

THE ROLE OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
IN URBAN AND URBANIZING AREAS;
AN ANALYSIS OF EXTENSION WORKERS' OPINIONS

Thesis for the Degree of M. S.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Kaye Francis Bartlett
1964

3 1293 10106 5757



ABSTRACT

THE ROLE OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE IN URBAN AND URBANIZING AREAS: AN ANALYSIS OF EXTENSION WORKERS' OPINIONS

by Kaye Francis Bartlett

This exploratory study is designed to gather information that reflects the views of Cooperative Extension Service personnel concerning the role and responsibilities in urban and urbanizing areas.

Change is the one characteristic which must be included in any description of American society. The Cooperative Extension Service is an example of an organization which has helped many changes to occur in the United States and has changed itself. It has taken the resources of the Land-Grant University's College of Agriculture to the farthest corners of the state and helped the rural resident apply the most recent research findings to his problems. Other segments of the population are now vocalizing their desires for similar services and other educational organizations are examining the Cooperative Extension Service for guidance in providing these and similar services.

It appears that the Cooperative Extension Service may be at a crossroads. If it is to remain an educational organization with the mission to help people, it should read the signs of the times and plot its course accordingly. In its favor is its past ability to change to serve the changing needs of the changing rural area. The current rapid changes in political,

economic, social, and technical forces of rural, suburban and urban areas bring into focus new and different informational and educational wants and needs.

The data for this study were gathered through a mailed opinionnaire, designed specifically for this study, and submitted to 150 county Cooperative Extension Service workers representing urban and urbanizing areas in the fifty states. The sample counties were selected on the basis of the greatest total population and the largest percentage of increase in total population in the past decade. An adaptation of the opinionnaire was also submitted to the State Cooperative Extension Service Director of each state.

Eighty-four percent of the county workers and ninety percent of the State Directors in the sample returned completed opinionnaires.

The respondents were asked specific questions concerning the present and future roles and responsibilities, and sources of support of the Cooperative Extension Service in these urban areas. The responses to these questions were incorporated on Hollerith (IBM) cards and processed on the CDC 3600 Computer at Michigan State University to determine the chi-square tests of significance for the relationship between personal background and locational factors, and the respondent's answers to the specific questions.

The following conclusions were formulated on the basis of the evidence obtained through the data analyses.

1. Contrary to popular beliefs, evidence gained in the study indicates

that, as a group, the county worker respondents who received their bachelor's degrees in the period from 1920 to 1940 were more urban oriented in their responses than those who received their bachelor's degrees more recently.

2. While the role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas is not sharply defined by the respondents there is a trend toward more educational programs and projects directed to urban people.

3. While both county worker and State Director respondents agree that workers should spend a substantial proportion of their time working with urban people, the county workers tend to say a larger proportion than State Directors.

4. Generally, the county worker and State Director respondents tend to agree in their views of the total Cooperative Extension Service and its responsibilities in urban and urbanizing areas.

5. The five major program areas of the Cooperative Extension Service ranked by all respondents in order of the number of urban oriented programs and projects are: extension home economics; 4-H and other youth extension work; community and public affairs; marketing and utilization of agricultural products; agricultural production, management and natural resource development.

The conclusions demand an objective appraisal of the Cooperative Extension Service and its role in serving the society of today.

First, it must be recognized that there is a clientele in urban and

urbanizing areas vocalizing requests for the type of educational assistance which the Cooperative Extension Service has so capably provided in rural areas. Second, it must be recognized that there is an ever-increasing interrelationship and interdependency of all segments of the society, and there is a need for an educational institution such as the Cooperative Extension Service to inform, interpret, and assist in helping people in their decision-making as individuals and groups. These general implications are followed by more specific implications.

1. The current enabling legislation for the Cooperative Extension Service is subject to a wide range of interpretations. It would appear that this legislation at the three levels of government should be reviewed and revised if necessary to assure that the legislative intent is articulated in accord with the needs of society and the Land-Grant University philosophy of education for all.

2. Programs of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban areas need to be more than rural programs adapted to the urban environment. There is need for evaluation of what has been done in the past and what can be done in the future. Underlying this is the need for personnel and resources to operate effective urban programs.

3. The personnel of the Cooperative Extension Service selected to serve in urban areas should be employed on the basis of their knowledge of and willingness to work with urban people and problems. The results of this study show that this has not been achieved in the highest degree.

THE ROLE OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
IN URBAN AND URBANIZING AREAS:
AN ANALYSIS OF EXTENSION WORKERS' OPINIONS

By

Kaye Francis Bartlett

A THESIS

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

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Resource Development

1964

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have provided encouragement and assistance in the development, progress, and completion of this study. To all who helped, named and unnamed, I extend my deepest gratitude.

Special acknowledgment is extended to Dr. William J. Kimball, thesis adviser and committee chairman, for his guidance in pursuing this study.

Appreciation for their assistance and suggestions is extended to Drs. Raleigh Barlowe, Mason E. Miller, and Milton H. Steinmueller, members of the study committee.

The cooperation received from the Cooperative Extension Service personnel who shared their already busy schedules in completing the opinionnaires is also appreciated.

The patience, understanding, and inspiration provided by my wife, Nancy, helped immeasurably.

Kaye Francis Bartlett

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF APPENDICES	x
Chapter	
I. BASES FOR STUDY	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	6
Purpose of the Study	9
The Basic Design for this Study	11
The Hypotheses	13
II. BACKGROUND CONSIDERATIONS	18
The Land-Grant College	19
The Land-Grant University and the Cooperative Extension Service	22
The Cooperative Extension Service.	26
The Cooperative Extension Service, Today.	32
The Cooperative Extension Service in Urban Areas. . .	40
III. METHODOLOGY EMPLOYED IN COLLECTING DATA	43
Scope of the Study	43
Information Gathered	44
The Opinionnaire	45
Procedure for Gathering Information	45
Selection of the Sample	46
IV. ANALYSES OF THE RESPONSES	49
Opinionnaires Sent and Returned	50
County Cooperative Extension Service Workers' Opinionnaire Responses	59

Chapter	Page
State Cooperative Extension Service	
Directors' Opinionnaire Responses	80
Summary of Information Gathered.	95
V. ANALYSES OF DATA	101
Data Analyses	102
Summary of Findings	128
Testing of Hypotheses	131
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	136
Summary	136
Conclusions	138
Implications	139
Limitations	141
Recommendations.	143
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	146
APPENDICES.	153

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Range and Average Percentage of Funds Available to the State Cooperative Extension Service from each Source for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1963 .	24
2. Locational Characteristics of the Counties Represented and the Number of County Cooperative Extension Service Worker Respondents Representing These Counties	52
3. Locational Characteristics of the States Represented and the Number of State Cooperative Extension Service Directors Respondents Representing These States	53
4. County Cooperative Extension Service Worker Positions and Percentages of the County Positions Represented in the Sample.	54
5. Major Subject Matter Interests of Respondents as they Relate to Professional Improvement.	55
6. County Cooperative Extension Service Workers' Cooperative Extension Service Total Tenure and Tenure in County Now Serving	55
7. The Number and Percentages of County Cooperative Extension Service Worker Respondents who Received Bachelor's and/or Master's Degrees from 1920 to 1963	56
8. Major Fields of Study as They Relate to the Formal Educational Experiences of the Respondents	57
9. Summary of Responses to Question 1: In Your Opinion What is the Current Role of the Cooperative Extension Service in Urban and Urbanizing Areas? . .	60
10. Summary of Responses to Question 2: In Your Opinion Should Extension Educational Assistance to Urban People be?	64

Table		Page
11.	Summary of Responses to Question 3: What Proportion of Time Do You Think Extension Workers Should Spend Working with Urban Residents of Your County?	64
12.	Summary of Responses to Question 4A: From What Sources Do You Think Extension Will Receive its Financial Support in the Future?	66
13.	Summary of Responses to Question 4B: From What Source Do You Think Extension Will Receive its Support Other than Financial?	67
14.	Summary of Responses to Question 5: What Kinds of Assistance Do You Feel the Total Extension Program Should Provide for Urban People in Each of the Following Areas?	68
15.	Summary of Responses to Question 6: What Personal Experiences Have You Had in Urban Extension Work? .	75
16.	Summary of Responses to Question 7: To What Extent Has Urban Extension Work Been Undertaken in the Following Areas in Your County?	78
17.	Summary of Responses to Question 8: In Your Opinion How Effective Have Urban Extension Programs Been in Your County?	79
18.	Summary of Responses to Question 1: In Your Opinion What is the Current Role of the Cooperative Extension Service in Urban and Urbanizing Areas?	80
19.	Summary of Responses to Question 2: In Your Opinion Should Extension Educational Assistance to Urban People be:	83
20.	Summary of Responses to Question 3: What Proportion of Time Do You Think Extension Workers Should Spend Working with Urban Residents of Your State?	83

Table		Page
21.	Summary of Responses to Question 4A: From What Sources Do You Think Extension Will Receive its Financial Support in the Future?	85
22.	Summary of Responses to Question 4B: From What Sources Do You Think Extension Will Receive its Support Other Than Financial?	86
23.	Summary of Responses to Question 5: What Kinds of Assistance Do You Feel the Total Extension Program Should Provide for Urban People in Each of the Following Areas?	87
24.	Summary of Responses to Question 6: Are Urban Areas in Your State now Participating in Extension Sponsored Activities?	93
25.	Summary of Responses to Question 7: To What Extent has Urban Extension Work Been Undertaken in the Following Areas in Your State?	94
26.	Summary of Responses to Question 8: In Your Opinion How Effective Have Urban Extension Programs Been in Your State?	96
27.	Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Current Role of the Cooperative Extension Service by the Period of Time in Which the Respondents Attained their Bachelor's Degree	104
28.	Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Proportion of Time that Should Be Spent Working with Urban Residents by Total Population.	106
29.	Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Proportion of Time that Should be Spent Working with Urban Residents by Population per Square Mile.	108
30.	Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Proportion of Time that Should be Spent Working with Urban Residents by the Percentage of Urban Population	109

Table		Page
31.	Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers and State Cooperative Extension Service Directors by the Proportion of Time that Should be Spent Working with Urban Residents	111
32.	Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers and State Cooperative Extension Service Directors by the Kind of Assistance the Total Extension Program Should Provide for Urban People in the Area of Community and Public Affairs . .	112
33.	Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Kinds of Assistance the Total Extension Program Should Provide for Urban People in the Area of Extension Home Economics by the Period of Time in Which the Respondents Attained their Bachelor's Degree	114
34.	Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Kinds of Assistance the Total Extension Program Should Provide for Urban People in the Area of Marketing and Utilization of Agricultural Products by the Population per Square Mile	116
35.	Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Kinds of Assistance the Total Extension Program Should Provide for Urban People in the Area of Marketing and Utilization of Agricultural Products by the Percentage of Population Increase from 1950 to 1960	118
36.	Opinion of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Effectiveness of Urban Extension Programs in Agricultural Production, Management, and Natural Resource Development by Total Population of Counties	120
37.	Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Effectiveness of Urban Extension Programs in Agricultural Production, Management, and Natural Resource Development by Percent Rural-Farm Population of Counties	121

Table		Page
38.	Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Effectiveness of Urban Extension Programs in Agricultural Production, Management and Natural Resource Development by Percentage of Population Increase from 1950 to 1960	122
39.	Opinions of State Cooperative Extension Service Directors Concerning the Effectiveness of Urban Extension Programs in Agricultural Production, Management and Natural Resource Development by Total Population of the State	123
40.	Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Effectiveness of Urban Extension Programs in Community and Public Affairs by the Population per Square Mile of the Counties	126
41.	Opinions of State Cooperative Extension Service Directors Concerning the Effectiveness of Urban Extension Programs in Community and Public Affairs by the Total Population of the States	127

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A. Census Data for Sample Counties	154
B. Total Number of County Extension Workers in Sample Counties	156
C. Correspondence and Opinionnaire: County Workers . . .	159
D. Correspondence and Opinionnaire: State Directors	168
E. Opinionnaire Response Coding System	176

CHAPTER I

BASES FOR STUDY

Introduction

The Cooperative Extension Service is one of many informational and educational services based on the needs of the people and is provided for through federal government leadership. The federal government made its first contribution toward the support of education shortly after the Constitution of the United States was ratified by the original thirteen states.

The Congress passed the Ordinance of 1787 which included provisions for the establishment of the public school system. One section of land in each surveyed township was dedicated to the state government for the support of a public school system. The funds from the sale of these lands were placed in trust with the interest from these funds providing a perpetual source of support for the public schools of each state.¹

By mid-nineteenth century, the federal government expanded its support of education toward including higher education for all people who desired it through the granting of public lands to the states for the establishment of "agriculture and mechanic arts" colleges by passing the Morrill Act in 1862.²

¹United States Department of Agriculture, Land, the 1958 Yearbook of Agriculture (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1958), pp. 39-40.

²United States Congress, Act of 1862 Donating Lands for Colleges of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts (12 Stat. 503). Commonly referred to as the Morrill Act.

These new colleges formed an innovation in education which was the dream of many people. C. R. Elder describes this dream in the following statement.

The people who surged westward a century ago dreamed of a new kind of education. They wanted colleges that would meet the practical needs of all citizens more directly than did the institutions that stressed classical studies and training for a few learned professions. They wanted "people's colleges" that their sons and daughters could attend at minimum cost and that would put emphasis on research and instruction that might increase agricultural production, improve the conditions of rural life, and support the young Nation's growing industry.³

These "agriculture and mechanic arts" or "people's" colleges have become known as Land-Grant Universities. From their meager beginnings a century ago these Land-Grant Universities have been growing and changing continuously. However, the unique feature of the Land-Grant University which distinguishes it from other institutions of higher learning remains today. That unique feature being practical education for the industrial and agricultural classes. In addition to this, two educational innovations have been created as units of the Land-Grant University.

The first of these units to be created was the Agricultural Experiment Station.⁴ Its purpose is to expand the base of scientific knowledge through applied research. The second unit, the Cooperative Extension

³United States Department of Agriculture, After a Hundred Years: the 1962 Yearbook of Agriculture (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962), p. 13.

⁴United States Congress, An act to establish Agricultural Experiment Stations in connection with colleges established in the several States under the provision of an act approved July second, eighteen hundred and sixty two, and of the acts supplementary thereto (24 Stat. 440). Commonly referred to as the Hatch Act of 1887.

Service was created in 1914.⁵ Its purpose is to disseminate information and extend knowledge to the people of the state who are not students regularly enrolled in academic course work. Both of these units of the Land-Grant University operate in close cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture.

The responsibilities of the United States Department of Agriculture include education, research and service of a general nature throughout the nation. It further acts as a coordinating body for the various state Agricultural Experiment Stations and Cooperative Extension Services by assisting in the exchange of information on education, research and services between the various states. Basic to these responsibilities is the Department of Agriculture's mandate by Congress to administer the federally appropriated funds for the Agricultural Experiment Stations and the Cooperative Extension Services.

While this discussion of the Land-Grant University, Agricultural Experiment Station, Cooperative Extension Service and United States Department of Agriculture has been brief it was intended only to point out the existing relationships between these institutions. This discussion will continue in greater depth in subsequent sections of this chapter and Chapter II as this study focuses on the Cooperative Extension Service.

It is important to note here that each of these institutions: the Land-Grant University, Agricultural Experiment Station, Cooperative Extension

⁵United States Congress, Act of 1914 providing for cooperative extension work (38 Stat. 372). Commonly referred to as the Smith-Lever Act of 1914.

Service, and the United States Department of Agriculture, were created out of the need for information and education in agricultural production. These four institutions may be viewed as broadening into new areas with the finding of new knowledge and as more people need a broader range of knowledge in living their lives.

The Cooperative Extension Service and its role in providing educational experiences for a rapidly changing society is the central concern of this study. As society changes its institutions must change also to meet new demands from society. Reflecting back to the time period when the Cooperative Extension Service was created it may be seen that farming was a major sector of the total economy. In 1920, the year of the first decennial census after the establishment of the Cooperative Extension Service, the farm population was 31,974,000 or 30.1 percent of the total population. There were 955,884,000 acres in 6,448,343 farms that same year. However, in 1959 the most recent census of agriculture showed a farm population of 16,592,000 or 9.4 percent of the total and 1,123,378,000 acres in 3,707,973 farms.⁶

The sectors in the economy other than agriculture have grown. As a nation we have become highly industrialized and urbanized. In 1920 approximately one-fourth of the employed persons worked in agriculture

⁶Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1963 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1963), pp. 613, 621.

while three-fourths worked in other occupations.⁷ By 1960 approximately 92 percent of the employed persons in the United States worked at occupations other than agricultural production and only 8 percent were employed on farms.⁸

The place of residence of the nation's population has changed also. In 1920 about one-half of the population lived in urban areas and one-half lived in rural areas. Forty years later in 1960, about 70 percent of the population lived in urban areas, and 30 percent in rural areas.⁹

In summary, there are fewer but larger farms, fewer farmers, and relatively fewer rural residents. The traditional rural and farm clientele of the Cooperative Extension Service is becoming smaller. However, there is a new clientele in urban areas vocalizing requests for educational assistance. What are the implications of these trends for the Cooperative Extension Service? In order to answer this question one must ask another question. How has the Cooperative Extension Service changed over the years?

The direction the Cooperative Extension Service has taken in the past may offer some guidelines as to the direction it will take in the future. Therefore, the following section of this chapter is a brief view of the Cooperative Extension Service which will be expanded in Chapter II.

⁷ National Resources Board, General Conditions and Tendencies Influencing the Nation's Land Requirements (Part I of the Report on Land Planning, Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1936), p. 23.

⁸ Bureau of the Census, op. cit., p. 219.

⁹ Ibid., p. 21.

Statement of the Problem

The Cooperative Extension Service created in 1914 with the passage of the Smith-Lever Act by the Congress of the United States launched a unique venture in education. This innovation completed the tripartite of resident instruction, research, and informal, off-campus instruction which is characteristic of the Land-Grant University. The basic, distinctive features of the Cooperative Extension Service have been retained throughout the institution's fifty-year history.

The primary purpose of the Cooperative Extension Service is "...to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects related to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same..." Generally, the organizational framework and the financial arrangements designed to accomplish this purpose involves the three major levels of government; namely, federal, state, and county.¹⁰

Today, the Cooperative Extension Service is an example of an organization which has helped many changes to occur in the United States by changing itself. It has taken the resources of the Land-Grant University's

¹⁰United States Congress, Smith-Lever Act of May 9, 1914 as amended (7 U.S.C. 341 et seq.). However, the proportion of financial support supplied by each level of government varies from state to state and county to county.

During fiscal year 1962 the average proportion from federal sources was 37.6 percent, from state sources 39.0 percent, from county sources to 21.6 percent, and from other non-tax sources 1.8 percent. Federal Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Form MO-406 (11-62).

College of Agriculture to the farthest corners of the state and helped the rural resident apply the most recent research findings to his problems.

Other segments of the population are now vocalizing their desires for similar services and other educational organizations are examining the Cooperative Extension Service for guidance in providing these and similar services. This period of change may well be labeled an era of exploring new horizons.

E. T. York, Jr., Administrator, Federal Extension Service, said,

Extension has never had a greater opportunity to exercise a more significant and meaningful leadership role--to make a more significant and meaningful contribution to the welfare of our people than we have now. We have built up a great reservoir of good will and developed experience and competencies of working with people that are badly needed in meeting today's problems.

Now we in Extension are confronted with an urgent need to move aggressively and positively towards adjusting and redirecting our efforts so that we can be certain that they are serving the needs of our time.¹¹

Thus, it appears that the Cooperative Extension Service may be at a crossroads. If it is to remain an educational organization with the mission to help people, it should read the signs of the times and plot its course accordingly. In its favor is its past ability to change to serve the changing needs of the changing rural area. The current rapid changes in political, economic, social, and technical forces of rural, suburban and urban

¹¹E. T. York, Jr., "The Federal Partner Looks at Extension's Challenge," E. J. Booth and C. M. Ferguson (eds.), Changing Dimensions in Agriculture and Home Economics (Madison, Wisconsin: National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study, 1962), p. 19.

areas bring into focus new and different informational and educational wants and needs.

There appear to be at least three broad alternatives open to the Cooperative Extension Service. Each alternative has its merits and each has its consequences. A decision should be made as to which of the following alternatives will be the focus: (1) the Cooperative Extension Service could direct its resources primarily to the rural segment of the population in a limited, but well defined area of subject matter; (2) the Cooperative Extension Service could direct its present resources, and add other resources, to include assistance in subject matter areas related to overall problems of rural people; (3) the Cooperative Extension Service could broaden its resource in such a manner as to be in a position to meet the needs of an ever increasing urban population, as well as the rural population. To date the Cooperative Extension Service has operated somewhere between these three alternatives to varying degrees at various times and places.

This study examines the current opinions of key Cooperative Extension Service workers at county and state levels, concerning the role of their organization in one hundred and fifty urban and urbanizing areas throughout the nation.

The role of the Cooperative Extension Service in these urban areas is becoming a concern of Cooperative Extension Service administrators, specialists and county workers. Evidence of this concern is available

when in-service training programs, annual state Cooperative Extension Service conferences, summer school catalogs, and other professional meetings and literature are reviewed. These concerns along with the author's personal experiences with the Cooperative Extension Service as a recipient of informal educational services and as a former employee generated interest in studying this problem.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study is to attempt to determine the current and future roles of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas as viewed by county Cooperative Extension Service workers and State Cooperative Extension Service Directors. It is hoped that such information will be useful to those working toward the improvement of the Cooperative Extension Service. This study is based on the premise that an increased understanding of the Cooperative Extension Service and the diverse conditions in which it serves is needed as a basis for improving it.

Terms

Cooperative Extension Service refers to the off-campus, non-classroom educational institution which is a part of the Land-Grant University. It is usually a subordinate unit of the College of Agriculture and Home Economics. In twenty-seven states it is called the Cooperative Extension Service, Agricultural Extension Service in thirteen states, Extension Service in eight states, Extension Division in one state, and Cooperative Extension in one state.¹²

¹²Herbert A. Berg, Assistant Director, Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, personal interview, November 20, 1962.

The Cooperative Extension Service has a Congressional mandate to provide educational assistance to the people of the United States in agriculture, home economics and subjects related thereto. Educational assistance is provided by personal contacts, group activities, and mass media.

State Cooperative Extension Service Directors are the persons responsible for the administration and supervision of the Cooperative Extension Service at the state level. These persons are selected by the governing bodies of the Land-Grant Universities at the state level, pending the approval of the United States Department of Agriculture. Depending on the state, these persons may be the dean of the college of agriculture, associate dean, assistant dean, or specifically listed as the director of extension. Regardless of title, they are usually responsible to the dean of the colleges of agriculture and home economics.¹³

Cooperative Extension Service Specialists are individuals who have become highly trained in specific areas of subject matter and have been employed by the Cooperative Extension Service to teach this subject matter using extension teaching methods. The specialist is often affiliated with a subject matter department of the Land-Grant University, thus forming an essential link in the research-teaching-extension chain.

County Cooperative Extension Service Worker refers to the person

¹³ Lincoln D. Kelsey and Cannon C. Hearne, Cooperative Extension Work (Ithaca, New York: Comstock Publishing Associates, 1949), pp. 41-42.

employed by the Cooperative Extension Service to conduct educational efforts at the county level. This person is responsible for localized Cooperative Extension Service programs in such areas as agriculture, community and public affairs, home economics, 4-H and other youth work, marketing and utilization of agricultural products. Persons in this position may have titles such as: Agricultural Agent, Consumer Information Agent, County Extension Agent or Director, Farm Agent, 4-H Club Agent, Home Demonstration Agent, Home Economics Agent, Marketing Agent, Youth Agent, etc.

Urban and Urbanizing Counties or Areas describe the counties included in this study. Selection of these counties was based on current population information. The specific criteria for selection of these counties are presented in Chapter III.

The Basic Design for this Study

The primary concerns of this study are the relationship between the views of: (1) County Cooperative Extension Service Workers concerning the current and future roles of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas and their personal background characteristics and locational factors; (2) State Cooperative Extension Service Directors concerning the current and future roles of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas and their locational characteristics.

The county and state background data were obtained by abstracting Census data, such as total population, population per square mile, percent

change in population from 1950 to 1960, percent urban and rural-farm population, from The County and City Data Book.¹⁴

This data is presented in Appendix A. A mailed opinionnaire, a copy of which may be found in Appendix C, was used to obtain the data analyzed in this study. The opinionnaire was designed specifically for this study and submitted to 150 county Cooperative Extension Service workers, three in each state, throughout the United States. An adaptation of this opinionnaire applicable to the state Cooperative Extension Service Director position was submitted to the fifty directors (see Appendix D). The selection of the sample, the design of the opinionnaire and census data used in this study are discussed in detail in subsequent chapters.

The responses to the opinionnaire were recorded on the opinionnaire by the respondents. The responses were then coded and incorporated on Hollerith cards.¹⁵ The coding systems used are presented in Appendix E. The data were then programmed on the CDC 3600 Computer for statistical analysis.¹⁶ Chi square tests of significance were thus obtained.

¹⁴Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, The County and City Data Book, 1962 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962), passim.

¹⁵Dr. Herman Hollerith conceived the punched card system in the latter part of the 1800's while employed by the U. S. Bureau of the Census. The Hollerith card is commonly referred to as punched cards or IBM cards.

¹⁶The Michigan State University Computer Center, where the study data was processed, uses the CDC 3600 Computer which is manufactured by Control Data Corporation, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

A detailed description of the personal background and locational data of the respondents are presented in Chapter IV. The data gathered in this study, through the opinionnaire and census information, are discussed in depth in Chapter V.

The study was designed specifically to gather the following categories of information:

1. The background and interests of Cooperative Extension Service workers currently serving in urban and urbanizing areas of the United States.
2. The current role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing counties as viewed by county Cooperative Extension Service workers and State Cooperative Extension Directors.
3. The future role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing counties as viewed by county Cooperative Extension Service workers and State Cooperative Extension Service Directors.

An analysis of the above data and the relationships of these data are the basis for considering the future of the Cooperative Extension Service when viewed from a Cooperative Extension Service worker's point of view. This analysis of data are presented in detail in Chapter V.

The implications of the results of this study for future Cooperative Extension Service work is included in the final chapter of this study.

The Hypotheses

The hypotheses of this study were generally based on the assumption

that an individual's prior experiences and his present environment affect his perception of the world about him and the way he behaves. In precise terminology related to this study: an Extension worker's professional training and current residence location are positively related to the way he views the future role of the Extension Service.

Several personal background and locational factors serve as the independent variables in this study, with the dependent variables being the responses to the attitude questions asked in the opinionnaire.

The independent variables are:

1. Personal background factors:¹⁷
 - a. Tenure in the Cooperative Extension Service
 - b. Tenure in the Cooperative Extension Service in the present county
 - c. Position
 - d. Level of higher education
 - e. Major course of study for degree work
 - f. Major course of study beyond the highest degree attained
 - g. Current subject matter interests
 - h. Sex.
2. Locational factors:
 - a. Region of the United States
 - b. Total population of county or state

¹⁷ Only item "c" was obtained from the State Cooperative Extension Service Directors because the researcher felt requests for this type of information might alienate potential respondents.

- c. Population per square mile of county or state
- d. Percent urban residents in county or state
- e. Percent rural farm residents in county or state
- f. Percent increase or decrease in population from 1950 to 1960 in county or state.

The dependent variables are the respondents' viewpoints concerning:

- a. The current role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas
- b. The trend in Extension educational assistance to urban people
- c. The proportion of time Extension workers should spend working with urban residents
- d. The kinds of educational assistance the total Extension program should provide for urban people in:
 - 1) Agricultural Production, Management, and Natural Resource Development
 - 2) Community and Public Affairs
 - 3) Extension Home Economics
 - 4) 4-H and other Youth Extension Work
 - 5) Marketing and Utilization of Agricultural Products
- e. The respondent's personal experience in urban Extension work
- f. The extent to which urban Extension work has been undertaken in the five major program areas listed under item d
- g. The effectiveness of urban Extension work which has been under-

taken in the respondent's state or county in the five major program areas listed under item d

- h. Sources of present financial support for the Cooperative Extension Service
- i. Sources of future financial support for the Cooperative Extension Service
- j. Sources of future support other than financial for the Cooperative Extension Service.

The generalized hypotheses of the study are presented here along with examples of the specific hypotheses. The hypotheses are presented in this manner because there are 1,127 different specific hypotheses possible using the above variables. The generalized hypotheses are:

1. Certain personal background factors of county Cooperative Extension Service workers are positively related to their opinions concerning the present scope of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas.

2. Certain personal background factors of county Cooperative Extension workers are positively related to their perceptions of the future role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas.

Example: The county worker's length of tenure in the Cooperative Extension Service is positively related to his perception of the proportion of time Extension workers should spend working with urban residents.

3. Certain locational factors of county Cooperative Extension Service workers are positively related to their opinions concerning the present

scope of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas.

4. Certain locational factors of county Cooperative Extension Service workers are positively related to their perceptions of the future role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas.

Example: The total population of the respondent's county is positively related to his perception of the kind of educational assistance the total Extension program should provide for urban people in community and public affairs.

5. Certain locational factors of State Cooperative Extension Service Directors are positively related to their opinions concerning the present scope of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas.

6. Certain locational factors of State Cooperative Extension Service Directors are positively related to their perceptions of the future role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas.

Example: The population per square mile of the state is positively related to the perceptions held by State Cooperative Extension Service Directors regarding the amount of educational assistance that should be provided to urban people.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND CONSIDERATIONS

In order to consider the future of the Cooperative Extension Service one must examine this institution from its origin through the present. In this examination it is important to consider the Cooperative Extension Service in its setting in our dynamic society.

Change is the one characteristic which must be included in any description of American society. Evidence of change may be seen everywhere. Changes in our political structures, economic systems, social structures and level of technology affect the lives of all, either directly or indirectly. "Change takes innumerable forms; it is rapid; it is vacillating; it is extensive; it is subtle; it is welcome; it is disturbing; but it is indiscriminate and it is universal."¹

Many far reaching changes in the total American way of life have come about as the result of three legislative decisions made in 1862. The United States Department of Agriculture was established May 15, 1862, for furtherance of agricultural development.² The Homestead Act passed

¹William J. Kimball, "The Relation between Personal Values and the Adoption of Recommended Farm and Home Practices" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1960), p. 1.

²M. L. Wilson, "Abraham Lincoln and the Historical Background of the Department of Agriculture," The Spirit and Philosophy of Extension Work, R. K. Bliss, et al. (ed.), (Washington: U. S. Department of Agriculture Graduate School and National Honorary Extension Fraternity Epsilon Sigma Phi, 1952), p. 17.

on May 20, 1862, made public lands available directly to the settler who would develop and operate his own farm.³ The Land-Grant College Act of July 2, 1862, created colleges which would serve the "practical needs of all citizens more directly than did the institutions that stressed classical studies and training for a few learned professions."⁴

The Land-Grant College

The law creating the Land-Grant College which has evolved into the Land-Grant University is known as the Morrill Act, or the Act of 1862 Donating Lands for Colleges of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. This law granted public lands in each state for:

...the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the states may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life...⁵

The Morrill Act, sponsored by Senator Justin Smith Morrill of Vermont, represents the culmination of efforts of diverse origin. Agricultural societies, labor groups, and working class oriented educators each

³Ibid., p. 22.

⁴United States Department of Agriculture, loc. cit.

⁵United States Congress, Morrill Act of 1862 (12 Stat. 503).

offered their own proposals for the "peoples colleges."⁶ There is some credence in the fact that the crises of the day brought these various forces together, helped to forge out the Land-Grant College Act, and assure its passage. Some examples are such phrases as: "...including military tactics, ...the mechanic arts, ...liberal and practical education, ... industrial classes..., and ...several pursuits and professions in life..."⁷

The Morrill Act served as an incentive to the states to take the initiative in making higher education available to all people. The Morrill Act, in itself, provided a broad framework of subject matter which could be taught in the new colleges. The actual organization of the institution to perform the teaching was left to the state legislatures, who in turn created administrative bodies to oversee the specific operation of the Land-Grant College.

Only a few years passed before the faculties of these colleges recognized that practical knowledge applicable to agricultural practices needed to be expanded through applied scientific research.⁸ In other words, it was recognized that the Land-Grant College had the responsibilities of not only teaching the truth, but also seeking the truth. Out of this recognition came the concept of experimental farms where science could be applied to specific agricultural problems.

⁶Paul A. Miller, "Cooperative Agricultural Extension Work in the Industrializing Society" (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1959; mimeographed), p. 6.

⁷United States Congress Morrill Act of 1862 (12 Stat. 503).

⁸James Bonnen, "The First One Hundred Years of the USDA-Land Grant System: Some Observations on the Organizational Nature of a Great Technological Pay-Off" (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1962; mimeographed), p. 5.

The Hatch Act of 1887 gave federal assistance to the Land-Grant College for the establishment of the institution known as the Agricultural Experiment Station. Provisions were made in this act to provide funds annually to the United States Department of Agriculture, which then distributed funds for research in agriculture to the states through the Land-Grant Colleges.

Research conducted at these Agricultural Experiment Stations has contributed to the base of scientific knowledge of agriculture and many related areas. Now that the Land-Grant College was in a position to do research and teach its students on campus, there remained a great number of potential "students" in the remainder of the population, the workers and farmers, or users of knowledge and information.

The problem of how to disseminate this growing body of knowledge and information to the users as soon as possible was attacked from several different approaches in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Short courses, farmers' institutes, agricultural trains, demonstrations, boys and girls clubs, and bulletins were but a few of the methods used to get information out to the last man in the country. All of these methods were successful to varying degrees, but they all had the same weaknesses, they were only available at one point in time and to a limited number of recipients. A means of taking the resources of the college out to the people of the state was needed.

The Land-Grant University and the Cooperative Extension Service

On May 8, 1914, the Smith-Lever Act was passed by the Congress of the United States creating the Cooperative Extension Service. The purpose of this new institution was:

...to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same, there may be continued or inaugurated in connection with the college or colleges in each State, Territory, or possession, now receiving, or which may hereafter receive, the benefits of the Act of Congress approved July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, entitled "an act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts..."⁹

The Smith-Lever Act provides a description of what the Cooperative Extension Service shall do:

Cooperative agricultural extension work shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics and subjects related thereto to persons not attending or resident in said colleges in the several communities, and imparting information on said subjects through demonstrations, publications, and otherwise and for the necessary printing and distribution of information in connection with the foregoing; and this work shall be carried on in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the State Agricultural College ... receiving the benefits of this Act.¹⁰

This new institution, the tripartition of the Land-Grant College system, brought together within a national framework the resources of the agricultural colleges and the home economics colleges for the purpose of

⁹ United States Congress, Smith-Lever Act as amended (7 U.S.C. 341 et seq.).

¹⁰ Ibid.

providing the users of information and knowledge with the information and knowledge necessary for the improvement of their farms, homes, and lives.

Ideally, the state became the campus of the Land-Grant University through the county Cooperative Extension Service worker's programs and efforts in agriculture, home economics and 4-H Club work. However, typically, this did not happen with spontaneity, but rather it evolved over a period of years as people saw the Cooperative Extension Service in neighboring counties and wanted similar services in their home county.

With this background on the legislation which created the Cooperative Extension Service it is important to consider the financial arrangements for this institution. This discussion is generalized because of the several special federal acts which provide funds for specific programs.¹¹

Funds are appropriated at the federal level by the Congress for the Federal Extension Service which is an agency of the United States Department of Agriculture. The Federal Extension Service in turn distributes the major portion of these funds to the Land-Grant University located in each individual state. In addition to the federal funds distributed to the states, the state legislatures allocate funds to the Land-Grant University for the support of the state Cooperative Extension Service which administers the educational programs of the organization throughout the State. The county governing body in each county where the Cooperative Extension

¹¹See Robert M. Jones, "The Cooperative Extension Service Legal Mandates and Directives" (East Lansing: Department of Resource Development, Michigan State University, 1963). (Mimeographed graduate student term paper.)

Service maintains an office also appropriates funds for the operation of this educational organization.

The three levels of government providing funds for the Cooperative Extension Service in the various states contribute varying proportions to the total budgets. The data in Table 1 present the range and average percentages of funds from all sources for one fiscal year to illustrate the differing contributions of the various sources from state to state.

Table 1. Range and Average Percentage of Funds Available to the State Cooperative Extension Services from each Source for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1963¹

Source	Percentage of Total Funds	
	Range	Average
Federal	19.1-54.9	37.6
State	19.8-69.2	39.0
County	1.2-48.0	21.6
Other (Non-tax)	0.1-21.0	1.8

¹Federal Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, "Ranking of States and Puerto Rico Based on Percentage of Funds Available from Each Source for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1963," FES form MO406(11-62). (Washington: Federal Extension Service, 1963.)

The range in the percentage of funds available from the various sources may be attributed to such variables as: (1) the percentages of rural and farm residents of a state as they relate to the national percentages,¹² (2) the availability of funds for conducting educational work in

¹²See United States Congress, Smith-Lever Act as amended (7 U.S.C. 341 et seq.).

specific subject matter areas,¹³ (3) the variation in the appropriations made by the state legislatures, (4) the differences in the requirements of counties to provide funds, and (5) the charging of fees for educational assistance and/or membership in the local organization which may underwrite the expenses of the Cooperative Extension Service in lieu of the county government.¹⁴ However, this list was not intended to be exhaustive. Its purpose is to illustrate some of the reasons for the differences in the contributions to the Cooperative Extension Service by the various sources.

The funds appropriated by each level of government are used by the Cooperative Extension Service for conducting educational work within that particular level of government. Funds are not transferred from state to state nor county to county. This financial arrangement allows each level of government an important role in determining the direction of the Cooperative Extension Service.

Policy decisions regarding Cooperative Extension Service programs are made at each level of government. Internal communications of the organization allow for an interchange of ideas from any level to the other two levels. A framework for the operation of the organization is provided for by a "Memorandum of Understanding" which is a statement of cooperation between the Land-Grant University and the United States Department

¹³ See Robert M. Jones, loc. cit.

¹⁴ Kelsey and Hearne, op. cit., p. 59.

of Agriculture. Similar memoranda describe the cooperative arrangements between the Land-Grant University and the county governing bodies of the state. There may be formal statements or informal understandings.

The Cooperative Extension Service

The creation of the Cooperative Extension Service is attributed to two forces by Kelsey and Hearne. They point out that agriculture "characterized by cheap land, scarce labor, new products, and the use of credit" and education characterized by the "ideal of education for any man or woman in any field" were the two forces working together which helped to create the Cooperative Extension Service.¹⁵

These forces in the United States may be contrasted against their counterparts in other areas of the world. In many other countries land is the limiting factor of production while here the limiting factor is labor. Therefore, in the United States emphasis has been placed on what the man can produce rather than what the unit of land can produce.¹⁶ In education the classical approach for the few was the tradition, while in the United States the practical education for the masses was emphasized.

Within this frame of reference it became evident that the Cooperative Extension Service should concentrate its early efforts on increased agricultural production efficiency. Further pressure to emphasize agricultural

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 11.

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 3-4.

production efficiency was brought to bear only a few months after the passage of the Smith-Lever Act when World War I broke out in Europe and a decreasing number of farmers were called upon to feed an increasing industrial labor force, military establishment, and our allies.¹⁷

After World War I the Cooperative Extension Service expanded its efforts in agricultural production and home economics by increasing the emphasis of youth work through 4-H Clubs. This provided another avenue of access to the farms and homes of the nation, not at the expense of on-going programs in agricultural production and home economics. The rural youth were taught newly found practices and techniques through their 4-H Clubs. The parents of the 4-H Club members could see the benefits of new knowledge applied directly to their farms and in their homes.

Seeing the results of their youngster's work, parents then realized that similar educational assistance was available to them. Thus, the parents found the Cooperative Extension Service and the Cooperative Extension Service programs were broadened to meet the needs of the whole family in rural areas.

An historical review of the functions of the Cooperative Extension Service at the county level brings into focus three distinct, yet overlapping, periods of change.¹⁸ Each of these periods of change in the

¹⁷C. W. Warburton, "Twenty-Five Years of Extension Work Under the Act of May 8, 1914," The Spirit and Philosophy of Extension Work, R. K. Bliss, et al. (ed.), (Washington: U. S. Department of Agriculture Graduate School and National Honorary Extension Fraternity Epsilon Sigma Phi, 1952), pp. 262-263.

¹⁸Paul A. Miller, "The Evolution of Extension," Agricultural Leaders Digest, March 1959, pp. 12-13.

order in which they are presented were the chief concern of the county Cooperative Extension Service worker at that time.

Early efforts of the county Cooperative Extension Service worker were directed to individual farms and homes. This informal educational innovation was taken directly to the potential information user.

Early county agents worked mostly with individual farmers or small groups in meetings or demonstrations. They conducted auto tours to demonstrate new practices, spoke at farmers' institutes, Granges, and Farm Bureau meetings, mailed bulletins. The college sent out specialists who helped in projects like poultry culling, spraying, and pruning demonstrations, drainage and the like.¹⁹

By the late 1920's and early 1930's the county Cooperative Extension Service worker realized that his efforts could best be directed toward training leaders, getting people together to work on problems of common interest, and organizing committees to plan projects and accept responsibilities.²⁰ Marketing associations, cooperatives, special interest agricultural commodity groups, and advisory committees of the several United States Department of Agriculture agencies came into being under the guidance of the county Cooperative Extension Service worker. During this period of change the Cooperative Extension Service organized many specialized interests into groups which represented the rural and agricultural interests of each county, the state and the nation.

¹⁹ Leo L. Rummel, One Hundred Years of Better Living, Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station Public Information Series 63, and Ohio State University of Agriculture and Home Economics Extension Bulletin 422 (Wooster and Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1962), p. 56.

²⁰ Ibid.

The third and current period of change is undoubtedly the most critical. Rapid changes have occurred in all facets of life in the past generation. These changes have radically reduced the rural-urban boundaries. They have solved problems and created new problems. They have come in political, economic, social and technological areas of interest. These changes have come to the Cooperative Extension Service both from internal and external forces.

While this trend was taking place in the Cooperative Extension Service other trends of equal significance were occurring elsewhere. The number of farms and the farm population were decreasing and the urban population was increasing. At the same time the number of industrial firms was decreasing. Efficiency in farming resulted in larger farms and greater productivity, but with surplus agricultural production the economic status of farming did not gain proportionately. However in industry the decrease in the number of firms increased the individual firm's position in the economy. In the 1930's the government started programs to mediate these differences by shifting some of the financial responsibilities for agriculture from the farm to society and the Cooperative Extension Service was given the educational duties of interpreting governmental programs directed to the farmer.

These events brought about specialization in the production phase of agriculture, and corporations assumed the responsibility for processing and distributing the agricultural products. This increase in specialization has brought about an interdependency in society which increases daily.

Man and his relationship to the land, human services, and other men is in a constant state of change.²¹ This requires continued readjustment by the individual, society, and the institutions created by them.

As the Cooperative Extension Service helped to bring into application better agricultural production practices a whole new series of problems arose on the farm. How can I combine my resources for the greatest personal benefit and satisfaction? How can we as farmers achieve a competitive advantage in the market place? Is there a place for my son in farming? How can we improve the schools in our community? What can we do to improve our local government and governmental services? These are but a few of the questions rural people have asked over the past fifty years.

Throughout the fifty years of the Cooperative Extension Service's life there have been many rapid changes in the political, economic, social, and technical segments of the United States and the world. Miller offers the following concise description of this period of time.

A half century of Extension history spans two world wars and other lesser ones; shifts in international balances between nations and some twenty new ones; the age of machinery into the age of atoms; from wireless to television; from horses to rockets; from public expenditures for peaceful purposes to big government and big taxes for not so peaceful purposes; and from scarcity and undeveloped resources to opulence, proxy battles and Madison Avenue.²²

²¹Paul A. Miller, "Cooperative Agricultural Extension Work in the Industrializing Society" (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1959; mimeographed), pp. 18-23.

²²Ibid., p. 18.

While the farmers and the rural people of the United States were being assisted by the Cooperative Extension Service, urban people did not have such assistance. But once urban people found the Cooperative Extension Service through newspaper articles, radio broadcasts, fairs and other such media, they started to ask questions. What is 4-H Club work? How can I improve my lawn or garden? Where can I get help in designing my kitchen for greater efficiency? Can you help me to prepare more nutritious meals for my family? What can we do to protect the value of our home and prevent blight in our neighborhood?

These questions from urban and rural-non-farm people, and questions directly related to agriculture from rural-farm people have created an internal ambivalence in the Cooperative Extension Service. York cites two prominent former Cooperative Extension Service workers in this issue:

The Scope Report gives us a broad framework for action--but are we taking action fast enough?

Paul Miller, Provost of Michigan State University (now President of West Virginia University), who played a prominent part in developing the Scope Report, commented that Extension has been notably active in considering its changing role in State conferences and the like, but notably "resilient" when it came to putting such changes into effect.

William Stucky of the Iowa Center for Agricultural and Economic Adjustment, recognized that Extension had been very aware of the need for internal adjustment. He commented that "the missing element seems to lie in converting from awareness to action."²³

²³E. T. York, Jr., "The Federal Partner Looks at Extension's Challenge," E. J. Boone and C. M. Ferguson (eds.), Changing Dimension in Agriculture and Home Economics (Madison, Wisconsin: National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study, 1962), p. 24.

The Cooperative Extension Service, Today

The Cooperative Extension Service is at a crossroads, as has been mentioned previously in this study. The direction the Cooperative Extension Service takes, as with any institution, is influenced by forces which impinge upon the institution. These forces may create indecision and confusion, maintenance of the status quo, or advancement--either in traditional or innovative directions. In this section of the study some of the more important forces affecting the Cooperative Extension Service will be examined.

It is necessary in reviewing these forces to be aware of not only the forces, but the images of the Cooperative Extension Service held by these forces and the force's self-image. Boulding says, "The image is built up as a result of all past experience of the possessor of the image." Further he says that behavior is dependent upon the image.²⁴ Therefore, as one views the following images of the Cooperative Extension Service, one must be cognizant that these images are the result of the holder's past experiences and that as the holder has additional experiences his images change.

The first series of images of the Cooperative Extension Service that shall be viewed are those of agricultural interests. The researcher has elected to start here because of the traditional Cooperative Extension Service programs in this area.

²⁴Kenneth E. Boulding, The Image (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1956), p. 6.

A national farm organization leader says:

... We recognize that the Extension Service must serve the public, but we insist that this serving the public be done through serving commercial farmers and their families. And I would differentiate between commercial farming and the rural residents and suburban dwellers. Included in commercial agriculture would be part-time as well as full-time farmers. But I want to differentiate because it's important to recognize that we face two vastly different kinds of problems in rural areas.

One has to do with the farm income problem, including prices, marketing, cost of production, and many other factors...

The other important problem area in rural America has to do with the folks who choose to live in rural areas but who are not making their living from or in agriculture.

Now we in the Farm Bureau and you in Extension, of course are as concerned as any other citizen. But in my opinion this is not a prime area of concern for the Extension Service. The Extension Service in agriculture and home economics was established to help farmers. It serves the public need through helping farmers...²⁵

An agricultural journalist expresses the following image of the Cooperative Extension Service.

There is practically unanimous agreement, in most cases quite strongly expressed, that the agricultural Extension Service has no business extending its service to urban residents. There is no implication here as to whether or not town people should have these services--it is simply a firm belief that this is not a function of the agricultural Extension Service and that the cost of serving town people should not be included in the budget of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

...

I think many agricultural editors would seriously question whether the same agency can serve a commercial agriculture

²⁵ Charles B. Shuman, "Organized Agriculture Looks at Extension," An Image of Cooperative Extension, E. J. Boone and C. M. Ferguson (eds.) (Madison, Wisconsin: National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study, 1962), pp. 55-56.

which has the goal of producing and marketing food at a profit and also serve urban housewives whose goal is to buy food and fiber most economically.²⁶

A representative of the off-farm sector of agriculture views the Cooperative Extension Service in this manner:

I realize that this manner of working more with the total population rather than just with agriculture is one that has been given much consideration by Extension for some time. I well recall when this was brought to the attention of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission several years ago. Should home economics Extension work more with city women? Should the county agent begin to think in terms of advice and service to urbanites and suburbanites as well as to rural people? The feeling was almost unanimous that non-farm segments of our population, who are taxpayers and who also have interests in nature and growing things, should have a right to the advice and counsel of Extension people. To them a lawn, a single shade tree or a rosebush is important. I personally share that view.

In line with this there is the question of extending the program of 4-H beyond rural fence lines. Again the feeling of our National Commission was that ... even though the approach and methods might be different, yet nevertheless the constructive influences of Club work should be extended to non-farm people.

...

Among farm leaders and non-farm businessmen there is a growing feeling that Extension may well give more attention to both the problems and the potentials of vertical integration. Regardless of the pros and cons, a definite feeling is developing that vertical integration is seriously disturbing the accustomed pattern of operation among individual farmers, and that vertical integration is leaving the farmer with less decision making as to expansion of operations and individual planning of feeding rations.

...

²⁶J. H. Florea, "The Farm Press Looks at Extension," E. J. Boone and C. M. Ferguson (eds.), An Image of Cooperative Extension (Madison, Wisconsin: National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study, 1962), pp. 31-32.

I know the question of Extension people moving into the arena of public policy has been hotly debated both ways. Many of those I contacted took the position that it is important for Extension workers to get more into the realm of public policy.

...

There were many comments to the effect that Extension workers must recognize, and work with, the growing reurbanization movements taking place in our country today. Better roads and more automobiles with more power have made Americans the moving-est people on earth. Rural and urban people are emerging on an entirely new and different basis. I defy anyone today to tell who are the real wearers of the blue jeans or the grey flannel suits. This new kind of hybrid society requires new and different Extension programs.²⁷

The preceding statements were made by recipients of the services of the Cooperative Extension Service. Each represents a strong force which has a part in guiding the destiny of the Cooperative Extension Service. However, there is a wide difference of opinion as to what the Cooperative Extension Service should be. Before analyzing any of these remarks the researcher presents another group of images for comparison.

This series of statements has been made by administrators of Land-Grant Universities, the parent institution of the Cooperative Extension Service. These images are included in this study because they are held by persons responsible for the total educational program of the university and its colleges of agriculture.

D. W. Colvard, president of Mississippi State University, had the

²⁷ Milo K. Swanton, "The Off-Farm Segments Look at Extension," E. J. Boone and C. M. Ferguson (eds.), An Image of Cooperative Extension (Madison, Wisconsin: National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study, 1962), pp. 67-69.

following to say about the Cooperative Extension Service in giving a Land-Grant University president's view of this institution.

The patterns of life of farm people, the needs of Society, and the structure of the economy are vastly different from what they were 50 years ago.

Currently we are not so much concerned about availability of food for the population as we are about the efficient use of available resources. Budgets and staffs have grown to be very large. Many of the people who use Extension information, including many former Extension workers, are well educated and demand the very latest scientific knowledge. Institutions have grown and have become involved in so many diversified activities that presidents depend more upon organization and less upon their own intimate knowledge of details of specific programs to operate their institutions. More and more of the presidents have backgrounds in fields other than agriculture and must rely upon leaders in their various programs for their guidance.

It is entirely possible that some presidents because of classical background or urban environment have not had the time or the incentive to observe the Extension movement from the grass roots up. They may, indeed, wish just to take it for granted--land-granted, if I may risk a pun. But Extension has always had its problems and always will have them, and these problems make noises that are inevitably heard in the acoustically insulated precincts where top administrators live. These noises come both from within and without. Presidents are looking to Extension leaders for clear interpretations of the future plans for their service.

All of these facts suggest the great importance of effective communication between presidents and Extension directors. If there is to be understanding, if the goals and procedures of Cooperative Extension are to be in harmony with those of the university, if the president and the officials in charge of agriculture are to lend complementary strength one to the other, it seems essential that lines of communication remain open and that no stones be left unturned to see that there exist both understanding and agreement as to the purposes and procedures.²⁸

²⁸D. W. Colvard, "A University President Looks at Extension," E. J. Boone and C. M. Ferguson (eds.) An Image of Cooperative Extension (Madison, Wisconsin: National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study, 1962), pp. 5-6.

H. Macy, Dean of the Institute of Agriculture at the University of Minnesota points out some important changes which have occurred and which are of great significance to the Cooperative Extension Service.

As agriculture developed in the early years of our nation, the physical resources were particularly important and appropriately applied. As time moved onward, the need for the development of the mind and its application to the solution of our problems became increasingly more important.

Agriculture no longer consists of just simple basic chores of farming. Now there is science, technology, the application of power other than the physical power of man or animal, and the related enterprises that constitute agricultural businesses and services. Here the ratio between mind and body has changed. All segments of our society participate to some degree in agriculture, and the utilization of our resources. This is one of the challenges we face in the Land-Grant college.

...

Agricultural Extension must accept responsibility for helping suburban and urban people with problems involving families, nutrition, food selection, lawns and shrubs, etc. Our people in the city and in the country must be fully informed about community affairs and the inter-relationships which exist among all of our people, including especially work with young people. This challenge encompasses the establishment of closer liaison with business and industry, professionals and trades, as well as all parts of private and public agencies, foundations, associations and organizations. It even involves, and importantly the field of international relations.²⁹

The preceding two groups of statements lead to the question of what are the images of the Cooperative Extension Service held by its administrators. For a view of their images the researcher has selected two

²⁹H. Macy, "Summing Up," Proceedings of the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 76th Annual Convention, November 11-14, 1962, pp. 120-121.

statements the first of which is by E. T. York, former Administrator, Federal Extension Service.

America today faces many broad social and economic problems requiring concentrated educational efforts. Land-Grant institutions are in the unique position to serve this need. They have demonstrated their effectiveness in dealing with problems of rural America through programs of research and extension in agriculture and home economics. By extending their philosophy of "education for all" and "education for use" to the problems of other segments of our total society, these universities can become the developmental arm of their states. In accepting this role, competencies from the total university would be involved in the same type of people--and problem--oriented programs characterizing the work in agriculture and home economics.

The problems of agriculture and rural people must continue to be a major focus of the Cooperative Extension Service. But these problems have changed greatly in recent years, and extension programs must change accordingly. These problems require educational resources beyond the traditional subject-matter fields. To meet them effectively, Extension must involve more of the competencies of the total university. With such a broadened scope, Extension can contribute to solution of problems confronting more areas of our total society. Extension is ready and anxious to explore any measures by which it can serve better its parent institutions and render greater service to the people of the nation.

To serve commercial agriculture, extension will need more highly specialized personnel, with many operating in multicounty areas. Extension must further concern itself with the economic growth and social well-being of communities and trade areas throughout rural America by providing leadership for total resource development efforts. Extension must also help the total citizenry develop an understanding of the problems of agriculture and rural America, as well as an appreciation of rural America's contributions to the welfare and happiness of all.³⁰

³⁰ E. T. York, "The Second Hundred Years--Tooling Up for Tomorrow," Proceedings of the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 76th Annual Convention, November 11-14, 1962, pp. 129-130.

Paul A. Miller, former Michigan Cooperative Extension Service Director and Michigan State University Provost (now president of the University of West Virginia) offers the following view of the Cooperative Extension Service's future.

The agricultural colleges have inherited one challenge among several which calls for vision, daring, courage, and intelligence. It deals with lifting up to the all-university level, the unique system of the Extension Service. It means that the array of local offices be brought to represent the entire university, continuing with integrity such local workers and programs as earmarked agricultural appropriations may provide for, flexibly rounding out specializations of local offices as their areas may vary and as additional resources may be provided by federal, state and local bodies, articulating their programs with those of other institutions and administering such a single field-arm of the land-grant institution with an appropriate official within the office of the university president. Under this plan the corps of agricultural extension specialists would remain the responsibility of the agricultural colleges, and, in cooperation with those specialists which other university divisions will come to have, would form into a competent task force to address directly from the campus the agricultural problems of the state, and indirectly through the medium of the field office other public agencies and the private sector. Such task forces would normally be coordinated by a central staff agency of the university (perhaps the general extension division) in order to mobilize and focus the educational resources of the entire university and of other agencies tangent to it. Land-Grant leaders will agree continuing education throughout life on issues which count is not unrelated to survival of democratic institutions. Even the turnover of knowledge requires a lifetime of learning. We cannot without peril overlook such a uniquely American innovation as the extension service to facilitate it.³¹

³¹ Paul A. Miller, "The Agricultural Colleges of the United States: Paradoxical Servants of Change," Proceedings of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, 75th Annual Convention, Vol. II, November 1961, pp. 39-40.

Seven statements of images of the Cooperative Extension Service have been presented. Seven different views of what is or what ought to be have been presented. These images have defined the roles of the Cooperative Extension Service from only agricultural production education to continuing education in all discipline areas and several points between.

The Cooperative Extension Service in Urban Areas

While the Cooperative Extension Service has been examined, studied, and analyzed from many different aspects there is an apparent lack of information on this institution's role in urban areas. The literature review conducted by the researcher resulted in finding only two studies directly related to educational activities of the total Cooperative Extension Service in urban areas. The first of these studies was conducted by Kaufman in 1956.³² The second study was completed by Smith in 1958.³³ The respondents in both of these studies were the county Cooperative Extension Service workers who were responsible for the agricultural programs to the exclusion of all other county worker positions.

Kaufman compiled statements from sixty-four respondents representing thirty-five states on the obligation of the Cooperative Extension Service to serve urban and rural-non-farm people. The study is summarized by

³²Charles R. Kaufman, "An Analysis of the Responsibilities of the Extension Service with Non-Farm Families" (unpublished master's degree research paper, Michigan State University, 1956).

³³Norman J. Smith, "Agricultural Extension Work in Densely Populated Counties of the United States" (unpublished master's degree research paper, Michigan State University, 1958; mimeographed).

Kaufman with the following statement:

The Extension Service is now, and has been for some time, in a transition period in its development. No one can quarrel with the fact that its educational services have been very commendable. The time is long past when the Extension Service can rest on the laurels won through the hard work of those capable individuals who built the organization to its present heights and acceptance in the county today. Past programs and procedures will have to be weighed carefully against the demands and opportunities of the future so that the Extension resources are utilized to render the greatest contribution possible.

The excerpts quoted above would indicate that individual agents who are out on the firing line every day are confused as to which way Extension should go from here. They all are pretty much in agreement that there is a big challenge facing the Extension worker of today.

In all fairness to those agents who have indicated that they do not work with non-farm families with the same concentrated effort that they do with farm families it should be pointed out that they see a danger in spreading themselves too thin, this can be an even greater danger than not taking the added responsibility of a program in the highly populated areas.

In some areas it is quite evident that the program has been sold far beyond the abilities of the Service to produce the end result that the people have grown to expect. The caliber of the program has been high. The people will not be satisfied with anything less. A careful balance must be maintained between the ability to serve a program and the desire created for programs.³⁴

Smith's research was primarily concerned with the types of educational programs conducted by the county Cooperative Extension Service worker responsible for the agricultural and horticultural areas of the Cooperative Extension Service programs in eighty-nine counties of thirty-two states. However, he did describe the changes in number of county Cooperative Extension Service workers, between 1950 and 1958, the

³⁴Kaufman, loc. cit.

clientele, subject matter areas, financing, office equipment, and new techniques used by county Cooperative Extension Service workers. He drew no conclusions from these data. He merely reported the number of responses and comments made by the respondents.

Both Kaufman and Smith may be criticized for not attempting to obtain a cross-section of county Cooperative Extension Service workers in their samples, and for not attempting to analyze their data in greater depth. While Kaufman obtained data on the total Cooperative Extension Service effort in the counties, Smith restricted his to the Cooperative Extension Service programs in agriculture.

All of the counties in Smith's study had populations of at least 140,000 people. This sample would automatically limit the number of states and prevent a total cross-section of opinion from all states. Kaufman selected counties of over 25,000 population, but he did not attempt to include all states in his sample.

It was after a review of these two studies that the researcher set about to design this study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY EMPLOYED IN COLLECTING DATA

Scope of the Study

This study is of an exploratory nature designed to gather information that would reflect the views of county Cooperative Extension Service workers and State Cooperative Extension Service Directors concerning the role and responsibility of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas of the United States.

The results of this study are not expected to provide sufficient data for the development of organizational policy recommendations. However, this study has been undertaken with the hope that it would provide some information on trends and directions which might be useful to Cooperative Extension Service workers and interest others to pursue more comprehensive research.

The study involved only those in the positions of county workers and State Directors who make the routine and long-range policy decisions which affect the direction of the Cooperative Extension Service at county and state levels. By confining the sample to Cooperative Extension Service personnel: (1) it was assumed that there would be greater homogeneity in the respondent's familiarity with and interpretation of the terms used in the opinionnaire, and (2) the many differences in organizational structure and responsibilities of the various state and county Cooperative

Extension Service advisory bodies, and state and local governmental units would be by passed.

The decision to ask three county Cooperative Extension Service workers, regardless of official title, from each state to participate was made so that a cross-section of viewpoints would be available for examination and analysis. Each state was involved equally, rather than on a population basis, so that this study would be national in scope and each state Cooperative Extension Service would be included in the analysis. State Cooperative Extension Service Directors were asked to participate in this study because they determine the direction the institution moves at the state level and relate these decisions to the county Cooperative Extension Service workers.

Information Gathered

The county Cooperative Extension Service worker in the urban and urbanizing area is at the point in time and space where changes are being felt with great pressure. Therefore, it is necessary to obtain opinions from county Cooperative Extension workers in urban and urbanizing areas as to the present and future roles of the Cooperative Extension Service. It is also considered necessary to obtain the opinions of State Cooperative Extension Service Directors on these same questions, because of their role in allocating resources and talents in urban and urbanizing areas. As background on the opinions expressed by the respondents about the present and future roles of the Cooperative Extension Service,

they are asked to evaluate the extent and effectiveness of urban type programs which have been conducted in their counties and states.

The Opinionnaire

An opinionnaire was designed to reflect the opinions of the respondents on the questions which were asked. This opinionnaire was sent to county Cooperative Extension Service workers. An adaptation of this opinionnaire was sent to State Cooperative Extension Service Directors. The terminology used through the opinionnaire was selected because of its general usage by the Federal Extension Service in various communications, bulletins and forms.

The adaptation of the opinionnaire for the State Cooperative Extension Service Directors was essentially the same as the original; however, certain questions were reworded to be applicable to the state level, and information concerning personal background was not requested.

The opinionnaire was pretested with ten county Cooperative Extension Service workers who were attending the Michigan State University Institute for Extension Personnel Development, and one Michigan county Cooperative Extension Service staff. Because of the similarity to the original opinionnaire, the adapted opinionnaire sent to State Cooperative Extension Service Directors was not pretested.

Procedure for Gathering Information

The opinionnaires were assigned code numbers to assure confidentiality and mailed to the potential respondents on May 9, 1963. A letter

explaining the purpose of the study, a stamped, self-addressed envelope for returning the completed opinionnaire, and a cover letter endorsing the request from the researcher's adviser were sent to each potential respondent. The State Cooperative Extension Service Director in each state was informed of the county Cooperative Extension Service workers in his state who were asked to participate in the study.

A follow-up postcard was sent to thirty-two potential participants on June 13, 1963. All responses were received by July 1, 1963.

The covering letters, opinionnaires, and follow-up postcard are presented in Appendices C and D.

Selection of the Sample

States

Each of the fifty states of the United States were included in the sample in order to obtain a broad cross-section of Cooperative Extension Service activities in urban and urbanizing areas. The sample included four potential respondents from each state: the State Cooperative Extension Service Director and three county Cooperative Extension Service workers.

Counties

The three county Cooperative Extension Service workers of each state who were asked to participate in this study represented three different counties. The counties selected were: (1) the county with the largest

total population; (2) the county with the second largest total population; (3) the county with the highest percentage of population increase from 1950 to 1960.

In cases where the county with the highest percentage of increase in population was included in criteria (1) or (2), the next highest percentage of increase in population were selected. If the criteria for increase in population could not be met, e.g., decrease, or increase lower than the national average, the county with the third largest population was selected.

Only counties which had Cooperative Extension Service offices were considered for the sample. Therefore, all of the above criteria is contingent upon this limitation.

Sample

Selection of the individual potential respondents was done randomly to give equal weight to each county Extension worker position in each county, i.e., Agricultural Agent, Home Demonstration Agent, 4-H Club Agent, Consumer Information Agent, etc. The procedure used to select the potential respondents consisted of locating the names of the county Extension workers of the sample counties in the County Agents Directory, 1963.¹ Each name was assigned a number based on the order in which the name was listed in the above publication for the sample county. A deck of numbered cards was prepared containing the number of cards equal

¹C. L. Mast, Jr., and Associates, County Agents Directory, 1963. (Chicago: C. L. Mast's Associates, 1963).

to the number of county Cooperative Extension Service workers in the sample county having the largest Cooperative Extension Service staff. The deck was shuffled, a card drawn and the number recorded. This process was repeated with the deck containing the number of cards showing consecutive digits which corresponded to the number of county Extension workers on the staff. In sample counties where there was only one county Cooperative Extension Service worker this person was included in the sample automatically.

Number of County Extension Workers in Sample Counties

The sample of one hundred and fifty county Extension workers was taken from a universe of eight hundred and eighty-two county Extension worker positions. The number of county Extension worker positions by counties and states is presented in tabular form in Appendix B.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSES OF THE RESPONSES

The material presented in this chapter is the descriptive data concerning the number of respondents and their answers to the questions contained in the opinionnaire. This material is presented in the following sequence: (1) the number of opinionnaires sent and returned; (2) the locational characteristics of the county Cooperative Extension Service workers; (3) the locational characteristics of the State Cooperative Extension Service Directors; (4) the personal background characteristics of the county Cooperative Extension Service workers;¹ (5) the county Cooperative Extension Service workers' opinionnaire responses; (6) the State Cooperative Extension Service Directors opinionnaire responses. The summary of responses follows the format of the opinionnaire except that the personal background characteristics of the county Cooperative Extension Service workers are presented first. The material is presented in this sequence so that the reader may become acquainted with the respondents' backgrounds prior to examining the summary of responses.

The various sections of this chapter present data gathered at the county level first followed by similar data gathered at the state level. Terms are defined, a brief discussion of the important data in the tables

¹Personal background information was not requested of State Cooperative Extension Service Directors. See Discussion in Chapter I.

is conducted, and quotations are cited to aid in defining the categories. The tables are constructed reading from low to high down the table and low to high read across the table to the right. This applies to all tables except those indicating positions and tenure.

The data presented in the tables of this chapter are presented as they were combined after an initial analysis was made on the CDC 3600 Computer. The mean and standard deviation were determined for each of the responses on the computer. This information was used in combining the data categories in order to obtain a more valid statistical analysis.

Opinionnaires Sent and Returned

Responses were received from 130 or 86.6 percent of the 150 potential county Cooperative Extension Service worker respondents. Of the 130 responses, 127 or 84.6 percent of the opinionnaires sent were usable. Approximately an equal number of the usable responses came from each of the four Federal Extension Service regions.

The adaptation of the opinionnaire sent to the fifty State Cooperative Extension Service Directors brought forty-seven responses or a 94.0 percent return. Of the forty-seven responses, forty-five or 90.0 percent of the opinionnaires sent were usable.

All questions on the opinionnaire were not answered by all respondents. This will account for variations in the total responses from question to question. Therefore, all tables in this study are subject to this condition.

County Locational Characteristics

The locational characteristics of the counties represented by the county Cooperative Extension Service worker respondents are presented in Table 2. These various characteristics were divided into categories of low, medium, and high. The lower and upper limits and the number of respondents representing each category are presented in Table 2.

The data in Table 2 indicate a nearly equal distribution of respondents in all low, medium, and high categories except in the percent of rural-farm population. In this particular locational characteristic over one-half of the respondents were from counties which had one percent or less rural-farm population. The medium and high categories of rural-farm population each contained about one-fourth of the respondents.

State Locational Characteristics

The locational characteristics of the states represented by the State Cooperative Extension Service Director respondents are presented in Table 3. These data, while similar to the county data, are presented in a separate table because of the differences in the units of measurement and comparison. The data in Table 3 shows a fairly uniform distribution of respondents in all categories of all locational characteristics.

Personal Background Characteristics

This section describes those characteristics which are held by the county Cooperative Extension Service worker respondents. These characteristics are: position, professional improvement interests, tenure in the Cooperative Extension Service, and educational background.

Table 2. Locational Characteristics of the Counties Represented and the Number of County Cooperative Extension Service Worker Respondents Representing These Counties

Locational Characteristics	Low	Medium	High	Total
Total population	0-120,999	121,000-399,999	400,000 and over	
Number of respondents	41	44	42	127
Population per square mile	0-160	161-750	751 and over	
Number of respondents	41	45	41	127
Percent urban population	0-75	76-89	90-100	
Number of respondents	41	46	40	127
Percent rural-farm population	0-1	2-4	5 and over	
Number of respondents	65	30	32	127
Percent population increase 1950 to 1960	0-24	25-50	51 and over	
Number of respondents	45	40	42	127

Table 3. Locational Characteristics of the States Represented and the Number of State Cooperative Extension Service Directors Respondents Representing These States

Locational Characteristics	Low	Medium	High	Total
Total population	0-1,500,000	1,500,001-3,500,000	3,500,001 and over	
Number of respondents		14	16	45
Population per square mile	0-40	41-80	81 and over	
Number of respondents		14	15	45
Percent urban population	0-55	56-69	70 and over	
Number of respondents		14	15	45
Percent rural-farm population	0-5	6-12	13 and over	
Number of respondents		14	16	45
Percent population increase 1950 to 1960	0-9	10-20	21 and over	
Number of respondents		15	14	45

The data in Table 4 show that 89.8 percent of the respondents were agricultural, 4-H Club, or home economics agents. The category "other agents" includes consumer information, marketing, horticulture, live-stock, and forestry.

Table 4. County Cooperative Extension Service Worker Positions and Percentages of the County Positions Represented in the Sample

Position	Respondents	
	Number	Percentage
Agricultural agents	57	44.9
4-H Club agents	18	14.2
Home economics agents	39	30.7
Other agents	11	8.6
No response	<u>2</u>	<u>1.6</u>
Total	127	100.0

The proportion of county Cooperative Extension Service worker positions in the United States is: 57.6 percent agricultural agents, 6.2 percent 4-H Club agents, and 36.2 percent home economics agents.² A comparison of the sample to the actual proportion of county positions shows that the proportion of agricultural agents in the sample is quite low, the proportion of 4-H is over twice the actual proportion, and the proportion of home economics agents is similar to the actual proportion.

In Table 5 technical subject matter includes such areas as: animal husbandry, agronomy, horticulture, dairy science, textiles, foods, and

²Federal Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1962 Statistics on Activities of Cooperative Extension Service, ESC-555, Washington, 1964, p. 1.

nutrition. Educational methods include education, vocational agriculture and home economics, etc. Sociology, psychology, human behavior, family living, etc. make up the category of human development.

Table 5. Major Subject Matter Interests of Respondents as they Relate to Professional Improvement

Subject Matter	Respondents	
	Number	Percentage
Technical	84	76.4
Educational methods	6	5.4
Human development	<u>20</u>	<u>18.2</u>
Total	110	100.0

A far greater number of respondents ranked technical subject matter as their major subject matter interest than the other two categories. Eighty-four or 76.4 percent said technical subject matter was their major concern. Twenty or 18.2 percent listed human development as their major interest. Only six or 5.4 percent were primarily interested in educational methods.

Tenure was viewed from two aspects. First, total tenure and second, tenure in the county now serving are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. County Cooperative Extension Service Workers' Cooperative Extension Service Total Tenure and Tenure in County Now Serving

Number of Years	Cooperative Extension Service			
	Total Tenure		Tenure in County Now Serving	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
0-5	39	30.7	51	40.2
6-15	44	34.6	51	40.2
16-over	42	33.1	21	16.5
No response	<u>2</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3.1</u>
Total	127	100.0	127	100.0

The data in Table 6 show approximately one-third of the county workers were in each of the three tenure categories for total tenure in the Cooperative Extension Service. However, approximately 40.0 percent of the county workers have served from 0 to 5 years, and 6 to 15 years in the county now serving, while about 16 percent have been in the county now serving over 16 years.

The period of time in which the county Cooperative Extension Service workers received bachelor's and/or master's degrees is presented in Table 7. About one-third of those respondents providing information on this question received their bachelor's degree in each of the three time periods. However, 21 or 84.0 percent of the respondents received their master's degrees in the 1955 to 1963 period.

Table 7. The Number and Percentages of County Cooperative Extension Service Worker Respondents who Received Bachelor's and/or Master's Degrees from 1920 to 1963

Period of Time	Bachelor's Degree		Master's Degree	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1920-1940	35	34.3	2	8.0
1941-1954	34	33.3	2	8.0
1955-1963	<u>33</u>	<u>32.4</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>84.0</u>
Total Responses*	102	100.0	25	100.0

* Total responses, total number of respondents having bachelor's degrees and total number of respondents having master's degrees, duplication not removed.

The criteria used to establish the subject matter categories in Table 8 is the same as that used in Table 5. The data in Tables 5 and 8 are presented separately to differentiate between subject matter interests of the respondents related to professional improvement and those interests related to formal education.

Table 8. Major Fields of Study as They Relate to the Formal Educational Experiences of the Respondents

Subject Matter	Formal Educational Level of Respondents					
	Bachelor's Degree		Master's Degree		Additional Study	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Technical	83	68.0	16	55.2	26	42.6
Educational Methods	38	31.2	11	37.9	26	42.6
Human Development	1	0.8	2	6.9	9	14.8
Total	122	100.0	29	100.0	61	100.0

Table 8 shows that at the bachelor's degree level eighty-three or 68.0 percent of the respondents pursued technical subject matter areas, thirty-eight or 31.2 percent of the respondents studied educational methods, and only one or 0.8 percent pursued the area of human development. At the master's degree level sixteen or 55.2 percent of the respondents studied in technical subject matter areas, eleven or 37.9 percent pursued educational methods, and two or 6.9 percent studied human development. The respondents who had continued to take courses beyond the highest degree which they had attained placed equal emphasis on technical subject matter and educational methods with twenty-six or 42.6 percent of the respondents in each category, and nine or 14.8 percent of the respondents were studying human development.

One of the respondents had completed his doctor's degree in a technical subject matter area. Also, one of the respondents had completed most of the requirements for a doctor's degree in educational methods.

Seventy-four or 58.3 percent of the respondents were males, fifty-one or 40.2 percent were females, and two or 1.5 percent did not respond to this question. Of the male respondents, fifty-six were agricultural agents, ten were 4-H Club agents, and eight were in other county agent positions. One female was an agricultural agent, eight were 4-H Club agents, thirty-nine were home economics agents, and three were in other county agent positions.

County Cooperative Extension Service Workers' Opinionnaire Responses

The material presented in this section includes the number and percentage of county Cooperative Extension Service workers' responses to each question asked in the opinionnaire. Because the responses to the open-ended questions are combined into three categories, the researcher presents direct quotations taken from the responses to aid in defining the categories.

The terms rural oriented, transitional, and urban oriented are used to identify the three categories of responses to the open-ended questions. The category in which the term rural oriented is used includes responses which emphasized: a farm or rural orientation; agricultural production over all other program areas; demonstration or "how to do it" type of programs; relating agricultural problems to urban people; and/or a reluctance to develop a broader clientele base. The term transitional is used to describe those responses which indicated movement toward a broader clientele base; however, this movement was limited by concerns over the loss of support from the traditional clientele and the uncertainty of the support a new clientele will provide; lack of total perspective in relation to the interdependency and interrelationships of the various segments of society; and attempting to work in new areas or new problems with a new clientele by using traditional methods and approaches. The response which indicated working with a new clientele in broad programs which explore the interdependency and interrelationships of society and investigate

the why of things were categorized as urban oriented.

Question 1: In your opinion what is the current role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas?

Less than 10 percent gave rural oriented responses. These data are presented in Table 9. Eighty-six percent of the county Cooperative Extension Service workers' responses were categorized transitional and urban oriented.

Table 9. Summary of Responses to Question 1: In Your Opinion What is the Current Role of the Cooperative Extension Service in Urban and Urbanizing Areas?

Responses	Respondents	
	Number	Percentage
Rural oriented	11	8.66
Transitional	57	44.88
Urban oriented	53	41.73
No response	6	4.72
Total	127	100.0

The following quotations are examples of responses which were categorized as being rural oriented. One county Cooperative Extension Service worker said the current role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas was:

Providing agricultural information as it may be related to urban problems. Extension's function is related to agriculture, and not urban areas. The full name of this organization is "Cooperative Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics." I note that you do not include agriculture in your headings. The fact that taxes support this work does not require that we get into areas outside agriculture and home economics.

Another county worker said,

In work such as home groups and youth there is some need. But don't forget there are private agencies already doing work in this area.

Some examples of transitional responses are presented here. As one county worker points out:

Our current role seems to be trying to be "all things to all people," an impossible situation. Our dilemma is that we can't decide whether to neglect farmers so as to develop urban programs and get support from the people with the most votes, or to ignore the city (except to fill specific requests) and develop new and better farm programs (where we are best qualified). We can't do both with the staff and finances now available.

Another county worker said,

To serve the increasing masses of publics in the field of education in home and family living, money management, and probably strongest in consumer buying or education. There is great opportunity and need for active youth programs in organized 4-H work as well as other phases leading youngsters in guided lines of career opportunities. Agriculture still remains the most important part of today's economy. Urban people need agricultural training and background in daily living as well as agriculture dependent careers.

Another responded,

To assist public agencies and community groups solve problems of area-wide importance where our knowledge of plant life, soils, animal life, water, etc. makes us the logical agency through which to seek the assistance. Examples of acceptable problems: parks, recreation areas, erosion and brush control in hillside residential areas, water supply, etc.

Another commented,

The current role is probably a rural program grafted on and slightly adopted to fit an urban setting. Subject

matter, the organizational framework, the methods of Cooperative Extension can be used to serve effectively the needs of the vast population groups in an urban setting.

Another listed his response,

1. Expanding
2. Needed but not publicized
3. Difficult for old timers to accept sometimes
4. Fills definite need but may require new methods
5. Inevitable for survival

Another responded,

Urban citizens are being shortchanged for their extension tax dollar. Too often extension agents work with cooperators who request help. But the urban person does not request help because he does not know it is available to him, nor just what kind of help he can have. The current role of extension is of minor educational importance.

The urban oriented responses include such comments as was made by this county worker.

I would quote from the Smith-Lever Act "to the people." Our role is to disseminate information "to the people." Where they are living does not enter into the picture. Their needs should be evaluated and responses included in our plan of work. If this results in increased effort, OK, decreased same. Trends should follow in proportion to usage.

Another remarked,

According to the "Statement of Scope and Responsibility of the Cooperative Extension Service" published April, 1958, the Extension Service has the same responsibility to urban people as rural, although priority is to be given those families producing good food and fiber, as I interpret this statement. In reality, however, I have found that Extension in this State has been slow to adjust to meet their urban responsibilities. We in urban areas, who must meet the needs of our rapidly growing urban populations have had to pioneer methods and programs to

meet these needs without much assistance from outside the county.

Another explained,

The role of the Cooperative Extension Service is to work with all the people. Being a part of the Land Grant College we should represent the college in the county. The exact work will depend on the local situation. If an area is being serviced by an established organization or group it should not be duplicated by the Cooperative Extension Service, but the Cooperative Extension Service should cooperate with similar groups.

Another commented,

I feel that the Extension Service must work with people in urban areas to carry out the philosophy of extension working with all people. This group cannot be ignored-- they play an important part in local government, and this is very important in securing local government support for extension work.

Another stated,

Working with all people toward economic and social development.

Another said,

I feel Cooperative Extension Service is designed for all people and thus believe in urban and urbanizing areas, the programs must be adapted to this audience.

Question 2: In your opinion should Extension educational assistance to urban people be?

The data in Table 10 show that approximately 15 percent of the county worker respondents said Extension educational assistance to urban people should be held the same to increased slightly, while over 80 percent of the responses were in the category increase moderately to substantially.

Table 10. Summary of Responses to Question 2: In Your Opinion Should Extension Educational Assistance to Urban People Be?

Responses	Respondents	
	Number	Percentage
Held the same to increase slightly	19	14.96
Increase moderately to substantially	104	81.89
No response	<u>4</u>	<u>3.15</u>
Total	127	100.00

Question 3: What proportion of time do you think Extension workers should spend working with urban residents of your county?

The responses to this question are summarized in Table 11. Approximately one-tenth of the county worker respondents replied that less than 20 percent of the time should be spent with urban work. One-half of the respondents indicated Extension workers should spend 21 to 60 percent of their time working with urban residents. Approximately one-third of the respondents said 61 to 100 percent of the worker's time should go into urban work.

Table 11. Summary of Responses to Question 3: What Proportion of Time Do You Think Extension Workers Should Spend Working with Urban Residents of Your County?

Responses	Respondents	
	Number	Percentages
0 to 20 percent	14	11.02
21 to 60 percent	64	50.40
61 to 100 percent	44	34.65
No response	<u>5</u>	<u>3.93</u>
Total	127	100.00

Question 4A: From what sources do you think Extension will receive its financial support in the future?

Question four was divided into two parts. The first part sought opinions concerning the sources of funds for the future operation of the Cooperative Extension Service. The second part of the question attempted to obtain opinions related to sources of support other than financial or goodwill and favorable attitudes toward the Cooperative Extension Service.

The respondents were also asked to supply information concerning the present sources of financial support for comparison with the future sources. The responses are presented in Table 12.

Table 12 shows the number and percentage of responses in each source category in terms of the present and the future. When comparing the number of responses for future financial support to the present it can be seen that county, state and federal sources received fewer responses in the future column, while more respondents indicated the other sources. The greatest increase in numbers of responses for future support from a source occurred in the categories city government, business, foundations, and industries.

Question 4B: From what sources do you think Extension will receive its support other than financial?

The greatest number of responses to this question were in the categories of county, state, and federal government. Business, industries, organizations, and foundations formed the next group of sources. This information is presented in Table 13.

Table 12. Summary of Responses to Question 4A: From What Sources Do You Think Extension Will Receive its Financial Support in the Future?¹

Source	Present Financial Support				Future Financial Support			
	Response		No Response		Response		No Response	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Government								
Township	2	1.57	125	98.43	5	3.94	122	96.06
City	5	3.94	122	96.06	17	13.39	110	86.61
County	94	74.02	33	25.98	84	66.14	43	33.86
State	91	71.65	36	28.35	82	64.57	45	35.43
Federal	102	80.31	25	19.69	90	70.87	37	29.13
Business	2	1.57	125	98.43	14	11.02	113	88.98
Foundations	4	3.15	123	96.85	16	12.60	111	87.40
Industries	3	2.36	124	97.64	14	11.02	113	88.98
Organizations	4	3.15	123	96.85	10	7.87	117	92.13
Other	5	3.94	122	96.06	7	5.51	120	94.49

¹The table totals representing the number of responses and no responses for each source in both the present and future categories is 127 or the total number of county Cooperative Extension Service worker responses used in the study.

Table 13. Summary of Responses to Question 4B: From What Source Do You Think Extension Will Receive its Support Other than Financial?¹

Source	Response		No Response	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Government				
Township	27	21.26	100	78.74
City	46	36.22	81	63.78
County	73	57.48	54	42.52
State	74	58.27	53	41.73
Federal	77	60.63	50	39.37
Business	69	54.33	58	45.67
Foundations	57	44.88	70	55.12
Industry	69	54.33	58	45.67
Organizations	61	48.03	66	51.97
Other	19	14.96	108	85.04

¹The total number of responses and no responses for each source is 127.

Question 5: What kinds of assistance do you feel the total Extension program should provide for urban people in each of the following areas?

Responses to this question were categorized into the three categories of rural oriented, transitional, and urban oriented. A summary of the responses is presented in Table 14.

Regarding the kind of assistance that should be provided to urban people in the area of agricultural production, management, and natural resource development; 33 percent of the responses were rural oriented, 45 percent were transitional, and 21 percent were urban oriented. Responses which were classified rural oriented were those which indicated direct service to farmers, or information to home owners about landscaping and

Table 14. Summary of Responses to Question 5: What Kinds of Assistance Do You Feel the Total Extension Program Should Provide for Urban People in Each of the Following Areas?

Area	Responses						Total Number
	Rural Oriented		Transitional		Urban Oriented		
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Agricultural production, management and natural resource development	35	33.65	47	45.20	22	21.15	104
Community and public affairs	25	22.12	62	54.87	26	23.01	113
Extension home economics	18	15.65	44	38.26	53	46.09	115
4-H and other youth Extension work	7	6.09	16	13.91	92	80.00	115
Marketing and utilization of agricultural products	53	50.00	22	20.75	31	29.25	106

horticultural problems. Examples of transitional responses are:

Knowledge resource in such areas as vegetable production, lawn care, horticultural problems, insect pests, marketing and consumer information. If farm still surrounded the urban area they may need help in how to be able to get out of farming. Tax problems, what to do after farm is sold for income etc.

And,

When help is not available from a private agency, extension should help people understand the benefits of sound management. No service should be provided when it is available from a private individual or agency.

Two examples of urban oriented responses are:

Assistance in coordinating the activities of many individuals and organizations working in this field. Offering technical guidance in timber production, crop production, and the use of forest lands for recreation. Promoting good resource planning and development.

And,

Assistance must be geared to the need. It will, of necessity, cover a wide range of subjects--food production, home maintenance, self-improvement, soil conservation, opportunities for taking advantage of natural resources, etc.

In the area of community and public affairs assistance for urban people 22 percent of the responses were rural oriented, 54 percent were transitional, and 23 percent urban oriented. Some examples of responses from each category are presented here. These responses were categorized as being rural oriented. One county worker said,

Inform these people of the large percentage of the labor force involved in agriculture. Keep them up to date on the government farm programs. Be sure the urban public understands the farmers problems. Tours, local farm visits, and agricultural field days would help.

Another expressed his feelings this way,

Very little. Public affairs (such as roads, schools, etc.) information may be very important but I don't feel it is our job as agents to be leaders in this field. Reasons:

1. Technology in trained fields of agriculture impossible to keep up with now.
2. Consists mostly of night work.
3. Too easily becomes politically involved.
4. Gives no personal satisfaction.

Another county worker stated,

I have no feeling upon extension's role in this area. After some study of the outline of public affairs in the SCOPE report, I wonder if the local chamber of commerce in our community is not already fulfilling this function.

These responses were transitional. One county worker stated his views this way.

Extension workers must get into politics when organizations are created and public opinion is necessary for a program to succeed. This should not be from a government angle but for the protection of private enterprise.

Another said,

Some work should be done in this field, but it should be done through existing organizations. These are already set up and it would be unhealthy for Extension to try to get in the forefront.

Another responded,

Much needs to be done by the Extension in Community Development. The urban people tend to be less interested in their community than farm folks. We need to work with the community groups on programs that are of interest to them and try to show how this will help their community.

The following responses were placed in the urban oriented category. One county worker said,

Extension should continue to expand in this area, working through an ever increasing number of groups. Membership in varied groups and serving on committees broadens the scope of Extension.

Another replied,

Programs to help people more fully understand their responsibilities as citizens and how public affairs affect their families and communities.

And another stated,

Community improvement is making great strides in some areas. With extension service leading the way many have been able to overcome "growing pains."

Fifteen percent of the responses in the area of extension home economics assistance for urban people were rural oriented, 38 percent were transitional, and 46 percent were urban oriented. Some of the responses are presented here. The examples of rural oriented responses are:

Since the home economics section of the Agricultural Extension system was originally designed for the rural families, I feel that it should remain to be so. Urban homes should seek home economics assistance from other sources or a special branch that is connected to Universities. However, the public is entitled to the publications that are written in this field.

And,

For those homemakers who have not had home economics training it has good possibilities provided ways are found to conform with bridge and bowling schedules. (We should add working wives also.)

The examples of transitional responses are:

Certainly extension can do as much in education in this area in urban communities as it has in the rural community. But with the use of good home economics people by many commercial and public utilities, the extension role must be different, more sophisticated than in the past.

And,

We place no distinction on Extension home economics for urban and rural people other than we find it necessary to work with them in a slightly different manner.

Some examples of urban oriented responses are presented here. As one county worker summarized,

There is unlimited potential for home economics extension work with urban women--everything from nutrition to clothing, home management, child care, budgeting and money management--the works.

Another stated,

There is a decided need and future for home economics assistance in urban areas. In fact, as great a need as was formerly in rural areas. We notice that families in low cost housing, our transient military families and the newly married couples are in great need of help with family financial planning and child development. Though they do not all recognize this need, agencies directly concerned for their welfare do. As in other urban areas, Extension is now beginning to establish contact with these agencies.

Another said,

This is one area in which Extension finds no barriers. Urban homemakers can and do use the services of home agents and homemaking information as well or perhaps even better than do rural homemakers. Our county home demonstration program is a classic example of how leadership can be devoted among urban ladies and the kinds of information that can be utilized fully.

Six percent of the responses in the area of 4-H and other youth extension work assistance for urban people were rural oriented, 14 percent transitional, and 80 percent were urban oriented. An example of a rural oriented response is:

Where land is available for working with animals or for planting a crop of vegetables, fruit or ornamentals, 4-H work has a particular place. When 4-H is reduced to a "riding club" of equestrians, 4-H has lost its purpose of building future citizens.

An example of a transitional response is:

Programs that would be of greater interest to urban youth should be worked in but they may be already available from other organizations. Duplication of this would be ridiculous.

The following are examples of urban oriented responses. They are included here in greater number than in the other categories because they point up different considerations in this area and because of the large proportion of responses in this category. A county worker said,

Extension should again stand ready to meet the needs of every boy and girl, whether in urban areas or not. Working with other youth agencies may be necessary but we must gear our image to meet the needs of all youth.

Another responded,

The 4-H Club program probably is the most far-reaching program in my county to urban people. Through 4-H, we are able to keep Extension's educational role before the people. We make good use of monthly newsletters, which the 4-H members take home to their parents, to detail in the information we teach in the clubs; and to keep them abreast of coming Extension events, as well as timely tips on home yard and garden care, and insect control.

Another stated,

This is the major area in which Extension can be of greatest service. Organizing clubs, selecting and training leaders and meeting the clubs as often as possible is the job of Extension agents. Our job is to find educational assistance to provide in whatever field the youth are interested.

Another replied,

4-H and Other Youth Extension Work have a place in urban areas. With our goal of building boys and girls by giving them opportunities to make their best even better, we are of the opinion that we haven't even dented the imaginative opportunities for building and assisting youth in the fields of personal interest, including commodities, health, safety, cooperation, industry, sportsmanship, citizenship, community service, etc.

Another offered,

Here we should depart from the old 4-H project rut and offer programs in recreation, health and hobbies. Provide the opportunity and atmosphere for older youngsters to discuss careers, occupation and marriage or other special interests.

In the area of assistance for urban people in marketing and utilization of agricultural products, 50 percent of the responses were rural oriented, 21 percent were transitional, and 29 percent were urban oriented. An example of a rural oriented response is this statement:

Urban people need to learn why a "beef animal in Kansas is not a steak in Chicago"--need to understand costly services between the producer and consumer.

This statement is an example of the transitional response.

Surplus picture might be one indication of the effectiveness of Extension's educational program in the fields of production. What impact might Extension have if equivalent resources were poured into the marketing of these agricultural products.

The urban oriented responses indicated that the respondent considered marketing and utilization as production, assembly, processing, sales and consumption.

Question 6: What personal experiences have you had in urban Extension work?

Twelve percent of the responses to this question were categorized as being rural oriented, 63 percent were transitional, and 21 percent were urban oriented. These data are presented in Table 15.

Table 15. Summary of Responses to Question 6: What Personal Experiences Have You Had in Urban Extension Work?

Responses	Respondents	
	Number	Percentage
Rural oriented	15	11.81
Transitional	80	62.99
Urban oriented	27	21.26
No response	5	3.94
Total	127	100.00

The following are examples of the responses. Thus county workers' responses were categorized as rural oriented.

I participated in a Public Affairs survey in ---- County, which I felt was ridiculous... We did little except argue over what is a public affair. We are not trained in this area. Why "meddle" or duplicate what professionals are hired by local governments to do?

This response was also rural oriented.

Telephone calls... Our office phones are constantly ringing. Urban dwellers requesting information on lawns, gardens, and flowers. We give out the latest information and send bulletins if requested. We limit our home visits due to the number of calls.

These responses were classified as transitional,

Radio--daily 5-minute program. Answer questions sent in by listeners. Negro station--owned, operated and listened to by Negroes in ----- area.

"Better Living Series"--meetings with homemakers. Meetings planned and sponsored in cooperation with such groups as

Credit Unions, PTA's, Church groups, Women's Clubs, Industrial Girls' Clubs, Labor Unions, Home Economics Extension Clubs, City Housing Commission, Social Agencies, etc. YWCA and YMCA.

And,

I have been employed to work primarily on the non-agricultural interpretation of the progressive soil survey now in operation. To date I have worked with Plan Commissions, Health Department, county and state highway officials and land developers. These agencies have been very receptive to the ideas and information available through the use of the soil survey. I have also carried on educational meetings with the general public and written articles for the "mass media" outlets available in this area.

These are urban oriented responses.

After coming to ----- County, I soon learned that the urban residents did not know anything about extension service. They did not know where to turn to get unbiased information in horticulture and home economics. After sizing up the situation our extension staff felt that the setting up of a home economics committee and a landscape committee, would contribute much to planning a program to meet the needs of this group. This approach has been successful. Speaking to various organizations and groups in urban areas, has been most helpful. Demonstrations and clinics have contributed much. Radio and TV programs in the past, have assisted in carrying badly needed information to this group. A regular mailing list of subject matter in which this urban group is interested, is maintained. A clean-up campaign was quite successful this spring. Initial plans were made by a Landscape Committee. Planning meetings were held with county officials, and all departments cooperated in carrying out this educational program. A special pick-up day was designated and county trucks collected the litter. Object of the campaign was to clean up roadways and vacant lots in the county of the debris which had collected. Many community organizations assisted. Radio, TV, and Newspapers helped.

And,

In this county, because of previous agents, and the total distribution of population, we have been involved with urban affairs for some time. We are extremely heavy on mass media. We have several in-town 4-H Clubs, as well as in the "urban" areas. Our membership would be less than half rural. There are several home programs directed at the (city) homemaker, as well as young homemakers, with program designed for their specific needs. The two telephone lines that are into the office are kept busy with urban calls. The agents feel like a "Jykel and Hyde" proposition as you are wearing several caps in the same day.

Question 7: To what extent has urban Extension work been undertaken in the following areas in your county?

The summary of responses to this question is presented in Table 16. It is shown in this table that 44 percent of the respondents said that a moderate amount to much work had been done in urban agricultural production, management, and natural resource development; 50 percent said the same for community and public affairs; 90 percent for extension home economics; 77 percent for 4-H and other youth extension work; and 53 percent said the same for marketing and utilization of agricultural products.

Question 8: In your opinion how effective have urban Extension programs been in your county?

The responses to this question are presented in Table 17. In all Extension program areas the majority of the county workers ranked the effectiveness of the area moderate to very high. Sixty-one percent of the respondents placed agricultural production, management and natural resource development efforts in this category; 61 percent did the same with

Table 16. Summary of Responses to Question 7: To What Extent Has Urban Extension Work Been Undertaken in the Following Areas in Your County?

Areas	Responses				Total
	Little to Some		Moderate to Very High		
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Agricultural production, management, and natural resource development	67	55.83	53	44.17	120
Community and public affairs	60	49.59	61	50.41	121
Extension home economics	12	9.60	113	90.40	125
4-H and other youth Extension work	28	22.40	97	77.60	125
Marketing and utilization of agricultural products	57	47.11	64	52.89	121

Table 17. Summary of Responses to Question 8: In Your Opinion How Effective Have Urban Extension Programs Been in Your County?

Areas	Responses				Total
	Very Low to Low		Moderate to Very High		
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Agricultural production, management, natural resource development	44	38.60	77	61.40	114
Community and public affairs	45	39.13	70	60.87	115
Extension home economics	10	8.00	115	92.00	125
4-H and other youth Extension work	20	16.39	102	83.61	122
Marketing and utilization of agricultural products	35	30.70	79	69.30	114

community and public affairs; 92 percent with extension home economics; 83 percent with 4-H and other youth extension work; and 69 percent of the respondents placed marketing and utilization of agricultural products in this category.

State Cooperative Extension Service Directors'
Opinionnaire Responses

The material presented in this section includes the number and percentages of the State Cooperative Extension Service Directors' responses to each question asked in the opinionnaire. The terms used in this section are defined as they were in the preceeding section which contained the summary of county Cooperative Extension Service workers' responses.

Question 1: In your opinion what is the current role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas ?

Thirteen percent of the State Cooperative Extension Service Directors' responses were classified as rural oriented, 40 percent transitional, and 44 percent urban oriented. These data are presented in Table 18.

Table 18. Summary of Responses to Question 1: In Your Opinion What is the Current Role of the Cooperative Extension Service in Urban and Urbanizing Areas ?

Responses	R e s p o n d e n t s	
	Number	Percentage
Rural oriented	6	13.33
Transitional	18	40.00
Urban oriented	20	44.44
No response	<u>1</u>	<u>2.22</u>
Total	45	100.00

The following quotations are examples of responses which were categorized in the three categories, rural oriented, transitional, and urban oriented. One State Cooperative Extension Service Director responding in the rural oriented category said:

Our primary responsibility is to rural people but all people will be given help when this is requested.

Another stated,

Until we have urban workers the present staff should become involved in urban work to the extent it is requested --not solicited.

Another said,

The current role is not clear. We do not have a well planned organized urban program. Much improvement needs to be made in Home Economics and 4-H Club Work in urban areas. Farm technology must not be decreased. Urban people will not lend real support as will farm and rural people.

Examples of transitional responses are:

Urban areas are legally entitled to the services of the Extension Services including youth work, home economics, policy and community development and those agricultural areas applicable to them.

Because we have been "farm oriented" we still would say in this state that our prime responsibility is to farm and rural families but not to them alone.

And,

Extension currently plays a restricted role in urban areas. Some leadership is given to industrial development efforts and some assistance is given primarily in the areas of health, nutrition, and horticulture.

Also,

Extension's main business is people and the development

of people the main objective. City people are taxpayers as well as rural people are. They are entitled to the kind of help Extension can give. Many of today's city people were rural people yesterday and know the value of Extension for themselves and their children. Extension can help city people with their agricultural problems--and they have many of them (lawn care and fertilization, insect control, and disease control, etc.) and with their home economics and youth needs, etc. Many city people are in agriculturally related activities.

Examples of urban oriented responses are:

As one state director remarked,

The Extension Service has a responsibility to all people and therefore, should design programs to reach urban people in an effective manner.

Another said,

The same as to other people, Extension has a responsibility to the people of the United States. Our responsibility is limited only by our competency.

Another stated,

We have a responsibility here and I see no reason why we should not accept the challenge. Ours is education, and I think we are expected to do the job regardless of where our clientele is!

Another replied,

The current role is to teach urban people to help themselves. We have a responsibility to all people--rural and urban. New information should be disseminated to those who have a need.

Question 2: In your opinion should Extension educational assistance to urban people be?

In response to this question 24 percent of the state directors said Extension educational assistance should be held the same to increased

slightly and 75 percent said it should be increased moderately to substantially. These responses are presented in Table 19.

Table 19. Summary of responses to Question 2: In Your Opinion Should Extension Educational Assistance to Urban People be:

Responses	Respondents	
	Number	Percentage
Held the same to increased slightly	11	24.44
Increased moderately to substantially	34	75.56
No response	<u>0</u>	<u>00.00</u>
Total	45	100.00

Question 3: What proportion of time do you think Extension workers should spend working with urban residents of your state?

The response to this question as summarized in Table 20 show that 49 percent of the state directors indicated Extension workers should spend 20 percent of their time or less working with urban residents, 47 percent said from 21 to 60 percent of the Extension workers time should be spent working with urban residents, and only 2 percent said over 60 percent of the time should be spent on urban work.

Table 20. Summary of Responses to Question 3: What Proportion of Time Do You Think Extension Workers Should Spend Working with Urban Residents of Your State?

Responses	Respondents	
	Number	Percentage
0 to 20 percent	21	48.89
21 to 60 percent	22	46.67
61 to 100 percent	1	2.22
No response	<u>1</u>	<u>2.22</u>
Total	45	100.00

Question 4A: From what sources do you think Extension will receive its financial support in the future?

The respondents were asked to provide information on present sources of financial support as well as future sources of financial support. The responses are presented in Table 21.

The data in Table 21 show the number and percentage of responses in each source category in terms of the present and the future. When comparing the number of responses for future financial support to the present it can be seen that an equal number responded in both the present and future regarding county financial support, there are fewer responses in state and federal government and other categories. All other sources contain a greater number of responses in the future column with the greatest gain in number being in the category of city government.

Question 4B: From what sources do you think Extension will receive its support other than financial?

This question differs from Question 4A in that it seeks opinions related to sources of favorable attitudes and goodwill toward the Cooperative Extension Service.

The group of categories receiving the greatest number of responses included county, state, and federal government. The middle group contained all other categories except township government and other sources. This information is presented in Table 22.

Table 21. Summary of Responses to Question 4A: From What Sources Do You Think Extension Will Receive its Financial Support in the Future?¹

Source	Present Financial Support				Future Financial Support			
	Response		No Response		Response		No Response	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Government								
Township	--	--	45	100.00	2	4.44	43	95.56
City	4	8.89	41	91.11	15	33.33	30	66.67
County	41	91.11	4	8.89	41	91.11	4	8.89
State	45	100.00	--	--	43	95.56	2	4.44
Federal	44	97.78	1	2.22	41	91.11	4	8.89
Business	1	2.22	44	97.78	2	4.44	43	95.56
Foundations	--	--	45	100.00	3	6.67	42	93.33
Industries	3	6.67	42	93.33	5	11.11	40	88.89
Organizations	4	8.89	41	91.11	4	8.89	41	91.11
Other	6	13.33	39	86.67	4	8.89	41	91.11

¹The table totals representing the number of responses and no responses for each source in both the present and future categories, is 45 or the total number of State Cooperative Extension Service Directors' responses used in the study.

Table 22. Summary of Responses to Question 4B: From What Sources Do You Think Extension Will Receive its Support Other Than Financial?¹

Source	Response		No Response	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Government				
Township	10	22.22	35	77.78
City	22	48.89	23	51.11
County	30	66.67	15	33.33
State	33	73.33	12	26.67
Federal	32	71.11	13	28.89
Business	21	46.67	24	53.33
Foundations	20	44.44	25	55.56
Industries	21	46.67	24	53.33
Organizations	21	46.67	24	53.33
Other	5	11.11	40	88.89

¹The total number of responses and no responses for each source is 45.

Question 5: What kinds of assistance do you feel the total Extension program should provide for urban people in each of the following areas?

The summary of responses to this question is presented in Table 23. The three categories of rural oriented, transitional, and urban oriented are again used to describe the responses.

The responses regarding the kind of assistance that should be provided to urban people in the area of agricultural production, management, and natural resource development were: 37 percent rural oriented, 46 percent transitional, and 16 percent urban oriented. Examples of rural oriented responses are:

Education of urban people as to role and importance of agriculture.

Table 23. Summary of Responses to Question 5: What Kinds of Assistance Do You Feel the Total Extension Program Should Provide for Urban People in Each of the Following Areas?

Area	Responses					
	Rural Oriented		Transitional		Urban Oriented	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Agricultural production, management and natural resource development	16	37.21	20	46.51	7	16.28
Community and public affairs	8	17.78	17	37.78	20	44.44
Extension home economics	6	13.33	18	40.00	21	46.67
4-H and other youth Extension work	3	6.67	4	8.89	38	84.44
Marketing and utilization of agricultural products	17	37.78	14	31.11	14	31.11
						45
						87

And,

Information pertaining to landscaping, production of horticultural crops, and disease and insect control.

Transitional responses looked like these:

Emphasize work with industry and such producers as florists, vegetable, etc. Avoid individual homeowner service. Utilize mass media and telephone service.

And, as one state director listed,

1. Ornamental horticulture
2. Household management
3. Legal documents--wills, estate planning, partnerships, etc.
4. Recreation
5. Use of water resources

State directors who provided urban oriented responses said:

An understanding of the interrelationship of agricultural production to urban living particularly with respect to the relationships between agricultural service industries and agricultural production. This same factor would be true of management. Natural resource development directly involves both the land owner and the land user. Therefore, a successful natural resource development program must involve the entire state's population. The Extension Service should provide organizational guidance, programs and motivation to accomplish the natural resource development.

And,

1. Furnishing information on gardening, home grounds, hobby farming, etc., to all by means of mass media.
2. Holding short courses--conferences in selected subjects to provide more information to those especially interested.
3. Applying agricultural business management and analysis principles to other small businesses.
4. Organizing and working with groups in resource development.

The responses regarding the kind of assistance that should be provided urban people in the area of community and public affairs were: 18 percent rural oriented, 38 percent transitional, and 44 percent urban oriented.

Examples of rural oriented responses are: as one respondent said,

Work with groups when requested.

Another said,

Understanding of government programs, farm organizations, and USDA agencies and their relationship to urban people. Understanding of pesticides and weedicides relating to public consumption.

Transitional responses ran similar to these:

1. Direct teaching in public affairs issues affecting rural people in which urban people have a stake.
2. Organizational know-how.
3. Arrange for resources which can help deal with problems of urban people especially from Land-Grant Institutions.

And,

An educational program designed to help governmental units become more effective.

These responses were classified urban oriented. One respondent said,

Assistance for this area should be increased by a large amount. This is possibly our area of greatest opportunity with urban people.

Another replied:

There appears to be more organized and concentrated leadership in towns than in rural areas. This makes the urban areas ready audiences for educational programs in public and community affairs.

Another responded,

Present unbiased facts on public affairs. Extension must not vacate its traditional role of educators to other agencies.

Thirteen percent of the responses regarding the kind of assistance that should be provided to urban people in extension home economics were rural oriented, 40 percent were transitional, and 47 percent were urban oriented. The following quotations are representative of the three categories. Examples of the rural oriented responses are:

Same as for rural people.

And,

Provide urban residents with the same applicable home economics assistance that is offered rural residents.

Several examples of transitional responses are:

"Subject matter is applicable but our methods of teaching may have to be changed." The unit system does not have a wide appeal in urban areas. Interest meetings or a series of sessions on one topic may be one approach.

And,

Little basic difference between rural and urban needs, except perhaps in degree or priorities.

In the urban oriented category the following quotations are examples. One state director said,

Programs must be modernized to stay ahead of advancing technology in the home. Less emphasis should be placed on crafts and more on home economics subject matter.

Another said,

An educational program which will gain the support of taxpayers and government representatives beyond the image of home economics.

And another said,

The Extension Service as the principal off-campus arm of the University should make available the home economics resources of the University to the entire population of the state. This is now being done primarily through the homemakers club organization. However, our basic organization provides a vehicle by which the total home economics educational program can be provided to both for carrying out our responsibilities.

The state directors' responses to the kind of assistance that should be provided in 4-H and other youth extension work were 7 percent rural oriented, 9 percent transitional and 84 percent urban oriented. The rural oriented responses emphasized providing general information and work with groups when requested on agriculture, home economics, and related subjects. Examples of the transitional responses are:

When project qualifications are met and other "success" factors are present, a young person can be a 4-H Club member regardless of location. Under these conditions, our urban youngsters can receive the same training and benefits as those from a rural area.

And,

In certain urban situations the Extension Service should develop 4-H Club work with urban youth.

The urban oriented responses were similar to these quotations.

Because of the greater opportunities for youth activities in towns there is less need for 4-H Clubs as such. There is a great need for our techniques and know-how in organization. This may mean a shift to leader training as Extension principle function.

And,

Youth program for urban areas will continue to increase as more specialized projects are developed, but again it is

hoped that youth workers will find ways of working through other professionally trained people who are conducting youth programs.

The tally of responses to the kind of assistance Extension should provide to urban people in marketing and utilization of agricultural products was 38 percent rural oriented, 31 percent transitional, and 31 percent urban oriented. The rural oriented responses were similar to these examples:

Education--more information about problem as related to the city people.

And

Developing an understanding in the consumer.

Some examples of transitional responses are:

Much work opportunity rests with firms whose personnel and headquarters are urban.

And,

Marketing work should be expanded, but not at the expense of production projects with rural people.

The urban oriented responses were similar to these quotations:

The Extension program in this area will be concerned with consumer education and stress assistance to marketing organizations in market and price analysis, cooperative organization and operational efficiency. Benefits from this assistance are passed directly to the urban consumer in lower prices and higher quality.

And,

Programs with firms that produce goods and services for agriculture.

Programs with firms that assemble, process and distribute food and fiber.

Programs for consumers on better buying of foods, etc., consumer buying of a number of items.

Question 6: Are urban areas in your state now participating in Extension sponsored activities?

Four percent of the responses to this question were categorized as rural oriented or no response, 20 percent were transitional, and 76 percent were urban oriented. These data are summarized in Table 24.

Table 24. Summary of Responses to Question 6: Are Urban Areas in Your State now Participating in Extension Sponsored Activities?

Responses	Respondents	
	Number	Percentage
Rural oriented	1	2.22
Transitional	9	20.00
Urban oriented	34	75.56
No response	<u>1</u>	<u>2.22</u>
Total	45	100.00

The criteria used for placing the responses in one of the three categories of Table 24 was the number of the five program areas mentioned in the response. If only one program area was mentioned the response was classified as rural oriented. Two or three program areas mentioned placed the response in the transitional category and four or more program areas mentioned were labeled urban oriented.

Question 7: To what extent has urban Extension work been undertaken in the following areas in your state?

The responses to this question are summarized in Table 25. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents said the extent of agricultural production, management, and natural resource development work conducted in urban

Table 25. Summary of Responses to Question 7: To What Extent Has Urban Extension Work Been Undertaken in the Following Areas in Your State?

Areas	Responses				Total
	Little to Some		Moderate to Very Much		
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Agricultural production, management, and natural resource development	31	68.89	14	31.11	45
Community and public affairs	30	66.67	15	33.33	45
Extension home economics	7	15.56	38	84.44	45
4-H and other youth Extension work	14	31.11	31	68.89	45
Marketing and utilization of agricultural products	24	53.33	21	46.67	45

areas was little to some. Sixty-seven percent said the same for community and public affairs. Eighty-four percent of the state directors said the extent of extension home economics work conducted in urban areas was moderate to very much. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents said the same for 4-H and other youth extension work. Fifty-three percent of the state directors said the extent of work in marketing and utilization of agricultural products in urban areas was little to some.

Question 8: In your opinion how effective have urban Extension programs been in your state?

The responses to this question are summarized in Table 26. The majority of the state directors responded by saying the effectiveness was moderate to very high in each of the five program areas.

Ranking of these responses: extension home economics was first; 4-H and other youth extension work was second; marketing and utilization of agricultural products was third; agricultural production, management, and natural resource development was fourth; and community and public affairs was fifth.

Summary of Information Gathered

Two hundred opinionnaires were sent to potential respondents. One hundred and seventy-two or 86.0 percent of the 200 opinionnaires sent were returned and used in this study.

The locational characteristics were combined into categories of low, medium, and high on the basis of means and standard deviations resulting

Table 26. Summary of Responses to Question 8: In Your Opinion How Effective Have Urban Extension Programs Been in Your State?

Area	Responses				Total
	Very Low to Low		Moderate to Very High		
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Agricultural production, management and natural resource development	20	44.44	25	55.56	45
Community and public affairs	20	45.45	24	54.55	44
Extension home economics	3	6.67	42	93.33	45
4-H and other youth Extension work	5	11.11	40	88.89	45
Marketing and utilization of agricultural products	16	35.56	29	64.44	45

in almost all categories containing approximately equal numbers of responses.

While the proportion of county workers in the various positions in the sample differs some from the actual proportion, the ranking of these proportions is in the same order as the actual.

The majority of the county workers indicated their major subject matter interests related to professional improvement was technical subject matter. Human development was the second highest area when viewed from professional improvement.

In terms of total tenure in the Cooperative Extension Service, approximately one-third of the county workers were in each of the three categories of time. Eighty percent of the respondents have served from 0 to 15 years in the county they are now serving.

Approximately one-third of the county workers received their bachelor's degrees in each of the three time categories. Eighty-four percent of the respondents received their master's degree in the 1955 to 1963 period.

The majority of the county workers received their bachelor's and master's degrees in technical subject matter areas. Of those pursuing additional study about 42 percent were working in technical subject matter areas and about 42 percent were working in educational methods.

Approximately 60 percent of the county workers were males and 40 percent were females.

The categories transitional and urban oriented respectively received the largest and second largest number of responses from county workers.

Over 80 percent of the county worker respondents said that Extension educational assistance to urban people should increase moderately to substantially.

One-half of the county workers said Extension workers should spend from 21 to 60 percent of their time working with urban residents and over one-third said 61 to 100 percent of the time should be spent in urban work.

In response to the questions concerning future financial support for Extension the respondents generally indicated the various governmental units; however, a large number did not respond to the question. County, state, federal government; business; and industry were said to be the sources of support other than financial in the future.

The responses of the county workers indicate that transitional kinds of assistance should be provided for urban people by Extension in agricultural production, management and natural resource development; and community and public affairs; urban oriented assistance in extension home economics, and 4-H and other youth extension work; rural oriented assistance in marketing and utilization of agricultural products.

Sixty-three percent of the county worker respondents indicated that they had had transitional experiences in urban Extension work.

The county workers indicated extension home economics had been undertaken to the greatest extent in their counties with 4-H and other youth Extension work second. The same respondents said the above two areas respectively were the most effective.

Forty-four percent of the State Directors said the current role of the Cooperative Extension Service was urban oriented and 40 percent said it was transitional.

The Extension educational assistance to urban people should be increased moderately to substantially was the response of 75 percent of the state directors.

In response to the question concerning the proportion of time Extension workers should spend working with urban residents of their states 49 percent of the state directors said 0 to 20 percent, and 47 percent said 21 to 60 percent of the time.

Fifteen state directors saw city government as contributing to the financial support of Extension in the future; this is eleven more than at present. The question on support other than financial received the most responses in county, state and federal governments.

In response to the question concerning the kinds of assistance the total Extension programs should provide for urban people the largest number of state directors said urban oriented in the areas of community and public affairs, extension home economics, and 4-H and other youth extension work; transitional in agricultural production, management, and natural resource development; and rural oriented in marketing and utilization of agricultural products.

Seventy-five percent of the state directors gave urban oriented responses

when asked if urban areas of their state were now participating in Extension sponsored activities.

Extension home economics and 4-H Club and other youth extension work were ranked first and second in terms of the extent of work in urban areas by the state director respondents. The same two areas received the same ranking in terms of their effectiveness.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study is primarily concerned with measuring the opinions of the respondents as expressed in answer to specific questions asked in the opinionnaire. A summary of the statistical analysis of the gathered data is presented in this chapter.

The chi square test was used in performing the statistical analyses of the data with significance determined at the 5 percent level. This statistic indicates the probability that the responses actually obtained would have been obtained if there were no relationship between the variables under consideration. Because of the limitations of this statistic and the small sample size it was necessary to combine categories of data to assure greater confidence in the results.

According to Dixon and Massey the sample size must be large enough so that none of the cells of the contingency table contain less than one response and not more than 20 percent of the cells contain less than five responses.¹ They also say that "...in the case of one degree of freedom, the approximation of the chi square distribution can be markedly improved by reducing the absolute value of each difference by .5 before it is squared."²

¹Wilfred J. Dixon and Frank J. Massey, Jr., Introduction to Statistical Analysis (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1957), p. 222.

²Ibid., pp. 225-226.

As was mentioned in Chapter I, there were 1,127 possible contingency tables. The data were processed on the CDC 3600 Computer and the 1,127 contingency tables were then examined to determine the significant comparisons and the variables in which the categories should be combined. After the categories had been combined and those variables to which there were few responses had been removed, the data were again processed on the CDC 3600 Computer. The second round of processing resulted in 291 contingency tables. Of the two hundred ninety-one tables, fifteen were significant and met the minimum limitations of the chi square statistic.

Data Analyses

This section contains a review of opinionnaire questions which, when compared to the independent variables, produced significant chi square tables. This material is presented in the same order as the questions were asked on the opinionnaire.

The independent variables used in the chi square tests of significance on the responses of both county Cooperative Extension Service workers and the State Cooperative Extension Service Directors were: total population, population per square mile, percent urban population, percent rural-farm population, and the percent of population increase from 1950 to 1960. In addition to the above independent variables the responses of the county Cooperative Extension Service workers concerning tenure in the Cooperative Extension Service, tenure in the Cooperative Extension Service in the county in which the respondent was serving, and the period of time in which the respondent attained his bachelor's

degree were used in testing the relationship to their responses to the dependent variables. Also, the responses of the county Cooperative Extension Service workers and the State Cooperative Extension Service Directors served as the independent variable in a series of chi square tests to determine if there were relationships in the response of these two groups.

The dependent variables of this study are the opinionnaire questions which are reviewed in this section.

Question 1: In your opinion what is the current role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas?

One of the fourteen chi square tests of significance applied to this question produced significant results. Table 27 summarizes the responses to this question when viewed from the period of time in which the county Cooperative Extension Service workers attained their bachelor's degree. While this table does not meet all of the limitations of the statistic used, as were mentioned earlier in this chapter, it describes how the responses occurred and it is included here to point out the relationship between when the county workers received their bachelor's degrees and their views of the current role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas.

The current role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas was viewed as being transitional by the majority of the county workers respondents. The second highest number of responses was in the urban oriented category.

Table 27. Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Current Role of the Cooperative Extension Service by the Period of Time in Which the Respondents Attained their Bachelor's Degree

Period of Time	Type of Responses					
	Rural Oriented		Transitional		Urban Oriented	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1920 to 1940	3	3.13	9	9.38	18	18.75
1941 to 1954	4	4.17	18	18.75	12	12.50
1955 to 1963	1	1.04	22	22.92	9	9.38
Total	8	8.33	49	51.04	39	40.63
					96	100.00

$\chi^2 = 10.455$; d.f. = 4; $p < .05$.

Those county worker respondents who received their bachelor's degree in the period 1920 to 1940 had the largest number of responses in the urban oriented category and the second highest number in the transitional category. Those who received their bachelor's degree in the period from 1941 to 1954 had the largest number of responses in the transitional category and the second largest number in the urban oriented category. Twenty-two of the thirty-two county worker respondents who received their bachelor's degree in the period from 1955 to 1963 gave transitional responses and nine gave urban oriented responses.

The data in Table 27 show that the group of county workers who received their bachelor's degree in the period farthest away from the present contains more urban oriented responses than the groups who attained their bachelor's degrees more recently. Also, the group of county workers who received their bachelor's degrees in the period from 1955 to 1963 gave the smallest number of rural oriented responses, but the most transitional responses.

Question 3: What proportion of time do you think Extension workers should spend working with urban residents of your county or state?

Four of the fourteen tests of significance produced significant results. These four tables are presented here.

The data in Table 28 present the relationship between the total population of the counties and the responses of the county Cooperative Extension Service workers concerning the proportion of time that should be spent working with urban residents.

Table 28. Opinions of County Extension Service Workers Concerning the Proportion of Time that Should Be Spent Working with Urban Residents by Total Population

Total Population	Type of Responses							
	0-20%		21-60%		61-100%		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Low	5	4.10	29	23.77	6	4.92	40	32.79
Medium	4	3.28	22	18.03	15	12.30	41	33.61
High	5	4.10	13	10.66	23	18.85	41	33.61
Total	14	11.48	64	52.46	44	36.07	122	100.00

$\chi^2 = 16.087$; d.f. = 4; $p < .01$.

When the county workers' responses to this question were compared with the total population of the counties, the majority said Extension workers should spend from 21 to 60 percent of the time working with urban residents, and the second highest number of responses was in the 61 to 100 percent category. The majority of responses from those counties which had the highest total population were in the 61-100 percent category, while the majority of responses from the counties classified medium and low in total population were in the 21-60 percent category. An overview of Table 28 shows that there are relatively more responses in the 61 to 100 percent category made by county workers from counties with larger total populations than those from counties of smaller total population.

The data describing the county workers' responses concerning the proportion of time that should be spent working with urban residents compared with the population per square mile are presented in Table 29. The results are similar to those of Table 28.

The opinions of county Cooperative Extension workers regarding the proportion of time that should be spent working with urban residents when compared with the percentage of urban population provided the results contained in Table 30. The data in Table 30 show the more urban the population of the county, the greater the relative number of responses in the 61 to 100 percent category. These results are similar to the results of Tables 28 and 29.

Table 29. Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Proportion of Time that Should be Spent Working with Urban Residents by Population per Square Mile

Population Per Square Mile	Type of Responses							
	0-20%		21-60%		61-100%		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Low	6	4.92	28	22.95	7	5.74	41	33.61
Medium	5	4.10	26	21.31	11	9.02	42	34.43
High	3	2.46	10	8.20	26	21.31	39	31.97
Total	14	11.48	64	52.46	44	36.07	122	100.00

$\chi^2 = 24.233$; d. f. = 4; $p < .01$.

Table 30. Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Proportion of Time that Should be Spent Working with Urban Residents by the Percentage of Urban Population

Percentage Urban Population	Type of Responses					
	0-20%		21-60%		61-100%	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Low	5	4.10	28	22.95	6	4.92
Medium	6	4.92	19	15.57	19	15.57
High	3	2.46	17	13.93	19	15.57
Total	14	11.48	64	52.46	44	36.07
					122	100.00

$\chi^2 = 11.787$; d.f. = 4; $p < .02$.

The comparison of the responses of county Cooperative Extension Service workers and State Cooperative Extension Service Directors concerning the proportion of time that should be spent working with urban residents show that the majority of responses were in the 21 to 60 percent category with the second highest number of responses in the 61 to 100 percent category. These data are presented in Table 31.

There is a significant difference between the responses of the county workers and the state directors on the proportion of time that should be spent working with urban residents. A general observation of the data contained in Table 31 shows that the majority of responses of the county workers indicated a greater amount of time should be spent working with urban residents while the responses of the state directors indicated a lower proportion of time.

Question 5, Part 2: What kinds of assistance do you feel the total Extension program should provide for urban people in community and public affairs?

One significant table resulted from the tests of significance used on this question. There was a significant difference in the response of the county workers and the state directors. These data are presented in Table 32.

The majority of the county Cooperative Extension Service workers gave transitional responses as to the kinds of assistance Extension should provide for urban people in community and public affairs. The remainder of

Table 31. Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers and State Cooperative Extension Service Directors by the Proportion of Time that Should be Spent Working with Urban Residents

Position	Type of Responses					
	0-20%		21-60%		61-100%	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
County workers	14	8.43	64	38.55	44	26.51
					122	73.49
State directors	21	12.65	22	13.25	1	.60
					44	26.51
Total	35	21.08	86	51.81	45	27.11
					166	100.00

$\chi^2 = 33.816$; d.f. = 2; $p < .01$.

Table 32. Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers and State Cooperative Extension Service Directors by the Kind of Assistance the Total Extension Program Should Provide for Urban People in the Area of Community and Public Affairs

Positions	Type of Responses					
	Rural Oriented		Transitional		Urban Oriented	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
County workers	25	15.82	62	39.24	26	16.46
State directors	8	5.06	17	10.76	20	12.66
Total	33	20.89	79	50.00	46	29.11
					113	71.52
					45	28.48
					158	100.00

$\chi^2 = 7.250$; d. f. = 2; $p < .05$.

the county worker responses were about equally distributed in the rural oriented and urban oriented categories. The greatest number of State Cooperative Extension Directors responded in the urban oriented category with the remainder of the responses in the transitional and rural oriented categories, respectively. The data presented in Table 32 also show that 50.00 percent of the responses were transitional, 29.11 percent were urban oriented and 20.89 percent were rural oriented. When the total table is viewed a larger proportion of state directors provided urban oriented responses than did county workers.

Question 5, Part 3: What kinds of assistance do you feel the total Extension program should provide for urban people in extension home economics?

When the responses of the county Cooperative Extension Service workers on this question were compared with the periods of time in which they received their bachelor's degree, there was a significant difference. This was the only comparison involving this question that produced a significant difference.

These data are presented in Table 33. Forty-seven percent of the county workers' responses were urban oriented, 39 percent were transitional, and 14 percent were rural oriented. The majority of the county workers who received their bachelor's degrees in the period 1920 to 1940 responded in the transitional category. The majority of those who received their bachelor's degrees from 1941 to 1954 responded in the urban oriented

Table 33. Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Kinds of Assistance the Total Extension Program Should Provide for Urban People in the Area of Extension Home Economics by the Period of Time in Which the Respondents Attained their Bachelor's Degree

Period of Time	Type of Responses					
	Rural Oriented		Transitional		Urban Oriented	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1920-1940	3	3.26	19	20.65	8	8.70
1941-1954	6	6.52	10	10.87	17	18.48
1955-1963	4	4.35	7	7.61	18	19.57
Total	13	14.13	36	39.13	43	46.74
					92	100.00

$\chi^2 = 11.767$; d.f. = 4; $p < .02$.

category as did those who received their bachelor's degrees in the period from 1955 to 1963.

Question 5, Part 5: What kind of assistance do you feel the total Extension program should provide for urban people in marketing and utilization of agricultural products?

Two of the tests of significance of this question resulted in significant differences. These significant differences were found when the responses of the county Cooperative Extension Service workers were ranked according to the population per square mile and the percentage of population increase from 1950 to 1960 for the counties.

The data on the responses of the county Cooperative Extension Service workers concerning the kinds of assistance the total Cooperative Extension Service program should provide for urban people in the area of marketing and utilization of agricultural products when compared with the population per square mile of the respondents' county is presented in Table 34.

The data in Table 34 show that 50.00 percent of the total responses were rural oriented, 29.25 were urban oriented, and 20.75 percent were transitional. The county workers from counties in the low population per square mile category responded in the greatest number in the urban oriented category, in the rural oriented category the second highest number, and the least number of responses was in the transitional category. The county workers in the medium population per square mile category responded

Table 34. Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Kinds of Assistance the Total Extension Program Should Provide for Urban People in the Area of Marketing and Utilization of Agricultural Products by the Population per Square Mile

Population Per Square Mile	Type of Responses					
	Rural Oriented		Transitional		Urban Oriented	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Low	11	10.38	5	4.72	13	12.26
Medium	26	24.53	5	4.72	10	9.43
High	16	15.09	12	11.32	8	7.55
Total	53	50.00	22	20.75	31	29.25
					106	100.00

$\chi^2 = 10.252$; d.f. = 4; $p < .05$.

in the largest number in the rural oriented category, second largest number in the urban oriented category and least in the transitional category. The numbers of county workers representing the high population per square mile category responded in the rural oriented, transitional, and urban oriented categories in that order.

The data in Table 35 describe the responses of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers concerning the kinds of assistance the total Cooperative Extension Service program should provide for urban people in the area of marketing and utilization of agricultural products when the responses were ranked according to the percentage of population increase from 1950 to 1960 in the respondents' counties. The total number of responses in the categories of rural oriented, transitional, and urban oriented is the same as they were in Table 34.

The county workers from the counties which had the least percentage of population increase from 1950 to 1960 gave the largest number of responses in the urban oriented category, the second largest number of responses was in the rural oriented category, and third largest number in the transitional category. Those county workers from counties which had medium increases in percentage of population from 1950 to 1960 responded in the greatest number in the rural oriented category followed by the transitional and urban oriented categories in number. The county worker from the counties which had high increases in percent of population increases from 1950 to 1960 responded similarly to the county workers in the counties which had low increases.

Table 35. Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Kinds of Assistance the Total Extension Program Should Provide for Urban People in the Area of Marketing and Utilization of Agricultural Products by the Percentage of Population Increase from 1950 to 1960

Percentage of Population Increase from 1950 to 1960	Types of Responses					
	Rural Oriented		Transitional		Urban Oriented	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Low	16	15.09	6	5.66	17	16.04
Medium	13	12.26	12	11.32	8	7.55
High	24	22.64	4	3.77	6	5.66
Total	53	50.00	22	20.75	31	29.25
					106	100.00

$\chi^2 = 14.583$; d.f. = 4; $p < .01$.

Question 8, Part 1: In your opinion how effective have urban Extension programs been in your county or state in agricultural production, management, and natural resource development?

Four of the tests of significance applied to this question resulted in significant findings. Those results are presented in Tables 36, 37, 38, and 39.

Sixty-one percent of the county Cooperative Extension Service workers rated the effectiveness of urban Extension programs in agricultural production, management, and natural resource development as moderate to very high, while 38 percent said it ranked very low to low.

The opinions of the county workers concerning this question ranked according to the total population of the counties are presented in Table 36. The majority of the county workers from counties with the least population said the effectiveness in urban Extension programs in agricultural production, management, and natural resource development was very low to low. The majority of the county workers from the counties in the medium and high total population categories said the effectiveness in this area was moderate to very high.

The opinions of the county workers concerning the effectiveness of urban Extension programs in agricultural production, management, and natural resource development are ranked according to the percentage of rural-farm population of the counties in Table 37.

Table 36. Opinion of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Effectiveness of Urban Extension Programs in Agricultural Production, Management, and Natural Resource Development by Total Population of Counties

Total Population	Type of Responses					
	Very Low to Low		Moderate to Very High		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Low	20	17.54	16	14.04	36	31.58
Medium	14	12.28	27	23.68	41	35.96
High	10	8.77	27	23.68	37	32.46
Total	44	38.60	70	61.40	114	100.00

$\chi^2 = 6.801$; d.f. = 2; $p < .05$.

Table 37. Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Effectiveness of Urban Extension Programs in Agricultural Production, Management, and Natural Resource Development by Percent Rural-Farm Population of Counties

Percentage of Rural-Farm Population	Type of Responses					
	Very Low to Low		Moderate to Very High		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Low	16	14.04	43	37.72	59	51.75
Medium	13	11.40	14	12.28	27	23.68
High	15	13.16	13	11.40	28	24.56
Total	44	36.60	70	61.40	114	100.00

$\chi^2 = 6.968$; d.f. = 2; $p < .05$.

Table 38. Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Effectiveness of Urban Extension Programs in Agricultural Production, Management and Natural Resource Development by Percentage of Population Increase from 1950 to 1960

Percentage of Population Increase From 1950-1960	Types of Responses					
	Very Low to Low		Moderate to Very High		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Low	19	16.67	22	19.30	40	35.96
Medium	18	15.79	17	14.91	35	30.70
High	7	6.14	31	27.19	38	33.33
Total	44	38.60	70	61.40	114	100.00

$\chi^2 = 9.996$; d.f. = 2; $p < .01$.

Table 39. Opinions of State Cooperative Extension Service Directors Concerning the Effectiveness of Urban Extension Programs in Agricultural Production, Management and Natural Resource Development by Total Population of the State

Total Population	Type of Response					
	Very Low to Low		Moderate to Very High		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Low	9	20.00	6	13.33	15	33.33
Medium	8	17.78	6	13.33	14	31.11
High	3	6.67	13	28.89	16	35.56
Total	20	44.44	25	55.56	45	100.00

$\chi^2 = 6.662$; d.f. = 2; $p < .05$.

The majority of the respondents from counties in the low and medium percentage of rural-farm population categories rated the effectiveness of urban Extension programs in this area moderate to very high. Those respondents from counties in the high percentage of rural-farm population category rated the effectiveness very low to low.

The opinion of county workers concerning the effectiveness of urban Extension programs in agricultural production, management, and natural resource development are ranked according to the percentage of population increase from 1950 to 1960 of the counties in Table 38.

The majority of the county workers representing counties in the low and high percent population increase categories rated the effectiveness in this program area moderately to very high. The number of responses of county workers representing the medium category of population increase were about equally divided between very low to low and moderate to very high.

The opinions of State Cooperative Extension Service Directors concerning the effectiveness of urban Extension programs in agricultural production, management, and natural resource development are ranked in Table 39 according to the total population of the states.

The majority of respondents from states in the low and medium total population categories ranked the effectiveness of urban Extension programs in this area very low to low. The reverse was true of majority of respondents from the states in the high total population category. They said the effectiveness was moderate to very high.

Question 8, Part 2: In your opinion how effective have urban Extension programs been in your county or state in community and public affairs?

Two of the tests of significance applied to this question resulted in significant findings. These usable significant data are presented in Tables 40 and 41.

Sixty-one percent of the county Cooperative Extension Service worker respondents said the effectiveness of urban Extension programs in community and public affairs was moderate to very high, while 39 percent said it was very low to low. The data presented in Table 40 show that the majority of county worker respondents from counties classified low and medium population per square mile said the effectiveness in urban Extension programs in community and public affairs was moderate to very high. The majority of respondents from high population per square mile counties said the effectiveness in this area was very low to low.

Fifty-four percent of the State Cooperative Extension Service Directors said the urban programs in community and public affairs were moderate to very high in effectiveness, 45 percent said they were very low to low. The respondents from states in the category low total population were equally divided in their responses of very low to low and moderate to very high. The majority of the respondents from states in the medium category rated the effectiveness moderate to very high. The majority of state directors from the high total population states said the effectiveness of urban Extension programs in community and public affairs was very low to low.

Table 40. Opinions of County Cooperative Extension Service Workers Concerning the Effectiveness of Urban Extension Programs in Community and Public Affairs by the Population per Square Mile of the Counties

Population Per Square Mile	Type of Responses					
	Very Low to Low		Moderate to Very High		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Low	13	11.30	24	20.87	37	32.17
Medium	12	10.43	30	26.09	42	36.52
High	20	17.39	16	13.91	36	31.30
Total	45	39.13	70	60.87	115	100.00

$\chi^2 = 6.292$; d.f. = 2; $p < .05$.

Table 41. Opinions of State Cooperative Extension Service Directors Concerning the Effectiveness of Urban Extension Programs in Community and Public Affairs by the Total Population of the States

Total Population	Responses					
	Very Low to Low		Moderate to Very High		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Low	7	15.91	7	15.91	14	31.82
Medium	2	4.55	12	27.27	14	31.82
High	11	25.00	5	11.36	16	36.36
Total	20	45.45	24	54.55	44	100.00

$\chi^2 = 9.104$; d.f. = 2; $p < .02$.

Summary of Findings

The material presented in this section is a summary of the findings. This information is presented to further develop the analysis of the data presented earlier.

Generally, the responses indicate transitional to urban oriented opinions concerning the current role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas. However, when the responses of the county workers were ranked according to the period of time in which they received their bachelor's degree, the county workers who had received their bachelor's degree in the period of 1920 to 1940 had a larger proportion of respondents in the urban oriented category than did the other two time period groups.

The majority of respondents generally agreed that Extension educational assistance to urban people should be increased. The responses varied only in the degree of increase and there were no significant differences when tested by the various independent variables.

The majority of all respondents said Extension workers in their counties and states should spend 21 to 60 percent of their time working with urban residents. County workers respondents representing counties high in total population, population per square mile, and percentage of urban population per square mile, and percentage of urban population responded in greater numbers in the 61 to 100 percent category than did county workers representing the medium and low categories of these same independent variables.

In comparing the responses of the county workers to the responses of the state directors there was a larger proportion of county workers who said Extension workers should spend 61 to 100 percent of their time working with urban residents.

Transitional responses were given by a majority of all respondents to the kinds of assistance that the total Extension program should provide for urban people in agricultural production, management, and natural resource development; and community and public affairs. The second highest number of responses occurred in the rural oriented category for the agricultural program area and in the urban oriented category for the community and public affairs program area.

There was a larger proportion of state directors than county workers who said the kinds of assistance the total Extension program should provide for urban people is in the area of community and public affairs. This, combined with a greater proportion of county workers responding with rural oriented responses accounts for a significant difference in the chi square.

The majority of the respondents gave urban oriented responses in regard to the kinds of assistance the total Extension program should provide for urban people in extension home economics, and 4-H and other youth extension work. The trend in the number of responses in both of these program areas went from lowest in rural oriented to highest in urban oriented.

The majority of the responses as to the kind of assistance the total Extension program should provide for urban people in marketing and utilization

of agricultural products was in the rural oriented category. The second highest number of responses to this question was in the urban oriented category. When the responses of the county workers were ranked according to the population per square mile and percentage of increase in population from 1950 to 1960 those county workers from counties medium and high in each responded with a majority of responses in the rural oriented category.

The majority of the responses regarding the extent of urban Extension work undertaken in: (1) agricultural production, management and natural resources was little to some; (2) community and public affairs was little to some; (3) extension home economics was moderate to very much; (4) 4-H and other youth extension work was moderate to very much; (5) marketing and utilization of agricultural products was moderate to very much, but in this category closer to 50 percent of the responses were moderate to very much than in the other program areas which indicates fewer responses.

The majority of the respondents rated the effectiveness of urban Extension programs in the above five program areas as moderate to very high. The greatest majority were in the areas of extension home economics, and 4-H and other youth extension programs.

The majority of the responses and county workers representing counties which were in the medium and high categories in terms of total population rated the effectiveness of the urban Extension programs in agricultural production, management, and natural resource development moderate to very high and workers from low total population counties said it was very low

to low; the opposite of the above was said by the county workers in low and high percentage of rural-farm population. The majority of county workers representing counties of low and high percentage of population increases from 1950 to 1960 said it was moderate to very high while the majority of those representing counties in the medium group said the effectiveness of agricultural programs was very low to low.

The majority of state director respondents representing states of high total population said the effectiveness of urban agricultural programs was moderate to very high. The majority of the state directors representing the states of low and medium total population said the effectiveness was very low to low.

In regard to the effectiveness of urban community and public affairs programs, the majority of county worker respondents representing the counties ranked low and medium in population per square mile replied that the effectiveness was moderate to very high, while those from the high category of counties said it was very low to low. The effectiveness of this same program area as viewed by a majority of the state directors ranked on the basis of total population was: about equal numbers in the very low to low, and moderate to very high categories by those from low population category states, moderate to very high from medium states, and very low to low from high population states.

Testing of Hypotheses

Evidence for the support of the hypotheses is presented in this section.

Hypothesis 1: Certain personal background factors of county Cooperative Extension Service workers are positively related to their opinions concerning the present scope of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas.

This hypothesis is partially supported by the evidence gathered in this study. One test of significance resulted in a significant difference. The test compared the responses of the county workers grouped according to the period of time in which they received their bachelor's degree by their opinions of the current role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas. Further evidence to support this hypothesis may be seen in the type and distribution of responses in the tables of Chapter IV. The responses tended to be transitional or urban oriented concerning the current role; moderate to very much concerning the extent of urban Extension work undertaken; and the moderate to very high concerning the effectiveness of urban Extension programs.

Hypothesis 2: Certain personal background factors of county Cooperative Extension Service workers are positively related to their perceptions of the future role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas.

This hypothesis is partially supported by the evidence gathered in this study. One test of significance resulted in a significant difference. This test compared the responses of the county workers as to the kinds of assistance the total Extension program should provide for urban people

in the area of extension home economics, according to the period of time in which they received their bachelor's degrees. Further evidence indicating support of this hypothesis is available in the type and distribution of responses. The responses tended to be: increased moderately or substantially in regard to future educational assistance to urban people; 21 to 60, and 61 to 100 percent concerning the proportion of time county workers should spend working with urban residents; transitional and urban oriented regarding the kinds of assistance Extension should provide for urban people in three of the five program areas.

Hypothesis 3: Certain locational factors of county Cooperative Extension Service workers are positively related to their opinions concerning the present scope of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas.

This hypothesis is fairly well supported by the evidence gathered in this study. There were four tests of significances which resulted in significant differences, however, all of these tests concerned the effectiveness of urban Extension work. Three of these tests were applied to questions on agricultural production, management and natural resource development and one was applied to a question concerning community and public affairs. Further evidence indicating support of this hypothesis is available in the type and distribution of responses.

Hypothesis 4: Certain locational factors of county Cooperative Extension Service workers are positively related to their perceptions of the future role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas.

This hypothesis is fairly well supported by the evidence gathered in this study. Six tests of significances resulted in significant differences. Four of these tests were concerned with the proportion of time Extension workers should spend working with urban residents and two were concerned with the kind of assistance the total Extension program should provide for urban people in the area of marketing and utilization of agricultural products. Further evidence indicating support of this hypothesis is available in the type and distribution of responses.

Hypothesis 5: Certain locational factors of State Cooperative Extension Service Directors are positively related to their opinions concerning the present scope of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas.

This hypothesis is partially supported by the evidence gathered in this study. Two tests of significance resulted in significant differences. These two tests involved the total population of the states and the responses to the questions concerning the effectiveness of the urban Extension programs in: agricultural production, management, and natural resource development; and community and public affairs. Further evidence indicating support of this hypothesis is available in the type and distribution of responses.

Hypothesis 6: Certain locational factors of State Cooperative Extension Service Directors are positively related to their perceptions of the future role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas.

This hypothesis is partially supported by the evidence gathered in this study. It is the least supported of the six hypotheses. None of the tests of significance resulted in significant differences; however, the responses tended to be: in the direction of moderately to substantially increased Extension educational assistance; 21 to 60 percent of the Extension workers' time should be spent in urban work; in the transitional to urban oriented categories concerning the kinds of assistance the total Extension programs should provide for urban people in the various program areas.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The material presented in this chapter include the summary, conclusions, implications, limitations, and recommendations as the title indicates.

Summary

The focus of this exploratory study was on the views of county Cooperative Extension Service workers and State Cooperative Extension Service Directors pertaining to the scope of responsibility of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas of the United States.

Background information for this study was abstracted from the 1960 U. S. Census of Population. This information was used to select 150 counties, three in each state, as potential areas from which to draw the random sample of county Cooperative Extension Service workers. All State Cooperative Extension Service Directors were included in the sample.

An opinionnaire was constructed to gather the data from the county workers. An adaptation was the opinionnaire used to gather the data from State Cooperative Extension Service Directors.

One hundred and seventy-two or 86.0 percent of the 200 potential respondents provided usable responses which were included in the study.

The chi square test of significance was used to determine if there

were positive relationships between the responses, and the independent variables. The independent variables were personal background and locational factors for the tests of the responses of county workers. Only the locational factors were used in the tests of the responses of State Directors, because personal background information was not requested of this group of respondents.

The tests of significance resulted in fifteen tests being significant.

Those county workers who received their bachelor's degrees in the period 1920 to 1940 responded with a larger proportion of urban oriented responses than did those who received their bachelor's degrees more recently.

The county workers from the highly populated, urbanized counties gave a larger proportion of responses which indicated that Extension workers should spend a major portion of their time working with urban residents than did those county workers from the less populated and urbanized counties. In response to the same question, the county workers indicated a major portion of time in a greater proportion than did State Directors.

The majority of the responses to questions concerning the role of the total Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas indicate greater efforts should be exerted in urban and urbanizing areas.

The responses to questions concerning specific Extension program areas were generally in the same direction as the questions concerning the total Extension program, however, there were variations in how the

respondents viewed the individual program areas. The program areas of extension home economics, 4-H and other youth extension work, and community and public affairs were generally rated by the respondents as higher in terms of extensiveness, effectiveness, and potential in urban areas than agricultural production, management, and natural resource development; or marketing and utilization of agricultural products.

Conclusions

The evidence obtained through the analyses of the data has been used as the bases for formulating the conclusions presented in this section.

1. Contrary to popular beliefs, evidence gained in the study indicates that as a group the county worker respondents who received their bachelor's degrees in the period from 1920 to 1940 were more urban oriented in their responses than those who received their bachelor's degrees more recently.

It would appear that the county worker who received his bachelor's degree in an earlier period of time and his work experience tend to help him perceive the current role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas as being more urban oriented than younger county workers. This difference may be due to the training and work experience of the older county workers and more specialized training which limits the perspective of the total Cooperative Extension Service for the younger county workers.

2. The role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanized

areas is not sharply defined. However, there is a trend toward greater involvement of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban oriented educational programs and projects directed to urban people.

3. It is generally agreed upon by both county worker and state director respondents that extension workers should spend a substantial proportion of their time working with urban people. The county workers tend to believe more time should be spent with urban work than do the state directors.

4. County Cooperative Extension Service worker and State Cooperative Extension Service Director respondents tend to agree in their views of the role of the total Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas.

5. The five major program areas of the Cooperative Extension Service, as listed in the opinionnaire, ranked by all respondents in order of the number of urban oriented programs and projects are: extension home economics; 4-H and other youth extension work; community and public affairs; marketing and utilization of agricultural products; agricultural production, management and natural resource development. Thus it appears that the programs (as they are now structured) are perceived as being adaptable to the urban situation in the order listed above.

Implications

The results and conclusions of this study have several far-reaching implications. They demand an objective appraisal of the Cooperative

Extension Service and its role in serving the society of today.

First, it must be recognized that there is a clientele in urban and urbanizing areas vocalizing requests for the type of educational assistance which the Cooperative Extension Service has so capably provided in rural areas. Second, it must be recognized that there is an ever-increasing interrelationship and interdependency of all segments of the society, and there is a need for an educational institution such as the Cooperative Extension Service to inform, interpret, and assist in helping people in their decision-making as individuals and groups. These general implications are followed by more specific implications.

1. The current enabling legislation for the Cooperative Extension Service is subject to a wide range of interpretations. It would appear that this legislation at the three levels of government should be reviewed and revised if necessary to assure that the legislative intent is articulated in accord with the needs of society and the Land-Grant University philosophy of education for all.

It appears that the Smith-Lever Act is often referred to when justifying Cooperative Extension Service work. It must be remembered that this Act is only one-third of the legal framework in which the Cooperative Extension Service functions. The state and county governments also have roles here.

2. Programs of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban areas need to be more than rural programs adapted to the urban environment. There is

a need for evaluation of what has been done in the past and what can be done in the future. Underlying this is the need for personnel and resources to operate effective urban programs.

3. The personnel of the Cooperative Extension Service selected to serve in urban areas should be employed on the basis of their knowledge of and willingness to work with urban people and problems. The results of this study show that this has not been achieved in the highest degree.

Only one of the respondents in this study received his bachelor's degree in a discipline other than agriculture or home economics. On the basis of this, it could be argued that Cooperative Extension Service workers in urban counties are trained in subject matter areas which are traditional to the Cooperative Extension Service and are not necessarily trained to work with urban people.

Limitations

1. The complexity of the Cooperative Extension Service makes a study of the organization rather difficult to perform. Recognizing this situation, the design of this study involved careful development of the opinionnaire, selection of the sample, and analysis of the responses. Nevertheless, there were certain limitations inherent in the design and procedures which limit the application of the findings.

2. The basic limitation results from the construction of the opinionnaire. This instrument was pretested, but the first time it was actually used was in this study. The large proportion of open-ended questions

contained in the instrument necessitated coding of responses by the researcher. This interpretation of the responses by the researcher provided an opportunity for his biases to enter the data. The terms used in the opinionnaire may have biased the respondent's answers. Terms such as urban and Cooperative Extension Service, are examples. However, they were the best terms found after considering the alternatives.

The order in which the questions appeared may have influenced the responses by breaking up the thought patterns of the respondents. In general, the opinionnaire sought a wide range of information which some of the respondents could not provide because they were not involved in all of the specific program areas, and their relative short length of tenure in the Cooperative Extension Service. However, responses from all county worker positions was desired in an effort to obtain results which would reflect the total role of the Cooperative Extension Service.

3. Only those directly involved in the daily and over-all policy decisions were included in the sample. It is recognized that there are others who act to influence the total Cooperative Extension Service programs. These are the various clientele groups, legislators who provide financial support, and Land-Grant University and United States Department of Agriculture administrators. These people were not included in the sample because of the variety of the organizational structures and differences in terms used in the various state Cooperative Extension Services. However, this study presents the current views of key Cooperative Extension Service

workers toward the role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas.

4. Because of the variety of titles for the position of state Cooperative Extension Service Director there is some question as to whether or not the individual directly responsible for the administration of the Cooperative Extension Service at the state level in all states was asked by the researcher or the recipient of the opinionnaire to respond to the opinionnaire.

5. Another limitation of the study is in validity of the responses. Did the respondents answer the questions as they see the situation or did they give the answers they thought were being sought? The validity of the responses may have been ascertained by in-depth interviews, before and after tests, or some other research method.

Recommendations

As a result of this exploratory study of the role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas the following recommendations are made concerning further study in this area.

1. There is need for further study of this study topic to pursue in greater depth the findings, and for determining policies and procedures.

A. The study should be of an in-depth nature of Cooperative Extension Service work with urban residents to determine programs now being conducted and potential program areas.

B. The individuals who serve in staff positions and are responsible for the subject matter work of the five major program areas of the

various state Cooperative Extension Services should be asked to participate in this study. This would provide an important and necessary view of the subject matter resources available to county workers in urban areas.

C. It is further recommended that all county worker positions in counties which are included in the U. S. Bureau of the Census, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas be named potential respondents in this study of their work with urban residents. This would give a more complete view of the total Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas, and a large sample for performing statistical analyses.

2. In order for the Cooperative Extension Service to most effectively meet the educational needs of people there is a need for investigation of the characteristics of urban, suburban, rural, and rural-farm cultures.

3. There is also need for studying the various aspects of training requirements for Cooperative Extension Service workers for working in urban counties. In this study area the basic preparation of potential county workers and the retraining of county workers for urban Cooperative Extension Service work should be considered.

It is inevitable that the Cooperative Extension Service will be working more and more with urban people and their problems. The current trends point in this direction. The requests from urban people for educational assistance, the growing urban society, and the ever-increasing interrelationships and interdependencies in the whole fabric of the society are causing the Cooperative Extension Service to move toward an urban clientele.

If the Cooperative Extension Service, an educational institution, is to continue to serve society, it too must change, with society, as it has in the past.

These necessary changes can be made by the Cooperative Extension Service only if it understands itself and its roles, and if there is a desire to continue to make useful contributions toward informing and educating the people.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Bliss, R. K., et al. (ed.). The Spirit and Philosophy of Extension Work. Washington: Graduate School, United States Department of Agriculture, and the Epsilon Sigma Phi, National Honorary Extension Fraternity, 1952.
- Boone, E. J. and C. M. Ferguson (ed.). An Image of Cooperative Extension: Implications for Extension Administration. Publication 18. Madison, Wisconsin: National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study, 1962.
- Boone, E. J. and C. M. Ferguson (ed.). Changing Dimensions in Agriculture and Home Economics: Impact on Cooperative Extension Administration. Publication 13. Madison, Wisconsin: National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study, 1962.
- Boulding, Kenneth E. The Image. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1956.
- Dixon, Wilfred J., and Frank J. Massey, Jr. Introduction to Statistical Analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1957.
- Kelsey, Lincoln David and Cannon Chiles Hearne. Cooperative Extension Work. Ithaca, New York: Comstock Publishing Associates, 1949.
- McCurdy, Charles P., Jr. (ed.). Proceedings of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities 75th Annual Convention. Centennial Convocation, Vol. II. Washington: American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, 1961.
- McCurdy, Charles P., Jr. (ed.). Proceedings of the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges 76th Annual Convention. Washington: American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, 1962.
- United States Department of Agriculture. After a Hundred Years: The 1962 Yearbook of Agriculture. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

United States Department of Agriculture. Land: The 1958 Yearbook of Agriculture. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1958.

United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. The County and City Data Book, 1962. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1961.

Public Documents

National Resources Board. General Conditions and Tendencies Influencing the Nation's Land Requirements. Part I of the Report on Land Planning. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1936.

Rummell, Leo L. One Hundred Years of Better Living through Education and Research in Agriculture and Home Economics. Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station, Public Information Series 63, and College of Agriculture and Home Economics, Extension Bulletin 422. Wooster and Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1962.

United States Congress. Act of 1862 Donating Lands for Colleges of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. 12 Stat. 503.

United States Congress. An Act to establish agricultural experiment stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provision of an act approved July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, and the acts supplementary thereto. 24 Stat. 440 (1887).

United States Congress. Act of 1914 providing for cooperative extension work. 38 Stat. 372, and amendment (7 U.S.C. 341 et seq.).

United States Department of Agriculture, Federal Extension Service. 1962 Statistics on Activities of Cooperative Extension Service. (ESC-555), Washington: Federal Extension Service, 1964.

United States Department of Agriculture, Federal Extension Service. "Ranking of States and Puerto Rico Based on Percentage of Funds Available from Each Source for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1963," FES form MO-406 (11-62). Washington: Federal Extension Service, 1963.

Articles and Periodicals

- Mast, C. L. Jr., and Associates. County Agent Directory, 1963.
Chicago: C. L. Mast, Jr., and Associates, 1963.
- Miller, Paul A. "The Evolution of Extension." Agricultural Leaders' Digest, 40 (March 1959), pp. 12-13.

Unpublished Material

- Bonnen, James. "The First One Hundred Years of the USDA-Land-Grant System: Some Observations on the Organizational Nature of a Great Technological Pay-Off." East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1962. (Mimeographed.)
- Jones, Robert M. "The Cooperative Extension Service Legal Mandates and Directives." East Lansing: Department of Resource Development, Michigan State University, 1963. (Mimeographed graduate student term paper.)
- Kaufman, Charles R. "An Analysis of the Responsibilities of the Extension Service with Non-Farm Families." Unpublished master's degree research paper, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1956.
- Kimball, William James. "The Relation Between Personal Values and the Adoption of Recommended Farm and Home Practices." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Chicago, Chicago, 1960.
- Miller, Paul A. "Cooperative Agricultural Extension Work in the Industrializing Society." East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1959. (Mimeographed.)
- Smith, Norman J. "Agricultural Extension Work in Densely Populated Counties of the United States." Master's degree research paper, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1958. (Mimeographed.)

Other Sources

- Michigan State University. Personal interview with Herbert A. Berg, Assistant Director of Michigan Cooperative Extension Service. November 28, 1962.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS WHICH WERE USEFUL AS BACKGROUND
TO UNDERSTANDING THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
IN TODAY'S SOCIETY

Books

United States Department of Agriculture. A Place to Live: The Yearbook of Agriculture 1963. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

United States Department of Agriculture. Farmers in a Changing World: The Yearbook of Agriculture 1940. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1940.

Public Documents
and
Publications of Learned Institutions

Center for Agricultural and Economic Development of Iowa State University and College of Agriculture of Colorado State University. The Century Ahead. The proceedings of a seminar on Agricultural Administration in the Land-Grant System held June 16-19, 1963 at Fort Collins, Colorado: Fort Collins, Colorado: Colorado State University, 1963.

Clark, Robert C. and N. P. Ralston (eds.). Directing the Cooperative Extension Service. Publication 15. Madison, Wisconsin: National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study, 1962.

Iowa State University, Cooperative Extension Service. Nonfarm Services of the Cooperative Extension Service. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University, Cooperative Extension Service, 1963.

Kearl, Bryant E. and O. B. Copeland. A Guide to Extension Programs for the Future. Raleigh: The Agricultural Extension Service, North Carolina State College, 1959.

Miller, Paul A. (chr.). The Cooperative Extension Service...Today: A Statement of Scope and Responsibility. Subcommittee on scope and responsibility of the 1957 Extension Committee on Organization and Policy of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, 1958.

The Ohio State University Agricultural Extension Service. "Scope of Urban Extension: Extension Agent Survey in 16 Urban Counties in Ohio." Columbus: The Ohio State University (Agricultural Extension Service), November 1962.

Ramsey, Ralph (chr.). "Report of Seminar on Land-Grant Colleges and Universities Serving Communities: Chicago, Illinois, November 1, 1960." Lexington, Kentucky: Subcommittee on Resident and Extension Teaching North Central Rural Sociology Committee, 1962.

Sabrosky, Laurel K. A Survey of Urban 4-H Club Work in the United States, 1962. United States Department of Agriculture, Federal Extension Service Circular 542. Washington: United States Department of Agriculture, 1963.

United States Department of Agriculture Federal Extension Service. Professionalism for Extension Workers. Annual Conference, January 9-11, 1963. Washington: United States Department of Agriculture, 1963.

Periodicals

Aiton, E. W. "Knowledge Wholesalers," Extension Service Review. 33 (July 1962), 139+153.

Blalock, T. C., Mary Nell Greenwood, and Roland H. Abraham. "What the Public Thinks of Extension," Journal of Cooperative Extension. I (Spring 1963), 47-54.

Kerr, Clark. "The Multiversity - Are Its Several Souls Worth Saving?" Harper's Magazine, 227 (November 1963), 37-42.

McKain, Walter C., Jr. "Rural Suburbs and Their People," Journal of Cooperative Extension. I (Summer 1963), 76-84.

Vines, C. A., Lowell H. Watts, and W. Robert Parks. "Extension's Future," Journal of Cooperative Extension. I (Winter 1963), 239-246.

Unpublished Materials

Beale, Calvin L., and Donald J. Bogue. "Recent U. S. Population Trends and Their Causes" (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1962).

Ferver, Jack C. "An Analysis of the Behavior of County Extension Directors as Coordinators of Michigan State University Community Development Programs." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1961.

- Garman, George J. "County Extension Agents Perception of Needed 4-H Program and Procedural Adjustments When 4-H Enrollment Increases to 5,000 Members in Ohio Counties." Unpublished Master's thesis, The Ohio State University, Columbus, 1963.
- Haygood, Kenneth. "Status Report on the Ford Foundation Grants for Urban Research, Education and Extension." Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1962. (Mimeographed.)
- Indiana Cooperative Extension Service. "Indiana Cooperative Extension Service Act of 1963." Lafayette: Indiana Cooperative Extension Service, 1963. (Mimeographed.)
- Kalangi, Christopher J. "An Analysis of Training Needs of Extension Agents in Urban and Farm Counties." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, 1963.
- Kimball, William J. "Resource Development--Perspective, Progress and Potential," Paper read at the North Central Rural Sociology Seminar on Resource Development, Nebraska Center for Continuing Education, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska, December 17-19, 1963.
- Luebbe, Donald John. "Michigan County Government's Perception of Its Responsibility and the Responsibility of the Cooperative Extension Service." Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1962.
- Ratchford, C. B. "The Land-Grant College--The Cooperative Extension Service and Their Relationship to Progress in the South During the Next Decade." Paper read at Southern Region Supervisory Workshop, Hot Springs, Arkansas, October 1-5, 1962.
- Sower, Christopher, and Paul A. Miller. "Changing Power Structure in Agriculture and Rural Society," Paper read at the annual meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, Ames, Iowa, August 27-29, 1961.
- Suggitt, Frank W. "Cooperative Area Analysis and Development as Applied to Michigan and Its Environs." Unpublished Master's thesis, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1956.
- VandeBerg, Gale L. (chr.). "Recommendations for Cooperative Extension Educational Work in Milwaukee County," Report of university committee (of University of Wisconsin). Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1962. (Mimeographed.)

VandeBerg, Gale L. (chr.). "Supplemental Report to Recommendations for Cooperative Extension Work in Milwaukee County," Report of university committee (of University of Wisconsin). Madison: University of Wisconsin, n.d. (Mimeographed.)

Zeidler, Frank P. "Town and Country Problems as Viewed in the Urban Setting," Milwaukee, Wisconsin: 1963. (Mimeographed.)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A CENSUS DATA FOR SAMPLE COUNTIES

State	County	Rank in U.S.	State	Population	Pop. Per Sq. Mi.	'50 to '60 % Increase	% Urban Residence	% Rural Farm
Alabama	Jefferson	43	1	3,266,740	67	6.7	55.0	12.3
	Madison	261	4	634,864	568	13.6	84.6	5
	Mobile	99	2	117,348	146	61.0	63.9	12.7
	Alaska			314,301	253	36.0	86.1	1.0
	Anchorage	362	1	226,167	000	75.8	37.9	1.0
	Fairbanks	710	2	82,833	---	---	64.4	1.1
	Palmer-Nasilla-Talkeetna	2,824	11	43,412	---	---	30.7	1.5
	Arizona			10,070	---	---	64.4	15.2
	Maricopa	39	1	1,302,161	12	73.7	74.5	3.8
	Pima	117	2	663,510	72	100.0	86.5	2.4
	Pinal	477	3	265,661	29	88.1	88.3	1.1
	Arkansas			62,673	12	45.1	44.0	11.1
	Jefferson	370	2	1,786,272	34	6.5	42.8	18.6
	Mississippi	428	3	81,373	91	7.0	57.4	10.8
	Pulaski	131	1	70,174	76	14.8	38.5	17.3
	California			242,980	317	21.5	82.1	1.6
	Los Angeles	1	1	15,717,204	100	48.5	86.4	2.1
	Orange	31	4	6,038,771	1,487	45.5	98.8	1.1
	San Diego	16	2	703,425	900	225.6	95.9	5
	Colorado			1,033,010	243	85.5	88.9	9
	Adams	253	4	1,753,947	17	32.4	73.7	7.3
	Denver	66	1	120,296	97	199.0	88.1	3.4
	El Paso	220	2	493,887	6,956	18.8	100.0	---
	Connecticut			143,742	67	92.9	76.0	1.3
	Fairfield	41	3	2,535,234	518	26.3	78.3	1.0
	Hartford	35	1	653,589	1,033	29.6	87.0	1.2
	New Haven	40	2	689,555	932	27.8	83.2	1.7
	Delaware			660,315	1,083	21.0	87.3	4
	Kent	462	3	446,292	226	40.3	65.6	4.9
	New Castle	103	1	65,651	110	73.4	19.4	9.6
	Sussex	412	2	307,446	704	40.5	86.6	1.2
	Florida			73,195	77	19.3	18.7	16.1
	Broward	97	5	4,951,560	91	78.7	74.0	2.1
	Dade	19	1	333,946	274	297.9	96.6	1.2
	Billsborough	81	3	935,047	455	88.9	95.6	1.2
	Georgia			397,788	383	59.2	79.8	2.0
	Cobb	266	7	3,943,116	68	14.5	55.3	10.3
	De Kalb	123	2	114,174	330	84.7	48.5	1.8
	Fulton	53	1	256,782	955	88.3	84.6	1.3
	Hawaii			556,326	1,064	17.5	93.8	5
	Hawaii	486	2	632,772	99	26.6	76.5	1.7
	Honolulu	65	1	61,332	15	10.3	42.3	9.9
	Idaho			500,409	837	41.8	86.5	1.4
	Idaho	719	3	42,576	37	11.6	41.5	5.3
	Idaho	320	1	667,191	8	13.3	47.5	19.9
	Idaho	645	4	93,460	90	32.3	70.2	7.6
	Bonneville	522	2	46,906	26	55.3	70.7	12.7
	Canyon			57,662	99	7.6	52.4	23.7
	Illinois			10,081,158	180	15.7	80.7	5.6
	Cook	2	1	5,129,725	5,377	13.8	99.0	1
	DuPage	101	2	313,459	947	102.8	85.5	1.0
	Lake	107	3	293,656	643	64.0	78.3	1.4
	Indiana			4,662,498	129	18.5	62.4	10.4
	Allen	137	4	232,196	347	26.4	77.3	5.3
	Lake	60	2	513,269	999	39.4	93.6	9
	Marion	33	1	697,567	1,735	26.4	91.2	5
	Iowa			2,757,537	49	5.2	53.1	24.0
	Blackhawk	250	3	122,482	216	21.9	84.0	6.8
	Linn	229	2	136,899	192	31.3	78.7	7.3
	Polk	116	1	266,315	448	17.8	91.7	2.5
	Kansas			2,178,611	27	14.3	61.0	14.7
	Johnson	219	3	143,792	302	129.0	84.9	3.1
	Sedgewick	93	1	343,231	344	54.4	90.7	2.0
	Wyandotte	178	2	185,495	1,237	12.2	88.5	5
	Kentucky			3,038,156	76	3.2	44.5	18.0
	Payette	236	2	131,906	471	30.9	84.9	4.3
	Jefferson	47	1	610,947	1,629	26.1	88.5	7
	Kenton	252	3	120,700	732	15.8	84.2	1.9
	Louisiana			3,257,022	72	21.4	63.3	7.2
	East Baton Rouge	139	2	230,058	498	45.4	85.1	9
	Jefferson	159	4	208,769	510	101.0	94.1	1
	Orleans	44	1	627,525	3,153	10.0	100.0	---
	Maine			969,265	31	6.1	51.3	5.0
	Acroctook	294	3	106,064	16	10.4	38.3	10.8
	Cumberland	180	1	182,751	214	8.0	67.9	1.0
	Penobscot	243	2	126,346	37	16.8	61.9	3.2
	Maryland			3,100,689	341	32.3	72.7	3.6
	Baltimore	67	1	492,428	810	82.2	85.2	1.2
	Montgomery	94	3	340,928	692	107.4	86.1	1.3
	Prince Georges	88	2	377,395	737	84.1	83.4	2.1
	Massachusetts			5,148,578	655	9.8	83.6	0.7
	Essex	51	3	568,831	1,138	8.9	90.7	3
	Middlesex	13	1	1,238,742	1,444	16.4	85.9	1.3
	Morfolk	61	5	510,256	1,282	30.1	86.4	1.6
	Michigan			7,823,194	137	22.8	73.4	5.6
	Macomb	78	3	405,804	844	119.4	87.4	1.7
	Oakland	34	2	690,259	787	74.3	88.2	1.7
	Wayne	3	1	2,666,297	4,393	9.5	97.5	1.1
	Minnesota			3,413,864	43	14.5	62.1	17.2
	Hennepin	24	1	842,854	1,492	24.6	98.1	7
	Ramsey	75	2	422,525	2,641	18.9	98.8	1.1
	St. Louis	138	3	231,588	37	12.4	74.3	2.5
	Mississippi			2,178,141	46	---	37.7	24.9
	Harrison	255	2	119,489	204	42.1	77.4	1.0
	Hinds	176	1	187,045	213	31.6	80.7	5.8
	Washington	383	3	78,638	108	11.5	67.3	9.0

State	County	Rank U.S.	State	Population	Pop. Per Sq. Mi.	'50 to '60 % Increase	% Urban Residence	% Rural Farm
Missouri	Greene	244	3	4,319,813	63	9.2	66.6	12.5
Green				126,276	187	20.5	77.0	6.3
Jackson		46	2	622,732	1,033	15.1	94.4	.8
St. Louis		32	1	703,532	1,416	73.1	92.4	.4
Montana				674,767	5	14.2	50.2	15.6
Cascade		411	2	73,418	28	38.5	78.5	4.7
Missoula		687	4	44,663	17	25.8	69.2	3.5
Yellowstone		380	1	79,016	30	41.4	82.7	6.0
Douglas		92	1	343,490	1,032	22.2	54.3	21.9
Lancaster		203	2	155,272	184	29.7	87.7	4.2
Sully		980	4	31,281	133	99.3	46.1	7.7
Nevada				285,278	3	78.2	70.4	3.5
Clark		242	1	127,016	16	163.0	83.5	1.0
Elko		2,073	3	12,011	1	3.1	52.4	13.7
Nashoe		351	2	84,743	14	68.8	82.8	.9
New Hampshire				606,921	67	13.8	58.3	3.1
Hillsborough		182	1	178,161	200	13.5	77.2	1.6
Rockingham		307	2	99,029	143	41.4	46.3	2.9
Stratford		503	3	59,799	159	16.0	80.7	1.5
New Jersey				6,066,782	807	25.5	88.6	0.8
Bergen		27	2	780,255	3,349	44.7	99.6	---
Essex		21	1	923,545	7,215	1.9	99.7	---
Ocean		284	15	108,241	169	91.2	35.7	1.4
New Mexico				951,023	8	39.6	65.7	6.1
Bernalillo		121	1	262,199	226	80.0	92.0	.4
Chaves		523	3	57,649	10	42.0	68.7	6.7
Dona Ana		501	2	59,948	16	51.5	56.3	9.9
New York				16,782,304	350	13.2	85.4	1.9
Erie		14	6	1,064,688	1,010	18.4	87.6	1.0
Nassau		11	5	1,300,171	4,334	93.3	99.7	---
Westchester		25	7	808,891	1,860	29.3	92.7	.1
North Carolina				4,556,155	93	12.1	39.5	17.7
Cumberland		211	5	148,418	225	54.6	47.3	6.7
Guilford		129	2	246,520	379	29.0	76.1	5.0
Mecklenburg		114	1	272,111	502	38.1	78.0	1.7
North Dakota				632,446	9	2.1	35.2	32.3
Cass		453	1	66,947	38	13.7	76.2	12.2
Grand Forks		618	2	48,677	34	23.4	70.8	12.8
Ward		643	3	47,072	23	35.3	65.0	12.5
Ohio				9,706,394	237	22.1	73.4	5.4
Cuyahoga		8	1	1,647,895	3,164	18.6	99.6	---
Hamilton		23	2	864,121	2,087	19.4	94.6	.3
Lake		210	12	148,700	641	95.7	79.3	1.3
Oklaoma				2,328,284	34	4.3	62.9	11.1
Comanche		329	3	90,803	84	64.6	68.2	4.1
Oklahoma		71	1	439,506	623	35.1	96.8	.5
Tulsa		91	2	346,038	605	37.5	88.9	1.1
Oregon				1,768,687	18	16.3	62.2	7.8
Clackamas		271	4	113,038	60	30.4	56.7	10.2
Lane		196	2	162,890	36	29.5	61.1	5.1
Maltomah		57	1	522,813	1,233	10.9	96.4	.5
Pennsylvania				11,319,366	253	7.8	71.6	3.1
Allegheny		9	2	1,628,587	2,231	7.5	93.2	.1
Bucks		102	7	308,567	500	113.4	75.3	2.5
Philadelphia		5	1	2,002,512	15,768	-3.3	100.0	---
Rhode Island				859,488	812	8.5	86.4	0.5
Kent		273	2	112,619	655	44.8	93.4	.2
New Port		367	3	81,891	712	33.1	68.2	1.3
Providence		52	1	568,778	1,348	-1.1	91.8	.3
South Carolina				2,382,594	79	12.5	73.5	1.0
Charleston		152	1	216,382	229	31.3	73.5	1.0
Greenville		157	2	209,886	266	24.8	63.7	3.3
Richland		166	3	200,102	268	40.4	69.4	1.6
South Dakota				680,514	9	4.3	39.3	30.2
Brown		901	3	34,106	20	4.6	67.7	18.3
Minnehaha		344	1	86,575	106	22.1	76.9	9.4
Pennington		518	2	58,195	21	70.9	72.9	5.1
Tennessee				3,567,089	85	8.4	52.3	16.4
Davidson		79	2	399,743	751	24.2	87.7	1.3
Shelby		45	1	627,019	835	30.0	87.8	2.2
Sullivan		267	5	114,139	269	20.1	47.2	8.0
Texas				9,579,677	36	24.2	75.0	7.2
Dallas		17	2	951,527	1,067	54.8	97.5	.3
Harris		12	1	1,243,158	727	54.1	94.5	.5
Taylor		302	16	101,078	111	59.5	90.4	2.9
Utah				890,627	-11	29.3	74.9	4.9
Salt Lake		83	1	383,035	501	39.3	90.4	1.4
Utah		291	3	106,991	54	30.6	84.3	4.4
Weber		280	2	110,744	202	32.9	86.8	2.9
Vermont				389,881	42	3.2	38.5	12.5
Chittenden		404	1	74,425	140	18.9	69.3	5.9
Rutland		648	2	46,719	50	1.8	39.2	8.6
Washington		717	3	42,860	61	---	51.7	8.3
Virginia				3,966,949	100	19.5	55.8	10.0
Fairfax		112	2	275,002	679	179.0	78.0	.7
Henrico		262	6	117,339	506	104.6	71.0	1.3
Morfolk		105	1	305,869	153	43.3	100.0	---
Washington				2,853,214	43	19.9	68.1	5.7
King		20	1	935,014	438	27.6	89.6	.7
Pierce		98	2	321,590	192	16.6	72.7	1.8
Shoemah		187	4	172,199	82	54.3	56.0	4.6
West Virginia				1,860,421	77	-7.2	38.2	6.5
Cabell		285	2	108,202	388	-2	73.8	2.4
Harrison		388	4	77,856	186	-8.7	45.0	4.3
Kanawha		124	1	252,925	279	5.5	66.8	.8
Wisconsin				3,951,777	72	15.1	63.8	14.0
Dane		145	2	222,095	186	31.1	75.4	9.0
Milwaukee		15	1	1,036,041	4,335	18.9	100.0	---
Waukesha		199	3	158,249	285	84.2	65.1	3.8
Wyoming				330,066	3	33.7	56.8	13.0
Framont		1,137	3	26,168	3	33.7	42.1	17.2
Laramie		498	1	60,149	22	26.2	72.3	4.0
Matrona		603	2	49,623	9	57.8	78.5	1.3

APPENDIX B

TOTAL NUMBER OF COUNTY EXTENSION WORKERS IN SAMPLE COUNTIES

State County	Number of Workers	State County	Number of Workers
Alabama		Delaware	
Jefferson	8	Kent	3
Madison	7	New Castle	4
Mobile	7	Sussex	4
Alaska		Florida	
Anchorage	1	Borward	5
Fairbanks	2	Dade	13
Palmer	2	Hillsborough	11
Arizona		Georgia	
Maricopa	11	Cobb	5
Pima	4	DeKalb	8
Pinal	7	Fulton	6
Arkansas		Hawaii	
Jefferson	5	Hawaii	23
Mississippi	10	Oahu	19
Pulaski	5	Maui	7
California		Idaho	
Los Angeles	18	Ada	6
Orange	9	Bonneville	3
San Diego	13	Canyon	6
Colorado		Illinois	
Adams	6	Cook	8
Denver	5	DuPage	3
El Paso	3	Lake	3
Connecticut		Indiana	
Fairfield	6	Allen	6
Hartford	7	Lake	6
New Haven	7	Marion	11

State County	Number of Workers	State County	Number of Workers
Iowa		Mississippi	
Blackhawk	4	Harrison	5
Linn	3	Hinds	6
Polk	5	Washington	5
Kansas		Missouri	
Johnson	5	Green	5
Sedgwick	7	Jackson	8
Wyandotte	3	St. Louis	8
Kentucky		Montana	
Fayette	3	Cascade	4
Jefferson	6	Missoula	2
Kenton	4	Yellowstone	4
Louisiana		Nebraska	
East Baton Rouge	5	Douglas	5
Jefferson	4	Lancaster	5
Orleans	2	Sarpy	3
Maine		Nevada	
Aroostook	10	Clark	5
Cumberland	5	Elko	5
Penobscot	4	Washoe	4
Maryland		New Hampshire	
Baltimore	6	Hillsborough	7
Montgomery	7	Rockingham	8
Prince Georges	7	Strafford	5
Massachusetts		New Jersey	
Essex	6	Bergen	5
Middlesex	12	Essex	6
Norfolk	8	Ocean	5
Michigan		New Mexico	
Macomb	6	Bernalillo	4
Oakland	7	Chaves	5
Wayne	8	Dona Ana	4
Minnesota		New York	
Hennepin	4	Erie	17
Ramsey	3	Nassau	23
St. Louis	6	Westchester	4

State	County	Number of Workers	State	County	Number of Workers
North Carolina			Tennessee		
	Cumberland	4		Davidson	5
	Guilford	9		Shelby	8
	Mecklenburg	6		Sullivan	5
North Dakota			Texas		
	Cass	4		Dallas	6
	Grand Forks	4		Harris	8
	Ward	4		Taylor	4
Ohio			Utah		
	Cuyahoga	3		Salt Lake	4
	Hamilton	3		Utah	3
	Lake	1		Weber	4
Oklahoma			Vermont		
	Comanche	6		Chittenden	4
	Oklahoma	8		Rutland	4
	Tulsa	7		Washington	3
Oregon			Virginia		
	Clackamas	9		Fairfax	7
	Lane	9		Henrico	4
	Multnomah	7		Norfolk	4
Pennsylvania			Washington		
	Allegheny	5		King	8
	Bucks	4		Pierce	7
	Philadelphia	2		Snohomish	5
Rhode Island			West Virginia		
	Kent	3		Cabell	3
	Newport	3		Harrison	5
	Providence	3		Kanawha	4
South Carolina			Wisconsin		
	Charleston	2		Dane	6
	Greenville	5		Milwaukee	5
	Richland	4		Waukesha	6
South Dakota			Wyoming		
	Brown	4		Fremont	6
	Minnehaha	4		Laramie	3
	Pennington	5		Natrona	3
			TOTAL (all states)		882

APPENDIX C

CORRESPONDENCE AND OPINIONNAIRE: COUNTY WORKERS

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY • EAST LANSING

Office of the Director

AND U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE COOPERATING

May 9, 1963

Dear

The demand for Extension assistance in urban areas is constantly growing. It is not easy for university administrators nor for Extension workers to know how to handle all the new demands. The attached opinionnaire is an attempt to obtain insights on Extension work for urban and urbanizing areas.

This study is being undertaken by Mr. Kaye Bartlett, a graduate student at Michigan State University and one who has had some experience with this problem as an Extension worker in Ohio. All State Extension Directors and three randomly selected Extension workers from more densely populated counties of each state are being asked to respond to the concise opinionnaire.

Your contribution in this study of urban Extension work will be most appreciated. Would you please return your responses in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible. Mr. Bartlett would like to begin tabulations on May 25.

Sincerely,

William J. Kimball
Extension Program Leader
Community Resource Development
and Public Affairs

Attachment

DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

May 9, 1963

Dear

What is the role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas?

Will there be increased assistance to urban people in the future?

Your responses to the enclosed opinionnaire will be valuable in suggesting answers to these questions which are being heard more frequently everywhere.

Your State Extension Director has been informed of this study and is aware of this request. You may be assured that any information submitted will be handled in strict confidence.

This study of urban Extension work is part of my graduate program at Michigan State. I would appreciate hearing from you by May 25.

If you are interested in the finished study, I'll be glad to send you a copy of the abstract.

Very truly yours,

K. F. Bartlett

KFB:dm
Enclosure

Dear Extension Workers:

One hundred twenty-one Extension Agents and forty-three State Extension Directors have responded to the opinionnaire, "The Role of the Cooperative Extension Service in Urban and Urbanizing Areas."

Would you please return your completed opinionnaire as soon as possible. Your responses are important, and I would like to include them in this study.

Sincerely,

K. F. Bartlett
Dept. of Resource Development
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

6/13/63

Sample of follow-up postal card.

OPINIONNAIRE

THE ROLE OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE IN URBAN AND URBANIZING AREAS

Please answer the following questions from the vantage point of your position as the questions relate to the total Extension program. Your contribution to this study should be helpful to fellow Extension workers in programming future educational activities for urban and urbanizing area residents.

1. In your opinion what is the current role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas? _____

-
2. In your opinion should Extension educational assistance to urban people be: (Please check your choice.) _____

Increased: __1. Slightly __2. Moderately __3. Substantially
Decreased: __4. Slightly __5. Moderately __6. Substantially
__7. Held the same
__8. No opinion

-
3. What proportion of time do you think Extension workers should spend working with urban residents of your county? (Please check your choice.) _____

__1. 0% __2. 1-20% __3. 21-40%
__4. 41-60% __5. 61-80% __6. 81-100%

-
4. From what sources do you think Extension will receive its support in the future?

A. Financial support-government and other. (Please indicate the approximate support Extension presently receives from the sources listed below, in percentages left of the slash. Right of the slash please indicate in percentages what Extension may expect to receive in the future.) _____

Present/Future

- ___% / ___% 1. Township government () _____
 ___% / ___% 2. City government () _____
 ___% / ___% 3. County government () _____
 ___% / ___% 4. State government () _____
 ___% / ___% 5. Federal government () _____
 ___% / ___% 6. Business () _____
 ___% / ___% 7. Foundations () _____
 ___% / ___% 8. Industry () _____
 ___% / ___% 9. Organizations () _____
 ___% / ___% 10. Other - Specify () _____

B. Support other than financial. (Please indicate the direction of future Extension support other than financial in the parentheses at the right of the above sources using the following scale:

(1) = Less Support; (2) = About the Same; (3) = More Support. _____

5. What kinds of assistance do you feel the total Extension program should provide for urban people in each of the following areas? (Please describe.)

1. Agricultural Production, Management
and Natural Resource Development _____

2. Community and Public Affairs _____

3. Extension Home Economics _____

4. 4-H and Other Youth Extension Work _____

5. Marketing and Utilization of
Agricultural Products _____

6. What personal experiences have you had in urban Extension work? (Please describe: Types of programs, subject matter, educational methods, etc.)
- _____
- _____

7. To what extent has urban Extension work been undertaken in the following areas in your county? (Please circle your choice on the scale for each area.)

	Extent of Urban Extension Work in Your County					
	1	2	3	4	5	
	Little or No	Some	Moderate	Much	Very Much	
1. Agricultural Production, Management and Natural Resource Development	1	2	3	4	5	_____
2. Community and Public Affairs	1	2	3	4	5	_____
3. Extension Home Economics	1	2	3	4	5	_____
4. 4-H and Other Youth Extension Work	1	2	3	4	5	_____
5. Marketing and Utilization of Agricultural Products	1	2	3	4	5	_____

8. In your opinion how effective have urban Extension programs been in your county? (Please circle your choice on the scale for each area in which there has been an urban Extension program in your county.)

Scale of Effectiveness of Urban Extension Work in Your County				
1	2	3	4	5
Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| 1. Agricultural Production,
Management and Natural
Resource Development | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | _____ |
| 2. Community and Public
Affairs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | _____ |
| 3. Extension Home
Economics | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | _____ |
| 4. 4-H and Other Youth
Extension Work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | _____ |
| 5. Marketing and Utiliza-
tion of Agricultural
Products | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | _____ |

9. Please check your position. _____

- ☐ 1. Agricultural Agent
☐ 2. Consumer Information Agent
☐ 3. 4-H Club Agent
☐ 4. Home Demonstration Agent
☐ 5. Marketing Agent
☐ 6. Resource Development Agent
☐ 7. Other (Specify)
☐ 8. _____

10. Your major subject matter interest(s) _____

11. Number of years in Extension work. _____

- ☐ 1. 0-2 ☐ 2. 3-5 ☐ 3. 6-10 ☐ 4. 11-15
☐ 5. 16-20 ☐ 6. 21 and over

12. Number of years of Extension work in this County? _____

___1. 0-2 ___2. 3-5 ___3. 6-10 ___4. 11-15

___5. 16-20 ___6. 21 and over

13. Formal education. (Please check all degrees held and indicate major field of study for each degree.) _____

___BS_____

___MS_____

___PhD_____

Indicate major field of study beyond the highest degree held, if work has been done.

14. Male_____ Female_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

APPENDIX D

CORRESPONDENCE AND OPINIONNAIRE: STATE DIRECTORS

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY • EAST LANSING

Office of the Director

AND U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE COOPERATING

May 9, 1963

Dear

The demand for Extension assistance in urban areas is constantly growing. It is not easy for university administrators nor for Extension workers to know how to handle all the new demands. The attached opinionnaire is an attempt to obtain insights on Extension work for urban and urbanizing areas.

This study is being undertaken by Mr. Kaye Bartlett, a graduate student at Michigan State University and one who has had some experience with this problem as an Extension worker in Ohio. All State Extension Directors and three randomly selected Extension workers from more densely populated counties of each state are being asked to respond to the concise opinionnaire.

Your contribution in this study of urban Extension work will be most appreciated. Would you please return your responses in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible. Mr. Bartlett would like to begin tabulations on May 25.

Sincerely,

William J. Kimball
Extension Program Leader
Community Resource Development
and Public Affairs

Attachment

DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

May 9, 1963

Dear

What is the role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas?

Will there be increased assistance to urban people in the future?

Your responses on the enclosed opinionnaire will be valuable in suggesting answers to these questions, which are being heard more frequently these days.

All State Extension Directors are being asked to participate in this study of Urban Extension work. A similar opinionnaire is planned for County Extension Agents who are working in more densely populated counties of each state. From such areas in your state agents have been randomly selected to participate in this study:

Your cooperation will contribute greatly to this study which is part of my graduate program at Michigan State. You may be assured that any information submitted will be handled in strict confidence.

I would appreciate hearing from you by May 25, if at all possible. If you are interested in the finished study, I'll be glad to send you a copy of the abstract.

Sincerely,

K. F. Bartlett

KFB:dm
Enclosure

Dear Extension Workers:

One hundred twenty-one Extension Agents and forty-three State Extension Directors have responded to the opinionnaire, "The Role of the Cooperative Extension Service in Urban and Urbanizing Areas."

Would you please return your completed opinionnaire as soon as possible. Your responses are important, and I would like to include them in this study.

Sincerely,

K. F. Bartlett
Dept. of Resource Development
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

6/13/63

Sample of follow-up postal card.

OPINIONNAIRE

THE ROLE OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE IN URBAN AND URBANIZING AREAS

Please answer the following questions from the vantage point of your position as the questions relate to the total Extension program. Your contribution to this study should be helpful to fellow Extension workers in programming future educational activities for urban and urbanizing area residents.

1. In your opinion what is the current role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas? _____

-
2. In your opinion should Extension educational assistance to urban people be: (Please check your choice.) _____

Increased: __1. Slightly __2. Moderately __3. Substantially
Decreased: __4. Slightly __5. Moderately __6. Substantially
__7. Held the same
__8. No opinion

-
3. What proportion of time do you think Extension workers should spend working with urban residents of your state? (Please check your choice.) _____

__1. 0% __2. 1-20% __3. 21-40%
__4. 41-60% __5. 61-80% __6. 81-100%

-
4. From what sources do you think Extension will receive its support in the future? _____

A. Financial support. (Please indicate the approximate support Extension presently receives from the sources listed below, in percentages left of the slash. Right of the slash please indicate in percentages what Extension may expect to receive in the future.) _____

Present/Future

____ % / ____ %	1. Township government	()	_____
____ % / ____ %	2. City government	()	_____
____ % / ____ %	3. County government	()	_____
____ % / ____ %	4. State government	()	_____
____ % / ____ %	5. Federal government	()	_____
____ % / ____ %	6. Business	()	_____
____ % / ____ %	7. Foundations	()	_____
____ % / ____ %	8. Industry	()	_____
____ % / ____ %	9. Organizations	()	_____
____ % / ____ %	10. Other - Specify	()	_____

B. Support other than financial. (Please indicate the direction of future Extension support other than financial in the parentheses at the right of the above sources using the following scale:

(1) = Less Support; (2) = About the Same; (3) = More Support.

5. What kinds of assistance do you feel the total Extension program should provide for urban people in each of the following areas? (Please describe.)

1. Agricultural Production, Management
and Natural Resource Development _____

2. Community and Public Affairs _____

3. Extension Home Economics _____

4. 4-H and Other Youth Extension Work _____

5. Marketing and Utilization of
Agricultural Products _____

6. Are urban areas in your state now participating in Extension sponsored activities? (Please describe.) _____

7. To what extent has urban Extension work been undertaken in the following areas in your state? (Please circle your choice on the scale for each area.)

Extent of Urban Extension Work in Your State					
	1	2	3	4	5
	Little or No	Some	Moderate	Much	Very Much
1. Agricultural Production, Management and Natural Resource Development	1	2	3	4	5
2. Community and Public Affairs	1	2	3	4	5
3. Extension Home Economics	1	2	3	4	5
4. 4-H and Other Youth Extension Work	1	2	3	4	5
5. Marketing and Utilization of Agricultural Products	1	2	3	4	5

8. In your opinion how effective have urban Extension programs been in your state? (Please circle your choice on the scale for each area in which there has been an urban Extension program in your state.)

Scale of Effectiveness of Urban Extension Work in Your State					
	1	2	3	4	5
	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
1. Agricultural Production, Management and Natural Resource Development	1	2	3	4	5
2. Community and Public Affairs	1	2	3	4	5
3. Extension Home Economics	1	2	3	4	5
4. 4-H and Other Youth Extension Work	1	2	3	4	5
5. Marketing and Utiliza- tion of Agricultural Products	1	2	3	4	5

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

APPENDIX E

OPINIONNAIRE RESPONSE CODING SYSTEM

(The responses to the instrument for obtaining data on the role of the Co-operative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas were recorded on the instrument. These data were then coded according to the following coding systems and incorporated on Hollerith cards for analysis.)

Hollerith

Card

Column

Deck One

- | | |
|-------|--|
| 1-3 | Opinionnaire Number
001-150 County Cooperative Extension Service Worker
200-249 State Cooperative Extension Service Director |
| 4 | Deck Number
1 First Deck
2 Second Deck |
| 5-10 | Computer Problem Number
Assigned by MSU Computer Center |
| 11-12 | Blank |
| 13 | Respondent's Position
0 No response, response not classifiable
1 Agricultural Agent
2 Consumer Information Agent
3 4-H Club Agent
4 Home Demonstration Agent
5 Marketing Agent
6 Resource Development Agent
7 Other Agent Position
8 State Cooperative Extension Service Director |
| 14 | Number of Years in Extension Work
0 No response
1 0-2
2 3-5
3 6-10
4 11-15
5 16-20
6 21-over |

Hollerith
Card
Column

- | | |
|-------|---|
| 15 | Number of Years in Extension Work in County
0 No response, response not coded (higher than column 14)
1 0-2
2 3-5
3 6-10
4 11-15
5 16-20
6 21-over |
| 16 | Major Subject Matter Interests of Respondent
0 No response
1 Technical subject matter
2 Educational methods
3 Human development |
| 17-18 | Year Bachelor's Degree Attained
00 No response
(Raw Data) |
| 19 | Bachelor's Degree Major
0 No response
1 Technical subject matter
2 Educational methods
3 Human development |
| 20-21 | Year Master's Degree Attained
00 No response
(Raw Data) |
| 22 | Master's Degree Major
0 No response
1 Technical subject matter
2 Educational methods
3 Human development |
| 23-24 | Year Ph. D. Degree Attained
00 No response
(Raw Data) |

Hollerith
Card
Column

25	Ph. D. Degree Major	
	0 No response	
	1 Technical subject matter	
	2 Educational methods	
	3 Human development	
26	Major Subject Matter Interests Beyond Highest Degree Held	
	0 No response	
	1 Technical subject matter	
	2 Educational methods	
	3 Human development	
27	Sex of Respondent	
	0 No response	
	1 Male	
	2 Female	
28-30	Blank	
31-32	State	
	01 Alabama	26 Montana
	02 Alaska	27 Nebraska
	03 Arizona	28 Nevada
	04 Arkansas	29 New Hampshire
	05 California	30 New Jersey
	06 Colorado	31 New Mexico
	07 Connecticut	32 New York
	08 Delaware	33 North Carolina
	09 Florida	34 North Dakota
	10 Georgia	35 Ohio
	11 Hawaii	36 Oklahoma
	12 Idaho	37 Oregon
	13 Illinois	38 Pennsylvania
	14 Indiana	39 Rhode Island
	15 Iowa	40 South Carolina
	16 Kansas	41 South Dakota
	17 Kentucky	42 Tennessee
	18 Louisiana	43 Texas
	19 Maine	44 Utah
	20 Maryland	45 Vermont
	21 Massachusetts	46 Virginia
	22 Michigan	47 Washington
	23 Minnesota	48 West Virginia
	24 Mississippi	49 Wisconsin
	25 Missouri	50 Wyoming

Hollerith
Card
Column

33	Federal Extension Service Region
	1 North Central
	2 Northeast
	3 South
	4 West
34-38	Total Population
	Raw data which has been rounded with the last three digits dropped
	00000 Response not classifiable
39-43	Population Per Square Mile
	Raw data
	00000 Response not classifiable
44-45	Percent Urban Residents
	Raw data
	00 Response not classifiable
46-47	Percent Rural-Farm Residents
	Raw data
	00 Response not classifiable
48-50	Percent Increase in Population '50 to '60
	Raw data
	000 Response not classifiable
51	In your opinion what is the current role of the Cooperative Extension Service in urban and urbanizing areas?
	0 No response, not coded
	1 Rural oriented
	2 Transitional
	3 Urban oriented
52	In your opinion should Extension educational assistance to urban people be:
	0 No response
	1 Decrease substantially
	2 " moderately
	3 " slightly
	4 Held the same
	5 Increased slightly
	6 " moderately
	7 " substantially

Hollerith
Card
Column

- 53 What proportion of time do you think Extension workers should spend working with urban residents in your county?
- 0 No response, not coded
 - 1 0 percent
 - 2 1-20 percent
 - 3 21-40 percent
 - 4 41-60 percent
 - 5 61-80 percent
 - 6 81-100 percent
- 54 What kinds of assistance do you feel the total Extension program should provide for urban people in each of the following areas?
- A. Agricultural Production, Management and Natural Resource Development
- 0 No response, not coded
 - 1 Rural oriented
 - 2 Transitional
 - 3 Urban oriented
- 55 B. Community and Public Affairs
- 0 No response, not coded
 - 1 Rural oriented
 - 2 Transitional
 - 3 Urban oriented
- 56 C. Extension Home Economics
- 0 No response, not coded
 - 1 Rural oriented
 - 2 Transitional
 - 3 Urban oriented
- 57 D. 4-H and Other Youth Extension Work
- 0 No response, not coded
 - 1 Rural oriented
 - 2 Transitional
 - 3 Urban oriented
- 58 E. Marketing and Utilization of Agricultural Products
- 0 No response, not coded
 - 1 Rural oriented
 - 2 Transitional
 - 3 Urban oriented

Hollerith
Card
Column

- 59 What personal experiences have you had in urban Extension work ?
- 0 No response, response not classifiable
 - 1 Rural oriented
 - 2 Transitional
 - 3 Urban oriented

To what extent has urban Extension work been undertaken in the following areas in your county?

- 0 No response
 - 1 Little or no
 - 2 Some
 - 3 Moderate
 - 4 Much
 - 5 Very much
- 60 Agricultural Production, Management and Natural Resource Development
- 61 Community and Public Affairs
- 62 Extension Home Economics
- 63 4-H and Other Youth Extension Work
- 64 Marketing and Utilization of Agricultural Products

In your opinion how effective have urban Extension programs been in your county?

- 0 No response
 - 1 Very low
 - 2 Low
 - 3 Moderate
 - 4 High
 - 5 Very high
- 65 Agricultural Production, Management and Natural Resource Development
- 66 Community and Public Affairs
- 67 Extension Home Economics
- 68 4-H and Other Youth Extension Work
- 69 Marketing and Utilization of Agricultural Products

Hollerith
Card
Column

70-80 Blank

Deck Two

1-3 Opinionnaire Number

4 Deck Number

5-10 Computer Problem Number

11-12 Blank

Approximate present financial support received from all
sources by Extension
Raw data (percentages)
00 No response

13-14 Township Government

15-16 City Government

17-18 County Government

19-20 State Government

21-22 Federal Government

23-24 Business

25-26 Foundations

27-28 Industry

29-30 Organization

31-32 Other

33-34 Blank

The financial support Extension may expect to receive in
the future from all sources
Raw data (percentages)
00 No response

Hollerith
Card
Column

35-36	Township Government
37-38	City Government
39-40	County Government
41-42	State Government
43-44	Federal Government
45-46	Business
47-48	Foundations
49-50	Industry
51-52	Organizations
53-54	Other
55-56	Blank

The direction of future Extension support other than financial

- 0 No response
- 1 Less support
- 2 About the same
- 3 More support

57	Township Government
58	City Government
59	County Government
60	State Government
61	Federal Government
62	Business
63	Foundations

Hollerith
Card
Column

64	Industry
65	Organizations
66	Other
67-80	Blank

ROOM USE ONLY

~~JAN 29 1965~~

~~Q-1038~~

~~SEP 15 1965~~

JAN 13 1966

~~APR 4 1966~~

~~OCT 25 1966~~

~~SEP 17 1967~~

~~AUG 1 1968~~

~~SEP 21 1967~~ 24

~~AUG 10 1968~~ 6
192

~~SEP 18 1968~~ R29

~~SEP 15 1968~~ 73

~~DEC 2 1970~~ E1338

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293101065757