CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS' PERCEPTION OF THE VIRGINIA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

by

Charles Russell Perkins

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
in
Adult and Continuing Education

APPROVED:

Harold W. Stubblefield, Chairman

James D. McAlister

Dennis E. Hinkle

Stephen R. Parson

James A. Reynolds

June, 1978

Blacksburg, Virginia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is indebted to a number of persons whose cooperation and assistance have contributed significantly to his pursuit of knowledge and to the completion of this dissertation.

Gratitude is expressed to the author's graduate committee, Dr. Harold W. Stubblefield, Dr. Dennis E. Hinkle, Dr. James D. McAlister, Dr. Stephen R. Parson, and Dr. James A. Reynolds, for their interest and assistance throughout the period of graduate study. Particular gratitude is expressed to Dr. Harold W. Stubblefield, major advisor and chairman of the dissertation committee, for his continuous support, guidance, and wise counsel. Special thanks are also expressed to Dr. Dennis E. Hinkle for his insistence that the author maintain the proper perspective in developing a statistically managable study and for his guidance in selecting statistical tools.

Appreciation is expressed to those organizations whose financial support enabled the author to pursue graduate study. Gratitude is extended to Dr. , Director of the Farm Foundation, the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University College of Education, Epsilon Sigma Phi, and the Alpha Gamma Chapter of Epsilon Sigma Phi for their financial assistance.

The author is indebted to the administration and staff of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Extension Division and to the Virginia Municipal League for their assistance. Gratitude is expressed to Dr. , Dean, and the administrative

staff of the Extension Division for granting educational leave, endorsing this study, and reviewing the instrument. Appreciation is expressed to Dr. , Director of Staff Development, for assistance in the preplanning phase of this educational endeavor. Special thanks are given to the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service District Agents who assisted in conducting interviews and to the city unit personnel who assisted in making local arrangements for the interviews. Gratitude is also expressed to Mr. , Director, and the Virginia Municipal League for kind assistance in reviewing the instrument and endorsing the study.

Sincere appreciation is expressed to the seventy-six city council members, to the ten city managers for their cooperation, and to both the city manager and council members in Danville, Virginia for their assistance in pretesting the instrument. Without the cooperation of all these persons, this study could not have been completed.

Strong family support has contributed immeasurably to the completion of this educational endeavor. The author expresses his sincere appreciation to his mother and father, his seven brothers and sisters, and his mother-in-law and father-in-law for their encouragement and assistance throughout the period of study. Special gratitude is expressed to his wife, , for the production of hundreds of type written pages and for her constant faith and encouragement. Special appreciation is also expressed to his three daughters, , , and for their patience, understanding, and many sacrifices during this educational pursuit.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

Table Page

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM

DESCRIPTION OF PROBLEM SITUATION

The Cooperative Extension Service was instituted by the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 primarily in response to the rural problems of inadequate and inefficient agricultural production practices and a substandard level of living. Its traditional educational programs in agriculture, family living, and 4-H have become very much a part of rural America. In performing its outreach function the Cooperative Extension Service has made the research findings of the land-grant universities and the United States Department of Agriculture available to American farmers and their families to assist them in improving production and management practices and their standard of living.

The trend within the Cooperative Extension Service since the 1940's has been a broadening interpretation of the Smith-Lever Act to include a wide range of programs and client groups beyond the farmer and his family (USDA, 1948). Today, as Harrington (1977) pointed out, urban and rural problems are interrelated. Such problems as conservation of energy, poverty, pollution, economic and social adjustments know no geographic bounds. The Cooperative Extension Service has increasingly become involved with the problems of people, regardless of where they live.

Several factors can be identified as having influenced the

Cooperative Extension Service to include urban clients and programs. The rural to urban population shift and the tremendous advances in agricultural production and marketing technology are basic factors influencing the Cooperative Extension Service's inclusion of new client groups and programs. The historic use of the county as the basic Cooperative Extension Service organizational unit has influenced changes in programs and client groups as counties have become more urbanized. More recently, urban programs have increased as the result of specific Congressional appropriations.

Historical Perspective on Urban Cooperative Extension Service Work

The legitimacy for broadening the scope of the Cooperative Extension Service is found in its enabling legislation, the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which specified in part that the Cooperative Extension Service:

> . . . aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same . . . .
>
> . . . work shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics and subjects relating thereto to persons not attending or resident in said colleges in the several communities . . . (U. S. Congress, 1915:372-373).

By identifying Cooperative Extension Service clients as the "people of the United States" and charging it with instruction not only in agriculture and home economics, but also in "subjects related thereto" the Smith-Lever Act can be broadly interpreted to include diverse educational programs for people throughout the United States regardless of rural or urban residency.

With advances in technology and urbanization, the Cooperative Extension Service has periodically taken a critical look at itself with the idea of reordering its priorities, changing the thrust of its programs, and assessing its appropriate role in the future. The result of the first comprehensive evaluation was the Joint Committee Report on Extension Programs Policies and Goals (USDA, 1948). The report was significant in that, although it reemphasized the Cooperative Extension Service's first obligation to the farm family and production agriculture, it recognized that urban segments of the population were beginning to place demands on its services.

In 1958 the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) published a comprehensive evaluation of the Cooperative Extension Service conducted by its Subcommittee on Scope and Responsibility (Miller, 1958). The report of the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, a national study committee to set policy and program guidelines for the Cooperative Extension Service nationwide, is generally referred to as the Scope Report.

The Scope Report pointed out the dramatic changes that had occurred between 1948 and 1958. Farming had become a complex business enterprise with advances in the technology of production and marketing. Farm population had continued to decrease while rural nonfarm and urban populations continued to increase. Farm size increased more than 12 percent, and increasingly farmers supplemented incomes by working part-time off the farm. Both rural and urban Americans enjoyed a higher standard of living and higher education levels than ever before. Demands of expanding urbanization and

increasing population resulted in increasingly greater demands on natural resources.

In view of the significant changes that were occurring, the Scope Report stressed that emphasis should be placed on public affairs, community improvement, and resource development programs as well as on the traditional agriculture, family living, youth development, and leadership programs (Miller, 1958). The report also recognized nonfarm rural residents and urban residents as legitimate Cooperative Extension Service clientele.

The most recent comprehensive study of the Cooperative Extension Service was conducted in 1968 by a joint committee of the United States Department of Agriculture and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (USDA, 1968). The committee's report entitled A People and a Spirit indicated a continuation of the trend toward broader and more diversified programs and client groups. It recommended increased emphasis on programs for disadvantaged segments of society, regardless of place of residence or geographic boundary. It also suggested increasing program efforts in developing social and economic resources in the community to improve the quality of living in both rural and urban areas.

Each of the reports cited reflected the influence of the rural to urban population shift and increasing technological expertise on Cooperative Extension Service efforts to remain relevant in a changing society. Additionally, the policy of expanding programs and client groups can be attributed to Cooperative Extension Service organizational structure which has historically utilized the county as its

basic unit (Brown, 1965). In the early years of the Cooperative Extension Service the county was basically a rural unit. Many counties now contain a rural-urban mix, and many counties adjacent to cities have recently become urban. The fact that the Cooperative Extension Service depends in part on local funding makes it accountable to all the residents of the locality, both rural and urban.

Influence on urban Cooperative Extension Service work at the national level, according to Federal Extension Director, Edwin L. Kirby (1973), has been limited to Congressional allocation of funds specifically designated for use in urban areas. Since 1968 Congress has passed a number of appropriations bills that included specific allocations within the Cooperative Extension Service budget for urban programs (U. S. Congress, 1968; U. S. Congress, 1969; U. S. Congress, 1972; U. S. Congress, 1976). The bills have directed funds to establish and enlarge the Expanded Food and Nutrition Educational Program (EFNEP), an educational program designed to help low income families acquire the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and changed behavior that will enable them to improve their diets nutritionally. Funds have also been directed toward teaching and demonstration gardening, and 4-H type work in the nation's cities. The Congressional appropriation trend has been to increase specifically allocated urban funds and to enlarge upon specified programs.

The Status of Virginia Cooperative Extension Service Urban Work

Urban Cooperative Extension Service work in Virginia has been influenced by the factors and trends previously identified. Virginia's

Cooperative Extension Service, like that of other states, has been influenced by the rural to urban population shift. In 1910 Virginia had an urban population of 23.1 percent. By 1970 Virginia's urban population had grown to 63.1 percent (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1973). As the population trend has changed, the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service has attempted to remain relevant to the needs of the people of the state.

A major step in this effort was the creation of an Extension Division at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. This was accomplished through legislative action by the 1966 Virginia General Assembly stating that the new division:

> . . . encompass the Cooperative Extension Service, Technical Services, and General Extension and subjects relating thereto . . . .
>
> The Division shall provide the people of the Commonwealth information and knowledge through instruction and practical demonstration in such fields as agriculture, business, industry, home economics, resource development, 4-H Club work, and subjects relating thereto . . . (Virginia General Assembly, 1966:577).

On August 1, 1976, the Technical Services component of the Extension Division was incorporated into the Cooperative Extension Service (Pusey, 1977). The three components of the Extension Division are currently the Cooperative Extension Service, General Extension, and the Center for Continuing Education at VPI&SU.

The administrative structure is such that the Dean of the Extension Division also serves as the Director of the Cooperative Extension Service (Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1970). The administrative and program functions of the division are carried out by personnel at the state, district, and local levels.

The effect of the formation of the Extension Division at VPI&SU was to broaden the base of the extension effort and make more university resources available to the people of Virginia (Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1970). The Virginia Cooperative Extension Service can now utilize these resources through the Extension Division and better serve both rural and urban people.

Urbanization in Virginia has changed the composition of a number of formerly rural counties. In addition to serving traditional rural counties, Cooperative Extension Service units now serve counties with a rural-urban mix. In more highly urbanized areas of the state some counties have merged with cities. As a result of the mergers, county units have become city units. Units have been introduced into other cities to initiate the Expanded Food and Nutrition Educational Program (EFNEP). County-city merger or initiation of an EFNEP program led to the establishment of sixteen city Cooperative Extension Service units in Virginia (Lester, 1977).

Of the sixteen cities having Cooperative Extension Service units, ten have populations of 50,000 or more and are the most populus cities in the state (Jones, 1977). Collectively the ten cities contain 31.09 percent of the state's total population. The four earlier established city units in Chesapeake, Hampton, Newport News, and Virginia Beach resulted from mergers occurring between 1958 and 1963 (O'Meara, 1977; Smith, 1977). The six later units in the cities of Alexandria, Lynchburg, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Richmond, and Roanoke were established to carry out EFNEP programs (Allen, 1977; Keffer, 1977; O'Meara, 1977; Smith, 1977; Weddle, 1977).

Cooperative Extension Service units in Virginia cities are relatively new. The image that the Cooperative Extension Service projects in Virginia cities is unknown. The Cooperative Extension Service does not have available under one cover a comprehensive study of its urban work. No research has been conducted to determine what image the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service projects in the cities it serves. There is evidence that a lack of information and research on Cooperative Extension Service urban programs exists throughout the nation. Paulson (1973:24) concluded from a national survey of state Cooperative Extension Service directors that information on urban efforts is inaccessible and it "is still too new to have become effectively integrated into the Extension apparatus."

Cooperative Extension Service directors surveyed by Paulson (1973) generally agreed that the basic Cooperative Extension Service model developed in rural areas, with modifications, should work in urban areas. There are obvious differences between traditional rural clientele and urban clientele that necessitate adapting the model to the urban situation. The urban population is much more heterogeneous and mobile than traditional rural clientele, producing a greater diversity of clientele and program needs. According to Cohnstaedt and Phillipson (1962), urban residents tend to have less feeling of community identity than rural residents. Bebout (1963) has stated that some of the most pressing urban problems are social rather than strictly economic in nature, whereas many traditional Cooperative Extension Service programs are aimed toward improving economic conditions.

No research has been conducted to determine how well the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service is adapting the model to meet the needs of the urban areas it is serving. Reisbeck and Reynolds (1976) emphasized that the credibility the Cooperative Extension Service has is based on its client's perception that the agency's programs meet their needs. They further emphasized that credibility is strengthened when programs are understood, practical, and responsive to the needs of people. It is critical in the present era of accountability and limited funds that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service choose its priorities wisely, that it not impose its values on its urban clients, and that it continue its tradition of involving local people in determining clientele needs, in planning, implementing, and evaluating its programs (Bebout, 1963; Klotsche, 1966; Reisbeck and Reynolds, 1976).

The perception held of the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service affects the organization's ability to generate funds. Bell (1960:140) wrote that:

> Tax supported institutions are constantly involved in competition for tax dollars. Success in this competition depends upon the public image of the institution and its programs as well as upon the image held by members of the legislative bodies.

Success in competition for funds, in the case of the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service, further depends on the image held by local governing bodies who determine the organization's share of the local budget.

Decisions on the appropriation of local funds to support the Cooperative Extension Service are ultimately made in Virginia cities by

members of the city council. Their decisions, colored by how they perceive what the Cooperative Extension Service does in their city, are critical to the success or failure of the city program.

City council members are also the elected representatives of the people and, as such, should be cognizant of the needs of their constituents. As elected leaders, it is assumed that they influence and are influenced by their constituents.

At the present time the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service has little knowledge of how city council members perceive its urban efforts. The agency does not know if city council members perceive it as meeting the needs of city residents. It lacks knowledge of whether communication and public relations efforts are adequate or need to be strengthened. Finally, the agency does not know generally how credible it is in the eyes of Virginia city council members.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem addressed in this study was: How do city council members serving cities with populations of 50,000 or more perceive Virginia Cooperative Extension Service programs and clientele as they relate to urban concerns?

More specifically, the research attempted to elicit answers to the following questions:

1. What perception do city council members have of the type and content of Virginia Cooperative Extension Service programs currently being conducted in their cities?

2. What type and content of Virginia Cooperative Extension

Service programs do city council members perceive as needed in their cities?

3. What client groups do city council members perceive as being served by the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service in their cities?

4. What client groups do city council members perceive should be served by the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service in their cities?

5. What perception do city council members have of the contribution that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service is making to city residents?

6. What relationships, if any, exist between the selected variables—size of city (population), and method of Cooperative Extension Service entry into the city—and the perception that city council members have of Virginia Cooperative Extension Service city programs and client groups?

HYPOTHESES

To guide and order the empirical findings of the study, the following null hypotheses were proposed:

1. No difference exists between city council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service currently places on city program and content areas and the priority it should place on city program and content areas.

2. No relationship exists between city council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension

Service should place on program and content areas and the size of the city.

3. No relationship exists between city council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on program and content areas and the Cooperative Extension Service method of entry into the city.

4. No difference exists between city council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service currently places on city client groups and the priority it should place on city client groups.

5. No relationship exists between city council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on client groups and the size of the city.

6. No relationship exists between city council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on client groups and the Cooperative Extension Service method of entry into the city.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this study were to:

1. Identify the selected variables—size of city (population) and method of Cooperative Extension Service entry into the city—that may affect city council members' perception of Virginia Cooperative Extension Service programs and client groups in cities.

2. Determine city program needs as reflected by council members.

3. Determine client groups that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should serve in cities as reflected by council members.

4. Draw implications that will lead to recommendations to the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service for:

a) reconsidering program emphases in cities

b) reconsidering client group emphases in cities

c) improving the agency's contribution toward meeting city needs

d) altering method of entry into cities of similar size

e) reconsidering overall agency policy to better meet the needs of Virginia cities.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study is significant in that the findings can be used by Cooperative Extension Service administrators in making decisions affecting the agency's programs and clientele in Virginia cities. The study provides the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service with knowledge about how city council members perceive the agency's worth and contributions in cities. The results have implications for the agency's ability to maintain fiscal accountability and general credibility in its city efforts.

Specifically the findings can be used by Virginia Cooperative Extension Service decision makers in establishing program and clientele priorities, in assessing the agency's effectiveness in communicating its goals, objectives, and accomplishments, and in determining public

relations needs. Findings may have some implications for introducing Cooperative Extension Service programs into other Virginia cities of similar size. The study's conceptual framework may also have some value as a basis of research for other state Cooperative Extension Services with similar situations.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

To increase clarity and understanding, the following frequently used terms are defined according to their meaning in this study:

1. Clientele — Those special interest groups or individuals who participate in or who could potentially benefit from Virginia Cooperative Extension Service educational programs.

2. City unit — Basic Virginia Cooperative Extension Service organizational component confined to a cooperating city.

3. Cooperative Extension Service — An outreach organization functioning under authorization of the Smith-Lever Act, in effect as of June 23, 1972, as a cooperative effort of the United States Department of Agriculture, the state land-grant institutions, and local governments. Its purpose is to provide informal education to the people of the United States in the broadly interpreted areas of agriculture, home economics, and related subjects.

4. Council members — Elected representatives of the people who constitute the city's governing body.

5. Expanded Food and Nutrition Educational Program (EFNEP) — A Cooperative Extension Service program designed to help low income families acquire the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and changed behavior

that will enable them to improve their diets nutritionally. Sub-professionals at the community level are employed to assist in conducting this program in both rural and urban areas.

6. Method of entry — Initial Cooperative Extension Service program content upon formation of a city unit. For this study there were two possible methods of entry, traditional and EFNEP. Traditional indicates that the initial programs in units resulting from county-city mergers were already established, on-going county programs in agriculture, family resources, 4-H, and community resource development. EFNEP indicates that the city unit was established specifically to initiate and conduct the Expanded Food and Nutrition Educational Program.

7. Need — The difference between city council members' perception of current Virginia Cooperative Extension Service program and clientele priorities and their perception of the priority that should be given to those programs and clientele.

8. Perception — The process of formulating an image, picture, awareness, or knowledge of any aspect of the world based on a composite of sensory information and individual interests, needs, and past experiences. In this study, perception refers to the image, picture, awareness, or knowledge that city council members have of current Virginia Cooperative Extension Service program and clientele priorities and the priorities that should be given those programs and clientele.

9. Program areas (within the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service) — Agriculture and natural resources, family resources, community resource development, 4-H, technical resources.

10. Program content areas — Activities and subject matter subdivisions included within Virginia Cooperative Extension Service program areas.

11. Size of city — Population of the city. For the purpose of this study, cities were grouped into three population categories: small—50,000-100,000, medium—100,001-150,000, and large—over 150,000.

12. Unit — Basic Virginia Cooperative Extension Service organizational component functioning within a cooperating local governmental jurisdiction.

13. Urban Cooperative Extension — Those specific outreach functions of the Cooperative Extension Service in serving metropolitan areas.

14. Urban Extension — Any university outreach function designed to provide educational programs in metropolitan areas.

15. Virginia Cooperative Extension Service — State agency conducting informal education programs through Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and Virginia State College in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture and local governments.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was limited to Virginia Cooperative Extension Service urban programs and clientele as perceived by present city council members in the cities identified. The criteria for selection of cities limited the study to cities having established Virginia Cooperative Extension Service units and populations of 50,000 or more. Findings

are specifically relevant only to those cities and present council members studied. The study made no attempt to predict perceptions held by past or future council members. Since only descriptive analyses were used in analyzing the data, the findings may not be true of other cities.

The fact that some prior relationships may have existed between the District Agents who assisted in conducting the interviews and the city council members could have influenced the findings. However, the investigator feels that this would not have biased the study since, in the few cases where they existed, prior relationships were not close.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

To provide a theoretical basis for, and to increase understanding of the problem chosen for study, literature related to the extension concept in an urban setting, the nature and general principles of perception, and related Cooperative Extension Service perception studies was reviewed.

Literature reviewed on the extension concept in an urban setting dealt with: 1) urban needs, 2) considerations in developing extension and continuing education programs for urban areas, 3) experiments in developing urban extension programs, and 4) adapting the Cooperative Extension Service to the urban setting. Emphasis in each case was on urban clientele and program needs, and methods being used or proposed to meet those needs. This area of literature was reviewed to specifically delineate and differentiate program and clientele needs that are indicated in urban areas that may differ from those the Cooperative Extension Service may have dealt with in its more traditional rural settings.

The literature reviewed on the nature and general principles of perception dealt with perception in a social context. Literature was reviewed in this area to develop a definition of perception consistent with the study and to provide increased understanding of factors that may have influenced city council members' perceptions of Cooperative Extension Service programs and clientele.

Review of the literature on perception of the Cooperative Extension Service included studies of how the agency was generally perceived and how it was perceived in urban areas. This literature was reviewed to determine if prior research indicated any trends with regard to how Cooperative Extension Service programs and clientele are perceived.

THE EXTENSION CONCEPT IN AN URBAN SETTING

The belief that university outreach programs should serve urban areas dates back to the early 1900's. C. R. Van Hise reorganized the extension division at the University of Wisconsin in 1907 because he felt that the university should reach out with programs to meet agricultural, political, social, and moral concerns of people (Curti, 1951). Unfortunately, as Klotsche (1966) indicated, university outreach in the past has been aimed toward segments of the population that are rarely found in the slums. Klotsche (1966:53) emphasized that "for all practical purposes, the lower classes of our urban society have been untouched by the university outreach."

Nash (1969) pointed out that the plight of the core city resident was dramatically brought to the attention of the American people by the big city riots of the sixties. President Johnson launched his "war on poverty" and advocated, along with a number of leading educators, an urban extension system patterned after the Cooperative Extension Service as a means of meeting city needs Klotsche, 1966). Although proposed in the Congress several times, an urban land-grant system never received serious support. Congress

preferred instead to opt for other means of dealing with urban concerns, e.g., Title I—Higher Education Act of 1965, State Technical Services Act of 1965, Cooperative Extension Service EFNEP programs.

The attention focused on urban problems during the sixties by social unrest in the cities and President Johnson's emphasis on alleviating poverty led to a considerable amount of research. In fact, a large portion of the research into the urban extension concept conducted to date was carried on during this time period. Although conducted some years ago, these studies comprise most of the literature pertinent to this study.

Urban needs

There is general agreement that the influx of large numbers of rural poor into the city coupled with the middle class exodus from the city is a basic source of urban problems (Bebout, 1963; Klotsche, 1966; Ford Foundation, 1966; Anderson, 1972; Miller, 1973). Anderson (1972) and Miller (1973) both associated the movement of rural poor into the cities with advancements in agricultural technology and the decrease in jobs for unskilled farm labor. The resulting problem, according to Bebout (1963), was one of urban adjustment that affected both the masses who moved and their communities.

Individual needs of the disadvantaged and community problems stemming from concentrations of low income people were manifested in the broad problem of urban adjustment in the inner city. Klotsche (1966) pointed out that new city residents live in rapidly deteriorating neighborhoods and have a full complement of individual needs and

problems, including high unemployment, low educational attainment, poverty, unstable families, chronic illness, and a high rate of school drop-out. Anderson (1972) indicated that the deprived condition of the inner city resident serves to keep him isolated from other segments of society. In essence, the rural poor are unable to cope in the city and the over-riding concern becomes one of survival (Ford Foundation, 1966). Bebout (1963) and Klotsche (1966) pointed out that the problem of assimilating new city residents is similar to, but more difficult than, Americanization of foreign immigrants in the early 1900's.

Bebout (1963) identified rapid obsolescence and advanced deterioration of inner city neighborhoods and communities as another significant problem associated with mass urbanization. Communities are characterized by high crime rates, juvenile delinquency, racial conflict, disproportionate welfare demands, and other community problems stemming from high concentrations of low-income people (Klotsche, 1966; Ford Foundation, 1966).

The inner city, according to Anderson (1972), has become physically and functionally obsolete. It is no longer the service center for consumer goods. The downtown shopping district as the center for consumer goods has been replaced by suburban shopping centers. Downtown entertainment centers and hotels have been replaced to a large degree by comparable facilities in the suburbs.

The central city has been abandoned by middle class residents and business interests in favor of suburban and urban fringe areas. The result has been unplanned development and urban sprawl in the outlying areas and a continually shrinking tax base for the core city.

The large number of annexation suits brought by core cities in an effort to get back some of their lost tax base is evidence of the financial strain on city revenues as a result of the suburban trend.

With diminishing revenues, the city is being faced with escalating physical and environmental problems, including mass transportation, public recreation, air and water pollution, water supply, sewerage and solid waste disposal, traffic congestion, shortage of parking, and lack of open space (Ford Foundation, 1966; Vaughn and Wyckoff, 1970). In addition, increased demands are being made on the city to provide more and better services (Klotsche, 1966).

The literature cited indicates that many of the most pressing urban problems stem from the social condition of the underpriviledged segments of the population. Others stem from physical and environmental problems such as increasing demands on the city for more and better quality services, shrinking revenues, and the city's growth into new and undeveloped areas.

Considerations in Developing Extension and Continuing Education Programs for Urban Areas

Considerable attention has been given to defining the university's role in urban affairs. Klotsche (1966) assigned the university four broad objectives for dealing with urban concerns: 1) improving the quality of urban life, 2) transmitting its research findings on urban problems to city leaders, 3) educating the general public to improve understanding of the urban society, and 4) providing trained leadership to help solve urban problems. The complexity and heterogeneity of urban needs requires that educational institutions

providing urban extension programs use an interdisciplinary approach in attempting to meet urban objectives. Further, the nature of urban problems implies that institutions developing or conducting extension programs must do so within their competencies. Urban extension programs, Petshek (1969) stressed, must be prefaced and accompanied by developing internal institutional competencies and using all university resources available in conducting urban programs.

The university's extension mission in the cities must be one of serving as a basic resource (Vaughn and Wyckoff, 1970). Extension programs must be developed in cooperation with and never in competition with existing agencies and organizations. Programs, the Ford Foundation (1966) warned, must not be allowed to fall into the category of providing routine urban services. Klotsche (1966) viewed the university's role as that of a creative innovator. Bebout (1963:45) wrote that as the university attacks urban problems:

> . . . it should seek to leave along the way trained persons, institutional arrangements, and habits of mind—especially among urban decision makers at all levels—that will so function as to enable it in good conscience to disengage its resources from established or repetitive operations and reinvest them in exploration.

The ultimate objective of the extension mission, according to Klotsche and Bebout, should be accomplishment to the point that the university can divorce itself from one endeavor and move on to another area of concern.

In the present age of accountability, practical consideration must be given to developing programs and approaches that will be most effective in terms of the cost benefit ratio. Klotsche (1966)

indicated that consideration must be given to making the best use of limited resources. Further consideration, according to Bebout (1963), in developing programs should be their long range impact on the community.

Another basic principle for consideration in developing program approaches to combat urban problems is the involvement of urban people. The institution and its representatives in the community must not fall into the trap of trying to impose values through attitudes, actions, or programs on the client groups it works with. As Petshek (1969) pointed out, citizen participation in planning, developing, and evaluating programs can play a vital role in assuring that the institution's values are not imposed on clientele. Bebout (1963) stressed that the university should not dictate, but provide alternatives from which decision makers can choose. Klotsche (1966) stated the belief that the problem of general apathy of urban people can also be combated by developing closer relationships with average city residents. Involvement is one way of developing closer relationships and rapport with urban people.

By developing closer relationships with client groups, by learning their major concerns, by encouraging their input in planning, carrying out, and evaluating programs, the institution can provide more relevant programs and develop rapport with its clients. Developing rapport with citizens, civic groups, the community power structure, city government, and other agencies and organizations is essential. Harrington (1977) hinted at the importance of developing rapport when he stated the belief that the biggest problem associated with university urban work in the sixties was difficulty in getting along

with the disadvantaged.

Bebout (1963) indicated that urban extension program strategies should deal with social concerns of people and encourage technological advances that can help urban residents improve their condition. Petshek (1969) placed emphasis on a community development strategy. Dobbs and McKinney (1974) stressed the importance of leadership development and providing the urban resident with expertise to improve his own condition. The concept of "helping people help themselves" is implied in these strategies as an important consideration in developing urban extension programs.

A number of underlying principles worthy of consideration in developing urban extension programs became apparent from the literature reviewed. The university should: 1) function as a provider of resources, 2) utilize urban research to improve its competencies, 3) cooperate with existing urban agencies and organizations, 4) build rapport and effective communication with many urban social structures, and 5) encourage citizen participation in all phases of its program development strategy to avoid imposition of university values on urban citizens and to encourage citizens to become actively involved in solving their own problems. The basic principles are evidenced to varying degrees in experimental urban extension projects that have been developed.

Experiments in Developing Urban Extension Programs

The Ford Foundation, through its grant program, has probably been responsible for making the greatest single impact on the initial

development of experimental urban extension programs. Although the Ford funded experiments were conducted in the sixties, they continue as the most significant research to date in urban extension. Beginning in 1959 the Ford Foundation granted funds to eight universities and two non-academic institutions for experimental programs in urban extension. Projects of Action-Housing in Pittsburgh, the National 4-H Club Foundation, and the universities of California, Delaware, Illinois, Missouri, Oklahoma, Purdue, Rutgers, and Wisconsin were funded through the grants. With the exception of the National 4-H Club Foundation study, the projects were reported in a single publication of the Ford Foundation (1966). The Ford Foundation report was reviewed to determine the primary thrust of each project. The four major project emphasis areas that emerged from the review were research, linkage, delivery systems, and self-help.

Research. The primary emphasis of the University of Illinois project conducted in the early sixties was research. Three urban generalists were hired to conduct research on problems in the urban areas to which they were assigned. Although the research provided a basis for action in some communities, university personnel did not actively participate in local programs.

Developing linkages. Projects initiated at Rutgers in 1959, Purdue in 1961, and the universities of California, Delaware, and Oklahoma in 1961 all sought to develop linkages. Most utilized research and/or delivery efforts to support the formation of linkages.

The purpose of the Rutgers urban extension project was to serve

as a communications link between the university and the community. The formation of linkages was enhanced by providing materials and other informational resources to government agencies and citizens on key urban problems and policy issues. Demonstration projects were also developed to deal with specific urban concerns.

At Purdue funds were used for a family service program that sought to establish a communications link with professional and volunteer leadership in health, education, and welfare. Efforts included setting up a cooperative play program in a housing project, providing consultants on special problems, identifying and utilizing unused professional resources in the community, and sponsoring community conferences to stimulate inservice training and improve communications between professional and lay leaders.

The project at the University of California (Berkley) sought to develop linkages between official agencies, grass-roots organizations, and the university. The project utilized public forums to bring issues to public attention and was a forerunner of federal community action programs.

The University of Delaware project sought to develop linkages between local governments and the university. Service to government included conducting economic and population studies for use in school planning, redistricting, transportation, and improvement of tax base. As part of service to government, a highly skilled urban agent served as a major resource to communities and stimulated interest in new projects.

The thrust of the project at the University of Oklahoma was to

develop urban scientists to serve as a link between the university and the community. The scientist lived in the community, became familiar with its problems, acquainted the leadership with resources available to solve them, and provided feedback to the university from his experience for use in developing urban research and curricula. Although the university questioned the success of the program, some business and civic groups felt the project was beneficial in providing impartial expertise and research potential in urban analysis and planning.

Delivery systems. Four projects, three at the University of Missouri initiated in 1962 and one at the University of Wisconsin initiated in 1960, sought to expand and coordinate general extension and Cooperative Extension Service delivery systems. The University of Missouri, the first major university to consolidate all extension activities into one department, used its grant to strengthen its urban program with projects in three areas. The first program was an experimental home economics program carried out by a black home economist to see if rural extension home economics programs could be successful in an urban setting. This program was considered highly successful. The second program was a labor education program, including institutes, lecture series, and conferences in areas of labor interest. This program utilized an advisory board of trade union officials who recommended and evaluated programs. The third program was an effort to transfer successful rural development programs into an urban setting. The program was judged a failure. The lack of success was attributed to

the agent's lack of experience and unclear definition of his role.

The Wisconsin project was an experiment in integrating general extension and Cooperative Extension Service efforts in Columbia County. The program led to adding a resource development agent and a resource home economist to the Cooperative Extension Service staff. However, the project pointed out the need for greater understanding by both general extension and Cooperative Extension Service personnel of what resources each had available.

A second project at Wisconsin in 1960 sought to improve university urban extension delivery efforts by making university urban extension specialists more accessible in areas away from the university. The project involved assigning a team of urban specialists to Fox Valley, a small two year college center. Recruiting staff with necessary skills posed problems. The university felt that the staff required scholarly orientations and that small centers, such as Fox Valley, could not sustain such a staff. The project was viewed as unsuccessful.

Self-help and social action. Self-help and social action received primary emphasis in projects funded at the University of Wisconsin in 1960 and Action-Housing, Pittsburgh in 1962. The project at the University of Wisconsin utilized interdisciplinary action research teams to work with local leaders in Milwaukee to stimulate interest in self-help and social action. They worked with low income groups and also helped middle class blacks organize to help poorer core city residents. Self-help neighborhood organizations were organized to help

give them the skills necessary to become involved.

The Pittsburgh Action-Housing project utilized the technique of organizing citizen groups and giving each group professional guidance through an extension worker that the group helped select. The purpose was to develop comprehensive social and physical improvement programs. The goal was to stay involved only until the group developed a self-generating organization capable of self-support and maintaining links to the city structure. Action-Housing, after the group was self-supporting, was available for specialized resources and consultation. The project was successful in stimulating both physical and social improvements in three large declining neighborhoods. Programs were felt to be beneficial in developing a sense of community identity and developing an interest in influencing policy decisions affecting people in the community. This project was viewed by the Ford Foundation as the most successful program in direct neighborhood services that it funded.

The experimental programs conducted by the eight universities and one non-academic organization were reviewed with emphasis on the primary thrust of each project. The projects included those that placed primary emphasis on the university's research role, on developing linkages between the university and various urban social structures, on adapting and coordinating already developed university extension program delivery systems, and on developing social action, self-help program strategies. Although a number of approaches was used, no single approach, according to the Ford Foundation's (1966) analysis, emerged as clearly superior to others in dealing with urban

needs. However, the project approaches utilized a variety of innovations that provide alternatives for developing urban extension programs.

Adapting the Cooperative Extension Service to the Urban Setting

The Cooperative Extension Service's major thrust historically has been directed toward rural America. Now, as it formulates programs directed toward urban concerns, adaptations in the rural model are indicated. Adapting the Cooperative Extension Service to the urban setting requires consideration of organizational guidelines, programs, clientele, and image.

Organizational guidelines. Development of organizational guidelines for urban efforts is the initial step in adapting the traditional model. Evidence exists that the Cooperative Extension Service needs to define its operational policy and objectives more clearly. An independent study of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service conducted by the Battelle Memorial Institute was critical of that agency's lack of clearly defined policy (Fishel, Collings and Wilhelmy, 1964). Battelle researchers concluded that:

> . . . the single most important factor underlying many of the current problems in Extension's organization and operations is a lack of a clear-cut definition of purpose and objectives. This results in unclear guidelines to Extension supervisors and workers concerning the choice of most needed programs and activities, selection of clientele, and operational procedures (Fishel, Collings and Wilhelmy, 1964:iii).

The problem of inadequately defined policy seems even more acute and widespread with regard to Cooperative Extension Service work

in urban areas. A Ford Foundation funded national study of urban 4-H programs conducted by Brown and Boyle (1964) revealed that those states whose programs were studied had no formal policy regarding urban Cooperative Extension Service work. State Cooperative Extension Services had no clear-cut urban goals. Program goals for urban areas lacked definition and were very general in nature. The study showed that, although state administrators generally had a favorable attitude toward urban 4-H work, limited resources had been provided for programs. This lack of commitment to urban 4-H programs was supported by the findings of Brownell's (1971) study of 4-H programs in thirty cities.

The need for a more clearly defined urban policy and stronger urban commitment was also supported by the findings of a national survey conducted by Paulson (1973). High level state Cooperative Extension Service administrators surveyed by Paulson identified size of urban audience, lack of funding, and the absence of clearly stated policy or commitment to aggressively attack urban problems as fundamental limitations in urban work.

In addition to clearly defined urban policy and commitment, Brown (1965) offered a number of organizational guidelines for the Cooperative Extension Service as it seeks to adapt to urban settings. The Cooperative Extension Service at the national, state, and local levels must have an appreciation for working with urban people. Urban staffs should have the orientations, skills, and competencies compatible with work in an urban setting; they must have access to university resources other than those of colleges of agriculture and

home economics. Urban program development should be based on an analysis of urban needs and the competencies the Cooperative Extension Service has to serve those needs. An attitude of experimentation and innovation should prevail as urban programs are developed. Finally, Brown emphasized the need for the Cooperative Extension to project an image more symbolic of urban people.

Urban programs and innovative techniques. The policy and goal decisions that administrators make regarding Cooperative Extension Service urban programs must be based on a recognition of urban needs and the Cooperative Extension Service's urban capabilities. Paulson's (1973) survey of Cooperative Extension Service administrators identifyed expanded food and nutrition, consumer education, and 4-H as the currently predominant urban program emphases.

Administrators responding to the survey also identified six areas of needed program emphasis that stood out: 1) inadequate housing, 2) youth, especially the disadvantaged, 3) consumer education, 4) employment economic base, 5) land-use planning in and around cities, and 6) food buying and nutrition, especially for low income people. Programs mentioned most often that would be developed if more funds were available included: 1) low income 4-H work, 2) housing, including education on alternate housing, home maintenance, and management, 3) food and nutrition programs for special interest groups, including pregnant women and the elderly, 4) consumer education through varied use of mass media, and 5) use of paraprofessionals in low income programs other than food and nutrition. Others mentioned included

urban home economics and management, urban home horticulture and landscape clinics, family living, career education, education for women in second careers, education in family planning, health education, training of the handicapped, land-use, planning, and establishing applied research centers for urban problems.

In 1964, Fishel, Collings and Wilhelmy projected an increasing need for Cooperative Extension Service programs in public policy as rural and urban populations become more cosmopolitan in their views. They further projected that with increasing urban expansion the demand for information and services related to lawns and gardens would increase. This last projection seems to be supported by the Cooperative Extension Service administrators in Paulson's (1973) survey who listed urban home horticulture as a program of interest as funds become available.

The studies conducted by Paulson (1973) and Fishel, Collings and Wilhelmy (1964) emphasized the great diversity of programs identified as worthy Cooperative Extension Service efforts in urban areas. Programming decisions relative to specific urban areas should reflect needs in those areas.

Cooperative Extension Service programs should not duplicate and compete with already established programs. This concept is supported by the findings of Brown and Boyle (1964) that some Cooperative Extension Service administrators felt that urban youth work should include providing university resources to all functioning urban youth organizations as well as providing 4-H programs. Paige (1970) offered support to this idea by stressing the importance of a coordinated and

cooperative city youth effort. The end result should be less duplication of effort and better overall programs. Parsons (1971) also stressed the need to avoid duplication of services, to know and work with professionals in other agencies, and to avoid competition. Although directed primarily toward urban 4-H programs, the ideas of cooperation rather than competition, reduction of duplication, and effective communication with other agencies and organizations are principles that apply to all areas of Cooperative Extension Service program development.

Core city people may have special needs of which Cooperative Extension Service personnel should be aware. Paige (1970) pointed out that professional staff members must work to solve the problem of ethnic insensitivity in dealing with core city residents. Parsons (1971) stressed the importance of striving for continuity in program efforts, particularly in working with inner city people who lack experience with groups. They may be unable to continue programs without professional help. He pointed out further that core city programs should be "now" oriented and deal with present situations. Involving inner city people in program development can help insure that programs are relevant and "now" oriented.

There is evidence that the Cooperative Extension Service is developing innovative approaches for its urban work. Administrators included in the Paulson (1973) survey cited several innovative urban programs and techniques including: 1) counseling low and moderate income families on home ownership, 2) developing youth aides to build racial harmony in schools, 3) seminars in shopping centers, 4) work

with business, industry, and citizens on procedures for use of solid wastes, 5) urban pest control, and 6) use of paraprofessional staff. Use of paraprofessional staff was cited most often as an innovative technique.

The significance and value of using paraprofessional staff in urban programs cannot be overlooked. According to Harrington (1977), the biggest problem of university associated urban work in the sixties was difficulty in getting along with the disadvantaged in the cities. The university was not accustomed to working with the poor and minority groups, and they, on the other hand, felt uncomfortable with university representatives. Use of paraprofessionals that inner city people can more closely identify with and relate to is one method the Cooperative Extension Service can successfully use to help alleviate the problem.

Urban client groups. The client groups who could profit from Cooperative Extension Service programs are almost as diverse as the programs. Specific target audiences mentioned in the literature included: 1) minority, low, and moderate income families, both youth and adults, 2) urban policy makers, 3) community leaders, 4) urban agencies and organizations, and 5) business and industry (Bebout, 1963; Petshek, 1969; Paulson, 1973; Dobbs and McKinney, 1974).

Vaughn and Wyckoff (1970) viewed assistance to established urban agencies as a significant Cooperative Extension Service urban role. Since urban people may look to those agencies first, the Cooperative Extension Service may serve best by providing back-up information and assistance to such organizations as Community Action,

Model Cities or urban renewal agencies, planning offices, chambers of commerce, industrial development councils, League of Women Voters, and public schools. The Ford Foundation (1966) pointed out that since cities already provide such a great diversity of services it may be difficult for another organization, such as the Cooperative Extension Service, to find a useful place of entry. Working through and backing up already established groups may be both a useful and suitable place of entry for the Cooperative Extension Service.

The EFNEP program has made urban low income groups, both youth and adults, a significant target audience for urban Cooperative Extension Service programs. In fact, current urban emphases, as identified by Paulson's (1973) survey, indicate that low income groups may well be the most significant Cooperative Extension Service urban audience.

Organizational image. Even though the people in an urban area may be aware that the Cooperative Extension Service conducts programs in their area, they still may not take advantage of them. Brown (1965:15) has said that even:

> . . . an intensive educational program to inform people that Extension is available to urban people will likely be ineffective unless changes are made in the organizational structure, programs, and symbols. The image people have of the organization will determine to a great extent whether or not they are willing to participate in it.

Brown further observed that a plastic cow in a city office is out of place. In effect, the Cooperative Extension Service cannot further its urban cause by promoting its rural image. It must develop an image in urban areas compatible with urban needs.

Further, the success of urban Cooperative Extension Service programs depends on the practical consideration of available funds to implement them. Success in this area is dependent, in large measure, on the importance and relevance of Cooperative Extension Service programs as perceived by governing bodies who control local appropriations that help support urban programs (Bell, 1960).

In their study of urban 4-H programs, Brown and Boyle (1964) found that elected city officials were opposed to initiating funding of Cooperative Extension Service 4-H programs currently funded by counties. They pointed out that their finding agreed with observations of some Cooperative Extension Service administrators who have had limited success in getting city government appropriations for programs. In view of their findings and the observations of some administrators, Brown and Boyle (1964:25) concluded that "city governments do not seem to provide a stable, continuous basis of support for Extension." This may well be due to the fact that city governments do not perceive the Cooperative Extension Service as possessing the capability of providing programs relevant to urban citizens.

In the literature reviewed, writers or researchers pointed out that the ultimate success or failure of urban Cooperative Extension Service work is linked to the agency's ability to adapt to the urban environment and to its ability to project a relevant urban image. Ascertaining how the Cooperative Extension Service is currently perceived in urban areas seems essential in helping determine current and future effectiveness with regard to goals, programs, and public relations.

THE NATURE AND GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF PERCEPTION

Since this study dealt with how city council members perceive the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service, it was important to develop a clear understanding of the term "perception" as used in the study. The definition of perception used in this study finds its basis in social psychology. Social psychology, as described by Lindesmith, Strauss and Denzin (1975), deals with relationships between people and various social structures, including intimate family, friendship, and work groups, as well as more complex relationships with organizations and institutions.

Considered in this context, McGrath (1964) identified perception as the link between a stimulus and the mental processes of judgement, reasoning, and memory. Perception is translating the stimulus information into a meaningful experience. In the same context, Hilgard, Atkinson and Atkinson (1975:610) defined perception as:

> . . . the process of becoming aware of objects, qualities, or relationships by way of the sense organs. While sensory content is always present in perception, what is perceived is influenced by set and prior experience, so that perception is more than a passive registration of stimuli impinging on the sense organs.

Considering the above definitions, perception, as used in this study, was defined as the process of formulating an image, picture, awareness, or knowledge of any aspect of the world based on a composite of sensory information and individual interests, needs, and past experiences.

The definition of perception points out the complexity and individuality of perception formation. Obviously, a number of factors

has influenced the perceptions that city council members have formulated of the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service. Although this study made no attempt to identify and relate specific personal social factors to the perceptions city council members held, it was deemed important to have a general understanding of the perception formation process.

Some cues seem to be more influential than others in forming perceptions. Asch (1946) found that some cues are so strong that they influence the resulting perception no matter where they occur in the order of cues. Luchines (1957) found evidence in support of the idea that first information exerts a controlling influence on how subsequent information about the same situation is interpreted. As Litterer (1965) pointed out, once perceptions have been formed they are likely to persist and resist change. He attributed this to the fact that we are selective about the cues we draw into the formation of our perceptions. There is a tendency to recognize those cues consistent with prior perceptions and interpret new information in ways that add meaning to already formed perceptions. The ease with which perceptions are changed is affected by the personality of the individual holding the perception, the importance of the perception to him, and the forces that are working to cause a change in the perception held.

Role expectation also influences the formation of perceptions. Litterer (1965) indicated that what is perceived depends on what is expected of a person in a given situation, and further, what is expected of him is dependent on the role he is seen as filling. McGrath (1964:47) supported this concept when he wrote that:

> . . . we are prone to perceive what we expect and fail to perceive things that do not fit our expectations. In fact, under some conditions, we perceive what we want to perceive, not necessarily what is actually present in the stimulus pattern.

In terms of the perception of organizations, what the organization actually is, or does, is of far less importance than what the individual perceives it to be or do.

The perception literature that was reviewed revealed the complexity, individuality, and subjectivity of perception formation. It emphasized the persistence of original perceptions and the fact that some cues are more influential than others in the formation of perceptions. The literature further indicated that perceptions are influenced by role expectation, that they reflect what the individual expects and in some cases what he wants to perceive. These principles are of particular importance to a study of how a traditionally rural agency such as the Cooperative Extension Service is perceived in an urban setting.

PERCEPTION OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

Considerable research effort has been devoted to determining the perception that various groups have of the Cooperative Extension Service. Almost without exception, the study results indicated an overwhelming perception of the Cooperative Extension Service as a rural institution (see, e.g., Conley, 1961; Griffith, 1961: Rynearson, 1961; Amburgey, 1962; Moore, 1962; Blalock, 1963; Jenkins, 1964; White, 1965; Loewenstein, 1966; Allen, 1967; Gregory, 1967; Miller, 1967; McCown, 1969). The Cooperative Extension Service has been building its

agricultural image since its inception, and, as the literature on the nature of perception indicated, perceptions once formed are difficult to change. Also, it should be pointed out that a large number of the perception studies cited above involved agriculture or agriculturally related groups who would logically perceive the Cooperative Extension Service as agricultural.

Research involving the perception that urban people have of the Cooperative Extension Service was much more limited. Studies conducted by Kohl (1951) and Wolfe (1956) indicated that the urban public perceived 4-H as a rural program. Brown and Boyle (1964) reported similar findings and suggested several reasons why the urban public may perceive 4-H as rural: 1) familiarity of people with 4-H as rural, 2) rural symbols surrounding the Cooperative Extension Service office and programs, 3) connotations of rural orientations in publicity and projects, and 4) conflicting interests of the Cooperative Extension Service staff in maintaining traditional procedures and organizational identity versus the desire to establish urban programs and reluctance to form linkages with other urban youth groups. Brown and Boyle's suggested reasons for the rural image imply a reluctance by both the urban public and Cooperative Extension Service personnel to change their perception of the agency as rural.

Moss (1974) and Gregory (1967) also found evidence that people living in towns and cities viewed the Cooperative Extension Service as a rural organization. In a study of three small mid-western cities, Moss (1974) found that community leaders were most familiar with Cooperative Extension Service programs related to agriculture, family

living, and youth development—the historic and traditional program base. Gregory (1967), in a study of 215 Virginia Garden Club members, found that regardless of city or rural town residence the highest rated Cooperative Extension Service programs dealt with rural youth or full-time farm families.

Evidence also exists that urban residents may not be familiar with the Cooperative Extension Service. Gregory (1967) found that 80 percent of the city respondents in his study had no idea what client groups the Cooperative Extension Service served. Barcus (1962) found similar results in a study of suburban Bostonians. Seventy-four percent of the respondents in the Barcus study indicated that they were not familiar with the Cooperative Extension Service. The findings showed that the county agent was relatively unknown. Few respondents, only 33 out of 400, had contact with the Cooperative Extension Service. Barcus found that they were not familiar with or did not identify with Cooperative Extension Service radio and television programs. The findings showed, however, that their attitudes toward agricultural agencies were generally positive or indifferent, but rarely negative.

Even so, the Cooperative Extension Service can relate to urban residents, as evidenced by the research of Prawl and Jorns (1976). Conducted in a predominantly urban Kansas county (83% urban, 11% rural nonfarm, 6% farm residents), the Prawl and Jorns (1976:14) study showed that 82 percent of 177 persons interviewed by telephone "felt Extension tries to meet the needs of both urban and rural citizens." Only 10 percent felt that farmers were given preference. The study also indicated that more programs designed to meet urban needs would be

welcomed.

Research indicating how urban residents perceive the Cooperative Extension Service was limited and spanned a twenty-five year time period. The studies conducted from 1951 through 1974 provided evidence that urban residents either did not know a great deal about the Cooperative Extension Service or that they perceived it as a rural organization. The most recent study by Prawl and Jorns (1976) provided contrary evidence indicating that urban people perceived the Cooperative Extension Service as serving both rural and urban people. It must be pointed out that although the result of one study does not indicate the reversal of a twenty-five year trend, it does show that the Cooperative Extension Service can make a contribution to urban people and that it was making a contribution in that particular urban setting.

The literature reviewed also provided limited information about how urban elected officials perceive the Cooperative Extension Service. In a study of Florida county commissioners, Kelly (1973) found that urban commissioners typically had either not participated or had participated to a limited degree in Cooperative Extension Service programs. Even so, he found rural and urban commissioners to be about equally familiar with the Cooperative Extension Service. He also found that the type of county served did not cause rural commissioners to place greater importance on traditional rural agricultural programs or urban commissioners to place greater importance on programs more oriented to social concerns. In effect, there seemed to be little difference between rural and urban commissioners' views of priority

programs.

In contrast, Brown and Boyle (1964) found that rural versus urban orientations of local government officials affected their perception of Cooperative Extension Service programs. Members of local government who had a rural orientation generally perceived a need for urban 4-H. Those with urban orientations generally saw no need for urban 4-H programs and did not perceive 4-H as being relevant to urban youth. Further, those who perceived urban 4-H as needed favored strengthening and enlarging the program. Those who felt it was not needed, logically, were opposed to increasing local appropriations. The study indicated, however, that local urban officials seemed more inclined to provide support for 4-H than for the program areas of agriculture and home economics. The study also indicated a reluctance on the part of city governments to initiate funding for Cooperative Extension Service programs currently funded by counties.

A proportionally greater number of Cooperative Extension Service related perception studies have dealt with agriculture or agriculturally related groups who would logically be more inclined to perceive the agency as agricultural. Those studies that have attempted to determine the perception more urban groups have of the agency have resulted in mixed findings. However, they generally supported the view that the Cooperative Extension Service's agricultural image may be a significant disadvantage in developing support for urban programs and reaching urban clientele. Those urban groups who perceived the Cooperative Extension Service as rural perceived it as irrelevant to them as urban residents.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

Literature related to the extension concept in an urban setting, the nature and general principles of perception, and the perception various groups have of the Cooperative Extension Service has been reviewed. The literature reviewed provided the conceptual framework for this study of Virginia Cooperative Extension Service urban programs and clientele as perceived by city council members.

The literature on the extension concept in an urban setting identified two major groups of city program needs: 1) the social needs of people and their communities and 2) the physical and environmental needs of people in cities. It generally recognized the need for an interdisciplinary approach utilizing total university resources and based on a sound research base in dealing with complex and heterogeneous urban concerns. The extension mission in dealing with urban concerns should be to serve as a basic resource rather than to provide routine urban services. Its mission should be carried out in a spirit of cooperation rather than competition with existing organizations and agencies. Programs should be developed within institutional competencies and based on cost-benefit ratio and long range impact.

The basic perception concepts reviewed in the literature—some perceptual cues are more influential than others in that some are recognized while others are ignored, original perceptions tend to persist, perceptions are influenced by role expectation—are relevant to other literature reviewed and to the framework for this study.

Previous Cooperative Extension Service perception studies

reviewed indicate that the Cooperative Extension Service is generally perceived as an educational organization serving rural people. People's original perception of it as an agricultural organization persists. Urban Cooperative Extension Service perception studies reviewed gave evidence that the persisting agricultural image may be a disadvantage in developing support for urban Cooperative Extension Service programs and reaching urban clientele. Perceptions were influenced by role expectation in that urban groups who perceived the Cooperative Extension Service as rural perceived it as irrelevant to them as urban residents.

The relationship that exists between how an organization is perceived and its success in a particular setting was repeatedly substantiated in the literature. The ability of an organization and its representatives to build rapport and effective communication with many urban social structures affects the success of its programs. It is important to project an image that urban people can relate to.

How a tax supported institution is perceived is important to its success in competition for funds. Studies showed that governing bodies were more likely to continue or increase financial support for institutions that they perceived as worthwhile.

These principles, considered together, provided the conceptual framework for this study. The conceptual framework that was built provided the basis and rationale for conducting this study of council members' perceptions of Virginia Cooperative Extension Service city programs and client groups.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research design, population, instrumentation, data collection, analysis and treatment of data used in the study.

RESEARCH DESIGN

This study utilized an ex post facto survey research design. Kerlinger (1973:411) explained that survey research is concerned with the "accurate assessment of the characteristics of whole populations of people." Most often in survey research, a sample of a given population is studied and characteristics of the whole population are inferred from the sample. However, the present study utilized the entire population for an assessment of perceptual characteristics. Specifically, this study identified city council members' perception of the priorities which the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service currently placed on city programs and clientele, the priorities it should place on city programs and clientele, the contribution the agency currently made in cities, and how the agency could increase its contribution.

Kerlinger (1973) further indicated that the primary distinguishing feature of ex post facto research, as opposed to experimental research, is the investigator's inability to exert control over the variables studied. The variables in this study were not

controlled or manipulated. The dependent variable, perception, was observed and the two independent variables, size of city and method of entry, were studied to determine their possible effects on perception.

POPULATION

The study population consisted of the total population of seventy-eight city council members serving the ten Virginia cities having populations of 50,000 or more and established Cooperative Extension Service units. Council members serving in the cities of Alexandria, Chesapeake, Hampton, Lynchburg, Newport News, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Richmond, Roanoke, and Virginia Beach were included in the study population. The cities and number of council members serving in each city, as of August, 1977, are shown in Table 1.

Council members serving in the previously identified cities were studied because the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service does not know how council members serving in the state's larger cities perceive its efforts in those cities. The perception literature reviewed indicated that the perception individuals have of an organization and its activities influences decisions they make pertaining to that organization. Council members' perception influence both the general and financial support they are willing to give the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service. Determining city council members' perception of the agency is important since council members play such a vital role in the cooperative relationship the agency has with the city government.

Table 1

City and Number of Council Members—August, 1977

City	Number of council members August, 1977[a]
Alexandria	7
Chesapeake	9
Hampton	7
Lynchburg	7
Newport News	7
Norfolk	7
Portsmouth	7
Richmond	9
Roanoke	7
Virginia Beach	11
Total: 10	78

[a]Reynolds, 1977

INSTRUMENTATION

Data for this study were collected by a structured interview schedule consisting of four sections. The instrument (Appendix A) solicited data pertaining to the council members' perception of Virginia Cooperative Extension Service program and clientele priorities, the agency's current contribution in cities, and how the agency could increase the contribution it makes in cities.

Section one recorded background information about the city and the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service in that city. It included the name of the city, the city's population, and the agency's initial date and method of entry into the city.

Section two sought information on how council members perceived Virginia Cooperative Extension Service programs in their city. Information included council members' perception of the priorities that the agency currently placed on content areas within each of its five program areas—Technical Resources, Family Resources, Community Resource Development, Agriculture and Natural Resources, and 4-H—and the perceived importance of each total program area in the city. It also solicited information on council members' perception of the importance that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on the same content and program areas. The response choices for each item in section two consisted of a Likert-type scale that allowed the respondent to choose from several degrees of perceived priority, with 1 as no priority, 2 as low priority, 3 as average priority, and 4 as high priority. Additionally, number 5 was given as a no response option.

Section three solicited similar information on council members' perception of Virginia Cooperative Extension Service clientele. The same four point Likert-type scale with a no response option used in section two was also used in section three. This section sought information on council members' perception of where the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service currently placed its city clientele priorities and their perception of where the agency should place its city clientele priorities.

Section four sought information on city council members' perception of the overall contribution that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service was making to city residents. A four point Likert-type scale of response choices indicating degrees of contribution was given for this item. A no response option was included. An open-ended question was used to collect data on how council members felt that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service could increase its contribution to city residents.

The instrument for collecting data was developed specifically for this study. Section one, background information, was developed around the two independent variables—size of city (small, medium, or large) and the method of entry (EFNEP or traditional)—chosen for study. Sections two and three were developed from the investigator's past experience, the literature reviewed for the study, and data collected from the plans of work and progress reports for fiscal year 1976 of the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service city units involved. The plans of work and progress reports reviewed were the most recent data available on those city units' program and clientele plans and

accomplishments.

Items were refined, altered, or added based on recommendations from each of the five Virginia Cooperative Extension Service State Program Directors (Appendix B) on his or her respective program area. The Dean of the Extension Division and four of his associates, the Director and Deputy Director of the Virginia Municipal League (Appendix C) reviewed the instrument for ambiguities and inadequate wording. Their suggestions were used to increase the clarity of items included in the instrument.

The instrument was pretested for clarity, understanding, and ease of administration with the nine city council members serving in Danville, Virginia because it is the next largest city having an established Cooperative Extension Service unit and only a slightly smaller population than the minimum 50,000 criteria established for this study. Danville council members judged the instrument to be clear and understandable. They offered on suggestions for improvement. The instrument was easily administered and required approximately one-half hour to complete. No further changes were made in the instrument as a result of the pretest.

DATA COLLECTION

The investigator collected background information for the study from sources other than city council members. Cities meeting the 50,000 or more population criteria for the study were selected according to 1970 census figures (Jones, 1977). The cities were then grouped into the small, medium, and large categories by population as

shown in Table 2. Information on method of entry was obtained from Virginia Cooperative Extension Service district staff members serving in each of the five administrative districts containing study cities. These data are shown in Table 3.

Individual structured interviews were held with council members in each of the ten cities to collect the remainder of the data. The structured interview was chosen because of its advantages over alternative methods of data collection. It utilized an interpersonal, one to one, method of collecting data specific to the problem following a previously developed standard schedule (Kerlinger, 1973). Since it was an interpersonal method, the advantages, as indicated by Byrn (1959), included the opportunity for clarification of items and a high degree of completion and return.

Data were collected by the investigator and District Agents serving each of the five Virginia Cooperative Extension Service administrative districts containing study cities. Both the investigator and District Agents were trained and experienced in conducting interviews. However, an orientation session was held in December, 1977, to acquaint the District Agents with the purposes of the study, the instrument, and the procedures to be followed in preparing for and conducting the interviews. Appendix D contains an outline of the orientation session.

The following procedure was used in scheduling and conducting the interviews:

1. The investigator made initial contact with each council member in an introductory letter (Appendix E) which stated the purpose

Table 2

Size of City

Small 50,000—100,000	Medium 100,001—150,000	Large over 150,000
Lynchburg (54,083)	Alexandria (110,927)	Virginia Beach (172,106)
Chesapeake (89,580)	Portsmouth (110,963)	Richmond (249,431)
Roanoke (92,115)	Hampton (120,779)	Norfolk (307,951)
	Newport News (138,177)	

Table 3

Virginia Cooperative Extension Service
Date and Method of Entry

Date	Traditional	Date	EFNEP
1/1/63[a]	Chesapeake[a]		
7/1/58[b]	Newport News[b]		
7/1/58[b]	Hampton[b]		
1/1/63[a]	Virginia Beach[a]		
		7/1/69[c]	Alexandria[c]
		7/1/69[b]	Richmond[b]
		7/1/70[d]	Roanoke[d]
		4/1/71[e]	Lynchburg[e]
		9/1/71[a]	Norfolk[a]
		11/1/75[a]	Portsmouth[a]

[a]O'meara, 1977

[b]Smith, 1977

[c]Weddle, 1977

[d]Allen, 1977

[e]Keffer, 1977

of the study, requested his cooperation, and indicated that he would be contacted by telephone in the near future to arrange for an interview. Letters of endorsement from the Dean of the VPI&SU Extension Division (Appendix F) and the Director of the Virginia Municipal League (Appendix G) accompanied the initial letter. Copies of material sent to council members were sent to the ten city managers with a cover letter (Appendix H). Copies of all correspondence were sent to the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service unit chairman in each city. Letters were mailed in late December, 1977. Interviews were scheduled, beginning approximately two weeks after council members received the initial correspondence.

2. The city manager was the first official contacted by telephone in each city. Telephone contact with the manager was made by either city unit chairman or the cooperating District Agent. An appointment was scheduled for the interviewer for that city with the city manager, so that the manager would have the opportunity to become fully informed about the study and the study procedure.

3. After contacting the city manager, the city unit chairman or the cooperating District Agent telephoned council members to arrange for interviews. Calls were made at least one week in advance of the anticipated interview date. The investigator's initial correspondence with the council member served as the point of reference for the call. The purpose of the study was restated briefly. The council member was asked to cooperate in the study, and a time and place were scheduled for the interview. Forty-five minutes of the council member's time was requested since the pretest experience indicated that the interview

schedule required approximately one-half hour to administer.

4. At the appointed time the investigator or the cooperating District Agent met the council member, reviewed the objectives of the study (Appendix D), explained that individual responses would be held confidential, and that council members would be identified in the study only by city.

5. In conducting the interview, the interviewer gave the council member a copy of the instrument. The council member was asked to identify his interview schedule by writing the name of the city in the space provided. The interviewer then read the general directions. and introduced the first question on the schedule. The council member was asked if he understood the directions. He was also encouraged to ask questions about any items that were not clear as he responded. He was then instructed to circle the appropriate response on his copy of the schedule to each item in question one. The same procedure was followed for each question on the schedule.

6. After the council member had completed the interview schedule, he was asked to review all items on the schedule to insure that he had responded to each item. When he had finished reviewing the schedule for missed responses he was requested to place the schedule in the envelope provided by the interviewer. The interviewer then thanked the council member for his time and cooperation and told him that he would be provided with a summary of the study findings.

Seventy-six of the seventy-eight council members or 97.44 percent of the population participated in the study. One council member each from Chesapeake and Lynchburg did not participate in the study.

Of the two non-participants, one granted an interview appointment, but declined participation in the study. After repeated efforts were made, the second non-participant refused to grant an interview appointment.

ANALYSIS AND TREATMENT OF DATA

To facilitate the analysis of data, the following null hypotheses were tested:

1. No difference exists between city council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service currently places on city program and content areas and the priority it should place on city program and content areas.

2. No relationship exists between city council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on program and content areas and the size of the city.

3. No relationship exists between city council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on program and content areas and the Cooperative Extension Service method of entry into the city.

4. No difference exists between city council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service currently places on city client groups and the priority it should place on city client groups.

5. No relationship exists between city council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on client groups and the size of the city.

6. No relationship exists between city council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on client groups and the Cooperative Extension Service method of entry into the city.

Data from the precoded instrument were primarily computer analyzed using the facilities of the VPI&SU Computer Center. Programs from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) were used to run frequency and percentage distributions, means, crosstabulations, chi squares, Yates' correction for continuity, and contingency coefficients (Nie et al, 1975). Spearman rho rank order correlation coefficients and weighted means were computed by hand.

Criteria were established for determining significance when statistical tests of relationships were used. The .05 level was considered significant for chi square tests. The degree of association, as indicated by contingency coefficients, used in conjunction with significant chi squares was determined according to the following scale:

0 to .2121—little or no association
.2121 to .3525—low association
.3525 to .4949—moderate association
.4949 to .6363—moderately high association
.6363 to .7070—high association

This scale allows for differences between a purely statistical association and a practically important association (Hinkle, 1977).

The established criterion for determining significance of Spearman rho values was .7000. The following scale was used to

describe Spearman rho rank order correlations:

0 to .3000—little or no correlation

.3000 to .5000—low correlation

.5000 to .7000—moderate correlation

.7000 to .9000—moderately high correlation

.9000 to 1.0000—high correlation

The descriptive scale was used to determine practically significant correlations rather than purely statistical correlations (Hinkle, 1977). The .7000 criterion, or a moderately high correlation, was determined to be a practical correlation because of the small number of content areas involved in the rank order correlations.

As the data were collected and analyzed, it became apparent that there were large numbers of "not familiar" responses to items on the interview schedule. The inclusion of a "not familiar" response option was originally designed primarily to avoid forcing a council member into a priority response about a program content area or client group with which he was not familiar. It was believed that such an option would enable him to give a more valid response on perceived priority. Although some "not familiar" responses were anticipated, the large number that was obtained indicated the desirability of including an in-depth examination of these particular data.

Unfamiliarity with program and content areas and clientele was treated with frequency and percentage distributions. Chi square was used to test the relationship between unfamiliarity and the variables—size of city and method of entry. Yates' correction for continuity was used on chi squares involving method of entry. The degree of

association was determined using the contingency coefficient.

Hypotheses one and four were tested using Spearman rho rank order correlation. Means, weighted means, and rank orders were used to describe program and clientele priorities.

Chi square was used to test hypotheses two, three, five, and six. When chi squares involving method of entry were computed, Yates' correction for continuity was used. The contingency coefficient was used to determine degree of association.

Frequencies and percentages were used in analyzing perception of current Virginia Cooperative Extension Service contributions. Chi square was used to test relationships between contribution and size of city and method of entry. Yates' correction for continuity was used on the chi square involving method of entry. Contingency coefficient was used to determine degree of association.

Data from the open-ended question were grouped into broad categories. They were analyzed descriptively in terms of frequency of responses, size of city, and method of entry.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS PERTAINING TO PROGRAM AND CONTENT AREAS

Findings relative to city council members' perception of Virginia Cooperative Extension Service program and content areas are reported in this chapter. Presented first are those findings treating council members' unfamiliarity with the five program areas and the relationships found between unfamiliarity and the variables of size of city and method of entry. Findings related to hypotheses one, two, and three which pertain to council members' perception of current and should be Virginia Cooperative Extension Service program priorities, and relationships between should be priorities and each of the variables—size of city and method of entry—are then presented.

UNFAMILIARITY

Council members' unfamiliarity with both current priorities and the priorities that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on program and content areas are presented in order from most unfamiliar to most familiar. Relationships between unfamiliarity with content areas and the variables—size of city and method of entry—as determined by chi square tests, are also presented. For the purposes of the chi square tests, the "familiar" group consisted of those council members familiar enough with a content area to assign it a current priority. The "unfamiliar" group consisted of those council members who responded as not familiar with current priority.

Technical Resources

Council members were most unfamiliar with current Virginia Cooperative Extension Service efforts in Technical Resources content areas. Over 56 percent were too unfamiliar to respond to any Technical Resources content area, with greatest unfamiliarity noted in the area of industrial health and safety (Table 4). Council members were also more unfamiliar with what priorities the agency should place on Technical Resources content areas than those of any other program area. Unfamiliarity with Technical Resources content areas did not appear to be significantly associated with size of city or method of entry, as indicated in Table 5.

Greater unfamiliarity with Technical Resources than with the other four program areas might have been expected since it is the newest Virginia Cooperative Extension Service program area. Also, no local unit staff members have full-time Technical Resources responsibilities. The only full-time field staff members with Technical Resources expertise are located at the district level. Consequently, city council members may have had less exposure to Technical Resources program efforts.

Community Resource Development

Community Resource Development was the second most unfamiliar program area. An overall average of 44.7 percent of the council members appeared to be unfamiliar with current Virginia Cooperative Extension Service priorities in Community Resource Development content areas (Table 6). Council members were most unfamiliar with the content

Table 4

Frequency and Percent of Respondents
Indicating Unfamiliarity with
Technical Resources
Content Areas

Content Area	Not familiar enough with content area to respond on current priority		Not familiar enough with content area to respond on should be priority	
	N	%	N	%
Control of air, water, noise pollution and solid waste management	43	56.6	14	18.4
System engineering and technical problems of business, industry, and city government	45	59.2	15	19.7
Industrial health and safety	48	63.2	15	19.7
Conservation of energy	43	56.6	11	14.5
Overall average of council members responding not familiar to content areas	44.75	58.9	13.75	18.1

Table 5

Summary of Relationships Between Familiar—Not Familiar Responses to Technical Resources Content Areas By Size of City and Method of Entry

Content Area	N	Size of City[a]			Method of Entry[b]		
		Chi sq.	Significance level	Contingency coefficient	Chi sq.	Significance level	Contingency coefficient
Control of air, water, noise pollution and solid waste management	76	0.23322	0.8899	-	3.79286	0.0515	-
System engineering and technical problems of business, industry, and city government	76	3.24547	0.1974	-	2.04871	0.1523	-
Industrial health and safety	76	1.00200	0.6059	-	2.57098	0.1088	-
Conservation of energy	76	0.44321	0.8012	-	2.19221	0.1387	-

[a]Two degrees of freedom

[b]One degree of freedom

Table 6

Frequency and Percent of Respondents Indicating Unfamiliarity with Community Resource Development Content Areas

Content Area	Not familiar enough with content area to respond on current priority		Not familiar enough with content area to respond on should be priority	
	N	%	N	%
Organization and leadership development training, including volunteerism	32	42.1	8	10.5
Community education (use of public schools as a focal point to provide services to meet needs identified by citizens)	37	48.7	13	17.1
Land-use planning, zoning, land-use taxation	36	47.4	13	17.1
Community improvement	29	38.2	10	13.2
Tourism and recreation	36	47.4	12	15.8
Community facilities and services such as housing, health, recreation, water, sewer, transportation	34	44.7	12	15.8
Overall average of council members responding not familiar to content areas	34	44.7	11.33	14.9

areas of (1) community education, (2) land-use planning, zoning, and land-use taxation, and (3) tourism and recreation. When asked what priority the agency should place on Community Resource Development content areas, council members were again most unfamiliar with the content areas of (1) land-use planning, zoning, and land-use taxation and (2) community education.

Council members' unfamiliarity with the content areas of (1) community education, (2) community improvement, (3) tourism and recreation, and (4) community facilities and services was related to size of city at the .05 level with a low degree of association (Table 7). In each case, as shown in Tables 8 through 12, as the size of the city increased council members' unfamiliarity increased. Council members serving medium and large cities were considerably more unfamiliar than those serving small cities.

There was also a relationship between method of entry and unfamiliarity with the content areas of (1) land-use planning, zoning, and land-use taxation, (2) community improvement, and (3) tourism and recreation, as shown in Table 7. Land-use planning, zoning, and land-use taxation was significant at the .01 level with a moderate association (Table 12). Community improvement and tourism and recreation showed a low association at the .05 level of significance (Tables 13, 14). In each of the three content areas, council members serving EFNEP entry cities were decisively more unfamiliar than those serving traditional entry cities.

Council members in large cities and council members in EFNEP entry cities were the two groups most unfamiliar with Community

Table 7

Summary of Relationships Between Familiar—Not Familiar Responses to Community Resource Development Content Areas By Size of City and Method of Entry

Content Area	N	Size of City[a]			Method of Entry[b]		
		Chi square	Significance level	Contingency coefficient	Chi square	Significance level	Contingency coefficient
Organization and leadership development training, including volunteerism	76	4.15053	.1255	-	2.53202	.1116	-
Community education (use of public schools as a focal point to provide services to meet needs identified by citizens)	76	6.95218	.0309*	.28950	1.41135	.2348	-
Land-use planning, zoning, land-use taxation	75	2.75319	.2524	-	15.07944	.0001**	.42926
Community improvement	76	6.78404	.0336*	.28627	5.88514	.0153*	.29226
Tourism and recreation	76	8.71838	.0128*	.32080	5.65715	.0174*	.28683
Community facilities and services such as housing, health, recreation, water, sewer, transportation	76	7.38790	.0249*	.29765	1.10958	.2922	-

*Significant at .05

**Significant at .01

[a]Two degrees of freedom

[b]One degree of freedom

Table 8

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Community Education and Size of City

COUNT / COL PCT	50,000--100,000 (1.)	100,001--150,000 (2.)	OVER 150,000 (3.)	ROW TOTAL
1. SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR)	15	15	9	39
	71.4	53.6	33.3	51.3
2. NOT FAMILIAR	6	13	18	37
	28.6	46.4	66.7	48.7
COLUMN TOTAL	21	28	27	76
	27.6	36.8	35.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE= 6.95218 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0309

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.28950

Table 9

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Community Improvement and Size of City

COUNT / COL PCT	50,000--100,000 (1.)	100,001--150,000 (2.)	OVER 150,000 (3.)	ROW TOTAL
1. SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR)	17	18	12	47
	81.0	64.3	44.4	61.8
2. NOT FAMILIAR	4	10	15	29
	19.0	35.7	55.6	38.2
COLUMN TOTAL	21	28	27	76
	27.6	36.8	35.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE= 6.78404 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0336

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.28627

Table 10

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Tourism and Recreation and Size of City

COUNT / COL PCT	50,000--100,000 (1.)	100,001--150,000 (2.)	OVER 150,000 (3.)	ROW TOTAL
1. SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR)	16	15	9	40
	76.2	53.6	33.3	52.6
2. NOT FAMILIAR	5	13	18	36
	23.8	46.4	66.7	47.4
COLUMN TOTAL	21	28	27	76
	27.6	36.8	35.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE= 8.71838 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0128

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.32080

Table 11

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Community Facilities and Services and Size of City

COUNT / COL PCT	50,000--100,000 (1.)	100,001--150,000 (2.)	OVER 150,000 (3.)	ROW TOTAL
1. SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR)	16	16	10	42
	76.2	57.1	37.0	55.3
2. NOT FAMILIAR	5	12	17	34
	23.8	42.9	63.0	44.7
COLUMN TOTAL	21	28	27	76
	27.6	36.8	35.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE= 7.38790 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0249

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.29765

Table 12

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Land-use Planning, Zoning, Land-use Taxation and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR) 1.	26	13	39
	78.8	31.0	52.0
NOT FAMILIAR 2.	7	29	36
	21.2	69.0	48.0
COLUMN TOTAL	33	42	75
	44.0	56.0	100.0

[a]CHI SQUARE= 15.07944 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0001

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.42926

[a]Chi square corrected--Yates'

Table 13

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Community Improvement and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR) 1.	26	21	47
	78.8	48.8	61.8
NOT FAMILIAR 2.	7	22	29
	21.2	51.2	38.2
COLUMN TOTAL	33	43	76
	43.4	56.6	100.0

[a]CHI SQUARE= 5.88514 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0153

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.29226

[a]Chi square corrected--Yates'

Table 14

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Tourism and Recreation and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
1. SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR)	23	17	40
	69.7	39.5	52.6
2. NOT FAMILIAR	10	26	36
	30.3	60.5	47.4
COLUMN TOTAL	33	43	76
	43.4	56.6	100.0

[a]CHI SQUARE= 5.65715 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0174

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.28683

[a]Chi square corrected--Yates'

Resource Development. It should be noted that since programs in Richmond and Norfolk, two of the three large cities, are less than ten years old and EFNEP programs have received primary agency emphasis, council members might logically be unfamiliar with Community Resource Development programs in those cities. It might also be noted that, as a group, programs in EFNEP entry cities are newer than those in traditional entry cities. These two factors could partially explain the greater degree of unfamiliarity with Community Resource Development content areas displayed in large and EFNEP entry cities.

4-H

The third most unfamiliar program area was 4-H, with an average of 40 percent of the council members giving not familiar responses to content areas (Table 15). Council members appeared most unfamiliar with current Virginia Cooperative Extension Service efforts in career exploration, with 48.7 percent responding as not familiar. They seemed to be more able to place priorities on what the agency should do in 4-H content areas than they were in the two previously discussed program areas of Technical Resources and Community Resource Development. However, more than 10 percent of the council members indicated that they were too unfamiliar to assess what priority the agency should place on career exploration and providing educational resources for other city youth organizations and special interest groups.

There appeared to be no relationship between council members' unfamiliarity with 4-H content areas and size of city. However, unfamiliarity with the content area of career exploration was related

Table 15

Frequency and Percent of Respondents Indicating Unfamiliarity with 4-H Content Areas

Content Area	Not familiar enough with content area to respond on current priority		Not familiar enough with content area to respond on should be priority	
	N	%	N	%
Food and nutrition	22	28.9	2	2.6
Career exploration	37	48.7	9	11.8
Developing citizenship, leadership, personal growth and development qualities	27	35.5	5	6.6
Developing skills through real life learning experiences with projects in such areas as electricity, photography, samll engine repair, clothing, etc.	35	46.1	5	6.6
Providing educational resources for other city youth organizations and special interest groups	31	40.8	9	11.8
Overall average of council members responding not familiar to content areas	30.4	40.0	6	7.9

to method of entry (Table 16). Chi square was significant at the .01 level with a low degree of association. Table 17 shows that council members serving EFNEP entry cities appeared to be considerably more unfamiliar with career exploration than those serving in traditional entry cities. Almost 63 percent of the EFNEP entry council members were unfamiliar as opposed to 30.3 percent of the traditional entry council members.

Although a considerably large number of council members were not familiar with current 4-H efforts, they did appear confident of their ability to assess what priorities should be placed on 4-H content areas. Council members were generally more familiar with food and nutrition than with other 4-H content areas. The high degree of unfamiliarity generally noted in career exploration may be attributed to the particularly high degree of unfamiliarity of those council members serving EFNEP entry cities where major emphasis in 4-H has been placed on food and nutrition.

Family Resources

Family Resources was the fourth most unfamiliar program area. Approximately one-third of the council members were too unfamiliar with Family Resources content areas to respond (Table 18). Job preparation was the most unfamiliar content area. Slightly over one-half of the council members were unfamiliar with current efforts related to job preparation and over 10 percent had no opinion about what priority it should be given. Council members generally exibited a high degree of familiarity with what priorities the agency should place on Family

Table 16

Summary of Relationships Between Familiar—Not Familiar Responses to 4-H Content Areas By Size of City and Method of Entry

Content Area	N	Size of City[a]			Method of Entry[b]		
		Chi square	Significance level	Contingency coefficient	Chi square	Significance level	Contingency coefficient
Food and nutrition	76	4.09969	.1288	-	0.00072	.9786	-
Career exploration	76	0.90037	.6375	-	6.64118	.0100**	.30664
Developing citizenship, leadership, personal growth and development qualities	74	0.95934	.6190	-	1.12466	.2889	-
Developing skills through real life learning experiences with projects in such areas as electricity, photography, small engine repair, clothing	76	0.64675	.7237	-	0.62110	.4306	-
Providing educational resources for other city youth organizations and special interest groups	76	1.50931	.4702	-	0.85237	.3559	-

**Significant at .01

[a]Two degrees of freedom

[b]One degree of freedom

Table 17

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Career Exploration and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR) 1.	23	16	39
	69.7	37.2	51.3
NOT FAMILIAR 2.	10	27	37
	30.3	62.8	48.7
COLUMN TOTAL	33	43	76
	43.4	56.6	100.0

[a]CHI SQUARE= 6.64118 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0100

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.30664

[a]Chi square corrected--Yates'

Table 18

Frequency and Percent of Respondents Indicating Unfamiliarity with Family Resources Content Areas

Content Area	Not familiar enough with content area to respond on current priority		Not familiar enough with content area to respond on should be priority	
	N	%	N	%
Practices that will contribute to good family health	18	23.7	1	1.3
Child and family relations	26	34.2	4	5.3
Consumer education	16	21.1	1	1.3
Home furnishing, maintenance, management, and home purchasing	25	32.9	3	3.9
Clothing construction	29	38.2	3	3.9
Food and nutrition	16	21.1	0	0
Job preparation--education and training of people in basic skills needed to apply for and hold jobs	39	51.3	9	11.8
Educational programs informing citizens of the resources available in their city to assist with family social and economic problems	33	43.4	7	9.2
Overall average of council members responding not familiar to content areas	25.25	33.2	3.5	4.6

Resources content areas, with the exception of job preparation.

Size of city did not appear to affect council members' unfamiliarity with Family Resources content areas. Method of entry did appear to affect council members' unfamiliarity with Family Resources educational programs informing citizens of the resources available in their city to assist with family social and economic problems. A significant chi square at the .01 level with a low degree of association was noted (Table 19). EFNEP entry council members appeared to be much more unfamiliar with this content area, with 58.1 percent responding not familiar as opposed to 24.2 percent of the traditional entry council members (Table 20).

Family Resources was the second most familiar program area. Further, council members were generally more able to assess what priorities the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on Family Resources content areas than they were in any of the other four program areas. The high degree of unfamiliarity with job preparation may indicate a lack of agency emphasis in this area. Council members serving EFNEP entry cities appeared to be considerably more unfamiliar than traditional entry council members with current agency programs to inform citizens of resources available to assist with family social and economic problems. This finding would not have been expected, since the content area receives major emphasis in EFNEP programs.

Agriculture and Natural Resources

Of the five program areas studied, council members were most familiar with Agriculture and Natural Resources. Even so, 27.8 percent

Table 19

Summary of Relationships Between Familiar—Not Familiar Responses to Family Resources Content Areas By Size of City and Method of Entry

Content Area	N	Size of City[a]			Method of Entry[b]		
		Chi square	Significance level	Contingency coefficient	Chi square	Significance level	Contingency coefficient
Practices that will contribute to good family health	76	0.65171	.7219	-	1.58912	.2075	-
Child and family relations	76	1.28461	.5261	-	0.76202	.3827	-
Consumer education	76	0.60862	.7376	-	0.67506	.4113	-
Home furnishing, maintenance, management, and home purchasing	75	0.33333	.8465	-	0.33385	.5634	-
Clothing construction	75	0.08210	.9598	-	0.80656	.3691	-
Food and nutrition	76	0.20273	.9036	-	0.06449	.7995	-
Job preparation--education and training of people in basic skills needed to apply for and hold jobs	76	5.28436	.0712	-	2.52840	.1118	-
Educational programs informing citizens of resources available in their city to assist with family social and economic problems	76	1.21853	.5437	-	7.40723	.0065**	.32103

**Significant at .01 [a]Two degrees of freedom [b]One degree of freedom

Table 20

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Educational Programs Informing Citizens of the Resources Available in Their City to Assist with Family Social and Economic Problems and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR) 1.	25	18	43
	75.8	41.9	56.6
NOT FAMILIAR 2.	8	25	33
	24.2	58.1	43.4
COLUMN TOTAL	33	43	76
	43.4	56.6	100.0

[a]CHI SQUARE= 7.40723 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0065

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.32103

[a]Chi square corrected--Yates'

of the council members indicated unfamiliarity with Agriculture and Natural Resources content areas (Table 21). The greatest degree of unfamiliarity with current priority was noted in the content area of production, harvesting, processing, and marketing of agriculture and seafood products. Council members were also most unfamiliar with what priority the agency should place on that content area. Considerable unfamiliarity was also noted regarding the priority that should be placed on farm and agriculture business management.

Unfamiliarity with Agriculture and Natural Resources content areas was not related to size of city. However, method of entry, as shown in Table 22, was related to (1) farm and agriculture business management at the .01 level with moderate association, (2) production, harvesting, processing, and marketing of agriculture and seafood products at the .01 level with moderate association, (3) household and public pest control at the .01 level with low association, and (4) proper use and conservation of natural resources at the .05 level with low association. Tables 23 through 26 indicate that EFNEP entry council members appeared to be decisively more unfamiliar with each of the four content areas than traditional entry council members.

Council members are generally most familiar with the Agriculture and Natural Resources program area. However, a high degree of unfamiliarity was noted with current and should be priorities in the content areas of (1) production, harvesting, processing, and marketing of agriculture and seafood products and (2) farm and agriculture business management. Since these two content areas are most closely related to production agriculture, council members might have been

Table 21

Frequency and Percent of Respondents Indicating Unfamiliarity with Agriculture and Natural Resources Content Areas

Content Area	Not familiar enough with content area to respond on current priority		Not familiar enough with content area to respond on should be priority	
	N	%	N	%
Home gardening and horticulture	10	13.2	2	2.6
Household and public pest control, e.g., rats mosquitoes	20	26.3	2	2.6
Farm and agriculture business management	23	30.3	13	17.1
Production, harvesting, processing and marketing of agriculture and seafood products	28	36.8	14	18.4
Proper use and conservation of natural resources	25	32.9	4	5.3
Overall average of council members responding not familiar to content areas	21.2	27.8	7	9.2

Table 22

Summary of Relationships Between Familiar—Not Familiar Responses to Agriculture and Natural Resources Content Areas By Size of City and Method of Entry

Content Area	N	Size of City[a]			Method of Entry[b]		
		Chi square	Significance level	Contingency coefficient	Chi square	Significance level	Contingency coefficient
Home gardening and horticulture	75	NC[c]	-	-	3.61048	.0574	
Household and public pest control, e.g., rats, mosquitoes	75	2.48377	.2888	-	7.06128	.0079**	.31963
Farm and agriculture business management	76	0.58190	.7476	-	10.67876	.0011**	.37438
Production, harvesting, processing, marketing of agriculture and seafood products	76	2.36632	.3063	-	17.25374	.0000**	.45006
Proper use and conservation of natural resources	75	2.33809	.3107	-	6.54750	.0105*	.30828

*Significant at .05

**Significant at .01

[a]Two degrees of freedom

[b]One degree of freedom

[c]Non-computable

Table 23

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Household and Public Pest Control and Method of Entry

	COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR)	1.	29	26	55
		90.6	60.5	73.3
NOT FAMILIAR	2.	3	17	20
		9.4	39.5	26.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	32	43	75
		42.7	57.3	100.0

[a]CHI SQUARE= 7.06128 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0079

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.31963

[a]Chi square corrected--Yates'

Table 24

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Farm and Agriculture Business Management and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR) 1.	30	23	53
	90.9	53.5	69.7
NOT FAMILIAR 2.	3	20	23
	9.1	46.5	30.3
COLUMN TOTAL	33	43	76
	43.4	56.6	100.0

[a]CHI SQUARE= 10.67876 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0011

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.37438

[a]Chi square corrected--Yates'

Table 25

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Production, Harvesting, Processing, Marketing of Agriculture and Seafood Products and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
1. SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR)	30	18	48
	90.9	41.9	63.2
2. NOT FAMILIAR	3	25	28
	9.1	58.1	36.8
COLUMN TOTAL	33	43	76
	43.4	56.6	100.0

[a]CHI SQUARE= 17.25374 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0000

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.45006

[a]Chi square corrected--Yates'

Table 26

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Proper Use and Conservation of Natural Resources and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR) 1.	27	23	50
	84.4	53.5	66.7
NOT FAMILIAR 2.	5	20	25
	15.6	46.5	33.3
COLUMN TOTAL	32	43	75
	42.7	57.3	100.0

[a]CHI SQUARE= 6.54750 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0105

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.30828

[a]Chi square corrected--Yates'

expected to be relatively more unfamiliar with them. The large number of relationships found between Agriculture and Natural Resources content areas and method of entry would appear to indicate the presence of more agriculturally oriented programs in traditional entry cities.

Summary of Unfamiliarity with Program and Content Areas

The findings showed an unusually high level of unfamiliarity with all Virginia Cooperative Extension Service program areas. Council members seemed to be most unfamiliar with Technical Resources and Community Resource Development, the two newer, less well established program areas.

Agriculture and Natural Resources, Family Resources, and 4-H are apparently the most familiar program areas to city council members. The indication is that council members are more familiar with the traditional program areas than they are with the less traditional program areas of Technical Resources and Community Resource Development.

Size of city appeared to influence only unfamiliarity with Community Resource Development content areas. Large city council members were most unfamiliar with the areas of (1) community education, (2) community improvement, (3) tourism and recreation, and (4) community facilities and services.

Although the Agriculture and Natural Resources program area appeared to be the most familiar program area, unfamiliarity was related to method of entry. The relationships found between method of entry and Agriculture and Natural Resources content areas apparently

indicates that Virginia Cooperative Extension programs in traditional entry cities have a stronger agricultural orientation than those in EFNEP entry cities. Further, the relationships found between method of entry and program content areas generally appeared to indicate that council members perceive the scope of Virginia Cooperative Extension Service program area activities in EFNEP cities to be more limited.

HYPOTHESIS ONE

Hypothesis one stated that no difference exists between city council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service currently places on city program and content areas and the priority it should place on city program and content areas. This hypothesis was tested by Spearman rho rank order correlations. Correlation coefficients were computed for each of the five program areas. It should be noted that the data utilized in making these computations included only those council members who were familiar enough to respond to current priorities and to give matching responses to should be priorities. The data including all responses were not used because of the large discrepancy that existed between the numbers of not familiar responses to current and should be priorities. The discrepancy was so great that it tended to distort the data.

Program content area rank orders and the Spearman rho correlation coefficients between current and should be rank orders are shown in Tables 27-31. The rho correlations between the rank orders of current and should be priorities are presented in order from least correlation to greatest correlation. The current and should be rank

Table 27

Rank Order and Spearman Rho Correlation Coefficient Using Matching Responses to Current and Should Be 4-H Content Area Priorities

Content Area	Current Priority			Should Be Priority		
	Number Responding	Mean	Rank	Number Responding	Mean	Rank
Food and nutrition	54	3.389	1	54	3.577	2
Developing citizenship, leadership, personal growth and development characteristics	47	3.213	2	47	3.565	3
Providing educational resources for other city youth organizations and special interest groups	45	2.978	3	45	3.333	4
Developing skills through real life experiences with projects in such areas as electricity, photography, small engine repair, clothing, etc.	41	2.902	4	41	3.585	1
Career exploration	39	2.821	5	39	3.316	5

Spearman rho correlation coefficient = .400

Table 28

Rank Order and Spearman Rho Correlation Coefficient Using Matching Responses to Current and Should Be Community Resource Development Content Area Priorities

Content Area	Current Priority			Should Be Priority		
	Number Responding	Mean	Rank	Number Responding	Mean	Rank
Community improvement	47	3.085	1	47	3.447	3
Organization and leadership development training, including volunteerism	44	3.023	2	44	3.455	2
Community education (use of public schools as a focal point to provide services to meet needs identified by citizens	39	2.949	3	39	3.513	1
Community facilities and services such as housing, recreation, health, water, sewer, transportation	42	2.690	4	42	3.024	5
Land-use planning, zoning, land-use taxation	39	2.615	5	39	3.077	4
Tourism and recreation	40	2.375	6	40	2.675	6

Spearman rho correlation coefficient = .714

Table 29

Rank Order and Spearman Rho Correlation Coefficient Using Matching Responses to Current and Should Be Technical Resources Content Area Priorities

Content Area	Current Priority			Should Be Priority		
	Number Responding	Mean	Rank	Number Responding	Mean	Rank
Conservation of energy	33	3.000	1	33	3.788	1
System engineering and technical problems of business, industry, and city government	31	2.516	2	31	3.061	3
Control of air, water, noise pollution and solid waste management	33	2.485	3	33	3.273	2
Industrial health and safety	28	2.464	4	28	2.893	4

Spearman rho correlation coefficient = .800

Table 30

Rank Order and Spearman Rho Correlation Coefficient Using Matching Responses to Current and Should Be Family Resources Content Area Priorities

Content Area	Current Priority			Should Be Priority		
	Number Responding	Mean	Rank	Number Responding	Mean	Rank
Food and nutrition	60	3.517	1	60	3.833	1
Practices that will contribute to good family health	58	3.345	2	58	3.776	2
Consumer education	60	3.217	3	60	3.733	4
Child and family relations	50	3.100	4	50	3.735	3
Home furnishing, maintenance, management, and home purchasing	50	3.080	5	50	3.580	5
Clothing construction	46	2.826	6	46	3.500	6
Educational programs informing citizens of the resources available in their city to assist with family social and economic problems	43	2.814	7	43	3.395	7
Job preparation—education and training of people in basic skills needed to apply for and hold jobs	37	2.297	8	37	3.108	8

Spearman rho correlation coefficient = .976

Table 31

Rank Order and Spearman Rho Correlation Coefficient Using Matching Responses to Current and Should Be Agriculture and Natural Resources Content Area Priorities

Content Area	Current Priority			Should Be Priority		
	Number Responding	Mean	Rank	Number Responding	Mean	Rank
Home gardening and horticulture	65	3.477	1	65	3.785	1
Household and public pest control, e.g., rats and mosquitoes	55	3.218	2	55	3.673	2
Proper use and conservation of natural resources	50	3.100	3	50	3.660	3
Farm and agriculture business management	53	2.925	4	53	3.340	4
Production, harvesting, processing, marketing of agriculture and seafood products	48	2.833	5	48	3.292	5

Spearman rho correlation coefficient = 1.000

orders of 4-H content area priorities showed a low correlation of .400. Considering the critical level to be .700, the correlation between the two rank orderings of 4-H content area priorities was not significant. The correlations between the current and should be rank orderings of the other four program areas were found to be significant at the following levels: Community Resource Development—moderately high at .714, Technical Resources—moderately high at .800, Family Resources—high at .976, and Agriculture and Natural Resources—high at 1.000.

Considering the critical level to be .700, hypothesis one failed to be rejected for Community Resource Development, Technical Resources, Family Resources, and Agriculture and Natural Resources. Hypothesis one was rejected for the 4-H program area.

Council members' assessment of current Virginia Cooperative Extension Service content area priorities generally coincided with their assessment of what priority content areas should receive in Community Resource Development, Technical Resources, Family Resources, and Agriculture and Natural Resources. This seems to indicate that, in terms of rank order priorities, the agency is generally offering educational programs that council members perceived it should be offering in those four program areas. This was not found to be true in the 4-H program area.

The findings relative to hypothesis one, however, raised the following question: What priorities did city council members assign to content areas in each of the five program areas? To answer this question, program content area priorities are presented in order beginning with the program area showing the lowest rank order

correlation between current and should be priorities. Content areas are discussed in terms of rank orders and mean priority ratings. To facilitate the discussion of mean priority ratings, the original priority scale on the interview schedule was further graduated as follows:

1.90—2.14 low priority

2.15—2.39 well below average priority

2.40—2.64 considerably below average priority

2.65—2.89 somewhat below average priority

2.90—3.14 average priority

3.15—3.39 somewhat above average priority

3.40—3.64 considerably above average priority

3.65—3.89 well above average priority

Current and Should Be Priorities in 4-H

The rank orders of current and should be priorities in 4-H were significantly different. Therefore, the question of what priorities council members assigned to 4-H content areas may be adequately answered only by discussing both current and should be priorities.

The greatest discrepancies in rank orders were noted in the content areas of (1) developing skills through real life experiences with projects in various areas and (2) providing educational resources for other city youth organizations and special interest groups. The discrepancies, as shown in Table 32, were influenced by whether or not all responses or only matching responses were included. It may be

Table 32

Comparison of Rank Orderings of 4-H Content Areas Utilizing Current Responses of All Council Members, Matching Should Be Responses of the Same Council Members and Should Be Responses of All Council Members

Content Area	Current Responses—all council members		Matching Should Be responses—same council members			Should Be Responses—all council members		
	Mean	Rank	Number	Mean	Rank	Number	Mean	Rank
Food and nutrition	3.389	1	54	3.577	2	71	3.577	1
Developing citizenship, leadership, personal growth and development	3.213	2	47	3.565	3	70	3.486	2
Providing educational resources for other city youth organizations and special interest groups	2.978	3	45	3.333	4	67	3.060	5
Developing skills through real life experiences with projects in such areas as electricity, photography, small engine repair, clothing, etc.	2.902	4	41	3.585	1	71	3.394	3
Career exploration	2.821	5	39	3.316	5	63	3.302	4

assumed with some confidence that council members who responded to both current and should be priorities felt that they were more familiar with the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service than those who responded only to should be priorities. In the following discussion, council members giving matching responses are referred to as the more familiar council members. Those who were familiar enough to respond only to should be priorities are referred to as the less familiar council members.

The rank order correlations, it may be recalled, were computed using matching responses in order to reduce distortion of the data. The low rank order correlation obtained was influenced most by the large discrepancy between current and should be rankings of developing skills through real life experiences with projects in various areas. These data indicated that the more familiar council members felt that while the agency currently ranked the area fourth, it should be ranked first. However, when the responses of the less familiar council members were added, the rank order was lowered to third. Apparently the less familiar council members felt that the agency should place a much lower priority on the content area than the more familiar council members. Both groups, however, indicated that the content area should receive a higher priority than it currently receives.

Council members generally believed that providing educational resources for other city youth organizations and special interest groups should receive a lower priority than it was currently receiving. The more familiar council members felt that the agency should lower the priority of the content area from third to fourth. When the responses

of the less familiar council members were added, the should be priority for the content area was further lowered to fifth. It is apparent that council members feel the agency should place a relatively low priority on providing resources to other youth organizations.

The highest ranked 4-H content area was food and nutrition. Council members expressed the view that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service currently places its highest priority and should place its highest priority on food and nutrition. Their mean priority rating showed that even more emphasis should be placed on 4-H food and nutrition than was currently placed on it.

In summary, relatively little discrepancy existed between the perception of what the agency currently does and should do in 4-H content areas with the exceptions of (1) developing skills through real life experiences with projects in various areas and (2) providing educational resources for other city youth organizations and special interest groups. It may be noted that the low priority council members placed on the agency's role of providing resources to other city youth groups is in disagreement with Cooperative Extension Service professionals such as Parsons (1971) and Paige (1970) who view this function as a very important aspect of city youth efforts.

Should Be Priorities in Community Resource Development, Technical Resources, and Agriculture and Natural Resources

The rank orders of current and should be priorities in Community Resource Development, Technical Resources, Family Resources, and Agriculture and Natural Resources generally coincided. Therefore,

the question of what priorities city council members assigned to content areas in these four program areas may be adequately answered by examining the priorities they feel should be placed on program content areas.

Community Resource Development. Council members indicated that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place its highest Community Resource Development program efforts on community education (Table 33). They gave it a considerably above average priority rating. Tourism and recreation was rated as the content area that should receive the lowest agency priority in Community Resource Development. The somewhat below average rating council members believed that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should give to tourism and recreation may imply that council members feel efforts in this area would duplicate those of established city tourism and recreation departments.

Technical Resources. Conservation of energy was ranked by council members as the Technical Resources content area which should receive top priority (Table 34). It received a well above average priority rating. The rating indicated a strong view that conservation of energy is a major city program need. Council members felt that lowest priority in Technical Resources should be placed on (1) system engineering and technical problems of business, industry, and city government and (2) industrial health and safety. Each of the two areas received average should be ratings.

Table 33

Rank Order of Perceived Priority that Should Be Placed on Community Resource Development Content Areas Using All Responses

Content Area	Should Be Priority		
	Number Responding	Mean	Rank
Community education (use of public schools as a focal point to provide services to meet needs identified by citizens	63	3.429	1
Organization and leadership development training, including volunteerism	68	3.382	2
Community improvement	66	3.379	3
Community facilities and services such as housing, health, recreation, water, sewer, transportation	64	3.094	4
Land-use planning, zoning, land-use taxation	61	3.066	5
Tourism and recreation	64	2.703	6

Table 34

Rank Order of Perceived Priority that Should Be Placed on Technical Resources Content Areas Using All Responses

Content Area	Should Be Priority		
	Number Responding	Mean	Rank
Conservation of energy	65	3.815	1
Control of air, water, noise pollution and solid waste management	62	3.355	2
System engineering and technical problems of business, industry, and city government	61	2.984	3.5
Industrial health and safety	61	2.984	3.5

Family Resources. Council members implied that above average priorities should be given to all Family Resources content areas (Table 35). They believed that well above average priority should be placed on food and nutrition and on practices that contribute to good family health. Considerably above average priority should be placed on consumer education and on child and family relations. Even the lowest ranked area of clothing construction received a somewhat above average should be priority.

Apparently council members believed that programs dealing with food and nutrition and good family health are of major importance to cities. The high ratings of all content areas indicated that Family Resources programs generally should receive considerable agency emphasis in cities.

Agriculture and Natural Resources. The content areas of (1) home gardening and horticulture, (2) proper use and conservation of energy, and (3) household and public pest control were all rated by council members as areas that should receive considerably above average priority. They indicated that average priority should be placed on production, harvesting, processing, marketing of agriculture and seafood products and on farm and agriculture business management (Table 36). The findings imply that Agriculture and Natural Resources programs should be directed toward the average city resident rather than be restricted primarily to agricultural sectors of the city population.

Table 35

Rank Order of Perceived Priority that Should Be Placed on Family Resources Content Areas Using All Responses

Content Area	Should Be Priority		
	Number Responding	Mean	Rank
Food and nutrition	75	3.760	1
Practices that will contribute to good family health	74	3.730	2
Consumer education	74	3.635	3
Child and family relations	71	3.620	4
Educational programs informing citizens of the resources available in their city to assist with family social and economic problems	69	3.362	5
Home furnishing, maintenance, management, and home purchasing	72	3.319	6
Job preparation—education and training of people in basic skills needed to apply for and hold jobs	67	3.269	7
Clothing construction	70	3.200	8

Table 36

Rank Order of Perceived Priority that Should Be Placed on Agriculture and Natural Resources Content Areas Using All Responses

Content Area	Should Be Priority		
	Number Responding	Mean	Rank
Home gardening and horticulture	73	3.630	1
Proper use and conservation of natural resources	72	3.611	2
Household and public pest control, e.g., rats, mosquitoes	73	3.603	3
Production, harvesting, processing, marketing of agriculture and seafood products	62	3.097	4
Farm and agriculture business management	63	3.063	5

Summary of Program and Content Area Priorities

Council members generally agreed that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service is placing proper rank order priority on content areas in all program areas except 4-H. They indicated that the 4-H content area of developing skills through real life experiences with projects in various areas should be given higher priority. Conversely, council members suggested that lower priority should be placed on providing educational resources for other city youth organizations and special interest groups.

The priority ratings and rankings of content areas that council members believed should receive major emphasis in cities are primarily centered around conservation and family oriented programs. Conservation of energy was singled out as the area which should receive the highest priority in Virginia cities. Proper use and conservation of natural resources was also denoted as an area which should receive considerably above average priority. Council members viewed conservation as an area that should be of great concern in cities.

Council members also strongly implied that program emphases should center around the needs of family groups or family members. They indicated that a total of eleven content areas should either receive considerably above average priority or well above average priority. Of these eleven, two related to conservation and nine centered around family groups or members. The nine family related areas were (1) family resources food and nutrition, (2) practices that contribute to good family health, (3) consumer education, (4) home gardening and horticulture, (5) child and family relations,

(6) household and public pest control, (7) 4-H food and nutrition, (8) developing citizenship, leadership, personal growth, and development qualities in youth, and (9) community education.

Comparatively lower priority should be placed on program emphases directed toward the physical and economic concerns of business, industry, and government. This was implied in the lower ratings given to such areas as (1) system engineering and technical problems of business, industry, and government, (2) industrial health and safety, and (3) tourism and recreation.

Council members expressed the view that high priority should be placed on programs for city residents and family groups and relatively lower priority should be placed on programs for business, industry, and government. Agency programs should assist residents with physical and social needs associated with urban life.

In terms of council members' overall perception of program areas, based on the weighted mean response for each program area, council members appeared to place the following rank orders on the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service currently places and should place on each of its five program areas in cities:

Current	Should Be
1. Agriculture and Natural Resources (3.133)	1. Family Resources (3.493)
2. 4-H (3.084)	2. Agriculture and Natural Resources (3.420)
3. Family Resources (3.077)	3. 4-H (3.368)
4. Community Resource Development (2.801)	4. Technical Resources (3.293)
5. Technical Resources (2.624)	5. Community Resource Development (3.179)

The priority ratings council members assigned to their perception of current Virginia Cooperative Extension Service efforts were consistently lower than their ratings of what priority the agency should place on program and content areas. In every program and content area the should be mean priority rating was higher than the current mean rating. Council members appeared to perceive that the agency should increase, at least to some degree, its efforts in all program and content areas given for their assessment. They further disclosed the belief that the agency currently places greatest emphasis on the traditional program areas of Agriculture and Natural Resources, 4-H, and Family Resources and that it should continue to place greater emphasis on those areas.

HYPOTHESIS TWO

Hypothesis two stated that no relationship exists between city council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on program and content areas and the size of the city. This hypothesis was tested by chi square. Data for the analysis consisted of all council members' responses to the should be priority scale, 1-4. Those data provided the best measure of council members' perception of what the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should be doing and were most indicative of program needs. For the purposes of analysis, the four levels of priority were collapsed into two—average or below average priority and high priority. The average or below average priority group consisted of no priority,

low priority, and average priority responses. The high priority group consisted of high priority responses.

Technical Resources, Community Resource Development, Family Resources

No significant chi squares at the .05 level were found between size of city and any content areas in Technical Resources, Community Resource Development, or Family Resources. Hypothesis two was not rejected for any content areas in each of the three program areas.

4-H

Size of city was related to council members' perception of the priority that should be placed on the 4-H content area of developing citizenship, leadership, personal growth, and development qualities in youth. Chi square was significant at the .05 level with a moderate degree of association (Table 37).

Council members serving small cities gave this content area a very high priority, with 94.7 percent high priority responses. Those in large cities also gave a high percentage of high priority responses, although not as high as council members in small cities. A considerably lower priority was placed on the content area by council members serving medium sized cities. In medium sized cities, only 48.1 percent responded that it should receive high priority, while 51.9 percent responded that it should receive average or lower priority.

Hypothesis two was rejected for the 4-H content area of developing citizenship, leadership, personal growth, and development qualities in youth. Hypothesis two was not rejected for the remaining

Table 37

Relationship Between Perceived Priority that Should Be Placed on Developing Citizenship, Leadership, Personal Growth and Development Qualities and Size of City

COUNT / COL PCT	50,000--100,000 (1.)	100,001--150,000 (2.)	OVER 150,000 (3.)	ROW TOTAL
1. AVERAGE OR BELOW PRIORITY	1 5.3	14 51.9	7 29.2	22 31.4
2. HIGH PRIORITY	18 94.7	13 48.1	17 70.8	48 68.6
COLUMN TOTAL	19 27.1	27 38.6	24 34.3	70 100.0

CHI SQUARE= 11.31858 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0035

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.37308

4-H content areas.

Agriculture and Natural Resources

Perception of the priority that should be placed on farm and agriculture business management was the only Agriculture and Natural Resources content area that was associated with size of city (Table 38). Chi square was significant at the .01 level with a moderate degree of association.

A large percentage of council members (88.9%) serving small cities gave a high priority to the content area. Council members in large cities (70%) also gave it a relatively high priority, although not as high as those in small cities. In contrast, only 28 percent of the medium sized city council members responded that the content area should receive high priority.

It appeared that council members in small cities perceived that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place a high priority on farm and agriculture business management. Council members in large cities also gave the content area almost as high a priority as those in small cities. Council members in medium cities, however, appeared to perceive that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place an average or below average priority on farm and agriculture business management in those cities. The high priority given to farm and agriculture business management in large and small cities may have been influenced by council members serving the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake. Virginia Beach, a large city, and

Table 38

Relationship Between Perceived Priority that Should Be Placed on Farm and Agriculture Business Management and Size of City

COUNT / COL PCT	50,000--100,000 (1.)	100,001--150,000 (2.)	OVER 150,000 (3.)	ROW TOTAL
1. AVERAGE OR BELOW PRIORITY	2	18	6	26
	11.1	72.0	30.0	41.3
2. HIGH PRIORITY	16	7	14	37
	88.9	28.0	70.0	58.7
COLUMN TOTAL	18	25	20	63
	28.6	39.7	31.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE= 17.54306 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0002

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.46670

Chesapeake, a small city, both have large commercial agriculture sectors within their boundaries.

Hypothesis two was rejected for the Agriculture and Natural Resources content area of farm and agriculture business management. The hypothesis was not rejected for any of the other Agriculture and Natural Resources content areas.

In summary, hypothesis two dealt with the relationship between perception of program and content area priorities and size of city. The moderate relationships found between size of city and the perceived priority of the two content areas of (1) developing citizenship, leadership, personal growth, and development qualities in youth and (2) farm and agriculture business management indicated that in both instances council members in small and large cities placed considerably higher priority on the areas than council members in medium cities.

HYPOTHESIS THREE

Hypothesis three stated that no relationship exists between city council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on program and content areas and the Cooperative Extension Service method of entry into the city. This hypothesis was tested using chi square. The same two categories of average or below average priority and high priority utilized in testing hypothesis two were also used in testing hypothesis three.

4-H, Technical Resources, Family Resources

No significant chi squares at the .05 level were noted between

method of entry and any content areas in 4-H, Technical Resources, and Family Resources. Hypothesis three was not rejected for any content areas within the three program areas.

Community Resource Development

Council members' perception of the priority that should be placed on community facilities and services was the only Community Resource Development content area that was related to method of entry (Table 39). Chi square was significant at the .01 level with a low degree of association.

Slightly over one-half (57.1%) of the EFNEP entry council members rated community facilities and services as a high priority content area, while only 20.7 percent of the traditional entry council members rated it as high priority. It appeared that traditional entry council members perceived that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place average or below average priority on educational efforts dealing with community facilities and services in their cities. EFNEP entry council members appeared slightly in favor of rating it as a high priority content area in their cities.

Hypothesis three was rejected for the content area of community facilities and services. It was not rejected for any other Community Resource Development content areas.

Agriculture and Natural Resources

Relationships were found between method of entry and perception of the priority that should be placed on the Agriculture and

Table 39

Relationship Between Perceived Priority that Should Be Placed on Community Facilities and Services and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
1. AVERAGE OR BELOW PRIORITY	23	15	38
	79.3	42.9	59.4
2. HIGH PRIORITY	6	20	26
	20.7	57.1	40.6
COLUMN TOTAL	29	35	64
	45.3	54.7	100.0

[a]CORRECTED CHI SQUARE= 7.29105 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0069

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.34658

[a]Yates'

Natural Resources content areas of (1) production, harvesting, processing, marketing of agriculture and seafood products and (2) farm and agriculture business management. Chi square was significant at the .01 level between each content area and method of entry. Production, harvesting, processing, marketing of agriculture and seafood products showed a moderate degree of association. Farm and agriculture business management showed a low degree of association (Tables 40, 41). Over three-fourths of the council members serving traditional entry cities placed a high priority on the content areas, while council members serving EFNEP entry cities indicated that both content areas should receive average or below average priority.

Hypothesis three was rejected for the Agriculture and Natural Resources content areas of (1) production, harvesting, processing, marketing of agriculture and seafood products and (2) farm and agriculture business management. Hypothesis three was not rejected for the content areas of (1) home gardening and horticulture, (2) household and public pest control, and (3) proper use and conservation of natural resources. Council members in traditional entry cities placed higher priority on the two content areas most closely related to production agriculture. Council members serving traditional entry cities appear to have a stronger orientation toward production agriculture than council members serving EFNEP entry cities.

The relationship between method of entry and the perceived priority that should be placed on program content areas was tested in hypothesis three. The content areas of (1) community facilities and services, (2) production, harvesting, processing, marketing of

Table 40

Relationship Between Perceived Priority that Should Be Placed on Production, Harvesting, Processing, Marketing of Agriculture and Seafood Products and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
1. AVERAGE OR BELOW PRIORITY	8	23	31
	25.0	76.7	50.0
2. HIGH PRIORITY	24	7	31
	75.0	23.3	50.0
COLUMN TOTAL	32	30	62
	51.6	48.4	100.0

[a]CORRECTED CHI SQUARE= 14.53125 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0001

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.45883

[a]Yates'

Table 41

Relationship Between Perceived Priority that Should Be Placed on Farm and Agriculture Business Management and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
1. AVERAGE OR BELOW PRIORITY	7	19	26
	22.6	59.4	41.3
2. HIGH PRIORITY	24	13	37
	77.4	40.6	58.7
COLUMN TOTAL	31	32	63
	49.2	50.8	100.0

[a]CORRECTED CHI SQUARE= 7.34252 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0067

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.35000

[a]Yates'

agriculture and seafood products, and (3) farm and agriculture business management were related to method of entry. Findings implied that council members serving traditional entry cities may be more production agriculture oriented than those serving EFNEP entry cities.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS PERTAINING TO PROGRAM AND CONTENT AREAS

The findings indicated that council members have a generally high degree of unfamiliarity with all program areas. They were apparently most unfamiliar with the newer, less traditional program areas of Technical Resources and Community Resource Development.

Members of council indicated greater familiarity with the more traditional program areas of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Family Resources, and 4-H. They were apparently most familiar with the Agriculture and Natural Resources program area. Additionally, they disclosed the belief that the agency currently places greater emphasis on the traditional program areas and that it should continue to do so.

Size of city appeared to influence unfamiliarity with Community Resource Development content areas. Council members in large cities were most unfamiliar with the areas of (1) community education, (2) community improvement, (3) tourism and recreation, and (4) community facilities and services.

The relationships found between method of entry and unfamiliarity with Agriculture and Natural Resources content areas apparently indicate that Virginia Cooperative Extension Service programs in traditional entry cities may have a stronger agricultural

orientation than those in EFNEP entry cities. Further, the relationships found between unfamiliarity with program content areas and method of entry generally appeared to indicate that council members perceive the scope of Virginia Cooperative Extension Service program area activities in EFNEP entry cities to be more limited.

Council members' assessment of current Virginia Cooperative Extension Service content area priorities generally coincided with their assessment of what priority content areas should receive in the program areas of Community Resource Development, Technical Resources, Family Resources, and Agriculture and Natural Resources. This seems to indicate that, in terms of rank order priorities, the agency is generally offering educational programs that council members perceived it should be offering in those four program areas. This was not found to be true in 4-H.

The greatest 4-H content area rank order discrepancies were in (1) developing skills through real life experiences with projects in various areas and (2) providing educational resources for other city youth organizations and special interest groups. Council members indicated that developing skills through real life experiences with projects should be ranked higher in the agency's order of priorities. They believed that providing resources for other city youth organizations should be ranked lower in the agency's order of priorities.

Council members' ratings of content areas implied the view that high priority should be placed on programs generally centering around conservation and the family or family members. The members indicated that a total of eleven content areas should either receive considerably

above average priority or well above average priority. Of these eleven, two related to conservation and indicated the view that conservation should be an area of primary concern in cities. The nine that centered around family related groups were (1) family resources food and nutrition, (2) practices that contribute to good family health, (3) consumer education, (4) home gardening and horticulture, (5) child and family relations, (6) household and public pest control, (7) 4-H food and nutrition, (8) developing citizenship, leadership, personal growth and development qualities in youth, and (9) community education. The high priority these nine groups received indicate that high priority should be placed on programs for city residents and family groups. Council members expressed the belief that relatively lower priority should be placed on programs for business, industry, and government. Agency programs should assist residents with physical and social needs associated with urban life. However, council members appeared to perceive that the agency should increase, at least to some degree, its efforts in all program and content areas given for their assessment.

Size of city appeared to influence the priority that council members felt the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on (1) the 4-H content area of developing citizenship, leadership, personal growth and development qualities and (2) the Agriculture and Natural Resources content area of farm and agriculture business management. In each case, council members in small cities placed highest priority on the areas. Council members in large cities placed next highest priority on them and those in medium cities placed

considerably lower priority on them.

Method of entry appeared to influence the priority council members felt the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on (1) the Community Resource Development content area of community facilities and services, (2) the Agriculture and Natural Resources content area of production, harvesting, processing, marketing of agriculture and seafood products, and (3) the Agriculture and Natural Resources content area of farm and agriculture business management. The high priority that traditional entry council members placed on the two Agriculture and Natural Resources content areas indicates that council members serving in traditional entry cities may be more production agriculture oriented than those in EFNEP entry cities.

Chapter 5

FINDINGS PERTAINING TO CLIENTELE AND CONTRIBUTION

The previous chapter reported findings pertaining to program and content areas. This chapter reports findings specific to council members' perception of Virginia Cooperative Extension Service city clientele and contribution.

CLIENTELE

Findings related to council members' unfamiliarity with clientele priorities are presented. Hypotheses four, five, and six pertaining to council members' perception of current and should be Virginia Cooperative Extension Service clientele priorities, and the relationships between should be priorities and each of the variables, size of city and method of entry, are discussed.

Unfamiliarity

Council members' unfamiliarity with both current priorities and the priorities that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on clientele are presented. Relationships between unfamiliarity with clientele and the variables, size of city and method of entry, as determined by chi square tests, are also presented. For the purposes of chi square analysis, the "familiar" group consisted of those council members familiar enough with a client group to respond on the priority scale, 1-4. The "unfamiliar" group consisted of those council members

who responded as not familiar.

A high level of unfamiliarity with priorities given to the following six client groups was noted: (1) problem youngsters, (2) state and federal agencies, including educational institutions located in the city, (3) home and family related business groups, (4) agriculturally related business and industry, (5) non-agriculturally related business and industry, and (6) young married couples under thirty years of age (Table 42). More than 40 percent of the council members were unfamiliar with the current emphasis on each of the six groups. Over 15 percent of the members were also unsure what priority should be placed on two of the previously identified groups of (1) agriculturally related business and industry and (2) problem youngsters.

Council members indicated greatest familiarity with priorities given to homemakers, interested city youth of 4-H age, and farmers. These three groups are representative of the traditional clientele served by the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service.

Relationships were found between size of city and unfamiliarity with (1) farmers at the .05 level, (2) agriculturally related business and industry at the .05 level, and (3) problem youngsters at the .01 level (Table 43). In each case the degree of association was low. As the size of the city increased, council members' unfamiliarity with each of the client groups increased (Tables 44-46).

Method of entry was related to unfamiliarity with (1) volunteer service, civic, and development organizations at the .05 level with a low association, (2) city employees at the .05 level with a low association, (3) state and federal agencies, including educational

Table 42

Frequency and Percent of Respondents Indicating Unfamiliarity with Clientele

Clientele	Not familiar enough with clientele to respond on current priority		Not familiar enough with clientele to respond on should be priority	
	N	%	N	%
Senior citizens	30	39.5	3	3.9
Young married couples (under 30 years of age)	34	44.7	4	5.3
Low income adults and youth	28	36.8	2	2.6
Middle income adults and youth	27	35.5	3	3.9
Upper income adults and youth	30	39.5	4	5.3
Minority adults and youth	26	34.2	3	3.9
Community leaders	28	36.8	3	3.9
Volunteer service, civic and development organizations	28	36.8	3	3.9
City employees, e.g., social services, parks and recreation workers	28	36.8	6	7.9
Home and family related business groups	38	50.0	10	13.2
State and federal agencies, including educational instiitions located in the city	40	52.6	9	11.8
Homemakers	18	23.7	3	3.9
Farmers	24	31.6	8	10.5
Business, industry-- non-agriculturally related	37	48.7	10	13.2

Table 42 (Continued)

Clientele	Not familiar enough with clientele to respond on current priority		Not familiar enough with clientele to respond on should be priority	
	N	%	N	%
Business, industry--agriculturally related	34	44.7	13	17.1
Any interested city youth of 4-H age (9-19)	20	26.3	1	1.3
Problem youngsters, e.g., school drop-outs, truants	41	53.9	12	15.8

Table 43

Summary of Relationships Between Familiar—Not Familiar Responses to Clientele By Size of City and Method of Entry

Clientele	N	Size of City[a]			Method of Entry[b]		
		Chi sq.	Significance level	Contingency coefficient	Chi sq.	Significance level	Contingency coefficient
Senior citizens	76	.03526	.9825	-	2.78754	.0950	-
Young married couples (under 30 years of age)	76	.11151	.9458	-	1.10958	.2922	-
Low income adults and youth	76	.22888	.8919	-	.63266	.4264	-
Middle income adults and youth	76	.68934	.7085	-	2.42998	.1190	-
Upper income adults and youth	76	.48370	.7852	-	1.43072	.2316	-
Minority adults and youth	75	.45462	.7967	-	.00086	.9766	-
Community leaders	75	1.76124	.4145	-	3.37513	.0662	-

Table 43 (continued)

Clientele	N	Size of City[a]			Method of Entry[b]		
		Chi sq.	Significance level	Contingency coefficient	Chi sq.	Significance level	Contingency coefficient
Volunteer service, civic, and development organizations	76	3.03143	.2197	-	4.99388	.0254*	.27307
City employees, e.g., social services, parks and recreation workers	76	2.36632	.3063	-	4.99388	.0254*	.27307
Home and family related business groups	76	1.66667	.4346	-	1.92812	.1650	-
State and federal agencies, including educational institutions located in the city	76	3.99100	.1359	-	5.09181	.0240*	.27446
Homemakers	76	.65171	.7219	-	3.25785	.0711	-
Farmers	76	6.54630	.0379*	.28161	11.87375	.0006**	.39022
Business, industry—non-agriculturally related	76	5.62322	.0601	-	2.72586	.0987	-

Table 43 (continued)

Clientele	N	Size of City[a]			Method of Entry[b]		
		Chi sq.	Significance level	Contingency coefficient	Chi sq.	Significance level	Contingency coefficient
Business, industry—agriculturally related	76	7.76777	.0206*	.30452	8.49800	.0036**	.33962
Any interested city youth of 4-H age (9-19)	76	1.06453	.5873	-	7.42344	.0064**	.32417
Problem youngsters, e.g., school drop-outs, truants	76	9.84694	.0073**	.33868	2.35140	.1252	-

*Significant at .05

**Significant at .01

[a]Two degrees of freedom

[b]One degree of freedom

Table 44

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Farmers and Size of City

COUNT / COL PCT	50,000--100,000 (1.)	100,001--150,000 (2.)	OVER 150,000 (3.)	ROW TOTAL
1. SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR)	19	17	16	52
	90.5	60.7	59.3	68.4
2. NOT FAMILIAR	2	11	11	24
	9.5	39.3	40.7	31.6
COLUMN TOTAL	21	28	27	76
	27.6	36.8	35.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE= 6.54630 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0379

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.28161

Table 45

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Business, Industry—Agriculturally Related and Size of City

COUNT / COL PCT	50,000--100,000 (1.)	100,001--150,000 (2.)	OVER 150,000 (3.)	ROW TOTAL
1. SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR)	17	13	12	42
	81.0	46.4	44.4	55.3
2. NOT FAMILIAR	4	15	15	34
	19.0	53.6	55.6	44.7
COLUMN TOTAL	21	28	27	76
	27.6	36.8	35.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE= 7.76777 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0206

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.30452

Table 46

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Problem Youngsters and Size of City

COUNT / COL PCT	50,000--100,000 (1.)	100,001--150,000 (2.)	OVER 150,000 (3.)	ROW TOTAL
1. SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR)	15	13	7	35
	71.4	46.4	25.9	46.1
2. NOT FAMILIAR	6	15	20	41
	28.6	53.6	74.1	53.9
COLUMN TOTAL	21	28	27	76
	27.6	36.8	35.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE= 9.84694 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0073

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.33868

institutions located in the city at the .05 level with a low association, (4) farmers at the .01 level with a moderate association, (5) agriculturally related business and industry at the .01 level with a low association, and (6) any interested city youth of 4-H age at the .01 level with a low association (Table 43). Council members serving EFNEP entry cities were more unfamiliar with each of the six clientele groups than those serving traditional entry cities (Tables 47-52).

Generally, council members displayed a high degree of unfamiliarity with clientele currently served by the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service. They seemed to be more unfamiliar with efforts directed toward business, industry, and government related groups than they were with those directed toward individuals or social groups. The most familiar groups appeared to be the more traditional Cooperative Extension Service clientele of farmers, homemakers, and youth.

Size of city seemed to have a definite influence on unfamiliarity with agriculturally related client groups. Council members serving in small cities seemed to be decisively more familiar with agriculturally related client groups than those in medium cities. Those serving in medium cities were slightly more familiar with agriculturally related client groups than those in large cities. Apparently, familiarity with agriculturally related client groups decreased as the size of the city increased.

Method of entry appeared to have greater influence on unfamiliarity with business or service oriented types of clientele than any other types of clientele. Of the six client groups that

Table 47

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Volunteer Service, Civic, and Development Organizations and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR) 1.	26	22	48
	78.8	51.2	63.2
NOT FAMILIAR 2.	7	21	28
	21.2	48.8	36.8
COLUMN TOTAL	33	43	76
	43.4	56.6	100.0

[a]CHI SQUARE= 4.99388 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0245

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.27307

[a]Chi square corrected--Yates'

Table 48

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with City Employees and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR) 1.	26	22	48
	78.8	51.2	63.2
NOT FAMILIAR 2.	7	21	28
	21.2	48.8	36.8
COLUMN TOTAL	33	43	67
	43.4	56.6	100.0

[a]CHI SQUARE= 4.99388 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0254

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.27307

[a]Chi square corrected--Yates'

Table 49

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with State and Federal Agencies, Including Educational Institutions Located in the City and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT		TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR)	1.	21	15	36
		63.6	34.9	47.4
NOT FAMILIAR	2.	12	28	40
		36.4	65.1	52.6
COLUMN TOTAL		33	43	76
		43.4	56.6	100.0

[a]CHI SQUARE= 5.09181 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0240

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.27446

[a]Chi square corrected--Yates'

Table 50

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Farmers and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR) 1.	30	22	52
	90.9	51.2	68.4
NOT FAMILIAR 2.	3	21	24
	9.1	48.8	31.6
COLUMN TOTAL	33	43	76
	43.4	56.6	100.0

[a]CHI SQUARE= 11.87375 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0006

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.39022

[a]Chi square corrected--Yates'

Table 51

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Business, Industry—Agriculturally Related and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR) 1.	25	17	42
	75.8	39.5	55.3
NOT FAMILIAR 2.	8	26	34
	24.2	60.5	44.7
COLUMN TOTAL	33	43	76
	43.4	56.6	100.0

[a]CHI SQUARE= 8.49800 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0036

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.33962

[a]Chi square corrected--Yates'

Table 52

Relationship Between Familiarity—Unfamiliarity with Any Interested City Youth of 4-H Age and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
SOME PRIORITY (FAMILIAR) 1.	30	26	56
	90.9	60.5	73.7
NOT FAMILIAR 2.	3	17	20
	9.1	39.5	26.3
COLUMN TOTAL	33	43	76
	43.4	56.6	100.0

[a]CHI SQUARE= 7.42344 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0064

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.32417

[a]Chi square corrected--Yates'

showed relationships between unfamiliarity and method of entry, four were business or service oriented types of clientele. These four client groups were (1) volunteer service, civic, and development organizations, (2) city employees, (3) state and federal agencies, and (4) agriculturally related business and industry. EFNEP entry council members were considerably more unfamiliar with these business or service oriented types of clientele than traditional entry council members. This may be an indication that less emphasis is placed on business and service oriented clientele in EFNEP entry cities or that the perceived scope of clientele served is narrower in those cities. The two remaining client groups, farmers and any interested city youth, related to method of entry were two of the more traditional Cooperative Extension Service client groups. Council members serving traditional entry cities appeared to be decisively more familiar with these two traditional groups than EFNEP entry council members.

Both size of city and method of entry influenced council members' unfamiliarity with the agriculturally related client groups of (1) farmers and (2) agriculturally related business and industry. Council members serving small traditional entry cities appeared considerably more familiar with agriculturally related clientele than those in EFNEP entry cities. These findings suggest that council members in small traditional entry cities or Virginia Cooperative Extension Service programs in those cities may be more oriented toward agriculture clientele.

Hypothesis Four

Hypothesis four stated that no difference exists between city

council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service currently places on city client groups and the priority it should place on city client groups. The hypothesis was tested by Spearman rho rank order correlation. Data used in the analysis included all responses on the priority scale, 1-4, for both current and should be priorities. These data were used after it was determined that there was only .045 difference between the rho coefficient computed using all responses and the rho coefficient computed using only matching responses. The data including all responses were used because they should be more indicative of perceived clientele needs.

The current and should be rank orders and Spearman rho correlation between the two sets of rank orders are shown in Table 53. A moderately high correlation of .733 was found between current and should be clientele rank orders. The correlation coefficient for the rank orders exceeded the established criterion of .700. Hypothesis four was not rejected for clientele groups.

Council members generally agreed that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service is placing proper rank order priority on clientele. However, the question is raised: What priorities did council members believe should be placed on each of the client groups given for their assessment? To answer this question, clientele priorities are discussed in terms of their rank orders and mean priority ratings.

Indications were that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place emphasis, in order of rank, on the following client groups: (1) any interested city youth of 4-H age, (2) minority

Table 53

Rank Order and Spearman Rho Correlation Coefficient Using All Responses to Current and Should Be Clientele Priorities

Clientele	Current Priority			Should Be Priority		
	Number Responding	Mean	Rank	Number Responding	Mean	Rank
Homemakers	58	3.414	1	73	3.575	4
Any interested city youth of 4-H age (9-19)	56	3.321	2	75	3.733	1
Low income adults and youth	48	3.125	3	74	3.581	3
Minority adults and youth	49	3.122	4	72	3.653	2
Farmers	52	3.058	5	68	3.000	13.5
Senior citizens	46	3.000	6	73	3.521	6
Business, industry—agriculturally related	42	2.976	7	62	3.097	10
City employees, e.g., social services, parks and recreation workers	48	2.958	8	70	3.114	9
State and federal agencies, including educational institutions located in the city	36	2.889	9	67	3.000	13.5
Volunteer service, civic, and development organizations	48	2.875	10	73	3.329	7

Table 53 (continued)

Clientele	Current Priority			Should Be Priority		
	Number Responding	Mean	Rank	Number Responding	Mean	Rank
Home and family related business groups	38	2.816	11	66	3.045	12
Problem youngsters, e.g., school drop-outs, truants	35	2.800	12	64	3.547	5
Young married couples (under 30 years of age)	42	2.738	13	72	3.208	8
Middle income adults and youth	49	2.735	14	72	2.986	15
Community leaders	47	2.638	15	73	3.096	11
Business, industry—non-agriculturally related	39	2.385	16	65	2.800	16
Upper income adults and youth	46	2.239	17	72	2.361	17

Spearman rho correlation coefficient = .733

adults and youth, (3) low income adults and youth, (4) homemakers, (5) problem youngsters, and (6) senior citizens (Table 54). Council members indicated that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place well above average priority (3.65—3.89) on any interested city youth and on minority adults and youth. They implied that the agency should place considerably above average priority (3.40—3.64) on each of the remaining four top ranked groups.

Apparently council members believed that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place its lowest priorities on (1) non-agriculturally related business and industry and (2) upper income adults and youth. They indicated that non-agriculturally related business and industry should receive somewhat below average emphasis, with a mean priority rating of 2.800. The upper income adult and youth client group was viewed as one which should receive well below average priority, with a mean priority rating of 2.361.

There was general agreement among council members that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service is placing proper rank order priority on clientele. They seemed to believe that city clientele emphases should be centered around (1) youth and (2) individual and social groups. Relatively lower emphasis, they believed, should be placed on business, industry, and government groups. Further, they seemed to emphasize that middle and upper income groups should receive a much lower priority than low income groups. However, council members' mean priority responses indicated that all client groups except farmers should receive additional emphasis.

Table 54

Rank Order of Perceived Priority that Should Be Placed On Clientele Using All Responses

Clientele	Should Be Priority		
	Number Responding	Mean	Rank
Any interested city youth of 4-H age (9-19)	75	3.733	1
Minority adults and youth	72	3.653	2
Low income adults and youth	74	3.581	3
Homemakers	73	3.575	4
Problem youngsters, e.g., school drop-outs, truants	64	3.547	5
Senior citizens	73	3.521	6
Volunteer service, civic, and development organizations	73	3.329	7
Young married couples (under 30 years of age)	72	3.208	8
City employees, e.g., social services, parks and recreation workers	70	3.114	9
Business, industry—agriculturally related	62	3.097	10
Community leaders	73	3.096	11
Home and family related business groups	66	3.045	12
Farmers	68	3.000	13.5
State and federal agencies, including educational institutions located in the city	67	3.000	13.5

Table 54 (continued)

Clientele	Should Be Priority		
	Number Responding	Mean	Rank
Middle income adults and youth	72	2.986	15
Business, industry—non-agriculturally related	65	2.800	16
Upper income adults and youth	72	2.361	17

Hypothesis Five

Hypothesis five stated that no relationship exists between city council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on client groups and the size of the city. Chi square was used to test this hypothesis. The data included responses of all council members who responded on the 1-4 scale of priorities that the agency should place on client groups. Responses were grouped into two categories, high priority and average or below average priority. The high priority category included only high priority responses. The average or below average priority category included no priority, low priority, and average priority responses.

Relationships were found between size of city and council members' perception of the priority that should be placed on (1) community leaders, (2) farmers, and (3) agriculturally related business and industry. The perceived priority that should be placed on community leaders was related to size of city at the .01 level. The degree of association was low (Table 55). Council members serving small cities gave the largest percentage of high priority responses, with 65 percent responding high priority. In medium and large cities, approximately one-fourth of the council members rated community leaders as high priority clientele. Council members in small cities appeared to place considerably greater priority on community leaders as clients than council members in either medium or large cities.

Size of city was also related to (1) farmers at the .05 level

Table 55

Relationship Between Perceived Priority that Should Be Placed on Community Leaders and Size of City

COUNT / COL PCT	50,000--100,000 (1.)	100,001--150,000 (2.)	OVER 150,000 (3.)	ROW TOTAL
1. AVERAGE OR BELOW PRIORITY	7	19	20	46
	35.0	73.1	74.1	63.0
2. HIGH PRIORITY	13	7	7	27
	65.0	26.9	25.9	37.0
COLUMN TOTAL	20	26	27	73
	27.4	35.6	37.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE= 9.28125 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0097

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.33586

with low association and (2) agriculturally related business and industry at the .01 level with moderate association (Tables 56-57). In each case council members serving small cities placed high priority on the client groups. Council members, serving large cities also gave each of the client groups a high priority, but not as high a priority as those serving small cities. In medium cities, council members gave each client group average or below average priority.

Hypothesis five was rejected for the client groups of (1) community leaders, (2) farmers, and (3) agriculturally related business and industry. The hypothesis was not rejected for the remaining fourteen client groups. Size of city appeared to influence council members' perception of the priority that should be placed on agricultural client groups more often than any other client groups. Council members serving small and large cities suggested that high priority should be placed on agricultural clientele in those cities. The high priority ratings given by council members in small and large cities may have been affected by the fact that Chesapeake, a small city, and Virginia Beach, a large city, have large commercial agricultural sectors.

Hypothesis Six

Hypothesis six stated that no relationship exists between city council members' perception of the priority that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on client groups and the Cooperative Extension Service method of entry into the city. Chi square was used to test hypothesis six. The data included responses

Table 56

Relationship Between Perceived Priority that Should Be Placed on Farmers and Size of City

COUNT / COL PCT	50,000--100,000 (1.)	100,001--150,000 (2.)	OVER 150,000 (3.)	ROW TOTAL
1. AVERAGE OR BELOW PRIORITY	6	17	10	33
	30.0	70.8	41.7	48.5
2. HIGH PRIORITY	14	7	14	35
	70.0	29.2	58.3	51.5
COLUMN TOTAL	20	24	24	68
	29.4	35.3	35.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE= 7.98141 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0185

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.32411

Table 57

Relationship Between Perceived Priority that Should Be Placed on Business, Industry—Agriculturally Related and Size of City

COUNT / COL PCT	50,000--100,000 (1.)	100,001--150,000 (2.)	OVER 150,000 (3.)	ROW TOTAL
1. AVERAGE OR BELOW PRIORITY	5	19	6	30
	25.0	82.6	31.6	48.4
2. HIGH PRIORITY	15	4	13	32
	75.0	17.4	68.4	51.6
COLUMN TOTAL	20	23	19	62
	32.3	37.1	30.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE= 17.31503 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0002

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.46723

of all council members who responded on the 1-4 scale of priorities that the agency should place on client groups. Responses were grouped into two categories, high priority and average or below average priority.

Method of entry was related to council members' perception of the priority that should be placed on (1) low income adults and youth and (2) minority adults and youth, at the .05 level of significance with low association (Tables 58, 59). In each case, more than half of all council members, regardless of method of entry, rated the two groups as high priority clientele. However, those council members serving in EFNEP entry cities gave each of the client groups a considerably higher priority than those in traditional entry cities.

A relationship was also found between method of entry and the perceived priority that should be placed on farmers. The relationship was significant at the .05 level. The degree of association was low (Table 60). Almost 69 percent of the traditional entry council members responded that farmers should receive high priority as a client group, whereas only 36.1 percent of the EFNEP entry council members responded that they should receive high priority. Traditional entry council members appeared to perceive that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place considerably greater priority on farmers than EFNEP entry council members.

Hypothesis six was rejected for the client groups of (1) low income adults and youth, (2) minority adults and youth, and (3) farmers. Hypothesis six was not rejected for the remaining fourteen client groups. EFNEP entry council members appeared to place a

Table 58

Relationship Between Perceived Priority that Should Be Placed on Low Income Adults and Youth and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
1. AVERAGE OR BELOW PRIORITY	16	9	25
	50.0	21.4	33.8
2. HIGH PRIORITY	16	33	49
	50.0	78.6	66.2
COLUMN TOTAL	32	42	74
	43.2	56.8	100.0

[a]CORRECTED CHI SQUARE= 5.41197 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0200

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.28671

[a]Yates'

Table 59

Relationship Between Perceived Priority that Should Be Placed on Minority Adults and Youth and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
1. AVERAGE OR BELOW PRIORITY	14	8	22
	46.7	19.0	30.6
2. HIGH PRIORITY	16	34	50
	53.3	81.0	69.4
COLUMN TOTAL	30	42	72
	41.7	58.3	100.0

[a]CORRECTED CHI SQUARE= 5.05683 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0245

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.28347

[a]Yates'

Table 60

Relationship Between Perceived Priority that Should Be Placed on Farmers and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
1. AVERAGE OR BELOW PRIORITY	10	23	33
	31.3	63.9	48.5
2. HIGH PRIORITY	22	13	35
	68.8	36.1	51.5
COLUMN TOTAL	32	36	68
	47.1	52.9	100.0

[a]CORRECTED CHI SQUARE= 5.97759 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0145

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.30992

[a]Yates'

considerably higher priority on low income and minority clientele than traditional entry council members. Conversely, traditional entry council members placed higher priority on farmers than EFNEP entry council members.

CONTRIBUTION OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

Council members were asked to rate the contribution that they perceived the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service was currently making in their city according to the following scale: 1—making few contributions, 2—making some contribution, 3—making many contributions, 4—making a very great contribution, and 5—do not know. Council members were then asked, in an open-ended question, to suggest how the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service might increase its contribution in their cities.

Findings relative to present contribution are presented in terms of frequency of responses and chi square associations between perception of contribution and the variables, size of city and method of entry. Findings for the open-ended question are grouped into four broad categories and discussed in terms of frequency of responses and generally in terms of the variables, size of city and method of entry, where appropriate.

Perception of Current Contribution

When asked how they rated the contribution that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service was currently making to the people of their cities, the 76 council members gave the following responses:

1) few contributions 6.6%

2) some contribution 26.3

3) many contributions. 28.9

4) a very great contribution . . . 27.6

5) do not know 10.5

It appeared that slightly over one-half of the council members perceived that the agency was making many or a very great contribution to the people in their cities.

For the purpose of testing the association between council members' perception of contribution and the variables, responses were grouped into two categories. The first category included responses indicating few contributions and some contribution. The second category included responses indicating many contributions and a very great contribution. Council members who indicated that they did not know what contribution the agency was making were not included.

There was no significant association at the .05 level between size of city and the contribution that council members perceived the agency to be making. However, there was a significant chi square at the .05 level with low association between method of entry and council members' perception of the contribution that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service was making in their cities (Table 61). Slightly over one-half of the council members in EFNEP entry cities responded that the agency was making few or some contributions. Slightly over 75 percent of the traditional entry council members responded that the agency was making many or a very great contribution. It appeared that council members in traditional entry cities perceived the agency to be

Table 61

Relationship Between Perceived Current Contribution and Method of Entry

COUNT / COL PCT	TRADITIONAL 1.	EFNEP 2.	ROW TOTAL
1. FEW AND SOME CONTRIBUTIONS	7	18	25
	21.2	51.4	36.8
2. MANY AND VERY GREAT CONTRIBUTION	26	17	43
	78.8	48.6	63.2
COLUMN TOTAL	33	35	68
	48.5	51.5	100.0

[a]CORRECTED CHI SQUARE= 5.43425 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM

SIGNIFICANCE= 0.0197

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT= 0.29889

[a]Yates'

making a greater contribution in their cities than EFNEP entry council members perceived it to be making in their cities.

Suggestions for Increasing Contribution

When asked what the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should do to make a greater contribution in their cities, 59 of 76 council members responded with a total of 122 suggestions. Responses were grouped into the following broad categories: (1) increase publicity and public relations efforts, (2) general programming suggestions, (3) specific programming suggestions, and (4) suggested clientele emphases (Table 62). Although all suggestions are included in Table 62, only those suggestions made by 10 percent or more of all council members are discussed.

By far the most frequently made suggestion was that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service increase its publicity and public relations efforts in cities. Twenty-four council members, 31.6 percent of the total council members interviewed, indicated that the agency could increase its contribution by better informing both the council members and the general public of the availability and variety of program offerings. Suggested methods included use of radio, television, the press, the schools, speakers, and mailings enclosed with other city department program announcements.

In terms of the variables, size of city and method of entry, six or more council members in each city size group indicated the desirability of increasing publicity and public relations. However, more suggestions came from council members in large cities than either

Table 62

Suggestions for Increasing the Cooperative Extension Service Contribution in Cities

Category	Total responses	Totals by size of city			Totals by method of entry	
		S	M	L	Trad.	EFNEP
1. Increase publicity and public relations efforts	24	6	7	10	10	14
2. General programing suggestions:						
a. Coordinate efforts with other agencies and volunteer organizations—eliminate duplication	9	3	4	2	3	6
b. Expand overall scope	5	1	1	3	1	4
c. Define goals, conduct objective evaluation—may be spreading self too thin	3	1	-	2	-	3
d. Serve as consultant in area of specialization	1	-	-	1	-	1
e. More personal contact in conducting programs	1	1	-	-	1	-
f. Design city programs to meet urban needs	1	-	1	-	1	-
g. Involve community leaders in planning, developing, and conducting programs	1	-	-	1	1	-
h. Acquaint citizens with available municipal services	1	1	-	-	-	1

Table 62 (continued)

Category	Total responses	Totals by size of city			Totals by method of entry	
		S	M	L	Trad.	EFNEP
3. Specific programming suggestions:						
a. Consumer education	5	1	3	1	2	3
b. Employment, including youth job preparation and placement	4	3	-	1	1	3
c. Expand 4-H programs including camping opportunities	4	1	1	2	2	2
d. Basic skills in urban living for low income, e.g., nutrition, budgeting, child care	4	-	4	-	1	3
e. Community education	3	2	1	-	1	2
f. Horticulture and home gardening	3	-	3	-	1	2
g. Conservation of energy	2	-	2	-	-	2
h. Limit scope to agriculture, family resources, and 4-H	2	-	1	1	2	-
i. Health education	2	2	-	-	-	2
j. Community resource development, including recreation	2	1	-	1	-	2
k. Emphasis on importance of agriculture and agri-business to cities	2	-	-	2	2	-

Table 62 (continued)

Category	Total responses	Totals by size of city			Totals by method of entry	
		S	M	L	Trad.	EFNEP
l. Environmental management	2	-	1	1	1	1
m. Clothing	1	-	1	-	-	1
n. Not much need for agriculture	1	-	-	1	-	1
o. Seafood industry	1	-	1	-	1	-
p. Economic education	1	-	-	1	1	-
q. Gun safety	1	1	-	-	-	1
r. Summer campus experience for youth with scholarships	1	-	1	-	-	1
4. Suggested Clientele Emphasis:						
a. Youth	15	4	7	4	8	7
b. Low income	6	1	4	1	2	4
c. Middle income	3	-	2	1	1	2
d. Senior citizens	2	1	1	-	1	1
e. Homemakers	2	-	1	1	2	-
f. Minorities	1	1	-	-	-	1

Table 62 (continued)

Category	Total responses	Totals by size of city			Totals by method of entry	
		S	M	L	Trad.	EFNEP
g. Unemployed	1	1	-	-	-	1
h. Community leaders	1	1	-	-	-	1
i. Families	1	-	1	-	-	1
j. Unskilled	1	-	1	-	-	1
k. Farmers	1	-	-	1	1	-
l. Upper income	1	-	1	-	-	1

of the other two groups. More council members in EFNEP entry cities than traditional entry cities suggested increasing publicity and public relations.

The general programming suggestion made most often was the desirability of the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service coordinating its efforts with other agencies and volunteer organizations. This suggestion was made by 11.8 percent of the council members. Three council members in small cities, four in medium cities, and two in large cities made the suggestion. Six of those council members served EFNEP entry cities and three served traditional entry cities.

Youth was the most often mentioned client group, with 19.7 percent of the council members suggesting the desirability of continuing or expanding youth programs. The suggestion was made most often in medium cities, with seven members making the suggestion. Four members each in small and large cities made the suggestion. Eight of the council members served traditional entry cities and seven served EFNEP entry cities.

Just over one-half of all council members perceived that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service was currently making many contributions or a very great contribution in their cities. Traditional entry council members appeared to perceive that the agency was making a greater contribution in their cities than EFNEP entry council members. Over 30 percent of the council members felt that the agency could increase its contribution by increasing its publicity and public relations efforts. More than 10 percent of the council members also suggested that the agency coordinate its efforts with other city

organizations and agencies and continue or expand its emphasis on youth.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS PERTAINING TO CLIENTELE AND CONTRIBUTION

The Virginia city council members studied displayed a high degree of unfamiliarity with clientele currently served by the Cooperative Extension Service. Of the six most unfamiliar client groups, two could be generally categorized as individuals or social groups and four could be categorized as business, industry, or government related groups. The two individual or social groups were (1) problem youngsters and (2) young married couples under thirty years of age. The four business, industry, or government related groups were (1) state and federal agencies, (2) home and family related business groups, (3) non-agriculturally related business and industry, and (4) agriculturally related business and industry. Council members appeared to be generally more unfamiliar with efforts directed toward business, industry, and government related groups than with efforts directed toward individuals or social groups.

The most familiar groups were farmers, homemakers, and any interested city youth of 4-H age. These groups are representative of the traditional Virginia Cooperative Extension Service client base.

Size of city appeared to affect council members' unfamiliarity with (1) farmers, (2) agriculturally related business and industry, and (3) problem youngsters. In all cases, as size of city increased, unfamiliarity increased. Agricultural client groups appeared to be

related to size of city more often than any other types of client groups. Council members in small cities indicated decisively greater familiarity with agricultural client groups than council members in either medium or large cities.

Method of entry appeared to be related to unfamiliarity with (1) volunteer service, civic, and development organizations, (2) city employees, (3) state and federal agencies, (4) farmers, (5) agriculturally related business and industry, and (6) any interested city youth of 4-H age. Council members in EFNEP entry cities were more unfamiliar with efforts currently directed toward all six groups. The relationships found may indicate that less emphasis is placed on business and service oriented types of clientele in EFNEP entry cities. They may also indicate that the perceived scope of clientele served is narrower in EFNEP entry cities than in traditional entry cities.

Council members generally agreed that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service is placing proper rank order priority on clientele. They seemed to believe that city clientele emphases should center around (1) youth and (2) individuals or social groups, particularly minority, low income, homemakers, problem youngsters, and senior citizens. Relatively lower priority, they believed, should be placed on business, industrial, and government related client groups. Further, they seemed to emphasize that low income clients should receive a much higher priority than middle or upper income clients. However, council members' mean priority responses indicated that all client groups except farmers should receive additional emphasis.

Size of city seemed to influence council members' perception

of the priority that should be placed on (1) community leaders, (2) farmers, and (3) agriculturally related business and industry. Council members in small cities placed considerably higher priority on community leaders as clients. Those in medium and large cities gave community leaders an average or below average rating. Council members in both small and large cities rated the two agricultural client groups as high priority groups, although those in small cities gave them a slightly higher priority. Council members in medium cities gave all three client groups average or below average ratings.

Method of entry appeared to be related to the perception council members have of the priority that should be placed on (1) low income adults and youth, (2) minority adults and youth, and (3) farmers. Although all council members placed a generally high priority on minority and low income clientele, EFNEP entry council members appeared to place a considerably higher priority on these two client groups. Conversely, traditional entry council members placed a higher priority on farmers.

The findings on program and clientele priorities generally appear to indicate that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service is perceived as providing assistance to urban clientele. Council members' rating of the contribution that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service is making in cities further supports this view. Slightly over one-half of all council members indicated that the agency was making many contributions or a very great contribution to the residents of their cities. It appeared, however, that traditional entry council members perceived it to be making a greater contribution than EFNEP

entry council members.

Almost one-third of all council members indicated that the agency's contribution could be increased by better informing both council members and the general public of the availability and variety of program offerings. This recommendation from council members appears justified in view of the high degree of unfamiliarity found with both programs and clientele. Council members in EFNEP cities and large cities generally perceived a greater need for increased publicity and public relations. The other two most frequently made suggestions for increasing the agency's contribution were that (1) the agency coordinate its efforts with other city organizations and agencies and (2) it continue or expand its emphasis on youth.

Chapter 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the present study, including the problem, research methodology, and findings. The summary of the study is followed by conclusions and recommendations.

SUMMARY

The Problem

The problem addressed in this study was: How do city council members serving Virginia cities with populations of 50,000 or more perceive Virginia Cooperative Extension Service programs and clientele as they relate to urban concerns? More specifically, this research assessed whether or not there was agreement between council members' perception of the agency's current city program and clientele priorities and their perception of what those priorities should be. It also identified council members' views on the emphasis they believed the agency should place on specific programs and clientele. The study solicited their views on the agency's present contribution in Virginia cities and how its contribution could be increased. Finally, the study attempted to determine if the size of the city or the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service method of entry into the city influenced council members' perception of agency programs, clientele, and contribution.

Research Methodology

This study utilized an ex post facto survey research design. The study population consisted of the total population of seventy-eight city council members serving the ten Virginia cities having populations of 50,000 or more and established Cooperative Extension Service units. Seventy-six of the seventy-eight council members serving in the cities of Alexandria, Chesapeake, Hampton, Lynchburg, Newport News, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Richmond, Roanoke, and Virginia Beach participated in the study.

Data were collected through structured interviews with council members. Likert-type scales indicating degree of priority or degree of contribution, with no response options, were utilized to elicit responses to all items except one. The exception was an open-ended item soliciting suggestions for improving the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service contribution in cities.

Computer analysis utilized the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to determine frequency and percentage distributions, means, crosstabulations, chi square tests, Yates' correction for continuity, and contingency coefficients (Nie et al, 1975). Spearman rho rank order correlations and weighted means were computed by hand. Data from the open-ended item were grouped into four broad categories and discussed. A significance level of .05 was used to determine the critical value for chi square analysis. The critical value for Spearman rho computations was .700.

Findings

Program and content areas. The findings indicated that council members have a generally high degree of unfamiliarity with all program areas. More than one-third of all council members were unfamiliar with nineteen of twenty-eight content areas given for their assessment. They were apparently most unfamiliar with the newer, less traditional program areas of Technical Resources and Community Resource Development.

Members of council indicated greater familiarity with the more traditional program areas of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Family Resources, and 4-H. They were apparently most familiar with the Agriculture and Natural Resources program area. However, within the Agriculture and Natural Resources program area, council members were most familiar with and placed highest priority on the more urban oriented content areas. Additionally, council members disclosed the belief that the agency currently places its greatest emphasis on the traditional program areas and that is should continue to do so.

Size of city appeared to influence unfamiliarity with Community Resource Development content areas. Council members in large cities were most unfamiliar with the areas of (1) community education, (2) community improvement, (3) tourism and recreation, and (4) community facilities and services.

Method of entry seemed to influence council members' unfamiliarity with (1) land-use planning, zoning, and land-use taxation, (2) community improvement, (3) tourism and recreation, (4) career exploration, (5) educational programs informing citizens of

resources available in their city to assist with family social and economic problems, (6) household and public pest control, (7) farm and agriculture business management, (8) production, harvesting, processing, and marketing of agriculture and seafood products, and (9) proper use and conservation of natural resources. Four of the content areas were Agriculture and Natural Resources content areas. EFNEP entry council members were more unfamiliar with each of the nine content areas than traditional entry council members.

Council members generally agreed that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service is placing proper rank order priority on content areas within the program areas of Community Resource Development, Technical Resources, Family Resources, and Agriculture and Natural Resources. This was not found to be true in 4-H. The rank order discrepancies in 4-H indicated that (1) higher priority should be placed on developing skills through real life experiences with projects in various areas and (2) lower priority should be placed on providing educational resources for other city youth organizations and special interest groups.

Members of council indicated that a total of eleven content areas should either receive considerably above average or well above average priority. Of these eleven, two related to conservation and indicated the view that conservation should be an area of primary concern in cities. The remaining nine high priority content areas centered around the family related groups of (1) family resources food and nutrition, (2) practices that contribute to good family health, (3) consumer education, (4) home gardening and horticulture, (5) child

and family relations, (6) household and public pest control, (7) 4-H food and nutrition, (8) developing citizenship, leadership, personal growth, and development qualities in youth, and (9) community education. Council members further expressed the belief that relatively lower priority should be placed on programs for business, industry, and government. However, they appeared to perceive that the agency should increase, at least to some degree, its efforts in all program and content areas given for their assessment.

Size of city appeared to influence the priority that council members felt the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on (1) developing citizenship, leadership, personal growth, and development qualities and (2) farm and agriculture business management. In each case, council members in small cities placed highest priority on the areas. Council members in large cities placed next highest priority on them and council members in medium cities placed considerably lower priority on them.

Method of entry appeared to influence the priority council members' felt the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should place on (1) community facilities and services, which was rated higher in EFNEP entry cities, and on (2) production, harvesting, processing, marketing of agriculture and seafood products and (3) farm and agriculture business management, which were rated higher in traditional entry cities.

Clientele. The Virginia city council members studied displayed a high degree of unfamiliarity with clientele currently served by the Cooperative Extension Service. Of the six most unfamiliar client

groups, two could be generally categorized as individuals or social groups and four could be categorized as business, industry, or government related groups. The two individual or social groups were (1) problem youngsters and (2) young married couples under thirty years of age. The four business, industry, or government related groups were (1) state and federal agencies, (2) home and family related business groups, (3) non-agriculturally related business and industry, and (4) agriculturally related business and industry. Council members appeared to be generally more unfamiliar with efforts directed toward business, industry, and government related groups than with efforts directed toward individuals or social groups.

The most familiar groups were farmers, homemakers, and any interested city youth of 4-H age. These groups are representative of the traditional Virginia Cooperative Extension Service client base.

Size of city appeared to affect council members' unfamiliarity with (1) farmers, (2) agriculturally related business and industry, and (3) problem youngsters. In all cases, as size of city increased unfamiliarity increased. Size of city appeared to be related to unfamiliarity with agricultural client groups more often than any other types of client groups. Council members in small cities indicated decisively greater familiarity with agricultural client groups than council members in either medium or large cities.

Method of entry appeared to be related to unfamiliarity with (1) volunteer service, civic, and development organizations, (2) city employees, (3) state and federal agencies, (4) farmers, (5) agriculturally related business and industry, and (6) any interested city

youth of 4-H age. Council members in EFNEP entry cities were more unfamiliar with efforts currently directed toward all six groups.

Council members generally agreed that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service is placing proper rank order priority on clientele. They seemed to believe that city clientele emphases should center around (1) youth and (2) individuals or social groups, particularly minority, low income, homemakers, problem youngsters, and senior citizens. They indicated that relatively low emphasis should generally be placed on business, industrial, and government related client groups. They further seemed to emphasize that low income clients should receive a much higher priority than middle or upper income clients. However, council members' mean priority responses indicated that all client groups except farmers should receive additional emphasis.

Size of city seemed to influence council members' perception of the priority that should be placed on (1) community leaders, (2) farmers, and (3) agriculturally related business and industry. Council members in small cities placed considerably higher priority on community leaders as clients. Council members in medium and large cities gave community leaders an average or below average priority. Those members in both small and large cities rated the two agricultural client groups as high priority groups, although those in small cities gave them a slightly higher priority. Council members in medium cities gave all three client groups average or below average ratings.

Method of entry appeared to be related to the perception council members have of the priority that should be placed on (1) low

income adults and youth, (2) minority adults and youth, and (3) farmers. Although all council members placed a generally high priority on minority and low income clientele, EFNEP entry council members appeared to place a considerably higher priority on these two client groups. Conversely, traditional entry council members placed a higher priority on farmers.

Contribution. Slightly over one-half of all council members indicated that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service was making many contributions or a very great contribution to the residents of their cities. It appeared, however, that traditional entry council members perceived it to be making a greater contribution than EFNEP entry council members.

Almost one-third of all council members indicated that the agency's contribution could be increased by better informing both council members and the general public of the availability and variety of program offerings. Council members in EFNEP cities and large cities generally perceived a greater need for increased publicity and public relations. The other two most frequently made suggestions for increasing the agency's contribution were that (1) the agency coordinate its efforts with other city organizations and agencies and (2) it continue or expand its emphasis on youth.

CONCLUSIONS

Several conclusions can be drawn related to city council members' perception of programs, clientele, and contribution that may

be useful in strengthening existing or developing new city Virginia Cooperative Extension Service programs. These conclusions pertain to (1) council members' knowledge of the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service, (2) their image of the agency, (3) the effects of the variables, size of city and method of entry, on the image of the agency and its scope, and (4) their assessment of priorities that the agency should place on programs and clientele.

Knowledge of the Agency

City council members have limited knowledge of Virginia Cooperative Extension Service programs and clientele. They were most unaware of Technical Resources and Community Resource Development programs. They were also most unaware of current efforts directed toward business, industry, and government related client groups, types of clientele usually served through Technical Resources and Community Resource Development programs.

A high percentage of council members suggested that the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service could increase its contribution to the residents of Virginia cities by increasing its efforts to inform both council members and the general public of the availability and variety of program offerings. Their suggestions that both council members and the public need to be better informed about the agency and their lack of knowledge of agency programs and clientele suggest the need for more effective communication between the agency and council members. It is important that council members are knowledgable and aware of agency efforts since, as the literature reviewed suggested, their image of the

agency will affect the agency's ability to compete for financial support to continue or increase its program efforts.

General Image of the Agency

As a group, the council members studied generally identified the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service program areas of Agriculture and Natural Resources, 4-H, and Family Resources as the most visible and most important program areas. At first inspection, this appears to imply that council members have a traditional image of the agency. This is true only in so far as council members generally were more knowledgable with and placed greatest importance on the traditional program areas. It does not imply that they think of the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service as being strictly a rural agency. When the findings beyond the broad program area image are considered, it is evident that council members are most knowldegable of and believe the agency places greater emphasis on content areas within the traditional program areas that are most relevant to urban needs. This was particularly true in the Agriculture and Natural Resources program area where council members were generally most aware of and felt the agency placed greatest importance on non-production agriculture content areas. The view generally held by the Virginia city council members studied support the conclusions of the study by Prawl and Jorns (1976) that the Cooperative Extension Service can and does assist in meeting the needs of urban people. This conclusion is contrary to the bulk of the literature reviewed for this study, which indicated that urban people did not perceive the Cooperative Extension Service as relevant to urban

people.

Effects of the Variables on the Image of the Agency

The variables, size of city and method of entry, both appeared to particularly affect council members' familiarity with and the priority they believed should be placed on Agriculture and Natural Resources content areas. This seemed to be true of both production and urban oriented Agriculture and Natural Resources content areas. Further, the findings seemed to imply that council members in traditional entry and small and large cities tend to be more oriented toward agricultural programs generally and production agricultural programs specifically. Some caution should be taken in looking only at the surface implications of these findings. The reader should be aware that two of the cities whose council members were studied are somewhat atypical cities in that they have large commercial agricultural sectors within their boundaries. These two cities were Virginia Beach, a large traditional entry city, and Chesapeake, a small traditional entry city. The presence of commercial agricultural sectors in these two cities might logically influence the perception that council members serving them have of the importance of Agriculture and Natural Resources content areas, particularly those more closely related to agricultural production. The findings indicated that council members in traditional entry, small, and large cities were more production agriculture oriented. The responses of council members from Virginia Beach and Chesapeake fell within one or more of these variable categories and their potential influence on the findings cannot be ignored.

Influence of Method of Entry on Perception of the Agency's Scope

The high degree of familiarity displayed by traditional entry council members with business and service oriented clientele and their higher degree of familiarity with more diverse content areas suggest that they have a broader view of the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service than EFNEP entry council members. Although a stronger production agriculture image also appears to prevail among traditional entry council members, they appear to have a more comprehensive view of the agency's scope not limited strictly to production agriculture. Traditional entry council members also believed that the agency was making a greater contribution in their cities than EFNEP entry council members. This seems to contradict previous studies reviewed in the literature which suggested that the Cooperative Extension Service agricultural image may be a disadvantage in developing support for urban programs and working with urban clientele.

Conversely, council members serving EFNEP entry cities seem to have a more limited view of the overall scope of the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service. In all cases, where significant relationships were found between unfamiliarity with content areas and clientele and the method of entry variable, EFNEP entry council members were the more unfamiliar group. The higher emphasis they placed on low income and minority clientele and the lower priority they placed on farmers and the two production agriculture related content areas further indicate a strong orientation toward EFNEP type clientele and away from agriculture programs and clients. EFNEP entry council

members' perception appears generally more limited and more specifically oriented toward the EFNEP program.

The Virginia Cooperative Extension Service seems to be closely identified with its initial method of entry into Virginia cities. The identity established through method of entry tends to persist.

Assessment of Agency Clientele and Program Priorities

Members of council generally agreed that the agency is placing proper rank order priority on the client groups offered for their assessment in this study. The greatest discrepancy was noted with farmers, whom they felt should receive lower priority than they presently receive.

Council members also generally agreed that the agency is placing proper rank order priority on the content areas within the Agriculture and Natural Resources, Technical Resources, Family Resources, and Community Resource Development program areas. However, they disagreed with the priority that they believed the agency currently places on 4-H content areas. They felt that the rank order priority in the 4-H content area of developing skills through real life experiences with projects in various areas should be raised. They also felt that the rank order priority on providing educational resources for other city youth organizations should be lowered.

Council members indicated that highest clientele priorities should be centered around youth, including problem youngsters, and other individual or social groups, including minorities, low income, homemakers, and senior citizens. The high priority they placed on

youth was further strengthened by the specific suggestions made to continue or expand agency emphasis on youth. The high priority they placed on individual and social groups was also emphasized in their assessment of what should be high priority programs. They indicated that high priority programs should center around the family or family members and conservation. Council members believed that the agency should place relatively lower emphasis on business, industry, and government related content areas and clientele. The priorities council members believe should be placed on both programs and clientele indicate that council members feel highest agency priorities should be those which assist city residents with individual physical and social needs associated with urban life. However, members appeared to perceive that the agency should increase, at least to some degree, its efforts in all program and content areas given for their assessment. They also indicated the belief that the agency should continue to place greater priority on the program areas of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Family Resources, and 4-H than on the program areas of Technical Resources and Community Resource Development.

In summary, city council members have limited knowledge of the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service. However, they believe the agency and its programs are relevant to meeting the needs of urban residents. Both size of city and method of entry appear to influence city council members' perception. The Virginia Cooperative Extension Service seems to be closely identified with its initial method of entry into cities and that identity tends to persist. The priorities that council members believe should be placed on both programs and clientele

indicate the belief that highest agency priorities should be given to assisting city residents with individual and social needs associated with urban living.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions point to several steps that may be taken by the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service in strengthening existing or developing new agency programs in cities. Further, this research has suggested several recommendations for additional study.

Recommendations for the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service

1. Considering the competition for local financial support and the influence that city council members' decisions have on local support of the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service, it is important that council members be aware of agency programs and activities in their cities. Increasing council members' awareness of the agency and its programs can enhance its credibility. Given the high level of unfamiliarity and the large number of suggestions that the council members need to be better informed, the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should actively seek to develop more effective communication with the city administrative structure in the cities it serves.

2. Not only is it desirable for council members to be aware of the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service and its programs, but it is also desirable that the agency be aware of those programs and client groups that city council members feel are most important in cities. Council members are more likely to support programs they feel are

assisting in meeting the needs of city residents. In view of this, the agency may wish to examine its priorities in cities in consideration of whether or not they are in agreement with council members' perceived priorities. Specifically, the agency may wish to reexamine its emphases in these three areas:

(1) The current program emphases in cities in view of the high priorities council members felt should be placed on programs generally centered around conservation and the family or family members and in view of the lower priority they felt should be placed on programs for business, industry, and government.

(2) The current program emphases in the 4-H program area in view of disagreement expressed in rank order priority of content areas by council members.

(3) The current clientele emphases in view of the high priority council members felt should be placed on youth, including problem youngsters, and other individual or social groups, including minorities, low income, homemakers, and senior citizens, and in view of the relatively low priority they believe should be given to business, industrial, and government related client groups.

Recommendations for Additional Study

1. Because of the length of this study, the data were not analyzed by individual city. Such individual city analysis would be valuable for several reasons. It would help provide some insight into how much, if any, influence the views of the council members in the cities of Chesapeake and Virginia Beach, cities with major

agricultural sectors, had on the findings of this study. Individual analysis may give some indication of whether it was method of entry or length of time programs have been established in the city or some combination of the two which may have influenced the findings of this study. Originally, length of time the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service programs had been in the cities was included as a variable in this study. However, when the variable categories were collapsed to the point that chi square analysis could be used, time became synonymous with method of entry. Analysis by city would provide valuable program planning information for unit staffs in the cities studied. Finally, both city unit staff members and members of council have expressed a desire to have the data analyzed by individual city.

2. This study should be replicated using a random sample of city residents. This would allow the people being served to have input in determining the priorities that should be placed on programs and clientele. This type of study, in itself, would be a mechanism for informing citizens of the availability and diversity of Virginia Cooperative Extension Service programs.

3. Perception formation is a very complex and individual process. Because of this, other factors, such as size of city unit staff, how long a program has been in the city, make up of cities, and demographic data on council members, could also have influenced the findings of this study. Consideration of these or other variables in future studies would be helpful in developing a composite of variables that may influence city council members' perception of Cooperative Extension Service programs and activities.

REFERENCES

Allen, Edward S. "The Perception That Certain County Boards of Supervisors in the Southwest Extension District Have of the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service." Unpublished MS thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1967.

Allen, Edward S., District Agent, Southwest Extension District. Telephone interview. Roanoke, Virginia, June 2, 1977.

Amburgey, Lyman R. "Commercial Fertilizer Manufacturer and Distributor Representatives' Perception of the Arizona Cooperative Extension Service." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1962.

Anderson, G. Lester. "The Land-Grant University and the Urban Condition," Education and Urban Society, V (November, 1972), 5-20.

Asch, S. E. "Forming Impressions of Personality," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 41 (July, 1946), 258-290.

Barcus, Francis E. "The Role of Agricultural Extension in the Suburban Community." Communications Research Center Report No. 6. Boston: Boston University, August, 1962.

Bebout, John. "University Services to the Urban Community," The American Behavioral Scientist, VI (February, 1963), 24-45.

Bell, Wilmer V. "Finance, Legislation, and Public Policy for Adult Education," Handbook of Adult Education. ed. Malcolm S. Knowles. Washington, D. C.: Adult Education Association, 1960.

Blalock, Thomas C. "State Legislators Perception of the North Carolina Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1963.

Brown, Emory J. "Adapting Extension to Urban Environment (Internal Forces)," Journal of Cooperative Extension, III (Spring, 1965), 11-18.

Brown, Emory J. and Patrick G. Boyle. 4-H In Urban Areas: A Case Study of 4-H Organization and Programs in Selected Areas. Washington, D. C.: National 4-H Club Foundation, 1964.

Brownell, Joseph C. "A Study of Urban 4-H Club Programs in Thirty Cities of the United States," Research and Investigation in Adult Education, 1972 Annual Register, 1971, 186. (Abstract)

Bryn, Darcie, ed. Evaluation in Extension. Topeka, Kansas: H. M. Ives and Sons, Inc., 1959.

Cohnstaedt, Martin L. and Thomas K. Phillipson. "The Urban Extension Agent," Adult Leadership, 10 (February, 1962), 225-226, 248.

Conley, Reginald D. "The Role of the Farm and Home Development Agent as Perceived by Cooperating Families." Unpublished MS thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1961.

Curti, Merle Eugene. The Growth of American Thought. 2d ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1951.

Dobbs, Ralph C. and Charles W. McKinney. "Extension for the Inner City Dweller," Negro Educational Review, XXV (October, 1974), 213-217.

Fisher, W.L., G. W. Collings and O. Wilhelmy, Jr. Final Report on an Objective Evaluation of the Present and Potential Structure and Functions of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. Columbus, Ohio: Battelle Memorial Institute, July 23, 1964.

Ford Foundation. Urban Extension: A Report on Experimental Programs Assisted by the Ford Foundation. New York: Ford Foundation, 1966.

Gregory, John Richard. "Perception of Selected Garden Club Members of Cooperative Extension Programs in Outdoor Environment." Unpublished MS thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1967.

Griffith, Paul W. "Formula Feed Operators' Perception of the Kansas Agricultural Extension Service." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1961.

Harrington, Fred Harvey. The Future of Adult Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

Hilgard, Ernest R., Richard C. Atkinson and Rita L. Atkinson. Introduction to Psychology. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1975.

Hinkle, Dennis E., Associate Professor, Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Lecture notes and personal interviews, 1977-1978.

Jenkins, David D. "The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service as Perceived by Resource Development Committee Representatives." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Ohio State University, 1964. Adult Education: A Journal of Research and Theory, XV (Summer, 1965), 199. (Abstract)

Jones, Daniel G. Population Projections—Virginia Counties and Cities—1980-2000. Richmond, Virginia: Department of Planning and Budget, Economic Research Section, June, 1977.

Keffer, Wayne M., District Agent, East Central Extension District. Telephone interview. Appomattox, Virginia, June 1, 1977.

Kelly, Earl McNeil. "A Study of the Relative Importance of Selected Content and Clientele of Cooperative Extension Service Programs as Reflected by County Commissioners from Rural and Urban Counties in Florida." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Florida State University, 1973.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Kirby, Edwin L., Administrator, Extension Service-USDA, Washington, D. C. "Statement on Urban Extension Work," Journal of Cooperative Extension, XI (Spring, 1973), 14.

Klotsche, J. Martin. The Urban University: And the Future of Our Cities. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Kohl, Margaret F. "Factors Affecting the Development of Urban 4-H Club Work." Unpublished MA thesis, University of Chicago, 1951.

Lester, C. Ned, Associate Dean, Extension Division. Personal interview. Blacksburg, Virginia, May, 1977.

Lindesmith, Alfred R., Anslem L. Strauss and Norman K. Denzin. Social Psychology. Hinsdale, Illinois: The Dryden Press, 1975.

Litterer, Joseph A. The Analysis of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.

Loewenstein, Duane E. "The Image the General Public of Northeast Nebraska has of University of Nebraska Extension Service." Nebraska Agricultural Extension Service, 1966. Adult Education: A Journal of Research and Theory, XVI (Summer, 1966), 196. (Abstract)

Luchines, Abraham S. "Experimental Attempts to Minimize the Impact of First Impressions," The Order of Presentation in Persuasion. ed. Carl I. Hovland. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.

McCown, Jack T. "The Florida Legislators' Perception of the Florida Agricultural Extension Service." Unpublished EdD thesis, North Carolina State University, 1969. Adult Education Dissertation Abstracts: 1968-69. 179. (Abstract)

McGrath, Joseph E. Social Psychology: A Brief Introduction. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Miller, Mason E. "Disagreement on Extension's Role and Clientele," Journal of Cooperative Extension, V (Fall, 1967), 187.

Miller, Paul A. A Statement of Scope and Responsibility: The Cooperative Extension Service...Today. (no publisher given) April, 1958.

Miller, Paul A. The Cooperative Extension Service: Paradoxical Servant—The Rural Precedent in Continuing Education. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University, Publications in Continuing Education, 1973.

Moore, Paul J. "Montana County Extension Program Planning Committee Members' Perception of the Cooperative Extension Service." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1962.

Moss, Gwenna. "How Community Leaders View Extension," Journal of Extension, XII (Fall, 1974), 8-15.

Nash, George. "Community Services," The University in Urban Affairs: A Symposium. ed. Peter M. Tobia. Brooklyn, New York: St John's University, 1969.

Nie, Norman H., C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner and Dale H. Bent. SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1975.

O'Meara, Delbert E., Program Leader, Community Resource Development, Southeast Extension District. Telephone interview. Emporia, Virginia, June 1 and June 15, 1977.

Paige, Joseph C. "4-H for Central City Minorities," Journal of Extension, VIII (Spring, 1970), 11-16.

Parsons, Jerry. "Inner-City Youth Programs: Guidelines," Journal of Extension, IX (Summer, 1971), 31-40.

Paulson, Belden. "Status of Extension's Urban Programming," Journal of Extension, XI (Spring, 1973), 23-34.

Petshek, Kirk R. "A New Role for City Universities—Urban Extension Programs," Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 30 (November, 1969), 304-316.

Prawl, Warren L. and William J. Jorns. "Reviewing County Extension Programs," Journal of Extension, XVI (July/August, 1976), 11-17.

Pusey, Robert H., Director, Technical Resources. Personal interview. Blacksburg, Virginia, May, 1977.

Reisbeck, Robert F. and James Reynolds. "Extension Is Involved," Heritage Horizons: Extension's Commitment to People. eds. C. Austin Vines and Marvin A. Anderson. Madison, Wisconsin: Journal of Extension, 1976.

Reynolds, J. A., Associate Dean, Extension Division. Personal interview. Blacksburg, Virginia, August, 1977.

Rynearson, Stanley I. "Understanding and Utilization of the Cooperative Extension Service Program in Columbia County, Wisconsin, by Selected Agri-Business Concerns." Unpublished MS thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1961.

Smith, Lewis B., District Agent, Northeast Extension District. Telephone interview. Richmond, Virginia, May 30, 1977.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. Census of Population 1970. Characteristics of the Population, Vol. 1. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1977. Report No. 94-1224, 94th Congress, 2d Session, June 8, 1976.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1969. Report No. 90-1335, 90th Congress, 2d Session, April 30, 1968.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1970. Report No. 91-265, 91st Congress, 1st Session, May 23, 1969.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Department of Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriation Bill, 1973. Report No. 92-1175, 92d Congress, 2d Session, June 26, 1972.

U. S. Congress. The Statutes at Large of the United States of America from March, 1913 to March, 1915, Concurrent Resolutions of the Two Houses of Congress, and Recent Treaties, Conventions, and Executive Proclamations. Part 1 - Public Acts and Resolutions, Vol. XXXVIII. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1915.

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

U. S. Department of Agriculture and National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. A Report of the Joint USDA-NASULGC Study Committee on Cooperative Extension: A People and a Spirit. Fort Collins, Colorado: Colorado State University, 1968.

Vaughn, Gerald F. and J. B. Wyckoff. Effective Community Development Education in Urbanizing Areas. Amherst, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts, May, 1970.

Virginia. General Assembly. Acts of Assembly. 1966.

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Extension Division. Administrative Handbook. Blacksburg, Virginia, 1970.

Weddle, Benjamin H., Jr., District Agent, Northern Extension District. Telephone interview. Luray, Virginia, June 15, 1977.

White, Estelle E. "A Study of County Commissioners' Perception of the North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service." Unpublished MEd thesis, North Carolina State University, 1965.

Wolfe, Marie A. "Methods of Establishing and Promoting 4-H Club Work in Urban Areas." Unpublished MS thesis, Cornell University, 1956.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENT

INSTRUMENT

SECTION I. Background Information (NOT TO BE COMPLETED BY COUNCIL MEMBER)

	Code
1. Name of city served	Cols. 1-2____
a. Alexandria	01
b. Chesapeake	02
c. Hampton	03
d. Lynchburg	04
e. Newport News	05
f. Norfolk	06
g. Portsmouth	07
h. Richmond	08
i. Roanoke	09
j. Virginia Beach	10
k. Danville (pretest)	11
2. Population of city	3____
a. Small (50,000--100,000)	1
b. Medium (100,001--150,000)	2
c. Large (over 150,000)	3
3. Length of time Virginia Cooperative Extension Service has been conducting programs in the city	4____
a. Less than 5 years	1
b. 5-10 years	2
c. More than 10 years	3
4. Method of entry into the city	5____
a. Traditional	1
b. EFNEP	2

(city)

SECTION II. Cooperative Extension Service Programs and Activities

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: Cooperative Extension Service programs and activities are grouped into five areas: 4-H, technical resources, agriculture and natural resources, community resource development, and family resources. There are programs and activities within each area which may be applicable in cities. Section II deals with a number of programs and activities within each area. Please use the scale below in rating your perception of the Cooperative Extension Service programs and activities given in this section:

1--No priority 2--Low priority 3--Average priority 4--High priority 5--Not familiar enough with program/activity to respond

CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH ITEM IN THIS SECTION.

1.	A. What priority do you perceive Cooperative Extension IS CURRENTLY PLACING on the following 4-H programs and activities in your city?					B. What priority do you perceive Cooperative Extension SHOULD BE PLACING on the following 4-H programs and activities in your city?					Code
a. food and nutrition	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6___ 7___
b. career exploration	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	8___ 9___
c. developing citizenship, leadership, personal growth and development qualities	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	10___ 11___
d. developing skills through real life learning experiences with projects in such areas as electricity, photography, small engine repair, clothing, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	12___ 13___
e. providing educational resources for other city youth organizations and special interest groups	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	14___ 15___

1--No priority 2--Low priority 3--Average priority 4--High priority 5--Not familiar enough with program/activity to respond

2.	A. What priority do you perceive Cooperative Extension IS CURRENTLY PLACING on the following technical resources programs and activities in your city?					B. What priority do you perceive Cooperative Extension SHOULD BE PLACING on the following technical resources programs and activities in your city?					Code	
a. control of air, water, noise pollution and solid waste management	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	16___	17___
b. system engineering and technical problems of business, industry, and city government	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	18___	19___
c. industrial health and safety	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	20___	21___
d. conservation of energy	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	22___	23___

3.	A. What priority do you perceive Cooperative Extension IS CURRENTLY PLACING on the following agriculture and natural resources programs and activities in your city?					B. What priority do you perceive Cooperative Extension SHOULD BE PLACING on the following agriculture and natural resources programs and activities in your city?						
a. home gardening and horticulture	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	24___	25___
b. household and public pest control, e.g., rats, mosquitoes	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	26___	27___
c. farm and agriculture business management	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	28___	29___

1--No priority 2--Low priority 3--Average priority 4--High priority 5--Not familiar enough with program/activity to respond

	IS CURRENTLY PLACING					SHOULD BE PLACING					Code
d. production, harvesting, processing, marketing of agriculture and seafood products	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	30___ 31___
e. proper use and conservation of natural resources	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	32___ 33___

4. A. What priority do you perceive Cooperative Extension IS CURRENTLY PLACING on the following community resource development programs and activities in your city? B. What priority do you perceive Cooperative Extension SHOULD BE PLACING on the following community resource development programs and activities in your city?

a. organization and leadership development training, including volunteerism	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	34___ 35___
b. community education (use of public schools as a focal point to provide services to meet needs identified by citizens)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	36___ 37___
c. land use planning, zoning, land use taxation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	38___ 39___
d. community improvement	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	40___ 41___
e. tourism and recreation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	42___ 43___

1--No priority 2--Low priority 3--Average priority 4--High priority 5--Not familiar enough with program/activity to respond

	IS CURRENTLY PLACING					SHOULD BE PLACING					Code
f. community facilities and services such as housing, health, recreation, water, sewer, transportation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	44___ 45___

5. A. What priority do you perceive Cooperative Extension IS CURRENTLY PLACING on the following family resources programs and activities in your city? B. What priority do you perceive Cooperative Extension SHOULD BE PLACING on the following family resources programs and activities in your city?

a. practices that will contribute to good family health	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	46___ 47___
b. child and family relations	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	48___ 49___
c. consumer education	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	50___ 51___
d. home furnishing, maintenance, management, and home purchasing	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	52___ 53___
e. clothing construction	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	54___ 55___
f. food and nutrition	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	56___ 57___

1--No priority 2--Low priority 3--Average priority 4--High priority 5--Not familiar enough with program/activity to respond

	IS CURRENTLY PLACING					SHOULD BE PLACING					Code
g. job preparation--education and training of people in basic skills needed to apply for and hold jobs	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	58___ 59___
h. educational programs informing citizens of the resources available in their city to assist with family social and economic problems	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	60___ 61___

SECTION III. Cooperative Extension Service Clientele Groups

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: A number of clientele groups may be served through Cooperative Extension Service programs and activities in your city. Using the scale below, please rate your perception of the clientele groups given and circle the number that best describes your response to each item in this section.

1--No priority 2--Low priority 3--Average priority 4--High priority 5--Not familiar enough with program/activity to respond

6.	A. What priority do you perceive Cooperative Extension IS CURRENTLY PLACING on each of the following clientele groups in your city?					B. What priority do you perceive Cooperative Extension SHOULD BE PLACING on each of the following clientele groups in your city?					Code
a. senior citizens	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	62___ 63___
b. young married couples (under 30 years of age)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	64___ 65___
c. low income adults and youth	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	66___ 67___
d. middle income adults and youth	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	68___ 69___
e. upper income adults and youth	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	70___ 71___
f. minority adults and youth	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	72___ 73___
g. community leaders	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	74___ 75___

1--No priority 2--Low priority 3--Average priority 4--High priority 5--Not familiar enough with program/activity to respond

	IS CURRENTLY PLACING					SHOULD BE PLACING					
h. volunteer service, civic, and development organizations	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	76___ 77___ Case 78-79___ Deck 80___
i. city employees, e.g., social services, parks and recreation workers	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1___ 2___
j. home and family related business groups	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	3___ 4___
k. state and federal agencies including educational institutions located in the city	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	5___ 6___
l. homemakers	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	7___ 8___
m. farmers	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	9___ 10___
n. business, industry—non-agriculturally related	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	11___ 12___
o. business, industry—agriculturally related	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	13___ 14___
p. any interested city youth of 4-H age (9-19)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	15___ 16___
q. problem youngsters, e.g., school drop-outs, truants	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	17___ 18___

SECTION IV. Value of Cooperative Extension Work

Code

7. In general, how would you rate the present contribution Cooperative Extension is making to the people in your city? (Circle the letter that best describes your response) 19___

a. is making few contributions 1

b. is making some contributions 2

c. is making many contributions 3

d. is making a very great contribution 4

e. do not know 5

Case 78-79___

Deck 80___

8. In your opinion, what should Cooperative Extension do to make a greater contribution in your city? You may want to include your comments on program additions and deletions, as well as other suggestions for increasing Extension's contribution. (Please write in your comments; be as concise as possible)

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

d. _____

e. _____

APPENDIX B

STATE PROGRAM DIRECTORS REVIEWING INSTRUMENT

STATE PROGRAM DIRECTORS REVIEWING INSTRUMENT

Dr. O. W. Cundiff, Director, Community Resource Development, VPI&SU Extension Division, Blacksburg, Virginia

Dr. Kenneth E. Dawson, Director, 4-H, VPI&SU Extension Division, Blacksburg, Virginia

Dr. M. F. Ellmore, Director, Agriculture and Natural Resources, VPI&SU Extension Division, Blacksburg, Virginia

Dr. Ruth D. Harris, Director, Family Resources, VPI&SU Extension Division, Blacksburg, Virginia

Dr. Robert H. Pusey, Director, Technical Resources, VPI&SU Extension Division, Blacksburg, Virginia

APPENDIX C

ADMINISTRATORS REVIEWING INSTRUMENT

ADMINISTRATORS REVIEWING INSTRUMENT

VIRGINIA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

Dr. W. R. Van Dresser, Dean, VPI&SU Extension Division, Director, Cooperative Extension Service, Blacksburg, Virginia

Dr. W. L. Flowers, Jr., Associate Dean, VPI&SU Extension Division, Blacksburg, Virginia

Dr. C. N. Lester, Associate Dean, VPI&SU Extension Division, Blacksburg, Virginia

Dr. Ann E. Thompson, Associate Dean, VPI&SU Extension Division, Blacksburg, Virginia

Dr. George T. Blume, Extension Leader, VPI&SU Extension Division, Editor, Journal of Extension, Blacksburg, Virginia

VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

, Executive Director, Virginia Municipal League, Richmond, Virginia

, Deputy Director, Virginia Municipal League, Richmond, Virginia

APPENDIX D

ORIENTATION SESSION: PROCEDURE FOR SCHEDULING AND CONDUCTING INTERVIEWS

PROCEDURE FOR SCHEDULING AND CONDUCTING INTERVIEWS

I. Preparation:

1) Interviewer and unit chairmen set dates that interviews can be conducted.

2) Unit chairman contacts city manager first--explains that he is setting up schedule for council members to be interviewed for Perkins study (make reference to letter he has received from Perkins).

3) Arrange for an appointment between manager and interviewer prior to first council member interview.

4) Explain to manager that he will not be interviewed, but the objectives of the study will be discussed with him.

5) Schedule ½ hr. appointments for interviewer with each council member (allow 45 min. + travel time). Indicate that responses will be confidential and findings of study identified by city only.

6) Confirm interview itinerary with the interviewer.

7) Provide each council member and manager with a copy of the interview itinerary (time and place of each appointment).

8) Have copy of itinerary for interviewer and clear directions or someone to go with the interviewer to the interview sites.

II. Conducting the interviews:

A. General

1) Pick up itinerary from unit office and check on last minute changes.

2) Visit city manager at appointed time and explain objectives of study. (See Objectives of the Study attached)

Explain that council members' responses will be confidential and identified by city only.

Show manager the questionnaire and answer any questions he may have about the study (manager is not to fill out the interview schedule, but copies of the schedule and study objectives can be left with him if he so desires).

B. Interview format:

1) Appear at the appointed time and place.

2) Introduce yourself.

3) Explain Objectives of the Study and show copy of objectives to council member.

4) Stress that all information will be treated confidentially and reported in the study by city only.

5) Give council member a copy of the interview schedule and an envelope.

6) Instruct him that when he has completed the questionnaire, he will place it in the envelope and seal it, then return the sealed envelope to the interviewer.

7) Show the council member where to identify his questionnaire by city on page 2. Make sure that he writes in the name of his city.

8) Explain that Part I of the questionnaire will be completed based on data concerning the city that is already available to the researcher.

9) Point out that the Code Numbers and Blanks appearing on the far right side of each page of the questionnaire are for computer use only.

10) Stress that each item in each question should be answered.

11) Introduce Section II of the questionnaire by reading "General Directions."

12) Explain the rating scale; make sure they understand that #1 is no priority, #4 is high priority, and #5 is not familiar enough with program/activity to respond.

13) Explain that if the council member has questions about items that appear on the questionnaire, he should ask them.

14) a. Read Question #1 and say that 4-H is Extension's youth program.

b. Explain by pointing out on the council member's copy that he should answer both A and B parts of each program or activity dealing with 4-H programs.

c. Instruct the council member to indicate when he has completed all items in Question #1.

15) Explain that Question #2 deals with Technical Resources and that Technical Resources is Extension's educational program that offers technical and engineering assistance to business, industry, and city governments.

Instruct him to indicate when he has finished Question #2.

16) Explain that Question #3 deals with Extension's Agriculture and Natural Resources programs offered in cities.

Ask him to indicate when he is finished with #3.

17) Explain that Question #4 deals with Community Resource Development, Extension's programs to assist organizations and groups in the city, including city governments.

Ask him to indicate when he is finished with #4.

18) Explain that Question #5 deals with Extension programs dealing with Family Resources--formerly home economics.

Ask him to indicate when he is finished with Question #5.

19) Explain that Section III deals with client groups. Read "General Directions." Indicate that the same scale used previously will be used in this section.

Ask him to indicate when he is finished with Question #6 (Section III).

20) Explain that Section IV deals with the value he places on the Cooperative Extension Service in his city. Ask him to indicate when he has responded to Question #7.

21) Indicate to the council member that he may use the blanks provided below Question #8 to comment on how he feels Extension can increase its contribution to his city.

22) When he has finished Question #8, say something to the effect that "This completes the questionnaire, please check to make sure that you have responded to each item."

23) Have the council member place the completed interview schedule in the envelope, seal it, and give it to you.

24) Inform the council member that he will be provided with a summary of the findings after the study has been completed.

25) Thank them for their time and express my appreciation for their participation in the study!

III. After you have completed all your interviews, deliver them to me either through CERTIFIED MAIL or PERSONALLY at the following address:

Charles R. Perkins

If you have questions or need further information, feel free to contact me at:

Area Code

T H A N K S !

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this study will be to:

1. Identify the selected variables—size of city (population), length of time the city Cooperative Extension Service unit has been established, method of Cooperative Extension Service entry into the city—that may affect city council members' perception of Virginia Cooperative Extension Service programs and client groups in cities.

2. Determine city program needs as reflected by council members.

3. Determine client groups the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service should serve in cities as reflected by council members.

4. Draw implications that will lead to recommendations for:

   a) improving the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service contribution toward meeting city needs

   b) reconsidering program emphases

   c) reconsidering client group emphases

   d) altering method of entry into cities of similar size

   e) reconsidering overall Cooperative Extension Service policy to better meet the needs of Virginia cities.

APPENDIX E

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Blacksburg, Virginia 24060
December 28, 1977

(Addressed to individual council members)

I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Adult and Continuing Education at VPI&SU on educational leave from the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service. As an Extension professional, I am interested in improving the educational effectiveness of the agency in its service to Virginians and, more specifically, its efforts in Virginia cities. For this reason, I have chosen to conduct a study of how city council members in Virginia's ten largest cities perceive Cooperative Extension Service programs and clientele. The study proposal has been reviewed and endorsed by the Dean of the VPI&SU Extension Division and the Virginia Municipal League (see enclosures).

Your cooperation, through participation in an interview, is requested in collecting data for the study. This method will be used to seek the input of each council member in each of the ten cities studied.

You will be contacted in the near future, either by me or my representative, to schedule a suitable time for your interview. With your assistance, the results of the study will be most useful to the Cooperative Extension Service in strengthening its efforts in Virginia cities.

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Charles R. Perkins

APPENDIX F

LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT—DEAN OF THE VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIVISION

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

OFFICE OF THE DEAN

December 14, 1977

Dear Councilmember:

Mr. Charles R. Perkins, District Agent on educational leave for the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service, is conducting a study on how extension can strengthen its effort to citizens in cities throughout the Commonwealth. We believe the study has great merit and its success will depend upon your participation as a councilmember.

We would appreciate your cooperation in scheduling a time for Mr. Perkins or his representative to visit with you for a few minutes.

Your continued support of the extension program is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dean

fr

APPENDIX G

LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT—DIRECTOR OF THE VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
MAGAZINE: VIRGINIA TOWN & CITY

President RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23206 *Executive Director*

December 2, 1977

Dear Councilmember/Manager:

The Virginia Municipal League has reviewed Mr. Charles Perkins' study of the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service, and has found it to be a study which can result in improving assistance to local governments in Virginia. Consequently, we ask that you provide whatever assistance you can to help Mr. Perkins complete this research project.

Please contact the League office if you need additional information about this matter.

Sincerely,

Executive Director

RLD/gp

APPENDIX H

EXPLANATORY LETTER TO CITY MANAGERS

Blacksburg, Virginia 24060
December 28, 1977

(Addressed to city manager)

For informational purposes, I am sending you the enclosed material which has been sent to each council member in your city. The material is relative to a study I plan to conduct on how city council members perceive Virginia Cooperative Extension Service city programs and clientele.

Although the study will be limited to city council members' perceptions, I felt that you, as city manager, would want to be aware that the study was being conducted and would be interested in what I hope to accomplish through the study.

Someone from the local Extension office will contact you soon to arrange an appointment for either me or my representative to further discuss the study with you.

Sincerely,

Charles R. Perkins

Encls.

The two page vita has been removed from the scanned document. Page 1 of 2

The two page vita has been removed from the scanned document. Page 2 of 2

CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS' PERCEPTION OF THE VIRGINIA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

by

Charles Russell Perkins

(ABSTRACT)

The problem addressed in this study was: How do city council members serving cities in Virginia with populations of 50,000 or more perceive Virginia Cooperative Extension Service programs and clientele as they relate to urban concerns? The study determined (1) council members' perception of priorities that should be given to specific agency programs and clientele, (2) whether there was agreement between their perception of current agency priorities and what its priorities should be, (3) their perception of the agency's contribution and how it could be increased, and (4) the influence the variables of size of city and the agency's method of entry had on council members' perception.

An ex post facto survey research design was utilized. The study population consisted of the total population of 78 council members serving the ten cities studied. Data were collected through individual structured interviews. The instrument solicited responses on Likert-type scales. One open-ended item solicited suggestions for increasing the agency's contribution. Primary analysis utilized descriptive statistics, Spearman rho rank order correlations, and chi square tests of independence.

Council members were highly unfamiliar with Virginia

Cooperative Extension Service programs and clientele. They were most unfamiliar with Technical Resources and Community Resource Development programs. Council members felt the agency was placing proper rank order priority on program content areas and clientele, with the following exceptions: (1) lower priority should be placed on farmers as a client group and on the 4-H content area of providing educational resources for other city youth organizations and (2) higher priority should be placed on the 4-H content area of developing skills through real life experiences with projects in various areas.

Members of council indicated that highest clientele priorities should be centered around youth, including problem youngsters, and other individual or social groups, including minorities, low income, homemakers, and senior citizens. High priority programs should center around conservation and concerns of families or family members. Relatively lower proirity should be placed on business, industry, and government related types of programs and clientele. The agency was perceived as making a contribution to urban citizens, but it was felt that the agency could increase its contribution by increasing publicity and public relations.

Size of city and method of entry appeared to influence council members' perception of certain clientele and content areas. Size of city most often influenced perception of agricultural clientele and programs. Method of entry appeared to have particular influence on the perceived scope of the agency.

Several conclusions were drawn that related to council members' perception of programs, clientele, and contribution. Council members

have limited knowledge of the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service. However, they believe the agency and its programs are relevant to meeting the needs of urban residents. The agency seems to be closely identified with its initial method of entry into cities and that identity tends to persist. Council members believed that the agency's highest priorities should be given to assisting city residents with individual and social needs associated with urban living.