



125  
717  
THS

THE EFFECT OF THE NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL  
EXTENSION MARKETING COMMITTEE IN RELATION TO  
ACQUAINTANCE AND PROGRAM KNOWLEDGE

Thesis for the Degree of M. S.  
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY  
Theodore H. Sidor  
1961



## ABSTRACT

### THE EFFECT OF THE NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL EXTENSION MARKETING COMMITTEE IN RELATION TO ACQUAINTANCE AND PROGRAM KNOWLEDGE

by Theodore H. Sidor

The marketing of farm products is receiving increasing attention in national, state and local programs. Extension educators have realized that increased emphasis must be placed on the agricultural marketing phases as they apply to the totality that encompasses agriculture.

Encouraged by the Agricultural Act of 1946 that provides for the development of new and additional lines of work relating directly to the marketing of agricultural commodities, twelve states in the North Central Region of the United States formally organized to increase the effectiveness of Extension Marketing programs.

The organization has been in effect over four years and recognized at the outset that more attention should be given to regional competition. Frequently the emphasis is on a local problem and local promotion when the broader marketing problems should be receiving major attention.

Encouraged by Administrators, regional meetings were called by specialists periodically to discuss marketing problems that crossed state lines or to compare ideas, methods and results.

Literature provides little information concerning

regional activities. Group process methods and results, however, have been studied and documented. Authors agree that the results of interaction increases friendship, increases communication, common goals are attack with vigor and activity will increase.

To measure the effect of the regional effort the author hypothesises that the degree of acquaintance and program knowledge between Extension Marketing Specialists in a twelve state area served by a Regional Agricultural Marketing Committee is greater than the degree of acquaintance and program knowledge between Extension Marketing Specialists not served by a Regional Marketing Committee.

To measure this effect a questionnaire was sent to all Extension personnel recognized by the Federal Extension Service as Extension Agricultural Marketing Specialists.

Four factors were included in the study for the purpose of testing the hypothesis (1) personal acquaintance, (2) personal knowledge of other specialist's marketing programs and responsibilities, (3) the acquaintance and knowledge of specialists in relation to tenure and (4) the relationship of acquaintance and program knowledge to marketing field of specialists.

Four areas in the United States were used in the study, the North Central Region, a twelve state area in the South was used as the control area, and areas in the East and West were involved to gather supplementary information.

The returns and the findings of the questionnaires

Theodore H. Sidor

indicated that (1) total acquaintance per specialist is greater in Marketing Areas served by a Regional Marketing Committee, (2) as tenure increases, the acquaintance ratio increases, (3) as the percentage of responsibility in Agricultural Extension Marketing increases the acquaintance ratio increased, (4) specialists that are encouraged to interact develop greater acquaintance in all fields of endeavor.

From the above findings the author accepts the original hypothesis, but suggest additional research that would discover the economic returns gained by the increased interaction gained by the formation of a Regional Agricultural Marketing Committee.

THE EFFECT OF THE NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL  
EXTENSION MARKETING COMMITTEE IN RELATION TO  
ACQUAINTANCE AND PROGRAM KNOWLEDGE

By

Theodore H. Sidor

A THESIS

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Institute for Extension Personnel Development

1961

G/15 215  
6/20/61

11

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Advisor Dr. George H. Axinn, past Associate Director Cooperative Extension Service and Chairman of the Institute of Extension Personnel Development of Michigan State University, Dr. James Shaffer, Associate Professor Agricultural Economics and Dr. Robert Kramer, Associate Director, Cooperative Extension Service for the counsel and guidance given in connection with the preparation of this thesis. The interest of the committee reviewing the thesis, Harold Foster, District Director, Cooperative Extension Service; Mrs. Miriam Kelley, Assistant Director, Home Economics, Cooperative Extension Service; Dr. Shaffer and Dr. Axinn, is acknowledged.

Gratitude is expressed to the State Extension Directors and their Marketing Specialists for the fine cooperation given toward the completion of this study.

Acknowledgment is made of the assistance given by Dr. Ray Scott of the Federal Extension Service and the Farm Foundation in making the research possible.

Finally, a special note of gratitude to my wife, Jean and my boys, Ted L. and Larry, whose patience have made this year of study possible.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	Page ii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Problems Facing Extension in Agricultural Marketing	5
Hypothesis	6
II. THE GROUP PROCESS. . . . .	8
Definition of Group	8
Group Interaction	9
Status	11
Group Norms	13
Communication	15
Conclusion	16
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	19
Population	19
Questionnaire Preparation	20
Pre-tests	20
States Included in Study	22
Computation of Information	24
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA IN RELATION TO TOTAL ACQUAINTANCE . . . . .	28
V. ANALYSIS OF ACQUAINTANCE TO MARKETING FIELD OF SPECIALISTS . . . . .	38
VI. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION . . . . .	44
Recommendation	46
Additional Studies Suggested	47
APPENDIX . . . . .	48
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	54

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Acquaintance ratio per Extension Marketing Specialist among other Marketing Specialists in four regional marketing areas of the United States . . . . .	29
2. Tenure relationship to the acquaintance factor of Extension Marketing Specialists in the four regional marketing areas of the United States. .	32
3. Percentage of responsibility in relation to acquaintance ratio for Agricultural Extension Marketing Specialists in the four regional marketing areas of the United States . . . . .	34
4. Acquaintance on a first-name basis of Extension Marketing Specialists in four regional marketing areas of the United States . . . . .	36
5. Agricultural marketing responsibilities of Extension Marketing Specialists and acquaintance on a first-name basis in the four regional marketing areas of the United States . . . . .	39
6. Agricultural Extension Marketing Specialists with multiple responsibilities and the acquaintance ratio in four regional marketing areas of the United States . . . . .	41
7. Ratio of acquaintance per women specialists in Agricultural Extension Marketing work in four regional marketing areas of the United States. .	42

THE EFFECT OF THE NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL  
EXTENSION MARKETING COMMITTEE IN RELATION TO  
ACQUAINTANCE AND PROGRAM KNOWLEDGE

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The program of the Cooperative Extension Service is primarily an educational program and is supported jointly by federal, state and county or local governments.

Although cooperation is between the three levels of government the program is a basic part of the Land-Grant College of each state and generally is administered by a division of the school or college of each state institution. The exact manner in which the Extension Service operates varies somewhat in each state though nation wide changes in procedures have occurred to keep pace with current trends. The purpose of the Cooperative Extension Service as stated in the Smith-Lever Act is:

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 same.<sup>1</sup>

During the developing period of the Cooperative Extension Service, agriculture educational services were primarily concerned and limited to the production phases of the service. Agricultural marketing during this period, although not given impetus needed, was recognized by such

---

<sup>1</sup>U. S., Congress, Amended Smith-Lever Act, Public Law 85, 83rd Congress, 1st Session, Chap. 157, Sl675.

leaders in the field as the co-author of the Smith-Lever Act, Honorable A. F. Lever, who stated:

To teach the farmer the best methods of increasing production is exceedingly important, but not more vitally so than is the importance of teaching him the best and most economical methods of distribution. It is not enough to teach him how to grow bigger crops, he must be taught to get the true value for these bigger crops, else Congress will be put in the attitude of regarding the work of the farmer as a kind of philanthropy. The itinerant teacher or demonstrator will be expected to give as much thought to the economic side of agriculture, to marketing, to standardizing and grading of farm products as he gives to the matter of large acreage and yields. He is to assume leadership in every movement whatever it may be, the aid of which is better farming, better living, more happiness, more education and better citizenship.<sup>2</sup>

During the past twenty years Extension educators have recognized the wisdom of such statements and have been increasing emphasis on agricultural marketing phases as they apply to the totality that encompasses agriculture. This increased emphasis has been encouraged by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 that provides for the development of new and additional lines of work relating directly to the marketing of agricultural commodities. Funds are allocated to the states on the basis of approved project setting forth the problem to be worked on, objectives to be accomplished and a definite plan of operation.

Conspicuous in these marketing endeavors has been a group of states in the North Central region. This region is composed of the states of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio,

---

<sup>2</sup>Lincoln David Kelsey and Cannon Chiles Hearne, Cooperative Extension Work (Ithaca, New York: Comstock Publishing Associates, 1955), p. 33.

South Dakota and Wisconsin. These states not only recognized the value of increasing agricultural marketing programs within states, but also recognized that cooperation between states, exchange of information between personnel and interstate meetings were essential.

This premise was also recognized by a Federal Extension Service Bulletin<sup>3</sup> which indicates that one of the characteristics of the marketing and distribution process is that it does not stop at state lines or any fixed boundaries. Some of the marketing problems are local, but many involve trade areas of regional and national importance. In the development of marketing educational work, proper attention needs to be given to work that can cut across state lines.

This group of states, as well as other areas in the United States recognized that expanded markets, faster transportation, greater population and other factors were in fact a challenge to the Cooperative Extension Service. Here was a responsibility for the Extension Service to contribute to the welfare of the producer, the handler and the general public simultaneously. Extension leaders were cognizant of the fact that expanded Extension effort was and is needed to (1) create greater efficiencies in processing, handling and improved marketing practices, (2) expand the market for farm products by helping producers, processors and handlers

---

<sup>3</sup>Federal Extension Service, Handbook for Extension Marketing Projects Conducted with Agricultural Marketing Act Funds, United States Department of Agriculture Publication AEP 88, May 1956, p. 1.

develop new products and adopt new marketing practices found through research, (3) guide those performing marketing services in developing the most efficient market organizations and facilities, (4) develop greater understanding by consumers of the importance of timely buying and the adaptability and suitability of various products for different uses, (5) get rapid adjustments by farmers, consumers and marketing firms to change in technology, supply and demand through improved understanding and communication.<sup>4</sup>

To fulfill these objectives it was increasingly clear to these twelve states that full advantage must be taken of the programs, information and experiences of all Extension Marketing personnel if the needs in agricultural marketing were to be fulfilled within a reasonable time.

A plan to formalize this group of states into a duly organized cohesive unit was realized in February of 1957 when the first meeting of the North Central Regional Agricultural Marketing Committee was formally organized. Personnel at the first meeting consisted of Extension Service representatives from each of the twelve states and representatives of the Federal Extension Service and of the Farm Foundation. Since 1957 a committee with the same representation has been meeting twice a year to coordinate and examine the work of the twelve state marketing area.

---

<sup>4</sup>Sub-committee on Scope and Responsibility of Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, "The Cooperative Extension Service," Today, April 1958, p. 9.

During the first meeting the committee recognized those areas and problems confronting the Extension Service in Agricultural Marketing and emphasized the following:

--There is a lack of information on basic principles of marketing. Too much of what is now available is not in understandable form. Proper co-ordination of effort within the region in this matter should reduce the effort required and results would be maximized.

--More attention is needed to the overall development and organization of an Extension Marketing Program and marketing projects in the individual state and in the region.

--A variety of relationships should be further developed which would help in keeping Extension Marketing work on an economical sound footing, and in making it more effective.

--More attention should be given to regional competition. Frequently the emphasis is on a local problem and local promotion, when the broader marketing problems should receive major attention.

A later survey of Marketing Specialists in these states showed the following items as procedures needed to accomplish a more effective Extension Program:

1. Periodic get-together of Marketing Specialists from the various states to compare ideas, methods and results. The people working in similar areas such as livestock, dairy, cooperative associations, etc. need to



meet occasionally for the purpose.

2. Studies and publications on interregional competition and trade barriers between states.

Considerable activity across state lines has accompanied these suggestions. An example from 1960 can be made when a total of fifty meetings on marketing were held involving from two to eleven states. Of these, twenty-two were in the field of agricultural economics, the remainder in specific commodity fields.

### Hypothesis

Because of this activity of relationships between states, the exchange of activities, the formalizing of a group and the increased emphasis on Extension Marketing work, a premise could be made that the increase of Extension activity between states would improve and facilitate closer working relations between Extension personnel in these states and therefore, enhance the success of an educational program in Extension Marketing.

The writer, therefore, hypothesises that the degree of acquaintance and program knowledge between Extension Marketing Specialists in a twelve state area served by a Regional Agricultural Marketing Committee is greater than the degree of acquaintance and program knowledge between Extension Marketing Specialists in areas not served by a Regional Marketing Committee. For the purpose of testing this hypothesis four factors will be considered (1) personal acquaintance, (2) personal knowledge of other Specialist's

marketing programs and responsibilities, (3) the acquaintance and knowledge of Specialists in relation to tenure, percentage of work load in Extension Marketing, (4) the relationship of acquaintance and program knowledge to marketing field of Specialists.

Economic tests to measure cost of the program against value received through increased interaction were not used as this was not within the scope of the hypothesis. However, cost is recognized as being an important factor in decisions concerning the implementation of such a program.

## CHAPTER II

### THE GROUP PROCESS

For the purposes of this study the group process is essential to understanding the processes involved in the formation, the behavior patterns and the accomplishments of the personnel in the Twelve State Regional Agricultural Marketing Committee. In fact the insistance on group behavior as a fundamental starting point is inherent in the basic premise of this thesis. The relationship can be linked to the market analyst who finds it essential to formulate most of his problem in terms of group behavior. While his final objective is the movement of goods, in this study the movement of information, he soon learns that group action is the key to his problem.<sup>1</sup>

To satisfy the basic premise of group process an understanding of the components that comprise a group is essential. For this purpose we define a group as a collection of individuals in which the existence of all is necessary for the satisfaction of certain needs of each.<sup>2</sup> Almsted defines a group as a plurality of individuals who are in contact

---

<sup>1</sup>Wroe Alderson, Marketing Behavior and Executive Action (Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1957), p. 14.

<sup>2</sup>D. M. Hall, Dynamics of Group Action (Danville: Danville Illinois Printers & Publisher, 1957), p. 133.

with one another, who take one another into account, and who are aware of some significant commonality.<sup>3</sup>

The various aspects of group action for the purpose of this study can be explained by dividing the study into four distinct parts which make up the whole. These are group interaction, group status, communication and group norms.

### Group Interaction

The most significant of these is the interaction that develops when a group is formed. The essence of any interpersonal relationship is interaction. Two individuals may be said to have formed a relationship when on repeated occasions they are observed to interact. By interaction it is meant that they emit behavior in each others presence, they create products for each other, or they communicate with each other. In every case we would identify as an instance of interaction, there is at least the possibility that the actions of each effects the other.<sup>4</sup>

Deutsch goes into the subject further when he explained the results of continued group interaction thusly:

1. Stronger individual motivation to complete the group task. Also, members reported stronger feelings of obligation toward one another.
2. Greater division of labor among the members.

---

<sup>3</sup>Michael S. Almsted, The Small Group (New York: Random House, 1959), p. 21.

<sup>4</sup>John W. Thibaut and Harold H. Kelly, The Social Psychology of Groups (New York: John Wiley & Son, Inc., 1959, p. 10.

At the same time exhibit greater coordination of effort.

3. More effective intermember communication, more ideas were verbalized, members were more attentive to one another and more acceptance of and effected by each others ideas.
4. More friendliness was expressed in the discussion and members rated themselves higher on strength of desire to win the respect of one another. Members were more satisfied with the group and its products.

In brief the interdependent relationship in which cooperation is rewarded seems to lead to strong motivation to complete the common task and to the development of considerable friendships among the members.<sup>5</sup>

The Twelve State Regional Agricultural Marketing Group depending on interaction to successfully attain its goals or to fulfill requirements must have some external pressures applied if complete interaction is to be reached. Simon explains both internal and external pressures and their application to group interaction in this way:

1. The intensity of interaction depends upon and increase with the level of friendliness and the amount of activity carried on within the group.

---

<sup>5</sup>M. Deutsch, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Cooperation and Competition Upon Group Processes," Human Relations, 1949b, 2, p. 199.

2. The level of group friendliness will increase if the actual level of interaction is higher than that "appropriate to the existing friendliness." That is if a group of persons with little friendliness are induced to interact a great deal, the friendliness will grow.
3. The amount of activity carried on by the group will tend to increase if the actual level of friendliness is higher than that "appropriate" to the existing amount of activity, and if the amount of activity imposed externally on the group is higher than the existing amount of activity.<sup>6</sup>

To sum up the result of interaction the following points are apparent (1) interaction increases friendship, (2) communication is increased, (3) common goals are attacked with vigor, (4) activity will increase, (5) when individuals interact with one another, the structural properties of the group situation produce differential effects upon their experiences and behavior.<sup>7</sup>

### Status

Whenever individuals with motives or goals in common interact for any length of time, a group structure or roles

---

<sup>6</sup>Herbert A. Simon, "A Formal Theory of Interaction in Social Groups," American Sociological Review, 1952 17, pp. 202-211.

<sup>7</sup>Mugafer Sherif, Groups in Harmony and Tension (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1953), p. 194.

take shape.<sup>8</sup>

Alderson says that the fundamental importance of the factor of status lies in linking the individual to the system, and each subsystem in turn to the larger system which it is apart.<sup>9</sup>

Any organized behavior system must have a place to stand in order to survive or prosper. An organized behavior system will tend to survive as long as the footing it occupies endures because of the collective action arising out of the status expectation of its components.

The individual or subsystem that comprise a behavior system have a stake in its survival because it serves them as a ground of status. If it is an operating system, their expectations in relation to the system pertain also to the income or good derived from it. These expectations are dependent upon status expectations, since shares in output are correlated with status. The position of collective action oriented toward status expectation can thus be identified as the main factor in the preservation of the system. This view concerning the role of status expectations in group behavior is supported by recent developments in social psychology.

Because the system, in this case, the Regional Marketing Committee, is the ground for status, individuals will work for it. They expect small returns over a long

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>Alderson, op. cit., p. 35.

period if they feel their status expectations will eventually be gratified. Most remarkable of all, perhaps is the extent to which they will accept group discipline in their behavior to conform to the requirements of the system.<sup>10</sup>

### Group Norms

Conformation in this case refers to the recognition of norms as they have been set by the group. We find that the closer a member comes to realizing the norms of the groups, the more interaction he will receive from and give to other members of the group.<sup>11</sup>

In a group with little interaction, a person is not sure what are the limits of the "conformity zone" and consequently plays safe and exhibits moderation in a wide variety of behaviors. There are two separate effects of interpersonal liking as they apply to the operation of group norms.

(1) Friendships makes for good interpersonal communications which can lead to high clarity about the realms of behavior to which norms apply, (2) friendship makes for high mutual influence which in terms further high conformity of whatever norms are specified.<sup>12</sup>

We must realize that a norm is merely a behavioral

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 55.

<sup>11</sup>Almsted, op. cit., p. 106.

<sup>12</sup>E. W. Bovard, Jr., "Clinical Insight as a Function of Group Process," Abnormal Sociological Psychology, 1952 47, pp.534-539 quoted in Gardner Lindzey (ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. II, (Cambridge, Mass: Addison Publishing Co., 1954)



rule that is accepted, at least to some degree, by the members of a group. In large groups, acceptance by all members is not an essential part of the concept, although acceptance by a sizable number is. Thus all members feel some obligation to adhere to it. Nonadherence is met with the use of power to attempt to produce conformity, but the influence appeal is to a supra individual value.

The extent that norms reduce interference, cut communication costs, heighten value similarity, and insure the interaction sequence necessary for task performance, norms improve the reward cost position obtained by the members of the group and thus increase the cohesiveness of the group. Norms also contribute to solidarity in another way, rendering the pattern of interaction less susceptible to disruption by external forces.

Festenger explains norms in terms of communication.<sup>13</sup> He indicates that there will be a high degree of uniformity in the information which members possess toward situations which are relevant to the functioning of the group and about which there is an active process of communication in a group.

In other words, there is a similarity in the behavior of members of the same group. We thus have the development of a group standard or a norm. The acceptance of a given pattern of behavior based upon a given set of attitudes and ideologies for all members of the group. Once such a group

---

<sup>13</sup>Leon Festenger et al., Social Pressures in Informal Groups (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950), pp. 170-173.

standard has developed it becomes self maintaining and self reinforcing by means of the same process which led to its development and growth. It is also able to assert itself on new members who enter the group.

### Communications

Basic to the premise and hypothesis, communications cannot only bring about greater understanding, it is the basis for effective interaction, the formation of group norms and group status.

To understand communications we must first accept the fact that every human interaction hinges upon the communication of meaning, communication is the catalytic means by which organizations are created, the means by which they are co-ordinated, and the means by which their purposes are translated into action.<sup>14</sup> By communication we mean here, the broad field of human interchange of facts and opinions and not the media of the telephone, telegraph, radio and television.<sup>15</sup>

Within this field of communication and particularly in language which serves as the chief form of social interaction between humans, it is through this medium that we learn to know people, to share experiences, ideas, sentiments and beliefs. We also use this means of communication to

---

<sup>14</sup>Harlan L. Hayman and Alfred Schwartz, Administration in Profile for School Executives (New York: Harper Bros, 1955), p. 189.

<sup>15</sup>Charles E. Redfield, Communication in Management (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955), p. 3.

define, to diagnose and to solve common problems.<sup>16</sup>

In summary it is well to note:

1. Research shows that groups which are most productive have a more adequate communication process than those which are less productive.
2. Members pay more attention to and work at communicating with one another with the result  
(a) there is higher group activity, (b) there is increased productivity, (c) there is greater individual and group satisfaction.
3. A group member is more productive when he feels that (a) he has access to the important line of communication, (b) relevant information is communicated to him, (c) he is communicated with on matters that affect him, (d) his role expectancy is communicated to him.

### Conclusion

Interaction is the key to the entire study, such areas as status, norms and communication cannot be developed without the opportunity to interact freely. It is interesting to note that authors, such as Homan, conclude that interaction and communication are synonymous, i.e., interaction cannot exist without communication and communication cannot

---

<sup>16</sup>Joseph M. Bohlen and George M. Beal (ed.), The Group Process, Developed by the National Project in Agricultural Communication, Copyright 1956 by the American Assn. of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, p. 1-3-D-9.

exist in groups without interaction.<sup>17</sup>

Through this interaction the North Central Marketing Committee is solving marketing problems collectively across state lines that were once solved or attempts made by individuals. A substantial number of experiments have been performed to detect differences between the problem solving performance of groups and individuals respectively.

Kelly<sup>18</sup> and Thibaut<sup>19</sup> divided the effects of the group on the problem solving process into two main types. (1) The effects of pooling a number of independent judgments, (2) modification in the problem solution produced by direct social influence.

Under the pooling of independent judgments, they examine the following factors as possible explanation for the superiority of group over individual problem solving capacities: (a) the scattering of errors. Since not all group members make the same errors simultaneously, the majority judgment is better than the average judgment of individual members. (b) Extra influence of considered judgments, not all proposed solutions will have equal weight with group members. Those proposals that appear to have the best basis will be the ones most likely to be accepted.

---

<sup>17</sup>James G. March and Herbert Simon, Organizations (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958), p. 181.

<sup>18</sup>H. H. Kelly, "Communication in Experimentally Created Hierarchies," Human Relations, 1950 4, pp. 36-56.

<sup>19</sup>J. Thibaut, "An Experimental Study of the Cohesiveness of Underprivileged Groups," Human Relations, 1950 3, pp. 251-278.

Hence, again the judgment accepted by the group will be better than the average of the group members. (c) Extra influence of confident judgments. Those members who are most likely to be correct are also most likely to be confident of their answers. Their confidence will attach extra weight to their judgments, and again this will improve the group judgments. (d) The division of labor. In handling some problems, the entire group need not deal with the whole problem, but may divide it in some way and assign the parts to "specialists." This will certainly speed the solution process and improve the quality of solutions.

When comparing individual and group solutions, the obvious possibility that suggest itself is that any difference between them may be accounted for simply on the basis of the greater number of independent judgments which enter into group solutions,<sup>20</sup> and finally, if group goals are known, efforts co-ordinated or integrated and the intent worthwhile, the results of group action will be permanent, stable and of merit.

---

<sup>20</sup>Gardner Lindzey (ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology Vol. II, (Cambridge, Mass: Addison Publishing Co., 1954), p. 738.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

To gather material for use in determining the communication between groups and some of the factors involved, the following procedure was used:

1. The establishment of the number of Extension Marketing Specialists in the United States and their location.
2. The preparation of a questionnaire.
3. Pre-tests of the questionnaire.
4. Decision of the states to be included in the study.
5. Permission of Extension Director to hold studies in their respective states.
6. Questionnaire distribution.
7. Follow-up letter.
8. The computation of information received in the questionnaires.

#### Population

To establish the number of Extension Marketing Specialists and their location, a request was sent to the Federal Extension Service. The list supplied by this source was compared with two national publications of County Exten-

sion employees. Due to the number of discrepancies in the three lists, it was decided, for the purpose of this study, only those recognized by the Federal Extension Service as Extension Marketing Specialists would be included.

### Questionnaire Preparation

With the computation of those to be included in the study, the preparation of the questionnaire was undertaken. The original questionnaire contained in addition to the degree of acquaintance, features that would determine the number of personal letters and mimeographed material sent between specialists in various areas and states. This feature was removed after it was ascertained that the request for this material would involve more than could reasonably be expected from those included in the study.

### Pre-tests

Two pre-test operations were undertaken. The first with two classes in Extension Personnel Development at Michigan State University in which the two factors of degree of acquaintance and field or responsibility with each student were included in the questionnaire. The questionnaire included six columns; three under "acquaintance" and three under "field of responsibility." The three columns under acquaintance were labeled "A" for know of them, "B" can recognize and call by name, "C" first-name basis. The columns under field or responsibilities were labeled "D" know prior general field of student, "E" know prior specific

field of student, "F" know student's prior program responsibility. The students were asked to check in the appropriate column those spaces that refer to your present acquaintance with each of the named graduate students and your knowledge of each student's position or field of work prior to coming to Michigan State University.

Following the completion of the questionnaire by the students, two comments were prevalent: (1) a column should be included for do not know of him or her, and (2) if the various areas of endeavors represented by the group were included, not only would the questionnaire be more meaningful, but would give an area that could be measured.

The second pre-test was given to six Agricultural Economists in the Michigan State University Extension Economics Department. These questionnaires contained a list of the fields of endeavors normally included in the programs of agricultural marketing. The Specialists were asked to fill out the questionnaires using the check mark for the degree of acquaintance and to assign numbers from the provided list to those columns under recognition of program responsibilities opposite the name of the specialist to designate what field of endeavors each specialist followed.

Recognition of the Specialists suggestions were noted and minor changes were made to the final questionnaire.

In addition the final questionnaire contained two questions, how many years have you been employed in Extension Marketing work and what percentage of your work load is



designated toward Extension Agricultural Marketing or Administration? (Appendix A)

States Included in the Study

The states in the established North Central Regional Marketing area are the nucleus of the thesis. The problem was to find an area that was similar in number of Extension Marketing Specialists, states that were geographically situated as to become a unit and states that have similar crops, cropping practices and agricultural marketing problems that would benefit from closer association.

Twelve states of the south and southwestern section of the United States aligned to the requirements as listed. The states included Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia. Although these twelve states are to be used as the control area, it was decided that all states should be included in the study. To accomplish this a twelve state area that included the states of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont and West Virginia was created. The western area was represented by Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, Utah and Washington. Only ten states were included in this area as Nevada and Wyoming were not listed as having Marketing Specialists on their staffs.

### Permission for Study

A letter explaining the thesis problem and the area to be covered was sent to each Extension Director in the forty-six states to be involved in the study. (Appendix A)

Enlistment of the administrators aid and cooperation was asked. The letters were sent under the signature of C. B. Ratchford, Director of the Missouri University Extension Service. Response was very good with eighteen letters pledging cooperation received from State Directors.

### Questionnaire Distribution

Questionnaires were completed for each area and colors were assigned for each marketing area to facilitate tabulation. In addition each questionnaire was coded by numbering each one on the second page under the staple. Each number corresponded to a number assigned each Specialist or Administrator as a means of identifying each with the questionnaire returned.

A letter was included (Appendix A) explaining the study, the area to be covered and an explanation of the questionnaire to all Specialists and Administrators. A self-addressed stamped envelope was included for the convenience of the Specialist.

### Follow-up Letter

Ten days after the original mailing a follow-up letter was sent to all Specialists and Administrators that had not at that date returned the original questionnaire.

(Appendix A) Included was an additional questionnaire and

a self-addressed stamped envelope to facilitate mailing. Questionnaires were sent to a total of 347 Extension Marketing Specialists and Administrators. Of these 19 were on leave or had been separated from the Extension Service. From the remaining 328, we received 312 completed questionnaires or a 95% return. By areas the returns were:

North Central	91	returns	from	a	possible	96	or	94%
Southern	85	"	"	"	"	90	or	94%
Eastern	80	"	"	"	"	87	or	91%
Western	53	"	"	"	"	55	or	96%

#### Computation of Information

With the original hypothesis in mind, the computation of data was assigned to categories to embrace the measurements. To facilitate this endeavor the following categories were assigned:

Total Acquaintance: Each returned questionnaire was tabulated and the number of total answers in each category was recorded. From this regional totals were compiled. To calculate the average specialists known by each participant, the totals were divided by the number of specialists in each region.

Originally two columns were tabulated for each category to discover if a significant factor was involved with the inclusion of the home state acquaintance ratio. This proved to be of no value and this method of tabulated was discontinued. Totals contain only the number of specialists known less home state acquaintance of each specialist.

An example of tabulation methods would appear thusly:

Area	NS		B	C	D
North Central	91	Number Known	985	787	1,344
		Average per Specialist	10.9	8.9	14.9

Categories were also established and calculated in the same manner for the following:

1. Average acquaintance for Specialist with less than one year of service.
2. Average acquaintance for Specialists from one to ten years inclusive service.
3. Average acquaintance for Specialists with over ten years of service.
4. Average acquaintance of those with less than a 50% responsibility in Extension Marketing.
5. Average acquaintance of those with more than a 50% responsibility in Extension Marketing.
6. Average acquaintance of women Extension Marketing Specialists.
7. Average acquaintance of each Marketing Specialist as categorized in the questionnaire under the following:
  1. Livestock, meat and wool
  2. Fruit and vegetables
  3. Poultry and eggs
  4. Dairy

5. Consumer education
6. Crops--seed, grain, cotton, etc.
7. Business education, retailer and other
8. Wood products
9. General marketing information and  
economic analysis
10. Administration
11. Agricultural engineering
12. Food technology
13. Other

8. The number of Specialists indicating multiple duties were totaled for each area and the various fields noted.

9. The number of Specialists and the number known by each was noted. (This was to ascertain if a very small number of Specialists were influencing the averages.)

10. Computation of the number of Specialists in each category.

To validate answers as received from each questionnaire, a system of crosschecking was established. Each Specialist's acquaintance and program knowledge of other Specialists were noted and recorded and then crosschecked. For example if Specialist "A" indicated that he was on a first-name basis with Specialist "B", "B" would be checked to find if his answers verified "A"s answer. The cross-checking showed a 95% verification. The same procedure was

used on program knowledge. In this case we used the program field the Specialist indicated as his particular field.

The analysis of this information as tabulated will be found in Chapter IV and V.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA IN RELATION  
TO TOTAL ACQUAINTANCE

In the analysis of the data collected it should be noted that a total population was used and with a 95% return obtained on questionnaires, analysis was obtained by dividing the number of returns into the totals for each category. This method has been recognized by various authorities including Hagood and Price who say: "If we restrict our procedure to the methods of descriptive statistics, the case is clear and simple; we have secured one or more descriptive measures for the finite universe we are interested in, and sampling and tests of significance have no meaning or application to the problem."<sup>1</sup>

To validate or test the original hypothesis as stated in Chapter I, i.e., the degree of acquaintance between Extension Marketing Specialists in a twelve state area served by a Regional Agricultural Marketing Committee is greater than the degree of acquaintance between Extension Marketing Specialists in areas not served by a Regional Marketing Committee the following table was developed.

---

<sup>1</sup>Margaret J. Hagood and Daniel O. Price, Statistics for Sociologists (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1952), pp. 356-370.

TABLE 1.--Acquaintance ratio per Extension Marketing Specialist among other Marketing Specialists in four regional marketing areas of the United States

Acquaintance Ratio	North Central Area	Southern Area	Eastern Area	Western Area
Number of Specialists	91	86	81	52
Average per Specialist				
*B-Know of	10.8	5.4	6.8	5.3
C-Recognize & Name	8.9	5.1	5.0	1.5
D-First-Name Basis	14.8	6.3	8.7	4.2
Total	34.5	16.8	20.5	11.0

\*Marketing Specialists scored only one degree of acquaintance for each Marketing Specialist listed on the questionnaire.

The average per Specialist as designated in lines "B, C and D" indicate the number checked by each Specialist on the original questionnaire. The questionnaire did not ask the participant to check line B and C if D was checked.

To explain further, the purpose of the study was to measure not only the number of acquaintance but primarily the degree of acquaintance. The designation I know of Specialist, indicates that the participant checking this column has read his articles, heard his name mentioned and at least recognizes the name as belonging in Extension. He would not be able to recognize this Specialist and attach the proper name if they were to meet as in category Recognize and Call by Name. Finally, if the Specialist could call the listed Specialist by his first name and expect similar recognition by the one



named, he would check this column or column "D".

Comparing the figures contained in the chart it is apparent that acquaintance per Marketing Specialist in the North Central Region is much higher than the other areas. It should be remembered for the purpose of the study, direct comparison is only made between the North Central Area and the Southern Area.

Using line B-Know of, Specialists in the North Central Region know of 5.4 more Specialists than do their counterparts in the Southern Area. In the line C-Recognize and Name a smaller ratio prevails, i.e., 3.8 more are recognized by the North Central Region Specialists.

The significance of the premise of group process as cited in Chapter II and the reaction created by increased interaction can be noted in the line D-First-Name Basis. An 8.5 difference exists between the two areas with the trend continuing in favor of the North Central Region.

Similar differences and trends could be developed for the other two areas tested.

### Tenure

To validate the degree of acquaintance findings the average acquaintance per years of service were charted, using similar methods as developed for Table 1. Additional categories were established such as, the acquaintance of Specialists with one year or less of service, over one year through nine years of service, and more than ten years in the Extension Service as Marketing Specialists. One column

was included to designate the number of Specialists whose returns omitted the tenure request.

Attention should be given in Table 2 to the breakdown of the various categories in tenure including the number of Specialists in each of the areas and the tenure patterns. Significance in tenure patterns are evidenced by the fact that in the North Central Area eleven Specialists has less than one year of service, while in the Southern Area, fourteen had less than one year of service. Analyzing the table further the North Central Area had forty-seven Marketing Specialists in the one through nine year category while the Southern Area had fifty-eight. Twenty-seven Marketing Specialists had more than ten years of service in the North Central Area while eleven Specialists passed the ten year period in the Southern Area. The No tenure column is included for verifying totals. The averages have no significance for the acquaintance factor.

Referring to the number of out-of-state Specialists known by each of the participants in the study, the medium lies in the one through nine year column. That is, the average of all Specialists in both regions correspond closely with the figures found in the column D-First-Name Basis in Table 1. As an example in Table 1, the North Central Area has an average of 14.8 and the Southern Area 6.3. In Table 2 using the same columns under one through nine years, the North Central Specialist knows an average of 16.7 and the Southern Area 6.0.

TABLE 2.--Tenure relationships to the acquaintance factor of Extension Marketing Specialists in the four regional marketing areas of the United States

Area Group and Acquaintance Ratio	Years of Tenure			
	1 Year or Less	1 Through 9 Years	Over 10 Years	No Tenure Listed
NORTH CENTRAL				
No. Specialists	11	47	27	6
*B-Know of	17.1	10.8	9.6	1.3
C-Recognize & Name	7.8	10.5	7.4	1.8
D-1st-Name Basis	9.9	16.7	17.8	.3
Total	34.8	38.0	34.8	3.4
SOUTHERN				
No. Specialists	14	58	11	3
B-Know of	3.9	6.2	3.2	.0
C-Recognize & Name	2.7	5.2	8.5	6.3
D-1st-Name Basis	3.1	6.0	11.6	6.0
Total	9.7	17.4	23.3	12.3
EASTERN				
No. Specialists	8	49	20	4
B-Know of	10.8	6.5	7.1	.3
C-Recognize & Name	4.0	4.7	6.8	.8
D-1st-Name Basis	8.3	7.8	12.5	1.8
Total	23.1	19.0	26.4	2.9
WESTERN				
No. Specialists	8	35	10	1
B-Know of	2.1	6.6	3.5	2.0
C-Recognize & Name	.8	1.8	1.3	1.0
D-1st-Name Basis	1.0	4.8	3.7	10.0
Total	3.9	13.2	8.5	13.0

\*Marketing Specialists scored only one degree of acquaintance for each Marketing Specialist listed on the questionnaire.

The line B-Know of in Table 2 relates an interesting comparison. North Central Specialists with less than one year of service indicated they knew of Specialists in other states but the degree of acquaintance dropped off rapidly in the higher acquaintance columns. The Southern Area indicates the same trend but the difference is not as pronounced.

Specialists with more than ten years of service reversed the trend, specifying a higher degree of acquaintance and less acquaintance in the lower categories.

In the two regional areas included in the study a comparison is made directly in that the number of acquaintance in the highest category, D-First-Name Basis, increases directly as the length of tenure increases.

Although the Eastern Area is not included in the test group, it is pertinent to observe this trend does not hold true. As noted in the column "1 year or less" in Table 2, a higher degree of acquaintance than Specialists with one through nine years of service. No explanation is offered as additional study of the Eastern Area would have to be facilitated to ascertain the reasons.

#### Percentage of Responsibility Factor

The following table was formulated to measure those differences in acquaintance of Specialists devoting less than fifty per cent of their work time and those devoting over fifty per cent work time in Extension Marketing work.

TABLE 3.--Percentage of responsibility in relation to acquaintance ratio for Agricultural Extension Marketing Specialists in the four regional marketing areas of the United States

Area Group and Acquaintance Ratio	Extension Responsibility	
	Less than 50%	More than 50%
NORTH CENTRAL		
No. Specialists	10	81
*B-Know of	9.0	11.1
C-Recognize & Name	3.5	9.3
D-First-Name Basis	6.5	15.6
Total	19.0	36.0
SOUTHERN		
No. Specialists	5	81
B-Know of	5.0	5.5
C-Recognize & Name	3.8	5.2
D-First-Name Basis	3.8	6.4
Total	12.6	17.1
EASTERN		
No. Specialists	26	55
B-Know of	4.0	8.0
C-Recognize & Name	3.2	5.8
D-First-Name Basis	5.3	10.3
Total	12.5	24.1
WESTERN		
No. Specialists	8	46
B-Know of	6.5	5.0
C-Recognize & Name	1.0	1.6
D-First-Name Basis	7.0	3.7
Total	14.5	10.3

\*Marketing Specialists scored only one degree of acquaintance for each Marketing Specialist listed on the questionnaire.

In Table 3 the North Central Area has ten Marketing Specialists in the less than fifty per cent category and eighty-one Specialists serving more than fifty per cent of their time in Agricultural Extension Marketing work. In the Southern Area, five Specialists are in the less than fifty per cent category and eighty-one listed Extension Marketing employment involving fifty per cent of their time or more.

Similar to the findings in the tenure schedule, the increase in percentage of time devoted to Extension Marketing work is correlated with an increase in the number of acquaintance. Comparing lines D-First-Name Basis in each of the categories, the average of the "Less than 50%" column is approximately half its counterpart in both the North Central and Southern regions. For example in the North Central region, Specialists with less than fifty per cent work load know an average of 6.5 on a first-name basis. Those with over fifty per cent responsibility had an average acquaintance of 15.8

Acquaintance per Specialist  
on First-Name Basis

To ascertain if a very small number of Specialists were influencing the averages, the information was segregated under the categories of the number of Specialists who knew no one, one through ten, eleven through twenty, twenty-one through thirty, thirty-one through forty and those who knew over forty-one. All of the information was gathered on the first-name basis.

TABLE 4.--Acquaintance on a first-name basis of Extension Marketing Specialist in four regional marketing areas of the United States

Specialists on a First-Name Basis with	North Central	Southern	Eastern	Western
No Specialists	9	19	14	14
1 to 10 Specialists	27	42	31	31
11 to 20       "	29	19	28	7
21 to 30       "	18	4	7	1
31 to 40       "	4	1	0	0
Over 41       "	4	0	0	0

Significant in this analysis between the North Central and the Southern Area is the difference in number known by each Marketing Specialist. Totaling the last four figures in the North Central and Southern columns would result in fifty-five Specialists on a first-name basis with from eleven to over forty-one Specialists in the North Central Area while the Southern Area would have twenty-four Specialists knowing more than eleven. To accentuate this difference combining the first two figures for the same areas would result in thirty-six Marketing Specialists on a first-name basis with from zero to ten other Specialists in the North Central Area while in the Southern Area sixty-one Marketing Specialists would be on a first-name basis with from zero to ten Specialists. From evidence preceding this table and previous analysis these significant differences

confirm the position relative to group interaction.

### Summary

The analysis has tested two of the four factors involved under the original hypothesis, i.e., personal acquaintance and the acquaintance and knowledge of Marketing Specialists in relation to tenure and percentage of work load in Extension Marketing work.

The third factor involving personal knowledge of other Specialists Marketing programs and responsibilities were compared with those answers in D-First-Name Basis in Table 1. Correlation was over 97%. Of those answering in the other areas of the acquaintance ratio item, in 95% of the cases, program knowledge was not reported. The conclusion to be drawn is that if Specialists reported a first-name basis acquaintance, they also correctly reported responsibilities and marketing programs of those Specialists named.

The remaining factor, the relationship of acquaintance and program knowledge to marketing field of Specialists will be analysed in Chapter V.



## CHAPTER V

### ANALYSIS OF ACQUAINTANCE TO MARKETING FIELD OF SPECIALIST

The preceding chapter analysed the degree of acquaintance as it involved the total population. The analysis of acquaintance as it involves Specialists in specific groups and areas of Marketing Programs, is to this study, as important as total action. To understand the total, the segments must be dissected, organized and analysed.

This chapter will divide the population into the thirteen marketing fields included in the questionnaire and recognize the women Extension Agents as a separate group as well as those Specialists involved in multiple assignments.

#### Acquaintance in Relation to Marketing Field

Referring to Appendix A, the questionnaire, thirteen separate fields of endeavor usually included in Extension Marketing Programs were listed. Specialists were asked in addition to listing the fields of Specialists in other states to include their home state.

Table 5 is a compilation of Marketing Specialists and their identification of the field or program responsibility that requires a greater share of their attention. In the

TABLE 5.--Agricultural marketing responsibilities of Extension Marketing Specialists and acquaintance on a first-name basis in the four regional marketing areas of the United States

Marketing Field	N. Central		Southern		Eastern		Western		TS
	NS	FNB	NS	FNB	NS	FNB	NS	FNB	
Livestock	18	18.7	15	7.9	3	8.3	12	4.8	48
Fruit & Vegetable	5	16.8	12	5.7	20	8.0	11	2.8	48
Poultry & Eggs	8	18.3	10	4.6	9	9.9	4	1.3	31
Dairy	13	15.2	5	6.6	9	7.3	1	11.0	28
Consumer	12	8.0	11	5.5	17	10.4	8	.8	48
Crops	9	24.2	10	2.7	1	14.0	4	1.8	24
Business	12	17.8	3	7.0	5	10.8	1	1.0	21
Wood Products	0	.0	5	.8	7	2.5	2	.5	14
General & Analysis	10	4.3	7	16.3	2	9.5	7	8.9	26
Administration	1	11.0	4	7.3	2	17.5	2	14.0	9
Ag. Engineering	0	.0	0	.0	4	.8	1	5.0	5
Food Technology	0	.0	0	.0	3	9.0	0	.0	3
Other	3	3.0	3	4.3	4	7.8	1	11.0	11
NS=Number of Specialists			FNB=First-Name Basis			TS=Total Specialists			

case of multiple responsibilities, the program listed first by the Specialist is the field included in this table. In addition acquaintance on a first-name basis of Specialists are listed for each regional area.

In the analysis to satisfy the fourth factor relative to the general hypothesis the number of each Marketing Specialists per field of endeavor is relative. The fields usually considered as livestock or animal products are given the greatest consideration in the North Central Region. Livestock and Dairy Marketing Specialists in this area total thirty-one. Twenty Specialists followed the same field in the Southern Area. Numbers of Marketing Specialists varied greatly in other fields such as Fruit and Vegetables, and Business Education.

Number of Specialists known on a first-name basis appears high in the North Central Area on specific commodities in comparison to the Southern Area. However, the latter region has a higher ratio of average Specialists known in the field of General Marketing Information and Economic Analysis. The conclusion could be drawn from this that these Specialists in the Southern Area are allowed and encouraged to interact more freely across state lines, passing information so gained to commodity Specialists.

An interesting comparison could be made between agricultural income in relation to the number of Marketing Specialists in each commodity field; however, this is outside the scope of the hypothesis, but the relationship should

receive consideration in future studies.

### Multiple Responsibilities

Multiple responsibilities and its effects on the acquaintance ratio may be of significance in future programming. Responsibilities as listed by participating Marketing Specialists were many and varied. No attempt will be made to list them as a correlation could not be established. That is, one Specialist listed Fruit and Vegetables plus Business Education as dual responsibilities. Although other Specialists included these two fields in a combination of responsibilities none had the exact combination. Therefore, Table 6 was created to enumerate the number of Marketing Specialists in each regional area with multiple responsibilities and the ratio of acquaintance with these Specialists.

TABLE 6.--Agricultural Extension Marketing Specialists with multiple responsibilities and the acquaintance ratio in four regional marketing areas of the United States

Acquaintance Ratio	North Central Area	Southern Area	Eastern Area	Western Area
Number of Multiple Specialists	21	20	34	18
Average per Specialist				
*B-Know of	8.8	3.9	7.0	3.7
C-Recognize & Name	7.8	6.4	5.7	1.9
D-First-Name Basis	17.0	7.5	9.8	5.5
Total	33.6	17.8	22.5	11.1

\*Marketing Specialists scored only one degree of acquaintance for each Marketing Specialist listed on the questionnaire.

Although Marketing Specialists listed from two to seven program responsibilities this did not seem to impair the acquaintance ratio. Referring to Table 1, the average of acquaintance on a first-name basis is less than in Table 6. From this analysis, a premise could be made that Marketing Specialists with multiple duties have more opportunities to interact with other Specialists, therefore, the degree of acquaintance would be greater.

Women Extension Marketing  
Specialist Acquaintance Ratio

To complete the analysis of data a final division was made, that of applying the same procedure to women involved in Extension Marketing programs.

TABLE 7.--Ratio of acquaintance per woman specialist in Agricultural Extension Marketing work in four regional marketing areas of the United States

Acquaintance Ratio	North Central Area	Southern Area	Eastern Area	Western Area
Number of Specialists	9	10	13	7
Average per Specialist				
*B-Know of	18.3	2.6	8.0	4.0
C-Recognize & Name	12.6	5.5	4.6	1.8
D-First-Name Basis	7.1	4.1	7.3	1.7
Total	38.0	12.2	19.9	7.5

\*Marketing Specialists scored only one degree of acquaintance for each Marketing Specialist listed on the questionnaire.

In Table 7 women Extension Marketing Specialists in the North Central and Southern Areas know approximately half as many Specialists on a first-name basis as the totals noted in Table 1 indicate. In the North Central Area women Marketing Specialists listed a lesser degree of acquaintance at a higher ratio of acquaintance than recorded totals for the entire region.

No explanation is offered as years of service average 3.9 and it will be noted that those in the service from one through nine years met the median of the group. It should be noted that women Specialists with one exception had singular responsibility.

### Summary

The remaining factor, the relationship of acquaintance to Marketing field of Specialists is resolved by the foregoing information. From the data conclusions can be drawn that Specialists in commodity fields in the North Central Area have a higher degree of acquaintance than do their counterparts in the Southern Area. Conversely General Information Specialists have a higher ratio of acquaintance in the Southern Area.

Specialists with dual or multiple responsibilities have a higher degree of acquaintance than Marketing Specialists with singular responsibilities and women engaged in Extension Marketing work decrease the ratio of acquaintance as the categories of acquaintance increases.

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

One of the greatest assets the Extension Service has is the individual experiences of its educators. To capitalize on these experiences by sharing the knowledge gained from these experiences with fellow educators will as an end result add to the efficiency of the organization. Directly contributing to the welfare of the producer, the handler and the general public simultaneously.

Extension educators, at least to a degree, are becoming aware of the need for greater interaction between its members if the development of solutions to the many problems facing agribusiness today are to be solved.

The formation of the North Central Regional Agricultural Marketing Committee that includes as its basic premise the exchange of information and the interaction of its members is an example of the recognition given this need.

This study and the presentation of material and the analysis of the factors involved has supported the original hypothesis, i.e., the degree of acquaintance and program knowledge between Extension Marketing Specialists in a twelve state area served by a Regional Agricultural Marketing

Committee is greater than the degree of acquaintance and program knowledge between Extension Marketing Specialists in areas not served by a Regional Marketing Committee.

The degree of acquaintance encouraged by the formation of the Regional Committee leads directly to the process of group action that encourages the establishment of increased communication, common goals and increased activity among group members.

Relating the various factors tested in the study to the effect of the Regional Marketing Committee and increased interaction a summary would be:

1. Total acquaintance per Specialist is greater in Marketing Areas served by a Regional Marketing Committee.
2. As tenure increases the acquaintance ratio increases.
3. As the percentage of responsibility in Agricultural Extension Marketing increases the acquaintance ratio increases directly.
4. As the degree of interaction increases between Agricultural Marketing Specialists the degree of acquaintance on a first-name basis increases.
5. Specialists that are encouraged to interact develop greater acquaintance in all fields of endeavors.
6. Specialists with multiple responsibilities in Agricultural Marketing have practically the



same or greater degree of acquaintance as those with singular responsibilities.

7. Women engaged in Extension Marketing have a lower degree of acquaintance than the average of all Marketing Specialists.

### Recommendation

In the analysis of the presented material the formation of the Regional Marketing Committee has assisted in the cohesion of a group that has a number of advantages that only begin with the increase in acquaintance. By having the committee meet twice a year, greater co-ordination is established between states assuring greater use of the talents of all Marketing Specialists for the benefit of those who depend on the Extension Service for guidance.

Experience and perception gained by this pioneer marketing group would be of invaluable aid to formative groups in the other regional areas of the United States. On the basis of this study the establishment of similar areas is recommended.

Although the study was conducted on twelve state areas, geographic, physical or agricultural differences may alter the pattern. Regions of smaller area would retain the same benefits described in the study.

If increased acquaintance is desired, the results regarding percentage of responsibility and the resulting acquaintance factor is of importance. Marketing Specialists

on a part time basis by the virtue of lesser acquaintance and the resulting lower communication factor be relegated to full time basis or be replaced with Specialists given multiple responsibilities.

Finally, because of the numerous benefits derived by group action, Agricultural Marketing Specialists should be encourage to meet and interact on an interstate basis regardless of existence or nonexistence of an organized Regional Marketing Group.

#### Additional Studies Suggested

In conjunction with this study various findings indicate the possibility for additional studies. Future research could explore to greater depth the foremost of these relative factors.

1. A device to measure the monetary value realized by the increase in interaction in the twelve state Regional Marketing Area be developed and a comprehensive study made.
2. A study of the number of Marketing Specialists in each commodity field in relation to the total income of each commodity.
3. The increase in tenure and its relation to increased group action on an area wide basis.

## A P P E N D I X

## APPENDIX A

Cooperative Extension Service  
Extension Division  
University of Missouri

February 16, 1961

State Extension Director

Dear Sir:

Approximately four years ago, a North Central Regional Agricultural Marketing Committee was formed. This Committee is composed of representatives from twelve states in the mid-west region of the United States. The purpose of this twelve-state union is to attempt to implement regional or area approaches to agricultural marketing problems.

Mr. Ted Sidor, a graduate student at Michigan State University, has undertaken a research project in an effort to evaluate the effect of this regional committee approach to agricultural marketing.

Within a short time, all marketing specialists in your state will receive a questionnaire that, when completed, will give some measure of the effectiveness of the program.

We would appreciate your cooperation and the cooperation of your marketing specialists toward the successful completion of this study.

You may be interested to know that at the present time the regional activity is being partly financed by the Farm Foundation. Additional funds are likely to be appropriated if this study shows a significant value to this type of regional approach for the establishment of other regional marketing areas.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed)

C. C. Ratchford  
Dean and Director

Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

Extension Marketing Specialist

Dear Specialist:

Your cooperation and assistance is being asked for completion of a study that involves your work and to some extent the success of future expansion in the field of Agricultural Marketing on an area wide basis.

The study is designed to measure the effect of a twelve state regional marketing area that has been operating for approximately four years. The measure of effect will be the acquaintance and knowledge of specialist and programs within adjacent states. In a few selected states we will also measure the flow of information on marketing matters between states with a selected area.

I would appreciate your completing and returning the enclosed questionnaire at the earliest possible date. The questionnaire is self explanatory, however, I would appreciate special attention to the two questions at the end of the questionnaire, these are quite important. We are surveying all personnel designated by the Federal Extension Service as Marketing workers.

Your State Director of Extension has been informed of the study and if there are other questions I suggest you contact him.

I would like to thank you in advance for your time, effort and prompt return of the questionnaire.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed)

Ted Sidor  
Graduate Student

## QUESTIONNAIRE

In the appropriate column under "Acquaintance", check that space that corresponds to your degree of acquaintance with the named Marketing Specialist.

In Column "E", write the number or numbers that correspond to the program responsibilities of the named Marketing Specialist.

In Column "E", following your name, place the number or numbers that correspond to your program responsibilities.

ACQUAINTANCE		PROGRAM KNOWLEDGE				
STATE & SPECIALIST	A	B	C	D	E	
<b>ARIZONA</b>						
Clarence Edmond						A-I do not know specialist
George Campbell						B-I know of the specialist
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>						
R. F. Kasmire						C-I can recognize specialist and call by name
F. G. Mitchell						D-We are on a first name basis
H. B. Richardson						
L. D. Sanborn						
G. A. Rowe						
K. R. Farrell						
I. W. Hardie						
J. L. Matthews						1-Livestock, Meat & Wool
G. A. Carpenter						2-Fruit & Vegetables
Eric Thor						3-Poultry & Eggs
A. W. Brant						4-Dairy
Marian Hoover						5-Consumer Education
R. C. Rock						6-Crops: Seed, Grain, Cotton, etc.
<b>COLORADO</b>						
J. H. Winn						7-Business Education, Retailer and Other
L. W. VanMeir						8-Wood Products
R. J. Crom						9-General Marketing Information & Economic Analysis
J. M. Lynch						10-Administration
L. S. Rosenfield						11-Agricultural Engineering
<b>IDAHO</b>						
Larry Summers						12-Food Technology
Wayne Robinson						13-Other

I have been employed as a marketing specialist or administrator at this institution for \_\_\_\_\_ years.

I devote \_\_\_\_\_% of my time to marketing work.

Institute for Extension Personnel Dev.  
113 Agricultural Hall  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

March 17, 1961

Extension Marketing Specialist

Dear Specialist or Administrator:

Approximately three weeks ago I sent you a questionnaire and asked that you fill it out and return it to me. To date, I have not received yours.

I realize that you are very busy, however, the information I need is important, not only to the study, but it is important to you. It is important for you to know if the type of program now in progress in the North Central States will be of value to you in the future programs you undertake across state lines.

I am enclosing another questionnaire and a self-addressed envelope for your convenience. I would appreciate your effort in returning the completed questionnaire at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

(Signed)

Ted Sidor  
Michigan State Graduate Student  
and Oregon State College  
Extension Agent

## APPENDIX B

Multiple responsibilities assigned Extension Marketing Specialist in each of the four regional marketing areas of the United States.

1=Livestock, Meat and Wool 2=Fruit and Vegetables 3=Poultry and Eggs 4=Dairy 5=Consumer Education 6=Crops: Seed, Grain, Cotton, etc. 7=Business Education, Retailer and Other	8=Wood Products 9=General Marketing Information and Economic Analysis 10=Administration 11=Agricultural Engineering 12=Food Technology 13=Other
---	--

NORTH CENTRAL Specialists	SOUTHERN Specialists	EASTERN Specialists	WESTERN Specialists
7-10	2-7-11-12	2-7	9-1-2-3-4-5-6
1-3-4-9	2-9	3-9	3-9-13-6
9-1-3-4-6	3-4	2-5-7-9-10	1-3-7-9-10
9-13	8-9-13	7-9-2	2-7-9
1-5-7-9-10	9-13	7-9	1-3-12
1-5-7	2-4-6-7-9-13	5-9-12-13	6-9-11
1-3-4-6-7	1-2-3	2-7-9	2-9
9-10	1-2-9	11-2-9	9-10
9-1-3-4-6	1-2-4	3-10	2-9
5-9	3-7-5	1-9	7-2-13
13-1-3-4-6-7	5-9	6-3-9	7-13
7-9	4-9-13	2-12	2-9-7
4-11-12	7-9	2-12	1-2-3-4-7-9
1-9	7-9	3-9	5-9
3-4-7-9-12-13	9-10	2-3-5	5-9
1-7	2-3-4-9	4-8-13	2-3-4
1-2-3-5-6-7-9	10-9	1-3-7-4-8	
2-6-9-10	9-2-7	1-7-11	
3-4		2-5-7	
4-9		3-4	
4-9		5-7	
		5-2-3-8	
		2-7-8	
		5-8	
		4-9	
		12-3	
		10-2	
		4-8-10	
		2-3-7-8	
		5-7	
		9-13	
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
21	18	31	16 Total



## B I B L I O G R A P H Y

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Alderson, Wroe. Marketing Behavior and Executive Action. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1957.
- Almsted, Michael S. The Small Group. New York: Random House, 1959.
- Benne, Kenneth D. and Muntzar, Bazider. Human Relations in Curriculum Change. New York: Dryden Press, 1951.
- Bernstein, Saul. Charting Group Process. New York: Association Press, 1949.
- Blumenthal, Louis A. Administration of Group Work. New York: Association Press, 1948.
- Bohlen, Joseph M. and Beal, George M. (ed.) The Group Process. Developed by the National Project in Agricultural Communication, Copyright 1956 by the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities.
- Boulding, Kenneth Ewart. The Organizational Revolution. New York: Harpers, 1953.
- Bovard, E. E. Jr. "Clinical Insight as a Function of Group Process," Abnormal Sociological Psychology, 1952 47, cited by Gardener Lindzey (ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. II. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison Publishing Company, 1954.
- Coyle, Grace Longwell. Group Experience and Democratic Value. New York: Women Press, 1948.
- Davis, R. E. G. (ed.) A Primer of Guidance Through Group Work. Associated Press, 1940.
- Dean, John Peebles. A Manual of Intergroup Relations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Festinger, Leon et al. Social Pressures in Informal Groups. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
- Hagood, Margaret J. and Price, Daniel O. Statistics for Sociologists. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1952.

- Hall, D. M. Dynamics of Group Action. Danville: Danville Illinois Printers and Publishers, 1957.
- Hayman, Harlan, L. and Schwartz, Alfred. Administration in Profile for School Executives. New York: Harper Bros. 1955.
- Hodge, William Vallance Douglas. The Theory and Application of Harmonic Integrals. Cambridge, England: The University Press, 1941.
- Kelsey, Lincoln David and Hearne, Cannon Chiles. Cooperative Extension Work. Ithaca, New York: Comstock Publishing Associates, 1955.
- Klein, Alan F. Society, Democracy and the Group. New York: Womons Press, 1953.
- Klein, Josephine. The Study of Groups. London: Routledge and Paul, 1956.
- Lieberman, Joshua (ed.). New Trends in Group Work. New York: Association Press, 1938.
- Lindzey, Gardner (ed.). Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison Publishing Co., 1954.
- Lippit, Gordon L. My Group and I. Washington: Educators Washington Dispatch, 1952.
- Lowry, Louis. Adult Education and Group Work. New York: Whiteside Inc. and M. Morrow, 1955.
- March, James G. and Simon, Herbert. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- National Society for the Study of Education. The Dynamics of Instructional Groups. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Redfield, Charles E. Communication in Management. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Schachler, Stanley. The Psychology of Affiliation. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.
- Sherif, Mugafer. Groups in Harmony and Tension. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1953.
- Sullivan, Dorothea (ed.). Readings in Group Work. New York: Association Press, 1952.

- Thelen, Herbert Arnold. Dynamics of Groups at Work.  
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Thibaut, John W. and Kelly, Harold H. The Social Psychology of Groups. New York: John Wiley & Son, Inc., 1959.
- Trecher, Harliegh B. Group Work. New York: Whiteside, 1955.
- Weyl, Herman. The Classical Groups. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1946.

#### Public Documents

- Federal Extension Service. Handbook for Extension Marketing Projects Conducted with Agricultural Marketing Act Funds. United States Department of Agriculture Publication AEP 88, May 1956.
- Sub-Committee on Scope and Responsibility of Extension Committee on Organization and Policy. "The Cooperative Extension Service," Today, April 1958.
- U. S. Congress. Amended Smith-Lever Act, Public Law 85. 83rd Congress, 1st Session. Chapter 157 S1675.

#### Articles and Periodicals

- Deutsch, M. "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Co-operation and Competition upon Group Process," Human Relations 1949 b, 2.
- Kelly, H. H. "Communication in Experimental Created Hierarchies," Human Relations 1950 4.
- Simon, Herbert A. "A Formal Theory of Interaction in Social Groups," American Sociological Review 1952 17.
- Thibaut, John. "An Experimental Study of the Cohesiveness of Underprivileged Groups," Human Relations 1950 3.

ROOM USE ONLY



3 1293 03174 7847