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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate Florida County Extension Directors' and county Extension advisory committee members' perception of the roles and role performance of county Extension advisory committees.

This purpose evolved from Extension personnel experiencing varying degrees of success in the committee approach to Extension program development. It was felt that this could be due to a lack of common understanding by Extension agents and committee members of the roles and functions of advisory committees.

Two, similar but separate, mail questionnaires were sent to the County Extension Directors and 308 members of the over-all Extension advisory committee in a random sample of 30 Florida counties. Fifty-two percent of the committee members and 93 percent of the County Extension Directors returned useable questionnaires. The questionnaires contained four sections: sixteen selected role statements that the respondents were asked to respond in their perception of what advisory committees should do; the same selected role statements that the respondents were requested to respond in their perception of what their committees did; five statements to assess committee members' attitude toward local
Extension units, and five to assess County Directors' perception of professional improvement; and selected personal characteristics.

A significant difference was found between perceived role function and role performance in 94 percent of the role statements by committee members, and 81 percent of the role statements by County Directors. However, there were also true relationships between role functions and role performance by both groups of respondents as their perception of how their committees performed was related to their knowledge of what committees should do.

There was a significant difference between County Directors' and committee members' perception of both role functions and role performance. Committee members expressed more agreement with the selected roles and perceived committees more completely performing these roles.

There was also a significant difference in the respondents' combined perception of role performance and role functions, with the combined group realizing that advisory committees did not completely perform their roles.

Significant differences also existed in the total respondent perception among the counties included in the sample.

xiv
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Situation

The Cooperative Extension Service continuously strives to perfect the methods and techniques it uses in contributing to the educational development of people. Program development has long been recognized as one of the major educational tasks of Extension workers, and Extension has always sought the leadership and guidance of local people in determining and implementing its educational programs.

The Florida Cooperative Extension Service is committed to the philosophy of helping people help themselves through informal educational programs. These programs result from people identifying their problems and considering the alternatives available which will help solve these problems.

Therefore, county Extension work should include: (1) all the human and material resources employed for the purposes of Extension in a county, (2) the manner in which these resources are organized, and (3) the procedures followed in utilizing them for the purpose of planning, conducting, and evaluating an educational program (12, p. 1).
This analysis recognizes program development as the process by which the county Extension unit will include these purposes in its recognized goals (12, p. 1).

Most Extension educators believe that program development in Extension is the process through which representatives of the people in a county are involved with county Extension staff members in the study of facts and trends; making decisions on problems needing program emphasis and suggesting methods of solving these problems.

The Florida Cooperative Extension Service recognizes that action in program development is more likely to result when decisions about program content and objectives are made jointly by the people concerned (or their representatives), aided by the professional Extension worker. To accomplish this, some organization of people, with well-defined roles and functions, clearly understood by the people and the professionals, is required. Such a structure in Florida is the local Extension Advisory Committee.

Recognizing the importance of role definition and role function to the process of Extension program development, state Cooperative Extension Services include these processes in their program development guidelines.

The Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service (4, p. 13), as an example, defines the role of the Parish Program Development Advisory Committee member as a citizen
who should:

1. Be willing to give time and accept orientation and training in their responsibilities.

2. Assist Parish Extension Agents in collecting information necessary for making rational decisions about program objectives.

3. Represent the people of the parish rather than themselves as individuals.

4. Work with other committee members in a cooperative manner.

5. Make rational decisions based on facts about Extension program objectives.


7. Assist in program execution where possible.

8. Help communicate the Extension program to the people of the parish whom they represent.

9. Assist agents in evaluating the accomplishments of Extension educational programs.

This role definition is very closely related to eight functions of County Extension Program Development Advisory Committee members included in the Florida Program Development Handbook (6, pp. V6-7). These are:

1. Help initiate program development procedures by giving of their time for training and meetings
of the committee.

2. Help awaken interest and widen vision of people to opportunities for better family living, improved agriculture, and community development.

3. Help discover the basic problems of the people.

4. Help determine extent and interest in problems before including them in the Extension programs.

5. Help interpret the Extension programs to local people.

6. Help where necessary by participating in carrying out the Extension programs.

7. Maintain a working relationship with other members of the committee and other interested citizens such as special interest groups.

8. Help evaluate the effectiveness of the county Extension program development procedures.

Each of the sixty-seven county Extension units in Florida has a system of advisory committees to help plan and implement that unit's Extension program. These committees are structured according to specific criteria developed by the Florida Cooperative Extension Service and the Federal Extension Service, and the functions of these committees are guided by procedures outlined in the Program Development Handbook.

Extension personnel in the counties have received
training by state personnel in using these concepts of program development, and each agent is provided a Program Development Handbook as a guide in identifying, implementing, and evaluating the programs.

County Extension units in Florida appear to experience varying degrees of success in this approach to program planning. It is felt that this could be due to a lack of understanding by agents and committee members of roles and functions of advisory committees.

In Extension, one finds many of the usual problems that are customarily found within a bureaucratic organization. Some of these are: over-extended spans of control, disfunctional communication, and profuse amounts of paper work are typical and often difficult to cope with (8, pp. 432-39). Compounding these problems, a county Extension professional may experience a highly complex assortment of situations that are unique to the program development process. Some of these situations are:

1. Within many of the rural counties in Florida there is a limited number of citizens willing to give of their time and talents in assisting their local Extension units in an advisory capacity, and within many of the urban counties in Florida it is difficult to discover interested citizens willing to assist in Extension
program development.

2. The county Extension advisory committee structure within a particular county in Florida is dependent upon many factors such as: population; rural versus urban orientation; and agricultural, industrial, or tourist economies. Within a state as diverse in these factors as Florida, it is extremely difficult for the state organization to develop program procedures and standards which are applicable to all counties.

For purposes of this study, the over-all county Extension advisory committee was specifically selected for study rather than the total program development committee structure because of the unique situations affecting county program development.

Certain factors within a particular county such as those noted in item 2 above would dictate the subcommittee structure, but the over-all county Extension advisory committee is the one group common in all counties regardless of these factors (Figure 1).

This over-all county Extension advisory committee is initially formed by one of the following procedures (6, chapter VII):

First, the county Extension staff appoints the over-all county Extension advisory committee according to the
FIGURE 1

FLORIDA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
COUNTY PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT
COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Over-all County Extension Advisory Committee

- Community Resource Development Advisory Committee*
- Agricultural Advisory Committee
- Marine Advisory Committee**
- Home Economics Advisory Committee
- 4-H Youth Advisory Committee

Appropriate Sub-Committees For Each of the Above

*May be integrated with Over-all County Extension Advisory Committee

**Applies to Coastal Counties only
guidelines of membership promulgated by state and Federal guidelines.

The second procedure is for the county Extension staff to appoint the membership of the program committees subject to the above guidelines and these program committees in turn designate representatives from within their ranks to membership on the over-all advisory committee.

The point of emphasis is that regardless of which procedure is followed, there is continuity within the committee structure of each of the sixty-seven counties in Florida. Therefore, the over-all county Extension advisory committee will hereafter be referred to as "the advisory committee" in the text of this study.

The County Extension Director is the only staff member included in this study because this position is common in all counties in Florida and is also the position given the over-all program development responsibility by the state organization (5, p. 1). The County Extension Director will hereafter be referred to as the "County Director."

Much of the success for program development is dependent upon the mutual perception of the role and function of the advisory committee by both the professional and the laity. The County Director and the committee members must work together with shared commitments if the State Extension goal of "helping people help themselves" is to be
achieved (6, p. 1-1).

The problem on which this study is focused is that there appears to be varying degrees of success in the committee approach to Extension program development which could be due to a lack of common understanding by agents and committee members of the roles and functions of advisory committees. Compounding this problem is a lack of information pertaining to Extension agents' and advisory committee members' perception of their roles in Extension program development in Florida.

Objectives of the Study

The primary objective of this study was to delineate as finitely as possible certain consistencies and/or inconsistencies present in selected advisory committee members' and County Directors' perception of role function and role performance of advisory committees in Extension program development.

More specifically, and in support of this primary objective, this study was developed to:

1. Determine the role function and role performance of advisory committees as perceived by selected committee members.

2. Determine the role function and role performance of advisory committees as perceived by
selected County Extension Directors.

3. Determine the association of individual characteristics of the committee members and County Extension Directors to perception of role functions and role performance of the advisory committee members.

Since the Florida Cooperative Extension Service is committed to the use of advisory committees in program development (6, p. I-1), it is essential that we better understand the members' perception and function of their role. Further, it is necessary that these key citizens be supported in this function with the most appropriate training and techniques available to Extension. Although the emphasis here would appear to be related to the committee member, the importance of the County Directors' perception of advisory committee role function and performance is explicit in this study.

Beavers (1), Gwinn (7), Lacy (9), and Moore (10) researched related objectives in program development in certain states. However, until the present time, there has not been a formal scientific study conducted specifically relating to Florida advisory committees and County Extension Directors. Therefore, the state Extension administrative staff may have been at a disadvantage in dealing with this method of county program development.
There is also an economic factor in the purpose of this study. Florida Extension programs, like other governmental efforts, are subjected to constant and incisive scrutiny by individuals and groups throughout the state. Some observers maintain that certain local Extension programs are vulnerable in the area of cost and return. Some boards of county commissioners and individuals within the State Legislature have observed that certain county Extension programs appear to be lacking in definite programs aimed at alleviating recognized problems of the people. Since fiscal policies are often defended best in respect to efficiency of programs, this study adopted added significance as a means of evaluating this method of program development.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are given to provide a more precise meaning and clarity of understanding of certain terms used in this study.

*Florida Cooperative Extension Service* designates an organization cooperatively sponsored by local boards of county commissioners, the State of Florida through the University of Florida (the Land-Grant institution) and the Federal government through the United States Department of Agriculture for the purpose of providing Florida citizens informal education in agriculture, home economics, youth,
and related subjects (11, p. 20).

State Extension Administrative Staff designates the professional members of the Florida Cooperative Extension Service who are responsible for training and supervising county Extension staff in all phases of the Extension Service, including county program development.

County Extension Advisory Committee refers to a group selected, elected, or appointed according to specific state and Federal guidelines to counsel and advise the Extension staff on the Extension program (6, p. III-2).

Program Development is the continuous and cooperative process between lay and professional people by which a program is developed, implemented, and evaluated (6, p. III-1).

Role refers to an integrated subset of norms, all of which are dedicated to the same function (2, p. 25).

Role Function refers to social patterns of behavior (norms) that change existing conditions in the direction of socially valued objectives (3, p. 90).

Role Definition refers to the explanation of the meaning or meanings of a role.

Perception refers to an immediate or intuitive cognition or judgement, often implying observation or discrimination (13, p. 552).
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine and analyze the perceived role of county Extension advisory committees by selected committee members and County Extension Directors.

Most studies in program planning have described the process and procedures. A very few have explored the perception of program planning as viewed by members of program planning committees and/or agents. The author of this study failed to discover any prior studies relating specifically to the primary purpose of this investigation.

This review of literature will be presented from three concepts identified in the purpose of this study, namely (1) program planning as an Extension educational process, (2) role function, and (3) perception.

Program Planning as an Extension Educational Process

The primary function of the Cooperative Extension Service is education (10, p. 18). Education is concerned with behavioral change in the learner's knowledge, skills,
and/or attitudes. Extension agents, therefore, are educators operating within the context of an educational program.

Ensminger points out that, "program planning is the most basic Extension method, for if properly applied it encompasses all educational methods into an integrated, forward looking, and balanced program" (10, p. 53).

The educational nature of Extension program planning may also be recognized in the thinking of others. For example, Huffman maintains that program planning is an educational experience for all who actively participate in the process (15, p. 18). He further adds that the experience gained by local people who take part contributes to knowledge of their environment and to their adroitness in making wise choices. He concludes that program planning enhances judgement, stimulates learning, and increases intellectual capacity.

Black and Wescott also recognize the educational opportunities when one participates in program planning by stating that teaching is a democratic planning procedure in that the teacher stimulates the learner to do his own thinking; that is, make decisions rather than having the teacher, alone, decide what is the truth (5, p. 400).

Tyler also supports the concept of program planning being an integral part of the Extension educational process by recognizing that the needs and desires of the learners
contribute heavily toward identifying objectives to be included in the educational process (22, pp. 5-16).

We can easily conclude that program planning is an integral part of Extension education and that participation in program planning is a learning experience for committee members.

**Role Function**

The fundamental premise of role function in Extension program planning is that the average individual is able to make, and given the proper circumstance, will desire to make important contributions to the solution of problems affecting him and his fellow-man.

A crucial need in Extension education today is for citizens to gain the knowledge, skills, and attitudes vital for successful group participation in identifying problems and solutions affecting them. Thus, role function may be closely related to participation by the committee member.

Analysis of participation in various organizations has discovered that one of the major problems lies in certain misconceptions people hold relative to participation. Alpert and Smith (2, p. 3) reported that participation is often regarded merely in a legitimizing sense, where decisions are made largely from above and plans of action are thoroughly "worked out at the top level." Where
this role persists for any length of time, the individual is
not functioning, but is merely an agent of the group along
with other agents.

Participation, or role function, implies much more
than a simple interaction between people. It involves work­
ing with others in making value judgements and determining
courses of action within a social situation (18, p. 22).

In discussing participation in this context, Cantril theorized that most of man's fears and anxieties are due to
his present inadequacies to participate effectively in the
process (8, p. 174). Along these same lines, Allport
pointed out that:

It has been shown in many psychological studies
that group decision, open discussion, and democratic
standards yield remarkable results. A person ceases
to be reactive and contrary in respect to a desir­
able course of conduct only when he himself has had
a hand in declaring that course of conduct desir­
able (1, p. 123).

Through participation, or role functioning, the com­
mittee member becomes aware of group standards and feels
that the decisions of the group are a part of his own
experience. He is, therefore, more involved in the process
than if he feels the decision is handed down by a force from
above or outside the role of his group.

Perception

Attempts to develop an acceptable definition for
perception date back many years. In 1892, James (3, p. 76) defined it as "consciousness of particular material things present to sense." He further stated that sensational and reproductive brain-processes combine to give us the content of our perception.

Some other authorities that have described their concepts of perception are: E. C. Kelly, Sigmund Koch, Floyd H. Allport, Ernest R. Hilgard, and Samuel Howard Bartley. According to Kelly:

Perception is that which comes into consciousness when stimuli, principally light or sound, impinge on the organism from the outside (9, p. 248).

Koch maintains that:

Perception is a hypothesis or prognosis for action which comes into being in awareness when stimuli impinge on the organism (17, p. 199).

Allport explains it as follows:

As a first approximation let us say that it has something to do with our awareness of the objects or conditions about us. It is dependent to a large extent upon the impressions these objects make upon our senses. It is the way things look to us, or the way they sound, feel, taste, or smell. But perception also involves, to some degree, an understanding, awareness, a "meaning" or a "recognition" of these objects or conditions (1, p. 14).

According to Hilgard:

Perception is 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 passive registration of stimuli
Bartley maintains that:

Perception is the over-all activity of the organism that follows or accompanies energetic impingements upon the sense organs (3, p. 22).

Even though perception can be defined in these relatively concise terms, it is a complex phenomenon. It is complex because the stimuli necessary to initiate perception come from a multitude of different sources. Each of these many sources vary in intensity and meaning to the receptors. The receptors, too, are many and varied. They also have tendencies to form multiple linkages which bring to the perceptual process both the past and the present (18, p. 24).

Cognitions, or a meaningful past, are important in the perception process. However, it must also be recognized that cognitions change with experience. Cartwright (9, pp. 253-267) points out that cognitive structures may be considered as the content and relationships among the parts of a person's mental world, built up from previous experiences, attitudes, values, and other things that impinge on the person's existence. The person's behavior then becomes a function of his cognitive structure because he selects from stimuli available to him. Cartwright concludes this discussion by suggesting that if a stimulus or message is not consistent with the person's cognitive structure, it may be rejected, distorted, or it may actually produce the
desired changes.

Sherif and Sherif take the approach that perception is influenced by psychological structuring involving internal and external factors and point out that:

Perceptional structuring is not only a "cognitive" affair. It is jointly determined by the totality of functionally related external factors and internal factors coming into the structuring process at a given time. The external factors are stimulating situations outside of the individual—objects, events, other persons, groups, cultural products and the like. The internal factors are motives, emotions, attitudes, general states of the organism, effects of past experience (21, p. 38).

Blake and Ramsey recognize experience as an important factor influencing the establishment of sets and attitudes and hence perception. According to them:

An individual's perceptual activity must be fabricated from his current organization of personally meaningful and significant experiences. These integrations, which achieve conceptual representation in the form of the individual's unique organization of internal sets, beliefs, attitudes, selector tendencies, or hypotheses, are derived from the scientific techniques of knowing adapted from the past for use in achieving a stable, definite and predictable present (6, p. 7).

Factors influencing perception can be classified as functional, structural, and cultural. Stated differently, these can be classified as "external" and "internal" factors. In this study of the perception of the role function and role performance of advisory committees by members and
County Extension Directors, primary attention was given to factors which could be classified as structural and functional in nature.

Moore (19, p. 38) states that because of the informal and complex nature of organizational patterns involving people in Extension programs, serious difficulties may be associated with misunderstood expectations and perceptions.

Therefore, if Extension is to administer an educational program in keeping with people's needs and interests, it must know and understand the nature of these needs and interests. Further, if Extension, as the teacher, is to know and understand its clientele, the prospective students, there needs to be free constructive interaction between the two.

Since Extension looks to advisory committees for help in identifying needs and interests of its clientele, and assistance in execution and evaluation of educational programs directed toward these needs and interests, it is important that Extension and the members share common perceptions and expectations of the role function and performance of advisory committees.

**Summary**

This review of literature revealed that several
studies have focused attention on Extension advisory committees. However, none have dealt specifically with members' and County Extension Directors' perception of role and role function of advisory committees.

A few studies have included information related to some segments of this study. Beckstrand (4, chap. VI), for example, in studying Extension program advisory councils in selected counties in Oregon and Colorado found that age, sex, education, size of farm, and frequency of association with county Extension programs, were characteristics which appeared to be associated with members' overall satisfaction with their council. The author concluded that the characteristics of council members and the organizational and operational procedures might have had the most influence on council members' overall satisfaction, however, other factors might have had as much influence. He included in these factors the personal and social interaction of the members within a council and the agents' influence on council organization and operation.

In his study of the role of county advisory committees in program projection, Gwinn (13, pp. 153-180) found that personal and social characteristics of committee members appeared to be associated with their degree of satisfaction with the organization and operation of their advisory committee. It was indicated that: (1) the group
indicating the highest degree of satisfaction were those fifty years of age and older, (2) men were more highly satisfied with their committee than women, (3) members with a grade school education expressed the highest degree of satisfaction while the lowest degree of satisfaction was expressed by college graduates, (4) farm residents were slightly more satisfied than non-farm residents, and (5) members who associated "very frequently" with Extension programs expressed a higher degree of satisfaction than members who associated "occasionally", "seldom", or "not at all" with Extension programs.

As a result of a study on factors in group interaction, Richert (20, chap. V) suggests the following considerations: (1) mere representation of groups and interests is not enough; committee members should exhibit leadership traits and have perspective beyond their own group boundaries, (2) individuals of high social status who can make important contributions to the program planning group might best serve as resource persons instead of committee members, (3) it is unwise to include professional persons from the various agencies as members, and (4) community leaders selected for program committees should be those who are the most aware of community problems and yet whose social and prestige status will not create distinct differences within the committee.
This review has provided limited information regarding the use of lay committees in the Extension program planning process. None of these investigations, however, have dealt specifically with the purposes of this research.
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CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Hypotheses

The primary objective of this study dealt with analysis of the relationships between the committee members' and County Directors' perception of role and role performance of advisory committees.

Null hypotheses have been found useful in testing significance of differences since it constitutes an exacting challenge that provides the facts a chance to refute, or fail to refute, such a challenge (3, p. 45). The following null hypotheses were developed to guide the major portion of the research design of this study in support of more exacting results:

1. There is no relationship between committee members' perception of what advisory committee role functions should be and perception of existing role performance of their advisory committee.

2. There is no relationship between County Directors' perception of what advisory committee role functions should be and perception of existing role performance of their advisory committee.
3. There is no difference between committee members' and County Directors' perception of what advisory committee role functions should be.

4. There is no difference between committee members' and County Directors' perception of existing role performance of advisory committees.

All hypotheses will be tested at the .05 significance level.

Special attention was also accorded certain individual characteristics of committee members and County Directors as related to perception of role function and role performance of advisory committees.

**Sampling Procedure**

The sixty-seven Florida county Extension units are divided into four geographic districts for administrative purposes. A random sample of eight county units was selected from each of these districts to be included in this study (Figure 2). Lafayette County and Monroe County were purposefully omitted to reduce personal bias by the respondents. The author of this study was Lafayette County Extension Director for six and one-half years preceding, and during the time of data collection, and Monroe County did not have an Extension program prior to January 1, 1973.
FIGURE 2
MAP OF FLORIDA INDICATING COUNTIES, COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE DISTRICTS, AND COUNTIES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

GEOGRAPHIC DESIGNATIONS
(1) West Florida
(2) West Coast Florida
(3) Central Florida
(4) East Coast Florida

[Map showing geographic designations and counties included in the study]
Letters explaining the purpose of this study and requesting the names and mailing addresses of all members of the over-all advisory committees were sent to the County Extension Directors in the counties included in the sample (Appendix A).

Thirty of the thirty-two County Directors responded with a total of 308 names and addresses of advisory committee members. The distribution of counties and number of advisory committee members by district are included in Table 1.

Two similar, but separate, mail questionnaires were used in this study. One was sent to the committee members (Appendix B) and the other was sent to the County Directors (Appendix C) in each of the counties included in the sample.

**Macrodvelopment of Instrument**

The committee member questionnaire and the County Director questionnaire used in this study each contained four major sections. The first section contained a list of sixteen statements related to certain role functions of advisory committees developed by the Louisiana and Florida Cooperative Extension Services (1, p. 13) (2, pp. V6-7). The second section contained the same sixteen statements, but were related to the respondents' perception of role performance by their respective committees.
### TABLE 1

**Florida Over-All Extension Advisory Committee Member Distribution by Extension Supervisory Districts and Selected Counties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escambia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: District 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernando</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: District 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alachua</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumpter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: District 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.19</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brevard</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dade</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: District 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.88</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>308</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The third section of the committee member questionnaire contained five statements used by Lacy as aids in determining committee members' attitude toward their total county Extension unit (4, p. 111).

The third section of the County Director questionnaire contained five statements developed by Wheaton to help determine their attitude toward professional improvement beyond their formal training as related to their role in program development (6, pp. 146-7).

The respondents were asked to respond within a scale of agreement-disagreement to each statement contained in these three sections.

The fourth section contained questions designed to elicit personal characteristics that differed considerably in content between the two sets of questionnaires.

The questionnaires were designed to be simple, uniform, and adequate for the purpose of the study. A special effort was made to develop an instrument that would require a minimum of time to complete and one that would not impart a "test" appearance.

The committee member questionnaire was reproduced on white paper, and the County Director questionnaire was color coded green. Thus, the questionnaires were easily distinguishable which facilitated processing.
The two questionnaires were pretested by similar non-experimental groups of respondents. This pretest proved valuable in identifying and amending certain vague statements which might have hampered the administration of the instruments in the full scale study. This trial test also included the transmittal letters developed to accompany the questionnaires.

The respondents were assured that their answers would be used anonymously in this study and a postage-paid envelope was included to facilitate return of the questionnaires.

Microdevelopment of Instrument

Section I of the committee members' and County Directors' questionnaires contained sixteen statements requiring responses employing certain principles of the Likert-type scale. The Likert-type scale makes possible the ranking of individuals in terms of the favorableness of their attitude toward a given condition, and the range of responses permitted to a given item provides, in effect, comparatively more precise information about the individual's opinion on the issue referred to by the given item (5, pp. 368-69).

The sixteen statements contained in Section I of each of the questionnaires were developed to support the
nine role functions of advisory committee members in the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service and the eight role functions of committee members identified in the Florida Program Development Handbook (1, p. 13) (2, pp. V6-7).

Section I of each of the questionnaires was designed to elicit a response from the committee members and County Directors, regarding their agreement with each of the sixteen statements in support of what they perceived the role functions of advisory committees "should" be. The scale of agreement the respondents were instructed to use in recording their responses were assigned the following value continuum: (5) strongly agree; (4) agree; (3) undecided; (2) disagree; (1) strongly disagree.

Section II of each of the questionnaires contained the same identical statements included in Section I, but the respondents were asked to respond in support of how they perceived their advisory committee "does" perform. The scale of agreement the respondents were instructed to use was identical to the one used in Section I of the questionnaires.

Section III of the committee member questionnaire contained five questions developed by Lacy to indicate the committee members attitude, in general, toward their county Extension unit (4, p. 111). The scale of agreement the respondents were instructed to use in recording their
responses was identical to the scale used in Sections I and II of the committee member questionnaire. However, the last three statements (numbers 35-37) were presented in "negative order" and were assigned the following value continuum: (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) undecided; (4) disagree; (5) strongly disagree.

Section III of the County Director questionnaire contained five statements recognized by Wheaton as being useful in determining Extension Agents' attitude toward professional improvement beyond their formal training as related to their role in program development (6, pp. 146-7).

The questions in Section IV of the committee member and County Director questionnaires were developed from a need to further define the nature of the individuals and groups being studied. Also, there was a need to examine the respondents' respective personal characteristics in terms of their relationship to certain aspects of the advisory committee role and performance considerations contained in the study.

Administration of Instrument

A total of 338 individual mail packets containing a transmittal letter, questionnaire, and return postage-paid envelope was mailed during the summer of 1973 to 308 advisory committee members and 30 County Directors.
The respondents were assigned a number coded questionnaire with the assurance that such coding would facilitate follow-up procedures and save postage.

A follow-up letter was developed and mailed to the committee members (Appendix D) and County Directors (Appendix E) three weeks after their respective packets were mailed. The letters reminded the respondents of the importance of their contribution to the study and invited them to return their questionnaires.

Three weeks after this letter was mailed, a second questionnaire was mailed to those respondents who had not returned the first questionnaire. No further contact was made with those respondents who did not return the second questionnaire.

**Data Processing**

The data on the returned questionnaires from committee members and County Directors were visually checked for completeness and legibility to help reduce processing problems.

After the questionnaires were visually checked, value scores were assigned to the responses for each statement in the first three sections of the committee members' and County Directors' questionnaires. In Section IV of each of the questionnaires, code numbers were assigned to each of
the possible responses to questions requiring qualitative responses. For those questions, such as age, permitting quantitative responses, the actual data contained in the response were recorded.

After the scores were assigned to each response in the questionnaires, they were re-checked for possible errors and the data were recorded on IBM code sheets. The code sheets were then re-checked against each questionnaire as a control for errors.

**Data Analyses**

Unpaired t tests, analyses of variance, including a factorial arrangement; regression and correlation analyses, along with frequency distributions were used to assess various differences and relationships within the scope of this study. The .05 significance level was used to declare statistical significance. The exact probability level was shown with each test except the Student t. Even though certain tests may fail to indicate a significant result, such findings can be important to the investigator and others.

The statistical analyses used with the committee members' data were the same as those used with the County Directors' data. The respective data were analyzed as follows:
1. Gosset's "Student t" tests were used in determining the difference between respondents' perception of what advisory committees should do (Section I), and what their advisory committees actually did (Section II).

2. Correlation analyses were used in determining the association between the first three sections of the committee members' questionnaires. The three comparisons were: sections I-II; sections I-III; and sections II-III.

3. Analyses of variance were used to determine the effect of selected background factors on the committee members' mean scores in each of the first three sections of their questionnaire. The selected background factors were: sex, race, occupation, level of education, place of residence, level of income, frequency of requests for Extension assistance, age, and attendance at advisory committee meetings.

4. Correlation analyses were used in determining the association between the first three sections of the County Directors' questionnaires. The three correlations were: sections I-II; sections I-III; and sections II-III.

5. An analysis of variance was used to determine
the effects of selected background factors on the County Directors' mean scores in each of the first three sections of their questionnaire. The selected background factors were: level of academic degree; content area of highest academic degree; graduate level academic credits in social science area; perceived importance of program development as a part of the total Extension program; age; years employed by Florida Cooperative Extension Service; years employed in present position; percent time devoted to Extension program development; size of county professional staff; and major program area of responsibility.

6. Frequency and percentage distributions were computed for each of the personal characteristics in Section IV of the questionnaires.

An analysis of variance was used in examining the differences between committee members' and County Directors' data. A factorial arrangement was developed to determine the following:

1. If differences exist in mean scores of Sections I and II in the committee members' and in the County Directors' questionnaires.

2. If differences exist in mean scores of committee
members and County Directors in Section I and Section II of the questionnaires.

3. If an interaction exists between Section and type of respondent.

4. If differences exist in mean scores among the counties.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The data obtained from the questionnaires used in this study were evaluated using the statistical tests described in Chapter III, and subsequent findings are presented in this chapter. The data presentation is divided into three sections which deal respectively with the committee members, the County Directors, and combination committee member-County Director findings. The null hypotheses stated in the preceding chapter were tested, and the findings recognized in the appropriate sections.

One hundred sixty of the 308 committee members included in the study returned their questionnaires, resulting in a 51.94 percent return. Twenty-eight of the 30 County Directors returned questionnaires resulting in 93.33 percent return.

Committee Member Findings

Selected Personal Characteristics

The following personal characteristics of the committee members were identified: sex, race, occupation,
level of family income, frequency of requests for local Extension assistance, and attendance at advisory committee meetings.

The frequency and percentage distribution of the committee members by sex is shown in Table 2. The data revealed that 61.25 percent of the respondents were male and 38.75 percent were female.

TABLE 2
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COMMITTEE MEMBERS BY SEX, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>61.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 reveals that 129 members (80.63 percent) were white and 29 (18.13 percent) were Negro. Two respondents (1.24 percent) reported their race as Oriental and American Indian, respectively.
TABLE 3
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COMMITTEE MEMBERS BY RACE, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>80.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)One respondent was American Indian and one respondent was Oriental.

Table 4 indicates the occupations of the respondents. Forty-five farmers accounted for approximately 29 percent of the respondents and was the largest occupational group. Thirty-one, or 20 percent of the respondents, were housewives; 22 (14 percent) were merchants; and 17 (11 percent) were included in the professional occupations such as doctors, lawyers, and teachers.

Five percent (9 respondents) reported their occupations within the skilled trades such as carpenters, plumbers, and machinists; while only two percent (3 respondents) were unskilled workers and domestics. Four committee members (2.6 percent) were elected officials and five (3.2 percent) were government employees. Twelve respondents (7.8 percent) indicated they were retired, and six (3.8 percent)
were students. Six respondents did not identify their occupation.

TABLE 4
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COMMITTEE MEMBERS BY OCCUPATION, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional(^a)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trade(^b)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled(^c)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Employee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>154</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) medical, legal, education

\(^b\) plumber, carpenter, machinist

\(^c\) day laborers, domestics
Fifty-one (32 percent) of the respondents reported they lived on farms while 35 (22 percent) indicated they lived in rural non-farm residences (Table 5). However, 73 respondents (46 percent) lived in towns and cities. One respondent did not identify his residence.

**TABLE 5**

**FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COMMITTEE MEMBERS BY AREA OF RESIDENCE, 1973**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Non-farm</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town or City</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were asked to indicate their highest grade completed in school and their responses were assigned to four educational level categories: (1) less than high school graduate; (2) high school graduate; (3) some college; and (4) college graduate. The frequency and percentage distribution of respondents by educational level is included in Table 6. One respondent did not include this information in his questionnaire.
TABLE 6
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COMMITTEE MEMBERS BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school graduate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>159</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age of the respondents ranged from 15 to 89 years, and the average age of all respondents was 45.7 years. Assigning the respondents to qualitative age groups, Table 7 reveals that six (3.9 percent) were under twenty years of age; eleven (7.2 percent) were twenty to thirty years; twenty-seven (17.65 percent) were thirty to forty; and forty-three (26.1 percent) were in the forty to fifty age group. Thirty-three respondents (21.57 percent) were fifty to sixty; twenty-four (15.69 percent) were sixty to seventy; and nine (5.88 percent) were seventy years old or older. Seven respondents elected not to reveal their age.
TABLE 7

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COMMITTEE MEMBERS BY AGE, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 through 29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 through 39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 through 49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 through 59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 through 69</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and above</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One hundred forty-five respondents identified their gross family income within the qualitative groups in Table 8 and fifteen respondents elected not to do so. Nine respondents (6.21 percent) reported their income as less than $5,000 per year; thirty-three (22.76 percent) had incomes between $5,000 and $10,000 annually; forty-eight (33.1 percent) reported incomes between $10,000 and $15,000; and fifty-five respondents (37.93 percent) reported annual gross family incomes in excess of $15,000. The majority of the respondents (71 percent) reported at least $10,000 in annual gross family income.
TABLE 8
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COMMITTEE MEMBERS BY GROSS ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $15,000</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 and above</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows that nineteen committee members (12 percent) did not request any assistance from their local Extension unit during the twelve months preceding responding to this study and the same number requested assistance on less than three occasions. Forty-one respondents (26 percent) made between three and six requests; forty-five (28 percent) made between six and twelve requests; and thirty-four (21 percent) made over twelve requests. Seventy-nine respondents (50 percent) requested assistance from their local extension unit on at least six occasions during this period, and one respondent did not include this information in the questionnaire.
TABLE 9

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COMMITTEE MEMBERS BY NUMBER OF REQUESTS ANNUALLY FOR EXTENSION ASSISTANCE, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Requests</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than three</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three - Six</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six - Twelve</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than twelve</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>159</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents averaged attending 2.45 advisory committee meetings during the twelve months preceding their response. However, Table 10 reveals that twenty-three respondents, or 16 percent, did not attend any meetings during this period while one respondent reported attending fourteen meetings. The frequency and percentage distribution of the remaining respondents is found in Table 10. Seventeen committee members did not include this information in their responses.
TABLE 10

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COMMITTEE MEMBERS BY NUMBER OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS ATTENDED, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings Attended</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advisory Committee Functions

The first consideration of the committee member data involves the relationship between the perceived role function and role performance of county Extension advisory committees.

The mean perception, by item, of what committee members should do (role function), and the mean perception of actual committee performance (role performance) are presented in Table 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Mean&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Should&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Does&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Prob.&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The advisory committee and the Extension agents should work together in identifying the problems in the county.</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The advisory committee members should work cooperatively with other members of the committee and respect their opinions.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The advisory committee members should be willing to meet as often as necessary and spend as much time as necessary to help determine and plan the county Extension educational programs.</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The membership of the advisory committee should represent all income levels, races, sections of the county, and Extension audiences.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Mean&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Mean&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Mean&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Prob&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The advisory committee and the Extension agents should decide together which problems are the most important.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The major responsibility of the Extension advisory committee is to represent the thinking of the people in the county rather than just their own personal opinions.</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The advisory committee members should use facts in making decisions and not just their own judgements.</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The advisory committee should help inform the people in the county about the Extension programs.</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents collect information about the county situation.</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. All other people in the county should know about the work the advisory committee is doing.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Mean&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Should&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Does&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Prob&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents in making decisions about Extension educational programs aimed at specific problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. All other people in the county should know who the advisory committee members are.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. All members of the advisory committee should be thoroughly trained in the job they are expected to do as a member of the committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents in determining the success of the Extension educational programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents select new members to serve on the committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Should</th>
<th>Does</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents in carrying out the Extension educational programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVERALL MEAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Should</th>
<th>Does</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.04</td>
<td>52.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.00)</td>
<td>(3.29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)Scale of agreement: 5.00, Strongly Agree; 4.00, Agree; 3.00, Undecided; 2.00, Disagree; 1.00, Strongly Disagree.

\(^{b}\)Perception of what advisory committee members should do (role function).

\(^{c}\)Perception of what advisory committee members actually do (role performance).

\(^{d}\)Probability associated with t test of difference between should and does.

The role statements (items) support the content of the role functions as recognized by the Florida Cooperative Extension Service, but equal numbers of statements were not specifically designed to support each role function.

Probability values indicate a highly significant difference appears to exist between perceived role function and role performance for each of the items, except item 16 (see Table 11). Further, the mean perception scores for each statement (item) and the overall mean perception
scores for Section I (role function) and II (role performance) indicate a higher mean for Section I than Section II.

The correlation between the committee members' perceived role function and role performance of advisory committees (Table 12) was highly significant (P < .01), however, not extremely large. This correlation analysis indicates a highly significant relationship between the perceived role functions and role performance, and that committee members' perception of advisory committees is associated with their perception of how advisory committee members function. Therefore, the null hypothesis which proposes that there is no relationship between perceived role function and role performance of committee members is rejected.

**Attitude Toward Local Extension Units**

The general attitude toward local Extension units by the selected committee members was also examined (Section III). Respondent mean scores for each of the attitude statements (items) and the overall mean score for this section are shown in Table 13.

The relationship between the respondents' perception of advisory committee role functions (Section I) and their general attitude toward local Extension units (Section III) is shown as the second relationship in Table 12. Analysis of these data indicates no statistically significant rela-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient (N=160)</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relationship between committee members' mean perception of what advisory committees should do and what their respective advisory committees do.</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relationship between committee members' mean perception of what advisory committees should do and mean general attitude toward local Extension units.</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relationship between committee members' mean perception of advisory committee role performance and mean general attitude toward local Extension units.</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 13
SELECTED ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS' MEAN PERCEPTION OF CERTAIN ATTITUDE STATEMENTS RELATIVE TO COUNTY EXTENSION UNITS, FLORIDA, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Statement</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In my opinion the Extension Service is worth every cent it costs.</td>
<td>4.23a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Extension Service has really been a lot of help to me and/or my family.</td>
<td>4.18a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Extension Service is run too much by the county and state staffs and does not involve local people enough in deciding what information to put out.</td>
<td>3.45b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my opinion too much money is spent on Extension for what the people get out of it.</td>
<td>3.97b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of things recommended by the Extension Service are not practical for most people.</td>
<td>3.70b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL MEAN</td>
<td>19.32c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a \) Scale of agreement: 5.00, Strongly Agree; 4.00, Agree; 3.00, Undecided; 2.00, Disagree; 1.00, Strongly Disagree.

\( ^b \) Scale of agreement: 1.00, Strongly Agree; 2.00, Agree; 3.00, Undecided; 4.00, Disagree; 5.00, Strongly Disagree.

\( ^c \) 25.00, most favorable mean score; 5.00, least favorable mean score.
tionship between respondent mean scores of Sections I (role functions) and III (attitude), thus one may conclude that committee members' perception of advisory committee role functions did not appear to be related to the respondents' general attitude toward local Extension units.

The relationship between the committee members' perception of advisory committee role performance (Section II) and the respondents' general attitude toward local Extension units (Section III) is shown as the third relationship in Table 12. Analysis of these data indicates a highly significant relationship between respondents' mean scores of Sections II and III. Therefore, the perception of advisory committee role performance appears to be closely associated with the respondents' general attitude toward local Extension units.

**Selected Relationships**

The effects of selected personal characteristics on the committee members' perception of advisory committee role functions, role performance, and general attitude toward local Extension units are found in Table 14.

Race was the only personal characteristic in which a statistically significant difference was found for committee members' perception of advisory committee role functions (Section I). Black committee members appeared to possess
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d. f.</th>
<th>Sec. Ia Prob.</th>
<th>Sec. IIb Prob.</th>
<th>Sec. IIIc Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.09 .733</td>
<td>28.30 .536</td>
<td>1.82 .673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>295.32 .019</td>
<td>7.01 .758</td>
<td>8.19 .372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.58 .901</td>
<td>113.18 .144</td>
<td>6.74 .740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.65 .942</td>
<td>70.28 .584</td>
<td>27.44 .049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.02 .699</td>
<td>37.40 .607</td>
<td>15.45 .222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Extension Assistance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.80 .796</td>
<td>105.24 .227</td>
<td>23.27 .065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Income</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.39 .512</td>
<td>84.43 .332</td>
<td>11.28 .349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (continuous)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.96 .812</td>
<td>0.33 .947</td>
<td>0.16 .900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at Advisory Committee Meetings (continuous)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.64 .637</td>
<td>28.70 .533</td>
<td>50.03 .029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>51.85 73.08</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aSection I (Role Functions)  
bSection II (Role Performance)  
cSection III (Attitude)
more agreement with the stated role functions of advisory committees than did white members as indicated in Table 15.

**TABLE 15**

**MEAN PERCEPTION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ROLE FUNCTIONS OF SELECTED COMMITTEE MEMBERS BY RACE, FLORIDA, 1973**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Score&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>63.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>69.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Mean score on advisory committee role functions identified in Table 11.

The committee members' perception of advisory committee role performance (Section II) was not affected by any of the selected personal characteristics. However, results in Table 14 suggest that respondent level of education and attendance at advisory committee meetings contributed significantly to their general attitude toward local Extension units (Section III). The distribution of respondents by educational level and mean general attitude toward local Extension units is found in Table 16.
TABLE 16

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF EDUCATIONAL LEVELS AND MEAN ATTITUDE SCORES OF SELECTED COMMITTEE MEMBERS, FLORIDA, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education (N=112)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Mean Attitude Score&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school graduate</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>17.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>36.61</td>
<td>20.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>20.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>19.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>25.00, most favorable mean score; 5.00, least favorable mean score. Attitude statements can be found in Table 13.

Approximately 15 percent of the respondents were not high school graduates and indicated the least favorable attitude toward local Extension units. High school graduates included approximately 37 percent of the respondents; 16 percent attended college; and 32 percent (almost one-third) of the committee members were college graduates. Although college graduate respondents' mean attitude score was slightly less than the committee members who were high school graduates and those who did attend college, analysis of these data suggests that advisory committee members who were at least high school graduates appeared to possess more...
favorable general attitudes toward local Extension units than did the members who were not high school graduates.

Committee members averaged attending 2.45 advisory committee meetings during the twelve months preceding responding to this study. A regression of the mean general attitude of committee members toward local Extension units (dependent variable) on attendance of advisory committee meetings (independent variable) indicated that the mean general attitude of committee members toward local Extension units significantly decreased as attendance frequency of advisory committee meetings increased (b = -.96, P < .05).

The data in Table 17 suggest that, as the level of education of committee members approached a high school graduate, the committee members appeared to attend advisory committee meetings less, but possessed a more favorable general attitude toward their local Extension unit.
TABLE 17
SELECTED COMMITTEE MEMBERS’ MEAN ATTENDANCE OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND MEAN GENERAL ATTITUDE TOWARD LOCAL EXTENSION UNITS, BY LEVELS OF EDUCATION, FLORIDA, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education (N=112)</th>
<th>Mean Attendance</th>
<th>Mean Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school graduate</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>17.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>20.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>20.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>19.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected Personal Characteristics

The following personal characteristics of the County Directors were identified: highest academic degree; content area of highest academic degree; graduate credits in social science areas; perceived importance of Extension program development; age; years employed in present Extension position; years employed by the Florida Cooperative Extension Service; size of county academic staff (including respondent); and percent time devoted to Extension program development.

The frequency and percentage distribution of the County Directors by highest academic degree is shown in Table 18. These data indicate that ten (35.7 percent) respondents reported Bachelor degrees, seventeen (60.7 percent) had Masters degrees, and one respondent (3.6 percent) reported an Education Specialist degree.

Table 19 indicates that the highest academic degree of twelve (42.9 percent) respondents was in the area of the biological sciences, two (7.1 percent) of the degrees were in the social science fields, and fourteen (50 percent) were in the education disciplines.
### TABLE 18
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COUNTY DIRECTORS BY ACADEMIC DEGREES, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Education Specialist

### TABLE 19
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COUNTY DIRECTORS BY CONTENT AREA OF HIGHEST ACADEMIC DEGREE, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological sciences</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four County Directors (14.2 percent) possessed one to six graduate credits in the social sciences (Table 20). Twelve (42.9 percent) had between 6 and 15 credits, and the same number (twelve, 42.9 percent) had fifteen graduate credits or more in these areas.

**TABLE 20**

**FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COUNTY DIRECTORS BY NUMBER OF GRADUATE CREDITS IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES, 1973**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 21, six County Directors (21.4 percent) reported that they perceive program development to be an unimportant function in the Extension process, while ten respondents (35.7 percent) reported the perceived function as important. Twelve County Directors (42.9 percent) considered this function to be a very important integral of Extension work.
TABLE 21

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COUNTY DIRECTORS BY PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT IN EXTENSION PROGRAMS, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 contains the age distribution of the County Directors at the time of their participation in this study. The youngest respondent was 32 years of age and the oldest was 57. The average age of the County Directors at the time of their responses was 47 years of age.

Table 23 reveals the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents by number of years employed in their present position. One respondent (3.6 percent) had served less than one year in his present position and one (3.6 percent) had served 27 years. The average length of service in their present position was 12.4 years.
### TABLE 22

**FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COUNTY DIRECTORS BY AGE, 1973**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 23

**FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COUNTY DIRECTORS BY NUMBER OF YEARS IN PRESENT POSITION, 1973**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 and above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents by the number of years employed by the Florida Cooperative Extension Service. One County Director had been employed only one year, while one respondent had served 31 years. The average years of employment was 18.2 years.

**Table 24**

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COUNTY DIRECTORS BY NUMBER OF YEARS EMPLOYED BY FLORIDA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Employed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**          | **28**    | **100.0**
The county extension units represented by the respondents averaged 4.9 academic staff members. Table 25 shows that three of the County Directors (10.7 percent) reported they were the only academic staff in their respective units, while one respondent reported twenty staff members, including himself.

**TABLE 25**

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COUNTY DIRECTORS BY SIZE OF THEIR ACADEMIC STAFF, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes respondent*
Table 26 reveals that respondents spent an average of 12.96 percent of their time in extension program development. One County Director reported only 2 percent of his time was devoted to this activity and one indicated that extension program development activities accounted for 40 percent of his time. One County Director omitted the percent time devoted to this function.

**TABLE 26**

**FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED FLORIDA COUNTY DIRECTORS BY PERCENT OF THEIR TIME DEVOTED TO EXTENSION PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, 1973**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advisory Committee Functions

The first consideration is the relationship between the role functions (Section I) and role performance (Section II) of county Extension advisory committees as perceived by the selected County Directors.

The mean perception, by item, of what committee members should do (role functions) and the mean perception of actual committee performance (role performance) are presented in Table 27. These statements (items) are identical in content to the statements relative to committee members' perception included in Table 11, and are also in support of the role functions of advisory committees contained in the program development literature of the Florida Cooperative Extension Service.

**TABLE 27**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Mean$^a$</th>
<th>Should$^b$</th>
<th>Does$^c$</th>
<th>Prob.$^d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The advisory committee and the Extension agents should work together in identifying the problems in the county.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 27 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Mean&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Should&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Does&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Prob.&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The advisory committee and the Extension agents should decide together which problems are the most important.</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The advisory committee members should work cooperatively with other members of the committee and respect their opinions.</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The major responsibility of the Extension advisory committee is to represent the thinking of the people in their county rather than just their own personal opinions.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The membership of the advisory committee should represent all income levels, races, sections of the county, and Extension audiences.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The advisory committee members should be willing to give the necessary time to help determine and plan the county Extension educational programs.</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 27 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Mean&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Should&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Does&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Prob.&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. The advisory committee should help inform the people in the county about the Extension educational programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The advisory committee members should use facts in making decisions and not just their own ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents in making decisions about Extension educational programs aimed at specific problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The advisory committee members should help the Extension agents collect information about the county situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents in determining the success of the Extension educational programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. All other people in the county should know about the work the advisory committee is doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. All other people in the county should know who the advisory committee members are.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 27 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Mean&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Should&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Does&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Prob.&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. All members of the advisory committee should be thoroughly trained in the job they are expected to do as a member of the committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents select new members to serve on the committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents in carrying out the Extension educational programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL MEAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.68</td>
<td>48.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Scale of agreement: 5.00, Strongly Agree; 4.00, Agree; 3.00, Undecided; 2.00, Disagree; 1.00, Strongly Disagree.

<sup>b</sup>Perception of what advisory committee should do (role function).

<sup>c</sup>Perception of what advisory committee actually do (role performance).

<sup>d</sup>Probability associated with t test of difference between should and does.
Probability values indicated a highly significant difference between perceived role function and role performance for the following role statements (P < .01):

1. The advisory committee and the Extension agents should work together in identifying the problems in the county.

2. The advisory committee and the Extension agents should decide together which problems are the most important.

3. The advisory committee members should work cooperatively with other members of the committee and respect their opinions.

4. The major responsibility of the Extension advisory committee is to represent the thinking of the people in their county rather than just their own personal opinions.

6. The advisory committee members should be willing to give the necessary time to help determine and plan the county Extension educational programs.

8. The advisory committee members should use facts in making decisions and not just their own ideas.

10. The advisory committee members should help the Extension agents collect information about the county situation.

12. All other people in the county should know about the work the advisory committee is doing.

13. All other people in the county should know who the advisory committee members are.

14. All members of the advisory committee should be thoroughly trained in the job they are expected to do as a member of the committee.
Perceived differences between role function and role performance of the following role statements were found to be significant ($P < .05$):

5. The membership of the advisory committee should represent all income levels, races, sections of the county, and Extension audiences.

7. The advisory committee should help inform the people in the county about the Extension educational programs.

11. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents in determining the success of the Extension educational programs.

There was found to be no statistically significant difference between perceived role function and role performance for the following role statements ($P > .05$):

9. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents in making decisions about Extension educational programs aimed at specific problems.

15. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents select new members to serve on the committee.

16. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents in carrying out the Extension educational programs.

The mean perception scores for each statement (item) and the overall mean perception scores for Section I (role functions) and II (role performance) indicate a higher mean for Section I than for Section II.

The correlation between the County Directors' perceived role functions and role performance of advisory
committees (first relationship, Table 28) was highly significant (P < .01). This correlation indicates a highly significant relationship between the perceived role functions and role performance, and that County Directors' perception of advisory committee role functions appears to be associated with their perception of how these committees performed. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there is no relationship between role functions and role performance of advisory committees as perceived by County Directors is rejected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient (N=28)</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relationship between County Directors' mean perception of what advisory committees should do and what their respective advisory committees do.</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relationship between County Directors' mean perception of advisory committee role functions and mean general attitude toward professional improvement.</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relationship between County Directors' mean perception of advisory committee role performance and mean general attitude toward professional improvement.</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitude Toward Professional Improvement

Respondent mean scores for each of the five general attitude questions (items) and the overall mean score (Section III) is included in Table 29.

The relationships between this mean professional improvement attitude of County Directors (Section III); and their mean perception of advisory committee role function (Section I) and role performance (Section II) are included in Table 28 as the second and third correlations, respectively.

The second correlation in this table indicates a highly significant positive relationship between County Directors' mean professional improvement attitude and their mean perception of advisory committee role functions (P < .01). Therefore, it appears that County Directors' mean perception of the role functions that advisory committees should perform was associated with their perceived attitude of the importance of professional improvement for Extension workers.

The third correlation in Table 28 suggests that there is no statistically significant relationship between County Directors' mean general attitude toward professional improvement and their mean perception of how well their advisory committees perform their roles (P > .05). It is
TABLE 29
SELECTED COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTORS' PERCEPTION OF CERTAIN ATTITUDE QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT, FLORIDA, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Question</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How important is an understanding of the behavioral sciences, concepts and theories (such as social action, leadership, adoption process, etc.) to the county Extension worker in carrying out his responsibilities?</td>
<td>4.32&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is an understanding, appreciation, and use of research methods for county Extension workers?</td>
<td>4.29&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How essential is specialized competence for a county Extension worker in his assigned area of program responsibility?</td>
<td>4.29&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is the continuance of education (graduate study, refresher short courses, etc.) for the county Extension worker?</td>
<td>4.21&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important are professional journals and periodicals (Adult Education, Adult Leadership, Journal of Extension, etc.) to the county Extension worker?</td>
<td>3.68&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL MEAN</td>
<td>20.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Scale of agreement: 5.00, Very Important; 4.00, Important; 3.00, Undecided; 2.00, Unimportant; 1.00, Very Unimportant.

<sup>b</sup>Scale of agreement: 5.00, Very Essential; 4.00, Essential; 3.00, Undecided; 2.00, Unessential; 1.00, Very Unessential.
noted, however, that the probability value of this relationship approaches the acceptable probability limit identified in this study to declare significance.

**Selected Relationships**

Effects of selected personal characteristics of County Directors on their perception of advisory committee role functions (Section I), advisory committee role performance (Section II), and respondents' attitude toward professional improvement (Section III) are shown in Table 30. These characteristics included: respondents' highest academic degree; general content area of highest academic degree; number of graduate academic credits in the social sciences; perceived importance of Extension program development; age; number of years employed in their present Extension position; number of years employed by the Florida Cooperative Extension Service; size of respondents' academic staff, including themselves; and percent time devoted to Extension program development by the respondents.
TABLE 30

RELATIONSHIPS OF CERTAIN PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SELECTED FLORIDA COUNTY DIRECTORS TO THEIR PERCEPTION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ROLE FUNCTIONS, ROLE PERFORMANCE, AND GENERAL ATTITUDE TOWARD PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d. f.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Square &amp; Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. I^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest academic degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content area of highest degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate credits in social sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>141.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived importance of program development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>126.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (continuous)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years employed in present position (continuous)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years employed by Florida Cooperative Extension Service (continuous)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>d. f.</td>
<td>Sec. I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Prob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of county academic staff (continuous)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent time devoted to program development (continuous)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.83</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Section I (Role Functions)  
<sup>b</sup> Section II (Role Performance)  
<sup>c</sup> Section III (Professional Improvement Attitude)
Analyses of the data included in Table 30 indicate no apparent significant relationship between the selected personal characteristics of County Directors and their perception of advisory committee role functions (Section I), advisory committee role performance (Section II), and respondents' general attitude toward professional improvement (Section III).

However, two of the selected personal characteristics of County Directors - degree content area (Section II) and perceived importance of program development (Section III) - appear to approach significance.

Results in Table 31 suggest that County Directors with degrees in the education disciplines were more critical of the role performance of advisory committees (mean score=60.71) than were those respondents with degrees in the biological and social sciences (mean scores=63.00).

The data shown in Table 32 reveal that those County Directors who indicated program development to be very important also perceived their advisory committee performing their roles more completely (Section II). These data also reveal that only six County Directors (22 percent) indicated Extension program development to be unimportant, while eleven (41 percent) perceived this function to be very important in Extension work.
TABLE 31

MEAN PERCEPTION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ROLE PERFORMANCE
OF SELECTED COUNTY DIRECTORS BY HIGHEST
ACADEMIC DEGREE CONTENT AREA,
FLORIDA, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences(a)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education(c)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\)Botany; biology; soil; plant; animal sciences
\(b\)Sociology; psychology; economics
\(c\)Elementary; secondary; agricultural; Extension

TABLE 32

SELECTED COUNTY DIRECTOR MEAN PERCEPTION OF ADVISORY
COMMITTEE ROLE PERFORMANCE AND IMPORTANCE
OF PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT BY
PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF
EXTENSION PROGRAM
DEVELOPMENT,
FLORIDA,
1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Section II(a)</th>
<th>Section III(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.40</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53.55</td>
<td>22.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\)Perception of advisory committee role performance.
\(b\)Respondent mean attitude toward professional improvement.
The personal characteristic – perceived importance of Extension program development – also approached significance in its effect on the respondents' perceived importance of professional improvement (Section III, Table 30).

Mean scores in Section III, Table 32, indicate that the County Directors who perceived Extension program development as very important, were also the respondents who attached the highest value to professional improvement for Extension workers.

**Combinative Committee Member-County Director Findings**

Table 33 shows the mean perception of advisory committee role function (Section I) and role performance (Section II) for both the selected committee members and the County Directors. This table also includes the combined respondent means for role function (Section I) and role performance (Section II), as well as the combined mean perception for role function and role performance for each of the respondent groups (committee members and County Directors).
TABLE 33
SELECTED RELATIONSHIPS PERTAINING TO COMMITTEE MEMBERS' AND COUNTY DIRECTORS' PERCEPTION OF ROLE FUNCTION AND ROLE PERFORMANCE OF EXTENSION ADVISORY COMMITTEES, FLORIDA, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Ia</th>
<th>Iib</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Members</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Directors</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a\] Section I: What advisory committees should do (Role Functions).

\[b\] Section II: What advisory committees actually do (Role Performance).

Analysis of these data reveals that committee members exhibited higher mean scores for each of the Sections (role functions and role performance) as well as a higher mean score for both Sections combined, than did the County Directors. Therefore, it appears that committee members were in more agreement with the stated role functions of advisory committees and they perceived advisory committees more completely performing these roles than did the County Directors. These data also suggest that both groups of respondents perceived role performance (Section II) of advisory committees not completely equalling the recognized
role functions (Section I).

Table 34 shows the analysis of variance conducted to test the differences observed in Table 33.

**TABLE 34**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PERCEPTION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ROLE FUNCTIONS AND ROLE PERFORMANCE, BY SELECTED COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND COUNTY DIRECTORS, FLORIDA, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d. f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>109.81</td>
<td>2.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. D. vs C. M.(^a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>286.23</td>
<td>6.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section I vs Section II(^b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4045.57</td>
<td>92.72**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>&lt;1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)County Directors vs Committee Members

\(^b\)Role Function vs Role Performance

*(P < .05) \quad **(P < .01)
This analysis indicates that a highly significant difference exists between advisory committee role functions (Section I) and role performance (Section II) as perceived by the respondents (P < .01). This analysis also reveals that a significant difference exists between committee members' and County Directors' mean perception of the combined role function and role performance of advisory committees (P < .05).

Since this test indicates no significant interaction between type of respondent and section, it appears that the difference which exists between advisory committee role functions and role performance is present in the mean perception of both committee members and County Directors. This nonsignificant interaction also reveals that the difference between the mean perceptions of committee members and County Directors is present in advisory committee role functions (Section I) and role performance (Section II).

Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there is no difference between committee members' and County Directors' perception of what advisory committee role functions should be is rejected. Further, the null hypothesis which states that there is no difference between committee members' and County Directors' perception of actual role performance of advisory committees is rejected.
This test also reveals that a highly significant difference exists in respondents' perception among the counties included in this study ($P < .01$). Combined respondent and section mean scores for each of the counties (grouped according to geographic districts) may be found in Appendix F.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate Florida County Extension Directors' and county Extension advisory committee members' perception of the role functions and role performance of county Extension advisory committees.

This purpose evolved from Extension personnel experiencing varying degrees of success in the committee approach to Extension program development. It was felt that this could be due to a lack of common understanding by Extension agents and committee members of the roles and functions of advisory committees.

Objectives of Study

The primary objective of this study was to delineate as finitely as possible certain consistencies and/or inconsistencies present in selected advisory committee members' and County Directors' perception of role functions and role performance of advisory committees in Extension program development.
Other specific objectives of the study were:

1. Determine the role functions and role performance of advisory committees as perceived by selected committee members.

2. Determine the role functions and role performance of advisory committees as perceived by selected County Extension Directors.

3. Determine the association of individual characteristics of the selected committee members and County Extension Directors to perception of role functions and role performance of advisory committee members.

**Methodology**

Two, similar but separate, mail questionnaires were used to collect data from the County Extension Directors and members of the Over-all County Extension Advisory Committee in a random sample of 30 Florida counties. The sample included 30 County Extension Directors and 308 committee members.

The questionnaires for each group of respondents contained 16 role statements in support of the recognized role functions of advisory committees contained in the program development literature of the Florida Cooperative Extension Service. The respondents were asked to respond
to these statements as how they perceived advisory committees should perform.

The second section contained the same 16 role statements and the respondents were requested to respond as how they perceived their advisory committee actually performed.

The third section of the committee member questionnaire contained 5 statements relative to their overall attitude toward their local Extension units. The third section of the County Directors' questionnaire was designed to assess their perceived importance of professional improvement for Extension workers.

The fourth section of the questionnaires requested selected personal characteristics and differed considerably between the two groups of respondents.

Analyses of variance, correlation, regression, unpaired t tests, and frequency distributions were used to test various differences and relationships. The .05 level of probability was selected for deciding whether or not statistically significant differences existed between variables tested.

The following four null hypotheses were developed for test in the study:

1. There is no relationship between committee members' perception of what advisory committee
role functions should be and perception of existing role performance of their advisory committee.

2. There is no relationship between County Directors' perception of what advisory committee role functions should be and perception of existing role performance of their advisory committee.

3. There is no difference between committee members' and County Directors' perception of what advisory committee role functions should be.

4. There is no difference between committee members' and County Directors' perception of existing role performance of advisory committees.

Special attention was also accorded certain personal characteristics of the respondents as related to perceived role functions and role performance of advisory committees.

**Findings**

**Committee Members**

A highly significant difference (P < .01) was found between committee members' mean perception of what advisory committees should do (role functions) and what their advi-
sory committees actually did (role performance), for the following 15 role statements:

1. The advisory committee and the Extension agents should work together in identifying the problems in the county.

2. The advisory committee members should work cooperatively with other members of the committee and respect their opinions.

3. The advisory committee members should be willing to meet as often as necessary and spend as much time as necessary to help determine and plan the county Extension educational programs.

4. The membership of the advisory committee should represent all income levels, races, sections of the county, and Extension audiences.

5. The advisory committee and the Extension agents should decide together which problems are the most important.

6. The major responsibility of the Extension advisory committee is to represent the thinking of the people in the county rather than just their own personal opinions.

7. The advisory committee members should use facts in making decisions and not just their own judgements.

8. The advisory committee should help inform the people in the county about the Extension programs.

9. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents collect information about the county situation.

10. All other people in the county should know about the work the advisory committee is doing.

11. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents in making decisions about Extension educational programs aimed at specific problems.
12. All other people in the county should know who the advisory committee members are.

13. All members of the advisory committee should be thoroughly trained in the job they are expected to do as a member of the committee.

14. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents in determining the success of the Extension educational programs.

15. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents select new members to serve on the committee.

No statistically significant difference was found between the mean perception of what advisory committees should do (role function) and what their advisory committee actually did (role performance) for the following role statement:

16. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents in carrying out the Extension educational programs.

Three correlation analyses were used to test selected relationships between the respondents' perception of role functions of advisory committees, role performance of advisory committees, and the committee members' overall attitude toward local Extension units. The following relationships were highly significant (P < .01):

1. The relationship between committee members' mean perception of what advisory committees should do (role functions) and what their respective advisory committees do (role performance).
2. The relationship between committee members' mean perception of advisory committee role performance and mean general attitude toward local Extension units.

No statistical significance was found for the following relationship:

1. Relationship between committee members' mean perception of what advisory committees should do (role functions) and mean general attitude toward local Extension units.

Regression analyses were used to test the effects of selected personal characteristics of committee members on their perception of advisory committee role functions, advisory committee role performance and mean general attitude toward local Extension units. These selected personal characteristics were: sex; race; occupation; level of education; area of residence; frequency of requests for Extension assistance; gross family income level; age; and attendance at advisory committee meetings.

The following relationships were found to be significant (P < .05):

1. Race was significantly associated with the respondents' mean perception of advisory committee role functions. Black committee members
had a higher mean perception of what advisory committees should do.

2. Level of education was significantly associated with the respondents' mean general attitude toward local Extension units. Committee members whose level of education was less than a high school graduate expressed less satisfaction with their local Extension units than respondents who were at least high school graduates.

3. Attendance frequency at advisory committee meetings appeared to have a significant negative effect on respondents' mean general attitude toward local Extension units (b = -.96). Committee members expressed less satisfaction with their local Extension units as the respondents' attendance of advisory committee meetings increased.

Selected personal characteristics of committee members were as follows:

1. Sixty-one percent were male; 80.6 percent were white; and the average age of all committee members was 45.7 years.

2. The largest group of respondents (29 percent) were farmers; 46 percent lived in towns and
cities; and one-third (33 percent) were college graduates.

3. Forty percent reported gross family incomes of at least $15,000 annually; a majority (50 percent) requested assistance from their local Extension units at least six times annually; and averaged attending 2.45 committee meetings annually.

**County Directors**

A highly significant difference (P < .01) was found between County Directors' mean perception of what advisory committees should do (role functions) and what county advisory committees actually did (role performance) for the following ten role statements:

1. The advisory committee and the Extension agents should work together in identifying the problems in the county.

2. The advisory committee and the Extension agents should decide together which problems are the most important.

3. The advisory committee members should work cooperatively with other members of the committee and respect their opinions.

4. The major responsibility of the Extension advisory committee is to represent the thinking of the people in their county rather than just their own personal opinions.

5. The advisory committee members should be willing to give the necessary time to help determine and
plan the county Extension educational programs.

6. The advisory committee members should use facts in making decisions and not just their own ideas.

7. The advisory committee members should help the Extension agents collect information about the county situation.

8. All other people in the county should know about the work the advisory committee is doing.

9. All other people in the county should know who the advisory committee members are.

10. All members of the advisory committee should be thoroughly trained in the job they are expected to do as a member of the committee.

A significant difference (P < .05) was found between County Directors' mean perception of role function and role performance for the following role statements:

1. The membership of the advisory committee should represent all income levels, races, sections of the county, and Extension audiences.

2. The advisory committee should help inform the people in the county about the Extension educational programs.

3. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents in determining the success of the Extension educational programs.

No statistically significant difference was found between County Directors' mean perception of role function and role performance for the following role statements:

1. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents in making decisions about Extension educational programs aimed at specific problems.
2. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents select new members to serve on the committee.

3. The advisory committee should help the Extension agents in carrying out the Extension educational programs.

Three correlation analyses were used to test selected relationships between perceived role functions of advisory committees, role performance of advisory committees, and respondents' mean general attitude toward professional improvement. Highly significant relationships (P < .01) were found to exist in the following:

1. Relationship between County Directors' mean perception of what advisory committees should do (role functions) and what their respective advisory committees do (role performance).

2. Relationship between County Directors' mean perception of advisory committee role functions and mean general attitude toward professional improvement.

No statistical significance appeared to exist in the following:

1. Relationship between County Directors' mean perception of advisory committee role performance and mean general attitude toward professional improvement.
No statistically significant relationships were found between County Directors' perception of advisory committee role functions, advisory committee role performance, and general attitude toward professional improvement and the following selected personal characteristics:

1. Highest academic degree
2. Content area of highest academic degree
3. Graduate credits in the social sciences
4. Perceived importance of Extension program development
5. Age
6. Years employed in present Extension position
7. Years employed by Florida Cooperative Extension Service
8. Size of county academic staff, including respondent
9. Percent time devoted to Extension program development functions

It might be significant to point out, however, that the following two items did approach the .05 level of probability:

1. Content area of County Directors' highest academic degree may have affected their perception of how their advisory committees performed. The County Directors with degrees in the education fields appeared to be more critical of advisory
committee role performance.

2. Perceived importance of Extension program development may have affected the County Directors' mean general attitude toward professional improvement. Those County Directors who placed the highest value on Extension program development also placed the highest value on professional improvement.

Frequency of the selected personal characteristics of the County Directors are summarized as follows:

1. The average age of the County Directors was 47 years; they averaged 18.2 years employment with the Florida Cooperative Extension Service and 12.4 years of service in their present Extension positions.

2. The majority of the County Directors (60 percent) held Master's degrees; one-half (50 percent) of the respondents' highest degree was in the education fields; and 86 percent had completed at least six graduate credits in the social sciences.

3. The county Extension units represented by the respondents averaged 4.9 academic staff members; the respondents averaged expending 13 percent of
their time in program development functions; and 78.6 percent indicated program development to be important.

**Combinative Committee Member—County Director**

Considering the combined responses of County Directors and committee members resulted in the following findings:

1. A highly significant difference (P < .01) between combined respondent perception of advisory role functions and role performance, with a higher mean score for role function than for role performance.

2. A significant difference (P < .05) between committee members' and County Directors' perception of the combined role functions and performance of advisory committees, with committee members exhibiting a higher combined mean score than the County Directors.

3. A highly significant difference (P < .01) in respondent perception among the counties included in the study.

The interaction test included in this analysis was not significant.
Null Hypotheses

Based on the findings summarily enumerated in this chapter, all four of the null hypotheses tested in this study were rejected.

Conclusions

The following conclusions represent the author's interpretation of the findings:

1. Committee members and County Directors agreed that the functions identified were important functions of advisory committees.

2. There was a real difference between the committee members' perception of what advisory committees should do and what they perceived their advisory committees did in fifteen of the sixteen (94 percent) role statements. The committee members recognized that performance of advisory committees did not completely equal what the committees should do.

3. Even though there were differences in the committee members' perception of role functions and role performance of advisory committees, a true relationship existed between perceived role functions and role performance. The committee
members' perception of how well their advisory committees performed was related to roles they perceived the committees should have.

4. There was a true relationship between committee members' perception of advisory committee performance and their general attitude toward local Extension units. As the committee members' attendance of advisory committee meetings increased their general attitude toward local Extension units became less favorable. This attitude could have been a result of the committee members' lack of understanding of the roles they were expected to perform as members of advisory committees.

5. Black committee members exhibited more agreement with the stated role functions of advisory committees than did white members and those committee members who were not high school graduates exhibited less favorable attitudes toward local Extension units than did those committee members with higher educational levels. A select group of Black citizens are usually identified in most communities who are willing to participate in such county or community efforts. Since
Extension program development is a social process, and Black committee members have more opportunities to participate in such efforts, it appears reasonable that they may be more knowledgeable of the roles associated with Extension program development efforts. Further, since Extension program development is not always a simple task, committee members with less than a high school education may have experienced difficulty in understanding the expected roles of the advisory committee. This could have affected their attitude toward local Extension units.

6. There was a real difference between what County Directors' perceived the role functions of advisory committees should be and how well the committees performed in thirteen of the sixteen (81 percent) stated roles. The County Directors believed the committee members were not completely performing the stated roles.

7. There was a true relationship between County Directors' perception of advisory committee role functions and role performance. The County Directors' perception of advisory committee role
performance was based on their perception of what advisory committees should do.

8. There was a true relationship between County Directors' perception of advisory committee role functions and their attitude toward professional improvement. The County Directors (41 percent) who were in the highest agreement with the stated roles of advisory committees also indicated the greatest value of Extension professional improvement. This indicated that professional improvement opportunities (workshops, conferences, professional journals, graduate study, etc.) were methods used for further training in the advisory committee approach to Extension program development.

9. There was a real difference between committee members' and County Directors' agreement with the stated roles of advisory committees. Committee members expressed more agreement than County Directors.

10. There was a real difference between committee members' and County Directors' perception of how well advisory committees performed their stated roles. County Directors were more critical of
role performance than were the committee members.

11. There was a real difference between the combined respondent perception of what the roles of advisory committees should be and how well committee members performed these roles. Both committee members and County Directors felt that committee members were not completely performing the roles identified.

12. The difference between advisory committee role functions and role performance was present in the perceptions of both the committee members and County Directors and the differences between perceptions of committee members and County Directors was present in role functions and in role performance of advisory committees.

13. There were real differences in the combined respondents' perception of advisory committee role functions and role performance among the counties included in the sample and the respondents' perception was also influenced by their individual county situations.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study,
the author suggests the following recommendations for further consideration.

The Florida Cooperative Extension Service might consider revising and simplifying the program development literature found in the Florida Program Development Handbook as an effort to seek more understanding and support of the committee member approach to Extension program development.

The Florida Cooperative Extension Service might consider more in-service training of county Extension personnel in program development methods and techniques employing the advisory committee approach.

The author also believes this study suggests the need for additional research to clarify the roles of Extension advisory committees in Extension’s efforts to help people help themselves.
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APPENDICES
To: Certain County Extension Directors

Gentlemen,

I need your assistance in obtaining certain information relative to the "Role of County Extension Advisory Committees in Florida". This information will be used to complete a portion of my graduate study at LSU.

This information will be collected by means of a short questionnaire submitted to you and to each of the members of your over-all County Extension Advisory Committee. I am using this designation to identify your top decision making group as directed in the Affirmative Action Plan requirements.

The District Agents have furnished me with the enclosed names of your committee members to help speed up the process, but I would like for you to verify the membership. Please update the list if needed and add the mailing addresses if your list does not contain this information.

Time is becoming an important factor in this study, therefore I would appreciate your immediate attention.

Very truly yours,

/s/ W. C. Smith, Jr.

W. C. Smith, Jr.
County Extension Director

WCS:js
Enclosure
Dear Extension Advisory Committee Member,

Attached is a questionnaire about your position and responsibility as a member of your County Extension Advisory Committee. You are providing a valuable service to the people in your county by serving on this important committee. I know your Extension Agents appreciate your help.

The purpose of this study is to help identify any improvements that we might need to make in this method of Extension program development. The successful completion of this study depends on your reply.

Please follow the instructions at the beginning of each section. It should not take over twenty minutes for you to complete the questionnaire, and a self-addressed envelope is enclosed for you to return it to me.

Your answers will be kept confidential and will only be used for compiling information relating to this study.

You will note that your questionnaire has been numbered. This number will only be used to record your reply so I will not bother you with another request for the information.

Thank you for your cooperation in this important study and I would appreciate your immediate reply.

Very truly yours,

/s/ W. C. Smith, Jr.

W. C. Smith, Jr.
County Extension Director

WCS:js
Enclosure
INTRODUCTION

This study is designed to determine the views held by selected Florida Extension Advisory Committee members relative to the role and function of the Extension Advisory Committee. You are asked to be an important part of achieving this purpose by completing this questionnaire.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please complete all parts of the questionnaire.

2. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Please give your frank opinion at all times.

3. Upon completing the questionnaire, please re-check to make sure all questions have been answered.

4. Your answers will be regarded as confidential. The information given will be used only in compiling group data.
SECTION I

The following sixteen statements are about the role of a County Extension Advisory Committee. We are interested in what you think about these statements. There are no right or wrong answers. Your answers are just your opinions. Please be frank and answer each statement.

1. All members of the Extension Advisory Committee should be thoroughly trained in the job they are expected to do as a member of the Committee. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

2. The Advisory Committee members should be willing to meet as often as necessary and spend as much time as necessary to help determine and plan the county Extension educational programs. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

3. The Advisory Committee members should help the Extension Agents collect information about the county situation. (check one)
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

4. The Advisory Committee members should use facts in making decisions and not just their own ideas. (check one)
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

5. The Advisory Committee and the Extension Agents should work together in identifying the problems in the county. (check one)
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

6. The Advisory Committee and the Extension Agents should decide together which problems are the most important. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

Do not write in this space

7. The Advisory Committee should help the Extension Agents in making decisions about Extension educational programs aimed at specific problems. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

8. The Advisory Committee should help the Extension Agents in carrying out the Extension educational programs. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

10, ___ 11, ___ 12, ___
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

9. The Advisory Committee should help the Extension Agents in determining the success of the Extension educational programs. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

10. The major responsibility of the Extension Advisory Committee is to represent the thinking of the people in the county rather than just their own personal opinions. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

11. The membership of the Advisory Committee should represent all income levels, races, sections of the county, and Extension audiences. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

12. The Advisory Committee should help inform the people in the county about the Extension educational programs. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

13. The Advisory Committee members should work cooperatively with other members of the committee and respect their opinions. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

14. All other people in the county should know who the Advisory Committee members are. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

15. All other people in the county should know about the work the Advisory Committee is doing. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

16. The Advisory Committee should help the Extension Agents select new members to serve on the committee. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

SECTION II

We would like your opinion about the following statements as you think about your present County Extension Advisory Committee. There are no trick questions and we are only interested in your opinion. Please answer each statement.
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

17. All members of my County Extension Advisory Committee are well trained in the job they are expected to do as members of the committee.
   (check one)
   ____ Strongly agree
   ____ Agree
   ____ Undecided
   ____ Disagree
   ____ Strongly disagree

18. All members of my County Extension Advisory Committee are willing to meet when necessary and spend as much time as necessary to help determine and plan the county Extension program.
   (check one)
   ____ Strongly agree
   ____ Agree
   ____ Undecided
   ____ Disagree
   ____ Strongly disagree
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

19. All members of my County Extension Advisory Committee help the Extension Agents collect facts about our county. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

20. All members of my County Extension Advisory Committee use facts in making their decisions and not just their own ideas. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

21. My County Extension Advisory Committee and Extension Agents work together in identifying the problems in the county. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

22. My County Extension Advisory Committee and Extension Agents decide together which problems are the most important. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

23. My County Extension Advisory Committee helps the Extension Agents make decisions about Extension educational programs aimed at specific problems. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

24. My County Extension Advisory Committee helps the Extension Agents carry out their Extension educational programs. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

25. My County Extension Advisory Committee helps the Extension Agents determine the success of their Extension educational programs. (check one)
   |   |   |   |   |   |
   |___|   |   |   |   |
   |   |   |   |   |   |
   |   |   |   |   |   |
   |   |   |   |   |   |
   |   |   |   |   |   |

26. All members of my Extension Advisory Committee represent the thinking of the people in my county rather than just their own personal opinions. (check one)
   |   |   |   |   |   |
   |___|   |   |   |   |
   |   |   |   |   |   |
   |   |   |   |   |   |
   |   |   |   |   |   |
   |   |   |   |   |   |

Do not write in this space 29, ___  

Do not write in this space 30, ___
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

27. The membership of my County Extension Advisory Committee represents all income levels, races, sections of the county and Extension audiences. (check one)
   ____ Strongly agree
   ____ Agree
   ____ Undecided
   ____ Disagree
   ____ Strongly disagree

28. My Extension Advisory Committee helps inform the people about the Extension educational programs. (check one)
   ____ Strongly agree
   ____ Agree
   ____ Undecided
   ____ Disagree
   ____ Strongly disagree

29. All members of my Extension Advisory Committee work together and respect each other's opinions. (check one)
   ____ Strongly agree
   ____ Agree
   ____ Undecided
   ____ Disagree
   ____ Strongly disagree

Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

30. Most people in my county know who the members of the Extension Advisory Committee are. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

31. Most people in my county know what the Extension Advisory Committee is doing. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

32. My Extension Advisory Committee assists the Extension Agents in selecting new members for the committee. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree
SECTION III

These are some statements that some people have made about their County Extension Service. We would like to know how you feel about these statements as you think about your County Extension Service. Please check your answer for each statement.

33. In my opinion the Extension Service is worth every cent it costs. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

34. The Extension Service has really been a lot of help to me and/or my family. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

35. The Extension Service is run too much by the county and state staffs and does not involve local people enough in deciding what information to put out. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

36. In my opinion too much money is spent on Extension for what the people get out of it. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

37. A lot of things recommended by the Extension Service are not practical for most people. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree
SECTION IV

PERSONAL DATA

The following ten questions are about yourself and your County Extension Advisory Committee. Your answers will help determine the profile of Extension Advisory Committee members in Florida.

Please answer all of the questions. Your answers will be kept confidential.

38. Sex (check one)
   ___ Male
   ___ Female

39. Your age (As of January 1, 1973)
   ___ Years

40. Your race (check one)
   ___ White
   ___ Negro
   ___ Spanish
   ___ Other (specify) ___________

41. What is your occupation?
   _____________________________

42. What was the highest grade that you completed in school? (check one)
   ___ Grade
   ___ High School Graduate
   ___ College
   ___ College Graduate

   42, ___

   43, 44, ___

   45, ___

   46, 47, ___

   48, ___
Please answer all of the questions. Your answers will be kept confidential.

43. Where do you live? (check one)
   ___ On a farm
   ___ In the country, but not on a farm
   ___ In a town or city

44. About how often have you asked one of your local Extension Agents for help during the last 12 months? (check one)
   ___ None
   ___ Less than 3 times
   ___ About 3 to 6 times
   ___ About 6 to 12 times
   ___ More than 12 times

45. How many times has your Advisory Committee met during the past 12 months?
   ___ Times

46. How many times did you attend these meetings during the past 12 months?
   ___ Times
47. What was your family income for 1972? Include wages from everyone living at home and/or the amount available from your farm or business income for you and your family to spend. (check one)

____ Less than $5,000
____ Between $5,000 and $10,000
____ Between $10,000 and $15,000
____ More than $15,000

THANK YOU
APPENDIX C

5116 Highland Rd., Apt. 1
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808

Dear County Extension Director,

Attached is a questionnaire relative to the County Extension Director's perception of the role and role function of county Extension advisory committees in Extension program development. For the purpose of this study, the county Extension advisory committee refers to your over-all county Extension advisory committee. It does not refer to any specific subcommittees if you employ these in your program development structure.

You will find complete instructions at the beginning of each section in the questionnaire, and it should not take you longer than about 15 minutes to complete. Your answers will be used in compiling data to complete a study of this method of Extension program development in Florida.

The successful completion of this study depends on your reply. You will note that your questionnaire is numbered, however, your responses will be kept confidential and no attempt will be made to match names with responses. The number is simply to identify your reply so I will not bother you with additional requests for this assistance.

A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation and immediate attention.

Very truly yours,

/s/ W. C. Smith, Jr.

W. C. Smith, Jr.
County Extension Director

WCS: js
Enclosure
INTRODUCTION

This study has been designed to determine the views held by selected Florida County Extension Directors relative to the role and function of the County Extension Advisory Committee. You are asked to assume an important part of achieving this purpose by completing this questionnaire.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please complete all parts of the questionnaire.

2. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Please give your frank opinion at all times.

3. Upon completing the questionnaire, please re-check to make sure all questions have been answered.

4. Your answers will be regarded as confidential. The information given will be used only in compiling group data.
Number ____

SECTION I

The following sixteen statements are about the role of a County Extension Advisory Committee. We are interested in what you think about these statements. There are no right or wrong answers. Your answers are just your opinions. Please be frank and answer each statement.

1. All members of the Extension Advisory Committee should be thoroughly trained in the job they are expected to do as a member of the Committee. (check one)
   ____ Strongly agree
   ____ Agree
   ____ Undecided
   ____ Disagree
   ____ Strongly disagree

2. The Extension Advisory Committee members should be willing to give the necessary time to help determine and plan the county Extension educational programs. (check one)
   ____ Strongly agree
   ____ Agree
   ____ Undecided
   ____ Disagree
   ____ Strongly disagree
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

3. The Advisory Committee members should help the Extension Agents collect information about the county situation. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

4. The Advisory Committee members should use facts in making decisions and not just their own ideas. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

5. The Advisory Committee and the Extension Agents should work together in identifying the problems in the county. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

Do not write in this space
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

6. The Advisory Committee and the Extension Agents should decide together which problems are the most important. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

7. The Advisory Committee should help the Extension Agents in making decisions about Extension educational programs aimed at specific problems. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

8. The Advisory Committee should help the Extension Agents in carrying out the Extension educational programs. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

9. The Advisory Committee should help the Extension Agents in determining the success of the Extension educational programs. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

10. The major responsibility of the Extension Advisory Committee is to represent the thinking of the people in the county rather than just their own personal opinions. (check one)
    ___ Strongly agree
    ___ Agree
    ___ Undecided
    ___ Disagree
    ___ Strongly disagree

11. The membership of the Advisory Committee should represent all income levels, races, sections of the county, and Extension audiences. (check one)
    ___ Strongly agree
    ___ Agree
    ___ Undecided
    ___ Disagree
    ___ Strongly disagree
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

12. The Advisory Committee should help inform the people in the county about the Extension educational programs. (check one)
   ____ Strongly agree
   ____ Agree
   ____ Undecided
   ____ Disagree
   ____ Strongly disagree

13. The Advisory Committee members should work cooperatively with other members of the committee and respect their opinions. (check one)
   ____ Strongly agree
   ____ Agree
   ____ Undecided
   ____ Disagree
   ____ Strongly disagree

14. All other people in the county should know who the Advisory Committee members are. (check one)
   ____ Strongly agree
   ____ Agree
   ____ Undecided
   ____ Disagree
   ____ Strongly disagree
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

15. All other people in the county should know about the work the Advisory Committee is doing. (check one)
   [ ] Strongly agree
   [ ] Agree
   [ ] Undecided
   [ ] Disagree
   [ ] Strongly disagree

16. The Advisory Committee should help the Extension Agents select new members to serve on the committee. (check one)
   [ ] Strongly agree
   [ ] Agree
   [ ] Undecided
   [ ] Disagree
   [ ] Strongly disagree

---

SECTION II

We would like your opinion about the following statements as you think about your present County Extension Advisory Committee. There are no trick questions and we are only interested in your opinion. Please answer each statement.
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

17. All members of my County Extension Advisory Committee are well trained in the job they are expected to do as members of the committee. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

18. All members of my County Advisory Committee are willing to give the time necessary to help determine and plan the county Extension programs. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

19. All members of my County Extension Advisory Committee help the Extension Agents collect facts about our county. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

20. All members of my County Extension Advisory Committee use facts in making their decisions and not just their own ideas. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

21. My County Extension Advisory Committee and Extension Agents work together in identifying the problems in the county. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

22. My County Extension Advisory Committee and Extension Agents decide together which problems are the most important. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

23. My County Extension Advisory Committee helps the Extension Agents make decisions about Extension educational programs aimed at specific problems. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

24. My County Extension Advisory Committee helps the Extension Agents carry out their Extension educational programs. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

25. My County Extension Advisory Committee helps the Extension Agents determine the success of their Extension educational programs. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

26. All members of my Extension Advisory Committee represent the thinking of the people in my county rather than just their own personal opinions. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

27. The membership of my County Extension Advisory Committee represents all income levels, races, sections of the county and Extension audiences. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

28. My Extension Advisory Committee helps inform the people about the Extension educational programs. (check one)
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

29. All members of my Extension Advisory Committee work together and respect each other's opinions. (check one)

   ____ Strongly agree
   ____ Agree
   ____ Undecided
   ____ Disagree
   ____ Strongly disagree

30. Most people in my county know who the members of the Extension Advisory Committee are. (check one)

   ____ Strongly agree
   ____ Agree
   ____ Undecided
   ____ Disagree
   ____ Strongly disagree

31. Most people in my county know what the Extension Advisory Committee is doing. (check one)

   ____ Strongly agree
   ____ Agree
   ____ Undecided
   ____ Disagree
   ____ Strongly disagree
Please check the answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

32. My Extension Advisory Committee assists the Extension Agents in selecting new members for the committee. (check one)

___ Strongly agree 36, ___
___ Agree
___ Undecided
___ Disagree
___ Strongly disagree

SECTION III

You are asked to respond to the following five statements by checking the one answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement. There are five alternative answers to each statement. Please be frank and honest in your answers.

33. How important is an understanding of the behavioral sciences, concepts and theories (such as social action, leadership, adoption process, etc.) to the County Extension worker in carrying out his responsibilities? (check one)

___ Very important 37, ___
___ Important
___ Undecided
___ Unimportant
___ Very unimportant
Please check the one answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

34. Do you feel that an understanding, appreciation, and use of research methods for County Extension workers is: (check one)
   ___ Very important
   ___ Important
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Unimportant
   ___ Very unimportant

35. How essential is specialized competence for a county Extension worker in his assigned area of program responsibility? (check one)
   ___ Very essential
   ___ Essential
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Unessential
   ___ Very unessential

36. How important is the continuance of education (graduate study, refresher short courses, etc.) for the county Extension worker? (check one)
   ___ Very important
   ___ Important
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Unimportant
   ___ Very unimportant
Please check the one answer which most nearly indicates your feeling toward the statement.

37. How important are professional journals and periodicals (Adult Education, Adult Leadership, Journal for Extension, etc.) to the county Extension worker? (check one)
   ___ Very important
   ___ Important
   ___ Undecided
   ___ Unimportant
   ___ Very unimportant

Do not write in this space

SECTION IV

PERSONAL DATA

38. Age (As of January 1, 1973)
   ___

39. As of January 1, 1973, how many years have you served in your present position? (Indicate nearest whole year(s)).
   ___

40. As of January 1, 1973, how many years have you been employed with the Florida Cooperative Extension Service? (Indicate nearest whole year(s)).
   ___
41. What is the highest academic degree you now hold? (check one)
   ___ Bachelor Degree
   ___ Master's Degree
   ___ Doctorate Degree
   ___ Other (specify) ________________

42. Indicate the general content area in which your highest degree was earned. (check one)
   ___ Physical Sciences (chemistry, physics, mathematics, etc.)
   ___ Biological Sciences (botany, biology, soil, plant and animal science, etc.)
   ___ Social Sciences (sociology, psychology, economics, etc.)
   ___ Education (elementary, secondary, agricultural, extension, etc.)
   ___ Other (specify) ________________

43. If you have taken academic courses for graduate credit, approximately how many course credits have you had in the "social sciences"? (education, sociology, public administration, etc.) (check one)
   ___ None
   ___ 1 to 6 credits
   ___ 6 to 15 credits
   ___ 15 or more credits
44. Indicate the one program area of responsibility in which you spend the most time.

________________________________________

45. Approximately what percent of your time during 1972 was spent in Extension program development?

__

46. What is the size of the academic staff in your County Extension Office? (Including yourself)

__

47. How important is Extension program development to you? (check one)

  ____ Very important
  ____ Important
  ____ Undecided
  ____ Unimportant
  ____ Very unimportant

57, __

48. When was your present County Advisory Committee organized in compliance with the Affirmative Action requirements? (Indicate month and year)

_____________________________

58, 59, __  

60, __

Please use the back of the pages to add comments that you desire regarding any part of this questionnaire.

THANK YOU
APPENDIX D

5116 Highland Rd., Apt. 1
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808

Dear Extension Committee Member,

You will recall that I mailed you a questionnaire a few weeks ago relative to your opinion of Extension Advisory Committees.

Your opinions will be included in a study that I am conducting regarding this method of involving local people in planning Extension programs. Therefore, the success of this study depends on your completing the questionnaire and returning it to me.

If you have not already done so, please fill in your opinions and return the questionnaire to me at your earliest convenience.

If I do not receive your questionnaire in about two weeks, I will assume that you have misplaced it and I will send you another copy.

It is very important that I receive your opinions and I hope you will cooperate.

Very truly yours,

/s/ W. C. Smith, Jr.

W. C. Smith, Jr.
County Extension Director

WCS:js
Dear County Extension Director,

You will recall that I mailed you a questionnaire a few weeks ago relative to your opinion of Extension Advisory Committees.

Your opinions will be included in a study that I am conducting regarding this method of involving local people in planning Extension programs. Therefore, the success of this study depends on your completing the questionnaire and returning it to me.

If you have not already done so, please fill in your opinions and return the questionnaire to me at your earliest convenience.

If I do not receive your questionnaire in about two weeks, I will assume that you have misplaced it and I will send you another copy.

It is very important that I receive your opinions and I hope you will cooperate.

Very truly yours,

/s/ W. C. Smith, Jr.

W. C. Smith, Jr.
County Extension Director

WCS:js
APPENDIX F

TABLE 35

COMBINED COMMITTEE MEMBERS' AND COUNTY DIRECTORS' MEAN PERCEPTION OF COUNTY EXTENSION ADVISORY COMMITTEE ROLE FUNCTION AND ROLE PERFORMANCE BY SELECTED COUNTIES AND GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICTS, FLORIDA, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL: District I</td>
<td>56.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL: District II</td>
<td>52.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>District III</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>District IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
William Carlton Smith, Jr. was born January 29, 1932, in Madison, Florida. He is the son of Ida Denson Smith and the late William Carlton Smith.

His youth included a farm environment and he was active in Future Farmers of America activities. He was graduated from Madison High School in 1950 and entered the University of Florida, receiving a Bachelor of Science in Agriculture degree in 1954.

Following graduation, he married the former Johnnie Ruth Walker of Gainesville, Florida. He accepted a position of Vocational Agriculture teacher with the Jackson County Florida School Board for one semester and then entered the United States Army. After completing two years of active duty, he enrolled in the Graduate School of the University of Florida and received a Master of Agriculture degree in 1957.

He began his Extension career in 1957 as Assistant County Agent in Taylor County, Florida. In 1965 he was promoted to County Agent in Liberty County, Florida and in 1966 transferred to Lafayette County, Florida as County Extension Director.

In September 1972, he enrolled in Louisiana State
University to begin study for a Doctor of Education degree in Extension Education. In August 1973, he returned to Florida and assumed the position of County Extension Director - Area Coordinator in Suwannee County.

He is a member of Epsilon Sigma Phi and Alpha Tau Alpha professional fraternities.
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