A STUDY OF THE ROLE EXPECTATIONS OF EXTENSION ADMINISTRATORS, COUNTY AGRICULTURAL AGENTS, AND THE SPECIALISTS THEMSELVES CONCERNING THE JOB OF THE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SPECIALIST IN KANSAS

763

by

JOHN K. STRICKLER

B. S., University of Missouri, 1957

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1967

Approved by:

Paul W. Griffin
Major Professor

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is deeply grateful for the assistance of his Graduate Program Committee, particularly for the guidance and counsel of his major professor, Dr. Paul W. Griffith. Other members of the committee were Dr. Wilbur E. Ringler and Dr. Delmer M. Hilyard. Gratitude is also expressed to Dr. Curtis Trent for his early guidance in this study.

Grateful acknowledgment is given to those members of the Kansas State Extension Service whose questionnaire responses contributed to this study.

To his wife, Joan, the author expresses his sincere appreciation for her patience, understanding, and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to examine certain aspects of the role of the agricultural subject-matter specialist in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service. It is hoped that this study will be of help in more clearly defining the specialist role and thus create better understanding of the specialist position and its relation to the entire Extension organization.

There have been only limited attempts in the past to define the role of the subject-matter specialist in the Kansas Extension Service. At present, there is very little information available to guide the new specialist in determining how his job should be handled. Lack of clear understanding of the specialist's role, however, is not confined to new specialists--it is all too common in experienced specialists and other Extension workers. Yet, T. C. Blalock stated that "If an organization is to function effectively and efficiently, it is important that there be agreement on what is expected of individuals occupying different roles."[1] And before there can be agreement, there must be understanding.

---

[1]T. C. Blalock, "Role of the Subject-Matter Specialist," Journal of Cooperative Extension, 1:94, Summer, 1963.

First, an individual must have e clear understanding of his own duties and responsibilities. Then he must understand the relationship of these duties end responsibilities to those of the others around him in an organization. To do this, he must have some knowledge of the duties and responsibilities of these other workers. Mooney and Reiley said essentially the same thing when they wrote:

> Functional correlation simply means that every member of an organization must know his duties, the full extent of his duties, and above all, their exact relation to all surrounding duties. It is the neglect of this latter point that so frequently causes a confusion in functional procedure. This is not only a bar to organized efficiency, but may frequently be disruptive of the harmony and destructive of the morale of the organization itself.[2]

Agreement on the expected performance functions and an understanding of the role of each employed individual are difficult to achieve in any large, rather complex organization. In the case of the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service of today, this is made even more difficult because of constant changes in organizational structure and program content. These changes are necessary to meet the shifting demands of an increasingly mobile, educated, and diversified society. The "Scope Report" of 1958 stated:

> One consistent characteristic of Extension work has been the necessity to shift programs and methods to meet ever-changing conditions and demands. Extension workers have been acutely

---

[2]James D. Mooney and Alan C. Reiley, Onward Industry (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1931), p. 518.

> aware of this need from the beginning. The tempo of such changes has been accelerated dramatically during the past decade. Every evidence points to an even faster acceleration in the decade ahead.[3]

Certainly, the changes in organization and programs of the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service since 1958 would strongly support this prediction of the "Scope" Committee.

An example of a change affecting the Extension specialist was the change in organizational structure in 1963 which placed most of the agricultural specialists administratively within their related subject matter departments of the University. Before this change, all specialists were under the direction of State Leaders solely within the Extension organization. The theory behind this change in administrative direction of the agricultural specialist was that the department head could better coordinate both research and Extension activities.

Although probably few would deny the necessity for change, many Extension workers undoubtedly experience difficulty in understanding the demands that these changes in organization, responsibilities, and programs place upon them. Changes in organization and programs make it much more difficult for the specialist to understand what is expected of him by his superiors, his fellow specialists, and the county Extension agents he serves. Thus, he may frequently lack the clear understanding of his own role and its relationship to others within the organization that is necessary for full effectiveness in his position.

---

[3]Subcommittee on Scope and Responsibility, The Cooperative Extension Service Today--A Statement of Scope and Responsibility (Washington: Federal Extension Service, April, 1958), p. 5.

Wilbur Ringler summarized this problem by stating:

> The importance of having each subject matter specialist clearly understand his role cannot be over emphasized. His duties, responsibilities, and his status in the organization should be clearly defined. Lacking full knowledge and requirements of his job, his duties, his responsibilities, and his status in the organization, the specialist can never be sure of the adequacy of his performance, the correctness of his decisions, or his relations with those with whom he works.[4]

Certainly the scope of this study will not provide all the information needed for the solution to this total problem, but it should contribute a necessary portion of the over-all needed understanding.

OBJECTIVES

The five objectives formulated for this study were as follows:

1. To determine the relative degree of emphasis that <u>should be given</u> to certain selected specialist functions as perceived by the respondent groups--Extension administrators, county agricultural agents, and agricultural Extension specialists--both collectively and separately.

2. To determine the relative degree of emphasis that is <u>currently being given</u> to these selected specialist functions as perceived by the three respondent groups, both collectively and separately.

3. To determine the relationship between the emphasis that should be given and the emphasis currently being given these specialist functions as perceived by the three respondent groups, both collectively

---

[4]Wilbur E. Ringler, "Role of Extension Specialists and their Status in Relation to Research and Teaching Personnel in Agronomy and Soils Departments of the North Central Region 1956" (unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1957), p. 2.

and separately.

4. To determine the degree of agreement among the agricultural Extension specialists by project groups concerning the relative degree of emphasis they believe should be given these functions.

5. To determine if there is a relationship between years of experience as an Extension specialist and the relative degrees of emphasis that agricultural Extension specialists believe should be placed on these functions.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Certain terms were used in a specific sense for this study and therefore are defined to provide clarity to the descriptions and analyses presented.

Agricultural Extension specialist or specialist. The male subject-matter specialists in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service who are included in Project III--Agricultural Production, Management and Natural Resources Use; Project IV--Marketing and Utilization of Agricultural Products; and Project VII--Community and Public Affairs.

Consensus. The highest percentage of respondents who selected the same degree of emphasis for a particular function. High consensus was considered to be a percentage of 70 or above for any single degree of emphasis. Medium consensus was a percentage from 50 to 69. Low consensus was a percentage of 49 or below.

Considerable or Considerably. A difference of four or more ranks.

County agricultural agent or county agent. The county agricultural agents, assistant county agricultural agents, and male assistant county Extension agents in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service.

Extension administrator or administrator. The male persons in Project I--Extension Administration plus all male state leaders, associate state leaders, and the academic department heads with administrative responsibilities over agricultural Extension specialists.

Function. A specific activity or group of similar activities that are done by an incumbent of a position.

Position. The location of an individual or group of individuals within an organization.

Role. What an individual does as an occupant of a position within an organization.

Role expectation or expectation. An evaluative standard applied to an incumbent of a position in terms of how the incumbent should behave concerning a particular function.

Respondent group. A group of individuals surveyed who occupy like positions within the Extension organization.

SCOPE AND PROCEDURE

The Research Design

The data used in this particular study were obtained from a part of an over-all role study of seven defined position groups within the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service. These seven position groups were:

(1) administrators, (2) district agricultural agents, (3) district home economics agents, (4) specialists, (5) county agricultural agents, (6) county home economics agents, and (7) county 4-H club agents. This over-all study was designed and conducted by a group of Kansas Cooperative Extension personnel and graduate students of which the author was a member.

The first step in the over-all study was the development of a list of major functions for each of the seven position groups. A questionnaire form was then developed to allow the rating of these functions, both as to the emphasis that should be given them and the emphasis that was currently being given them. For the emphasis that should be given, each function was to be rated by one of five descriptive terms--"no," "minor," "intermediate," "important," or "major." An equal distance between each such descriptive term was assumed and the numerical values of one, two, three, four, and five were assigned to each of the above qualitative terms, respectively. The same rating system was used for each function as to the emphasis it was currently being given.

The questionnaire form developed was critically reviewed by Extension faculty members and then pretested on selected Kansas Extension personnel. Every professional Extension worker in Kansas was then sent a questionnaire and asked to rate the functions for his own position group and those for certain other position groups with which he was most closely associated. For example, administrators were asked to rate the functions for themselves, specialists, and district agricultural agents.

The specialists were asked to rate functions for themselves, administrators, county agricultural agents (county home economics agents instead if they were women specialists), and county club agents. The county agricultural agents were asked to rate functions for themselves, county home economics agents, county club agents, district agricultural agents, and specialists.

This particular study utilized only a part of the date collected in the over-all study. It was confined to an examination of the role of the male agricultural Extension specialists in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service. This included all male specialists in Project III, Project IV, and Project VII. It was assumed that this group of specialists represented a relatively homogeneous group for purposes of examination of the broader, more general aspects of the specialist role.

This study is primarily descriptive in nature. The role of the specialist was examined in terms of fourteen major functions that were identified from literature, research studies, and the practical experience of Kansas Extension personnel. The expectations of Extension administrators, county agricultural agents, and the specialists themselves concerning these fourteen functions were compared and analyzed.

The fourteen specialist functions considered were as follows:

1. Acting as an on-call source of information for agents to phone or write on problems.

2. Backing up county programs with suitable statewide publicity in the form of news releases, radio talks, TV programs, or other mass media techniques.

3. Performing direct service type activities, such as making visits to an individual farm, home, or firm.

4. Serving as a resource person to agents and county Extension councils in county program development.

5. Advising research staff on the research needs and problems determined in the field.

6. Training agents in subject matter, its application, and methods of presentation.

7. Helping agents evaluate projects that have been carried out in specific subject matter areas.

8. Holding public meetings.

9. Acting in a liaison capacity between Extension and industries in their field on new projects, recommendations, marketing, field tests, and research findings.

10. Developing an interest at the county level in the specialist's subject-matter area where there is a need for this specialty.

11. Developing and supplying to agents visual aids, leaflets, bulletins, and other materials that could be used by agents in carrying out county programs.

12. Training lay leaders in subject matter, its application, and methods of presentation.

13. Reporting program progress and accomplishments.

14. Keeping up to date on pertinent new developments and research in his subject matter area.

For brevity and ease of reference, a standard set of abbreviations for the fourteen functions is used throughout the text. These abbreviations are shown in Appendix A.

Collection of the Data

The data used in this study were collected by mail questionnaire as part of the previously described over-all role study of the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service. As the questionnaires were returned, they were checked, numbered, and all data were punched and verified on IBM cards. Sufficient information was included on the face date of the questionnaires to allow needed identification and categorization of the responses. However, no provision was made in the questionnaire to enable identification of individual respondents by name (see questionnaire in Appendix B).

When all of the data for the over-all study had been punched, the author sorted out all of the responses that rated the specialist functions. These were further sorted to eliminate all responses but those of the three respondent groups set forth in the definition of terms: (1) Extension administrators, (2) agricultural Extension specialists, and (3) county agricultural agents. It should be noted perhaps that this study did not include the responses of specialists in Project II (Information), Project V (Home Economics), and Project VI (4-H). The selected cards were

processed through the Kansas State University computing center. The computer program utilized gave by respondent groups the ratings of each specialist function by numbers, percentage distributions, and mean weighted scores.

Table I shows the number of responses to the questionnaire on specialist functions as compared to the number of responses possible for the three respondent groups.

TABLE I

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF RESPONSE BY POSITION GROUP

Position Group	Questionnaires Sent	Questionnaires Received	Per cent
Extension Administrators	20	11	55
Agricultural Specialists	83	79	95
Agricultural Agents	126	106	84
Total	229	196	86

The relatively poor response on the part of administrators was probably due to several factors. There may have been some misunderstanding on the part of a few who decided that the only functions they should rate were those of the administrator. A possibly larger factor may have been that a number of persons in the administrator category were academic department heads who had only recently assumed administrative responsibilities over agricultural Extension specialists. Some

of these people may have decided that they were not yet familiar enough with the work of Extension specialists to rate the specialist functions.

Presentation and Analysis of the Data

The respondents in this study were assumed to represent for all practical purposes the total universe of the three selected respondent groups (administrators, specialists, and county agents) within the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service rather than a sample. Thus, various descriptive statistical techniques were used to analyze the data including mean weighted scores, rankings, percentage distributions, Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficients, and Kendall's Coefficients of Concordance.

The data was analyzed on the basis of the numerical values assigned to the descriptive terms or ratings of the various specialist functions. An over-all mean weighted score was determined for each function by averaging scores of all the respondents. Also, mean scores by each of the three respondent groups was determined for each of the functions. The specialist functions were then ranked by these mean scores and comparisons made among the respondent groups, both as to what they believe the emphasis should be and what they believe the emphasis currently is on the specialist functions. Table II shows the distribution of respondents by their type of position.

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY TYPE OF POSITION

Respondent Group	Frequency Distribution	
	Number	Per cent
Administrators	11	6
Specialists	79	40
County Agents	106	54
Total	196	100

In making comparisons between specialist project groups, only two groups were used. Respondents in Projects IV and VII were combined because Project VII represented too small a group to analyze separately. Since all the specialists in these two projects were agricultural economists, this was a logical combination. Of the seventy-nine specialist respondents, sixty-five or 82 per cent of them were Project III specialists.

Table III shows the distribution of specialist respondents according to categories of specialist experience listed on the questionnaire form. For analyzing the relationship between years of specialist experience and the ratings of specialist functions, only three experience categories were used: (1) less than one year, (2) one year but less than six, and (3) six years and over.

TABLE III

DISTRIBUTION OF SPECIALIST RESPONDENTS
BY YEARS OF SPECIALIST EXPERIENCE

Years of Specialist Experience	Frequency Distribution	
	Number	Per cent
Less than 1 year	9	11
1 year but less than 6	38	48
6 years but less than 11	11	14
11 years but less than 16	10	13
16 years but less than 21	5	6
21 years and over	6	8
Total	79	100

Limitations of the Study

The scope of this study has been limited to the role of the male agricultural Extension specialist in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service. It was further confined to examining the specialist role in terms of fourteen selected major functions.

It was realized that many different groups, both inside and outside of the Kansas Extension Service, influence to varying degrees the agricultural Extension specialist's role. However, it was impossible in a study of this scope to examine the expectations of all these different groups concerning the specialist. This study, therefore, was limited to the expectations held by Extension administrators, county

agricultural agents, and the specialists themselves.

No attempt has been made to generalize the findings, conclusions, or recommendations of this study beyond the scope of the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of literature made for this study involved a critical review of past and current statements, articles, books, and research concerning the role of the Extension subject-matter specialist. From this, determination was made of what subject areas are not yet investigated or are only partially investigated, and thus still need research. A review was also made of literature concerned with the role concept and its approach to studying a particular job. The main purposes of this review of literature were to sharpen the focus of the proposed study and to help in developing a research model or framework for conducting it.

BACKGROUND OF THE SPECIALIST ROLE

The fundamental task of Cooperative Extension is "to help...rural families help themselves by applying science, whether physical or social, to the daily routines of farming, homemaking, and family and community living."[1] The basic "grass roots" element of the Cooperative Extension Service is the county agent and the success of Extension work must be measured in terms of the effectiveness of the county agent.

---

[1]Edmund deS. Brunner and E. Hsin Pao Yang, Rural America and the Extension Service (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949), p. 1.

The county agent of today must be versatile to satisfy the ever increasingly wide variety of demands and needs of the people he serves. It is naturally impossible for any one person to keep abreast of the constantly growing vast body of knowledge made available through modern research. Yet, the very nature of the county agent's job seems to demand that he do so. It is the job of the subject-matter specialist to assist the county agent in the dissemination of this knowledge to the people of the state, and thus make a seemingly impossible job possible. Since the specialist has one particular subject for which he is responsible, he should be able to keep current on new developments in his field and achieve a competency in that particular area that seldom can be expected of an agent because of his broader subject matter responsibilities.

The necessity for having subject-matter specialists to assist the county agent was recognized from the early beginnings of Cooperative Extension work. Brunner and Yang wrote: "There...came into existence, almost with the inception of the Extension Service, the position of 'specialist.' Each such person deals with a single area of subject matter or possibly a few closely related areas."[2]

In 1921 the report of the Committee on Extension Organization and Policy at the annual meeting of the Land Grant College Association included the following statement:

---

[2]Ibid., p. 45.

> A fundamental principle underlying extension work is that the agricultural college and experiment station and the United States Department of Agriculture have something to extend. If this principle is correct, it then makes necessary the employment of subject-matter specialists who shall represent the subject-matter departments of our colleges and stations and the United States Department of Agriculture and who shall assist the county agents in organizing and forwarding their subject-matter programs. These specialists are absolutely necessary to the greatest success of county agent work, and to all cooperative extension work. We recommend that in reports of accomplishments the work done by specialists shall be recognized and their place in the organization shall be clearly shown.[3]

Writing of Extension's development during the period of 1915-1937, Eddy stated that:

> . . . The subject-matter of agriculture had become so specialized that he /the county agent/ was no longer able to be the technical advisor ready to offer some solution to every farm problem. Instead he had become an administrator of a large and expanding county program. To assist him in the technical phases of his work, the colleges sent out 'specialists' in particular fields, representing most of the teaching areas of the college. As new subjects were developed, specialists were added. Whereas in 1914 there had been approximately 221 full and part-time specialists, by 1924 the number had grown to 850.[4]

As the Cooperative Extension Service grew, the need for more specialists also continued to grow. Brown and Vandeberg wrote in 1959 that:

> Of the almost 15,000 employees in the Cooperative Extension Service, about 2,200 are specialists. These people are the connecting link

---

[3]T. Roy Reid and M. C. Wilson, Functions and Activities of State Extension Specialists, Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Circular 89 (Washington: Government Printing Office, September, 1933), p. 3.

[4]Edward Danforth Eddy, Jr., Colleges for Our Land and Time (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 177.

between researchers and county agents. This communication channel must operate effectively, otherwise the agents at the end of the line will be operating below par.[5]

Brunner and Yang summarized the job of the specialist in the following manner:

> . . . specialists are the professional liaison between the county agents, the agricultural colleges, the experiment stations, and the United States Department of Agriculture. They are analysts and interpreters of scientific knowledge and factual information. They are dispensers of subject-matter information in their own fields, simplifying and clarifying this information so as to enable the people to understand and apply it to their everyday affairs, whether on the farm, in the home, or in marketing procedures or organization of the community for some desired end.[6]

Brunner and Yang added further that:

> . . . They /specialists/ are vitally related to county agents, their first resource on any problems on which additional information may be needed. They are expected to bring new information, pertinent in given county situations, to the attention of the agents and of fellow members of the state staff who may be concerned.[7]

Speaking on the role of subject-matter specialists, John E. Hutchison, Director of the Texas Agricultural Extension Service, emphasized their value when he said:

---

[5]Emory J. Brown and Gale Vandeberg, "The Job of the Extension Specialist Is Changing," County Agent and Vo-Ag Teacher, June, 1959, p. 13.

[6]Brunner, op. cit., pp. 45-46.

[7]Ibid., p. 46.

> . . . I should say in the beginning that in my judgement that no category of staff has contributed more to the success and effectiveness of the Cooperative Extension Service than have subject-matter specialists. They are largely responsible for the very high confidence level people have in Extension information.[8]

It would seem from a review of the literature that the need for specialists in Cooperative Extension work has never been seriously questioned, but the degree to which their role will continue to grow in the future seems to be more open to question.

One viewpoint was expressed in the 1948 Joint Committee Report On Extension Programs, Policies, and Goals:

> . . . The 'specialist' approach to individual problems of the farm, the home, and the family has become conventional in extension work. It has experienced varying degrees of effectiveness. It may have a definite and significant place in the future. But there is reason to consider this approach with particular care in light of the current needs for an extension program of wide scope.[9]

The committee then expressed the opinion that:

> . . . with the varied expansion of scientific knowledge, and the desirability in many areas of some diversification, the average farm family needs the help of more generalists rather than of more specialists. They need a competent interpreter and integrator of usable facts.[10]

---

[8]John E. Hutchison, "The Changing Role of the Extension Subject-Matter Specialist" (talk presented to Agricultural and Home Economics Specialists bi-monthly Staff Conference, College Station, Texas, January 16, 1961), p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

[9]Joint Committee Report on Extension Programs, Policies, and Goals, U. S. Department of Agriculture and Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1948), p. 38.

[10]Ibid., p. 39.

It should perhaps be noted that to date there has been no apperent let up in the employment of subject-matter specialists by Extension. As Harvey pointed out, "In order to meet the demands for more specialized work, Extension has created positions in new subject areas and has increased specialist personnel in many of the established subject areas.[11]

A viewpoint somewhat different from that of the committee was expressed by Hutchison:

> Extension specialists in agriculture and home economics must be increasingly well trained and technicelly competent since they set the standard for the technical quality of our programs in the field. Agriculture is big business today. Farmers are no longer satisfied with information given in generelities; they want to delve deeper--they are interested in specifics. If we are not able to provide this kind of information, they will by-pass us. Programs developed without specialists' assistance are not likely to have sufficient depth to be challenging enough, and certainly such programs are not likely to reech the potentials that are possible in e specific subject-matter erea.[12]

Blelock supported Hutchison's viewpoint when he wrote:

> As specialization increases and agriculture becomes more highly technical, there may be an increasing number of instances of farmers by-passing the local agent. One who is forced by the nature of his responsibilities to be a generalist cannot also act as a technicel expert in several fields. As the 'stakes get bigger' the farmer is going to be content only with the latest information. Unless the specialist keeps up to date, the farmer may even by-pass him and go

---

[11] John Jackson Harvey, "A Comparative Analysis of the Functions of Specialists in the Cooperative Extension Service, by Broad Subject Areas" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1961), p. 118.

[12] Hutchison, op. cit., pp. 2-3.

directly to the research worker. The practicality of the task of training county workers in all phases of technology must be faced.[13]

In 1958 the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy appointed nine task forces of Extension leaders to correspond with the nine program areas outlined in the "Scope Report."[14] These task forces were asked to outline for their respective program areas a statement on subject matter, clientele, Extension responsibilities and objectives, how these are to be accomplished, and requirements if Extension is to accomplish them. The resulting published report, A Guide to Extension Programs for the Future, is perhaps the most comprehensive and widely accepted statement to date on Extension programs--past, present, and future. Concerning the specialist in future Extension work, this report included the following statement.

> The Extension staff of the future will have more specialized personnel at every level.
>
> Many counties or geographic areas will have specialist-agents working with one kind of farming, one aspect of marketing, one area of family living or youth development, or some other special interest.
>
> Specialists will,of course, work together perhaps even more closely than in the past, lending individual skill and knowledge to the group effort. Yet state staffs will probably see a higher degree of specialization than ever before. Marketing, for example, may need the services of men and women trained in fields as varied as bacteriology, industrial engineering and retail sales. Conservation may require talents as specialized as those

---

[13]Blalock, op. cit., p. 97.

[14]Subcommittee on Scope and Responsibility.

of the forest ecologist, the land economist, or the economic geographer. And in the counties varying degrees of specialization among Extension personnel may be required to fill peculiar needs.[15]

Judging from the literature that was reviewed, there seems to be with few exceptions a consensus of opinion that the subject-matter specialist will continue to play an increasingly important role in future Cooperative Extension work. The only real question seems to be one of exactly how this increasingly important role should be played.

THE ROLE CONCEPT

"People do not behave in a random manner; their behavior is influenced to some extent by their own expectations and those of others in the group or society in which they are participants."[16]

In recent years the role concept has come into quite popular use and acceptance in the analysis of jobs and of what is expected of persons in these jobs. Based on works such as those of Linton,[17]

---

[15]Bryant E. Kearl and O. B. Copeland (eds.), A Guide to Extension Programs for the Future (Raleigh: Agricultural Extension Service, North Carolina State College, July, 1959), p. 46.

[16]Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), p. 17.

[17]Ralph Linton, The Study of Man (New York: Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1936).

Newcomb,[18] and Parsons,[19] the role concept is continuously being redefined and expanded as more and more use is being made of it.

In their book on role analysis, Gross, Mason, and McEachern stated that:

> The role concept, in its present most frequent usage, focuses attention on ideas of central importance to the several social sciences. One of these is that human behavior is influenced to some degree by the expectations individuals hold for themselves or which other individuals hold for them. Another is that a person's locations or positions in social structures influence the kind of social relationships in which he is involved and the evaluative standards he or others apply to his behavior. Derivative from these is the basic proposition that human behavior is in part a function of the positions an individual occupies and the expectations held for incumbents of these positions.[20]

One of the first steps in nearly all studies involving the role concept is to differentiate between the two terms, role and position. Although there is frequent variation in the wording, there is rather uniform agreement on the essential meaning and distinction between these terms.

In his book, The Study of Man, Linton substituted the term status for position when he wrote:

---

[18]Theodore M. Newcomb, Social Psychology (New York: The Dryden Press, 1950).

[19]Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951).

[20]Gross, op. cit., p. 319.

> A role represents the dynamic aspect of a status. The individual is socially assigned to a status and occupies it with relation to other statuses. When he puts the rights and duties which constitute the status into affect, he is performing a role.[21]

Parsons also used the term status when he gave the following definitions:

> . . . there is the positional aspect--that of where the actor in question is 'located' in the social system relative to other actors. This is what we call his status, which is his place in the relationship system considered as a structure. . . . On the other hand there is the processual aspect, that of what the actor does in his relations with others seen in the context of its functional significance for the social system. It is this which we shall call his role.[22]

Newcomb explained the terms in the following manner:

> A position . . . is something static; it is a place in a structure, recognized by members of the society and accorded by them to one or more individuals. A role, on the other hand, is something dynamic; it refers to the behavior of the occupants of a position--not to all their behavior, as persons, but to what they do as occupants of the position.
>
> Roles and positions are thus inseparable. A position has no meaning without its accompanying role, and any given role applies only to persons who occupy a stated position in a stated group or society. To each position its role, and to each role its position.[23]

Newcomb then went on to elaborate:

> Roles thus represent ways of carrying out the functions for which positions exist--ways which are generally agreed upon within whatever group recognizes any particular position and role. But not all the things that all occupants of any particular position do are equally

---

[21] Linton, op. cit., p. 114.

[22] Parsons, op. cit., p. 25.

[23] Newcomb, op. cit., p. 280.

> essential in carrying out the functions of that position. Some of the things that occupants of a position do in taking their roles are essential, but some are not; some of them may actually interfere with the functions which are supposed to be performed.[24]

If role and position are inseparable, role and expectations are nearly as difficult to separate. Most writers seem to prefer studying role in terms of expectations. Gross defined an expectation as "an evaluative standard applied to an incumbent of a position."[25] He then went on to define a role as "a set of expectations applied to an incumbent of a particular position."[26]

Sargent wrote that:

> A person's role is a pattern or type of social behavior which seems situationally appropriate to him in terms of the demand and expectations of those in his group.[27]

Jacobson used the following definition of role: "A set of expectations which others share of the behavior an individual will exhibit as an occupant of a position, or status category."[28]

---

[24] Ibid., p. 281.

[25] Gross, op. cit., p. 67.

[26] Ibid., p. 67.

[27] Stansfeld Sargent, "Conceptions of Role and Ego in Contemporary Psychology," Social Psychology at the Crossroads, John H. Rohrer and Muzafer Sherif, editors (New York: Harper and Bros., 1951), p. 360.

[28] Eugene Jacobson, W. W. Charters, Jr., and Seymour Lieberman, "The Use of the Role Concept in the Study of Complex Organizations," Journal of Social Issues, 7:19, 1951.

For the purposes of this study, the author accepted the definition of role used by Trent: "What an individual does as an occupant of a position within an organization."[29] This definition was preferred because it allowed the examination of the specialist role both in terms of expectations and of present behavior.

If there is agreement on the importance of expectations in role study, the next question should obviously be one of whose expectations should be considered. The persons or groups of persons whose expectations are relevant to the study of a particular role are known as role definers for that particular position.

Gross stated that "If a particular position has no meaning apart from other positions, it is necessary for an investigator, in focusing on one position, to specify the other positions with which his analysis will be concerned."[30]

In his study of the role concept in complex organizations, Jacobson wrote:

> The definition of role in terms of shared expectations must take account of the question of whose expectations are relevant. . . . In hierarchical organizations, at least three . . . groups should receive consideration. One is composed of persons who occupy like positions. Another is composed of persons who have a high degree of functional interdependence with the position in question. A third is composed of persons who do not have direct

---

[29]Curtis Trent, "The Administrative Role of the State 4-H Club Leader in Selected States--A Study in Role Perception" (unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1961), p. 4.

[30]Gross, op. cit., p. 50.

> functionally interdependent relationships with the position, but who nevertheless are related to it through a concern with the formulation and implementation of the broader purposes of the organization.[31]

Concerning the practical aspects of determining role definers for a position, Gross pointed out that:

> . . . a position cannot be completely described until all the other positions to which it is related have been specified. Of course a complete relational specification is a limiting case with which it would be impossible to deal empirically. For a given research problem it may be necessary to take into account only a limited set of counter position.[32]

In their article on the job of the Extension specialist, Brown and Vandeberg listed four groups of people who helped decide what the specialist does: "(1) the specialists themselves, (2) the resident researchers, (3) the extension administrators, and (4) the county extension staff."[33]

For the purposes of this study, Extension administrators, male specialists in Projects III, IV, and VII, and county agricultural agents were considered as role definers for the position of agricultural Extension specialist.

An assumption or concept basic to most role studies is the one of role consensus. Jacobson, Charters, and Lieberman wrote that:

---

[31]Jacobson, op. cit., p. 20.

[32]Gross, op. cit., p. 51.

[33]Brown and Vandeberg, op. cit., p. 12.

> The search for insights into the functioning of complex organizations has led to the development of a variety of systematic frameworks within which organizations may be described and measured. One of the approaches used stems from the common observations that people in organizations tend to have relatively uniform expectations about the behavior of persons in various positions and that the behavior of these persons is interpreted in terms of such expectations.[34]

Newcomb suggested that:

> When we study human behavior in terms of roles, we are looking at its public, or shared aspects.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> When we talk about role we are referring to a set of behaviors which are expected of everyone in a particular position, regardless of who he is. When we use this concept we are not referring to the known ways in which people differ as they take the same roles, or to the variations in their motives and attitudes as they do so. Role is strictly a sociological concept; it purposely ignores individual psychological facts.[35]

Certainly without some degree of consensus on what is expected of a person in a particular position, any statistical analysis of expectations concerning that position would be extremely difficult, if not impossible.

It is interesting to note, however, that role consensus is not only a study concept--it is considered by many to be a very practical and desirable objective to try to achieve. "If an organization is to function effectively and efficiently," wrote Blalock, "it is important

---

[34] Jacobson, op. cit., p. 18.

[35] Newcomb, op. cit., p. 328.

that there be agreement on what is expected of individuals occupying different roles."[36]

Jacobson, Charters, and Lieberman pointed out a real value in role consensus when they wrote:

> The system of shared expectations in a formal organization can be looked upon as the basis for the behavior of individuals in the organization and for their interpretations of the behavior of others. Thus, the degree of integration existing within an organization at any time stems in part from the degree of consensus or sharing of expectations about the behavior of people who occupy various positions.[37]

RELATED LITERATURE

The author found a number of publications, formal and informal, that discussed to some degree the specialist's job in Cooperative Extension work. The 1948 Joint Committee Report on Extension Programs, Policies, and Goals described the specialist's job in the following manner:

> Their main functions are to keep abreast with the latest knowledge in their fields of specialization and to serve as liaison persons between county extension workers and the sources of new subject matter; to keep county workers advised of new scientific developments and their application to local problems; and to translate such findings into the form of effective teaching tools which the local agents may use in their educational programs. In cooperation with the supervisory staff, they perform a very valuable

---

[36] Blalock, op. cit., p. 94.

[37] Jacobson, op. cit., p. 20.

service through conducting organized training schools for county extension workers and local leaders.[38]

In their comprehensive book on Cooperative Extension Work, Kelsey and Hearne listed five broad group functions performed by subject-matter specialists: "planning functions, training functions, direct teaching, field studies to increase the effectiveness of the work in their respective subject-matter lines, and preparation of teaching materials."[39]

Kelsey and Hearne went on to list the following specific duties of specialists:

1. Keeping state and county extension workers up-to-date with regard to the findings of science and their application to the solution of farm and home problems.

2. Serving as a bridge between subject-matter research departments and field extension workers; interpreting the results of research in terms of desirable farm and home practices.

3. Assembling and analyzing facts, clarifying problems in the subject-matter field, studying the status of his enterprise throughout the state and the nation.

4. Helping county agents to develop sound county and community programs in which subject matter is correlated to best serve the interests of the farm and home as a family unit.

5. Assisting agents in the effective use of teaching methods peculiarly adapted to the subject matter involved.

---

[38]Joint Committee Report, op. cit., p. 38.

[39]Lincoln David Kelsey and Cannon Chiles Hearne, Cooperative Extension Work (third edition; Ithaca, New York: Comstock Publishing Associates, 1963), p. 73.

6. Backing up the county programs with suitable state-wide publicity, popular bulletins, form letters, motion pictures, film strips, slides, exhibits materials, and other teaching aids.

7. Making studies to determine successful and unsuccessful methods of organizing and conducting extension teaching in the particular subject-matter field.

8. Outlining measuring devices and procedures applicable to the subject-matter problems being attacked and assisting agents in their use.

9. Handling direct teaching of rural people within the county in such a manner as to strengthen the position of the county worker and enable him better to meet subject-matter problems arising after the specialist's departure.[40]

The 1960 "Organization Plan and Duties for Kansas Extension Service" outlines the following responsibilities of subject-matter specialists:

1. Training of county Extension agents in subject-matter and in methods of presenting subject-matter in the specific specialties which they represent.

2. Assisting county Extension agents in developing sound county programs in the subject matter fields which they represent and coordinating these programs on a statewide basis for the most effective teaching.

3. Interpreting research results in terms of desirable farm and home practices. Also presenting farm and home problems requiring research to the proper departments of the University.

4. Supporting county programs with suitable state-wide publicity and information in the form of radio, T.V. presentations and materials, popular bulletins, news stories, exhibits, slide sets and other teaching aids in their subject matter field.

5. Promoting cooperation with state and regional subject matter or enterprise groups. This includes such groups as livestock breed associations, crop improvement groups, fertilizer industries and etc.

---

[40] Ibid., pp. 74-75.

6. Coordinating Extension activities with their specific subject-matter departments in the University and with other state and federal agencies such as SCS, ASC, FHA, State Board of Agriculture and etc.

7. Keeping the Director advised, through their appropriate state leaders, of problems existing in their subject-matter fields and assisting in the evaluation of educational programs to dissolve these problems.[41]

Most of the other publications examined concerning the specialist's role indicate that formal listings of duties would be essentially the same as those listed above. There were, however, several articles that pointed out some rather interesting factors that might tend to influence how the specialist actually operates within his role.

In their article on the Extension specialist in Rural Sociology, Brown and Deakens pointed out:

> The Cooperative Extension Service does not fit the pattern of the formally organized bureaucracy with a hierarchy of offices in which channels of authority are clearly defined and offices have subordinate-superordinate relationships. In general, the specialist feels the administrator is his 'boss,' but directions are given by the county staff. In fact, it would seem that the specialist occupies a dysfunctional position, caught between the expectations of the administrator and county staff, both of whom exercise authority over the specialist, but in a different manner.
>
> The administrator is a source of reward for the specialist, concerning raises in rank and salary. But the county staff is also a source of reward because the specialist gets into a county only by invitation of the county staff. If he doesn't have his program accepted by the counties, he has no program. Extension administrators don't require the county agents to adopt the specialist's program. The degree to which a specialist gets his program accepted by the counties determines

---

41. "Organization Plan and Duties for Kansas Extension Service" (Manhattan: Kansas State University, January, 1960), pp. 10-11. (Mimeographed.)

> to a considerable extent his evaluation by administrators. Hence, the specialist uses many methods to promote his program and gain acceptance by counties. One of the most important techniques is to sell himself.[42]

Blalock recognized much the same problem when he stated;

> Even though the specialist is responsible to the state administration, the success of his efforts depends in great measure on how well he is received, and his services utilized, by county staffs. To be in the good graces of county personnel he may find his energies being expended in a direction not altogether in keeping with how he thinks his competence can be most effectively utilized.[43]

This presents somewhat of a practical problem to the subject-matter specialist in how he interprets his role and then applies that interpretation to actual practice.

If there was one sure consensus from the literature reviewed, it was that further study was needed concerning the specialist's role, especially in relation to a particular state's needs and programs. Brown and Vandeberg emphasized this when they wrote:

> This evidence substantiates the fact that the job of the specialist is changing. Change always means new arrangements and adjustments. It should be planned for. More effective extension organizations will result if county staff, specialists, supervisors, and administrators frankly discuss with each other implications of the changing times as they affect the specialist's job. Each state needs to discuss and think through what proportion of the specialists' time and resources should be allocated to: 1) performing duties of an agent trainer by keeping county agents informed in subject-matter and equipped with skills and materials to do teaching,

---

[42]Emory J. Brown and Albert Deekens, "Roles of the Extension Subject-Matter Specialist," Rural Sociology, 23:275, September, 1958.

[43]Blalock, op. cit., pp. 99-100.

2) doing direct teaching for the county agent by visiting rural people and talking at county meetings, and 3) working with individuals, groups, and organizations at district, state, regional, or even national levels.[44]

Two relatively new trends in Cooperative Extension work may have a vital effect on the specialist's role in the future. These two trends are toward (1) the area Extension specialist and (2) the multicounty or area agent. At present the available literature on these trends is limited and largely speculative, but it seems likely that more and more studies and trials will be needed to evaluate the effectiveness of these trends.

The area specialist is the older and more established trend of the two. There has been a significant increase in the use of area specialists in the last decade or so. The effect of this area specialist trend on the specialist role will probably be more limited because it is a relatively easy trend to integrate into the traditional Cooperative Extension concepts and methods of operation. Lanpher points out that the area specialist "tends to perform much like a State specialist but in a smaller geographical area."[45]

The newer concept of the area agent would appear to present more complex organizational problems to the Cooperative Extension Service. This trend is geared to meet the need for specialization on a more

---

[44]Brown and Vandeberg, op. cit., p. 13.

[45]Buel F. Lanpher, "What About Area Agents," Extension Service Review, 36:3, July, 1965.

localized level. Commenting on the need for an area agent program, J. B. Claar, Director of the Illinois Cooperative Extension Service, stated:

> No longer is it possible for one person to maintain high competance in all the fields in which Cooperative Extension conducts programs. The public will thus be better served if the subject-matter scope of each staff member's assignment is limited.[46]

In his article on the work of Extension area agents, Lanpher pointed out:

> Multicounty area agents work directly with clientele in much the same manner as county agents have done. In contrast to State and area specialists they have little or no responsibility for supporting the programs of county or other Extension personnel. Also, they have little responsibility for training other agents.[47]

The area agent is generally more free to work on his program, as he sees fit, throughout his multicounty area in a relatively independent manner.

There seemed to be no indication from the literature reviewed that the area agent concept was intended to replace the Extension subject-matter specialist, but neither did there seem to be much doubt that it would significantly influence and alter the specialist's role. Judging from the results of a Federal Extension Service study of area agents in thirteen states, Lanpher wrote:

> State specialist programs appeared to be significantly affected by area agent staffing. They are expected to become 'super-specialists' in more basic technology areas in order to give

---

[46] J. B. Claar, "More Specialization for County Extension Staff," Illinois Research, Illinois Agricultural Experiment Station, 8:17, Summer, 1966.

[47] Lanpher, op. cit., p. 3.

needed support to area agent programs. In general, they tended to become increasingly involved and influential in program development at the field level.[48]

In writing about a 1961 pilot study on area Extension work in California, Robert Johnson concluded:

> The role of the state subject matter specialist will likely be substantially altered by area work. More specific assignments may be required to enable state specialists to continue effective service as resource consultants and in-service trainers to area extension staff. Constant attention to the role of the state specialist, as area work develops, is needed. Changing roles will require increasingly specialized academic work for specialists, with a need for corresponding opportunities for professional improvement.[49]

RELATED STUDIES

A number of studies have been conducted with the objective of further defining the subject-matter specialist's role in the Cooperative Extension Service--particularly in more recent years.

One of the earliest attempts was a study conducted by Reid and Wilson of the Federal Extension Service and published in 1933. In this very comprehensive study, administrators, specialists, and county agents from all over the United States were questioned concerning the specialist role. They summarized some of their findings in the following manner:

---

[48] Ibid., p. 5.

[49] Robert L. Johnson, Area Extension Work: A Pilot Study of the Professional Status of Area Extension Personnel in California, 1961, Extension Study 1 (Manhattan: Extension Service, Kansas State University, April, 1966), p.13.

> The functions of subject-matter specialists may be divided into planning functions, requiring 26 per cent of the time of specialists; training functions taking 25 per cent; direct teaching 42 per cent; and studying the extension job 7 per cent.
>
> The planning of extension projects is the most important function of specialists according to extension directors; the preparation of teaching materials, the determination of programs, the training of extension workers, and direct extension teaching following in the order given.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Participation in extension teaching activities in counties, conferences with agents, field observations, preparation of bulletins and circulars, demonstrational materials, and charts, and the handling of correspondence are their most important activities according to the statements of the specialists themselves.
>
> The problems most frequently mentioned by agents for additional attention by specialists were studies to determine the most effective way of conducting subject-matter projects, keeping posted, teaching materials, ways of determining results of work, collection of data on results, community and county programs of work and assistance with demonstrations and leader training meetings.[50]

Several of Reid and Wilson's findings concerning the expectations held by administrators about the specialist job are particularly interesting when compared with more recent studies:

> Nearly two-thirds of the directors consider the direct teaching of rural people either on the state-wide or county basis as of high value. It is rather surprising, however, to note that but 60 per cent of the directors rate high the function of specialists to keep other extension workers posted on recent developments in the subject-matter field.[51]

---

[50] Reid and Wilson, op. cit., pp. 39-40.

[51] Ibid., p. 6.

It would appear that there has been a change in attitude concerning these functions between 1933 and more recent times.

In 1952, administrators, specialists, and county staff in the Iowa Extension Service were interviewed concerning the functions of specialists. The results of this study were published in a report by Neil Raudabaugh.[52] In one part of the study, all participants were asked to check which of seven statements of common concepts of the functions of specialists most nearly coincided with their understanding of the specialist's job. Following are the concepts ranked in descending order of importance as determined by the percentage of persons agreeing with them:

1. Supply technical 'know-how' in subject matter field (84%).

2. Liaison between experiment station and county extension staff (83%).

3. Instruct county staff and local leaders in problems involving subject matter (74%).

4. Advise state director and supervisory staff on problems in subject matter field (72%).

5. Head extension program in subject matter field throughout the state (49%).

6. Assist county staff with problems in subject-matter field much like a county agent at large (38%).

7. Functions largely as a 'service man' who speaks at meetings and does other direct teaching upon request of counties (33%).[53]

---

[52] J. Neil Raudabaugh, Functions of Extension Specialists, ST 383 (Ames: Agricultural Extension Service, Iowa State College, 1952).

[53] Ibid., p. 14.

In another portion of the same study, participants were asked to rate eight general functions as being of major, intermediate, or minor relative importance in providing the most desirable basis for conducting extension work. The results were as follows:

Major Importance.
1. Keeping up to date on subject-matter and methods.
2. Keeping county staff posted.
3. Preparation of teaching.

Intermediate Importance.
4. Indirect teaching through training.
5. Program determination and work planning.
6. Evaluation of procedures, methods, outcomes, progress reports.

Minor Importance.
7. Direct teaching of individuals and groups beyond that required for demonstration purposes.
8. Service activity.[54]

Brown and Deekens summarized their findings from a study involving fifty-three Pennsylvania extension specialists in the following manner:

> Acting as a student was rated as the most important role for a specialist to perform. Other important roles in rank order were keeping county staff up to date on subject-matter, being a demonstrator or public speaker, being consultant to the county staff, and interpreting research results for other people.
>
> Roles such as performing office details, assisting county with evaluation and methods, training local leaders, evaluating own program, direct teaching of farmers and homemakers, and advising research people on research needs were rated relatively low in order of importance. It is evident that consultant to county staff is generally restricted to subject matter, rather than methods. With the exception of direct teaching, the roles

---

[54] Ibid., pp. 30-31.

considered important form a pattern that is somewhat similar to the roles they actually perform.[55]

Scheneman conducted a study of the specialist in the Missouri Extension Service. All extension personnal were asked to rate fourteen spacialist functions according both to their importance and to how they were actually being performed. The following six functions listed in descending rank order were considered to be of major importance (the numbers in parentheses indicate how the functions ranked in performance):

1. Keeping agents supplied with technical information and developing agent understanding of its application (8).

2. Supplying background and outlook information in the specialist's field to aid counties in program planning (5).

3. Acting as a resource person for agents to phone or write on problems (1).

4. Maintaining two-way relationships with industries in their field, keeping them posted as to recommendations being made in Extension and vice-versa (13).

5. Developing and supplying to agents visual aids, out-lines, and materials in the specialist's field that could be used by agents in carrying out the county program (14).

6. Keeping agents and state agents posted on resources in their field, i.e., new books, bulletins, articles, movies and equipment (10).[56]

Using similar techniques, Harvey questioned specialists in six states concerning the specialist role. In this study he divided the specialists into the following five broad subject matter categories:

---

[55]Brown and Deekens, op. cit., p. 268.

[56]Carl N. Scheneman, "The Functions and Procedures of Subject Matter Specialists in the Missouri Cooparative Extension Service" (unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1959), p. 128.

I. Specialists generally dealing with primary production problems in agriculture.

II. Specialists generally relied upon to provide specialized technical skills or knowledge in support of Extension programs in other specialities.

III. Specialists dealing primarily with over-all management and marketing problems.

IV. Specialists dealing primarily with social and community questions.

V. Specialists dealing primarily with home economics and family life.[57]

Using these categories, he analyzed the differences in how these various groups of specialists viewed their roles in Cooperative Extension work. Harvey summarized a portion of his findings in the following manner:

> Based upon the findings in this study, specialist policies and procedures are different for the different broad subject areas. The classifications of specialists considered in this study recognized different groups as their primary clientele, perceived different major functions, identified different hinderances in their work and had different concepts regarding their general role in the Extension organization. This study provides clear evidence that generalizations cannot be made to the effect that extension specialists constitute a homogeneous group.[58]

In his conclusions, Harvey stated:

> Administrators frequently tend to place or deal with personnel in large groups to facilitate personnel management and administration. Under these circumstances, unless there are flexible policies and procedures, the work of extension specialists may be impeded because of differences in the specialization of their training,

---

[57] Harvey, op. cit., p. 17.

[58] Ibid., pp. 118-119.

differences in the primary clientele for whom their specialized subject matter is most appropriate, and in the nature of the work they perform.[59]

In Ringler's study of agronomy specialists, the two most important functions were determined to be:

1. Preparing and providing county agents with circulars, form letters, and bulletins, which can be used in carrying out a sound program in agronomy.

2. Keeping county agents and district leaders informed on new research information releassd by the experiment station.[60]

Donald Hamilton conducted a study of Kansas extension specialists in 1960. Specialists and county agents were asked to rank five specialist functions in their order of importance. Specialists and agents generally agreed on the following ranking:

1. A trainer and teacher of agents by devoting major emphasis to developing their understanding of subject matter and ways of using it.

2. A subject matter consultant and expert always on call to county staffs, organizations, and individuals for answering questions and helping solve problems.

3. Teaching people in the state by speaking at public meetings in counties, training local leaders, or making visits to individuals in counties upon request of county extension personnel.

4. A resource and liaison person transmitting problems and needs of people to research and resident staff members and extension administrators.

---

[59] Ibid., p. 119.

[60] Ringler, op. cit., p. 91.

5. Developing an interest at the county level in the specialist's subject matter area where there is need for the speciality but where there has been little or no awareness.[61]

Commenting on some of his results, Hamilton stated:

A brief summary of findings in the area of role expectations provides evidence that training agents especially in new developments within the subject-matter specialist's area is wanted and may be assumed as not being sufficiently done. The entire atmosphere presented by the agents reflects a need for assistance and training that is useful, valuable, and reliable; the county personnel are pressed for time and cannot investigate all information for every answer to every question.[62]

SUMMARY

A review of the literature indicates a rather general agreement on the need for subject-matter specialists in Cooperative Extension work. However, when it comes to the specific functions and how the specialist can best fulfill this need, related research has indicated fraquant variations in perceptions among the different individuals and groups concerned.

Several studies concerning the specialist's role indicated that there was a very real conflict between some of the expectations held by Extension administrators and those held by county agents, with the specialists caught somewhere in the middle. For example, Baudabsugh's

---

[61]Donald Frank Hamilton, "An Examination of Role Expectation, Role Performance and Perception of Extension Specialists in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service" (unpublished Masters report, Kansas State University, Manhattan, 1960), pp. 16-19.

[62]Ibid., p. 17.

report on his Iowa study stated, "The evaluation of the present basis of doing extension work in the state indicates a lack of a definite concept of which general functions of subject matter specialists are major, which are intermediate, and which are minor."[63] The research review also showed that some variations in role expectations were related to the various subject matter project areas and to the different types of state Extension organization.

Nearly every article and research report reviewed stressed the opinion that further study and discussion were needed to clarify and understand the specialist role in a changing Cooperative Extension Service. Brown and Vandeberg pointed this out when they wrote:

> Each state needs to discuss and think through what proportion of the specialists' time and resources should be allocated to: 1) performing duties of an agent trainer by keeping county agents informed in subject matter and equipped with skills and materials to do teaching, 2) doing direct teaching for the county agent by visiting rural people and talking at county meetings, and 3) working with individuals, groups, and organizations at district, state, regional, or even national levels.[64]

---

[63]Raudabaugh, op. cit., p. 1.

[64]Brown and Vandeberg, op. cit., p. 13.

CHAPTER III

EXPECTATIONS CONCERNING THE ROLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SPECIALIST IN KANSAS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with an analysis of data collected by mail questionnaire from three groups of Kansas Extension personnel concerning their expectations of the role of the agricultural Extension specialist. The three respondent groups selected by the author as role definers of the agricultural specialist's job were: (1) Extension administrators, (2) county agricultural agents, and (3) the agricultural Extension specialists themselves. Their expectations were measured in terms of fourteen selected specialist functions that they were asked to rate according to: (1) the emphasis that should be given them and (2) the emphasis currently being given them.

The fourteen specialist functions rated were:

1. Acting as an on-call source of information for agents to phone or write on problems.

2. Backing up county programs with suitable statewide publicity in the form of news releases, radio talks, TV programs, or other mass media techniques.

3. Performing direct service type activities, such as making visits to an individual farm, home, or firm.

4. Serving as a resource person to agents and county Extension councils in county program development.

5. Advising research staff on the research needs and problems determined in the field.

6. Training agents in subject matter, its application, and methods of presentation.

7. Helping agents evaluate projects that have been carried out in specific subject matter areas.

8. Holding public meetings.

9. Acting in a liaison capacity between Extension and industries in their field on new projects, recommendations, marketing, field tests, and research findings.

10. Developing an interest at the county level in the specialist's subject-matter area where there is a need for this specialty.

11. Developing and supplying to agents visual aids, leaflets, bulletins, and other materials that could be used by agents in carrying out county programs.

12. Training lay leaders in subject matter, its application, and methods of presentation.

13. Reporting program progress and accomplishments.

14. Keeping up to date on pertinent new developments and research in his subject matter area.

For brevity and ease of reference, a standard set of abbreviations for the fourteen functions is used throughout the text. These abbreviations are shown in Appendix A.

Five degrees of emphasis with numerical values of 5 to 1 were used in rating each of these specialist functions. The same type of rating scale was used for both emphasis that should be given and emphasis currently being given. The five degrees of emphasis with the numerical values assigned them were as follows:

(5) Major Emphasis - A function which receives (or should recive) a great deal of attention and top priority of time.

(4) Important Emphasis- A function which is seldom (or seldom should be) neglected, but might be postponed for top priority work.

(3) Intermediate Emphasis - A function which is done (or should be done) but might be postponed for more urgent work.

(2) Minor Emphasis - A function which might be (or might ought to be) done, but only if a person finds time.

(1) No Emphasis - A function on which no time is (or ought to be) spent.

For each function, respondents were asked to circle a number indicating the emphasis they believed it should receive and a number indicating the emphasis they believed it was currently receiving.

After the data were punched on IBM cards, sorted, and grouped, they were processed through a computer program that furnished for each function the number and per cent of respondents for each degree of emphasis. The mean weighted score for each function also was given. This information was computed both for emphasis that should be given and for emphasis

currantly being given. For brevity, the emphasis that should be given will be referred to as "should be" emphasis and the emphasis currently being given as "currently being" emphasis. The data were computed for each of the three respondent groups and then for all respondents combined. Computations also were made for the two specialist project groups and the three specialist experience groups analyzed.

For each of the different groups whose ratings were analyzed, the fourteen specialist functions were ranked according to their mean weighted scores. Tables were then prepared to show the rankings of these functions by each of the groups. In making comparisons and analyses of these rankings, differences of four or more ranks are indicated by the words "considerable" or "considerably."

The overall degree of agreement or association between any two sets of rankings of the specialist functions was measured by the calculation of the Spearman coefficient of rank correlation (rho): $\frac{1 - 6\ d^2}{N^3 - N}$. For a measure of agreement or association among three sets of rankings, the Kendall coefficient of concordance was used: $W = \frac{S}{1/12K^2(N^3-N)}$. The one-tailed t-test was used in determining the significance of rho since a general agreement was expected among the three respondent groups concerning the specialist functions. Correlations that were not at least significant at the .10 level were considered not significant for purposes of this study. Chi square was used in testing the significance of W.

The highest percentage of respondents who selected the same degree of emphasis for a particular function was used as an indication of consensus

within a group concerning that function. High consensus was considered to be percentages of 70 or above. Medium consensus was considered to be percentages from 50 to 69. Percentages of 49 or below were considered to indicate low consensus.

Tables showing the rankings of the specialist functions by the various groups analyzed are included in this chapter. More detailed tables showing numbers, percentage distributions, mean weighted scores, and consensus figures for each function are included in Appendix C.

The rest of this chapter is organized on the basis of the five stated objectives for this study.

OBJECTIVE ONE--EMPHASIS THAT SHOULD BE GIVEN

The first stated objective of this study was:

> To determine the relative degree of emphasis that should be given to certain selected specialist functions as perceived by the three respondent groups--Extension administrators, county agricultural agents, and agricultural Extension specialists--both collectively and separately.

The data in Table IV reflects the ratings of the fourteen specialist functions by the three major respondent groups as to the emphasis that should be given them. Included in the table is a ranking by the composite total of all three groups combined.

The four functions considered to be most important in the composite ranking were: "Keeping up to date . . .," "Acting as an on-call source . . .," "Advising research staff . . .," and "Developing and supplying visual aids. . . ." The four functions considered to be least important in the

TABLE IV

RANK ORDER OF FUNCTIONS OF THE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SPECIALIST IN KANSAS AS TO EMPHASIS THAT SHOULD BE GIVEN, 1964

Functions	Rank Order			
	Composite All Groups (N=196)	Spec. (N=79)	Admin. (N=11)	CA (N=106)
Keeping up to date on partinent new developments and research in his subject matter area.	1	1	2	1
Acting as an on-call source of information for agents to phone or write on problems.	2	2	11.5	2
Advising research staff on the research needs and problems determined in the field.	3	3	4	4.5
Developing and supplying to agents visual aids, leaflets, bulletins, and other materials that could be used by agents in carrying out county programs.	4	4.5	1	4.5
Training agents in subject matter, its application, and methods of presentation.	5	6	3	3
Serving as a resource person to agents and county Extension councils in county program development.	6	4.5	5.5	6
Backing up county programs with suitable statewide publicity in the form of news releases, radio talks, TV programs, or other mass media techniques.	7	7	7	7
Acting in a liaison capacity between Extension and industries in their field on new projects, recommendations, marketing, field tests, and research findings.	8	8	5.5	8
Holding public meetings	9	11	13	9

TABLE IV (continued)

Functions	Rank Order: Composite All Groups (N=196)	Spec. (N=79)	Admin. (N=11)	CA (N=106)
Helping agents evaluate projects that have been carried out in specific subject matter areas.	10	10	8.5	10
Developing an interest at the county level in the specialist's subject-matter area where there is a need for the specialty.	11	9	8.5	12.5
Reporting program progress and accomplishments	12	12	10	12.5
Training lay leaders in subject matter, its application and methods of presentation.	13	14	11.5	11
Performing direct service type activities, such as making visits to an individual farm, home, or firm.	14	13	14	14

composite ranking were in descending order: "Developing an interest . . .," "Reporting program progress . . . ," "Training lay leaders . . . ," and "Performing direct service . . . ."

In general, there was a great deal of agreement among the three respondent groups in their rankings of these functions as to emphasis that should be given. The major difference was on the function of "Acting as an on-call source . . ." Both the specialists and the county agents ranked this function second only to "Keeping up to date . . ." in order of importance. Administrators on the other hand ranked "Acting as an

on-call source . . ." at 11.5. The administrator group ranked "Developing and supplying visual aids . . ." as the most important specialist function while both the specialists and county agents ranked it at 4.5. "Keeping up to date . . ." was ranked second in importance by the administrators.

The greatest agreement in the "should be" rankings was between the specialist and county agent respondent groups. The rho correlation between these two groups was +.912. On none of the fourteen functions was there a considerable difference of four or more ranks between specialist and agent rankings. County agents ranked "Training agents . . ." as the third most important function whereas specialists ranked it sixth. Although both groups ranked "Training lay leaders . . ." low, specialists ranked it last while agents gave it a ranking of 11. The widest difference between the specialist and county agent groups was on the function "Developing an interest . . ." which specialists ranked ninth while agents ranked it at 12.5. The high agreement between these two groups on the "should be" emphasis is indicated by the fact that they had identical rankings on six of the fourteen specialist functions.

The two respondent groups with the lowest rho correlation were the administrator and county agent groups with a rho correlation of +.666. Using the one-tailed test, this correlation is still significant at the .005 level. In addition to the wide disagreement on "Acting as an on-call source . . .," administrators and county agents differed considerably on their rankings of two other functions. Both groups rated

"Developing an interest . . ." and "Holding public meetings" on the lower half of the over-all ranking scale, but administrators ranked "Developing an interest . . ." considerably higher than the agents did. The agent group in turn rated "Holding public meetings" considerably higher than did the administrators.

In comparing the rankings of the administrator and specialist respondent groups, a rho correlation of +.694 was determined. This was significant at the .0005 level using the one-tailed test. Except for the wide spread on "Acting as an on-call source . . ., "there were no functions on which the specialists and administrators differed considerably. There were three functions which the administrators ranked 3 or 3.5 ranks higher than did the specialists. These three functions were "Developing and supplying visual aids . . .," "Training agents . . .," and "Training lay leaders . . ."

In considering the three respondent groups together, there was a high degree of agreement among the three groups concerning the emphasis that should be given the specialist functions. Kendall's coefficient of concordance for the groups was a W of .835 which was significant somewhere above the .01 level. This agreement also was evident from comparison of which functions the three respondent groups ranked in the top seven ranks. While varying somewhat on individual functions, the specialist and county agent groups included the same seven specialist functions in the top seven categories. Administrators, in turn, rate six of these same seven functions in the top seven. The one difference was that

administrators included "Acting in a liaison capacity . . ." instead of "Acting as an on-call source . . ." in the top seven ranks.

When considering the overall rankings, the specialist group fell somewhere between the administrator and the county agent groups. However, it was readily apparent from comparing the different rankings and rho correlations that the specialists were generally in far closer agreement with the agents than with the administrators on what the specialist should be doing.

It was interesting to compare the consensus figures for the various groups and functions. The consensus figure for any particular function and group was the highest percentage of respondents who selected the same degree of emphasis for that particular function. High consensus was considered to be 70 per cent or more and medium consensus, 50 to 69 per cent. The consensus figures are recorded in Appendix C, Table XII.

The only function on which all three respondent groups reached a high degree of consensus was "Keeping up to date . . ." The greatest amount of consensus was among the administrators who reached high consensus on five functions and medium consensus on four others. On the function, "Developing and supplying visual aids . . .," the administrators had perfect consensus when they all rated it of major importance. The county agents reached high consensus on two functions and medium consensus on four more. The lowest consensus was generally among the specialists who only reached high consensus on one function and medium consensus on two others.

Among all three respondent groups, there was a general pattern in the consensus figures for the higher ranking functions--the higher a function was ranked, the higher the consensus on it tended to be. No such trend was apparent in the lower ranking functions. There were three functions on which all three groups had a low consensus of less than 50 per cent. These three functions were "Reporting program progress . . .," "Training lay leaders . . .," and "Performing direct service . . . ."

OBJECTIVE TWO--EMPHASIS CURRENTLY BEING GIVEN

The second stated objective of this study was:

> To determine the relative degree of emphasis that is currently being given to these selected specialist functions as perceived by the three respondent groups, both collectively and separately.

Table V lists the rankings of the fourteen specialist functions by the three respondent groups as to the degree of emphasis they believe is currently being given them. The composite ranking is for all three groups combined.

The four functions considered in the composite ranking to be receiving the greatest current emphasis were in descending order: "Acting as an on-call source . . .," "Keeping up to date . . .," "Holding public meetings," and "Backing up county programs . . ." The four functions currently receiving the least emphasis according to the composite group were in their descending rank order: "Performing direct service . . .," "Acting in a liaison capacity . . .," "Training lay leaders . . .," and "Helping agents evaluate . . ."

TABLE V

RANK ORDER OF FUNCTIONS OF THE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SPECIALIST IN KANSAS AS TO EMPHASIS CURRENTLY BEING GIVEN, 1964

Functions*	Rank Order			
	Composite All Groups (N=196)	Spec. (N=79)	Admin. (N=11)	CA (N=106)
Acting as an on-call source . . .	1	1	2	2
Keeping up to date . . .	2	3	6	1
Holding public meetings	3	2	1	3
Backing up county programs . . .	4	6	4.5	5
Training agents . . .	5	4	7.5	6
Reporting program progress . . .	6	7	14	9
Developing and supplying visual aids . . .	7	8	3	10
Serving as a resource person . . .	8	9	10.5	7
Advising research staff . . .	9	13	10.5	4
Developing an interest . . .	10	10	9	11
Performing direct service . . .	11	5	4.5	14
Acting in a liaison capacity . . .	12	12	12.5	8
Training ley leaders . . .	13	11	7.5	12
Helping agents evaluate . . .	14	14	12.5	13

*Functions are stated in full in Table IV and Appendix A.

There was general agreement among the three respondent groups in their rankings of the specialist functions according to the emphasis currently being given them. However, a comparison between the specialist and administrator rankings was the only comparison that yielded a higher Spearman rank correlation coefficient for current emphasis than for emphasis that should be given. The rho correlation between specialists and administrators was +.726 which was the highest rho correlation between any two groups on the "currently being" rankings. This rho correlation was significant at the .0005 level using the one-tailed t-test.

The specialist and administrator groups differed considerably in their rankings on two functions. The administrators ranked "Reporting program progress . . ." last in terms of current emphasis while the specialists ranked it seventh. On the other hand, administrators ranked "Developing and supplying visual aids . . ." considerably higher than did the specialists. The specialists ranked "Acting as an on-call source . . ." first and "Holding public meetings" second in current emphasis while the administrators reversed these two rankings. The specialists ranked "Keeping up to date . . ." third while administrators ranked it sixth.

The specialist and county agent groups differed far more widely on the emphasis currently being given than they did on the emphasis that should be given. The rho correlation for these two groups dropped from a +.912 on the "should be" rankings t a +.552 on the "currently being" rankings. This lower correlation figure for current emphasis, however,

was still significant at the .01 level.

The specialists and county agents varied considerably in their rankings of three functions as to current emphasis--two of the variations being extremely wide. The specialists ranked "Performing direct service . . ." fifth, but the county agents ranked it in last place. In turn, the county agents ranked "Advising research staff . . ." fourth in current emphasis while the specialists ranked it thirteenth. County agents also ranked "Acting in a liaison capacity . . ." considerably higher. The agent group ranked "Keeping up to date . . ." first, "Acing as an on-call source . . ." second, and "Holding public meetings" third in current specialist emphasis.

The greatest disagreement on emphasis currently being given the specialist functions was between administrators and county agents. The rho correlation for these two groups was +.349 which was significant at the .10 level. This was by far the lowest rho correlation for any two groups in either the "should be" or the "currently being" rankings.

The administrator and county agent groups differed considerably on their rankings of seven specialist functions as to emphasis currently being given them. The county agents ranked "Keeping up to date. . ." as the function receiving the greatest current emphasis, while the administrators ranked it sixth. County agents also ranked "Advising research staff . . .," "Acting in a liaison capacity . . .," and "Reporting program progress . . ." considerably higher and "Training lay leaders . . ." considerably lower than did the administrators. The administrator group

ranked "Developing and supplying visual aids . . ." third, but the county agents ranked it clear down to tenth on current emphasis. The widest difference was on "Performing direct service . . ." which was ranked 4.5 by the administrators and last by the agents.

In considering the rankings of all three respondent groups together there was a general agreement among them concerning the emphasis currently being given the specialist functions. The Kendall coefficient of concordance for the three groups was a W of .692. While this was lower than the W for the "should be" rankings, it was still significant at somewhere above the .02 level. This indicated a general, overall agreement on what the specialists were actually doing.

Among all three respondent groups there was far less consensus on the "currently being" rankings than there was on the "should be" rankings. In the current emphasis rankings, none of the three groups reached high consensus on a function. The group with the greatest amount of consensus was the administrator group which reached medium consensus on six functions. The specialists reached medium consensus on only one function--"Developing an interest . . ." The only function that county agents had medium consensus on was "Holding public meetings."

There was no apparent pattern in the consensus figures for the current emphasis rankings. The high ranking functions were just as likely to have a lower consensus figure as were the low ranking functions. There were a total of seven functions on which all three groups had a low consensus of less than 50 per cent. The consensus figures on the "currently

being" ratings are recorded in Appendix C, Table XIII.

OBJECTIVE THREE--COMPARISON OF "SHOULD BE" TO "CURRENTLY BEING"

The third stated objective of this study was:

> To determine the relationship between the emphasis that should be given and the emphasis currently being given these specialist functions as perceived by the three respondent groups, both collectively and separately.

A comparison was made between each group's ranking according to emphasis that should be given and its ranking according to emphasis currently being given. Such a comparison gave an indication of how well a group felt the specialists currently were doing in meeting that group's expectations. A high degree of agreement between "should be" and "currently being" rankings was assumed to indicate that a group believed that the Extension specialist was doing what he should be doing.

The comparison shown in Table VI between the composite rankings for "should be" and "currently being" gave a rho correlation of +.618 which was significant at the .005 level. This indicated a fairly high agreement even though there were five functions on which there was considerable difference between "should be" and "currently being" rankings. The agreement between the composite rankings was somewhat misleading, however, since only one of the three respondent groups actually had a significant rho correlation between "should be" and "currently being" rankings.

TABLE VI

COMPARISON OF THE "SHOULD BE" AND "CURRENTLY BEING" RANKINGS OF THE SPECIALIST FUNCTIONS BY THE COMPOSITE OF ALL THREE GROUPS, KANSAS, 1964

Functions*	Rank Order		Difference
	Should be	Currently Being	
Keeping up to date . . .	1	2	1
Acting as an on-call source . . .	2	1	1
Advising research staff . . .	3	9	6
Developing and supplying visual aids . . .	4	7	3
Training agents . . .	5	5	0
Serving as a resource person . . .	6	8	2
Backing up county programs . . .	7	4	3
Acting in a liaison capacity . . .	8	12	4
Holding public meetings	9	3	6
Helping agents evaluate . . .	10	14	4
Developing an interest . . .	11	10	1
Reporting program progress . . .	12	6	6
Training lay leaders . . .	13	13	0
Reforming direct service . . .	14	11	3

*Functions are stated in full in Table IV and Appendix A.

The county agent group had a rho correlation of +.769 which was significant at the .0005 level. The comparison between the two sets of county agent rankings is shown in Table VII. There were only two functions on which there was a considerable difference between the "should be" and "currently being" rankings of the agricultural county agents. They felt that the specialist should be giving greater emphasis to "Developing and supplying visual aids . . ." and less emphasis to "Holding public meetings." In general, however, the county agents apparently thought that the specialist was doing just about what he should be doing in terms of relative emphasis given the different functions.

It did not appear that the specialists themselves were as contented as the county agents were with the job that the specialists were doing. The rho correlation between the "should be" and "currently being" rankings of the specialists was +.221 which was not significant at the .10 level.

Table VIII shows that there were seven functions on which the specialists differed considerably between their "should be" and "currently being" rankings. The specialists felt that they should be giving considerably greater emphasis than they currently were to "Advising research staff . . .," "Serving as a resource person . . .," "Acting in a liaison capacity . . .," and "Helping agents evaluate . . . ." The widest variation was on "Advising research staff . . ." which the specialist group ranked third as to emphasis that should be given and thirteenth in terms of current emphasis. Specialists also felt that less emphasis should be

TABLE VII

COMPARISON OF THE "SHOULD BE" AND "CURRENTLY BEING" RANKINGS OF THE SPECIALIST FUNCTIONS BY THE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL AGENTS, KANSAS, 1964

Functions*	Rank Order		Difference
	Should Be	Currently Being	
Keeping up to date . . .	1	1	0
Acting as an on-call source . . .	2	2	0
Training agents . . .	3	6	3
Advising research staff . . .	4.5	4	.5
Developing and supplying visual aids . . .	4.5	10	5.5
Serving as a resource person . . .	6	7	1
Backing up county programs . . .	7	5	2
Acting in a liaison capacity . . .	8	8	0
Holding public meetings	9	3	6
Helping agents evaluate . . .	10	13	3
Training lay leaders . . .	11	12	1
Developing an interest . . .	12.5	11	1.5
Reporting program progress . . .	12.5	9	3.5
Performing diract service . . .	14	14	0

*Functions are stated in full in Table IV and Appendix A.

TABLE VIII

COMPARISON OF THE "SHOULD BE" AND "CURRENTLY BEING" RANKINGS OF THE SPECIALIST FUNCTIONS BY THE SPECIALISTS THEMSELVES, KANSAS, 1964

Functions*	Rank Order		Difference
	Should Be	Currently Being	
Keeping up to date . . .	1	3	2
Acting as an on-call source . . .	2	1	1
Advising research staff . . .	3	13	10
Developing and supplying visual aids . . .	4.5	8	3.5
Serving as a resource person . . .	4.5	9	4.5
Training agents . . .	6	4	2
Backing up county programs . . .	7	6	1
Acting in a liaison capacity . . .	8	12	4
Developing an interest . . .	9	10	1
Helping agents evaluate . . .	10	14	4
Holding public meetings . . .	11	2	9
Reporting program progress . . .	12	7	5
Performing direct service . . .	13	5	8
Training lay leaders . . .	14	11	3

*Functions are stated in full in Table IV and Appendix A.

given to "Holding public meetings," "Performing direct service . . .," and "Reporting program progress . . . ." They ranked "Holding public meetings" second only to "Acting as an on-call source . . ." on emphasis currently being given, but they ranked it eleventh on emphasis that should be given.

Of the three respondent groups, the Extension administrators had the lowest correlation between their "should be" and "currently being" rankings of the specialist functions. Comparison of their two rankings actually gave a negative rho correlation of -.186. However, this was not a significant negative correlation at even the .10 level.

Table IX shows the comparative rankings by the administrators. On eleven of the fourteen functions, the administrator group differed considerably between its "should be" and "currently being" rankings. Functions which they felt the specialists should be giving considerably more emphasis to were "Keeping up to date . . . ," "Training agents . . .," "Advising research staff . . . ," "Serving as a resource person . . .," "Acting in a liaison capacity . . .," "Helping agents evaluate . . . ," and "Reporting program progress . . . ." In turn, they felt that relatively less emphasis should be given to "Acting as an on-call source . . .," "Training lay leaders . . . ," "Holding public meetings," and "Performing direct service . . . ." The widest variation was on the two functions, "Holding public meetings" and "Acting as an on-call source . . . ." In terms of current emphasis, administrators ranked these functions first and second respectively. When it came to emphasis that should be given, however, these same two functions were given rankings of 13 and

TABLE IX

COMPARISON OF THE "SHOULD BE" AND "CURRENTLY BEING" RANKINGS OF THE SPECIALIST FUNCTIONS BY THE EXTENSION ADMINISTRATORS, KANSAS, 1964

Functions*	Rank Order		Difference
	Should Be	Currently Being	
Developing and supplying visual aids . . .	1	3	2
Keeping up to date . . .	2	6	4
Training agents . . .	3	7.5	4.5
Advising research staff . . .	4	10.5	6.5
Serving as a resource person . . .	5.5	10.5	5
Acting in a liaison capacity . . .	5.5	12.5	7
Backing up county programs . . .	7	4.5	2.5
Helping agents evaluate . . .	8.5	12.5	4
Developing an interest . . .	8.5	9	.5
Reporting program progress . . .	10	14	4
Acting as an on-call source . . .	11.5	2	9.5
Training lay leaders . . .	11.5	7.5	4
Holding public meetings	13	1	12
Performing direct service . . .	14	4.5	9.5

*Functions are stated in full in Table IV and Appendix A.

11.5 respectively. Another wide difference was on "Performing direct service . . ." which administrators ranked last in emphasis that should be given, but 4.5 in current emphasis.

One other comparison made between the "should be" and the "currently being" ratings was the comparison of mean weighted scores. The mean weighted scores for "should be" and "currently being" emphasis are shown in Appendix C, Tables XII and XIII. A mean weighted score represents the average numerical value of the ratings given a particular function by the members of a respondent group. It should be remembered that the rankings used in this study were actually an indication of the relative values rather than the actual values of the mean weighted scores assigned to the various functions by a particular group. A comparison between two sets of rankings was only a comparison of relative values within each rank, not of actual rating values. The comparison between the mean weighted scores, therefore, was an entirely different type of comparison from those previously discussed.

When the mean weighted scores were compared, a pattern that was common to all respondent groups became quite evident. This pattern was that for equivalently ranked functions, the mean weighted scores for "currently being" ratings were consistently lower than those for the "should be" ratings. For example, the function ranked highest by the specialist group in terms of current emphasis had a mean weighted score of 4.09, while the function they ranked first according to "should be" emphasis had a mean weighted score of 4.78. This pattern held true

even where the same function had identical ranking for both types of emphasis. The county agent respondent group ranked "Keeping up to date . . ." first both for "currently being" and for "should be" emphasis, but the corresponding mean weighted scores were 4.19 and 4.87 respectively. At the other end of the scale, the county agents ranked "Performing direct service . . ." last in both emphasis categories, but the mean weighted scores were 2.88 for "currently being" and 3.26 for "should be." This difference between "currently being" and "should be" ratings was so consistent that it could probably be credited to a tendency for all respondents to rate the specialist's actual performance somewhat lower than what was desired.

OBJECTIVE FOUR--COMPARISON OF "SHOULD BE" EMPHASIS BY PROJECT GROUPS

The fourth stated objective of this study was:

> To determine the degree of agreement among the agricultural Extension specialists by project groups concerning the relative degree of emphasis they believe should be given these functions.

For this comparison, the specialists were broken into two major project groups: (1) Project III /Agricultural Production, Management and Natural Resources use/; and (2) Project IV /Marketing and Utilization of Agricultural Products/ and Project VII /Community and Public Affairs/ Project III was the much larger group with sixty-five of the seventy-nine specialists included in this study. Projects IV and VII were combined into a single group because separately they would have been toosmall to

analyze. This combination was reasonable since all the specialists in these two projects were agricultural economists.

Table X shows how the two specialist project groups ranked the fourteen specialist functions according to emphasis that should be given. Also included in this table for easier reference is the composite rankings by the entire specialist respondent group.

Comparison of the rankings indicated that there was a general agreement between the two specialist project groups concerning the relative emphasis that should be given the functions. The rho correlation for the two project groups was +.677 which was significant at the .005 level according to the one-tailed t-test.

Both groups ranked "Keeping up to date . . ." first and "Training lay leaders . . ." last in terms of "should be" emphasis. They differed considerably in their rankings on five of the fourteen functions, but it should perhaps be noted that three of these five were differences of 4 or 4.5 ranks and the widest spread was a difference of only 6 ranks. The Project III specialists ranked "Acting as an on-call source . . ." second while Project IV and VII specialists gave it a 6.5 ranking. Project III specialists also ranked "Training agents . . ." considerably higher than did the other group.

The Project IV and VII specialists, on the other hand, gave a 2.5 ranking to both "Backing up county programs . . ." and "Acting in a liaison capacity . . .," while the Project III group gave these two functions rankings of 7 and 8 respectively. The Project IV and VII group

TABLE X

RANK ORDER OF FUNCTIONS OF THE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SPECIALIST IN KANSAS IN ORDER OF EMPHASIS THAT SHOULD BE GIVEN AS RELATED TO SPECIALIST PROJECT GROUP, 1964

Functions*	Rank Order		
	Composite All Specialists (N=79)	Proj. 3 (N=65)	Proj. 4 & 7 (N=14)
Keeping up to date . . .	1	1	1
Acting as an on-call source . . .	2	2	6.5
Advising research staff . . .	3	3	4.5
Developing and supplying visual aids . . .	4.5	4	6.5
Serving as a resource person . . .	4.5	6	4.5
Training agents . . .	6	5	11
Backing up county programs . . .	7	7	2.5
Acting in a liaison capacity . . .	8	8	2.5
Developing an interest . . .	9	9	8
Helping agents evaluate . . .	10	10	12
Holding public meetings	11	11	13
Reporting program progress . . .	12	13	9
Performing direct service . . .	13	12	10
Training lay leaders . . .	14	14	14

*Functions are stated in full in Table IV and Appendix A.

also ranked "Reporting program progress . . ." considerably higher than the other group in terms of emphasis that should be given.

The consensus figures for the two project groups according to emphasis that should be given are shown in Appendix C, Table XIV. Both specialist project groups reached high consensus on only one function which was "Keeping up to date . . . ." The Project III group reached medium consensus on three functions and the Project IV and VII specialists reached medium consensus on only two functions. While both groups had relatively low overall consensus figures, the Project IV and VII group generally tended to have somewhat lower consensus scores. On only three of the fourteen functions did the Project IV and VII specialists have a higher consensus figure than the Project III specialists.

OBJECTIVE FIVE--COMPARISON OF "SHOULD BE" EMPHASIS BY EXPERIENCE CLASSES

The fifth and final stated objective of this study was:

> To determine if there is a relationship between years of experience as an Extension specialist and the relative degrees of emphasis that agricultural Extension specialists believe should be placed on these functions.

For this objective, the specialist respondents were broken into three specialist experience categories: (1) less than one year, (2) one year but less than six, and (3) six years and over. For simplified reference, these three groups will be referred to as least experienced, middle experienced, and most experienced group respectively. The first category was the smallest with only nine respondents out of seventy-nine,

but it was kept separate because of the possibility that relative inexperience might cause some significant differences in the way the specialist functions were ranked.

Table XI lists the "should be" rankings of the fourteen specialist functions by the three specialist experience groups. Also included in this table for easier reference is the composite rankings by the entire specialist respondent group. The more detailed data for these three experience groups are shown in Appendix C, Table XV.

There was a generally high degree of agreement among all three experience groups concerning the "should be" emphasis. In comparing the groups by pairs, the lowest rho correlation was +.773 which was the correlation between the least experienced and the middle experienced groups. Even though this was the lowest correlation, it was still significant at the .0005 level. These two groups differed considerably in their rankings on three of the fourteen specialist functions. The middle experienced group ranked "Developing and supplying visual aids . . ." considerably higher than did the least experienced group. While the least experienced specialists ranked "Holding public meetings" last, the middle group ranked it tenth. In turn, the least experienced group felt that considerably more emphasis should be given to "Helping agents evaluate . . ." than did the middle experienced group.

Comparison between the rankings of the least experienced group and the most experienced group gave a rho correlation of +.845. These two groups differed considerably in their rankings on only one function.

TABLE XI

RANK ORDER OF FUNCTIONS OF THE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SPECIALIST IN KANSAS IN ORDER OF EMPHASIS THAT SHOULD BE GIVEN AS RELATED TO YEARS OF SPECIALIST EXPERIENCE, 1964

Functions*	Rank Order			
		Years of Experience		
	Total (N=79)	Less than 1 (N=9)	1 but less than 6 (N=38)	Over 6 (N=32)
Keeping up to date . . .	1	3	1	1
Acting as an on-call source . . .	2	1.5	2	3
Advising research staff . . .	3	5	4	2
Developing and supplying visual aids . . .	4.5	7.5	3	5
Serving as a resource person . . .	4.5	1.5	5	5
Training agents . . .	6	5	6	5
Backing up county programs . . .	7	10	7	7
Acting in a liaison capacity . . .	8	7.5	8	8
Developing an interest . . .	9	9	9	9
Helping agents evaluate . . .	10	5	11	10
Holding public meetings	11	14	10	13
Reporting program progress . . .	12	11.5	12.5	11
Performing direct service . . .	13	11.5	12.5	12
Training lay leaders . . .	14	13	14	14

*Functions are stated in full in Table IV and Appendix A.

The least experienced specialists ranked "Helping agents evaluate . . ." considerably higher than did the most experienced specialists. It was interesting to note that the least experienced group ranked "Keeping up to date . . ." third in emphasis that should be given while both the middle experienced and the most experienced groups ranked it first in importance.

The highest rho correlation for any comparison in this entire study was the correlation of +.950 between the middle experienced group and the most experienced group. These two groups did not differ considerably in their rankings of any of the functions according to emphasis that should be given. Only on one of the functions was there a difference of over two ranks and that was on "Holding public meetings" which was ranked tenth by the middle group and thirteenth by the most experienced group. A further indication of the high degree of agreement between these two experience groups was the fact that on six of the fourteen functions, their rankings were identical.

An indication of the overall agreement among all three of the specialist experience groups was the Kendall coefficient of concordance. Comparison of the three sets of rankings yielded a W of .895 which was significant at the .001 level using the Chi-square test. It appeared, therefore, that regardless of their years of specialist experience, the specialists had a high degree of agreement concerning what their job should be.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine certain aspects of the role of the agricultural subject-matter specialist in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service as perceived by the Extension administrator, the county agricultural agent, and the specialist himself. The role of the specialist was examined in terms of fourteen major functions that were identified from literature, research studies, and the practical experience of Kansas Extension personnel. The expectations of Extension administrators, county agricultural agents, and specialists concerning these fourteen functions were compared and analyzed.

The specific objectives of this study were:

1. To determine the relative degree of emphasis that should be given to certain selected specialist functions as perceived by the three respondent groups--Extension administrators, county agricultural agents, and agricultural Extension specialists--both collectively and separately.

2. To determine the relative degree of emphasis that is currently being given to these selected specialist functions as perceived by the three respondent groups, both collectively and separately.

3. To determine the relationship between the emphasis that should be given and the emphasis currently being given these specialist functions as perceived by the three respondent groups, both collectively and separately.

4. To determine the degree of agreement among the agricultural Extension specialists by project groups concerning the relative degree of emphasis they believe should be given these functions.

5. To determine if there is a relationship between years of experience as an Extension specialist and the relative degrees of emphasis that agricultural Extension specialists believe should be placed on these functions.

The data used in this study were collected by a structured, mail questionnaire submitted to all of the Kansas Extension personnel in the three respondent group categories. The actual percentages of usable responses were: Extension administrators--55 per cent, county agricultural agents--84 per cent, and agricultural Extension specialists--95 per cent. The three respondent groups were asked to rate the fourteen specialist functions both as to the emphasis that should be given and as to the emphasis currently being given them. Each of the functions was rated on a scale of one (lowest emphasis) to five (highest emphasis).

The information from the questionnaires was punched onto IBM cards for computation. The computer program utilized gave by respondent groups the ratings of each specialist function by numbers, percentage distributions, and mean weighted scores. The fourteen functions were then ranked according to mean weighted scores for each of the respondent groups. These rankings were used for comparisons of the "should be" and the "currently being" ratings among the different study groups. For a particular function, a difference of four or more ranks between two sets of

rankings was assumed to be a considerable difference.

The overall degree of agreement between two sets of rankings was measured by the Spearman coefficient of rank correlation (rho) and the significance of rho was tested by the one-tailed t-test. For a measure of agreement among three sets of rankings, the Kendall coefficient of concordance (W) was used. The significance of W was tested using a chi-square test. The consensus figure--this was the largest percentage of respondents who selected the same degree of emphasis for a particular function--was used as a limited measure of the agreement within a particular group.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS BY OBJECTIVES

The summary and conclusions for this study are organized according to the five stated objectives and presented as follows:

Objective 1: To determine the relative degree of emphasis that should be given to certain selected specialist functions as perceived by the three respondent groups--Extension administrators, county agricultural agents, and agricultural Extension specialists--both collectively and separately.

There was a great deal of general agreement among all three respondant groups concerning the relative emphasis that should be given the specialist functions. This agreement is indicated by the Kendall coefficient of concordance obtained by comparing all three sets of rankings together. The resulting W was .835 which was significant somewhere

between the .01 and .001 levels.

In comparing two groups, the greatest degree of agreement was between the county agricultural agents and the specialists, while the lowest agreement was between the Extension administrators and the agents. The rho correlations with their corresponding levels of significance for the three comparisons are listed below:

Groups	rho	Level of Significance
Agents vs. Specialists	+.912	.0005
Administrators vs. Specialists	+.694	.0005
Agents vs. Administrators	+.666	.005

There were no functions on which there was a considerable difference between the agent and the specialist rankings. The specialists and administrators differed considerably on only one function. Even between the agents and the administrators there were only three functions on which there were considerable differences.

The largest disagreement in the "should be" rankings was on the function "Acting as an on-call source . . ." While both the county agent and the specialist groups ranked this function second only to "Keeping up to date . . .," the administrators gave it a ranking of 11.5. The administrators ranked "Developing and supplying visual aids . . ." first in "should be" emphasis while both the agents and specialists ranked it at 4.5. The administrators felt that considerably more emphasis should be given to "Developing an interest . . ." than did the agents. The

agents, in turn, ranked "Holding public meetings" considerably higher than did the administrators.

As an indication of agreement within individual groups, consensus figures were compared. The administrators had the greatest amount of consensus reaching high (70 per cent or more) or medium (50 to 69 per cent) consensus on nine of the fourteen specialist functions. The agents reached high or medium consensus on six functions while the specialists did so on only three functions. Among all three groups there was a definite tendency for the higher ranking functions to have the higher consensus figures.

When all the comparisons had been made and the data analyzed, one fact was most apparent. In spite of the general agreement among all three respondent groups, it was quite evident that the specialists were in closer agreement with the county agents than with the administrators on what the specialist's role should be.

Objective 2: To determine the relative degree of emphasis that is currently being given to these selected specialist functions as perceived by the three respondent groups, both collectively and separately.

There was general agreement among the three respondent groups concerning the relative emphasis currently being given the specialist functions. However, the overall agreement was lower on the "currently being" ratings than it was on the "should be" ratings. The Kendall coefficient of concordance (W) for the three sets of "currently being" rankings was .692 which was significant somewhere between the .02 and .01 levels using

the chi-square test.

In compering the rankings according to current emphasis between two respondent groups, the highest degree of agreement was between the administrators and the specialists. The comparison between these two groups was the only comparison that yielded a higher rho correlation for "currently being" emphasis than for "should be" emphasis. The lowest agreement was between the Extension administrators and the county agents. The rho correlations for the "currently being" rankings with their corresponding levels of significance are listed below:

Groups	rho	Level of Significance
Administrators vs. Specialists	+.726	.0005
Agents vs. Specialists	+.552	.01
Administrators vs. Agents	+.349	.10

The administrators and the specialists differed considerably on only two functions. Specialists felt that they were giving considerebly more emphasis to "Reporting program progress . . ." than did the administrators while the administrators ranked "Developing and supplying visual aids . . ." considerably higher.

The specialist and county agent groups differed fer more widely on their "currently being" rankings than on their "should be" rankings. These two groups differed considerably on three functions according to current emphasis. The agents felt that the specialists were giving considerably more emphasis to "Advising research staff . . ." and "Acting

in a liaison capacity . . ." and considerably less emphasis to "Performing direct service . . ." than did the specialists themselves.

The administrator and county agent groups differed considerably on their rankings of seven functions according to current emphasis. The agents felt that the specialists were giving considerably more emphasis to "Keeping up to date . . .," "Advising research staff . . .," "Acting in a liaison capacity . . .," and "Reporting program progress . . ." than did the administrators. The administrators felt that considerably more emphasis was being given to "Developing and supplying visual aids . . .," "Performing direct service . . .," and "Training lay leaders . . . ."

Among all three respondant groups there was far less consensus on the "currently being" rankings than on the "should be" rankings. As the group with the greatest amount of consensus, the administrators reached medium consensus only in six functions.

Objective 3: To determine the relationship between the emphasis that should be given and the emphasis currently being given these specialist functions as perceived by the three respondent groups, both collectively and separately.

The "should be" and "currently being" rankings of each group were compared to get an idea of how well each group felt the specialists currently were doing in meeting that group's expectations. A high degree of agreement between the two rankings was assumed to indicate that a group believed that the Extension specialist was doing what he should be

doing. The rho correlations between the "should be" and "currently being" rankings of the three respondent groups along with their corresponding levels of significance are listed below:

Group	rho	Level of Significance
County Agents	+.769	.0005
Specialists	+.221	Not significant
Administrators	-.186	Not significant

The county agent group was the only respondent group with a high degree of agreement. There were only two functions on which there were considerable differences. The agents felt that the specialists should be giving considerably more emphasis to "Developing and supplying visual aids . . ." and considerably less emphasis to "Holding public meetings."

It did not appear that the specialists themselves were as contented as the county agents were with the job they were doing. There were seven functions on which the specialists differed considerably between their "should be" and their "currently being" rankings. Three of these functions had extremely wide differences. In terms of relative emphasis, specialists felt they should be giving much more emphasis to "Advising research staff . . ." and much less emphasis to "Holding public meetings" and "Performing direct service . . . ."

The administrators had the widest disagreement between "should be" and "currently being" rankings of the specialist functions. On eleven of the fourteen functions, there were considerable differences between

the two sets of rankings. The widest variation was on the two functions, "Holding public meetings" and "Acting as an on-call source . . . ." In terms of current emphasis, administrators ranked these functions first and second respectively. When it came to emphasis that should be given, however, these same two functions were given rankings of 13 and 11.5 respectively. The numerous differences in rankings and the negative rho correlation seemed to indicate that the administrators felt there was little or no relationship between what the specialists should be doing and what they actually were doing.

A comparison between the "should be" and "currently being" mean weighted scores revealed a pattern that was consistent and common to all three respondent groups. This pattern was that for equivalently ranked functions, the mean weighted scores for "currently being" ratings were consistently lower than those for the "should be" ratings. This difference was so consistent that it could probably be credited to a natural tendency for all respondents to rate the specialist's actual performance somewhat lower than what was desired.

Objective 4: To determine the degree of agreement among the agricultural Extension specialists by project groups concerning the relative degree of emphasis they believe should be given these functions.

For this comparison, the specialists were divided into two major project groups: (1) Project III specialists, and (2) Projects IV and VII specialists. Comparison of the rankings by these two groups indicated that there was general agreement between them concerning the

relative emphasis that should be given the specialist functions. The rho correlation for this comparison was +.677 which was significant at the .005 level.

The two project groups differed considerably in their rankings on five of the fourteen functions. Project III specialists ranked "Acting as an on-call source . . ." and "Training agents . . ." considerably higher and "Acting in a liaison capacity . . .," "Backing up county programs. . .," and "Reporting program progress . . ." considerably lower than did the Project IV and VII specialists.

Objective 5: To determine if there is relationship between years of experience as an Extension specialist and the relative degrees of emphasis that agricultural Extension specialists believe should be placed on these functions.

For this objective, the specialist respondents were broken into three specialist experience categories: (1) least experienced--less than one year, (2) middle experienced--one year, but less than six, and (3) most experienced--six years and over.

There was an overall high degree of agreement among all three experience groups concerning the emphasis that should be given the specialist functions. This was indicated by the Kendall coefficient of concordance (W) for the three groups of .895 which was significant at the .001 level.

In comparing the experience group rankings by pairs, the least agreement was between the least experienced and middle experienced groups,

but even this was a relatively high agreement. The middle experienced and most experienced groups reached nearly perfect agreement with the highest rho correlation of any comparison made in this study. The rho correlations with their corresponding levels of significance for the three comparisons are listed below:

Group	rho	Level of Significance
Least vs. Middle Experienced	+.773	.0005
Least vs. Most Experienced	+.845	.0005
Middle vs. Most Experienced	+.950	.0005

It would appear from these figures that regardless of years of specialist experience, the specialists had--with minor variations--a high degree of agreement concerning what their job should be.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

On both the "should be" and the "currently being" rankings, the Extension administrators and the county agents had the lowest agreement of any two respondant groups compared. This disagreement carried through to the comparison of "should be" against "currently being" rankings. The county agents felt that the specialists in general were actually giving the relative emphasis that they should to the selected functions. The administrators, on the other hand, did not seem to feel that there was any relationship between what the specialists should be doing and what they actually were doing.

In every type of comparison, the specialist group fell somewhere between the administrators and the agents. On emphasis that should be given, the specialists agreed fer more closely with the agents, but on current emphesis, they agreed more closely with the administrators. The specialists tended to egree with the edministrators that they were not giving the functions the relative emphasis that they should, but they did not feel as strongly on this as did the administrators. Consistently they were somewhere between the other two respondent groups.

Considering the relationships of the agricultural Extension specialist to the edministrators and the county agents, these conclusions would seem to place the specialist in an awkwerd position. Administratively, the specialist is responsible to the Extension administrators, yet his effectiveness is meesured largely in terms of how well he can relate to and meet the demands of the county agents. The specialist, therefore, would eppear to be pleced in the position of necessarily trying to eccomodate two somewhat different sets of expectations.

While it is true that the administretors and agents were in relatively close agreement on the "should be" rankings, their wider disagreement on the "currently being" rankings would indicete that the two groups might be using different eveluetive stendards in measuring the actual performance of the specialists. The widely different correlations between administrators and agents on the "should be"-"currently being" comparisons would lend support to this assumption.

Perhaps the fact pointed to most strongly by the results of this

study was that there was a lack of effective communication among all three respondent groups concerning the specialist's role--most particularly between administrators and agents. This lack of communication might actually be a far stronger factor in the differences observed than any variations in evaluative standards or outright disagreement on emphasis would be.

An example might be on the function "Acting as an on-call source of information for agents to phone or write on problems." All three respondent groups agreed that the specialists were giving this function a relatively high degree of current emphasis. The specialists and county agents also rated this function extremely high on "should be" emphasis, but the administrators ranked it low. The question might be raised as to whether the agents had communicated the high value they placed on this particular function to the administrators.

Another indication of this lack of communication was the fact that there appeared to be a fairly high degree of agreement among the three groups as to the emphasis that should be given and yet completely different viewpoints among them as to how well the specialists were meeting their expectations. This raises a number of valid questions. Are the specialists effectively informing both administrators and agents on the job they actually are doing? Are the administrators effectively communicating to the specialists on what their expectations are concerning the specialist's job and on how well they believe these expectations are presently being met? Are the county agents actually communicating to the

administrators what their needs are in terms of specialist assistance and how well they feel these needs are presently being met? Certainly these questions need to be asked in light of the results of this study.

Before the specialist can reach maximum effectiveness in his job, there must be reasonable consensus among the specialists, administrators, and agents on what this job should be and on how well it is presently being done. And before there can be this reasonable consensus, there must be open and effective communication among all three groups concerning the specialist's role.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based upon the results of this study and the author's interpretations of these results.

1. The findings of this study should be made available to all groups of respondents involved in this study. They should definitely be made available to those responsible for teaching "duties and responsibilities of Extension specialists" in the Induction Training Program.
2. A further study should be made to determine if the viewpoints of Extension specialists other than agricultural Extension specialists are significantly different from those expressed by the specialists in this study.
3. A position or job description should be developed for the Kansas Extension specialist to provide broad guidelines and

a framework by which both new and old specialists might evaluate their own performances. Any group responsible for developing such a job description for Extension specialists should include both administrators and county agents to allow a more complete exchange of ideas on the specialist role.

4. There should be some positive provision made for more open and effective communication among specialists, administrators, and county agents in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service concerning what the specialist is doing and should be doing.
5. There should be some definite provision made for periodically reevaluating the role of the specialist in light of new and changing programs and emphasis in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

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

Eddy, Edward Danforth, Jr. Colleges for Our Land and Time. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Gross, Neal, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

Kelsey, Lincoln David, and Cannon Chiles Hearns. Cooperative Extension Work. Third edition. Ithaca, New York: Comstock Publishing Associates, 1963.

Linton, Ralph. The Study of Man. New York: Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1936.

Mooney, James D., and Alan C. Reiley. Onward Industry. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1931.

Newcomb, Theodore M. Social Psychology. New York: The Dryden Press, 1950.

Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951.

Sargent, Stansfeld. "Conceptions of Role and Ego in Contemporary Psychology," Social Psychology at the Crossroads, John H. Rohrer and Muzafer Sherif, editors. New York: Harper and Bros., 1951. pp. 355-368.

Selltiz, Claire, et al. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1959.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.

B. PERIODICALS

Blalock, T. C. "Role of the Subject-Matter Specialist," Journal of Cooperative Extension, 1:93-100, Summer, 1963.

Brown, Emory J., and Albert Deekens. "Roles of the Extension Subject-Matter Specialist," Rural Sociology, 23:263-76, September, 1958.

_____, and Gale Vandeberg. "The Job of the Extension Specialist Is Changing," County Agent and Vo-Ag Teacher, June, 1959, pp. 12-13.

Claar, J. B. "More Specialization for County Extension Staff," Illinois Research, Illinois Agricultural Experiment Station," 8:17, Summer, 1966.

Jacobson, Eugene, W. W. Charters, Jr., and Seymour Lieberman. "The Use of the Role Concept in the Study of Complex Organizations," Journal of Social Issues, 7:18-27, 1951.

Lanpher, Buel F. "What About Area Agents," Extension Service Review, 36:3-5, July, 1965.

C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Hamilton, Donald Frank. "An Examination of Role Expectation, Role Performance and Perception of Extension Specialists in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service." Unpublished Master's report, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, 1960.

Harvey, John Jackson. "A Comparative Analysis of the Functions of Specialists in the Cooperative Extension Service, by Broad Subject Areas." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1961.

Hutchison, John E. "The Changing Role of the Extension Subject-Matter Specialist." Talk presented to Agricultural and Home Economics Specialists bi-monthly Staff Conference, College Station, Texas, January 16, 1961. (Mimeographed.)

"Organization Plan and Duties for Kansas Extension Service." Manhattan: Kansas State University, January, 1960. (Mimeographed.)

Ringler, Wilbur E. "Role of Extension Specialists and their Status in Relation to Research and Teaching Personnel in Agronomy and Soils Departments of the North Central Region 1956." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1957.

Scheneman, Carl N. "The Functions and Procedures of Subject-Matter Specialists in the Missouri Cooperative Extension Service." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1959.

Trant, Curtis. "The Administrative Role of the State 4-H Club Leader in Selected States--A Study in Role Perception." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1961.

D. OTHER

Johnson, Robert L. Area Extension Work: A Pilot Study of the Professional Status of Area Extension Personnel in California, 1961. Extension Study 1. Manhattan: Extension Service, Kansas State University, April, 1966.

Joint Committee Report on Extension Programs, Policies, and Goals. U. S. Department of Agriculture and Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1948.

Kearl, Bryant E., and O. B. Copaland (eds.). A Guide to Extension Programs for the Future. Raleigh: Agricultural Extension Service, North Carolina State College, July, 1959.

Reudabaugh, J. Neil. Functions of Extension Specialists. ST 383. Ames: Agricultural Extension Service, Iowa State College, 1952.

Reid, T. Roy, and M. C. Wilson. Functions and Activities of State Extension Specialists. Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Circular 89. Washington: Government Printing Office, September, 1933.

Subcommittee on Scope and Responsibility. The Cooperative Extension Service Today--A Statement of Scope and Responsibility. Washington: Federal Extension Service, April, 1958.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

A FULL AND ABBREVIATED LISTING OF THE SELECTED SPECIALIST FUNCTIONS

Below are listed the fourteen specialist functions in full and in the standard abbreviated form used throughout the text.

Complete Statement	Abbreviated Form
1. Acting as an on-call source of information for agents to phone or write on problems	1. Acting as an on-call source . . .
2. Backing up county programs with suitable statewide publicity in the form of news releases, radio talks, TV programs, or other mass media techniques	2. Backing up county programs . . .
3. Performing direct service type activities, such as making visits to an individual farm, home, or firm	3. Performing direct service . . .
4. Serving as a resource person to agents and county Extension councils in county program development	4. Serving as a resource person . . .
5. Advising research staff on the research needs and problems determined in the field	5. Advising research staff . . .
6. Training agents in subject matter, its application, and methods of presentation	6. Training agents . . .
7. Helping agents evaluate projects that have been carried out in specific subject-matter areas	7. Helping agents evaluate . . .
8. Holding public meetings	8. Holding public meetings
9. Acting in a liaison capacity between Extension and industries in their field on new projects, recommendations, marketing, field tests, and research findings	9. Acting in a liaison capacity . . .

Complete Statement	Abbreviated Form
10. Developing an interest at the county level in the specialist's subject-matter area where there is a need for this specialty	10. Developing an interest . . .
11. Developing and supplying to agents visual aids, leaflets, bulletins, and other materials that could be used by agents in carrying out county programs	11. Developing and supplying visual aids . . .
12. Training lay leaders in subject matter, its application, and methods of presentation	12. Training lay leaders . . .
13. Reporting program progress and accomplishments	13. Reporting program progress . . .
14. Keeping up to date on pertinent new developments and research in his subject matter area	14. Keeping up to date . . .

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FORM AND RELATED PAPERS

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Division of Extension
Office of Director, Umberger Hall
MANHATTAN, KANSAS 66504

100

November 14, 1964

TO: Kansas Cooperative Extension Service Staff Members

RE: "The Role of Cooperative Extension Personnel in Kansas"

Dear Colleagues:

Attached to this letter is an Opinion Survey designed to give you the opportunity to express your feelings regarding certain functions of Extension Personnel.

Please respond conscientiously to all items on all pages. No attempt will be made to identify individual respondents.

You should be able to complete the questionnaire in 20 to 30 minutes.

Please return the completed questionnaire to my office not later than December 15, 1964.

Sincerely yours,

Harold E. Jones

Harold E. Jones
Director

HEJ:sf

Attachment

THE ROLE OF COOPERATIVE EXTENSION PERSONNEL IN KANSAS

Purpose of the Study

This study represents one step in the attempt to define more clesrly the various jobs of Cooperetive Extension Personnel in Kansas. The results of the study will be made aveilable to committees working on job descriptions during 1965.

The study deals with certain identified functions of staff members. The primary purpose is to determine the degree of concensus emong members of the Extension staff and among members of county executive boards as to the order of importance of these functions, now and in the future.

The data will be anelyzed by graduate students in Extension Education at Kanses State University.

General Instructions

e. Please do not sign the questionnaire.
b. There are no "right" or "wrong" responses to the statements. Your own feelings end opinions, based on your knowledge and experience, as of now are important.
c. Pleese disregard IBM numbers in the margins as they are to be used for tabulation purposes only.
d. Please re-check the totel questionneire after you heve completed it to make sure you have responded to ell items on all pages.

THE ROLE OF COOPERATIVE EXTENSION PERSONNEL IN KANSAS

QUESTIONNAIRE

I.B.M.
Col. No.

1.____
2.____
3.____
4. Please check the category into which your present position falls:

1.____Administration (includes all people in Project 1 plus State Leaders, Associate State Leaders, and Academic Department Heads)

2.____District Agricultural Agent

3.____District Home Economics Agent

4.____Specialist (includes Associate and Assistant Editors, Section Leaders, District Economists, F.M. Fieldmen, Area Agriculturalists, Area and District Foresters, Area Engineers, Assistants to State Leaders, and 4-H Club Specialists)

5.____Agricultural Agent (includes County Agricultural Agents, Assistant County Agricultural Agents and Male Assistant County Extension Agents)

6.____Home Economics Agent (includes County Home Economics Agents, Assistant County Home Economics Agents, Female Assistant or Associate County Extension Agents)

7.____4-H Club Agent (includes County Club Agents and Assistant County Club Agents)

5. Please indicate your Extension project number (county workers check Project 8):

1.____Project 1 (Extension Administration)

2.____Project 2 (Information)

3.____Project 3 (Agricultural Production, Management and Natural Resources)

4.____Project 4 (Marketing)

5.____Project 5 (Home Economics)

6.____Project 6 (4-H)

7.____Project 7 (Community Public Affairs)

8.____Project 8 (County Extension Operations)

6. Sex:

1.____Male

2.____Female

7. Age - as of December 1, 1964:

1.___Under 25 years
2.___25 & under 35 years
3.___35 & under 45 yesrs
4.___45 & under 55 years
5.___55 & under 65 years
6.___65 years & over

8. Number of years experience as a county Extension worker as of December 1, 1964:

1.___None
2.___Less than 1 year
3.___1 year but less than 6
4.___6 years but less than 11
5.___11 years but less than 16
6.___16 years but less than 21
7.___21 years and over

9. Number of years experience in your present type of Extension work as of December 1, 1964:

1.___Less than 1 year
2.___1 year but less thsn 6
3.___6 years but less than 11
4.___11 years but less than 16
5.___16 years but less than 21
6.___21 years and over

10. What is the highest degree you hold as of December 1, 1964?:

1.___Bachelor
2.___Master's
3.___Doctor's

11. Have you done graduate work beyond degree checked above?:

1.___Yes
2.___No

12. Have you completed the 5 week Kenses Extension Service Induction Training Program?:

1.___Yes
2.___No

13. (If a county worker) in which Extension District do you work?:

1.___Central
2.___Northesst
3.___Southeast
4.___Northwest
5.___Southwest

14. (If s county worker) would you classify the economy of your county as rural or urban?:

1.___Rural
2.___Urban

15. Have you ever taken e college couree in Extension Education?:

1.___Yes
2.___No

SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS

On the following pages are lists of functions indentified from the literature and research studies which are performed by individuals in various job categories of the Cooperative Extension Service. Please evaluate the functions listed for each of the job categories included in this questionnaire. There are two sets of rating scales for each function. On rating scale I, please indicate the degree of emphasis you believe should be given to each function by circling the appropriate number.

On rating scale II, circle the number indicating the degree of emphasis you feel is currently given to each function.

If you feel important functions have been omitted, please add and indicate the degree of emphasis.

Definitions:

(5) Major Emphasis - A function which receives (or should receive) a great deal of attention and top priority of time.
(4) Important Emphasis - A function which is seldom (or seldom should be) neglected, but might be postponed for top priority work.
(3) Intermediate Emphasis - A function which is done (or should be done) but might be postponed for more urgent work.
(2) Minor Emphasis - A function which might be (or might ought to be done) but only if a person finds time.
(1) No Emphasis - A function on which no time is (or ought to be) spent.

PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS ON ALL PAGES

FUNCTIONS OF EXTENSION SPECIALISTS
(Includes Associate and Assistant Editors, Section Leaders, District Economists, Farm Management Fieldmen, Area Agriculturists, Area and District Foresters, Area Engineers, Assistants to State Leaders, 4-H Club Specialists.)

49 Deck No. 2

Functions of Extension Specialists	I Emphasis should be given function						II Emphasis currently being given function					
	Major	Important	Intermed.	Minor	No		Major	Important	Intermed.	Minor	No	
50. Acting as an on-call source of information for agents to phone or write on problems.	5	4	3	2	1		5	4	3	2	1	51.
52. Backing up county programs with suitable statewide publicity in the form of news releases, radio talks, TV programs, or other mass media techniques.	5	4	3	2	1		5	4	3	2	1	53.
54. Performing direct service type activities, such as making visits to an individual farm, home, or firm.	5	4	3	2	1		5	4	3	2	1	55.
56. Serving as a resource person to agents and county Extension councils in county program development.	5	4	3	2	1		5	4	3	2	1	57.
58. Advising research staff on the research needs and problems determined in the field.	5	4	3	2	1		5	4	3	2	1	59.
60. Training agents in subject matter, its application, and methods or presentation.	5	4	3	2	1		5	4	3	2	1	61.
62. Helping agents evaluate projects that have been carried out in specific subject-matter areas.	5	4	3	2	1		5	4	3	2	1	63.
64. Holding public meetings.	5	4	3	2	1		5	4	3	2	1	65.
66. Acting in a liaison capacity between Extension and industries in their field on new projects, recommendations, marketing, field tests, and research findings.	5	4	3	2	1		5	4	3	2	1	67.
68. Developing an interest at the county level in the specialist's subject-matter area where there is a need for this speciality.	5	4	3	2	1		5	4	3	2	1	69.
70. Developing and supplying to agents visual aids, leaflets, bulletins, and other materials that could be used by agents in carrying out county programs.	5	4	3	2	1		5	4	3	2	1	71.
72. Training lay leaders in subject matter, its application and methods of presentation.	5	4	3	2	1		5	4	3	2	1	73.
74. Reporting program progress and accomplishments.	5	4	3	2	1		5	4	3	2	1	75.
76. Keeping up to date on pertinent new developments and research in his subject matter area.	5	4	3	2	1		5	4	3	2	1	77.
78. Other (specify)	5	4	3	2	1		5	4	3	2	1	79.

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX TABLES

APPENDIX TABLE XII

FUNCTIONS OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SPECIALISTS IN KANSAS, RANKED IN ORDER OF PERCEIVED EMPHASIS THAT SHOULD BE GIVEN, 1964

Functions	Group*	Degree of Emphasis												Mean Wtd. Score	Consensus
		Major		Important		Intermediate		Minor		No		Total**			
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Keeping up to date on pertinent new developments and research in his subject matter area.	Spec.	60	77	17	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	78	100	4.78	77
	Admin.	10	91	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	100	4.91	91
	CA	93	88	12	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	106	100	4.87	88
	Total	163	84	30	15	2	1	0	0	0	0	195	100	4.83	84
Acting as an on-call source of information for agents to phone or write on problems.	Spec.	44	56	24	30	9	11	1	1	1	1	79	99	4.38	56
	Admin.	3	27	3	27	5	45	0	0	0	0	11	99	3.82	45
	CA	74	70	28	26	3	3	1	1	0	0	106	100	4.65	70
	Total	121	62	55	28	17	9	2	1	1	1	196	101	4.49	62
Advising research staff on the research needs and problems determined in the field.	Spec.	43	54	23	29	11	14	2	3	0	0	79	100	4.35	54
	Admin.	8	73	3	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	100	4.73	73
	CA	58	55	40	38	7	7	0	0	0	0	105	100	4.49	55
	Total	109	56	66	34	18	9	2	1	0	0	196	100	4.45	56
Developing and supplying to agents visual aids, leaflets, bulletins, and other materials that could be used by agents in carrying out county programs.	Spec.	37	47	27	34	13	16	2	3	0	0	79	100	4.25	47
	Admin.	11	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	100	5.00	100
	CA	63	60	31	30	10	10	1	1	0	0	105	101	4.49	60
	Total	111	57	58	30	23	12	3	2	0	0	195	101	4.42	57

*As perceived by: (Spec.) Agricultural Extension specialists, (Admin.) Administrators, (CA) County Agricultural Agents, and (Total) composite of all three groups.

**Percentages rounded to the nearest percent, total columns sum of individual columns.

APPENDIX TABLE XII (continued)

Functions	Group*	Degree of Emphasis												Mean Wtd. Score	Consensus
		Major		Important		Intermediate		Minor		No		Total**			
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Training agents in subject matter, its application, and methods of presentation.	Spec.	37	47	25	32	12	15	4	5	1	1	79	100	4.18	47
	Admin.	9	82	2	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	100	4.82	82
	CA	64	60	34	32	6	6	2	2	0	0	106	100	4.51	60
	Total	110	56	61	31	18	9	6	3	1	1	196	100	4.39	56
Serving as a resource person to agents and county Extension councils in county program development.	Spec.	34	43	33	42	10	13	2	3	0	0	79	101	4.25	43
	Admin.	7	64	4	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	100	4.64	64
	CA	40	38	47	44	17	16	2	2	0	0	106	100	4.18	44
	Total	81	41	84	43	27	14	4	2	0	0	196	100	4.23	43
Backing up county programs with suitable statewide publicity in the form of news releases, radio talks, TV programs, or other mass media techniques.	Spec.	26	33	28	36	21	27	3	4	0	0	78	100	3.99	36
	Admin.	3	27	7	64	1	9	0	0	0	0	11	100	4.18	64
	CA	37	35	44	42	18	17	5	5	1	1	105	100	4.06	42
	Total	66	34	79	41	40	21	8	4	1	1	194	101	4.04	41
Acting in a liaison capacity between Extension and industries in their field on new projects, recommendation, marketing, field tests, and research findings.	Spec.	29	37	29	37	12	15	8	10	1	1	79	100	3.97	37
	Admin.	8	73	2	18	1	9	0	0	0	0	11	100	4.64	73
	CA	31	29	51	48	19	18	4	4	1	1	106	101	4.01	48
	Total	68	35	82	42	32	16	12	6	2	1	196	100	3.97	42
Holding public meetings	Spec.	11	14	24	31	34	44	7	9	2	3	78	101	3.45	44
	Admin.	0	0	5	45	4	36	2	18	0	0	11	99	3.27	45
	CA	22	21	60	58	19	18	2	2	0	0	103	99	3.99	58
	Total	33	17	89	46	57	30	11	6	2	1	192	100	3.73	46

APPENDIX TABLE XII (continued)

Functions	Group*	Major No.	Major %	Important No.	Important %	Intermediate No.	Intermediate %	Minor No.	Minor %	No No.	No %	Total** No.	Total** %	Mean Wtd. Score	Consensus
Helping agents evaluate projects that have been carried out in specific subject matter areas.	Spec.	12	15	32	41	23	29	10	13	1	1	78	99	3.56	41
	Admin.	2	18	6	55	3	27	0	0	0	0	11	100	3.90	55
	CA	23	22	46	44	26	25	9	9	1	1	105	101	3.77	44
	Total	37	19	84	43	52	27	19	10	2	1	194	100	3.70	43
Developing an interest at the county level in the specialist's subject-matter and where there is a need for this specialty.	Spec.	22	28	28	35	21	27	7	9	1	1	79	100	3.80	35
	Admin.	2	18	6	55	3	27	0	0	0	0	11	100	3.91	55
	CA	11	10	49	47	30	29	13	12	2	2	105	100	3.51	47
	Total	35	18	83	43	54	28	20	10	3	2	195	101	3.65	43
Reporting program progress and accomplishments.	Spec.	14	18	17	22	32	42	14	18	0	0	77	100	3.40	42
	Admin.	3	30	3	30	4	40	0	0	0	0	10	100	3.90	40
	CA	12	11	43	41	38	36	11	10	1	1	105	99	3.51	41
	Total	29	15	63	33	74	39	25	13	1	1	192	101	3.49	39
Training lay leaders in subject-matter, its application and methods of presentation.	Spec.	7	9	23	29	29	37	15	19	4	5	78	99	3.18	37
	Admin.	2	18	5	45	4	36	0	0	0	0	11	99	3.82	45
	CA	15	14	43	41	32	31	14	13	2	2	106	101	3.52	41
	Total	24	12	71	36	65	33	29	15	6	3	195	99	3.40	36
Performing direct service type activities, such as making visits to an individual farm, home, or firm.	Spec.	17	22	14	18	32	41	13	17	2	3	78	101	3.40	41
	Admin.	0	0	3	27	3	27	5	45	0	0	11	99	2.82	45
	CA	11	10	31	29	42	40	19	18	3	3	106	100	3.26	40
	Total	28	14	48	25	77	39	37	19	5	3	195	100	3.29	39

APPENDIX TABLE XIII

FUNCTIONS OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SPECIALISTS IN KANSAS, RANKED IN ORDER OF PERCEIVED EMPHASIS CURRENTLY BEING GIVEN, 1964

Functions	Group*	Degree of Emphasis												Mean Wtd. Score	Consensus
		Major		Important		Intermediate		Minor		No		Total**			
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Acting as an on-call source of information for agents to phone or write on problems.	Spec.	28	36	32	41	15	19	3	4	0	0	78	100	4.09	41
	Admin.	5	45	3	27	3	27	0	0	0	0	11	99	4.18	45
	CA	34	32	36	34	31	30	4	4	0	0	105	100	3.95	34
	Total	67	35	71	37	49	25	7	4	0	0	194	101	4.02	37
Keeping up to date on pertinent new developments and research on his subject matter area.	Spec.	22	28	24	32	25	33	4	5	1	1	76	99	3.82	33
	Admin.	1	9	6	55	4	36	0	0	0	0	11	100	3.73	55
	CA	39	37	49	47	15	14	2	2	0	0	105	100	4.19	47
	Total	62	32	79	41	44	23	6	3	1	1	192	100	4.02	41
Holding public meetings	Spec.	23	30	30	39	16	21	7	9	0	0	76	99	3.91	39
	Admin.	5	45	6	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	100	4.45	55
	CA	20	20	58	57	21	21	3	3	0	0	102	101	3.93	57
	Total	48	25	94	50	37	20	10	5	0	0	189	100	3.95	50
Backing up county programs with suitable statewide publicity in the form of news releases, radio talks, TV programs, or other mass media techniques.	Spec.	10	13	23	30	29	38	11	14	3	4	76	99	3.34	38
	Admin.	2	18	5	45	4	36	0	0	0	0	11	99	3.81	45
	CA	18	17	36	35	37	36	12	12	1	1	104	101	3.56	36
	Total	30	16	64	34	70	37	23	12	4	2	191	101	3.49	37

*As perceived by: (Spec.) Agricultural Extension Specialists, (Admin.) Administrators, (CA) County Agricultural Agents, and (Total) composite of all three groups.

**Percentages rounded to the nearest 1%.

APPENDIX TABLE XIII (continued)

Functions	Group*	Degree of Emphasis												Mean Wtd. Score	Consensus
		Major		Important		Intermediate		Minor		No		Total**			
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Training agents in subject matter, its application, and methods of presentation.	Spec.	8	10	33	43	20	26	13	17	3	4	77	100	3.39	43
	Admin.	1	9	4	36	6	55	0	0	0	0	11	100	3.55	55
	CA	12	11	44	42	34	32	14	13	1	1	105	99	3.50	42
	Total	21	11	81	42	60	31	27	14	4	2	193	100	3.46	42
Reporting program progress and accomplishments.	Spec.	9	12	18	23	35	45	14	18	1	1	77	99	3.26	45
	Admin.	0	0	3	30	4	40	3	30	0	0	10	100	3.00	40
	CA	7	7	35	34	47	45	14	13	1	1	104	100	3.32	45
	Total	16	8	56	29	86	45	31	16	2	1	191	99	3.28	45
Developing and supplying to agents visual aids, leaflets, bulletins, and other materials that would be used by agents in carrying out county programs.	Spec.	6	8	21	27	34	44	14	18	3	4	78	101	3.17	44
	Admin.	3	27	5	45	3	27	0	0	0	0	11	99	4.00	45
	CA	7	7	34	33	44	42	18	17	1	1	104	100	3.27	42
	Total	16	8	60	31	81	42	32	17	4	2	193	100	3.27	42
Serving as a rsource person to agents and county Extension councils in county program development.	Spec.	10	13	20	26	22	28	20	26	6	8	78	101	3.10	28
	Admin.	2	18	2	18	4	36	2	18	1	9	11	99	3.18	36
	CA	9	9	37	35	46	44	12	11	1	1	105	100	3.39	44
	Total	21	11	59	30	72	37	34	18	8	4	194	100	3.26	37
Advising research staff on the research needs and problems determined in the field.	Spec.	6	8	9	12	31	40	22	28	10	13	78	101	2.73	40
	Admin.	1	9	2	18	6	55	2	18	0	0	11	100	3.18	55
	CA	16	15	43	41	33	32	10	10	2	2	104	100	3.59	41
	Total	23	12	54	28	70	36	34	18	12	6	193	100	3.22	36

APPENDIX TABLE XIII (continued)

Functions	Group*	Degree of Emphasis												Mean Wtd. Score	Con-aen-sus
		Major		Impor-tant		Inter-mediate		Minor		No		Total**			
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Developing an interest at the county level in the specialist's subject-matter area where there is a need for this specialty.	Spec.	6	8	14	18	41	53	13	17	3	4	77	100	3.09	53
	Admin.	1	9	4	36	5	45	1	9	0	0	11	99	3.45	45
	CA	5	5	33	32	46	44	19	18	1	1	104	100	3.21	44
	Total	12	6	51	27	92	48	33	17	4	2	192	100	3.18	48
Performing direct service type activities, such as making visits to an individual farm, home, or firm.	Spec.	10	13	23	30	32	42	8	10	4	5	77	100	3.35	42
	Admin.	2	18	5	45	4	36	0	0	0	0	11	99	3.82	45
	CA	7	7	14	13	45	43	35	34	3	3	104	100	2.88	43
	Total	19	10	42	22	81	42	43	22	7	4	192	100	3.12	42
Acting in a liaison capacity between Extension and industries in their field on new projects, recommendations, marketing, field tests, and research findings.	Spec.	3	4	14	18	30	38	26	33	5	6	78	99	2.79	38
	Admin.	1	9	1	9	7	64	2	18	0	0	11	100	3.09	64
	CA	9	9	36	34	46	44	12	11	2	2	105	100	3.36	44
	Total	13	7	51	26	83	43	40	21	7	4	194	101	3.12	43
Training lay leaders in subject matter, its application and methods of presentation.	Spec.	3	4	18	23	32	42	17	22	7	9	77	100	2.90	42
	Admin.	2	18	3	27	5	45	1	9	0	0	11	99	3.55	45
	CA	5	5	32	30	42	40	22	21	4	4	105	100	3.11	40
	Total	10	5	53	27	79	41	40	21	11	6	193	100	3.06	41
Helping agents evaluate projects that have been carried out in specific subject matter areas.	Spec.	2	3	9	12	32	43	26	35	6	8	75	101	2.67	43
	Admin.	1	9	1	9	7	64	2	18	0	0	11	100	3.09	64
	CA	5	5	24	23	45	43	29	28	1	1	104	100	3.03	43
	Total	8	4	34	18	84	44	57	30	7	4	190	100	2.89	44

APPENDIX TABLE XIV

FUNCTIONS OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SPECIALISTS IN KANSAS, RANKED IN ORDER OF PERCEIVED EMPHASIS THAT SHOULD BE GIVEN AS RELATED TO SPECIALIST PROJECT AREA, 1964

Functions	Group*	Degree of Emphasis												Mean Wtd. Score	Consensus
		Major		Important		Intermediate		Minor		No		Total**			
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Keeping up to date on pertinent new developments and research in his subject matter area.	Proj. 3	50	78	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	100	4.78	78
	Proj. 4&7	10	71	3	21	1	7	0	0	0	0	14	99	4.64	71
	Total	60	77	17	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	78	100	4.76	77
Acting as an on-call source of information for agents to phone or write on problems.	Proj. 3	41	63	17	26	6	9	1	2	0	0	65	100	4.51	63
	Proj. 4&7	3	21	7	50	3	21	0	0	1	7	14	99	3.79	50
	Total	44	56	24	30	9	11	1	1	1	1	79	99	4.38	56
Advising research staff on the research needs and problems determined in the field.	Proj. 3	38	58	19	29	7	11	1	2	0	0	65	100	4.45	58
	Proj. 4&7	5	36	4	29	4	29	1	7	0	0	14	101	3.93	36
	Total	43	54	23	29	11	14	2	3	0	0	79	100	4.35	54
Developing and supplying to agents visual aids, leaflets, bulletings, and other materials that could be used by agents in carrying out county programs.	Proj. 3	34	52	21	32	9	14	1	2	0	0	65	100	4.35	52
	Proj. 4&7	3	21	6	43	4	29	1	7	0	0	14	100	3.79	43
	Total	37	47	27	34	13	16	2	3	0	0	79	100	4.25	47
Serving as a resource person to agents and county Extension councils in county program development	Proj. 3	28	43	30	46	7	11	0	0	0	0	65	100	4.32	46
	Proj. 4&7	6	43	3	21	3	21	2	14	0	0	14	99	3.93	43
	Total	34	43	33	42	10	13	2	3	0	0	79	101	4.25	43

*As perceived by: (Proj. 3) Specialists in Project III--Agricultural Production, Management and Natural Resources Use, (Proj. 4 & 7) Specialists in Project IV--Marketing and Utilization of Agricultural Products and in Project VII--Community and Public Affairs, (Total) Composite of both groups.

**Percentages taken from tables to the nearest 1%.

APPENDIX TABLE XIV (continued)

Functions	Group*	Degree of Emphasis												Mean Wtd. Score	Consensus
		Major		Important		Intermediate		Minor		No		Total**			
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Training agents in subject matter, its application, and methods of presentation.	Proj. 3	32	49	24	37	8	12	1	2	0	0	65	100	4.34	49
	Proj. 4&7	5	36	1	7	4	29	3	21	1	7	14	100	3.43	36
	Total	37	47	25	32	12	15	4	5	1	1	79	100	4.18	47
Backing up county programs with suitable statewide publicity in the form of news releases, radio talks, TV programs, and other mass media techniques.	Proj. 3	20	31	25	39	17	27	2	3	0	0	64	100	3.98	39
	Proj. 4&7	6	43	3	21	4	29	1	7	0	0	14	100	4.00	43
	Total	26	33	28	36	21	27	3	4	0	0	78	100	3.99	36
Acting in a liaison capacity between Extension and industries in their field on new projects, recommendations, marketing, field tests, and research findings.	Proj. 3	21	32	27	42	11	17	6	9	0	0	65	100	3.97	42
	Proj. 4&7	8	57	2	14	1	7	2	14	1	7	14	99	4.00	57
	Total	29	37	29	37	12	15	8	10	1	1	79	100	3.97	37
Developing an interest at the county level in the specialist's subject-matter area where there is a need for this specialty.	Proj. 3	19	29	22	34	19	29	4	6	1	2	65	100	3.83	34
	Proj. 4&7	3	21	6	43	2	14	3	21	0	0	14	99	3.64	43
	Total	22	28	28	35	21	27	7	9	1	1	79	100	3.80	35
Helping agents evaluate projects that have been carried out in specific subject matter areas.	Proj. 3	8	13	29	45	21	33	6	9	0	0	64	100	3.61	45
	Proj. 4&7	4	29	3	21	2	14	4	29	1	7	14	100	3.36	29
	Total	12	15	32	41	23	29	10	13	1	1	78	99	3.56	41
Holding public meetings	Proj. 3	9	14	22	34	29	45	4	6	1	2	65	101	3.52	45
	Proj. 4&7	2	15	2	15	5	38	3	23	1	7	13	98	3.08	38
	Total	11	14	24	31	34	44	7	9	2	3	78	101	3.45	44

APPENDIX TABLE XIV (continued)

Functions	Group*	Degree of Emphasis												Mean Wtd. Score	Consensus
		Major		Important		Intermediate		Minor		No		Total**			
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Reporting program progress and accomplishments.	Proj. 3	11	17	13	20	28	44	12	19	0	0	64	100	3.36	44
	Proj. 4&7	3	23	4	31	4	31	2	15	0	0	13	100	3.62	31
	Total	14	18	17	22	32	42	14	18	0	0	77	100	3.40	42
Performing direct service type activities, such as making visits to an individual farm, home, or firm.	Proj. 3	12	19	12	19	29	45	10	16	1	2	64	101	3.38	45
	Proj. 4&7	5	36	2	14	3	21	3	21	1	7	14	99	3.50	36
	Total	17	22	14	18	32	41	13	17	2	3	78	101	3.40	41
Training lay leaders in subject matter, its application and methods of presentation.	Proj. 3	5	8	20	31	27	42	11	17	1	2	64	100	3.27	42
	Proj. 4&7	2	14	3	21	2	14	4	29	3	21	14	99	2.79	29
	Total	7	9	23	29	29	37	15	19	4	5	78	99	3.18	37

APPENDIX TABLE XV

FUNCTIONS OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SPECIALISTS IN KANSAS, RANKED IN ORDER OF PERCEIVED EMPHASIS THAT SHOULD BE GIVEN AS RELATED TO YEARS OF SPECIALIST EXPERIENCE, 1964

Functions	Group*	Degree of Emphasis												Mean Wtd. Score	Consensus
		Major		Important		Intermediate		Minor		No		Total**			
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Keeping up to date on pertinent new developments and research in his subject matter area.	L-1E	5	56	4	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	100	4.55	56
	M-1,L-6E	25	68	11	30	1	3	0	0	0	0	37	101	4.65	68
	M-6E	30	94	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	100	4.94	94
	Total	60	77	17	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	78	100	4.76	77
Acting as an on-call source of information for agents to phone or write on problems.	L-1E	7	78	1	11	1	11	0	0	0	0	9	100	4.67	78
	M-1,L-6E	21	55	12	32	4	11	0	0	1	3	38	101	4.37	55
	M-6E	16	50	11	34	4	13	1	3	0	0	32	100	4.31	50
	Total	44	56	24	30	9	11	1	1	1	1	79	99	4.38	56
Advising research staff on the research needs and problems determined in the field.	L-1E	4	44	3	33	2	22	0	0	0	0	9	99	4.22	44
	M-1,L-6E	20	53	8	21	8	21	2	5	0	0	38	100	4.21	53
	M-6E	19	59	12	37	1	3	0	0	0	0	32	100	4.56	59
	Total	43	54	23	29	11	14	2	3	0	0	79	100	4.35	54
Developing and supplying to agents visual aids, leaflets, bulletins, and other materials that could be used by agents in carrying out county programs.	L-1E	5	56	1	11	2	22	1	11	0	0	9	100	4.11	56
	M-1,L-6E	19	50	12	32	6	16	1	3	0	0	38	101	4.29	50
	M-6E	13	41	14	44	5	16	0	0	0	0	32	101	4.25	44
	Total	37	47	27	34	13	16	2	3	0	0	79	100	4.25	47

*As perceived by specialists according to years of experience: L-1E (less than 1 year), M-1, L-6E (more than 1 year but less than 6 years), M-6E (more than 6 years), Total (composite of all three groups).

**Percentages taken from tables to the nearest 1%.

APPENDIX TABLE XV (continued)

Functions	Group*	Degree of Emphasis												Mean Wtd. Score	Consensus
		Major		Important		Intermediate		Minor		No		Total**			
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Serving as a resource person to agents and county Extension councils in county program development.	L-1E	6	67	3	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	100	4.67	67
	M-1,L-6E	14	37	17	45	6	16	1	3	0	0	38	101	4.16	45
	M-6E	14	44	13	41	4	12	1	3	0	0	32	100	4.25	44
	Total	34	43	33	42	10	13	2	3	0	0	79	101	4.25	43
Training agents in subject matter, its application, and methods of presentation.	L-1E	4	44	4	44	0	0	1	11	0	0	9	99	4.22	44
	M-1,L-6E	16	42	14	37	5	13	2	5	1	3	38	100	4.11	42
	M-6E	17	53	7	22	7	22	1	3	0	0	32	100	4.25	53
	Total	37	47	25	32	12	15	4	5	1	1	79	100	4.18	47
Backing up county programs with suitable statewide publicity in the form of news releases, radio talks, TV programs, and other mass media techniques.	L-1E	2	22	4	44	2	22	1	11	0	0	9	99	3.78	44
	M-1,L-6E	11	29	15	39	10	26	2	5	0	0	38	99	3.92	39
	M-6E	13	42	9	29	9	29	0	0	0	0	31	100	4.13	42
	Total	26	33	28	36	21	27	3	4	0	0	78	100	3.99	36
Acting in a liaison capacity between Extension and industries in their field on new projects, recommendations, marketing, field tests and research findings.	L-1E	5	56	2	22	0	0	2	22	0	0	9	100	4.11	56
	M-1,L-6E	12	32	12	32	11	29	2	5	1	3	38	101	3.84	32
	M-6E	12	38	15	47	1	3	4	12	0	0	32	100	4.09	47
	Total	29	37	29	37	12	15	8	10	1	1	79	100	3.97	37
Developing an interest at the county level in the specialist's subject-matter area where there is a need for this specialty.	L-1E	2	22	4	44	3	33	0	0	0	0	9	99	3.89	44
	M-1,L-6E	7	18	14	37	12	32	4	11	1	3	38	101	3.58	37
	M-6E	13	41	10	31	6	19	3	9	0	0	32	100	4.03	41
	Total	22	28	28	35	21	27	7	9	1	1	79	100	3.80	35

APPENDIX TABLE XV (continued)

Functions	Group*	Degree of Emphasis												Mean Wtd. Score	Consensus
		Major		Important		Intermediate		Minor		No		Total**			
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Helping agents evaluate projects that have been carried out in specific subject matter areas.	L-1E	4	44	3	33	2	22	0	0	0	0	9	99	4.22	44
	M-1,L-6E	5	13	12	32	13	34	7	18	1	3	38	100	3.34	34
	M-6E	3	10	17	55	8	26	3	10	0	0	31	101	3.65	55
	Total	12	15	32	41	23	29	10	13	1	1	78	99	3.56	41
Holding public meetings	L-1E	2	22	2	22	3	33	1	11	1	11	9	99	3.33	33
	M-1,L-6E	6	16	11	30	16	43	4	11	0	0	37	100	3.51	43
	M-6E	3	9	11	34	15	47	2	6	1	3	32	99	3.41	47
	Total	11	14	24	31	34	44	7	9	2	3	78	101	3.45	44
Reporting program progress and accomplishments.	L-1E	2	22	2	22	3	33	2	22	0	0	9	99	3.44	33
	M-1,L-6E	7	19	6	16	16	43	8	22	0	0	37	100	3.32	43
	M-6E	5	16	9	29	13	42	4	13	0	0	31	100	3.48	42
	Total	14	18	17	22	32	42	14	18	0	0	77	100	3.40	42
Performing direct service type activities, such as making visits to an individual farm, home, or firm.	L-1E	3	33	0	0	4	44	2	22	0	0	9	99	3.44	44
	M-1,L-6E	6	16	7	19	18	49	5	14	1	3	37	101	3.32	49
	M-6E	8	25	7	22	10	31	6	19	1	3	32	100	3.47	31
	Total	17	22	14	18	32	41	13	17	2	3	78	101	3.40	41
Training lay leaders in subject matter, its application and methods of presentation.	L-1E	1	12	3	38	2	25	2	25	0	0	8	100	3.38	38
	M-1,L-6E	3	8	9	24	14	37	9	24	3	8	38	101	3.00	37
	M-6E	3	9	11	34	13	41	4	13	1	3	32	100	3.34	41
	Total	7	9	23	29	29	37	15	19	4	5	78	99	3.18	37

A STUDY OF THE ROLE EXPECTATIONS OF EXTENSION ADMINISTRATORS, COUNTY AGRICULTURAL AGENTS, AND THE SPECIALISTS THEMSELVES CONCERNING THE JOB OF THE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SPECIALIST IN KANSAS

by

JOHN K. STRICKLER

B. S., University of Missouri, 1957

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1967

Purpose and Procedure

The purpose of this study was to examine the role of the agricultural Extension specialist in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service as perceived by the Extension administrator, the county agricultural agent, and the specialist himself. The role was examined in terms of fourteen preselected specialist functions.

The data were gathered using a structured, mail questionnaire submitted to all the Kansas Extension personnel in the three respondent group categories. Respondents were asked to rate each function on a five point scale according to emphasis that should be given and then according to emphasis currently being given. The functions were then ranked by different respondent groups by use of mean weighted score. Methods of analysis used were: rank difference, coefficient of correlation, and coefficient of concordance.

Results

1. There was general agreement among the three respondent groups concerning the relative emphasis that should be given the specialist functions. The specialists were in closer agreement with the county agents than with the administrators on what the specialist's role should be. The lowest degree of agreement was between the administrators and agents. Both the specialists and agents felt that "Acting as an on-call source of information for agents to phone or write on problems" was a very important function while administrators ranked it relatively low.

2. While there was general agreement among the three respondant groups concerning the relative emphasis currently being given the specialist functions, the overall agreement was lower than on the "should be" ratings. The highest degree of agreement on the current emphasis rankings was between the administrators and the specialists. This was the only comparison which showed more agreement on the "currently being" than on the "should be" rankings. The lowest agreement on the current emphasis rankings was between the administrators and the county agents.

3. The "should be" and "currently being" rankings of each group were compared to get an idea of how well each group felt the specialists currently were doing in meeting that group's expectations. The county agent group was the only respondent group with a high degree of agreement between its "should be" and "currently being" rankings. The data seemed to indicate that the administrators felt there was little or no relationship between what the specialists should be doing and what they actually are doing.

4. There was general agreement among the agricultural Extension specialists in the different project groups concerning the relative emphasis that should be given the fourteen specialist functions.

5. The number of years of specialist experience did not appear to have a significant effect on the "should be" rankings given the fourteen functions by the agricultural Extension specialists.

Recommendations

1. A further study should be made to determine if the viewpoints of Extension specialists other than agricultural Extension specialists are significantly different from those expressed by the specialists in this study.

2. A position or job description should be developed for the Kansas Extension specialist to provide broad guidelines and a framework by which both new and old specialists might evaluate their own performances. Any group responsible for developing such a job description for Extension specialists should include both administrators and county agents to allow a more complete exchange of ideas on the specialist role.

3. There should be some positive provision made for more open and effective communication among specialists, administrators, and county agents in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service concerning what the specialist is doing and should be doing.

4. There should be some definite provision made for periodically re-evaluating the role of the specialist in light of new and changing programs and emphasis in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service.