

DEVELOPING AND TESTING A COUNTY EXTENSION  
PROGRAM EVALUATION MODEL

by

STEVEN DOUGLAS FISHER

B. S., Kansas State University, 1971

---

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1977

Approved by:



---

Major Professor

Docu-  
ment  
LD  
2668  
T4  
1977  
F56  
C.2

113

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
CONTEXT OF THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
PURPOSE. . . . .	3
DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS . . . . .	3
SCOPE AND PROCEDURE. . . . .	4
The Research Design. . . . .	4
Source of Data . . . . .	5
Development of the Data Collection Instruments . . . . .	6
Collecting and Assembling the Data . . . . .	10
Presentation and Analysis of the Data. . . . .	11
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	13
BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM. . . . .	13
FRAMEWORK. . . . .	15
RELATED STUDIES. . . . .	19
3. EVALUATION OF A KANSAS COUNTY EXTENSION PROGRAM. . . . .	22
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	22
ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA. . . . .	22
Characteristics of Respondents . . . . .	22
Strengths and Weaknesses of Program Development. . . . .	27
Strengths and Weaknesses of Program Implementation . . . . .	28
Awareness and Utilization of the Extension Program . . . . .	31

Chapter	Page
Future Program Content . . . . .	33
4. SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	38
SUMMARY . . . . .	38
IMPLICATIONS. . . . .	41
RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	43
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	44
APPENDIXES. . . . .	46
A. SAMPLE TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE WITH COMPLETED RAW DATA. . . . .	46
B. SAMPLE COVER LETTER AND PERSONAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE WITH COMPLETED RAW DATA . . . . .	55
C. REVISED TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE. . . . .	64

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Sex and Age of Respondents as Given by a Random Sample of Adults in Telephone Interviews when Evaluating a County Extension Program. . . . .	23
2. Sex and Residence of Respondents as Given by a Random Sample of Adults in Telephone Interviews when Evaluating a County Extension Program . . . . .	24
3. Effectiveness of a Kansas County Extension Service as Perceived by a Random Sample of Adult Respondents in Telephone Interviews, 1976. . . . .	25
4. The Relationship of Respondent's Age and Their Perception of Effectiveness of a Kansas County Extension Service, as Reported in Telephone Interviews with a Random Sample of Adults. . . . .	26
5. Degree of Involvement by Various Planning Groups in a County Extension Program as Perceived by Selected Leaders in Personal Interviews. . . . .	27
6. Rank Order of Methods Selected Leaders Felt Should be Used by Extension Faculty for Disseminating Information Among Clientele in the Future . . . . .	29
7. Mean Weighted Scores of Program Implementation Factors as Reported by Selected Leaders in Personal Interviews. . . . .	30
8. How Adult Respondents of a Random Telephone Interview Utilized a County Extension Service . . . . .	32
9. The Relationship of Respondent's Age and Their Use of Extension Information as Reported by a Random Sample of Adults in Telephone Interviews . . . . .	33
10. Needs and Problems of Teenagers as Expressed by a Random Sample of Adults in Telephone Interviews in a Kansas County . . . . .	34
11. Rank Order of Needs or Problems of Teenagers as Perceived by Selected County Leaders in Personal Interviews. . . . .	35



## Chapter 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### CONTEXT OF THE PROBLEM

Program evaluation has traditionally been an important element in the program development process. The emphasis on program evaluation has intensified in recent years. Administrators, decision makers and funding agencies have required a more formal, systematic, broad-based approach to evaluation than what was expected in the past. This new direction in program evaluation has caused concern for those responsible for conducting evaluations. The Cooperative Extension Service (CES) is one such agency involved in conducting program evaluations or reviews.

Established by the passage of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, "Cooperative agriculture extension work shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics and subjects relating thereto to persons not attending or resident in said colleges."<sup>1</sup>

The law mandated that Cooperative Extension was "to apply educational programs for the individual and the family which would enhance human development and maximize the individual's contribution to his society."<sup>2</sup> Sanders wrote that, "Continually improved family living

---

<sup>1</sup>Smith-Lever Act, Federal Congress, 1914.

<sup>2</sup>Cooperative Extension Service, A People and a Spirit (Fort Collins: Colorado State University Printing and Publication Service, November 1968), p. 18.

is the ultimate goal of Extension education."<sup>3</sup>

The effectiveness of the CES in achieving its mission of improved family living was discussed in the 1968 report on Cooperative Extension, A People and a Spirit. The report said that effectiveness would be determined by integrating a strategy of education that must include: "(1) planning and preparation, (2) teaching, (3) evaluation, and (4) continuous staff recruitment, training, and development."<sup>4</sup>

One of the responsibilities of County Extension (CE) Agents and Extension Councils is to evaluate their County Extension program. According to the Kansas Handbook for County Extension Councils, "Members of the county Extension Council are elected to represent agriculture, home economics or 4-H and youth work. . . . Extension council members are to actively participate in program planning activities."<sup>5</sup>

It specifically states that members of the agricultural advisory committee will: "Assist the county Extension agricultural agent to evaluate the agricultural program and help to keep the public informed about accomplishments."<sup>6</sup> The same duties are also defined for the other Council members.

Even with this purpose clearly defined, Frutchey noted:

Extension workers have been hearing about evaluation during most of their association with Extension. They sometimes feel

---

<sup>3</sup>H. C. Sanders and others, The Cooperative Extension Service (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966), p. 10.

<sup>4</sup>A People and a Spirit, p. 41.

<sup>5</sup>Kansas State University, Manhattan, Handbook for County Extension Councils, Cooperative Extension Service, No. C-350 Revised (Manhattan: Cooperative Extension Service, October 1975), pp. 12-13.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 14.

that as "doers of extension work, evaluation and research are out of their field; that evaluation and research are something mystical or for persons with years of specialized training; . . .<sup>7</sup>

With the increasing emphasis and need for program evaluation, CE faculty and Councils will be required to further document the effectiveness of their overall county program.

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to develop and test a model for use by County Extension faculty for program evaluation. Five specific areas were identified on which to gather information:

1. total program effectiveness,
2. strengths and weaknesses of the program development process,
3. strengths and weaknesses of program implementation,
4. level of awareness and utilization of the Extension Service among the population of the county,
5. future program content and direction.

A proven program evaluation model such as this would be of benefit for use by CE Agents and CE Councils. This procedure would be of value at two levels. One would be to document program impact and effectiveness for accountability purposes. The second would be to provide evidence for program improvement and direction.

#### DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS

1. Model: The design of a telephone interview schedule,

---

<sup>7</sup>Fred P. Frutchey, "Evaluation--What It Is," Evaluation in Extension, ed. Darcie Byrn (Topeka: H. M. Ives and Sons, 1959), p. 3.

personal interview schedule, and compilation of secondary data with appropriate instructions to be used by CE faculty.

2. Kansas CE Faculty: All professional County Extension staff members including, but not limited to, the CE Director, CE Agricultural Agent, CE Home Economist, CE 4-H and Youth Agent, and CE Horticultural Agent.

3. County Extension Council: The twenty-seven persons elected in the county to serve on the respective agriculture, home economics, 4-H and youth advisory committees who are charged with the responsibility of planning, implementing, and evaluating the Extension program in their county.

4. Program Evaluation: The systematic process of judging the worth, effectiveness, or adequacy of a total CE educational program according to definite criteria and purposes. Macro evaluation is a synonymous concept that is further defined in the literature review.

#### SCOPE AND PROCEDURE

##### The Research Design

According to Selltitz and others, "A research design is the arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance to the research purpose with economy in procedure."<sup>8</sup>

Formulative or exploratory studies approach research with the purpose of gaining "familiarity with a phenomenon or to achieve new

---

<sup>8</sup>Claire Selltitz and others, Research Methods in Social Relations (New York: Holt, Reinehart and Winston, 1959), p. 50.

insights into it. . ."<sup>9</sup> They continued to explain that in exploratory studies the major emphasis is on discovery of ideas and insights. Some exploratory studies have the purpose of formulating a problem for investigation or of developing hypotheses. It may however, have other functions:

. . . increasing the investigator's familiarity with the phenomenon he wishes to investigate in a subsequent, more highly structured study, or with the setting in which he plans to carry out such a study; clarifying concepts; establishing priorities for further research; gathering information about practical settings; providing a census of problems regarded as urgent by people working in a given field of social relations.<sup>10</sup>

The design of this study had as its two major purposes the clarifying of concepts relating to program evaluation and testing an evaluation procedure at the practical setting of the County Extension program level.

#### Source of the Data

One county was randomly selected from within one of the five Kansas Extension Areas to serve as the model county. Permission to carry out the program evaluation in this county was then obtained from the Area Extension Director, County Extension Agents and the County Extension Executive Board. In order to insure the confidentiality of the results, the county thus selected will only be identified in this paper as a Kansas County.

Two sources of data have been recognized as providing evidence on which to base evaluative judgments, primary sources and secondary

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 51.

sources. Byrn has offered these definitions:

. . . think of primary sources as the original documents, the first reporting of the facts, the first grouping of the raw data. Secondary sources bring together facts from primary sources. They can make a substantial contribution to knowledge by way of <sup>11</sup>analysis and interpretation of primary sources. . . .

Data for the evaluation were collected by three methods: secondary data, telephone interviews and personal interviews. The survey population for the telephone interviews included all the telephone subscribers in the county. A selected group of elected county officials, CE Executive Board members and Advisory Committee Chairpersons, Extension Agents and presidents of various agriculturally oriented county organizations served as the survey population for the personal interviews.

#### Development of the Data Collection Instruments

A nine page situational report regarding the county and its Extension educational program was first compiled. Sources of this secondary data included the 1970 U. S. Census of Population, 1975 Kansas Statistical Abstract, 1974 Census of Agriculture preliminary report and the 1975-1976 Farm Facts published by the Kansas State Board of Agriculture.

Information was also taken from the county Extension program of work, 1976 County Extension Management Information System (EMIS) reports, state and county 4-H enrollment statistics and reports from the County Clerk as well as other relevant county documents. It is not

---

<sup>11</sup>Darcie Byrn, "Sources of Data," Evaluation in Extension, ed. Darcie Byrn (Topeka: H. M. Ives and Sons, 1959), p. 3.

possible to include this secondary data in this paper without revealing the identity of the county.

Tuckman stated that the use of questionnaires and interviews by researchers allows them to convert information into data given directly by a person.

. . . these approaches make it possible to measure what a person knows (knowledge or information), what a person likes and dislikes (values and preferences), and what a person thinks (attitudes and beliefs).<sup>12</sup>

It was determined that a telephone interview would be the most desirable procedure of acquiring information from the general public on their awareness, perception, support and utilization of the County Extension program. Fessenden reported that telephone interviewing could be very useful if the interview schedule is relatively brief. In cases where respondents are familiar with the program, she noted that they would remain attentive for approximately a half hour and complete and accurate data could be assembled. However, the telephone interview is not so effective when "thought" questions are used.<sup>13</sup>

Selltiz and others noted that interviewing by telephone, in certain situations, would cost less per return than a mail questionnaire. Brevity was also noted as an important element of this type of interview. They pointed out that "telephone surveys cannot reach a random sample of the total population, since not all people have telephones, and people who work away from home are hard to reach by telephone."<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>Bruce W. Tuckman, Conducting Educational Research (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972), p. 173.

<sup>13</sup>Jewell G. Fessenden, "Interviewing," Evaluation in Extension, ed. Darcie Byrn (Topeka: H. M. Ives and Sons, 1959), p. 50.

<sup>14</sup>Selltiz et al., p. 239.

The telephone interview schedule for this study was developed by a group of people including personnel of the Department of Extension Staff and Program Development, Extension Assistant Directors, graduate students, and the County Extension Agents of the county being evaluated. The schedule was pre-tested in written form with upper classmen and graduate students enrolled in the fall semester of Extension Organization and Programs at Kansas State University. It was further refined and tested so that the interview could be completed within a maximum period of fifteen minutes.

Concerning sample size, Sabrosky wrote:

Proper sample size for the particular evaluation or study depends on: (1) Desired level of statistical accuracy, (2) costs in material and other resources, (3) homogeneity of the population, and (4) contemplated intensity of analysis.<sup>15</sup>

It was believed that most households in the county did have operating telephones and that the telephone listings would provide a homogeneous selection of adults residing in the county. Because of this and for practical reasons of time and expense, the sample size was set at 200. Telephone directories from all exchanges operating in the county were obtained and efforts were made to delete those numbers which were residences outside the county boundaries.

The total number of telephone listings was determined and divided by 200. This established every thirteenth number as the random sample. A number between one and thirteen was drawn and this number was used as the first interviewee. Then every thirteenth telephone subscriber was taken until the end of the listing. This procedure produced a random sample of 203 telephone listings which represented a 7.5 percent

---

<sup>15</sup>Laurel K. Sabrosky, "Sampling," Evaluation in Extension, ed. Darcie Byrn (Topeka: H. M. Ives and Sons, 1959), p. 39.



sample of the total. Only numbers of personal residences were to be called, thus 29 business phones were deleted from the original random sample. There were 109 completed calls yielding 96 useable interviews, 25 no answers, 21 refusals, 11 numbers not in service and 8 listings which were outside the county.

A third method of collecting data, the personal interview, was also determined to be of value for this study. A personal interview with selected County officials, officers, Extension Board members and Agents would provide data on program support and leadership involvement in the program development process as well as be useful for future program direction. The purposive selection of the respondents was jointly determined by the evaluation team and the CE Faculty. There were 24 persons completing the schedule including 8 Executive Board members, 3 County Commissioners and 1 Commissioner-elect, 2 school superintendents, 2 mayors, 1 Chamber of Commerce official, the Home Economics Advisory Chairperson, the Extension Homemaker's Council chairperson, the 2 CE Agents, and the presidents of the County Farm Bureau, Swine Producers Association and Livestock Association.

The personal interview schedule was also group developed by the Department of Staff and Program Development, Extension Assistant Directors, graduate students, and the County Extension Agents involved. The personal interview was chosen over the mail questionnaire for the reasons summarized by Gallup:

1. The people who participate have an opportunity to observe and study situations and conditions; they talk directly with people and get their reactions to practices and programs.
2. The personal interview method usually yields a high percentage of returns, as most people are willing to cooperate.
3. The interviewer has an opportunity to explain questions to respondent.

4. Complete answers to all questions can usually be obtained.  
This contributes to statistical accuracy, validity and reliability.<sup>16</sup>

There were 27 persons selected to be interviewed and 24 were completed. Three city officials elected not to participate in the interviews because they felt unfamiliar with the Extension program.

#### Collecting and Assembling the Data

The telephone calls were made during October and November of 1976. The interviews were conducted by the author, a staff member of the Extension Staff and Program Development Department, and a graduate student in Adult and Occupational Education. All three interviewers have had previous experience with County Extension programs. Calls were placed in the morning, afternoon and evening in an effort to reach as many respondents as possible. Each number selected was called back three times at various times of the day before a no response was recorded.

It was believed that more women would be available to answer the telephone, thus the interviewers were instructed to ask for the male head of the household and if there was none available, to speak with any person at this residence who was 18 years old or older. Generally this was the female head of the household. The interviewer then identified himself as a representative of the Kansas State University Extension Service and explained that a random telephone survey was being conducted to determine what the residents of the county knew about their Extension program. Respondents were then assured of the confidentiality of their response. If the respondent has not heard

---

<sup>16</sup>Gladys Gallup, "Methods of Collecting Data," Evaluation in Extension, ed. Darcie Byrn (Topeka: H. M. Ives and Sons, 1959), p. 46.

of the CES, the CE Agricultural Agent, the CE Home Economist or the 4-H program, the interview was concluded at that point.

A copy of the telephone survey instrument complete with the raw data is shown in Appendix A.

The personal interviews were conducted by the author in November, 1976. Approximately 10 days before the interview, the schedule was sent to each selected respondent with a cover letter of explanation and a confirmation slip for the interview. The letter explained the purpose of the interview, the need for the evaluation and the importance of their opinions. Respondents were invited to complete it at their convenience or wait and fill it out during the personal interview. They were also notified that their responses would not be identified.

Twenty-one personal interviews were conducted and three questionnaires were returned by mail for a total of 24 completed schedules. The personal interviews ranged from 20 minutes to one hour in length. A copy of the cover letter and personal interview schedule with completed raw data has been inserted as Appendix B in this report.

#### Presentation and Analysis of the Data

The completed telephone interview data were processed by the Kansas State University Computing Center for number and percentage of response. Cross tabulations were run on selected variables and tested for significance with the chi-square test. Dixon and Massey stated that for the chi-square formula to be effective, the sample size must be large enough so that none of the theoretical frequencies is less than

one and not more than 20 percent of the theoretical frequencies are less than five.<sup>17</sup>

Data from the personal interview schedules were hand tabulated. The results of the personal interviews, telephone interviews and the secondary data were then made available at a meeting of the County Extension Executive Board, County Extension Agents and County Commissioners. An oral report as well as copies of a written documentation of the findings were presented. In addition to the descriptive results, implications drawn from the findings were also presented by the evaluator.

---

<sup>17</sup>Wilfrid J. Dixon and Frank J. Massey, Jr., Introduction to Statistical Analysis (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969), p. 238.

## Chapter 2

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The intent of this study was to develop and test a model for evaluating a total County Extension Service program. More specifically, the study was not designed to focus on individual projects, but to concentrate on evaluation of the whole program, considering all agents' participation, methods, clientele and overall effectiveness.

Specific points that were to be measured included strengths and weaknesses of the program development process and program implementation; the extent of approval or acceptance of the current program; level of awareness of Extension among the general population; and inputs for future program content or direction. The evaluation was to be for the benefit of the County Extension Service to aid it in program improvement.

### BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Knowles has noted that evaluation has become the source of more confusion, frustration and guilt among adult educators than any other aspect of their work. "An overemphasis on evaluation has caused an underproduction of practical, feasible and artistic evaluation in terms of program review and improvement."<sup>1</sup> He granted it would be desirable to

---

<sup>1</sup>Malcolm S. Knowles, The Modern Practice of Adult Education (New York: Association Press, 1970), p. 219.

precisely measure and analyze statistically for significance what adult education programs are accomplishing. But by the nature of these programs, it is realized:

. . . 1.) human behavior is too complicated, and the number of variables affecting it are too numerous, for us ever to be able to "prove" that it is our program alone that produce desired changes; 2.) that the social sciences have not yet produced the "rigorous research procedures" and measurement instruments for getting the kind of hard data required for evaluating many of the subtle and more important outcomes of a comprehensive program of adult education; 3.) that the kind of intensive and scientific evaluation these statements are advocating require investments of time and money that many institutional policy makers are unwilling to make simply to document the worth of training, which they can see is valuable; and 4.) adult education is, unlike youth education, an open system in which participation is voluntary, so that the worth of a program is more readily tested by the degree of persistence and satisfaction of its clientele.<sup>2</sup>

Knowles also pointed out that the adult educator's philosophy of education will determine if they will accept a broader definition of program evaluation. If one sees education as a process of taking responsibility for making changes in human behavior, the educator will want to measure these changes as precisely as possible. On the other hand, if adult education is defined as a process of facilitating and providing resources for self-directed inquiry and self-development, evaluation will involve participants in collecting data that will enable them to assess the effectiveness of the program.<sup>3</sup>

In the late 1960's, the Urban Institute undertook an evaluation of the federal government's evaluation of selected social programs. It also discovered that the art and techniques of program evaluation at this level are underdeveloped.<sup>4</sup> The study further noted that improving

---

<sup>2</sup>Knowles, p. 220.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 222.

<sup>4</sup>Joseph S. Wholey and others, Federal Evaluation Policy: An Overview (Washington: The Urban Institute, 1970), p. i.

methodologies is a vital function of comprehensive evaluations. Evaluation should not be emphasized for its own sake, but for the development of a necessary, useful tool for improving social programs.<sup>5</sup>

Congressman Robert H. Finch made this statement regarding the need and purpose of program evaluation:

Evaluation is a necessary foundation for effective implementation and judicious modification of our existing programs. . . . Evaluation will provide the information we require to strengthen weak programs, fully support effective programs, and drop those which simply are not fulfilling the objectives intended by the Congress when the programs were originally enacted.<sup>6</sup>

This statement is just as appropriate for County Extension programs at the local level as it is for other social programs at the federal level.

The early 1970's saw an increase in the literature regarding a broader definition of program evaluation. Steele noted that Extension's traditional educational evaluation framework based on the Tyler approach of assessing behavioral change was so small, that it frustrated many Extension educators in terms of program evaluation. She suggested that the recent literature was defining Extension's concept of evaluation as only a part of the total concept of program evaluation.<sup>7</sup>

#### FRAMEWORK

Several contemporary writers have begun to form a consensus about the concept of program evaluation, its objectives, components,

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>6</sup>U. S., Congress, House, Committee on Education and Labor, Hearings on the Extension of Elementary and Secondary Programs, Part IV, 1969 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1969).

<sup>7</sup>Sara M. Steele, "Program Evaluation--A Broader Definition," Journal of Extension, VIII, No. 2 (1970), 5-6.

and procedures. Weiss, writing about evaluation of social programs designed to improve people's lives, equated program evaluation with evaluation research. She stated that evaluation research establishes clear and specific criteria for success. It collects evidence systematically from a representative sample of units. It translates evidence into quantitative terms and compares it with the criteria. It then draws conclusions about the effectiveness, the merit, the success of the program.<sup>8</sup>

According to Weiss, "The purpose of evaluative research is to measure the effects of a program against the goals it set out to accomplish as a means of contributing to subsequent decision making. . ."<sup>9</sup> Regarding procedures, she noted that if a program seeks to alter public values or attitudes, the appropriate indicator of outcome is obviously the public's views.<sup>10</sup> Also, program records and agency files are a major source for evaluation data.<sup>11</sup>

Steele defined program evaluation by contrasting it with the more familiar project evaluation. Program evaluation is concerned with additive effects of a series of instructional components and with the impact that it has on a person. Generally it deals with community needs. Project evaluation, on the other hand, deals with specific projects or activities and with changes in knowledge, skill and attitudes of the individual learner.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>Carol H. Weiss, Evaluation Research: Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972), pp. 1-2.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 42.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 54.

<sup>12</sup>Sara Steele, "An Emerging Concept of Program Evaluation," Journal of Extension, XIII (March/April, 1975), 13-14.



She further clarified program evaluation by stating:

Evaluation that's concerned with the overall effectiveness of a program is concerned not only with results in terms of behavioral changes in people, but also with the proportion of the potential clientele that's reached, the balance in types of people reached, the extent to which the results deal with urgent and continual needs, and the care with which participant, agency, and societal resources are used.<sup>13</sup>

According to Steele, instrumentation and statistical processes must be tested for validity and reliability as tools in program evaluation, but considerable adaptation may be needed. When conclusive proof is not needed, a 0.25 or 0.10 rather than a 0.05 level of statistical significance may be enough.<sup>14</sup>

Bennett has proposed a seven level hierarchy of objectives and evaluative evidence in terms of Extension programs. The levels are (1) inputs, (2) activities, (3) people involvement, (4) reactions, (5) change of knowledge, attitudes, skills, and/or aspiration, (6) practice changes, and (7) end result. He noted that evidence of program impact becomes stronger as the hierarchy is ascended and evaluations are strengthened by assessing Extension programs at several levels of the hierarchy.<sup>15</sup>

The purpose of program evaluation as viewed by Bennett is similar to that already noted by Weiss and Steele. In terms of the broader definition of program evaluation, he pointed out it could

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., Steele, p. 16

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 14

<sup>15</sup>Claude F. Bennett, Analyzing Impacts of Extension Programs, Federal Extension Service Publication No. ESC-575 (Washington: Extension Service, U.S.D.A., 1976), p. 2.

include comparing program objectives and accomplishments with the mission of Extension as an agency.<sup>16</sup>

In a paper presented during a national workshop on program evaluation, Steele offered this definition. "Macro evaluation is the evaluating of a whole made from several pieces without looking at each piece individually."<sup>17</sup> Macro evaluation is useful for making long range policy decisions, improving Extension program implementation and providing a framework for major results and benefits. It is concerned with all efforts relating to a particular emphasis, building upon specifics into larger units, main purposes and overall objectives and general results of major importance.<sup>18</sup>

She also wrote that evaluation may be macro in terms of the program element or the nature of the results. Macro evaluation is a flexible approach.<sup>19</sup> This concept does not eliminate looking at the parts of a program separately. She noted that the use of cross tabs and sub-analysis of the macro data enables this to occur.<sup>20</sup>

Burton and Rogers have noted the advantages of using the Classical Experimental Evaluation Model when the use of experimental design enables the control of variables. They further reported however, that this model has been inappropriately used when applied to large-scale, social action programs.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>17</sup> Sara M. Steele, "A Concept of Macro Evaluation as It Relates to State and Federal Accountability" (paper read at a National Extension Workshop on Program Effectiveness, February, 1977, Madison, Wisconsin).

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

Burton and Rogers have proposed an alternative evaluation approach which they called the Inductive, System-Process Model (ISP Model). The basic components of this model include negotiating the scenario, evidence collection, and judgments/evaluation.<sup>22</sup> The evaluator collaborates with program administration and participants to determine the purpose of the evaluation, criteria, and evidence. He then defines the context of the program and documents the inputs, processes and outcomes of the evidence collection. The final step involves making judgments as to the adequacy of what happened.<sup>23</sup>

They concluded that evaluations may be limited by certain factors, yet the ISP Model approach will produce the most desirable evaluation under the circumstances, and is better than no attempt at systematic evaluation.<sup>24</sup>

#### RELATED STUDIES

Steele reported on a methodology of macro program evaluation in Shawano County, Wisconsin. Data was collected from records of the County Extension program, interviews with 300 selected leaders and 1,200 cross-sectional respondents. The interviews were conducted by telephone and were contracted to a private survey research laboratory. A long telephone survey instrument was developed which took about an hour to complete. The short form required approximately 20 minutes. An 80.5 percent response rate was achieved.

---

<sup>22</sup>Burton and Rogers, Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., pp. 8-10.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 14.

The project attempted to study the impact of Extension in the several program areas which it works as well as the various methods used to reach people. It sought cumulative impact over several years. Descriptive elements of the study included clientele's amount of contact, proportion of clientele reached and nature of results. Judgments were made by respondents about the helpfulness of their Extension contacts and how Extension operates. Extension personnel and lay leaders were also involved in setting standards of performance against which to compare data. The evaluation team assisted County personnel in making judgments based on the data.<sup>25</sup>

Prawl and Jorns tested a model for reviewing the County Extension program in Douglas County, Kansas. They collected data using for different methods, including a review of secondary county and Extension information, 361 random telephone interviews, 980 random mail questionnaires and personal interviews with selected county leaders. The telephone interviews averaged seven minutes and 49 percent were completed. The sampling technique for the telephone interview proved very reliable as the sample percentage was about the same as the percentage of each group in the total population. Only an 18.7 percent response to the mail questionnaire was achieved and results were judged to be biased.

The review was conducted at the request of the County Extension Service to determine level of awareness and acceptance of Extension, program effectiveness, program direction, and to establish a base line for future evaluation efforts. Through this program review the county agents discovered how their clientele felt about Extension.

---

<sup>25</sup>Sara M. Steele, "Putting the Pieces Together" (paper read for the Adult Education Research Conference, April, 1976, Toronto, Canada).

Suggestions made by respondents were incorporated into the program goals for the next year.<sup>26</sup>

Ringler discussed the purpose and methodology of a citizen's needs inventory conducted in fifteen counties in northwest Kansas during 1973. The objective of the survey was to determine the key concerns of county leaders so that county and state programs could more adequately reflect those needs. County agents were asked to identify approximately 200 leaders within the county. A post card mail survey form was then sent to these leaders requesting them to identify the key concerns in agriculture, home economics, 4-H and youth, and community resource development necessary for their county to progress in the future. These concerns were then summarized and sent back to the original respondents. The leaders were then asked to rank order the first 15 issues they saw as most important from this list.

This procedure proved to be reasonably simple and effective for achieving the desired results. Ringler noted that if county agents have good rapport with the clientele, results will be reliable and accurate.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup>Warren L. Prawl and William J. Jorns, "Reviewing County Extension Programs," Journal of Extension, XIV, (July/August, 1976), 11-16.

<sup>27</sup>Statement by Wilber E. Ringler, Assistant Director, Kansas Cooperative Extension Service, personal interview, June, 1977.

## Chapter 3

### EVALUATION OF A KANSAS COUNTY EXTENSION PROGRAM

#### INTRODUCTION

The data for this chapter were produced from telephone interviews of a randomly selected sample of adult residents of a Kansas County and from personal interviews with 24 selected county leaders. Telephone interviews were conducted by three Extension staff members of the Department of Extension Staff and Program Development in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service during November and December of 1976. The telephone survey instrument was precoded and results were key punched and tabulated by computer. Results were recorded by number and percentage and selected variables were analyzed and tested for reliability by chi-square. Four questions were open-ended which necessitated hand tabulation.

Personal interviews were conducted by the author in November of 1976. These results were hand tabulated and scored by mean weights, number of responses, or percentage, depending on the type of question.

#### ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

##### Characteristics of Respondents

The sex and age of respondents in the telephone interviews are shown in Table 1. There was an equal number of men and women interviewed. Respondents 65 and older accounted for 36 percent of the sample while

the 1970 U. S. Census of Population showed only 26 percent of the county population to be over 65 years old. Younger adults and the 51 to 64 year old respondents in the random sample were slightly below their respective age group percentage according to the census figures. Older adults are not as mobile and thus were more easily reached by telephone.

Table 1

Sex and Age of Respondents as Given by a  
Random Sample of Adults in Telephone  
Interviews when Evaluating a  
County Extension Program\*

Sex	Age									
	18-30		31-50		51-64		65 & Over		Total	
	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent
Female	4	3.7	14	13.0	10	9.3	26	24.1	54	50.0
Male	9	8.3	18	16.7	13	12.0	14	13.0	54	50.0
Totals	13	12.0	32	29.6	23	21.3	40	37.0	108	100.0

\*Percentage based on total calls completed, one missing response

Table 2 shows the residence of telephone respondents by sex. According to the County Assessor's records, the 1976 population was 78 percent town and 22 percent rural. The random sampling yielded a slightly higher percentage of rural residents over town residents when compared to the assessor's figures. Prawl and Jorns found the telephone sampling technique to very accurate in Douglas County, Kansas. Their

sample percentages were within 2 percent of the census records.<sup>1</sup> Because of the differences between counties, however, generalities cannot be made regarding sampling accuracy.

Table 2

Sex and Residence of Respondents as Given by  
a Random Sample of Adults in Telephone  
Interviews when Evaluating a County  
Extension Program

Sex	Residence						Totals	
	Town		Outside City Limits		Farm			
	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent
Female	38	34.9	6	5.5	10	9.2	54	49.5
Male	35	32.1	9	8.3	11	10.1	55	50.5
Totals	73	67.0	15	13.8	21	19.3	109	100.0

\*Percentage based on total calls completed

#### Effectiveness of the County Extension Program

One of the specific criteria to be evaluated was total program effectiveness of the CES. Both the telephone interview and personal interview instruments were designed to obtain information about this factor. Respondents of the personal interview scored the total program effectiveness 4.23, based on mean weighted scores of one to five with one as "not adequate" and five as "very adequate."

---

<sup>1</sup>Warren L. Prawl and William J. Jorns, "Reviewing County Extension Programs," Journal of Extension, XIV, (July/August, 1976), p. 13.



Of the adults interviewed in the telephone survey who said they utilized Extension information regularly, 59 percent reported it was "very effective", while 30 percent said it was "somewhat effective", none reported "ineffective", and 11 percent had no opinion.

Even those who conceded they were not regular users of Extension information thought well of the Extension program. Sixty-three percent believed it was effective and 37 percent had no opinion. These respondents based their judgments on limited experience with Extension or on testimonials from acquaintances. These results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Effectiveness of a Kansas County Extension Service as Perceived  
by a Random Sample of Adult Respondents in Telephone  
Interviews, 1976

Utilize Extension Information Regularly	Effectiveness								Total	
	Very Effective		Somewhat Effective		In- effective		No Opinion			
	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent
Yes	36	59.0	18	29.5	0	0	7	11.5	61	100.0
No	5	14.3	17	48.6	0	0	13	37.1	35	100.0

$\chi^2 = 19.66$ , significant at .01\*

\* $\chi^2$  tells whether two independent samples have significantly different distributions so that the frequencies obtained are different from frequencies expected on chance variation alone.

When all responses were considered, nearly 80 percent of the adults questioned said their Extension service was "very effective" or

"somewhat effective", none said it was "ineffective", and 20 percent gave no opinion. These results were significant at the .01 level when tested by chi-square.

Table 4 shows the relationship of age of the respondents interviewed by telephone with their perception of effectiveness of the CE program. These data indicate that middle aged respondents tended to be more satisfied with their Extension Service than the younger and older adults of the county. Results were not significant at the .10 level when tested by chi-square.

Table 4

The Relationship of Respondent's Age and Their Perception  
of Effectiveness of a Kansas County Extension  
Service, as Reported in Telephone Interviews  
with a Random Sample of Adults

Degree of Effective- ness	Age of Respondents							
	18-30		31-50		51-64		65 & Over	
	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent
Very Effective	3	25.0	13	40.6	13	65.0	12	35.3
Somewhat Effective	6	50.0	10	31.3	4	20.0	15	44.1
Ineffective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Opinion	3	25.0	9	28.1	3	15.0	7	20.6
Total	12	100.0	32	100.0	20	100.0	34	100.0

$\chi^2 = 7.69$ , not significant at .10 level

### Strengths and Weaknesses of Program Development

A second element to be measured was the strengths and weaknesses of the Extension program development process.

During the telephone interview, respondents were asked who was involved in planning the county Extension educational program. Nearly 75 percent of the respondents did not know who planned the Extension program. About 15 percent of the respondents said the "Extension Agents", 6 percent said "citizen suggestions", and only 4 percent knew that the Extension Council, Advisory Committees and Executive Board were involved in program development.

Further information concerning program development was obtained from the personal interviews. Table 5 describes the involvement of various planning groups as perceived by selected leaders.

Table 5

Degree of Involvement by Various Planning  
Groups in a County Extension Program  
as Perceived by Selected Leaders  
in Personal Interviews

Groups Involved in Planning the County Extension Program	Extent of Involvement Based on Weighted Means, Using a 1-5 Scale
Home Economics Advisory Committee	4.25
Extension Executive Board	4.13
4-H and Youth Advisory Committee	4.06
Homemakers Council	3.9
Agricultural Advisory Committee	3.7
Community Resource Development Advisory Committee	3.25

Respondents in the personal interviews felt the Home Economics Advisory Committee was the most involved of the planning groups while the Agricultural Advisory and Community Resource Development Advisory Committees were the least involved. The Extension Agents could support these opinions by comparing actual meeting times and participation in Advisory Committee meetings among the various groups.

#### Strengths and Weaknesses of Program Implementation

The third factor which was measured for the County program evaluation was resident's judgments about strengths and weaknesses of implementing the Extension program.

The telephone survey was designed to ask respondents what would be the most effective methods for the Extension Agents to use to present information to people in the county. More than half of the respondents indicated they believed the newsletter and newspaper were the two most effective methods to reach people. Almost 20 percent felt public meetings were the best approach. Other responses included bulletins, telephone, personal visits, radio and television.

Female respondents in the telephone survey were also asked if they would be interested in enrolling in a correspondence course from the County Extension Home Economist. Nearly half of the women said they would not, about one-fourth indicated yes and the other one-fourth said they possibly might take a correspondence course from the Extension office.

The personal interviews were designed to investigate the factors of program implementation more thoroughly. Table 6 lists the mean weighted rank of methods to be used by Extension Agents for disseminating

information in the future. A county-wide, monthly newsletter was ranked first, the local newspaper was second and radio was third. Personal contacts ranked fourth, bulletins and telephone fifth and sixth, and public meeting were ranked seventh by the selected leaders. Television was ranked last.

Table 6

Rank Order of Methods Selected Leaders Felt Should be Used  
by Extension Faculty for Disseminating Information  
Among Clientele in the Future

Rank	Weighted Means Based on 1-8 Scale	Method
1	2.4	Newsletter
2	2.7	Newspaper
3	4.2	Radio
4	4.3	Personal contacts
5	4.6	Bulletins
6	5.1	Telephone
7	5.3	Public meetings
8	6.8	Television

Newsletter and newspaper coverage was also ranked high by the adult telephone respondents, yet a wide discrepancy was noted between the groups for public meetings and radio presentations. Leaders familiar with the Extension Agents' job demands tended to rank mass media methods higher than did the random adults in the telephone interviews.

During the personal interview, the respondents were asked to score various aspects related to program implementation on a scale ranging from one to three, with one representing a "great extent" and three representing "not at all". Mean weighted scores were then determined for each factor.

Scores were intermediate between a "great extent" and "some extent" for all factors measured. Respondents strongly believed their Extension program was open for all to participate, reflected needs of citizens, used a variety of teaching methods, methods were adjusted for each need, and programs were coordinated with other agencies. Mean scores ranged from 2.86 to 2.58 and results are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

Mean Weighted Scores of Program Implementation  
Factors as Reported by Selected Leaders  
in Personal Interviews

Mean Weighted Score using a 3-1 Scale*	Program Implementation Factor
2.86	Open to all who wish to participate
2.70	Based on needs of county residents
2.65	Use wide variety of teaching methods
2.62	Methods adjusted to meet needs of clientele
2.58	Coordinated with other agencies

\*3 is most desirable, 1 is least desirable

### Awareness and Utilization of the Extension Program

A fourth objective of the evaluation was to determine the level of awareness and utilization of the Extension Service among the population of the county. These data were collected only from the random telephone interviews. Of the 108 adults asked if they had heard of their County Extension Service, 93 or 86.1 percent answered yes. Eighty-six percent of the respondents were aware of the County Extension Home Economist, 82 percent had heard of the County Extension Agricultural Agent, and 88 percent had heard of the 4-H program. Most of the respondents became familiar with the Extension Service through visiting the office, hearing about Extension from friends, or through 4-H.

All respondents were asked if they had heard of the Extension Homemaker Units (EHU). Nearly 90 percent of the women and 75 percent of the men had heard of this group. Of the 43 women asked, nearly 12 percent were present members of EHU, 29 percent were former members, 31 percent of the women indicated they had had the opportunity to join an EHU and 28 percent said they had not had the chance to join an EHU.

Table 8 shows how adult respondents of the random telephone interviews utilized their County Extension Service.

Eighty-three percent responded that they read Extension articles in the newspaper, 68 percent said they read Extension newsletters regularly, 63 percent answered that they made regular use of Extension information and 24 percent participated in Extension activities regularly.

Newspaper readership appeared high as the two local papers which served the county were very cooperative with the CE Agents. Both of the Agents sent a dual newsletter and the mailing lists were extensive,

thus even in a random sample, a majority of the respondents received and read the CE newsletter. Only 24 percent perceived themselves as participating regularly in Extension activities. Those familiar with the CE program would have to determine if this percentage was acceptable.

Table 8  
How Adult Respondents of a Random Telephone  
Interview Utilized a County  
Extension Service

Means of Utilizing an Extension Service	Yes		No		Total	
	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent
Read Extension articles in the newspaper	80	83.0	16	17.0	96	100.0
Read Extension newsletters regularly	65	68.0	31	32.0	96	100.0
Make regular use of Extension information	61	63.0	35	37.0	96	100.0
Participate in Extension activities regularly	23	24.0	73	76.0	96	100.0

A comparison between the respondent's age and their use of Extension information is made in Table 9.

The trend for utilizing Extension information regularly increased with each age group until about retirement age, then declined. These results were tested with chi-square and were significant at the .10 level.



It is apparent from the data that a rather significant percentage of the population do utilize Cooperative Extension in this county.

Table 9

The Relationship of Respondent's Age and Their  
Use of Extension Information as Reported  
by a Random Sample of Adults  
in Telephone Interviews

Utilize Information Regularly	Age of Respondents							
	18-30		31-50		51-64		65 & Over	
	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent
Yes	7	58.3	21	65.6	17	85.0	16	50.0
No	5	41.7	11	34.4	3	15.0	16	50.0
Total	12	100.0	32	100.0	20	100.0	32	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 6.70, \text{ significant at } .10 \text{ level}$$

#### Future Program Content

The fifth purpose of the evaluation was to collect evidence for future program content or direction.

The telephone survey instrument was designed to ask respondents what they saw as the most pressing needs or problems of teenagers in their community. Table 10 shows the results.

Nearly 30 percent of the responses indicated a lack of adequate recreational opportunity for young people, while 13 percent indicated drug and alcohol abuse was a problem. An additional 11 percent reported a lack of job opportunities. Approximately 9 percent said

teenagers had too many activities competing for their time. Another 7 percent reported the generation gap was a problem for teenagers. Almost 17 percent identified other factors and 13 percent gave no opinion.

Table 10

Needs and Problems of Teenagers as Expressed  
by a Random Sample of Adults in Telephone  
Interviews in a Kansas County

Need or Problem Identified	Number of Times Mentioned by Respondents	
	Number	Percent
Lack recreational opportunities	38	30.0
Drug, alcohol abuse	16	13.0
Lack job opportunities	15	11.0
Too many activities	11	9.0
Generation gap	9	7.0
Others	21	17.0
No opinion	<u>16</u>	<u>13.0</u>
Total	126	100.0

The personal interview schedule was also constructed to determine future program suggestions and direction. The respondents were asked to rank a listing of nine concerns or problems facing teenagers. Table 11 summarizes the rank of problems of youth as judged by the selected leaders in the county.

Selected county leaders felt the priority concern of young people was preparing for life as adults. Drug and alcohol abuse was ranked as the second factor which was also the second most often mentioned problem identified by the telephone respondents. The third ranked concern was developing meaningful relationships with others. Part time job opportunities was ranked seventh and adequate recreational opportunities was ranked last. These two issues were ranked as high priority by adults in the random telephone interview. Apparently, the random sample of adults were considering what they thought to be the more immediate needs, while the respondents in the personal interviews were thinking of longer range concerns.

Table 11

Rank Order of Needs or Problems of Teenagers  
as Perceived by Selected County Leaders  
in Personal Interviews

Rank	Weighted Mean Score, 1-9 Scale	Need or Problem
1	2.84	Preparing for life as adults
2	3.79	Drug and alcohol abuse
3	4.05	Developing meaningful relationships
4	4.79	Constructive use of leisure time
5	5.0	Adjusting to changing society
6	5.05	Vocational training
7	6.05	Part-time job opportunities
8	6.05	Disregard for authority
9	6.95	Adequate recreational opportunities

Respondents were asked in the personal interview to indicate which program areas in the future should receive more, the same, or less emphasis from the Extension Agents. Pasture improvement, weed, disease and insect control were seen as subjects needing more attention from the Agricultural Agent in the future. Family economics and consumer education surfaced as subjects for the Home Economist that needed more emphasis in the future.

When respondents of the personal interview were asked if the Extension Agents should spend more time working on Community Resource Development projects, 46 percent said yes, 4 percent said to spend less time, and 50 percent gave no opinion.

Respondents in both the telephone and personal interviews were asked to make suggestions for improving or expanding the County Extension program in the program areas of agriculture, home economics, 4-H and youth, and community resource development. These lists were compiled and summarized for use by the County Extension Advisory Committees to be used in future program development. See Appendix A, page 46, Telephone Interview Schedule With Completed Raw Data, for the lists of program suggestions.

The findings from the telephone and personal interviews together with the secondary data, were reproduced and distributed to the County Extension Agents, Extension Council members, and County Commissioners. An oral report was also presented to the Extension Agents, Executive Board and County Commissioners which highlighted the results of the County Extension Program evaluation. Implications of the data were drawn by the evaluation team and also presented during the oral report.

Further judgments of the data were left to be made by the County Extension Advisory Committees as they analyzed the information.

Only selected data were presented in this chapter to demonstrate the kind of results which could be expected by using the model. For a complete presentation of the raw data, consult Appendixes A and B, pages 46 and 55.

## Chapter 4

### SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to develop and test a model for evaluating a County Extension program. Information was to be gathered on five specific factors. The five factors were program effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of program development, strengths and weaknesses of program implementation, level of awareness and utilization of the Extension Service among the population of the county, and future program direction.

A Kansas county was randomly selected from one of the five Extension administrative areas to serve as the evaluation model. Respondents for the evaluation were adult residents of the county randomly selected from a listing of the current telephone subscribers and a selected groups of adult leaders who were involved with the County Extension program.

Three different methods were used to collect data for this study. A compilation of relevant secondary data was obtained from Extension records and other county, state and federal documents. A telephone interview schedule was designed and 109 randomly selected adults were interviewed on the telephone by a team of three Extension evaulators. A personal interview schedule was also developed and completed by 24 selected persons including Extension Council members,

Extension Agents, County Commissioners, school and city officials and representatives of special interest groups within the county.

The survey instruments consisted of various types of questions so that a determination could be made of those most effective for collecting data supportive of the purpose of the evaluation. The telephone schedule was precoded and results were key punched and tabulated by computer. Results of the personal interviews were hand tabulated.

The descriptive findings of the surveys were presented orally and in writing to the County Extension faculty, Executive Board, and County Commissioners of the county being evaluated. The evaluation team also drew implications from the data and presented these judgments during the report. Further analysis and judgments concerning the evidence were to be made by the County Extension Agents and their Extension Advisory Committees.

The test county results were as follows:

1. Nearly 43 percent of the adult telephone respondents said their County Extension program was "very effective". Another 36 percent stated it was "somewhat effective" and none reported that it was "ineffective". The selected leaders who were familiar with the Extension program scored program effectiveness at 4.23, with a score of 5 representing very effective.

2. The general population did not know who was involved in planning the County Extension program. Seventy-five percent of the random telephone respondents did not know about the program development process. The leaders involved with the program ranked the Home Economics Advisory Committee as the most involved. The Executive Board and 4-H

Advisory were also scored as being highly involved. Agricultural and Community Resource Development Advisory Committees were moderately involved.

3. Random respondents indicated the newsletter and local newspaper to be the best method for presenting information to the public. These methods were also ranked first and second by leaders in personal interviews. Public meetings were ranked as low priority methods.

4. There was a high level of awareness among the general population concerning Extension. More than 85 percent responding had heard of the County Extension Service and the Agents. Utilization of Extension information was also relatively high. Eighty-three percent read Extension articles in the newspaper, 68 percent read newsletters, and 63 percent reported they made regular use of the information. Only twenty-four percent regularly participated in Extension activities.

5. Recreational opportunities and drug education programs were concerns identified as needs for youth. Expanded programs in conservation of natural resources and marketing of agricultural products surfaced as major issues for Agriculture. In Home Economics, family economics, consumer education and programs for elderly were the factors of concern for the future. A community and county clean-up program was suggested for the Community Resource Development effort.

The methodology suggested by this study was effective and reasonable to implement, however, the validity would be in question if County Extension Agents conducted the evaluation in their own county. Standards for judging evidence should be set before data collection. Short answer or opinion questions were most effective in the telephone interview. The personal interview allowed for more



probing, thorough questions to be asked. Data were generated that proved useful for program improvement as well as program accountability.

The findings of this study should be made available to Extension Administrators and County Extension faculty. After further refinement of the telephone questionnaire, personnel and resources should be available for counties wishing to participate in this type of program evaluation for County Extension Services.

### IMPLICATIONS

This proved to be a reasonable, effective and reliable model to evaluate a broad-based County Extension educational program. It is reasonable in terms of time and resources required; effective as it produced data necessary to meet the purposes of the evaluation; and reliable regarding technique and producing of statistically significant results.

The evaluation model fulfilled the definition of program evaluation as stated in the introductory chapter. The purposes of the evaluation were established, criteria and evidence needed to support the purposes were decided, the evidence was systematically collected and tabulated, judgments were made by the respondents regarding the effectiveness of the program, and the evaluation team and the Extension Advisory Committees made further judgments from the descriptive results.

A weakness of the model was that it did not allow for standards to be set against which the evidence could be compared. Since each county situation is unique, standards for each respective county should be decided by the Extension Agents and Extension Council members before the start of the data collection.

The telephone interview was an effective method of acquiring information from the general public about their awareness, support, and utilization of the Extension program. When a valid introduction to the purpose of the interview was given, respondents were usually very cooperative and willing to help.

Questions designed to solicit short answer facts or opinions were more adaptable to the telephone survey instrument. Questions which asked telephone respondents to rank certain factors were not well suited to this type interview. Less time was required to score responses if a possible list of answers followed the question. This allows the interviewer to check the appropriate response.

Personal interviews with selected leaders who were involved in or familiar with the County Extension program were most useful to further probe issues identified in the random telephone interviews. The most beneficial use of the personal interview for the purpose of this study was to investigate program support and leadership involvement in the program development process. It was also more helpful in obtaining suggestions for future program efforts.

Questions which were structured to be answered by ranking or scaled responses worked well in the personal interview instrument. Open response questions were satisfactory in providing evidence which was desired.

The combination methodology using the secondary data, telephone interview and personal interview was necessary and beneficial in providing the data required to carry out the total program evaluation effort. The evidence which was needed to measure the specific

evaluation objectives could not have been effectively produced by only a random telephone survey or only a set of personal interviews.

Collection of data using these methodologies allowed a broad-spectrum approach to program evaluation. It covered work of both County Extension faculty, at various locations within the county, with different clientele, using several delivery methods. The results provided a general overview of the total program, yet specific program areas could be examined and cross tabulation allowed analysis of selected details.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on the findings of this exploratory study concerning evaluating County Extension educational programs.

1. Results of this study should be made available to the Administration of the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service.
2. Results of this study should be made available to each of the County Extension offices in Kansas.
3. The telephone interview instrument should be further refined and shortened so that it could be completed in less than 10 minutes. A revised telephone interview schedule is located in Appendix C, page 64.
4. Standards against which to compare the evidence should be set by Extension Agents and Extension Council members before collecting the data.
5. Personnel and resources of the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service be made available to assist counties who wish to participate in this type of program evaluation.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BOOKS

- Dixon, Wilfrid J., and Frank J. Massey, Jr. Introduction to Statistical Analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.
- Knowles, Malcolm S. The Modern Practice of Adult Education. New York: Association Press, 1970.
- Sanders, H. C., and others. The Cooperative Extension Service. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Selltiz, Claire, and others. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959.
- Tuckman, Bruce W. Conducting Educational Research. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972.
- Weiss, Carol H. Evaluation Research: Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

## UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

- Steele, Sara M. "A Concept of Macro Evaluation as it Related to State and Federal Accountability." Paper read at a National Extension Workshop on Program Effectiveness, Madison, Wisconsin, February, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Putting the Pieces Together." Paper presented at the Adult Education Research Conference, Toronto, Canada, April, 1976.
- Ringler, Wilber E. Personal interview. Manhattan, Kansas, June, 1977.

## OTHER

- Bennet, Claude F. Analyzing Impacts of Extension Programs. Federal Extension Service Publication No. ESC-575. Washington: Extension Service, U.S.D.A., 1976.
- Burton, John E. Jr., and David L. Rogers. A Model for Evaluating Development Programs. Ames: Iowa State University, North Carolina Regional Center for Rural Development, 1976.
- Byrn, Darcie. ed. Evaluation in Extension. Topeka: H. M. Ives and Sons, 1959.
- Cooperative Extension Service. A People and a Spirit. Fort Collins: Colorado State University Printing and Publication Service, 1968.

- Kansas State University. Handbook for County Extension Councils.  
Cooperative Extension Service. No. C-350 Revised. Manhattan:  
Cooperative Extension Service, 1975.
- Prawl, Warren L., and William J. Jorns. "Reviewing County Extension  
Programs." Journal of Extension, XIV (July/August, 1976), 11-16.
- Steele, Sara M. "An Emerging Concept of Program Evaluation."  
Journal of Extension, XIII (March/April, 1975), 13-15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Program Evaluation--A Broader Definition." Journal of  
Extension, VIII, No. 2 (1970), 5-6.
- U. S. Congress. House. Committee of Education and Labor. Hearings  
on the Extension of Elementary and Secondary Programs. Part IV,  
1969. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1969.
- U. S. Congress. Smith-Lever Act. 1914.
- Wholey, Joseph S., and others. Federal Evaluation Policy: An Overview.  
Washington: The Urban Institute, 1970.

APPENDIX A  
SAMPLE TELEPHONE INTERVIEW  
SCHEDULE WITH COMPLETED RAW DATA

I.D. Number  
1 2 3

Female 54 Male 55  
4 1 2

## A KANSAS COUNTY EXTENSION PROGRAM EVALUATION

### Telephone Survey

Dial and ask, "May I speak to Mr. John Doe?" If he is not home, make assumption that he is married and ask for Mrs. John Doe. If neither party is available, go to next name and call back later. Call back three times, at various times of the day, before recording a "No Answer." Open conversation by saying, "Hello, I am a representative of the Kansas State University Extension Service from Mannhattan. We are making a telephone survey to find out what people know about the County Extension Service. May I have a few minutes of your time to have you answer some questions, if you don't mind. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential."

When recording responses, a YES or positive response is always recorded as 1 and a NO as 2.

- 5 1. Do you live in a town 73; outside the city limits but not on a  
1 farm 15; on a farm 21; outside of the County 8?  
2 3 4
- 6 2. We are conducting this survey only with voting age citizens of  
the County. May I have your age please? 13 18-30; 32 31-50;  
23 51-64; 40 65 and over 1 2  
3 4
- 7 3. Have you heard of the County Extension Service? 93 yes; 15 no  
1 2
- 8 4. Have you heard of the County Extension Agricultural Agent? You  
refer to him as the County Agent. 89 yes; 19 no  
1 2
- 9 5. Have you heard of the County Extension Home Economist? You may  
refer to her as the Home Agent or the Home Demonstration Agent.  
93 yes; 15 no
- 10 6. Have you heard of the County Extension 4-H program? 95 yes; 11 no  
1 2
- 11 7. Have you heard of the County Extension Community Improvement or  
Rural Development activities?     yes;     no. IF ALL ANSWERS  
3-7 ARE NO, CONCLUDE INTERVIEW. 1 (not asked)

8. As you know, Extension means different things to different people. What do you feel is Extension's primary purpose?  
12 Present information (21), Help people (20), Educate public (11), Help farmers (8), Better Community (7), 4-H (5)
9. How effective is your County Extension Service in presenting technical information in Agriculture, Home Economics, 4-H and Youth, and Community Improvement and Rural Development? (read choices)  
13 41 very effective; 35 somewhat effective; 0 ineffective;  
1 2 3  
22 no opinion  
4
10. How did you come to know of the Agents working for the County Extension Service: (check first 4 responses)  
14 18 meeting 0 test plot 7 Fair  
15 1 5 9  
10 letter 19 thru 4-H 22 other (list)\_\_\_\_  
2 6 10  
11 can't remember 27 office, farm, home  
3 7 home visit  
19 newspaper 3 radio, TV  
17 4 8
11. Based on what you know about the County Extension Service, can you tell me what kinds of information the Agricultural Agent provides? (subject matter, list the first 4 responses)  
18  
19 54 crops, soils 0 CRD activities  
1 6  
20 27 livestock 0 farm machinery and structures  
2 7  
21 17 lawns, garden, landscaping 3 forestry  
3 8  
12 farm management 35 don't know  
4 9  
9 4-H and Youth Activities 16 other (list)\_\_\_\_  
5 10
12. Based on what you know about the County Extension Service, can you tell me what kinds of information the Home Economist provides? (list the first 4 responses)  
22  
23  
24 57 foods, nutrition 0 CRD activities  
1 5  
36 clothing 11 Arts and Crafts  
2 6  
18 home furnishing, 8 4-H and Youth  
3 appliances 7  
5 family relations 29 don't know  
4 8  
25 25 other (list)\_\_\_\_  
9



13. If the County Agents wanted to present some new information to  
26(1st) the people of the County, what are the two best ways? (check  
the first and second choices)

	1st	2nd		1st	2nd
27	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	radio	5	<u>4</u>
		<u>1</u>			<u>6</u>
28	<u>15</u>		newspaper	5	<u>2</u>
	<u>2</u>				<u>7</u>
24	<u>21</u>		newsletter	0	<u>0</u>
	<u>3</u>				<u>8</u>
17	<u>15</u>		public meetings, tours,	1	<u>1</u>
	<u>4</u>		demonstrations		<u>9</u>
2	<u>10</u>		bulletins	0	<u>0</u>
	<u>5</u>				<u>10</u>

14. The Home Economist is planning to offer more correspondence  
28 courses in the future. Would you be willing to enroll in a  
correspondence course from the Extension Office? 12 yes 24 no,  
11 maybe (uncertain, probably yes, probably no, etc) 1 2  
3

15. What subjects would you enroll in as correspondence courses  
29 from the Extension Home Economist? (be specific in recording  
topics) 13 Response; 10 No Response  
1 2  
Crafts (4), Gardening (2), Sewing (2), Insurance, Estate planning

16. Have you heard of the Extension Homemaker Units, E.H.U.'s or Home  
30 Demonstrations units? FEMALE: 43 yes, 4 no (IF NO, SKIP TO  
QUESTION 20) 1 2  
MALE: 36 yes, 12 no (IF MALE respondent,  
to to question #20) 1 2

17. Are you a member of an EHU? FEMALE: 5 yes, 38 no (IF YES, go to  
31 1 2 #19)  
MALE: 3 NA  
3

Or have you ever been a member of an EHU? FEMALE: 13 yes, 25 no  
(if YES, go to #20) 4 5

18. If not, have you ever had the opportunity to be a member of an  
32 EHU? 14 yes, 11 no  
1 2

19. Why do you belong to an EHU? 1 Keep Current on Home Economics  
33 1  
2 Social 0 Community Service  
2 5  
5 Educational 0 Other \_\_\_\_\_  
3 6  
0 Keep Busy 0 No Answer  
4 7

20. Approximately 825 or 13% of the County's population is teenagers.  
 34 What do you see as the most pressing needs of these youth?  
 (record first 4 responses)

35	<u>1</u> Self-Identity	<u>38</u> Recreational Opportunities
	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>
36	<u>0</u> Coping With Peer Pressure	<u>9</u> Generation Gap
	<u>2</u>	<u>7</u>
37	<u>11</u> Too Many Activities	<u>15</u> Job Opportunities
	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>
	<u>16</u> Drug Abuse	<u>35</u> Other (list) _____
	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u> _____
	<u>1</u> Careers	
	<u>5</u>	

21. I am going to read a list of 5 topics which seem to be of concern to youth today. Would you please tell me if you believe the County Extension Service should help the community solve each of these problems?

	Yes	No
38	751. <u>12</u> Help provide recreational opportunities for young people.	<u>1</u>
39	752. <u>12</u> Help work toward more part-time and full-time job opportunities.	<u>2</u>
40	763. <u>11</u> Assist in providing career planning and information counseling.	<u>3</u>
41	594. <u>28</u> Assisting with adult-youth communications and personal	<u>4</u>
42	725. <u>15</u> Help youth cope with problems of drugs, smoking, alcohol, sex.	<u>5</u>

22. There are about 1,300 youth of 4-H age in the County, yet only slightly more than 200 are members of 4-H groups. Would you rank the first two following methods that you feel would be most successful in getting more youth involved in Extension youth activities? (rank the first 2 choices)

	1st	2nd
27	<u>14</u> Develop school related 4-H groups, or,	<u>1</u>
12	<u>24</u> Organize special interest groups that study or work on one specific subject, or	<u>2</u>
9	<u>11</u> Advertise youth programs more in the media, or	<u>3</u>
33	<u>24</u> Recruit and train more volunteer leaders.	<u>4</u>
15	<u>0</u> No opinion	<u>5</u>

23. In your opinion, should the Extension Agents spend more of their Youth program time:  
24 training adult 4-H leaders, or  
1  
32 more time working directly with the youth, or  
2  
omitted do they use their time about right now.  
3  
24 No opinion  
4
24. Can you recall the County Extension Service having been involved with any of the following Community Resource Development or Rural Development activities? (read the list)
- |   | Yes       | No        | Yes       | No                          |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|
| <u>26</u> <u>61</u> Community Pride Program | <u>34</u> | <u>53</u> | <u>53</u> | <u>Community Recreation</u> |
| <u>48</u> <u>1</u>                          |           | <u>5</u>  |           |                             |
| <u>48</u> <u>39</u> Land Use                | <u>33</u> | <u>54</u> | <u>54</u> | <u>Economic Development</u> |
| <u>49</u> <u>2</u>                          |           | <u>6</u>  |           |                             |
| <u>25</u> <u>62</u> Community Housing       | <u>14</u> | <u>73</u> | <u>73</u> | <u>Local Government</u>     |
| <u>50</u> <u>3</u>                          |           | <u>7</u>  |           |                             |
| <u>60</u> <u>27</u> Community Health        | <u>53</u> | <u>34</u> | <u>34</u> | <u>City or Community</u>    |
| <u>51</u> <u>4</u>                          |           | <u>8</u>  |           | <u>Beautification</u>       |
25. Should the Extension Agents be involved in giving assistance of this nature to communities? 72 yes, 9 no, 7 no opinion  
(IF NO, skip to #27) 1 2
26. If so, to what extent do you believe they should be involved? (read the 3 choices and have respondent select one)  
9 Take an active leadership role  
1  
10 Supply information only  
2  
47 Assist with organizing groups and activities  
3
27. More than 20% of the County's population is over 65 years of age. What do you see as the most pressing needs of these elderly? (record the first three mentioned)
- |                                 |           |                                       |
|---------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|
| <u>16</u> Housing               | <u>0</u>  | <u>Organizing them as volunteers</u>  |
| <u>1</u>                        | <u>6</u>  |                                       |
| <u>7</u> Nutrition              | <u>12</u> | <u>Budgeting</u>                      |
| <u>2</u>                        | <u>7</u>  |                                       |
| <u>14</u> Recreation            | <u>19</u> | <u>No opinion</u>                     |
| <u>3</u>                        | <u>8</u>  |                                       |
| <u>10</u> Creative Leisure time | <u>23</u> | <u>Other (list) <u>Loneliness</u></u> |
| <u>4</u>                        | <u>9</u>  |                                       |
| <u>21</u> Transportation        |           |                                       |
| <u>5</u>                        |           |                                       |

28. How can the County Extension Service best provide the information required to meet these needs of the senior citizens? (record first three responses)

59	21	Home Visits	7	Educate general public about
60	1		5	elderly
61	23	Develop newsletter for	28	No opinion
62	2	elderly	6	
	14	Hold meetings at Senior	22	Other, Newspaper 9-misc.
	3	Center	7	
	6	Provide special radio programs		
	4			

29. How frequently do you vote at the annual Extension Council elections? 2 always, 14 sometimes, 80 never

1	2	3
---	---	---

30. Who is involved in planning the County Extension educational program? (check first 4 responses)

63	16	Agents	0	State
64	1		5	
	4	Council	6	Citizens Suggestions
65	2		6	
	4	Advisory Committees	71	Don't know
66	3		7	
	2	Executive Board	1	Other
	4		8	

31. Do you feel County residents have an opportunity to offer suggestions that may be used in planning the County Extension Programs?

69 yes (IF YES go to question #33)

1

9 no

2

14 No opinion

3

32. If no, what should the Extension Service do to improve this situation? survey, no opinion

33. Some people utilize the County Extension Service quite often and for many things. How about you? Do you:

Yes No

23 73 Participate in Extension activities as often as you can?

69

1

65 31 Read the newsletters from the agents on a regular basis?

70

2

80 16 Read Extension articles in the newspaper?

71

3

35 61 Do you make regular use of the information you do receive from the agents?

72

4

- 73 34. To help the Extension Service better meet the needs of County citizens, what topics, suggestions, or problems do you feel need attention during the next three to five years in:

---

Concerns, future programs in Agriculture

---

- 2 - Marketing
  - Tree trimming
  - Conservation
  - Young farmer programs
  - Irrigation
  - Use of credit and money on farms
  - Suburban farming
  - Keeping current on machinery
  - Interest young people to come back to farm
  - Land use - keeping the land in the family farm
  - Emphasize more agricultural programs

---

Concerns, future program suggestions in Home Economics

---

- 6 - Emphasize programs for elderly
- 2 - Organize volunteers to visit elderly
- 2 - Good program now
  - More group meetings
  - Stress old crafts
  - More interesting Unit lessons
  - Unit lessons for older homemakers
  - Good Microwave lesson
  - Consumer education, unit pricing
  - Food additives and preservatives
  - Remodeling older homes
  - Interior design
  - Home enrichment
  - More correspondence courses
  - Horticulture
  - Energy
  - Highway safety

---

Concerns, future program suggestions in 4-H and Youth

---

- 5 - Emphasize youth programs
- 4 - Expand 4-H
- 3 - Assist with recreational programs
- 2 - More help for town youth
- 2 - Drug abuse
- 2 - Constructive use of time
  - Strengthen 4-H leadership
  - More Christian youth programs
  - Too many sport activities
  - Agricultural related jobs
  - Meeting place for youths

---

Concerns, future program suggestions in CRD

---

- 3 - City beautification
- 2 - Inform public on governmental programs affecting farmers
  - Small towns need more community improvements
  - Improve or remove deteriorated housing
  - More Community Resource Development emphasis
  - Community center
  - How labor and price controls affect us locally
  - Long range planning for water supply
  - Improve county roads
  - Boost farm economy

---

Miscellaneous concerns, suggestions

---

- 9 - Good program now, agents doing all they can
- 3 - Publicize Extension more
- 3 - Elderly programs are good
  - Good newsletter
  - Method of receiving information from missed meetings

## APPENDIX B

### SAMPLE COVER LETTER AND PERSONAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE WITH COMPLETED RAW DATA

# **ILLEGIBLE DOCUMENT**

**THE FOLLOWING  
DOCUMENT(S) IS OF  
POOR LEGIBILITY IN  
THE ORIGINAL**

**THIS IS THE BEST  
COPY AVAILABLE**



**ILLEGIBLE**

**THE FOLLOWING  
DOCUMENT (S) IS  
ILLEGIBLE DUE  
TO THE  
PRINTING ON  
THE ORIGINAL  
BEING CUT OFF**

**ILLEGIBLE**

Cooperative

# EXTENSION SERVICE

of Kansas State University

Division of Extension  
Extension Staff and Program Development  
Umberger Hall  
MANHATTAN, KANSAS 66506  
Phone: 913 532-5787

"Taking the UNIVERSITY to the PEOPLE"



November 17, 1976

The Office of Staff and Program Development of the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service is cooperating with your County Extension Council in conducting a County Extension program review. The first phase of the review involved a telephone survey of randomly selected phone subscribers. The second phase involves personally interviewing about 25 selected individuals who have a background and experience with Extension. These observations and comments which you will provide will be extremely valuable.

A copy of the interview questionnaire is enclosed for your early consideration and study. You may complete the survey at your convenience and we can review it when I pick it up next week.

Please answer all questions as fully as you feel you can. While your names is on the front sheet, your individual response will not be identified. The county Extension staff will see only a summary of the information gained from these interviews.

I would like to meet with you on

Please confirm this appointment by completing the tear slip on the bottom of this page and mail it in the provided post-paid envelope.

Thank you for your help and consideration.

Sincerely,

Steven D. Fisher  
Extension Specialist  
Program Evaluation

cut or tear along this line

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Yes, I will be able to make the appointment as scheduled.
- ☐ No, I will be unable to make this appointment. Please call me and arrange an appropriate time. My phone is \_\_\_\_\_.

Return in the postage-paid, addressed envelope to  
Steven D. Fisher  
Extension Specialist  
Program Evaluation

Interviewee's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Position \_\_\_\_\_

A Kansas County Extension Service Review  
Personal Interview Schedule

Please answer the questions as fully as you can. For those questions that ask for a numerical response, circle the number which best describes your opinion or evaluation of the question or statement.

1. How would you rate your level of knowledge and familiarity with the County Extension Service?
 

not familiar					very familiar	
1	2	3	4	5	--	3.23
  
2. Do you feel that the County Extension program responds adequately to major problems and concerns of County residents?
 

not adequate					very adequate	
1	2	3	4	5	--	4.23
  
3. In your opinion, how much are the following groups involved in planning the County Extension program?
 

	not involved				very involved	
Agricultural Advisory Committee	1	2	3	4	5	-- 3.7
Home Economics Advisory Committee	1	2	3	4	5	-- 4.25
4-H Advisory Committee	1	2	3	4	5	-- 4.06
Extension Executive Board	1	2	3	4	5	-- 4.13
Unit Affairs Committee	1	2	3	4	5	-- 3.9
4-H Council	1	2	3	4	5	-- 3.8
Extension Agents	1	2	3	4	5	-- 4.7
Community Resource Development Advisory Committee	1	2	3	4	5	-- 3.25

4. All youth have concerns and problems that continually confront them. Some of these are listed below. Rank them in order of importance to you as a concerned adult or parent. (#1 being most important, 9 being least important)

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Concern</u>
<u>7</u>	Part time job opportunities -- 6.05
<u>8</u>	Disregard for authority -- 6.05
<u>9</u>	Adequate recreation opportunities and facilities -- 6.95
<u>6</u>	Vocational training opportunities -- 5.05
<u>4</u>	Construction use of leisure time -- 4.79
<u>5</u>	Adjusting to a rapidly changing and complex society -- 5.0
<u>3</u>	Developing meaningful relationships with others -- 4.05
<u>2</u>	Drugs & alcohol abuse -- 3.79
<u>1</u>	Preparing for life as adults -- 2.84

5. In your opinion, what are the strong points of the 4-H and youth program in your County? Educational and social, 5; Jr. Leader Club, 2; Good Agent and leader support, 2; Open to all youth if they want it, 2; Speech and parliamentary training, 2
- 
6. What aspects of the 4-H and youth program do you feel need strengthening? Discourage parental competition through 4-H members, 4; More trained leadership, 3; More parental support, 2
- 
7. Why do you feel more young people do not participate in the County 4-H program? Too busy with school activities and jobs (especially sports), 8; Parents are not interested in their children, 5; Isn't made attractive enough to compete against other events, 2.
- 
8. What suggestions do you have for increasing 4-H membership in the County? Parental support, 3; Full or part-time 4-H Agent to take work load off Ag. and Home Ec. Agent, 2; More adult leaders, 2.
- 
9. Can you suggest youth programs or efforts, other than the traditional 4-H club program, that you feel should be tried in the County? School related 4-H interest groups, 5.
-

10. How effective is the County 4-H program?

very  
effective                      ineffective

1            2            3            4            5 -- 3.82

11. At the present time the County agricultural agent provides information in the following areas. Would you like to see MORE, THE SAME, OR LESS emphasis placed on these topics in the future?

<u>Program Area</u>	<u>MORE</u>	<u>SAME</u>	<u>LESS</u>	<u>NO OPINION</u>
4-H	6	8		1
Beef production	4	10		1
Swine production	4	9		1
Dairy production	4	8		2
Pasture improvement	7	6		1
Weed control	9	6		
Disease control	8	9		
Insect control	8	9		
Crop production	3	10		
Farm Management	6	8		1
Animal health	3	8		1
Lawns, flowers, shrubs, landscaping	3	12		1
Gardening and Orchards	4	12		
Farm machinery, buildings, equipment	4	8		1
Community improvement & Rural Development	5	8		1
Forestry, including community forestry	2	10		2
Soil Conservation	4	11		
Safety	3	12		
OTHER: PLEASE LIST <u>Marketing</u>	1			

12. What are some of the stronger points of the present agricultural program? Agent does excellent job on keeping current and getting information out, 4; All areas adequately covered, 3; Wheat variety plot, 2; 4-H work, 2; Soil Conservation, 2.

13. What do you feel are aspects of the agricultural program that need strengthening? More profitable crop production practices, Marketing, Farm and financial management, Public awareness about agriculture, More active agriculture advisory, Improved agricultural tours and programs.

14. What additional agricultural topics do you feel should receive more information over the next few years? None, already has too full a schedule, 2; Develop irrigation potential, increase corn and alfalfa production; Soil Conservation, Marketing; Forage production; more programs on insect and disease control of crops.

15. At the present time the County home economist provides information in the following areas. Would you like to see MORE, THE SAME, OR LESS emphasis placed on these topics in the future?

<u>Program Area</u>	<u>MORE</u>	<u>SAME</u>	<u>LESS</u>	<u>NO OPINION</u>
4-H	4	9		1
Foods and Nutrition	1	12		1
Clothing and textiles		14		
Family health	4	9		
Family economics (budgeting)	6	7		
Consumer education	6	7		
Family relations	3	9	1	
Household appliances and furnishings	2	9	1	1
Senior citizens programs	4	8		
Young homemakers programs	4	8		
Landscaping	5	6		2
Safety	5	9		
Arts and crafts	2	12		
Housing	2	11		
Extension Homemaker Units	3	10		
Gardening	4	9		

16. In your opinion, what are some of the strong points of the home economics program? Capable and talented agent, 5; Works with all ages, 4; Excellent newsletter, 3; E.H.U. numbers and activity adequate, 2
17. What do you feel are aspects of the home economics program that need strengthening? Prepare age group-directed lessons, 2; Family economics, especially young homemakers, 2; Better Unit lessons
18. What additional home economics programs do you feel should receive attention over the next few years? Teaching prospective homemakers how to use available financial resources wisely, 2; Keep current on new appliances; Consumer education
19. Does Extension seem to you to be spending too much time with any particular group or class of clientele? Yes 1 No 14 Don't really know 4
- A. If YES, what group? Low income
- B. On any particular subject matter area? \_\_\_\_\_
20. The needs of senior citizens living in the County seat seem to be met fairly adequately, but those living in the outlying areas of the County are not as fortunate. How do you believe the County Extension Service should function to meet the needs of these elderly? Inform citizens that the County bus is county-wide, 3; Bus elderly from smaller towns to activities in county seat, 2; Newsletter for elderly, 2; Work through the E.H.U.'s, 2; Don't overlap programs; Work with local Council on Aging, 2.

21. In your opinion, the Extension Agents:

- 3 Should spend more time working with low income persons
- 1 Should spend less time working with low income persons
- 18 No Opinion

22. In your opinion, should the Extension Agents:

- 10 Spend more time working with Community Improvement and Rural Development activities.
- 1 Spend less time working with Community Improvement and Rural Development activities.
- 11 No Opinion

23. What Community Resource Development type activities or projects should be tackled in your community or on a county-wide basis during the next 3 to 4 years? Pride program, 2; Beautification of county seat; Enlarge C.R.D. to cover rural community areas; Recreational facility for all ages; Community building--fairgrounds

24. What methods have the most promise for effectively and efficiently disseminating information to County citizens in the future?  
(Rank in order of preference 1 to 8)

- 2 newspaper - 2.74
- 3 radio - 4.2
- 7 public meetings - 5.27
- 5 bulletins - 4.58
- 1 newsletters - 2.38
- 4 personal contacts - 4.58
- 6 telephone - 5.10
- 8 television - 6.83

25. In reference to the County Extension Service, please check one block after each question. If you do not have any opinion, you may leave it blank.

	to a great extent (3 pts)	to some extent (2 pts)	not at all (1 pt)
A. Local people are aware of the extension service	2.5		
B. Local leaders help determine the needs in the County.	2.48		
C. The program is based on educational needs facing county residents.	2.7		
D. The program is open to all who wish to participate	2.86		
E. Local people help plan the program.	2.43		
F. Local people help evaluate the program	2.43		
G. A wide variety of teaching methods are used to reach as many people as possible.	2.65		
H. Methods are designed and adjusted to meet the needs of the clientele.	2.62		
I. Program is coordinated with those of other educational and service agencies.	2.58		
J. A system of continuous evaluation is built into the program.	2.6		

26. What suggestions can you provide for improving or expanding the County Extension Program?

Agriculture

Stress soil conservation  
 Have silage production plot  
 More agricultural marketing programs  
 Emphasize irrigation, silage, hay production  
 Public knowledge about agriculture  
 Agriculture advisory needs to take a more active part in program development  
 (continued on next page)



26. What suggestions can you provide for improving or expanding the County Extension Program?

Home Economics

- 3 - Programs for low income were offered, but little response, not the Agent's fault.

4-H & Youth

Continue to expand the strengthen 4-H program

4-H program is satisfactory

Have County project groups or meetings

More 4-H response to preparing for the fair - would generate community support

Community Resource Development

When need arises for C.R.D., fill it, otherwise, work on other areas

Use newspaper editorials to initiate Community Development

General

- 4 - Agents doing a good job, effort is above what is expected  
 Keep people informed about Extension  
 Encourage participation at Extension elections  
 Encourage Extension Council members to become more involved in their duties and more sensitive to people's needs

APPENDIX C

REVISED TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

I. D. Number  
 1 2 3  
 Female 1 Male 2  
 4

Completed  
 No Answer  
 Refused  
 Not Working Number

# A COUNTY EXTENSION PROGRAM EVALUATION

## Telephone Survey

Dial and ask, "May I speak to Mr. John Doe?" If he is not home, assume he is married and ask for Mrs. John Doe or any person at this number who is 18 or older. If no adult is available, go to the next name and call back later. Call back three times, at various times of the day, before recording a "No Answer". Open conversation by saying "Hello, I am a representative of the Kansas State University Extension Service. We are making a random telephone survey in your county to find out what people feel are the needs of county residents and their experience with the County Extension Service. Do you have a few minutes so that I could ask you some questions? Your answers will be kept strictly confidential."

1. Do you live in a town or city? 1; outside city limits but  
 5 not on a farm 2; on a farm 3; outside the County 4 (if  
 not in the County, conclude interview).

2. Would you mind giving me your age, please?  
 6

18-19	40-44	65 & over
1	6	11
20-24	45-49	
2	7	
25-29	50-54	
3	8	
30-34	55-59	
4	9	
35-39	60-64	
5	10	

3. Have you heard of the County Extension Service? 1 yes;  
 7 2 no

4. Have you heard of the County Extension Agricultural Agent?  
 8 (May be known as County Agent.) 1 yes; 2 no

- 9 5. Have you heard of the County Extension Home Economist? (May be known as the Home Agent or Home Demonstration Agent.) 1 yes;  
2 no
- 10 6. Have you heard of the County Extension 4-H program? 1 yes;  
2 no
- 11 7. What do you feel is Extension's primary purpose? (Check first  
12 two responses)
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <u>1</u> provide information                    | <u>6</u> take university to the people |
| <u>2</u> help people                            | <u>7</u> help youth, 4-H               |
| <u>3</u> education                              | <u>8</u> help communities              |
| <u>4</u> increase ag. production (help farmers) | <u>9</u> don't know                    |
| <u>5</u> improve home life (help homemakers)    | <u>  </u> other _____                  |
- 13 8. What is the best way for the Extension Agents to present  
14 information to people of the County? (record first 2 responses)
- |   |                                    |
|---|------------------------------------|
| <u>1</u> newspaper                              | <u>6</u> TV                        |
| <u>2</u> newsletter                             | <u>7</u> farm, home, office visits |
| <u>3</u> public meetings, tours, demonstrations | <u>8</u> don't know                |
| <u>4</u> bulletins                              | <u>9</u> other _____               |
| <u>5</u> radio                                  |                                    |

NOTE: Ask women only questions 9-11. For men, go directly to Number 12.

- 15 9. Have you heard of the Extension Homemaker Units (EHU) or Home Demonstration Units? 1 yes; 2 no (If NO, skip to number 12)

- 16 10. Are you now or have you ever been a member of an EHU?  
 \_\_\_ present member; \_\_\_ former member; \_\_\_ never a member  
 1 2 3
- 17 11. If never a member, have you ever had the opportunity to  
 become an EHU member? \_\_\_ yes; \_\_\_ no  
 1 2
- 18 12. Approximately 800 or 20% of the County population is teenagers.  
 19 What do you see as the most pressing problems of these youths?  
 (record first two responses)
- |                                   |                               |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| ___ coping with peer pressure     | ___ relationship with parents |
| 1                                 | 6                             |
| ___ too many competing activities | ___ no respect for authority  |
| 2                                 | 7                             |
| ___ drug and alcohol abuse        | ___ other (list) _____        |
| 3                                 | 8                             |
| ___ lack of recreational          | ___ don't know                |
| 4 opportunities                   | 9                             |
| ___ job opportunities             |                               |
| 5                                 |                               |
- 20 13. There are about 1000 youth of 4-H age in the County. About  
 200, or 20% are 4-H members. Do you feel an effort should be  
 made to attract more youth into some kind of 4-H program?  
 \_\_\_ yes; \_\_\_ no; \_\_\_ not sure (If NO, skip number 14)  
 1 2 3
- 21 14. What suggestions do you have for increasing the 4-H membership  
 in your county? (record first 2 responses)
- 22
- |                               |                            |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| ___ school related 4-H groups | ___ recruit and train more |
| 1                             | 4 leaders                  |
| ___ special interest groups   | ___ don't know             |
| 2                             | 5                          |
| ___ publicize 4-H more        | ___ other (list) _____     |
| 3                             | 6                          |

- 23 15. Nearly 15% of the population is over 65 years of age. What  
24 do you see as the most pressing problems of this age group  
of people? (Record first 2 responses)

<u>1</u> Housing	<u>6</u> Health
<u>2</u> Nutrition	<u>7</u> Loneliness
<u>3</u> Things to do	<u>8</u> Not enough money
<u>4</u> Transportation	<u>9</u> Other (list) _____
<u>5</u> Budgeting	

- 25 16. In your opinion, should the Extension Agents be involved in  
community improvement and rural development activities such  
as Land Use Planning, Zoning, Community Housing, etc.?

1 yes; 2 no; 3 not sure

- 26 17. Does the average citizen have much influence over the kinds  
of educational programs offered by the County Extension Service?

1 yes; 2 no; 3 not sure

18. Do you:

27 1 yes; 2 no Contact the Extension Office when you need  
information?

28 1 yes; 2 no Participate in Extension activities?

29 1 yes; 2 no Receive a newsletter from the Extension office?  
(If NOT, skip next question)

30 1 yes; 2 no Read the newsletter

31 1 yes; 2 no Make use of information received from the  
Extension Service?

19. Do you feel County citizens should continue the financial support  
of their Extension Service? 1 yes; 2 no; 3 undecided  
(budget is about 1% of total county budget.)

20. How effective do you feel the County Extension Service has been  
in meeting the needs of county residents? 1 very effective;  
2 somewhat effective; 3 ineffective; 4 no opinion

21. This is the last and a most important question. What topics or problems do you feel will need attention during the next several years in your county, or what suggestions do you have for improving the County Extension Service?

## Agriculture

Home Economics

4-H and Youth

CRD

General

DEVELOPING AND TESTING A COUNTY EXTENSION  
PROGRAM EVALUATION MODEL

by

STEVEN DOUGLAS FISHER

B. S., Kansas State University, 1971

---

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1977



The purpose of this study was to develop and test a model for evaluating a County Extension educational program. Evidence was gathered concerning five specific areas: total program effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of program development, strengths and weaknesses of program implementation, level of awareness and utilization of the Extension Service among the population of the county, and future program content or direction.

A Kansas county was randomly selected from one of the five Extension administrative areas to test the evaluation model. Respondents for the evaluation were adult residents of the county randomly selected from a listing of the current telephone subscribers and a selected group of adult leaders who were involved with the County Extension program.

Data for this study were collected by three different methods. A compilation of relevant secondary data was obtained from Extension records and other county, state and federal documents. A telephone interview schedule was designed and 109 randomly selected adults were interviewed on the telephone by a team of three Extension evaluators. A personal interview schedule was also developed and completed by 24 selected persons including Extension Council members, Extension Agents, County Commissioners, school superintendents, mayors, and representatives of special agricultural interest groups within the county.

The survey instruments consisted of various types of questions so that a determination could be made of those most effective for collecting data supportive of the purpose of the evaluation. The telephone schedule was precoded and results were key punched and

tabulated by computer. Results of the personal interviews were hand tabulated.

A descriptive report of the findings was presented both orally and in written form to the County Extension Agents, Executive Board, and County Commissioners of the county being evaluated. The evaluation team also drew implications from the data and presented these judgments during the oral report. Further analysis and judgments concerning the evidence were to be made by the County Extension Agents and their Extension Advisory Committees.

The findings in the test county included:

1. The general population of adults in the county perceived the County Extension Service as being effective. Leaders familiar with the Extension program also felt it was very effective within the county.
2. There was a general lack of understanding among the population regarding the program development process in Extension. Certain Extension Advisory Committees were identified by leaders as being more involved in program development than other advisory groups.
3. A county-wide newsletter and the local newspaper were identified as the best methods for the Agents to use in presenting information to their clientele.
4. There was a high level of awareness among the general population concerning the County Extension program and a moderate level of utilization.
5. Several specific issues among the county residents surfaced as major concerns for the future in the four Extension program areas.

The methodology suggested by this study was effective and reliable. Short answer fact or opinion questions were most desirable for the telephone interview. The personal interview allowed for more probing, in-depth questions. Data were generated that proved useful for program improvement as well as program accountability.

The findings of this study should be made available to Extension Administrators and County Extension faculty. After further refinement of the telephone questionnaire, personnel and resources should be available for counties wishing to participate in this type of program evaluation.