

**PARTICIPATION IN EXTENSION
COUNCILS IN TWO KANSAS COUNTIES**

by

KHAIRY HASSAN ABOUL-SEUD

**B. Sc. Cairo University, 1954
M. A., Delhi University, 1958**

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Economics and Sociology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Manhattan, Kansas

1962

LD
2668
T4
1962
A25
C.2
Documents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION..... 1

CHAPTER II - PARTICIPATION AND ITS CORRELATES: A REVIEW OF LITERATURE... 6

 Measurement of Social Participation..... 6

 Factors Related to Participation..... 9

 Age and Participation..... 9

 Male vs. Female Participation..... 12

 Participation and Socio-economic Level..... 14

 Activities Involvement and Participation..... 16

 Commuting, Accessibility of Organization Activities,
 and Participation..... 17

 Understanding the Goals and Work of the Organization
 and Participation..... 19

 Intra-Group Status and Participation..... 19

 Summary..... 20

CHAPTER III - THE PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY..... 22

CHAPTER IV - THE FINDINGS: GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF EXTENSION
COUNCIL PARTICIPANTS..... 32

 Age..... 32

 Sex..... 35

 Marital Status and Number of Children Living at Home..... 36

 Socio-Economic Level..... 37

 Income..... 37

 Education..... 38

 Occupation and Hours Spent at Work..... 42

 Length of Residence, Residential Mobility, Residential
 Ownership and Distance of the Residence from the County Seat..... 44

 Commuting..... 47

Civic and Political Involvement.....	48
Voting in Presidential, State and Local Elections.....	48
Involvement in Formal Organizations.....	51
Involvement in Local, State, National, International Affairs as Indicated by Talking to Neighbors and Indicating Prior Interest.....	51
CHAPTER V. THE FINDINGS: EXTENSION PARTICIPATION AND ITS CORRELATES.....	54
Age and Extension Participation.....	54
Sex and Extension Participation.....	57
Socio-Economic Level and Extension Participation.....	60
Income and Extension Participation.....	60
Education and Extension Participation.....	63
Occupation and Extension Participation.....	66
Participation in Formal Organizations and Extension Participation.....	69
Frequency of Committee Meetings and Extension Participation...	72
Commuting and Extension Participation.....	75
Distance from the County Seat and Extension Participation.....	78
Extension Participation and Understanding the Purpose and Basic Working Relations Between the Council and Other Institutions.....	81
Leaders and Extension Participation.....	84
Effectiveness of the Council and Extension Participation.....	87
CHAPTER VI. DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUMMARY.....	89
The Approach and the Methods.....	89
The Findings.....	92
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	100
LITERATURE CITED.....	101
APPENDIX.....	105

CONTENTS OF TABLES

Table	Subject	Page
Table 1	Participation scores for different age groups in religious and nonreligious organizations in Taietz and Larson study.....	9
Table 2	Mean age for Morris and Elk extension council members....	32
Table 3	Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members distributed among eleven age groups.....	33
Table 4	Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members distributed among three age groups.....	35
Table 5	Number and percentage of male and female members in Morris and Elk extension councils.....	35
Table 6	Number and percentage of single, married, widowed and divorced members of Morris and Elk extension councils.....	36
Table 7	Mean number of children living at home for Morris and Elk extension council members.....	36
Table 8	Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members distributed among six income groups (gross annual income).....	37
Table 9	Number and percentage of members of extension councils of Morris and Elk distributed among three income groups (gross annual income).....	38
Table 10	Mean years of full time education for members of Morris and Elk extension councils.....	38
Table 11	Number and percentage of members of Morris and Elk extension council members who do and do not hold diplomas or degrees.....	39
Table 12	Number and percentage of the members of Morris and Elk extension councils as distributed between six groups on the basis of number of years of full-time education.....	40
Table 13	Number and percentage of the members of Morris and Elk extension council with grade school, high school and college education.....	41

Table	Subject	Page
Table 14	Number and percentage of members of households mainly dependent on farming and members of households mainly dependent on other occupations in Morris and Elk extension councils.....	42
Table 15	Number and percentage of members of Morris and Elk extension councils who spend less than 20, 20 - 40 and more than 40 hours in regular and additional tasks.....	44
Table 16	Mean length of residence of Morris and Elk extension council members.....	44
Table 17	Number and percentage of the members of Morris and Elk extension councils who own and rent their residences.....	45
Table 18	Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members with varying numbers of addresses outside the county in the past ten years.....	46
Table 19	Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members according to the number of their addresses within the county in the past ten years.....	46
Table 20	Number and percentage of the members of Morris and Elk extension councils as distributed among three groups according to the distance of their residence from the county seat.....	47
Table 21	Mean distance from the county seat for Morris and Elk extension council members.....	47
Table 22	Number and percentage of commuters and noncommuters of Morris and Elk extension councils.....	48
Table 23	Mean mileage of daily commuting for commuters of Morris and Elk extension council members.....	48
Table 24	Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members who voted and who did not vote in the last presidential, state governor and local elections.....	49
Table 25	Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members who missed none, one or more presidential elections in which they were eligible to vote in the past ten years.....	49
Table 26	Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members who voted in all, most, about half, few and none of state governor and local elections in which they were eligible to vote in the last ten years...	50

Table	Subject	Page
Table 27	Mean number and participation scores in formal organizations for members of Morris and Elk extension councils.....	51
Table 28	Frequency of talking with neighbors about local, state or national affairs for Morris and Elk extension council members.....	52
Table 29	Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members according to the priority of interest given by them to either local, state, national or international affairs.....	52
Table 30	Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members according to their local areas of interest.....	53
Table 31	Levels of potential and actual attendance of extension council and advisory committee meetings for Morris and Elk extension council members by age groups.....	55
Table 32	Activity levels of members of Morris and Elk extension councils by age groups.....	56
Table 33	Levels of potential and actual attendance of extension council and advisory committee meetings by sex in Morris and Elk extension councils.....	58
Table 34	Activity levels of Morris and Elk county council members by sex.....	59
Table 35	Levels of potential and actual attendance of meetings of extension councils and advisory committees by income groups.....	61
Table 36	Activity levels of members of Morris and Elk extension councils by income groups.....	62
Table 37	Levels of potential and actual attendance of extension council and advisory committee meetings for Morris and Elk by educational categories.....	64
Table 38	Activity levels of members of Morris and Elk extension councils by educational categories.....	65
Table 39	Levels of potential and actual attendance of extension council and advisory committee meetings for Morris and Elk extension council members by occupation.....	67
Table 40	Activity levels of members of Morris and Elk extension councils by occupation.....	68

Table	Subject	Page
Table 41	Levels of potential and actual attendance of extension council and advisory committee meetings for Morris and Elk extension members who scored less and those who scored more than the mean in formal organization participation.....	70 70
Table 42	Activity levels of Morris and Elk council members for those who scored more and those who scored less than the mean in formal organizations participation.....	71
Table 43	Levels of potential and actual attendance in extension council and advisory committee meetings for members of different committees.....	73
Table 44	Activity levels of members of different committees of Morris and Elk extension councils.....	74
Table 45	Levels of potential and actual attendance for commuters and noncommuters of Morris and Elk counties extension councils.....	76
Table 46	Activity levels of commuters and noncommuters of Morris and Elk county extension council members.....	77
Table 47	Levels of potential and actual attendance of extension council and advisory committee meetings by distance groups in Morris and Elk extension councils.....	79
Table 48	Activity levels of Morris and Elk county extension council members by distance groups.....	80
Table 49	Levels of potential and actual attendance of extension council and advisory committee meetings by levels of understanding.....	82
Table 50	Activity levels of Morris and Elk county extension council members by levels of understanding.....	83
Table 51	Levels of potential and actual attendance of extension council and advisory committee meetings for leaders and nonleaders of Morris and Elk extension councils.....	85
Table 52	Activity levels for leaders and nonleaders of Morris and Elk county extension council members.....	86
Table 53	Comparison between Morris and Elk councils in proportion of meetings attended and mean activity scores.....	88

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The Smith Lever Act, under which the present extension system was established, states the major purpose of the Cooperative Extension Service as:

"To aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same..."¹

Broadly speaking, this act identifies the principal extension function as education. But this is not education either in the abstract or in the classroom sense; it is rather an informal type of education which is designed for action. To distinguish the educational character of the extension service from classroom education, the Smith Lever Act states:

"Cooperative agricultural extension work shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics and subjects relating thereto to persons not attending as resident in said colleges in the several communities..."²

Kelsey and Hearne define extension work as "an out of school system of education in which adults and young people learn by doing."³

All this clarifies the distinctive character of extension service as an educational system. It should be planned by the people according to their needs, capacities and level of aspiration. It should be directed to helping people solve the various problems which they encounter from day to day in agriculture, home economics and related subjects. And this

¹Smith Lever Act, Section I, Public Law 83, 93d Congress, Chapter 157, 1st Session, S. 1679.

²Ibid., Section II.

³Lincoln David Kelsey and Cannon Chiles Hearne, Cooperative Extension Work, New York: Comstock Publishing Company, Ithaca, 1949, p. 1.

is to be done through action which is people's action.

This suggests one thing: the fundamental importance of involving the people concerned in all phases and processes of the extension programs and activities. Achieving people's participation in extension work is a "sacred" task for all those involved in extension, starting with the county agent and carrying up to the director of extension, simply because on this fact lies the success or failure of any extension activity.

One very important fact has to be mentioned here. People's participation in the extension program is secured in the most democratic fashion, and that gives all extension organizations a voluntary character. The voluntary nature of all extension organizations has been characteristic since the inception of the extension service and persists in all present activity. This is very important because as Hall holds, "higher quality participation comes easiest in a permissive atmosphere."¹

To see the persistence of the voluntary aspect of the extension service, let us review the history of extension in the United States. All authors of extension histories agree that the establishment of the Philadelphia Agriculture Society by a group of farmers in 1785, was the real beginning of the extension services. Subsequently agricultural societies spread all over the United States and played a very important role in extension work till 1852.

This was followed by the establishment of farmer's institutes which enhanced extension activities and work. True states that "between 1880 and 1890 farmers institutes or equivalent public meetings were established

¹D. M. Hall, Dynamics of Group Action, Second Edition, Danville, Illinois, The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1960, p. 187.

on a more or less permanent basis in 26 states."¹

The year 1862 represents a landmark in extension development with the establishment of a federal Department of Agriculture and the passage of the Morrill Act which provided for the foundation and maintenance of colleges "where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and essential studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts..."²

This was followed by the passage of the Hatch Act in 1887 according to which experiment stations were established in state agricultural colleges for carrying on research in agriculture.

In 1914, the Smith Lever Act was passed by Congress, creating the extension service as we see it today.

The passage of these acts put extension services on an organized basis, but they did not destroy the voluntary character of the activity. Extension programs are still carried out through voluntary organizations in all states.

In Kansas before 1951, the county farm bureau was for 36 years the organization through which extension programs were conducted. According to the Kansas Farm Bureau Law which was passed in 1915, any county farm bureau, after meeting certain membership requirements, was entitled to county appropriations and state funds to aid in the execution of a county extension program.

In 1951, the County Extension Council Law was passed. Since that time, the county extension programs have been the cooperative responsibility of

¹Alfred Charles True, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States 1885 - 1923, Washington D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1928, p. 14.

²The Morrill Acts.

county agricultural extension councils and Kansas State University. The councils are given the responsibility of planning and executing the extension program with the advice and help of the county agents and various specialists at Kansas State University.

A county extension council is composed of three members from each township and each city not a part of a township.¹ These three members are elected at a township meeting, one to represent agriculture, one to represent home economics, and one to represent 4-H club work.

The law also provides for advisory committees. Three advisory committees are found in Kansas counties. These are the agricultural advisory committee, the home economics advisory committee and the 4-H advisory committee which are composed of the agricultural, home economics and 4-H representatives of the council respectively.

An executive board consisting of a chairman, a secretary and a treasurer and six other members is also elected at the annual meeting of a council. Only one member of each township is elected for the executive board unless the county has less than nine townships or cities not a part of any township.

These are the extension organizations at the county level. Because of the character of extension organization as outlined, full responsibility for the planning and execution of the extension program rests with local units. It is, therefore, essential that the people who constitute these organizations understand the broad objectives of the extension program and realize that they must assume the initiative. Member understanding and

¹Handbook for County Agricultural Extension Councils, Kansas State University, Manhattan, 1961, p. 6.

member participation, under this organizational arrangement may be assumed to be closely related to their success.

This study of participation in extension organizations at the county level was designed as a case study with the above facts and assumptions in mind. Its objectives are:

1. To describe the general characteristics of participants in extension organizations at the county level in the two counties selected.
2. To determine the relationship between some static characteristics of the participants and their levels of participation. (By static characteristics is meant those which can not be changed by the county agent or any other person working with the councils such as age, sex, socio-economic characteristics, etc.)
3. To determine the relationship between some of the dynamic characteristics of the council members and their levels of participation. (By dynamic characteristics is meant those which can be changed by persons working with the council such as understanding of council objectives, etc.)
4. To compare two councils in terms of the levels of participation of officers and members as these relate to their effectiveness as perceived by knowledgeable extension officials.
5. To examine the relation between participation and leadership.

CHAPTER II

PARTICIPATION AND ITS CORRELATES: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Measurement of Social Participation

Various scales have been devised to measure social participation in voluntary organizations. The oldest and the most popular is the Chapin Scale¹ in which weights are assigned to five levels of activity as follows: (1) membership, (2) attendance, (3) contributions, (4) membership on committees and (5) position as an officer.

In a participation research project undertaken at the Utah State University, the plan was to use the Chapin Scale already mentioned. But, later on the idea was abandoned for three reasons: (1) The Chapin Scale gives heavy weight to financial contributions and many of the more recent scales drop this item from the measurement. (2) The scoring system, especially in relation to the contribution item, was difficult to handle in the Utah Study. (3) Chapin's scale measurement of attendance seemed too gross.

For the Utah study, Black² devised a participation scale based on his involvement theory which views participation as an involvement of the individual with the group which can be experienced by the individual in varying degrees. The scale accordingly was developed to reflect degrees of involvement and weights were assigned to it as follows: (1) membership (2) attendance at about one-fourth of the meetings (3) attendance at about one-half of the meetings (4) attendance at about three-fourths or more of

¹F. Stuart Chapin, "Social Participation and Social Intelligence," American Sociological Review, Vol. 4, No. 2, April, 1939, pp. 157-166.

²Therel R. Black, "Formal Social Participation," Rural Sociology, Vol. 22, No. 1, March, 1957, pp. 61-65.

the meetings (5) membership on a committee (6) holding an office.

Beal¹ developed a different sort of scale to measure participation in cooperatives. It was based on his theoretical model of the nature and function of an economic cooperative association. He classified levels of participation in cooperatives according to static and dynamic factors. The static levels were (1) controlling (2) financing (3) patronizing (4) getting facts and understanding (5) maintaining the organization and (6) sharing in the economic benefits. These are static in the sense that they can not be readily changed by the members of the group or by those working with the group.

According to Beal, these levels of participation (of the "static" type) are an important but incomplete measures of participation. The "dynamic" type levels are important too. The dynamic levels as listed by Beal are: (1) understanding of basic cooperative principles, (2) knowledge of facts about the cooperative, (3) satisfaction with the cooperative association, (4) having a say in running the cooperative, (5) identity with the cooperative association, (6) definition of the role of the cooperative, (7) number of neighbors who belong to the cooperative, (8) greatest benefit from cooperatives and (9) knowledge of existence of wholesale or regional cooperatives.

Another scale was developed by Rose² to measure participation in labor unions which includes the following items: (1) attendance at meetings, (2) speaking up at these meetings, (3) estimations of interest in union

¹George M. Beal, "Additional Hypothesis in Participation Research," Rural Sociology, Vol. 21, No. 3-4 September-December, 1956, pp. 249-256.

²Arnold M. Rose, Union Solidarity, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1952.

activities, (4) preferences for attending meetings as compared to attending non-union social functions, (5) supporting negotiating committees during periods of contract negotiation, (6) reading and understanding the contract and (7) serving on picket lines during times of strike.

The forgoing mentioned scales measure one level of participation, namely formal participation. The other level which is called by Duncan and Artis¹ the semi formal and by Anderson² the informal is also very important. The semi-formal participation "includes attendance at activities and programs where participation does not imply more than temporary association with the sponsoring organization."³

Foskett⁴ in his schedule (GCP Score) which was designed to measure formal and informal participation mentioned such things as rating frequency of serious discussion of educational, governmental, and civic affairs, involvement in local issues, attendance at meetings where educational and governmental affairs are a subject of major consideration, and frequency of association with leaders and officials as an indicator of informal participation.

¹O. D. Duncan and J. W. Artis, "Social Stratification in a Pennsylvania Rural Community," Bulletin 543, State College, Pennsylvania State College Agricultural Experiment Station, 1951.

²W. A. Anderson and H. E. Smith, Formal and Informal Group Participation in a New York Village, mimeographed Bulletin 28, Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station, 1952.

³Edmund de S. Brunner, David S. Wilder, Corinne Kirchner and John S. Newberry, Sr., "An Overview of Adult Education Research," Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., Chicago 11, Illinois, p. 101.

⁴Marvin B. Sussman, editor, Community Structure and Analysis, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York, p. 315.

Factors Related to Participation

Age and Participation. Philip Taietz and Olaf F. Larson¹ of Cornell University undertook a study of participation in four rural communities of New York State. They interviewed the heads and homemakers in about 13,000 households. This study reveals participation scores in religious and non religious organizations for different age groups as shown in the following table.

Table 1. Participation scores for different age groups in religious and non religious organizations in the Taietz and Larson study.

Age Years	Religious Organizations		Non-Religious Organizations	
	Male Heads Participation Scores	Home Makers Scores	Male Heads Participation Scores	Home Makers Scores
Under 25	3.8	4.9	11.9	5.2
25 - 34	4.6	7.6	13.8	8.5
35 - 44	4.9	8.9	15.0	9.7
45 - 54	5.6	10.1	15.3	10.1
55 - 59	4.5	9.6	12.7	9.9
60 - 64	4.5	10.4	9.2	7.1
65 - 69	4.9	9.5	8.4	6.9
70 - 74	4.5	11.7	9.5	9.1
75 - 79	5.7	11.5	10.8	6.4
80 years and over	3.3	8.8	4.9	2.0

Source: Philip Taietz and Olaf F. Larson, "Social Participation and Old Age," Rural Sociology, Vol. 21, No. 3-4, September- December 1956, p. 229-238.

¹Philip Taietz and Olaf F. Larson, "Social Participation and Old Age," Rural Sociology, Vol. 21, No. 3-4, September - December 1956, pp. 229-238.

The findings as shown in the table suggest that the younger age groups have comparatively low participation scores; then, participation scores increase with age up to a certain limit after which they gradually decline.

The results suggest that the decline in participation scores is at a comparatively younger age in non religious organizations than in religious organizations.

Selz C. Mayo¹ undertook an analysis of the intensity of participation at all age levels in the rural areas of Wake County, North Carolina, in which Chapin Scale weights were assigned to various activities within organizations as follows: membership - 1, attendance - 2, contributions - 3, committee memberships - 4, and officerships - 5. The final participation score for each member was obtained by summing the weights assigned to each activity category in all organizations with which the person was affiliated.

The study indicated that the average individual social participation score for the 15 - 19 year age group was higher than that for the next higher age groups (20 - 24 and 25 - 29). The average scores began to increase at about age thirty and finally reached a peak in the 55 - 59 age groups. Then the scores decreased in the older age groups (60 years and above).

The study also showed that the peak of participation intensity among females came about ten years earlier than among males. The average score was highest for females in the 45 - 49 age group, as compared with the 55 - 59 age group for males.

¹Selz C. Mayo, "Age Profiles of Social Participation in Rural Areas of Wake County, North Carolina," Rural Sociology, Vol. 15, No. 4, September, 1950, pp. 242-251.

Arnold Anderson and Bryce Ryan¹, in their study of social participation differences among tenure classes in a prosperous farming area, where there is no sharp distinction between owner and tenant groups in education, income scales of living and social relationships, found that the proportion of farmers not belonging to any group increased roughly with age in each tenure class.

Donald G. Hay², in a study of social participation of individuals in four rural communities of the northeast, found that young people 10 - 18 years of age were lowest in average formal organization scores. The 19 - 34 age groups generally showed an increase in extent of participation. Individuals 35 - 54 years old were consistently and to a marked degree highest in formal organization scores. Persons 55 years of age and over had significantly lower participation scores than persons 35 - 54 years of age.

John M. Foskett's³ study in Valley City I and Valley City II indicated that there is a tendency for participation scores to decline in later years. In Valley City I, the decline set in after the thirties and the mean score was lowest for those over 70 years of age, while in Valley City II the mean score rose until age 45 - 54 and then declined.

The lack of correspondence between the two communities for the middle age groups was explained by the author in terms of the fact that income

¹Arnold Anderson and Bryce Ryan, "Social Participation Differences Among Tenure Classes in a Prosperous Commercialized Farming Area," Rural Sociology Vol. 8, No. 3, September, 1943, pp. 281-290.

²Donald G. Hay, "Social Participation of Individuals in Four Rural Communities of the Northeast," Rural Sociology, Vol. 16, No. 2, June, 1951, pp. 132 - 133.

³John M. Foskett, "Social Structure and Social Participation," American Sociological Review, Vol. 20, No. 4, August, 1955, pp. 431-442.

and education of the middle age groups in Valley City I were lower than in Valley City II. The income and education levels of those in the lower and upper age groups was the same for both communities.

Verner and Newberry¹ reported that middle aged adults are more attracted to extension programs than older age groups. They also reported that among both sexes the age group from 18 to 29 is least interested in extension programs. In 1953, it was estimated that 3.3 per cent of all rural youth were involved, and a report for 1956 indicates that this figure has not increased materially. Home demonstration clubs draw the largest number of their members from women between the ages of 30 and 39.

Male vs. Female Participation. Brunner, Wilder, Kirchner, and Newberry, Jr. report that, "differences in the participation patterns of men and women have been widely reported."² As a matter of fact there is no unanimity in participation research as to the question of who participates more - male or female. Different studies in different areas produced different findings.

In the previously cited study by Hay³, male heads of families constantly out scored home makers, and sons generally scored higher than daughters in three communities out of the four covered by this study.

The same trend is shown in a study of informal participation of farm families in New York state undertaken by W. W. Reeder⁴. Husbands, it was found, took part in more different informal activities than wives but not

¹Cooler Verner and John S. Newberry, "The Nature of Adult Participation," Adult Education, Vol. III, No. 4, Summer, 1958, p. 214.

²Brunner, Wilder, Kirchner and Newberry, op. cit., p. 106.

³Hay, op. cit., p. 127.

⁴Hay, Ibid.

quite so frequently.

Anderson¹, in his study of social participation and religious affiliations in rural areas, found that much larger proportions of wives than of the husbands did not belong to any secular organizations.

An opposite trend is shown in Frederick A. Bushee's² study of social organizations in the small city of Boulder, Colorado. The study showed that attendance is slightly higher for women than for men. The percentages of attendance were estimated as 53 per cent in all-female groups, 51.4 per cent in mixed clubs and 50 per cent in all-male groups. These differences are slight, but a detailed analysis by Bushee showed that the attendance of women was perceptibly higher in specific groups (particularly the social, recreational and cultural), while the attendance of men was greater in the social service groups only.

The same study also found that women belonged to more organizations than men. The percentages of women belonging to all, five or more and six or more organizations were 62 per cent, 65 per cent and 72 per cent respectively.

A third trend is shown in Anderson's³ study of the family and individual social participation in which he analyzed Chapin participation scores of husbands, wives, sons and daughters. He found a positive relation between the participation scores of husbands and wives. When husbands scored high on social participation, their wives were also likely to score high.

¹W. A. Anderson, "Social Participation and Religious Affiliations in Rural Areas," Rural Sociology, Vol. 9, No. 3, September, 1944, p. 242.

²Frederick A. Bushee, "Social Organizations in a Small City," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LI, No. 3, November 1945, pp. 217-232.

³W. A. Anderson, "The Family and Individual Social Participation," American Sociological Review, Vol. 8, August, 1943, pp. 420-424.

Participation and Socio-Economic Level. Though differing indicators of socio-economic level have been utilized in various research, there is near unanimity in the finding that a positive relation exists between participation and socio-economic level.

Francena L. Nolan¹ found this relation in research undertaken in a rural community which included a village and several small open country neighborhoods. Families were classed into six status groupings on the basis of education, income and occupation. These categories were: white-collar, farm high, farm low, craftsman-high, craftsman low and laborer. The highest status grouping (white collar) had the highest average participation score (26.3 for husbands and 19.3 for wives), and the lowest status grouping (laborer) had the lowest average participation score (8.1 for husbands and 6.0 for wives).

Phillip Taletz and Olaf E. Larson² found in their study of four rural communities in New York state that low scio-economic status and retirement combined to produce low participation in formal organizations among aged male household heads in rural communities. The study also disclosed that the highest proportion of participators was from the young high-status group.

Similar trends were shown in Morris Axelrod's³ study undertaken in the metropolitan area of Detroit. Axelrod found that education was quite strikingly related to formal group participation. More than three-fourths of all persons with some college experience had formal group memberships, while only

¹Francena L. Nolan, "Relationship of Status Groupings to Differences in Participation," Rural Sociology, Vol. 21, No. 3-4, September-December, 1956, pp. 298-302.

²Taletz and Larson, op. cit., p. 237.

³Morris Axelrod, "Urban Structure and Social Participation," American Sociological Review, Vol. 21, No. 1, February 1956, pp. 13-18.

half of those with grade school were members of such groups.

The same trend is shown by the study in relation to income and occupation. Less than one half of those whose family income was under \$3,000 had formal group memberships, while among those whose family earnings exceed \$7,000, twice the proportion were members of formal groups. The study also showed that where the head of the family was engaged in a white-collar occupation, the family members were somewhat more likely to belong to more formal organizations.

Dorothy Dickins¹, in a study of white farm families of Mississippi in 1942, found that the families whose clothing supplies were ranked as minimum were also the ones who had the lowest social participation and the families whose clothing supplies were ranked as above average were also the ones whose social participation rank was above average.

W. A. Anderson's² study of social participation and religious affiliation, in which farm land was classified from class I to class VI, again revealed the existence of a positive relation between participation and socio-economic level. The land owners residing on better farm lands were more active participants than those residing on poorer farm land.

Bell and Force³, in a study of urban neighborhood types and participation in formal associations, found that the higher economic status neighborhoods contained relatively more men belonging to formal associations, more who

¹Dorothy Dickins, "Social Participation As a Criterion for Determining Scientific Minimum Standards in Clothing," Rural Sociology, Vol. 9, No. 4, December 1944, pp. 341-349.

²Anderson, op. cit., p. 244.

³Wendell Bell and Maryanne T. Force, "Urban Neighborhood Types and Participation in Formal Associations," American Sociological Review, Vol. 21, No. 1, February 1956, pp. 25-34.

frequently attended meetings, and more who held office in formal associations than did neighborhoods of a lower economic level.

In testing the reliability of his participation scale, Hay¹ also found this positive relation between participation scores and socio-economic status.

Activities Involvement and Participation. Various studies show that those who participate actively in certain specific organizations and activities tend also to be active participants in other organizations and activities. W. A. Anderson², in a study undertaken in Cortland and Otsego counties, New York state, found that individuals belonging to rural churches tend to be active in other kinds of organizations in greater proportions than those who are not church members. Seventy-eight per cent of the husbands and eighty-eight per cent of the wives who belonged to no church organizations had participation scores of less than ten points. No other group had such low scores.

F. Stuart Chapin³, in his research measuring volume of social stimuli, found that people who become involved in many activities are more likely to be characterized by higher levels of participation in these activities than persons involved in few activities.

Hay⁴, in a study of social participation of households in four selected rural communities of the northeast, found that persons with relatively high

¹Donald G. Hay, "A Scale for the Measurement of Social Participation of Rural Households," Rural Sociology, Vol. 13, No. 3, September 1948, pp. 285-294.

²Anderson, op. cit., p. 242.

³F. Stuart Chapin, "Measuring the Volume of Social Stimuli," Social Forces, Vol. IV, No. 3, March 1926, p. 489.

⁴Donald G. Hay, "The Social Participation of Households in Selected Rural Communities of the Northeast," Rural Sociology, Vol. 15, No. 2, June 1950, pp. 141-155.

formal organization participation scores were generally high in informal organization scores in all the localities covered by the study. The same author¹, in another study oriented to test the validity of his scale, found a positive relation between participation and number of group affiliations. The coefficient of correlation was .81 and .80, for the two samples taken in this study.

In a research project² carried out by a team of staff members of Cornell University's Department of Child Development and Family Relationships in Springdale township, it was found that individuals who engaged in any of a variety of particular informal activities tended also to be more highly involved in the formal organizational life of the community than were those not informally active. Also, there was a tendency for participation in one informal activity to be associated with participation in other activities.

Beal³, studying participation in cooperative, found that there was greater participation among members who said many or all of their neighbors belonged to cooperatives than among other members. Being involved with many neighbors is apparently positively related to active participation.

Commuting, Accessibility of Organization Activities, and Participation.

Research findings in the area of commuting and participation reveal that commuters tend to be less active participants than noncommuters.

Martin⁴, studying the small village of Cobura, Oregon, found that

¹Hay, op. cit., pp. 285-294.

²Jacqueline D. Goodchilds and John Harding, "Formal Organizations and Informal Activities," The Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XVI, No. 4, 1960, pp. 16-28.

³Beal, op. cit., p. 254.

⁴Walter T. Martin, "The Structuring of Social Relationships Engendered by Suburban Residence," American Sociological Review, Vol. 21, No. 4, August 1956, p. 447.

noncommuters were significantly more likely to get high participation scores than commuters.

Scaff¹, in his Claremont study of the effect of commuting on participation in community organizations, found that the families residing in Claremont whose chief breadwinner was also employed in Claremont participated in community activities 29 per cent more than did the members of commuter families.

Foskett² found that fringe dwellers were consistently lower level participants in the organizational life of a central community than those residing in the center itself.

Whetten and Field³ also found that commuters participated less in voluntary associations and informal groupings in the central community than noncommuters.

Martin⁴, following a study of the formal associational activities of rural-urban residents, concludes that the accessibility of the city center influences the location of organizational membership. He also concludes that the location of associational activities and the extent of formal participation are meaningfully related.

A study undertaken by a team of staff members of Cornell University's Department of Child Development and Family Relationships in Springdale

¹Alvin H. Scaff, "The Effect of Commuting on Participation in Community Organizations," American Sociological Review, Vol. 17, No. 2, April 1952, pp. 215-220.

²Foskett, op. cit., p. 432.

³N. L. Whetten and R. F. Field, "Studies of Suburbanization in Connecticut, 2, Norwich: An Industrialized Part-time Farming Area," Bulletin 226 Agricultural Experiment Station, Connecticut State College, May 1938, p. 107.

⁴Walter T. Martin, "A Consideration of Differences in the Extent and Location of the Formal Associational Activities of Rural-Urban Fringe Residents," American Sociological Review, Vol. 17, No. 6, December 1952, pp. 687-694.

Village¹ showed that accessibility to the village center turned out to be closely related to levels of community participation. Almost two-thirds of the highest level participants were living in the village itself.

Understanding the Goals and Work of the Organization and Participation.

George M. Beal², in his research on factors related to participation in cooperatives, found a significant positive relationship between members' understanding of basic cooperative principles and their participation. The coefficient of correlation between the understanding scores and participation scores in this study was $r = + .493$. He also found a low positive relation between the members' knowledge of facts related to their organization and their participation in that organization. The coefficient of correlation between knowledge scores and participation scores was $r = + .289$.

In the Springdale project³, it was found that high level participants tended to be more knowledgeable about local affairs than low level participants.

Intra-group Status and Participation. All participation scales tend to rank officership in organizations highly. This indicates a unanimous agreement among participation students of the positive relation between being an officer and high level participation.

Bell and Force state that "holding positions of leadership in a formal association denotes more active participation in the group than not holding

¹Edward C. Devereux, Jr., "Community Participation and Leadership," The Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XVI, No. 3, 1960, pp. 29-45.

²Beal, op. cit., p. 249.

³Devereux, op. cit., p. 24-25.

positions of leadership."¹ They believe that this is consistent with their finding which indicates a larger percentage of members holding office in formal association in high economic status neighborhoods than in low economic status neighborhoods.

Thibant² has shown that giving privileges to members of groups increased the attractiveness of the groups and raised members' participation. Kelley³ also observed that attraction to a group was lowest among members who were in danger of losing high status positions or who were not allowed to rise out of low status positions.

In the previously cited Springdale project⁴, the researchers distinguished three types of leaders: Type 1 leaders who hold formal offices and are perceived as influential persons, Type 2 leaders who are perceived as influential persons but do not hold formal offices, and Type 3 leaders who hold office but are not perceived as influential. The study also showed that local leaders seemed to have high economic status, long residence and a vested interest in the community, generally conservative orientations and values and an extensive and detailed knowledge of local affairs. The study also showed that leaders of the three types were higher level participants than other group members.

Summary. In summary, we may say that the trends given in the previously

¹Bell and Force, op. cit., p. 29.

²John Thibant, "An Experimental Study of the Cohesiveness of Underprivileged Groups," Human Relations, Vol. III, No. 3, 1960, pp. 251-278.

³Harold H. Kelley, "Communication in Experimentally Created Hierarchies," Human Relations, Vol. IV, No. 1, 1951, pp. 39-56.

⁴Devereux, op. cit., p. 29-45.

cited literature are:

1. Middle aged adults are likely to participate more in voluntary associations than both younger and older age groups.
2. Participation patterns of men and women have been widely reported by different researchers. Some studies show that male are higher participants than females, others show just the opposite and still others show a positive relation between husband and wives levels of participation.
3. High socio-economic level persons have a higher level of participation than low socio-economic level persons.
4. Those who are involved in a larger number of organizations are likely to be more active participants in those organizations than those who are involved in fewer organizations. Even within the organization, those who take part in more activities are likely to do it better than those who take part in fewer activities.
5. Noncommuters are likely to be more active participants in voluntary organizations than commuters.
6. The distance of the participant's residence from the center of activity affects his level of participation. The greater the distance, the lower the level of activity.
7. Those who have a better understanding of the purpose, goals and working relations of the organizations they belong to are likely to be more active participants than members who have less understanding of the purpose, goals and working relations of their organizations.
8. Leaders are likely to have higher levels of participation than non-leaders.

CHAPTER III

THE PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

This study focuses on the correlates of participation in a particular type of voluntary organization - the extension council. Though many studies have been made of general levels of participation in various types of communities, few have been focused on participation in a particular voluntary organization, and fewer still on the extension council.

Broadly, the study attempts, as stated in chapter one, to determine the relation between certain static and dynamic characteristics of council members and their levels of council participation, and to determine the extent to which the pattern is stable in similar environments.

Specific hypotheses to guide the data collection process have been formulated after a review of the literature to establish what is known about the main patterns of participation and the trends in methods of participation research.

These hypotheses are:

1. Middle-aged extension council members will be more active participants than both younger and older extension council members.
2. Female members of the councils will have higher participation levels than male members.
3. High socio-economic status council members will have significantly higher participation levels than low socio-economic status council members.
4. Council members who take active part in other organizational activities will be more active participants in extension councils than will those who are less active in other organizational activities.
5. Members of committees which hold meetings frequently will be more active council participants than members of committees which hold their

meetings less frequently.

6. Commuting members will have lower participation levels than non-commuting members.

7. Council members residing near the county seat (place of meetings and the major center of extension council activities) will participate on higher levels than those whose residences are far away.

8. Council members who have a better understanding of the purpose and basic working relation of the council will be higher level participants than those with lower levels of understanding.

9. Leaders, whether position leaders (those who hold offices on the council) or those chosen by other members as leaders but who do not occupy an official position on the council, will have higher levels of participation than other council members.

10. The extension council which has members of high level participation will be more effective in the extension program than the council with members of comparatively lower level participation.

The two councils included in this study were selected after consultation with extension personnel in the director's office. Three criteria were employed in selecting the councils:

- a. The two counties selected were to be predominately rural.
- b. The counties selected should contain no community of over 10,000 population.
- c. The two counties would have extension councils presenting maximum contrast in terms of operations and effectiveness.

That is, from among the counties meeting the first two criteria, two would be selected which were judged by extension experts to be as unlike as possible in terms of their modes of operation and their effectiveness. The

first two criteria were established to assure general comparability in terms of (1) the environment within which the councils would operate and (2) the types of activities in which they would likely to be engaged.

According to the United States census¹, the total populations of these two counties in 1960 were 4,728 and 5,048 for Morris and Elk counties respectively. According to the same census, the largest city in Morris county (Council Grove) had a population of 2,664. Howard was the largest place in Elk county with a population of 1,017.

The interview was used as a tool for data collection. Since the organizations were small, it was decided to interview all members of the two selected councils to maximize analytic opportunities. The schedule designed for the interview process embodied questions yielding the following information:

(a) General characteristics of the council members: age, sex, income, years of formal education, occupation, marital status, length of residence in the area, residential mobility, distance from the county seat, and commuting, (b) Civic and political involvement: voting in presidential, state and local elections, membership and activity in voluntary organizations, and interest in local, national and international issues, (c) Participation in extension organizations: attendance, contributions made in meetings, and activity outside the meetings in behalf of the council, (d) Identification of leaders: innovators, integrators, and friends, (e) Knowledge about the purpose of the council and its basic working relations with other institutions.

The schedule was pretested outside the counties selected for study. Minor changes were introduced in the schedule as a result of the pretest.

¹U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Final report PC(1) - 18B, General Population Characteristics, Kansas, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, pp. 146, 113, 78, and 65.

Tentative dates for field work in the two counties were established in consultation with extension personnel at the director's office who in turn consulted the county agents in the two selected counties about the most suitable time for data collection. At the time of the annual meetings of the extension councils in the counties, permission was secured to undertake the study and the time for the data collection was confirmed. A schedule of five interviews a day was adopted and checked through the county agents with the informants. Letters were sent in advance to all informants by the county agents to remind them of the date and time of the scheduled interviews.

One day prior to the actual field work, the complete schedule was published in the local papers. About one hour was spent interviewing each informant. Forty-five out of fifty-one council members were interviewed in Morris county during a period of nine days and twenty-eight out of thirty informants were interviewed in Elk county during a period of six days. The few informants not interviewed were unavailable during the two weeks of field work.

Following the field interviews, the data were tabulated and analyzed. Means were employed to describe the two councils in terms of such general characteristics as age composition, number of children living at home, years of formal full-time education, length of residence, mileage of daily commuting, and participation scores in formal organizations. Also, the distributions of members in relation to each variable were calculated by number and per cent.

A modified version of the Chapin scale was used to measure participation in formal organizations. The modification was the dropping of the item on contributions. The scale as adopted for the study included the following items: membership in formal organizations, attendance at meetings, memberships in committees, holding of offices or committee chairmanships.

Each of these factors was assigned an arbitrary weight, generally approximating the Chapin scheme. Total participation scores were computed as follows:

1. A score of one point was given to each organization membership mentioned by the informant.
2. A score of two points was given to each active membership. "Active" was defined to mean having attended at least one meeting of the organization during the year preceeding the study.
3. Three points were given to each membership on a committee.
4. Four points were given to each office or committee chairmanship held.

The total participation score for an individual was obtained by simply totalling all points.

Mean participation scores for each council were compiled as a measure describing the prevailing participation levels characterizing the councils.

In the second part of this study, related to testing the hypotheses formulated to relate extension participation to other factors mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, data were grouped into two or more categories in relation to the factor tested such as age, sex, etc., and the extension participation of these groups was estimated. This, of course, was done to see whether or not these categories featured significant differences in extension participation and to determine if these differences corresponded with the trends presumed by the hypotheses. This follows an analytic pattern frequently employed in social research to show interrelation between variables.¹

¹Claire Seltiz, Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutch, Stuart W. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations, Second edition, Henry Holt and Co., Inc., 1959, p. 414.

In grouping the data, two principles were observed:

1. The number of cases in each category should be sufficiently large to allow for meaningful comparison. In so far as possible, the data should be grouped to contain equitable categories.

Since the number of cases included in the study was relatively small, the limitations to the analysis were stringent. For example, in relation to age, income, education and distance of the residence from the county seat it did not seem sound to employ more than three categories for analysis and in relation to occupation, participation in formal organizations, commuting, understanding the purpose of the extension council and officeship and leadership the cases were grouped into two categories.

A two-fold technique of measuring extension participation was used:

1. Attendance: The proportion of attendance for each group was computed by dividing the actual number of meetings attended by the members of the group during their terms of membership by the potential number of meeting units the members of the groups were eligible to attend during their terms of membership. Information on the actual number of meetings attended and the potential number of meeting units for each member during his present term of membership was collected from the county agent's records. The proportion of meetings attended was computed separately for extension council meetings and advisory committees meetings. Grossing the attendance of the council and committees was avoided since the extension councils in both the counties hold only two meetings a year while some advisory committees hold as many as fourteen meetings a year. Thus, advisory committees attendance would overshadow extension council attendance if both were grossed. For example, if the two types of attendance were grossed, it would be impossible to distinguish between a member who attended ten out of fourteen advisory committee meetings

and no extension council meetings of the two held annually and a member who attended eight meetings of the advisory committee and both the two council meetings.

2. Extension activity: A three-part composite score of extension activity was computed. The three parts of this composite score are:

(a) Public meeting activity: The scoring on this part was done on questions asking about activities beyond attendance. The person was asked if he ever introduced new proposals or resolutions at committee or council meetings, if he had ever delivered talks or extended comments in favor of a proposal in council or committee meetings and if he had ever delivered talks or made extended comments against proposals in the meetings.

Scoring of this part was on the basis of the quantity rather than quality of talking. Prior research indicates this to be an important dimension of participation and group status. For example, Bales¹ reported a clear tendency for the member who does the most talking to be credited by his fellow members with having contributed most to the solution of the problem. Also the findings of a study done by Riechen² suggested that the participants in a discussion confound quality with quantity in such a way that the greatest talker was also seen as making the best contributions.

(b) Private activity: This item related to informal activity on behalf of the council or one of its committees outside of formal meetings. The

¹F. R. Bales, "The Equilibrium Problem in Small Groups," in T. Parsons, R. E. Bales, and E. A. Shils, Working Papers in the Theory of Action, Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1953.

²Henry W. Riechen, "The Effect of Talkativeness on Ability to Influence Group Solutions of Problems," Sociometry, Vol. 21, No. 4, December 1958, pp. 309-321.

informant was asked if he had ever done "spade work" for proposals on a private basis outside official meetings. Then he was asked if he had ever done "spade work" against proposals on a private basis outside official meetings.

(c) Semi-public activity: This item pertained to supervision of council projects and to contacting neighbors to give information about a project or to enlist their support for extension work.

The weights assigned to the replies on all questions were as follows: (3) yes - frequently, (2) yes - occasionally, (1) yes - just once or twice and (0) no. Only those activities related to extension council and advisory committees were scored; executive board activity was not included. Extension council and advisory committee membership is shared by all the members while executive board membership is confined to a few.

A composite activity score for each member was arrived at by summing the scores on all questions. Mean activity scores for the various categories in this study were computed. The composite activity maximum theoretical score for each member is 21, 9 for public meetings activity, 6 for private activity and 6 for semi-public activity.

To test the hypothesis related to participation and understanding of extension, replies to the open-end question dealing with the main purpose of the Extension Council and to questions dealing with the relations of the Council to other agencies and institutions were graded with the help of extension experts at the state level.

Replies to the question, "What is the purpose of the Extension Councils?" were grouped and scored as follows:

(1) Some persons viewed the extension council as an organization for planning and helping to carryout the extension program. These answers were given a score of 3.

Others viewed the extension council as an educational agency in agriculture and home economics. These answers were also given a score of 3.

(2) Some informants viewed the extension council as a community development agency for the betterment of the county. This type reply was scored 2.

(3) Certain respondents viewed the extension council as a social welfare agency. This reply was given a score of 1.

(4) Other views of the purpose of the council were given such as bettering human relations in the county, organizing the people, etc. Such replies were given scores of 0.

To obtain a further measure of respondent understanding of the councils, each was asked, "In employing extension agents in your county, who makes the final decision?" All the replies which stated that the executive board of the county agriculture extension council makes the final decision were given the score of 2 and replies which stated that the extension council makes the final decision were given the score of 1. Other replies were scored zero.

Each member was also asked to check (from among six alternatives) the agencies and institutions which he believed his county extension service was a part of. Each correct alternative was given the score of one. Only two alternatives were correct and the theoretical maximum given to replies on this question was, therefore, two.

As a final measure of knowledge and understanding of extension councils, informants were asked to check, from among five alternatives, those agencies which they believed contributed to the salary and expenses of their extension agents. Every correct alternative was given the score of one and the theoretical maximum on this question was three because only three alternatives from among the five stated in the question were correct.

The theoretical maximum on all three questions related to understanding

of the purpose and the basic working relations between the extension council and other institutions is thus 10 points. A composite "understanding" score for each member was arrived at by summing the scores on all questions. The mean for each council was computed by summing the total composite scores for all the members of the council and dividing by the number of members in each council.

To test the hypothesis relating to leadership and participation, each informant was asked to indicate two council members whom he considered to be most effective in introducing new ideas and in harmonizing relations among members. Also each informant was asked to indicate two council members whom he considered to be his best friends. Replies on these questions indicated there were a few informal persons who did not hold offices but who were nevertheless viewed by others as leaders on the basis of their effectiveness in introducing new ideas, harmonizing relations among council members and friendliness. Both leaders who hold office and leaders who got more than four choices as innovators, harmonizers or friends were compared with the rest of the extension council members in their extension participation.

To test the final hypothesis, dealing with the relation between participation and organizational effectiveness, mean attendance levels in extension council and advisory committee meetings as well as mean composite activity scores for each council were compared in the two counties. Four state extension experts whose jobs brought them into close touch with extension councils were asked to indicate which one of the two councils he thought to be more effective and why. This was done to see whether official opinion coincides with the findings of his study in relation to this hypothesis.

CHAPTER IV

THE FINDINGS: GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF EXTENSION COUNCIL PARTICIPANTS

Age

The mean age for members of the Elk and Morris county councils combined was 46.9 years. It was slightly higher in Morris than in Elk county. Tables 3 and 4, which give the proportionate distribution of extension council members among various age groups, indicate that the middle-aged were proportionately over-represented in the two extension councils.

Comparison of the age distributions in the Morris and Elk councils reveals an important difference, the pattern in Morris was more sharply modal than of Elk county. Also, Elk extension council members were more heterogeneous with respect to age than members of the Morris council.

Table 2. Mean age for Morris and Elk extension council members.

	Morris County Extension Council	Elk County Extension Council	Both Elk and Morris Counties Extension Council
Mean Age	47.5	45.8	46.9

Table 3. Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members distributed among eleven age groups.

Age Groups	: Morris Extension Council		: Elk Extension Council		: Both Elk and Morris Extension Councils	
	: Number of Members	: Percentage of the Total Members	: Number of Members	: Percentage of the Total Members	: Number of Members	: Percentage of the Total Members
1. Less than 25 years of age	0	-	0	-	0	-
2. From 25 - 29 years of age	4	8.89	4	14.29	8	10.96
3. From 30 - 34 years of age	0	-	4	14.29	4	5.48
4. From 35 - 39 years of age	10	22.22	2	7.14	12	16.44
5. From 40 - 44 years of age	6	13.33	1	3.57	7	9.59
6. From 45 - 49 years of age	5	11.11	6	21.43	11	15.07
7. From 50 - 54 years of age	9	20.00	3	10.71	12	16.44
8. From 55 - 59 years of age	4	8.89	5	17.86	9	12.33
9. From 60 - 64 years of age	3	6.67	1	3.57	4	5.48

Table 3. (Concluded)

Age Groups	: <u>Morris Extension Council</u> :		: <u>Elk Extension Council</u> :		: <u>Both Elk and Morris Extension Councils</u>	
	: Number of Members	: Percentage of the Total Members	: Number of Members	: Percentage of the Total Members	: Number of Members	: Percentage of the Total Members
10. From 65 - 69 years of age	2	4.44	0	-	2	2.74
11. 70 years of age and over	2	4.44	2	7.14	4	5.48
Totals	45	100.00	28	100.00	73	100.01

The percentage has not come to 100 because of rounding.

Table 4. Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members distributed among three age groups.

Age Groups: Years	: Morris Extension : Council		: Elk Extension : Council		: Both Morris and Elk : Extension Councils	
	:No. of :Members	Percentage from the Total Council Members	:No. of :Members	Percentage from the Total Council Members	:No. of :Members	Percentage from the Total Council Members
1. Less than 40	14	31.11	10	35.71	24	32.88
2. 40-54	20	44.44	10	35.71	30	41.10
3. 55 and over	11	24.44	8	28.57	19	26.03
Totals	45	99.99	28	99.99	73	100.01

The percentage has not come to 100 because of rounding.

Sex

Table 5 shows that the male participants were in the majority in the combined councils: the percentages were 56.16 and 43.84 per cent for male and female respectively. The two councils differed significantly, however, as regards sex composition, Morris council was predominately male (60%), whereas Elk was balanced.

Table 5. Number and percentage of male and female members in Morris and Elk extension councils.

Sex	: Morris Extension : Council		: Elk Extension : Council		: Both Elk and Morris : Extension Council	
	: Number	Percentage	: Number	Percentage	: Number	Percentage
Male	27	60	14	50	41	56.16
Female	18	40	14	50	32	43.84
Totals	45	100	28	100	73	100

Marital Status and Number of Children Living at Home

Table 6 indicates that virtually all the extension council members are married. In the combined councils 90.41% of the members were married. However, differences between councils are suggested by these data. The proportion of single and widowed members was somewhat higher in Elk than in Morris. Though the portion of married members was lower in Elk than in Morris, the mean number of children living at home was slightly higher in Elk. This difference does not seem significant.

Table 6. Number and percentage of single, married, widowed and divorced members of Morris and Elk extension councils.

Marital Status	Morris Extension Council		Elk Extension Council		Both Elk and Morris Extension Council	
	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage
Single	2	4.45	3	10.71	5	6.85
Married	42	93.33	24	85.71	66	90.41
Widowed	1	2.22	1	3.57	2	2.74
Divorced	0	-	0	-	0	-
Totals	45	100.00	28	99.99	73	100.00

The percentage has not come to 100 because of rounding.

Table 7. Mean number of children living at home for Morris and Elk extension council members.

	Morris Extension Council Members	Elk Extension Council Members	Both Morris and Elk Extension Council Members
Mean number of children living at home	1.55	1.71	1.62

Socio-Economic Level

Income. In the combined councils as well as in each considered separately, the highest income group was proportionately over-represented. However, the findings in tables 8 and 9 show that the higher income levels were proportionately more over-represented in the Morris council than they were in Elk. The proportion of high and middle income groups was slightly higher in Morris than that in Elk and the proportion of the low income group was significantly lower in Morris than that in Elk.

Table 8. Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members distributed among 6 income groups (gross annual income).

Income Group (gross) Per Year	Morris Extension Council		Elk Extension Council		Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils	
	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage
1. Under 2,000	0	-	1	3.57	1	1.37
2. 2,000-4,000	4	8.89	2	7.14	6	8.22
3. 4,000-6,000	6	13.33	7	25.00	13	17.81
4. 6,000-8,000	4	8.89	2	7.14	6	8.22
5. 8,000-10,000	10	22.22	5	17.86	15	20.55
6. More than 10,000	21	46.67	11	39.25	32	43.84
Totals	45	100.00	28	99.96	73	100.01

The percentage has not come to 100 because of rounding.

Table 9. Number and percentage of members of extension councils of Morris and Elk distributed among three income groups (gross annual income).

Income Groups (Gross) Per Year	: Morris Extension		: Elk Extension		: Both Morris and Elk	
	: Council		: Council		: Extension Councils	
	: No. of		: No. of		: No. of	
	: Members	Percentage:	: Members	Percentage:	: Members	Percentage
1. Under 6,000	10	22.22	10	35.71	20	27.40
2. 6,000-10,000	14	31.11	7	25.00	21	28.77
3. Over 10,000	21	46.67	11	39.25	32	43.84
Totals	45	100.00	28	99.96	73	100.01

The percentage has not come to 100 because of rounding.

Education. The mean years of formal full-time education for members of the Elk and Morris county councils combined was 12.38 years. It was slightly higher in Morris than in Elk. Table 11, which gives the number and proportion of members holding diplomas and degrees, indicates that members holding high school diplomas constituted the majority in the combined councils. Comparison of the two councils reveals that the proportion of members holding high school diplomas was significantly higher in Morris than in Elk. The proportion of members who held no diploma or degree was significantly lower in Morris than in Elk. No significant difference in the proportions of members holding bachelors degrees was found. Tables 11, 12 and 13 indicate that members in Morris county were more homogeneous in relation to education than members in Elk County.

Table 10. Mean years of full time education for members of Morris and Elk extension councils.

	Morris	:	Elk	:	Morris and Elk
	Extension Council	:	Extension Council	:	Extension Councils
Mean years of full time education	12.44		12.04		12.38

Table 11. Number and percentage of members of Morris and Elk extension council members who do and do not hold diplomas or degrees.

Diplomas or Degrees	Morris Extension Council		Elk Extension Council		Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils	
	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage
1. No diploma or degree	7	15.56	10	35.71	17	23.29
2. High school diploma	31	68.89	14	50.00	45	61.44
3. Bachelor's degree	7	15.56	4	14.29	11	15.07
4. Advanced college degree	0	-	0	-	0	-
Totals	45	100.01	28	100.00	73	100.00

The percentage is not 100 because of rounding.

Table 12. Number and percentage of the members of Morris and Elk extension councils as distributed between six groups on the basis of number of years of full-time education.

Years of Formal Full Time Education	Morris Extension Council		Elk Extension Council		Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils	
	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage
1. Under 9 years	4	8.9	5	17.9	9	12.3
2. 9 - 10 years	3	6.7	2	7.1	5	6.8
3. 11 - 12 years	24	53.3	11	39.3	35	37.9
4. 13 - 14 years	7	15.6	4	14.3	11	15.3
5. 15 - 16 years	7	15.6	6	21.4	13	17.8
6. Over 16 years	0	-	0	-	0	-
Totals	45	100.1	28	100.0	73	100.1

The percentage is not 100 because of rounding.

Table 13. Number and percentage of the members of Morris and Elk extension council with grade school, high school and college education.

Years of Formal Education	: Morris Extension Council		: Elk Extension Council		: Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils	
	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage
1. Under 9 years (Grade school)	4	8.9	5	17.9	9	12.3
2. 9 - 12 years (High school)	27	60.0	13	46.4	40	54.8
3. 13 - 16 years (college)	14	31.1	10	35.7	24	32.9
Totals	45	100.0	28	100.0	73	100.0

Occupation and Hours Spent at Work. Table 14 reveals that virtually all the extension council members in both the counties were from households mainly dependent on farming. The members coming from households mainly dependent on farming was proportionately lower in Morris than in Elk.

Table 15 shows that a proportionately larger number of Elk members worked at additional tasks than Morris members. However, the proportion of members who spend more than 40 hours a week in regular work was slightly higher in Morris than in Elk.

Table 14. Number and percentage of members of households mainly dependent on farming and members of households mainly dependent on other occupations in Morris and Elk extension councils.

	: Morris Extension		: Elk Extension		: Both Morris and	
	: Council		: Council		: Elk Extension	
	: No. of		: No. of		: No. of	
	: Members		: Members		: Members	
	: Percentage		: Percentage		: Percentage	
	: Percentage		: Percentage		: Percentage	
	: Councils		: Councils		: Councils	
	: No. of		: No. of		: No. of	
	: Members		: Members		: Members	
	: Percentage		: Percentage		: Percentage	
	: Percentage		: Percentage		: Percentage	
1. Members of households mainly dependent on farming. ¹	37	82.22	27	96.42	64	87.67
2. Members of households mainly dependent on other occupations. ²	8	17.78	1	3.57	9	12.33
Totals	45	100.00	28	99.99	73	100.00

The percentage is not 100 because of rounding.

¹"Members of households mainly dependent on farming are persons who either have farming as their usual occupation or who are supported by someone having farming as his usual occupation."

²"Members of households mainly dependent on other occupations are those who either have, or are supported by others who have, occupations other than farming as a usual occupation."

Table 15. Number and percentage of members of Morris and Elk extension councils who spend less than 20, 20 - 40 and more than 40 hours in regular and additional tasks.

Hours Spent: at Work During a Week	Morris Extension Council				Elk Extension Council				Combined Councils			
	Regular Work		Additional Tasks		Regular Work		Additional Tasks		Regular Work		Additional Tasks	
	No. of Members	Percent	No. of Members	Percent	No. of Members	Percent	No. of Members	Percent	No. of Members	Percent	No. of Members	Percent
Less than 20	0	-	7	70	2	7.14	6	54.55	2	2.74	13	61.90
20 - 40	15	33.33	3	30	9	32.14	5	45.45	24	32.88	8	38.10
More than 60	30	66.67	0	-	17	60.71	0	-	47	64.38	0	-
Totals	45	100.00	10	100	28	99.99	11	100.00	73	100.00	21	100.00

The percentage is not 100 because of rounding.

Length of Residence, Residential Mobility, Residential Ownership
and Distance of the Residence from the County Seat

The mean length of residence for members of Morris and Elk combined was 19.22 ^{miles} years. It was slightly higher in Elk than in Morris. Most of the members of the two councils owned their own residences. The proportion of owners was, however, higher in Morris than in Elk.

Virtually all members of the two councils had no addresses outside the county during the past ten years. Results reveal that most council members have not even changed residences within the county during the past ten years. Overall, the results show slightly higher residential stability in Morris as compared to Elk.

The mean distance of the members' residence from the county seat was 14.68 miles for the combined councils. It was slightly higher in Morris than in Elk. A larger proportion of Morris extension council members resided within a distance of less than ten miles from the county seat than did Elk extension council members.

Table 16. Mean length of residence of Morris and Elk extension council members.

	:	:	:Both Morris and Elk
	Morris Extension Council	Elk Extension Council	Extension Councils
Mean length of residence	17.91	21.32	19.22

Table 17. Number and percentage of the members of Morris and Elk extension councils who own and rent their residences.

	Morris Extension Council		Elk Extension Council		Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils	
	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage
1. Members own their residence	39	86.67	22	78.59	61	83.56
2. Members rent their residence	6	13.33	6	21.43	12	16.44
Totals	45	100.00	28	100.02	73	100.00

The percentage is not 100 because of rounding.

Table 18. Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members with varying numbers of addresses outside the county in the past ten years.

Number of Addresses Outside the County in the Past Ten Years	Morris Extension Council		Elk Extension Council		Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils	
	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage
1. None	42	93.33	25	89.29	67	91.78
2. One	2	4.44	-	-	2	2.74
3. Two	-	-	1	3.57	1	1.37
4. Three	-	-	1	3.57	1	1.37
5. Four	1	2.22	1	3.57	2	2.74
Totals	45	99.99	28	100.00	73	100.03

The percentage is not 100 because of rounding.

Table 19. Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members according to the number of their addresses within the county in the past ten years.

Number of Addresses Within the County in the Past Ten Years	Morris Extension Council		Elk Extension Council		Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils	
	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage
1. One	36	80.00	21	75.00	57	78.08
2. Two	7	15.56	6	21.43	13	17.81
3. Three	2	4.44	1	3.57	3	4.11
Totals	45	100.00	28	100.00	73	100.00

Table 20. Number and percentage of the members of Morris and Elk extension councils as distributed among three groups according to the distance of their residence from the county seat.

Distance of the Residence from the County Seat :	Morris Extension Council :		Elk Extension Council :		Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils	
	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage
1. Less than 10 miles	18	40	9	32.14	27	36.99
2. From 10 - 19 miles	11	24.44	12	42.86	23	31.51
3. 20 miles and over	16	35.56	7	25.00	23	31.51
Totals	45	100.00	28	100.00	73	100.01

The percentage is not 100 because of rounding.

Table 21. Mean distance from the county seat for Morris and Elk extension council members.

	Morris Extension Council	Elk Extension Council	Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils
Mean distance from the county seat.	15.00	14.18	14.68

Commuting

Table 22 shows that most of the members in the two councils combined and in each of them separately were noncommuters. The proportion of noncommuters was only slightly higher in Elk than in Morris. Table 23 shows that the mileage of daily commuting was 10.5 miles for both the councils combined. It was slightly higher in Elk than in Morris.

Table 22. Number and percentage of commuters and noncommuters of Morris and Elk extension councils.

	Morris Extension Council		Elk Extension Council		Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils	
	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage
1. Commuters	9	20	5	17.86	14	19.18
2. Noncommuters	36	80	23	82.14	59	80.82
Totals	45	100	28	100.00	73	100.00

Table 23. Mean mileage of daily commuting for commuters of Morris and Elk extension council members.

	Morris Extension Council	Elk Extension Council	Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils
Mean mileage of daily commuting	10.33	10.80	10.50

Civic and Political Involvement

Voting in Presidential, State and Local Elections. Tables 24, 25 and 26 show that both Morris and Elk council members were very active in voting in presidential, state and local elections. Virtually all members in both the councils said they missed none of the presidential elections during the past ten years. The proportion of those who missed none of these elections during the past ten years is somewhat higher in Morris than in Elk. Table 26 shows that virtually all members of both councils voted in all or most of the state governor and local elections during the past ten years. The proportion of those who voted in all elections of state governor during the past ten years was significantly higher in Morris than in Elk. The table also shows that the proportion of those who voted in all local elections during the past ten years was slightly higher in Elk than in Morris.

Table 24. Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members who voted and who did not vote in the last presidential, state governor and local elections.

Name of the Election	Morris Extension Council				Elk Extension Council				Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils			
	Voted		Did Not Vote		Voted		Did Not Vote		Voted		Did not vote	
	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage
1. Presidential	45	100	0	-	28	100	0	-	73	100	0	-
2. State Governor	44	97.78	1	2.22	27	96.43	1	3.57	71	97.2	2	2.74
3. Local	40	88.88	5	11.11	27	96.43	1	3.57	67	91.78	6	8.22

Table 25. Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council member who missed none, one or more presidential elections in which they were eligible to vote in the past ten years.

Number of Presidential Elections Missed	Morris Extension Council		Elk Extension Council		Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils	
	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage
1. None	43	95.56	24	85.71	67	91.78
2. One	2	4.44	3	10.71	5	6.85
3. Two	0	-	0	-	0	-
4. All	0	-	1	3.57	1	1.37
Totals	45	100.00	28	99.99	73	100.00

The percentage is not 100 because of rounding.

Table 26: Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members who voted in all, most, about half, few and none of state governor and local elections in which they were eligible to vote in the last ten years.

Number of Elections Voted in	Morris Extension Council				Elk Extension Council				Morris and Elk Extension Council			
	State Governor Election		Local Elections		State Governor Election		Local Elections		State Governor Election		Local Elections	
	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage
1. All	36	80.00	27	60.00	19	67.86	18	64.29	55	75.34	47	64.38
2. Most	5	11.11	10	22.22	5	17.86	5	17.86	10	13.70	15	20.55
3. About half	3	6.67	6	13.33	1	3.57	2	7.14	4	5.48	7	9.59
4. Few	1	2.22	1	2.22	2	7.14	2	7.14	3	4.11	2	2.74
5. None	0	-	1	2.22	1	3.57	1	3.57	1	1.57	2	2.74
Totals	45	100.00	45	99.99	28	100.00	28	100.00	73	100.00	73	100.00

The percentage is not 100 because of rounding.

Involvement in Formal Organizations. Table 27 shows that the mean number of organizations to which the members belong for both Morris and Elk councils combined was 3.96 and the mean formal organization participation score was 20.47. Elk council members belonged to more organizations and also were more active participants in those organizations than those members of the Morris council.

Table 27. Mean number and participation scores in formal organizations for members of Morris and Elk extension councils.

	Morris Extension Council	Elk Extension Council	Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils
1. Mean number of organizations to which the member belongs	3.84	4.14	3.96
2. Mean formal organization participation scores	19.60	21.64	20.47

Involvement in Local, State, National, International Affairs as Indicated By Talking with Neighbors and Indicating Prior Interest. Table 28 shows that the majority of both the councils frequently talked with their neighbors about local, state, national, and international affairs. Only insignificant proportions of the members in both councils talked rarely about these matters.

Table 29 shows that the majority of the members gave priority of interest to local affairs. Proportionately, a larger number in Elk council than in Morris gave their first choice of interest as local affairs. None in both the councils gave state affairs as his first choice.

As to local subjects of interest, table 30 shows that a large proportion of both the council members are interested in general educational and extension

affairs." The three areas of extension, namely agriculture, home economics and 4-H, comes second." The table also shows that Elk council members had a wider area of interest than Morris council members."

Table 28. Frequency of talking with neighbors about local, state or national affairs for Morris and Elk extension council members.

Frequency of Talking with Neighbors About Local, State or National Affairs:	Morris Extension Council		Elk Extension Council		Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils	
	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage
1. Frequently	24	53.33	16	57.14	40	54.80
2. Occasionally	20	44.44	12	42.86	32	43.84
3. Rarely	1	2.22	0	0	1	1.37
Totals	45	99.99	28	100.00	73	100.01

The percentage is not 100 because of rounding.

Table 29. Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members according to the priority of interest given by them to either local, state, national or international affairs.

Priority of Interests	Morris Extension Council		Elk Extension Council		Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils	
	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage	No. of Members	Percentage
1. Local affairs	32	71.11	25	89.29	57	78.08
2. State affairs	0	-	0	-	0	-
3. National affairs	8	17.78	2	7.14	10	13.70
4. International affairs	5	11.11	1	3.57	6	8.22
Totals	45	100.00	28	100.00	73	100.00

Table 30. Number and percentage of Morris and Elk extension council members according to their local areas of interest.

Classification of the Local Areas of Interest Given By the Respondents	: Morris Extension Council		: Elk Extension Council		: Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils	
	: No. of Members	Percentage	: No. of Members	Percentage	: No. of Members	Percentage
1. General education and extension affairs	22	48.89	13	46.43	35	47.95
2. Specific extension areas						
a. Agriculture	9	20.00	3	10.72	12	16.44
b. Home economics	6	13.33	3	10.72	9	12.33
c. 4-H	3	6.67	2	7.14	5	6.85
3. Health and sanitation	1	2.22	1	3.57	2	2.74
4. Religious activities	4	8.89	1	3.57	5	6.85
5. Civil defense	0	-	1	3.57	1	1.37
6. Social welfare	0	-	1	3.57	1	1.37
7. Watershed	0	-	2	7.14	2	2.74
8. County finance and taxation	0	-	1	3.57	1	1.37
Totals	45	100.00	28	100.00	73	100.01

The percentage is not 100 because of rounding.

CHAPTER V

THE FINDINGS: EXTENSION PARTICIPATION AND ITS CORRELATES

Age and Extension Participation

The findings presented in tables 31 and 32 suggest two different patterns in Morris and Elk extension councils. In Morris county, as shown in table 31, the proportion of extension council meetings attended was highest for the middle age group (40 to 55), lowest for the younger age group (less than 40 years of age) and intermediate for the older age (55 and over). The same tendency was shown also in the mean activity scores in table 32.

Attendance of advisory committee meetings of the Morris council did not, however, follow this pattern. Here the highest proportion of attendance was in the older age group, the lowest was in the middle age, and the level was intermediate for the younger age groups.

Elk displayed a markedly different pattern. In this county, the highest participant group whether in proportion of meetings attended or in mean activity scores was the younger aged group (less than 40 years). The lowest was the middle aged group and the aged group fell in between.

Table 31. Levels of potential and actual attendance of extension council and advisory committee meetings for Morris and Elk extension council members by age groups.

Age Groups (Full Years)	: Extension Council Meetings :			: Advisory Committee Meetings :		
	: P. No.	A. No.	Proportion of	: P. No.	A. No.	Proportion of
	: M. U.	M. A.	Attendance	: M. U.	M. A.	Attendance
Morris Extension Council						
1. Less than 40 years of age	48	18	37.50	75	54	72.00
2. From 40 - 54	70	44	62.86	120	59	49.17
3. 55 and over	36	18	50.00	127	98	77.17
Elk Extension Council						
1. Less than 40 years of age	35	26	74.29	77	61	79.22
2. From 40-54	38	14	36.84	65	38	58.46
3. 55 and over	28	16	57.14	37	22	59.46
Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils						
1. Less than 40 years of age	83	44	53.01	152	115	75.66
2. From 40 - 54	108	58	53.21	185	97	52.43
3. 55 and over	64	34	53.13	164	120	73.17

P. No. M. U. = Potential number of meetings units.

A. No. M. A. = Actual number of meetings attended.

Table 32. Activity levels of members of Morris and Elk extension councils by age groups

	Morris Extension Council :			Elk Extension Council :			Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils		
	Composite	Mean	Actual	Composite	Mean	Actual	Composite	Mean	Actual
	Activity No.	Scores	Scores	Activity No.	Scores	Scores	Activity No.	Scores	Scores
	of Cases			of Cases			of Cases		
1. Less than 40 years	57	14	4.1	85	10	8.5	142	24	5.9
2. From 40 - 54	164	20	8.5	47	10	4.7	216	30	7.2
3. 55 and over	74	11	6.7	60	8	7.5	134	19	7.1

Sex and Extension Participation

If both councils are taken together (tables 33 and 34), females were higher level participants than males on all measures - proportion of meetings of the extension council and of the advisory committees attended, as well as the mean activity scores. This tendency also holds in Morris county.

In Elk, however, the proportion of council meetings attended was slightly higher for males than for females while there did not seem to be a significant difference between male and female component activity scores. Only the proportion of extension advisory meetings attended was significantly higher for females than for males.

Table 33. Levels of potential and actual attendance of extension council and advisory committee meetings by sex in Morris and Elk extension councils.

Sex	: Extension Council Meetings :			: Advisory Committee Meetings :		
	: P. No.	A. No.	of	: P. No.	A. No.	of
	: M. U.	M. A.	Attendance	: M. U.	M. A.	Attendance
Morris Extension Council						
Male	92	40	43.5	46	22	47.8
Female	62	40	64.5	276	189	68.5
Elk Extension Council						
Male	52	30	57.7	52	30	57.7
Female	49	26	53.1	104	69	66.4
Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils						
Male	144	70	48.6	98	52	53.1
Female	111	66	59.5	380	258	67.9

P. No. M. U. = Potential number of meetings units.

A. No. M. A. = Actual number of meetings attended.

Table 34. Activity levels of Morris and Elk county council members by sex.

Sex	Morris Extension Council			Elk Extension Council			Both Morris & Elk Extension Councils		
	Total	Mean		Total	Mean		Total	Mean	
	Composite	Composite		Composite	Composite		Composite	Composite	
	Activity No.	Activity		Activity No.	Activity		Activity	No.	Activity
	Scores	of Cases	Scores	Scores	of cases	Scores	Scores	of Cases	Scores
Male	120	27	4.4	95	14	6.8	215	41	5.2
Female	180	18	10.0	97	14	6.9	277	32	8.7

Socio-Economic Level and Extension Participation

Income and Extension Participation. As regards income and participation, contrasting patterns are again displayed by Morris and Elk counties. In Morris, as shown in tables 35 and 36, the highest level participants on all measures were those having the highest income level.

In Elk, however, the highest participants on all measures were those in the middle income group.

Table 35. Levels of potential and actual attendance of meetings of extension councils and advisory committees by income groups.

Income Group (Thousands of Dollars of Gross Income Annually)	Extension Council Meetings			Advisory Committee Meetings		
	P. No. M. U.	A. No. M. A.	Proportion of Attendance	P. No. M. U.	A. No. M. A.	Proportion of Attendance
Morris Extension Council						
1. Under 6	14	5	35.7	32	22	68.8
2. From 6 - 10	46	22	47.8	116	80	68.9
3. Over 10	68	41	60.3	102	74	72.5
Elk Extension Council						
1. Under 6	33	17	51.5	63	39	61.9
2. From 6 - 10	26	18	69.2	40	28	70.0
3. Over 10	40	21	55.0	48	29	60.4
Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils						
1. Under 6	47	22	46.8	95	61	64.2
2. From 6 - 10	72	40	55.6	156	108	69.2
3. Over 10	108	62	57.4	150	103	69.7

P. No. M. U. = Potential number of meetings units.

A. No. M. A. = Actual number of meetings attended.

Table 36. Activity levels of members of Morris and Elk extension councils by income groups.

Income Groups: (Thousands of Dollars of Gross Annual Income)	Morris Extension Council			Elk Extension Council			Both Morris & Elk Extension Councils		
	Total Composite Activity Scores	No. of Cases	Mean Activity Score	Total Composite Activity Scores	No. of Cases	Mean Activity Score	Total Composite Activity Scores	No. of Cases	Mean Activity Score
1. Under 6	23	4	5.8	65	9	7.2	88	13	6.8
2. From 6 - 10	81	14	5.8	57	7	8.1	138	21	6.6
3. Over 10	157	19	8.3	59	11	5.4	216	30	7.2

Education and Extension Participation. Tables 37 and 38 suggest that participation in extension work generally increases with increasing education. This pattern held consistently for the councils taken together on all except the "private" activity measure. It holds on all measures in Morris, and on the attendance measures in Elk. However, it did not hold for activity beyond meeting attendance in Elk and even the reverse of what would be expected was found in the private activity participation.

Table 37. Levels of potential and actual attendance of extension council and advisory committee meetings for Morris and Elk by educational categories.

Years of Formal Full Time Education	Extension Council Meetings			Advisory Committee Meetings		
	P. No. M. U.	A. No. M. A.	Proportion of Attendance	P. No. M. U.	A. No. M. A.	Proportion of Attendance
Morris Extension Council						
1. Under 9 years	12	4	33.3	6	3	50
2. From 9 - 12 years	78	43	55.1	157	105	66.9
3. From 13 - 16 years	38	21	55.3	87	68	78.2
Elk Extension Council						
1. Under 9 years	22	5	22.7	30	8	26.7
2. From 9 - 12 years	47	28	59.6	80	55	68.8
3. From 13 - 16 years	30	23	76.7	41	33	80.5
Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils						
1. Under 9 years	34	9	26.5	36	11	30.6
2. From 9 - 12 years	125	71	56.8	256	169	66.0
3. From 13 - 16 Years	68	44	64.7	128	101	78.9

P. No. M. U. = Potential number of meetings units.

A. No. M. A. = Actual number of meetings attended.

Table 38. Activity levels of members of Morris and Elk extension councils by educational categories.

		:Public	:Private	:Semi-private:	Composite				
Years	:	:Activity	:Activity	:Activity	:Activity	:	:	:	:
of Formal	:	:Scores	:Scores	:Scores	:Scores	:	:	:	:
Full Time	:	No. of:Total	Mean	Total	Mean	Total	:	Total	Mean
Education	:	Cases	:Score	Score	Score	Score	Score:	Score	Score
Morris Extension Council									
1. Under 9	4	10	2.5	0	0	2	.5	12	3.0
2. From 9 - 12	22	70	3.2	14	.6	58	2.6	142	6.5
3. From 13 - 16	11	55	5.0	10	.9	42	3.8	107	9.7
Elk Extension Council									
1. Under 9	5	10	2.0	7	1.4	9	1.8	26	5.2
2. From 9 - 12	13	49	3.8	13	1.0	35	2.7	97	7.5
3. From 13 - 16	9	32	3.6	6	.7	20	2.2	58	6.4
Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils									
1. Under 9	9	20	2.2	7	.8	11	1.2	38	4.2
2. From 9 - 12	35	119	3.4	27	.8	93	2.7	239	6.8
3. From 13 - 16	20	87	4.4	16	.8	62	3.1	165	8.3

Occupation and Extension Participation. Tables 39 and 40 reveal that those members who were from households mainly dependent on farming were higher level participants in council affairs (whether in proportion of extension council and advisory committee meetings attended or in mean activity score) than were those members from households mainly dependent on occupations other than farming. The pattern holds generally whether the two councils are taken together or each is taken separately. The sole exception is the mean activity score in the Elk council which is higher for members of households mainly dependent on nonfarming occupations than those of households mainly dependent on farming. Actually we find that only one case in Elk comes under the heading of households mainly dependent on nonfarming occupations. This doesn't, of course, provide sufficient evidence.

Table 39. Levels of potential and actual attendance of extension council and advisory committee meetings for Morris and Elk extension council members by occupation.

	: <u>Extension Council Meetings</u> :			: <u>Advisory Committee Meetings</u> :		
	P. No.	A. No.	Proportion	P. No.	A. No.	Proportion
	M. U.	M. A.	of Attendance	M. U.	M. A.	of Attendance
Morris Extension Council						
1. Members of households mainly dependent on farming occupation	128	68	53.1	250	176	70.4
2. Members of households mainly dependent on nonfarming occupation	26	12	46.2	72	35	48.6
Elk Extension Council						
1. Members of households mainly dependent on farming occupation	99	56	56.6	151	96	63.6
2. Members of households mainly dependent on nonfarming occupation	2	0	0	5	3	60.0
Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils						
1. Members of households mainly dependent on farming occupation	227	124	54.6	401	272	67.8
2. Members of households mainly dependent on nonfarming occupation	28	12	42.9	77	38	49.4

P. No. M. U. = Potential number of meetings units.

A. No. M. A. = Actual number of meetings attended.

Table 40. Activity levels of members of Morris and Elk extension councils by occupation.

	Morris Extension Council			Elk Extension Council			Morris and Elk Extension Councils		
	Composite Scores	Mean No. of Activity Cases	Mean Activity Score	Composite Scores	Mean No. of Activity Cases	Mean Activity Score	Composite Scores	Mean No. of Activity Cases	Mean Activity Score
1. Members of households mainly dependent on agriculture occupation	261	37	7.1	181	27	6.7	442	64	6.9
2. Members of households mainly dependent on non-agriculture occupations	39	8	4.9	11	1	11	50	9	5.6

Participation in Formal Organizations and Extension Participation

Tables 41 and 42 clearly show that above average participants in formal organizations generally were also more active participants in extension than were those characterized by low levels of participation in formal organizations. This pattern holds whether both the councils are taken together or each one is taken separately. There seems to be a strong positive relationship between active participation in various types of organizations and participation in extension work in rural-type areas.

Table 41. Levels of potential and actual attendance of extension council and advisory committee meetings for Morris and Elk extension members who scored less and those who scored more than the mean in formal organization participation.

	:Extension Council Meetings :			: Advisory Committee Meetings :		
	:P. No.	A. No.	Proportion	: P. No.	A. No.	Proportion
	:M. U.	M. A.	of Attendance	: M. U.	M. A.	of Attendance
Morris Extension Council						
1. Members who scored more than the mean in formal organization participation	66	41	62.1	177	125	70.6
2. Members who scored less than the mean in formal organization participation	88	39	44.3	145	86	59.3
Elk Extension Council						
1. Members who scored more than the mean in formal organization participation	52	39	75.0	85	71	83.5
2. Members who scored less than the mean in formal organization participation	49	17	34.7	71	28	39.4
Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils						
1. Members who scored more than the mean in formal organization participation	118	80	67.8	262	196	74.8
2. Members who scored less than the mean in formal organization participation	137	56	40.9	216	114	52.8

P. No. M. U. = Potential number of meetings units.

A. No. M. A. = Actual number of meetings attended.

Table 42. Activity levels of Morris and Elk council members for those who scored more and those who scored less than the mean in formal organizations participation.

	:Morris Extension Council			: Elk Extension Council			:Morris & Elk Extension Councils		
	:Total :Composite :Activity :Scores	Mean Composite No. of Cases	Activity Score	:Total :Composite :Activity :Scores	Mean Composite No. of Cases	Activity Score	:Total :Composite :Activity :Scores	Mean Composite No. of Cases	Activity Score
1. Members who scored more than the mean in formal organization participation	165	18	9.2	130	14	9.3	295	32	9.2
2. Members who scored less than the mean in formal organization participation	135	27	5.0	62	14	4.4	197	41	4.8

Frequency of Committee Meetings and Extension Participation

Table 43 and 44 compare the participation levels of executive board members, home economics advisory committee members, and other extension council members. The executive boards of both councils hold at least one meeting every month. The home economics advisory committees hold one meeting every month in Morris county and one meeting every two months in Elk county. The committees in which the other members are involved hold only two meetings a year.

The tables show that executive committee members and home economics advisory committee members were more active participants whether in proportion of meetings attended or in mean activity score than the rest of the council members. This was the over-all pattern in both the Morris and the Elk councils, indicating that those who serve on committees which hold frequent meetings tend to be more active participants than those with a more tenuous tie to a council.

Table 43. Levels of potential and actual attendance in extension council and advisory committee meetings for members of different committees.

	:Extension Council Meetings :			: Advisory Committee Meetings :		
	:P. No. of M. U.	A. No. of M. A.	Proportion of Attendance	: P. No. of M. U.	A. No. of M. A.	Proportion of Attendance
Morris Extension Council						
1. Executive board members	30	27	90.0	74	50	67.6
2. Home economics advisory committee members	58	37	63.8	274	187	68.3
3. Rest of the council members	80	29	36.3	40	16	40.0
Elk Extension Council						
1. Executive board members	36	29	80.6	55	48	87.3
2. Home economics advisory committee members	35	23	65.7	90	66	73.3
3. Rest of the council members	42	15	35.7	42	15	35.7
Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils						
1. Executive board members	66	56	84.8	129	98	76.0
2. Home economics advisory committee members	93	60	64.5	364	253	69.5
3. Rest of the council members	122	44	36.07	82	31	37.8

P. No. M. U. = Potential number of meetings units.

A. No. M. A. = Actual number of meetings attended.

Table 44. Activity levels of members of different committees of Morris and Elk extension councils.

	: Morris Extension Council :			: Elk Extension Council :			: Morris and Elk Extension Council :		
	:Total	Mean		: Total	Mean		: Total	Mean	
	:Composite	Composite:		: Composite	Composite:		: Composite	Composite	
	:Activity	No. of Activity		: Activity	No. of Activity		: Activity	No. of Activity	
	:Scores	Cases	Score	: Scores	Cases	Score	: Scores	Cases	Score
1. Executive board members	103	9	11.4	102	9	11.3	205	18	11.4
2. Home economics advisory members	163	16	10.2	88	10	8.8	251	26	9.6
3. Rest of the council members	64	22	2.9	54	9	6.0	118	31	3.8

Commuting and Extension Participation

Tables 45 and 46 indicate that there is no constant relation between commuting and extension participation. In Morris county, the proportion of extension council meetings attended was higher for commuters than non-commuters, but the proportion of advisory committee meetings attended was lower for commuters than for noncommuters. Further, the mean activity score was higher for commuters than for noncommuters.

In Elk county, the proportion of extension council meetings attended was lower for commuters than for noncommuters, but the proportion of advisory committee meetings attended was higher for commuters than that for noncommuters. The mean activity score was lower for commuters than for noncommuters. In short, the pattern is opposite to that of Morris county. No definite relation is visible in these data; but this may be due to the small number of members who commuted. Only 9 out of 45 and 5 out of 28 in Morris and Elk respectively were commuting.

Table 45. Levels of potential and actual attendance for commuters and non-commuters of Morris and Elk extension councils.

	Extension Council Meetings			Advisory Committee Meetings		
	P. No.	A. No.	Proportion	P. No.	A. No.	Proportion
	M. U.	M. A.	Attendance	M. U.	M. A.	Attendance
Morris Extension Council						
1. Commuters	28	20	71.43	49	24	49.0
2. Noncommuters	126	60	47.6	273	187	68.5
Elk Extension Council						
1. Commuters	19	10	52.6	27	20	74.0
2. Noncommuters	82	46	56.1	129	79	61.2
Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils						
1. Commuters	47	30	63.8	76	44	57.9
2. Noncommuters	208	106	50.6	402	266	66.1

Table 46. Activity levels of commuters and noncommuters of Morris and Elk county extension council members.

	Morris Extension Council			Elk Extension Council			Morris and Elk Extension Councils		
	Total	Mean	Composite	Total	Mean	Composite	Total	Mean	Composite
	Activity	No. of	Activity	Activity	No. of	Activity	Activity	No. of	Activity
	Scores	Cases	Score	Scores	Cases	Score	Scores	Cases	Score
1. Commuters	71	9	7.9	33	5	6.6	104	14	74.3
2. Noncommuters	229	36	6.4	159	23	6.9	388	59	65.8

Distance from the County Seat and Extension Participation

Analysis of data related to distances of the members' residences from the county seat was made for members of the councils and for officers of the councils (members of the executive board or committee chairman) separately since it was felt that adding office bearers to the rest of the council members would disturb the pattern. This fact will be appreciated if we examine section "b" of tables 47 and 48. The findings do not suggest a consistent pattern in relation to officer participation and distance from the county seat.

If we examine section "a" of the tables related to distance and extension participation for those who are not executive board members or advisory committee chairmen, we find that those who resided 20 miles or more from the county generally had the lowest proportion of attendance and the lowest mean activity scores. This tendency is consistent in the proportion of extension council as well as advisory committee meetings attended in Elk. In the proportion of extension council meetings attended in Morris, this tendency is very clear, but the proportion of advisory committee meetings attended by those 20 miles and over was slightly higher than that of those who resided less than ten miles from the county seat.

Table 47. Levels of potential and actual attendance of extension council and advisory committee meetings by distance groups in Morris and Elk extension councils.

Distance	Morris Extension Council									Elk Extension Council									Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils								
	Extension Council Meetings			Advisory Committee Meetings			Extension Council Meetings			Advisory Committee Meetings			Extension Council Meetings			Advisory Committee Meetings			Extension Council Meetings			Advisory Committee Meetings					
	P. No. of M. U.	A. No. of M. A.	Proportion of Attendance	P. No. of M. U.	A. No. of M. A.	Proportion of Attendance	P. No. of M. U.	A. No. of M. A.	Proportion of Attendance	P. No. of M. U.	A. No. of M. A.	Proportion of Attendance	P. No. of M. U.	A. No. of M. A.	Proportion of Attendance	P. No. of M. U.	A. No. of M. A.	Proportion of Attendance	P. No. of M. U.	A. No. of M. A.	Proportion of Attendance						
A. Council Members																											
1. Less than 10 miles	52	26	50.0	102	60	58.8	21	10	47.61	40	25	62.5	73	36	49.3	142	85	59.9									
2. From 10 - 19 miles	34	17	50.0	85	56	65.9	20	9	45.0	34	15	44.12	54	26	48.2	119	71	59.7									
3. 20 miles and over	30	5	16.7	40	24	60.0	19	6	31.6	22	9	40.9	49	11	22.4	62	33	53.2									
B. Council Officers (members of the executive board and committee chairman)																											
1. Less than 10 miles	12	10	83.3	23	19	82.6	12	12	100	12	12	100	24	22	91.7	35	31	88.6									
2. From 10 - 19 miles	6	6	100	11	11	100	22	13	59.1	30	21	70.0	28	19	67.9	41	32	78.0									
3. 20 miles and over	20	16	80.0	61	41	67.2	7	6	85.7	18	17	94.4	27	22	81.5	79	58	73.4									

P. No. M. U. = Potential number of meeting units.
 A. No. M. A. = Actual number of meetings attended.

Table 48. Activity levels of Morris and Elk county extension council members by distance groups.

Distance of residence from the county seat	Morris Extension Council										Elk Extension Council					Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils											
	Public		Private		Semi-private		Composite		Public		Private		Semi-	Private	Composite	Public		Private		Semi-private		Composite					
	Activity		Activity		Activity		Activity		Activity		Activity		Activity	Activity	Activity	Activity		Activity		Activity		Activity					
	No. of	Total	Mean	Total	Mean	Total	Mean	Total	Mean	No. of	Total	Mean	Total	Mean	Total	Mean	No. of	Total	Mean	Total	Mean	Total	Mean	Total	Mean		
Cases	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Cases	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Cases	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score			
A. Council Members																											
1. Less than 10 miles	14	34	2.4	5	.4	27	1.9	66	4.7	6	18	3	5	.8	12	2	35	5.8	20	52	2.6	10	2.0	39	2.0	101	5.1
2. From 10 - 19 miles	9	29	3.2	6	.7	25	2.8	60	6.7	7	3	.4	2	.3	12	1.7	17	2.4	16	32	2	8	2.0	37	2.3	77	4.8
3. 20 miles and over	11	21	1.9	4	.4	17	1.5	42	3.8	5	10	2	2	.4	11	2.4	23	4.6	16	31	1.9	6	2.7	28	1.8	65	4.6
B. Council officers (members of the executive board and advisory committee chairman)																											
1. Less than 10 miles	4	20	5	3	.8	19	4.8	42	10.5	3	17	5.7	5	1.4	7	2.3	29	9.67	7	37	5.3	8	1.1	26	3.7	71	10.1
2. From 10 - 19 miles	2	10	5	2	1.0	8	4.0	20	10	5	32	6.4	8	1.6	20	4	60	12.0	7	42	6.0	10	1.4	28	4.0	80	11.4
3. 20 miles and over	5	40	8	11	2.2	19	3.8	70	14	2	15	7.5	6	3.0	7	3.5	28	14	7	55	7.9	17	2.4	26	3.7	98	14

Extension Participation and Understanding the Purpose
and Basic Working Relations Between the Council and Other Institutions

Tables 49 and 50 indicate clearly, strikingly and consistently the positive relationship between levels of participation in council activities and levels of understanding of the purposes of extension councils and their working relations with other institutions. The differences between those with below average and above average understanding are of large magnitude. We could reason that either the levels of understanding are greatly enhanced by participation, or that understanding fosters participation.

Table 49. Levels of potential and actual attendance of extension council and advisory committee meetings by levels of understanding.

Levels of Understanding of the Extension Councils:	:Extension Council Meetings			: Advisory Committee Meetings		
	:P. No. M. U.	A. No. M. A.	Proportion of Attendance	: P. No. M. U.	A. No. M. A.	Proportion of Attendance
Morris Extension Council						
1. Members who scored more than the mean*	104	68	65.4	247	184	74.5
2. Members who scored less than the mean*	50	12	24.0	75	27	36.0
Elk Extension Council						
1. Members who scored more than the mean*	51	43	84.3	79	68	86.1
2. Members who scored less than the mean*	50	13	26.0	77	31	40.3
Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils						
1. Members who scored more than the mean*	155	111	71.6	326	252	77.3
2. Members who scored less than the mean*	100	25	25	152	58	38.2

P. No. M. U. = Potential number of meeting units.

A. No. M. A. = Actual number of meetings attended.

*The mean for questions related to understanding of the purpose and basic working relations between extension council and other institutions is 5.96 and 6.36 in Morris and Elk correspondingly.

Table 50. Activity levels of Morris and Elk county extension council members by levels of understanding.

	Morris Extension Council			Elk Extension Council			Both Morris and Elk Extension Council		
	Composite Scores	Mean	No. of Activity Cases	Composite Scores	Mean	No. of Activity Cases	Composite Scores	Mean	No. of Activity Cases
1. Members who scored more than the mean	255	8.8	29	145	9.7	15	400	9.1	44
2. Members who scored less than the mean	45	2.8	16	47	3.6	13	92	3.2	29

Leaders and Extension Participation

Tables 51 and 52 show that formal and informal leaders participated at much higher levels than did the other members. The pattern was consistent whether the measure was attendance at council meetings, attendance at advisory committee meetings or composite activity score.

Results are entirely consistent for both councils and are impressively different for leaders as compared with members.

Table 51. Levels of potential and actual attendance of extension council and advisory committee meetings for leaders and nonleaders of Morris and Elk extension councils.

	: Extension Council Meeting			: Advisory Committee Meeting		
	P. No.	A. No.	Proportion:	P. No.	A. No.	Proportion
	M. U.	M. A.	of Attendance:	M. U.	M. A.	of Attendance
Morris Extension Council						
a. Formal and in- formal leaders	50	40	80.00	135	99	73.3
b. Other council members	104	40	38.5	187	112	59.9
Elk Extension Council						
a. Formal and in- formal leaders	48	36	75.0	75	65	86.7
b. Other council members	53	20	37.7	81	34	42.0
Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils						
a. Formal and in- formal leaders	98	76	77.6	200	164	82.0
b. Other council members	157	60	38.2	268	146	54.5

P. No. M. U. = Potential number of meeting units.

A. No. M. A. = Actual number of meetings attended.

By formal leaders is meant those who are members of the executive board or advisory committee chairman.

By informal leaders is meant those who are not members of the executive board or advisory committee but got more than four choices in questions designed to spot innovators, harmonizers and friends.

Table 52. Activity levels for leaders and nonleaders of Morris and Elk county extension council members.

	Morris Extension Council			Elk Extension Council			Both Morris and Elk Extension Councils		
	:Composite: :Activity :Scores	:No. of :Cases	: Mean : Activity : Scores	: Composite : : Activity : Scores	: No. of : Cases	: Mean : Activity : Scores	: Composite: : Activity : Scores	: No. of : Cases	: Mean : Activity : Scores
a. Formal and informal leaders	168	14	12	130	12	10.8	298	26	11.5
b. Rest of the council members	132	31	4.3	62	16	4.4	194	47	4.1

Effectiveness of the Council and Extension Participation

The data presented indicate that Elk county extension members are slightly higher in their participation as indicated by the proportion of extension council and advisory committee meetings attended. The difference between the councils is not, however, very striking.

Actually these findings coincide with the opinions of the four extension officials at the state level who were asked to give their opinions as to which one of the councils they considered to be more effective. All of them, for different reasons, believed that Elk county was slightly more effective over-all. One of the four, however, whose job brought her into contact with females believed that Elk, though more effective in agriculture programs, might not be more effective in the home economics program. She believed that female programs in Morris county were somewhat more effective due to the fact that Elk county spent some time without a home economics county agent.

Table 53. Comparison between Morris and Elk councils in proportion of meetings attended and mean activity scores.

	Morris	Elk
a. Attendance on the Extension Council meetings.		
1. Potential number of meeting units	154	101
2. Actual number of meetings attended	80	56
3. Proportion of attendance	51.95	55.45
b. Attendance on the Advisory Committee meetings		
1. Potential number of meetings attended	322	156
2. Actual number of meetings attended	211	99
3. Proportion of attendance	63.32	63.46
c. Activity scores		
1. Total composite activity score	300	192
2. Number of cases	45	28
3. Mean Activity scores	6.7	6.9

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUMMARY

The Approach and the Methods

Participation in voluntary associations has been a popular subject among sociologists in recent years. Many studies have been reported, adding to the bulk of participation literature. Very few studies have been reported in the area of extension organizations. In Kansas, no such studies have been reported, particularly on extension councils and other related extension organizations at the county level. As a matter of fact, the establishment of extension councils in Kansas is a recent development, since these councils came into existence after the passage of the Kansas Extension Council law in 1951.

In this sense, this study is a pioneer effort in this area. Admittedly, it is limited in its scope, utilizing the case approach to describe the general characteristics of extension councils and their participants, and to examine ten of the correlates of extension participation in two selected Kansas extension councils. In view of this limitation, the writer does not claim to generalize its findings to all Kansas extension council participants. The study may be thought of as a start in this direction. As a matter of fact, further research based on sampling to represent all Kansas extension participants is needed to arrive at such generalizations.

The method of measuring extension participation used in this study was based on the nature of extension councils and the role expectation of council participants. After reviewing the literature on scales used in different studies, it was felt that these scales were not quite satisfactory for this study due to the different natures of the organizations for which they were

designed and the extension council.

In this study, attendance at extension council meetings has been given special prominence. The importance of attendance will be appreciated if we look to the following facts.

1. Only three elected members from each township or a city not a part of a township are represented in the extension council. One of the major roles of those members is to represent the people's interests in the extension program planning which takes place at the meetings. Bible, Nolan and Brown¹ supported this fact through research on consensus of role definition of the county extension executive committee member.

2. Since extension services are mainly educational, the extension council member is supposed to transfer the knowledge he gets in meetings to the rest of the members in his township.

Most scales gross attendance with other measures of participation and, in fact, weight attendance lower than they do the other measures.

This has been avoided in this study.

But attendance alone is not a sufficient measure of all dimensions of participation, even in extension councils. Active participation requires contribution to the meetings as well. Since one of the most important functions of the extension council with its advisory committees is to help in planning the extension program, introducing new proposals, talking in favor or against proposals was taken into consideration in measuring extension participation.

¹Bond L. Bible, Francena L. Nolan, and Emory J. Brown, "Consensus on Role Definition of the County Extension Executive Committee Member," Rural Sociology, Vol. 26, No. 2, June 1961, p. 152.

Research studies¹ have shown that all classes and segments of farm population are not reached in the same degree by extension. Straus² also found a selectivity in the recruitment of extension participants. The same trend has been shown by Coleman³ in his study of differential contact with extension work in a New York rural community.

This very fact makes the role of the extension council member as an agent transmitting information from the county seat to his neighbors of utmost importance. That is why contacting neighbors to give them information about a project and to enlist their support for extension work was part of the extension activity scores computed in this study.

Actually, two limitations confronted this study in relation to extension participation measurement. These were:

1. Attendance and activity were computed separately in this study and no composite extension participation schedule was followed. The task of developing an accurate extension participation scale requires considerable research in testing the validity and reliability of such a scale. That task in itself is worthy of a full-fledged study. As a matter of fact, research beyond that attempted in this study is needed to develop such a scale.

2. Arbitrary weights were used in scoring the various items of the activity score computed in this study. Research on scaling has not been successful to date in entirely eliminating arbitrary decisions on scale

¹Edmund de S. Brunner and E. Hsin Poa Yang, Rural America and the Extension Service, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949, pp. 147-170.

²Murray A. Straus, "Managerial Selectivity of Intensive Extension Work," Rural Sociology, Vol. 24, No. 2, June 1959, p. 151.

³Lee Coleman, "Differential Contact with Extension Work in a New York Rural Community," Rural Sociology, Vol. 16, No. 3, September, 1951, pp. 207-216.

weightings. Coleman, in a discussion of Hay's study of social participation of individuals in four rural communities of the northeast, states:

"At best, scale weightings involve some arbitrary decisions."¹

The Findings

The findings given in this study in relation to age coincided with the previous literature in some parts and did not quite fit in with previous studies in other parts. Numerically, the middle aged group constituted the majority of the extension participants in both councils combined. Data on Morris also showed that generally the middle aged extension participants tend to be the most active group. However, the data on Elk showed the middle aged to be least active.

The limited number of cases encountered in this study presented a serious limitation for an adequate analysis of the relation between age and participation. Most of the previous studies on the subject have separated male and female in analysis of age and participation. This could not be done in this study because it would have resulted in insignificant numbers of cases in each group.

The findings of this study as regards age and participation are not very surprising. Coleman's² study, previously mentioned, found no consistent relation between age and the various indices of contact with extension. The results of this study are also not very conclusive. Indications are that councils vary with respect to age composition and that some are more homogeneous than others. Research on the impact of such homogeneity, which goes beyond that attempted here, is much needed.

Data on sex and participation in both of the councils combined supported

¹Hay, op. cit., p. 136

²Coleman, op. cit., p. 215.

the hypothesis that females are more active participants than males. The difference between male and female participation in one of the councils was not very striking. This was probably due to the lack of a home economics agent in that county during a considerable period just preceding this study.

As hypothesized, the data show a positive relation between socio-economic level, as indicated by income and education, and extension participation. The highest income group was proportionately over represented in both the councils. In the combined councils, this category had a higher participation level than other income groups. In Elk, however, the highest participants were the middle income group. This relation was more strikingly evident and consistent when the educational levels of the participants were analyzed.

To argue in favor of the findings related to income and education, we have to use the same argument presented by Coleman to support similar findings. He says:

Since extension is an educational program, the persons most in need of its services presumably would be those who have had least formal schooling. But from what we know about the cumulative nature of learning and the desire to learn, as well as about the situation in which Extension works, one would not necessarily expect that those most needing the program would automatically become participators.¹

Findings related to occupation and participation indicate that farmers and home-makers in households dependent on farming are more active participants in extension affairs than nonfarmers. This finding will really have some value if we bear in mind the fact that extension councils are in ultimate analysis a special interest group for the benefit of the farmers.

From the beginning of the cooperative extension program to the present

¹Coleman, op. cit., p. 313.

time, there has been some uncertainty as to whether the objective is to serve all rural people or all farm people.¹ Evidence from research shows that, though the formal statements of objectives have included all rural people, in practice the program has typically been oriented towards farming.² Coleman³ also found that farmers had the highest contact with extension and nonfarmers had the least contact.

It seems evident that there is a direct relation between program orientation and participation. At this point, it is significant to note that persons from rural farm households numerically dominated the councils and thus, very likely, the program orientation. This introduces the possibility of a relationship between majority status and high levels of participation - a relationship also suggested by other data in this study.

The findings of this study showed a positive relation between participation in other formal organizations and in extension participation. This finding goes along with previous studies and supported the hypothesis formulated in this respect. It is interesting to note that Coleman found a direct and consistent relationship between participation in all organizations as measured on the Chapin Scale and contact with extension.

Actually, the data did not allow for further analysis on the relation between extension participation and other indices of local activities involvement. The findings of this study showed that nearly all extension council members were very similar in claimed behaviors on voting and other indices of local activity involvement employed in this study. This did not allow grouping the data to obtain sizable categories for comparative purposes.

¹Kelsey and Hearne, op. cit., p. 17.

²Coleman, op. cit., p. 208.

³Ibid., p. 212.

The data also suggested a positive relation between frequency of committee meetings and levels of extension participation. Members of committees which held frequent meetings had a higher level of extension participation than members of committees meeting less frequently. Frequency of meeting is also another indicator of activity involvement and the findings of this study in this respect support a hypothesis based on a review of previous literature.

Data of this study did not allow for analysis to show how far participation levels will increase with increasing frequency of meeting. The maximum committee meeting frequency included in this study was only one meeting a month. According to the law of diminishing returns, it is doubtful that the levels of participation will increase indefinitely with increasing numbers of meetings. There must be a certain limit beyond which levels of participation will start decreasing. As a matter of fact, further research is needed in this area.

In relation to commuting, the findings of this study did not give support to the prior literature which suggests that commutation depresses levels of participation in voluntary organizations. The fact that so few commuters were found in the councils means, of course, that the results reported here are not to be regarded as conclusive. Also, because the average distance commuted was so low, a decisive test of participation through the full range of commutation was not possible. Within these limitations, it may be asserted that commuting seems to have no important effect on extension participation.

The hypothesis asserting a negative relation between extension participation and distance of the member's residence from the county seat is supported only with respect to those holding no council office. Increases in distance from the county seat seem to have an adverse impact on the nonofficers' levels of participation. For officers, the findings established no relation between

distance of the county seat and levels of participation. This study, as other literature cited previously, supports the fact that holding an office in any organization is a very crucial incentive for active participation.

These results also coincide with the findings on the hypothesis asserting a positive relationship between leadership and participation. The study found that leaders, whether formal or informal, were strikingly higher in their levels of participation than the rest of the members. This result supports those of similar studies, previously cited.

We may look at participation as being associated with certain costs and certain rewards. Distance from the place of meeting may be regarded as one of the costs of participation. Status recognition may be regarded as one of the rewards. Without the latter, the former seem to be regarded as prohibitive by some people at relatively low levels.

The study also indicated a positive and constant relation between participation and understanding of the purpose and the basic working relations between the council and other institutions. The data showed that those who had higher levels of participation also had a better understanding of the council's purpose and relations. This finding supports the hypothesis which was formulated after reviewing the previous literature on the subject. Actually, all literature on extension objectives and philosophy emphasizes its educational aspect and participation in extension organization should lead ultimately to better understanding. We do not know, of course, whether to interpret those results as showing that participation leads to better understanding or better understanding leads to participation. The data and methods of this study do not permit any conclusion as to this important point. A study of these two variables through time is suggested.

Because of the method of selection of the two councils, it was not possible

to make adequate tests of the relation between council member participation and council effectiveness. To make these tests, it would have been necessary to choose councils which differed significantly on objective criteria of effectiveness. As a limited test of this relation, however, evaluations of the councils by extension personnel were sought and these related to levels of participation in them. The findings, within these limitations, suggest there is a positive relation between council effectiveness and the levels of its member participation. An examination of the history of the extension services in the United States shows that extension programs and service have moved from county agents programs toward people's programs. Results of this study indicate this is sound policy. The effectiveness of extension services is not solely determined by the county agent; membership participation should also be credited.

In the foregoing discussion, we have tried to interpret the results of this study from a participation research point of view. At this point, an attempt will be made to evaluate some of the results from the point of view of extension personnel.

What do these findings mean to extension workers? The findings indicate selectivity of membership in extension councils in relation to income, education and farming as an occupation. This writer is quite aware that this selectivity is natural since extension council members are elected by the people in township meetings and the county agents have nothing to do with it. The evidence indicates that the selectivity process may result in a homogeneity which in fact enhances participation in the dominant group. However, this may occur at the expense of participation by other segments of the population and has serious implications for expansion of the extension program.

This writer is not suggesting that county agents or extension personnel

tamper with the mechanism of electing council members to reduce selectivity and broaden participation. This cannot be done within the democratically constituted present framework. What is recommended here for extension workers is the use of all means intended to activize council members participation in the interest of making extension services accessible to all segments of the population.

Based on the findings of this study, the writer offers the following suggestions to activize extension participation:

1. Since office bearing is positively related to active participation, this writer recommends enlargement of the number of officers in the extension councils. This could be done by forming additional committees to serve on various activities and occasions from among the extension council members.
2. Increase of the number of meetings of those advisory committees which at the present time meet only occasionally.
3. Involving as many extension council members as possible in additional extension activities which bring them in frequent contact with the program.

The study also indicates to the extension worker two sources where he can look for people to depend upon in carrying out his extension program. These are:

1. High level participants in formal organizations generally. Active participants in other formal organizations can be of valuable help to the county agent in gaining community-wide support for his programs. Since this study has shown a positive relation between participation in formal organizations generally and in extension participation, he may readily identify the key people by observing their participation in extension.
2. Local leaders with the reputation of being friendly, innovators or harmonizers. This study has shown that they are more active in extension

participation than others. This study indicates the need of developing criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of extension councils. And in this respect this study offers two criteria which should be taken into consideration in this evaluation. These are: (1) levels of extension members participation as measured by this study, (2) members understanding of the purpose of the extension council and its working relations.

In summary, this study was designed to describe the general characteristics of extension participants and to examine the relation between extension participation and ten of its correlates. The study took the following into consideration in measuring extension participation:

- a. Extension council and advisory committees meeting attendance.
- b. Extension activity represented by talking with neighbors at meetings, doing spade work for or against proposals on private basis and talking with neighbors about extension projects.

The study found a positive relation between extension participation and income, education, farming as an occupation, participation in other formal organizations, understanding of the purpose and relations of the extension council, leadership and effectiveness of the council. It found a negative relation between participation and distance from the county seat for non-officers. No relation was found between extension participation and age, commuting or (for officers) distance from the county seat. The study also found that female members were more active participants than male members.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer acknowledges with a deep sense of gratitude the valuable suggestions and help rendered by his Major Advisor, Dr. Ralph Dakin. His encouragement to the writer to take up this study is also acknowledged.

The writer also appreciates the help of Dr. Wilber Ringler, the Assistant Director of Extension. The friendliness and cooperation this writer received from the members of the Morris and Elk Extension Councils and the agents in these counties is also acknowledged and deeply appreciated.

And last but not least, the financial support given to the writer by the tax payers of the U.A.R. is gratefully acknowledged.

Khairy Hassan Aboul-Seoud

LITERATURE CITED

Books

- Brunner, Edmund de S., and Hsin Pao Yang, Rural America and the Extension Service. New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949.
- Brunner, Edmund de S., David S. Wilder, Corinne Kirchner and John S. Newberry, Sr. An Overview of Adult Education Research. Chicago, Ill, Illinois, Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1959.
- Hall, D. M., Dynamics of Group Action. Second Edition, Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1960.
- Kelsey, Lincoln David and Cannon Chiles Hearne, Cooperative Extension Work. Ithaca, New York, Comstock Publishing Associations, 1955.
- Parsons, T., R. E. Bales and E. A. Shils, Working Papers in the Theory of Action. Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1953.
- Rose, Arnold Marshal, Union Solidarity. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1952.
- Sussman, Marvin B., Editor, Community Structure and Analysis. New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1959.
- Selltiz, Claire and Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutch and Stuart W. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations. Second Edition, Henry Holt and Co., Inc., 1959.
- True, Alfred Charles, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States 1889-1923. Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1928.

Bulletins

- Anderson, W. A. and H. E. Smith, Formal and Informal Group Participation in a New York Village, Mimeographed Bulletin 28, Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station, 1952.
- Duncan, A. D., and J. W. Artis. Social Stratification in a Pennsylvania Rural Community, Bulletin 543, State College, Pennsylvania State College Agricultural Experiment Station, 1951.
- Whetten, N. L. and R. F. Field, Studies of Suburbanization in Connecticut, Bulletin 226, Connecticut State College Agricultural Experiment Station, May, 1938.

Periodical Articles

- Anderson, Arnold and Bryce Ryan, "Social Participation of Individuals in Four Rural Communities of Northeast," Rural Sociology, Vol. 16, No. 2, June 1951, pp. 132-133.
- Anderson, W. A., "Social Participation and Religions Affiliations in Rural Areas," Rural Sociology, Vol. 9, No. 3, September 1944, p. 242.
- Anderson, W. A., "The Family and Individual Social Participation," American Sociological Review, Vol. 8, August 1943, pp. 420-424.
- Axelrod, Morris, "Urban Structure and Social Participation," American Sociological Review, Vol. 21, No. 1, February, 1956, pp. 13-18.
- Black, Theres R., "Formal Social Participation," Rural Sociology, Vol. 22, No. 1, March 1957, pp. 61-65.
- Beal, George M., "Additional Hypothesis in Participation Research," Rural Sociology, Vol. 22, No. 3-4, September-December, 1956, pp. 249-256.
- Bushee, Frederick A. "Social Organizations in a Small City," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. II, No. 3, November 1945, pp. 217-232.
- Bell, Wendell and Maryanne T. Force, "Urban Neighborhood Types and Participation in Formal Associations," American Sociological Review, Vol. 21, No. 1, February 1956, pp. 25-34.
- Bible, Bend L., Francena L. Nolan, and Emery J. Brown, "Consensus on Role Definition of the County Extension Executive Committee Member," Rural Sociology, Vol. 26, No. 2, June 1961, p. 152.
- Chapin, F. Stuart, "Social Participation and Social Intelligence," American Sociological Review, Vol. 4, No. 2, April 1939, pp. 157-166.
- Chapin, F. Stuart, "Measuring the Volume of Social Stimuli," Social Forces, Vol. IV, No. 3, March 1926, p. 489.
- Coleman, Lee, "Differential Contact with Extension Work in a New York Rural Community," Rural Sociology, Vol. 16, No. 3, September 1951, pp. 207-216.
- Dickens, Dorothy, "Social Participation As a Criterion for Determining Scientific Minimum Standards in Clothing," Rural Sociology, Vol. 9, No. 4, December 1944, pp. 341-369.
- Devereux, Edward C. Jr., "Community Participation and Leadership," The Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XII, No. 3, 1960, pp. 29-45.
- Foskett, John M., "Social Structure and Social Participation," American Sociological Review, Vol. 22, No. 4, August, 1955, pp. 431-442.

- Goodchilds, Jacquelin D. and G. John Harding, "Formal Organizations and Informal Activities," The Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XVI, No. 4, 1960, pp. 16-28.
- Hay, Donald G., "Social Participation of Individuals in Four Rural Communities of the Northeast," Rural Sociology, Vol. 16, No. 2, June 1951, pp. 132-133.
- Hay, Donald, "A Scale for the Measurement of Social Participation of Rural Households," Rural Sociology, Vol. 13, No. 3, September 1948, pp. 285-294.
- Hay, Donald G. "The Social Participation of Households in Selected Rural Communities of the Northeast," Rural Sociology, Vol. 15, N . 2, June 1950, pp. 141-155.
- Kelsey, Harold H., "Communication in Experimentally Created Hierarchies," Human Relations, Vol. IV, No. 1, 1951, pp. 39-56.
- Martin, Walter T., "The Structuring of Social Relationships Engenered by Suburban Residence," American Sociological Review, Vol. 21, No. 4, August 1956, pp. 447.
- Martin, Walter T., "A Consideration of Differences in the Extent and Location of the Formal Associational Activities of Rural-Urban Fringe Residents," American Sociological Review, Vol. 17, No. 6, December 1952, pp. 687-694.
- Nolan, Francena L., "Relationship of Status Groupings to Differences in Participation," Rural Sociology, Vol. 21, No. 3-4, September-December 1956.
- Riechen, Henry W., "The Effect of Talkativeness on Ability to Influence Group Solutions of Problems," Sociometry, Vol. 21, No. 4, December 1958, pp. 309-321.
- Selz, C. Maye, "Age Profiles of Social Participation in Rural Areas of Wake Country, North Carolina," Rural Sociology, Vol. 13, No. 4, September 1950, pp. 242-251.
- Straus, May A., "Managerial Selectivity of Intensive Extension Work," Rural Sociology, Vol. 24, No. 2, June 1959, p. 151.
- Taletz, Philip and Olaf F. Larson, "Social Participation and Old Age," Rural Sociology, Vol. 21, No. 3-4, September-December 1956, pp. 229-238.
- Thibant, John, "An Experimental Study of the Cohesiveness of Under-privileged Groups," Human Relations, Vol. III, No. 3, 1960, pp. 251-278.
- Verner, Coolier and John S. Newberry, "The Nature of Adult Participation," Adult Education, Vol. III, No. 4, Summer 1958, p. 216.

Other Publications

Handbook for County Agricultural Extension Councils, Kansas State University,
Manhattan, 1961.

Smith Lever Act, Public Law, 93rd Congress, Chapter 157, 1st Session,

U. S. Census of Population, Kansas, 1960, Final report PC (1) 10 B, Kansas,
U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

The Morrill Acts.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX I

Dept. of Economics and Sociology
 Kansas State University
 In Cooperation with
 the Extension Division

Schedule Number _____

Date of Interview _____

Place of Interview _____

County _____

PART I: Information About Participants

1. Name _____
2. Address: Office _____ Home _____
3. Sex: Male () Female ()
4. What is your age? Years _____
5. What is your present marital status? Single () Married ()
 Divorced () Widowed ()
6. (Only to married persons) How many years have you been married? _____
7. (To married, widowed and divorced persons) How many children do you
 have living at home? _____
8. What is your usual occupation? Please describe this as specifically
 as possible. _____

9. In this work are you presently self employed? () employed by
 others? () unemployed? () retired? () not employed for
 pay or profit? ()
10. Are you regularly performing any additional tasks whether paid or
 unpaid? Yes () No ()
11. If yes, what do you do? _____

12. About how much time do you normally spend at each of these during a week? (Check one answer in each column)

Regular WorkAdditional Tasks

 Less than 20 hours

 Less than 20 hours

 20 to 40 hours

 20 to 40 hours

 More than 40 hours

 More than 40 hours

13. (Ask only of married women and widows not working for pay or profit.)

What is (or was) your husband's occupation? _____

14. (Ask only of unmarried persons not working for pay or profit.)

What is (or was) your father's usual occupation? _____

15. Approximately how much gross total annual income before taxes does your household have from all sources?

() Under \$2,000

() \$6,000 to \$8,000

() \$2,000 to \$4,000

() \$8,000 to \$10,000

() \$4,000 to \$6,000

() More than \$10,000

16. How many years of formal full-time education have you completed?

Full years _____

17. (a) Do you hold a high school diploma? Yes () No ()

(b) Do you hold a bachelors degree? Yes () No ()

(c) Do you hold an advanced college degree or its equivalent? Yes ()

No ()

18. How many miles is your place of residence from the county seat? _____

19. How long have you resided at this address? (Record to nearest year.)

20. Is your home owned () or rented ()?

21. Do you regularly work or perform other paid or unpaid tasks away from this residence? Yes () No ()

22. (Ask only of those working away from their residences.)
- (a) How many miles do you travel each day to and from your place of work or tasks? _____
- (b) How much time do you spend at this travel each day?
- Hours _____ Minutes _____
23. At how many different addresses within the county have you lived during the past ten years? _____
24. At how many different addresses outside the county have you lived during the past ten years? _____

PART II. Civic and Political Involvement

25. (Ask only of those eligible to vote.) Did you vote in the last presidential election? Yes () No ()
26. In how many presidential elections in which you were eligible to vote have you voted in the past ten years? _____ In how many such elections did you not vote? _____
27. Did you vote in the last election for a state governor? Yes ()
No ()
28. In about how many elections for state governor in which you were eligible to vote did you vote in the last ten years?
- All () Most ()
- About half () A few ()
- None ()
29. Did you vote in the last local election? Yes () No ()
30. In about how many local elections in which you were eligible to vote did you vote in the last ten years?
- All () Most ()
- About half () A few () None ()

31. Please name all of the voluntary organizations to which you belong at the present time. A voluntary organization is any neighborhood, community, county, state, regional or national group with some official membership list, and established meeting time. (List these in the table below.)
32. In which of these are you presently active? "Active" means you attended at least one meeting during the past year. (Check the table.)
33. What offices, committee memberships, and committee chairmanships do you now hold in these organizations? (List them in the table.)

Name of Organization	Activity		Office	Committees	
	Active	Inactive		Membership	Chairmanship
1)					
2)					
3)					
4)					
5)					
6)					
7)					
8)					
9)					
10)					

34. Do you ever talk with your neighbors about local, state or national affairs? Yes () No ()
35. If yes, how often? Frequently () Occasionally () Rarely ()

36. Number the following topics from one to four according to their interest to you?

() Local affairs

() State affairs

() National affairs

() International affairs

37. In what local affairs are you most interested? _____

Part III. Council Participation

38. How many Extension Council meetings have been held during your present term of membership on the Council? _____

39. How many of these did you attend? _____

40. Have you ever held any offices in the Council, any chairmanships of advisory committees or any chairmanships of subcommittees?

Yes () No ()

41. (If yes) Please tell me what these offices or chairmanships were and when you held them. (Record in table.)

Name of offices and chairmanships	Duration of office From _____ to _____	Now in office	Left office

42. (If member of the Executive Board) (a) How many meetings of the Board have been held during your present term of office? _____

(b) How many of these did you attend? _____

43. (If member of a chairman of an advisory committee or a subcommittee) How many meetings of each of these committees and subcommittees were

held during the time of your current term as a council member?

(Record in table.)

(b) How many of these did you attend? (Record in table.)

	Committee Meetings Held	Committee Meetings Attended
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		

44. (Ask only about those groups to which the respondent belongs, but check an answer on each part of the question.)

Have you ever personally introduced new proposals or resolutions at a meeting of:

- (a) the Extension Council? Yes () No ()
- (b) the Executive Board? Yes () No () Not a member ()
- (c) an advisory committee or a subcommittee? Yes () No ()
Not a member ().

45. If yes, how often in each case?

- (a) Extension Council: Frequently () Occasionally ()
Just once or twice ()
- (b) Executive Board: Frequently () Occasionally ()
Just once or twice () Not a member ()
- (c) Committees: Frequently () Occasionally () Just
once or twice () Not a member ()

46. Have you ever delivered a talk or made extended comments in favor of a proposal in the meetings of the council or committees?

(a) Extension Council meetings: Yes () No ()

(b) Executive Board meetings: Yes () No () Not a member ()

(c) Committees: Yes () No () Not a member ()

47. If yes, how often in each case?

(a) Extension Council: Frequently () Occasionally ()
Just once or twice ()

(b) Board: Frequently () Occasionally () Just once or twice () Not a member ()

(c) Committees: Frequently () Occasionally () Just once or twice () Not a member ()

48. Have you ever delivered a talk or made extended comments against any proposal in meetings?

(a) Extension Council: Yes () No ()

(b) Executive Board: Yes () No ()

(c) Committees: Yes () No ()

49. If yes, how often?

(a) Extension Council: Frequently () Occasionally () Just a time or two ()

(b) Executive Board: Frequently () Occasionally () Just a time or two () Not a member ()

(c) Committees: Frequently () Occasionally () Just a time or two () Not a member ()

50. Have you ever done any "spade work" for proposals on a private basis outside official meetings? Yes () No ()

51. If yes, how often? Frequently () Occasionally () Just once or twice ()
52. Have you ever done any "spade work" against proposals on a private basis outside official meetings? Yes () No ()
53. If yes, how often? Frequently () Occasionally () Just once or twice ()
54. Have you ever personally supervised a council project? Yes () No ()
55. If yes, how often? Frequently () Occasionally () Just once or twice ()
56. Have you ever voluntarily contacted people (your neighbors or otherwise) to give them information about a project and to enlist their support for extension work? Yes () No ()
57. If yes, how often? Frequently () Occasionally () Just once or twice ()
58. Have you ever had a field demonstration at your farm? Yes () No ()
59. If yes, how many times? _____
60. Have you ever arranged a field demonstration at one of your neighbor's farms or homes? Yes () No ()
61. If yes, how many times? _____
62. Who are those in the Council that introduce most of the effective new ideas or proposals?
 1. _____ 2. _____
63. Who, in the Council, work most effectively to harmonize relations among members and to reduce tensions?
 1. _____ 2. _____

64. Who, among the members of the Council, do you consider to be your best friends?

1. _____ 2. _____

65. In your opinion, what is the purpose of the Extension Council?

66. In employing extension agents in your county, who makes the final decision? _____

67. Based on your understanding of the Ag. Extension service in Kansas, which of the following do you believe to be correct?

(a) Your county Ag. Extension service is a part of the:

(1) Kansas State Board of Ag. ()

(2) Kansas University ()

(3) Kansas Farm Bureau ()

(4) Soil Conservation Service ()

(5) Kansas State University ()

(6) U. S. Department of Ag. ()

(b) Which one or more of the following do you believe contribute to the salary and expenses of your county Extension agents?

(1) Your county ()

(2) Kansas Farm Bureau ()

(3) Kansas State University ()

(4) U. S. Department of Ag. ()

(5) Kansas State Board of Ag. ()

**PARTICIPATION IN EXTENSION
COUNCILS IN TWO KANSAS COUNTIES**

by

KHAIRY HASSAN ABOUL-SEUD

**B. Sc. Cairo University, 1954
M. A., Delhi University, 1958**

**AN ABSTRACT OF
A MASTER'S THESIS**

submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Economics and Sociology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Manhattan, Kansas

1962

This case study of participation in extension organizations at the county level in two Kansas counties was designed to describe the characteristics of extension participants and to determine the relation between certain static and dynamic characteristics of council members and their levels of participation. The two councils were selected on the basis of comparability in terms of their general environment or settings.

Interviewing, guided by a schedule, was the tool used for data collection. The following devices were used to measure extension participation:

a. The proportion of extension council and advisory committee's meetings attended.

b. Extension activity which included: (1) Public meeting activity covering introduction of new proposals or resolutions and talks in favor or against proposals in the meetings of the extension council or the advisory committees. (2) Private activity covering spade work for or against proposals on private basis outside official meetings. (3) Semi-public activity including supervision of council projects and contacting of neighbors to give information about a project. However, a composite activity score was computed based on 1, 2, and 3 above.

A modified version of the well known Chapin scale was used to measure council members' participation in formal organizations. The item pertaining to contributions was omitted. A composite understanding score was computed in this study by grading questions related to extension council purpose, and the relation of the council to some other important institutions.

To test the hypotheses formulated after reviewing previous studies, the data were grouped into two or more categories according to the factor tested. The findings of this study indicated a positive relation between extension participation and income, education, farming as an occupation, participation

in other formal organizations, leadership, and effectiveness of the council. A negative relation between participation and distance from the county seat was found for nonofficers. No relation was found between extension participation and age, commuting, and distance from the county seat for officers. Female members were found to be more active participants than male members.

The study recommended activating council member's participation by increasing the number of council offices and by involving members in more activity. The study also recommends further research aimed at developing an objective scale for evaluating the effectiveness of extension councils. The study also called for further research to formulate a composite extension participation scale.

This is a case study. It is hazardous to generalize the findings to all extension councils in Kansas and more extensive research which includes additional units is needed to arrive at such generalizations. The study is to be regarded as pioneer work and a start in extension participation research.