually independent</td>
<td>Minor adaptations called for within tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Broad Social-economic Adjustment</td>
<td>Education and services to assist the political process and management of change in society as distinct from change of practice in the individual farm unit.</td>
<td>Coordinate resources and administer in close cooperation with other agencies or on an equal basis.</td>
<td>Sharp departure in several respects from tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Increasing emphasis on education and teaching methods appropriate to content at a college level.</td>
<td>Administrative subsidiary of substantive agencies.</td>
<td>Total departure from tradition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes all divisions and departments of the land-grant institutions, other state institutions of higher education, and all other appropriate agencies and institutions.

---

County Agricultural Agent. But they may also symbolize his neglect of technical agricultural problems within his community.50

Along the same vein of thinking is the following statements that were contributed to a past Dean of Agriculture at the University of California:

In the past Extension has served primarily as an agency of technological service. Historically there are several reasons for this. Primarily, however, it has been because (1) farmers in general have not had extensive formal technical training, and (2) technological service was consistent with the efforts of the teaching and research divisions of the Land-Grant College system.

Now, however, times are changing rapidly. Each year sees a higher and higher percentage of farm operators who are graduates of land-grant institutions and who are becoming Extension's foremost clients, the type of information their fathers sought. Today's farmers are seeking problem solving assistance. They already have general information or can get it from farm magazines and technical publications.

Extension must, therefore, prepare itself to meet the increasing specialization in order to deal with the complex problems which lie ahead.51

Another alternative of the time was that of continuing the Extension program much as it was, but broadening the scope of responsibility.

J. L. Matthews in describing the Scope Report stated:

The principle of first responsibilities is recognized in the report, but attention is called to the broader audience being served that includes these general groups: Farm families; non-farm rural residents; urban residents; farm, commodity and related organizations which provide farm people with essential


services and supplies such as credit, fertilizer, feed and many others.52

Statements such as Matthews are echoed further by the document of A People and a Spirit:

Cooperative Extension has a legitimate role of helping people solve problems, wherever they may live--on farms, in the village, in the open country, in the central city or in the suburb.53

Matthews further stated:

... the Cooperative Extension Services, as a national educational system, must reappraise it's programs and move into some of the program areas that generally have had less attention than the traditional subject matter programs.54

A former president of the American Farm Bureau, Allan Kline said:

Extension people will need as much or more competence in the technical fields and in addition will need to increase competence in liberal education.55

Kline also stated that "if you are competent only in a technical field, you make a good living, but a poor citizen."56

For the last two decades several agricultural and educational leaders have expressed the need for change in the Extension Service or at least to have Extension take a good look at itself. Perhaps statements
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that typify this point more than a decade and a half ago are the following made by a Michigan State University President, Dr. John Hannah:

Traditionally, the agricultural colleges and Cooperative Extension Service have been well thought of by farm people. Agricultural colleges have been told over and over again of the great contribution that they have made to the increased efficiency of agriculture and that this has played a significant role in making possible the development of our nation.

The increasing efficiency of agriculture in the past 100 years that has shifted from a situation where approximately 85 percent of all has released the energies of approximately three quarters of all of our people to make possible the building of the communication systems, the industries, the television sets, the dish washers, and all of the other components of our higher standard of living.

It has been good to be given credit for the valuable role contributed by our agricultural colleges.

But in another sense it has been a bad influence because it has encouraged a situation where the people in our colleges of agriculture have been inclined to accept the plaudits and have been less vigorous than they might have been in seeking this increasing number of people formerly engaged in agriculture pursuits who are now working elsewhere.

It is my feeling that those of us who are a part of the Cooperative Extension Service and staff members of College of Agriculture had better take a hard look at the appropriate role for Colleges of Agriculture and for Cooperative Extension Services, and this is particularly true in areas of the country where the people in agriculture are in the minority.

We have a continuing obligation to render effective service to agriculture, but we also have an obligation to serve all people who need service and who want it.57

57 James R. Hazlitt, Correspondence from John A. Hannah, President, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, August 29, 1960.
While change was indicated in the previous statements, there seemed to have been little ultraism noted except perhaps by those who advocated no change at all.

To move into the third alternative where considerable change to policies was deemed advisable is to move into the field of liberal adult education.

Blakely pointed out that "Whatever interests free citizens in a free society are subject matter for adult education."\(^{58}\)

Wilbur Hallenbeck presented another thought when he wrote:

> The job of adult education is to help people to understand the basis of order and security in a world of rapid change and to build their goals realistically in fitting terms; and to help people understand problems and to reach their goals under current circumstances.\(^{59}\)

Statements such as these are related very close to the problem solving process type of education which Extension employees have advocated over the years in their particular program area.

Another way of expressing the definition of adult education as it relates to Cooperative Extension is in the form of community development as a means of educating people in a community. McClusky indicated that:

> ... community development is essentially a direct method of teaching. Instead of standing on the sidelines and assuming that instruction done out of context will somehow automatically lead to a productive attack on local problems; community development helps the learner make the connection between

---


his learning and its application directly and without
the interference of intervening factors. It may deal
with concrete data or concepts and at times be highly
intellectual, but in any case, relevance is the chief
characteristic of its approval.60

After reviewing the statements of these people on adult education,
it appears they fairly well followed an area outlined in the Scope
Report as to one of Extension's problem areas—community improvement.
Hutchinson, a former director in Texas wrote:

Extension's principal objective in community improve­
ment work is development of the ability of the people
through their own initiative to identify and solve
problems affecting their welfare. Community improve­
ment programs offer the means for tying together, at
the point of execution, the contributive portions of
the other eight areas of Extension program emphasis
outlined in the Scope Report.61

These were a few of the opinions of various leaders throughout the
country concerning the role of Extension as an educational organization.
Others were reviewed, however, in an article by McCormick entitled
"What Should County Agents Know?" he concluded:

Agents feel that they are and should be educators or
teachers. This concept implies that a county agent
must go beyond giving recommendations for fertilizer,
increasing milk production, controlling weeds, or
seeding a lawn. He must create an educational atmos­
phere in which his clientele will understand the
principles involved in agricultural production, mar­
keting, family living, conservation and land use,
youth development and public affairs. He must equip
the people he serves so they can make adequate

60 Howard Y. McClusky, "Community Development," Handbook of Adult
Education in the United States, ed. Malcolm S. Knowles (Chicago: Adult

61 John E. Hutchinson, "A Responsibility and Challenge," Extension
decisions as they face changing life situations.  

**Groups Defining the Role of the Cooperative Extension Service**

Several groups have been studied with regard to their definition of Cooperative Extension's educational role. Biever, investigating members of local Extension advisory boards in Wisconsin, found that these board members primarily saw Extension's role as agriculturally oriented and specifically related to "providing information on specific farm practices" and "teaching principles of farming and homemaking." Functions associated with providing information and leadership for community services and with analysis and management of the "total" farm and home were considered less important by these respondents. In a somewhat similar study, Utz concluded from his investigation of Executive Committee members in Kentucky that the "Executive Committee members placed more emphasis on objectives associated with traditional programs (those with an agricultural orientation) than those associated with broad base programs."  

Another group of clientele--commercial cotton growers, were investigated by Lawson. He found that this group defined Extension's major function to be one of providing farmers with specific answers to problems

---

they encounter.65

From her study of North Carolina county governing bodies, White found that county commissioners viewed Extension as an agricultural agency and felt that primary emphasis should be in helping farmers achieve "efficiency in agricultural production." Assistance to nonfarm clientele groups was given relatively low priority by these officials.66

The concepts which different participants in Extension have of the responsibilities of the Cooperative Extension Service was explored in a study by Blalock entitled "A Study of What Legislators Think of Extension." He interviewed 145 of the 170 members of the State General Assembly of North Carolina. The legislators viewed the Extension Service as primarily an educational agency, conducting programs in agriculture and homemaking; they had in mind an "action-oriented, problem solving type of educational program directed primarily at rural people."67

Blalock presented comparisons of the rank order attached to different phases of Extension listed in the Scope Report. The listings by County Extension staff ranked the different areas of work according to the time spent on each during the previous two years (1959-61); the legislators' listings ranked each program area in order to importance. The agreement between the two rankings was low. For example, legislators ranked

---


programs in marketing, efficiency of agricultural production, and conservation of natural resources as the first three priorities, whereas, the Extension personnel ranked 4-H and Youth development, efficiency of agricultural production and family living as the three first priorities.68

Bralock also compared the ranking given by legislators in North Carolina with the rankings given by Extension administrators in relation to particular clientele or audience groups of Extension. There were important differences—legislators put much more emphases on subsistence and part-time farmers, and less on large commercial firms and businesses supply farmers. Within the legislators' groups, those who had a high degree of knowledge of Extension tended to rank businesses supplying farmers much higher than did other legislators and to support agricultural readjustment programs more.69

Bralock concluded his study by stressing the need for more effort to inform legislators of Extension's organizational structure and financing, the need to broaden the scope of Extension, and the need for more effective means of communicating with the legislators. 70

As to exactly how groups define the role of the Extension Service, Ferrell in his 1971 study of "The Educational Role of the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service as Defined by State and County Extension Workers," found that the education of the individual is related to the manner in which the individual defines the educational role of the

68Ibid., p. 34.
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Cooperative Extension Service. More specifically the findings indicated that the extent of study within the social and behavioral sciences is associated with how the role is defined.71

Those respondents who had little or no education in the social or behavioral sciences tended to define Extension's role in "traditional" terms. This suggests that Extension workers whose undergraduate and graduate programs of study were based heavily in technological subject matter with little or no training in the social sciences are likely to feel that Extension should limit its educational role to agricultural subjects and clientele. Conversely, those Extension workers who have supplemented their technical training with a relatively high degree of study in the social and behavioral sciences will tend to view Extension as a "general adult education" agency with a responsibility for broad-based educational programs designed to serve all segments of society.72

Ferrell's findings also suggested some relationship between job assignment and the area of responsibility of County Extension agents and the way in which these agents defined Extension's educational role. The agricultural County Extension respondents felt that Extension's educational role should be restricted to agriculture and related areas. However, Extension agent respondents with responsibilities in home economics, community and resource development, and 4-H and youth programs felt that Extension had broader educational responsibilities. "Nonagricultural"
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agents tended to see Extension as a "general adult education" organization with a role responsibility to diverse audiences on a multiplicity of topics.\textsuperscript{73}

In "An Objective Evaluation of the Present and Potential Structure and Functions of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service," Fishel, Collings and Wilhelmy reported that:

\begin{quote}
Extension has a single function to perform--education for action, supported by facts derived from research, and directed at specific needs and problems. In general, it is the philosophy of the Cooperative Extension Service to develop an educational program in agriculture and home economics that contributes to the general welfare of urban and rural people in Ohio.\textsuperscript{74}
\end{quote}

Audiences and clientele have long been the concern of agents and other administrators of the Cooperative Extension Service with respect to felt needs, program development and the overall role of the Cooperative Extension Service.

Collings wrote:

\begin{quote}
In recent years, Extension has sought to find its most appropriate role in a vastly changing environment. The once recognized distinction between rural and urban populations has faded. Problems of each group are becoming so interwoven that a program designed solely for either sector of society becomes unrealistic.\textsuperscript{75}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{73}Ibid., p. 94-95.
\textsuperscript{74}W. L. Fishel, G. W. Collings and O. Wilhelmy, Jr., "An Objective Evaluation of Present and Potential Structure and Functions of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service," Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, Ohio, 1964.
Extension Workers' Concepts of the Role of the Cooperative Extension Service

The Cooperative Extension Service grew out of the authorization outlined in 1914 by the Smith-Lever Act. The broad purpose of the Cooperative Extension Service was designated as follows:

... to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same ... 76

Harris wrote, this legal mandate identified the fact that the Cooperative Extension Service does not have the total responsibility for educating society. Rather, Extension's function is "to aid" other institutions and organizations in the task of educating people. The idea of aiding and thus coordinating and cooperating gives rise to the basic concept included in the word Cooperative in Cooperative Extension Service. The Cooperative Extension Service is "cooperative" in funding as well as in programming. 77

Harris further writes, the Smith-Lever Act also very clearly identified Extension's function as education—education of an informal and distinct type, education lifted out of the abstract and stripped of its formalities. It is education directed to helping people take advantage of opportunities and solve their problems of living and making a living. 78

In performing its function of education, Extension is basically concerned with using its resources in helping people in the problem-solving or decision-making process. It features the objective presentation

---
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and analysis of factual information for decision-making by the people themselves. Extension joins with people in helping them identify and understand their problems and use new technology or information in solving them.79

In the 1959 Guide Report,80 nine task forces of Extension administration and specialists from the different states and USDA set out in more detail the areas of responsibility of the Cooperative Extension Service that had been defined in the 1958 Scope Report.81 These areas so discussed in the Scope Report were:

--Efficiency in agricultural production
--Marketing, distribution and utilization of farm products
--Conservation, wise use, and development of natural resources
--Management on the farm and in the home
--Family living
--Youth development
--Leadership development
--Community improvement and resource development
--Public affairs


worked together to define the scope and purposes of Extension, and to identify the attitudes that underly these services. This review arose partly as a defensive measure by the Cooperative Extension Service, in light of the changing relative importance of rural industries in the economy. There had been a rapid expansion of other agencies of the federal government that infringed on educational programs, especially the Soil Conservation Service, and the Vocational Agricultural programs conducted through the high schools. But there was also within the Cooperative Extension Service a sense of responsibility to reappraise goals, and especially to identify the role of information adult education and content and purpose of Extension programs.82

Mosher in his search for the essence of Extension, as it has developed in the United States concluded that Extension is an out of school educational process: 1) working with rural people along those lines of their current interests and need which are closely related to gaining a livelihood, improving the physical level of living, and fostering community welfare; 2) utilizing particular teaching technique . . . (this) heading includes farm and home visits; method demonstrations, result demonstrations; local participation in program planning, tours, meetings, exhibits, . . . 3) conducted with the aid of certain supporting activities . . . (including) provision of subject matter specialists, formation of work plans, preparation of a calendar of events, planning for in-service training, planning for evaluation, . . . 4) carried on within a distinctive spirit

---

of cooperation and mutual respect.  

Thus, in the mid 1950's the roles of Extension were identified as part of a public purpose based on adjustment to and a contribution to the changes that economic growth imply for the rural sector. With an eye on the relative incomes earned by rural people compared with urban, one of the purposes of Extension is to find ways by which people can adapt themselves and farm resources to change. In the words of the Guide Report "Extension has a single function to perform education for action supported by facts derived from research, and directed at specific needs and problems."  

Griffith, in an important review of "The Cooperative Extension Service in Today's Setting," concluded that yet again the "Land-Grant Colleges and Universities are confronted with a compelling need to define the purpose of all their Extension activity. The leaders of the Cooperative Extension Service have a great deal at stake in this re-definition of roles."  

According to Lippitt, the importance of clearly specified goals and objectives is as follows:  

The functioning of an organization is often strongly affected by the nature of its . . . goals and the extent to which those goals are understood and accepted by all members of the system. Vague or
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mixed goals tend to produce apathy and internal competitiveness; clear accepted goals tend to produce greater commitment and interdependence.\textsuperscript{86}

This points to the importance of developing a system with clear roles and objectives to which all persons in the organization feel committed, thereby enhancing motivation.

By achieving and retaining clarity of roles among all members of an organization, i.e., establishing congruence as to the role or mission of an organization is sometimes complicated. Organizations and the roles that guide them are compelled to change. Lippitt explained:

\begin{quote}
In the nineteen-seventies, there will be an increasing stress placed on organizations to be both viable and relevant to the society of which they are a part. This will demand that more and more organizations confronted their present stage of existence and develop further . . . to contribute more effectively to the larger society.\textsuperscript{87}
\end{quote}

Directing attention to the combined significance of the concept of roles and the concept of change, Katz and Kahn stated:

\begin{quote}
Organizations faced with the problem of adjusting to environmental change without losing their basic character and distinctive contributions and capabilities. On the one hand, if objectives around which the structure has been built are adhered to strictly in spite of environmental change, there may be losses in input or even threats of survival. On the other hand, if goals are modified over time, there is the risk of eventual defeat in carrying out the original mission of the organization. Decisions to comprise the principles upon which the organization is based may cause it to lose its distinctive character, its members, and its clientele. . . .
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{87}Ibid., p. 24
On the other hand, in a dynamic world an organization cannot maintain its goals in pristine purity without the risk of becoming ineffective or even distinct. 88

Wilkening in a Wisconsin study concerning perceptions of role definitions as viewed by agricultural agents, home economics agents, and 4-H agents revealed a lack of consensus as to functions that should receive major emphasis in Extension programs. The respondents were asked to rank the following broad functions according to the emphasis they felt each should receive.

1. Providing information on specific farm and home practices.
2. Teaching underlying principles of farming and homemaking.
3. Consulting in the analysis and management of the total farm and home enterprise.
4. Providing information and leadership for community services and activities (recreation, health, safety, art).

Respondents also were asked to rank these four functions according to emphasis given the function during the past year, as well as according to what they believed the farm people wanted. In both instances "providing information on specific farm and home practices" ranked highest. 89

Utz's study of Kentucky Extension agents revealed that only 20 percent of these agents perceived Extension's primary clientele as "farm families and farm organizations." Another 20 percent would restrict program content to agriculture alone. The majority (58 percent) felt that Extension's

---


primary audience is "farm families, organizations and related groups."

"A Study of the Relative Importance of Selected Content and Clientele of Cooperative Extension Service Programs as Reflected by County Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties in Florida" by Kelley investigated programs and audiences. The major objectives were to: 1) identify selected personal and social characteristics of the county commissioners; 2) determine the commissioner's perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program's content; and 3) determine the commissioner's perception of the relative importance of selected Extension program's clientele.

The conclusions drawn from this study were favorable to the Cooperative Extension Service. The study suggested the following implications for the Extension Service: 1) Extension administrators, supervisors and county personnel should seriously consider the personal and social differences of rural and urban county commissioners in their working relationship; 2) the Extension Service needs to take positive steps to familiarize more county commissioners with, and involve them in Extension educational programs and activities; 3) the Extension Service should continue to plan and implement sound educational programs in agriculture; 4) the Extension Service should provide 4-H (youth work) in broad areas of interest for young people in contrast to the traditional agricultural and home economics areas only; and 5) Extension administrators, supervisors, and agents should re-evaluate the amount of time and effort

90Utz, p. 175.

expanded in certain areas of program content and clientele in view of the lower priority assigned to these areas by rural and urban commissioners. 92

Studies such as these indicated the lack of consensus among Extension Workers as to how and to whom the organization's educational efforts and resources should be directed.

With such variation in organizational role definition, George examined the attitudes of male North Carolina County Extension Agents toward Extension's educational role. Based on the responses to a series of items, George arrived at a role definition score on each respondent. These role definitions ranged from a narrow (agriculturally oriented) to broad (general adult education) definitions. In an attempt to explain why the agents defined Extension's role as they did, George found that the role definitions were influenced by the individual's level of education. More specifically, agricultural technology graduates tended to view Extension as merely an agricultural agency, while individuals whose education included a reasonable amount of training in the social sciences view Extension's role in broader terms. 93

Ferrell in his investigation of "The Educational Role of the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service as defined by state and county Extension workers followed a similar procedure for discovering role definition scores on the respondents and also investigated education as an independent variable. However, several additional dimensions were included:

92Ibid.

1. Female and male Extension workers
2. Agents in all areas of county work
3. State-level and county-level Extension workers

In an effort to contribute to the explanation of "why" the variations in role definitions exist, other independent variables were studied in addition to education. These include:

1. A humanistic-technological orientation
2. State versus county-level position
3. County-level job assignment and area of responsibility
4. Population of county served
5. Sex
6. Age\textsuperscript{94}

The population studied consisted of 185 Maryland Extension workers—administrators, supervisors, specialists, and county Extension agents.

The definition of the educational mission (role) of the organization was conceptualized as being along a continuum with one pole described as "traditional" and the opposite pole as "emerging." At the "traditional" pole were those individuals who regarded Extension as an "agricultural agency"; they tended to believe that Extension's educational programs should emphasize, if not be restricted to, agricultural and home economics subjects, and that the clientele of the organization should be restricted to farm and rural nonfarm clientele. All the "emerging" pole, were those who viewed Extension as a "general adult education agency"; they viewed Extension as having diverse educational programs including such areas

\textsuperscript{94}Ferrell, p. 27.
as public affairs, cultural and aesthetic arts, community resource
development, environmental education, and quality of living education,
in addition to programs in agricultural technology.\textsuperscript{95}

The forgoing legislation, review of past roles, definitions and
concepts not with standing Frandson\textsuperscript{96} suggested that Extension cannot
be expected to fulfill its mission without encountering difficulties,
both internally and externally. Some of the most visible obstacles
currently facing were:

1. 'Eroding of financial support'
2. 'Eroding of political force'
3. Difficulty in assessing precisely the nature of Extension's
   future audience
4. Fear of programming in areas of great controversy and fear
   of involving dissident elements in program planning

\textit{Summary of Related Literature}

The survey of related research identified in this chapter provides
background to the investigation of the projected role of the Cooperative
Extension Service in relation to program and delivery methods in states
containing both 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions. The findings of
these studies provide some provocative leads that offer clues to possible
relationships and projections.

\textsuperscript{95} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{96} P. Frandson, A Concensus of the Obstacles and Opportunities for
University Extension. NUEA Spectator 36(5), 1972, p. 11-16.
The study report of the Joint USDA-NASULGC *A People and a Spirit*\(^{97}\) provide a guide for the areas of investigation along with evidence toward directions for this study. This document provided much insight into how the Cooperative Extension Service might function in the 1970's as well as lending some support to it's characteristics and program areas.

A thorough review of the research, related to this investigation did uncover one interesting point that should be noted. Several pieces of literature cited in this review, although dated, do provide a benchmark for what seems to be a thrust of writings and documentations that follow ten year intervals. To this point *A People and a Spirit* has been the most recent, highly recognized document.

Kelsey's\(^{98}\) and Brunner's\(^{99}\) work, along with the 1958 Guide Report and the 1959 Scope Report provided background to the study while Hazlitt's 100 "... Study Indicating the Future Direction of the Cooperative Extension Service in Order to Meet the Problems of the People" provided useful intermediate information. James Ferrell's study, "The Educational Role of the Cooperative Extension Service along with the other studies presented, provided some recent evidence of a lack of consensus among Extension personnel as to the organization's role, clientele and program emphasis in the years ahead.

\(^{97}\)USDA-NASULGC Extension Study Committee.

\(^{98}\)Kelsey.

\(^{99}\)Brunner.

\(^{100}\)Hazlitt.
Overall, the studies presented in this review provide a general overview that tend to support the need for a guide or some assessment of the role of the Cooperative Extension Service in meeting the needs of the people and that Extension personnel, to some degree might provide such assessment.
CHAPTER III
FINDINGS

The specific objectives of this study were: 1) To describe Extension personnel (agents, specialists and administrators) employed by 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities in terms of their; a) sex, b) age, c) background training, d) tenure in the Extension Service, e) tenure in present position, f) area of major responsibility, g) type of institution graduated, and h) highest academic degree held. 2) To describe the amount of time presently devoted to Extension activities conducted in states containing both 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities in terms of; a) Extension program areas, b) selected program audiences, c) selected methods of program dissemination, d) contact time devoted to ethnic groups, and e) present projections of working with selected audiences in the future. 3) To determine the perceptions of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators of present Extension work in the following role areas; a) selected characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service, b) selected quality of living programs, c) selected social and economic development programs, and d) selected agriculture and related industries programs. 4) To determine the perceptions of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators of the future Extension work in the following role areas; a) selected characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service, b) selected quality of living
programs, c) selected social and economic development programs, and e) selected clientele audiences. 5) To determine the relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, background training, tenure in Extension Service, area of major responsibility, kind of institution graduated and highest academic degree held and perceptions of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators concerning the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service, future program areas and clientele audiences.

The findings in this chapter will be presented in four sections. The first section will present a description of the personal characteristics of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators in 15 of the 16 states that contain both 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities. The second section will present a description of time presently devoted to Extension activities. The third section will be an identification of the present and a description of the projected future role of the Cooperative Extension Service. The third section will also indicate the order of importance of role and clientele audiences as perceived by respondents. The fourth section in this chapter will present an analysis of the relationship between the amount of emphasis in specific role areas and the future role of the Cooperative Extension Service as perceived by respondents and their personal characteristics of sex, age, background training, tenure in the Extension Service, area of major responsibility, kind of institution graduated and highest academic degree held.
Distribution of Respondents by States

The target population of this study was comprised of 205 county extension agents, 185 state specialists and 96 or a census of extension administrators within the 15 states where permission was granted to conduct this study. Table 3 shows the distribution of respondents by states. One hundred seventy-eight or 86.3 percent of the county extension agents responded, one hundred fifty-two or 82.1 percent of the state specialists responded and seventy-seven or 80.2 percent of the administrators responded.

Personal Characteristics of Respondents

Part I of the research questionnaire was designed to collect data on personal characteristics of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators in this study. The personal characteristics that were investigated were: 1) sex; 2) age; 3) background training; 4) tenure in the Extension Service; 5) tenure in present position; 6) area of work responsibility; 7) type of institution from which respondent graduated; and 8) highest academic degree held. These characteristics were analyzed to determine if they were related to the perceived future role of the Cooperative Extension Service as viewed by the respondents.

Sex of the Respondents

The data gathered in this study indicated that 315 or 77.4 percent of the respondents were male and that 92 or 22.6 percent of the respondents were female. Table 4 shows that 129 or 40.9 percent of the male respondents held the position of county extension agent. One hundred eighteen or 37.5 percent of the male respondents held the position of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>County Extension Agents</th>
<th></th>
<th>State Specialists</th>
<th></th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Sampled</td>
<td>Number Responded</td>
<td>Number Sampled</td>
<td>Number Responded</td>
<td>Number Sampled</td>
<td>Number Responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>205</strong></td>
<td><strong>178</strong></td>
<td><strong>185</strong></td>
<td><strong>152</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCENT RESPONSE</strong></td>
<td><strong>86.8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>82.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>80.2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERCENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>37.3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>19.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>Male (n = 315)</td>
<td>Female (n = 92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#    %</td>
<td>#    %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Extension Agents</td>
<td>129  40.9</td>
<td>49  53.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Specialists</td>
<td>118  37.5</td>
<td>34  36.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>68   21.6</td>
<td>9   9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>315 100.0</td>
<td>92 100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
state specialist and 68 or 21.6 percent of the male respondents held the position of administrator. Table 4 also shows that 49 or 53.3 percent of the female respondents held the position of county extension agent. Thirty-four or 36.9 percent of the female respondents held the position of state specialist and 9 or 9.8 percent of the female respondents held the position of administrator.

**Age of Respondents**

Table 5 shows the age of extension agents, specialists and administrators ranged from 23 to 68 years. The data indicated that 24 or 13.5 percent of the agents were 23 to 29 years old. Sixty-one or 34.3 percent of the agents were 30 to 39 years old. Forty-six or 25.8 percent of the agents were 40 to 49 years old. Forty-three or 24.1 percent of the agents were 60 to 68 years old. The age of state specialists as shown in Table 5 indicates that 6 or 3.9 percent of the state specialists were 23 to 29 years old. Fifty-five or 36.1 percent of the state specialists were 30 to 39 years of age. Forty-four or 28.9 percent of the state specialists were 40 to 49 years old. Thirty-six or 23.6 percent of the state specialists were 50 to 59 years old and eleven or 7.2 percent of the state specialists were 60 to 68 years old. Also Table 5 shows that no administrators were under 30 years of age. Six or 7.8 percent of the administrators were 40 to 49 years old. Thirty-three or 42.8 percent of the administrators were 50 to 59 years old and ten or 12.9 percent of the administrators were 60 to 68 years old.
### TABLE 5

**AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Agents (N = 178)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 - 29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background Training

The data in Table 6 shows that eighty-eight or 49.5 percent of the agents that responded to the research questionnaire held their highest degree in Education. Fifteen or 8.4 percent of the agents' highest degrees were in Home Economics. Fifty-two or 29.2 percent of the agents' highest degrees were in the field of Production subject matter. Five or 2.8 percent of the agents' highest degrees were in the Biological Sciences. Eight or 4.5 percent of the agents' highest degrees were in the Agricultural Social Sciences. Two or 1.1 percent of the agents' highest degrees were in Public Administration. No agents had their highest degree in Educational Administration. Eight or 4.5 percent of the agents' highest degrees were in fields other than those identified on the research questionnaire.

Table 6 also reveals that thirty-nine or 25.7 percent of the specialists that responded received their highest degree in Education. Fifteen or 9.9 percent of the specialists' highest degrees were in Home Economics. Thirty-six or 23.7 percent of the specialists' highest degrees were in the Production subject matter field. Ten or 6.6 percent of the specialists' highest degrees were in the Biological Sciences. Twenty-six or 17.1 percent of the specialists' received their highest degree in the Agricultural Social Sciences. No specialist that responded had received their highest degree in Public Administration. Five or 3.3 percent of the specialists' received their highest degrees in Educational Administration. Twenty-one or 13.8 percent of the specialists received their highest degree in subject matter fields other than those listed on the research questionnaire.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Training Areas</th>
<th>Agents (N = 178)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (Agriculture Education, Home Economics Education, or General Education)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics (Including majors in Nutrition, Home Management, Clothing, etc.)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production subject matter field (including majors in Animal Science, Poultry, Agronomy, Horticulture, Agricultural Engineering)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Science (including majors in Agricultural Chemistry, Entomology, Plant Pathology and Dairy Technology)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Social Sciences (including majors in Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also revealed in Table 6, twenty-seven or 35.0 percent of the administrators that responded to the questionnaire had their background training for the highest degree in Education. Three or 3.9 percent of the administrators' highest degrees were in Home Economics. Six or 7.8 percent of the administrators' highest degrees were in the Production subject matter field. Only one or 1.3 percent of the administrators' highest degrees were in the Biological Sciences. Fifteen or 19.5 percent of the administrators' highest degrees were in the Agricultural Social Sciences. Two or 2.6 percent of the administrators' highest degrees were in Public Administration. Fifteen or 19.5 percent of the administrators' highest degrees were in Educational Administration and eight or 10.4 percent of the administrators' highest degrees were in background training areas other than those listed on the research questionnaire.

**Tenure in the Extension Service**

Tenure in the Extension Service refers to the total number of years the respondent may have been employed in the Cooperative Extension Service including service in all states and positions in the United States. Table 7 shows that the tenure of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators that responded to the research questionnaire range from one to forty-one years of service. Twenty-six or 14.6 percent of the agents had 1 to 4 years of tenure. Fifty-five or 30.9 percent of the agents had 5 to 10 years of tenure. Twenty-eight or 15.7 percent of the agents had 11 to 15 years of tenure. Nineteen or 10.7 percent of the agents had 16 to 20 years of tenure. Twenty-seven or 15.2 percent of the agents had 21 to 25 years of tenure. Seventeen or 9.5 percent of the agents had 26 to 30 years of tenure and six or 3.4 percent had 31 to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Years</th>
<th>Agents (n = 178)</th>
<th>Specialists (n = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (n = 77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
41 years of tenure.

Table 7 also illustrates that twenty-four or 15.8 percent of the specialists had 1 to 4 years of tenure. Fifty-three or 34.9 percent of the specialists had 5 to 10 years of tenure. Seventeen or 11.2 percent of the specialists had 11 to 15 years of tenure. Fifteen or 9.9 percent of the specialists had 16 to 20 years of tenure. Nineteen or 12.5 percent of the specialists had 21 to 25 years of tenure. Eighteen or 11.8 percent of the specialists had 26 to 30 years of tenure. Six or 3.9 percent of the specialists had 31 to 41 years of tenure.

The data in Table 7 also reveals that only one or 1.3 percent of the administrators had 1 to 4 years of tenure. Seventeen or 22.0 percent of the administrators had 5 to 10 years of tenure. Six or 7.8 percent of the administrators had 11 to 15 years of tenure. Thirteen or 16.9 percent of the administrators had 16 to 20 years of tenure. Nineteen or 24.7 percent of the administrators had 21 to 25 years of tenure. Thirteen or 16.9 percent of the administrators had 26 to 30 years of tenure and eight or 10.4 percent had 31 to 41 years of tenure.

Tenure in Present Position

The data in Table 8 reveal that the tenure in the present position for the county extension agents, state specialists and administrators that responded to the research questionnaire ranged from one year to thirty-two years. Sixty-six or 37.1 percent of the agents had 1 to 4 years of tenure in their present position. Fifty-one or 28.7 percent of the agents had 5 to 9 years of tenure in their present position. Twenty-three or 12.9 percent of the agents had 10 to 14 years of tenure in their present position. Twelve or 6.7 percent of the agents had 15 to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Years</th>
<th>Agents (N = 178)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>178</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>152</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19 years of tenure in their present position. Seventeen or 9.6 percent of the agents had 20 to 24 years of tenure in their present position. Nine or 5.0 percent of the agents had 25 to 32 years of tenure in their present position.

Table 8 also reveals that fifty-six or 36.8 percent of the specialists had 1 to 4 years of tenure in their present position. Forty-seven or 30.9 percent of the specialists had 5 to 9 years in their present position. Twenty-five of 16.4 percent of the specialists had 10 to 14 years of tenure in their position. Thirteen or 8.6 percent of the specialists had 15 to 19 years of tenure in their present position. Eight or 5.3 percent of the specialists had 20 to 24 years of tenure in their present position. Three or 2.0 percent of the specialists had 25 to 32 years of tenure in their present position.

Table 8 further illustrates that forty or 51.9 percent of the administrators had 1 to 4 years of tenure in their present position. Twenty-five or 32.5 percent of the administrators had 5 to 9 years of tenure in their present position. Five or 6.5 percent of the administrators had 10 to 14 years of tenure in their present positions. Seven or 9.1 percent of the administrators had 15 to 19 years in their present position. No administrator had more than 19 years of tenure in their present position. However, overall 65 or 84.4 percent of the administrators had held their present position less than 10 years. Twelve or 15.6 percent of the administrators had held their present position at least 10 years but not more than 19.
Area of Major Responsibility

Table 9 illustrates the areas of major responsibility for county extension agents, state specialists and administrators. As indicated earlier the agent sample and the specialist sample were randomly subdivided into two sub-groups each one to gather information pertinent to the "present" role and the second to gather information pertinent to the "future" role of the Cooperative Extension Service in the 16 states that contain both 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities. The sample of agents and specialists were sub-divided for the two following reasons: 1) to eliminate the high degree of correlation exhibited when asking the same group to respond to what "is" and "what should be"; and 2) to cut down on the overall length of the questionnaire and the time required to complete it. Table 9 shows that of the agents that responded forty-three or 24.2 percent had major responsibility in the area of 4-H and youth with twenty-three responding to the "present" role and twenty responding the the "future" role. Thirty-two or 18.0 percent of the agents had major responsibility in the area of Home Economics:(Auldt) with seventeen responding to the "present" role and fifteen responding to the "future" role. Ninety-one or 51.1 percent of the agents had major responsibility in the areas of Agriculture:(Adult) with forty-six responding to the "present" role and forty-five responding to the "future" role. Nine or 5.0 percent of the agents had major responsibility in the area of Community Resource Development with seven responding to the "present" role and two responding to the "future" role. No agent reported major responsibility in any other area except those listed on the research questionnaire.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Agents (n = 178)</th>
<th>Specialists (n = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (n = 77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H and Youth</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics: (Adult)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture: (Adult)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resource Development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 also shows that of the specialists responding to the questionnaire sixteen or 10.5 percent had major responsibility in the area of 4-H and youth with seven responding to the "present" role and nine responding to the "future" role. Thirty-eight or 18.4 percent of the specialists had major responsibility in the area of Home Economics:(Adult) with twelve responding to the "present" role and twelve responding to the "future" role. Sixty-three or 41.5 percent of the specialists had major responsibility in Agriculture:(Adult) with thirty-three responding to the "present" role and thirty responding to the "future" role. Thirty or 19.7 percent of the specialists had major responsibility in the area of Community Resource Development with twelve responding to the "present" role and eighteen responding to the "future" role. Six or 4.0 percent of the specialists had major responsibility in the area of Administration with four responding to the "present" role and two responding to the "future" role. Nine or 5.9 percent of the specialists had major responsibility in some program area other than those listed on the research questionnaire.

Table 9 illustrates also that eight or 10.4 percent of the administrators that responded to the questionnaire had major responsibility in the area of 4-H and youth. Another eight or 10.4 percent of the administrators had major responsibility in the area of Home Economics:(Adult). Nine or 11.7 percent of the administrators had major responsibility in the area of Agriculture:(Adult). Three or 3.9 percent of the administrators had major responsibility in Community Resource Development. Forty-eight or 62.3 percent of administrators had major responsibility in the area of Administration. One or 1.3 percent of the administrators had major
responsibility in an area other than those listed on the research questionnaire.

Type of Institution from Which Respondent Graduated

The data presented in Table 10 illustrates that of the county extension agents, state specialists and administrators responding to the questionnaire, three hundred and six or 72.5 percent received their highest degree from an 1862 land-grant institution. Thirty or 7.4 percent received their highest academic degree from an 1890 land-grant institution. Seventy-one or 17.4 percent received their highest academic degree from some institution other than an 1862 or 1890 land-grant institution.

Table 10 illustrates that of the three hundred and six respondents who received their highest academic degree from an 1862 land-grant institution one hundred twenty-one or 39.5 percent were county extension agents; one hundred twenty or 39.3 percent were state specialists and sixty-five or 21.2 percent were administrators.

Table 10 also illustrates that of the thirty respondents that received their highest academic degree from an 1890 land-grant institution nineteen or 63.3 percent were county extension agents; eleven or 36.7 percent were state specialists. No administrator that responded indicated receiving his/her highest academic degree from an 1890 land-grant institution.

The data in Table 10 further shows that of those seventy-one respondents reporting their highest academic degree from an institution other than an 1862 or 1890 land-grant institution, thirty-eight or 53.5 percent were agents; twenty-one or 29.6 percent were specialists; and twelve or 16.9 percent were administrators.
TABLE 10

TYPE OF INSTITUTION (1862, 1890, OTHER) GRADUATED FOR HIGHEST ACADEMIC DEGREE HELD BY COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS, STATE SPECIALISTS, AND ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>1862 Land-Grant Institution (n = 306)</th>
<th>1890 Land-Grant Institution (n = 30)</th>
<th>Other (n = 71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Extension Agents</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Specialists</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Total</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highest Academic Degree Held

Table 1 shows that eighty-one or 45.5 percent of the county extension agents that responded to the questionnaire held the Bachelor's degree as the highest academic degree. Eighty-eight or 49.4 percent of the agents held the Master's degree as the highest academic degree. Nine or 5.1 percent of the agents held the Doctorate as the highest academic degree.

Table 1 also reveals that five or 3.3 percent of the specialists responding to the questionnaire held the Bachelor's degree as the highest academic degree. Eighty or 52.6 percent of the specialists held the Master's degree as the highest academic degree and sixty-seven or 44.1 percent of the specialists held the Doctorate as the highest degree.

Also illustrated in Table 1 is that one or 1.3 percent of the administrators responding to the questionnaire held the Bachelor's degree as the highest academic degree. Eighteen or 23.4 percent of the administrators held the Master's degree as the highest academic degree. Fifty-eight or 75.3 percent of the administrators held the Doctorate as the highest academic degree.

Time Presently Devoted to Extension Activities Conducted in States Containing Both 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Colleges and Universities

One of the factors thought to relate the projection of the future role of the Cooperative Extension Service was that of time devoted to Extension activities. Therefore, one of the major objectives of this study was to describe the amount of time presently devoted to Extension activities conducted in states that contain both 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities. The description as to the allocation of time
### TABLE 11

**HIGHEST ACADEMIC DEGREES HELD BY COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS, STATE SPECIALISTS AND ADMINISTRATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Academic Degree</th>
<th>Agents (n = 178)</th>
<th>Specialists (n = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (n = 77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Total</em></td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was described as it related to the following five activities:

1) Extension program areas
2) Selected present program audiences
3) Selected methods of program dissemination
4) Contact time spent meeting or working with ethnic groups
5) Projections of selected program audiences for the future

To accomplish the above objectives a combined total of 50 sub-items related to the five activity areas were incorporated into the research questionnaire. The respondents (county extension agents, state specialists and administrators) were instructed to "indicate the percentage of their Extension time is spent annually working with the following" activity areas described above (see Appendix A, page 298). Each respondent was advised that their total percentage should equal 100 percent. All directions to the respondents were identical for this specific objective, although as previously pointed out, county extension agents and state specialists were randomly divided into two equal groups—"present" and "future" in order to collect data in the second half of the questionnaire. Though two groups existed for agents and specialists the data were collected as it related presently from the groups as a whole.

Time Devoted to Extension Activities

Percentage of Time Devoted to Extension Program Areas. Respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of their Extension time spent annually working in specific areas. As Table 12 illustrates that when compared on Extension program areas, state specialists reportedly devoted 38.8 percent of their Extension time to Agricultural and Natural Resources, followed by county extension agents at 37.6 percent and administrators.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extension Program Areas</th>
<th>County Extension Agents (n = 178)</th>
<th>State Specialists (n = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (n = 77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Percent of Time Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean Percent of Time Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean Percent of Time Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Natural Resources</td>
<td>37.6 33.85</td>
<td>38.8 43.01</td>
<td>6.7 19.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics and Family Living</td>
<td>13.8 27.06</td>
<td>17.5 34.57</td>
<td>8.2 22.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H and Youth</td>
<td>28.4 30.43</td>
<td>13.5 23.39</td>
<td>8.9 22.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resource Development</td>
<td>11.3 19.22</td>
<td>19.5 36.09</td>
<td>5.8 17.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>8.7 14.63</td>
<td>5.8 16.71</td>
<td>62.7 40.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.2 2.05</td>
<td>4.9 17.58</td>
<td>1.9 17.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
at 6.7 percent. In the area of Home Economics and Family Living, state specialists again indicated the greater percentage of time with 17.5 percent, followed by county extension agents at 13.8 and administrators at 8.2 percent. County extension agents indicated the greatest percentage of time devoted to the area of 4-H and Youth with 28.4 percent followed by state specialists at 13.5 percent and administrators with 8.9 percent. In the area of Community Resource Development state specialists indicated the greater percentage of time spent with 19.5 percent, county extension agents followed by indicating 11.3 percent and administrators indicated 5.8 percent. Administrators indicated the greater percentage of their time was devoted to the program area of Administration with 62.7 percent followed by county extension agents with 8.7 percent and state specialists at 5.8 percent. In areas other than those listed on the questionnaire, administrators spent 1.9 percent of their Extension time, state specialists 4.3 percent and county extension agents .2 percent.

Percentage of Time Devoted to Selected Program Audiences. Respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of the Extension time devoted annually to working with the following selected program audiences. As Table 13 shows, county extension agents' time was devoted in the following ways: commercial farms, 16.7 percent; county and community organizations, 15.5 percent; home garden, lawn and grounds purchasers, 11.2 percent; low-income urban families or groups, 10.6 percent; low-income farms, 8.8 percent; low-income rural non-farm, 8.6 percent; Extension support groups; 8.2 percent; highly specialized farms, 6.2 percent; other audiences, 4.3 percent; farm organizations, 3.3 percent; farm product purchasers and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extension Program Audiences</th>
<th>County Extension Agents (n = 178)</th>
<th>State Specialists (n = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (n = 77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Percent of Time</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean Percent of Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly specialized farms</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial farms</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income farms</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income rural non-farm</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income urban families or groups</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>21.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm product purchasers &amp; processors</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home garden, lawn and grounds purchasers</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County and community organizations</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>20.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm organizations</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension support groups</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research personnel</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 13

PERCENTAGE OF TIME DEVOTED TO WORKING WITH SELECTED PROGRAM AUDIENCES BY COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS, STATE SPECIALISTS AND ADMINISTRATORS


processors, 2.6 percent; and research personnel, 2.5 percent.

State specialists indicated the percentage of their Extension time was allocated in the following ways with respect to selected program audiences: audiences other than those listed on the questionnaire, 17.7 percent; county and community organizations, 14.6 percent; Extension support groups, 14.0 percent; commercial farms, 13.8 percent; low-income farms, 7.0 percent; low-income non-farm, 5.1 percent; highly specialized farms, 4.3 percent; farm product purchasers and processors, 4.3 percent; home garden, lawn and ground purchasers, 3.6 percent; and farm organizations, 3.3 percent.

Table 13 also indicates that administrators reported the allocation of their Extension time in the following ways with respect to the selected program audiences: Extension support groups, 40.0 percent; other audiences not listed on the questionnaire, 16.6 percent; farm organizations, 8.2 percent; research personnel, 7.9 percent; county and community organizations, 5.7 percent; highly specialized farms, 5.0 percent; low-income rural non-farm, 4.6 percent; low-income farms, 4.1 percent; commercial farms, 4.1 percent; low-income urban families or groups, 2.8 percent; home garden, lawn and ground purchasers, .6 percent; and farm product purchasers and processors, .4 percent.

**Percentage of Program Activities Disseminated Through Selected Methods.** Respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of their program activities disseminated through the following selected methods. Table 14 illustrates the percentage of county extension agents' program activities that are disseminated through the following methods of dissemination: outside office group meetings, 16.7 percent; house calls,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of Program Dissemination</th>
<th>County Extension Agents (n = 178)</th>
<th>State Specialists (n = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (n = 77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Percent of Time</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean Percent of Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office telephone calls</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual office calls</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group office visits</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside office group meetings</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House calls</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal correspondence</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television shows</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News articles</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special interest meetings</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio broadcasting</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of paraprofessionals</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, district and support team members</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14.6 percent; office telephone calls, 14.4 percent; individual office calls, 10.8 percent; special interest meetings, 7.4 percent; newsletters, 6.1 percent; news articles, 5.7 percent; personal correspondence, 5.3 percent; use of paraprofessionals, 4.9 percent; radio broadcasting, 4.2 percent; group office visits, 4.0 percent; state, district and support team members, 2.3 percent; other methods of dissemination not listed on the questionnaire, 2.2 percent; and television shows, 1.5 percent.

Table 14 also shows the percentage of state specialists' program activities that are disseminated through the following methods of program dissemination: outside office group meetings, 17.7 percent; state, district and support team members, 11.7 percent; special interest meetings, 11.5 percent; office telephone calls, 10.4 percent; use of paraprofessionals, 8.8 percent; personal correspondence, 8.5 percent; individual office calls, 8.0 percent; newsletters, 4.9 percent; other methods of dissemination not listed on the questionnaire, 3.6 percent; news articles, 3.8 percent; house calls, 3.9 percent; group office visits, 2.8 percent; radio broadcasting, 2.6 percent; and television shows, 1.8 percent.

Further illustrated in Table 14 is the percentage of the administrators' program activities that are disseminated the following selected methods of program dissemination: state, district and support team members, 34.3 percent; other methods of program dissemination not listed on the questionnaire, 9.8 percent; outside office group meetings, 9.9 percent; individual office calls, 9.4 percent; office telephone calls, 8.9 percent; personal correspondence, 7.7 percent; use of paraprofessionals, 5.7 percent; special interest meetings, 4.9 percent; group office visits, 4.8 percent; newsletters, 1.4 percent; news articles, 1.2 percent;
television shows, .8 percent; house calls, .7 percent; and radio broadcasting, .5 percent.

Percentage of Contact Time Working with Ethnic Groups. Respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of the time spent meeting and working with ethnic groups. Table 15 illustrates that the percentage of county extension agents' contact time spent meeting or working with ethnic groups is as follows: White, non-Hispanic, 3.2 percent; Black, non-Hispanic, 23.3 percent; Hispanic, 3.2 percent; American Indian or Alaskan Native, 1.7 percent; Asian or Pacific Islander, .4 percent; and other ethnic groups, .1 percent.

Also Table 15 illustrates that the percentage of state specialists' contact time is spent meeting and working with ethnic groups is as follows: White, non-Hispanic, 66.0 percent; Black, non-Hispanic, 26.0 percent; American Indian or Alaskan Native, 3.0 percent; Hispanic, 2.9 percent; other ethnic groups not listed on the questionnaire, 1.3 percent; and Asian or Pacific Islander, 1.1 percent.

Table 15 further shows that the percentage of administrators' contact time is spent meeting or working with ethnic groups is as follows: White, non-Hispanic, 67.0 percent; Black, non-Hispanic, 25.0 percent; American Indian or Alaskan Native, 2.7 percent; Hispanic, 2.6 percent; other ethnic groups not listed on the questionnaire, 1.6 percent; and Asian or Pacific Islander, 1.1 percent.

Projections of Time to be Spent in the Future on Selected Program Audiences. Respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of their Extension time they felt should be spent annually working with the following groups in the future in order to better serve Extension
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Groups</th>
<th>County Extension Agents (n = 178)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>State Specialists (n = 152)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Administrators (n = 77)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Percent of Time</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean Percent of Time</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean Percent of Time</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.23</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>22.79</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>26.42</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>28.28</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
clientele. Table 16 illustrates the projections of county extension agents' as to the percentage of time to be spent in the future on selected program audiences is as follows: commercial farms, 16.0 percent; county and community organizations, 14.0 percent; low-income farms, 11.5 percent; home garden, lawn and ground purchasers, 11.0 percent; low-income urban families or groups, 10.6 percent; Extension support groups, 8.9 percent; low-income rural non-farm, 7.2 percent; other future program audiences not listed on the questionnaire, 4.5 percent; farm organizations, 4.5 percent; highly specialized farms, 4.0 percent; research personnel, 3.9 percent; and farm product purchasers, 3.7 percent.

Table 16 also shows the projections of state specialists' as to the percentage of time to be spent in the future on selected program audiences. They are: other future audiences not listed on the questionnaire, 15.3 percent; county and community organizations, 15.3 percent; Extension support groups, 12.8 percent; commercial farms, 12.7 percent; research personnel, 7.6 percent; low-income farms, 7.4 percent; low-income urban families or groups, 7.2 percent; low-income rural non-farm, 6.4 percent; farm product purchasers and processors, 5.6 percent; farm organizations, 4.0 percent; home garden, lawn and ground purchasers, 3.1 percent; and highly specialized farms, 2.9 percent.

Also, as further illustrated in Table 16 the projections of administrators' in reference to the percentage of their Extension time to be spent in the future on selected program audiences is as follows: Extension support group, 44.9 percent; other future program audiences not listed on the questionnaire, 12.1 percent; county and community organizations, 8.3 percent; research personnel, 8.1 percent; low-income rural
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Program Audiences</th>
<th>County Extension Agents (n = 178)</th>
<th>State Specialists (n = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (n = 77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Percent of Time</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean Percent of Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm product purchasers and processors</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County and community organizations</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm organizations</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income farms</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial farms</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home garden, lawn and grounds purchasers</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income rural non-farm</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly specialized farms</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income urban families or groups</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension support groups</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research personnel</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>21.55</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
non-farm, 6.2 percent; low-income farms, 5.2 percent; low-income urban families or groups, 4.6 percent; farm organizations, 3.9 percent; commercial farms, 3.2 percent; farm product purchasers and processors, 1.6 percent; home garden, lawn and ground purchasers, 1.1 percent; and highly specialized farms, .8 percent.

Perceived Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service by County Extension Agents, State Specialists and Administrators

The primary objectives of this study were to describe the present and projected role of the Cooperative Extension Service in those states containing both 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities. Also the degree of emphasis placed on role items within each area of role definition and the order of ranking of role areas as expressed by each group of respondents will be presented in this section. The projected role was described as it related to the following five corresponding role areas:

1) Characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service
2) Quality of living programs
3) Social and economic development programs
4) Agriculture and related industries programs
5) Selected clientele audiences

To accomplish the above objectives 76 role items in five different role areas were involved in the study. Three seven point scales were utilized to determine the degree of agreement or disagreement and the amount of emphasis the respondents perceived to be appropriate for each of the role items involved. The area of the characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service utilized the seven point scale as follows:
7 = very strongly agree; 6 = strongly agree; 5 = agree; 4 = undecided; 3 = disagree; 2 = strongly disagree; 1 = very strongly disagree. The areas of quality of living programs, social and economic development programs and agriculture and related industry programs utilized a seven point scale with the following values: 7 = very heavy emphasis; 6 = heavy emphasis; 5 = moderate emphasis; 4 = undecided; 3 = little emphasis; 2 = very little emphasis; 1 = no emphasis. The area of selected clientele audiences utilized a seven point scale also but with the following values: 7 = very heavy emphasis; 6 = heavy emphasis; 5 = moderate emphasis; 4 = undecided; 3 = keep the same; 2 = little emphasis; and 1 = not at all important.

An objective of this study was to determine the perceptions of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators of the present Extension work in the following role areas:

a. Selected characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service
b. Selected quality of living programs
c. Selected social and economic development programs
d. Selected agriculture and related industries programs

The following are descriptions of the findings for each role area corresponding with the role of the Cooperative Extension Service as perceived by the respondents. The descriptions are presented in the form of differential comparison of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators.
Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of Agreement on the Present Characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service

The respondents were asked to indicate their perceptions of the present characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service by using the following scale:

- 7 = very strongly agree
- 6 = strongly agree
- 5 = agree
- 4 = undecided
- 3 = disagree
- 2 = strongly disagree
- 1 = very strongly disagree

Table 17 provides data that shows a comparison in relation to all three groups of respondents on each item relating to selected characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service. The items were ranked from highest to lowest for each group of respondents by using mean weighted scores. The Kruskall-Wallis Test, a non-parametric alternate to the one way-analysis of variance, was performed to compare the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators on their ranks of each individual characteristic item. The Spearman-Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was also calculated to show the strength of agreement between the rankings by agents, specialists and administrators on the overall group of items. Table 17 indicates that the respondents perceptions of agreement on the following four present characteristic items were ranked highest.

The Cooperative Extension Service:

1. Helps people solve problems and take advantage of opportunities through education

2. Provides informal non-credit education conducted primarily beyond the formal classroom, and for all ages
TABLE 17
COMPARISON OF COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS', STATE SPECIALISTS' AND ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF AGREEMENT ON THE PRESENT CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic Item</th>
<th>Agents (N = 178)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cooperative Extension Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Helps people solve problems and take advantage of opportunities through extension</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides informal non-credit education conducted primarily beyond the formal classroom, and for all ages</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is educational in program content and methodology, not regulatory or financial</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is administratively attached to a public university system and is a major part of it, rather than being attached directly to state government</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Features objective research based information and analysis of factual information for decision making by the people themselves</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic Item</td>
<td>Agents  (N = 178)</td>
<td>Specialists (N = 152)</td>
<td>Administrators  (N = 77)</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Helps people identify and understand their needs and use new technology in solving them</td>
<td>6.03 6</td>
<td>6.11 7</td>
<td>6.42 7</td>
<td>.004*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Involves cooperative but not necessarily equal sharing of financial support among federal, state and county or local levels</td>
<td>6.01 7</td>
<td>6.25 5</td>
<td>6.56 5</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is a professional function staffed by college trained personnel specifically qualified for positions</td>
<td>5.81 8</td>
<td>5.89 9</td>
<td>6.29 9</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is practical, problem centered and situation based</td>
<td>5.78 9</td>
<td>5.93 8</td>
<td>6.47 6</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides educational programs directed at broad national purposes, yet services specific local needs with priorities determined locally</td>
<td>5.73 10</td>
<td>5.67 10</td>
<td>6.18 10</td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 10

$r_S^* =$ Agents-Specialists = .84*

$r_S^* =$ Agents-Administrators = .77*

$r_S^* =$ Specialists-Administrators = .94*

*Significant at .01
3. Is educational in program content and methodology, not regulatory or financially oriented

4. Is administratively attached to a public university system and is a major part of it, rather than being attached directly to state government

Although the respondents differed slightly in their ranking of the four highest ranked items, the data indicated they were in strong to very strong agreement on these four highest ranked items.

The rankings also showed that the present characteristic items indicating that the Cooperative Extension Service: is a professional function staffed by college trained personnel specifically qualified for positions; is practical, problem centered and situation based; and provides educational programs directed at broad national purposes, yet serves specific local needs with priorities determined locally were ranked lowest with reference to the respondents perceptions of agreement with these items.

Table 17 further indicates that there were differences in the perceptions of agreement by agents, specialists and administrators. These differences were shown to be statistically significant according to the Kruskall-Wallis Test on the following characteristic items:

- Provides informal non-credit education conducted primarily beyond the formal classroom, and for all ages

- Is educational in program content and methodology, not regulatory or financial

- Is administratively attached to a public university system and is a major part of it, rather than being attached directly to state government

- Helps people identify and understand their needs and use new technology or information in solving them

- Involves cooperative but not necessarily equal sharing of financial support among federal, state and county or local levels
- Is a professional function staffed by college-trained personnel specifically qualified for positions

- Is practical, problem centered and situation based

- Provides educational programs directed at broad national purposes, yet serves specific local needs with priorities determined locally

The data presented in Table 17 show that the differences on these items were the result of a greater degree of difference in the mean weighted scores of administrators than agents or state specialists.

Table 17 shows a comparison of the overall rankings of the perceptions of agents, specialists, and administrators regarding their agreement on the present characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service. Three rs of .84 for agents and specialists, .77 for agents and administrators and .94 for specialists and administrators resulted from an application of the Spearman-Rank Order Correlation to the rankings of the ten characteristic items. These rs between agents, specialists and administrators indicate a high degree of agreement among the groups in terms of rankings.

**Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Present Emphasis Placed on Quality of Living Programs**

Data in this section present findings regarding the perceptions of the present emphasis placed on quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service as viewed by agents, specialists and administrators. The following rating scale was used to indicate the respondents perceptions:
Table 18 illustrates the comparison of the agents, specialists and administrators regarding the emphasis presently placed on quality of living program items. The data show that the perceptions of the amount of emphasis on the following four quality of living program items ranked them highest.

1. Assist clientele in the effective use and management of resources
2. Assist clientele in seeking out the availability of resources to provide for the need of the individual and family
3. Promoting the process of individual and family decision making and the skills necessary to carry out the decisions
4. Providing clientele with assistance in choosing among the abundance of goods and services available

Overall, agents, specialists and administrators indicated that moderate to slightly heavy emphasis was presently being placed on the four highly ranked items.

The data in Table 18 further show the four items that were ranked the lowest in relation to the amount of emphasis presently being placed on them. Those four items were:

1. Providing clientele with an awareness of the manner in which attitudes, values and patterns of behavior are formed
2. Assisting young families in the family planning process
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Living Item</th>
<th>Agents (N = 94)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 72)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist clientele in the effective use and management of resources</td>
<td>5.68 1</td>
<td>5.61 1</td>
<td>5.57 1</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist clientele in seeking out the availability of resources to provide for the need of the individual and family</td>
<td>5.57 2</td>
<td>5.35 2</td>
<td>5.27 3</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting the process of individual and family decision making and the skills necessary to carry out the decisions</td>
<td>5.37 3</td>
<td>5.21 4</td>
<td>5.44 2</td>
<td>.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing clientele with assistance in choosing among the abundance of goods and services available</td>
<td>5.29 4</td>
<td>5.22 3</td>
<td>4.97 4</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping clientele contribute to the family's ability to promote the development of children</td>
<td>5.16 5</td>
<td>4.61 9</td>
<td>4.75 7</td>
<td>.011**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting clientele in developing skills necessary to optimize their development as individuals and as members of the family and community (children, youth and adults)</td>
<td>5.09 6</td>
<td>4.63 6.5</td>
<td>4.43 13.3</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Living Item</td>
<td>Agents (N = 94)</td>
<td>Specialists (N = 72)</td>
<td>Administrators (N = 77)</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting clientele participation in volunteer activities aimed at community problems as a means for developing skills</td>
<td>5.06 7</td>
<td>3.90 19.5</td>
<td>4.51 12</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiding individuals in understanding the functions of the family and its relation to the community</td>
<td>4.99 8.5</td>
<td>4.29 13</td>
<td>4.68 8</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping clientele develop as informed leaders for identifying and solving problems in a democratic society</td>
<td>4.99 8.5</td>
<td>4.63 6.5</td>
<td>4.43 13.3</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the social, physical and economic mobility of the individual clientele</td>
<td>4.94 10</td>
<td>4.62 8</td>
<td>4.66 9</td>
<td>.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting individuals in the development of skills necessary to use credit wisely</td>
<td>4.93 11</td>
<td>4.83 5</td>
<td>4.87 5</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting increased interaction of individual clientele with others</td>
<td>4.81 12</td>
<td>4.38 12</td>
<td>4.65 10</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting clientele in developing the skills necessary to make decisions related to career choice and development</td>
<td>4.80 13.5</td>
<td>4.07 15.5</td>
<td>4.01 22</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting clientele improvements of their community organizations and environment</td>
<td>4.80 13.5</td>
<td>4.39 11</td>
<td>4.52 11</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Living Item</td>
<td>Agents (N = 94)</td>
<td>Specialists (N = 72)</td>
<td>Administrators (N = 77)</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting individuals in acquiring the ability to utilize community services and to participate in the development of community services</td>
<td>4.78 15</td>
<td>4.60 10</td>
<td>4.80 6</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing clientele with information needed to analyze available alternatives in terms of jobs, living conditions, and cost involved</td>
<td>4.73 16</td>
<td>4.07 15,5</td>
<td>4.07 18,5</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting clientele in developing the skills necessary to assist in the evaluation of community services such as housing, educational resources, child care facilities and employment opportunities</td>
<td>4.60 17</td>
<td>4.01 17</td>
<td>4.27 16</td>
<td>.032**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping individual clientele or groups develop skills in order to use increased leisure time</td>
<td>4.57 18</td>
<td>4.15 14</td>
<td>4.08 17</td>
<td>.025**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting various groups in developing working relationships with community service agencies</td>
<td>4.51 19</td>
<td>3.90 19,5</td>
<td>4.07 18,5</td>
<td>.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing clientele with an awareness of the manner in which attitudes, values and patterns of behavior are formed</td>
<td>4.50 20</td>
<td>3.82 21</td>
<td>4.03 20,5</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Living Item</td>
<td>Agents (N = 94)</td>
<td>Specialists (N = 72)</td>
<td>Administrators (N = 77)</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting young families in the family planning process</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing in-service training for public employers and decision makers</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting clientele in developing the basic skills necessary to apply for and hold a job</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 23

r_s - Agents-Specialists = .90*

r_s - Agents-Administrators = .86*

r_s - Specialists-Administrators = .89*

*Significant at .01

**Significant at .05
3. Providing in-service training for public employees and decision makers

4. Assisting clientele in developing the basic skills necessary to apply for and hold a job

Table 18 shows that there were noticeable differences in the perception of respondents on several items. These differences were shown to be statistically significant according to the Kruskall-Wallis Test on the following items:

- Helping clientele contribute to the family's ability to promote the development of children

- Assisting clientele in developing skills necessary to optimize their development as individuals and as members of the family and community (children, youth and adults)

- Promoting clientele participation in volunteer activities aimed at community problems as a means for developing skills

- Aiding individuals in understanding the functions of family and its relation to community

- Helping clientele develop as informed leaders for identifying and solving problems in a democratic society

- Assisting clientele in developing the skills necessary to make decisions related to career choice and development

- Assisting clientele in developing the skills necessary to assist in the evaluation of community services such as housing, educational resources, child care facilities and employment opportunities

- Helping individual clientele or groups develop skills in order to use increased leisure time

- Assisting various groups in developing working relationships with community service agencies

- Providing clientele with an awareness of the manner in which attitudes, values and patterns of behavior are formed
- Assisting young families in the family planning process

The data presented in Table 18 show that the differences on these items were the result of a greater degree of difference in the mean weighted scores of agents than state specialists or administrators.

Table 18 shows a comparison of the overall rankings of the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators regarding their agreement on the present emphasis being placed on quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service. An $r_s$ of .90 for agents and specialists, .86 for agents and administrators and .89 for specialists and administrators resulted from an application of the Spearman-Rank Order Correlation to the rankings of the twenty-three quality of living items. The $r_s$ indicate a very strong position correlation on the overall rankings of agents, specialists and administrators. This very strong positive correlation indicates that agents, specialists and administrators were in a high degree agreement on the emphasis presently placed on quality of living programs which were most highly ranked and those lowest ranked.

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Present Emphasis Placed on Social and Economic Development Programs

The data presented in this section reflect the comparison of the respondents' perceptions of the present emphasis placed on social and economic development programs of the Cooperative Extension Service. The scale used to indicate the respondents' perceptions was:

7 = very strongly agree
6 = strongly agree
5 = agree
4 = undecided
3 = disagree
2 = strongly disagree
1 = very strongly disagree
The data presented in Table 19 illustrates a comparison of agents, specialists and administrators on each item relating to selected social and economic development programs of the Cooperative Extension Service. Agents and administrators ranked the following four items highest:

1. Assisting landowners in understanding soil and water conservation problems, their effects on agriculture production and the general economy

2. Assisting producers in developing skills for improving their marketing decisions

3. Helping landowners understand the need for long-range planning for management and use of their soil and water resources and the economic alternate available to them for developing these resources

4. Assisting producers in developing new and improved systems for marketing and processing

State specialists felt that the following four items presently received the heaviest emphasis and therefore ranked the following four items highest:

1. Assisting producers in developing skills for improving their marketing decisions

2. Assisting producers in developing new and improved systems for marketing and processing

3. Assisting producers in improving the efficiency of supply, marketing and processing firms

4. Providing producers with updated information and research necessary for expanding markets for agricultural products

Table 19 shows that agents, specialists and administrators all ranked the same item lowest with reference to present emphasis being placed on it. The item ranked lowest was:

1. Helping landowners develop non-food producing businesses such as recreation enterprises
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social and Economic Development Item</th>
<th>Agents (N = 94)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 72)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisting landowners in understanding soil and water conservation problems, their effects on agriculture production and the general economy</td>
<td>5.72 1</td>
<td>5.11 5.5</td>
<td>4.90 2</td>
<td><strong>.001</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting producers in developing skills for improving their marketing decisions</td>
<td>5.69 2</td>
<td>5.50 1</td>
<td>5.00 1</td>
<td><strong>.001</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping landowners understand the need for long-range planning for management and use of their soil and water resources and the economic alternative available to them for developing these resources</td>
<td>5.62 3</td>
<td>5.11 5.5</td>
<td>4.75 3</td>
<td><strong>.001</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting producers in developing new and improved systems for marketing and processing</td>
<td>5.33 4</td>
<td>5.36 2</td>
<td>4.74 4</td>
<td><strong>.001</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing producers with updated information and research necessary for expanding markets for agricultural products</td>
<td>5.14 5</td>
<td>5.22 4</td>
<td>4.58 6</td>
<td><strong>.009</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping the general public understand soil and water problems and support programs directed at solving them</td>
<td>5.09 6</td>
<td>4.49 13</td>
<td>4.10 13</td>
<td><strong>.001</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Social and Economic Development Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social and Economic Development Item</th>
<th>Agents (N = 94)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 72)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisting landowners in cooperative planning for development of soil and water resources on a complete watershed basis</td>
<td>4.98 7</td>
<td>4.67 12</td>
<td>4.43 8</td>
<td>.029**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting producers in developing new farm supply and marketing enterprises</td>
<td>4.96 8</td>
<td>4.99 8</td>
<td>4.46 7</td>
<td>.016**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting producers in improving the efficiency of supply, marketing, and processing firms</td>
<td>4.92 9</td>
<td>5.26 3</td>
<td>4.62 5</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting forestry production and marketing clientele in obtaining information and recent research pertaining to timber production technology</td>
<td>4.60 10</td>
<td>5.01 7</td>
<td>4.20 10</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing forestry production and marketing clientele with assistance in the multi-use of small woodlands</td>
<td>4.52 11</td>
<td>4.90 9</td>
<td>4.18 11</td>
<td>.015**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to improve decisions made concerning forest products, marketing and utilization</td>
<td>4.43 12</td>
<td>4.76 11</td>
<td>4.21 9</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to marketing primary forestry products</td>
<td>4.37 13</td>
<td>4.89 10</td>
<td>4.13 12</td>
<td>.008*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 19 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social and Economic Development Item</th>
<th>Agents (N = 94)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 72)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping landowners develop non-food producing businesses such as recreation enterprises</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 14  
*r_s - Agents-Specialists = .63  
*r_s - Agents-Administrators = .82  
*r_s - Specialists-Administrators = .83

*Significant at .01  
**Significant at .05
It is interesting to note that agents, specialists and administrators ranked the social and economic development item of "helping landowners develop non-food producing businesses such as recreation enterprises" lowest with reference to present emphasis being placed on it.

Table 19 illustrates the differences in the perceptions of respondents on several items. These differences were shown to be statistically significant according to the Kruskall-Wallis Test on the following items:

- Assisting landowners in understanding soil and water conservation problems, their effects on agriculture production and the general economy

- Assisting producers in developing skills for improving their marketing decisions

- Helping landowners understand the need for long-range planning for management and use of their soil and water resources and the economic alternate available to them for developing these resources

- Assisting producers in developing new and improved systems for marketing and processing

- Providing producers with updated information and research necessary for expanding markets for agricultural products

- Helping the general public understand soil and water problems and support programs directed at solving them

- Assisting landowners in cooperative planning for development of soil and water resources on a complete watershed basis

- Assisting producers in developing new farm supply and marketing enterprises

- Assisting producers in improving the efficiency of supply, marketing and processing firms

- Assisting forestry production and marketing clientele in obtaining information and recent research pertaining to timber production technology
- Providing forestry production and marketing clientele with assistance in the multi-use of small woodlands

- Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to marketing primary forestry products

The data presented in Table 19 show that the differences on these items were the result of a greater degree of difference in the mean weighted scores of administrators than agents or state specialists.

Table 19 shows a comparison of the overall rankings of the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators regarding their agreement on the present emphasis placed on social and economic development programs by the Cooperative Extension Service. An $r_s$ of .63 for agents and specialists, .82 for agents and administrators and .83 for specialists and administrators resulted from an application of the Spearman-Rank Correlation to the rankings of the fourteen social and economic development items. The $r_s$ calculated for agents and specialists indicates a substantial positive correlation on the overall rankings of agents and specialists. The $r_s$ calculated for agents and administrators and the $r_s$ calculated for specialists and administrators indicated a very strong positive correlation between the perceptions of these groups on these selected social and economic development items. The substantial positive correlation and very strong positive correlation indicate a high degree of agreement among agents, specialists and administrators in terms of the rankings and the emphasis indicated as presently being placed on social and economic development programs.
Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Present Emphasis Placed on Agriculture and Related Industries Programs

The data presented in this section reflect the comparison of agents, specialists and administrators' perceptions of the present emphasis on agriculture and related industries programs of the Cooperative Extension Service. The scale used to indicate the respondents' perceptions was:

- 7 = very heavy emphasis
- 6 = heavy emphasis
- 5 = moderate emphasis
- 4 = undecided
- 3 = little emphasis
- 2 = very little emphasis
- 1 = no emphasis

Table 20 presents data that illustrates a comparison of the respondents on each item relating to present emphasis on selected agriculture and related industries programs of the Cooperative Extension Service. As shown in Table 20, agents, specialists and administrators ranked the following items highest with reference to present emphasis placed on them. The four highest ranked items were:

1. Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with updated research information related to controlling disease, insects, weeds, and other pests

2. Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in obtaining information necessary for improving plant and animal nutrition and feeding

3. Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in obtaining information necessary for plant and animal selection and breeding

4. Helping agriculture and related industries clientele acquire the skills necessary to adopt more effective and economically feasible technology
TABLE 20

COMPARISON OF COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS', STATE SPECIALISTS' AND ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE PRESENT EMPHASIS PLACED ON AGRICULTURE AND RELATED INDUSTRIES PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agriculture and Related Industries Item</th>
<th>Agents (N = 94)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 72)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing agriculture and related ind-</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dustries clientele with updated research information related to controlling disease, insects, weeds, and other pests</td>
<td>6.49 1</td>
<td>6.26 1</td>
<td>5.90 1</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting agriculture and related indus-</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tries clientele in obtaining information necessary for improving plant and animal nutrition and feeding</td>
<td>6.14 2</td>
<td>5.96 2</td>
<td>5.73 2.5</td>
<td>.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting agriculture and related indus-</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tries clientele in obtaining information necessary for plant and animal selection and breeding</td>
<td>6.12 3</td>
<td>5.92 4</td>
<td>5.73 2.5</td>
<td>.015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping agriculture and related industry clientele acquire the skills necessary to adopt more effective and economically feasible technology</td>
<td>6.09 4</td>
<td>5.94 3</td>
<td>5.57 4</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping agriculture and related industries clientele obtain the most recent research results on improving harvesting, storage and marketing</td>
<td>6.04 5</td>
<td>5.79 6</td>
<td>5.40 6</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 20 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agriculture and Related Industries Item</th>
<th>Agents (N = 94)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 72)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting agriculture and related indu-</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stries clientele in organizing their re-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources into more effective and profit-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>able production units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance and educational</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs to agriculture and related in-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dustry clientele necessary to adjust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>output to market demands as related to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantity, quality and seasonality of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing agriculture and related indus-</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tries clientele with educational inform-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ation to aid in developing and under-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standing of situations, outlook, policy,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>market structure and other forces affect-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ing decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting agriculture and related indus-</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>try clientele in developing skills neces-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sary to improve management through con-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sideration of size, organization and ef-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fective allocation of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping agriculture and related indus-</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tries clientele improve the efficiency of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selection, procurement and use of supplies,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labor and credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 20 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agriculture and Related Industries Item</th>
<th>Agents (N = 94)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 72)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with information necessary for design,</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.040*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction, procurement, maintenance, and use of buildings and equipment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in developing skills necessary to compete</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more effectively in world markets</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_s \ - \text{Agents-Specialists} = .97 \]

\[ r_s \ - \text{Agents-Administrators} = .95 \]

\[ r_s \ - \text{Specialists-Administrators} = .95 \]

*Significant at .05
Agents, specialists and administrators perceived the following three items lowest with reference to the present emphasis being placed on them. These items were:

1. Helping agriculture and related industries clientele improve the efficiency of selection, procurement and use of supplies, labor and credit

2. Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with information necessary for design, construction, procurement, maintenance, and use of buildings and equipment

3. Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in developing skills necessary to compete more effectively in world markets

Table 20 also illustrates noticeable differences in the perceptions of respondents on several agriculture and related industry items. These differences were shown to be statistically significant according to the Kruskall-Wallis Test on the following items:

- Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with updated research information related to controlling disease, insects, weeds, and other pests

- Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in obtaining information necessary for improving plant and animal nutrition and feeding

- Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in obtaining information necessary for plant and animal selection and breeding

- Helping agriculture and related industries clientele acquire the skills necessary to adopt more effective and economically feasible technology

- Helping agriculture and related industries clientele obtain the most recent research results on improving harvesting, storage and marketing
- Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in organizing their resources into more effective and profitable production units

- Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with information necessary for design, construction, procurement, maintenance, and use of buildings and equipment

The data presented in Table 20 show that the differences on these items were the result of a greater degree of difference in the mean weighted scores of administrators than agents or state specialists.

Table 20 further illustrates the application of the Spearman-Rank Order Correlation to the overall rankings by agents, specialists and administrators yielded the following three \( r_s \) correlations: agents-specialists, .97; agents-administrators, .95; and specialists-administrators, .95. These correlations indicate that there were very high degree of agreement between the respondents on the rankings and the perceived emphasis presently placed on agriculture and related industries items which were most highly ranked and those ranked lowest.

One of the primary objectives of this study was to determine the perceptions of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators of the future Extension work in the following areas:

a. Selected characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service
b. Selected quality of living programs
c. Selected social and economic development programs
d. Selected agriculture and related industries programs

The following are descriptions of the findings for each area corresponding with the future role of the Cooperative Extension Service as perceived by the respondents. The descriptions are presented in the form of comparisons of the perceptions of county extension agents, state
specialists and administrators.

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of Agreement on the Future Characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service

The respondents were asked to indicate their perceptions of the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service by using the following scale:

7 = very strongly agree
6 = strongly agree
5 = agree
4 = undecided
3 = disagree
2 = strongly disagree
1 = very strongly disagree

Table 21 provides data that shows a comparison in relation to all three groups of respondents on each item relating to future selected characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service. The items were ranked from highest to lowest for each respondent group by using mean weighted scores. The Kruskall-Wallis Test, a non-parametric alternate for the One Way Analysis of Variance, was performed to compare the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators on their ranking of each individual future characteristics item. The Spearman-Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was also calculated to show the strength of agreement between the rankings by agents, specialists and administrators on the overall group of items. Table 21 indicates that the respondents' perceptions of agreement on the following five future characteristic items were ranked the highest.

The Cooperative Extension Service:

1. Will help people identify and understand their needs and problems and use new technology in solving them
# TABLE 21

**COMPARISON OF COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS', STATE SPECIALISTS' AND ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF AGREEMENT ON THE FUTURE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic Item</th>
<th>Agents (N = 178)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cooperative Extension Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will help people identify and understand their needs and problems and use new technology in solving them</td>
<td>6.20 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.40 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will help people solve problems and take advantage of opportunities through education</td>
<td>6.15 2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.28 2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will be educational in problem content and methodology, not regulatory or financial oriented</td>
<td>6.15 2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.28 2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will be administratively attached to a public university system and is a major part of it rather than being attached directly to state government</td>
<td>6.11 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.14 5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will be practical, problem centered and situation based</td>
<td>6.10 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.18 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic Item</td>
<td>Agents (N = 178) Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Specialists (N = 152) Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will be a professional function staffed by college trained personnel specifically qualified for positions</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will feature objective research based information and analysis of factual information for decision making by the people themselves</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will provide informal non-credit education conducted primarily beyond the formal classroom and for all ages</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will provide educational programs directed at broad national purposes, yet serves specific local needs with priorities determined locally</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will involve cooperative but not necessary equal sharing of financial support among federal, state and county or local levels</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[r_s = \text{Agents-Specialists} = .88^*\]
\[r_s = \text{Agents-Administrators} = .81^*\]
\[r_s = \text{Specialists-Administrators} = .81^*\]

*Significant at .01
**Significant at .05
2. Will help people solve problems and take advantage of opportunities through education

3. Will be educational in program content and methodology, not regulatory or financial orientated

4. Will be administratively attached to a public university system and is a major part of it rather than being attached directly to state government

5. Will be practical, problem centered and situation based

It was interesting to note that of the five items that were ranked by all respondents in the top four places, agents and specialists ranked the same item "1"

The Cooperative Extension Service: "Will help people identify and understand their needs and problems and use new technology in solving them."

Agents and specialists also ranked the same item "2.5"

The Cooperative Extension Service: "Will help people solve problems and take advantage of opportunities through education."

Agents, specialists and administrators all ranked the second "2.5" item the same;

The Cooperative Extension Service: "Will be educational in program content and methodology, not regulatory or financial oriented."

Although the respondents differed slightly in their ranking of the four highest ranked items the data indicated they were in strong agreement on these highest ranked items.

Table 21 also showed the items that were ranked lowest by agents, specialists and administrators with respect to their perceptions of the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service. Agents ranked the following four items lowest:
The Cooperative Extension Service:

1. Will feature objective research based information and analysis of factual information for decision making by the people themselves

2. Will provide informal non-credit education conducted primarily beyond the formal classroom, and for all ages

3. Will provide educational programs directed at broad national purposes, yet serves specific local needs with priorities determined locally

4. Will involve cooperative but not necessarily equal sharing of financial support among federal, state and county or local levels

The four items that were ranked lowest by specialists are as follows:

The Cooperative Extension Service:

1. Will be a professional function staffed by college personnel specifically qualified for positions

2. Will feature objective research based information and analysis of factual information for decision making by the people themselves

3. Will involve cooperative but not necessarily equal sharing of financial support among federal, state and county or local levels

4. Will provide educational programs directed at broad national purposes, yet serves specific local needs with priorities determined locally

Administrators ranked the following four items lowest:

The Cooperative Extension Service:

1. Will provide informal non-credit education conducted primarily beyond the formal classroom, and for all ages

2. Will provide educational programs directed at broad national purposes, yet serves specific local needs with priorities determined locally
3. Will be a professional function staffed by college trained personnel specifically qualified for positions

4. Will involve cooperative but not necessarily equal sharing of financial support among federal, state and county or local levels

The three respondent groups ranking of the lowest four items differed slightly, however, the data indicated that they did agree, that these items should be ranked lowest.

The rankings in Table 21 also showed the comparison in the perceptions of agreement by agents, specialists and administrators. These differences were shown to be statistically significant according to the Kruskal-Wallis Test on the following future characteristic items:

The Cooperative Extension Service:
- Will help people identify and understand their needs and problems and use new technology in solving them
- Will help people solve problems and take advantage of opportunities through education
- Will be educational in problem content and methodology, not regulator or financial oriented
- Will be administratively attached to a public university system and is a major part of it rather than being attached directly to state government
- Will be practical, problem centered and situation based
- Will feature objective research based information and analysis of factual information for decision making by the people themselves
- Will provide informal non-credit education conducted primarily beyond the formal classroom, and for all ages
- Will provide educational programs directed at broad national purposes, yet serves specific local needs with priorities determined locally

- Will involve cooperative but not necessarily equal sharing of financial support among federal, state and county or local levels

The data presented in Table 21 show that the differences on these items were the result of a greater degree of difference in the mean weighted score of administrators than agents or state specialists.

Table 21 shows a comparison of the overall rankings of the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators regarding their agreement on the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service. A value of .88 for agents and specialists; .81 for agents and administrators; and .81 for specialists and administrators resulted from an application of the Spearman-Rank Order Correlation to the rankings of the ten future characteristics items. These $r_s$ indicated a very high degree of agreement among the agents, specialists and administrators in terms of the rankings.

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Future Emphasis to be Placed on Quality of Living Programs

Data in this section present findings regarding the perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service as viewed by agents, specialists and administrators. The respondents were asked to indicate their perceptions by using the following scale:
7 = very heavy emphasis  
6 = heavy emphasis  
5 = moderate emphasis  
4 = undecided  
3 = little emphasis  
2 = very little emphasis  
1 = no emphasis

Table 22 illustrates a comparison of the respondents regarding the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living program items. The data shows that the perceptions of the amount of emphasis to be placed on the following quality of living items ranked them highest. Agents ranked the following four items highest:

1. Assisting clientele in the effective use and management of resources
2. Assisting clientele in seeking out the availability of resources to provide for the needs of the individual and family
3. Promoting the process of individual and family decision making and the skills necessary to carry them out
4. Promoting clientele with assistance in choosing among the abundance of goods and services available

Specialists ranking of the top four items were slightly different. They ranked the following four items highest:

1. Assisting clientele in the effective use and management of resources
2. Promoting the process of individual and family decision making and the skills necessary to carry out the decisions
3. Assisting clientele in seeking out the availability of resources to provide for the needs of the individual and family
4. Assisting individuals in the development of skills necessary to use credit wisely
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Living Item</th>
<th>Agents (N = 84)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 80)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisting clientele in the effective use and management of resources</td>
<td>6.21 1</td>
<td>6.44 1</td>
<td>6.39 1</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting clientele in seeking out the availability of resources to provide for the needs of the individual and family</td>
<td>6.02 2</td>
<td>6.00 3</td>
<td>5.90 4</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting the process of individual and family decision making and the skills necessary to carry out the decisions</td>
<td>5.80 3</td>
<td>6.06 2</td>
<td>6.07 2</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting clientele with assistance in choosing among the abundance of goods and services available</td>
<td>5.66 4</td>
<td>5.558 8</td>
<td>5.61 6</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping clientele contribute to the family's ability to promote the development of children</td>
<td>5.64 5</td>
<td>5.76 5</td>
<td>5.57 7</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting individuals in the development of skills necessary to use credit wisely</td>
<td>5.63 6</td>
<td>5.91 4</td>
<td>5.94 3</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Living Item</td>
<td>Agents (N = 84)</td>
<td>Specialists (N = 80)</td>
<td>Administrators (N = 77)</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting clientele in developing skills necessary to optimize their development as individuals and as members of family and community (children, youth and adults)</td>
<td>5.49 7</td>
<td>5.61 7</td>
<td>5.49 8</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping clientele develop as informed leaders for identifying and solving problems in a democratic society</td>
<td>5.45 8</td>
<td>5.63 6</td>
<td>5.69 5</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiding individuals in understanding the functions of the family and its relation to the community</td>
<td>5.36 9</td>
<td>5.41 11</td>
<td>5.48 9.5</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting individuals in acquiring the ability to utilize community services and to participate in the development of community service</td>
<td>5.33 10</td>
<td>5.55 9</td>
<td>5.48 9.5</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the social, physical and economic mobility of the individual clientele</td>
<td>5.31 11</td>
<td>5.38 12.5</td>
<td>5.25 14</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting clientele in developing the skills necessary to make decisions related to career choice and development</td>
<td>5.23 12</td>
<td>5.38 12.5</td>
<td>5.26 13</td>
<td>.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Living Item</td>
<td>Agents (N = 84)</td>
<td>Specialists (N = 80)</td>
<td>Administrators (N = 77)</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting clientele participation in volunteer activities aimed at community problems as a means for developing skills</td>
<td>5.18 13.5</td>
<td>5.23 15.5</td>
<td>5.40 12</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting clientele improvements of their community organizations and environment</td>
<td>5.18 13.5</td>
<td>5.23 15.5</td>
<td>5.46 11</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting increased interaction of individual clientele with others</td>
<td>5.13 15.5</td>
<td>5.15 17</td>
<td>5.17 16.5</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing clientele with information needed to analyze available alternatives in terms of jobs, living conditions, and cost involved</td>
<td>5.13 15.5</td>
<td>5.46 10</td>
<td>5.17 16.5</td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting clientele in developing the skills necessary to assist in the evaluation of community services such as housing, educational resources, child care facilities and employment opportunities</td>
<td>5.02 17</td>
<td>5.30 14</td>
<td>5.22 15</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping individual clientele or groups to develop skills in order to use increased leisure time</td>
<td>4.92 18.5</td>
<td>4.91 20</td>
<td>4.92 19</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing clientele with an awareness of the manner in which attitudes, values and patterns of behavior are formed</td>
<td>4.92 18.5</td>
<td>5.06 18</td>
<td>4.86 21</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Living Item</td>
<td>Agents (N = 84)</td>
<td>Specialists (N = 80)</td>
<td>Administrators (N = 77)</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting young families in the family planning process</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting various groups in developing working relationships with community services</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting clientele in developing the basic skills necessary to apply for and hold a job</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing in-service training for public employees and decision makers</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_s - Agents$-$Specialists = .96^*$
$r_s - Agents$-$Administrators = .95^*$
$r_s - Specialists$-$Administrators = .95^*$

*Significant at .01
**Significant at .05
Administrators' ranking of the top four items were also slightly different. They ranked the following four items highest:

1. Assisting clientele in the effective use and management of resources
2. Promoting the process of individual and family decision making and the skills necessary to carry out the decisions
3. Assisting individuals in the development of skills necessary to use credit wisely
4. Assisting clientele in seeking out the availability of resources to provide for the needs of the individual and family

An observation of the data indicated that agents, specialists and administrators all ranked the same item "1":

"Assisting clientele in the effective use and management of resources."

Specialists and administrators each ranked the same item "2":

"Promoting the process of individual and family decision making and the skills necessary to carry out the decisions."

Although the respondent groups differed slightly in their ranking of the four highest ranked items, the data also indicated that they perceived moderate to heavy emphasis to be placed on these highest ranking items in the future.

The data in Table 22 also show the four items that were ranked lowest by the agents, specialists and administrators. Agents ranked the following four items lowest:

1. Assisting young families in the family planning process
2. Assisting various groups in developing working relationships with community service agencies
3. Assisting clientele in developing the basic skills necessary to apply for and hold a job
4. Providing in-service training for public employees and decision makers

Specialists' perceptions on the four lowest ranked items differed slightly, hence, their ranking on the lowest four items were:

1. Helping individual clientele or groups to develop skills in order to use increased leisure time
2. Assisting young families in the family planning process
3. Assisting clientele in developing the basic skills necessary to apply for and hold a job
4. Assisting various groups in developing working relationships with community service agencies

Administrators also differed slightly based on their perceptions of the four that were ranked lowest in relation to the amount of future emphasis to be placed on them. Those four items were:

1. Assisting young families in the family planning process
2. Providing clientele with an awareness of the manner in which attitudes, values and patterns of behavior are formed
3. Assisting various groups in developing working relationships with community service agencies
4. Assisting clientele in developing the basic skills necessary to apply for and hold a job

Table 22 further illustrates that there was a noticeable difference in the perceptions of respondents on one item. This difference was shown to be statistically significant according to the Kruskall-Wallis Test on the following item:

- Providing in-service training for public employees and decision makers
The data presented in Table 22 show that the difference on this item was the result of a greater degree of difference in the mean weighted score of agents than state specialists or administrators.

Table 22 illustrates a comparison of the overall rankings of the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators regarding their agreement on the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service. A value of .96 for agents and specialists; .95 for agents and administrators; and .95 for specialists and administrators resulted from an application of the Spearman-Rank Order Correlation to the rankings of the twenty-three quality of living items. These values indicate a very strong positive correlation on the overall rankings of agents, specialists and administrators. This indicates a very high degree of agreement among agents, specialists and administrators in terms of the rankings and the emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs which were most highly ranked and those lowest ranked.

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Future Emphasis to be Placed on Social and Economic Development Programs

The data presented in this section reflect the comparison of the respondents' perceptions of the future emphasis placed on social and economic development programs of the Cooperative Extension Service. The scale used to indicate the respondents perceptions was:

7 = very heavy emphasis
6 = heavy emphasis
5 = moderate emphasis
4 = undecided
3 = little emphasis
2 = very little emphasis
1 = no emphasis
TABLE 23

COMPARISON OF COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS', STATE SPECIALISTS' AND ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS
OF THE FUTURE EMPHASIS TO BE PLACED ON SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social and Economic Development Item</th>
<th>Agents (N = 84)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 80)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score Rank</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score Rank</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score Rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting producers in developing skills for improving their marketing decisions</td>
<td>6.19 1</td>
<td>6.08 1</td>
<td>6.18 1</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting landowners in understanding soil and water conservation problems, their effects on agriculture production and the general economy</td>
<td>6.06 2</td>
<td>5.94 4</td>
<td>5.84 4</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting producers in developing new and improved systems for marketing and processing</td>
<td>6.05 3.5</td>
<td>5.98 3</td>
<td>5.90 2</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing producers with updated information and research necessary for expanding markets for agricultural products</td>
<td>6.05 3.5</td>
<td>5.81 5</td>
<td>5.86 3</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping landowners understand the need for long-range planning for management and use of their soil and water resources and the economic alternative available to them for developing these resources</td>
<td>6.04 5</td>
<td>6.03 2</td>
<td>5.73 5</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Economic Development Item</td>
<td>Agents (N = 84)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specialists (N = 80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping the general public understand soil and water problems and support programs directed at solving them</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting producers in improving the efficiency of supply, marketing and processing firms</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting producers in developing new farm supply and marketing enterprises</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting forestry production and marketing clientele in obtaining information and recent research pertaining to timber production technology</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting landowners in cooperative planning for development of soil and water resources on a complete watershed basis</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to improve decisions made concerning forestry products, marketing and utilization</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to marketing primary forestry products</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table continues on the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social and Economic Development Item</th>
<th>Agents (N = 84)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 80)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing forestry production and marketing clientele with assistance in the multi-use of small woodlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.51 13</td>
<td>5.64 9</td>
<td>5.43 9</td>
<td>.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping landowners develop non-food producing businesses such as recreation enterprises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.93 14</td>
<td>4.76 14</td>
<td>4.77 14</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_s$ - Agents-Specialists = .80*  
$r_s$ - Agents-Administrators = .90*  
$r_s$ - Specialists-Administrators = .90*  

*Significant at .01  
**Significant at .05
The data presented in Table 23 show a comparison of agents, specialists and administrators on each item relating to social and economic development programs of the Cooperative Extension Service. The following five items were ranked the highest by agents, specialists and administrators. Those items were:

1. Assisting producers in developing skills for improving marketing decisions
2. Assisting landowners in understanding soil and water conservation problems, their effects on agriculture production and the general economy
3. Assisting producers in developing new and improved systems for marketing and processing
4. Providing producers with updated information and research necessary for expanding markets for agricultural products
5. Helping landowners understand the need for long-range planning for management and use of their soil and water resources and the economic alternative available to them for developing these resources.

Although the respondents differed slightly in their ranking of the four highest ranked items, the data indicated that they perceived moderate to heavy emphasis should be placed on these highest ranked items in the future.

As illustrated in Table 23, the respondent groups did not rank the lowest four items similarly with respect to their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on them. Agents ranked the following four items lowest with reference to future emphasis to be placed on them:

1. Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to improve decisions made concerning forestry products, marketing and utilization
2. Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to marketing primary forestry products
3. Providing forestry production and marketing clientele with assistance in the multi-use of small woodlands

4. Helping landowners develop non-food producing businesses such as recreation enterprises

Specialists perceived the following five items as being ranked the lowest four with reference to future emphasis to be placed on them:

1. Assisting landowners in cooperative planning for development of soil and water resources on a complete watershed basis

2. Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to marketing primary forestry products

3. Assisting producers in developing new farm supply and marketing enterprises

4. Helping the general public understand soil and water problems and support programs directed at solving them

5. Helping landowners develop non-food producing businesses such as recreation enterprises

Administrators also perceived five items as being ranked the lowest four with reference to future emphasis being placed on them. Those five items were as follows:

1. Assisting producers in developing new farm supply and marketing enterprises

2. Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to marketing primary forestry products

3. Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to improve decisions made concerning forestry products, marketing and utilization

4. Assisting landowners in cooperative planning for development of soil and water resources on a complete watershed basis

5. Helping landowners develop non-food producing businesses such as recreation enterprises
Although the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators ranked the lowest four or five social and economic development items differently, it is interesting to note that all three respondent groups perceived the same item least with reference to future emphasis to be placed on it. That item was:

"Helping landowners develop non-food producing businesses such as recreation enterprises."

Table 23 illustrates that there were noticeable differences in the perceptions of the respondents on several social and economic development items. Those differences were shown to be statistically significant according to the Kruskall-Wallis Test on the following items:

- Helping the general public understand soil and water problems and support programs directed at solving them
- Assisting landowners in cooperative planning for development of soil and water resources on a complete watershed basis
- Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to improve decisions made concerning forestry products, marketing and utilization

The data presented in Table 23 show that the differences on these items were the result of a greater degree of difference in the mean weighted scores of agents, specialists and administrators. The data show that the difference on the item "helping the general public understand soil and water problems and support programs directed at solving them" was a result of a greater difference in the mean weighted score of agents than state specialists and administrators. The difference on the items "assisting landowners in cooperative planning for development of soil and water resources on a complete watershed basis" and "helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to
improve decisions made concerning forestry products, marketing and utilization" were a result of a greater difference in the mean weighted scores of administrators than agents or specialists.

Table 23 shows a comparison of the overall rankings of the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators regarding their agreement of the future emphasis to be placed on social and economic development programs by the Cooperative Extension Service. A value of .80 for agents and specialists; .90 for agents and administrators; and .90 for specialists and administrators resulted from an application of the Spearman-Rank Order Correlation to the rankings of the fourteen social and economic development items. These values indicate a very strong positive correlation of the overall rankings of agents, specialists and administrators. This indicates a very high degree of agreement among agents, specialists and administrators in terms of the rankings of quality of living programs which were most highly ranked and those lowest ranked.

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Future Emphasis to be Placed on Agriculture and Related Industries Programs

The data presented in this section reflect the comparison of agents, specialists and administrators perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs of the Cooperative Extension Service. Respondents were instructed to indicate their perceptions by using the following scale:

7 = very heavy emphasis
6 = heavy emphasis
5 = moderate emphasis
4 = undecided
3 = little emphasis
2 = very little emphasis
1 = no emphasis
Table 24 presents data that illustrates a comparison of the respondents on each item relating to future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs of the Cooperative Extension Service. As shown in Table 24, agents, specialists and administrators differed in their ranking of the highest four agriculture and related industries items with respect to their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on them. The agents ranking for the highest four items were:

1. Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with updated research information related to controlling disease, insects, weeds and other pests

2. Helping agriculture and related industries clientele obtain most recent research results on improving harvesting, storage and marketing

3. Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in obtaining information necessary for improving plant and animal nutrition and feeding

4. Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in obtaining information necessary for plant and animal selection and breeding

Specialists ranked the following four items highest:

1. Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with updated research information related to controlling disease, insects, weeds, and other pests

2. Helping agriculture and related industries clientele obtain the most recent research results on improving harvesting, storage and marketing

3. Helping agriculture and related industries clientele acquire the skills necessary to adopt more effective and economically feasible production technology

4. Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with educational information to aid in developing an understanding of situations, outlook, policy, market structure and other forces affecting decisions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agriculture and Related Industries Item</th>
<th>Agents (N = 84)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 80)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with updated research information related to controlling disease, insects, weeds, and other pests</td>
<td>6.44 1</td>
<td>6.23 1</td>
<td>6.29 1</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping agriculture and related industries clientele obtain the most recent research results on improving harvesting, storage and marketing</td>
<td>6.32 2</td>
<td>6.13 2</td>
<td>6.00 4</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in obtaining information necessary for improving plant and animal nutrition and feeding</td>
<td>6.14 3</td>
<td>6.00 6</td>
<td>6.01 3</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting agricultural and related industry clientele in obtaining information necessary for plant and animal selection and breeding</td>
<td>6.13 4</td>
<td>4.01 5</td>
<td>5.84 7.5</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping agricultural and related industry clientele acquire the skills necessary to adopt more effective and economically feasible production technology</td>
<td>6.11 5</td>
<td>6.09 3</td>
<td>5.97 5</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Related Industries Item</td>
<td>Agents (N = 84)</td>
<td>Specialists (N = 80)</td>
<td>Administrators (N = 77)</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score Rank</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting agriculture and related indus-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tries clientele in organizing their re-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources into more effective and profit-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>able production units</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance and educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs to agriculture and related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industries clientele necessary to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjust output to market demands as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related to quantity, quality and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seasonality of output</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing agriculture and related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industries clientele with educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information to aid in developing and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding of situations, outlook,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy, market structure and other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forces affecting decisions</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting agriculture and related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industries clientele in developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills necessary to improve manage-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ment through consideration of size,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization and effective allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of resources</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping agriculture and related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industries clientele improve the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiency of selection, procurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and use of supplies, labor and credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Related Industries Item</td>
<td>Agents (N = 84)</td>
<td>Specialists (N = 80)</td>
<td>Administrators (N = 77)</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in developing skills necessary to compete more effectively in world markets</td>
<td>5.75 11</td>
<td>5.95 8.5</td>
<td>5.69 10</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with information necessary for the design, construction, procurement, maintenance, and use of buildings and equipment</td>
<td>5.70 12</td>
<td>5.34 12</td>
<td>5.18 12</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n = 12 \)

\( r_s - \text{Agents-Specialists} = .84^* \)

\( r_s - \text{Agents-Administrators} = .83^* \)

\( r_s - \text{Specialists-Administrators} = .68^{**} \)

*Significant at .01

**Significant at .05
Administrators ranked top four somewhat differently than did agents and specialists. They ranked the following four highest:

1. Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with updated research information related to controlling disease, insects, weeds, and other pests

2. Assisting agriculture and related industry clientele in organizing their resources into more effective and profitable production units

3. Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in obtaining information necessary for improving plant and animal nutrition and feeding

4. Helping agriculture and related industries clientele obtain the most recent research results on improving harvesting, storage and marketing

Although the three respondent groups differed somewhat in their ranking of the four highest agriculture and related industries items with reference to the future emphasis to be placed on them, it was interesting to note that there was agreement on several items. Agents, specialists and administrators all ranked the same item "1":

"Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with updated research information related to controlling disease, insects, weeds, and other pests."

Agents and specialists both ranked the same item "2":

"Helping agriculture and related industries clientele obtain the most recent research results on improving harvesting, storage and marketing."

Agents and administrators both ranked the same item "3":

"Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in obtaining information necessary for improving plant and animal nutrition."
While there were differences in the overall rankings of the top highest four items by agents, specialists and administrators, the data indicated that they perceive moderate to heavy emphasis to be placed on these four highest ranked agriculture and related industries items in the future by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 24 also shows the four items that were ranked lowest by agents, specialists and administrators. Agents ranked the following four items lowest:

1. Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in developing skills necessary to improve management through consideration of size, organization and effective allocation of resources

2. Helping agriculture and related industries clientele improve the efficiency of selection, procurement and use of supplies, labor and credit

3. Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in developing skills necessary to compete more effectively in world markets

4. Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with information necessary for the design, construction, procurement, maintenance, and use of buildings and equipment

Specialists perceived the following five items to be the lowest ranked with reference to future emphasis. The lowest ranked items were:

1. Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in developing skills necessary to improve management through consideration of size, organization and effective allocation of resources

2. Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in developing skills necessary to compete more effectively in world markets
3. Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in organizing their resources into more effective and profitable production units

4. Helping agriculture and related industries clientele improve the efficiency of selection, procurement and use of supplies, labor and credit

5. Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with information necessary for the design, construction, procurement, maintenance, and use of buildings and equipment

Administrators also ranked the lowest items slightly differently than agents and specialists. The four lowest ranked items by administrators were:

1. Providing assistance and educational programs to agriculture and related industries clientele necessary to adjust output to market demands as related to quantity, quality and seasonality of output

2. Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in developing skills necessary to compete more effectively in world markets

3. Helping agriculture and related industries clientele improve the efficiency of selection, procurement and use of supplies, labor and credit

4. Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with information necessary for the design, construction, procurement, maintenance and use of buildings and equipment

Although there were differences in the rankings of the lowest agriculture and related industries items by agents, specialists and administrators with reference to the future emphasis to be placed on them, it should be noted that the data showed there were agreement on several items. Agents, specialists and administrators all ranked the same item lowest:
"Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with information necessary for the design, construction, procurement, maintenance, and use of buildings and equipment."

Table 24 illustrates that there were differences in the perceptions of the respondents on several agriculture and related industries items with respect to the amount of emphasis to be placed on them in the future. However, no difference was shown to be statistically significant at the .05 level of significance according to the Kruskall-Wallis Test.

Table 24 also shows a comparison of the overall rankings of the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators regarding their agreement of the future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries program by the Cooperative Extension Service. A value of .84 for agents and specialists; .83 for agents and administrators; and .68 for specialists and administrators resulted from the application of the Spearman-Rank Correlation to the rankings of the twelve agriculture and related industries items. The values between agents and specialists and agents and administrators indicate a very strong positive correlation on the overall rankings of agents and specialists and agents and administrators. The value between specialists and administrators indicates a substantial positive correlation on the overall rankings of specialists and administrators. The very strong positive correlation and the substantial positive correlation indicate that agents, specialists and administrators are in a relative high degree of agreement on the rankings and the future emphasis indicated to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs.
Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Future Emphasis to be Placed on Clientele Audiences (Farm Operations)

The data presented in this section reflect the comparison of agents, specialists and administrators' perceptions of the emphasis the Cooperative Extension Service should place on the following audiences in the future. To record the respondents perceptions the following rating scale was used:

7 = very heavy emphasis  
6 = heavy emphasis  
5 = moderate emphasis  
4 = undecided  
3 = keep the same  
2 = little emphasis  
1 = not at all important

Table 25 presents data that shows a comparison of agents, specialists and administrators on each farm operations group with reference to future emphasis to be placed on the overall clientele audience of farm operations by the Cooperative Extension Service. Table 25 shows that agents, specialists and administrators ranked the same groups the highest four clientele audiences of farm operations with respect to their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on them. The highest four audience groups of farm operations were:

1. Family farms  
2. Low-income farms  
3. Other commercial family farms  
4. Part-time farms

With all three respondent groups ranking the top four highest groups the same, the data indicated that agents, specialists and administrators perceived moderate to fairly heavy emphasis to be placed on these four
### TABLE 25

**COMPARISON OF COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS', STATE SPECIALISTS' AND ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE FUTURE EMPHASIS TO BE PLACED ON CLIENTELE AUDIENCES (FARM OPERATIONS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele Audiences</th>
<th>Agents (N = 178)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family farms</td>
<td>6.41 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.28 1</td>
<td>6.43 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income farms</td>
<td>5.82 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.67 2</td>
<td>5.97 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other commercial family farms</td>
<td>5.60 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.47 3</td>
<td>5.73 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time farms</td>
<td>5.12 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.66 4</td>
<td>5.29 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other commercial corporate farms</td>
<td>4.82 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.65 5</td>
<td>4.51 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired farm families</td>
<td>4.72 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.45 6</td>
<td>4.79 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly specialized farms</td>
<td>4.33 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.36 7</td>
<td>4.25 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 7

*Significant at .01  
**Significant at .05
highest farm operation clientele groups in the future by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 25 also shows that agents, specialists and administrators ranked the same audience groups lowest with reference to their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on them. These lowest ranked three farm operation audience groups were:

1. Other commercial farms
2. Retired farm families
3. Highly specialized farms

While there was a slight difference in the ranking of the lowest three farm operation audience groups by agents, specialists and administrators the data showed there were agreement on the audience group ranked least;

"Highly specialized farms."

It was also illustrated in Table 25 that there were noticeable differences in the perceptions of the respondents on one farm operation group. That difference was shown to be statistically significant according to the Kruskall-Wallis Test on the following group:

- Part-time farms

The data present in Table 25 show that the difference on this item was the result of a greater degree of difference in the mean weighted score of specialists than agents or administrators.

Table 25 shows a comparison of the overall rankings of the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators regarding their agreement of the future emphasis to be placed on farm operation audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service. A value of 1.00 for agents and specialists;
.83 for agents and administrators; and .83 for specialists and administrators resulted from an application of the Spearman-Rank Correlation to the rankings of the seven farm operation clientele audiences. The value for agents and specialists indicated a correlation on the overall rankings of these two groups. The value for agents and administrators and specialists and administrators indicate a very strong positive correlation on the overall rankings. The perfect correlation between agents and specialists was significant at the .01 level. This indicates a very high degree of agreement among agents, specialists and administrators in terms of the ranking of farm operation clientele audiences which were most highly ranked and those ranked lowest.

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Future Emphasis to be Placed on Clientele Audiences (Rural Non-Farm Families)

Data presented in this section reflect the comparison of agents, specialists and administrators perceptions of the emphasis the Cooperative Extension Service should place on the following audiences in the future. Respondents were instructed to use the following scale to record their perceptions:

7 = very heavy emphasis  
6 = heavy emphasis  
5 = moderate emphasis  
4 = undecided  
3 = keep the same  
2 = little emphasis  
1 = not at all important

Table 26 presents data that shows a comparison of agents, specialists and administrators on each rural non-farm family group with reference to future emphasis to be placed on the clientele audience of rural non-farm families by the Cooperative Extension Service. Table 26 shows that
## TABLE 26

COMPARISON OF COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS', STATE SPECIALISTS' AND ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE FUTURE EMPHASIS TO BE PLACED ON CLIENTELE AUDIENCES (RURAL NON-FARM FAMILIES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele Audiences</th>
<th>Agents (N = 178)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Test Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>5.44 1</td>
<td>5.37 2</td>
<td>5.62 1</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village and town (under 2,500 pop.)</td>
<td>5.35 2</td>
<td>5.47 1</td>
<td>5.33 2</td>
<td>.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open country</td>
<td>5.10 3</td>
<td>5.12 3</td>
<td>5.21 3</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>4.83 4</td>
<td>4.76 4</td>
<td>4.74 4</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 4 \]

\[ r_s - \text{Agents-Specialists} = .98** \]

\[ r_s - \text{Agents-Administrators} = 1.00* \]  

\[ r_s - \text{Specialists-Administrators} = .98** \]

*Significant at .01  
**Significant at .05
agents, specialists and administrators ranked the same groups highest with respect to their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on them. The highest two audience groups of rural non-farm families were:

1. Low-income
2. Village and town (under 2,500 population)

Although agents, specialists and administrators ranking of the top two highest groups was slightly different, the data indicated that the respondents perceived moderate emphasis to be placed on these two groups in the future by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 26 also shows that agents, specialists and administrators ranked the same audience groups lowest with reference to their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on them. The lowest ranked two rural non-farm families audience groups were:

1. Open country
2. Retirement

While agents, specialists and administrators ranked the audience groups of rural non-farm families slightly different as a group, there were no differences shown to be statistically significant according to the Kruskal-Wallis Test at the .05 level of significance.

Table 26 shows a comparison of the overall rankings of the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators regarding their agreement of the future emphasis to be placed on clientele audiences groups of rural non-farm families by the Cooperative Extension Service. A value of .98 for agents and specialists; 1.0 for agents and administrators; and .98 for specialists and administrators resulted from an application
of the Spearman-Rank Correlation to the rankings of the four rural non-farm family clientele audiences. Each of these $r_s$ indicated a very strong positive correlation between the respondents on the overall rankings. This indicates a very high degree of agreement among agents, specialists and administrators in terms of the ranking of rural non-farm clientele audiences which were most highly ranked and those ranked lowest.

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Future Emphasis to be Placed on Clientele Audiences (Urban Families)

The data presented in this section reflect the comparison of agents, specialists and administrators perceptions of the future emphasis the Cooperative Extension Service should place on the clientele audiences of urban families in the future. Respondents were instructed to record their perceptions by using the following scale:

- 7 = very heavy emphasis
- 6 = heavy emphasis
- 5 = moderate emphasis
- 4 = undecided
- 3 = keep the same
- 2 = little emphasis
- 1 = not at all important

Table 27 presents data that illustrates a comparison of agents, specialists and administrators on each urban family group with reference toward future emphasis to be placed on the clientele audiences of urban families by the Cooperative Extension Service. Table 27 shows that agents, specialists and administrators ranked each of the clientele audience of urban families the same. The two highest ranked groups were:

1. Small cities (2,000 - 50,000 population)
2. Low-income
TABLE 27

COMPARISON OF COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS', STATE SPECIALISTS' AND ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS
OF THE FUTURE EMPHASIS TO BE PLACED ON CLIENTELE AUDIENCES (URBAN FAMILIES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele Audiences</th>
<th>Agents (N = 178)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Score Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small cities (2,000 - 50,000 pop.)</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1 1 .854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>2 2 .834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>3 3 .413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired families</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4 4 .228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central cities (over 50,000 pop)</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>5 5 .500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 5 \]
\[ r_s - \text{Agents-Specialists} = .90^{**} \]
\[ r_s - \text{Agents-Administrators} = 1.00^* \]
\[ r_s - \text{Specialists-Administrators} = .90^{**} \]

*Significant at .01
**Significant at .05
With all three respondent groups ranking the same, the data shows that agents, specialists and administrators perceive moderate emphasis to be placed on these two highest ranked urban family clientele audience groups by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 27 also shows that agents, specialists and administrators also ranked the same audience groups lowest with reference to their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on them. These lowest ranked three urban family clientele audience groups were:

1. Suburban
2. Retired families
3. Central cities (over 50,000 population)

With agents, specialists and administrators ranking each group of urban family clientele audiences the same, an application of the Kruskall-Wallis Test revealed that there were no differences that were statistically significant at the .05 level of significance.

Table 27 shows a comparison of the overall rankings of the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators regarding their agreement of the future emphasis to be placed on clientele audience groups of urban families by the Cooperative Extension Service. A value of .90 for agents and specialists; 1.0 for agents and administrators; and .90 for specialists and administrators resulted from application of the Spearman-Rank Correlation to the rankings of the four urban family clientele audiences. All three values indicated a very strong positive correlation between the respondents on the overall rankings. This indicates a very high degree of agreement among agents, specialists and administrators in terms of urban family clientele audiences which were most highly ranked and those
Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Future Emphasis to be Placed on Clientele Audiences (Industry Personnel)

Data presented in this section reflect the comparison of agents, specialists and administrators' perception of the future emphasis the Cooperative Extension Service should place on the clientele audiences of industrial personnel in the future. The following scale was used to record the respondents' perceptions:

- 7 = very heavy emphasis
- 6 = heavy emphasis
- 5 = moderate emphasis
- 4 = undecided
- 3 = keep the same
- 2 = little emphasis
- 1 = not at all important

Table 28 presents data that shows a comparison of agents, specialists and administrators on each industrial personnel audience clientele group with reference toward future emphasis to be placed on these audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service. Table 28 shows that specialists and administrators ranked industry personnel clientele audiences the same with references toward their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on them. The following three groups were ranked highest:

1. Cooperatives
2. Small businesses
3. Farm product purchasers and processors

Agents ranked the industrial personnel clientele audiences somewhat differently than agents or specialists. Agents ranked the following four groups as being the top three with reference toward their perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on them:
TABLE 28
COMPARISON OF COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS', STATE SPECIALISTS' AND ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE FUTURE EMPHASIS TO BE PLACED ON CLIENTELE AUDIENCE (INDUSTRY PERSONNEL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele Audiences</th>
<th>Agents (N = 178)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm product purchasers and processors</td>
<td>5.17 1.5</td>
<td>5.09 3</td>
<td>5.17 3</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td>5.17 1.5</td>
<td>5.26 1</td>
<td>5.46 1</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm suppliers</td>
<td>5.12 2</td>
<td>4.93 4</td>
<td>4.97 4</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small businesses</td>
<td>5.09 3</td>
<td>5.20 2</td>
<td>5.21 2</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit and finance institutions</td>
<td>5.03 4</td>
<td>4.84 5</td>
<td>4.90 5</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>4.49 5</td>
<td>4.37 6</td>
<td>4.25 6</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 6
rs - Agents-Specialists = .73
rs - Agents-Administrators = .73
rs - Specialists-Administrators = 1.00

*Significant at .01
1. Farm product purchasers and processors
2. Cooperatives
3. Farm suppliers
4. Small businesses

Although there were slight differences in the rankings of the highest ranked groups by agents, specialists and administrators, the data showed that the respondents perceived moderate emphasis to be placed on the highest three ranked industrial personnel clientele audience groups by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 28 also shows that specialists and administrators ranked the same three industrial personnel clientele audiences lowest. Those three groups were:

1. Farm suppliers
2. Credit and finance institutions
3. Corporations

Agents ranked two of the same industrial personnel clientele audiences lowest as did specialists and administrators. Those two lowest ranked groups were:

1. Credit and finance institutions
2. Corporations

Although agents, specialists and administrators ranked the groups of industrial personnel clientele audiences slightly differently, the data in Table 28 shows that these differences were not significant at the .05 level according to the Kruskall-Wallis Test.

Table 28 shows a comparison of the overall rankings of the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators regarding their agreement of the future emphasis to be placed on industrial personnel clientele audiences
by the Cooperative Extension Service. A value of .73 for agents and specialists; .73 for agents and administrators; and 1.00 for specialists and administrators resulted from an application of the Spearman-Rank Correlation to the rankings of the six industrial personnel clientele audiences. These values indicated a very strong positive correlation on the overall rankings of agents, specialists and administrators. This indicates a relative high degree of agreement among the groups in terms of the ranking of industrial personnel clientele audiences which were most highly ranked and those ranked lowest.

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Future Emphasis to be Placed on Clientele Audiences (Organizations and Institutions)

The data presented in this section reflect a comparison of agents, specialists and administrators perceptions of the emphasis to be the clientele audiences of organizations and institutions by the Cooperative Extension Service in the future. Respondents were instructed to record their perceptions by using the following scale:

- 7 = very heavy emphasis
- 6 = heavy emphasis
- 5 = moderate emphasis
- 4 = undecided
- 3 = keep the same
- 2 = little emphasis
- 1 = not at all important

Table 29 presents data that shows a comparison of agents, specialists and administrators on each organization and institution group with reference to future emphasis to be placed on the overall clientele of organizations and institutions by the Cooperative Extension Service. Table 29 shows that agents, specialists and administrators all ranked the
TABLE 29

COMPARISON OF COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS', STATE SPECIALISTS' AND ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE FUTURE EMPHASIS TO BE PLACED ON CLIENTELE AUDIENCES (ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele Audiences</th>
<th>Agents (N = 178)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations and Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County and community organizations</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm organizations</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agencies and officials</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and industry organizations</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor organizations</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 6

$r_s$ - Agents-Specialists = 1.00  
$r_s$ - Agents-Administrators = .83  
$r_s$ - Specialists-Administrators = .83  

*Significant at .05
three groups highest with reference to their perceptions of the emphasis to be placed on them in the future, however, administrators perceived the order of the top three highest groups slightly different than agents or administrators. Agents and specialists ranked the top three highest organization and institution clientele audiences as follows:

1. Educational
2. County and community organizations
3. Farm organizations

Administrators ranked the top three highest organization and institution clientele audiences in the following order:

1. County and community organizations
2. Farm organizations
3. Educational

While the order in which agents, specialists and administrators ranked the top three highest groups slightly different, the data shows that the respondents perceived moderate to heavy emphasis to be placed on these three highest ranked organization and institution clientele audiences in the future by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 29 also shows that agents, specialists and administrators ranked the same groups lowest with reference to their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on them. These lowest ranked three organization and institution clientele audiences were:

1. Government agencies and officials
2. Trade and industry organizations
3. Labor organizations
Although there were slight differences the rankings of the groups of organization and institution clientele audiences by agents, specialists and administrators, Table 29 shows that none of these differences were shown to be statistically significant according to the Kruskall-Wallis Test.

Table 29 further shows a comparison of the overall rankings of the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators regarding their agreement of the future emphasis to be placed on organization and institution clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service. A value of 1.00 for agents and specialists; .83 for agents and administrators; and .83 for specialists and administrators resulted from an application of the Spearman-Rank Correlation to the rankings of the six organization and institution clientele audiences. Each of these correlations represent a very strong positive correlation between agents and specialists, agents and administrators, and administrators and specialists. This indicates a very high degree of agreement among agents, specialists and administrators in terms of the ranking of organization and institution clientele audiences which were most highly ranked and those ranked lowest.

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Future Emphasis to be Placed on Clientele Audiences (Non-Extension Professionals)

Agents, specialists and administrators were asked to indicate their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on the clientele audience of "Non-Extension Professionals" by the Cooperative Extension Service. To record the respondents perceptions the following rating scale was used:
As shown in Table 30 the data indicated that agents, specialists and administrators perceived moderate to heavy future emphasis to be placed on non-extension clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

According to the Kruskall-Wallis Test there was no significant difference in the perceptions of the respondents on this clientele group.

**Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Future Emphasis to be Placed on Clientele Audiences (General Public)**

Agents, specialists and administrators were asked to indicate their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on the clientele audience of the "General Public" by the Cooperative Extension Service. The respondents were asked to record their perceptions by using the following scale:

- 7 = very heavy emphasis
- 6 = heavy emphasis
- 5 = moderate emphasis
- 4 = undecided
- 3 = keep the same
- 2 = little emphasis
- 1 = not at all important

As shown in Table 31 the data indicated that agents, specialists and administrators perceived moderate to heavy future emphasis to be placed on the general public clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.
**TABLE 30**

COMPARISON OF COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS', STATE SPECIALISTS' AND ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE FUTURE EMPHASIS TO BE PLACED ON CLIENTELE AUDIENCES (NON-EXTENSION PROFESSIONALS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele Audience</th>
<th>Agents (N = 178)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Extension Professionals</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 31

COMPARISON OF COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS', STATE SPECIALISTS' AND ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS
OF THE FUTURE EMPHASIS TO BE PLACED ON CLIENTELE AUDIENCES (GENERAL PUBLIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele Audience</th>
<th>Agents (N = 178)</th>
<th>Specialists (N = 152)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 77)</th>
<th>Kruskall-Wallis Test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean Wt. Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the Kruskall-Wallis Test there was no significant difference in the perceptions of the three respondent groups on this clientele group.

One of the major objectives of this study was to determine the relationship of the personal characteristics of sex, age, tenure in the Extension Service, area of major responsibility, kind of institution graduated, background training and highest academic degree held on the perceptions of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators concerning future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service and future program areas and clientele. Spearman-Rank Order Coefficient of Correlation ($r_s$) and the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance ($W$) were used as the two measures of association of the ranks.

**Future Characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service**

Table 32 presents data concerning the relationship between the perceptions of agreement of the different personal characteristics category groups of the respondents regarding the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 32 shows there was a low positive correlation between the perceptions of the respondents falling in the different sex category groups. A $r_s$ value of .11 was found between female and male respondents regarding the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service. This low positive correlation between female and male respondent groups showed a low degree of agreement existed between these two groups on their perceptions of the future characteristic of the Cooperative Extension Service.
### TABLE 32

RANK OF FUTURE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE FOR AGREEMENT BY SEX AND AGE RESPONDENT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Characteristics Item</th>
<th>Sex Rank</th>
<th>Age Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will help people identify and understand their needs and problems and will use technology or other information in solving them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will be practical, problem centered and situation based</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will help people solve problems and take advantage of opportunities, through education</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will be a professional function staffed by college trained personnel specifically qualified for positions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will provide educational programs directed at broad national purposes, yet serving specific local needs with priorities determined locally</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will provide informal, non-credit education conducted primarily beyond the formal classroom, and for all ages</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will be educational in problem content and methodology not regulatory or financial oriented</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will be administratively attached to a public university system and will be a major part of it, rather than being attached directly to state government</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Characteristics Item</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will feature objective research based information and analysis of factual information for decision making by the people themselves</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will involve cooperative but not necessarily equal sharing of financial support among federal, state and county or local levels</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\begin{align*}
n &= 10 \\
R_s - \text{Sex} &= .11 \\
R_s - \text{Age} &= .91^{**}
\end{align*}

**Significant at .01**
It can be seen from the data in Table 32 that there was a very high positive correlation between the perceptions of the respondents falling in the different age category groups. A $r_s$ value of .91 was found between younger and older respondents. This value showed a very high degree of agreement on the perceived future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service.

Data presented in Table 33 shows that a coefficient of concordance ($W$) value for the future characteristics items among the different tenure category groups was .92. This value showed that a very high degree of agreement existed between the three tenure groups—under 10 years, 10 to 20 years, and over 20 years.

Table 33 shows that a coefficient of concordance ($W$) value for the future characteristics items among the different area of responsibility groups was .96. This value indicated that a very high degree of agreement existed between the perceptions of 4-H and Youth group, Agriculture: (Adult) group, Home Economics: (Adult) group, the CRD group and the Administration group.

Also illustrated in Table 33 is a coefficient of concordance ($W$) value for the different highest academic degree groups of respondents. The coefficient of concordance among these groups was .80. This value showed that there was a high degree of agreement between those respondents holding the B.S. degree as the highest academic degree, those respondents holding the M.S. degree as the highest academic degree and those respondents holding the Ph.D. degree regarding their perceptions of agreement on the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Characteristics Item</th>
<th>Area of Responsibility</th>
<th>Highest Academic Degree</th>
<th>Institution Graduated</th>
<th>Background Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under (Years)</td>
<td>4-H Agriculture</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>M.A./ M.S./ Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will help people identify and understand their needs and problems and will use technology or other information in solving them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will help people solve problems and take advantage of opportunities through education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will be educational in problem content and methodology not regulatory or financial oriented</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will be administratively attached to a public university system and will be a major part of it, rather than being attached directly to state government</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will be practical, problem centered and situation based</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Characteristics Item</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Background Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure (Years)</td>
<td>Area of Responsibility</td>
<td>Highest Academic Degree</td>
<td>Institution Graduated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>4-H Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will be a professional function staffed by college trained personnel specifically qualified for positions</td>
<td>6 8 7</td>
<td>8 7 6</td>
<td>7.5 5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will provide informal, non-credit education conducted primarily beyond the formal classroom, and for all ages</td>
<td>7.5 4.5 8</td>
<td>4.5 4</td>
<td>8 7.5 7</td>
<td>8 6 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will feature objective research based information and analysis of factual information for decision making by the people themselves</td>
<td>7.5 7 5.5</td>
<td>7 9 5</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will provide educational programs directed at broad national purposes, yet serving specific local needs with priorities determined locally</td>
<td>9 10 10</td>
<td>9 5</td>
<td>10 10 10</td>
<td>9 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will involve cooperative but not necessarily equal sharing of financial support among federal, state and county or local levels</td>
<td>10 9</td>
<td>10 10</td>
<td>9 9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*\*Significant at .01
Table 33 shows a coefficient of concordance (W) value for the future characteristics items among the respondents of the three types of institution graduated (1862, 1890 and other) groups. This coefficient of concordance value was .77. This showed a high degree of agreement existed among the perceptions of groups who graduated from an 1862 institution, 1890 institution and the group who graduated from an institution other than an 1862 or 1890 institution.

Also illustrated in Table 33 is a coefficient of concordance (W) value for the future characteristics items among the different background training groups. The coefficient of concordance value among these groups was .66. This value showed a substantial degree of agreement on the perceptions of the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service.

Research Hypothesis H1: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future characteristics by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Overall, the data in Table 32 and 33 show there was a high degree of agreement between the perceptions of the respondents falling in each of the personal characteristics groups regarding the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service. In general a relationship was found to exist between the perceptions of each personal characteristics groups. All associations were found to be significant at the .01 level of significance except the sex category group. Therefore, the research hypothesis H1 was accepted for each group except the sex category group. The coefficient of concordance (W) value for the sex category was found not to be significant at the .05 level of significance.
Based on this data the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis for those respondents falling in the personal characteristic group of sex.

**Quality of Living Programs**

Table 34 presents data concerning the relationship between the perceptions of male and female respondents regarding the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 34 shows there was a very high positive correlation between the perceptions of male and female respondents. A $r_s$ value of .81 was found between female and male respondents. This value showed a very high degree of agreement on the perceived future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs of the Cooperative Extension Service.

Also shown in Table 34 is a rank order correlation ($r_s$) of .88 found to have existed between the perceptions of the respondents of different age category groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on the area of quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service. This $r_s$ value indicated that a very high degree of agreement existed between the groups of younger and older respondents and their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 35 shows that a coefficient of concordance ($W$) value for the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living program items among the different tenure groups was .92. This value indicated that a very high degree of agreement between those respondent groups with under 10
TABLE 34
RANK OF QUALITY OF LIVING PROGRAMS OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE ITEMS FOR FUTURE EMPHASIS TO BE PLACED ON THEM BY SEX AND AGE RESPONDENT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Living Program Items</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Younger (23-43)</th>
<th>Older (44-68)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist clientele in the effective use and management of resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping clientele contribute to the family's ability to promote the development of children</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting the process of individual and family decision making and the skills necessary to carry out the decisions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting individuals in the development of skills necessary to use credit wisely</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting clientele in developing skills necessary to optimize their development as individuals and as members of the family and community (children, youth and adults)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting clientele in seeking out the availability of resources to provide for the needs of the individual and family</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiding individuals in understanding the functions of the family and its relation to the community</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 34 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Living Program Items</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing clientele with assistance in choosing among the abundance of goods and services available</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting individuals in acquiring the ability to utilize community services and to participate in the development of community services</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the social, physical and economic mobility of the individual clientele</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing clientele with an awareness of the manner in which attitudes, values, and patterns of behavior are formed</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping clientele develop as informed leaders for identifying and solving problems in a democratic society</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting clientele participation in volunteer activities aimed at community problems as a means for developing skills</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing clientele with information needed to analyze available alternatives in terms of jobs, living conditions, and cost involved</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting clientele in developing the skills necessary to assist in the evaluation of community services such as housing, educational resources, child care facilities and employment opportunities</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting clientele improvements of their community organizations and environment</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Living Program Items</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting increased interaction of individual clientele with others</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping individual clientele or groups to develop skills in</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>order to use increased leisure time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting young families in the family planning process</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting clientele in developing the skills necessary to make</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decisions related to career choice and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting clientele in developing the basic skills necessary to</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apply for and hold a job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting various groups in developing working relationships with</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community service agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing in-service training for public employees and decision</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_s - \text{Sex} = 0.81^* \]
\[ r_s - \text{Age} = 0.88^* \]

*Significant at .01
TABLE 35
RANK OF QUALITY OF LIVING PROGRAMS OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE ITEMS FOR FUTURE EMPHASIS TO BE PLACED ON THEM BY TENURE, AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY, HIGHEST ACADEMIC DEGREE, INSTITUTION GRADUATED AND BACKGROUND TRAINING RESPONDENT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Living Program Item</th>
<th>Tenure (Years)</th>
<th>Area of Responsibility</th>
<th>Highest Academic Degree</th>
<th>Institution Graduated</th>
<th>Background Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assist clientele in the effective use and management of resources
Assisting clientele in seeking out the availability of resources to provide for the needs of the individual
Assisting individuals in the development of skills necessary to use credit wisely
Promoting the process of individual and family decision making and the skills necessary to carry out the decisions
Aiding individuals in understanding the functions of the family and its relation to the community
Assisting individuals in acquiring the ability to utilize community services and to participate in the development of community services
TABLE 35 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Living Program Item</th>
<th>Tenure (Years)</th>
<th>4-H Agricultural Education</th>
<th>Home Economics</th>
<th>Highest Academic Degree</th>
<th>Institutional Graduates</th>
<th>Background Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Over 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing clientele with information needed to analyze available alternatives in terms of jobs, living conditions, and cost involved</td>
<td>10.5 15 18</td>
<td>14.5 13 14 15 17</td>
<td>13.5 14 14</td>
<td>15 7 10</td>
<td>12 18.5 14.5 14.5</td>
<td>18.5 14.5 14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting clientele participation in volunteer activities aimed at community problems as a means for developing skills</td>
<td>12 13.5 15</td>
<td>11 14.5 16 8.5 9.5</td>
<td>18 12 12</td>
<td>13 11.5 17</td>
<td>11 12 16.5 16</td>
<td>18.5 14.5 14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing clientele with assistance in choosing among the abundance of goods and services available</td>
<td>5 5 8</td>
<td>7.5 5 5 6 11</td>
<td>3 7 7</td>
<td>6 3 5</td>
<td>8.5 5.5 5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping clientele contribute to the family's ability to promote the development of children</td>
<td>6 7 7</td>
<td>7.5 2 6.5 12.5 6</td>
<td>6 5 6</td>
<td>7 2.5 2</td>
<td>5 1 7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping clientele develop as informed leaders for identifying and solving problems in a democratic society</td>
<td>7.5 8 6</td>
<td>9 12 6.5 2.5 5</td>
<td>7 8 5</td>
<td>5 6 11.5</td>
<td>6 18.5 8.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting clientele in developing skills necessary to optimize their development as individuals and as members of the family and community (children, youth and adults)</td>
<td>7.5 6 9</td>
<td>4 8 0 10.5 8</td>
<td>8 6 8</td>
<td>8 17 6</td>
<td>7 10 10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Area of Responsibility</td>
<td>Highest Academic Degree</td>
<td>Background Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Living</td>
<td>Institution Graduated</td>
<td>4-H Agricult.</td>
<td>Home &amp; Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Item</td>
<td>B.S. M.S. Ph.D.</td>
<td>Youth (Adult)</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure (Years)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Adult)</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under</td>
<td>Over</td>
<td>CRD Admin.</td>
<td>Biological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Assisting clientele in</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>developing the skills</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>necessary to assist in</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the evaluation of</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community services such</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as housing, educational</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resources, child care</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>facilities and</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Promoting clientele</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improvements of their</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community organizations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and environment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Enhancing the social,</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>physical and economic</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mobility of the</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>individual clientele</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Promoting increased</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interaction of</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>individual clientele with</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>others</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Assisting clientele in</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>developing the skills</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>necessary to make</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decisions related to</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>career choice and</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Helping individual</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clientele or groups to</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>develop skills in order</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to use increased leisure</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>time</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Help</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Living Program Item</td>
<td>Area of Responsibility</td>
<td>Highest Academic Degree</td>
<td>Institution Graduated</td>
<td>Production &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-H Agricultural Home</td>
<td>M.A./B.S. M.S. Ph.D.</td>
<td>1862 1890 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Family Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRD Admin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing clientele with</td>
<td>Under 10 10-20 Over 20</td>
<td>17 19.5 19 20 21 21</td>
<td>18 20 19 20.5 8 1 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an awareness of the manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in which attitudes, values,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and patterns of behavior are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting various groups in</td>
<td>19 21 19 20 9 20 21 21</td>
<td>22 21 21 22 22 21.5 20 22</td>
<td>22 21.5 23 22 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developing working relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with community service agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing in-service training</td>
<td>20 22 20.5 21 19 19 23 19</td>
<td>19.5 19.5 20 19 21 22</td>
<td>19 17 19 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for public employees and</td>
<td>19 19 20.5 23 22 18 16.5 18</td>
<td>21 22 23 23 23 23 21.5</td>
<td>23 23 21.5 14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision makers</td>
<td>22 20 20.5 23 22 18 16.5 18</td>
<td>21 22 23 23 23 23 21.5</td>
<td>23 23 21.5 14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting clientele in</td>
<td>23 23 23 22 23 21.5 22 23</td>
<td>21 23 23 23 16 14 22 21.5</td>
<td>21.5 21.5 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developing the basic skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary to apply for and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hold a job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W – Tenure = .92** W – Area of Responsibility = .60** W – Highest Academic Degree = .67** W – Institution Graduated = .80** W – Background Training = .81**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01
year of tenure, 10 to 20 years of tenure, and those with over 20 years of tenure regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 35 also shows that a coefficient of concordance (W) value for the perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on quality of living program items among the different area of responsibility groups was .60. This value indicated a substantial degree of agreement existed between the 4-H and Youth group, Agriculture:(Adult) group, Home Economics:(Adult) group, the Community Resource Development group and the Administration group.

Also illustrated in Table 35 is a coefficient of concordance (W) value for the different highest academic degree groups of respondents regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living program items. The coefficient of concordance among these groups was .67. This value showed that there was a substantial degree of agreement between those respondents holding the B.S. degree as the highest academic degree, those respondents holding the M.S. degree as the highest academic degree and those respondents holding the Ph.D. degree regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs of the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 35 shows that a coefficient of concordance (W) value of .80 was found to exist among the respondent groups of the three types of institutions (1862, 1890 and other) graduated. This value showed a very high degree of agreement between the groups who graduated from an
1862 institution, an 1890 institution and the group who graduated from an institution on their perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Also shown in Table 35 is a coefficient of concordance (W) value for the quality of living program items between the different background training groups. The coefficient of concordance among the groups was found to be .81. This value indicated that a very high degree of agreement existed between these groups regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Research Hypothesis H2: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Overall, the data presented in Tables 34 and 35 show there was a very high degree of agreement between the perceptions of respondents falling in all the personal characteristics groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service. In general a relationship was found to exist between the perceptions of respondents of each personal characteristics category group. All associations between the rankings for each group were found to be significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, based on the data the research hypothesis H2 was accepted.

Social and Economic Development Programs

Table 36 presents data concerning the relationship between the perceptions of agreement of the different personal characteristics category groups of the respondents regarding the future emphasis to be placed on
### TABLE 36
RANK OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE ITEMS FOR FUTURE EMPHASIS TO BE PLACED ON THEM BY SEX AND AGE RESPONDENT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social and Economic Development Item</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping landowners understand the need for long-range planning for management and use of their soil and water resources and the economic alternative available to them for developing these resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting landowners in understanding soil and water conservation problems, their effects on agriculture production and the general economy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting producers in developing skills for improving their marketing decisions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping landowners develop nonfood producing businesses such as recreation enterprises</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting producers in developing new and improved systems for marketing and processing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing producers with updated information and research necessary for expanding markets for agricultural products</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting producers in improving the efficiency of supply, marketing and processing firms</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting landowners in cooperative planning for development of soil and water resources on a complete watershed basis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 36 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social and Economic Development Item</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting forestry production and marketing clientele in obtaining information and recent research pertaining to timber production technology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to improve decisions made concerning forest products, marketing and utilization</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing forestry production and marketing clientele with assistance in the multi-use of small woodlands</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting producers in developing new farm supply and marketing enterprises</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to marketing primary forestry products</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping landowners develop nonfood producing businesses such as recreation enterprises</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_s - \text{Sex} = .65^* \quad \quad r_s - \text{Age} = .91^{**} \]

*Significant at .05
**Significant at .01
social and economic development programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

As shown in Table 36, there was a high positive correlation between the perceptions of respondents falling in the different sex category groups. A $r_s$ value of .65 was found to have existed between the perceptions of female and male respondents. This value indicated a substantial degree of agreement on the perceived future emphasis to be placed on social and economic development programs by the Cooperative Extension Service by the respondents falling in the different sex category groups.

Table 36 also shows a very high positive correlation between the perceptions of respondents falling in the different age category groups. A $r_s$ value of .91 was found between the perceptions of younger and older respondents. This value shows a very high degree of agreement on the perceived future emphasis to be placed on social and economic development programs by the Cooperative Extension Service falling in the different age category groups.

Data presented in Table 37 shows that a coefficient of concordance ($W$) value for the future emphasis to be placed on social and economic development program items among the different tenure category groups was .91. This coefficient of concordance value indicated a very high degree of agreement existed between the perceptions of the respondent group with 10 to 20 years of tenure and the group with over 20 years of tenure regarding the future emphasis to be placed on social and economic development programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.
### Table 37

Rank of Social and Economic Development Programs of the Cooperative Extension Service Items for Emphasis to be Placed on Them by Tenure, Area of Responsibility, Highest Academic Degree, Institution Graduated and Background Training Respondent Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social and Economic Development</th>
<th>Tenure (Years)</th>
<th>Area of Responsibility</th>
<th>Highest Academic Degree</th>
<th>Institution Graduated</th>
<th>Background Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td>10-20 20</td>
<td>4-H Agricultural Home</td>
<td>Home &amp; Social</td>
<td>Production &amp; Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Turf Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education &amp; Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assisting producers in</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developing skills for improving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their marketing decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assisting landowners in</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding soil and</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water conservation problems,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their effects on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agriculture production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the general economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helping landowners understand</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the need for long-range planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for management and use of their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soil and water resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the economic alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>available to them for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developing these resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assisting producers in</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developing new and improved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systems for marketing and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Providing producers with</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>updated information and research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary for expanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>markets for agricultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rank

1. 1 1 1 3 1 1
2. 2 4 4 2.5 2 4 6 3.5
3. 3 5 5 2.5 1 7 1.5 2
4. 4 3 2 4 5 2 1.5 3.5
5. 5.5 2 3 5 6 3 7 5
6. 6 5 2.5 3 10.5 5
7. 5 4 3 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social and Economic Development Item</th>
<th>Tenure (Years) Under Over 10 20 10-20</th>
<th>Area of Responsibility Agriculture</th>
<th>High Academic Degree H.A./ B.S. H.S. Ph.D. 1862 1890 Other</th>
<th>Background Training Home Economics &amp; Social Sciences</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping the general public understand soil and water problems and support programs directed at solving them</td>
<td>5.5 12 10.5</td>
<td>7 4 12 8.5 8</td>
<td>4.5 9 10 8 7 7</td>
<td>6 5.5 11 11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting producers in improving the efficiency of supply, marketing and processing firms</td>
<td>7 7 6</td>
<td>8.5 7 5 10.5 6</td>
<td>7 6 7 6 13 6</td>
<td>7 7 4 7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting landowners in cooperative planning for development of soil and water resources on a complete watershed basis</td>
<td>8 13 13</td>
<td>6 8 13 5 13</td>
<td>9.5 10 13 13 3 11.5</td>
<td>8 10.5 13 12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting producers in developing new farm supply and marketing enterprises</td>
<td>9 11 12</td>
<td>11 12 9.5 12 12</td>
<td>12 7 12 10 12 9</td>
<td>10 10.5 6 13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting forestry production and marketing clientele in obtaining information and recent research pertaining to timber production technology</td>
<td>10 17</td>
<td>8.5 9.5 6 4 7</td>
<td>8 8 6 7 7.5 8</td>
<td>9 8 7 6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing forestry production and marketing clientele with assistance in the multi-use of small woodlands</td>
<td>11 10 10.5</td>
<td>11 9.5 11 8.5 9</td>
<td>13 11.5 8 11 5 6 10</td>
<td>11 9 12 8.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Economic Development Item</td>
<td>Tenure (Years)</td>
<td>Area of Responsibility</td>
<td>Highest Academic Degree</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Background Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td>4-H Agric- Home and Forestry Economics</td>
<td>Under B.S. H.S.</td>
<td>Graduated 1862</td>
<td>Producers &amp; Social Economists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1890 Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to improve decisions made concerning forest products, marketing and utilization</td>
<td>12 8 9</td>
<td>13 11 8 10.5 10</td>
<td>11 13 9 10.5 11.5</td>
<td>12 13 8 8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to marketing primary forestry products</td>
<td>13 9 8</td>
<td>8 13 9.5 13 11</td>
<td>9.5 11.5 11</td>
<td>12 5.5 13</td>
<td>13 12 10 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping landowners develop nonfood producing businesses such as recreation enterprises</td>
<td>14 14 14</td>
<td>14 14 14 14</td>
<td>14 14 14</td>
<td>14 14 14 14</td>
<td>14 14 14 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W - Tenure = .87**
W - Area of Responsibility = .76**
W - Highest Academic Degree = .87**
W - Institution Graduated = .63**
W - Background Training = .82**

**Significant at .01
Table 37 also shows that a coefficient of concordance (W) value of .82 was found to exist among the respondents falling in different background training groups and their perceptions as to the future emphasis to be placed on social and economic development programs. This coefficient of concordance value shows a very high degree of agreement among these groups regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on social and economic development programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Research Hypothesis H₃: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on social and economic development programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Overall, the data presented in Tables 36 and 37 show there was a high degree of agreement between the perceptions of respondents falling in all personal characteristics groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on social and economic development programs by the Cooperative Extension Service. In general a relationship was found to exist between the perceptions of respondents of each personal characteristics category group. All associations between the rankings for each group were found to be significant at the .05 level of significant level of significance. Therefore based on the data the research hypothesis H₃ was accepted.

Agriculture and Related Industries Programs

Table 38 presents data concerning the relationship between the perceptions of respondents of different sex category groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs of the Cooperative Extension Service.
### TABLE 38

**RANK OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED INDUSTRIES PROGRAMS OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE ITEMS FOR FUTURE EMPHASIS TO BE PLACED ON THEM BY SEX AND AGE RESPONDENT GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agriculture and Related Industries Items</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing agricultural and related industry clientele with updated research information related to controlling diseases, insects, weeds and other pests</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping agricultural and related industry clientele obtain the most recent research results on improving harvesting, storage and marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping agricultural and related industry clientele acquire the skills necessary to adopt more effective and economically feasible production technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting agricultural and related industry clientele with information necessary for improving plant and animal nutrition and feeding</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting agricultural and related industry clientele in obtaining information necessary for plant and animal selection and breeding</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance and educational programs to agricultural and related industry clientele necessary to adjust output to market demands as related to quantity, quality, and seasonality of output</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 38 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agriculture and Related Industries Items</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing agriculture and related industry clientele with educational information to aid in developing and understanding of situations, outlook, policy, market structure and other forces affecting decisions</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting agricultural and related industry clientele in organizing their resources into more efficient and profitable production units</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting agricultural and related industry clientele in developing skills necessary to compete more effectively in world markets</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting agricultural and related industry clientele in developing skills necessary to improve management through consideration of size, organization and effective allocation of resources</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping agricultural and related industry clientele improve the efficiency of the selection, procurement and use of supplies, labor and credit</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing agricultural and related industry clientele with information necessary for improving the design, construction, procurement, maintenance and use of buildings and equipment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_s - \text{Sex} = .94^* \quad r_s - \text{Age} = .96^* \]

*Significant at .01
Table 38 shows that there was a very high positive correlation between the respondents in the different sex category groups and their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on the quality of living items. A $r_s$ value of .94 was found to have existed between female and male respondents. This value indicated a very high degree of agreement between females and males on the perceived future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Also shown in Table 38 is a very high positive correlation between the respondents in the different age category groups and their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on the quality of living items. A $r_s$ value of .94 was found to have existed between the different age category groups regarding their perceptions as to the future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs. This $r_s$ value shows that a very high degree of agreement existed between the younger and older respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 39 shows that a coefficient of concordance ($W$) value for the agriculture and related industries program items among the different tenure groups was .96. This coefficient of concordance value indicated a very high degree of agreement between those tenure category groups with under 10 years of tenure, those with 10 to 20 years of tenure and those with over 20 years of tenure regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.
### Table 39

Rank of Agriculture and Related Industries Programs of the Cooperative Extension Service Items for Future Emphasis to Be Placed on Them by Tenure, Area of Responsibility, Highest Academic Degree, Institution Graduated and Background Training Respondent Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agriculture and Related Industries</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Area of Responsibility</th>
<th>Highest Academic Degree</th>
<th>Background Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-H Agricultural Home</td>
<td>4-11 - - - - - - - - - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth (Adult) (Adult)</td>
<td>CRD Admin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.S. M.S. Ph.D. 1862 1890 Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing agricultural and related industry clientele with updated research information related to controlling diseases, insects, weeds and other pests</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1.5 1 1 6 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1.5 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping agricultural and related industry clientele obtain the most recent research results on improving harvesting, storage and marketing</td>
<td>2 4 2</td>
<td>1.5 2 2 10 5</td>
<td>2 2 3.5 2.5 2 5.5 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting agricultural and related industry clientele in obtaining information necessary for improving plant and animal nutrition and feeding</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>4 6 4 7.5 3.5</td>
<td>2 5 6.5 3 5 3 4.5 3.5 3 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting agricultural and related industry clientele in obtaining information necessary for plant and animal selection and breeding</td>
<td>4 5.5 6</td>
<td>5 3 3 9 10</td>
<td>6 3.5 4 6.5 3.5 4 9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Tenure (Years)</td>
<td>Area of Responsibility</td>
<td>Highest Academic Degree</td>
<td>Institution Graduated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td>4-H Agric. Home</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>1892 Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Agric.-Home Youth</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>1890 Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>Youth (Adult)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1890 Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Helping agricultural and related industry clientele acquire the skills necessary to adopt more effective and economically feasible production technology:
  - Rank: 5 2 5 4 3 3.5
  - Tenure: Under 10 10-20 20

- Assisting agricultural and related industry clientele in organizing their resources into more efficient and profitable production units:
  - Rank: 6 5.5 4 7 6 4 2
  - Tenure: Under 10 10-20 20

- Providing assistance and educational programs to agricultural and related industry clientele necessary to adjust output to market demands as related to quantity, quality, and seasonality of output:
  - Rank: 7 8 7 6 6.5 1.5 7.5 7
  - Tenure: Under 10 10-20 20

- Providing agricultural and related industry clientele with educational information to aid in developing and understanding of situations, outlook policy, market structure and other forces affecting decisions:
  - Rank: 8.5 / 9 11 5 7.5 1 8 8 7 8
  - Tenure: Under 10 10-20 20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Agriculture and Related Industries</th>
<th>Area of Responsibility</th>
<th>Highest Academic Degree</th>
<th>Background Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Highest</strong></td>
<td><strong>Youth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Economics</strong></td>
<td><strong>M.A./</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Under</strong></td>
<td><strong>10-20</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>CRD Admin.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
<td><strong>Years</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>&amp; Others</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assisting agricultural and related industry clientele in developing skills necessary to improve management through consideration of size, organization and effective allocation of resources</strong></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assisting agricultural and related industry clientele in developing skills necessary to compete more effectively in world markets</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helping agricultural and related industry clientele improve the efficiency of the selection, procurement and use of supplies, labor and credit</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Providing agricultural and related industry clientele with information necessary for improving the design, construction, procurement, maintenance, and use of buildings and equipment</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W - Tenure = .96**  
W - Area of Responsibility = .61**  
W - Highest Academic Degree = .80**  
W - Institution Graduated = .92**  
W - Background Training = .76**  
**Significant at .01
Also shown in Table 39 is a coefficient of concordance (W) value for agriculture and related industries program items between the different background training groups. The coefficient of concordance among the groups was .76. This indicated a high degree of agreement existed between these education background groups, home economics background, production and biological science background and social sciences and other background groups regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Research Hypothesis H₄: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Overall, the data presented in Tables 38 and 39 show there was a very high degree of agreement between the respondents falling in the different personal characteristics groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs by the Cooperative Extension Service. Generally, a relationship was found to exist between the perceptions of respondents of each personal characteristics groups. All associations between the rankings for each group were found to be significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore from the data the research hypothesis H₄ was accepted.
Clientele Audiences:

Clientele Audiences (Farm Operations)

Data presented in Table 40 concern the relationship between the perceptions of agreement of respondents of the different sex category groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on farm operations clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 40 shows there was a high positive correlation between the perceptions of respondents in the different sex category groups. A $r_s$ value of .97 was found to have existed between female and male respondents. This value showed a very high degree of agreement between the different sex category groups and their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on farm operations clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Also shown in Table 40 is a rank order correlation ($r_s$) of 1.00 found to have existed between the perceptions of the respondents of the different age category groups regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on farm operations clientele audiences. This perfect correlation indicated total agreement between younger and older respondents' perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on these farm operations clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 41 shows a coefficient of concordance ($W$) value for different tenure category groups of .97. This value indicated a very high degree of agreement among the perceptions of different tenure groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on farm operations clientele audiences. This very high coefficient of concordance indicated that the respondent groups with under 10 years of tenure, those with 10 to 20 years of tenure
TABLE 40  
RANK OF CLIENTELE AUDIENCES (FARM OPERATIONS) OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE FOR FUTURE EMPHASIS TO BE PLACED ON THEM BY SEX AND AGE RESPONDENT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele Audiences (Farm Operations) Item</th>
<th>Sex Rank</th>
<th>Age Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family farms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income farms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other commercial family farms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time farms</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired farm families</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other commercial corporate farms</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly specialized corporate farms</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_s$ - Sex = .97*  
$r_s$ - Age = 1.00**

*Significant at .05  
**Significant at .01
# TABLE 41

**RANK OF CLIENTELE AUDIENCES (FARM OPERATIONS) OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE FOR FUTURE EMPHASIS TO BE PLACED ON THEM BY TENURE, AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY, HIGHEST ACADEMIC DEGREE, INSTITUTION GRADUATED AND BACKGROUND TRAINING RESPONDENT GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele Audiences (Farm Operations) Item</th>
<th>Tenure (Years)</th>
<th>Area of Responsibility</th>
<th>Highest Academic Degree</th>
<th>Institution Graduated</th>
<th>Background Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10, 10-20, 20</td>
<td>4-H Agr.-Youth (Adult)</td>
<td>Home Economics CRD Admin.</td>
<td>B.S./H.S./Ph.D.</td>
<td>1852-1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family farms</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income farms</td>
<td>2 2 3</td>
<td>2 2 3 2 2 2</td>
<td>2 2 3 2 2 2</td>
<td>3 2 2 2 2 2</td>
<td>2 2 3 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other commercial family farms</td>
<td>3 3 2</td>
<td>3 3 2 3 3 3</td>
<td>3 3 2 4 4 3</td>
<td>4 4 3 4 4 3</td>
<td>3 3 2 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time farms</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>4 4 5 4 4 4</td>
<td>4 4 4 5 4 4</td>
<td>5 3 4 5 4 4</td>
<td>4 5 5 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired farm families</td>
<td>5 6 6</td>
<td>5 5 6 5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 7 5 5 6</td>
<td>7 5 6 5 6 6</td>
<td>5 4 6 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other commercial corporate farms</td>
<td>6 5 5</td>
<td>6 6 4 6 6 6</td>
<td>6 6 5 6 5 6</td>
<td>6 6 4 5 6 5</td>
<td>6 4 5 6 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly specialized corporate farms</td>
<td>7 7 7</td>
<td>7 7 7 7 7 7</td>
<td>7 7 7 7 7 7</td>
<td>2 7 7 7 7 7</td>
<td>7 7 7 7 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W - Tenure = .97**  
W - Area of Responsibility = .95**  
W - Highest Academic Degree = .94**  
W - Institution Graduated = .73**  
W - Background Training = .90*

**Significant at .01**
and those with over 20 years of tenure highly agree as to the future emphasis to be placed on farm operations clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 41 shows that a coefficient of concordance (W) value for the perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on farm operations clientele audiences among the different area of responsibility groups was .95. This value indicated a very high degree of agreement existed between the 4-H and Youth group, Agriculture:(Adult) group, Home Economics:(Adult) group, the Community Resource Development group and the Administration group regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on farm operation clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Also shown in Table 41 is a coefficient of concordance (W) value for the different highest academic degree groups of respondents regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on farm operations clientele audiences. The coefficient of concordance among these groups was .94. This value showed that there was a very high degree of agreement between those respondents holding the B.S. degree as the highest academic degree, those respondents holding the M.S. degree as the highest academic degree and those respondents holding the Ph.D. degree regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on farm operations clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Also, Table 41 shows that a coefficient of concordance (W) value of .73 was found to exist among the respondent groups of the three types of institution (1862, 1890 and other) graduated. This coefficient of
concordance value show a high degree of agreement existed between the
groups who graduated from an 1862 institution, an 1890 institution and
the respondent group who graduated from an institution other than an
1862 or 1890 institution regarding their perceptions of the future
emphasis to be placed on farm operations clientele by the Cooperative
Extension Service.

Table 41 further shows a coefficient of concordance (W) for farm
operations clientele audiences and the different background training
groups. The coefficient of concordance among these groups was found to
be .90. This value indicated a very high degree of agreement existed
between the different background training groups of education, home
economics, production and biological sciences, social sciences and other
backgrounds regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be
placed on farm operations clientele audiences by the Cooperative Exten­
sion Service.

Research Hypothesis H5: There will be relationships
between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure,
area of responsibility, highest academic degree,
institution graduated and background training of the
respondents and their perceptions of the future emphasis
to be placed on farm operations clientele audiences by
the Cooperative Extension Service.

Overall, the data presented in Tables 40 and 41 illustrates there
was a very high degree of agreement between the perceptions of respon­
dents falling in the different personal characteristics category groups
regarding the future emphasis to be placed on the clientele audiences
(farm operations) by the Cooperative Extension Service. In general it
was found that a relationship did exist between the perceptions of the
respondents of each personal characteristics category group. All
associations between the rankings for each group were found to be significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore based on the data the research hypothesis $H_5$ was accepted.

**Clientele Audiences (Rural Non-Farm Families)**

Table 42 presents data concerning the relationship between the perceptions of female and male respondents regarding the future emphasis to be placed on rural non-farm families clientele audiences.

Table 42 shows there was a very high positive correlation between the perceptions of female and male respondents. A $r_s$ value of .98 was found between female and male respondents. This very high positive correlation between female and male respondents showed a very high degree of agreement on the perceived future emphasis to be placed on rural non-farm family clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 42 also shows a rank order correlation ($r_s$) of 1.00 that was found to have existed between the perceptions of the respondents of different age category groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on rural non-farm family clientele audiences. This $r_s$ value indicated a very high degree of agreement between groups of younger and older respondents and their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on rural non-farm clientele by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 43 illustrates a coefficient of concordance ($W$) value for the different tenure groups. The coefficient of concordance for these groups was .56. This value indicated a moderate degree of agreement between those respondent groups with under 10 years of tenure, 10 to 20 years of tenure and those with over 20 years of tenure regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on rural non-farm
TABLE 42

RANK OF CLIENTELE AUDIENCES (RURAL NON-FARM FAMILIES) OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE FOR FUTURE EMPHASIS TO BE PLACED ON THEM BY SEX AND AGE RESPONDENT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele Audiences (Rural Non-Farm Families) Item</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Younger (23-43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village and town (under 2,500 pop.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open country</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_s - \text{Sex} = .98$ \hspace{2cm} $r_s - \text{Age} = 1.00$
TABLE 43

RANK OF CLIENTELE AUDIENCES (RURAL NON-FARM FAMILIES) OF COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE FOR EMPHASIS TO BE PLACED ON THEM BY TENURE, AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY, HIGHEST ACADEMIC DEGREE, INSTITUTION GRADUATED AND BACKGROUND TRAINING RESPONDENT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele Audiences (Rural Non-Farm Families)</th>
<th>Tenure (Years)</th>
<th>Area of Responsibility</th>
<th>Highest Academic Degree</th>
<th>Institution Graduated</th>
<th>Background Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>4-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village and town (under 2,500 pop.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open country</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 4

W - Tenure = .56
W - Area of Responsibility = .64**
W - Highest Academic Degree = 1.00**
W - Institution Graduated = .91**
W - Background Training = .93

**Significant at .01
cliente audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

A coefficient of concordance ($W$) is also illustrated in Table 43 for the perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on rural non-farm family clientele audiences among the different area of responsibility groups. The coefficient of concordance among these respondent groups was .84. This value indicated a very high degree of agreement between the groups whose area of responsibility was 4-H and Youth, Agriculture: (Adult), Home Economics:(Adult), Community Resource Development and Administration regarding their perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on rural non-farm family clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 43 also shows a coefficient of concordance ($W$) value for the different highest academic degree groups of respondents regarding their clientele audiences. The coefficient of concordance among these groups was 1.00. This value showed that there was a very high degree of agreement between respondents holding the B.S. degree as the highest academic degree, those respondents holding the M.S. degree as the highest academic degree and those respondents holding the Ph.D. degree regarding their perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on rural non-farm families clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 43 shows that a coefficient of concordance ($W$) value of .91 was found to exist among the respondent groups of the three types of institutions (1862, 1890 and other) graduated. This value showed a very high degree of agreement between the respondent group who graduated from an 1862 institution, the respondent group who graduated from an 1890 institution and the respondent group who graduated from an institution
other than an 1862 or 1890 institution regarding their perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on rural non-farm family clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Further shown in Table 43 is a coefficient of concordance ($W$) value for rural non-farm clientele audiences between the respondent groups with different background training. The coefficient of concordance among these groups was found to be .93. This value indicated that a very high degree of agreement existed between the respondent group with background training in education, the respondent group with background training in production and biological science and the respondent group with background training in the social sciences and other areas regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on rural non-farm family audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Research Hypothesis $H_6$: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on rural non-farm families clientele by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Overall, the data presented in Tables 42 and 43 show there was a high degree of agreement between the perceptions of respondents falling in different personal characteristics category groups except tenure regarding the future emphasis to be placed on clientele audiences (rural non-farm families) by the Cooperative Extension Service. The data shows there was a moderate degree of agreement between the perceptions of the respondents of the different tenure groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on clientele audiences (rural non-farm families) by the Cooperative Extension Service. In general a relationship was found to
exist between the perceptions of respondents of each personal characteristic group. All associations between the rankings for each group except the sex category group, the age category group and the tenure group were found to be significant at the .01 level of significance. Therefore based on the data the research hypothesis $H_6$ for each group except sex, age and tenure was accepted. Because of the small number of items ($n = 4$) the table value for the rank order correlations of sex and age could not be checked for significance at the .05 level of significance. The coefficient of concordance ($W$) value for tenure was found not to be significant at the .05 level of significance. Based on the data the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis for those respondents falling in the personal characteristics category groups of sex, age and tenure.

**Clientele Audiences (Urban Families)**

Data presented in Table 44 show the relationships of agreement of the different personal characteristics category groups of the respondents regarding the future emphasis to be placed on urban family clientele audiences.

It can be seen from the data in Table 44 that there was a very high positive correlation between the perceptions of the respondents falling in the different sex category groups. A $r_s$ value of .98 was found between female and male respondents regarding the future emphasis to be placed on urban family clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service. This very high positive correlation between female and male respondents showed that a very high degree of agreement existed between these two groups on the perceived future emphasis to be placed on urban family clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.
**TABLE 44**

**RANK OF CLIENTELE AUDIENCES (URBAN FAMILIES) OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE FOR FUTURE EMPHASIS TO BE PLACED ON THEM BY SEX AND AGE RESPONDENT GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele Audiences (Urban Families) Item</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small cities (2,000 - 50,000 pop.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central cities (over 50,000 pop.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired families</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_s - \text{Sex} = .98* \quad r_s - \text{Age} = .99* \]

*Significant at .05
Also shown in Table 44 is a rank order correlation (rₜ) of .99 found to have existed between the younger and older respondents regarding the future emphasis to be placed on urban family clientele audiences. This rₜ value indicated that a very high degree of agreement existed between the groups of younger and older respondents and their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on urban family clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 45 shows that a coefficient of concordance value for the future emphasis to be placed on urban family clientele audience among the different tenure groups was .96. This value indicated that a very high degree of agreement between those respondent groups with under 10 years of tenure, 10 to 20 years of tenure and those with over 20 years of tenure regarding the future emphasis to be placed on urban family clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 45 also shows that a coefficient of concordance (W) value for the perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on urban family clientele audiences among the different area of responsibility groups was .86. This value indicated a very high degree of agreement between the 4-H and Youth group, the Agriculture:(Adult) group, the Home Economics:(Adult) group, the Community Resource Development group and the Administration group regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on urban family clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Also illustrated in Table 45 is a coefficient of concordance (W) value for the different highest academic degree groups of respondents regarding their perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on urban family clientele audiences. The coefficient of concordance among these
### Table 45

Rank of Clientele Audiences (Urban Families) of the Cooperative Extension Service for Future Emphasis to Be Placed on Them by Tenure, Area of Responsibility, Highest Academic Degree, Institution Graduated and Background Training Respondent Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele Audiences (Urban Families)</th>
<th>Tenure (Years)</th>
<th>Area of Responsibility</th>
<th>Highest Academic Degree</th>
<th>Institution Graduated</th>
<th>Background Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td>Over 10-20</td>
<td>4-H Agric.-Home Youth (Adult) (Adult) CRO Admin.</td>
<td>M.S./</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small cities (2,000 - 50,000 pop.)</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>3 4 3</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central cities (over 50,000 pop.)</td>
<td>4 5 5</td>
<td>5 3 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired families</td>
<td>5 4 4</td>
<td>4 5 4</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W - Tenure = .96**  
W - Area of Responsibility = .86**  
W - Highest Academic Degree = .96**  
W - Institution Graduated = .84**  
W - Background Training = .86**

n = 5  
**Significant at .01
groups was .96. This value showed that there was a very high degree of agreement between those respondents holding the B.S. degree as the highest academic degree, those respondents holding the M.S. degree as the highest academic degree and those respondents holding the Ph.D. degree regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on urban family clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 45 shows that a coefficient of concordance (W) value of .84 was found to exist among the respondent groups of the three types of institutions (1862, 1890 and other) graduated. This value showed a very high degree of agreement between the groups who graduated from an 1862 institution, an 1890 institution and the group who graduated from an institution other than an 1862 or 1890 institution on their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on urban family clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Also shown in Table 45 is a coefficient of concordance (W) value for urban family clientele audiences between the different background training groups. The coefficient of concordance among the groups was found to be .86. This value indicated that a very high degree of agreement existed between those different respondent groups who had background training in education, home economics, production and biological science, and social science and other areas regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on urban family clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Research Hypothesis H7: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on urban families clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.
Overall, the data presented in Tables 44 and 45 show there was a very high degree of agreement between the perceptions of the respondents falling in each of the different personal characteristics groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on clientele audiences (urban families) by the Cooperative Extension Service. In general a relationship was found to exist between the perceptions of respondents of each personal characteristics group. All associations between the rankings for each group were found to be significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore from the data the research hypothesis $H_7$ was accepted.

**Clientele Audiences (Industry Personnel)**

Data presented in Table 46 concerns the relationship between the perceptions of agreement of the different personal characteristics category groups of the respondents regarding the future emphasis to be placed on industry personnel clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 46 shows there was a perfect positive correlation between the perceptions of respondents falling in the different sex category groups. A $r_s$ value of 1.00 was found to exist between females and males and their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on industry personnel clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Also shown in Table 46 is a rank order correlation ($r_s$) of .90 found to have existed between the perceptions of the respondents of the different age category groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on industry personnel clientele audiences. This correlation showed there was a very high degree of agreement between the younger and older respondents perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on industry
### Table 46

**Rank of Clientele Audiences (Industry Personnel) of the Cooperative Extension Service for Future Emphasis to Be Placed on Them by Sex and Age Respondent Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele Audiences (Industry Personnel) Item</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small businesses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm product purchasers and processors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm suppliers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit and finance institutions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_s$ - Sex = 1.00*  
$r_s$ - Age = .90*  

*Significant at .05
personnel clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 47 shows a coefficient of concordance (W) value for tenure category groups of .49. This value indicated a moderate degree of agreement among the perceptions of different tenure groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on industry personnel clientele audiences. This moderate coefficient of concordance indicated that the groups with under 10 years of tenure, those with 10 to 20 years of tenure and those with over 20 years of tenure moderately agree as to the future emphasis to be placed on industry personnel clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 47 shows that a coefficient of concordance (W) value for the perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on industry personnel audiences among the different area of responsibility groups was .69. This value indicated a substantial degree of agreement existed between the 4-H and Youth group, the Agriculture:(Adult) group, the Home Economics:(Adult) group, the Community Resource Development group, and the Administration group regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on industry personnel clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Also shown in Table 47 is a coefficient of concordance (W) value for the different highest academic degree groups of respondents regarding their perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on industry personnel clientele audiences. The coefficient of concordance among these groups was .91. This value showed there was a very high degree of agreement between those respondents holding the B.S. degree as the highest academic degree, those respondents holding the M.S. degree as the highest
### Table 47

**Rank of Clientele Audiences (Industry Personnel) of the Cooperative Extension Service for Future Emphasis to Be Placed on Them by Tenure, Area of Responsibility, Highest Academic Degree, Institution Graduated and Background Training Respondent Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele Audiences (Industry Personnel)</th>
<th>Tenure (Years) Under 10</th>
<th>Tenure (Years) 10-20</th>
<th>Tenure (Years) Over 20</th>
<th>Area of Responsibility</th>
<th>Highest Academic Degree</th>
<th>Institution Graduated</th>
<th>Background Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small businesses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm product purchasers and processors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm suppliers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit and finance institutions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ W - \text{Tenure} = .49 \quad W - \text{Area of Responsibility} = .69^* \quad W - \text{Highest Academic Degree} = .91^{**} \quad W - \text{Institution Graduation} = .71^* \quad W - \text{Background Training} = .78^{**} \]

*Significant at .05  
**Significant at .01
academic degree and those respondents holding the Ph.D. degree regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on industry personnel clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 47 shows that a coefficient of concordance (W) value of .71 was found to exist among the respondent groups of the three types of institution (1862, 1890 and other) graduated. This coefficient of concordance value showed a high degree of agreement existed between the groups who graduated from an 1862 institution, an 1890 institution and the respondent group who graduated from an institution other than an 1862 or 1890 institution regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on industry personnel clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 47 also shows a coefficient of concordance (W) for industry personnel clientele audiences and the different background training groups. The coefficient of concordance among these groups was found to be .78. This value indicated a high degree of agreement among the perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on industry personnel clientele audiences by the respondent groups with background training in education, home economics, production and biological science and those with background training in social science and other background areas regarding the future emphasis to be placed on industry personnel clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Research Hypothesis H₈: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on industry personnel audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.
Overall, the data presented in Tables 46 and 47 show there was a high degree of agreement between the respondent groups falling in each of the different personal characteristics groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on clientele audiences (industry personnel) by the Cooperative Extension Service. In general a relationship was found to exist between the perceptions of respondents of each personal characteristics group. All associations between the rankings for each group were found to be significant at the .05 level of significance except the tenure group. Therefore the research hypothesis $H_8$ was accepted for each group except the tenure group. The coefficient of concordance ($W$) value for tenure was found not to be significant at the .05 level of significance. Based on this data the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis for those respondents falling in the personal characteristics category group of tenure.

**Clientele Audiences (Organizations and Institutions)**

Table 48 presents data concerning the relationship between the perceptions of agreement of the different personal characteristics category groups of the respondents regarding the future emphasis to be placed on organizational and institution clientele audiences.

It can be seen from the data in Table 48 that there was a very high positive correlation between the perceptions of the respondents falling in the different sex category groups. A $r_s$ value of .99 was found between female and male respondents. This value showed a very high degree of agreement on the perceived future emphasis to be placed on organizations and institutions clientele audiences among the perceptions of female and male respondents by the Cooperative Extension Service.
## TABLE 48

RANK OF CLIENTELE AUDIENCE (ORGANIZATION AND INSTITUTIONS) OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE BY SEX AND AGE RESPONDENT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele Audiences (Organizations and Institutions)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County and community organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm organizations</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agencies and officials</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and industry organizations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor organizations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_s$ - Sex = .99**

$r_s$ - Age = 1.00**

*Significant at .05
Table 48 also shows a rank order correlation \( (r_s) \) of 1.00 that was found between the perceptions of the respondents of different age category groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on organization and institution clientele audiences. This \( r_s \) value indicated a very high degree of agreement between the groups of younger respondents and older respondents and their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on organization and institution clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 49 illustrates a coefficient of concordance (\( W \)) value for the different tenure groups. The coefficient of concordance for these groups was .94. This value indicated a very high degree of agreement between those respondent groups with under 10 years of tenure, 10 to 20 years of tenure and the respondent group with over 20 years of tenure regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on organization and institution clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

A coefficient of concordance (\( W \)) is also illustrated in Table 49 for the perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on organization and institution clientele audiences among the different area of responsibility groups. This value showed a very high degree of agreement between the groups whose area of responsibility was 4-H and Youth, Agriculture:(Adult), Home Economics:(Adult), Community Resource Development, and Administration regarding their perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on organization and institution clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.
### TABLE 49

Rank of Clientele Audiences (Organizations and Institutions) of the Cooperative Extension Service by Tenure, Area of Responsibility, Highest Academic Degree, Institution Graduated and Background Training Respondent Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele Audiences (Organizations and Institutions)</th>
<th>Tenure (Years)</th>
<th>Area of Responsibility</th>
<th>Highest Academic Degree</th>
<th>Institution Graduated</th>
<th>Background Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td>Over 10-20</td>
<td>4-H Agric.- Youth (Adult)</td>
<td>Home and Family Economics</td>
<td>CRD Admin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County and community organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm organizations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agencies and officials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and industry organizations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor organizations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W - Tenure = .94**  W - Area of Responsibility = .83**  W - Highest Academic Degree = .97**  W - Institution Graduated = .97**  W - Background Training = .79**

**Significant at .01
Table 49 also shows a coefficient of concordance (W) value for the different highest academic degree groups of respondents regarding their perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on organization and institution clientele audiences. The coefficient of concordance among these groups was .97. This value showed there was a very high degree of agreement between respondent groups holding the B.S. degree as the highest academic degree, those holding the M.S. degree as the highest academic degree and those holding the Ph.D. degree regarding their perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on organization and institution clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 49 shows that a coefficient of concordance (W) value of .97 was found to exist between the respondent groups of the three types of high degree of agreement between the respondent group who graduated from an 1862 institution, the respondent group who graduated from an 1890 institution and the respondent group who graduated from an institution other than an 1862 or 1890 institution regarding their perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on organization and institution clientele by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Further shown in Table 49 is a coefficient of concordance (W) value for organization and institution clientele audiences among the perceptions of respondent groups with different background training. The coefficient of concordance among these groups was found to be .79. This value indicated that a high degree of agreement existed between the respondent group with background training in home economics, the respondent group with background training in production and biological science and the respondent group with background training in social science and other
areas regarding their perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on organization and institution clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

**Research Hypothesis Hg:** There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on organizations and institutions clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Overall, the data presented in Tables 48 and 49 show there was a very high degree of agreement between the perceptions of respondents falling in all personal characteristics groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on clientele audiences (organizations and institutions) by the Cooperative Extension Service. In general a relationship was found to exist between the perceptions of respondents of each personal characteristic category group. All associations between the rankings for each group were found to be significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore based on the data the research hypothesis Hg was accepted.

No research hypotheses were formulated for the clientele audiences: non-Extension professionals and general public because no further rankings were acquired from respondent groups. The reader is instructed to review Table 30 for non-Extension professionals clientele audiences and Table 31 for general public clientele audiences. A differential comparison of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators was presented. According to the Kruskall-Wallis Test there was no significant difference in the perceptions of the three respondent groups on the clientele audiences of non-Extension professionals or the general public.
 CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Problem

In the years since its beginning, a multitude of changes have made the job of defining Extension's proper role in today's world a far more complex one. Some changes have come subtly, some abruptly. Some have come by choice, some by legislative mandate. Extension now is, or should be, a quite different organism than it was in 1914, or even 1953 (or 1978). Some changes that made it a different organism are:

- Extension is no longer confined to rural areas
- Extension is no longer confined to agriculture and rural life. It has entered, or has been thrust, far beyond the original visions of Smith and Lever into forestry, marine advisor, community development, and 4-H and family living in an urban setting. 101

The major purpose of this study was, "The projected role of the Cooperative Extension Service in states that contain both 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions as perceived by county extension agents, state specialists and administrators. The projected role was described as it related to the following five corresponding role areas:

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were:

1. To describe Extension personnel (agents, state specialists and administrators) employed by 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities in terms of their:
   a. Sex
   b. Age
   c. Background training
   d. Tenure in the Extension Service
   e. Tenure in present position
   f. Area of major responsibility
   g. Type of institution graduated
   h. Highest academic degree held

2. To describe the amount of time presently devoted to Extension activities conducted in states containing both 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities by:
   a. Extension program areas
   b. Selected program audiences
   c. Selected methods of program dissemination
   d. Contact time devoted to selected ethnic groups
   e. Present projections of working with selected audiences in the future
3. To determine the perceptions of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators of present Extension work in the following areas:

a. Selected characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service
b. Selected quality of living programs
c. Selected social and economic development programs
d. Selected agriculture and related industries programs

4. To determine the perceptions of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators of future Extension work in the following areas:

a. Selected characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service
b. Selected quality of living programs
c. Selected social and economic development programs
d. Selected agriculture and related industries programs
e. Selected clientele audiences

5. To determine the relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, background training, tenure in the Extension Service, area of major responsibility, type of institution graduated and highest academic degree held and the perceptions of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators concerning the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service, future program areas and clientele audiences.

Hypotheses

Based on the literature review, the following hypotheses were established:

Research Hypothesis $H_1$: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service.
**Null Hypothesis H₀**: There will be no relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service.

**Research Hypothesis H₁**: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

**Null Hypothesis H₀**: There will be no relationships between the personal characteristics of sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

**Research Hypothesis H₃**: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on social and economic development programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

**Null Hypothesis H₀**: There will be no relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest
academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on social and economic development programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Research Hypothesis $H_4$: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs of the Cooperative Extension Service.

Null Hypothesis $H_0$: There will be no relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs of the Cooperative Extension Service.

Research Hypothesis $H_5$: There will be relationships between the general characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on farm operations clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.
Null Hypothesis $H_0$: There will be no relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on farm operations clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Research Hypothesis $H_6$: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on rural non-farm families clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Null Hypothesis $H_0$: There will be no relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on rural non-farm families clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Research Hypothesis $H_7$: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on urban families clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.
Null Hypothesis $H_0$: There will be no relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on urban families clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Research Hypothesis $H_a$: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on industry personnel clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Null Hypothesis $H_0$: There will be no relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on industry personnel clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Research Hypothesis $H_a$: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on organizations and institutions clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.
Null Hypothesis $H_0$: There will be no relationships between the personal characteristics sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on organizations and institutions clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

**Research Methodology**

The design for this study was a combination of descriptive survey and correlational research ex post facto research as defined by Campbell and Stanley. The dependent variables were:

1. Extension staff perceptions of the present role of the Cooperative Extension Service in those states that contain both 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions

2. Extension staff perceptions of the future role of the Cooperative Extension Service in those states that contain both 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions

3. Extension staff perceptions of the percentage of time presently placed in Extension activities conducted in states containing both 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and universities

The following variables in this study were the following characteristics of county extension agents and administrators:

a. Sex

b. Age

c. Background training

---

d. Tenure in the Extension Service

e. Tenure in present position

f. Area of major responsibility

g. Type of institution graduated

h. Highest academic degree held

**Instrumentation and Data Collection**

The research instrument used in this study was a two part mail questionnaire. Part I of the questionnaire consisted of questions pertaining to personal and demographic data concerning: 1) age; 2) area of work responsibility; 3) background training; 4) kind of institution; 5) type of institution employed; 6) tenure in the Extension Service; 7) sex; 8) tenure in present position; and 9) type of degree held.

In addition, Part I of the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate the percentage of time they spent devoted to the following:

1. Working in specific extension program areas

2. Working with specific program audiences

3. Dissemination of extension program activities through specific methods

4. Contact time spent meeting or working with ethnic groups

5. Projection as to working with specific extension audiences in the future

Part II of the questionnaire was designed to identify and describe the projected role of the Cooperative Extension Service in states that contain both 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions as perceived by county extension agents, state specialists and administrators. This
part of the questionnaire contained 76 role items in five role areas. In developing the instrument for this study joint USDA-NASULGC Study Committee's report *A People and a Spirit* was used extensively. The instrument was reviewed by faculty members of the researcher's doctoral program at The Ohio State University. Seven graduate students with a combination of more than 50 years of prior service in the Cooperative Extension Service served as a jury of experts in finalizing the questionnaire before it was pilot tested.

**Pilot Test**

During the month of November 1978 the researcher mailed 38 questionnaires to county extension agents and specialists in the 15 states previously identified in this study where permission was granted. These persons were extension staff who were not a part of the sample for the study. A total of 29 or 76 percent of the questionnaires were properly completed with one questionnaire not adequately completed. Test results from the instrument was subjected to the reliability analysis program Cronback alpha, which was designed to test the internal consistency of a questionnaire for scale reliability. As a result of the analysis, an overall reliability coefficient of .94 was obtained for the five areas of Part II of the questionnaire. Only one item was eliminated from the questionnaire as a result of the pilot test.
Population and Sample

The target population of this study was county extension agents, state specialists and administrators from 15 states containing both 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions where permission was granted. A stratified random sample of county extension agents, state specialists and a census of administrators comprised the sample in this study. The sample was comprised of 205 county extension agents, 185 state specialists and 96 or a census of administrators from 15 of the selected states.

Data Collection Procedure

The data obtained in this study were collected by mail questionnaires during March and April 1979. The research instrument was sent, along with a cover letter from the researcher to the dean, director or vice-president of Extension for each particular state asking each agent, specialist and administrator's cooperation in recording his/her perceptions as to the projected future role of the Cooperative Extension Service in those states containing both 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions. A total of 184 questionnaires were returned by the county extension agents which was 89.7 percent response. One hundred fifty-five or 83.7 percent of the questionnaires were returned by the state specialists and 81 or 84.3 percent of the questionnaires were returned by the extension administrators. An overall total of 420 or 86.4 percent of the questionnaires were returned. Data from 407 completed questionnaires were coded for computer application and computer analysis at the Instructional and Research Computer Center on the campus of The
Analysis of Data

The data used in this study was taken from 407 questionnaires returned to the researcher by the respondents. Responses to the questions in Part II of the questionnaire were recoded by using three seven-point scales. For those questions pertaining to the "characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service" a seven-point rating scale with values from 1 to 7 was used. Agreement on these items were recorded with seven representing "very strongly agree", four representing "undecided" and one representing "very strongly disagree". For those questions pertaining to the areas of "quality of living programs", "social and economic development" and "agriculture and related industries" a seven-point scale was used with seven representing "very heavy emphasis", four "undecided" and one representing "no emphasis". For those questions pertaining to "selected clientele audiences" a seven-point scale was also used. A value of seven represented "very heavy emphasis", four "undecided" and one "not at all important". The data were analyzed using measures of central tendencies, frequencies, measures of association and measures of variation.

Mean weighted scores and rank orders were calculated for each projection item and for each of the five areas corresponding with the projected role of the Cooperative Extension Service. The Kruskall-Wallis Test which is an alternative non-parametric test for one way analysis of variance for two or more groups, was used to test the differences between the respondents perceived projected role of the Cooperative Extension Service on each item in the five areas corresponding with the projected role. Spearman-Rank Order Correlation Coefficients
were calculated to investigate the degree of relationship between the three groups of respondents and their perceptions of the five role areas. Spearman-Rank and Kendall Coefficient of Concordance were computed to determine the degree of association between sex, age, background training, tenure, area of major responsibility, kind of institution graduated, highest academic degree and the perceptions of the future role of the Cooperative Extension Service.

An alpha level of .05 was set to test the significance of associations. The measurement scale for each independent variable was considered to be ordinal.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) subprogram for: the Kruskall-Wallis Test; Spearman-Rank Correlation Coefficient; and the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance were used.

Summary of Findings

The findings of this study were composed of four parts:

1. A description of the personal characteristics of county extension agents, state specialists and administrators in 15 of the 16 states that contain both 1862 and 1890 land-grant colleges and institutions.

2. A description of time presently devoted to selected Extension activities: a) Extension program areas; b) selected program audiences; c) selected methods of program dissemination; d) contact time devoted to selected ethnic groups; and e) present projections of working with selected audiences in the future.

3. An identification of the present and a description of the projected future role of the Cooperative Extension Service in each of the role areas of: a) selected characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service; b) selected quality of living programs; c) selected social and economic development programs; d) selected agriculture and related industries programs.
4. An analysis of the relationship between the amount of emphasis in specific role areas and the future role of the Cooperative Extension Service as perceived by respondents and their personal characteristics of: a) sex; b) age; c) background training; d) tenure; e) area of major responsibility; f) kind of institution graduated; and g) highest academic degree held.

Personal Characteristics of Respondents

Sex

The data indicated that 77 percent of the respondents were male and 23 percent female. Forty-one percent of the male respondents and 53 percent of the female respondents held the position of county extension agents. Thirty-eight percent of the male respondents and 37 percent of the female respondents held the position of state specialists. Twenty-two percent of the male respondents and 10 percent of the female respondents held the position of administrators.

Age

The age of the respondents ranged from 23 to 68 years. Fourteen percent of the agents and 4 percent of the specialists were 23 to 29 years old. No administrator was under 30 years of age. Thirty-four percent of the agents, 36 percent of the specialists and 8 percent of the administrators were 30 to 39 years old. Twenty-six percent of the agents, 29 percent of the specialists and 36 percent of the administrators were 40 to 49 years old. Twenty-four percent of the agents and specialists and 43 percent of the administrators were 50 to 59 years old. Two percent of the agents, 7 percent of the specialists and 13 percent of the administrators were 60 to 68 years of age.
Background Training

Fifty percent of the agents, 26 percent of the specialists and 35 percent of the administrators had their highest degree in Education. Eight percent of the agents, 10 percent of the specialists and 4 percent of the administrators had their highest degree in Home Economics. Twenty-nine percent of the agents, 17 percent of the specialists and 20 percent of the administrators had their highest academic degree in the Agricultural Social Sciences. One percent of the agents and 3 percent of the administrators had their highest degree in Public Administration. No state specialist had their highest degree in Public Administration. Three percent of the specialists and 20 percent of the administrators had their highest degree in Educational Administration. No agent had his/her highest degree in Educational Administration. Five percent of the agents, 14 percent of the specialists and 10 percent of the administrators held their highest degree in background training areas other than those listed on the research questionnaire.

Tenure in the Extension Service

The tenure of agents, specialists and administrators in the Extension Service ranged from one to forty-one years. Fifteen percent of the agents, 16 percent of the specialists and one percent of the administrators had 1 to 4 years of tenure. Thirty-one percent of the agents, 35 percent of the specialists and 22 percent of the administrators had 5 to 10 years of tenure. Sixteen percent of the agents, 17 percent of the specialists and 8 percent of the administrators had 11 to 15 years of tenure. Eleven percent of the agents, 10 percent of the specialists and 17 percent of the administrators had 16 to 20 years of
tenure. Fifteen percent of the agents, 13 percent of the specialists and 25 percent of the administrators had 21 to 25 years of tenure. Ten percent of the agents, 12 percent of the specialists and 17 percent of the administrators had 31 to 41 years of tenure. No agent or specialist had more than 30 years of tenure in the Extension Service.

Tenure in Present Position

The tenure in present position of agents, specialists and administrators ranged from 1 to 32 years. Thirty-seven percent of the agents, 37 percent of the specialists and 52 percent of the administrators had 1 to 4 years of tenure in their present position. Twenty-nine percent of the agents, 31 percent of the specialists and 33 percent of the administrators had 5 to 9 years of tenure in their present position. Thirteen percent of the agents, 16 percent of the specialists and 7 percent of the administrators had 10 to 14 years of tenure in their present position. Seven percent of the agents, 9 percent of the specialists and 9 percent of the administrators had 15 to 19 years of tenure in their present position. Ten percent of the agents and 5 percent of the specialists had 20 to 24 years in their present position. Five percent of the agents and 2 percent of the specialists had 25 to 32 years of service in their present position. No administrator had more than 19 years of tenure in their present position.

Area of Major Responsibility

Twenty-four percent of the agents, 11 percent of the specialists and 10 percent of the administrators held major responsibility in the area of 4-H and Youth. Eighteen percent of the agents and specialists
and 10 percent of the administrators had major responsibility in the area of Home Economics:(Adult). Fifty-one percent of the agents, 42 percent of the specialists and 12 percent of the administrators had major responsibility in the area of Agriculture:(Adult). Five percent of the agents, 20 percent of the specialists and 4 percent of the administrators had major responsibility in the area of Community Resource Development. Two percent of the agents, 4 percent of the specialists and 62 percent of the administrators had major responsibility in the area of Administration. Six percent of the specialists and 1 percent of the administrators held major responsibility in areas other than those listed on the questionnaire.

Type of Institution From Which Respondents Graduated

Three-fourths of all respondents (agents, specialists and administrators) received their highest academic degree from an 1862 land-grant institution; 7 percent received their highest academic degree from an 1890 land-grant institution; 17 percent received their highest academic degree from some other institution than an 1862 or 1890 land-grant institution.

Of those respondents who received their highest academic degree from an 1862 land-grant institution 40 percent were agents; 39 percent were specialists; and 21 percent were administrators.

Of those respondents who received their highest academic degree from an 1890 land-grant institution 63 percent were agents and 37 percent were specialists. No administrator that responded received their highest academic degree at an 1890 land-grant institution.
Of those respondents who received their highest academic degree from institutions other than 1862 or 1890 land-grant institutions 54 percent were agents; 30 percent were specialists and 17 percent were administrators.

Highest Academic Degree Held

Forty-six percent of the agents, 3 percent of the specialists and 1 percent of the administrators held the Bachelor's degree as the highest academic degree. Forty-nine percent of the agents, 52 percent of the specialists and 23 percent of the administrators held the Master's degree as the highest academic degree. Five percent of the agents, 44 percent of the specialists and 75 percent of the administrators held the doctorate as the highest academic degree.

Time Presently Devoted to Extension Activities Conducted in States Containing Both 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Colleges and Universities

Percentage of Time Devoted to Extension Program Areas

The following discussion will outline and summarize the annual percentage of time devoted to Extension program areas by county extension agents, state specialists and administrators.

The typical county extension agent in 15 of the 16 states that contain both an 1862 and an 1890 land-grant institution would most likely devote the highest percentage of time annually working in the Extension program area of Agricultural and Natural Resources (37.6%), followed by the program area of 4-H and Youth (28.4%) second. The program area that would most likely be devoted the third highest percentage of time would be Home Economics and Family Living (13.8%). Community Resource Development (11.3%) would be the program area that
would be devoted the fourth highest percentage of time, followed by administration (8.7%) fifth and some other program areas (.2%) not covered on the questionnaire receiving the least devotion of time by agents.

The typical state specialist would most likely devote the highest percentage of time annually working in the Extension program area of Agricultural and Natural Resources (38.8%) followed secondly by the program area of Community Resource Development (19.5%). Home Economics (17.5%) would most likely be the Extension program area where the third highest percentage of time would be devoted by specialists. The area most likely receiving the fourth highest percentage of time by specialists would be the program area of 4-H and Youth (13.5%) followed by Administration (5.8%) and other program areas (4.9%) not listed on the questionnaire.

Administrators would typically devote the highest percentage of their time annually working in Administration (62.7%). The Extension program area of 4-H and Youth (8.9%) would most likely be the program area receiving the second highest percentage of time by administrators. Home Economics (8.2%) would most likely be the Extension program receiving the third highest percentage of time by administrators. Areas other (1.9%) than those listed on the questionnaire would receive the fourth highest percentage of time by administrators. Agricultural and Natural Resources (6.7%) would most likely be the Extension program area devoted the fifth highest percentage of time by administrators with Community Resource Development (5.8%) being the Extension program devoted the least percentage of time by administrators.
Percentage of Time Devoted to Selected Program Audiences

The following discussion will outline and summarize the annual percentage of time devoted to selected Extension program audiences by county extension agents, state specialists and administrators.

The typical county extension agent would most likely devote the highest percentage of time annually working with commercial farms (16.7%); the second highest percentage of time annually working with county and community organizations (15.5); the third highest percentage of time annually working with home garden, lawn and ground purchasers (11.2%); the fourth highest percent of time annually working with low-income urban families or groups (10.6%). The typical county agent would most likely devote the fifth highest percent of time annually working with low-income farms (8.8%) followed in order by low-income rural non-farm (8.6%); Extension support groups (8.2%); highly specialized farms (6.2%); other audiences not listed on the questionnaire (4.2%); farm organizations (3.3%); farm product purchasers and processors (2.6%) and research personnel (2.5%).

The typical state specialist would most likely devote the highest percent of time annually working with program audiences other (17.7%) than those listed on the research questionnaire; the second highest percent of time annually working with county and community organizations (14.6%); the third highest percent of time annually working with Extension support groups (14.0%); the fourth highest percent of time annually working with commercial farms (13.8%). The typical state specialist would most likely devote the fifth highest percent of time annually working with low-income farms (7.0%) followed in order by low-income
rural non-farm (5.1%); highly specialized farms (4.4%); farm product purchasers and processors (4.3%); home garden, lawn and ground purchasers (3.6%); and farm organizations (3.3%).

The typical administrator would most likely devote the highest percentage of time annually working with Extension support groups (40.0%); the second highest percent of time annually working with other (16.6%) audiences not listed on the questionnaire; the third highest percent of time annually working with farm organizations (8.2%); the fourth highest percent of time annually would most likely be devoted to working with research personnel (7.9%) followed in order by county and community organizations (5.7%); highly specialized farms (5.0%); low-income rural non-farm (4.6%); low-income farms (4.1%); commercial farms (4.1%) low-income urban families or groups (2.8%); home garden, lawn and grounds purchasers (0.6%); and farm product purchasers and processors (0.4%).

Percentage of Program Activities Disseminated Through Selected Methods

The selected methods utilized most by agents through which the greater percentage of program activities are disseminated were: outside office group meetings (17.7%); house calls (14.6%); office telephone calls (14.4%); individual office calls (10.8%); special interest meetings (7.4%); newsletters (6.2%); news articles (5.7%); and personal correspondence (5.3%).

Selected methods utilized least by agents through which a lesser percentage of program activities are disseminated were: use of para-professionals (4.9%); radio broadcasting (4.2%); group office visits (4.0%); state, district and support team members (2.3%); other methods of dissemination not listed on the questionnaire (2.0%); and television
Specialists indicated the methods they utilized most and those through which the greater percentage of their program activities are disseminated were: outside office group meetings (17.7%); state, district and support team members (11.7%); special interest meetings (11.5%); office telephone calls (10.4%); use of paraprofessionals (8.8%); personal correspondence (8.5%); and individual office calls (8.0%).

Those selected method utilized least by specialists through which a lesser percentage of program activities are disseminated were: other methods of dissemination not listed on the questionnaire (3.6%); news articles (3.8%); house calls (3.9%); group office visits (2.8%); radio broadcasting (2.6%); and television shows (1.8%).

The selected methods utilized most by administrators through which the greater percentage of program activities are disseminated were: state, district and support team members (34.3%); other methods of program dissemination not listed on the questionnaire (9.8%); outside office group meetings (9.9%); individual office calls (9.4%); office telephone calls (8.9%); personal correspondence (7.7%); and the use of paraprofessionals (5.7%).

Selected methods utilized least by administrators through which a smaller percentage of their program activities were disseminated were: special interest meetings (4.9%); group office visits (4.8%); newsletters (1.2%); news articles (1.2%); television shows (.8%); house calls (.7%); and radio broadcasting (.5%).
Percentage of Contact Time Working with Ethnic Groups

County extension agents reported the percentage of their time spent meeting or working with ethnic groups as follows: 71.3 percent meeting or working with White, non-Hispanic ethnic groups; 23.3 percent meeting or working the Black, non-Hispanic ethnic groups; 3.2 percent meeting or working with Hispanic ethnic groups; 1.7 percent meeting or working with American Indian or Alaskan Native ethnic groups; .4 percent meeting or working with Asian or Pacific Islander ethnic groups; and .1 percent meeting or working with ethnic groups not listed on the research questionnaire.

State specialists reported the percentage of their time spent meeting or working with ethnic groups as follows: 66.0 percent meeting or working with White, non-Hispanic ethnic groups; 26.0 percent meeting or working with Black, non-Hispanic ethnic groups; 3.0 percent meeting or working with American Indian or Alaskan Native; 3.0 percent meeting or working with Hispanic ethnic groups; 1.1 percent meeting or working with Asian or Pacific Islander ethnic groups; and 1.0 percent meeting or working with other groups not listed on the research questionnaire.

Administrators reported the percentage of their time spent meeting or working with ethnic groups were as follows: 67.0 percent meeting or working with White, non-Hispanic ethnic groups; 25.0 percent meeting or working with Black, non-Hispanic ethnic groups; 2.7 percent meeting or working with American Indian or Alaskan Native ethnic groups; 2.6 percent meeting or working with Hispanic ethnic groups; 1.1 percent meeting or working with Asian or Pacific Islander ethnic groups; and 1.6 percent meeting or working with other ethnic groups not listed on
the research questionnaire.

Projections of Time to be Spent in the Future on Selected Program Audiences

County extension agents projected that in order to better serve Extension clientele in the future, the percent of their Extension time spent annually working with clientele audiences should be: 16.0 percent working with commercial farms; 14.0 percent working with county and community organizations; 11.5 percent working with low-income farms; 11.0 percent working with home garden, lawn and ground purchasers; 10.6 percent working with low-income urban families or groups; 8.9 percent working with Extension support groups; 7.2 percent working with low-income rural non-farm audiences; 4.5 percent working with farm organizations; 4.0 percent working with highly specialized farms; 3.9 percent working with research personnel; 3.7 percent working with farm product purchasers and processors; and 4.5 percent working with audiences not listed on the research questionnaire.

State specialists projected that in order to better serve Extension clientele in the future, the percent of their Extension time spent annually working with clientele audiences should be: 15.3 percent working with county and community organizations; 12.8 percent working with Extension support groups; 12.7 percent working with commercial farms; 7.6 percent working with research personnel; 7.4 percent working with low-income farms; 7.2 percent working with low-income urban families or groups; 6.4 percent working with low-income rural non-farm clientele; 5.6 percent working with farm product purchasers and processors; 2.9 percent working with highly specialized farms; and 15.0
percent working with other Extension clientele not listed on the research questionnaire.

Administrators projected that in order to better serve Extension clientele in the future, the percentage of their Extension time spent annually working with clientele audiences should be: 44.9 percent working with Extension support groups; 8.3 percent working with county and community organizations; 8.1 percent working with research personnel; 6.2 percent working with low-income rural non-farm clientele; 5.2 percent working with low-income farms; 4.9 percent working with low-income urban families or groups; 3.9 percent working with farm organizations; 3.2 percent working with commercial farms; 1.6 percent working with farm product purchasers and processors; 1.1 percent working with home garden, lawn and groups purchasers; .8 percent working with highly specialized farms; and 12.1 percent working with Extension clientele not listed on the research questionnaire.

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions on the Present Characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service

The Kruskal-Wallis Test was performed to compare the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators on their rankings of each characteristic item. The Spearman-Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was calculated to show the strength of agreement between the rankings on the overall group of items by the respondents.

The respondents ranked the following four items highest with reference to their agreement of the present characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service:
1. Helps people solve problems and take advantage of opportunities through education

2. Provides informal non-credit education conducted primarily beyond the classroom, and for all ages

3. Is educational in program content and methodology, not regulatory or financial oriented

4. Is administratively attached to a public university system and is a major part of it, rather than being attached directly to state government

The ranking also showed that the present characteristic items indicating that the Cooperative Extension Service: is a professional function staffed by college trained personnel specifically qualified for positions; is practical, problem centered and situation based; and provides educational programs directed at broad national purposes, yet serves specific local with priorities determined locally were ranked lowest with reference to the respondents perceptions of agreement with these items.

It was noted that the characteristic item, "The Cooperative Extension Service provides educational programs directed at broad national purposes, yet serves specific local needs with priorities determined locally" was all ranked lowest by all respondents.

There were differences in the perceptions of agreement by agents, specialists and administrators. Those differences were shown to be statistically significant according to the Kruskall-Wallis Test on the following characteristic items. The Cooperative Extension Service:

- Provides informal non-credit education conducted primarily beyond the formal classroom, and for all ages

- Is educational in program content and methodology, not regulatory or financial
- Is administratively attached to a public university system and is a major part of it, rather than being attached directly to state government.

- Helps people identify and understand their needs and use new technology or information in solving them.

- Involves cooperative but not necessarily equal sharing of financial support among state, and county or local levels.

- Is a professional function staffed by college trained personnel specifically qualified for positions.

- Is practical, problem centered and situation based.

- Provides educational programs directed at broad national purposes, yet serves specific local needs with priorities determined locally.

Application of Spearman-Rank Order Correlation to the rankings of agents, specialists and administrators indicated that all three groups were in very high agreement on the present characteristics which were ranked highest and those which were ranked lowest ($r_s$ - agents and specialists = .84; $r_s$ - agents and administrators = .77; $r_s$ - specialists and administrators = .94; sig. = .05).

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Present Emphasis Placed on Quality of Living Programs

The Kruskall-Wallis Test was performed to compare the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators on their rankings of each quality of living program item. The Spearman-Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was calculated to show the strength of agreement between the rankings on the overall group of items by the respondents.

The respondents ranked the following four quality of living items highest with respect to the present emphasis placed on them by the Cooperative Extension Service:
1. Assist clientele in the effective use and management of resources

2. Assist clientele in seeking out the availability of resources to provide for the need of the individual and family

3. Promoting the process of individual and family decision making and the skills necessary to carry out the decision

4. Providing clientele with assistance in choosing among the abundance of goods and services available

The rankings showed that the respondents ranked the following items lowest: providing clientele with an awareness of the manner in which attitudes, values and patterns of behavior are formed; assisting young families in the family planning process; providing in-service training for public employees and decision makers; and assisting clientele in developing the basic skills necessary to apply for and hold a job.

There were differences in the perceptions of the present emphasis placed on quality of living programs by agents, specialists and administrators. Those differences were shown to be statistically significant according to the Kruskal-Wallis Test on the following quality of living items:

- Helping clientele contribute to the family's ability to promote the development of children

- Assisting clientele in developing skills necessary to optimize their development as individuals and as members of the family and community (children, youth and adults)

- Promoting clientele participation of volunteer activities aimed at community problems as a means for developing skills

- Aiding individuals in understanding the functions of family and its relation to community
- Helping clientele develop as informed leaders for identifying and solving problems in a democratic society

- Assisting clientele in developing the skills necessary to make decisions related to career choice and development

- Assisting clientele in developing the skills necessary to assist in the evaluation of community services such as housing, educational resources, child care facilities and employment opportunities

- Helping individual clientele or groups develop skills in order to use increased leisure time

- Assisting various groups in developing working relationship with community service agencies

- Providing clientele with an awareness of the manner in which attitudes, values and patterns of behavior are formed

- Assisting young families in the family planning process

Application of Spearman-Rank Order Correlation to the rankings of agents, specialists and administrators indicated that all three groups were in a very high agreement on the present emphasis placed on the quality of living items which were ranked highest and those which were ranked lowest ($r_s$ - agents and specialists = .90; $r_s$ - agents and administrators = .86; and $r_s$ - specialists and administrators = .89; sig. = .05).

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Present Emphasis Placed on Social and Economic Development Programs

The Kruskall-Wallis Test was performed to compare the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators on their rankings of each social and economic development program item. The Spearman-Rank Order Correlation was calculated to show the strength of agreement between
The rankings on the overall group of items by the respondents.

The respondents ranked the following items highest with reference to the present emphasis placed on them by the Cooperative Extension Service:

1. Assisting landowners in understanding soil and water conservation problems, their effects on agriculture production and the general economy
2. Assisting producers in developing skills for improving their marketing decisions
3. Helping landowners understand the need for long-range planning for management and use of their soil and water resources and the economic alternative available to them for developing these resources
4. Assisting producers in developing new and improved systems for marketing and processing
5. Assisting producers in improving the efficiency of supply, marketing and processing firms
6. Providing producers with updated information and research necessary for expanding markets for agricultural products

The rankings showed that agents, specialists and administrators ranked the lowest items differently. The social and economic development items ranked lowest by the respondents were: providing forestry production and marketing clientele with assistance in multi-use of small woodlands; helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to improve decisions made concerning forestry products, marketing and utilization; helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to marketing primary forestry products; helping landowners develop non-food producing businesses such as recreation enterprises; assisting landowners in cooperative planning for development of soil and water resources on a complete
watershed basis; and helping the general public understand soil and water problems and support programs directed at solving them.

It was noted that agents, specialists and administrators all ranked the same item lowest. That item was: helping landowners develop non-food producing businesses such as recreation enterprises.

There was also differences in the perceptions of the present emphasis placed on social and economic development programs by agents, specialists and administrators. Those differences were shown to be statistically significant according to the Kruskall-Wallis Test on the following social and economic development items:

- Assisting landowners in understanding soil and water conservation problems, their effects on agriculture production and the general economic

- Assisting producers in developing skills for improving their marketing decisions

- Helping landowners understand the need for long-range planning for management and use of their soil and water resources and the economic alternative available to them for developing these resources

- Assisting producers in developing new and improved systems for marketing and processing

- Providing producers with updated information and research necessary for expanding markets for agricultural products

- Helping the general public understand soil and water problems and support programs directed at solving them

- Assisting landowners in cooperative planning for development of soil and water resources on a complete watershed basis

- Assisting producers in developing new farm supply and marketing enterprises

- Assisting producers in improving the efficiency of supply, marketing and processing firms
- Assisting forestry production and marketing clientele in obtaining information and recent research pertaining to timber production technology.

- Providing forestry production and marketing clientele with assistance in the multi-use of small woodlands

- Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to marketing primary forestry products

An application of the Spearman-Rank Order Correlation to the rankings of agents, specialists and administrators indicated that all three groups were in agreement on the present emphasis placed on the social and economic development items which were ranked highest and those which were ranked lowest ($r_s$ - agents and specialists = .63; $r_s$ - agents and administrators = .82; and $r_s$ - specialists and administrators = .83; sig. = .05).

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Present Emphasis Placed on Agriculture and Related Industries Programs

The Kruskall-Wallis Test was performed to compare the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators on the rankings of each agriculture and related industries program item. The Spearman-Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was calculated to show the strength on the overall group of items by the respondents.

The respondents ranked the following four agriculture and related industry items highest with respect to the present emphasis placed on them:

1. Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with updated research information related to controlling disease, insects, weeds and other pests
2. Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in obtaining information necessary for improving plant and animal nutrition and feeding

3. Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in obtaining information necessary for plant and animal selection and breeding

4. Helping agriculture and related industries clientele acquire the skills necessary to adopt more effective and economically feasible technology

The rankings also showed the following three items: helping agriculture and related industries clientele improve the efficiency of selection, procurement and use of supplies, labor and credit; providing agriculture and related industries clientele with information necessary for design, construction, procurement, maintenance and use of buildings and equipment; and assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in developing skills necessary to compete more effectively in world markets.

There were also differences in the perceptions of the present emphasis placed on agriculture and related industries programs by agents, specialists and administrators. Those differences were shown to be statistically significant according to the Kruskall-Wallis Test on the following agriculture and related industries programs items:

- Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with updated research information related to controlling disease, insects, weeds, and other pests

- Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in obtaining information necessary for improving plant and animal nutrition and feeding
- Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in obtaining information necessary for plant and animal selection and breeding

- Helping agriculture and related industries clientele acquire the skills necessary to adopt more effective and economically feasible technology

- Helping agriculture and related industries clientele obtain the most recent research results on improving harvesting, storage and marketing

- Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in organizing their resources into more effective and profitable production units

- Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with information necessary for design, construction, procurement, maintenance, and use of buildings and equipment

Application of Spearman-Rank Order Correlation to the rankings of agents, specialists and administrators indicated that all three groups were in very high agreement on those items ranked highest and those items ranked lowest ($r_s$ - agents and specialists = .97; $r_s$ - agents and administrators = .97; and $r_s$ - specialists and administrators = .95; sig. = .05).

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of Agreement on the Future Characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service

The Kruskall-Wallis Test was used to compare the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators on their rankings of each individual characteristic item. The Spearman-Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was calculated to show the strength of agreement between the rankings of the overall group of items by the respondents.
The respondents ranked the following items highest with reference to their agreement of the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service. The Cooperative Extension Service:

1. Will help people identify and understand their needs and problems and use new technology in solving them
2. Will help people solve problems and take advantage of opportunities through education
3. Will be educational in program content and methodology, not regulatory or financial oriented
4. Will be administratively attached to a public university system and will be a major part of it rather than being attached directly to state government
5. Will be practical, problem centered and situation based

It was interesting to note that of the five items that were ranked by all respondents in the top four places, agents and specialists ranked the same item "1": the Cooperative Extension Service "will help people identify and understand their needs and problems and use new technology in solving them." Agents and specialists also ranked the same items "2.5: the Cooperative Extension Service "will help people solve problems and take advantage of opportunities through education." Agents, specialists and administrators all ranked the second "2.5" item the same: the Cooperative Extension Service "will be educational in program content and methodology, not regulatory or financial oriented."
The rankings showed that the future characteristics items indicating that the Cooperative Extension Service: will feature objective research based information and analysis of factual information for decision making by the people themselves; will provide informal non-credit education conducted primarily beyond the formal classroom, and for all ages; will provide educational programs directed at broad national purposes, yet serves specific local needs with priorities determined locally; will involve cooperative but not necessarily equal sharing of financial support among federal, state and county or local levels; and will be a professional function staffed by college personnel specifically qualified for positions were all ranked lowest by the respondents.

There were differences in the perceptions of agreement by agents, specialists and administrators. Those differences were shown to be statistically significant according to the Kruskal-Wallis Test on the following characteristics items. The Cooperative Extension Service:

- Will help people identify and understand their needs and problems and use new technology in solving them
- Will help people solve problems and take advantage of opportunities through education
- Will be educational in program content and methodology, not regulatory or financially oriented
- Will be administratively attached to a public university system and will be a major part of it rather than being attached directly to state government
- Will be practical, problem centered and situation based
- Will feature objective research based information and analysis of factual information for decision making by the people themselves

- Will provide informal non-credit education conducted primarily beyond the formal classroom, and for all ages

- Will provide educational programs directed at broad national purposes, yet serves specific local needs with priorities determined locally

- Will involve cooperative but not necessarily equal sharing of financial support among federal, state and county or local levels

An application of the Spearman-Rank Order Correlation to the rankings of agents, specialists and administrators illustrated that all three groups were in very high agreement on those items ranked highest and those items ranked lowest ($r_s$ - agents and specialists = .88; $r_s$ - agents and administrators = .81; and $r_s$ - specialists and administrators = .81; sig. = .05).

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Future Emphasis to be Placed on Quality of Living Programs

The Kruskall-Wallis Test was performed to analyze the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators on their rankings of each individual quality of living program item. The Spearman-Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was calculated to show the strength of agreement between the rankings on the overall group of items by the respondents.

The respondents ranked the following items highest with reference to their agreement of the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.
1. Assisting clientele in the effective use of management of resources

2. Assisting clientele in seeking out the availability of resources to provide for the needs of the individual and family

3. Promoting the process of individual and family decision making and the skills necessary to carry them out

4. Promoting clientele with assistance in choosing among the abundance of goods and services available

5. Promoting the process of individual and family decision making and the skills necessary to carry out the decisions

6. Assisting individuals in the development of skills necessary to use credit wisely

It was noted that of the items ranked highest, agents, specialists and administrators all ranked the same item "1": "assisting clientele in the effective use and management of resources". Specialists and administrators each ranked the same item "2": "promoting the process of individual and family decision-making and the skills necessary to carry out the decisions".

The rankings also showed the respondents ranked the following items lowest: assisting young families in the family planning process; assisting various groups in developing working relationships with community services agencies; assisting clientele in developing the basic skills necessary to apply for and hold a job; providing in-service training for public employees and decision makers; helping individual clientele or groups to develop skills in order to use increased leisure time; and providing clientele with an awareness of the manner in which attitudes, values and patterns of behavior are
formed.

An application of the Kruskall-Wallis Test showed there were differences in the perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on one quality of living program item. Those differences were shown to be statistically significant on the following item:

- Providing in-service training for public employees and decision makers

An application of Spearman-Rank Order Correlation to the rankings of agents, specialists and administrators indicated that all three groups were in very high agreement on the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living items which were ranked highest and those which were ranked lowest ($r_s$ - agents and specialists = .96; $r_s$ - specialists and administrators = .95; sig. = .05).

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of Future Emphasis to be Placed on Social and Economic Development Programs

The Kruskall-Wallis Test was utilized to compare the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators on their rankings of each social and economic development program item. The Spearman-Rank Order Correlation was used to show the strength of agreement between the rankings on the overall group of items by the respondents.

The respondents ranked the following five items highest with reference to the future emphasis to be placed on them by the Cooperative Extension Service:

1. Assisting producers in developing skills for improving marketing decisions
2. Assisting landowners in understanding soil and water conservation problems, and their effects on agriculture production and the general economy

3. Assisting producers in developing new and improved systems for marketing and processing

4. Providing producers with updated information and research necessary for expanding markets for agricultural products

5. Helping landowners understand the need for longrange planning for management and use of their soil and water resources and the economic alternative available to them for developing these resources

The rankings showed that agents, specialists and administrators ranked the following social and economic development items lowest with reference to the perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on them: helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to improve decisions made concerning forestry products, marketing and utilization; helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to marketing primary forestry products; providing forestry production and marketing clientele with assistance in the multi-use of small woodlands; helping landowners develop non-food producing businesses such as recreation enterprises; assisting landowners in cooperative planning for development of soil and water resources on a complete watershed basis; assisting producers in developing farm supply and marketing enterprises; and helping the public understand soil and water problems and support programs directed at solving them.
It was noted that agents, specialists and administrators all ranked the same item lowest: "helping landowners develop non-food producing businesses such as recreation enterprises".

There were differences in the perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on one social and economic development item by agents, specialists and administrators. Those differences were shown to be statistically significant according to the Kruskal-Wallis Test on the following social and economic development item:

- Helping landowners develop non-food producing businesses such as recreation enterprises

Application of the Spearman-Rank Order Correlation to the rankings of agents, specialists and administrators showed that all three groups were in very high agreement on their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on those social and economic development items which were ranked highest and those which were ranked lowest ($r_s$ - agents and specialists = .80; $r_s$ - agents and administrators = .90; and $r_s$ - specialists and administrators = .90; sig. = .05).

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Future Emphasis to be Placed on Agriculture and Related Industries Programs

The Kruskal-Wallis Test was performed to compare the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators on their rankings of each quality of living program item. The Spearman-Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was utilized to show the strength of agreement between the rankings on the overall group of items by the respondents.
The respondents ranked the following agriculture and related industries items highest with reference to the future emphasis to be placed on them by the Cooperative Extension Service:

1. Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with updated research information related to controlling disease, insects, weeds and other pests

2. Helping agriculture and related industries clientele obtain the most recent research results on improving harvesting, storage and marketing

3. Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in obtaining information necessary for improving plant and animal nutrition and feeding

4. Assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in obtaining information necessary for plant and animal selection and breeding

5. Helping agriculture and related industry clientele acquire the skills necessary to adopt more effective and economically feasible production technology

6. Providing agriculture and related industries clientele with educational information to aid in developing and understanding of situations, outlook, policy, market structure and other forces affecting decisions

7. Helping agriculture and related industries clientele obtain the most recent research results on improving harvesting, storage and marketing

It was noted that agents, specialists and administrators each totally agreed on several items. Each group ranked the same item "1": "providing agriculture and related industries clientele with updated research information related to controlling disease, insects, weeds, and other pests." Agents and specialists each ranked the same item
"2": "helping agriculture and related industries clientele obtain the most recent research results on improving harvesting, storage and marketing." Agents and administrators each ranked the same item "3": "assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in obtaining information necessary for improving plant and animal nutrition."

The rankings showed that the respondents ranked the following items lowest: assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in developing skills necessary to improve management through consideration of size, organization and effective allocation of resources; helping agriculture and related industries clientele improve the efficiency of selection, procurement and use of supplies, labor and credit; assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in developing skills necessary to compete more effectively in world markets; providing agriculture and related industries clientele with information necessary for the design, construction, procurement, maintenance and use of buildings and equipment; assisting agriculture and related industries clientele in organizing their resources into more effective and profitable production units; and providing assistance and educational programs to agriculture and related industries clientele necessary to adjust output to market demands as related to quantity and seasonality of output.

It was also noted from the rankings that agents, specialists and administrators each ranked the same item lowest: "providing agriculture and related industries clientele with information necessary for the design, construction, procurement, maintenance, and use of buildings and equipment."
According to the Kruskall-Wallis Test, there were no differences in the perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs as perceived by agents, specialists and administrators that were shown to be statistically significant.

An application of the Spearman-Rank order correlation to the rankings of agents, specialists and administrators indicated that the respondents were in high agreement on the agriculture and related industries items which were ranked highest and those which were ranked lowest ($r_s$ - agents and specialists = .84; $r_s$ - agents and administrators - .83; and $r_s$ - specialists and administrators = .68; sig. = .05).

**Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Future Emphasis to be Placed on Clientele Audiences (Farm Operations)**

The Kruskall-Wallis Test was used to compare the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators on their rankings of each individual farm operation clientele audience item. The Spearman-Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was utilized to show the strength of agreement between the rankings on the overall group of items by the respondents.

The respondents ranked the following items highest with reference to their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on them by the Cooperative Extension Service. The four highest ranked audience groups of farm operations were:

1. Family farms
2. Low-income farms
3. Other commercial family farms

4. Part-time farms

The rankings showed that agents, specialists and administrators ranked the following farm operations clientele audiences lowest: other commercial farms; retired farm families; and highly specialized farms.

It was noted that agents, specialists and administrators all ranked the same farm operations clientele audience least: "highly specialized farms."

There were differences in the perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on one farm operations clientele audience by the respondents. Those differences were shown to be statistically significant according to the Kruskall-Wallis Test on the following farm operations clientele audience:

- Highly specialized farms

An application of the Spearman-Rank order correlation to the rankings of agents, specialists and administrators showed that all three respondent groups were in very high agreement on the perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on those farm operations clientele audiences that were ranked highest and those that were ranked lowest ($r_s$ - agents and specialists = 1.00; $r_s$ - agents and administrators = .83; and $r_s$ - specialists and administrators = .83; sig. = .05).

Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Future Emphasis to be Placed on Clientele Audiences (Rural Non-Farm Families)

The Kruskall-Wallis Test was performed to compare the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators on their rankings of each
rural non-farm family clientele audience item. The Spearman-Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was utilized to show the strength of agreement between the rankings on the overall group of items by the respondents.

The respondents ranked the following items highest with reference to their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on them by the Cooperative Extension Service. The two highest ranked rural non-farm family clientele audiences were:

1. Low-income
2. Village and town (under 2,500 population)

The rankings also showed the rural non-farm family clientele audiences ranked lowest by agents, specialists and administrators regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on them by the Cooperative Extension Service. Those lowest ranked audiences were: open country and retirement non-farm family clientele.

According to the Kruskall-Wallis Test, there were no differences in the perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on rural non-farm family clientele audiences as perceived by agents, specialists and administrators that were shown to be statistically significant.

Application of the Spearman Rank order correlation to the rankings of agents, specialists and administrators indicated that the respondents were in very high agreement on the rural non-farm family clientele audiences which were ranked highest and those which were ranked lowest ($r_s$ - agents and specialists = .98; $r_s$ - agents and administrators = 1.00; and $r_s$ - specialists and administrators = .98; sig. = .05).
The Kruskall-Wallis Test was used to compare the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators on their rankings of each individual urban family clientele audience item. The Spearman-Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was utilized to show the strength of agreement between the rankings on the overall group of items by the respondents.

The respondents ranked the following items highest with reference to their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on them by the Cooperative Extension Service. The two highest ranked urban family clientele audiences were:

1. Small cities (2,000 - 50,000 population)
2. Low-income

The rankings illustrated that agents, specialists and administrators ranked the following urban family clientele audiences lowest: suburban; retired families; and central cities (over 50,000 population).

According to the Kruskall-Wallis Test, there were no differences in the perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on urban family clientele audiences as perceived by agents, specialists and administrators that were shown to be statistically significant.

An application of the Spearman-Rank Order Correlation to the rankings of agents, specialists and administrators showed that the respondents were in very high agreement on the urban family clientele audiences which were ranked highest and those which were ranked lowest ($r_s$ - agents and specialists = .90; agents and administrators = 1.00; and $r_s$ - specialists and administrators = .90; sig. = .05).
Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Future Emphasis to be Placed on Clientele Audiences (Industry Personnel)

The Kruskal-Wallis Test was performed to compare the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators on the rankings of each industry personnel clientele audience item. The Spearman-Rank Order Correlation was utilized to show the strength of agreement between the rankings on the overall groups of items by the respondents.

The respondents ranked the following items highest with reference to their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on them by the Cooperative Extension Service. The four highest ranked industry personnel clientele audiences were:

1. Cooperatives
2. Small businesses
3. Farm product purchasers and processors
4. Farm suppliers

The rankings also showed the industry personnel clientele audiences ranked lowest by agents, specialists and administrators regarding their agreement of the future emphasis to be placed on them by the Cooperative Extension Service. Those lowest ranked audiences were: farm suppliers; credit and finance institutions; and corporations.

It was noted that agents, specialists and administrators all ranked the same two industry personnel clientele audiences least with reference to future emphasis being placed on them by the Cooperative Extension Service. Those items were: "credit and financial institutions" and "corporations".
According to the Kruskall-Wallis Test there were no statistically significant differences in the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators regarding emphasis to be placed on industry personnel clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Application of the Spearman Rank order correlation to the rankings of agents, specialists and administrators indicated that the respondents were in high agreement on industry personnel clientele audiences which were ranked highest and those which were ranked lowest ($r_s$ - agents and specialists = .73; $r_s$ agents and administrators = .73; and $r_s$ - specialists and administrators = 1.00; sig. = .05).

**Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Future Emphasis to be Placed on Clientele Audiences (Organizations and Institutions)**

The Kruskall-Wallis Test was performed to compare the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators on their rankings of each organization and institution clientele audience item. The Spearman-Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was utilized to who the strength of agreement between the rankings on the overall group of items by the respondents.

The respondents ranked the following items highest with reference to their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on them by the Cooperative Extension Service. The three highest ranked organization and institution clientele audiences were:

1. Educational
2. County and community organizations
3. Farm organizations
The rankings also show the organization and institution clientele audiences which were ranked lowest by agents, specialists and administrators regarding their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on them by the Cooperative Extension Service. Those lowest ranked audiences were: government agencies and officials; trade and industry organizations; and labor organizations.

According to the Kruskal-Wallis Test, there were no differences in the perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on organization and institution clientele audiences as perceived by agents, specialists and administrators that were shown to be statistically significant.

The application of the Spearman-Rank order correlation to the rankings of agents, specialists and administrators indicated that the respondents shared a very high degree of agreement on the organization and institution clientele audiences that were ranked highest and those ranked lowest ($r_s$ - agents and specialists = 1.00; $r_s$ - agents and administrators = .83; and $r_s$ - specialists and administrators = .83; sig. = .05).

**Comparison of County Extension Agents', State Specialists' and Administrators' Perceptions of the Future Emphasis to be Placed on Clientele Audiences (Non-Extension Professionals and General Public)**

Respondents indicated their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on the clientele audience of "Non-Extension Professionals" by the Cooperative Extension Service. There were no further subcategories of "Non-Extension Professionals" clientele audiences to be ranked by agents, specialists and administrators with regards to their perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on them. However, the mean
weighted score for the respondents were: agents = 5.17; specialists = 5.22; and administrators = 4.99 (4 = undecided and 5 = moderate emphasis).

An application of the Kruskall-Wallis Test showed there was no significant difference in the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators regarding the future emphasis to be placed on non-Extension clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Respondents also indicated their perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on the clientele audiences of "General Public" by the Cooperative Extension Service. There were no further subcategories of the "General Public" clientele audiences to be ranked by agents, specialists and administrators with regards to their perceptions of future emphasis to be placed on them. However, the mean weighted score for the respondents were: agents = 6.01; specialists = 5.83; and administrators = 5.78 (5 = moderate emphasis and 6 = heavy emphasis).

An application of the Kruskall-Wallis Test showed there was no significant difference in the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators to be placed on the general public clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

To meet objective five of this study research hypothesis were developed and relevant statistical methods applied. The summary in relation to the developed research hypotheses is listed as follows: Null Hypotheses were also formulated but have been omitted here to avoid repetition.
Future Characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service

Research Hypothesis $H_1$: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics: sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future characteristics by the Cooperative Extension Service.

A relationship was found between the perceptions of agreement of respondents of the different personal characteristics groups regarding the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service. There was a high degree of agreement on the perceived future characteristic group except sex—sex ($r_s = .11$); age ($r_s = .91$); tenure ($r_s = .92$); area of responsibility ($W = .96$); highest academic degree ($W = .80$); institution graduated ($W = .77$) and background training ($W = .66$). Therefore, based on the data the Research Hypothesis $H_1$ is accepted for each personal characteristic group except sex. The rank order correlation coefficient ($r_s = .11$) for the sex category group was not found to be significant at the .05 level of significance. Based on the data the Research hypothesis is $H_1$ is not supported for those respondents falling in the personal characteristics category group of sex.

Quality of Living Programs

Research Hypothesis $H_2$: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics: sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

In general, a relationship was found in the perceptions of agreement of the different personal characteristics group regarding
the future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs by the Cooperative Extension Service. There was a high degree of agreement on the perceived future emphasis to be placed on quality of living programs by each personal characteristic group—sex \((r_s = .81)\); age \((r_s = .88)\); tenure \((W = .92)\); area of responsibility \((W = .60)\); highest academic degree \((W = .67)\); institution graduated \((W = .80)\) and background training \((W = .81)\). Based on this data, the Research Hypothesis \(H_2\) is supported.

Social and Economic Development Programs

**Research Hypothesis \(H_3\):** There will be relationships between the personal characteristics: sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on social and economic development programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

A relationship was found between the perceptions of agreement of respondents of the different personal characteristics groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on social and economic development programs by the Cooperative Extension Service. There was a high degree of agreement on social and economic development programs by each personal characteristic group—sex \((r_s = .65)\); age \((r_s = .91)\); tenure \((W = .87)\); area of responsibility \((W = .76)\); highest academic degree \((W = .87)\); institution graduated \((W = .63)\); and background training \((W = .82)\). Therefore, based on the data the Research Hypothesis \(H_3\) is supported.
Agriculture and Related Industries Programs

Research Hypothesis $H_4$: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics: sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs by the Cooperative Extension Service.

A relationship was found between the perceptions of agreement of respondents of the different personal characteristics groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs by the Cooperative Extension Service. There was a very high degree of agreement on the perceived future emphasis to be placed on agriculture and related industries programs by each personal characteristics group—sex ($r_s = .94$); age ($r_s = .96$); tenure ($W = .96$); area of responsibility ($W = .61$); highest academic degree ($W = .80$); institution graduated ($W = .92$); background training ($W = .76$). Therefore, based on the data the Research Hypothesis $H_4$ is supported.

Clientele Audiences (Farm Operations)

Research Hypothesis $H_5$: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics: sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions of the future emphasis to be placed on farm operations clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

A relationship was found between the perceptions of the different personal characteristic groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service. There was a very high degree of agreement on the perceived future
emphasis to be placed on clientele audiences (farm operations) by each personal characteristic group—sex ($r_s = .97$); age ($r_s = 1.00$); tenure ($W = .97$); area of responsibility ($W = .95$); highest academic degree ($W = .94$); institution graduated ($W = .73$); and background training ($W = .90$). Therefore, based on this data the Research Hypothesis $H_5$ is accepted.

**Clientele Audiences (Rural Non-Farm Families)**

Research Hypothesis $H_6$: There will be relationships between the personal characteristics: sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on rural non-farm families clientele by the Cooperative Extension Service.

A relationship was found between the perceptions of agreement of respondents of the different personal characteristics groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on clientele audiences (rural non-farm families) by the Cooperative Extension Service. There was a high degree of agreement on the perceived future emphasis to be placed on clientele audiences (rural non-farm families) by each personal characteristic group except tenure—sex ($r_s = .98$) age ($r_s = 1.00$); tenure ($W = .56$); area of responsibility ($W = .84$); highest academic degree ($W = 1.00$); institution graduated ($W = .91$); and background training ($W = .93$). Therefore, based on this data the Research Hypothesis $H_6$ is accepted for each group except age, sex and tenure.

Because of the small number of items ($n = 4$) the table value for the rank-order correlations of sex and age could not be substantiated.
for significance at the .05 level. The coefficient of concordance \((W = .56)\) for tenure was found not to be significant at the .05 level of significance. Based on the data the research Hypothesis \(H_6\) is not supported for these respondents falling in the personal characteristics category groups of sex, age and tenure.

**Clientele Audiences (Urban Families)**

Research Hypothesis \(H_7\): There will be relationships between the personal characteristics: sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on urban families clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

A relationship was found between the perceptions of agreement of respondents of the different personal characteristics groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on clientele audiences (urban families) by the Cooperative Extension Service. There was a very high degree of agreement on the perceived future emphasis to be placed on clientele audiences (urban families) by the Cooperative Extension Service. There was a very high degree of agreement on the perceived future emphasis to be placed on clientele audiences (urban families) by each personal characteristic groups—sex \((r_s = .98)\); age \((r_s = .99)\); tenure \((W = .96)\); area of responsibility \((W = .86)\); highest academic degree \((W = .96)\); institution graduated \((W = .84)\); and background training \((W = .86)\). Therefore, based on this data the Research Hypothesis \(H_7\) is accepted.
Clientele Audiences (Industry Personnel)

**Research Hypothesis H₉:** There will be relationships between the personal characteristics: sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on industry personnel audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.

A relationship was found between the perceptions of the different personal characteristic groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed on clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service. There was a high degree of agreement on the perceived future emphasis to be placed on clientele audiences (industry personnel) by each personal characteristic group except tenure—sex ($r_s = 1.00$); age ($r_s = .90$); tenure ($W = .49$); area of responsibility ($W = .69$); highest academic degree ($W = .91$); institution graduated ($W = .71$); and background training ($W = .78$). Therefore, based on this data the Research Hypothesis $H_9$ is accepted for each personal characteristic category group except tenure. The coefficient of concordance ($W = .49$) for tenure was found not to be significant at the .05 level of significance. Based on the data the Research Hypothesis $H_9$ is not supported for those respondents falling in the personal characteristics category group of tenure.

Clientele Audiences (Organizations and Institutions)

**Research Hypothesis H₉:** There will be relationships between the personal characteristics: sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training of the respondents and their perceptions regarding the future emphasis to be placed on organizations and institutions clientele audiences by the Cooperative Extension Service.
A relationship was found between the perceptions of agreement of respondents of the different personal characteristics groups regarding the future emphasis to be placed clientele audiences (organizations and institutions) by the Cooperative Extension Service. There was a very high degree of agreement on the perceived future emphasis to be placed on clientele audiences (organizations and institutions) by each personal characteristic group -- sex ($r_s = .99$); age ($r_s = 1.00$); tenure ($W = .94$); area of responsibility ($W = .83$); highest academic degree ($W = .97$); institution graduated ($W = .97$); and background training ($W = .79$). Therefore, based on this data the Research Hypothesis Hg is supported.

**Conclusions**

The major findings of this study provided the basis for the following conclusions:

1. There was a high degree of agreement among agents, specialists, and administrators concerning their perceptions of the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service, future program areas and clientele audiences.

2. Age, tenure, area of responsibility, highest academic degree, institution graduated and background training did not influence the perceptions of agents, specialists and administrators regarding their perceptions of the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service, future program areas and clientele.
3. Males and females differed in their perceptions of the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service. Males viewed the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service as more closely aligned with the public land-grant university and educational programs while females saw the future characteristics as more practical and problem solving in character.

4. Agents, specialists, and administrators perceived the future characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service as being highly aligned with the following: will help people identify and understand their needs and problems and use new technology in solving them; will help people solve problems and take advantage of opportunities through education; will be educational in program content and methodology, not regulatory or financially oriented; will be administratively attached to the public university system and will be a major part of it rather than being attached directly to state government; and situation based.

5. Agents, specialists and administrators viewed the following quality of living program items highest with reference to future emphasis to be placed on them: assisting clientele in seeking out the availability of resources to provide for the needs of the individual and family decision making and the skills necessary to carry them
out; providing clientele with assistance in choosing among the goods and services available; and assisting individuals in the development of skills necessary to use credit wisely.

6. Agents, specialists, and administrators viewed the following social and economic development program items highest with reference to future emphasis to be placed on them: assisting producers in developing skills for improving marketing decisions; assisting landowners in the understanding of soil and water conservation problems, their effects on agriculture production and the general economy; assisting producers in developing new and improved systems for marketing and processing; providing producers with updated information and research necessary for expanding markets and agricultural products; and helping landowners understand the need for long-range planning for management and use of their soil and water resources and economic alternatives available to them for developing resources.

7. Agents, specialists, and administrators viewed the following agriculture and related industries program items highest with reference to future emphasis to be placed on them: providing agriculture and related industries clientele with updated research information related to controlling disease, insects, weeds,
and other pests; and helping agriculture and related industries clientele obtaining the most recent research results on improving harvesting, storage and marketing.

8. Agents, specialists, and administrators viewed the following clientele audiences highest with reference to future emphasis to be placed on them: farm operations; family farms; general public; organizations; farm operations--low-income farms; organizations and institutions--educational; organizations and institutions--farm organizations; farm operations--other commercial family farms; rural non-farm families--low-income; rural non-farm families--village and town (under 2,500 population) and urban families--small cities (2,000 - 5,000 population).

9. Agents and specialists currently tend to devote the annual percentage of their Extension time to Extension program areas similarly with the exception of 4-H and youth where agents devote more than twice as much of their Extension time.

10. Administrators currently tend to devote the highest percentage of their Extension time to administration and the Extension program areas of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Home Economics and Family Living, 4-H and Youth, and Community Resource Development equally.
11. Extension program audiences that currently receive the highest annual percentage of County Extension Agents' and State Specialists' time were: commercial farms; county and community organizations; home garden, land and grounds purchasers; Extension support groups; and low-income urban families or groups.

12. Extension program audiences that currently receive the highest annual percentage of Administrators' time were: Extension support groups; farm organizations; and research personnel.

13. Dissemination methods most utilized to deliver the greater percentage of program activities by County Extension Agents were: outside office group meetings; house calls; office telephone calls; individual office visits; special interest meetings; newsletters; news articles; and personal correspondence.

14. Dissemination methods most utilized to deliver the greater percentage of program activities by State Specialists were: outside office group meetings; state, district and support team members; special interest meetings; office telephone calls; use of paraprofessionals; personal correspondence; and individual office calls.

15. Dissemination methods most utilized to deliver the greater percentage of program activities by
Administrators were: state, district and support team members; outside office group meetings; individual office calls; office telephone calls; personal correspondence; and the use of paraprofessionals.

16. Agents, specialists, and administrators spend a similar percentage of their Extension time meeting and working with ethnic groups: white, non-Hispanic, 66-71 percent; Black, non-Hispanic, 23-26 percent; Hispanic, 3 percent; American Indian or Alaskan Native, 2-3 percent; and Asian or Pacific Islander, 1 percent.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the results of this study:

1. It is recommended that the State Director, Dean or Coordinator of the Cooperative Extension Service in each of the 16 states that contain both 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Institutions establish an ad hoc committee made up of varied sex, age, tenure, area of responsibility, academic degree, institution graduated and background training categories to evaluate the future direction of the Extension Service in each state using this study as a beginning point.
2. It is recommended that the Southern Region establish a task force to evaluate the future direction of the Extension Service using this study as a starting point.

3. It is recommended that those persons responsible for program planning and staff development at the state level in each of the 16 states that contain 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Institutions:
   a. Identify the areas of quality of living programs that should receive greatest emphasis in the future.
   b. Identify the areas of social and economic development programs that should receive greatest emphasis in the future.
   c. Identify the areas of agriculture and related industries that should receive the greatest emphasis in the future.
   d. Identify the clientele audiences that should receive the greatest emphasis in the future.

4. It is recommended that the findings of the above recommendations be incorporated in the overall state program plan of work and program thrust.

5. It is recommended that the findings of this study be evaluated by those persons responsible for program planning and staff development in the states that
contain both 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Institutions for usefulness in programming.

**Recommended Areas for Further Study**

1. It is recommended that ECOP establish another committee to duplicate and build upon the 1968 study *A People and a Spirit.*

2. It is recommended that this study be duplicated using Extension clientele audiences as respondents.

3. It is recommended that this study be duplicated by collecting data in another geographic area of the United State
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PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS

QUESTIONNAIRE: PART I

1. In what Extension program does your major responsibility focus? (Check only one)
   (1) 4-H and Youth
   (2) Home Economics: (adult)
   (3) Agricultural: (adult)
   (4) Community Resource Development
   (5) Administration
   (6) Other, please specify _________________________________________

2. In what capacity (position) do you serve in the Cooperative Extension Service?
   (1) County Extension Agent/Director
   (2) State Specialist
   (3) Administrator (Dean/Director; Assistant or Associate Dean/Director; Coordinator; etc.)
   (4) Other, please specify _________________________________________

3. What percent of your professional time is devoted to Extension activities? __________% Precent

4. How many years have you served in the Cooperative Extension Service (Including service in all states and positions)? _______Years

5. How many years have you served in your present position? _______Years

6. Please indicate your age on your last birthday: ______

7. Please indicate your sex: _____ Female _____ Male

8. Please indicate the highest academic degree you hold:
   (1) Bachelor's
   (2) Master's
   (3) Doctorate
   (4) Other, please specify _________________________________________

9. Please indicate the name of the college or university from which you graduated:
   (1) Bachelor's
   (2) Master's
   (3) Doctorate
   __________________________________________________________

10. What was your major field of study for your highest degree?
    (1) Education (Agriculture Education, Home Economics Education, or General Education)
    (2) Home Economics (Including majors in Nutrition, Home Management, Clothing, etc.)
    (3) Production subject matter field (Including majors in Animal Science, Poultry, Agronomy, Horticulture, Agricultural Engineering)
    (4) Biological Science (Including majors in Agricultural Chemistry, Entomology, Plant Pathology and Dairy Technology)
    (5) Agricultural Social Science (Including majors in Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology)
    (6) Public Administration
    (7) Educational Administration
    (8) Other, please specify _________________________________________

11. Please indicate the name of the institution in which you are presently employed: _____________________________________________________
Directions: Please indicate the percentage of your Extension time is spent annually working with the following: Your total should equal 100%.

1. What percent of your Extension time is spent working in the following areas?
   (1) Agriculture and Natural Resources, including production, marketing and utilization
   (2) Home Economics and Family Living
   (3) 4-H and Youth
   (4) Community Resource Development
   (5) Administration
   (6) Other, please specify
   100% TOTAL

2. What percent of your Extension time is spent annually working with the following groups?
   (1) Highly specialized farms
   (2) Commercial farms
   (3) Low-income farms
   (4) Low-income rural non-farm
   (5) Low-income urban families or groups
   (6) Farm product purchasers and processors
   (7) Home garden, lawn and grounds purchasers
   (8) County and community organizations
   (9) Farm organizations
   (10) Extension support groups (county commissioners/directors, college/university administrators, legislators, etc.)
   (11) Research personnel
   (12) Other, please specify
   100% TOTAL

3. What percent of your Extension program activities is disseminated through the following methods?
   (1) Office telephone calls
   (2) Individual office visits
   (3) Group office visits
   (4) Outside office group meetings
   (5) House calls
   (6) Personal correspondence
   (7) Television shows
   (8) News articles
   (9) Special interest meetings
   (10) Radio broadcasting
   (11) Newsletters
   (12) Use of paraprofessionals
   (13) State, District and other support team members
   (14) Other, please specify
   100% TOTAL

4. What percent of your Extension contact time is spent meeting or working with the following groups?
   (1) American Indian or Alaskan Native
   (2) Black, non-Hispanic
   (3) Hispanic
   (4) White, non-Hispanic
   (5) Asian or Pacific Islander
   (6) Other, please specify
   100% TOTAL

5. What percent of your Extension time do you feel should be spent annually working with the following groups in the future in order to better serve Extension clientele?
   (1) Farm product purchasers and processors
   (2) County and community organizations
   (3) Farm organizations
   (4) Low-income farms
   (5) Commercial farms
   (6) Home garden, lawn and grounds purchasers
   (7) Low-income rural non-farms
   (8) Highly specialized farms
   (9) Low-income urban families or groups
   (10) Extension support groups (county commissioners/directors, college/university administrators, legislators, etc.)
   (11) Research personnel
   (12) Other, please specify
   100% TOTAL
QUESTIONNAIRE: PART II (PLEASE READ CAREFULLY)

Explanatory Note: Various Extension Personnel hold different views about the job of the Cooperative Extension Service—who are the clientele and what programs it should carry out.

On the following pages you will find a series of statements describing areas which you might feel lend some description of the present and projected role of the Cooperative Extension Service in relation to program and delivery methods.

General Instructions: A list of projections and roles that will provide substance to this study has been developed. Rating scales are provided in order to describe and record your responses and reactions. Please read each item carefully and rate each with the response that represents your situation or present feeling.

It is necessary that you answer all questions and react in terms of your most sincere feelings and beliefs. At the beginning of each section, further instructions will be given that applies to that section. THERE ARE NO "right" OR "wrong" ANSWERS.

Directions: The column of numbers to the right of each statement indicates your perceptions concerning the following statements. Please circle only one number for each statement. The following rating scale is to be used for defining your feelings:

| 7 | Very Strongly Agree | 3 | Disagree |
| 6 | Strongly Agree | 2 | Strongly Disagree |
| 5 | Agree | 1 | Very Strongly Disagree |
| 4 | Undecided |

(Very Strongly Agree - Very Strongly Disagree)

EXAMPLE: Extension's future role refers to the function or position played by Cooperative Extension in the years to come

The CURRENT role of the Cooperative Extension Service as I know it:

6. Is educational in program content and methodology, not regulatory or financial

7. Is administratively attached to a public university system and is a major part of it, rather than being attached directly to state government

8. Provides informal, non-credit education conducted primarily beyond the formal classroom, and for all ages

9. Helps people solve problems and take advantage of opportunities through education

10. Features objective, research based information and analysis of factual information for decision making by the people themselves

11. Involves cooperative but not necessarily equal sharing of financial support among federal, state and county or local levels

12. Is practical, problem centered and situation based

13. Is a professional function staffed by college trained personnel specifically qualified for positions

14. Provides educational programs directed at broad national purposes, yet serves specific local needs with priorities determined locally

15. Helps people identify and understand their needs and problems and uses new technology or information in solving them
Rating Scale: 7-Very Strongly Agree; 6-Strongly Agree; 5-Agree; 4-Undecided; 3-Disagree; 2-Strongly Disagree; 1-Very Strongly Disagree

The FUTURE role of the Cooperative Extension Service as I foresee it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Will provide educational programs directed at broad national purposes, yet serving specific local needs with priorities determined locally</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Will involve cooperative but not necessarily equal sharing of financial support among federal, state and county or local levels</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Will provide informal, non-credit education conducted primarily beyond the formal classroom, and for all ages</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Will be administratively attached to a public university system and will be a major part of it, rather than being attached directly to state government</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Will help people identify and understand their needs and problems and will use technology or other information in solving them</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Will be practical, problem centered and situation based</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Will be educational in problem content and methodology not regulatory or financial oriented</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Will feature objective research based information and analysis of factual information for decision making by the people themselves</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Will help people solve problems and take advantage of opportunities through education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Will be a professional function staffed by college trained personnel specifically qualified for positions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directions: In this section, you will be responding to questions which are related to program emphasis in Extension. Some may not be directly related to your area of work; therefore, your response should not be limited to just what you feel you are doing or do in your own situation—rather, I am interested in your reaction as to the statements as you feel they relate to the ORGANIZATION AS A WHOLE.

After reading each of the statements carefully, please indicate the EMPHASIS Extension is or should place on the program activities by circling the code number that best represents your feelings. Remember, THERE ARE NO "right" OR "wrong" ANSWERS, just your personal reaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Heavy Emphasis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Heavy Emphasis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moderate Emphasis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Very Heavy Emphasis - No Emphasis)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is necessary that you answer all statements and react in terms of your most sincere feelings and beliefs. To the left of each statement an emphasis rating scale to indicate the emphasis of the program activity you feel Extension is CURRENTLY placing in the following program areas will be found. To the right of each statement is also an emphasis rating scale to indicate the emphasis you feel Extension should place in the following areas in the FUTURE.
Rating Scale: 7-Very Heavy Emphasis; 6-Heavy Emphasis; 5-Moderate Emphasis; 4-Undecided; 3-Little Emphasis; 2-Very Little Emphasis; 1-No Emphasis

Please indicate the amount of emphasis you feel Extension is or should place on each activity presently and in the future.

**EXAMPLE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Emphasis</th>
<th>Future Emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activity Descriptions:**

1. Assisting County Agents in developing increased skills in program development.
2. Assisting individuals in acquiring the ability to utilize community services and to participate in the development of community services.
3. Promoting increased interaction of individual clientele with others.
4. Enhancing the social, physical and economic mobility of the individual clientele.
5. Promoting the process of individual and family decision making and the skills necessary to carry out the decisions.
6. Assisting clientele in seeking out the availability of resources to provide for the needs of the individual and family.
7. Assist clientele in the effective use and management of resources.
8. Providing clientele with assistance in choosing among the abundance of goods and services available.
9. Assisting individuals in the development of skills necessary to use credit wisely.
10. Helping individual clientele or groups to develop skills in order to use increased leisure time.
11. Assisting clientele in developing the skills necessary to make decisions related to career choice and development.
12. Aiding individuals in understanding the functions of the family and its relation to the community.
13. Helping clientele contribute to the family's ability to promote the development of children.
Rating Scale: 7-Very Heavy Emphasis; 6-Heavy Emphasis; 5-Moderate Emphasis; 4-Undecided; 3-Little Emphasis; 2-Very Little Emphasis; 1-No Emphasis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Emphasis</th>
<th>Future Emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(38) Providing clientele with an awareness of the manner in which attitudes, values, and patterns of behavior are formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(39) Assisting young families in the family planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(40) Assisting clientele in developing the skills necessary to assist in the evaluation of community services such as housing, educational resources, child care facilities and employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(41) Promoting clientele participation in volunteer activities aimed at community problems as a means for developing skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(42) Providing clientele with information needed to analyze available alternatives in terms of jobs, living conditions, and cost involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(43) Assisting clientele in developing the basic skills necessary to apply for and hold a job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(44) Assisting various groups in developing working relationships with community service agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(45) Providing in-service training for public employees and decision makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(46) Promoting clientele improvements of their community organizations and environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(47) Helping clientele develop as informed leaders for identifying and solving problems in a democratic society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(48) Assisting clientele in developing skills necessary to optimize their development as individuals and as members of the family and community (children, youth and adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(49) Assisting agricultural and related industry clientele in organizing their resources into more efficient and profitable production units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Emphasis</td>
<td>Future Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(50) Helping agricultural and related industry clientele acquire the skills necessary to adopt more effective and economically feasible production technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(51) Providing assistance and educational programs to agricultural and related industry clientele necessary to adjust output to market demands as related to quantity, quality, and seasonality of output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(52) Assisting agricultural and related industry clientele in developing skills necessary to compete more effectively in world markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(53) Providing agricultural and related industry clientele with educational information to aid in developing and understanding of situations, outlook, policy, market structure and other forces affecting decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(54) Assisting agricultural and related industry clientele in developing skills necessary to improve management through consideration of size, organization and effective allocation of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(55) Helping agricultural and related industry clientele improve the efficiency of the selection, procurement and use of supplies, labor and credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(56) Providing agricultural and related industry clientele with information necessary for improving the design construction, procurement, maintenance, and use of buildings and equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(57) Assisting agricultural and related industry clientele in obtaining information necessary for improving plant and animal nutrition and feeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(58) Assisting agricultural and related industry clientele in obtaining information necessary for plant and animal selection and breeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Emphasis</td>
<td>Future Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(59) Providing agricultural and related industry clientele with updated research information related to controlling diseases, insects, weeds and other pests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(60) Helping agricultural and related industry clientele obtain the most recent research results on improving harvesting, storage and marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(61) Assisting producers in developing skills for improving their marketing decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(62) Assisting producers in developing new and improved systems for marketing and processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(63) Assisting producers in improving the efficiency of supply, marketing and processing firms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(64) Providing producers with updated information and research necessary for expanding markets for agricultural products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(65) Assisting producers in developing new farm supply and marketing enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(66) Assisting forestry production and marketing clientele in obtaining information and recent research pertaining to timber production technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(67) Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to marketing primary forestry products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(68) Providing forestry production and marketing clientele with assistance in the multi-use of small woodlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>(69) Helping forestry production and marketing clientele develop skills necessary to improve decisions made concerning forest products, marketing and utilization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rating Scale: 7-Very Heavy Emphasis; 6-Heavy Emphasis; 5-Moderate Emphasis; 4-Undecided; 3-Little Emphasis; 2-Very Little Emphasis; 1-No Emphasis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Emphasis</th>
<th>Future Emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1 (70) Assisting landowners in understanding soil and water conservation problems, their effects on agriculture production and the general economy</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1 (71) Helping landowners understand the need for long-range planning for management and use of their soil and water resources and the economic alternative available to them for developing these resources</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1 (72) Assisting landowners in cooperative planning for development of soil and water resources on a complete watershed basis</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1 (73) Helping the general public understand soil and water problems and support programs directed at solving them</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1 (74) Helping landowners develop nonfood producing businesses such as recreation enterprises</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recognizing that the competition and availability for responses to support and maintain Extension programs and audiences in the future may be limited, please indicate the emphasis you feel Extension should place on the following audiences in the future. The following rating scale is to be used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 - Very Heavy Emphasis</td>
<td>3 - Keep the Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Heavy Emphasis</td>
<td>2 - Little Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Moderate Emphasis</td>
<td>1 - Not at All Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Undecided</td>
<td>(Very Heavy Emphasis - Not at All Important)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75. Farm Operations
- Highly specialized corporate farms 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Family farms 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Other commercial corporate farms 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Low-income farms 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Other commercial family farms 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Part-time farms 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Retired farm families 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

76. Rural Non-Farm Families
- Open country 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Village and town (under 2,500 pop.) 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Low-income 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Retirement 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
### Rating Scale:

- **7** - Very Heavy Emphasis
- **6** - Heavy Emphasis
- **5** - Moderate Emphasis
- **4** - Undecided
- **3** - Keep the Same
- **2** - Little Emphasis
- **1** - Not at All Important

---

#### 77. Urban Families
- Small cities (2,000 - 50,000 pop.) 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Suburban 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Central cities (over 50,000 pop.) 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Low-income 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Retired families 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

#### 78. Industry Personnel
- Farm suppliers 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Farm product purchasers and processors 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Cooperatives 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Corporations 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Small businesses 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Credit and finance institutions 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

#### 79. Organizations and Institutions
- Educational 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Government agencies and officials 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- County and community organizations 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Trade and industry organizations 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Farm organizations 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
- Labor organizations 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

#### 80. Non-Extension Professionals
- 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

#### 81. General Public
- 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

---

Now that you have finished the Questionnaire please briefly look back through to see if there are any items that were omitted. If not, seal the Questionnaire in the pre-addressed stamped envelope and mail.

**THANK YOU!**
Dear Director/Dean:

I am Fred Harrison, Jr., a graduate student at The Ohio State University majoring in Extension Education. I am currently on study leave from the Georgia Extension Service where I worked for four years before being granted study leave to pursue the doctoral degree.

I am conducting a study on "The Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service in States that Contain both 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Institutions as Perceived by County Extension Agents, State Specialists, Assistant Directors and Directors." In order to add validity to my study, I would like to request your permission to contact Extension personnel in the above categories in (name of state) who would be chosen at random as respondents in this study. A stratified random will be drawn with no more than (number) people being contacted from (name of state).

Enclosed is a sample copy of a cover letter I would like to enclose along with the questionnaire to respondents in (name of state) if granted your permission. If you would be as kind to revise it as you see fit, have it retyped on your Extension letterhead and return it to me with your signature affixed I would be greatly appreciative. Also, if you supply me with a current copy of your latest personnel list including addresses and telephone numbers it would be of great help.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Fred Harrison, Jr.
Dear Agents, Specialists and Assistant Directors:

Fred Harrison, Jr., a graduate student at The Ohio State University on study leave from the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service is conducting a study of "The Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service as Perceived by County Extension Agents, State Specialists, Assistant Directors and Directors.

Mr. Harrison has requested the cooperation of the Extension Personnel in (Name of your State) in collecting data necessary for completion of his study. Please join me in supporting this study by responding to all of the questions on the enclosed questionnaire and returning it in the enclosed pre-addressed stamped envelope at your most earliest convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Director/Dean
Dear Title and Name:

Recently you granted me permission to contact a small sample of Extension personnel in your state for the purpose of collecting data necessary to complete my doctoral dissertation research. My study is entitled, "The Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service in States That Contain Both 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Institutions as Perceived by County Extension Agents, State Specialists and Administrators."

You are one of many Directors that I am requesting to assist me in this study by completing the enclosed questionnaire. The items in section two of the questionnaire may not be directly related to your work area, therefore your response should not be limited to just what you are doing in your own situation—rather, I am interested in your reaction to the statements as you feel they relate to the ORGANIZATION as a whole.

The names of any respondents will not appear in any material to be published as a result of this study. The questionnaire is coded for research control purposes only.

Please assist me by completing the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me in the pre-addressed, stamped envelope at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Fred Harrison, Jr.

Enclosure
Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr.
Graduate Student
The Ohio State University
College of Agriculture and Home Economics
Room 100
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Harrison:

I received your letter in regard to the study which you are conducting pertaining to the projected role of the Cooperative Extension Service in states that contain both 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Institutions as perceived by County Extension Agents, State Specialists, Assistant Directors, and Directors.

We shall be glad to cooperate with you. Attached is the letter which you requested along with current lists of Arkansas Cooperative Extension Service personnel.

Very truly yours,

Kenneth S. Bates
Director

KSB:fh
Attach.

The Arkansas Cooperative Extension Service offers its programs to all eligible persons regardless of race, color, national origin, or sex, and is an Equal Employment Opportunity Employer.
To Extension Employees:

Fred Harrison, Jr., a graduate student at The Ohio State University, on study leave from the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service, is conducting a study of "The Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service as Perceived by County Extension Agents, State Specialists, Assistant Directors, and Directors."

Mr. Harrison has requested the cooperation of the Extension Personnel in Arkansas in collecting data necessary for completion of his study. Please join me in supporting this study by responding to all of the questions on the enclosed questionnaire and returning it in the enclosed pre-addressed stamped envelope at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Kenneth S. Bates
Director

Encl.
November 20, 1978

Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr.
Graduate Student
The Ohio State University
Room 100
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Fred:

The University of Missouri Extension staff would welcome the opportunity of participating in your study on the Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service in States that Contain both 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Institutions as Perceived by County and State Extension Staff. I am enclosing a signed copy of a letter that you can include with your questionnaire when you mail to Missouri staff.

Also enclosed is our latest University Extension Directory that provides the names and addresses of staff located on the four University of Missouri campuses, Lincoln University, and the 114 County Extension Offices. You should note that we do not have a county director in each county but have organized around 21 area planning units which are headed and administered by an area director. The county extension staff are titled area specialists and have discontinued the role of district supervisor or state agent as some states call them.

I would suggest that before you draw your stratified random sample you contact Dr. Randel Price, Director of Training and Staff Development, so he can provide assistance with the identity of people in the directory who work on cooperative extension and also assist in identifying those positions and titles which are comparable to titles in other states. Dr. Price's address is 511 Clark Hall and his telephone number is (314) 882-6586.

Best wishes on your graduate study.

Sincerely yours,

Carl N. Scheneman
Vice President for Extension

CNS/jm

cc: Dr. Randel Price
Dear Colleagues:

Fred Harrison, Jr., a graduate student at The Ohio State University on study leave from the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service, is conducting a study of "The Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service in States that Contain both 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Institutions as Perceived by State and Area Extension Staff."

Mr. Harrison has requested the cooperation of the extension personnel in Missouri in collecting data necessary for completion of his study. Please join me in supporting this study by responding to all of the questions on the enclosed questionnaire and returning it in the enclosed pre-addressed stamped envelope at your most earliest convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Carl N. Scheneman
Vice President for Extension

cc: Dr. Wayne Atkins
Dr. Randal Price
Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr.
College of Agriculture and
Home Economics
The Ohio State University
Room 100
2120 Pyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Harrison:

This is permission for you to contact certain Texas Extension Service personnel to be respondents in your study "The Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service in States That contain both 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Institutions as Perceived by County Extension Agents, State Specialists, Assistant Directors, and Directors." Enclosed is the cover letter which you requested to be returned to you for enclosure with the questionnaire which you plan to send to certain members of our staff.

Also, enclosed is a copy of the latest personnel list for the Texas Agricultural Extension Service as requested in your letter of November 15.

We would appreciate having a copy of your findings of this study upon its completion.

Good luck!

Yours very truly,

Daniel C. Pfannstiel
Director

DCP:s1
Enclosure
cc: Dr. George Gist
    Dr. Tal Duvall
MEMORANDUM TO: Certain County Extension Agents, Specialists, and Assistant Directors

Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr., a graduate student at the Ohio State University on study leave from the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service, is conducting a study of "The Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service as Perceived by County Extension Agents, State Specialists, Assistant Directors and Directors." Mr. Harrison has requested the assistance of certain Extension personnel in Texas in collecting data necessary for completion of his study.

We are asking you to take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire to the best of your knowledge. When completed, please forward it in the enclosed self-addressed envelope to Mr. Harrison.

Thank you for your assistance.

Yours very truly,

Daniel C. Mannstiel
Director

OSCP:SI
Enclosure
Mr. Fred Harrison, Junior  
Room 100  
2120 Fyffe Road  
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Harrison,

I am pleased to grant you permission to contact some of our Extension faculty for correspondence in your study. Enclosed is a list of our current faculty that should be of help to you in your random sample. Also enclosed is a cover letter from me to our faculty for your study.

I would like to have a copy of your study when it is completed.

If you desire additional information or assistance, please contact me.

Sincerely,

John T. Woeste  
Dean for Extension

Enclosures: Transmittal letter  
Staff directory

cc: Jack McCown  
District Agents  
JTW:me

The Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences is an Equal Employment Opportunity - Affirmative Action Employer authorized to provide research, educational information and other services only to individuals and institutions that function without regard to race, color, sex, or national origin.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS, STATE OF FLORIDA, IFAS, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AND BOARDS OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS COOPERATING.
TO: Selected Extension Faculty and Administrators
FROM: John T. Woeste
RE: Study by Fred Harrison, Jr.

Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr., a graduate student and The Ohio State University is conducting a study of "The Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service in States as Perceived by County Extension Agents, State Specialists, Assistant Directors and Directors". Mr. Harrison is on study leave from the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service.

Mr. Harrison has requested the cooperation of the Florida Cooperative Extension Service faculty and administrators in collecting data necessary for completion of this study. This appears to be a study that could be of benefit to us and other states. I have given our support for this study. Therefore, I am asking you to join with me in supporting this study by responding to all the questions on the enclosed questionnaire and returning it in the enclosed pre-stamped envelope at your earliest convenience.

Thanks for your support and cooperation with this study.

JTW

The Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences is an Equal Employment Opportunity - Affirmative Action Employer authorized to provide research, educational information and other services only to individuals and institutions that function without regard to race, color, sex, or national origin.  COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS, STATE OF FLORIDA, IFAS, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AND BOARDS OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS COOPERATING
Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr.
Graduate Student
College of Agriculture
and Home Economics
Room 100, 2120 Pyfe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Harrison:

This is in response to your letter of November 15, to Director John A. Cox.

The topic you have chosen for study is a good one and should be useful to states that have both 1862 and 1890 institutions.

We are sending you a copy of our personnel list and you have my permission to contact Extension personnel in the state. However, I prefer not to provide you with a letter endorsing your study. This has been the policy that we have generally followed in Louisiana because we have a Department of Extension Education that grants both M.S. and Doctoral degrees. This means that our personnel often serve as populations for studies and it would be difficult for me to sanction certain studies over others.

Sincerely,

Denver T. Loupe
Director

DTL/jhm

Enclosure
Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr.
Graduate Student
Extension Education
The Ohio State University
Room 100
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Harrison:

Attached is a copy of a Directory of The University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture. Please note that the Extension portion of that Directory starts on page 19.

As we discussed by telephone, after you have selected the Extension personnel in Tennessee that you wish to contact, please send me their names and I will advise them that they may expect to receive a questionnaire from you.

Sincerely yours,

M. Lloyd Downen
Dean

Attachment
December 11, 1978

Dear Agents, Specialists and Assistant Directors:

Fred Harrison, Jr., a graduate student at The Ohio State University on study leave from the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service is conducting a study of "The Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service as Perceived by County Extension Agent, State Specialists, Assistant Directors and Directors."

Mr. Harrison has requested the cooperation of the Extension Personnel in Kentucky in collecting data necessary for completion of his study. I have given Mr. Harrison approval to send the enclosed questionnaire to a random sample of our Kentucky Extension staff.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Earnhart
Dean and Director
Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr.
College of Agriculture and Home Economics
Ohio State University
Room 100
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Dear Mr. Harrison:

I have reviewed your dissertation proposal and the questionnaire you will be using to gather data for your dissertation. I have no objections to your including Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service personnel in your study. However, I have operated under a long-standing policy to not sign cover letters to endorse graduate studies. You do have my permission to include a statement in your cover letter indicating that you have contacted me and have my approval to include Mississippi Cooperative Extension personnel in the study.

Yours very truly,

W.M. Bost
Director

WMB/lrp
December 13, 1978

Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr.
The Ohio State University
College of Agriculture and Home Economics
Room 100, 2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Fred:

Enclosed is the letter you requested from Director Barnhart granting permission to include a sample of Kentucky Extension employees in your study on the projected role of Cooperative Extension Service as perceived by various levels of employees.

I have also enclosed a copy of our field directory, giving names and addresses of all our staff. I note in your letter to Director Barnhart that you are limiting your study to states that contain both 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Institutions. I thought you might be interested in knowing that the 1890 Extension program is currently only operating in four of our Extension areas. I have marked these areas in red on the enclosed field directory.

Best of luck with your study. We would appreciate a copy of your findings when they are complete.

Sincerely,

Randall Barnett
Assistant Director

cc: Dr. Charles E. Barnhart
Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr.
Graduate Student in Extension Education
College of Agriculture and Home Economics
The Ohio State University
Room 100
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Mr. Harrison:

Dean Van Dresser has asked that I write you expressing our approval for you to include Virginia in your study on "The Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service in States That Contain Both 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Institutions as Perceived by County Extension Agents, State Specialists, Assistant Directors and Directors."

The enclosed letter may be sent with the instrument.

I think you have undertaken a good study and I hope you have good luck in obtaining the data.

Sincerely,

J. A. Reynolds
Associate Dean

Enclosure

cc: Dr. T. C. DuVall
Mr. M. C. Harding, Sr.
TO VIRGINIA EXTENSION PERSONNEL ADDRESSED

Dear Co-workers:

Fred Harrison, Jr., a graduate student at The Ohio State University on study leave from the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service is conducting a study of "The Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service in States That Contain Both 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Institutions as Perceived by County Extension Agents, State Specialists, Assistant Directors and Directors."

I have granted approval for a sample from Virginia to provide data for the study. I hope you will give Mr. Harrison your cooperation and return the questionnaire in the pre-addressed stamped envelope.

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

W. R. Van Dresser, Dean

Blackburg, Virginia 24061

December 13, 1978
December 19, 1978

TO: Agents, Specialists and Assistant Directors

Dear Co-Workers:

Fred Harrison, Jr., a graduate student at The Ohio State University, on study leave from the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service, is conducting a study of "The Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service as Perceived by County Extension Agents, State Specialists, Assistant Directors, and Directors."

Mr. Harrison has requested the cooperation of the Extension Personnel in Oklahoma, in collecting data necessary for completion of his study. Please join me in supporting this study by responding to all of the questions on the enclosed questionnaire and returning it in the enclosed pre-addressed, stamped envelope at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Frank H. Baker
Director/Dean

FHB:jlt

enclosure (1)
December 21, 1978

Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr.
College of Agriculture &
Home Economics
Room 100, 2120 Fyffe Road
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Fred:

As requested in your letter of November 20, I am enclosing a letter to be sent to our Georgia Extension personnel to help you in your study.

If we can be of further help please let us know.

Sincerely,

Tal C. DuVall
Director

Enclosures
TO: CERTAIN GEORGIA EXTENSION WORKERS

Fred Harrison, Jr., a graduate student at The Ohio State University on study leave from the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service is conducting a study of "The Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service as Perceived by County Extension Agents, State Specialists, Assistant Directors and Directors."

Mr. Harrison has requested the cooperation of the Extension personnel in our state in collecting data necessary for completion of his study. Please join me in supporting this study by responding to all of the questions on the enclosed questionnaire and returning it in the enclosed pre-addressed stamped envelope at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Tal C. DuVall
Director
TO: Mr. Robert Rathbone
FROM: John M. Curtis, Director
SUBJECT: Note for next issue of Briefs

Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr., a Ph.D. candidate at Ohio State University, has asked us to cooperate in his dissertation study: "The Projected Role of the CES in States That Contain Both 1862 and 1890 Land Grant Institutions as Perceived by County Extension Agents, State Specialists, Assistant and Associate Directors, and Directors."

His sample in Maryland will include six Agents, eight Specialists, and five Administrators.

Dr. Marion and I have reviewed Mr. Harrison's study, and we agree that it could produce useful information. Therefore, we ask all who are selected in the sample to cooperate with Mr. Harrison.

mw
cc: Dr. Frank L. Bentz, Jr.
    Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr.
    Dr. William P. Hytche
    Dr. Claud C. Marion
MEMORANDUM

TO: Appropriate MCES Personnel

Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr., a graduate student at Ohio State University is on study leave from the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service. He is conducting a study of "The Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service in States That Contain Both 1862 and 1890 Land Grant Institutions, as Perceived by County Extension Agents, State Specialists, Assistant and Associate Directors, and Directors."

Mr. Harrison has requested the cooperation of 19 CES employees in Maryland to supply data necessary for the completion of his study. Please join me in supporting this study by responding to the questions on the enclosed questionnaire and returning it in the pre-addressed stamped envelope as soon as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

John M. Curtis
Director

Enclosures
January 9, 1979

Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr.
Room 100, College of Agriculture
and Home Economics
Ohio State University
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Harrison:

Attached is my covering letter to be sent out with your questionnaire and also the names, titles and addresses of our extension personnel.

Sincerely,

Sam Gwinn
Director
MEMO TO: Extension Staff
FROM: Sam Gwinn, Director
SUBJECT: Study of Extension Programs in 1862 and 1890 Colleges

Fred Harrison, Jr., a graduate student at The Ohio State University on study leave from the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service is conducting a study of "The Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service as Perceived by County Extension Agents, State Specialists, Assistant Directors and Directors."

Mr. Harrison has requested the cooperation of the Extension Personnel in Delaware in collecting data necessary for completion of his study. Please join me in supporting this study by responding to all of the questions on the enclosed questionnaire and returning it in the enclosed pre-addressed stamped envelope at your most earliest convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation.

SG: fgb
January 19, 1979

Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr.
Graduate Student
The Ohio State University
Room 100, 2120 Pyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Harrison:

I enjoyed visiting with you by telephone last week and again want to indicate my appreciation for your indulging us in the Alabama Cooperative Extension Service while we came to a decision to participate in your study. We do very much want to be a part of your study, and as such, I am including a copy of the latest personnel list for all academic staff within the ACES. This includes the two-page orange sheet which covers administrative and specialist staff and the smaller yellow booklet which covers county and district staff. These documents are as current as we have on hand.

Please supply this office a list of those individuals that you intend to survey so that I can notify them of our support for your study prior to their receiving documents, questionnaires, etc. from you. This paving of the way will be of great assistance to you insofar as your response rate is concerned.

Thanks again for your willingness to wait while we made the decision to participate in your study. Best wishes for a successful graduate career.

Sincerely yours,

Director

encl. a/s

cc: Dr. Ray Cavender, Assoc. Dir.-Programs
Mr. Cecil Davis, Assoc. Dir.-Field Oper.
District Agents-Coordinators
Mr. P. W. Brown, Admin. Tuskegee Extension Programs
Dr. James L. Dawson, Administrator, 1890 Prog. for A&M Univ.
Dr. James L. Smith, Head, Staff Development
Dr. Tal Duvall, Director, Extension, Georgia

(w/cy Mr. Harrison’s Nov. 15 ltr)
TO: Selected Staff Members

Dear Co-workers:

Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr., a graduate student at The Ohio State University on study leave from the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service, is conducting a study of "The Projected Role of the Cooperative Extension Service as Perceived by County Extension Agents, State Specialists, Assistant Directors and Directors."

We have given Mr. Harrison permission to contact you to provide him data needed for the completion of his study. You will receive a questionnaire from him soon. After it is received, please complete and return it to him promptly.

Sincerely yours,

M. Lloyd Downen
Dean

cc: District Supervisors, Section Leaders, and Extension Leaders Concerned
Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr.
College of Agriculture and
Home Economics
Ohio State University
Room 100
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Harrison:

I talked with my administrative staff yesterday regarding our participation in your thesis study on the projected role of the Cooperative Extension Service in states that contain both 1862 and 1890 land grant institutions.

As I pointed out to you in our conversations we get so many requests for this kind of assistance and endorsement that our agents have at times almost rebelled on us. At the same time we recognize the need for studies such as this and the need to support our own people in a similar situation. Nevertheless, I recognize there is a limit as to how much we can logically ask them to do.

In light of this, what I would like to propose is that you proceed with your study but rather than sending a letter along with your questionnaire from me that you simply write directly to the agents whom you select as your sample population and state in the letter something to the effect that: "I have talked with your Director about this study and he is aware that I am contacting selected staff members in North Carolina." I personally believe this will give you the same kind of response that you would receive from a letter in which I endorse the study and ask them to complete the questionnaire. It does put it up to them as an individual choice rather than sort of a mandate from my office which I think they prefer.

For your information I am enclosing a copy of our latest personnel directory for you to use in selecting your...
Mr. Fred Harrison, Jr.  January 23, 1979

stratified random sample. I personally believe you will get a good response from those who are selected for your study.

Best of luck with your graduate program.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

T. C. Blalock  
Associate Dean and Director

TCB:gh

Encl.
March 12, 1979

To: Selected Extension Personnel

Dear Colleague:

Approximately two weeks ago you should have received a letter asking your help in a research project by completing a questionnaire. The response rate has been good, but to date I have not received your response. You were selected by stratified random sampling and thus your response is very much needed.

Could I ask you to take a few minutes from your busy schedule to complete the questionnaire and mail it in the pre-addressed stamped envelope. If you have already mailed the questionnaire please accept my sincere thanks.

Your help will make this research valid and, above all, I'll appreciate it very much.

Sincerely yours,

Fred Harrison, Jr.
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