A STUDY INDICATING THE FUTURE DIRECTION OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE IN ORDER TO MEET THE PROBLEMS AND NEEDS OF THE PEOPLE

Thesis for the Degree of M. S.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

James R. Hazlitt

1961

ABSTRACT

A STUDY INDICATING THE FUTURE DIRECTION
OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
IN ORDER TO MEET THE PROBLEMS AND
NEEDS OF THE PEOPLE

by James R. Hazlitt

Extension work grew out of a situation. It has come to be a system of service and education designed to meet the needs of people. Recognizing that the speed of change has become an established pattern in our present society, it is increasingly important that the Cooperative Extension Service continually evaluate its program offerings to meet the changing needs of the people.

The purpose of this study was to seek information which would be helpful in guiding Extension programs and policies for the future. In this pursuit, a review of literature concerning opinions and attitudes of others was made. Also, a study of the concerns and issues as seen by 294 Yuma County, Arizona citizens as well as their attitudes on whether or not the Extension Service should be working on these problems was conducted.

The sample was obtained from a complete up-to-date list of names and addresses of families in Yuma County. Using random sampling methods, every nth address was selected which provided for a uniform distribution of men and women in approximately equal numbers.

Over 90 percent of the concerns mentioned by Yuma County citizens were in the general area of community needs

or public affairs. Sixty-three percent of these concerns were in the categories of schools, employment and industry, community physical upkeep, recreation and water. The study showed that such concerns applied to both urban and rural people.

When asked if they would approve or disapprove of County Agents working on such concerns, nine in ten of those having definite opinions approved. Of the total group interviewed, 68 percent approved of Extension Agents working on their problems and concerns, less than nine percent disapproved and about 22 percent did not express themselves one way or another.

Over four-fifths of the interviewees residing in rural areas in relation to less than 65 percent of those residing in urban areas approved of agents working on public affairs educational programs. Also, three-fourths of those who had had Extension contacts felt that agents should work on public affairs problems as contrasted to 40 percent of those who had had no contacts with Extension.

Extension accomplishments in 1959 indicated that 67 percent of agricultural agent's time was devoted to agricultural or related projects in comparison to less than six percent of their time being devoted to community improvement and public affairs.

The implications of this study are that the people are desirous of Cooperative Extension's help in meeting their problems and needs which normally have been beyond Extension's

scope of offering; and that if Extension is to meet these needs, it must broaden the scope of its program offerings.

A STUDY INDICATING THE FUTURE DIRECTION OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE IN ORDER TO MEET THE PROBLEMS AND NEEDS OF THE PEOPLE

By

James R. Hazlitt

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

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his appreciation to the following without whose help this thesis could never have been written:

To the University of Arizona for the periods of educational leave in which to pursue such interests;

To the staff of Michigan State University from whose council the author has been privileged to benefit, and especially to Dr. George Axinn and Dr. Frank Suggitt;

To the Fund for Adult Education for providing the opportunity for pilot projects in Public Affairs and Leadership Development programs in the author's county;

To Dr. J. L. Matthews of the Federal Extension Service and Dr. E. J. Boone, formerly with the Arizona Cooperative Extension Service, for providing guidance and leadership in conducting the survey from which portions of this study have been compiled; and for jointly authoring, along with this author, a more complete study of Yuma County citizens' attitudes and responses towards public affairs education;

To the staff members of the University of Arizona Cooperative Extension Service who served as interviewers in the collection of this data;

To the subjects interviewed, citizens of Yuma County.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

> The history of education in America can be traced in the story of its changing social circumstances. The forms which education takes, the kinds of education and their contents which are offered, and the parts of the population to which educational opportunities are offered are determined by the needs which changes generate.[1]

There appears to be little, if any, disagreement by all types of educators to this statement. Whether they be educators in the fields of youth or adult, formal or informal, most will agree that problems and needs of people are the basis for education.

Acceptance of this philosophy implies that those who are involved as educators must develop educational programs to fit the problems and needs of the people. It is reasoning such as this which lends direction to the scope and purpose of this study.

More specifically this study is concerned with the extent to which educational programs of the Cooperative Extension Service are based upon the problems and needs of the people--compared to the extent that they merely follow what they have been in the past--or are based on tradition.

---

[1]Wilbur C. Hallenbeck, "The Function and Place of Adult Education in American Society," Handbook of Adult Education in the United States, ed., Malcolm S. Knowles, (Chicago: Adult Education Association, 1960) p. 29.

A. THE CHANGING SCENE

> One of the few certainties in this world is change. It goes without saying that if educators are to keep abreast of these changes, not to mention help direct them, educators must be aware of them.[2]

Since the inception of the Cooperative Extension Service in 1914, the world, the nation, and lesser communities have been propelled through a period of vehement change.

Man has made astounding strides in scientific research, invention, and technology. Outer space craft, guided missiles, supersonic aircraft, hydrogen bombs, miracle drugs are but a few of the many objects new to people of the world in the last decade or two.

During the last ten years the population of the United States has increased about 20 percent. The mobility of our people has been more pronounced than ever before.

People are moving from east to west, from north to south and vice versa. Perhaps more important, as far as Extension's potential is concerned, is the vast movement of farm people to the city and the movement of city people to suburban and rural areas. Between 1950 and 1955 the population of urban fringes increased by 9.6 million people, or 28 percent.

---

[2]Harold F. Kaufman, et al, "Concerns of Adult Education in Mississippi," Adult Education, (Adult Education Association of the U. S. A., Chicago, Autumn, 1957), Vol. VIII No. 1, p. 20.

Rural farm population outside metropolitan areas declined by 2.5 million, while non-farm rural population outside metropolitan areas increased by 3 million, or 11 percent, and the population of central cities increased by 2 million, or 4 percent.[3]

In 1930, 24.6 percent of the United States population was rural farm as compared to 11.8 percent in 1958.[4] In 1954 the Agricultural Census showed a total of 3,327,617 farms.[5] However, over 1,900,000 farms had incomes under $2,500 or were part-time farms. The balance, which produces the majority of our food and fiber, make up about 4 percent of the nation's families.

This vast movement of population, largely towards the metropolitan areas, has created many problems--social, political, transportation, education, health, housing, industry and commerce, to name a few, for practically all communities.

A publication by the United States Department of Agriculture on selected references of urbanization and changing land uses from 1950-58 lists 1,319 such studies and

---

[3]H. G. Brunsman and H. S. Shyrock, "Population Migration--Who's Moving Where?" Appraisal Journal, XXV (January 1957), pp. 74-80.

[4]Donald I. Bogue, The Population of the United States, (The Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, 1959) p. 23.

[5]United States Bureau of the Census, County and City Data Book: 1956, (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1957) p. 8.

papers.[6] These include subjects on: regional studies, land use and land use surveys, industrial location, population, urban and metropolitan areas, rural areas, community studies, government, taxation and services, annexation, rural areas, community studies, government, taxation and services, annexation, rural-urban fringes, sociological and cultural aspects, rural land encroachment, recreation, transportation, employment and others.

---

[6]United States Department of Agriculture, Urbanization and Changing Land Uses: A Bibliography of Selected References 1950-1958, Miscellaneous Publication No. 825 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960).

A look at the future as foreseen by Joseph L. Fisher, President, Resources for the Future, Inc., shows a few items as follows:

TABLE I

ESTIMATED CHANGES FROM THE PRESENT TIME TO 1980 AND 2000[7]

	Now	1980	2000
Population (millions)	180	245	330
Labor force (millions)	73	102	140
Household (millions)	52	73	100
GNP (billions)	510	1,060	2,200
GNP per worker	7,000	10,000	15,000
Government expenditures ($ billion)	100	230	500
Meat consumed (billion pounds)	29	46	65
Cotton produced (billion pounds)	7	10.5	16
Autos produced (millions)	7	13	27
New dwelling units (millions)	1.5	2.6	4.2
Fertilizer produced (million tons)	8	20	42
Cropland (million acres)	460	460	460
Water withdrawals (billion gallons per day)	250	340	480

While Mr. Fisher acknowledges these are only tentative estimates and a portrayal of the distant future is risky, the figures give one the magnitude of change.

By his estimates, the nation will be able to produce food and fiber for the increased population with the same number of acres of cropland in use at the present time. This is judged to be possible because of the continued technological advance in the field of agricultural production.

[7] Joseph L. Fisher, "Cities and Resources For the Future." Paper read before the 66th National Conference on Government, Phoenix, Arizona, November 14, 1960.

It appears inevitable that the problems produced in our changing society in the last 15 years or so will be magnified in the future.

It also appears inevitable that such problems of the community and society will become more complex as the population continues to grow. While it is impossible to halt change and may be impossible to avoid problems created by change, it is possible for most individuals to learn more about, and to better understand some of the alternatives which must be considered in making basic decisions in regard to problems created by change.[8] This, too, might offer Extension a potential for educational assistance.

---

[8] A. A. Liveright, Strategies of Leadership in Conducting Adult Education Programs, (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959) pp. 3-8.

B. THE FORMATION OF COOPERATIVE EXTENSION AND ITS ROLE TO DATE

> Extension work grew out of a situation. It has come to be a system of service and education 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.[9]

Long before the passage of the Morrill Act and the Smith-Lever Act, societies and institutes, were organized for the purpose of acquainting people with what was being done to improve agriculture and to disseminate agricultural information. 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. This act created an opportunity for each state to set up an educational institution where the leading object was the teaching of branches of learning related to agriculture and mechanic arts. Also in 1862, Congress created the United States Department of Agriculture, whose function was to gain useful information about agricultural subjects and relay this knowledge throughout the land.

---

[9] L. D. Kelsey and C. C. Hearne, Cooperative Extension Work, (Ithaca, New York: Comstock Publishing Company, 1949) p. 3

In 1890 the Second Morrill Act was passed (which increased the funds to Land Grant Colleges) and in 1914 the Smith-Lever Act provided for financial help for Extension work. This act designated Extension's major function as "... 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 application of the same ..."

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.[10]

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 employees performed their functions.

The second period was the agricultural depression of the twenties. During the war when high prices prevailed many farmers went deeply in debt for equipment and land. Many farmers faced bankruptcy and foreclosure. Government

---

[10]Edmond de S. Brunner and E. Hsin Poo Yang, Rural America and the Extension Service, (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949) pp. 73-90.

agencies used Extension agents to carry out recommendations. Emphasis was placed on efficient production rather than on production alone. The demonstration method was revived, more attention was placed on community programs and the development of local leaders.

During the thirties, 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. It also worked closely with Rural Rehabilitation program and had discussion groups in public affairs.

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 of time Paul Miller states that in 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 thirties as the chapter or organizational custodianship. The current debate is shaping what the third chapter will become."[11]

---

[11]Paul A. Miller, "Adjustments Needed in Extension Thinking," Journal of Farm Economics, Proceedings No. Vol. XLI, No. 5, (December, 1959) pp. 1435-1445.

C. PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY AND HYPOTHESES

The purpose of this study is to indicate the future direction of the Cooperative Extension Service if it is to be of educational service in helping the people help themselves in adjusting to change, in meeting their needs and in solving their problems. Two major areas of study will be pursued. These being: A review of literature regarding the opinions of leaders in the fields of Extension and Adult Education concerning the potential of educational programs in a community; the findings of a survey concerning the problems and issues of citizens of Yuma County, Arizona, and their opinions concerning Extension agents working with prople on these problems and issues.

Hypothesis I. It will be necessary for the Cooperative Extension Service to broaden the scope of its program offerings from the traditional offerings of the past if the Extension Service is going to help people help themselves in adjusting to change, in meeting their needs and in solving their problems.

To more fully explain this concept of traditional offerings and to build the rationale for this hypothesis, the following data from Extension activities and accomplishments for the year of 1959 were given.[12]

---

[12] U.S.D.A. Extension Service, Extension Activities and Accomplishments 1959, Circular No. 531, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, July 1960) p. 14.

The statistics in this report showed that 67 percent of the agricultural agents' time was devoted to agricultural or related projects which include: crops, livestock, marketing, soil and water conservation, forestry, wildlife, farm management and farm buildings, and mechanical equipment. Less than six percent of their time was devoted to projects concerned with community improvement and public affairs. The percentage distribution of time of all Extension agents, which included those doing primarily agricultural, home demonstration and 4-H club work, was as follows: Slightly over 27 percent of their time was devoted to Extension organization and planning and in-service training. Slightly over 36 percent of their time was devoted to agricultural projects. Almost 21 percent of their time was devoted to home economics subjects. Less than nine percent of their time was devoted to the combined areas of public affairs, community development, health and safety.

It may be questioned by some whether or not the data presented in this publication actually reflects what the county agents are doing, particularly in the fields of community improvement and public affairs. This is because this data is obtained from Federal Extension report forms which some think may be too rigid. A review of the Extension activities and accomplishments circular listed the following areas which agents reported educational activities in the fields of community development and public affairs:

citizenship activities; developing and improving county or community organizations; general community studies and surveys; improving health facilities, services and program; improving schools and churches; bettering rural-urban relations; projects on libraries, roads, telephones, and community centers; regional or area development programs or projects; national programs and proposals affecting agriculture and rural life; world affairs; and emergency activities. It would appear that there is ample opportunity for reporting such activities accomplished in these areas.

Further indications that many Extension programs are not fully geared towards community problems and public affairs issues ensue from a review of states having specialists in these fields. Minnesota has a specialist in Public Affairs. Alabama, Georgia, and Tennessee all have specialists for Community Activities; Illinois has one in Community Betterment; Washington one in Community Organization: Michigan one in Resource Development and Wisconsin one in Land Use Planning.[13] Specialists in these fields number sixteen out of a total specialist force in the United States of 2,496[14] or about seven-tenths of one percent of the total States' Extension specialists force. However, in addition to the above states, Kansas, Missouri and Utah have Depart-

---

[13] County Agents Directory, (Chicago: C. L. Mast, Jr. and Associates, 1960).

[14] U. S. D. A. Federal Extension Service, MO 246, (September, 1959).

ments of Continuing or Adult Education in conjunction with their Extension Services. It is also known that Iowa, Colorado, Oregon and Montana have public affairs type programs and undoubtedly specialists in areas of sociology or economics guide their activities. Also, there are probably other states which have similar specialist responsibility.

Hypothesis II. The problems and needs of the people are varied and extend to a much greater extent beyond the areas in which Cooperative Extension has traditionally been working.

Hypothesis III. The people of a community are desirous of the help Cooperative Extension could give in helping them to meet their problems and needs.

The three hypotheses, in essence, are: The people are desirous of Cooperative Extension's help in meeting their problems and needs which normally have been beyond Extension's scope of offering; and that if Extension is to meet these needs, it must broaden the scope of its program offerings.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In chapter one a certain amount of literature was cited in support of the general area of the study as well as to build the rationale for the hypotheses. In this chapter, the literature will fall into two categories. First are the articles and opinions of various people concerning the role of the Extension Service and adult education. These have been responsible for the direction of this study and for the areas of thought conveyed to this writer in the general subject of the future Extension Service. The other area of literature reviewed concerns other studies dealing with peoples' attitudes on community problems and their conception of Extension's role in the community.

A. OPINIONS OF OTHERS

The opinion of others in regard to the future of the Cooperative Extension Service might be described in three categories, recognizing some overlapping of each. These are: (1) Continuing as at present with more emphasis on specialty action and technical proficiency; (2) Continuing much as at present but broadening the scope of responsibilities; (3) Complete change of present policies in regard to being mainly agricultural service workers to one of liberal adult educa-

tion. These categories correlate somewhat with those presented by Warren Rovetch in the following table. (See page 16)

It would appear, from a limited number of personal contacts the author has had with other agents and specialists, that a considerable number would agree that Extension personnel should continue much as they have in the past, but with increased emphasis on technical efficiency. John Carew states:

> The Extension Service is in danger of becoming client-oriented instead of subject 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 monuments to the civic mindedness of the County Agricultural Agent. But they may also symbolize his neglect of technical agricultural problems within his community.[2]

Somewhat along the same vein of thinking is the following statement by the 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 they seek differs considerably from the more general information their fathers sought. Today's

---

[2]John Carew, "The Role of the Extension Specialist in Agriculture," Farm Policy Forum, Vol. XI, No. 4, (1958-59), pp. 31-32.

TABLE II

THE THREE LEVELS OF EXTENSION'S FUTURE POTENTIAL[1]

SUBJECT MATTER	METHOD	RELATION TO OTHER AGENCIES*	RELATION TO COOPERATIVE EXTENSION TRADITION
1. Agriculture	Technological services designed for individual farm units, with increasing emphasis on management rather than "demonstration" communication	Virtually independent	Minor adaptations called for within tradition
2. Broad Social-economic Adjustment	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	Coordinate resources and administer in close cooperation with other agencies on equal basis	Sharp departure in several respects from tradition
3. Adult Education	Increasing emphasis on education and teaching methods appropriate to content at a college level	Administrative subsidiary of substantive agencies	Total departure from tradition

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

[1]Warren Rovetch, "Cooperative Extension and the Land-Grant System in University Adult Education," University Adult Education A Guide to Policy, Renee Peterson and William Peterson, (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1960) p. 226.

> 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.[3]

In respect to the above opinions, it may be well to pose the question of the needed technical proficiency of a County Agent, realizing situations vary with communities. In some areas the emergence of large "corporation" type farm units is becoming increasingly prevalent. Under this type of farming each enterprise is a specialty and a specialist in each enterprise is in charge. Ordinarily these foremen have at least a bachelors degree and many have advanced degrees, including Ph.D.'s. Can a County Agent be any value to these types of people unless he too becomes a specialist in a narrow field?

Another alternative is that of continuing the Extension program much as it is at present, but broadening the scope of responsibility. J. L. Matthews in describing the Scope Report stated:

> The principle of first responsibility to farm families 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; individuals, firms, and organizations which provide farm people with essential services

---

[3]Daniel D. Aldrich, Jr., "Implications of Agricultural Adjustment for Land Grant Colleges." Paper read at the Southwest Agricultural Adjustment Conference, Tucson, Arizona, October 12, 1960.

and supplies such as credit, fertilizer, feed and many others.[4]

Mr. Matthews also stated:

> ... the Cooperative Extension Services, as a national educational system, must reappraise its programs and move into some of the program areas that generally have had less attention than the traditional subject matter programs.[5]

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.[6]

He also stated: "If you are competent only in a technical field, you make a good living, but a poor citizen."[7]

For the past several years all types of 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 a statement that typifies this point is the following from Michigan State University President, John Hannah.

> Traditionally the agricultural colleges and the Cooperative Extension Service have been well thought of

---

[4] J. L. Matthews, "The Cooperative Extension Service," Handbook of Adult Education in the United States, ed. Malcolm S. Knowles, Op. Cit., pp. 223-224.

[5] J. L. Matthews, Address to the Arizona Extension personnel at the Program Development Conference, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, October 3, 1959. Permission to quote secured.

[6] Allan B. Kline, Address to the FAE-CES Program Consultants, Michigan State University, East Lansing, July 13, 1959. Permission to quote secured.

[7] Ibid.

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 productive workers were engaged in agriculture to the present situation where approximately 12 percent are engaged in agriculture 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 new ways to serve agriculture and to serve 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 Colleges 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 of the people who need service and who want it.[8]

While change has been indicated in the previous statements, there has been little ultraism noted except perhaps by those who advocate no change at all.

---

[8]Correspondence from John A. Hannah, President, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, August 29, 1960

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

Robert Blakely has stated, "Whatever interests free citizens in a free society is subject matter for adult education."[9]

Another thought by Wilbur Hallenbeck is:

> 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 their problems and to reach their goals under current circumstances.[10]

This statement relates very closely to the problem solving process type of education which Extension workers have advocated over the years in their particular program.

Another way of expressing the definition of adult education is in the form of community development as a means of educating the people in a community. Howard McClusky remarks:

> ... 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

---

[9]Robert J. Blakely, "What Is Adult Education," Handbook of Adult Education in the United States, ed., Malcolm S. Knowles, (Chicago: Adult Education Association, 1960) p. 4

[10]Hallenbeck, Op. Cit., p. 31.

case, relevance is the chief characteristic of its approval.[11]

From reviewing the statements of these people on liberal adult education, it appears they fairly well follow an area outlined in the Scope Report as to one of Extension's problem areas--community improvement. Director Hutchison of Texas wrote:

> Extension's principal objective in community improvement work is development of the ability of the people through their own initiative to identify and solve problems affecting their welfare. Community improvement 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.[12]

These are a few of the opinions of various leaders throughout the country concerning the role of Extension and Adult Education. Others reviewed, but which somewhat paralleled those mentioned, are included in publications of the "Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults," "Farm Policy Forum," "Center for Agricultural and Economic Adjustment," "Farm Foundation," "1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth" and "National Agricultural Center for Advanced Study."[13]

---

[11]Howard Y. McClusky, "Community Development," Handbook of Adult Education in the United States, ed., Malcolm S. Knowles, (Chicago: Adult Education Association, 1960) pp. 419-420.

[12]John E. Hutchison, "A Responsibility and a Challenge," Extension Service Review, Vol. XXX, No. 10, (October, 1959) p. 203.

[13]See Bibliography.

B. OTHER STUDIES

A review of literature on surveys or studies conducted by the Cooperative Extension Services during the past fifteen years reveals very little concerning the people's opinion on their problems and needs and whether or not they think county agents should help in working on problems and needs which range beyond Extension's present scope. The Director of the Division of Research and Training in the Federal Extension Service, J. L. Matthews, informed the author that the Yuma Study,[14] was the first of its kind conducted in Cooperation with the Federal Extension Service in regard to an actual survey of the people's opinion on concerns, Public Affairs Education, Leadership Development and their approval or disapproval of agents working in these areas.

At the time of this writing, a similar study was being conducted in Pennsylvania.[15] Portions of this study have been completed and will be reported along with portions of the Yuma study later in the text.

---

[14] James R. Hazlitt, Edgar J. Boone, J. L. Matthews, "A Study of Public Affairs Education and Leadership Development, Yuma County, Arizona, 1960," (The University of Arizona Cooperative Extension Service, 1960).

[15] Erie County Agricultural Extension Association and Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Corry Community As Seen by Its People, Extension Studies No. 6, (University Park, Pennsylvania, September 1960).

Several of the other studies had to do with clientele with whom Extension should be working. In Wisconsin, Biever found that over two-thirds of the agricultural committee members indicated that home agents and 4-H club agents could include urban people in regular group programs, while agricultural agents could provide individual assistance upon request in working with urban people.[16]

In Michigan, Cornett conducted a study in regard to public concepts related to the role of the Cooperative Extension Service. In answer to a question posed as follows he received the following responses:

> Urban people seem to use an increasing amount of Extension Agent work time. Normally this will mean less time for farm areas. Due to the urban load, do you favor less rural service or adding another Extension Agent?

He received replies from 269 out of 305 people and which included 63 full time farmers, 40 part time farmers, 96 Rotarians, 65 Kiwanians and 41 business and professional women. Twenty-five percent of those responding were in favor of adding another agent; twenty-two percent were in favor of doing less urban work; five percent were in favor of doing less rural work; and thirty-five percent did not know.[17]

---

[16] L. J. Biever, "Roles of County Extension Agents as Perceived by County Agricultural Committee Members in Wisconsin." (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1957).

[17] E. M. Cornett, "A Study of Public Concepts Related to the Role of Cooperative Extension Service" (Unpublished M.S. thesis, Michigan State University, 1958) pp. 49-50.

In regard to program areas in the Extension Service, Wilkening reports that a majority of 112 agricultural committee members in Wisconsin saw Extension workers as serving the people in the county. Very few of them voluntarily indicated that a major objective of Extension work was accomplishing sectional, state or national objectives. The committee members tended to reinforce the local orientation of Extension work. Very few of them rated problems of public policy, consumer education and marketing as areas needing high emphasis. Wilkening also reported that the survey suggested the local people still regard involvement in community affairs as an important function although the agents do not.[18]

In Cornett's study farmers and urban people were asked:

> Should Extension agents increase their educational efforts on public programs such as zoning, taxation, community development, health, etc.?

Of those responding 47 percent answered yes, 15 percent said some, 16 percent said no and 22 percent did not know. Fifteen percent of the farmers said no compared to 17 percent of the urban people. There was no difference between the urban and rural groups in approving.[19]

In addition to the review of literature concerning surveys or studies conducted by the Cooperative Extension

---

[18] E. A. Wilkening, "Consensus in Role Definition of County Extension Agents Between the Agents and Local Sponsoring Committee Members," Rural Sociology, Vol. XXVIII, No. 2 (June 1958), pp. 186-189.

[19] Cornett Op. Cit., p. 51

Services, a review of educational research over the last ten years published by the "American Educational Research Association" -- a department of the National Education Association of the U. S. -- was made. Nothing germane to this thesis was found in this review.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Yuma County, Arizona, was one of twelve counties in the United States selected to participate in the pilot project in public affairs and leadership development sponsored by the Fund for Adult Education and the Cooperative Extension Service.

The purpose of the project is to encourage and assist the participating state Cooperative Extension Services to establish successful pilot county programs designed:

1. To broaden and strengthen the program offerings, stimulate the interest of the public and obtain citizen participation in public affairs; and

2. To advance education for public responsibilities though involving large numbers of citizens in program development and other appropriate experiences to develop their leadership.

One of the steps undertaken in Yuma County in conjunction with this project was to design and conduct a study to obtain information regarding the present status of the people's knowledge, understanding and attitudes toward certain citizenship activities and public affairs issues; and to obtain information to establish guidelines for County Extension program development regarding the concerns of people and the type of educational programs desired.

For the purpose of this thesis, only those areas germane to the hypotheses will be used.

A. DESIGN OF STUDY

Population[1]

According to the latest estimates obtained from the Census Bureau, Yuma County has a population of about 45,000 people. Of these about 27,500 live in the City of Yuma and its adjacent suburbs; 4,500 in towns with less than 2,500 people; and the balance throughout the county. There are about 530 commercial farms in the county.

The population is predominately Anglo-white with about 15 percent Spanish-American. Many of those employed in farming and the farmers themselves live in the City of Yuma and the small towns scattered throughout the county. Also, many people employed in Yuma reside in the country on tracts of land too small to be considered farms.

The major sources of income in the county are military and agriculture with approximately 3,000 military and civilians personnel employed by the military.

The Sample[2]

A complete up-to-date list of names and addresses of families in Yuma County was compiled. The list was obtained from telephone directories, lists of water users in the

---

[1] Hazlitt, Boone, Matthews, Op. Cit., p. 10.

[2] Ibid., p. 10.

irrigation districts and from the Yuma City-County Directory. Possibly the number selected to be interviewed in the City of Yuma was disproportionately high since employed persons were listed in the Yuma City-County Directory and in several instances more than one employed person resided at the same address.

Using random list sampling methods, every nth address was selected. Sample addresses were written on 3 by 5 inch cards. Each card was marked to indicate whether a man or a woman was to be interviewed. The cards were marked alternately so that there would be a uniform distribution of men and women in the sample and approximately equal numbers would be interviewed.

The plan was to have a minimum of 250 completed interviews, half men and half women respondents. Three samples were drawn independently from the total population--300, 100 and 100 addresses--so as to allow for adjusting the sampling plan to the actual degree of sample attrition experienced in the field. The third sample of 100 addresses was subsampled by random method to obtain the 25 addresses shown in Table III.

TABLE III

INTERVIEWS COMPLETED AND ATTRITIONS OF YUMA COUNTY SAMPLE

February, 1960[3]

	Sample #1	Sample #2	Sample #3
Interviews completed	209.7	68.4	17
Refusals	17	6	0
Vacant houses*	34	12	3
California addresses	13	6	1
No man	1		
No woman	1		
Away from home	5	4	1
Three calls without contact	14	3	
Mexico address	2		1
Deceased	2		
Unable to locate		2	1
Ill	2	3	1
Total attrition	91	36	8
Total in sample	300	104	25
Percent return	69.7	64.4	68

*A large number of military families had moved from the county several months before the survey was conducted.

The Questionnaire[4]

The questionnaire used in the Yuma study contained eight major divisions, namely: Characteristics of the population, concerns of the people, knowledge of and participation in the Extension Service, Farm-City relationships, attitudes toward labor unions, political attitudes, attitudes toward schools, and adult education interests. As mentioned previously, only portions of these results are used in this thesis.

[3]Ibid., p. 35.

[4]Ibid., p. 10.

The questionnaire was pre-tested with approximately 25 Yuma County citizens. Based on the responses obtained, several of the questions were revised.

The Field Survey

Eleven of the State Extension Office personnel and four agents from county offices, other than the Yuma office, interviewed full time. In addition, part time interviewing was done by agents from another county office. One of the Yuma County office secretaries, who could converse in Spanish, interviewed several who could not speak English. Editing was handled by the author and Dr. J. L. Matthews of the Federal Extension Service.

The interviewers were given extensive training in interviewing techniques and questionnaire acquaintance. Approximately four and one half days were needed to complete the interviews.

Tabulation and Summary of Findings

Because of the numerous open end questions and responses, considerable effort was expended categorizing these responses. Categorization was accomplished by having each answer to an open end question typed on a 3 by 5 inch card and then categorized according to their similarity.

After the categories were obtained, codes were devised and the information from the questionnaires was transferred to tabulation sheets. The IBM tabulation was conducted by the Numerical Laboratory, University of Arizona, and the Federal Extension Service.

B. DEFINITIONS

For clarity of understanding, and for the purposes of this study, the following definitions are offered:

Occupation Classification: All occupations were classified according to the "Classified Index of Occupation and Industries," U. S. Bureau of the Census.

White Collar: Those employed in the professional, managers and officials, clerical, and sales persons employment categories.

Blue Collar: Those employed in the craftsmen and foremen, operatives, service workers and laborer employment categories.

Farmers and Farm Managers: Those employed as managing, owning or renting farm units.

Non-Employed: Housewives and others not holding positions of employment.

Urban: Those residing within the incorporated city limits of Yuma and its adjacent suburbs.

Rural: Those living in open country and towns or villages under 2,500 population.

Commercial Farms: Farms with a value of sales of farm products amounting to $1,200 or more.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The findings of the survey used in this thesis have been broken into six major areas. They are: Characteristics of the population, concerns of respondents, issues concerning Yuma County citizens, Yuma County citizens' participation in solution of problem areas, acquaintance with Extension, and attitudes about agents working in problem areas.

A. CHARACTERISTICS OF YUMA COUNTY POPULATION

The characteristics of Yuma County population as derived from the Survey included place of residence, age of respondents, total net annual income after farm on business expenses, education of the respondents, occupation of the respondents and tenure in Yuma County. Since up-to-date census figures are not yet available for comparative purposes on most of these items, only place of residence and occupation of the respondents will be considerable.

TABLE IV

PLACE OF RESIDENCE OF YUMA COUNTY PEOPLE - 1960[1]

Residence	Percent All Respondents	Males	Females
On a farm (or ranch)	6.5	6.5	6.4
In the country, but not on a farm	3.4	4.6	2.1
In a town or village less than 2,500	9.9	11.7	7.8
In a suburban area of Yuma	8.2	8.5	7.8
In Yuma	72.0	68.7	75.9
Total Number	294	153	141

Eight out of ten respondents lived in the City of Yuma or its suburban areas. Two out of ten respondents lived in rural areas. Approximately 53 percent of the farmers and farm managers interviewed lived off the farm.

The latest census estimates show that approximately 55 percent of the population live in the City of Yuma, 5.5 percent live in a suburban area of Yuma, 10 percent live in a town or village less than 2,500 population.[2] According to preliminary agriculture census data, 40 percent of those operating farms lived off the farm.[3] Those residing on farms would then account for 3.2 percent of the population. The most disparate areas, concerning those interviewed and estimated census figures, are those living in Yuma and those

[1]Ibid., p. 11.

[2]Data obtained from Walt Wissner, Yuma County Census Leader.

[3]United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1959 Census of Agriculture - Preliminary, (Washington: Bureau of the Census, 1961).

living in the country, but not on a farm. There are several "squatter" settlements scattered throughout the county whose inhabitants, along with many farm laborers, were not included in any of the sources from which the sample was drawn. It is assumed this is a major reason for this disparity.

TABLE V

OCCUPATION OF YUMA COUNTY RESPONDENTS - 1960[4]

Item	All Respondents	Percent Males	Females
Professional	8.2	9.2	7.1
Farmers and farm managers	5.1	9.8	---
Managers and officials	8.8	13.7	3.5
Clerical	7.5	3.9	11.3
Sales persons	4.1	5.2	28.0
Craftsmen and foremen	7.8	15.0	---
Operatives	10.5	17.7	2.8
Service workers	8.2	9.2	7.1
Laborers	4.8	3.9	5.7
Not employed	31.3	5.9	59.0
Retired	3.7	6.5	.7

Sixty-five percent of all the people interviewed were employed. Thirty-one percent were not employed and nearly four percent were retired. Of the total that were not employed, 90 percent were women.

Slightly over 52 percent of all the employed men were craftsmen, operatives, service workers and laborers. Less than 37 percent of the employed men were white collar workers, including professional people, managers, clerks and salesmen. About ten percent were engaged in farming. Six percent of the men were not employed and slightly more than six percent

[4]Hazlitt, Boone, Matthews, Op. Cit., p. 12.

were retired.

Nearly six out of ten women were not employed. Slightly over 61 percent of the employed women were white collar workers. The remaining 39 percent were employed as operatives, service workers and laborers. Less than one percent of all the women interviewed were retired.

While 1960 census data is lacking in regard to occupations, the 1959 preliminary agriculture census indicates 747 farm operators.[5] Assuming one operator to a household, then farm operators account for approximately 5.5 percent of the total households. Hence, farm operators would account for approximately the same percentage in regard to occupational categories.

---

[5]United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Op. Cit.

E. CONCERNS OF YUMA COUNTY RESPONDENTS[6]

The first question the interviewees were asked was: "What would you say are two or three things that people in your vicinity should be concerned about?" This was an open-end question aimed at getting respondents to fully express themselves about this subject without the benefit of suggested topics.

Of the 294 interviewees, 268 or 91 percent listed one or more concerns. A total of 584 concerns were mentioned by the 268 respondents who had concerns. Of these, 370 concerns, or better than 63 percent, were in the categories of schools, employment and industry, community physical upkeep, recreation, and water.

---

[6]Hazlitt, Boone, Matthews, Op. Cit., pp. 14-16.

TABLE VI

CONCERNS OF YUMA COUNTY RESPONDENTS - 1960

Item (Ranked in order percentage of responses)	% Mentioning Each (268 out of 294)
Schools	40.7
Employment and industry	31.7
Community and physical upkeep	24.6
Recreation	20.9
Water and utilities	20.1
Human relationships	17.2
Community protection	11.2
City government and general politics	9.3
Religion	7.5
Hospital, health and sanitation	6.0
General agriculture	5.6
Public apathy	4.1
Taxes	3.4
City planning and zoning	3.0

Other items receiving less than three percent responses included: Housing, international and national affairs, transportation, high cost of living, Indians and Indian lands, and other miscellaneous items.

It is interesting to note the similarity between community concerns of the people in Yuma County and those of a community in Pennsylvania. In a study of Corry Community, Pennsylvania,[7] the respondents were asked, "What two or three things in this community are you concerned about?" Their replies were as follows:

[7]Erie County Agricultural Extension Association and Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Op. Cit., p. 2.

TABLE VII

CONCERNS OF CORRY COMMUNITY, PENNSYLVANIA, RESPONDENTS - 1960

Item	% Mentioning Each
Employment, industry, business	35
Schools	16
Roads	13
Churches	13
Taxes	10
Community upkeep	10
No concern at all	12
Recreation	9
Local government	5
Medical health	4
Control of cats and dogs	4
Housing	3
Youth	3

Other items receiving less than three percent included: Human relations, organizations, cost of living, sewage, public transportation, gambling, public utilities, work for handicapped and vandalism.

Items such as schools, employment and industry, community upkeep, recreation, local government, etc. ranked high in both communities. Of the nineteen categories listed in the Yuma survey, only the categories of water, general agriculture, public apathy, city-county planning and zoning, Indians and Indian lands, and international and national affairs were not listed in the Corry survey. Of the twenty-one categories listed in the Corry survey only two, work for handicapped and organizations, were not mentioned in the Yuma study. While categories in the Corry study such as roads and vandalism were not listed in the Yuma study per se, they were mentioned by those interviewed, but categor-

ized under different headings. Also, at the time of this writing, two other communities in Erie County had been surveyed and the responses to this question were quite similar to the one reported.[8]

There were nine areas in both surveys which had nearly identical headings. Following is a rank order correlation between the two surveys and the nine areas.

TABLE VIII

RANK-ORDER CORRELATION BETWEEN YUMA COUNTY, ARIZONA RESPONDENTS AND CORRY COMMUNITY, PENNSYLVANIA RESPONDENTS - 1960

Subject	Yuma Survey	Corry Survey	Yuma Rank	Corry Rank	Diff. in Rank	D
Schools	41	16	1	2	1	1
Employment & Industry	32	35	2	1	1	1
Community upkeep	23	10	3	5	2	4
Recreation	21	9	4	6	2	4
Human relationship (youth)	17	3	5	9	4	16
City Government & general politics	9	5	6	7	1	1
Religion	8	13	7	3	4	16
Hospitals, health and sanitation	6	4	8	8	0	0
Taxes	3	10	9	4	5	25
						58

The rank order correlation coefficient for these groups is .617. This tends to show some similarity between the concerns of the two communities especially when considering the concerns came from open-end questions aimed at

[8]Correspondence from John W. Bergstrom, Program Consultant, Erie County Agricultural Association, Erie, Pennsylvania, November 3, 1960.

getting respondents to express themselves without benefit of suggested topics.

A few of the major responses from those concerned about schools were: Need for higher educational facilities, curriculum needs, teacher qualifications and financing of education. Men were slightly more concerned about this subject than were the women. According to age groups, schools ranked highest with the 40-49 year old group and lowest with those over the age of 60 with one-half of the former mentioning this item compared to slightly over one-fourth of the latter. Slightly over 40 percent of those in the age groups of 30-39 and 50-59 mentioned schools as a concern. Of those surveyed, 150 had children in school and 117 of those were in the 30-49 year old age group.

As the level of education increased, the more concern there was about schools. Forty-eight percent of those with some college education, compared to 31 percent of those having eight years or less of education, mentioned this subject. The same correlation held true in regard to income levels. Over 52 percent of those with incomes over $10,000 mentioned this item compared to 27.5 percent of those with incomes under $2,500.

Rural groups had considerably more responses to schools than did the urban people, as 55 percent in these groups mentioned this item compared 37 percent of the urban people.

Schools were ranked either first or second in per-

centage of responses by the nine occupational groups. Farmers had the most numerous responses, percentagewise, with 69 percent. The balance of the occupational groups were fairly consistent, running from slightly over 38 percent to 45 percent.

Employment and Industry

The need for employment opportunities and industry also ranked high with the respondents. A few of the concerns in this category included: Lack of industry in the Yuma area, unemployment and poor wages, the need to bring more tourist trade to this area, the general economy of the area needed to be improved, etc. Men respondents were more concerned about employment and industry than were the women with 38 percent of the men mentioning this item compared to 25 percent of the women.

Thirty-four percent of the urban respondents compared to 21 percent of the rural respondents mentioned this item. At the time of the survey approximately 500 people were collecting unemployment compensation and a majority of these people resided in the urban area.

Approximately a third of the respondents in the different age groups between 25 and 59 mentioned this item compared to about two out of ten for those over 60 and those 24 years of age and younger. In this aspect, less than 38 percent of those over 60 were employed and might be expected to mention this item less than the other groups.

The two income groups mentioning this item the most were those with incomes under $1,000 and those with incomes over $10,000 with one-half of the former listing this as a concern.

It was of interest to note the white collar workers mentioned concerns in this area more often than did the blue collar workers with almost 40 percent of the former compared to 28 percent of the latter listing this item.

Community Physical Upkeep

The third item of concern, as mentioned by the total group of respondents, was community physical upkeep. This had to do with the poor conditions of streets and roads, the need for sidewalks and sewers and the general appearance of the community. Thirty percent of the women interviewed indicated a concern about this area compared to 20 percent of the men.

The survey indicated those residing in towns or villages under 2,500 population and those living in the suburban area but not in the City of Yuma were most concerned about this subject. About three out of ten in these groups compared to less than 17 percent of those residing on farms mentioned it. Almost one out of four of those living within the City of Yuma felt this was a concern.

Thirty-one percent of those with less than eight grades of school listed this as being of concern compared to less than 12 percent of those with one or more years of

college. There was not a single response to this item from the group whose incomes were over $10,000 while over 35 percent of those with incomes under $1,000 listed this as a concern. Service workers, managers and officials were most concerned about this item while farmers were the least concerned.

Recreation

Another major concern of Yuma County people was recreation. The responses were about equally divided into three categories: Needed recreational facilities for children, for teenagers, and needed recreation facilities in general. There was a sprinkling of responses concerning inadequate television programs and the need for more cultural opportunities.

Again women were more concerned about this item than were the men with over 26 percent of the former responding compared to less than 16 percent of the latter. Respondents under 30 years of age mentioned recreation more often than those over 30 years of age.

This was of major concern to those living in the country, but not on a farm, with over 44 percent mentioning it. It was of least concern to those living on a farm and in the suburbs of Yuma.

Comparing recreation to income groups, it was noted that those with incomes of $10,000 and over listed this item about 35 percent of the time while the balance of the groups

responded from 19 to 21 percent.

There was little difference between educational groups, and their mentioning this concern with the exception that those with less than eight grades of schooling were less concerned than were the other educational groups. There also was little difference between occupational groups mentioning it about 40 percent more than the other occupational groups.

Water and Utilities

Responses concerning this issue had to do mostly with high water rates and the desire for municipal ownership of the water company with a few responses concerning the water situation in general and water rights to the Colorado River water.

There was no difference between the different sexes in mentioning this item. There were no replies from the farm group on this issue and very few from the rural group as a whole, as they responded slightly over five percent compared to 25 percent for the people of Yuma.

Those over 60 mentioned this concern considerably more so than did the other age groups. This was also true of those with incomes under $1,000 and those with less than eight years of schooling. It was mentioned the least by those with incomes over $10,000 and by those with four or more years of college. The occupational groups were fairly consistent in percentage of respondents mentioning this

issue, with the exception of farmers. They mentioned it less than eight percent of the time compared to 20 percent for the total.

Human Relations

Human relationships concerns mentioned consisted of juvenile delinquency problems, family and neighbor relationships, and welfare. Twenty-one percent of the women, compared to slightly over 13 percent of the men, thought this was a concern.

By age, over 31 percent of those 60 years and older mentioned this item compared to less than five percent for those 24 years and under.

Approximately 35 percent of those with four or more years of college listed this as a concern compared to those in the other educational levels who listed it from 11 to 18 percent. Those with incomes of $10,000 and over also listed it more so than did those in the other income levels.

Community Protection

Community protection was listed as a concern by slightly over 11 percent of the respondents. Included under this item were concerns about law enforcement and safety with a few respondents concerned about stray animals and legalized dog racing. Those living on the farm were more concerned about this item than other residential groups. Respondents 60 years old and older, professional people and service workers were also more concerned than were the other age and

occupational groups.

City Government and General Politics

This concern mainly had to do with the need for improvement in these areas and general dissatisfaction of the respondents.

The suburban and farm people listed concerns in these areas more so than the other residential area groups. Those in the age group of 30 to 39 responded more so than did the other age groups. The percentage of responses increased as did income. No one listed this as a concern who had an income under $1,000 compared to almost 22 percent of those with incomes of $10,000 or more.

Hospital, Health and Sanitation

The majority of replies in this category dealt with the inadequacy of hospital service. A few mentioned sanitation conditions and health programs.

This was mentioned the most numerous, percentagewise, by those residing in towns or villages under 2,500 population. It might be assumed this was because of the distance to hospitals in Yuma or other cities and because of the lack of adequate hospital and doctor facilities in these towns.

General Agriculture

Concerns under this category had to do with the farm surplus and farm programs, agricultural research, public relations, drainage problems, and problems with neighbors and others concerning farming operations. This item was

listed more often by farmers than others and by men than women.

Yuma County Citizens' Awareness of Concerns and Methods of Obtaining and Sharing Information

After the respondent mentioned a concern, he was asked whether or not he had any reason to believe other people in his vicinity were concerned about that particular issue. If he answered "Yes," he was asked to indicate whether he had (1) heard people talking about it; (2) talked to people about it; (3) read about it in newspapers or magazines; or (4) or seen it on radio or television programs.

Seventy-two percent of all the replies fell into two categories. Forty-six percent had heard people talking about it and had talked to people about it, while 26 percent had communicated in all four areas. The balance fell into one or a combination of the other categories.

Items which had considerable local publicity by radio, television and newspapers and which the respondents ranked high with all four types of communication were water, city government and politics, religion, taxes, and national and international affairs.

C. ISSUES CONCERNING YUMA COUNTY CITIZENS[9]

In conjunction with the previous question, another question was designed to give respondents an opportunity to study and evaluate 18 public affairs issues of a local, state, national, and international nature. Specifically, the respondents were asked to indicate whether any of the 18 issues were of concern to the people in Yuma County and to indicate their opinion regarding the importance of the issues.

About 95.6 percent of all those interviewed responded to this question and averaged 5.6 items of concern. Of all those responding, 53.4 percent listed employment opportunities, 52.7 percent listed water rights and 48.3 percent listed public schools as concerns of people in their vicinity. It was also evident that the more local the issue, the greater was the percent identifying the issue as a concern to Yuma citizens.

There was a decided similarity in responses to these two questions in the Yuma survey. The main difference was that issues mentioned in the first question were more of a local nature such as community physical upkeep, recreation facilities, human relationships, community protection, local government and politics, and public apathy. Of the 18

---

[9]Hazlitt, Boone, Matthews, Op. Cit., pp. 17-20.

issues listed on the second question, only regulation of communication channels was not mentioned by respondents in question one.

TABLE IX

ISSUES CONCERNING YUMA COUNTY CITIZENS - 1960

Item	% Mentioning Each (281 out of 294)
Employment opportunities	53.4
Water rights	52.7
Public schools	48.3
Property taxation	39.8
Financing education	38.8
Health service and facilities	37.4
Federal taxation	34.4
Transportation	31.6
Public assistance and welfare	30.3
Housing conditions	29.3
Farm programs	27.9
Labor vs industry	22.8
U.S. Foreign Policy	22.1
Zoning	18.4
Communism vs capitalism	17.3
Art and music	14.6
Regulation of communication channels	8.5
United Nations	7.8

Employment Opportunities

The most important item was employment opportunities. Over 53 percent indicated this was an issue in Yuma County. Men were more concerned about this item than were the women. Small town and urban people were more concerned about employment opportunities than those living in the country. Respondents between the ages of 25 and 50 were more concerned about employment opportunities than those under 25 and over 50 years of age. Over 62 percent of the blue collar respon-

dents mentioned this item compared to 55 percent of the white collar respondents.

Water Rights

Water rights was listed as a concern by about 53 percent of the respondents. Men were somewhat more concerned about water rights than were the women. Respondents living in the open country mentioned this item more than those living in small towns and urban areas.

Slightly over 18 percent of the respondents in the age group of 24 years and younger mentioned this item compared to over 53 percent of the other age groups. This concern increased proportionately with years of school completed. Professional workers and farmers were more concerned about water rights than other occupational groups.

Public Schools

There was a substantial difference in responses of the various residential groups mentioning public schools. About 66.5 percent of the rural respondents mentioned public schools as compared to 46.4 percent of the urban people.

Respondents in the 25-29 year old age group listed schools more often than did those in the other groups. Those under 24 and over 50 showed the least concern. The higher the level of schooling and income, the greater was the percentage of respondents that identified schools as a concern to people. Schools were mentioned more by professional people than by other occupational groups.

Property Taxation

Approximately 40 percent of all those interviewed listed property taxation as being of concern to people in this area. Men were more concerned about this issue than were the women. This item was of the least concern to those 60 years and older and those with incomes under $2,500. Property taxation was of more concern to the farmers and white collar workers than it was to the blue collar workers, retired and unemployed.

Financing Education

Men were more concerned about financing education than were the women, and the rural groups were more concerned than were the urban people. Respondents under 24 years and over 60 years of age were least concerned about the problem of financing education. In general, this was of more concern to people as their educational and income levels increased. The professional people were considerably more concerned about this item than were the other occupational groups.

Health Service and Facilities

Health service and facilities was ranked high as a concern to Yuma citizens by the interviewees between the ages of 25-29. The white collar workers, retired persons and farmers had a larger percentage of responses to this item than did the blue collar workers and the unemployed.

Federal Taxation

Federal taxation concerned those living in the country, but not on a farm, much more than the other residential groups with 70 percent of the former replying compared to 34 percent of the groups as a whole. Those with some college education responded to this subject more often percentagewise than did those with high school education or less. There was a relationship between responses to this item and the level of income. The higher the level of income the greater was the number mentioning federal taxation as a concern of people. It was of more importance to the white collar workers and farmers than it was to the blue collar workers.

Transportation

Transportation was of the most concern to the women, the urban groups, those over 60 and white collar workers. This concern also increased proportionately with education and ranked highest with the high income group. The city of Yuma does not have a public transportation system.

Public Assistance and Welfare

Public assistance and welfare increased in percentage of responses as age of the respondents increased. It also was mentioned more often by those with less than eight grades of schooling and by those with incomes under $1,000. The farmers replied to this item more than did the other occupational groups.

Farm Programs

Over 55 percent of the rural people identified farm programs as being an item of concern compared to about 22 percent of the urban people. The implication may be that the urban people lack understanding about farm programs in general even though they are substantially dependent upon the agricultural enterprise in the county. In general, the percentage of responses to this item increased as education and income levels increased. A difference regarding responses was evident in the occupational groups. Six out of ten of the farmers felt that farm programs were of concern in relation to 42 percent of the white collar workers and slightly less than 22 percent of the blue collar workers.

Labor vs Industry

Almost 23 percent of those interviewed felt that labor vs industry was a concern to Yuma citizens. Male respondents were more concerned about this item than female respondents. This issue concerned those in the 30-39 year old age group, those with four years or more of college and those with incomes over $10,000 more than those in corresponding groups. About 32.9 percent of the blue collar workers mentioned this item compared to 22.6 percent of the white collar workers.

U. S. Foreign Policy

Men were more concerned about U. S. Foreign Policy than women. Most of the respondents who indicated that this was a major concern were under 24 years of age, had completed

high school or college work, and had incomes exceeding $7,000. Farmers and white collar workers mentioned U.S. Foreign Policy as a concern more than other occupational groups.

Zoning

Zoning was of major concern to the urban people and those in the highest education and income levels. It was also of more concern to the white collar workers than blue collar workers and farmers.

Communism vs Capitalism

Over twice as many men as women responded to Communism vs Capitalism. It was of interest to note that those under 24 years old and those over 60 years mentioned this more than did the other age groups.

D. YUMA COUNTY CITIZENS' PARTICIPATION IN SOLUTION OF PROBLEM AREAS[10]

After the interviewees had the opportunity to fully express themselves about things concerning people and to indicate whether or not 18 selected public affairs and community improvement issues were of concern to people, they were shown the card of the 18 issues and asked this question: "Did you as an individual, or with others, try to do something about any of the things you mentioned or the items listed on this card?"

TABLE X

PARTICIPATION OF YUMA COUNTY PEOPLE IN SOLUTION OF PROBLEM AREAS

Response	% (283 out of 294)
Yes, as an individual	9.2
Yes, with others	19.4
No	70.7
Don't remember	17

Slightly less than three out of 10 people had tried to do something about the things that they felt were of concern to people in their vicinity. Of the total respondents about one out of 10 had tried to do something as an individual, while two out of 10 indicated that they had worked with others on some of the concerns.

[10] Ibid., pp. 19-20.

Thirty-five percent of those interviewed who belonged to some type of an organization had tried to do something about the identified problems as compared to 13 percent who did not belong to an organization. The least active group attempting to work on certain concerns were the respondents who had lived in Yuma County less than one year.

Rural people were more active in working on concerns than urban residents. About 44 percent of the rural people compared to 25 percent of the urban people had tried to do something about some of the issues. Those persons with high school education or more were more active in working on concerns than those having less than a high school education. As income increased so did activity, with less than 13 percent of those with income under $1,000 working on problems compared to 39 percent of those with incomes over $10,000.

It is worthy to note that while the majority of those interviewed expressed themselves as having concern over a number of problems and issues facing the community, less than three out of ten had reportedly done anything in attempting to alleviate these problems.

E. KNOWLEDGE OF AND PARTICIPATION OF YUMA COUNTY PEOPLE IN EXTENSION ACTIVITIES[11]

The Yuma County Cooperative Extension Office is located in the City of Yuma and is presently staffed with nine agents. The average tenure of the total Yuma Extension staff, at the time of the survey, was 2.5 years. Three of the staff members had been in the county for four years, while the tenure of the others ranged from six months to two and one-half years.

In the past, the duties of the agents were broken into three areas: 4-H Club Work, Home Economics and Agriculture. The agricultural agents primarily spent their time in the field of agricultural efficiency.

Prior to determining the people's reactions to Extension working in these problem areas it was desirous to obtain their knowledge of and participation in Extension. It is well to point out that at the time of the survey, the people interviewed had no knowledge to the fact that the Extension Service was conducting the survey.

Acquaintance with Extension

The first question asked in regard to the people's acquaintance with Extension was: "Do you know the County or Home Agents in this county? If yes, do you remember any of

their names?"

Of the 294 interviewed, three out of ten named one or more of the agents.

A larger percentage of people residing on farms knew an agent compared to the general population. Seven out of ten of the farmers knew one or more of the agents. The percentage knowing an agent increased with age, with eleven percent of the respondents between 15 and 24 years knowing an agent compared to 21 percent in the 25-29 age group. Thirty-three percent of those over 30 years of age could name an agent. A larger percentage of the respondents in the higher income brackets knew an agent than tid those in lower income brackets. One out of two with incomes of $7,000 and over could name an agent in relation to only 16 percent of those with incomes under $7,000. A similar relationship held true with educational status. Seven out of ten with four or more years of college knew at least one agent as compared to six percent with less than five years of education. Seventy-three percent of the farmers and farm managers, 66 percent of the professional group and 7 percent of the laborers knew an agent. Tenure in Yuma County had some bearing on whether or not people knew an agent. Only three percent of those living in Yuma County under one year knew one; 31 percent of those living in the county from one to ten years knew an agent; while 35 percent of those living in the county over ten years knew one of the agents.

When asked to describe the responsibilities of the

County Agent, 55 percent indicated that he worked with farmers, homemakers and 4-H Club members. About two percent had him confused with other agencies, while the balance had no knowledge of agents' responsibilities.

Slightly over 46 percent of those interviewed said they knew how the County Agent's work was financed; however, less than six percent knew that all three levels of government --county, state and national--were involved. The balance knew that Extension work was tax supported by one form or another.

Another question was designed to obtain different types of contacts the people may have had with the Extension Service. The interviewees were handed a card with several different contact possibilities. The question read: "I have here a card with a list of activities that the Extension workers carry on. I mean the different ways the agents work with families. I will go through the list and you can just answer yes or no to each."

TABLE XI

CONTACTS WITH EXTENSION ACTIVITIES
BY YUMA COUNTY PEOPLE DURING 1959

Response	% Answering
Seen 4-H or Home Economics Exhibit	67.0
Seen 4-H Members Project	60.5
Read Extension Article in Paper	53.7
Heard on Radio or TV	44.9
Received Extension Bulletin	22.8
Attended Extension Meeting	16.0
Received Letter	14.3
Agent Visited Home	12.6
Visited Office	12.2
Phone Conversation	12.2
Belong to Home Economics Group	3.4
4-H Leader	2.4
Other Contacts	2.7
No Contacts at All	18.7

Over eight out of ten interviewed had some sort of an Extension contact during the past year. Sixty-seven percent of those interviewed had seen a 4-H or Home Economics exhibit while 60.5 percent had seen a 4-H member's project. It was assumed the majority of these contacts were made at the County Fair. This posed the question of how many people had Extension contacts excluding exhibits and 4-H members' projects. A further analysis showed that 7 out of 10 interviewed had some type of an Extension contact in areas other than 4-H or Home Economics exhibits or projects.

There are three newspapers in Yuma County--a small town weekly in Northern Yuma County; a farm weekly and a daily published in Yuma. Other information behicles include four radio stations and one television station. The agents have regular programs on two of the radio stations and at

one time had programs on the television station. The study showed almost 54 percent of the people interviewed had read an Extension article in a newspaper and 45 percent had heard or seen an gent's program on radio or television.

In general, a larger percentage of women respondents had contacts than did the men. Of all types of Extension contacts the men had a higher percentage of responses in visiting the agent's office, reading an Extension article in the paper and attending an Extension meeting. The women had a higher percentage of responses in all other types of Extension contacts.

Persons residing on farms or ranches ranked considerably higher than any of the other residence groups in regard to all the different types of Extension contacts. All of those interviewed living on a farm had some Extension contact last year as compared to 90 percent of those living in the country, but not on a farm; 83 percent of those in towns under 2,500 population; 80 percent of those living in Yuma; and 75 percent of the suburban people. It was of interest to note that of the total Yuma City people interviewed over 45 percent had heard or seen an agent on radio or television and over 50 percent had read an Extension article. Fifty-eight percent had seen a 4-H member project and over 60 percent had seen a 4-H or Home Economics exhibit. About 10 percent of the city people had visited the Extension office, had a phone conversation with an agent, had an agent visit their home, received a letter from an Extension

worker or attended an Extension meeting.

In practically every instance there was a positive relationship between the amount of education or income of the respondents and percentage of Extension contacts. Of those with less than eight grades of schooling, 43 percent had no Extension contact while only three percent of those with four years or more of college had no contact. Of those interviewed with less than $2,500 income over 40 percent had no Extension contact while everyone with over $10,000 income had some contact. Seven percent of those in the $5,000 to $9,999 income range had no contact while 26 percent of those with incomes in the $2,500 to $4,999 income bracket had no Extension contact.

Those living in Yuma County less than one year had the fewest Extension contacts. Three in four of those residing in Yuma from one to five years had contacts with Extension while nine in ten of those with five to twenty-five years tenure had Extension contacts.

The Extension Service is well known throughout the county as indicated by the findings. The findings indicated that a large percentage of respondents had contacts with the Extension Service during the past year.

F. ATTITUDES ABOUT AGENTS WORKING IN PROBLEM AREAS[12]

One of the most important questions asked of the people concerning the possible future role of Extension programs was: "From what you know about the people in this county, how do you think they would feel about agents working with people on problems and issues such as those listed on the cards I showed you a few minutes ago?"

TABLE XII

ATTITUDES OF RESPONDENTS ABOUT AGENTS WORKING IN COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS EDUCATION

Response	Percent
Would Approve	68.0
Would Disapprove	8.8
No Opinion	21.8
No Response	1.4

Sixty-eight percent of the total group interviewed approved of agents working in these areas while about 22 percent did not express themselves one way or another. Of those actually having an opinion one way or another, almost nine out of ten approved. In the Corry Community, Pennsylvania, Study concerning a similar question with 103 interviewees, 57 would approve, 3 would disapprove, 25 didn't

[12] Ibid., pp. 25-26.

know, and 18 had no answer.[13]

Of those in Yuma County who disapproved the typical comments were: they have enough to do at the present time without doing this sort of work; they should not become involved in politics; and this type of work is out of the agents' line. Those approving thought there was a definite need for assistance in these areas and thought the County Agent was well qualified to assume responsibility.

It was noted that membership in organizations was associated with respondents' attitudes regarding agents working on public affairs issues and community improvement problems as compared to 57 percent of those who were not members of an organization. Too, a slightly larger percent of those holding leadership positions in organizations favored the idea of agents working on public affairs-community improvement type educational programs than those who were only members of an organization.

While less than one-third of those interviewed knew an agent by name, seventy percent of those knowing him endorsed the idea of county agents working in this type of an educational program. Three-fourths of those who had had Extension contacts felt that agents should work on public affairs-community improvement problems as contrasted to 40 percent of those who had had no contacts with Extension.

---

[13]Correspondence from John W. Bergstrom, Program Consultant, Erie County Agricultural Extension Association, Erie, Pennsylvania.

Place of residence was associated with respondents' attitudes regarding agents' participation in such programs. Over four-fifths of the interviewees residing in rural areas in relation to less than 65 percent of those residing in urban areas approved of agents working on public affairs-community improvement educational programs.

A larger percent of respondents in the high income brackets approved of agents working on this type educational program than did those in lower income brackets. Seventy percent of the respondents with incomes over $7,000 approved compared to 62 percent of those with income less than $2,500.

Eight out of ten of the respondents who had completed one or more years of college indicated that agents should work with people in these problem areas, while less than six in 10 with no high school education approved.

In general, it can be concluded that Yuma County citizens approved of the idea of broadening the Extension program to include public affairs-community improvement types of programs.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to seek information which would be helpful in guiding Extension programs and policies for the future. In this pursuit, a review of literature concerning opinions and attitudes of others was made. Also a study of the concerns and issues as seen by 294 Yuma County citizens as well as their attitudes on whether or not the Extension Service should be working on these problems was conducted.

The results of this study, the review of opinions and the results of other studies provide the basis for the following summary of findings, implications and recommendations.

A. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

At the time of the conception of the Land Grant Colleges and later the Cooperative Extension Service, the population of the United States was predominantly rural. The major problem these people faced was in the area of agricultural production.

Agricultural research, technological changes and education have been responsible, to a considerable degree, in the increased productivity of a farm unit. Today the

average farm worker in the United States produces enough food and fiber for himself and 23 others. At the turn of the century he produced enough for himself and six others. During this period migration of rural people to the metropolitan areas had been prevalent. It is now estimated that less than ten percent of the total population reside on farms.

The society of today is an industrial one and not agrarian. The vast technological changes, population increases and movements, and the overall shrinkage of the world due to transportation and communication developments have created many social, political, economical and psychological problems.

Hypothesis II of this thesis was: The problems and needs of the people are varied and extend to a much greater extent beyond the areas in which Cooperative Extension has traditionally been working.

In pursuing this hypothesis a study was made of 294 Yuma County, Arizona, citizens in regard to their concerns. Sixty-three percent of their concerns fell into the categories of schools, employment and industry, community physical upkeep, recreation, and water. Outside of about 5.5 percent who mentioned concerns in general agriculture and less than two percent who mentioned high cost of living, all the concerns mentioned were in the general area of community needs or public affairs.

The study showed that concerns as listed above applied to both urban and rural people. The urban people were

more concerned than the rural people in matters dealing with employment and industry and water and utilities. The rural people were more concerned than the urban people on concerns dealing with schools, recreation, government and politics, community protection, health and agriculture.

The study undertaken in Corry Community, Pennsylvania, showed comparable concerns. Practically all of their concerns were also in the general area of community needs or public affairs.

In addition to asking the Yuma people what their specific concerns were, they were also given the opportunity to study 18 public affairs issues of local, state, national and international nature, and asked to indicate if any of these were of concern to Yuma County people. Over 95 percent of all those interviewed responded to this question and the group responding listed an average of 5.6 items as being of concern to Yuma County people.

The U. S. D. A. bibliography of selected references concerning urbanization and changing land uses showed 1,319 studies and papers mainly dealing with areas of community improvement and public affairs. It appears that there is ample evidence that the problems and needs of the people are varied.

Extension accomplishments in 1959 indicated that 67 percent of agricultural agents' time was devoted to agricultural or related projects in comparison to less than six percent of their time being devoted to community improvement

and public affairs. At the state level, outside of Kansas, Missouri, Utah and Michigan, less than one percent of the total states Extension specialist force were listed as working in the fields of community improvement, or development, and public affairs. While it is realized that other states have individuals working in these fields, the implication remains that the fields of community improvement and public affairs constitute a minor portion of Extension's effort.

Even though the Extension Service has increased the scope of its clientele to include services to urban families, "... these services have followed Extension's tradition, shifting mainly in the sense of doing the old things for new people. Even in agricultural work 40 percent (1958) of the assisted families were urban; they were given advice on how to grow better lawns and rose bushes."[1] Therefore it appears that there is ample evidence to support Hypothesis II. That is: The problems and needs of the people are varied and extend to a much greater extent beyond the area in which Cooperative Extension has traditionally been working.

Hypothesis III was: The people of a community are desirous of the help Cooperative Extension could give in helping them to meet their problems and needs.

The Yuma study showed that the people had many varied concerns, yet the majority failed to attempt to do something about them. Of the total respondents about one in ten had

---

[1] Warren Rovetch, Op. Cit., pp. 216-217.

tried to do something as an individual and two in ten indicated that they had worked with others on some of the concerns.

The study also showed that over 80 percent of those interviewed had some sort of an Extension contact during the past year, hence, they had some knowledge of the Extension Service even though it may have been limited.

When asked if they would approve or disapprove of County Agents working on their problems and issues, nine in ten of those having definite opinions approved. Of the total group interviewed, 68 percent approved of Extension Agents working on their problems and issues, less than nine percent disapproved and about 22 percent did not express themselves one way or another.

In the Corry Community study 95 percent of those having definite opinions on the question of agents working on their problems indicated approval.

In Michigan Cornett found that eight in ten of those having definite opinions favored Extension Agents increasing their educational efforts on public programs as zoning, taxation, community development, health, etc.

Biever in Wisconsin and Cornett also indicated the people's approval of broadening the scope of clientele to include more urban people and work in Extension program offerings.

In the Yuma study over four-fifths of the interviewees

residing in rural areas in relation to less than 65 percent of those residing in urban areas approved of agents working on public affairs educational programs. Also, three-fourths of those who had had Extension contacts felt that agents should work on public affairs problems as contrasted to 40 percent of those who had had no contacts with Extension.

In view of the preceding, Hypothesis III has been developed. That is: The people of a community are desirous of the help Cooperative Extension could give in helping them to meet their problems and needs.

Therefore, if the people of a community are desirous of the help Cooperative Extension could give in helping them to meet their problems and needs; and the problems and needs of the people are varied and extend to a much greater extent beyond the areas in which Cooperative Extension has traditionally been working, then Hypothesis I is developed. That is: It will be necessary for the Cooperative Extension Service to broaden the scope of its program offerings from the traditional offerings of the past if the Extension Service is going to help people help themselves in adjusting to change, in meeting their needs, and in solving their problems.

B. IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Because of the momentous changes that rural America has undergone, Rovetch, in his analysis of the Cooperative Extension Service, visualizes three alternatives as to the future of the Extension Service.

> The first to close down Cooperative Extension with a suitable commendation for a job well done and now virtually completed.
>
> A second "solution" is to ignore, to the extent that it is still feasible, the changes that have taken place and to continue along the old road.
>
> The third alternative is to adapt more basically to the changed circumstances, following the population both to greater literacy and to cities.[2]

The development of the hypotheses implies that there are many needs of a community in which the people desire help; and in order for these needs to be met by the Extension Service it will be necessary for Extension to broaden the scope of its program offerings. This compares favorably with Rovetch's third alternative.

Since its inception, the Cooperative Extension Service has been credited with being flexible. As such it has met various challenges throughout the years and has emerged as a strong and respected institution. However, constant adjustment is essential for survival and efficient function. Failure to adjust means almost certain deterioration and

---

[2] Ibid., pp. 215-217.

possible extinction.

At the present time the General Extension Service, in several states, is developing programs which are attempting to meet community needs in much the same manner as are the rural development programs of the Cooperative Extension Service. There is also a growing demand for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to enter into this field in both rural and urban communities as a "... major rallying point for stimulating and assisting citizen action to improve the quality of our family and community life."[3] Added to these are the efforts of the labor unions to obtain federal help for education.

The Cooperative Extension Service is unique in that it has personnel in practically every county of the United States doing educational work in conjunction with the Land Grant Colleges. Duplication of efforts by other organizations appears wasteful--providing the Cooperative Extension Service can adjust to meet the needs these agencies strive to meet.

To more fully utilize the potential of the Cooperative Extension Service framework, their personnel and the universities, it would appear logical for the Cooperative Extension and General Extension Services to coordinate or combine efforts. In this manner the County Agents' office

---

[3]John H. Moore, "Community Action" Conference Proceedings: 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth. (Washington, D. C.) p. 119.

could truly become the front door of the university at the county level. At the present time such combinations have been accomplished in the states of Kansas, Utah and Missouri. In addition, Michigan has a combination program in the Upper Peninsula Counties in relation to their resource development program and Montana and other states are studying the possibility.

While the farm population is diminishing, it is far from becoming extinct. Agricultural production will be of paramount importance as more and more people will need food and fiber in future years. Technical agricultural information to the farm people will still be essential. Much of this information can be supplied by private industrial resources such as bankers, fertilizer, insecticide, feed and machinery dealers. Agents, specialized in much the same manner as are our present state specialists, could still be available to the farm people. However, in this day of rapid transportation and communication, this agent could be responsible for an area larger than our present counties. In order to keep abreast of the latest technical developments, this agent probably should be connected directly to his specialty department at the Land Grant Institution.

Under such an organizational structure, the county or community agent would be more a generalist. One of his principal duties would be that of a coordinator. He would be a central point from whence calls and problems would be diffused and channeled to their proper places for action.

Not only would the agent have direct lines to the universities, but also to private, public and human resources. He need not be an expert in everything as long as he knows or can discover those who are.

For such an evolution to take place, it appears that county agents, state specialists, extension directors, college deans, university presidents, special interest groups, and others will have to take a long, hard, critical look at extension and themselves and perhaps they will need to develop new understanding in regard to extension's potential and future. It is logical to assume that if the Cooperative Extension Service does not adjust to meet the needs of the people, some other educational organization will evolve or adjust to do so.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

It is realized that the studies and opinions presented in this paper represent only a small faction of the total. Further studies are recommended in the following:

1. Surveys of various communities throughout the nation on people's concerns and needs.
2. More specific information on the relative importance of these concerns and needs and whether they are of enough importance to the people to promote action.
3. Studies of the opinions of the people on the desirability of Extension working in these areas.
4. Surveys of the total Extension Service's involvement in meeting community improvement and public affairs needs.
5. Surveys of attitudes of university presidents, college of agriculture deans and extension directors in regard to overall, coordinated educational programs for the communities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Blakely, Robert J. "What is Adult Education," Handbook of Adult Education in the United States. Edited by Malcolm S. Knowles. Chicago: Adult Education Association, 1960.

Bogue, Donald I. The Population of the United States. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1959.

Brunner, Edmund de S. and Yang, E. Hsin Poo. Rural America and the Extension Service. New York: Columbia University Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, 1949.

Clark, R. C. and Abraham, R. H. Ed. Administration in Extension. Madison: National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study, University of Wisconsin, 1960.

Hallenbeck, Wilbur C. "The Function and Place of Adult Education in American Society," Handbook of Adult Education in the United States. Edited by Malcolm S. Knowles. Chicago: Adult Education Association, 1960.

Kelsey, L. D. and Hearne, C. C. Cooperative Extension Work. Ithaca, New York: Comstock Publishing Company, 1949.

Knowles, Malcolm S. Informal Adult Education. New York: Association Press, 1950.

Liveright, A. A. Strategies of Leadership in Conducting Educational Programs. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Manning, D. W. and Levine, S. Elementary Statistics for Journalists. New York: The MacMillan Company, 2nd Printing, 1959.

Matthews, J. L. "The Cooperative Extension Service," Handbook of Adult Education in the United States. Edited by Malcolm S. Knowles. Chicago: Adult Education Association, 1960.

McClusky, Howard Y. "Community Development," Handbook of Adult Education in the United States. Edited by Malcolm S. Knowles. Chicago: Adult Education Association, 1960.

Moore, John H. "Community Action" Conference Proceedings: 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth. Washington: 1960.

Rovetch, Warren. "Cooperative Extension and the Land-Grant System in University Adult Education," University Adult Education A Guide to Policy. Renee and William Peterson. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Periodicals

Brunsman, H. G. and Shyrock, H. S. "Population Migration--Who's Moving Where?" Appraisal Journal, XXV, January, 1957.

Carew, John. "The Role of the Extension Specialist in Agriculture," Farm Policy Forum, XI, No. 4, 1958-1959.

County Agents Directory. 45th Edition. Chicago: C. L. Mast, Jr., and Associates, 1960.

Hutchison, John E. "A Responsibility and a Challenge," Extension Service Review, XXX, No. 10, October, 1959.

Kaufman, Harold F. and Others. "Concerns of Adult Education in Mississippi," Adult Education, Vol. VIII, No. 1, Autumn, 1957.

Miller, Paul A. "Adjustments Needed in Extension's Thinking," Journal of Farm Economics, XLI, No. 5, December 1959.

U. S. Bureau of the Census, County and City Data Book: 1956. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1957.

U. S. D. A. The Yearbook of Agriculture: 1958, Land. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1958.

Wilkening, E. A. "Consensus in Role Definition of County Extension Agents Between the Agents and Local Sponsoring Committee Members," Rural Sociology, XXVIII, No. 2, June 1958.

Bulletins and Circulars

Center for Agricultural and Economic Adjustment. Some Selected Papers on Goals and Values in Agricultural Policy. Presented at the Ames Conference, June 27-29, 1960. (Duplicated by permission of the Center, U.S.D.A., Federal Extension Service, AEP-96, 1960.)

_____. Agricultural Adjustment: A Challenge and Opportunity for Land Grant Colleges. Iowa State University, Center for Agricultural and Economic Adjustment, AAC-66, 1960.

_____. A Statement on a Possible Role for Cooperative Extension in Relation to Agricultural Adjustment Problems and Changing American Society. Iowa State University, Center for Agriculture and Economic Adjustment, AAC-78.

Erie County Agricultural Extension Association and Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology. Corry Community as Seen by Its People. Pennsylvania State University Extension Studies No. 6, September 1960.

Farm Foundation. Increasing Understanding of Public Problems and Policies. (Major Discussions of the Eighth National Agricultural Policy Conference.) Chicago: Farm Foundation, 1958.

Houle, Cyril O. Major Trends in Higher Adult Education. No. 24. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1959.

Hazlitt, J. R., Boone, E. J. and Matthews, J. L. A Study of Public Affairs and Leadership Development Yuma County, Arizona. The University of Arizona Cooperative Extension Service, 1960.

Jaccard, C. R. The Development of Public Affairs Education in the Extension Service. U. S. D. A., Federal Extension Service, AEP-103, 1957.

U. S. D. A. Urbanization and Changing Land Uses: A Bibliography of Selected References, 1950-1958. Miscellaneous Publication No. 825. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

_____. Federal Extension Service. A Guide to Extension Programs for the Future. North Carolina State College Agricultural Extension Service, 1959.

_____. Federal Extension Service. MO 246, September, 1959.

_____. Extension Activities and Accomplishments: 1959. U. S. D. A. Extension Circular No. 531, July 1960.

_____. Public Relations Inventory of the Cooperative Extension Service. U. S. D. A. Extension Service, October 1951.

_____. The Cooperative Extension Service Today: A Statement of Scope and Responsibility. U. S. D. A. Extension Service, 1958.

U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1959 Census of Agriculture - Preliminary. Washington: Bureau of the Census, 1961.

Wilkening, Eugene A. The County Agent in Wisconsin: Perceptions of Role Definitions as Viewed by Agents. University of Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station Research Bulletin 203, 1957.

Unpublished Material

Biever, J. L. "Roles of County Extension Agents as Perceived by County Agricultural Committee Members in Wisconsin," Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1957.

Cornett, E. M. "A Study of Public Concepts Related to the Role of Cooperative Extension Service," Unpublished M.S. Thesis, Michigan State University, 1958.

Miller, Paul A. "Cooperative Extension Work in the Industrializing Society," Unpublished Manuscript, Michigan State University, 1959.

Other Sources

Aldrich, Daniel D., Jr. "Implications of Agricultural Adjustment for Land Grant Colleges." Paper read at Southwest Agricultural Adjustment Conference, Tucson, Arizona, October 12, 1960.

Bergstrom, John W., Program Consultant, FAE-CES Project, Erie County, Pennsylvania, Personal correspondence.

Fisher, Joseph L. "Cities and Resources for the Future." Paper read before the 66th Conference on Government, Phoenix, Arizona, November 14, 1960.

Hannah, John A., President, Michigan State University. Personal correspondence.

Kline, Allan B. Address at FAE-CES Seminar, Michigan State University, July 13, 1959.

Matthews, J. L. Address at Program Development Conference, University of Arizona, October 3, 1959.

Miller, Paul A. Address at FAE-CES Seminar, Michigan State University, August 17, 1959.

Suggitt, Frank W. "The Broad Problems of Rural Communities." Paper read at the North Central Extension Directors Meeting, Kansas State University, September 20, 1960.

Federal Extension Service
USDA

INSTRUCTIONS FOR INTERVIEWERS

Yuma County, Arizona, Pilot Program Benchmark Survey

The main purpose of this survey is to obtain information to establish a benchmark regarding the present status of the people's knowledge, understanding and attitudes toward certain citizenship activities and public affairs issues. The specific objectives of the benchmark survey are as follows:

1. To determine present status of public affairs education and participation, including:

    a. Level of awareness of public affairs issues, current or continuing.
    b. Interest in public affairs issues.
    c. Participation in organization or action.
    d. Leadership status and experience.

2. To assess the attitudes toward certain government programs, such as:

    - Government farm programs
    - The Extension Service

3. To determine attitudes about rural-urban and farm nonfarm relationships.

4. To assess awareness of opportunities for participation in and sources of information on public affairs issues.

5. To determine extent of participation in educational programs or activities, such as:

    Extension organization - home demonstration, 4-H Club, commodity groups.

    Knowing about Extension - perception and role.

The Sample

The information is to be collected by personal interview with a randomly selected cross-section sample in the urban and rural areas of Yuma County. The sample was drawn from telephone directories and lists of residents covering substantially all of the permanent residents of the country.

Outline of the interviewer's job:

1. Familiarize yourself with these instructions.

2. Become proficient in this use of questionnaire.

3. Be sure you have all the needed maps, forms, etc., before you go to the field to contact respondents.

4. Make sure that you have located and identified the right person to interview.

5. When you have properly located the residence of the person to be interviewed fill out the appropriate spaces at the top of the questionnaire indicating date and time of call(s).

6. If the person you seek is not at home on the first call, follow the procedure that was given to you for call backs until you have obtained an interview or until you have made at least three attempts to get the interview.

7. When you have completed an interview check back over the questionnaire item by item to see that (1) you have made an entry in each response item and (2) that your entries are legible and consistent.

Not-at-homes and others who can't be interviewed:

Our goal is to obtain an interview from every person in the sample. This may call for some ingenuity on your part. If you find no one at home you should inquire from a neighbor as to the time when the person you seek can most likely be found. If the first call is made at one hour, time the second one for a different hour. If children are at home, learn the time when the parent is likely to be at home. If the man or woman is too busy to be interviewed at the time you call, make an appointment for a time that will be convenient. Record the date and hour of each visit to the sample address in the spaces provided on the questionnaire. After having made three careful attempts to locate a respondent without having found him or her, write "not at home," the date and hour in the last line of the call record and make no further effort to get a schedule.

Questionnaire entries:

Careful and legible entries are essential. If it best to use a medium or soft pencil. Every item on the questionnaire requires an entry. If the question calls for a check mark or other entry locate it so that there will be no question as to which category it was intended for.

Make notes on the questionnaire regarding any unusual circumstances that affect the entries. Also make other comments that may be useful in analyzing the results. You need not be concerned about giving too much information.

Try to keep "don't know" and "no answer" entries to a minimum by probing for an estimate when the respondent hesitates to answer.

Interviewing:

Based on experiences in pretesting the questionnaire, complete interviews will require an average of about one hour each.

Each interviewer should study the "Instructions for Interviewers." Whenever an interviewing problem arises, ask Dr. Boone for help.

In general, whenever we contact a person to obtain information we must create an interest in the study and a willingness to cooperate. This means persuading the respondents of the importance of the study. They must have confidence both in the objectives of the study and in the interviewer as a person. An honest, simple, and friendly approach is the best way to do this.

Suggested introduction:

The introduction on the questionnaire should satisfy most persons whom you will contact. Avoid identifying yourself with the local extension office so as not to bias the responses to questions 5 and 6.

If there is any hesitancy, it is well to stress the confidential nature of the interview. It is sometimes helpful to encourage the prospective respondent by adding: "I'm sure you'll find some of the questions interesting and I know your answers can be of great help to us."

Every interviewing situation is different. Each situation is new and challenging. This means the interviewer should adapt his approach to fit the circumstances.

Remember that your errand is a friendly and constructive one, and that it can be - and usually is - as interesting to the respondent as it is to you.

Do not try to "educate" the respondent, however. Leave this to the local Extension Service. The vast majority of people are friendly and enjoy talking about their homes, their families, and themselves. If the interviewer is at ease and puts the respondent at ease, the stage is ordinarily set for a good interview.

Getting accurate answers:

Ask each question as it is worded on the schedule. Sometimes this may not be possible but changes in wording should be kept to a minimum. To change the wording of some questions may also change the meaning conveyed to the respondent and in turn affect the answer.

To obtain adequate answers it is sometimes necessary to use probing questions. Either the original question can be repeated, a neutral question may be asked, or a reassuring statement made. One of the most common

errors in probing is to suggest an answer to the respondent. When he hesitates the interviewer should not suggest an answer to him. Give him or her time to think. One of the best "probes" is to repeat the question.

The schedule is divided into several parts dealing with different subjects. It is desirable to make a transition statement between these parts so as to help the respondent to think in terms of the new subject. Such statements help to make the interview more natural and informal.

Closing the interview:

When the interview is finished thank the respondent for his or her cooperation. If more time has been required than you had indicated at the beginning of the interview, apologize and express your hope that it may have proven interesting.

It is important to leave a good impression. If the schedule is in any way incomplete, inaccurate, or inconsistent, you may be asked to call again in the next day or two in order to get additional information. (There is also the possibility - even likelihood - that the respondent will "spread the word" by telephone as soon as you leave.)

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

General Instruction:

The portions that appear on the questionnaire typed all in capital letters and underlined are instructions to you as the interviewer and are not to be read to the person who is being interviewed.

Comments, suggestions and explanations, where they appear desirable, are given below opposite the appropriate question numbers.

1a. Is to find out what people think are some of the things that concern the general public in Yuma County.

1b. Is to find out the extent to which the respondent thinks the concern is shared by others and the basis for whatever response is given.

2. This table is to record the answers of the respondents to the items that are listed on the deck of 18 cards. Hand the deck, arranged in any order, to the respondent, ask him to look at each card and answer questions (1) and (2). Call the respondent's attention to any that are skipped in going through the deck, making sure you obtain two responses for each item he selects.

3. This series of questions is intended to find out about any action taken or attempted by this respondent individually on any of the items he or she mentioned or any of the 18 in the deck of cards.

The purpose of the d. part of this question is to find out if the respondent is a member of any group or organization that has as one of its purposes making improvements or doing something about any of the things he mentioned or that are listed on the cards. It is to find out about any groups or organizations concerned with such issues, the respondent's participation in such and his perception of its results.

5. Is to find out if the respondent knows the county extension agent, how he or she became acquainted and the perception of extension work. The subparts are to find out if there is identification with the University of Arizona and to check on role definitions in relation to public problems and issues.

7-11. Are to find out about farm-city attitudes and attitudes toward government farm programs.

13-22. Are to find out the local attitudes and positions on certain items suggested by the county staff.

24-29. Are to get information about the respondents for analyzing the data.

Federal Extension Service
U. S. Dept. of Agriculture

Budget Bureau No. 40-6003.1
Approval Expires 3/15/60

YUMA COUNTY, ARIZONA, PROGRAM BENCHMARK SURVEY

Interviewer _____ Questionnaire No. _____

Sample Segment No. ___(1) ___(2) ___(3)

Card No. _____

Name of person interviewed:

_____

Call No.	Date	Time
1	_____	_____ am pm
2	_____	_____ am pm
3	_____	_____ am pm

Sex: _____ (1) Male _____ (2) Female

Address _____

INTRODUCTION: I am helping with a survey that is being made by the University of Arizona. The purpose is to obtain information to use in planning an educational program in Yuma County. The answers you give will be confidential and used only to add in with the answers given by other people who are being interviewed in this county.

I want to ask you a few questions to find out what citizens like yourself think are important.

1a. What would you say are two or three things that people in your vicinity should be concerned about?

(1) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

No answer _____

b. Have you any reason to believe that other people in your vicinity are now concerned about (item mentioned)?

___ (1) Yes ___(2) No ___(3) Don't know

IF YES, Have you:

___(1) Heard people talking about it?

___(2) Talked with people about it?

___(3) Read about it in newspapers or magazines?

___(4) Heard or seen it on radio or T.V. programs?

	___(5) Other WRITE IN _____
(2) _____	___(1) Yes ___ (2) No ___ (3) Don't know IF YES, Have you: ___ (1) Heard people talking about it? ___ (2) Talked with people about it? ___ (3) Read about it in newspapers or magazines? ___ (4) Heard or seen it on radio or T.V. programs? ___ (5) Other WRITE IN _____
(3) _____	___(1) Yes ___ (2) No ___ (3) Don't know IF YES, have you: ___ (1) Heard people talking about it? ___ (2) Talked with people about it? ___ (3) Read about it in newspapers or magazines? ___ (4) Heard or seen it on radio or T.V. programs? ___ (5) Other WRITE IN _____

2. Maybe you have an idea about whether one or more of these HAND CARDS are of concern to people around here. Look over the items on the cards and tell me (1) which ones in your opinion are of concern to people around here, and (2) how important do you think the selected items are.

Instructions: CHECK "YES" RESPONSES ONLY

Item No.	Is this of concern to people around here?	IF YES: How important do you think it is?			IF VERY IMPORTANT OR IMPORTANT? Why do you say that?
	Yes	Very important	Important	Little importance	INSTRUCTION: USE BRACKETS TO INDICATE PROPER ITEM(S) WHEN MORE THAN ONE LINE IS NEEDED FOR RESPONSE(S).
1		(1)	(2)	(3)	
2		(1)	(2)	(3)	
3		(1)	(2)	(3)	
4		(1)	(2)	(3)	
5		(1)	(2)	(3)	
6		(1)	(2)	(3)	
7		(1)	(2)	(3)	
8		(1)	(2)	(3)	
9		(1)	(2)	(3)	
10		(1)	(2)	(3)	
11		(1)	(2)	(3)	
12		(1)	(2)	(3)	
13		(1)	(2)	(3)	
14		(1)	(2)	(3)	
15		(1)	(2)	(3)	
16		(1)	(2)	(3)	
17		(1)	(2)	(3)	
18		(1)	(2)	(3)	

3. Did you as an individual, or with others, try to do something about any of the things you mentioned or the items listed on this card?
SHOW CARD

___(1) Yes, as an individual
FILL OUT A, B AND C

___(2) Yes, with others
FILL OUT A, B, C AND D

___(3) No

___(4) Don't remember

If yes:

a. What was (were) the issue(s)?	b. What action was taken?	c. What resulted from your efforts?
(1)	(1)	(1)
(2)	(2)	(2)
(3)	(3)	(3)

No answer _____

d. IF TRIED TO DO SOMETHING WITH OTHERS:

(1) What was (were) the name(s) of the group(s) or organizations:

(a) _____

(b) _____

(c) _____

INSTRUCTION: ENTER ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS (2) THROUGH (6) IN APPROPRIATE COLUMNS ON RIGHT.	Group (a)	Group (b)	Group (c)
(2) How many other persons were involved. (write in the number)			
(3) About how many members were in the total group? (write in number)			
(4) What year was this? (write in year)			
(5) About how many times a year did (does) it usually meet? (write in number)			
(6) How long were you (have you been) a member. (write in full years)			

e. How did you happen to become a member?

IDENTIFY RESPONSES FOR DIFFERENT GROUPS: (a) (b) (c)

_____

_____

_____

_____

f. What would you say is the (are the) most important accomplishment(s) of the group(s) to date?

(1) _____

_____

_____

_____

____ (2) Don't know

4. Please name all of the organizations in which you now hold a membership or office regardless of their purpose.

	Name WRITE COMPLETE NAME(S) OR NONE	CHECK BELOW IF OFFICER
a		
b		
c		
d		
e		

USE BACK OF PAGE IF MORE SPACE IS NEEDED

5. Now, I want to find out if you are acquainted with certain local persons. Do you know the county agents or home agents in this county?

____(1) Yes ____(2) No ____(3) Uncertain

IF YES:

a. Do you remmber any of their names?

(1) Names _____

_____ (2) Cannot give names

b. How did you happen to become acquainted with him (her)?

(1) _____

_____

_____

_____

c. How would you describe what the county agent (home agent) does?

(1) _____

_____

_____

_____

d. Can you tell me how this work is financed?

____(1) Yes ____(2) No ____(3) Not sure

e. IF YES OR NOT SURE, how is it financed? (How do you think it is financed?)

(1) _____

_____

_____

f. As you understand it, what connection, if any, exists between the county agent's (home agent's) office and the University of Arizona in Tucson?

(1) _____

_____

_____

_____

____ (2) Don't know

g. From what you know about the people in this county, how do you think they would feel about the county agents (home agents) working with people on problems and issues such as those listed on the cards I showed you a few minutes ago? Do you think they:

____(1) Would approve, or

____(2) Would disapprove?

Why do you say that?

(1) _____

_____

_____

____(2) No opinion

6. I have here a card with a list of activities that the Extension workers carry on. I mean the different ways the agents work with families. I will go through the list and you can just answer YES or NO to each.

During the past year:	(CHECK ONE ANSWER FOR EACH QUESTION)
(a) Have you visited the Agricultural Extension office in Yuma?	____(1) Yes ____(2) No
(b) Have any of the agents visited your farm or home?	____(1) Yes ____(2) No
Have you during the past year:	
(c) Received a letter from an Extension worker?	____(1) Yes ____(2) No
(d) Had a telephone conversation with an Extension worker?	____(1) Yes ____(2) No
(e) Received an Extension bulletin?	____(1) Yes ____(2) No
(f) Read Extension articles in newspapers?	____(1) Yes ____(2) No
(g) Seen an exhibit of 4-H Club or home economics club work?	____(1) Yes ____(2) No
(h) Seen any 4-H Club member's project?	____(1) Yes ____(2) No
(i) Attended any Extension meeting (field days, tours, achievement days, folk school, 4-H Club meeting, meeting at result demonstration, etc.)?	____(1) Yes ____(2) No
Belonged to a home economics group?	____(1) Yes ____(2) No
(j) Served as an Extension Leader?	____(1) Yes ____(2) No
(1) In 4-H Club work?	____(1) Yes ____(2) No
(2) As group or project leader in home demonstration work, as home demonstration club officer, or as committee member?	____(1) Yes ____(2) No
(k) Had no contact of any kind with county Extension Service.	_____

7. How do you think the city man feels about the farmer?

(1) _____

_____

_____

_____

___(2) No opinion

8. How do you think the farmer feels about the city man?

(1) _____

_____

_____

_____

___(2) No opinion

9. How do you think the city man feels about the government paying farmers not to plant certain crops and supporting the prices of some crops?

(1) _____

_____

_____

_____

10. In general how do you feel about the amount of help farmers are receiving from the government? Would you say they are receiving too much, about the right amount, or too little?

___(1) too much ___(2) about the right amount ___(3) too little

___(4) no opinion

IF "TOO MUCH" OR "TOO LITTLE"; why do you say that?

(1) _____

_____

_____

_____

11. Do you have in mind any other comments or ideas about farm-city relationships that you would like to mention?

_____(1) Yes _____(2) No

IF YES: What do you have in mind?

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. Now, I want to ask you a few questions to get your ideas about labor unions.

a. What do you think is the chief argument in FAVOR OF LABOR unions?

_____

_____

b. What do you think is the chief argument AGAINST labor unions?

_____

_____

c. In general, do you approve or disapprove of labor unions?

____(1) Approve ____(2) Disapprove ____(3) No opinion

d. How do you feel about unions for these different groups of people - would you favor or approve unions for:

(1) Public school teachers? ____(1) Favor ____(2) Oppose ____(3) Don't know

(2) Policemen? ____(1) Favor ____(2) Oppose ____(3) Don't know

(3) Firemen? ____(1) Favor ____(2) Oppose ____(3) Don't know

(4) Pro baseball players ____(1) Favor ____(2) Oppose ____(3) Don't know

e. What is the picture in your mind of a typical labor leader? What kind of person is he, how would you describe him?

_____

_____

_____

_____

f. What about the head of a big corporation - what kind of person is he, how would you describe him?

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. If you had a son interested in going into politics, how would you feel about it? Would you approve or disapprove?

____(1) Approve ____(2) Disapprove ____(3) Don't know

Why do you say that?

(1) _____

_____

_____

_____

14. Compared with the general population, how would you describe people in politics or political jobs? Would you say:

They usually are: (READ POSSIBLE RESPONSES, CHECK 1 IN EACH COLUMN)

___(1) More honest,	___(1) More able,
___(2) About as honest, or	___(2) About as able, or
___(3) Less honest.	___(3) Less able.

15. If you had a considerable amount of extra money what do you think you would do with it?

_____

_____

_____

Why would you do this?

_____

_____

_____

16. We would like to get some of your ideas about the public schools.

a. In your opinion what are some of the more important things children are taught in the local schools.

INSTRUCTION: DO NOT READ THE POSSIBLE ANSWERS TO THE RESPONDENT LISTEN CAREFULLY TO THE RESPONSES AND CHECK THE ITEM(S) THAT MOST ACCURATELY REFLECT THE IDEAS EXPRESSED. WRITE IN "OTHER" ANY IDEAS EXPRESSED THAT ARE DIFFERENT FROM THOSE LISTED.

____(1) English

____(2) Reading

____(3) Mathematics

____(4) Languages

____(5) Physical education

____(6) Government

____(7) Citizenship

____(8) Shop

____(9) Auto mechanics

____(10) Other WRITE IN _____

_____

____(11) No opinion

b. How many children, if any, do you have in:

elementary school? ____ Number

junior high school? ____ Number

high school? ____ Number

No children in family CHECK _____

c. How do you feel about the qualifications of the teachers in the public schools?

Do you feel that they are READ RESPONSES, CHECK ONE:

___(1) Well qualified?

___(2) Fairly well qualified?

___(3) Poorly qualified?

___(4) No opinion

Why do you say that?

(1) _____

_____

d. Regarding the amount taught in the local schools what is your opinion of the following?

(1) English, reading, etc?

___(1) Too much ___(2) About right ___(3) Too little

___(4) No opinion

Why do you say that? (1) _____

_____

(2) Government, citizenship, etc?

___(1) Too much ___(2) About right ___(3) Too little

___(4) No opinion

Why do you say this? (1) _____

_____

(3) Science, mathematics, etc.?

___(1) Too much ___(2) About right ___(3) Too little

___(4) No opinion

Why do you say that? (1) _____

_____

e. Are you in favor of or against the public schools running on a 12-month basis?

___(1) In favor of ___(2) Against ___(3) No opinion

___(4) No answer

Why do you feel that way? (1) _____

_____

17. In your opinion, what is the main obstacle to Yuma County's future growth and development?

(1) _____

_____

_____

18. It is the policy that public utilities in this State shall charge for their services at a rate that will return a minimum of 5% on the investment. Would you say that this is:

___(1) Fair to all concerned ___(2) Unfair to the consumer

___(3) Unfair to the utility ___(4) Have no opinion

Why do you say this? (1) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

A few issues are listed below on which many people in Yuma County take one side or the other. Please tell me what your position is on each of the following:

19. Manager vs. council type of city government.

___(1) Favor manager type ___(2) No difference

___(3) Favor council type ___(4) No opinion

Why do you take this position? (1) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

20. Municipal vs. private ownership of water system.

___(1) Favor municipal ownership ___(2) Favor private ownership

___(3) No difference ___(4) No opinion

Why do you hold this view? (1) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

21. How do you feel about the suggestion of placing all the Arizona State colleges and universities under one administrative person?

____(1) Favor the idea ____(2) Am against the idea

____(3) No opinion

Why do you feel this way? (1) _____

_____

_____

22. Have you heard anything about the question of Yuma County's rights to Colorado River water?

____(1) Yes ____(2) No ____(3) Don't remember

IF YES, what are the issues?

____(1) Arizona-California suit

____(2) Yuma County-Central Arizona dispute

____(3) Other WRITE IN _____

_____

_____

23. Look over the list of topics on this card and tell me if you think you would be interested in attending a discussion series or in taking a course on any of the following topics, if available. HAND RESPONDENT CARD AND CHECK OR WRITE IN THE TOPICS WHICH INTEREST HIM (HER).

1. ___Methods of Logical Thought (ethics)
2. ___American Social History
3. ___Investment Principles
4. ___Economic History
5. ___American Foreign Policy
6. ___Practical Politics and Civic Affairs
7. ___American Political Thought
8. ___Political Science
9. ___Geology
10. ___Philosophy of Human Nature
11. ___Psychological basis of Human Behavior
12. ___Development of Human Culture
13. ___Biology
14. ___Drawing and sketching
15. ___Painting
16. ___Sculpture
17. ___History of the American West
18. ___Modern drama
19. ___Family financial record keeping
20. ___Citizenship and Political Behavior
21. ___Conversational Spanish
22. ___Leadership
23. ___Other WRITE IN _____

_____

24. ___Not interested in any series or course.

24. Which of the following statements best describes where the respondent lives? (CHECK ONE)

___ (1) On a farm (or ranch)

___ (2) In the country but not on a farm(or ranch)

___ (3) In a town or village with less than 2,500 people

___ (4) In a town or city with 2,500 to 10,000 people

___ (5) In a suburban area (not in city limits) of Yuma

___ (6) In Yuma

25. What number of persons in each of the following age groups are living in your home now, including yourself, your spouse, relatives, children, hired help, etc.? (WRITE IN 0 IN GROUPS WHERE THERE ARE NONE AND CIRCLE THE AGE GROUP IN WHICH RESPONDENT BELONGS)

Number	Number
___ Under 5 years	___ 25-29 years
___ 5-9 years	___ 30-39 years
___ 10-14 years	___ 40-49 years
___ 15-19 years	___ 50-59 years
___ 20-24 years	___ 60 years and over

26. Which of the following is nearest your net annual income after farm or business expenses are deducted? (CHECK ONE)

___ (1) Less than $1,000

___ (2) $1,000 - 1,499

___ (3) 1,500 - 2,499

___ (4) 2,500 - 3,499

___ (5) 3,500 - 4,999

___ (6) $5,000 - 6,999

___ (7) 7,000 - 9,999

___ (8) 10,000 and over

___ (9) Refused

___

27. What was the highest grade you completed in school?

___ (1) 1st - 4th grade

___ (2) 5th - 6th grade

___ (3) 7th grade

___ (4) 8th grade

___ (5) 1 - 3 years high school

___ (6) 4 years high school

___ (7) 1 - 3 years college

___ (8) 4 years or more of college

___ (9) No answer

28. Are you employed? ___(1) Yes ___(2) No ___ (3) Retired ___(4) No answer

IF YES, what is your occupation?

Kind of business: _____

Kind of work: _____

Is your employment: ___(1) Full-time ___(2) Part-time (less than 35 hours per week)

29. How long have you lived at this address? _____Years

How long have you lived in Yuma County? _____Years or _____Native

IF NOT NATIVE:

Where did you live before coming to Yuma County?

Town _____ State_____