

COMMUNITY LEADERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE  
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE'S IMAGE AND ITS  
NEEDS IN SALINE COUNTY, KANSAS

by

CARL HENRY GARTEN

B.S., Kansas State University, 1976

---

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1987

Approved by:

  
Major Professor

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

U  
W  
T4  
181  
-57  
-2

A special thank you to my wife Christine, for her love, support, understanding and sacrifices. To my major professor, Dr. Charles Oaklief, many thanks for his constant encouragement and support. Sincere appreciation is due to my other committee members Dr. Robert Meisner and Dr. Robert Johnson for their support, interest and help along the way.

I appreciate the much assistance of Dr. Sallie McNulty and her graduate assistant Martha Katz for all their help in survey design and statistical analysis.

A special thanks to Candy Langley, Donna Johnson, Shirley Snoddy, and Mary Bosch for their positions and endurance in typing this study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Introduction .....	1
Need for the Study .....	2
Research Statement .....	4
Specific Objectives .....	4
Hypotheses .....	5
Assumptions .....	5
Limitations .....	6
Definition of Terms .....	6
Implications of the Study .....	7
Time Frame .....	8
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	9
Introduction .....	9
The Image of Extension .....	13
Awareness of Extension Service Programs .....	16
Use of Extension Programs .....	19
Satisfaction of Extension Programs .....	20
Support For Funding of Extension .....	22
The Kansas Cooperative Extension Service Image .....	23
III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES .....	26
Introduction to the Study .....	26
Design of Research .....	26
Population .....	29
Data Collection and Instruments .....	31
Statistical Analysis .....	33
Protection of Subject Rights .....	34
VI. ANALYSIS OF DATA .....	35
Introduction .....	35
Demographic Data .....	36
Need for Education By Extension Program Areas .....	42
Awareness of Extension .....	45
Use of Extension .....	45
Satisfaction of Extension .....	47
Funding The Cooperative Extension Service .....	52
Hypothesis Testing .....	57

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	68
Summary .....	68
Conclusions .....	72
Recommendations .....	76
REFERENCES .....	78
APPENDICES .....	80
A. Introduction Letters To Sample Population.	81
B. Survey Instrument.....	88

## LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Page
1. Respondents Prior Extension Program Experience .....	37
2. Respondents With Children Under 18 Years of Age .....	38
3. Respondents Sex .....	38
4. Respondents Age .....	39
5. Respondents Place of Residence .....	39
6. Respondents Occupation .....	40
7. Respondents Education .....	41
8. Respondents Frequency of Use of The Extension Service In the Past Year .....	42
9. Respondents Need for Educational Information On Selected Program Thrusts.....	44
10. Respondents Awareness of Extension .....	46
11. Respondents Use of Extension .....	48
12. Respondents Satisfaction of Extension by Percentages...	50
13. Respondents Satisfaction of Extension.....	51
14. Respondents With an Opinion on Satisfaction of Extension .....	53
15. Respondents Opinion on Funding of Extension by Percentage .....	55
16. Respondents Opinion on Funding of Extension.....	56
17. Respondents With An Opinion on Funding of Extension....	58
18. Goals for Salina Correlation of Awareness, Use, Satisfaction, and Funding of Extension .....	60
19. Elected Officials Correlation of Awareness, Use, and Funding of Extension .....	60
20. Program Development Committee Correlation of Awareness, Use, Satisfaction, and Funding of Extension .....	61

## LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Tables	Page
21. Community Leaders Correlation of Awareness, Use, Satisfaction, and Funding of Extension .....	61
22. Analysis of Variance Table For Awareness .....	62
23. Analysis of Variance Table For Use .....	62
24. Analysis of Variance Table For Satisfaction .....	63
25. Analysis of Variance Table For Funding .....	63
26. Least Squares Means of Awareness, Use, Satisfaction, and Funding For Extension .....	64
27. Paired T-Test Comparing 4-H to Agriculture, Home Economics and Horticulture .....	66

Chapter 1  
Introduction

Introduction

An organization's image can greatly influence the effectiveness of its community goal achievements. The image we develop about an organization comes from what we perceive from its name, where it is located, and its associations. With public services, that image centers on the type of people an organization represents, the services it is expected to provide and its importance to the community. An organization's image is also influenced by the observer's outlook on life and attitude toward public services in the community.

Community leaders can play a significant role in the development and projection of a service organizational image. They are the individuals most often quoted in papers, on local radio, and in other forms of mass media. Unless community leaders have used or actively participated in an organization, their opinion may be slanted by those who were not fully satisfied with the organization. By nature, people tend to

remember their bad experiences. This negative reaction is what they communicate to their community leaders.

Therefore, communication is critical to inform people, especially community leaders, about quality services. Effective communication becomes more crucial as the size and complexity of society grows. Extension, like other public service organizations must have effective communication to improve its public image if it is to survive the cutting axe of today's society.

#### Need for the Study

In recent years, extension has been one of the organizations threatened with severe budget cuts. These potential cuts are due in part to the image extension has with the policy makers.

Extension started as a program to improve agricultural products, homemaking skills, and rural youth education. Now extension has broadened its clientele with a diversity of program thrusts. The extension image becomes "diluted" with the more programs extension generates. As Warner and Christenson (1984 p.9) point out, "Extension has broadened its role with existing clientele and, at the same time, has acquired new audiences." These changes are generally seen as a positive way of responding to clients' needs. But from the standpoint of an organizational image, it is more difficult to project a single identity. These new



programs have made it more difficult for the public to comprehend the nature of extension.

The image of an organization must change with the times and the important issues. Extension is not an organization that works with specific clientele or problems but one that is much more complex, with programs open to everyone. "These new programs have led to increased complexity and have made it more difficult for the public to comprehend the nature of Extension" (Warner and Christenson, 1984, p.47).

Thus, extension services must develop a new, more comprehensive image and make efforts to improve any programs which may contribute to negative feelings in the community. However, before any effort goes into improving extension's image, one must determine the current status of extension among the community leaders.

Extension previously has not been concerned with its image. Now, the federal, state, and county governments are all seeking places to cut funds. Those organizations that have negative images or images that are not clearly defined in the public's mind receive much pressure. Policy makers and community leaders must develop a positive image of a program if it is to continue to be funded adequately.

### Research Statement

The purpose of this study is to analyze the image of the Cooperative Extension Service in Saline County as perceived by community leaders and to identify those areas that need attention relative to fiscal and program integrity.

### Specific Objectives

The following objectives provided direction to the study:

1. To determine the community leaders' image of the Saline County Extension Service.

2. To determine the extent and nature of community leader participation in extension programs.

3. To determine community leader awareness of extension organizational structure and service programs.

4. To determine the relationship of community leader satisfaction with extension and the level of community leader use of the Extension Service.

5. To determine what level of financial support community leaders think is needed for extension in relationship to their awareness, use, satisfaction, and support of extension programs.

6. To determine how community leaders prioritize the importance of extension programs.

7. To determine the degree of satisfaction with extension programs in Saline County by different groups of community leaders.

#### Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses were tested in the null format.

H<sub>1</sub> The higher the use of extension by community leaders, the more positive the image of extension will be.

H<sub>2</sub> The more knowledge of extension programs by community leaders, the more positive the image of extension will be.

H<sub>3</sub> Community leaders will be significantly more aware of 4-H than of extension programs in agriculture, home economics and horticulture.

H<sub>4</sub> The higher the participation of community leaders in extension programs, the more support for funding at the same level or higher there will be.

#### Assumptions

The following assumptions are necessary for conducting this study:

1. That participants will read, interpret, and respond to questions accurately.

2. That participants will answer the questions honestly; that they provide accurate assessment of their perceptions, opinions and attitudes; and that they

answer the questions without the consultation of others.

3. That the responses of participants reflect their own personal bias and should, therefore, be considered in that context.

#### Limitations

The study has the following limitations:

1. The survey does not indicate when image change accrued but provides a base line for future comparisons.

2. This study provides only image information. It does not attempt to measure the economic and social impact of extension programs.

3. This study looks only at extension's image with community leaders and not with the total population.

4. This study assesses only Saline County community leaders, whose attitudes cannot be compared to community leaders of other counties.

#### Definition of Terms

Community Leaders. --Includes elected officials in Saline County, those individuals that participate on committees for the Goals for Salina, and those people that make up the Extension Council program development committee.

Extension (Cooperative Extension Service). --The Cooperative Extension Service was developed by the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 to disseminate and encourage the

application of useful and practical information relating to agriculture, home economics, and related subjects (Warner and Christensen, 1984, p.6). In Kansas it is headquartered at Kansas State University with offices in each county in Kansas. Saline County Extension works cooperatively with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Kansas State University, and Saline County. Together, they assess clientele needs and develop programs to meet those needs.

Extension Programs. --Extension's educational programs are the basic vehicle of the Cooperative Extension Service to disseminate information that is generated by research to improve the clienteles' life, business, family, and community. These programs are continuously adapted and changed in response to clientele needs.

Image. --Is a mental concept or idea of something held by a person about an organization.

#### Implications of the Study

Possible implications of the study include:

1. Information gained may be used to increase awareness of extension by community leaders.
2. Data ascertained may be used to increase the use of extension by community leaders and the general public.

3. The results will be used to make a concentrated effort by the extension staff in Saline County to improve the image of extension.

4. The resulting data may be used in renaming programs to allow community leaders and the public to know the educational value of activities related to the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service.

#### Time Frame

Over a six month period, this paper and survey will be developed and completed. The following steps will be followed:

Step 1: During the first six weeks the first three chapters and the instrument will be completed.

Step 2: The committee will review the material and instrument so that, within four weeks, the instrument will be ready to use.

Step 3: The instrument will be mailed out to the population of community leaders. A follow up survey will be sent in two weeks to those not responding.

Step 4: Four weeks after the survey is mailed, the data will be totaled for results.

Step 5: In the last month and a half, the results will be summarized, and the research report will be completed.

## Chapter 2

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Introduction

The Cooperative Extension Service was created by the Smith Lever Act in 1914 as the third arm of the land-grant system in order to transmit information from the colleges and the Department of Agriculture to local people (Warner and Christensen, 1984). The Extension Service's greatest need was to provide practical education to rural America in the areas of agriculture, home economics, and related subjects.

Kansas started county extension programs in 1915 and Saline County Extension officially began in December of 1926. Prior to 1926, the Downtown Lions Club hired a 4-H agent to organize summer 4-H youth activities and the fair. Since Saline County's beginning with one agent in 1926 to its current status of a staff of six in 1987, many educational programs have been developed. At first, the Cooperative Extension Service was strictly agricultural. Today, the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service provides programs in all areas.

Over the years, Saline County has changed from a primarily farm population to a more urban population. As the social structure has changed, extension has received new mandates through the legislative process. This legislation has expanded extension's role to include educational programs such as nutrition education, gardening, energy, and rural development. Some of the funds have been earmarked for non-traditional audiences such as low-income, urban residents. These new programs have added new clientele, resulting in a broadened role for extension as pointed out by Warner and Christenson, 1984.

Providing educational programming for new clientele has caused identity problems for extension. This broader scope has also caused problems in funding. Legislators wonder if this new extension should continue to be funded at its present level, not just in Washington, where the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation threatened to cut 60% in 1986 and now 20% in 1987, but also in Kansas, where the state legislature has study committees on extension and county commissioners working to achieve full control of the local county budget (Lindquist, 1987).

The total educational program of extension is being studied to see if the programs are really causing change. So, programs must be accountable to show



justification for extension if it is to survive. Extension cannot merely identify the needs of the public, but it must, at the same time, provide programs that meet those needs (Warner and Christensen, 1984).

This change has led to a national study committee to look at what the future direction of the Cooperative Extension Service should be. The joint USDA and NASULGC Committee concluded in 1983 that: "Cooperative Extension programming must retain broad flexibility at all levels if it is to remain relevant and respond to the dynamics of change for the greater good of people and their communities. Extension's accomplishments have been impressive; the service has great potential for continued educational impact on America. The committee reaffirms the value and the need for the land-grant system, including Cooperative Extension" (p.12).

The heart of the Cooperative Extension Service is the county staff, who must be responsive to local needs and priorities by providing information based on research from land-grant colleges and the United States Department of Agriculture. The county staff is aided by volunteer leaders who help in all areas to provide the programs (Warner and Christenson, 1984). The development of the extension educational programs in Kansas is organized by county program development committees which are made up of nine people in the area of agricul-

ture, nine in home economics, and nine in 4-H. The program development committee, with the assistance of the county agent, plans the program for the county as provided in the Extension Council Law. The law further points out that this body of 27 selects nine individuals to oversee the county extension program in all areas, from budget to programs. The Extension Council Law, as appearing in the Handbook for County Extension Councils, states, "It shall be the duty of said Extension Council to plan the educational extension programs of the county." (KSU Cooperative Extension Service, 1985, pp.3-4).

The Warner and Christenson (1984) study points out that people's needs are not just in agriculture and home economics, as they were in the beginning of extension, but now include everything from economic development to energy conservation. This diversity has developed over the past 70 years of extension to create the image problem of extension today. However, extension's goal has always been the same: to educate people so that whatever people do, they can do it better (Warner and Christenson, 1984). Blackburn (1984) points out that in early years extension meant education in agriculture and in home economics for rural people, that this was practical education aimed at improving farm and home skills, and that it was science applied to real life,

but in recent years, extension services have become much broader in scope.

The key to extension, as pointed out by Blackburn (1984), is participation--not only in the program, but also in the program planning. Through planning and participation people learn to analyze and recognize their own problems. Participation in extension programs is also meant to develop community leaders. There may be many short-term objectives of extension programs, but they are all based on long-term goals. So extension is not just a vehicle through which the college provides the latest research information, but is an educational arm that helps to solve local needs and stimulate new research challenges for the university. Extension thus becomes the catalyst to keep the land-grant institutions in harmony with the needs of the people (Warner and Christenson, 1984).

#### The Image of Extension

The community leaders' and the general public's image of extension becomes very important if people are going to receive extension's educational programs and use them effectively. The public's image becomes the measuring stick by which extension funding is determined. The image must be favorable if extension services are to receive adequate funding. The concern is that the broadened scope of extension has diluted the

image to the point of weakening it (Warner and Christenson, 1984).

How did extension develop this broad scope program? As rural people moved to more urban settings, they remembered their extension service and its educational programs. So with new challenges, they looked to extension to help them solve their problems. Extension met these challenges and met them well; so well that additional programs were added as years passed, to the point that extension has become the organization with the answers. These increased demands have stretched the extension staff and facilities to the extent that concern is raised about program quality. New programs are added each year and very few old programs are removed, furthering the concern about quality (Warner and Christenson 1984).

This concern has led to several land-grant universities conducting studies on extension image. One such study was conducted by the Ohio State University. Ohio's long-range Planning Committee (Young, 1983) concluded that to maintain or improve extension, its leaders, staff, and clientele must take a critical look at all programs and how they are perceived by the general public. Minnesota (Donohue, 1983) also ran a study in 1983 that showed extension received high levels of support not only in the farm area but also in the

metropolitan area. This study made extension appear as a "God-mother-apple pie" organization with very strong support. Cosner (1979) found in Oklahoma that over 90% of the respondents felt the extension information was valuable, and over three-fourths felt that increased funding would be beneficial to Oklahoma residents. A Kansas study conducted by Lindquist (1987) found that to improve extension's image, people must become more aware of the organization's name and not just its programs. Also, Warner and Christenson (1984) found, in their 1982 national study, that programing greatly influenced the image the public has for extension. Their study showed that clientele perceived as the most important program needs for the next five years: energy conservation (89%), food production (87%), human nutrition (86%), youth development (84%), food marketing (70%), health care (68%), consumer affairs (61%), economic development (61%), family life and personal development (57%), community services and facilities (55%), home gardening and lawn care (55%), and housing (46%).

In 1983, an Ohio study (Young) also asked clientele to rate on a five-point scale program topics that should be emphasized. In agriculture, those that rated 3.9 or higher were: (1) drainage, erosion control, soil and water; (2) farm financial planning and credit; (3) farm

records and enterprise planning; (4) small farm operations. In horticulture topics the highest rated were vegetable and fruit production problems at 3.3. Family nutrition, managing family income, reducing expenditures through home produced goods/service, food purchasing and preparation, adjusting to inflation/ unemployment, food preservation, and conserving energy/resources through household practices, all rated 4.0 or higher in the home economics topics. Accidents and emergencies rated highest in community development topics at 3.9. In 4-H related topics, over 14 rated 4.0 or higher with developing self-confidence being the highest at 4.7. This was followed by getting along with others, practicing leadership skills, and developing technical skill, knowledge, and attitudes through projects.

A study in Idaho (Carlson, 1985) found that only 21% of respondents felt Extension Service educational programs should be limited to those directly serving the needs of farmers. The majority, 76%, felt Extension Service educational programs should assist everyone living in the state.

#### Awareness of Extension Service Programs

Many times people that have been satisfied users of extension programs are not aware that extension is the source of the information or educational programs. Others are very familiar with just one program, such as

4-H, and do not know programs exist in agriculture, home economics, horticulture, energy, and community development. There are some who do not know that extension exists and have not participated in available programs.

In 1986, a statewide Kansas study was conducted by Lindquist (1987). His results showed that 91% of the population sampled were at least slightly familiar with extension and/or one of its programs. Eighty-one percent said there was an extension office in the county. The highest awareness of individual programs was 4-H with 77%, followed by home economics 59%, agriculture 48%, community development with 47%, horticulture with 45%, and energy with 40%.

Oklahoma Extension conducted a study in 1979 to establish baseline data on public awareness of the Cooperative Extension Service (Cosner, 1980). Findings showed that 79% were aware of extension in their county. A similar study in Nebraska in 1979 and 1980 showed that two-thirds of the respondents indicated they were familiar with extension. In 1981 surveys, three-fourths indicated they were familiar with the Extension Service in Nebraska (Nebraska Cooperative Extension Service, 1981).

Warner and Christenson's (1984) national study conducted in 1982, found that 87% were aware of extension or at least one of its programs. In rural areas,

awareness increased to 95%. In large cities, the awareness dropped to 83%. Of the programs, 4-H had the greatest awareness at 77%, agriculture was next at 52%, followed by community development at 46%, home economics at 45%, and the extension name at 40%. The highest level of awareness came from those with an income over \$30,000 at 91%, while those making less than \$10,000 had an 83% awareness. The lowest level of awareness by any sub-group was 79%, a level with which any organization would be pleased.

Other studies do not report as high an awareness as the national study. In Muskogee County, Oklahoma, (Bergman, 1982), 56% were aware of a county office, while 91% were aware of the Cooperative Extension Service. A Minnesota study in 1983 (Donohue, Olien and Sponaugle) looked at awareness by recognition of the names of county extension agents. The results were: general awareness of the county extension office, 66%; agriculture agent, 42%; home economics agent, 40%; 4-H agent, 14%; and community development agent, 14%. In Arkansas (Jennings, 1983) a study found 63% were aware of Cooperative Extension Service and 68% aware of their local office. A 1985 study in Maine (Northeast Research, 1985) found that 62% had heard of the Cooperative Extension Service. Ninety seven percent recognized 4-H in an Idaho study (Carlson, 1985). An Iowa State



University study (Padgitt, et al., 1985) found that 58% of the survey respondents had heard of the Cooperative Extension Service.

#### Use of Extension Programs

The key to measuring an organization's success is its use by the people it serves. In a 1979 Kentucky study that surveyed the general population (Warner and Christenson, 1981) researchers found that 25% of the respondents indicated a member of their family used or contacted the services of an extension agent in the prior year. A Kansas study conducted in 1986 (Lindquist, 1987) showed 5% using the extension service every week or two, 11% every month or two, and 27% at least once in the prior year. An Oklahoma study conducted in 1979 (Cosner, 1981) reported program participation to be 47% in 4-H, 25% in Extension Homemakers Clubs, and 14% in agriculture or related programs, with an overall use of 37% in extension programs.

The national survey by Warner and Christenson (1984) found that over one-quarter of U.S. households reported using the Extension Service--nearly 22 million families. Twenty-three percent of those questioned indicated they had used extension, along with 20% of their family members, thereby giving a household percentage of 27. This study also looked at the past year's use (1981) and found that 10% of the respondents

and 9% of the family members used extension, to give a household use score of 14% for 1981. A Minnesota study (Donohue, Olien, and Sponaugle, 1983) found 14.7% saying at least one member of the family had participated in an extension meeting in the past year. Twenty-three percent had contacted the county agent, while 46.7% read the newspaper columns prepared by agents. In the Muskogee County, Oklahoma study, (Bergman, 1982), 74% had contacted the extension office by phone for information; 21% participated in an extension-sponsored meeting, with over 93% indicating the information was valuable. Jennings reported in an Arkansas study (1983) that 45% had contacted the extension office, and 30% had attended meetings. Seventy-two percent had read extension news columns, and 75% had listened to radio or television programs presented by extension agents, but these programs were not strongly associated with Arkansas Cooperative Extension Service.

A North Dakota study (Dorow, 1984) found that those with children in 4-H made more over-all use of extension than those without. An Idaho study (Carlson, 1985) found a high usage of extension, with 87% of agricultural respondents and 45% of non-agriculture reporting regular use of extension services.

#### Satisfaction With Extension Programs

The image of extension by users depends greatly on

how well they are satisfied with programs being conducted by the extension service. In the national study (Warner and Christenson, 1984), surveyors found 90% of clientele were satisfied with extension programs, with 95% satisfaction among 4-H program users. The Kansas Study conducted in 1986 (Lindquist, 1987) found most with no opinion on satisfaction--46% satisfied, and only 2% indicating dissatisfaction. The greatest satisfaction came in the 4-H area with 55% satisfied. A Nebraska study (Nebraska Cooperative Extension, 1979, 1980 and 1981) found 70% satisfied, 5% not satisfied, and 25% having no opinion. The 1979 Kentucky study (Warner and Christenson, 1984) found 7 out of 10 satisfied with extension whether they were users or non-users. A Minnesota study (Donohue, Olien, and Sponaugle, 1983) found 94% satisfied with extension meetings. A fifth of the respondents felt that extension was doing an excellent job overall, about two-fifths a good job, and less than 1%, a poor job. Sixty-two percent were satisfied with extension in an Arkansas study (Jennings, 1983), with only 1% dissatisfied and the remaining expressing no opinion.

A Kansas study (C.R. Oaklief and M.M. Oaklief, 1983) indicated that satisfaction of Cooperative Extension Programs was high: 15% were very satisfied, 47% quite satisfied, 30% moderately, 3% slightly, and only 2% not

at all.

Support For Funding of Extension

Increasing demands by legislators to cut budgets and an increasing demand by new clientele for educational programs has caused extension to examine how clientele view government funding for the extension service. The question is, "Do they want to increase or decrease funding for extension programs?" In a 1980 study (Cosner, 1981) of Oklahoma's general population, 75% felt that increased funding for Oklahoma Extension would be beneficial to Oklahoma residents. The national study by Warner and Christenson (1984) found in 1982 that most people wanted extension support to remain the same. Ten percent wanted funding increased, while only 21% indicated a decrease in one of the four program areas of agriculture, home economics, 4-H youth, and community development. Lindquist (1987) found in 1986 that 40% of Kansas residents had no opinion relative to funding: 27% said it should stay the same, 27% wanted an increase, and 3% suggested a decrease. In terms of individual Kansas programs, 4-H received 44% supporting for increased funding; agriculture, 43%; community development, 33%; energy, 29%; home economics, 25%; and horticulture, 19%. In the Muskogee County, Oklahoma, study (Bergman, 1982), 67% felt increased funding would benefit the residents of Muskogee County.

Twenty-five percent of the respondents of a Minnesota study by Donohue, Olien, and Sponaugle (1983) felt funding should be increased, while 49% indicated it should remain the same, with only 3.4% indicating it should be decreased. In Jennings' (1983) Arkansas study, 47% said they would like to see extension offer expanded services and 23% would be willing to pay more taxes for the service.

#### The Kansas Cooperative Extension Service Image

In an effort to gather information on Kansas' image among county decision-makers, a series of three meetings were held to discuss the future of Kansas Cooperative Extension Service. They were conducted in August of 1986 in Hays, Wichita, and Topeka (Ward, 1986) with a total of 14 groups at the three sites. Reports for each group were given orally. Several indicated that Extension Service needs a new name, a new image, and/or better advertising and public relations. Four groups indicated that extension must provide quality programs and not spread itself too thin, covering everything. They indicated extension should drop less effective programs and add dynamic new programs.

Programs that were mentioned as important for the future included: nine groups, farm/financial management; seven groups, marketing; six groups, natural resources (water and soil); and five groups, economic

development for agriculture and community development. In the area of 4-H, seven groups mentioned 4-H as their number one priority; two groups, need for agriculture education; four groups, promotion of leadership and citizenship development; and two groups, 4-H's importance on the growth of urban youth. In home economics, most groups implied nutrition and family development were most important; several were concerned there was a duplication of services offered by other groups; some questioned Extension Homemaker Units' (EHU) importance; and several mentioned the need for more programs to the poor and minority groups.

Groups stressed the need for extension to deliver information quickly. Four suggested better use of modern communications such as Telenet, television, small video tape libraries, local hotline, or an 800 number linked to specialists. All but three groups said that extension should be doing more in the urban areas because that is where most Kansans live. Several groups implied that extension is not reaching enough of the populace.

In the area of funds, nine groups like the status quo, but seven said to expect further federal cuts. Two of the groups believed the state could be convinced to increase funding, but three felt that additional funds would have to come from the county. The greatest

support was for user fees on particular programs, publications, and video tape use.

The Kansas study, run in 1986 by Lindquist (1987) and the Extension Marketing Strategies Committee, found the Kansas image to be good with 91% of the general population knowing about extension and 81% saying there was an extension office in their county. The greatest need was in the area of improving the organization's name, with only 48% indicating they had knowledge of the Cooperative Extension Service. People knew of extension by the programs it provides but did not associate those programs with the Cooperative Extension Service name.

## Chapter 3

### METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

#### Introduction to the Study

The Cooperative Extension Service has suffered cutbacks in funding at all levels of government because of limited tax dollars. In addition to providing the traditional services to improve agriculture, homemaking, and education for rural youth, over the years extension has diversified its programs into many areas, increasing the need for additional funding. These changes may have been positive for clients needs but not for extension's image, because added programs have made it more difficult to comprehend the image of extension.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the image of the Saline County Extension Service. This chapter discusses the methodology of the study.

#### Design of the Research

There are three main types of educational research that Moore (1983) discusses. They are experimental, quasi-experimental, and descriptive. Moore (1983, p. 162) points out they can best be distinguished by "the



distinction between random assignment and random selection; and the distinction between the two types of independent variables, those which are an experimental type and those which are a measurement type of operational definition."

Moore (1983) defines the three types of educational research as:

1. In experimental research, the experimenter must have manipulative control over the independent variable whose effects are to be studied. Also the subjects must be randomly assigned to levels of the independent variable or to the different treatments.

2. In a quasi-experimental research, the experimenter must again have manipulative control over the independent variable whose effects are to be studied. Second, there is no random assignment of subjects to the treatments.

3. In descriptive research, the only criterion used is the type of independent variable. If the researcher has no control over the independent variable, that is, the variable has already occurred, it is then a measurement type of operational definition, and it falls under the category of descriptive research. (Moore, 1983).

This study follows the area of descriptive research because the independent variable is the committees of

the Goals for Salina study; all elected officials of Saline County including city, county, and school board members; and the Program Development Committees of the Saline County Extension Service. The study entails collecting data in an attempt to describe as accurately as possible the image that community leaders in the groups have of the Saline County Extension Service.

The goal of experimental research as pointed out by Moore (1983) is predicting and establishing cause-and-effect relationships among variables. This type of research is done only by manipulation of the independent variable with random assignment of subjects to treatment. The purpose of descriptive research is to determine what presently exists with regard to the problem or phenomenon. Moore (1983) points out that descriptive research attempts to portray accurately situations and events and, sometimes, to describe their interrelationship in the hope of obtaining useful information, often in order to plan subsequent experimental studies.

Survey research is one of the main types of descriptive research. Its purpose is to obtain information that describes the existing image of the community leaders by asking the leaders their perceptions, attitudes, behaviors, or values. Therefore, it is a self-report assessment. In this study, the independent

variable--the groups of Goals for Salina Committees, elected officials, and the Extension Program Development Committees--will be measured by the use of a survey to assess the dependent variables of awareness, use, satisfaction, and funding that make up the image.

#### Population

The population for this study consists of Saline County community leaders age 18 years and older. Three groups were selected, totaling 444 community leaders for sampling. The groups included: (1) those community leaders elected to public office by ballot n=69, (2) those community leaders participating in the Goals for Salina program n=340, (3) those community leaders who are now, and have been in the last two years, members of the Saline County Cooperative Extension Council, n=35. Those community leaders in public office or the Goals for Salina Program had varying contact with extension, while the Saline County Cooperative Extension Council had high contact with extension programs. These groups were selected because community leaders influence their followers and in turn the followers' ideas influence policy-makers who determine funding. If extension's image among community leaders is positive, it may indicate that extension has good communication and relations among community leaders. If the image is not positive, extension may need to work to improve com-

munication and relations. The elected officials and the program development committee groups have been selected by the democratic vote to be the best for the job. Those elected show they are concerned enough about their community to run for office and give of their time to better the community.

By selecting this group, there should be a greater return of the instrument because of their commitment to improving the community. The answers should reflect what respondents feel is good for the community and not just for themselves.

Adults age 18 years and older were selected to represent the adult sample population. Other studies, such as the national study by Warner and Christenson completed in 1984 and the Kansas study by Lindquist completed in 1986, were opinion surveys that obtained information about extension's image from adults 18 years old and older.

The sample size was determined using sample size techniques. Moore, 1983, recommended 9 to 50 for each subgroup, with a "cookbook" recommendation of 20 from each subgroup. In this study 30 were selected from the groups of Saline County elected officials and Saline County Cooperative Extension Council. To assure that the sample was large enough, 90 were selected from the Goals For Salina Group.

In order to obtain a random sample from each group, a table of random numbers was used (Moore 1983). This sampling resulted in a sample population of 150 who were mailed surveys.

#### Data Collection and Instruments

The data was collected by the use of a survey questionnaire. Included with the survey was a letter informing the population of the purpose of the survey and of the fact that responses would remain anonymous and confidential. The instrument was coded only to assure return and to allow for any necessary calls where more information was required. A mail survey was selected because it (1) allowed people to answer questions as they had time so that they could give the questions their full attention and (2) eliminated the need for interviewers necessary for a telephone survey.

The survey instrument used was developed from a telephone questionnaire used by Jim Lindquist, Riley County Extension Director, Kansas State Extension, and the extension marketing committee made up of county, area, and state staff to assist Kansas Extension image in 1986 (Lindquist 1987).

The first section of the survey dealt with demographic information of those surveyed and included questions on the following: (1) 4-H Club experience; (2) E. H. U. experience; (3) extension volunteer experience;

(4) children in the household; (5) sex; (6) age; (7) place of residence; (8) occupation; (9) level of education completed; (10) contact with extension in the past year.

The second section of the instrument was designed to determine the perception of Saline County from a set of extension program thrusts. This section consisted of 20 different program thrusts. These 20 were developed from a list of 50 that were written by extension directors for agriculture, 4-H and Youth, home economics, and community development to indicate important program subject matter possibilities of the next five to ten years. The 20 questions also contained the 13 program thrusts included in Warner and Christenson's (1984) national assessment study of the Cooperative Extension Service. These 20 questions were broken into six program areas for the purpose of analysis: (1) agriculture; (2) horticulture; (3) home economics; (4) community development; (5) 4-H youth development; and (6) energy.

The last four sections of the survey instrument were modified from the national survey instrument of Warner and Christenson (1984) in which questions were used to determine extension image. They include the sections on Awareness of Extension, Use of Extension, Satisfaction of Extension, and Funding the Cooperative

Extension Service. In the national study nonusers were excluded from answering questions relating to satisfaction and support but in this survey, as in the 1987 study done by Lindquist in Kansas, respondents answered all questions. The opinions of nonusers of extension in this study were assigned a 0 (zero) value for no opinion so their opinion, if given, would not bias the data. A modification from the national survey was the addition of questions about horticulture and energy. Horticulture was added as a separate program area because Saline County has had a separate horticulture agent for the past six years. Energy was added because the Kansas Energy Extension Service was started five years ago, and Saline County has used this service.

#### Statistical Analysis

The data collected from this study was analyzed using frequencies, percentages, and cumulative percentages. The hypotheses were analyzed using Chi-square tests, one way analysis of variance, and tests of association (Fry, 1986; Norusis, 1983). The material was treated and analyzed through the central computing facilities at Kansas State University. The data was reported using means, medians, and percentage. Variance is reported by the standard error which is the standard deviation, which gives the variance of individual answers, divided by the square root of the number in

each group. The standard error is giving the variance of the group on each individual questions.

#### Protection of Subjects Rights

The sample population in this study received no unreasonable stress, discomfort, risk, or invasion of privacy. All were informed that their participation was voluntary. The sample population identification and individual responses remained anonymous and confidential. The return envelope was coded to assure return of the questionnaire and was destroyed after the data was received. Only data from the group was reported. Approval to conduct the survey was obtained from the thesis advisory committee, extension directors, and the Saline County Extension Council Executive Board.



Chapter 4  
ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to evaluate Saline County community leaders' image of the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service by assessing their educational needs, awareness, use, satisfaction, and financial support for the Cooperative Extension Service. The responses were divided into seven categories: the Cooperative Extension Service in general, agriculture, horticulture, home economics, community development, 4-H youth, and energy.

Demographic data was collected to be used in answering the research questions and hypotheses of the study. The demographic variables collected were: (1) 4-H club experience; (2) Extension Homemaker Unit (EHU) experience; (3) extension volunteer experience; (4) children in the household; (5) sex; (6) age; (7) place of residence; (8) occupation; (9) education; and (10) number of extension contacts.

A mail survey was sent to 150 community leaders in Saline County. The population was randomly selected

from a total list of 444 who were from one of three groups: Goals for Salina committee, elected officials, and Extension Program Development committees.

On April 20, 1987, the survey was mailed with a return envelope to the 150 randomly selected subjects with an introduction letter addressed to one of each of the three groups. Two weeks later, the 75 subjects who had not responded were mailed a new introductory letter, another survey and a stamped return envelope. Those not responding in ten days were called to make sure they had received the survey and encouraged to return the survey. One hundred thirty-one responded by returning in the mail a completed survey, resulting in an 87% response.

This chapter presents the data and analysis of the 131 responses. This chapter is divided into (1) presentation of demographic data and (2) reporting and analysis of data to answer the specific objectives and hypothesis of the study.

#### Demographic Data

Demographic information was collected to determine the characteristics of the population and what effect it had on certain responses. This was collected in the first section, background information, of the survey.

Extension Program Experience. Respondents were asked if they or anyone in their family had ever been a 4-H club member, an Extension Homemaker Unit (EHU)

member, or an extension volunteer to determine the extent of their extension program experience. Table 1 gives the frequency distribution of this question by group.

Table 1  
Respondents Prior Extension Program Experience  
N = 131

Type of experience	No		Yes		Don't know		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<u>Goals for Salina</u>								
4-H Club member	38	49	40	51	0	0	78	100
EHU member	67	86	11	14	0	0	78	100
Extension Volunteer	59	77	16	21	3	2	78	100
<u>Elected Officials</u>								
4-H Club member	7	28	18	72	0	0	25	100
EHU Member	19	76	5	20	1	4	25	100
Extension Volunteer	16	64	7	28	2	8	25	100
<u>Program Development Committee</u>								
4-H Club Member	3	11	25	89	0	0	28	100
EHU Member	12	43	15	54	1	3	28	100
Extension Volunteer	6	21	20	72	2	7	28	100
<u>Total Respondents</u>								
4-H Club Member	48	37	83	63	0	0	131	100
EHU Member	98	75	31	24	2	1	131	100
Extension Volunteer	81	62	43	33	7	5	131	100

4-H club experience was claimed by 63% of the total respondents or family members with the program development committee having 89%. One third of all respondents said they or a member of their family had been an extension volunteer with the program development committee claiming 72% involvement. Of the total, 24% had reported extension homemaker experience with the program development committee having 54% participation.

Children in the Household. Respondents were asked if they had children under 18 years of age in their household. Responses are reported on Table 2.

TABLE 2  
RESPONDENTS WITH CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE  
N = 131

Group	No		Yes		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Goals for Salina	28	36	50	64	78	100
Elected Officials	11	44	14	56	25	100
Program Dev. Comm.	13	46	15	54	28	100
Total	52	40	79	60	131	100

Sixty percent of the population reported children, the Goals for Salina group with 64% and the other two groups with over 50% indicating they had children under the age of 18.

Sex. Question five asked the respondents if they were male or female. Table 3 displays the results.

TABLE 3  
RESPONDENTS SEX  
N = 131

GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Goals for Salina	52	67	26	33	78	100
Elected Officials	17	68	8	32	25	100
Program Dev. Committee	11	39	17	61	28	100
TOTAL	80	61	51	39	131	100

Of the respondents surveyed 61% were male and 39% female. Of the total population of community leaders used for this study, N=444, 60% were male and 40% were female. The program development committee respondents were 61% female and 39% males, which was almost opposite

of the Goals for Salina and Elected Officials groups.

Age. Survey respondents were asked to categorize their age into one of four groupings: 18-25, 26-45, 46-65, and 66 and over. Table 4 shows the results.

TABLE 4  
RESPONDENTS AGE  
N = 129

Group	18-25		26-45		46-65		66 and over		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Goals for Salina	1	1	53	69	17	22	6	8	77	100
Elected Officials	1	4	13	52	9	36	2	8	25	100
Program Dev. Comm.	0	0	14	52	10	37	3	11	27	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>100</b>

Of the total 131 surveyed, two did not respond. Of the 129 that did respond, only two were under the age of 26, and only eleven were 66 or older. The largest group was 26-45, with 62% of the respondents. The Goals for Salina group comprised the youngest members, and the program development committee comprised the oldest.

Place of Residence. Respondents were asked if they lived on a farm, in a rural area, in Salina, or in some other community. Table 5 shows the place of residence of the survey respondents.

TABLE 5  
RESPONDENTS PLACE OF RESIDENCE  
N = 131

Group	Farm		Rural Non-Farm		Salina		Other		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Goals for Salina	1	1	0	0	77	99	0	0	78	100
Elected Officials	3	12	11	44	3	12	8	32	25	100
Program Dev. Comm.	13	47	4	14	11	39	0	0	28	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>100</b>

Seventy percent of the respondents live in Salina, 13% on farms, 11% rural non-farm, and 6% in other communities. In the groups, 99% of the Goals for Salina respondents live in Salina. Among the elected officials, 44% live in the rural non-farm area, with 32% in other communities. The program development committee reported that 47% lived on farms, while 39% live in Salina. Salina's population accounts for 84% of Saline county population. Also 4% live on farms as reported by U.S. Bureau of the Census in 1980.

Occupation. The respondents were asked to mark their occupation as farm, farm and non-farm, or non-farm. The results are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6  
RESPONDENTS OCCUPATION  
N = 131

Group	Farm		Farm and Non-Farm		Non-Farm		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Goals for Salina	0	0	6	8	72	92	78	100
Elected Officials	0	0	5	20	20	80	25	100
Program Dev. Comm.	6	21	8	29	14	50	28	100
TOTAL	6	5	19	14	106	81	131	100

Only 5% of the 131 surveyed listed farming as their occupation, and only 14% were represented as farm and non-farm. Of the respondents, 81% listed their occupation as non-farm. The only group that listed farming as an occupation was the program development committee with 21%, and they also had the highest percentage at farm

and non-farm with 29%. All three groups' highest percentage of employment was non-farm with the Goals for Salina group at 92%, elected officials at 80%, and the program development committee at 50%. Saline county employment is mainly non-farm with only 4% farmers.

Education. Table 7 shows the results when respondents were asked to report their highest level of education.

TABLE 7  
RESPONDENTS EDUCATION  
N = 131

Group	Some High School		High School		Some Post-Secondary		College Graduate		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Goals for Salina	1	1	4	5	10	13	63	81	78	100
Elected Officials	0	0	6	24	11	44	8	32	25	100
Program Dev. Comm.	0	0	4	14	10	36	14	50	28	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>100</b>

Only one reported some high school, and only 11% had only a high school degree. The balance, 65%, were college graduates. The lowest educated group was the elected officials with only 32% with college degrees, whereas the Goals for Salina group had 81% college graduates, and the program development committee was at 50%.

Frequency of Use. The survey asked about frequency of use of extension programs in the past year; the respondents had five responses available: never, once or twice, every couple of months, every week or two, and

don't know. Since there was only one "don't know," it was included in with the never's. Table 8 shows the results.

TABLE 8  
RESPONDENTS FREQUENCY OF USE OF THE EXTENSION SERVICE IN THE  
PAST YEAR  
N = 131

Group	Never		Once or Twice		Every Couple of Months		Every Week or Two		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Goals for Salina	29	37	37	47	9	12	3	4	78	100
Elected Officials	9	36	10	40	3	12	3	12	25	100
Program Dev. Comm.	0	0	3	11	21	75	4	14	28	100
TOTAL	38	29	50	38	33	25	10	8	131	100

Two thirds of the respondents have used extension at least once the past year. Only one third said they had not used extension in the past year. Of the program development committee, 75% stated that they had used extension at least every couple of months. In the Goals for Salina group 47% had used extension at least once or twice, and the elected officials also had 40% in this category. The Goals for Salina and elected officials had over one third that had not used extension in this past year.

#### Need For Education By Extension Program Areas

Respondents were asked how great they felt their need was for educational information on selected program thrusts. They indicated their need by marking no need, slight need, moderate need, great need, or very great need. Table 9 displays the results of the need by



showing the mean score for the total group of community leaders and each group individually. The values used to calculate the mean scores were no need 0, slight need 1, moderate need 2, great need 3, and very great need 4.

Table 9 points out that from the total group only three educational needs were higher than a mean of three on a four-point scale. They were: development of youth, farm financial management, and marketing farm products. Other important areas were: family life, family financial management, efficient livestock production, efficient crop production, and human nutrition. In the groups, the Goals for Salina group listed development of youth first followed by marketing farm products, farm financial management, family financial management, and family life. The elected officials group had the lowest average mean score of 2.79 on marketing farm products, followed by farm financial management, development of youth, and family life. The program development committee had the highest average mean with five needs having mean scores greater than three. They are, in descending order, marketing farm products, farm financial management, efficient livestock production, and development of youth.

TABLE 9  
RESPONDENTS' NEED FOR EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION  
ON SELECTED PROGRAM THRUSTS

Program Thrusts	Total		Goals for salina				Elected Officials				POC	
	n <sup>a</sup>	SE of Mean <sup>e</sup>	b	Mean <sup>e</sup>	SE of Mean <sup>e</sup>	n <sup>c</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup>	SE of Mean <sup>e</sup>	n <sup>d</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup>	SE of Mean <sup>e</sup>	
Marketing Farm Products	130	3.08	78	3.05	.121	24	2.79	.240	28	3.39	.157	
Farm Financial Management	129	3.03	77	3.00	.121	24	2.75	.243	28	3.36	.147	
Development of Youth	130	3.02	78	3.06	.095	24	2.71	.204	28	3.18	.126	
Family Life	128	2.76	78	2.81	.106	23	2.61	.175	27	2.74	.174	
Family Financial Management	130	2.75	78	2.82	.094	24	2.38	.232	28	2.89	.188	
Efficient Livestock Production	130	2.69	78	2.59	.115	24	2.25	.202	28	3.36	.147	
Efficient Crop Production	130	2.68	78	2.60	.116	24	2.25	.211	28	3.25	.151	
Human Nutrition	128	2.65	77	2.69	.098	23	2.35	.214	28	2.79	.157	
Natural Resources and Environment	129	2.61	78	2.67	.094	23	2.35	.205	28	2.68	.166	
Health Care	130	2.60	78	2.62	.102	24	2.46	.225	28	2.68	.171	
Energy Conservation	130	2.55	78	2.68	.097	24	2.25	.173	28	2.46	.158	
Consumer Affairs	128	2.53	77	2.57	.100	23	2.09	.208	28	2.79	.130	
Economic Development	129	2.35	78	2.37	.108	23	2.35	.214	28	2.29	.162	
Community Leadership Development	129	2.33	78	2.37	.105	23	2.17	.205	28	2.32	.179	
Public Affairs Issues	129	2.33	77	2.26	.089	24	2.21	.225	28	2.61	.173	
Community Services and Facilities	129	2.29	78	2.32	.097	23	2.22	.226	28	2.25	.160	
Home Gardening and Lawn Care	130	2.24	78	2.15	.113	24	2.04	.175	28	2.64	.156	
Small Business Mgmt.	129	2.17	78	2.24	.099	23	1.96	.194	28	2.14	.197	
Housing	130	1.95	78	1.94	.095	24	1.88	.193	28	2.07	.144	
Clothing	128	1.95	77	1.82	.101	23	1.83	.174	28	2.43	.169	

Note a: Total possible  $\Delta$  = 131

b: Total possible  $\Delta$  = 78

c: Total possible  $\Delta$  = 25

d: Total possible  $\Delta$  = 28

e: Maximum Value = 4; 0=No Need, 1=Slight Need, 2=Moderate Need, 3=Great Need, 4=Very Great Need

### Awareness of Extension

The survey asked respondents how familiar they were with the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service and its programs. They indicated their awareness by marking not familiar, slightly familiar, or very familiar. The mean scores from the total group of community leaders and each group are reported in Table 10. The values used to calculate the mean scores were not familiar 0, slightly familiar 1, familiar 2, and very familiar 3.

In Table 10 the total community leaders' three top areas of awareness were 4-H, Cooperative Extension in general, and horticulture. The Goals for Salina group placed 4-H first, followed by Cooperative Extension in general, and Home Economics. The elected officials also had 4-H first, Cooperative Extension in general second, and Home Economics third. The program development committee differed, with Cooperative Extension in general first, home economics second, and agriculture third. The mean scores were highest for the program development committee, followed by elected officials, and then the Goals for Salina group.

### Use Of Extension

The respondents were asked if they or a member of their family had contacted an Extension Agent or used extension services. The first six questions concerned programs; the last four dealt with information sources.

TABLE 10  
RESPONDENTS' AWARENESS OF EXTENSION

Areas	n <sup>a</sup>	Total		Goals for Salina		Elected Officials		POC				
		Mean <sup>e</sup>	SE of Mean	n <sup>b</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup>	SE of Mean	n <sup>c</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup>	SE of Mean	n <sup>d</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup>	SE of Mean
4-H Youth	130	1.61	.083	78	1.46	-109	1.56	25	1.56	27	2.07	.176
Cooperative Extension	126	1.56	.082	76	1.21	.086	1.44	23	1.44	27	2.63	.095
Horticulture	130	1.54	.081	78	.87	.094	1.08	25	1.08	27	2.04	.164
Home Economics	131	1.26	.084	78	.92	.091	1.16	25	1.16	28	2.29	.162
Agriculture	129	1.17	.085	76	.84	.097	1.12	25	1.12	28	2.11	.157
Community Development	131	.79	.069	78	.58	.076	.68	25	.68	28	1.46	.166
Pride Program	131	.79	.068	78	.63	.084	1.08	25	1.08	28	.96	.131
Energy	131	.54	.058	78	.35	.060	.76	25	.76	28	.89	.139

Note a: Total possible n = 131

b: Total possible n = 78

c: Total possible n = 25

d: Total possible n = 28

e: Maximum Value = 3; 0=Not Familiar, 1=Slightly Familiar, 2=Familiar, 3=Very Familiar

Table 11 reports the percents of respondents that marked either yes, no, or don't know. The don't know's were combined with the no's because there were only five respondents who marked don't know.

The results in Table 11 point out that from the total of the community leader groups, the highest use was in the delivery methods of newspaper articles, followed by bulletins or newsletters, radio or TV, and public meeting. This same order was true in the other three groups except the program development committee, who rated newsletters as number one. In the area of extension programs, the total group marked horticulture first with 59%; followed by home economics, 45%; 4-H Youth, 44%; agriculture, 30%; energy, 18%; and community development, 12%. This pattern was the same for the Goals for Salina group. The elected officials put 4-H Youth first, followed by horticulture; the program development committee had horticulture first, followed by home economics, agriculture, and then 4-H Youth.

#### Satisfaction with Extension

In question 49 through 55 the respondents were asked how satisfied they were with the Saline County Cooperative Extension programs. The programs included Saline County Cooperative Extension in general, 4-H Youth, energy, home economics, horticulture, agriculture, and community development. They indicated their

TABLE 11  
RESPONDENTS USE OF EXTENSION

Area of Use	Total		Goals for Salina				Elected Officials				POC		
	No/Don't Know	Yes	No/Don't Know	Yes	n <sup>b</sup>	%	No/Don't Know	Yes	n <sup>c</sup>	%	No/Don't Know	Yes	%
<u>Extension Programs</u>													
Horticulture	131	41	59	78	47	53	25	56	44	28	11	89	
Home Economics	128	55	45	76	64	36	25	60	40	27	22	78	
4-H Youth	130	56	44	77	62	38	25	52	48	28	43	57	
Agriculture	131	70	30	78	82	18	25	72	28	28	32	68	
Energy	131	82	18	78	86	14	25	80	20	28	71	29	
Community Development	130	88	12	77	91	9	25	92	8	28	75	25	
<u>Delivery Methods</u>													
Newspaper Articles	130	15	85	78	18	82	25	16	84	27	4	96	
Bulletins or Newsletters	131	18	82	78	23	77	25	20	80	28	0	100	
Radio or T.V.	131	30	70	78	36	64	25	28	72	28	14	86	
Public Meetings	131	56	44	78	72	28	25	64	36	28	4	96	

Note a: Total possible  $\bar{n}$  = 131

b: Total possible  $\bar{n}$  = 78

c: Total possible  $\bar{n}$  = 25

d: Total possible  $\bar{n}$  = 28

satisfaction by marking very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, no opinion, satisfied, or very satisfied. Those that gave an opinion that were nonusers as indicated in questions 39 through 48 were marked as no opinion or 0 when results were calculated.

The results are reported in three tables. Table 12 gives the percentage of response on each question by groups and the total of the groups. The response of no opinion was the one used most with 36% on cooperative extension in general to 82% on energy. On the other side 64% did give an opinion about Cooperative Extension in general, 63% on 4-H and Youth, 53% on horticulture, 44% on home economics, 37% on agriculture, 20% on community development, and just 18% on energy. Only one question within the satisfaction group of questions received 100% response, that being Cooperative Extension in general in the program development group.

Table 13 displays the total of the scores in a mean score, the median score and the standard error of the mean for each group and the total group. The values used to calculate the mean scores were no opinion 0, very dissatisfied 1, dissatisfied 2, satisfied 3, and very satisfied 4. The high number of no opinion lowers the mean value. The table shows that the total of the community leaders groups were most satisfied with Saline County Cooperative Extension in general, followed by 4-

TABLE 12

## RESPONDENTS' SATISFACTION OF EXTENSION BY PERCENTAGES

Areas	VERY DISSATISFIED		DISSATISFIED		SATISFIED		VERY SATISFIED		NO OPINION		TOTAL RESPONSES	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Goals for Salina N = 78												
Cooperative Extension	0	0	0	0	24	31	16	21	37	48	77	100
4-H Youth	0	0	0	0	31	40	15	19	32	41	78	100
Energy	0	0	0	0	8	10	1	1	69	88	78	100
Home Economics	0	0	0	0	20	26	7	9	50	65	77	100
Horticulture	0	0	0	0	20	26	12	15	46	59	78	100
Agriculture	1	1	0	0	13	17	4	5	60	77	78	100
Community Development	0	0	0	0	5	6	2	3	71	91	78	100
Elected Officials N = 25												
Cooperative Extension	0	0	0	0	14	56	1	4	10	40	25	100
4-H Youth	0	0	1	4	12	48	4	16	8	32	25	100
Energy	0	0	1	4	4	16	0	0	20	80	25	100
Home Economics	0	0	0	0	7	28	1	4	17	68	25	100
Horticulture	0	0	1	4	9	36	2	8	13	52	25	100
Agriculture	0	0	1	4	7	28	1	4	16	64	25	100
Community Development	1	4	0	0	2	8	1	4	21	84	25	100
Program Development Committee N = 28												
Cooperative Extension	0	0	0	0	8	29	20	71	0	0	28	100
4-H Youth	0	0	0	0	8	29	11	39	9	32	28	100
Energy	0	0	0	0	8	29	2	7	18	64	28	100
Home Economics	0	0	0	0	5	18	17	61	6	21	28	100
Horticulture	0	0	0	0	13	46	13	46	2	7	28	100
Agriculture	0	0	0	0	6	21	16	57	6	21	28	100
Community Development	0	0	0	0	9	33	6	22	12	45	28	100
Total Respondents N = 131												
Cooperative Extension	0	0	0	0	46	35	37	29	47	36	130	100
4-H Youth	0	0	1	1	51	39	30	23	49	37	131	100
Energy	0	0	1	1	20	15	3	2	107	82	131	100
Home Economics	0	0	0	0	32	25	25	19	73	56	130	100
Horticulture	0	0	1	1	42	32	27	21	61	47	131	100
Agriculture	1	1	1	1	26	20	21	16	82	63	131	100
Community Development	1	1	0	0	16	12	9	7	104	80	130	100



TABLE 13  
RESPONDENTS SATISFACTION OF EXTENSION

AREAS	TOTAL			GOALS FOR SALINA			ELECTED OFFICIALS			POC		
	n <sup>a</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup>	SE of Med. <sup>f</sup> Mean	n <sup>b</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup>	SE of Med. <sup>f</sup> Mean	n <sup>c</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup>	SE of Med. <sup>f</sup> Mean	n <sup>d</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup>	SE of Med. <sup>f</sup> Mean
Cooperative Extension	130	2.20	.150	77	1.77	.199	25	1.84	.309	28	3.71	.087
4-H Youth	131	2.10	.146	78	1.96	.191	25	2.16	.314	28	2.43	.331
Horticulture	131	1.80	.151	78	1.38	.192	25	1.48	.322	28	3.25	.197
Home Economics	130	1.51	.153	77	1.59	.181	25	1.00	.300	28	2.96	.306
Agriculture	131	1.26	.147	78	1.36	.154	25	1.08	.300	28	2.93	.304
Community Development	130	.65	.117	78	.95	.108	25	.44	.224	27	1.89	.339
Energy	131	-.56	.106	78	-.36	.114	25	-.56	.231	28	1.14	.299

Note a: Total possible  $\bar{x}$  = 131

b: Total possible  $\bar{x}$  = 78

c: Total possible  $\bar{x}$  = 25

d: Total possible  $\bar{x}$  = 28

e: Maximum Value = 4

f: 0=No Opinion, 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Satisfied, 4=Very Satisfied

H Youth, horticulture, home economics, agriculture, community development, and energy. In the individual groups the Goals for Salina group rated 4-H Youth top, followed by Extension, horticulture, home economics, agriculture, community development, and energy. The elected officials rated 4-H Youth the highest, followed by Extension, horticulture, agriculture, home economics, energy, and community development. In the program development committee, number one was extension, followed by horticulture, home economics, agriculture, 4-H Youth, community development, and energy.

Table 14 gives the results with the no opinions removed. The number responding on some of the questions are small. The mean value for the total of the community leader groups all were three or higher, falling between satisfied and very satisfied. The only time they fell below three was in the elected officials' group on the items of community development and energy.

#### Funding The Cooperative Extension Service

The last section of questions on the survey, 56 through 62, asked about the amount of funds that should be spent in the program areas. The programs areas included Saline County Cooperative Extension in general, agriculture, energy, horticulture, 4-H Youth, home economics, and community development. The respondents indicated the level of funding by marking greatly

TABLE 14  
RESPONDENTS WITH AN OPINION ON SATISFACTION OF EXTENSION

Areas	TOTAL		GOALS FOR SALINA		ELECTED OFFICIALS		PDC	
	n <sup>a</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup> Median <sup>f</sup>	n <sup>b</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup> Median <sup>f</sup>	n <sup>c</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup> Median <sup>f</sup>	n <sup>d</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup> Median <sup>f</sup>
Cooperative Extension	83	3.45	40	3.40	15	3.07	28	3.71
Home Economics	57	3.44	27	3.26	8	3.12	22	3.77
Horticulture	70	3.37	32	3.38	12	3.08	26	3.50
Agriculture	49	3.37	18	3.11	9	3.00	22	3.73
4-H Youth	82	3.35	46	3.33	17	3.18	19	3.58
Community Development	26	3.27	7	3.29	4	2.75	15	3.40
ENERGY	24	3.08	9	3.11	5	2.80	10	3.20

Note a: Total possible  $\square = 131$

b: Total possible  $\square = 78$

c: Total possible  $\square = 25$

d: Total possible  $\square = 28$

e: Maximum Value = 4

f: 0=No Opinion, 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Satisfied, 4=Very Satisfied

decreasing, slightly decreasing, stay the same, slightly increasing, greatly increasing, or no opinion. Again those that gave an opinion that indicated they were nonusers in questions 39 through 48 were marked as no opinion or 0 when results were calculated.

The funding results are also reported in three tables. Table 15 gives the percentage of responses on each question by groups and the total of the groups. The response of no opinion varied from 34% on cooperative extension to 70% on energy. Sixty-six percent responded on Cooperative Extension in general, 64% on 4-H and youth, 54% on horticulture, 51% on home economics, 49% on agriculture, 39% on community development, and 30% on energy. This was the same order as in satisfaction but more opinions were given in the funding area.

Table 16 displays the total of the scores averaged in the mean score for each group and the total group relating to funding of extension. The values used to calculate the mean scores were no opinion 0, greatly decreasing 1, slightly decreasing 2, stay the same 3, slightly increasing 4, and greatly increasing 5. The high number of no opinions lowers the mean score. The results in Table 16 show that the total of the community leaders' group ranked funding with extension in general first, followed by 4-H, agriculture, horticulture, home economics, community development, and energy. The Goals

TABLE 15

## RESPONDENTS OPINION ON FUNDING OF EXTENSION BY PERCENTAGE

Areas	Greatly Decreasing		Slightly Decreasing		Stay the Same		Slightly Increasing		Greatly Increasing		No Opinion		Total Respondents	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Goals for Salina N = 78														
Cooperative Extension	1	1	1	1	15	20	24	32	3	4	32	42	76	100
Agriculture	0	0	0	0	11	14	15	19	3	4	49	63	78	100
Energy	0	0	0	0	8	10	7	9	1	1	62	80	78	100
Horticulture	1	1	1	1	15	19	16	21	0	0	45	58	78	100
4-H Youth	2	3	0	0	15	19	17	22	8	10	36	46	78	100
Home Economics	1	1	1	1	18	23	12	16	0	0	46	59	78	100
Community Development	0	0	3	4	9	12	9	12	2	3	54	69	78	100
Elected Officials N = 25														
Cooperative Extension	1	4	0	0	4	16	6	24	3	12	11	44	25	100
Agriculture	1	4	1	4	4	16	1	4	2	8	16	64	25	100
Energy	0	0	2	8	1	4	1	4	2	8	19	76	25	100
Horticulture	1	4	2	8	5	20	2	8	1	4	14	56	25	100
4-H Youth	0	0	1	4	4	16	9	36	2	8	9	36	25	100
Home Economics	0	0	2	8	5	20	1	4	2	8	15	60	25	100
Community Development	0	0	1	4	1	20	3	12	2	8	18	72	25	100
Program Development Committee N = 28														
Cooperative Extension	0	0	0	0	8	29	16	57	3	11	1	4	28	100
Agriculture	0	0	1	4	7	25	17	61	1	4	2	7	28	100
Energy	0	0	1	4	14	50	2	7	0	0	11	39	28	100
Horticulture	0	0	1	4	14	50	11	39	0	0	2	7	28	100
4-H Youth	0	0	0	0	11	39	12	43	3	11	2	7	28	100
Home Economics	0	0	1	4	10	36	13	46	1	4	3	11	28	100
Community Development	0	0	3	11	10	36	7	25	0	0	8	29	28	100
Total Respondents N = 131														
Cooperative Extension	2	2	1	1	27	21	46	35	9	7	44	34	129	100
Agriculture	1	1	2	2	22	17	33	25	6	4	67	51	131	100
Energy	0	0	3	2	23	18	10	8	3	2	92	70	131	100
Horticulture	2	2	4	3	34	26	29	22	1	1	61	46	131	100
4-H Youth	2	2	1	1	30	23	38	29	13	10	47	36	131	100
Home Economics	1	1	4	3	33	25	26	20	3	2	64	49	131	100
Community Development	0	0	7	5	21	16	19	15	4	3	80	61	131	100

TABLE 16  
RESPONDENTS OPINION ON FUNDING OF EXTENSION

Areas	TOTAL			GOALS FOR SALINA			ELECTED OFFICIALS			POC		
	n <sup>a</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup>	SE of Mean <sup>f</sup>	n <sup>b</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup>	SE of Mean <sup>f</sup>	n <sup>c</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup>	SE of Mean <sup>f</sup>	n <sup>d</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup>	SE of Mean <sup>f</sup>
Cooperative Extension	129	2.43	3	76	2.09	3	25	2.08	3	28	3.68	4
4-H Youth	131	2.37	3	78	1.99	3	25	2.40	3	28	3.43	4
Agriculture	131	1.78	0	78	1.38	0	25	1.16	0	28	3.43	4
Horticulture	131	1.78	2	78	1.44	0	25	1.32	0	28	3.14	3
Home Economics	131	1.73	2	78	1.35	0	25	1.32	0	28	3.18	3.5
Community Development	131	1.32	0	78	1.05	0	25	1.08	0	28	2.29	3
Energy	131	.99	0	78	.73	0	25	.84	0	28	1.86	3

Note: a: Total possible  $\square = 131$   
 b: Total possible  $\square = 78$   
 c: Total possible  $\square = 25$   
 d: Total possible  $\square = 28$   
 e: Maximum Value = 5  
 f: 0=No Opinion, 1=Greatly Decrease, 2=Slightly Decrease, 3=Stay the Same, 4=Slightly Increase, 5=Greatly Increase

for Salina group had the same ranking. The elected officials group started with 4-H, followed by extension in general, horticulture, home economics, agriculture, community development, and energy. The program development committee had the highest mean scores and ranked the programs as follows: extension in general, 4-H, agriculture, home economics, horticulture, community development, and energy.

Table 17 gives the results with the no opinions removed. Again, the number responding on some of the questions is small. The mean value in all three groups and the total of the groups were three or higher falling between "stay the same" and "slightly increasing".

#### Hypothesis Testing

Two of the hypotheses looked at how image was affected by use and awareness. A third one looked at funding in relation to use. The fourth dealt with which programs people were most aware of.

The four hypotheses or research questions were:

H<sub>1</sub> The higher the use of extension by community leaders, the more positive the image of extension will be.

H<sub>2</sub> The more knowledge of extension programs by community leaders, the more positive the image of extension will be.

TABLE 17  
RESPONDENTS WITH AN OPINION ON FUNDING OF EXTENSION

Areas	TOTAL			GOALS FOR SALTINA			ELECTED OFFICIALS			PDC		
	n <sup>a</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup>	Med. <sup>f</sup>	n <sup>b</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup>	Med. <sup>f</sup>	n <sup>c</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup>	Med. <sup>f</sup>	n <sup>d</sup>	Mean <sup>e</sup>	Med. <sup>f</sup>
4-H Youth	84	3.70	4	42	3.69	4	16	3.75	4	26	3.69	4
Cooperative Extension	85	3.69	4	44	3.61	4	14	3.71	4	27	3.81	4
Agriculture	64	3.64	4	29	3.72	4	9	3.22	3	26	3.69	4
Home Economics	67	3.39	3	32	3.28	3	10	3.30	3	25	3.56	4
Community Development	51	3.39	3	24	3.42	3	7	3.86	4	20	3.20	3
Horticulture	70	3.33	3	33	3.39	3	11	3.00	3	26	3.69	4
ENERGY	39	3.26	3	16	3.56	3.5	6	3.50	3.5	17	3.06	3

Note a: Total possible  $\square = 131$

b: Total possible  $\square = 78$

c: Total possible  $\square = 25$

d: Total possible  $\square = 28$

e: Maximum Value = 5

f: 0=No Opinion, 1=Greatly Decrease, 2=Slightly Decrease, 3=Stay the Same, 4=Slightly Increase, 5=Greatly Increase



H<sub>3</sub> Community leaders will be significantly more aware of 4-H than extension programs in agriculture, home economics and horticulture.

H<sub>4</sub> The higher the participation of community leaders in extension programs the more support they will have for funding at the same level or higher.

This section will discuss hypotheses one, two, and four together. Hypothesis three will be discussed later. In order to determine the image of extension, which includes awareness, use, satisfaction, and funding, correlation coefficients were calculated. The mean for each area was computed by adding all the mean scores from questions in each area together: awareness, questions 31 through 38; use, questions 39 through 48; satisfaction, questions 49 through 55; and funding, questions 56 through 62. Correlations of the variables were calculated for each group and the total of the groups. The closer the correlation coefficient is to a value of one the more positive the correlation. The education section was computed, but there were no significant differences, so those results were not reported. Table 18 shows the correlation results of the Goals for Salina group.

TABLE 18  
GOALS FOR SALINA CORRELATION OF AWARENESS, USE, SATISFACTION,  
AND FUNDING OF EXTENSION  
[Correlation Coefficients/Number of Observations (n)]

Area	Awareness	Use	Satisfaction	Funding
Awareness	----	.680	.775	.676
	74	72	72	72
Use		----	.749	.637
		76	74	74
Satisfaction			----	.717
			76	74
Funding				----
				76

Table 18 shows awareness, use, satisfaction, and funding all had strongly positive correlation.

The results from the correlation test on the elected officials' group are listed in Table 19.

TABLE 19  
ELECTED OFFICIALS CORRELATION OF AWARENESS, USE,  
SATISFACTION, AND FUNDING OF EXTENSION  
[Correlation Coefficients/Number of Observations (n)]

Area	Awareness	Use	Satisfaction	Funding
Awareness	----	.522	.468	.439
	23	23	23	23
Use		----	.724	.632
		25	25	25
Satisfaction			----	.564
			25	25
Funding				----
				25

In Table 19 the results for the elected officials show that awareness, use, satisfaction, and funding were positively correlated. Elected officials also had to be more than just aware of a program to be satisfied and willing to fund it.

The program development committee was reported in Table 20.

TABLE 20  
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE CORRELATION OF AWARENESS, USE,  
SATISFACTION, AND FUNDING OF EXTENSION  
[Correlation Coefficients/Number of Observations (n)]

Area	Awareness	Use	Satisfaction	Funding
Awareness	----	.503	.804	.575
	26	25	25	26
Use		----	.325	.365
		26	25	26
Satisfaction			----	.680
			27	27
Funding				----
				28

The program development committee results in Table 20 show that awareness was more strongly correlated to satisfaction than the results of any other groups.

In Table 21 the three groups of community leaders are reported together.

TABLE 21  
COMMUNITY LEADERS CORRELATION OF AWARENESS, USE,  
SATISFACTION, AND FUNDING OF EXTENSION  
[Correlation Coefficients/Number of Observations (n)]

Area	Awareness	Use	Satisfaction	Funding
Awareness	----	.731	.811	.694
	123	120	120	121
Use		----	.772	.701
		127	124	125
Satisfaction			----	.747
			128	126
Funding				----

From the total community leaders list in Table 21 the results show strong positive correlation among all areas.

To discover if there was statistically significant differences between the areas of awareness, use, satisfaction, and funding among the three groups, an analysis of variance or ANOVA test was run. Table 22 shows the results for awareness.

TABLE 22  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE FOR AWARENESS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	P Value
Within Groups	2	1152.36	576.18	33.57	.0001*
Between Groups	120	2059.70	17.16		
Corrected Total	122	3212.06			

Note \*  $p \leq .05$  significantly different

From Table 22 there was a statistically significant difference among the three groups in awareness.

The results for use and the groups are shown in Table 23.

TABLE 23  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE FOR USE

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	P Value
Within Groups	2	404.20	202.10	24.83	.0001*
Between Groups	124	900.47	7.26		
Corrected Total	126	1304.67			

Note \*  $p \leq .05$  significantly different

Table 23 shows that there was a statistically significant difference among the three groups in the area of use.

In Table 24 the area of satisfaction is compared among all three groups.

TABLE 24  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE FOR SATISFACTION

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	P Value
Within Groups	2	2398.63	1199.31	24.47	.0001*
Between Groups	125	6125.25	49.00		
Corrected Total	127	8523.88			

Note \*  $p \leq .05$  significantly different

The results from Table 24 show a statistically significant difference among the three groups in the satisfaction area.

The funding area is compared among the three groups in Table 25.

TABLE 25  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE FOR FUNDING

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	P Value
Within Groups	2	2718.65	1359.33	16.31	.0001*
Between Groups	126	10499.74	83.33		
Corrected Total	128	13218.39			

Note \*  $p \leq .05$  significantly different

Table 25 results show that there is also a statistically significant difference among the three groups in the funding area.

In order to discover where the differences were among the groups in each of the areas, a comparison of least squares means was made for each of the groups in each area. The results of the test are shown in Table 26.

TABLE 26  
LEAST SQUARES MEANS OF AWARENESS, USE, SATISFACTION,  
AND FUNDING FOR EXTENSION  
[Least Squares Mean/Standard Error of Least Squares Mean]

<u>Community Leaders</u>	<u>Awareness</u>	<u>Use</u>	<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Funding</u>
Goals for Salina	6.84 <sup>a</sup> (.48)	5.72 <sup>a</sup> (.31)	7.55 <sup>a</sup> (.80)	9.76 <sup>a</sup> (1.05)
Elected Officials	8.82 <sup>b</sup> (.86)	6.44 <sup>a</sup> (.54)	8.56 <sup>a</sup> (1.40)	10.20 <sup>a</sup> (1.83)
Program Dev. Comm.	14.57 <sup>c</sup> (.81)	10.27 <sup>b</sup> (.53)	18.37 <sup>b</sup> (1.35)	21.00 <sup>b</sup> (1.72)

Note: a, b, c, means in columns with different superscripts are significantly different ( $p \leq .05$ )

In the area of awareness in Table 26 there was a statistically significant difference among all three groups. The table also shows the mean score was lowest for the Goals for Salina group, 6.84; followed by the elected officials, 8.82; and highest for the program development committee, 14.57. There was not a statistically significant difference in use between the Goals for Salina group and the elected officials, whose mean scores ran 5.72 and 6.44 respectively, but there was a statistically significant difference between those two and the program development committee, with a mean score of 10.27. The same was true in the area of satisfac-

tion. No statistically significant difference was found for satisfaction between the Goals for Salina, with a mean score of 7.55 and the mean score of elected officials at 8.56, but there was a statistically significant difference for the program development committee at 18.37, as compared to the other two groups. The funding issue was also the same. The Goals for Salina score at 9.76 and the elected officials at 10.20 were not significantly different, but again there was a statistically significant difference between the program development committee and the other two groups with a mean score of 21.00 for the program development committee.

The hypotheses will be considered one at a time. Hypothesis #1: The higher the use of extension by community leaders, the more positive the image of extension is supported. The correlation Table 21 shows that use has a positive correlation with all other areas that relate to the image of extension. Hypothesis #2: The more knowledge of extension programs by community leaders, the more positive the image of extension will be. This hypothesis is also supported by the correlation Table 21, by the positive coefficients of use, satisfaction and funding to awareness. Hypothesis #4: The higher the participation of community leaders in extension programs the more support will be for funding at

the same level or higher. This hypothesis is not as clear because a third of those surveyed had no opinion, but, as the correlation Table 21 points out, funding was positive in comparison to use of extension.

The 4-H issue of hypothesis #3 is determined by conducting a paired t-test that compared the 4-H program to agriculture, home economics and horticulture. These programs were used because they all have agents assigned to them. The 4-H related questions were added together to create the 4-H mean. They were questions 37 in the awareness section, 40 in the use section, 50 in the satisfaction section, and 60 in the funding section. The comparable question relating to agriculture, home economics, and horticulture were added from each section, divided by three and added to create the mean for the other programs. The results are shown in Table 27.

TABLE 27  
PAIRED T-TEST COMPARING 4-H TO AGRICULTURE,  
HOME ECONOMICS AND HORTICULTURE

Group	Mean Difference*	Standard Error of Mean	P Value
Goals for Salina	1.84	(.34)	.0001**
Elected Officials	2.15	(.51)	.0003**
P.D.C.	-.79	(.60)	.2016
Total Groups	1.33	(.28)	.0001**

Note \* 4-H - [(Agriculture + Home Economics + Horticulture)/3]

\*\* Significant difference in responses ( $p \leq .05$ )



Table 27 results show that community leaders were significantly more aware of 4-H than the other programs. This awareness was also true in the individual groups of Goals for Salina and the elected officials. The program development committee's awareness of 4-H was not significantly different from their awareness of the other programs of agriculture, home economics, and horticulture.

Therefore, hypothesis #3: community leaders will be significantly more aware of 4-H than extension programs in agriculture, home economics, and horticulture is supported.

## Chapter 5

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The study was conducted to discover what image Saline County community leaders have of the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service and their opinions on educational needs. As stated in Chapter 3, 150 community leaders were randomly surveyed from a total population of 444 that came from three different groups. The groups were the members of the Goals for Salina program, Saline County elected officials, and the program development committee of the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service. The survey was mailed in late April of 1987. The following paragraphs summarize the findings of the study.

Education. One of the objectives of the study was to find out how community leaders prioritize educational needs. Twenty program thrusts were listed for leaders to mark their level of need. A mean score was calculated from this survey with a maximum value of four. Only two did not have a mean score of two or higher.

Three had a mean score of three or higher. These areas were: marketing farm products 3.08, farm financial management 3.03, and development of youth 3.02. This result was despite the fact that 70% lived in Salina and only 19% had farm and/or farm and non-farm occupation. Of the population, 60% had children at home under 18 years of age, a fact which may explain why emphasis on or awareness of youth was so high. The next highest was family life, with a mean score of 2.76, and family financial management at 2.75. There was no statistically significant difference among the total mean scores of the different groups of leaders.

Awareness. In the area of awareness of extension those surveyed were asked how familiar they were with the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service and its programs. The programs were agriculture, home economics, horticulture, 4-H, community development, pride program, and energy. A mean score was calculated from the four choices and their values of not familiar 1, slightly familiar 1, familiar 2, and very familiar 3. The highest awareness for the community leaders was 4-H at 1.61, extension in general at 1.56, and horticulture at 1.54. The lowest was energy at .54. There was a statistically significant difference among the groups on their total means score. The Goals for Salina group was lowest at 6.84, followed by the elected officials at

8.82, but the highest awareness was in the program development committee at 14.57, which was statistically significantly different from the others.

Use. The community leaders were also asked about their use of extension by marking no, yes, or don't know. In the area of information, sources showed that 85% of the community leaders read articles, 82% read newsletters or bulletins, 70% listened to radio or watched T.V., and 44% attend public meetings. The horticulture program had been used by 59%, home economics 45%, 4-H 44%, and agriculture 30%. There was a significant difference in use between the program development committee, which was highest, and the other two groups.

Satisfaction. Respondents were next asked to rate their satisfaction with extension in general and its programs by marking either very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, no opinion, satisfied, or very satisfied. The community leaders were most satisfied with extension in general at 2.20, followed by 4-H at 2.10 and horticulture at 1.80. When those with no opinion were removed, the values increased. The top five then were 3.45 for extension in general, 3.44 for home economics, 3.37 for horticulture and agriculture, and 3.35 for 4-H and youth. Among groups there was no statistically significant difference between the Goals for Salina group

and elected officials, but there was statistically significant difference between the program development committee and the other two groups.

Funding. Respondents were asked about funding of extension which they indicated by marking either greatly decrease, slightly decrease, stay the same, slightly increase, greatly increase, or no opinion. Over one third chose no opinion. The community leaders supported funding of extension in general most strongly at 2.43, followed by 4-H at 2.37, agriculture and horticulture at 1.78, home economics at 1.73, community development at 1.32, and energy at .99. When the no opinion respondents were removed, the values raised to 3.70 for 4-H, 3.69 for extension general, 3.64 for agriculture, 3.39 for home economics and community development, 3.33 for horticulture and 3.26 for energy. Among groups the funding issue was not statistically significant between the Goals for Salina group and the elected officials. There was statistically significant difference between the program development committee and the other two groups.

Hypothesis. Hypothesis #1 stated that the higher the use of programs, the more positive the image would be. This hypothesis was supported by a correlation test that compared the areas of awareness, use, satisfaction, and funding together. Use of extension was positively

correlated to all other areas, all of which relate to make up extension's image.

Hypothesis #2 stated that the more knowledge of extension programs reported by respondents, the more positive their image of extension. This hypothesis, too, was supported by the correlation test that showed awareness was positive in its correlation to all the other areas.

Hypothesis #3 stated that community leaders would be significantly more aware of 4-H than the other extension programs in agriculture, home economics, and horticulture. This hypothesis was supported by a T-test that compared 4-H to the other programs by adding up all the questions dealing with 4-H and the other areas. The total group of community leaders, the Goals for Salina group, and the elected officials were significantly aware of 4-H. Only the program development committee was not, because they were highly aware of all areas.

Hypothesis #4 stated that the higher the participation of community leaders in extension programs, the more they would support funding. This hypothesis was also supported by the correlation test that showed funding was positive in comparison to use.

### Conclusions

Based on the results of statistical analysis and subsequent interpretations of the data collected from

those responding to this study of community leaders in Saline County, the following conclusions were formulated by the researcher:

1. Educational Needs.

a. There was at least a moderate need for educational information in all 20 of the Extension program thrusts. Only two were not in the "great" area by .05 of a point. Three were classified as "very great" need, those being marketing farm products, farm financial management, and development of youth.

b. There was no statistically significant difference among groups on how they scored educational needs.

2. Awareness of Extension.

a. There are differences in awareness of various extension programs, with 4-H being the most widely known, followed closely by Cooperative Extension in general and horticulture.

b. There was significant difference in awareness among the groups, with the program development committee being most aware because of their work with the extension agent to develop the programs.

c. People must be aware of the programs to use them and be satisfied, as found by the correlation test. Awareness did not greatly affect their responses towards funding.

### 3. Use of Extension.

a. In frequency of use, 71% said they had used the service of extension in the past year, but, when asked how many had read articles written by extension personnel, 85% said they had. Some respondents may not consider themselves users if they receive information by media.

b. There are differences in the use of extension programs with 59% using horticulture, 45% home economics, 44% 4-H, and 30% using agriculture.

c. Among the groups the program development committee indicated they used extension significantly more than the other two groups. This may be because they work with agents directly on planning, but they are also the most aware group.

d. Use was highly correlated with awareness and satisfaction and had a positive correlation with funding.

e. The highest use was in the media area with 85% for articles, 70% for radio and T.V., 82% for bulletins or newsletters.

### 4. Satisfaction of Extension.

a. Half of all surveyed had no opinion on satisfaction, but of those that did, people were most satisfied with extension in general, followed by 4-H, horticulture, home economics, and agriculture.



b. Satisfaction was highly correlated with awareness, use, and funding.

c. The program development committee was significantly more satisfied with extension than the other two groups, but they were also the most aware and the highest users.

#### 5. Funding The Cooperative Extension Service.

a. More people are willing to give an opinion on funding than on satisfaction.

b. The difference in funding among programs was small. The highest support was for extension in general, followed by 4-H, agriculture, horticulture, and home economics.

c. Funding had a positive correlation to awareness, use, and satisfaction. But satisfaction was first, followed by use, indicating people must use the programs and be satisfied to support them.

d. Among groups the program development committee was more willing to fund extension at a higher level than the other two groups. They were also the most aware group, highest users, and the most satisfied group with extension and its programs.

#### 6. Program Awareness to 4-H.

a. People were most aware of 4-H in comparison to agriculture, home economics, and horticulture.

b. In the groups, this awareness was true of the Goals for Salina and elected officials, but the program development committee was highly aware of all areas.

Recommendations.

Based on the data collected and analyzed in this study and the conclusions resulting from that information, the following recommendations are made for Saline County Extension Service and further research:

1. The planners of the Saline County Extension Service should look at those perceived educational needs with the highest mean scores, some of which are: marketing farm products, farm financial management, development of youth, family life, and family financial management.

2. Because people must use extension to be satisfied, and satisfied with extension to support funding, it is then important to make sure users are aware of the source of information and that quality work is done so people are satisfied.

3. Agents must use media and use it well, because such a high percentage of the public read extension articles, newsletters, bulletins, and listen to the radio and watch T.V.

4. To increase funding for extension, more people must be made aware of the programs, use the programs, and be satisfied with what they receive. Positive

support for funding should be enhanced by increased marketing of extension programs.

5. More detailed analysis of educational needs is necessary to target more adequately and reach currently underserved audiences.

6. Agents should make certain that people identify them as employees of Kansas State University and Saline County Extension Service.

7. Research is needed to determine the effectiveness of mass media in promoting the use of extension programs.

8. Further research is needed to determine the most effective delivery methods for specific extension audiences.

9. Research should be undertaken to determine the program features which result in high user satisfaction.

10. Research is needed to see if those participating on the program development committee in past years have continued their support of the Cooperative Extension Service.

11. Agents should involve more people in the program development area so they become more actively involved and feel a part of the program.

## REFERENCES

- Bergman, Michael F., 1982, "Impact of a Planned Public Relations Program by the Cooperative Extension Service in Muskogee County, Oklahoma". A PhD dissertation, Oklahoma State University.
- Blackburn, Donald J., 1984, Extension Handbook. Canada: University of Guelph.
- Carlson, John E., 1985, "The Present and Future Role of Cooperative Extension in Idaho", Bulletin No. 645. University of Idaho: Cooperative Extension Service.
- Cosner, Barney L., and James P. Key., 1981, "Does the Public Know?" Journal of Extension, November/December, pp.19-23.
- Cosner, Barney L., and C. Wesley Holley, Thomas E. Randle, Eddy Finley, and James P. Key., 1979, "The Awareness of the General Public of Oklahoma of the Instruction, Extension and Research Components of the Division of Agriculture and Oklahoma State University". A survey summary report. Oklahoma State University.
- Donohue, G. A., C. N. Olien and G.C. Sponaugle., 1983, "Citizens' Views of the Minnesota Agricultural Extension Service". A Summary Report. University of Minnesota: Cooperative Extension Service.
- Dorow, Norbert A., 1984, "Farm and Home Survey on Cooperative Extension Service Programs for Review of Role and Function of Extension Field Staff". A report, March, 1984. North Dakota State University: Cooperative Extension Service.
- Fry, J., 1986, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences-Extended (computer program). Chicago: SPSS Incorporated.
- Jennings, Jo Lynn., 1983, "Arkansas Residents' Perception of the Arkansas Cooperative Extension Service". A PhD dissertation, University of Arkansas.
- Joint USDA - NASULGC Committee., 1983, "Extension in the '80s - A Perspective for the Future of the Cooperative Extension Service." Washington, D.C.: Extension Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- Kansas Cooperative Extension Service., 1986, EMIS Manual and Codes, Fiscal Year 1986." Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas Cooperative Extension Service.

- KSU Cooperative Extension Service., 1985, Handbook for County Extension Councils. Manhattan, Kansas: Cooperative Extension Service.
- Lindquist, James L., 1987, "The Kansas Cooperative Extension Service". An Analysis of External Factors Impacting Organizational Decision Making". A PhD dissertation, Kansas State University.
- Moore, Gary W., 1983, Developing And Evaluating Educational Research. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Nebraska Cooperative Extension Service., 1981, "Nebraskans and their Cooperative Extension Service". A summary publication.
- Northeast Research., 1985, "1985 Maine Cooperative Extension Service Name Recognition Survey Segment". Paper No. 5539-D. Orono, Maine: Mainepoll/Northeast Research.
- Norusis, M. J., 1983, Introductory Statistics Guide: SPSS-X.
- Oaklief, Charles R. and Oaklief, Margery M., 1983, Participation In Kansas Noncredit Adult Education. Manhattan: Kansas State University.
- Padgitt, Steve, Vern Ryan, Ronald C. Powers, Paul Lasley and John Wallize., 1985, "Summary of Four Opinion Surveys about Iowa State University Extension, for the Future Directions Task Force." Ames: Cooperative Extension Service, Iowa State University, pp. 2-3.
- USDA/NASULGC Joint Committee., 1983, Extension in the '80s: A Perspective for the Future of the Cooperative Extension Service. Madison: University of Wisconsin, Cooperative Extension Service.
- Ward, Kathleen., 1986, "Community, Agea and State Opinion Leaders' Field Discussions On the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service of the Future". A summary report sent to all field discussion participants and all Kansas Extension Service personnel. Kansas State University: Cooperative Extension Service.
- Warner, Paul D., and Christenson, James A., 1981, "Who is Extension Serving?" Journal of Extension, March/April, pp. 22-28.
- Young, Clair W., 1983, "Extension Program Emphasis as Perceived by Ohio Clientele". A summary of results of a local needs survey, July, 1983. Ohio State University: Cooperative Extension Service.

**APPENDIXES**

APPENDIX A  
Introduction Letters to  
Sample Population



## Cooperative Extension Service

Saline County Extension Office  
 City-County Board of Education Building  
 300 West Ash  
 Salina, Kansas 67401  
 913 827-3651

May 4, 1987

TO: PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS

FROM: Carl H. Garten *C.H.G.*  
 County Extension  
 Director

SUBJECT: Assessment of Saline County Extension

Two weeks ago you received a letter and a survey asking for assessment on the image of the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service and the needs for educational information in Saline County. As of today, I have not received your surveys.

I am writing to you again because it is very important to receive all the surveys to make the information in this report meaningful and valid. Your opinion is important because agents look to you for advice on programs and activities for Saline County.

The enclosed survey takes only about 5 minutes to complete and all information is strictly confidential. The number on the return envelope is only for follow up. This Research is part of my work toward a masters degree at Kansas State University.

Thank you for taking a few minutes now to complete the enclosed survey and return it in the enclosed stamped envelope. If you have any questions, or would like to receive a copy of the results when the survey is completed, please call Carl Garten at 827-3651.





### Cooperative Extension Service

Saline County Extension Office  
 City-County Board of Education Building  
 300 West Ash  
 Salina, Kansas 67401  
 913 827-3651

May 4, 1987

TO: ELECTED OFFICIALS

FROM: Carl H. Garten *C.H.G.*  
 County Extension  
 Director

SUBJECT: Assessment of Saline County Extension

Two weeks ago you received a letter and a survey asking for assessment on the image of the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service and the needs for educational information in Saline County. As of today, I have not received your survey.

I am writing to you again because it is very important to receive all the surveys to make the information in this report meaningful and valid. Your opinion is important because it affects the success of the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service.

The enclosed survey takes only about 5 minutes to complete and all information is strictly confidential. The number on the return envelope is only for follow up. This research is part of my work toward a masters degree at Kansas State University.

Thank you for taking a few minutes now to complete the enclosed survey and return it in the enclosed stamped envelope. If you have any questions, or would like to receive a copy of the results when the survey is completed, please call Carl Garten at 827-3651.



## Cooperative Extension Service

Saline County Extension Office  
 City-County Board of Education Building  
 300 West Ash  
 Salina, Kansas 67401  
 913 827-3651

May 4, 1987

TO: COMMUNITY LEADERS

FROM: Carl H. Garten *C.H.G.*  
 County Extension  
 Director

SUBJECT: Assessment of Saline County Extension

Two weeks ago you received a letter and a survey asking for assessment on the image of the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service and the needs for educational information in Saline County. As of today, I have not received your survey.

I am writing to you again because it is very important to receive all the surveys to make the information in this report meaningful and valid. Your opinion of an organization is very important because as a community leader, people look to you for advice.

The enclosed survey takes only about 5 minutes to complete and all information is strictly confidential. The number on the return envelope is only for follow up. This research is part of my work toward a masters degree at Kansas State University.

Thank you for taking a few minutes now to complete the enclosed survey and return it in the enclosed stamped envelope. If you have any questions, or would like to receive a copy of the results when the survey is completed, please call Carl Garten at 827-3651.

KSU, County Extension  
 Councils and U.S. Department  
 of Agriculture Cooperating

All educational programs and  
 materials available without  
 discrimination on the basis  
 of race, color, national  
 origin, sex, or handicap



### Cooperative Extension Service

Saline County Extension Office  
 City-County Board of Education Building  
 300 West Ash  
 Salina, Kansas 67401  
 913 827-3651

April 20, 1987

TO: PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS

FROM: Carl H. Garten *CHG*  
 County Extension  
 Director

SUBJECT: ASSESSMENT OF SALINE COUNTY EXTENSION

You are or have been a member of a Program Development Committee to advise agents on programs and activities for Saline County.

You have been randomly selected to provide your assessment on the image of Saline County Cooperative Extension Service and the needs for educational information in Saline County. The enclosed survey takes about 5 minutes to complete. All information is strictly confidential. This research on the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service is part of my work toward a masters degree at Kansas State University.

Thank you for taking a few minutes now to complete the enclosed survey and return it in the enclosed stamped envelope. If you have any questions, or would like to receive a copy of the results when the survey is completed, please call Carl Garten at 827-3651.

sms

enc.

**Cooperative Extension Service**

Saline County Extension Office  
City-County Board of Education Building  
300 West Ash  
Salina, Kansas 67401  
913 827-3651

April 20, 1987

TO: Elected Officials  
FROM: Carl H. Garten <sup>CHG</sup>  
County Extension  
Director

SUBJECT: ASSESSMENT OF SALINE COUNTY EXTENSION

As elected officials, your opinion of an organization becomes very important to that organization's success.

You have been randomly selected to provide your assessment on the image of Saline County Cooperative Extension Service and the needs for educational information in Saline County. The enclosed survey takes about 5 minutes to complete. All information is strictly confidential. This research on the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service is part of my work toward a masters degree at Kansas State University.

Thank you for taking a few minutes now to complete the enclosed survey and return it in the enclosed stamped envelope. If you have any questions, or would like to receive a copy of the results when the survey is completed, please call Carl Garten at 827-3651.

sms

enc.



## Cooperative Extension Service

Saline County Extension Office  
City-County Board of Education Building  
300 West Ash  
Salina, Kansas 67401  
913 827-3651

April 28, 1987

TO: COMMUNITY LEADERS

FROM: Carl H. Garten *C.H.G.*  
County Extension  
Director

SUBJECT: ASSESSMENT OF SALINE COUNTY EXTENSION

As a community leader, people look to you for advice, so your opinion of an organization becomes very important to that organization's success.

You have been randomly selected to provide your assessment on the image of Saline County Cooperative Extension Service and the needs for educational information in Saline County. The enclosed survey takes about 5 minutes to complete. All information is strictly confidential. This research on the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service is part of my work toward a masters degree at Kansas State University.

Thank you for taking a few minutes now to complete the enclosed survey and return it in the enclosed stamped envelope. If you have any questions, or would like to receive a copy of the results when the survey is completed, please call Carl Garten at 827-3651.

sms

enc.

APPENDIX B  
Survey Instrument

IMAGE OF SALINE COUNTY COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE AND OPINIONS OF  
INFORMATIONAL NEEDS

SURVEY OF COMMUNITY LEADERS

Background Information:

All responses are confidential and will not be individually identified.

- (Check One)
1. Have you or anyone in your family ever been a 4-H club member? NO.....  
YES.....  
DON'T KNOW.....
2. Have you or anyone in your family ever been an Extension Homemaker Unit (EHU) member? NO.....  
YES.....  
DON'T KNOW.....
3. Have you or any member of your family ever been a volunteer helper with any phase of Extension educational programs? NO.....  
YES.....  
DON'T KNOW.....
4. Are there any children under 18 years of age in your household? NO.....  
YES.....
5. Your sex? MALE.....  
FEMALE.....
6. What is your age? 18 to 25.....  
26 to 45.....  
46 to 65.....  
66 and over.....
7. Where do you live? FARM.....  
RURAL NON-FARM.....  
SALINA.....  
OTHER.....
8. What are the occupations of the adult members of your household? FARM.....  
FARM AND NON FARM.....  
NON FARM.....
9. What is the highest level of education you have completed? 8 YEARS OR LESS.....  
SOME HIGH SCHOOL.....  
HIGH SCHOOL.....  
SOME POST-SECONDARY.....  
COLLEGE GRADUATE.....
10. In the past year, how often have you personally contacted a county extension agent, or used the services of extension? NEVER.....  
ONCE OR TWICE.....  
EVERY COUPLE OF MONTHS.....  
EVERY WEEK OR TWO.....  
DON'T KNOW.....

(OVER)

Educational Needs:

How great do you think the need is for educational information about the following?

(Circle One)

	No need	Slight need	Moderate need	Great need	Very Great need
11. To assist in the personal development of youth?	N	S	M	G	VG
12. Energy conservation?	N	S	M	G	VG
13. Housing?	N	S	M	G	VG
14. Clothing?	N	S	M	G	VG
15. Family life?	N	S	M	G	VG
16. Family financial management?	N	S	M	G	VG
17. Consumer affairs?	N	S	M	G	VG
18. Health care?	N	S	M	G	VG
19. Human nutrition?	N	S	M	G	VG
20. Community services and facilities	N	S	M	G	VG
21. Public affair issues, such as tax changes water policy or new laws?	N	S	M	G	VG
22. Community leadership development?	N	S	M	G	VG
23. Small business management?	N	S	M	G	VG
24. Economic development?	N	S	M	G	VG
25. Natural resources and the environment?	N	S	M	G	VG
26. Home gardening and lawn care?	N	S	M	G	VG
27. Efficient crop production?	N	S	M	G	VG
28. Efficient livestock production?	N	S	M	G	VG
29. Financial management of farm operations?	N	S	M	G	VG
30. Marketing of farm products?	N	S	M	G	VG

Awareness of Extension:

How familiar are you with the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service and its programs?

(Circle One)

	Not familiar	Slightly familiar	Familiar	Very familiar
31. The Saline County Cooperative Extension Service in general?	NF	SF	F	VF
32. Extension agricultural programs?	NF	SF	F	VF
33. Extension horticulture programs?	NF	SF	F	VF
34. Extension home economics programs?	NF	SF	F	VF
35. Extension community development programs?	NF	SF	F	VF
36. The Kansas community Pride program?	NF	SF	F	VF
37. Extension 4-H youth programs?	NF	SF	F	VF
38. The Kansas Energy Extension Service?	NF	SF	F	VF



Use of Extension:

Have you or any other member of your family contacted an Extension Agent or used the services of Extension in the following areas?

(Circle One)  
Contacts with Extension

	No	Yes	Don't Know
39. Horticulture?	N	Y	DK
40. 4-H Youth?	N	Y	DK
41. Community Development?	N	Y	DK
42. Agriculture?	N	Y	DK
43. Energy?	N	Y	DK
44. Home Economics?	N	Y	DK
45. Within the past year, have you or your family seen or read any newspaper or magazine articles that used Extension agents or specialists as an information source?	N	Y	DK
46. Within the past year, have you or your family listened to a radio program or seen a TV program involving Extension personnel?	N	Y	DK
47. Within the past year have you or your family read any written material such as bulletins or newsletters written by Extension agents or specialists?	N	Y	DK
48. Within the past year have you or your family attended a meeting, workshop, or conference that featured Extension personnel?	N	Y	DK

Satisfaction with Extension:

How satisfied are you with Saline County Cooperative Extension Programs?

(Circle One)

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	No Opinion	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
49. The Saline County Cooperative Extension Service in general?	VD	D	N	S	VS
50. Extension 4-H youth activities and programs?	VD	D	N	S	VS
51. Extension energy?	VD	D	N	S	VS
52. Extension home economics?	VD	D	N	S	VS
53. Extension horticulture?	VD	D	N	S	VS
54. Extension agriculture?	VD	D	N	S	VS
55. Extension community development?	VD	D	N	S	VS

(OVER)

Funding The Cooperative Extension Service:

The Saline County Cooperative Extension Service receives federal, state, and county funds to finance its educational programs. How do you feel about the amount of funds that should be spent on the following program areas?

(Circle One)

	Greatly decreased	Slightly decreased	Stay the same	Slightly increased	Greatly increased	No opinion
	GD	SD	SS	SL	GL	N
56. For the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service in general?	GD	SD	SS	SL	GL	N
57. Extension agriculture?	GD	SD	SS	SL	GL	N
58. Extension energy?	GD	SD	SS	SL	GL	N
59. Extension horticulture?	GD	SD	SS	SL	GL	N
60. Extension 4-H youth?	GD	SD	SS	SL	GL	N
61. Extension home economics?	GD	SD	SS	SL	GL	N
62. Extension community development?	GD	SD	SS	SL	GL	N

COMMUNITY LEADER'S PERCEPTIONS OF THE  
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE'S IMAGE AND ITS  
NEEDS IN SALINE COUNTY, KANSAS

by

CARL HENRY GARTEN

B.S., Kansas State University, 1976

---

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1987

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to evaluate Saline County community leader's image of the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service and to get their opinions of informational needs. This was done by surveying 150 leaders for their assessment of educational needs, awareness, use, satisfaction, and financial support for the Saline County Cooperative Extension Service. The survey was mailed to 150 randomly selected community leaders from one of three groups, Goals for Salina, elected officials, and program development committee members. The survey was returned by 87% of the community leaders.

The results indicated that the top three educational needs were marketing farm products, farm financial management, and development of youth.

In the awareness section community leaders were more aware of 4-H, followed by extension in general, and horticulture. Correlation tests found that awareness was strongly correlated with use and satisfaction.

In frequency of use, 71% of the community leaders used extension in the past year. The reading of extension articles was done by 85%, and 82% read newsletters or bulletins. In the programs, 59% used horticulture, 45% home economics, and 44% 4-H. Use was highly correlated with the other areas.

The satisfaction area had 53% no opinions, but they were most satisfied with extension in general, followed by 4-H. Satisfaction was highly correlated with the other areas.

In the area of funding, 64% had an opinion. Extension in general ranked highest, followed by 4-H and agriculture. Funding was correlated to awareness, use, and satisfaction.

Conclusions and recommendations for action and further research are discussed. Two of the main recommendations are that Saline County Extension Service look at educational needs with the highest mean scores and that agents use the media as much as possible.