

THE ROLE OF THE DISTRICT EXTENSION HOME ECONOMIST
IN KANSAS

by 544

MARY DORIS SCHROEDER

B. S., Kansas State University, 1938

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1968

Approved by:



Major Professor

LD
2668
T4
1968
3347
C.2

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is grateful to her major advisor, Professor Curtis Trent, for his guidance and counsel in all phases of this study, and to the other members of her committee: Professors Oscar Norby, Stephan Bollman and Marjorie Stith for their helpful suggestions.

The author is indebted to the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service for the Sabbatical leave which made a full time graduate study program possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose and Need	1
Background	2
Theoretical Orientation	4
Definition of Concepts	5
Statement of Objectives	6
Statement of Hypotheses	7
Scope and Procedure	8
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	10
The Concept of Role	10
Studies Related to the Role of the District	
Extension Home Economist	15
III. THE DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF KANSAS DISTRICT EXTENSION HOME ECONOMISTS AS PERCEIVED BY RESPONDENTS ...	22
Introduction	22
Analysis and Interpretation of Data	26
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	51
Introduction	51
Summary and Conclusions	55
Recommendations	63
BIBLIOGRAPHY	65
APPENDICES	69

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. The Duties and Responsibilities of Kansas District Extension Home Economists as Perceived by Respondents	22
II. Rank Order of Functions of the District Extension Home Economist in Kansas as to Emphasis that Should be Given, 1964	27
III. Rank Order of Functions of the District Extension Home Economist in Kansas as to Emphasis Currently Being Given, 1964	31
IV. Comparison of the "Should Be" and "Currently Being" Rank Order of the District Home Economist Functions by the County Home Economists, Kansas, 1964	34
V. Comparison of the "Should Be" and "Currently Being" Rank Order of the District Home Economist Functions by the District Supervisors, Kansas, 1964	35
VI. Comparison of the "Should Be" and "Currently Being" Rank Order of the District Home Economist Functions by the District Home Economists Themselves	36
VII. Comparison of the "Should Be" and "Currently Being" Rank Order of the District Home Economist Functions by the Total Group Rank Average, Kansas, 1964	37
VIII. Rank Order of Functions of the District Extension Home Economist in Kansas as to Emphasis that Should be Given, by District, 1964	39

TABLE	PAGE
IX. Rank Order of Functions of the District Extension Home Economist in Kansas as to Emphasis Currently Being Given, by District, 1964	43
X. Summary of Associations of Five Independent Variables and County Extension Home Economists Perception of Eight Role Definition Items, Kansas, 1964	48

APPENDIX TABLE

I. Comparison of the "Should Be" and "Currently Being" Rank Order of the District Home Economist Functions by County Extension Home Economists of the Southwest District, Kansas, 1964	74
II. Comparison of the "Should Be" and "Currently Being" Rank Order of the District Home Economist Functions by County Extension Home Economists of the Northwest District, Kansas, 1964	75
III. Comparison of the "Should Be" and "Currently Being" Rank Order of the District Home Economist Functions by County Extension Home Economists of the Southeast District, Kansas, 1964	76
IV. Comparison of the "Should Be" and "Currently Being" Rank Order of the District Home Economist Functions by County Extension Home Economists of the Northeast District, Kansas, 1964	77

TABLE

PAGE

V. Comparison of the "Should Be" and "Currently Being" Rank Order of the District Home Economist Functions by County Extension Home Economists of the Central District, Kansas, 1964	78
---	----

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Need

The purpose of this study was to more clearly define the duties and responsibilities of the District Extension Home Economist in Kansas, through the process of role analysis.

In a discussion of the changing role of the supervisor, Durfee said, "A profession such as Extension supervision responds to two major influences, (1) the changing knowledge available in the broad field and (2) the changing need within the organization."¹

He further noted:

The fact that the need in many instances is for programs built upon a different geographical area or a broader subject-matter base requires leadership from staff members who are not tied to geographical or subject matter areas. This leadership role is one which supervisors should fill. It requires that they be more than organizers or facilitators. They must have keen insight and a broad understanding of the needs of society. They must have a thorough understanding of technical agriculture or home economics subject matter and, more importantly, must be able to grasp the adjustments which are taking place and which are to come.²

A new Extension Home Economics program, designed to reach a larger and increasingly urban audience, has been launched recently in Kansas. This change has profoundly affected the roles of the County

¹ Arthur Durfee, "Changing Role of the Supervisor," Journal of Cooperative Extension, I (Fall, 1963) 149.

²Ibid., p. 153.

Extension Home Economist, the District Extension Home Economist, the Home Economics Administrative Staff and Specialists--and to some degree all other personnel of the Kansas Agricultural Extension Service.

Background

The Extension Service was officially established with the adoption of the Smith-Lever act by the United States Congress in 1914.

Changes in state administrative organization have been marked. In the beginning, when staffs were small, county agents were in close contact with the director's office. An increasing number of requests for additional personnel for agriculture, home economics, and 4-H Club work resulted in the employment of state leaders to supervise the work being done by specialists and county staffs. These state leaders had considerable authority for personnel and funds required for planning and executing their programs. As the programs increased, supervisory positions were created, with the supervisors being directly responsible to their respective state leaders.³

In Kansas, three supervisory districts were designated in 1923, each with a male district leader in charge of all agriculture, home economics, and 4-H work in his district. In 1931, the supervision of County Home Demonstration Agents was placed on a district basis with one Assistant Home Demonstration Leader for each district. As more

³H. C. Sanders, and others, The Cooperative Extension Service (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966), p. 40.

counties were added and the work-load increased, another agricultural supervisor was added to each district; and later, another home economics supervisor and a supervisor for 4-H work.⁴

In 1956, when a new Director of Extension arrived in Kansas, a revised organization plan was made. The new plan included five districts, each staffed by one District Agricultural Agent, one District Home Economics Agent, and one 4-H Club Specialist.⁵

On July 1, 1961, the project known as County Agent Work was changed to County Extension Operations with the State Leader of Field Operations as head. He was assigned the responsibility of coordinating the work in county extension finances, county personnel, and programs. At the same time, the five District Home Economics Agents, who had been responsible to the State Leader for Home Economics, were made administratively responsible to the State Leader of Field Operations through the District Extension Supervisors. The Home Economics supervisors at this time ceased to have direct responsibility for staffing and budgetary matters concerning County Home Economics Agents. The Agricultural supervisors were assigned these responsibilities for all county agents, and the District Home Economics Agents became largely program leaders. The Job Description states, "The District Agricultural Agent serves as chairman of the district agent team."⁷ Also, the County Agricultural Agent in each county was designated as county chairman and charged with

⁴Earl H. Teagarden, History of the Kansas Extension Service (Manhattan: Kansas State University, 1964), I, p. 256.

⁵Ibid., p. 263. ⁶Ibid., p. 269.

⁷Job Description for Professional Staff of the Cooperative Extension Service, (Kansas State University, 1967). (Mimeographed.)

financial and supervisory functions over the county staff. According to Sanders, these changes were a national trend at the time.⁸

The four District Home Economics Agents who completed the questionnaire for this study in December, 1964, were all supervisors during the 1961 change in organizational structure, and all except one during the 1956 change.

Changes in organization and programs make it more difficult for the supervisor to understand what is expected of her by her superiors, her peers, and the agents she supervises. In addition to the frustrations that come with change, the supervisor's position as the person in the "middle" is a source of role conflict. The supervisor is the transfer point at which management policies are stepped down to the agent, and the agent's problems are stepped up to management.⁹ She must win approval and respect, but also must maintain standards.

Theoretical Orientation

The theoretical frame of reference for this study was based on certain aspects of role theory developed by Parsons, Newcomb and Sarbin, Linton, and Getzels and Guba--which is covered in detail in the review of literature.

⁸Sanders, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

⁹L. Cassels and R. L. Randall, "Next Big Step: Upgrade Supervisors," Nations Business, (August, 1959), p. 46.

Trent stated:

Most of the concepts of role that have been advanced contain at least two basic ideas: (1) the location of the individual within a social system or institution, and (2) the behavior of the individual occupying a position within a social system or institution.¹⁰

Definition of Concepts

1. District Extension Home Economist (official title since July 1, 1967), or District Home Economics Agent (1956 to 1967), or Assistant Home Demonstration Leader (1931 to 1956): The person responsible for working with the County Extension Home Economists in a district, in programming, as coordinator of the home economics program, as trainer of new agents; and in cooperating with the District Extension Supervisor on all other district responsibilities relating to the home economics program.

2. County Extension Home Economist (official title since July 1, 1967), or County Home Economics Agent (1956 to 1967), or County Home Demonstration Agent (to 1956): The persons responsible for carrying on the extension educational program in family living in the counties.

3. District Extension Supervisor: The chairman of the district agent team in a district.

¹⁰Curtis Trent, "The Administrative Role of the State 4-H Club Leader in Selected States--A Study in Role Perception." (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Cooperative Extension Administration, University of Wisconsin, 1961), p. 10.

4. Respondents: District Extension Home Economists, County Extension Home Economists, and District Extension Supervisors in Kansas.

5. Role: A set of expectations which others share of the behavior of an individual as an occupant of a position within an organization.

6. Consensus: Agreement.

Statement of Objectives

1. To determine the relative degree of emphasis that should be given to fifteen selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist as perceived by the District Extension Home Economists, County Extension Home Economists, and District Extension Supervisors.

2. To determine the relative degree of emphasis that is currently being given to fifteen selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist as perceived by the District Extension Home Economists, County Extension Home Economists, and District Extension Supervisors.

3. To determine the relationship between the emphasis that should be given and the emphasis that is currently being given to the functions of the District Extension Home Economist as perceived by the respondent groups.

4. To determine whether there are associations between age, experience, induction training, formal Extension education, and the degree of urbanization of county of the County Extension Home Economist, and the relative degree of emphasis County Extension Home Economists

perceive should be given to eight selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist.

Statement of Hypotheses

1. There is no consensus among the District Extension Home Economists, County Extension Home Economists, and District Extension Supervisors as to the relative degree of emphasis that should be given to fifteen selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist in Kansas.

2. There is no consensus among the District Extension Home Economists, County Extension Home Economists, and District Extension Supervisors as to the relative degree of emphasis that is currently being given to fifteen selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist in Kansas.

3. There is no relationship between the emphasis that should be given and the emphasis that is currently being given to the functions of the District Extension Home Economist as perceived by the respondent groups.

4. There is no association between the relative degree of emphasis that County Extension Home Economists perceive should be given to eight selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist and the County Extension Home Economist's age, experience, induction training, formal Extension education, and the degree of urbanization of the county.

Scope and Procedure

This study is one of a group of studies planned to more clearly define the roles of Administrators, Specialists, District Extension Supervisors and Home Economists, County Extension Agricultural Agents, County Extension Home Economists, and County Extension 4-H Agents in the Kansas Extension Service. A committee of administrators and graduate students developed the structured mail questionnaire. Two pages of bibliographical data were included. Extension administrative districts were identified. A questionnaire was sent to each staff member of the Extension Service.

Those responding to the questionnaire were: eighty-six County Extension Home Economists (80 per cent), four District Extension Home Economists (100 per cent), and five District Extension Supervisors (100 per cent). The respondents were asked to rate, on a five point scale, the importance they believed was being given and the importance that, ideally, should be given to each of fifteen functions of the District Extension Home Economists. A score of five indicated major emphasis, four indicated important emphasis, three indicated intermediate emphasis, two indicated minor emphasis, and one indicated no emphasis. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix C.

Presentation and Analysis of the Data

A mean weighted score was computed for each function for each of the three groups of respondents. The functions were ranked, with

the highest score given a rank of one, the lowest a rank of fifteen, and the others ranked accordingly.

The agreement between two sets of rankings of the duties and responsibilities of the District Extension Home Economist was measured by the Spearman rank difference correlation (Rho). Walter Borg stated:

Although the rank difference correlation is valuable when data are available only in ranks, its main use is in studies where the experimenter must calculate a large number of correlations on moderately small samples of individuals.¹¹

Limitations of the Study

The scope of this study has been limited to the role of the District Extension Home Economist in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service in terms of fifteen selected functions.

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

¹¹Walter R. Borg, Educational Research (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1965), p. 151.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Concept of Role

The stated purpose of this study was to more clearly define the duties and responsibilities of the District Extension Home Economist in Kansas, through the process of role analysis. The first section of the review of literature is devoted to studies related to the concept of role.

According to Blalock:

In recent years the concept of role has assumed a key position in the fields of sociology, social psychology, and cultural anthropology. It is now frequently used as a central term in the study of the structure and functioning of social systems, such as the Cooperative Extension Service, as well as for the explanation of individual behavior.¹

Gross, Mason and McEachern², place most role definitions in three categories: (1) Definitions which define role to include normative culture patterns: Linton's definition comes in this category when he says, "A role represents the dynamic aspect of status . . . When (the individual) puts the rights and duties which constitute

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

²Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), pp. 11-15.

the status into effect, he is performing a role."³ (2) Definitions which treat role as an individual's definition of his situation with reference to his and other's social positions: Sargent's definition is an example of this category. He says, "A person's role is a pattern or type of social behavior which seems situationally appropriate to him in terms of the demands and expectations of those in his group."⁴ He points out that roles "have ingredients of cultural, of personal, and of situational determination. But never is a role wholly cultural, wholly personal, or wholly situational."⁵ (3) Definitions which treat role as the behavior of actors occupying social positions--not what they "should do" but what actors "actually do" as position occupants: In this category are Davis' definition of role as "how an individual actually performs in a given position, as distinct from how he is supposed to perform"⁶ Parson's definition, which defines role as ". . . what the actor does in his relations with others seen in the context of its functional significance for the social system;"⁷ and Sarbin's definition in which he defines role as ". . . a patterned

³Ralph Linton, The Study of Man (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1936), p. 114.

⁴Stansfeld Sargent, "Concepts of Role and Ego in Contemporary Psychology," in John H. Rohrer and Muzafer Sherif (Editors), Social Psychology at the Crossroads (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), p. 360.

⁵Ibid., p. 359.

⁶Kingsley Davis, Human Society (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948 and 1949), p. 90.

⁷Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951), p. 25.

sequence of learned actions or deeds performed by a person in an interaction situation."⁸

Definitions of role appear to be influenced by the discipline of the definer, and by the special problem in which he is interested at the time. Another reason for differences is that the same phenomena frequently are given different names. What Linton and Newcomb define as role, Davis defines as status. What Davis defines as role, Newcomb calls role behavior and Sarbin calls role enactment. Almost all of these authors acknowledge indebtedness to Linton, but some start from his conception in The Study of Man, and others start from his The Cultural Background of Personality. Gross states that, "Although their formulations have some fundamental differences . . . most are concerned with the same phenomena. Three basic ideas which appear in most of the conceptualizations . . . are that individuals: (1) in social locations (2) behave (3) with reference to expectations."⁹

Getzels and Guba speak of the place of expectations in role theory:

" . . . each actor inhabits a number of well-defined roles, the definition of the roles stemming not alone from the actor who fills the roles but from his alter who holds the expectations. Deviance from a role brings disapproval and negative sanction; conformity, approval and position sanction . . . Since the actor filling the role is himself a member of the group that defines the role, he will in general share the expectations

⁸Theodore R. Sarbin, "Role Theory" in Gardner Lindzey (Editor), Handbook of Social Psychology, Volume 1 (Cambridge: Addison Wesley Publishing Company, 1954) p. 225.

⁹Gross, Mason and McEachern, op. cit., pp. 16-17.

of the role, and the expectations will have for him a legitimacy that stems from mutual acceptance. The actor feels an internal obligation to conform to the role, even when in some respects the role expectations run counter to his own needs."¹⁰

Jacobson, Charters and Lieberman, in their study of the use of role concept in studying complex organizations, speak of role consensus:

The value of a definition of role based on shared expectations is that it emphasizes the social consequences of consensus The degree of integration existing within an organization at any time stems in part from the degree of consensus or sharing of expectations about the behavior of people who occupy various positions. Behavior can be predicted more accurately in an organization where consensus is highly developed than in one where it is relatively undeveloped, even though the formal organization charts may be identical.¹¹

They go on to explain the importance of role definers:

The definition of role in terms of shared expectations must take account of the question of whose expectations are relevant In hierarchical organizations, at least three such groups should receive consideration. One is composed of persons who occupy like positions. Another is composed of persons who have a high degree of functional interdependence with the position in question. A third is composed of persons who do not have direct functionally interdependent relationships with the position, but who nevertheless are related to it through a concern with the formulation and implementation of the broader purposes of the organization.¹²

¹⁰J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba, "Role, Role Conflict, and Effectiveness: An Empirical Study," American Sociological Review, XIX (April, 1954), 165.

¹¹Eugene Jacobson, S. S. Charters, Jr., and Seymour Lieberman, "The Use of the Role Concept in the Study of Complex Organizations," Journal of Social Issues, VII, No. 3 (1951), 20.

¹²Ibid.

They define effective supervision within an hierarchical organization as, "An effective supervisor is one who is able to and motivated to meet the role expectations of relevant peers, superiors, and subordinates."¹³

Another aspect of role is role conflict. Jacobson, Charters and Lieberman define it as the situation in which there are differences between criterion groups with respect to social role. They gave as an example the conflict between "line" and "staff" in an organization which sometimes arises because of differing expectations about whose "role" it is to make a particular decision.¹⁴ Getzels and Guba say that "Role conflicts ensue whenever an actor is required to fill two or more roles whose expectations are in some particulars inconsistent."¹⁵ The supervisor's position as being "in the middle" between workers and management, sometimes brings conflicting demands.

For the purposes of this study, the author has accepted Jacobson, Charters and Lieberman's definition of role, "A set of expectations which others share of the behavior an individual will exhibit as an occupant of a position (within an organization)."¹⁶

¹³Ibid., p. 26.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 21.

¹⁵Getzels and Guba, op. cit., p. 166.

¹⁶Jacobson, Charters and Lieberman, op. cit., p. 19.

Studies Related to the Role of the District
Extension Home Economist

The author found a wide variety of publications, formal and informal, which discussed middle management. First, research and literature relating specifically to the role of the Extension supervisor are reviewed--followed by a brief review of studies made in business and other areas of education which have relevance to this study.

Ballard stated that, "An Extension staff should include persons who, in addition to being well grounded in subject matter technology, possess a sensitivity to human reactions and a grasp of useful techniques for rendering public service--along with an understanding and acceptance of the underlying philosophies, objectives, and policies of the organization."¹⁷

The specific responsibilities of the District Extension Home Economist in Kansas were outlined in the "Organization Plan and Duties for the Kansas Extension Service" as follows:

The district home economics agent is responsible for the coordination of the county home economics program within the district. She assists the county home economics agent with preparation, evaluation, and reporting of programs. The district home economics agent works with the district agricultural agent in all phases of programs, schedules, agent training, reports, personnel qualifications and public relations.¹⁸

¹⁷F. L. Ballard, "Public Relations in Extension," Journal of Cooperative Extension, II (Winter, 1964), 219.

¹⁸"Organization Plan and Duties for Kansas Extension Service," (Manhattan: Kansas State University, January, 1960), p. 14. (Mimeographed).

Broadbent found that district home economics supervisors were selected from the ranks of county home demonstration agents or home economics subject matter specialists. In general, Home Economics supervisory personnel had had ten or more years of experience in other Extension positions before being selected for supervisory positions, and tended to be between forty-one and sixty years of age.¹⁹

Durfee says, "For the United States as a whole the typical Extension supervisor is responsible for fourteen agents or assistant agents. The territory served may vary from a few counties . . . to as many as twenty-five or more."²⁰ In his Wisconsin study, he found that, "The more counties supervised, the higher number of differences existed between the expectations of the supervisor and those of the agents."²¹

The purpose of Durfee's study was to determine whether concepts in fundamental role theory provide a useful way of examining the relationships between a member of the supervisory staff in an adult education agency and the persons he supervises. Results of the study showed that in a supervisor-supervised situation, there are definite expectations which can be measured. He found that:

¹⁹Marden Broadbent, "An Analysis of Induction Training for Supervisors in the Cooperative Extension Services of the Southern and Western Region of the United States." (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1960), p. 6-17.

²⁰Arthur Durfee, "Expectations Held Toward the Extension Supervisor's Role." (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, Chicago, 1956), p. 19.

²¹Ibid., p. 134.

Supervisors cannot predict accurately the expectations of the individual agents they supervise--but come closer to predicting the expectations of agents who are in reasonable agreement with them The more an agent's expectations differed from those of the supervisor, the greater the chance that the supervisor would rate him as an agent with whom he felt a less satisfactory supervisory relationship. . . . There were no important relationships between differences in expectations and age of agent and tenure.²²

VandeBerg, in his study of the functions and responsibilities of District Leaders in Wisconsin, found that counseling and working with new personnel in counties during an agent's first year on the job was considered the District Leader's most important function.²³ Home Agents in Wisconsin were receiving 6.3 supervisory visits per year. Two thirds of the agents said that they desired more visits than they were receiving from supervisors. Most preferred visits on a regular around the year basis, and considered visits especially important during the process of program planning.²⁴

Durfee said:

County Extension programs are the core of Extension work; the major function of supervisors, specialists and administrators is to support county staffs with guidance and leadership on programming and teaching methods.²⁵

²²Ibid., pp. 123-128.

²³G. L. VandeBerg, "The Functions and Responsibilities of District Leaders in the Cooperative Extension Service in Wisconsin." (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1957), p. 123.

²⁴Ibid., pp. 91-93.

²⁵Arthur Durfee, "Changing Role of the Supervisor," Journal of Cooperative Extension, I (Fall, 1963), 151.

Browne interviewed District Agents in three states (including Kansas) in her study of job attitudes of Extension middle management personnel. The three states had all made extensive changes in organizational structure within the five years preceding the study, and these changes appeared to affect the satisfactions of middle management personnel.²⁶

Communication was a major problem. A typical comment was: "I learned about many things in the field I should have known before I left the state office." Most of the comments about poor communications were made by 4-H and Home Economics Supervisors. In states where the district team was officed together, communication was better.²⁷

Many said that if they were to feel that they were a part of administration they needed to be in on the discussion that preceded decision making. The number of respondents who believed they had authority commensurate with their responsibilities varied widely from state to state. Too little authority limited their leadership opportunities, and lowered the morale of agents.²⁸

Role conflict and ambiguity caused frustration for many supervisors. This was brought about by lack of understanding of the supervisors' functions at every level of the structure; conflict between

²⁶Margaret C. Browne, "Job Attitudes of Middle Management in Three Cooperative Extension Services." (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1959), p. 127.

²⁷Ibid., p. 122.

²⁸Ibid., p. 137.

professional or program phase loyalties and total Extension program loyalties; confusions as to when one should operate as line or staff; and lack of clarity as to division of functions within the supervisory team.²⁹

In recent years, an increasing amount of research has been done by business concerning middle management. Some of these findings have relevance for the Extension supervisor.

Strauss and Sayles say:

. . . there is empirical evidence that the effective supervisor spends a greater proportion of his time on upward and horizontal contacts than the ineffective supervisor does Every (supervisor) . . . belongs to two groups: the work group of which he is the leader, and the higher-management group of which he is the immediate representative. The manager is thus a man in the middle, endlessly beset by conflicting loyalties and demands. The ineffective manager allows himself to be squeezed by these conflicting pressures: the effective supervisor resists them and serves as a communications link between those above and those below him.³⁰

Berlew and Hall³¹ found that something happens during the first year of employment which has a strong impact on a trainee's career. Company expectations in the first year were more strongly related to later success than was performance in that year--yet both expectations and first year performance were related to later success.

²⁹Ibid., p. 151.

³⁰George Strauss and Leonard R. Sayles, Personnel: The Human Problems of Management (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), p. 335.

³¹David E. Berlew and Douglas T. Hall, "The Socialization of Managers: Effects of Expectations on Performance," Administrative Science Quarterly, XI (September, 1966), 207-223.

Researchers speculate that meeting high expectations in that year leads to internalizing positive job attitudes and high standards. Such attitudes and standards would lead to high performance in later years.

Bruce and Carter report that:

There is evidence that "management gets what it inspects" What the supervised observes his supervisor doing--what the supervisor spends time doing, how he approaches problems, what commands his attention--is what is important The knowledge that good performance will be recognized is an essential part of a healthy administrative climate Security seems to be fostered by a sense that the supervisor can give help or has access to help The employee must see himself as having the freedom to fail in a good try for an important end A good climate demands that rules be kept to an absolute minimum and that, rather than limiting initiative, they aid in understanding the organization.³²

In a study of a liberal arts college, Bentz³³ concluded that there was less discrepancy between ideal and reported behavior of department heads in those departments which had the reputation for being well led. He found that a department's reputation for good or bad administration was closely related to how far the department chairman deviates from what members of his department consider the conduct of the ideal chairman. A department's reputation seemed also to be related to how the chairman's actual behavior was perceived by his subordinates regardless of their standards of ideal behavior.

³²Robert L. Bruce and G. L. Carter, Jr., "Administrative Climate," Journal of Cooperative Extension, V (Spring, 1967), 12-14.

³³Vernon Jon Bentz, "A Study of Leadership in a Liberal Arts College" (Columbus: The Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board, 1950) (unpublished report).

McCormick stated that "Research related to the practice of Extension education will certainly accelerate . . . New levels of effectiveness are possible for the Extension educator who can understand and utilize the results of educational research."³⁴

³⁴Robert W. McCormick, "A Basis for Change," Journal of Cooperative Extension, V (Summer, 1967), 121.

CHAPTER III

THE DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF KANSAS DISTRICT EXTENSION HOME ECONOMISTS AS PERCEIVED BY RESPONDENTS

Introduction

This chapter deals with an analysis of data collected through the use of a structured mail questionnaire submitted to the three groups of respondents considered to be the role definers of the District Extension Home Economist. The number and positions of respondents are shown in Table I.

TABLE I
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS, BY POSITION

Position	Potential respondents	Responding	
		Actual	Percent
District Extension Home Economists	4	4	100
District Extension Supervisors	5	5	100
County Extension Home Economists	108	86	80
Total	117	95	81

The respondents were asked to react to fifteen selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist in terms of (1) the degree of emphasis they felt the function should receive; and (2) the degree of emphasis they felt the function was currently receiving.

The fifteen functions were:

1. Interpreting Extension policies and procedures to county Extension staff and to the public.
2. Training county Extension agents.
3. Recruiting, selecting, and placing county Extension agents.
4. Coordinating county and/or district Extension events or activities.
5. Establishing and maintaining cooperative relations with advisory boards, organizations, and public agencies at district and county level.
6. Serving as a public relations person for Extension.
7. Counseling with county Extension personnel on professional problems.
8. Coordinating the work of county Extension staffs with specialists staffs and other Extension personnel.
9. Arranging for financial support at the county level.
10. Assisting county Extension staffs and lay groups in developing county Extension programs.
11. Assisting county Extension staffs in determining program progress and accomplishments.
12. Evaluating quality and quantity of county staff performance.
13. Reporting program progress and accomplishments.
14. Counseling with county Extension personnel on personal problems.

15. Keeping up to date on pertinent new developments in the field of supervision.

For brevity and ease of reading, a standard set of abbreviations of the functions was used throughout the text. The abbreviations are listed along with the full statements of functions in Appendix A.

Five degrees of emphasis were defined, and respondents were asked to circle a number from five to one to indicate the degree of emphasis they felt the function was receiving or should be receiving.

The degrees of emphasis were as follows:

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

A program was designed for use with the IBM computer, which furnished the number of responses to each function, the number and per cent rating of each function, and the mean weighted score for each function.

The fifteen supervisory functions were then entered in the various tables in descending order according to the total mean weighted score. Consensus between groups was determined through the application of the Spearman coefficient of rank correlation.

$$(\text{rho}) = 1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}$$

The "mid-rank" method was used in cases where there were ties. The tied items were given the same rank, and the rank given represented the mean rank of the tied items.¹

The County Extension Home Economists were divided into groups according to district and compared by rank order to show both the "should be" and "currently being" emphasis as perceived by the five groups.

In comparing the ranking of the functions in this study, the word "considerably" indicated a difference of three or more ranks.

The author accepted the null hypothesis when the rank-difference coefficient of correlation was below .500.

Yule's Q was used to indicate associations between the emphasis placed on the eight selected functions and age, experience, induction training, formal Extension education, and the degree of urbanization of the county of the County Extension Home Economists. Young states:

Yule has proposed a coefficient usually designated as "Q" which measures association in a fourfold table. Q is found by computing

¹Pauline V. Young, Scientific Social Surveys and Research (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966), p. 318.

the ratio between the difference and the sum of the cross products of the diagonal cells. That is, if the cells of the fourfold table are designated as in the figure below:

A	B
C	D

$$Q = \frac{AD-BC}{AD+BC}$$

Q varies between minus one and plus one as BC is less than or greater than AD.²

The coefficient of association, or Q score, provided an indication of the existence of association, the direction of that association, and the degree of association between the independent variables being studied and the dependent variable, role perception. The author considered that the degree of association should be at least .300 before recognizing it as important.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Hypothesis 1

The data were analyzed in this chapter according to the hypotheses stated in Chapter I. The first hypothesis was:

There is no consensus among the District Extension Home Economists, County Extension Home Economists, and District Extension Supervisors as to the relative degree of emphasis that should be given to fifteen selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist in Kansas.

Table II shows the rank order of functions of the District Extension Home Economist in Kansas as they should be performed, as

²Ibid., p. 323.

TABLE II

RANK ORDER OF FUNCTIONS OF THE DISTRICT EXTENSION HOME ECONOMIST
IN KANSAS AS TO EMPHASIS THAT SHOULD BE GIVEN, 1964

Functions*	Group Rank Avg.	Rank Order			Total Staff Avg.
		Dist. Home Econ.	Dist. Ext. Super.	Co. Home Econ.	
Keeping up to date . . .	1	3.5	1	1	1
Training agents . . .	2	1	3	5	3
Coordinating county work with specialists . . .	3	3.5	3	2	2
Assisting in developing programs. . .	4	3.5	5.5	7	7
Counseling on professional problems . . .	5	3.5	10	4	4.5
Coordinating events . . .	6	8.5	3	9	9
Assisting in determining program progress . . .	7	6	7	8	8
Serving as a public relations person . . .	8	8.5	8.5	3	4.5
Reporting program progress . . .	9	11.5	5.5	12	10
Evaluating staff performance . . .	10	8.5	8.5	13	12.5
Interpreting policies . . .	11	8.5	13	6	6
Establishing cooperative relations . . .	12	14	11.5	10.5	11
Recruiting agents . . .	13	11.5	14	10.5	12.5
Counseling on personal problems. . .	14	13	11.5	14	14
Arranging for financial support . . .	15	15	15	15	15

*Functions are stated in full in Appendix A.

perceived by the three respondent groups. The total group rank was shown in two ways, the total staff rank average and the group rank average. The total staff rank average followed the County Extension Home Economist rank order very closely, because most of the respondents were in this group. To get a group average that was representative of all three groups, the three mean weighted scores for each function were added, then divided by three--giving an average which gave equal weight to the opinion of each group. This was the method used in arriving at rank order in "Total" columns in tables in this study.

There was general agreement among the three groups. Three of the functions, "Keeping up to date . . .," "Training agents . . .," and "Coordinating county work with specialists . . .," were ranked among the top five by all groups. "Assisting in developing programs . . ." was ranked in the top five by the district groups, while the County Extension Home Economists ranked it seventh; and "Counseling on professional problems . . ." was ranked in the top five by all but the District Extension Supervisors, who ranked it tenth.

The small size of the two district groups resulted in numerous tied scores, making identical ranking among the three groups unlikely. However, one function, "Arranging for financial support . . .," was ranked in last place by all groups throughout the study. This is a function that is performed exclusively by the District Extension Supervisor. Even so, there was low consensus concerning this function, with the function receiving ratings in all five degrees of emphasis. Seventy-eight per cent of the County Extension Home Economists, half of the District Extension Home Economists, and one of the District

Extension Supervisors indicated that they thought it should receive some degree of consideration as a function of the District Extension Home Economist.

County Extension Home Economists ranked "Serving as a public relations person . . ." third, while the two district groups gave it a rank of eight. The District Extension Supervisors ranked "Coordinating events . . ." and "Reporting program progress . . ." considerably higher than did the other two groups. The County Extension Home Economists ranked "Interpreting policies . . ." considerably higher, and "Evaluating staff performance . . ." considerably lower than did the district groups.

The agreement between groups of respondents as to how the functions should be performed, determined by the coefficient of rank correlation was:

District Home Economists--County Home Economists	$r = .79$
District Home Economists--District Supervisors	$r = .72$
District Supervisors--County Home Economists	$r = .57$

The null hypothesis was rejected because there was general consensus as to rank order among the three respondent groups. The County and District Extension Home Economists indicated high agreement, and the District Extension Supervisors lower agreement, especially with the county group. The District Extension Supervisors gave considerably less importance to "Counseling on professional problems . . ." and "Interpreting policies . . ." than did the County and District Extension Home Economists. They may regard these as important functions

that they themselves perform, and thus tend to view them as less important functions of the District Extension Home Economist. The District Extension Supervisors ranked "Reporting program progress . . ." much higher than the County and District Extension Home Economists. The District Extension Supervisors are responsible for agent reports in their districts, and thus tend to see this as an important function. The County Extension Home Economists ranked "Serving as a public relations person . . ." considerably higher in rank order than did the two district groups. The district groups may feel that time and distance is a limiting factor--when one District Extension Home Economist supervises about twenty-four counties, in some cases at a considerable distance from the central office. However, all three respondent groups agreed on three of the functions as being in the top five in importance, and agreed that "Arranging for financial support . . ." was the least important function. The average coefficient of rank correlation of the three groups was $r = .69$, indicating fairly high agreement.

Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis was tested by analyzing the data as shown in Table III, which gives the rank order of functions as they were currently being performed as perceived by respondent groups. The second hypothesis was stated as follows:

TABLE III

RANK ORDER OF FUNCTIONS OF THE DISTRICT EXTENSION HOME ECONOMIST
IN KANSAS AS TO EMPHASIS CURRENTLY BEING GIVEN, 1964

Functions*	Rank Order				Total Staff Avg.
	Group Rank Avg.	Dist. Home Econ.	Dist. Ext. Super.	Co. Home Econ.	
Training agents . . .	1	1.5	1	3	3
Coordinating county work with specialists . . .	2	1.5	2	2	1
Assisting in developing programs . . .	3	3.5	5.5	9	9
Coordinating events . . .	4	5.5	5.5	7	7
Keeping up to date . . .	5	11.5	3	1	2
Assisting in determining program progress . . .	6	7.5	5.5	8	8
Counseling on professional problems . . .	7	3.5	11	6	6
Interpreting policies . . .	8	5.5	11	5	5
Reporting program progress . . .	9	9.5	5.5	10	10
Serving as a public relations person . . .	10	7.5	13	4	4
Evaluating staff performance. . .	11	11.5	8	13	11
Counseling on personal problems . . .	12	9.5	9	14	14
Establishing cooperative relations . . .	13	14	11	11	12
Recruiting agents . . .	14	13	14	12	13
Arranging for financial support . . .	15	15	15	15	15

*Functions are stated in full in Appendix A.

There is no consensus among the District Extension Home Economists, County Extension Home Economists, and District Extension Supervisors as to the relative degree of emphasis that is currently being given to fifteen selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist in Kansas.

The total group thought "Training agents . . ." and "Coordinating county work with specialists . . ." were receiving most emphasis, and "Arranging for financial support . . ." was receiving least emphasis.

The County Extension Home Economists felt that "Keeping up to date . . .," "Serving as a public relations person . . .," and "Establishing cooperative relations . . ." were receiving considerably more emphasis, and "Counseling on personal problems . . ." considerably less emphasis than the District Extension Home Economists felt they were giving these functions.

The District Extension Supervisors felt that "Keeping up to date . . .," "Reporting program progress . . .," "Evaluating staff performance . . .," and "Establishing cooperative relations . . ." were receiving considerably more emphasis, and "Serving as a public relations person . . .," "Interpreting policies . . ." and "Counseling on professional problems . . ." were receiving considerably less emphasis than the District Extension Home Economists felt they were giving these functions.

The hypothesis was rejected because of the general, though not high, agreement between groups of respondents as to how the functions were currently being performed. Determined by coefficient of rank correlation, the agreement was:

District Home Economists--County Home Economists $r = .66$

District Home Economists--District Supervisors $r = .58$

District Supervisors--County Home Economists $r = .56$

The average coefficient of rank correlation of the three groups was $r = .60$.

Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis was tested by analyzing the data as shown in Tables IV, V, VI and VII, and in Appendix B. A comparison was made between each respondent group's rank order of functions of the District Extension Home Economist as to emphasis that they thought should be given and emphasis they thought was currently being given. This comparison should indicate how well the District Extension Home Economists were meeting each group's expectations. In addition, the County Extension Home Economists were grouped according to districts for a comparison of the "should be" and "currently being" rank order, to see if there was a difference in perceived emphasis according to district. Hypothesis three was stated as follows:

There is no relationship between the emphasis that should be given and the emphasis that is currently being given to the functions of the District Extension Home Economist as perceived by the respondent groups.

Table IV shows clearly that the County Home Economists felt that the District Extension Home Economists were doing about what they should be doing. There were six identical rankings, and no rank differences of more than two. The rank correlation coefficient was $r = .96$.

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF THE "SHOULD BE" AND "CURRENTLY BEING" RANK ORDER
OF THE DISTRICT HOME ECONOMIST FUNCTIONS BY THE
COUNTY HOME ECONOMISTS, KANSAS, 1964

Functions*	Rank Order		
	Should be	Currently being	Difference
Keeping up to date . . .	1	1	0
Coordinating county work with specialists . . .	2	2	0
Serving as a public relations person . . .	3	4	1
Counseling on professional problems . . .	4	6	2
Training agents . . .	5	3	2
Interpreting policies . . .	6	5	1
Assisting in developing programs . . .	7	9	2
Assisting in determining program progress . . .	8	8	0
Coordinating events . . .	9	7	2
Establishing cooperative relations . . .	10.5	11	.5
Recruiting agents . . .	10.5	12	1.5
Reporting program progress . . .	12	10	2
Evaluating staff performance . . .	13	13	0
Counseling on personal problems . . .	14	14	0
Arranging for financial support . . .	15	15	0

*Functions are stated in full in Appendix A.

TABLE V

COMPARISON OF THE "SHOULD BE" AND "CURRENTLY BEING" RANK ORDER
OF THE DISTRICT HOME ECONOMIST FUNCTIONS BY THE
DISTRICT SUPERVISORS, KANSAS, 1964

Functions*	Rank Order		
	Should be	Currently being	Difference
Keeping up to date . . .	1	3	2
Training agents . . .	3	1	2
Coordinating county work with specialists . . .	3	2	1
Coordinating events . . .	3	5.5	2.5
Assisting in developing programs . . .	5.5	5.5	0
Reporting program progress . . .	5.5	5.5	0
Assisting in determining program progress . . .	7	5.5	1.5
Evaluating staff performance . . .	8.5	8	.5
Serving as a public relations person . . .	8.5	13	4.5
Counseling on professional problems . . .	10	11	1
Counseling on personal problems . . .	11.5	9	2.5
Establishing cooperative relations . . .	11.5	11	.5
Interpreting policies . . .	13	11	2
Recruiting agents . . .	14	14	0
Arranging for financial support . . .	15	15	0

*Functions are stated in full in Appendix A.

TABLE VI

COMPARISON OF THE "SHOULD BE" AND "CURRENTLY BEING" RANK ORDER
OF THE DISTRICT HOME ECONOMIST FUNCTIONS BY THE
DISTRICT HOME ECONOMISTS THEMSELVES

Functions*	Rank Order		
	Should be	Currently being	Difference
Training agents . . .	1	1.5	.5
Coordinating county work with specialists . . .	3.5	1.5	2
Assisting in developing programs . . .	3.5	3.5	0
Counseling on professional problems . . .	3.5	3.5	0
Keeping up to date . . .	3.5	11.5	8
Assisting in determining program progress . . .	6	7.5	1.5
Interpreting policies . . .	8.5	5.5	3
Coordinating events . . .	8.5	5.5	3
Serving as a public relations person. . .	8.5	7.5	1
Evaluating staff performance . . .	8.5	11.5	3
Reporting program progress . . .	11.5	9.5	2
Recruiting agents . . .	11.5	13	1.5
Counseling on personal problems . . .	13	9.5	3.5
Establishing cooperative relations . . .	14	14	0
Arranging for financial support . . .	15	15	0

*Functions are stated in full in Appendix A.

TABLE VII

COMPARISON OF THE "SHOULD BE" AND "CURRENTLY BEING" RANK ORDER
OF THE DISTRICT HOME ECONOMIST FUNCTIONS BY THE
TOTAL GROUP RANK AVERAGE, KANSAS, 1964

Functions*	Rank Order		
	Should be	Currently being	Difference
Keeping up to date . . .	1	5	4
Training agents . . .	2	1	1
Coordinating county work with specialists . . .	3	2	1
Assisting in developing programs . . .	4	3	1
Counseling on professional problems. . .	5	7	2
Coordinating events . . .	6	4	2
Assisting in determining program progress	7	6	1
Serving as a public relations person. . .	8	10	2
Reporting program progress . . .	9	9	0
Evaluating staff performance . . .	10	11	1
Interpreting policies . . .	11	8	3
Establishing cooperative relations . . .	12	13	1
Recruiting agents . . .	13	14	1
Counseling on personal problems . . .	14	12	2
Arranging for financial support . . .	15	15	0

*Functions are stated in full in Appendix A.

The District Extension Supervisors (Table V) indicated that only one function should be considerably different from the "currently being" rank. They thought the District Extension Home Economist should give more emphasis to "Serving as a public relations person . . ." than she was giving currently. The rank correlation coefficient was $r = .91$.

The District Extension Home Economists (Table VI) were the least satisfied of the three groups with the emphasis they were currently giving functions compared to the emphasis they felt they should be giving. Table VI shows that they felt that considerably more emphasis should be given to "Keeping up to date . . ." and "Evaluating staff performance . . .," and considerably less emphasis given to "Counseling on personal problems . . .," "Coordinating events . . .," and "Interpreting policies" The rank correlation coefficient was $r = .78$.

Table VIII makes a "should be" and "currently being" rank order comparison of the total group. "Keeping up to date . . ." was felt to be receiving less emphasis than it should receive, and "Interpreting policies . . ." to be receiving more emphasis than the function deserved. The rank correlation coefficient was $r = .91$.

At the time of this study Kansas counties were divided into five administrative districts--Southwest, Northwest, Southeast, Northeast, and Central. For this comparison, the County Extension Home Economists were divided into groups according to their respective administrative districts. Table VIII shows the group total rank order as to emphasis that should be given to functions, and how each district compared with the total rank order.

TABLE VIII

RANK ORDER OF FUNCTIONS OF THE DISTRICT EXTENSION HOME ECONOMIST IN KANSAS
AS TO EMPHASIS THAT SHOULD BE GIVEN, BY DISTRICT, 1964

Functions*	Total	SW N=16	NW N=14	SE N=18	NE N=17	Central N=21
Keeping up to date . . .	1	1	1	1	2	5
Coordinating county work with specialists . . .	2	2.5	2.5	3.5	1	4
Serving as a public relations person . . .	3	5.5	4.5	2	5	1.5
Counseling on professional problems . . .	4	5.5	4.5	6	3	1.5
Training agents . . .	5	2.5	2.5	3.5	5	6
Interpreting policies . . .	6	7.5	7.5	5	7.5	3
Assisting in developing programs . . .	7	4	9.5	7	10.5	9
Assisting in determining program progress . . .	8	10.5	6	9	10.5	9
Coordinating events . . .	9	10.5	9.5	9	9	9
Establishing cooperative relations . . .	10.5	7.5	11	11	13	7
Recruiting agents . . .	10.5	9	14	9	7.5	11
Reporting program progress . . .	12	13	7.5	13	12	12.5
Evaluating staff performance . . .	13	12	12	12	5	12.5
Counseling on personal problems . . .	14	14	13	14	14	14
Arranging for financial support . . .	15	15	15	15	15	15

*Functions are stated in full in Appendix A.

"Keeping up to date . . ." was given top priority in rank order in Southwest, Northwest, and Southeast, and second high in Northeast. However, the Central district gave this function a considerably lower rank of five.

"Coordinating county work with specialists . . ." received top rank in Northeast, and from second to fourth rank in all other districts. County Extension Home Economists may see this as an important function of the District Extension Home Economist because of the limited number of Home Economics specialists in Kansas. They see the District Extension Home Economist as their representative, assuring each county a fair share of agent training and public meeting time from specialists.

"Serving as a public relations person . . ." was also ranked in the top five by all districts. Central and Southeast districts perceived this function as being more important than the other three districts.

"Counseling on professional problems . . ." was ranked in the top six by all districts, with Central and Northeast giving it the most emphasis and Southeast and Southwest the least emphasis of the groups.

"Training agents . . ." also was ranked in the top six by all districts, with Southwest and Northwest giving it a rank of two and Central and Northeast a rank of six and five.

"Interpreting policies . . ." was given a seventh place rank in Southwest, Northwest and Northeast. Central district gave this function a considerably higher rank of three.

"Assisting in developing programs . . ." was ranked from seven to ten by all districts except Southwest, which gave it a considerably higher rank of four. It was interesting to note that in the Northwest district half the agents felt this function should receive top emphasis and the other half felt it should receive low emphasis.

"Assisting in determining program progress . . ." received eighth to tenth rank emphasis in all districts but Northwest, where this function received a considerably higher rank of six.

There was high agreement on the function "Coordinating events . . .," with all districts ranking it ninth or tenth in importance.

"Establishing cooperative relations . . ." was given a rank of seven by Central and Southwest districts, and a considerably lower rank of eleven or thirteen by the other three districts.

"Recruiting agents . . ." received a low rank of fourteen in Northwest district. Northeast district gave this function a considerably more important seventh rank. Other districts varied from nine to eleven in emphasis. This was interesting in view of the fact that this was no longer a function of the District Extension Home Economist.

All districts but one indicated that "Reporting program progress . . ." should rank twelfth or thirteenth. Northwest district ranked it a considerably higher seventh in importance.

"Evaluating staff performance . . ." was given a rank of twelve by all districts except Northeast, which gave it a considerably higher rank of five.

There was high agreement that "Counseling on personal problems . . ." and "Arranging for financial support . . ." should be receiving the least amount of attention from the District Home Economist.

The County Extension Home Economists perception of the rank order of functions of the District Extension Home Economist as to emphasis that is currently being given, by district, is presented in Table IX. Separate "should be" and "currently being" tables of rank order by district were made to show this comparison more clearly. These five tables may be found in Appendix B. These comparisons should be of particular interest to the District Extension Home Economists in the respective districts.

Southwest district indicated that the District Home Economist should be giving considerably more emphasis to "Serving as a public relations person . . .," and "Establishing cooperative relations . . .," and considerably less emphasis to "Assisting in determining program progress . . .," and "Coordinating events" The coefficient of rank correlation was $r = .77$.

Northwest district thought the District Home Economist was doing about what she should be doing, except that she should be giving more emphasis to "Counseling on professional problems" The coefficient of rank correlation was $r = .96$.

TABLE IX

FRANK ORDER OF FUNCTIONS OF THE DISTRICT EXTENSION HOME ECONOMIST IN KANSAS
AS TO EMPHASIS CURRENTLY BEING GIVEN, BY DISTRICT, 1964

Functions*	Total	SW N=16	NW N=14	SE N=18	NE N=17	Central N=21
Keeping up to date . . .	1	1.5	1	1	3	3
Coordinating county work with specialists . . .	2	1.5	3.5	3	1	1
Training agents . . .	3	3.5	2	4	3	7
Serving as a public relations person . . .	4	11	3.5	2	6.5	4
Interpreting policies . . .	5	8	6	7.5	6.5	2
Counseling on professional problems . . .	6	7	8	5	3	5.5
Coordinating events . . .	7	3.5	9	7.5	8	5.5
Assisting in determining program progress . . .	8	6	6	6	12	8
Assisting in developing programs . . .	9	5	10	9	9	11.5
Reporting program progress . . .	10	13	6	10	10	9.5
Establishing cooperative relations . . .	11	11	11	11	12	13
Recruiting agents . . .	12	11	14	12	5	11.5
Evaluating staff performance . . .	13	9	13	13	12	9.5
Counseling on personal problems . . .	14	14	12	14	14	14
Arranging for financial support . . .	15	15	15	15	15	15

*Functions are stated in full in Appendix A.

Southeast district indicates that more attention should be given to "Recruiting agents . . .," and less attention to "Assisting in determining program progress" The coefficient of rank correlation was $r = .93$.

Northeast district County Extension Home Economists approved of what they perceived that the District Extension Home Economist was doing, except that they thought she should give considerably more emphasis to "Evaluating staff performance . . ." The coefficient of rank correlation was $r = .78$.

Central district disapproved of the current emphasis on more of the functions than the other districts. They thought she should give considerably more attention to "Assisting in developing programs . . .," "Establishing cooperative relations . . .," and "Counseling on professional problems . . .," than she was currently giving, and considerably less attention to "Coordinating county work with specialists . . .," "Coordinating events . . .," "Reporting program progress . . .," and "Evaluating staff performance . . ." The coefficient of rank correlation was $r = .80$.

Hypothesis three was rejected because of the high rank order agreement between the emphasis that should be and was currently being given to the functions of the District Extension Home Economist as perceived by the three respondent groups. The coefficient of rank correlation for the total group was $r = .91$. When the County Extension Home Economists were divided into groups by district, the agreement between "should be" and "currently being" emphasis again was

high. The coefficient of rank correlation for the County Extension Home Economist group (total of districts) was $r = .96$. Although there was high correlation between "should be" and "currently being" by district, and by total districts, there were interesting differences of perception of rank order of some of the functions by individual districts. The differences may be a reflection of the individual District Extension Home Economist's views and consequent behavior, or (as indicated in the next section of this chapter) a reflection of the degree of urbanization of the various districts, or both.

Hypothesis 4

The fourth hypothesis was tested by using Yule's Q to measure association between the relative degree of emphasis that County Extension Home Economists think should be given to some of the functions of the District Extension Home Economist and five independent variables. Hypothesis four was stated as follows:

There is no association between the relative degree of emphasis that County Extension Home Economists perceive should be given to eight selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist and the County Extension Home Economist's age, experience, inducting training, formal Extension education, and the degree of urbanization of the county.

The coefficient of association represented by Q was calculated for each variable in relation to eight role items, "Training agents . . .," "Coordinating county work with specialists . . .," "Assisting in developing programs . . .," "Counseling on professional

problems . . .," "Keeping up to date . . .," "Assisting in determining program progress . . .," "Serving as a public relations person . . .," and "Recruiting agents . . ." The role items used were the seven highest ranking "should be" functions as perceived by the District Home Economist, and one other function, "Recruiting agents . . .," because it appeared to be a somewhat controversial function.

In order to make the Q calculation, the variables were dichotomized as follows:

Age--younger age group, 34 years and under (N=48)
 older age group, 35 years and over (N=38)

Experience--short tenure group, less than 6 years (N=47)
 long tenure group, 6 years and over (N=39)

Training--high training, completed Induction Training (N=36)
 low training, not completed Induction Training (N=50)

Education--higher education, completed Extension
 Education course (N=40)
 lower education, not completed Extension
 Education course (N=46)

Economy of county--urban, high urbanization (N=22)
 rural, low urbanization (N=63)

The role perceptions were dichotomized by grouping the Important Emphasis, Intermediate Emphasis, Minor Emphasis, and No Emphasis responses into the low importance category, and the Major Emphasis responses into the high importance category.

The coefficient of association, or Q score, provided an indication of the existence of association, the direction of that association, and the degree of association between the independent variables being studied and the dependent variable, role perception.

The author considered that the degree of association should be at least $\pm .300$ before recognizing it as important.

Table X shows the presence of nine important associations between the five independent variables and County Home Economists' perception of the eight role definition items.

The association between age and amount of emphasis on the function "Coordinating county work with specialists . . ." was $+ .526$, a fairly high positive association.

The association between experience and the amount of emphasis placed on "Coordinating county work with specialists . . ." was $+ .471$. Older County Extension Home Economists and those with long tenure could normally be expected to be about the same group, and thus respond in about the same manner in ranking the functions of the District Extension Home Economist. This appeared to be the case in this study. It is interesting to note that three other functions, "Assisting in developing programs . . ." and "Assisting in determining program progress . . .," and "Recruiting agents . . ." show some positive association with both age and experience, though not enough to meet the $\pm .300$ level of importance.

The association between formal Extension education and the amount of emphasis placed on the function "Assisting in determining program progress . . ." was a positive association of $.367$, and a lesser positive association with "Assisting in developing programs . . ." There was an important negative association of $-.509$

TABLE X

SUMMARY OF ASSOCIATIONS OF FIVE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND COUNTY EXTENSION HOME ECONOMISTS PERCEPTION
OF EIGHT ROLE DEFINITION ITEMS, KANSAS, 1964

Functions*	Coefficient of Association--O Scores					
	Age	Experience	Education	Training	Urbaniza- tion	
Training agents . . .	+ .000	- .140	- .093	+ .189	- .257	
Keeping up to date . . .	+ .191	- .089	- .157	+ .015	- .067	
Coordinating county work with specialists . . .	+ .526	+ .471	- .064	- .119	+ .333	
Assisting in developing programs . . .	+ .226	+ .291	+ .157	- .015	- .353	
Counseling on professional problems . . .	- .041	- .089	- .227	+ .333	+ .075	
Assisting in determining program progress . . .	+ .219	+ .294	+ .367	- .054	- .032	
Serving as a public relations person . . .	+ .014	- .049	- .111	+ .040	+ .410	
Recruiting agents . . .	+ .172	+ .241	- .509	+ .138	+ .556	

*Functions are stated in full in Appendix A.

between education and "Recruiting agents . . .," and a slight negative association with "Counseling on professional problems . . ." and "Keeping up to date . . ."

The association between induction training and the amount of emphasis on "Counseling on professional problems . . ." was + .333. There was also a lesser degree of positive association between Training and "Training agents . . ." and "Recruiting agents"

The independent variable, urbanization, showed a larger number of important associations with the dependent variable, role perception, than the other independent variables. There were positive associations between urbanization and three of the eight functions--"Coordinating county work with specialists . . ." (+.333), "Serving as a public relations person . . ." (+.410), and "Recruiting agents . . ." (+.558). There was a negative association between urbanization and the function "Assisting in developing programs . . ." (-.353). There was a lesser degree of negative association between urbanization and "Training agents"

There was association between each of the five independent variables and one or more of the eight role definition items. Therefore, Hypothesis five was rejected. The County Extension Home Economist's perception of the functions of the District Extension Home Economist appeared to vary to a considerable degree according to whether she worked in a rural or an urban county. This may indicate a need for careful study of the situation and program approach in urban areas,

and a re-evaluation of recruiting, training, and supervision of the urban Extension worker.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to more clearly define the role of the District Extension Home Economist in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service. This was done through the process of role analysis by three groups of role definers--the District Extension Home Economists, the District Extension Supervisors, and the County Extension Home Economists. Rank order comparisons were made of fifteen selected major duties and responsibilities of the District Extension Home Economist.

The objectives of this study were:

1. To determine the relative degree of emphasis that should be given to fifteen selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist as perceived by the District Extension Home Economists, County Extension Home Economists, and District Extension Supervisors.
2. To determine the relative degree of emphasis that is currently being given to fifteen selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist as perceived by the District Extension Home Economists, County Extension Home Economists, and District Extension Supervisors.

3. To determine the relationship between the emphasis that should be given and the emphasis that is currently being given to the functions of the District Extension Home Economist as perceived by the respondent groups.
4. To determine whether there are associations between age, experience, induction training, formal Extension education, and the degree of urbanization of county of the County Extension Home Economist, and the relative degree of emphasis County Extension Home Economists perceive should be given to eight selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist.

The data were summarized and conclusions drawn in relation to the following hypotheses established for this study:

1. There is no consensus among the District Extension Home Economists, County Extension Home Economists, and District Extension Supervisors as to the relative degree of emphasis that should be given to fifteen selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist in Kansas.
2. There is no consensus among the District Extension Home Economists, County Extension Home Economists, and District Extension Supervisors as to the relative degree of emphasis that is currently being given to fifteen selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist in Kansas.

3. There is no relationship between the emphasis that should be given and the emphasis that is currently being given to the functions of the District Extension Home Economist as perceived by the respondent groups.
4. There is no association between the relative degree of emphasis that County Extension Home Economists perceive should be given to eight selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist and the County Extension Home Economist's age, experience, induction training, formal Extension education, and the degree of urbanization of the county.

The data used in this study were collected by a structured mail questionnaire submitted to the three respondent groups. Respondents were asked to check two pages of face data, and to indicate their perceptions of the relative importance of the fifteen functions of the District Extension Home Economist by scoring each on a five point scale. A computer program determined the mean weighted scores for each function. The functions were then ranked, with the highest score given a rank of one, and the lowest a rank of fifteen.

The data were presented in the form of tables and were analyzed by means of the rank order coefficient of correlation or Yule's Q coefficient of association in order to accept or reject the null hypotheses.

A group average, giving equal weight to the opinion of each group, was calculated by adding the total mean weighted scores (for

each function) of the three groups and dividing by three. The group average rank order of the functions of the District Extension Home Economist as to emphasis that should be given was:

1. Keeping up to date on pertinent new developments in the field of supervision.
2. Training county Extension agents.
3. Coordinating the work of county Extension staffs with specialists staffs and other Extension personnel.
4. Assisting county Extension staffs and lay groups in developing county Extension programs.
5. Counseling with county Extension personnel on professional problems.
6. Coordinating county and/or district Extension events or activities.
7. Assisting county Extension staffs in determining program progress and accomplishment.
8. Serving as a public relations person for Extension.
9. Reporting program progress and accomplishments.
10. Evaluating quality and quantity of county staff performance.
11. Interpreting Extension policies and procedures to county Extension staff and to the public.
12. Establishing and maintaining cooperative relations with advisory boards, organizations, and public agencies at district and county level.

13. Recruiting, selecting, and placing county Extension agents.
14. Counseling with county Extension personnel on personal problems.
15. Arranging for financial support at the county level.

Summary and Conclusions

Hypothesis I

The data in this study were analyzed according to rank order of fifteen selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist by three respondent groups. The first hypothesis was:

There is no consensus among the District Extension Home Economists, County Extension Home Economists, and District Extension Supervisors as to the relative degree of emphasis that should be given to fifteen selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist in Kansas.

Three of the functions, "Keeping up to date . . .," "Training agents . . .," and "Coordinating county work with specialists . . .," were ranked among the top five by all groups. "Assisting in developing programs . . ." was ranked in the top five by the district groups, while the County Extension Home Economists ranked it seventh. "Counseling on professional problems . . ." was ranked in the top five by all but the District Extension Supervisors, who ranked it tenth.

The highest degree of agreement, throughout the study, was between the District Extension Home Economist and County Extension Home Economist groups, and the lowest agreement was between the District

Extension Supervisor and County Extension Home Economist groups. The agreement between groups of respondents as to how the functions should be performed, determined by coefficient of rank correlation was:

District Home Economists--County Home Economists $r = .79$

District Home Economists--District Supervisors $r = .72$

District Supervisors--County Home Economists $r = .57$

The District Extension Supervisors gave considerably less importance to the functions "Counseling on professional problems . . ." and "Interpreting policies . . ." than did the County and District Extension Home Economists. They may regard these as important functions that they themselves perform, and thus tend to view them as less important functions of the District Extension Home Economist. The District Extension Supervisors ranked "Reporting program progress . . ." much higher than the County and District Extension Home Economists. The District Extension Supervisors are responsible for agent reports in their districts, and thus tend to see this as an important function. The County Extension Home Economists ranked "Serving as a public relations person . . ." considerably higher in rank order than did the two district groups. The district groups may feel that time and distance is a limiting factor--when one District Extension Home Economist supervises about twenty-four counties, and in some cases at a considerable distance from the central office.

The null hypothesis was rejected because there was general consensus as to rank order among the three respondent groups. All three respondent groups agreed on three of the functions as being in

the top five in importance, and agreed that "Arranging for financial support . . ." was the least important function. The average coefficient of rank correlation of the three groups was $r = .69$, indicating fairly high agreement.

Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis was tested by analyzing the rank order of functions as they were currently being performed as perceived by respondent groups and determining agreement by the coefficient of rank correlation method. The second hypothesis was stated as follows:

There is no consensus among the District Extension Home Economists, County Extension Home Economists, and District Extension Supervisors as to the relative degree of emphasis that is currently being given to fifteen selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist in Kansas.

The hypothesis was rejected because there was general agreement among the three respondent groups concerning the relative emphasis that was currently being given to functions of the District Extension Home Economist. However, the overall agreement was lower than it was on the "should be" ratings. The coefficient of rank correlation was:

District Home Economists--County Home Economists $r = .66$

District Home Economists--District Supervisors $r = .58$

District Supervisors--County Home Economists $r = .56$

The average coefficient of rank correlation of the three groups was $r = .60$.

Except for two differences, the top five functions in the "currently being" rank order were the same as the "should be" rank

order. "Coordinating events . . ." replaced "Counseling on professional problems . . .," and "Keeping up to date . . ." moved down from first place to fifth place on the list. This indicates that the respondents felt that the District Extension Home Economist was not giving enough emphasis to "Keeping up to date . . ." and "Counseling on professional problems . . .," and was giving more attention to "Coordinating events . . ." than she should have been giving.

Hypothesis 3

A comparison was made between each respondent group's rank order of functions of the District Extension Home Economist as to emphasis that they thought should be given and emphasis they thought was currently being given. This comparison should indicate how well the District Extension Home Economists were meeting each group's expectations. In addition, the County Extension Home Economists were grouped according to districts for a comparison of the "should be" and "currently being" rank order, to see if there was a difference in perceived emphasis according to district. Hypothesis three was stated as follows:

There is no relationship between the emphasis that should be given and the emphasis that is currently being given to the functions of the District Extension Home Economist as perceived by the respondent groups.

The coefficient of rank correlation indicated high agreement between emphasis that should be given and emphasis that is currently being given to functions of the District Extension Home Economist as perceived by respondents. The coefficient of rank correlation was:

County Extension Home Economists	r = .98
District Extension Supervisors	r = .91
District Extension Home Economists	r = .78

The District Extension Home Economists were the least satisfied of the three groups with the emphasis they were currently giving to their duties and responsibilities. They felt that considerably more emphasis should be given to "Keeping up to date . . ." and "Evaluating staff performance"

The District Extension Supervisors indicated that they felt more emphasis should be given to "Serving as a public relations person"

The County Extension Home Economists thought that the District Extension Home Economists were doing about what they should be doing.

There was general agreement among County Extension Home Economists, when grouped by district, as to emphasis that should be given functions of the District Extension Home Economist. As a total group, the top five rank order was (1) "Keeping up to date . . ." (2) "Coordinating county work with specialists . . ." (3) "Serving as a public relations person . . ." (4) "Counseling on professional problems . . ." (5) "Training agents"

A comparison of individual district rank order to total group rank order showed that Southwest district gave more emphasis to "Training agents . . .," "Assisting in developing programs . . .," and "Establishing cooperative relations" Northwest district gave more emphasis to "Training agents . . ." and "Reporting program progress" Southeast district agreed with the emphasis of the total group.

Northeast district gave considerably more emphasis to "Recruiting agents . . ." and "Evaluating staff performance . . ." Central district gave more emphasis to "Counseling on professional problems . . .," "Interpreting policies . . .," and "Establishing cooperative relations"

A separate "should be" and "currently being" comparison of rank order of functions by the County Extension Home Economists in each district was made. There was high agreement, especially in Northwest and Southeast districts. The coefficient of rank correlation was:

Southwest district	r = .77
Northwest district	r = .96
Southeast district	r = .93
Northeast district	r = .78
Central district	r = .80

Hypothesis three was rejected because of the high rank order agreement between the emphasis that should be and was currently being given to the functions of the District Extension Home Economist as perceived by the three respondent groups. The coefficient of rank correlation for the total group was $r = .91$. When the County Extension Home Economists were divided into groups by district, the agreement between "should be" and "currently being" emphasis again was high. The coefficient of rank correlation for the County Extension Home Economist group (total of districts) was $r = .96$. Although there was high correlation between "should be" and "currently being" by district, and by total

districts, there were interesting differences of perception of rank order of some of the functions by individual districts. The differences may be a reflection of the individual District Extension Home Economist's views and consequent behavior, or (as indicated in the next section) a reflection of the degree of urbanization of the various districts, or both.

Hypothesis 4

The fourth hypothesis was tested by using Yule's Q to measure association between the relative degree of emphasis that County Extension Home Economists think should be given to some of the functions of the District Extension Home Economist and five independent variables.

Hypothesis four was stated as follows:

There is no association between the relative degree of emphasis that County Extension Home Economists perceive should be given to eight selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist and the County Extension Home Economist's age, experience, induction training, formal Extension education, and the degree of urbanization of the county.

The coefficient of association Q was calculated for each of the five variables in relation to eight role items. The role items selected were the seven highest ranking "should be" functions as perceived by the District Extension Home Economist, and one other function, "Recruiting agents . . .," which was included because it appeared to be a somewhat controversial function.

In order to make the Q calculation, the variables were dichotomized as follows:

- Age--younger age group, 34 years and under (N=48)
 older age group, 35 years and over (N=38)
- Experience--short tenure group, less than 6 years (N=47)
 long tenure group, 6 years and over (N=39)
- Training--high training, completed Induction Training (N=36)
 low training, not completed Induction Training (N=50)
- Education--higher education, completed Extension Education
 course (N=40)
 lower education, not completed Extension Education
 course (N=46)
- Economy of county--urban, high urbanization (N=22)
 rural, low urbanization (N=63)

The role perceptions were dichotomized by grouping the Important Emphasis, Intermediate Emphasis, Minor Emphasis, and No Emphasis responses into the low importance category, and the Major Emphasis responses into the high importance category.

The coefficient of association, or Q score, provided an indication of the existence of association, the direction of that association, and the degree of association between the independent variables being studied and the dependent variable, role perception. The author considered that the degree of association should be at least $\pm .300$ before recognizing it as important.

The important associations between variables and County Extension Home Economists' perception of eight role definition items were:

Age--"Coordinating county work with specialists . . ."	+ .526
Experience--"Coordinating county work with specialists . . ."	+ .471
Education--"Assisting in determining program progress . . ."	+ .367
"Recruiting agents . . ."	- .509

Training--"Counseling on professional problems . . ."	+ .333
Urbanization--"Coordinating county work with specialists . . ."	+ .333
"Serving as a public re- lations person . . ."	+ .410
"Recruiting agents . . ."	+ .558
"Assisting in developing programs . . ."	- .353

There was an important association between each of the five independent variables and one or more of the eight selected role definition items. Therefore, hypothesis five was rejected. The County Extension Home Economist's perception of the functions of the District Extension Home Economist appeared to vary to a considerable degree according to whether she works in a rural or urban county. This may indicate a need for careful study of the situation and program approach in urban areas, and a re-evaluation of training and supervision needs of the urban Extension worker.

Recommendations

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

1. Further study should be undertaken to determine the viewpoints and expectations of Extension Administration, including the State Leader, Home Economics, and her associate leader and assistants, concerning the role of the District Extension Home Economist.
2. There should be some positive provision made for more open and effective communication among the District

Extension Home Economist, County Extension Home Economist, District Extension Supervisors, and Administration (including the Home Economics leader) concerning what the District Extension Home Economist is doing and should be doing.

3. There should be some provision made for periodically re-evaluating the role of the District Extension Home Economist in light of new and changing Home Economics programs and emphasis.
4. More opportunity and time for keeping up to date on pertinent new developments in the field of supervision should be provided for District Extension Home Economists.
5. The process of county program planning and methods of teaching the process to new agents may need re-evaluation. This study indicates that a large number of County Extension Home Economists do not perceive programming as important a function as the district team views it. Recent changes in Home Economics programs underscore the need for a fresh look at county program planning.
6. Further study should be made concerning the difference in perceived needs and expectations of County Extension Home Economists in urban counties. This study indicates that there may be a need for a different approach to agent training, program development, and supervision for urban counties.
7. This study should be made available to the County Operations Department, Programs and Training Office, and the Department of Extension Home Economics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

- Borg, Walter R. Educational Research. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1965.
- Davis, Kingsley. Human Society. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948 and 1949.
- Gross, Neal, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Kendall, Maurice G. Rank Correlation Methods. New York: Hafner Publishing Company, 1955.
- Linton, Ralph. The Study of Man. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1936.
- Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951.
- Sanders, H. C. et al. The Cooperative Extension Service. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.
- Sarbin, Theodore R. "Role Theory" in Gardner Lindzey (Editor). Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge: Addison Wesley Publishing Company, 1954.
- Sargent, Stanfeld. "Concepts of Role and Ego in Contemporary Psychology," in John H. Rorer and Muzafer Sherif (Editors), Social Psychology at the Crossroads. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.
- Selltiz, Claire, et al. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1959.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.
- Strauss, George and Leonard R. Sayles. Personnel: The Human Problems of Management. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1967.
- Young, Pauline V., Scientific Social Surveys and Research. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

B. Periodicals

- Ballard, F. Y. "Public Relations in Extension." Journal of Cooperative Extension, II (Winter, 1964), pp. 216-220.
- Berlew, David E. and Douglas T. Hall. "The Socialization of Managers: Effects of Expectations on Performance." Administrative Science Quarterly, XI (September, 1966), pp. 207-223.
- Blalock, T. C. "Role of the Subject-Matter Specialist." Journal of Cooperative Extension, I (Summer, 1963), pp. 93-100.
- Bruce, Robert L. and G. L. Carter. "Administrative Climate." Journal of Cooperative Extension, V (Spring, 1967), pp. 7-14.
- Durfee, Arthur. "Changing Role of the Supervisor." Journal of Cooperative Extension, XIX (Fall, 1963), pp. 149-154.
- Getzels, J. W. and E. G. Guba. "Role, Role Conflict, and Effectiveness." American Sociological Review, XIX (April, 1954), pp. 164-175.
- Jacobson, Eugene, et al. "The Use of the Role Concept in the Study of Complex Organizations." Journal of Social Issues, VII (1951), pp. 18-27.
- McCormick, Robert W. "A Basis for Change," Journal of Cooperative Extension, V (Summer, 1967), pp. 117-21.

C. Unpublished Materials

- Bentz, Vernon Jon. "A Study of Leadership in a Liberal Arts College." Columbus: The Ohio State State University. Personnel Research Board, 1950 (Unpublished report).
- Broadbent, Marden. "An Analysis of Induction Training for Supervisors in the Cooperative Extension Services of the Southern and Western Region of the United States." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1960.
- Browne, Margaret C. "Job Attitudes of Middle Management in Three Cooperative Extension Services." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1959.
- Durfee, Arthur. "Expectations Held Toward the Extension Supervisor's Role." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, Chicago, 1956.

- "Job Description for Professional Staff of the Cooperative Extension Service." Kansas State University, 1967. (Mimeographed).
- "Organization Plan and Duties for Kansas Extension Service."
Kansas State University, January, 1960, p. 14. (No. N387-16 mimeographed).
- Teagarden, Earl H. "History of the Kansas Extension Service."
Manhattan: Kansas State University. Vol. I and II.
- Trent, Curtis. "The Administrative Role of the State 4-H Club Leader in Selected States--A Study in Role Perception." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1961.
- VandeBerg, G. L. "The Functions and Responsibilities of District Leaders in the Cooperative Extension Service in Wisconsin." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1957.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

STATEMENTS OF FUNCTIONS OF THE DISTRICT EXTENSION HOME ECONOMIST AND
THE ABBREVIATED FORMS OF THESE STATEMENTS USED THROUGHOUT THE TEXT

Complete Statement	Abbreviated Form
1. Interpreting Extension policies and procedures to county Extension staff and to the public	1. Interpreting policies . . .
2. Training county Extension agents	2. Training agents . . .
3. Recruiting, selecting, and placing county Extension agents	3. Recruiting agents . . .
4. Coordinating county and/or district Extension events or activities	4. Coordinating events . . .
5. Establishing and maintaining cooperative relations with advisory boards, organizations, and public agencies at district and county level	5. Establishing cooperative relations . . .
6. Serving as a public relations person for Extension	6. Serving as a public relations person . . .
7. Counseling with county Extension personnel on professional problems	7. Counseling on professional problems . . .
8. Coordinating the work of county Extension staffs with specialists' staffs and other Extension personnel	8. Coordinating county work with specialists . . .
9. Arranging for financial support of the county level	9. Arranging for financial support . . .
10. Assisting county Extension staffs and lay groups in developing county Extension programs	10. Assisting in developing programs . . .
11. Assisting county Extension staffs in determining program progress and accomplishments	11. Assisting in determining program progress . . .

- | | |
|--|---|
| 12. Evaluating quality and quantity of county staff performance | 12. Evaluating staff performance . . . |
| 13. Reporting program progress and accomplishments | 13. Reporting program progress ... |
| 14. Counseling with county Extension personnel on personal problems | 14. Counseling on personal problems . . . |
| 15. Keeping up to date on pertinent new developments in the field of supervision | 15. Keeping up to date . . . |

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX TABLE I

COMPARISON OF THE "SHOULD BE" AND "CURRENTLY BEING" RANK ORDER OF THE DISTRICT HOME ECONOMIST FUNCTIONS BY COUNTY EXTENSION HOME ECONOMISTS OF THE SOUTHWEST DISTRICT, KANSAS, 1964

Functions	Should be	Rank Order	
		Currently being	Difference
Keeping up to date . . .	1	1.5	.5
Coordinating county work with specialists . . .	2.5	1.5	1
Training agents . . .	2.5	3.5	1
Assisting in developing programs . . .	4	5	1
Counseling on professional problems . . .	5.5	7	1.5
Serving as a public relations person . . .	5.5	11	5.5
Interpreting policies . . .	7.5	8	.5
Establishing cooperative relations . . .	7.5	11	3.5
Recruiting agents . . .	9	11	2
Coordinating events . . .	10.5	3.5	7
Assisting in determining program progress . . .	10.5	6	4.5
Evaluating staff performance . . .	12	9	3
Reporting program progress . . .	13	13	0
Counseling on personal problems . . .	14	14	0
Arranging for financial support . . .	14	14	0

APPENDIX TABLE II

COMPARISON OF THE "SHOULD BE" AND "CURRENTLY BEING" RANK ORDER OF THE DISTRICT HOME ECONOMIST FUNCTIONS BY COUNTY EXTENSION HOME ECONOMISTS OF THE NORTHWEST DISTRICT, KANSAS, 1964

Functions	Should be	Rank Order	
		Currently being	Difference
Keeping up to date . . .	1	1	0
Training agents . . .	2.5	2	.5
Coordinating county work with specialists . . .	2.5	3.5	1
Serving as a public relations person . . .	4.5	3.5	1
Counseling on professional problems . . .	4.5	8	3.5
Assisting in determining program progress . . .	6	6	0
Reporting program progress . . .	7.5	6	1.5
Interpreting policies . . .	7.5	6	1.5
Coordinating events . . .	9.5	9	.5
Assisting in developing programs . . .	9.5	10	.5
Establishing cooperative relations . . .	11	11	0
Evaluating staff performance . . .	12	13	1
Counseling on personal problems . . .	13	12	1
Recruiting agents . . .	14	14	0
Arranging for financial support . . .	15	15	0

APPENDIX TABLE III

COMPARISON OF THE "SHOULD BE" AND "CURRENTLY BEING" RANK ORDER OF THE DISTRICT HOME ECONOMIST FUNCTIONS BY COUNTY EXTENSION HOME ECONOMISTS OF THE SOUTHEAST DISTRICT, KANSAS, 1964

Functions	Rank Order		
	Should be	Currently being	Difference
Keeping up to date . . .	1	1	0
Serving as a public relations person . . .	2	2	0
Coordinating county work with specialists . . .	3.5	3	.5
Training agents . . .	3.5	4	.5
Interpreting policies . . .	5	7.5	2.5
Counseling on professional problems . . .	6	5	1
Assisting in developing programs . . .	7	9	2
Assisting in determining program progress . . .	9	6	3
Coordinating events . . .	9	7.5	1.5
Recruiting agents . . .	9	12	3
Establishing cooperative relations . . .	11	11	0
Evaluating staff performance . . .	12	13	1
Reporting program progress . . .	13	10	3
Counseling on personal problems . . .	14	14	0
Arranging for financial support . . .	15	15	0

APPENDIX TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF THE "SHOULD BE" AND "CURRENTLY BEING" RANK ORDER OF THE DISTRICT HOME ECONOMIST FUNCTIONS BY COUNTY EXTENSION HOME ECONOMISTS OF THE NORTHEAST DISTRICT, KANSAS, 1964

Functions	Rank Order		Difference
	Should be	Currently being	
Coordinating county work with specialists	1	1	0
Keeping up to date . . .	2	3	1
Counseling on professional problems . . .	3	3	0
Training agents . . .	5	3	2
Serving as a public relations person . . .	5	6.5	1.5
Evaluating staff performance . . .	5	12	7
Interpreting policies . . .	7.5	6.5	1
Recruiting agents . . .	7.5	5	2.5
Coordinating events . . .	9	8	1
Assisting in developing programs . . .	10.5	9	1.5
Assisting in determining program progress . . .	10.5	12	1.5
Reporting program progress . . .	12	10	2
Establishing cooperative relations . . .	13	12	1
Counseling on personal problems . . .	14	14	0
Arranging for financial support	15	15	0

APPENDIX TABLE V

COMPARISON OF THE "SHOULD BE" AND "CURRENTLY BEING" RANK ORDER OF THE DISTRICT HOME ECONOMIST FUNCTIONS BY COUNTY EXTENSION HOME ECONOMISTS OF THE CENTRAL DISTRICT, KANSAS, 1964

Functions	Rank Order		
	Should be	Currently being	Difference
Serving as a public relations person . . .	1.5	4	2.5
Counseling on professional problems . . .	1.5	5.5	4
Interpreting policies . . .	3	2	1
Coordinating county work with specialists . . .	4	1	3
Keeping up to date . . .	5	3	2
Training agents . . .	6	7	1
Establishing cooperative relations . . .	7	13	6
Coordinating events . . .	9	5.5	3.5
Assisting in determining program progress . . .	9	8	1
Assisting in developing programs . . .	9	11.5	2.5
Recruiting agents . . .	11	11.5	.5
Reporting program progress . . .	12.5	9.5	3
Evaluating staff performance . . .	12.5	9.5	3
Counseling on personal problems . . .	14	14	0
Arranging for financial support . . .	15	15	0

APPENDIX C

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

IN

AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS

80

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

November 14, 1964

TO: Kansas Cooperative Extension Service Staff Members

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

Dear Colleagues:

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

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

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

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

Sincerely yours,



Harold E. Jones
Director

HEJ:sf

Attachment

THE ROLE OF COOPERATIVE EXTENSION PERSONNEL IN KANSAS

Purpose of the Study

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

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

The data will be analyzed by graduate students in Extension Education at Kansas State University.

General Instructions

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

QUESTIONNAIRE

I. B. M.
Col. No.

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

1. ___ Administration (includes all people in Project 1 plus State Leaders, Associate State Leaders, and Academic Department Heads)
2. ___ District Agricultural Agent
3. ___ District Home Economics Agent
4. ___ Specialist (includes Associate and Assistant Editors, Section Leaders, District Economists, F.M. Fieldmen, Area Agriculturalists, Area and District Foresters, Area Engineers, Assistants to State Leaders, and 4-H Club Specialists)
5. ___ Agricultural Agent (includes County Agricultural Agents, Assistant County Agricultural Agents and Male Assistant County Extension Agents)
6. ___ Home Economics Agent (includes County Home Economics Agents, Assistant County Home Economics Agents, Female Assistant or Associate County Extension Agents)
7. ___ 4-H Club Agent (includes County Club Agents and Assistant County Club Agents)

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. ___ Project 1 (Extension Administration) | 5. ___ Project 5 (Home Economics) |
| 2. ___ Project 2 (Information) | 6. ___ Project 6 (4-H) |
| 3. ___ Project 3 (Agricultural Production, Management and Natural Resources) | 7. ___ Project 7 (Community Public Affairs) |
| 4. ___ Project 4 (Marketing) | 8. ___ Project 8 (County Extension Operations) |

6. Sex:

- | | |
|-------------|---------------|
| 1. ___ Male | 2. ___ Female |
|-------------|---------------|

7. Age - as of December 1, 1964:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Under 25 years | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> 45 & under 55 years |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> 25 & under 35 years | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> 55 & under 65 years |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> 35 & under 45 years | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> 65 years & over |

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> None | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> 11 years but less than 16 |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 year | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> 16 years but less than 21 |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> 1 year but less than 6 | 7. <input type="checkbox"/> 21 years and over |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> 6 years but less than 11 | |

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 year | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> 11 years but less than 16 |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> 1 year but less than 6 | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> 16 years but less than 21 |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> 6 years but less than 11 | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> 21 years and over |

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

1. Bachelor
2. Master's
3. Doctor's

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

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|

2. Have you completed the 5 week Kansas Extension Service Induction Training Program?:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|

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

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Central | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Northwest |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Northeast | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Southwest |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Southeast | |

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

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Rural | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Urban |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

5. Have you ever taken a college course in Extension Education?:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|

SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

Definitions:

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

PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS ON ALL PAGES

FUNCTIONS OF COUNTY HOME ECONOMICS AGENTS
(Includes County Home Economics Agents, Ass't. and Assoc. County Home Economics Agents and female assistant County Extension Agents.)

85

47 Deck No. 3

Functions of County Home Economics Agents	I Emphasis should be given function				II Emphasis currently being given function						
	Major	Important	Intermed.	Minor	No	Major	Important	Intermed.		Minor	No
48. <u>Planning annual and long-time programs.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	49.
50. <u>Performing administrative functions, including budgeting, reporting, coordinating, office management and etc.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	51.
52. <u>Developing and maintaining good public relations.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	53.
54. <u>Coordinating University and U.S.D.A. programs at the county level.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	55.
56. <u>Training leaders.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	57.
58. <u>Relaying needs of the people to the University.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	59.
50. <u>Providing specific information on agriculture, and/or home economics and/or club work and related subjects to the people of the county.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	61.
52. <u>Acting as secretary and/or performing services for associations, fairs, shows, camps, etc.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	63.
54. <u>Assisting in the development of the community and its resources.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	65.
56. <u>Organizing and coordinating clubs, units, and/or special interest groups.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	67.
58. <u>Helping specialists evaluate projects that have been carried out in specific subject matter areas.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	69.
70. <u>Reporting program progress and accomplishments.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	71.
72. <u>Evaluating quality and quantity of county staff performance.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	73.
74. <u>Keeping up to date in subject matter and teaching methods.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	75.
76. <u>Other (specify)</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	77.

FUNCTIONS OF COUNTY AGRICULTURAL AGENTS
(Includes County Agricultural Agents, Assistant County Agricultural Agents and male County Extension Agents.)

86

16 Deck No. 3

Functions of County Agricultural Agents	I Emphasis <u>should be given</u> function					II Emphasis <u>currently being</u> given function					
	Major	Important	Intermed	Minor	No	Major	Important	Intermed	Minor	No	
17. <u>Planning annual and long-time programs.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	18.
19. <u>Performing administrative functions, including budgeting, reporting, coordinating, office management and etc.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	20.
21. <u>Developing and maintaining good public relations.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	22.
23. <u>Coordinating University and U.S.D.A. programs at the county level.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	24.
25. <u>Training leaders.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	26.
27. <u>Relaying needs of the people to the University.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	28.
29. <u>Providing specific information on agriculture, and/or home economics and/or club work and related subjects to the people.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	30.
31. <u>Acting as secretary and/or performing services for associations, fairs, shows, camps, etc.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	32.
33. <u>Assisting in the development of the community and its resources.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	34.
35. <u>Organizing and coordinating clubs, units, and/or special interest groups.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	36.
37. <u>Helping specialists evaluate projects that have been carried out in specific subject matter areas</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	38.
39. <u>Reporting program progress and accomplishments.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	40.
41. <u>Evaluating quality and quantity of county staff performance.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	42.
43. <u>Keeping up to date in subject matter and teaching methods.</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	44.
45. <u>Other (specify)</u>	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	46.

FUNCTIONS OF COUNTY CLUB AGENTS
(Includes County Club Agents and
Assistant County Club Agents)

87

Deck No. 4

Functions of County Club Agents	I Emphasis should be given function					II Emphasis currently being given function										
	Major	Important	Minor	No		Major	Important	Minor	No							
1. <u>Planning annual and long-time programs.</u>	5	4	3	2	1						5	4	3	2	1	18.
1. <u>Performing administrative functions, including budgeting, reporting, coordinating, office management and etc.</u>	5	4	3	2	1						5	4	3	2	1	20.
1. <u>Developing and maintaining good public relations.</u>	5	4	3	2	1						5	4	3	2	1	22.
1. <u>Coordinating University and U.S.D.A. programs at the county level.</u>	5	4	3	2	1						5	4	3	2	1	24.
1. <u>Training leaders.</u>	5	4	3	2	1						5	4	3	2	1	26.
1. <u>Relaying needs of the people to the University.</u>	5	4	3	2	1						5	4	3	2	1	28.
1. <u>Providing specific information on agriculture and/or home economics and/or club work and related subjects to the people of the county.</u>	5	4	3	2	1						5	4	3	2	1	30.
1. <u>Acting as secretary and/or performing services for associations, fairs, shows, camps, etc.</u>	5	4	3	2	1						5	4	3	2	1	32.
1. <u>Assisting in the development of the community and its resources.</u>	5	4	3	2	1						5	4	3	2	1	34.
1. <u>Organizing and coordinating clubs, units, and/or special interest groups.</u>	5	4	3	2	1						5	4	3	2	1	36.
1. <u>Helping specialists evaluate projects that have been carried out in specific subject matter areas.</u>	5	4	3	2	1						5	4	3	2	1	38.
1. <u>Reporting program progress and accomplishments.</u>	5	4	3	2	1						5	4	3	2	1	40.
1. <u>Evaluating quality and quantity of county staff performance.</u>	5	4	3	2	1						5	4	3	2	1	42.
1. <u>Keeping up to date in subject matter and teaching methods.</u>	5	4	3	2	1						5	4	3	2	1	44.
1. <u>Other (specify)</u>	5	4	3	2	1						5	4	3	2	1	46.

Deck No. 1

Functions of District Agricultural Agents	I Emphasis should be given function				II Emphasis currently being given function						
	Major	Important	Intermed.	Minor	No	Major	Important	Intermed.		Minor	No
Interpreting Extension policies and procedures to county Extension staff and to the public.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	47.
Training county Extension agents.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	49.
Recruiting, selecting, and placing county Extension agents.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	51.
Coordinating county and/or District Extension events or activities.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	53.
Establishing and maintaining cooperative relations with advisory boards, organizations and public agencies at district and county level.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	55.
Serving as a public relations person for Extension.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	57.
Counseling with county Extension personnel on professional problems.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	59.
Coordinating the work of county Extension staffs with specialists staffs and other Extension personnel.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	61.
Arranging for financial support at the county level.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	63.
Assisting county Extension staffs and lay groups in developing county Extension programs.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	65.
Assisting county Extension staffs in determining program progress and accomplishments.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	67.
Evaluating quality and quantity of county staff performance.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	69.
Reporting program progress and accomplishments.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	71.
Counseling with county Extension personnel on personal problems.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	73.
Keeping up to date on pertinent new developments and research in the field of supervision.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	75.
Other (specify)	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	77.

Deck No. 2

Functions of District Home Economics Agents	I Emphasis should be given function				II Emphasis currently being given function						
	Major	Important	Intermed.	Minor	No	Major	Important	Intermed.		Minor	No
Interpreting Extension policies and procedures to county Extension staff and to the public.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	18.
Training county Extension agents.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	20.
Recruiting, selecting, and placing county Extension agents.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	22.
Coordinating county and/or district Extension events or activities.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	24.
Establishing and maintaining cooperative relations with advisory boards, organizations, and public agencies at district and county level.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	26.
Serving as a public relations person for Extension.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	28.
Counseling with county Extension personnel on professional problems.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	30.
Coordinating the work of county Extension staffs with specialists staffs and other Extension personnel.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	32.
Arranging for financial support at the county level.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	34.
Assisting county Extension staffs and lay groups in developing county Extension programs.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	36.
Assisting county Extension staffs in determining program progress and accomplishments.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	38.
Evaluating quality and quantity of county staff performance.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	40.
Reporting program progress and accomplishments.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	42.
Counseling with county Extension personnel on personal problems.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	44.
Keeping up to date on pertinent new developments in the field supervision.	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	46.
Other (specify)	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	48.

FUNCTIONS OF EXTENSION SPECIALISTS

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

Deck No. 2

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

THE ROLE OF THE DISTRICT EXTENSION HOME ECONOMIST
IN KANSAS

by

MARY DORIS SCHROEDER

B. S., Kansas State University, 1938

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1968

Purpose and Procedure

The purpose of this study was to define more clearly the role of the District Extension Home Economist in the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service as perceived by themselves, the District Extension Supervisors, and the County Extension Home Economists.

Role theory was used as the theoretical basis. The data were collected through the use of a structured mail questionnaire. Respondents were asked to rate fifteen selected functions of the District Extension Home Economist according to emphasis that should be given and emphasis that was being given to the functions at the time the study was conducted.

Rank order of the functions was determined by mean weighted score, with the highest score receiving a rank of one, and the lowest a rank of fifteen. Methods of analysis used were rank difference coefficient of correlation and the coefficient of association, C .

Results

1. There was general, though not high, agreement among the three respondent groups concerning relative emphasis that should be given to the functions of the District Extension Home Economist. When the group average was calculated, giving equal weight to the opinion of each of the three groups, the five most important functions were: (1) keeping up to date, (2) training agents, (3) coordinating county work with specialists, (4) programming, and (5) counseling

on professional problems. The highest degree of agreement, throughout the study, was between the County and District Extension Home Economists, and the lowest agreement was between the District Extension Supervisors and the County Extension Home Economists.

2. There was general agreement among the respondent groups concerning the relative emphasis that was being given to the various functions at the time the study was conducted. However, agreement was higher among the groups relative to the emphasis that should be given to the functions.
3. There was high agreement between emphasis that should be given and emphasis that was being given to functions as perceived by respondent groups. The District Extension Home Economists were the least satisfied of the three groups. They felt they should be giving more emphasis to keeping up to date and evaluating staff performance. When the County Extension Home Economists were grouped by district there was again high agreement, especially in the Northwest and Southeast districts. There were some interesting differences in perception of rank order of certain functions by individual districts, which may have been a reflection of the individual District Extension Home Economist's views and behavior, or a reflection of the degree of urbanization of the various districts, or both.

4. Age, experience, completion of an Extension education course, completion of induction training, and degree of urbanization of the county seemed to be important factors in the ranking of some functions by the County Extension Home Economists. The degree of urbanization of the county was the factor most highly associated with the ranking of functions by the County Extension Home Economists.

Recommendations

1. Further study should be undertaken to determine the viewpoints and expectations of Extension Administration (including the State Leader, Home Economics) concerning the role of the District Extension Home Economist.
2. More opportunity and time for keeping up to date on pertinent new developments in the field of supervision should be provided for District Extension Home Economists.
3. The process of county program planning and methods of teaching the process to new agents may need re-evaluation. Recent changes in Home Economics programs underscore this need.
4. Further study should be made concerning the differences in perceived needs and expectations of County Extension Home Economists in urban counties. This study indicates that there may be a need for a different approach to agent training, program development, and supervision for urban counties.