

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 948

AC 006 234

AUTHOR Alexander, Frank D.  
TITLE Office of Extension Studies, New York Cooperative Extension; A Case Study.  
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Ithaca. Coll. of Agriculture at Cornell.; State Univ. of New York, Ithaca. Coll. of Home Economics at Cornell Univ.  
REPORT NO SR-23  
PUB DATE Mar 69  
NOTE 82p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.50 HC-\$4.20  
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy, Bibliographies, Budgeting, Evaluation Criteria, Information Dissemination, \*Institutional Research, Personnel, Program Administration, \*Program Evaluation, Research, \*Researchers, \*Rural Extension, \*State Agencies  
IDENTIFIERS Cooperative Extension Service, New York State, \*Office of Extension Studies

ABSTRACT

Based on criteria drawn from a policy and functions statement, an evaluation was made of activities from 1956 to 1968 by the Office of Extension Studies (OES), a research unit attached to the Office of the Director of New York Cooperative Extension. Formulated in 1958, the statement covers the nature of Extension studies, planning principles for OES studies, OES cooperation in studies by other Extension personnel, the communication or feedback of findings, and specific OES ties with New York Extension Service staff, college departments, and others. Research areas are delineated: needs and socioeconomic status; Extension effectiveness in terms of resulting changes in behavior, attitudes, and knowledge; and Extension Service policies, organization, operations, costs, and personnel. OES also bears responsibility for assisting the Extension Staff with study designs, construction of questionnaires, and data processing. An examination of the characteristics of the 57 OES studies, together with staff involvement, distribution of reports, and other aspects of program operation, has uncovered many important strengths and weaknesses. (Appendixes list OES reports and staff members' publications.) (1y)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE  
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
POSITION OR POLICY.

OFFICE OF EXTENSION STUDIES  
NEW YORK COOPERATIVE EXTENSION  
A CASE STUDY

by

Frank D. Alexander  
Extension Studies Analyst

Special Report No. 23

Office of Extension Studies

New York State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics  
Statutory Colleges of the State University  
at Cornell University  
Ithaca, New York

March, 1969

ED034948

AC006234

## PREFACE

This report is different in a number of respects from the usual study produced by the Office of Extension Studies. It is a self-evaluation study in that the data which are entirely concerned with OES activities were selected, organized, and interpreted by the Extension Studies Leader who has been largely responsible for OES operations. In a sense, it can be called the "last will and testament" of this leader. The defense for a study that could easily be considered a subjective product afflicted with many biases is that the author has diligently sought to be professional. This is no easy assignment, but the author's efforts have been undergirded by the presentation of as many facts as he was able to muster. Moreover, a conscientious effort has been made to present these facts so that disagreements with their interpretation may find their bases in the facts thus presented. Since information on the use of OES reports was somewhat limited, it should be remembered that a number of studies may have been used in an effective manner, but information on their use was not available for this report.

A relevant problem which will be readily apparent to the critically minded, but which receives little if any consideration in the report is whether or not research by a unit within Extension is more effective as well as objective than similar research conducted by an outside organization. Other than a few references to the problem, no serious attempt to deal with this issue is made in the study. If anyone is interested in delving into this problem, the author suggests he read Murray A. Straus' paper, Social Psychological Aspects of Extension Research Organization.<sup>1</sup>

A refined alternative of the problem of who should conduct Extension research is whether or not a research unit within Extension should be primarily responsible or various departments

---

<sup>1</sup>Available from files of the Division of Extension Research and Education, FES, USDA.

in the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics. A careful study of the findings and implications of this study should throw some light on this problem.

The principal concern which the exercise of preparing the study has stimulated has been how effective instrumentation can be devised whereby the findings and implications of studies can enter the life-blood of the agency whose activities have been studied. The invention of this instrumentation constitutes an important challenge to Cooperative Extension in the years ahead.

The study has also pointed out the need for a more systematic approach to the study of the activities of the agency. It has shown that the study of the activities of the agency should be a continuous process, rather than a one-time affair. It has also shown that the study of the activities of the agency should be a joint effort of the agency and the researcher.

The study has also shown that the study of the activities of the agency should be a joint effort of the agency and the researcher. It has shown that the study of the activities of the agency should be a continuous process, rather than a one-time affair. It has also shown that the study of the activities of the agency should be a joint effort of the agency and the researcher.

The study has also shown that the study of the activities of the agency should be a joint effort of the agency and the researcher. It has shown that the study of the activities of the agency should be a continuous process, rather than a one-time affair. It has also shown that the study of the activities of the agency should be a joint effort of the agency and the researcher.

The study has also shown that the study of the activities of the agency should be a joint effort of the agency and the researcher. It has shown that the study of the activities of the agency should be a continuous process, rather than a one-time affair. It has also shown that the study of the activities of the agency should be a joint effort of the agency and the researcher.

The study has also shown that the study of the activities of the agency should be a joint effort of the agency and the researcher. It has shown that the study of the activities of the agency should be a continuous process, rather than a one-time affair. It has also shown that the study of the activities of the agency should be a joint effort of the agency and the researcher.

*With appreciation to the Cooperative Extension Staff  
of New York State whose interest and participation  
made possible the reports with which this study deals.*



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Summary . . . . .	1
Implications . . . . .	11
Introduction . . . . .	15
Policy and Functions of the Office of Extension Studies . . . . .	17
Operations of Office of Extension Studies . . . . .	20
Report Series . . . . .	20
Substantive Classification of Reports . . . . .	21
Subject Matter of Classes of Reports . . . . .	23
By Whom OES Studies Have Been Initiated . . . . .	27
Responsibility for Production of Reports . . . . .	27
Staff Involvement in Reports . . . . .	29
Feedback by OES of Findings and Implications . . . . .	32
Other Known Uses of Reports . . . . .	40
Approximate Distribution of OES Reports . . . . .	43
Annual Production of Reports . . . . .	47
Number of Pages in Reports . . . . .	49
Studies on Which OES Has Advised or Assisted:	
1965-68 . . . . .	50
Classes and subject matter of studies . . . . .	50
Staff initiating and responsible for studies . . . . .	52
Service rendered by the Office of Extension Studies . . . . .	53
Status of studies . . . . .	54
Budgets and Staff of the Office of Extension Studies . . . . .	54
Office of Extension Studies Output Related to to Straus' Characterization . . . . .	56

	<u>Page</u>
Relationship of OES Operations to Its Policy and Functions Statement . . . . .	58
Evaluation Relative to Policy and Functions Statement . . . . .	58
Resumé of Evaluation Relative to Policy and Functions Statement . . . . .	61
Nature of extension studies . . . . .	61
Planning principles . . . . .	62
Relationships of OES to studies conducted by other extension personnel . . . . .	62
Communication by OES of results of its studies . . . . .	62
Specific relationships of segments of extension staff in initiating and participating in OES research . . . . .	62
Appendix A: List of Reports by the Office of Extension Studies . . . . .	65
Appendix B: List of Articles and Papers by OES Staff .	77

OFFICE OF EXTENSION STUDIES  
NEW YORK COOPERATIVE EXTENSION  
A CASE STUDY

Summary

Introduction

This case study covers the activities from 1956 to 1968 of the Office of Extension Studies, a research unit attached to the Office of the Director of New York Cooperative Extension. The operations of OES have been guided by a policy and functions statement which was formulated in 1958. This statement set forth: 1) the nature of extension studies, 2) planning principles for studies conducted by OES, 3) relationship of OES to studies conducted by other extension personnel, 4) communicating the results of studies, and 5) specific relationships of OES to New York Extension Service staff, to college departments, and others.

Under the nature of extension studies the statement delineated the three major areas of research with which OES should be concerned, i.e., 1) studies of situations concerned with the needs of people and their social and economic status,<sup>1</sup> 2) studies of changes in attitudes, knowledge, and behavior of people for the purpose of measuring the effects of Extension's educational activities, and 3) studies of the Extension Service which are directed to its policies, organization, operations, costs, and personnel.

An equally important section of the statement indicated that OES would assist the extension staff with: 1) study designs, 2) construction of questionnaires, 3) plans for processing of data including exploration of resources to do this, and 4) actual processing of data for a limited number of experimental or demonstration studies.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although not specifically stated, the intent of these studies was to provide bases for program planning.



Operations of Office of Extension Studies

**A. Report Series**

1. In classifying its reports, OES developed five separate series and numbered the reports in four of the series. The number of reports in each of the series were:<sup>1</sup>

	<u>No. of reports</u>
a. Preliminary reports on evaluation of the Farm and Home Management Program	12
b. Extension studies	19 <sup>2</sup>
c. Special reports	20 <sup>3</sup>
d. Cooperative studies	2
e. Home demonstration membership reports (not numbered)	58 <sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>In addition to these five classes, OES has produced two reports and cooperated on another, all three of which may be classified as miscellaneous; however, the three reports were never given any formal classification.

<sup>2</sup>Two of these reports had supplements and one was a summary (Part VII) based on five of six additional parts, each of which was under separate cover.

<sup>3</sup>One of these reports had a supplement.

<sup>4</sup>This series of reports consisted of 55 county, two city and a state report.

**B. Substantive Classification of Reports**

1. While for convenience the OES reports were classified as indicated on the preceding page, a more meaningful classification is as follows:

	Reports	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
a. Evaluation	33 <sup>1</sup>	57
b. Agency (Extension)	13 <sup>2</sup>	23
c. Situation	3	5
d. Methodology	3	5
e. Evaluation and agency	1	2
f. Evaluation and methodology	2	4
g. Miscellaneous	2	4
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	57 <sup>3</sup>	100

2. Evaluation reports constitute by far the largest number (33) of the 57 reports.

---

<sup>1</sup>Two of these reports had supplements, neither of which is counted in this tabulation. Another of these 33 reports was a joint report with the Department of Communication Arts (Extension Teaching and Information).

<sup>2</sup>One report was a summary (Part VII) based on five of six additional parts, each of which was under separate cover, but not included in this tabulation (One part was quite brief and not included in the summary report.); another was a state report, whose data were also used in 55 county and two city reports, but these 57 reports are not included in this tabulation; and another report had a supplement which is not included in the tabulation. To have included the reports and supplements referred to in this footnote would have inflated the number of reports unduly and made the subsequent treatment misleading.

<sup>3</sup>A report produced in December, 1968, but not included in this study because it was purposely withheld from distribution and use until sometime in 1969, plus three additional reports produced in the early part of 1969 raises the total to 61.

3. Reports concerned with agency (Extension) matters constitute 23 percent of the total.
4. Only three of the 57 reports have dealt with situational data used for program planning.

C. Subject Matter of Classes of Reports

1. The studies which OES has conducted or been significantly involved in have largely arisen out of current interests or concerns of the extension staff as discerned by OES and have been somewhat opportunistic rather than planned around carefully selected problems that were considered basic to Extension's activities and organization.
2. However, that some important problems and concerns have received attention is clear when the following list is reviewed:

Annual extension conference of staff  
 Community and resource development  
 Distribution of home economics leaflets and bulletins  
 Farm and/or home management  
 Farm labor study groups  
 4-H Leaders  
 Formation of farm management study groups  
 Home economics fees for leader training and study groups  
 Home economics newsletter  
 In-service training of staff  
 Low-income programs  
 Membership in home demonstration units  
 New 4-H programs  
 Personnel of extension organization  
 Pre-service training of staff  
 Program planning  
 Situation of beef cattle farmers as a basis for program planning  
 Situation of dairy farmers as a basis for program planning  
 Study methodology and techniques  
 TV programs and resources

D. By Whom OES Studies Have Been Initiated

1. Of 57 OES reports (or studies), 23, or 40.4 percent, were initiated primarily by OES. No other staff member or group of staff members approached this number of OES reports for which they were the primary initiators.
2. A fairly wide range of the extension staff had a primary role in initiating OES reports not initiated by OES itself.

E. Responsibility for Production of Reports

1. OES has had full responsibility for 43, or 75 percent, of the 57 reports. Even for the remaining 14 reports, the responsibilities of OES were considerable.

F. Staff Involvement in Reports

1. For almost half (46 percent) of 57 reports, OES was the primary contributor in terms of staff input.
2. For 27, or 47 percent, of the 57 reports, OES had considerable assistance from others, primarily staff members of New York Cooperative Extension.

G. Feedback by OES of Findings and Implications

1. About one third (35 percent) of the 57 OES reports were given feedback presentations by the OES staff. This record is not especially outstanding and indicates some failure on the part of OES to develop effective methods or devise opportunities for this kind of operation, or the lack of interest on the part of the extension staff in feedback, or both.
2. Thirty-three percent of the 33 evaluation reports produced by OES were given feedback presentations, 46 percent of the 13 agency reports, and 33 percent of the three situational reports.

3. The procedure for feedback presentations has included:
  - a. When possible, provision of copies of reports in advance.
  - b. Copies of reports made available at time of feedback presentation.
  - c. Review of summary of findings.
  - d. Review of implications or conclusions.
  - e. Discussion of findings and implications during or at end of presentations.
  - f. Occasionally, decisions as a result of presentations.

#### H. Other Known Uses of Reports

1. Of the 57 reports, 18, or 32 percent (known to author), were used in other than direct feedback.

#### I. Approximate Distribution of OES reports

1. The average (median) number of persons or institutions sent at least one copy of the 61 reports was 86.3.
2. Of the 61 OES reports for which distribution data were available, 44, or 72 percent, were distributed to 51 or more individuals or institutions with each being sent at least one copy.<sup>1</sup>
3. The two principal classes of reports in terms of number of reports, evaluation and agency, had an average (median) distribution respectively of 92.2 and 83.8 individuals or institutions.
4. Only a small number of the 61 reports on which distribution data were available have not gone to at least

---

<sup>1</sup>More than one copy of a report has gone to a number of recipients.



one extension agent, faculty member, extension leader (or state leader) and program leader, and extension director at some level.

5. For the 61 reports, the average (median) number of agents sent at least one copy was 10.3 and of faculty members in the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics, 8.0. These averages are somewhat low, but it should be remembered they refer to all 61 reports and not simply to those of special interest to the two groups.
6. Distribution of reports to extension and program leaders has been fairly adequate and the same is true for extension directors.
7. Distribution to FES staff members has not been as extensive as it should have been.
8. The average (median) number of other (than Cornell) individuals and institutions to which reports were sent was 14.4.

#### J. Annual Production of Reports

1. The annual production of reports ranged from zero in the years 1956 and 1957 when OES was concentrating on the early stages of a longitudinal study of the Farm and Home Management Program to 11 in 1968.
2. The mean number of reports published per year during the period 1956 to 1968 was 4.9.

#### K. Number of Pages in Reports

1. Most of the OES reports have contained summaries of findings which are usually accompanied by implications, and a number of reports have had appendices in which appeared the principal research instruments used.

2. About one half (53 percent) of the OES reports have been 50 pages or less. Slightly over one fourth have been 25 pages or less. However, 17 percent have had from 101 to around 200 pages.

L. Studies on Which OES Has Advised or Assisted: 1965-68

1. Classes and subject matter of studies

- a. During the four years for which accurate data were available, 1965-69, OES advised or assisted with 34 studies; 16, or 47 percent, were situational; 14, or 41 percent, were evaluations; and four, or 12 percent, agency.
- b. These 34 studies covered a wide range of subjects with little concentration on any one topic.

2. Staff initiating and responsible for studies

- a. Approximately one fourth of the 34 studies were initiated by and were the responsibility of college departmental extension staff members and another one fourth were initiated by and were the responsibility of county extension agents. Except for four studies, or 12 percent, which were initiated by and were the responsibility of Cooperative Extension specialists, the remaining 13 studies were scattered over a fairly wide range of other staff members.

3. Service rendered by OES

- a. OES rendered a wide variety of services in connection with the 34 studies. These services in rank order of frequency were: assisting with questionnaire (schedule) construction (27), advising on design (13), doing IBM runs (13), and preparing IBM codes (12).

4. Status of studies

- a. Of the 29 studies for which data were available, nine had been completed, eight were in process, five were partially completed, four will never be completed, two were in preliminary form, and no study was done in one case.

M. Budgets and Staff of OES

1. Approximate estimates of budgeted funds for OES from 1963-64 to 1968-69 ranged from \$40,501 to \$57,478 with an average (mean) for the six years of \$49,199.
2. The most important feature of the staff has been the use of a well-trained research technician who has had supervision of the clerical staff and has been responsible for data organization and editorial and physical production of reports.

OES Output Related to Straus' Characterization<sup>1</sup>

- A. The two characteristics set forth by Straus for a within agency research unit which fully or almost fully describe OES are:
1. Specificity and applicability maximized at expense of generalizability--applied research. True for OES.
  2. Research tends to be completed on time. True for OES.

---

<sup>1</sup>See Introduction of this report, p. 16. The evaluation of OES in relation to Straus' characteristics was done by the leader of OES and should be recognized as somewhat subjective.

B. The four Straus' characteristics which only partially describe OES are:

1. Projects designed to minimize risk and ensure some findings. Designs not concerned with minimizing risk, but have sought to ensure findings.
2. Adequate but not exceptional technical competence. Professional staff has been reasonably adequate. OES evaluation designs have often required considerable technical competence.
3. Lower volume of production and more of it in the form of internal mimeo documents. Volume of production has been large, but principally mimeographed reports.
4. Takes responsibility for feedback of research results into organization. Feedback has been somewhat low despite OES concern about it.

Relationship of OES Operations to  
Its Policy and Functions Statement<sup>1</sup>

A. Nature of Extension Studies

1. Evaluation studies have been most frequent with a fairly large number of agency studies, but situational studies have been negligible.

B. Planning Principles

1. While some planning principles for studies were followed, the principles set forth in the policy and functions statement were not consciously and consistently applied.

---

<sup>1</sup>The evaluation of these operations in the light of the OES policy and functions statement was done by the leader of OES and should be recognized as somewhat subjective.

C. Relationships of OES to Studies Conducted by Other Extension Personnel

1. On the whole, OES attained a reasonably high level of performance in regard to relationships to studies conducted by other extension personnel. The main negative aspect of these relationships has been the failure to complete studies.

D. Communication by OES of Results of Its Studies

1. OES has fed back the results of only about one third of its reports.
2. A number of its reports have had fairly wide distribution, although distribution to the extension staff has not been as good as it should have been. While often unknown, the recipients have undoubtedly made use of a number of them.

E. Specific Relationships of Segments of Extension Staff in Initiating and Participating in OES Research<sup>1</sup>

1. Relationships with the agent staff can be rated highest and with extension administrators<sup>2</sup> lowest.

Implications

1. Because the image of OES which the extension staff has traditionally held was focused on evaluation, this function came to be the most important research area of OES. It would have been desirable for greater attention to have been given to situational studies as the bases for program planning, and more pressure from the administrative staff for studies of Cooperative Extension as an organization would have been appropriate.

---

<sup>1</sup>This research refers to the 57 OES reports.

<sup>2</sup>Extension administrators, extension administration, or administrative staff here and elsewhere in the report should be interpreted to include director, associate directors, and assistant directors.



2. While the reports of OES covered a wide range of extension concerns, greater attention to the selection of study problems with due recognition of the need for service studies would have been appropriate. Planning a research program for a research unit such as OES is an area in which greater effort should be expended, and in which extension administration should take an active part.
3. OES succeeded in involving a goodly number of the extension staff in its studies. This would appear to be desirable, and points to the fact that a within-Extension research unit might very well undertake to follow this pattern.
4. The extent of feedback of its studies by OES leaves something to be desired. If extension administration could be led to recognize the importance of research such as that conducted by OES, perhaps the responsibility for administrative leadership in the instrumentation of effective feedback would be more fully accepted.
5. The leader of a research unit such as OES should give as much attention to the distribution of reports as to their production.
6. There is a significant role for the professional and clerical staff of a unit such as OES in servicing the study efforts of the extension staff. This service should include: 1) assistance with study designs including sampling, 2) assistance with questionnaire (schedule) construction, and 3) assistance with processing data.
7. The Office of Extension Studies when measured by Straus' characteristics performed well on producing applied research and completion of studies on time, both of which would appear to be desirable if findings and implications are to be used. In relation to some of Straus' other characteristics such as feedback, OES did not perform too well; however, its operations raise some doubt about one

of his characteristics, i.e., a professional staff not possessing exceptional technical competence. Thus, it is believed that some of the evaluation designs of OES called for considerable technical competence on the part of the professional staff.

8. When measured by its own policy and functions statement, OES's performance followed a number of the statement's guidelines, but not all. However, it is the author's opinion that the statement not only provided some very helpful guidelines, but also served to protect it from encroachment that would have diverted it from its research function.
9. Whether or not the findings of the study throw light on the problem of who should be responsible for extension studies may not be entirely clear-cut; however, the involvement of the extension staff in OES studies as well as the assistance provided them by OES on their own studies indicates, in the opinion of the author, a real necessity for having in Cooperative Extension an organizational unit on which this responsibility is placed and for whose functions an adequate staff is provided.

OFFICE OF EXTENSION STUDIES  
NEW YORK COOPERATIVE EXTENSION  
A CASE STUDY

Introduction

Extension studies have had a fairly lengthy history at Cornell. As early as 1945, an Office of Extension Studies was established in the College of Home Economics and continued to operate until 1958. In 1946 an extension staff member in agriculture was designated as a part-time worker to be associated with the Office of Extension Studies. In 1956 an Office of Extension Studies was initiated in the College of Agriculture with the employment of a sociologist to assume leadership for studies concerned with the activities of the Extension Service in adult and 4-H agriculture. The actual circumstance which stimulated this development was the obtaining of a Kellogg Foundation grant of \$75,000 for a five year evaluation study of a newly inaugurated Farm and Home Management Program.<sup>1</sup> This evaluative study was concluded during the fiscal year 1961-62. During this six year period, two professional staff members, both of whom were sociologists, and a small clerical staff not only conducted the evaluation study of the Farm and Home Management Program as a major responsibility, but also undertook various other studies of extension activities.<sup>2</sup> In the seven subsequent years the Office

---

<sup>1</sup>At the same time grants were made by the Foundation for studies of similar programs in the states of North Carolina, Iowa, and Washington with the Division of Extension Research and Training, FES, having the role of coordinating the planning and conducting of the studies.

<sup>2</sup>A staff of several field interviewers was employed to conduct the pre- and the post-surveys associated with the evaluation of the Farm and Home Management Program.

of Extension Studies has undertaken a variety of studies as well as assisted the extension staff with studies.

No attempt was made to combine the two Extension Studies Offices, but in 1958 upon the retirement of the person in charge of Extension Studies in the College of Home Economics, the Office of Extension Studies in the College of Agriculture assumed responsibility for all extension research in the New York Extension Service.

It was never assumed that the Office of Extension Studies would be entirely responsible for studies of extension programs and organization. However, its establishment rested on the assumption that it was important to have within the Extension Service a unit which would carry the major responsibility for conducting as well as encouraging the conduct of research that was directed to the activities and organization of the Extension Service.

Within-agency research has not been without its critics, whose major concern has been the question of objectivity. This question is not easily answered. A high quality of professionalism on the part of those responsible for within-agency research can guarantee considerable objectivity, but it can never be fully assumed that he who pays the piper will not also call the tune.

Murray Straus, in a paper presented at the National Extension Research Seminar at Purdue University in 1961, analyzed in a very thorough manner the differences between applied and basic research and at one point described the output associated with internal (within-agency) research as follows:

1. Specificity and applicability maximized at expense of generalizability--applied research.
2. Projects designed to minimize risk and ensure some findings.
3. Adequate but not exceptional technical competence.
4. Lower volume of production and more of it in the form of internal mimeo documents.

5. Research tends to be completed on time.
6. Willingness to suppress research findings to protect sponsoring agency or respondents.
7. Takes responsibility for feedback of research results into the organization by special publications or personal communications.<sup>1</sup>

These characteristics will be used at the end of this report to evaluate the operations of OES.

#### Policy and Functions of the Office of Extension Studies

At the time that the Office of Extension Studies was established in the College of Agriculture as an arm of Extension in 1956, there was an advisory committee to the Office of Extension Studies in the College of Home Economics. This committee immediately added to its functions an advisory role to the newly established OES in the College of Agriculture. In 1958, when all extension research was assigned to the OES in the College of Agriculture, the advisory committee prepared, under the guidance of the professional in charge of the office, a statement of Policy and Functions of the Office of Extension Studies. This document set forth guidelines, a number of which have been of inestimable value in giving direction to the operations of OES and have served to prevent its staff from being shifted hither and thither as the Extension Service encountered new demands and programs which might have so easily absorbed the time and energies of the OES staff.

---

<sup>1</sup> Straus, Murray A., Social Psychological Aspects of Extension Research Organization, paper presented at the National Extension Research Seminar, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, sponsored by the Division of Extension Research and Training, FES, USDA, 1961, p. 204.



This policy and functions statement, after designating the Office of Extension Studies as a staff unit of the Office of Director of Extension, set forth: (1) the nature of extension studies, (2) planning principles for studies conducted by OES, (3) relationship of OES to studies conducted by other extension personnel, (4) communicating the results of studies, and (5) specific relationships of OES to New York Extension Service staff, to college departments, and others.

The nature of extension studies section set forth three study areas as the concern of the Office of Extension Studies, i.e., (1) studies of situations concerned with the needs of people and their social and economic status,<sup>1</sup> (2) studies of changes in attitudes, knowledge, and behavior of people for the purpose of measuring the effects of Extension's educational activities, and (3) studies of the Extension Service which are directed to its policies, organization, operations, costs, and personnel. In addition, it was emphasized that the Office of Extension Studies would continuously plan and conduct studies that were basic (analytical) as well as service in character.

The planning principle which the policy and functions statement emphasized was the allocation of funds and staff to studies of general applicability, of relative importance, of immediate and ready use to Extension, of previously little investigated areas, of pressing demands from the extension staff, and for which adequate finances and personnel were available. It was also stated that OES should give attention to conducting studies which would have broad application to Extension as a whole.

Since county agents, state leaders, specialists, and administrators frequently find it necessary to do studies, especially

---

<sup>1</sup> Although not specifically mentioned in the policy and functions statement, these studies were to be designed to provide the basis for program planning.

service ones, the policy and functions statement indicated that for these studies the Office of Extension Studies would assist with: (1) study designs, (2) construction of questionnaires, (3) plans for processing data including exploration of resources to do this, and (4) actual processing of data for a limited number of experimental or demonstration studies. It was noted that the resources of OES would tend to be adequate for accomplishing the first three types of assistance, but hardly for meeting any extensive demand for the fourth type. In the latter case, OES would choose to give assistance to experimental or demonstration studies associated with the initiation of new programs which were judged to have significance.

While recognizing the need for the diffusion of findings and implications of a broad range of extension studies, the policy and functions statement emphasized the obligation of the Office of Extension Studies to feed back findings and implications to the extension staff involved in its studies with limited obligation to diffuse the findings of other studies. The office was expected to maintain a loan file of all studies that came to its attention.

In specifying relationships with the extension staff, the policy and functions statement indicated that proposals for studies would be a two-way process with the director and his immediate staff, state leaders, county agents, and college departmental specialists making proposals and the Office of Extension Studies in turn doing the same. Informing about and involving in studies, relevant state leaders (supervisors), county agents, and college specialists, was treated in some detail, and the use of the latter in constructing questionnaires was emphasized. Recognition was given to the relationship of OES to its advisory committee, to study committees of agents' associations, to special program committees, and college departments and their graduate students. The policy and functions statement called for close contact with the Division of Extension Research and Training (now Education) (FES),<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>A project agreement with FES was actually indicated; however, no such agreement was ever consummated.

especially in terms of consulting on research problems and cooperation on interstate studies and on research workshops and conferences. Assistance in providing the Division with summaries of extension research done at Cornell for inclusion in the Review of Extension Research was also to be given.

The policy and functions statement has never been revised. Although the New York Extension Service (now designated as New York Cooperative Extension) has been reorganized in recent years, the organization still retains four basic categories of staff members, i.e., the director and his immediate staff (now consisting of three associate directors and three assistant directors), extension leaders and extension representatives in place of state leaders, county agents<sup>1</sup>, and college extension staff in place of specialists. Thus, it has not been difficult to apply the guidelines of the policy and functions statement to the new organization.

The advisory committee has been allowed to die since its function became increasingly less important over the years, and meetings of the committee appeared to be nonfunctional. The relationship to program committees, can, when necessary, still become operative; and contact, though less important than formerly, is still maintained with the Division of Extension Research and Education (formerly Training). No extension study committee members are any longer appointed by agents' associations.

#### Operations of Office of Extension Studies

##### Report Series<sup>2</sup>

The research conducted by the Office of Extension Studies

---

<sup>1</sup>The field staff now includes, in addition to county agents, Cooperative Extension specialists who usually operate on an area basis (multicounty).

<sup>2</sup>This study includes OES reports organized in report form from June, 1956 through 1968 with one exception, a report produced in December, 1968, but to be withheld from distribution and use until sometime in 1969.

since 1956 has been presented almost entirely in the form of mimeographed reports; only one has been a printed document. For convenience, the reports have been classified in five separate series and numbered for four of the series:

	<u>Number of reports</u>
1. Preliminary reports on evaluation of the Farm and Home Management Program	12
2. Extension studies	19 <sup>1</sup>
3. Special reports	20 <sup>2</sup>
4. Cooperative studies	2
5. Home demonstration membership reports (not numbered)	58 <sup>3</sup>

In addition to these five classes, OES has produced two reports and cooperated in the production of another, all three of which may be classified as miscellaneous; however, the three reports were never given any formal classification.

The series designated as extension studies was so named because these reports were considered more basic to the research conducted by OES. The reports in the special series were more incidental, but the difference between some of them and those designated as extension studies is a bit arbitrary and not based on definitive criteria.

#### Substantive Classification of Reports

While for convenience the reports produced by the Office of Extension Studies have been labeled according to the first four categories listed above, a more meaningful classification

---

<sup>1</sup>Two of these reports had supplements and one was a summary (Part VII) based on five of six additional parts, each of which was under separate cover. (One part was quite brief and not included in the summary report.)

<sup>2</sup>One of these reports had a supplement.

<sup>3</sup>This series of reports consisted of 55 county, two city, and a state report.

of these reports is presented in Table 1.<sup>1</sup> (See Appendix A for list of reports including those referred to in footnotes to Table 1.) Three classes presented in this table correspond with the

Table 1  
Number and Percentage Distribution of Reports  
According to Major Classes

<u>Classes of reports</u>	<u>Reports</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Evaluation	33 <sup>a</sup>	57
Agency (Extension)	13 <sup>b</sup>	23
Situation	3	5
Methodology	3	5
Evaluation & agency	1	2
Evaluation & methodology	2	4
Miscellaneous	2	4
Total	57 <sup>c</sup>	100

<sup>a</sup>Two of these reports had supplements, neither of which is counted in this table. Another of these 33 reports was a joint report with the Department of Communication Arts (Extension Teaching and Information).

<sup>b</sup>One report (Part VII) was a summary based on five of six additional parts, each of which was under separate cover, but not included in this table (One part was quite brief and not included in the summary report.); another was a state report whose data were also used in 55 county and two city reports, but these 57 reports are not included in this table; and another report had a supplement which is not included in the table. To have included the reports, certain parts of a report, and supplements referred to in this footnote and footnote (a) would have inflated the number of reports unduly and made the subsequent treatment misleading.

<sup>c</sup>A report produced in December, 1968, but not included in this study because it was purposely withheld from distribution and use until sometime in 1969 plus three additional reports produced in the early part of 1969 raises this total to 61.

<sup>1</sup>The state report on home demonstration members is included among the agency reports of Table 1.



three major areas of study which the policy and functions statement of the Office of Extension Studies delineated, i.e., situational--relating to the needs of people and their social and economic status; evaluation--measurement of change induced by Extension's educational efforts; and agency--relating to Extension policies, organization, costs, and personnel.

A total of 57 reports is classified in Table 1. In arriving at this classification, supplementary reports were not counted, a report consisting of seven parts is counted only once, and a state-wide home demonstration membership report is counted, but 55 county and two city reports which resulted from the membership study are not counted. This treatment of these reports was considered a more accurate accounting procedure than would have resulted had they been included.

Evaluation reports constitute by far the largest number (33) of the 57 reports classified in Table 1. Reports concerned with agency (Extension) matters constitute 23 percent of the total. Surprisingly, only three, or five percent, of the 57 reports have dealt with situational data. Two reports dealt with evaluation and methodology and one with evaluation and agency. In view of the probable image which extension personnel have of OES as primarily concerned with evaluation research, the distribution reported in Table 1 is not unexpected.

#### Subject Matter of Classes of Reports

The only subject matter to which any appreciable number of reports has been directed is the evaluation of the Farm and Home Management Program with 13 reports (Table 2). As has already been pointed out, the present Office of Extension Studies had its origin with the initiation of research on this program. No other type of subject matter has been given attention by more than three reports. Evaluation of county 4-H programs, county home economics low-income programs, TV programs, and an agency study of the home demonstration membership were each considered

Table 2  
 Number and Percentage Distribution of Reports  
 According to Classes of Reports and to Types of Subject Matter for Each Class

Classes of reports and types of subject matter of classes	Reports	
	Number	Percent
<u>Evaluation</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>57</u>
Farm and/or home management program . . . . .	13 <sup>a</sup>	
County 4-H programs . . . . .	3	
County home economics low-income programs . . . . .	3	
TV programs . . . . .	3	
Farm labor opinions of farmers participating in farm labor study groups . . . . .	2	
Home economics leaflets and bulletins . . . . .	2	
Training--in-service . . . . .	2	
Evaluation of an annual extension conference . . . . .	1	
Experimental study of sociometric formation of farm management study groups . . . . .	1	
Foreign graduate students and their orientation (preliminary) . . . . .	1	
Home economics county newsletter . . . . .	1	
National Seminar on Curriculum Development for Extension Workers . . . . .	1	
<u>Agency</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>23</u>
Home demonstration membership . . . . .	3	
Input on low income and community resource development . . . . .	2	
Relating to extension personnel . . . . .	2	
Training--pre-service and in-service . . . . .	2	
Fees for service, home economics division . . . . .	1	
First year 4-H club leaders . . . . .	1	
Readiness of N. Y. Cooperative Extension to undertake farm labor program . . . . .	1	
TV educational function of Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics . . . . .	1	

<u>Methodology</u>		<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>
Bibliography on program projection . . . . .	1		
Demonstration on using survey information for program planning . . . . .	1		
Methodology for extension studies . . . . .	1		
<u>Evaluation and methodology</u>		<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
Adequacy of sample and control in farm and home management study . . . . .	1		
Design and methodology in farm and home management study . . . . .	1		
<u>Evaluation and agency</u>		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Volunteer study groups in a selected county--characteristics of groups and relationship to learning . . . . .	1		
<u>Situation</u>		<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>
Rural resource development--patterns and characteristics of rural landowners (Broome Co.)	1		
Survey of beef cattle farmers . . . . .	1		
Survey of dairy farmers . . . . .	1		
<u>Miscellaneous</u>		<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
Low-income case accounts . . . . .	1		
A socio-drama on sociological concepts relevant to county agents' jobs . . . . .	1		
Total		<u>57</u>	<u>100</u>

<sup>a</sup>Because of their relevance to evaluation, ten of the reports classified in the tabulation on page 21 under "Preliminary reports on evaluation of the Farm and Home Management Program" were considered appropriate for classification under this category.



by three reports. As one scans the list of types treated, it becomes obvious that no one area of extension activities or organizations other than the Farm and Home Management Program has received any noticeable amount of attention in terms of number of reports devoted to it. Thirty-one different types of subject matter were treated by one or more reports. For 20 types of subject matter, only one report has been produced; for six types, two reports each; for four types, three each; and for one, 13. It is the opinion of the author that the studies which OES has conducted or been significantly involved in have largely arisen out of the current interests or concerns of the extension staff as discerned by OES and have been somewhat opportunistic rather than planned around carefully selected problems that were considered basic to Extension's activities and organization. This does not mean that important problems have not been studied, but if they have, it was not the result of long-range planning.

That some important problems and concerns have received attention is clear when the following list is reviewed:

- Annual extension conference of staff
- Community and resource development
- Distribution of home economics leaflets and bulletins
- Farm and/or home management
- Farm labor study groups
- 4-H leaders
- Formation of farm management study groups
- Home economics fees for leader training and study groups
- Home economics newsletters
- In-service training of staff
- Low-income programs
- Membership in home demonstration units
- New 4-H programs
- Personnel of extension organization
- Pre-service training of staff
- Program planning
- Situation of beef cattle farmers as a basis for program planning
- Situation of dairy farmers as a basis for program planning
- Study methodology and techniques
- TV programs and resources

That these as well as other activities and aspects of Extension have been given attention should not be allowed, however,

to confirm the view that a better planned study program should not have been developed.<sup>1</sup>

#### By Whom OES Studies Have Been Initiated

Of the 57 reports (or studies), 23, or 40.4 percent, were initiated primarily by the Office of Extension Studies (Table 3).<sup>2</sup> In addition, OES or one of its professional staff was involved with others as primary initiators of three other reports. No other staff member or group of staff members approached this number of reports for which they were the primary initiators. Leaders of county home economics divisions were primary initiators for five reports. In addition, a county leader of home economics and an extension leader of home economics were primary initiators of two other reports. The director or associate directors were primary initiators of four reports, and an associate director along with an assistant director for 4-H were primary initiators of another. From Table 3 it can be seen that a fairly wide range of the extension staff excluding OES had a primary role in initiating around 54.2 percent of the 57 reports. Exclusive of the Office of Extension Studies as the only initiator, 23 different extension staff members or groups of staff members may be considered initiators of reports.

#### Responsibility for Production of Reports

The responsibility for the production of reports has rested largely with the Office of Extension Studies. OES has had full responsibility for 43, or 75 percent, of 57 reports (Table 4). Even for the remaining 14 reports the responsibilities of OES were considerable.

---

<sup>1</sup>Two attempts at such planning were made, one with state leaders, the other with directors; neither was successful.

<sup>2</sup>Thirteen of these reports dealt with the Farm and Home Management Program. Actually, this study as a whole was initiated by an extension staff member before the present leader was employed. However, the individual reports were initiated by the Office of Extension Studies as organized under the present leader. In fact, the design of the over-all study was considerably revised by the present leader.



**Table 3**  
**Number and Percentage Distribution of Reports**  
**According to Primary Initiator or Initiators**

<u>By whom primarily initiated</u>	<u>Reports</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Office of Extension Studies	23	40.4
Leader of county home economics division	5	8.8
Director and associate directors	4	7.0
Associate state leader of agriculture	3	5.3
Extension leader of home economics & leader of county home economics division	2	3.5
Leader of county agricultural division	2	3.5
Associate director & assistant director for 4-H	1	1.8
Associate director of home economics	1	1.8
Associate state leader of home economics	1	1.8
Associate state leader of agriculture & Professional Committee of Agricultural Agents' Association	1	1.8
Contact officer for foreign visitors	1	1.8
Coordinator of Extension in home economics, Office of Extension Studies, & assistant state leader of home economics	1	1.8
Extension leader of home economics	1	1.8
Extension staff member of Department of Food & Nutrition, College of Home Economics	1	1.8
4-H club leaders at National 4-H Conference, 1958, and 4-H club state leaders	1	1.8
Head of Department of Communication Arts	1	1.8
H.E. county agent in charge of Albany area H.E. TV program	1	1.8
Leader of county agricultural division & county agricultural agent	1	1.8
Office of Extension Studies & chairman of Farm Labor Committee of College of Agriculture	1	1.8
Planning committee of county agricultural agents for TV Dairy Cattle Feeding School	1	1.8
Professional from OES and professional from University of Kentucky	1	1.8
State 4-H club leader	1	1.8
Three members of departmental extension staff of College of Agriculture & 4-H program leader	1	1.8
Unknown	1	1.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>100.9<sup>a</sup></b>

<sup>a</sup>Does not add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 4  
Number and Percentage Distribution of Reports  
According to Responsibility for Production

<u>Responsibility for production</u>	<u>Reports</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Full responsibility with OES	43 <sup>a</sup>	75
Leadership in production by OES	3	5
Report prepared by OES (not a study)	3	5
Data processed & report written by OES-- initiation and collection of data by others	2	4
Most of study conducted by OES, written by county agricultural agent and edited by OES	1	2
OES reorganized data and wrote and reproduced report	1	2
OES advised on study, processed data, edited and reproduced report	1	2
OES assisted with design, sampling, and construction of questionnaire, and processed data	1	2
OES assisted with design, construction of questionnaire and statistical analysis and edited report	1	2
OES assisted with design and edited and reproduced report	1	2
Total	57	101 <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Two of these reports were parts of a larger study under the leadership of the Division of Extension Research and Training (FES). The New York report on this study was prepared by the Office of Extension Studies from data collected from New York subjects and partially processed by that office.

<sup>b</sup>Does not add to 100 because of rounding.

#### Staff Involvement in Reports

For 13, or 23 percent, of 57 reports, the staff of the Office of Extension Studies did all of the work connected with the reports, and for another 13, or 23 percent, the OES staff did the work primarily (Table 5). Thus, for almost half of the 57 reports, OES was the primary contributor in terms of staff input.

Table 5

Number and Percentage Distribution of Reports According to Staff Involved in Production<sup>a</sup>

Staff involved in production	Reports	
	Number	Percent
Office of Extension Studies staff (professional and clerical) entirely . . . . .	13	23
Office of Extension Studies staff (professional and clerical) primarily--combined with: . . . . .	13	23
Extension staff members of departments in Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics, several county agricultural agents, several county home economics agents, OES special interviewers . . . . .	7	
Associate director . . . . .	1	
Associate state leader of agriculture . . . . .	1	
4-H secretary in county . . . . .	1	
Professional worker from University of Kentucky . . . . .	1	
Rural Sociology graduate student . . . . .	1	
Three county agricultural agents, several extension staff members of departments in College of Agriculture, clerks in Department of Agricultural Economics . . . . .	1	
Office of Extension Studies staff (professional and clerical, and sometimes interviewers) with considerable assistance from others--combined with: . . . . .	27	47
Several county agricultural agents . . . . .	3	
County agricultural agent . . . . .	2	
Associate 4-H state leader, leader of county 4-H division, 4-H county agent . . . . .	1	
Chairman of Farm Labor Committee in College of Agriculture, several county agr. agents . . . . .	1	
County home economics agent . . . . .	1	
County home economics agent, OEO training consultant, leader of county home economics division, several family service aides . . . . .	1	
County home economics agent, several teaching homemakers . . . . .	1	
Extension staff member of Department of Food & Nutrition in College of Home Economics, an extension aide, four leaders of county home economics divisions . . . . .	1	
57 leaders of county and city home economics divisions, associate state leader of home economics . . . . .	1	
4-H program leader, extension staff member in Veterinary College, four 4-H county agents. Leader of county agricultural division . . . . .	1	

Leader of county home economics division . . . . .	1
Leader of county home economics division, county home economics agent, secretary to county home economics division . . . . .	1
Leader of county home economics division, county home economics agent, several family service aides . . . . .	1
Leader of county home economics division, several HD unit members . . . . .	1
Leaders of county home economics divisions, extension staff member in Department of Child Development and Family Relationships of College of Home Economics . . . . .	1
Members of an evaluation committee consisting of extension personnel . . . . .	1
Nine county agricultural agents, extension staff member of Department of Animal Science in College of Agriculture, associate state leader of agriculture . . . . .	1
Professional Committee of Agricultural Agents' Association . . . . .	1
Professional staff member of Division of Extension Research & Training (FES), clerks of DERT (FES), 4-H state leaders in northeast states, 4-H agents in northeast states, advisory committee for northeast study of 4-H leaders, special interviewers in some northeast states . . . . .	1
Research associate and clerks in Department of Communication Arts, special interviewer in College of Agriculture, special interviewer in College of Home Economics, extension television specialist in Department of Communication Arts . . . . .	1
Staff member of Department of Education, clerk in Department of Communication Arts, committee on Early Training School for New Agricultural Agents . . . . .	1
Staff member of Division of Extension Research and Training (FES), clerks in DERT (FES). Two leaders of county home economics divisions . . . . .	1
Others with major input assisted by Office of Extension Studies--combined with: . . . . .	4
County agricultural agent, leader of county agricultural division . . . . .	1
County agricultural agent, leader of county agricultural division, county secretarial staff, staff member of Department of Agricultural Economics in College of Agriculture, program leader of rural resource development, associate state leader of agriculture, extension conservationist, members of College Advisory Committee on Broome County Rural Development . . . . .	1
Home economics agent in charge of Albany area TV program, extension TV specialist in Department of Communication Arts . . . . .	1
Research associate and associate professor in Department of Communication Arts in College of Agriculture, three graduate students, special interviewers, commercial TV service with professional interviewers, leader of county home economics division . . . . .	1
Total	57
	100

<sup>a</sup>It should be noted that the lists of staff members involved in production are only approximately correct. It is possible that there are some omissions since the lists were partially compiled from memory.





For 27, or 47 percent of the reports, OES had considerable assistance from others, primarily staff members of New York Cooperative Extension. For four reports the major input was from others assisted by OES. This involvement of other staff members may have been an important by-product of the program of OES.

#### Feedback by OES of Findings and Implications

The critical stage in the operations of a research unit in an organization is the feedback of findings and implications to relevant members of the organization's staff. The management of this stage requires ingenuity and alertness on the part of the staff of the research unit, but also depends on the understanding of administrators and other staff members and their willingness to provide time and attention. In Table 6 is presented a record of feedback presentations of OES for 57 reports. About one third (35 percent) of the 57 reports were given feedback presentations by the OES staff. Thirty-three percent of the 33 evaluation reports were given feedback presentations, 46 percent of the 13 agency reports, and 33 percent of the three situation reports. The last three report classes included in Table 6 consisted of only one or two reports. Each of the two reports concerned with evaluation and methodology was given a feedback presentation; the same was true of the miscellaneous class, but no presentation was made for the one evaluation and agency report.

This record of feedback presentations is not especially outstanding and indicates some failure on the part of OES to develop effective methods or devise opportunities for this kind of operation, or the lack of interest on the part of the extension staff in feedback. The author believes that both factors have been involved. He recognizes that the OES program tended to put too much emphasis on producing reports without enough effort to carry out feedback operations. On the other hand, it is also believed that extension administrators and supervisors in the midst of



Table 6

Number and Percentage Distribution of Reports  
According to Whether or Not OES Made Feedback  
Presentations, by Classes of Reports

<u>Class of report</u>		<u>No feedback by OES</u>	<u>Feedback by OES</u>	<u>Total</u>
Evaluation	Number	22	11	33
	Percent	67	33	100
Agency	Number	7 <sup>a</sup>	6 <sup>b</sup>	13
	Percent	54	46	100
Situation	Number	2	1	3
	Percent	67	33	100
Methodology	Number	3	0	3
	Percent	100	--	100
Evaluation & agency	Number	1	0	1
	Percent	100	--	100
Evaluation & methodology	Number	1	1	2
	Percent	50	50	100
Miscellaneous	Number	1	1	2
	Percent	50	50	100
Total	Number	37	20	57
	Percent	65	35	100

<sup>a</sup>One of these studies was a statewide study of women enrolled in home demonstration units. While the state study was not used for feedback, several of the 55 county reports which were prepared in connection with the membership study were used in regional feedback conferences with home demonstration agents.

<sup>b</sup>There were seven parts to one of these studies. Part VII--Summary of Findings and Implications, which covered five of the other six parts (One part was very brief and not included in the summary.), was the part that OES used for feedback presentations.

various pressures did not utilize feedback simply through neglect or possibly through lack of appreciation of how findings and implications of studies could be utilized.

The tabulation which follows gives the specific feedback presentations made by OES for the 20 reports receiving this treatment:

<u>Class and Title of Report</u>	<u>Feedback Presentations by OES</u>
<u>Evaluation</u>	
<u>Study of the Operations of the Farm and Home Management Program in New York State, Report No. 2, January, 1959.</u>	a. At regional meetings of county agents involved in Farm and Home Management Program.
<u>Evaluation of the Farm Management Phase of the Farm and Home Management Program in New York State, Extension Study No. 1, June, 1962.</u>	a. At a meeting of agricultural agents in counties in which study was conducted.
<u>Evaluation of Induction and Early Training of New Assistant Agricultural Agents in New York Extension Service, Extension Study No. 7, October, 1964.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Reported at a series of regional meetings of agricultural agents.</li> <li>b. Reported at a meeting of committee on Early Training of New Agricultural Agents.</li> <li>c. Reported at a meeting of faculty for training new agricultural agents at Early Training School which was to follow the one covered by the study.</li> <li>d. Reported at meeting of Professional Training Committee of Agricultural Agents' Association.</li> </ul>
<u>Otsego County Experimental Program for Testing Methods of Forming Farm Management Study Groups, Extension Study No. 8, February, 1965.</u>	a. At conference (or conferences) of agricultural agents responsible for farm management.
<u>Study of the Syracuse City 4-H Program, Special Report No. 9, May, 1966.</u>	a. At a conference of associate directors, state 4-H leader, and leader of 4-H division in Onondaga County; resulted in a set of agreements for operating the 4-H inner city program.

Class and Title of Report

Evaluation of Family Service Program of Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension, Clinton County, New York, Extension Study No. 15, September, 1967.

Farm Labor Opinions of Farmers Participating in Farm Labor Study Groups in Nine Counties in New York State, Special Report No. 14, May, 1968.

The National Seminar on Curriculum Development for Extension Workers as Seen by Participants, Special Report No. 17, October, 1968.

Evaluation of Selected Aspects of the Home Economics Service Program in the City of Rochester, New York, Extension Study No. 17, October, 1968.

Volunteer Study Groups, Characteristics and Educational Functions, Home Demonstration Units in Onondaga County, Extension Study No. 18, October, 1968.

Feedback Presentations by OES

- a. At a seminar in H.E. Education of College of Home Economics.
  - b. At a conference of H.E. divisional leaders.
  - c. At a joint conference of OEO and H.E. Extension at College of Home Economics
  - d. At a meeting of a few faculty members of the College of Home Economics at which research projects were reported.
- a. At a conference with the Extension Director, the acting chairman of Farm Labor Committee, the assistant director for agriculture.
- a. A brief statement of contents was made when distributed at National Extension Staff Training and Development Conference.
- a. At a meeting of the Monroe County home economics staff with a few members of the H.E. division's executive committee.
  - b. At a conference which included the Monroe County H.E. division leader, one committeewoman, chairman of county extension administrative team, county budget officer, county welfare director, and a social work professional.
  - c. At a joint conference of OEO and Extension.
  - d. At a meeting of a few faculty members of the College of Home Economics at which research projects were reported.
- a. Preliminary data were reported at a meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee for Study of HD Units which was developing policy regarding relationship of Home Economics Extension to HD units.

Class and Title of Report

Evaluation of Family Service Program of Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension, Essex County, New York, Extension Study No. 19, November, 1968.

Agency

In-service Training of Agricultural Agents in New York State: 1963, Extension Study No. 6, September, 1964.

TV Educational Function of the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics, Extension Study No. 9, Part VII, "Summary of Findings and Implications," September, 1965.

Input on Community and Resource Development of the New York State Extension Staff, Extension Study No. 11, February, 1966.

Study of First-Year 4-H Club Leaders in New York State: Tenure, Characteristics of Leaders and Evaluation of Job Performance by 4-H Agents, Extension Study No. 12, March, 1966.

Readiness of New York Cooperative Extension to Undertake a Farm Labor Program, Extension Study No. 16, November, 1967.

An Examination of the Personnel Function in New York Cooperative Extension, Special Report No. 13, February, 1968.

Feedback Presentations by OES

- a. At a joint conference of OEO and Home Economics Extension.
  - b. At a meeting of a few faculty members of the College of Home Economics at which research projects were reported.
- a. Reported briefly at a meeting of Committee on Early Training of New Agricultural Agents.
  - b. Reported at a meeting of agricultural leaders.
- a. Presented at a meeting with Director of Extension and the head of the Department of Communication Arts.
  - b. Presented at a meeting with Deans of Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics along with Director of Extension and a few others.
- a. Reported at a meeting of Director of Extension and associate directors.
- a. Some data presented at a regional meeting of 4-H agents.
- a. Reported at a meeting of the Farm Labor Committee of the College of Agriculture.
  - b. Reported at a meeting which included the Director of Extension, acting chairman of Farm Labor Committee, and assistant director for agriculture.
- a. Reported at a meeting which included the Director of Extension, associate directors, assistant directors, and two extension leaders for personnel.



<u>Class and Title of Report</u>	<u>Feedback Presentations by OES</u>
<u>Situation</u> <u>Beef Cattle Farming in the Capital District of New York State, Extension Study No. 14, October, 1966.</u>	a. Reported at a meeting of agricultural agents who participated in the study.
<u>Evaluation and methodology</u> <u>Design and Methodology (Farm and Home Management Study), Report No. 9, September, 1961.</u>	a. Presented at National Extension Research Seminar held at Purdue University in 1961.
<u>Miscellaneous</u> <u>A Socio-Drama Relating Sociological Concepts to County Agents' Behaviors, Special Report No. 19, November, 1968.</u>	a. Presented as a live socio-drama at National Extension Staff Training and Development Conference, 1968.

The procedure for feedback presentations has in general consisted of several major steps. Whenever possible, copies of reports have been provided in advance to those for whom the feedback was to be presented. When a presentation was made, copies of the report were made available to those present. Since each report has usually had a summary of findings placed at the beginning of the report, the more important items of these findings have been presented. Following the summary of findings in each report has been a list of implications or conclusions. These have been reviewed at the end of presentations. Comments and questions have been welcomed and dealt with throughout presentations. The weakest part of the feedback procedure has been to bring about decisions as a result of the presentations.

An example of a feedback presentation of an evaluation study should provide substance to the foregoing outline of procedure. The study was entitled, Evaluation of Family Service Program of Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension, Clinton County, New York. It was presented to two groups



by the author assisted by the leader of the Clinton County Home Economics Division.<sup>1</sup> The members of the groups were provided with copies of the report at the time of the presentation, not before. The author reviewed the summary of findings. Then, as each implication was indicated, the home economics leader stated a program decision which she had formulated relating to that implication. The report contained 16 implications, and for nine of these the leader stated a parallel program revision. Through these two presentations the audiences were not only brought face to face with realistic use of study implications, but the home economics leader was led to formulate significant program revisions based on the findings and implications of a study of her county's low-income program.

A feedback presentation of an agency study entitled, Study of the Syracuse City 4-H Program, illustrates a possible procedure for dealing with an internal problem of an agency. The Syracuse City 4-H program was directed at an inner-city low-income area populated by a large number of Negroes. The program had experienced a number of personnel problems, and communications between the state 4-H office and the county leader of 4-H had deteriorated. An associate director and the assistant director of 4-H Extension requested OES to make a study of the situation. A limited investigation was made and several complex personnel problems were encountered. A report was prepared and a copy given to the associate director, assistant director, and the 4-H county leader with the recommendation that they meet with the author of the report to consider his findings. It was also recommended that, instead of trying to clarify all of the personnel disturbances, a positive approach be made. Accordingly, the author prepared an agenda of topics that had a bearing on the situation. Using this agenda, the two directors, the county 4-H leader, and the author met and took up each major item on the agenda. Agreement was sought on these items. Following a two-day

---

<sup>1</sup>One of these groups was a seminar of the Department of Home Economics Education in the College of Home Economics and the other, a conference of leaders of county home economics divisions.

meeting devoted to seeking agreements, the author prepared a statement of agreement between the assistant director in charge of the 4-H program and the county 4-H leader. This statement of agreement was accepted as the basis for further development of the Syracuse inner-city 4-H program. The important result of the study was the establishment of communication and understanding between the assistant director and the county 4-H leader.

Only one situational study, Beef Cattle Farming in the Capital District of New York State, has been given a feedback presentation by OES. This study was fed back to the nine agents in the area who were concerned about a beef program and who participated in the interviewing of farm operators. One of these agents was the senior author of the report. The writer was the second author and presented the report to the group of agents, the assistant director responsible for agriculture, and a college specialist responsible for beef animals. The principal sections of the report (not merely the summary) were reviewed and discussed. On the basis of the report, the agents decided not to initiate a regional program, but agreed to work with the specialist in a limited manner.

The foregoing illustrations of feedback are more or less positive. Not all feedback efforts have been so successful. In fact, the absence of effective instrumentation of report findings and implications has been a real obstacle. Thus, when the findings and implications of a TV study which included the staffs of both the College of Agriculture and the College of Home Economics, as well as the extension field staff, were reported to the deans of the two colleges, the follow-up was poorly designed and never effective enough to result in a TV policy statement which was one of the major objectives of the study.

Likewise, a study of the Readiness of New York Cooperative Extension to Undertake a Farm Labor Program, which was suggested by an associate director, has failed to have any influence on program, even though it was reported in some detail to the College of Agriculture Farm Labor Committee, and subsequently to the Director of Extension, the assistant director in charge of agriculture, and the acting chairman of the College of Agriculture Farm Labor Committee. Again the absence of an effective procedure for the findings to be incorporated into program development was the problem.

### Other Known Uses of Reports<sup>1</sup>

In addition to direct feedback, other known uses have been made of reports. Of the 57 reports, 18, or 32 percent, were used in other than direct feedback (Table 7).<sup>2</sup> The evaluation

Table 7

Number and Percentage Distribution of Reports According to Whether or Not Known Uses Other Than OES Feedback Were Made of Them

Class of report		No other	Other	Total
		use	use	
Evaluation	Number	20	13	33
	Percent	61	39	100
Agency	Number	9	4	13
	Percent	69	31	100
Situation	Number	3	0	3
	Percent	100	--	100
Methodology	Number	3	0	3
	Percent	100	--	100
Evaluation & agency	Number	1	0	1
	Percent	100	--	100
Evaluation & methodology	Number	2	0	2
	Percent	100	--	100
Miscellaneous	Number	1	1	2
	Percent	50	50	100
Total	Number	39	18	57
	Percent	68	32	100

<sup>1</sup>While not accounted for in the table and tabulation presented in this section, a number of the OES reports were used in 1964-65 in teaching a Rural Sociology graduate course entitled, Evaluation Research.

<sup>2</sup>Seven of these 18 reports were also used for feedback purposes. The uses reported here are those known to the author. It is quite possible that a number of reports have been used by recipients in ways unknown to the author.

reports constituted most of the reports which were used in ways other than direct feedback. The following tabulation gives for each of the 18 reports the other known use or uses made of them:

<u>Class and Title of Report</u>	<u>Other Uses</u>
<u>Evaluation</u>	
<u>Study of the Operations of the Farm and Home Management Program in New York State, Report No. 2, January, 1959.</u>	a. Incorporated in Extension Study No. 1.
<u>The Farm and Home Management Program in New York State as Known and Viewed by Extension Administrators, Supervisors, and Specialists, Report No. 3, June, 1960.</u>	a. Incorporated in Extension Study No. 1.
<u>A Case Study of the Function of the Neighborhood in the Farm and Home Management Program, Report No. 5, June, 1960.</u>	a. Research note, <u>Rural Sociology</u> , Vol. 26, No. 2, June, 1961.
<u>Time and Cost In-put and Cost-benefit Relationship for the Farm and Home Management Program in the 10 Study Counties of New York State, Report No. 6, May, 1961.</u>	a. Incorporated in Extension Study No. 1.
<u>Evaluation of the Farm and Home Management Program by Participants and by Agents in the 10 Study Counties of New York State, Report No. 7, June, 1961.</u>	a. Incorporated in Extension Study No. 1.
<u>Changes in Farm Practices and Related Knowledge of Participants in the Farm Management Phase of the Farm and Home Management Program in the 10 Study Counties of New York State, Report No. 8, July, 1961.</u>	a. Incorporated in Extension Study No. 1.
<u>Evaluation Study of the TV Dairy Cattle Feeding School, Special Report No. 6, February, 1962.</u>	a. Research note, <u>Rural Sociology</u> , Vol. 28, No. 4, December, 1963. b. Paper read at Rural Sociological Society meeting (1963). c. Article in <u>Extension Review</u> .



Class and Title of Report:

Farm Business Factors Affecting Income Change for 87 Pair-matched Participants and Nonparticipants, Report No. 11, February, 1962.

Personal and Academic Adjustment of Foreign Graduate Students with Views of Their Faculty Advisers, March, 1967.

Farm Labor Opinions of Farmers Participating in Farm Labor Study Groups in Nine Counties in New York State, Special Report No. 14, May, 1968.

Evaluation of Family Service Program of Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension, Clinton County, New York, Extension Study No. 15, September, 1967.

Evaluation of Selected Aspects of the Homemaking Service Program in the City of Rochester, New York, Extension Study No. 17, October, 1968.

Evaluation of Family Service Program of Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension, Essex County, New York, Extension Study No. 19, November, 1968.

Other Uses

- a. Incorporated in Extension Study No. 1.
- a. Memorandum of preliminary data to staff member associated with Director of International Agr. Development.
- b. Preliminary report to Director of International Agr. Development, to Rockefeller Foundation representative, to Director and to an associate director of Cooperative Extension.
- a. Paper read at Rural Sociological Society meeting (1968).
- a. Used as part of report of extension associate responsible for H.E. low-income programs.
- a. Some of data used to prepare Special Report No. 15.
- b. Used as part of report of extension associate responsible for H.E. low-income programs.
- a. Some of data used to prepare Special Report No. 15.



Class and Title of ReportOther UsesAgency

TV Educational Function of the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics, Extension Study No. 9, Part VII "Summary of Findings and Implications," September, 1965.

- a. Attempted to develop a TV policy statement by Department of Communication Arts, but it was never completed.

Input on Low-Income Work of the New York State Extension Staff, Specialists, and Agents, Extension Study No. 10, January, 1966.

- a. Used to help prepare part of Extension Study No. 11.

Input on Community and Resource Development of the New York State Extension Staff, Extension Study No. 11, February, 1966.

- a. Used by Director of Cooperative Extension to support budget presentation in Washington.

Study of First-Year 4-H Club Leaders in New York State: Tenure, Characteristics of Leaders and Evaluation of Job Performance by 4-H Agents, Extension Study No. 12, March, 1966.

- a. Two attempts were made to use with 4-H state leaders for training, but so far no results from these efforts.

Miscellaneous

The War on Poverty: Twenty-Four Skirmishes, Special Report No. 15, July, 1968.

- a. Used as part of a report of extension associate responsible for H.E. low-income programs.

Approximate Distribution of OES Reports

Of 61 OES reports for which distribution data were available, 44, or 72 percent of the total, were distributed to 51 or more individuals or institutions, with each being sent at least one copy (Table 8).<sup>1</sup> For the 61 reports, the average (median) number of persons or institutions sent at least one copy was 86.3. The two principal classes of reports in terms of numbers, evaluation and agency, had an average (median) distribution respectively of 92.2 and 83.8 individuals or institutions. At least one copy of 76 percent of the 33 evaluation

<sup>1</sup>Note especially footnote e to Table 8.

Table 8  
Number and Percentage Distribution of Reports According to Number of  
Individuals or Institutions Sent One or More Copies, by Classes of Reports.

Approximate number to whom sent	Classes of reports												Total No.	%		
	Evaluation		Agency		Situation		Methodology		Evaluation & methodology		Miscellaneous					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%				
1 - 10	4	12.1	1	5.6	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	5	8.2
11 - 20	2	6.1	3	16.7	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	5	8.2
21 - 30	0	---	0	---	1	50.0	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	1	1.6
31 - 40	1	3.0	2	11.1	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	3	4.9
41 - 50	1	3.0	1	5.6	0	---	1	33.3	0	---	0	---	0	---	3	4.9
51 - 60	5	15.2	1	5.6	0	---	0	---	1	50.0	0	---	0	---	7	11.5
61 - 70	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---
71 - 80	2	6.1	0	---	1	50.0	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	3	4.9
81 - 90	1	3.0	3	16.7	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	2	100.0	6	9.8
91 - 100	3	9.1	1	5.6	0	---	1	33.3	0	---	0	---	0	---	5	8.2
101 - 150	9	27.3	2	11.1	0	---	1	33.3	1	100.0	0	---	0	---	13	21.3
151 - 200	2	6.1	1	5.6	0	---	0	---	0	---	1	50.0	0	---	4	6.6
201 - 250	1	3.0	1	5.6	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	2	3.3
251 - 300	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---
301 - 350	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---
351 - 400	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---
401 - 450	0	---	1	5.6	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	1	1.6
451 - 500	1	3.0	1	5.6	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	2	3.3
1774	1	3.0	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	1	1.6
Total	33 <sup>a</sup>	100.0	18 <sup>b</sup>	100.4 <sup>c</sup>	2	100.0	3	99.9 <sup>c</sup>	1	100.0	2	100.0	2	100.0	61	99.9 <sup>c</sup>
Median		92.2		83.8												86.3
No information	2		2 <sup>d</sup>		1											5 <sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Includes two supplementary reports.

<sup>b</sup>Includes the seven parts of Extension Study No. 9.

<sup>c</sup>Does not add to 100 because of rounding.

<sup>d</sup>Includes a supplementary report.

<sup>e</sup>The five no information plus the total of 61 in this column add to 66; this number includes the 57 reports of Table 1 plus three supplementary reports and six additional parts (separate documents) of Extension Study No. 9, part VII of which is counted as one of the 57 reports.

reports went to 51 or more individuals, and at least one copy of 61 percent of the agency reports was sent to 51 or more persons. The other five classes of reports consisted of small numbers, but for each class at least 50 percent of the reports (one copy at least) were sent to 51 or more individuals or institutions.

Only a small number of the 61 reports on which distribution data were available have not gone to at least one extension agent, faculty member, extension leader (or state leader) and program leader, and extension director at some level (Table 9).<sup>1</sup> Twenty-two, or 36 percent, of the 61 reports were sent to from one to 10 extension agents, while another 18, or 30 percent, were sent to from 51 to 100 agents. For the 61 reports the average (median) number of agents sent at least one copy was 10.3.<sup>2</sup> In the case of faculty members in the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics, 30, or 49 percent, of the 61 reports were distributed to from one to 10 individuals. For the 61 reports the average (median) number of faculty members sent at least one copy was 8.0. In view of the relatively small number of extension and program leaders, the distribution of reports to this group appears to have been fairly adequate and the same appears to be true of extension directors. As high as one third of the 61 reports were not sent to at least one FES staff member. No attempt has been made to distribute reports regularly to college and university administrators. These administrators received less than one half of the reports. Only when a report was considered especially relevant to their interest was distribution to them made.

Reports have also been distributed to others (besides Cornell and FES personnel), i.e., librarians, extension workers in

---

<sup>1</sup>Several recipients were sent more than one copy of some reports.

<sup>2</sup>This median and the subsequent ones used in this and the next paragraph were calculated with the inclusion of the zero category.

Table 9  
Number and Percentage Distribution of Reports According to  
Number to Whom Distributed, by Classes to Whom Sent

Approximate number to whom sent	Extension agents		Faculty members <sup>a</sup>		Extension and program leaders		Extension directors		FES staff		College & university administrators at Cornell		Others		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
0	9	15	8	13	12	20	9	15	21	34	35	57	3	5	
1 - 10	22	36	30	49	31	51	52	85	39	64	26	43	24	39	
11 - 20	2	3	8	13	16	26	0	0	1	2	0	0	9	15	
21 - 30	2	3	7	11	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	
31 - 40	2	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	
41 - 50	2	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	
51 - 100	18	30	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	
101 - 150	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	
151 - 200	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
201 - 250	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
251 - 300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
301 - 350	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
351 - 400	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
401 - 450	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1574	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	
Total	61	101 <sup>b</sup>	61	101 <sup>b</sup>	61	100	61	100	61	100	61	100	61	100	14.4
Median (inc. 0)	10.3		8.0												16.1
Median (exc. 0)	30.5		9.3												
No information	5 <sup>c</sup>		5		5		5		5		5		5		

<sup>a</sup> Most of these faculty members were in the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics and devoted some time to extension work.

<sup>b</sup> Does not add to 100 because of rounding.

<sup>c</sup> The five no information of each of the number columns plus the total of 61 in each add to 66; this number includes the 57 reports of Table 1 plus three supplementary reports and six additional parts (separate documents) of Extension Study No. 9, part VII of which is counted as one of the 57 reports.

other states, foreign visitors, graduate students, etc. Of the 61 reports on which data were available, 24, or 39 percent, had gone to from one to 10 other persons or institutions. The average (median) number to whom (or which) one or more copies of the reports were sent was 14.4. Extension Study No. 1, Evaluation of the Farm Management Phase of the Farm and Home Management Program in New York State (a printed publication) was sent to over 1500 other persons or institutions not officially connected with Cornell University or FES.

#### Annual Production of Reports

A distribution of reports by year of publication may be a bit misleading since the time period of research operations for various studies may often extend over several months or even a year. However, an annual record of publications does provide some indication of the flow of reports. In 1956 and 1957, no reports were produced by the Office of Extension Studies (Table 10). It was during this period that the longitudinal study of the Farm and Home Management Program was in its initial stage. The design for the study, interviewing for the bench-mark phase, and organization of data for this phase of the study occupied these two years. A few incidental service surveys whose data were organized in tabular form, but never presented in report form, were also conducted during this period.<sup>1</sup> No report was published in 1963. The leader of OES was completing the last half of a sabbatic year during the first part of this year, and no new studies which could be completed within the year were initiated in the first part of the year. The Office of Extension Studies reached its peak production in 1968 with 11, or

---

<sup>1</sup> Among these surveys were a survey of 4-H agents to ascertain research problems, a survey of the Extension Advisory Council to assess the members' views regarding emphasis on various extension audiences, and a survey of the agent staff regarding agent employment policy.



Table 10

Number and Percentage Distribution of Reports  
According to Year in Which Published

Year report published	Reports	
	Number	Percent
1956	0	--
1957	0	--
1958	4	7
1959	3	5
1960	3	5
1961	7	12
1962	6	11
1963	0	--
1964	6	11
1965	2 <sup>a</sup>	4
1966	9 <sup>b</sup>	15
1967	6 <sup>b</sup>	11
1968	11	19
Total	57 <sup>c</sup>	100
Mean		4.9

<sup>a</sup>One of these studies consisted of seven parts, each of which was a separate document.

<sup>b</sup>A supplement to one of these reports was issued in 1968 and is not counted in the number for 1968.

<sup>c</sup>All but one of the 57 studies were completed. That one is in preliminary status and may never be completed, or if it is, will be considerably different from the preliminary report.

19 percent, of its 57 reports being published in that year. The mean number of reports published per year for the 13-year period was 4.9.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The data for a number of sociometric surveys for determining farm management study groups has been processed from time to time. No exact record of the number of these surveys has been kept, but during the period 1964-68, at least 10 of these surveys were done. See Appendix B for list of articles and papers of OES staff.

### Number of Pages in Reports

It is fully recognized that the number of pages in a report is no indication of its quality. However, number of pages can be taken to indicate the volume of data and amount of work required to produce a report.

Most of the OES reports have contained summaries of findings which are usually accompanied by implications. In addition, because of their importance in providing a better understanding of the data in a report, a number of reports have contained in the appendices copies of the principal research instruments used. It was felt that these copies of instruments would be useful to others who might wish to conduct similar studies.

About one half (53 percent) of the OES reports have been 50 pages or less in length (Table 11). Slightly over one fourth of them have been 25 pages or less. However, 11, or 17 percent, of

Table 11  
Number and Percentage Distribution of Reports  
According to Number of Pages

<u>Number of pages</u>	<u>Reports</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 - 25	17	26
26 - 50	18	27
51 - 75	13	20
76 - 100	7	11
101 - 125	3	5
126 - 150	4	6
151 - 175	2	3
176 - 200	2	3
Total	66 <sup>a</sup>	101 <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Included are the 57 reports of Table 1 plus three supplementary reports and six additional parts (separate documents) of Extension Study No. 9, part VII of which is counted as one of the 57 reports.

<sup>b</sup>Does not add to 100 because of rounding.

the reports have been from 101 to around 200 pages in length. Since a number of reports have contained large numbers of tables, considerable statistical work, including checking for accuracy, has been involved in their production.

Studies on Which OES Has Advised or Assisted: 1965-68

Classes and subject matter of studies. An important function of OES has been to advise or assist the extension staff on studies. It is only possible to present accurate data on this function for the period 1965-68. During this four-year period, OES advised on or assisted with 34 studies (Table 12). Sixteen, or 47 percent, of these 34 studies were situational; 14, or 41 percent, dealt with evaluation; and four, or 12 percent, with agency (Extension) matters.

Table 12

Number and Percentage Distribution of Studies on Which OES Has Advised on and/or Assisted with According to Major Classes of Studies: 1965-68

<u>Classes of studies</u>	<u>Studies</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Evaluation	14	41
Agency	4	12
Situation	16	47
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	34	100

The tabulation on the following page presents these studies listed according to the principal subject matter of each.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<u>Evaluation studies</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>41</u>
TV programs . . . . .	3	
Conservation teaching by college specialists . . . . .	1	
A county beautification conference . . . . .	1	
A county home economics newsletter . . . . .	1	
4-H camp whose enrollees included		
low-income youth . . . . .	1	
4-H conservation camp at Arnot Forest . . . . .	1	
Home grounds bulletins by county		
agricultural agents . . . . .	1	
Home grounds maintenance program . . . . .	1	
An in-service training school . . . . .	1	
Model farm at Sharpe Reservation . . . . .	1	
A regional poultry program through contact		
records . . . . .	1	
Summer conservation course for public school		
teachers given by Conservation Department . . . . .	1	
<u>Agency studies</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>12</u>
Identification of job competencies needed by		
county extension agents . . . . .	1	
Inventory of home economics agents' work with		
low-income audiences . . . . .	1	
Study of county agricultural news . . . . .	1	
Study of one county's extension reorganization . . . . .	1	
<u>Situational studies</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>47</u>
County study of low-income families (OEO) . . . . .	2	
Resurvey of poultry operations in a three		
county area . . . . .	1	
Township study of farm leaders . . . . .	1	
Study of a county rural development		
program (second study) . . . . .	1	
Study to determine major problems as a		
basis for long-range program planning		
in a county . . . . .	1	
Study of DHIC participants and nonparticipants . . . . .	1	
Study of farmers in a township as a basis for		
program planning . . . . .	1	
Study of HD units in a selected county		
(using manuscript data) . . . . .	1	
Study of institutions relative to management		
and preparation of foods . . . . .	1	
A study of pallet users (School of Forestry,		
Syracuse University) . . . . .	1	
Study of poultry operators in states of		
Washington and Texas . . . . .	1	
Study of poultry operators in Western New York . . . . .	1	
Study of visitors to a New York State park . . . . .	1	
Study of women's knowledge in field of textiles		
and clothing as a basis for programming . . . . .	1	
Survey of local government officials relative		
to planning . . . . .	1	
Total	<u>34</u>	<u>100</u>

An examination of the foregoing subject-matter list shows no concentration. With the exception of three studies dealing with TV programs and two with low-income families, the other 29 studies dealt with disparate subjects.

Staff initiating and responsible for studies. Approximately one fourth of the 34 studies on which OES has advised and/or assisted from 1965-68 were initiated by and were the responsibility of college departmental extension staff members, and about the same proportion of the studies were initiated by and were the responsibility of one or more county agents (Table 13). Four studies were initiated by and were the responsibility

Table 13

Number and Percentage Distribution of Studies Advised on  
And/or Assisted with According to Staff Initiating and  
Responsible for: 1965-68

<u>Staff initiating and responsible</u>	<u>Studies</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
College departmental extension staff member	9	26
One or more county agents	8	24
Cooperative Extension specialist	4	12
Agent committee of Agricultural Agents' Association	2	6
Extension leader	2	6
Program leaders	2	6
Extension representative & county adminis- trative committee	1	3
Extension temporary employee in charge of program	1	3
Leader of county H.E. division & director of county CAP (OEO)	1	3
Leader of OES & faculty member in extension education	1	3
OEO county director	1	3
Staff member of School of Forestry, Syracuse University	1	3
Summer 4-H assistant	1	3
Total	34	101 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Does not add to 100 because of rounding.



of Cooperative Extension specialists. The remaining 13 studies were distributed among 10 categories of staff and nonstaff people.

Service rendered by the Office of Extension Studies. OES rendered a wide variety of services in connection with the 34 studies on which it advised and/or assisted during the period 1965-68. Sometimes this advice and assistance covered several functions, sometimes only one. Assisting with the construction of questionnaires (schedules) or tests occurred most frequently, 27 times for the 34 studies (Table 14). Advising on design

Table 14

Service Rendered by OES on Studies Advised  
On and/or Assisted with: 1965-68

<u>Services rendered</u>	<u>Number of instances</u>
Assisting with questionnaire (schedule) or test construction	27
Advising on design	13
Doing IBM runs	13
Preparing IBM code	12
Coding questionnaires or tests	7
Preparation of tables	6
Assisting with sampling	5
Teaching how to code	3
Advising on data analysis	2
Advising on handling of data	2
Advising on or reviewing report	2
Checking coding	2
Supervising coding	2
Advising on table construction	1
Assisting with bibliography	1
Doing statistical testing	1
Locating graduate student to conduct study	1
Organizing record system	1
Preparation of data cards	1
Pre-testing interviewing procedure	1
Summarizing taped accounts	1
Transcription of tapes	1

occurred 13 times, doing IBM runs 13 times, and preparing IBM codes 12 times. The remaining 18 functions of OES in connection with advising and/or assisting with studies occurred from one to seven times.

Status of studies. For 29 of the 34 studies on which OES has advised and/or assisted during the period 1965-68, it was possible to ascertain the status of the studies. Nine of the 29 studies were completed, preliminary reports were prepared for two, and five were partially completed (Table 15). Another

Table 15

Number and Percentage Distribution of Studies on Which OES Advised and/or Assisted According to Status of Studies: 1965-68

<u>Status of studies</u>	<u>Studies</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Study completed	9	26
Study in process	8	23
Study carried to partial completion	5	15
Unknown	5	15
Study will never be completed	4	12
Preliminary report completed	2	6
No study done	1	3
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	Total	34 100

eight can be considered in process. Four will never be completed, and in one instance, the study was never undertaken. This is not an especially satisfactory performance, and is probably related to available time and to the priorities of those responsible for the studies.

#### Budgets and Staff of the Office of Extension Studies

From fiscal year 1956-57 through 1961-62, the Office of Extension Studies had as its major project an evaluation study of the Farm and Home Management Program in New York State. During this period, the office was supported by a Kellogg Foundation grant of \$75,000 which budget-wise was matched by an equal

amount from the state Extension Service. During this six-year period, OES was able to conduct other studies since the state Extension Service made funds available in addition to the \$75,000 used for matching the Kellogg Foundation grant. The period following the completion of the Farm and Home Management study provides an opportunity for examining the financing of OES under what may be considered normal circumstances in that no special study supported by an outside grant was being conducted. Estimates of approximate budget totals could be calculated for the six fiscal years 1963-64 through 1968-69. During these six years, the budget totals ranged from \$40,501 to \$57,478 (Table 16). The average (mean) for the six years was \$49,199.<sup>1</sup>

Table 16

Budgets for OES: 1963-64 Through 1968-69

<u>Fiscal year</u>	<u>Total amount budgeted</u>
1963-64	\$53,785 <sup>a</sup>
1964-65	50,573 <sup>a</sup>
1965-66	49,316 <sup>b</sup>
1966-67	57,478 <sup>c</sup>
1967-68	40,501 <sup>d</sup>
1968-69	43,540 <sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Two professionals were on staff during this fiscal year.

<sup>b</sup>One professional was on sabbatic at half salary during this fiscal year. Only his half salary was budgeted.

<sup>c</sup>Although the salaries of two professionals were budgeted, one of these resigned at the end of seven months.

<sup>d</sup>Professional staff consisted of only one person.

<sup>1</sup>These budget figures do not include the costs of mimeograph facilities and operator and several other items, such as occasional pieces of new equipment, usual telephone charges, and allocations for administration. Also, the April 1 to June 30 portions of annual increments given NP employees are not included.

For only about two and one half of these six years did the professional staff consist of two members.<sup>1</sup> The clerical and secretarial staff has varied from three to four during the same period. Occasionally part-time clerks as well as field interviewers have been employed. A significant aspect of the clerical staff has been the use during the past five years of a well-trained research technician who has had supervision of the clerical staff and has been responsible for data organization and the editorial and physical production of reports. This technician has had the support of a competent clerk who understood coding for IBM purposes and was skilled in preparing statistical tables.

Office of Extension Studies Output  
Related to Straus' Characterization

In the Introduction of this study Straus' seven output characteristics of within agency research were presented. At this point, an attempt is made to indicate on the basis of its operations the appropriateness of these characteristics for OES. The following tabulation reflects the author's judgment of the fit:

<u>Straus' characteristics</u>	<u>Appropriateness as applied to OES</u>
1. <u>Specificity</u> and applicability maximized at expense of generalizability--applied research	The majority, if not all, of the OES studies represent applied research with specificity and applicability maximized at the expense of generalizability.

---

<sup>1</sup>During the entire period (calendar years 1956-68) covered by this study, there were two professional man-years of input for six years, one and one half for five years, and one for two years.

Straus' characteristics

2. Projects designed to minimize risk and ensure some findings.
3. Adequate but not exceptional technical competence.
4. Lower volume of production and more of it in the form of internal mimeo documents.
5. Research tends to be completed on time.

Appropriateness as applied to OES

The studies done have emphasized findings, but it is doubtful that study designs were aimed at minimizing risk. In fact some of the evaluation studies faced considerable risks in dealing with researchable situations.

It is difficult for the author to be objective at this point. The two professionals who have served on the OES staff possessed reasonably adequate competence, both having Ph.D.'s in sociology. It should also be noted that designing evaluation studies for volunteer participants frequently requires a great deal of imagination and creativity. Actually, such research may be more difficult than other kinds of social research.

This characterization is only partially correct for OES. All but one of the reports produced were mimeographs. However, the production has been relatively large, perhaps exceeding that of a number of sociology departments.

The leader of OES has made this a primary goal, and it is believed it has been achieved with some degree of success, but not always. The view held by the leader has been that if a research project is not completed according to deadlines, action decisions will seldom await completion.



Straus' characteristics

6. Willingness to suppress research findings to protect sponsoring agency or respondents.
7. Takes responsibility for feedback of research results into the organization by special publications or personal communications.

Appropriateness as applied to OES

There has been no suppression and misinterpretation has been negligible.<sup>1</sup> OES reports have been prepared and distributed without censorship or suppression.

The publications of OES have been distributed moderately widely to the extension staff, but not as widely as they should have been in some instances. OES has made feedback presentations for about one third of its reports. However, effective utilization of findings has too often lacked adequate instrumentation.

Two of Straus' characteristics have found full or almost full expression in the operations of OES, i.e., numbers 1 and 5. Four, i.e., numbers 2, 3, 4, and 7 only partially describe the operations of OES; and one, number 6, only slightly describes the operations. Since this is only a case study, no generalization is possible. Perhaps in the not too distant future, there will be an increase in the number of research units such as OES so that they can be adequately evaluated.

Relationship of OES Operations to Its Policy and Functions Statement

Evaluation Relative to Policy and Functions Statement

Another possible evaluation of OES operations is in terms of its policy and functions statement. This will be undertaken

---

<sup>1</sup> Only one case of serious misinterpretation of an OES study can be recalled, and this related to a study that was never put in report form although its findings were made available.

on the basis of the five areas set forth in that statement. The following is a tabular presentation of such an evaluation by the OES leader:

<u>Summary of Policy and Functions Statement</u>	<u>Evaluation</u>
1. <u>Nature of extension studies</u>	
a. Studies of situations concerned with the needs of people and their social and economic situation.	Only three studies conducted in this area.
b. Studies of changes in attitudes, knowledge, and behavior of people for the purpose of measuring the effects of Extension's educational activities.	Thirty-three studies plus three others which included other concerns conducted in this area.
c. Studies of the Extension Service directed to its policies, organization, operations, costs, and personnel matters.	Thirteen studies plus one other combined with another concern conducted in this area.
d. Basic studies should be continuously planned and conducted. <sup>1</sup>	An attempt was made to keep an analytical study on the OES work agenda at all times. However, even these more basic studies always had an applied orientation.

---

<sup>1</sup>This item is included here under Nature of extension studies. In the policy and functions statement, it was repeated under Planning principles, etc.

Summary of Policy and  
Functions Statement

2. Planning principles--

Funds and staff should be allocated to studies:

- a. Of general applicability
- b. Relative importance
- c. Immediate and ready use to extension
- d. Previously little investigated area
- e. Of pressing demand from staff
- f. Having adequate finances and personnel available
- g. With broad application to Extension as a whole

Total

Evaluation

These principles were not systematically followed as studies were initiated.

Ratings based on degree in general to which studies have met principles

	1 (high)	2	3	4	5 (low)
a.				X	
b.		X			
c.		X			
d.					X
e.		X			
f.		X			
g.				X	
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

3. Relationships of OES to studies conducted by other extension personnel

- a. Assisted with study designs
- b. Construction of questionnaires
- c. Planning for processing data including exploration of resources to do this
- d. Processing of data for limited number of experimental studies

Total

	1 (high)	2	3	4	5 (low)
a.			X		
b.	X				
c.		X			
d.				X	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Summary of Policy and  
Functions Statement

Evaluation

4. Communication by OES of results  
of its studies

Rating of feedback by OES:

1. Approximately one third of OES studies fed back by OES.
2. A number of reports have had fairly wide distribution, although distribution to the extension staff has not been as good as it should have been.

5. Specific relationships of  
segments of extension staff  
in initiating and partici-  
pating in OES research<sup>1</sup>

Ratings of relationship level

	1	2	3	4	5
	(high)				(low)
a. With extension administrators (directors) <sup>2</sup>				X	
b. With extension leaders (state leaders) <sup>3</sup>			X		
c. With extension agents		X			
d. With college departments (extension staff in departments)			X		
Total	0	1	2	1	0

Resumé of Evaluation Relative to Policy and Functions Statement

Nature of extension studies. The nature of the studies (reports) conducted by OES is uneven. Evaluation studies have been most frequent, with a fairly good number of agency studies, but few situational studies which could serve as the basis for program planning. While efforts have been made to do basic studies, these have always had an applied orientation.

<sup>1</sup>This research refers to the 57 OES reports.

<sup>2</sup>Refers to director, associate directors, and assistant directors; while not actually used in this analysis, the extension representatives might have been included with extension administrators.

<sup>3</sup>Because of their program function, consideration was given to including assistant directors here, but it was decided to include them with extension administrators. In terms of relationships with OES, it was considered appropriate to include the former state leaders and their associates and assistants with extension leaders.

Planning principles. Of seven specific planning principles, four were ranked second on a scale of five with respect to having been followed generally. Two were ranked fourth, and one fifth. The four principles given second place on the scale were: 1) relative importance, 2) immediate and ready use to extension, 3) of pressing demand from staff, and 4) having adequate finances and personnel available. While several of the planning principles listed in the policy and functions statement may have been followed, these principles were not consciously and consistently used as guides in initiating studies.

Relationships of OES to studies conducted by other extension personnel. On a five-point rating scale for four aspects of relationships, one of four relationships was rated one; one, two; and two, three. Constructing questionnaires was the relationship rated one. On the whole, OES attained a reasonably high level of performance in regard to relationships to studies conducted by other extension personnel.<sup>1</sup>

Communication by OES of results of its studies. The record here is that only about one third of the OES reports were given feedback presentations by the OES. Distribution of reports to the extension staff might have been better. However, a number of the reports have had fairly wide distribution; and, although often unknown, the recipients have undoubtedly made use of a number of them.

Specific relationships of segments of extension staff in initiating and participating in OES research. On a rating scale of five, the relationships with extension agents were rated two; with two other groups, i.e., extension leader (state leaders) and college departments (extension staff in departments), three; and with extension administrators, four. Thus, the extension

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted, however, that for the period 1965-68, five of 34 studies which OES advised on and/or assisted with were only partially completed by the end of 1968, and four others will never be completed (see Table 15).



agents rated highest on these relationships and administrators lowest.<sup>1</sup>

It should be recognized that a considerable portion of the foregoing evaluation is quite subjective, having been made by the leader of OES. Moreover, it was somewhat complicated because of changes in extension organization and personnel. Perhaps its principal contribution is its methodology in which an attempt has been made to relate the policy and functions statement of OES to performance.

### Finis

With a plea for tolerance for what may appear to be cynicism, this study closes with this quote from Wilensky:

In governments, business enterprises, political parties, labor unions, the professions, educational institutions, and voluntary associations, and in every other sphere of modern life, the chronic condition is a surfeit of information, useless, poorly integrated, or lost somewhere in the system. Too many critics of the organizational and political sources of our troubles see diabolical plots where there is only drift, a taste for reckless adventure where there is only ignorance of risks, the machinations of a power elite where there is, in William James's phrase, only a "bloomin' buzzin' confusion."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>In the first half of 1967, some plans were initiated by the director and associate directors to have OES conduct intelligence studies through which information would be provided for administrative decisions. The plans should have given extension administrators a larger role in initiating studies, but with the change in directors, only one or two studies were ever conducted under these plans. Furthermore, initiation but not involvement of administrators was emphasized in the OES policy and functions statement.

<sup>2</sup>Wilensky, Harold L., Organizational Intelligence, Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, New York, 1967, p. vii (preface).

**APPENDIX A**

**LIST OF REPORTS BY THE OFFICE OF EXTENSION STUDIES**

Evaluation

Alexander, Frank D.  
Survey of Farm and Home Management Participants--St. Lawrence County,  
Special Report No. 1, May, 1958, pp. 22

Alexander, Frank D. and James W. Longest.  
Study of the Operations of the Farm and Home Management Program in New York State,  
Report No. 2, January 15, 1959, pp. 102<sup>1</sup>

Longest, James, Chairman of Evaluation Committee.  
Report on Evaluation of the 1959 Annual Extension Conference at Cornell University, New York State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics,  
February, 1959, pp. 67

Alexander, Frank D.  
The Farm and Home Management Program in New York State as Known and Viewed by Extension Administrators, Supervisors, and Specialists,  
Report No. 3, June 15, 1960, pp. 48<sup>1</sup>

Alexander, Frank D.  
A Case Study of the Educational Exposure of a Sample of 25 Families Participating in the Farm and Home Management Program in a County in New York State,  
Report No. 4, June 15, 1960, pp. 27

Longest, James W., Frank D. Alexander, and Jean Harshaw.  
A Case Study of the Function of the Neighborhood in the Farm and Home Management Program,  
Report No. 5, June 15, 1960, pp. 16<sup>1</sup>

Alexander, Frank D.  
Evaluation Study of 4-H Program for Older Youth, Madison County,  
Special Report No. 4, March, 1961, pp. 49

Alexander, Frank D. and James W. Longest.  
Time and Cost In-put and Cost-benefit Relationship for the Farm and Home Management Program in the 10 Study Counties of New York State,  
Report No. 6, May 31, 1961, pp. 27

Alexander, Frank D. and James W. Longest.  
Evaluation of the Farm and Home Management Program by Participants and by Agents in the 10 Study Counties of New York State,  
Report No. 7, June 30, 1961, pp. 46<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>This is one of a series of 12 preliminary reports issued under the general title, "Evaluation Study of Farm and Home Management Program in New York State."

Alexander, Frank D. and James W. Longest.  
Changes in Farm Practices and Related Knowledge of Participants  
 in the Farm Management Phase of the Farm and Home Management  
 Program in the 10 Study Counties of New York State,  
 Report No. 8, July 15, 1961, pp. 98<sup>1</sup>

Alexander, Frank D. and James W. Longest.  
Tabular Summaries of Data for 21 Randomly Selected Participants  
 in the Farm and Home Management Program in New York State,  
 Report No. 10, September 30, 1961, pp. 165<sup>1</sup>

Longest, James W. and Frank D. Alexander.  
Changes in Homemaking Practices of Participants in the Home  
 Management Phase of the Farm and Home Management Program in  
 New York State,  
 Report No. 12, February 15, 1962, pp. 41<sup>1</sup>

Eschler, Richard E., Joseph C. Dell, Jr., and Frank D. Alexander.  
Evaluation Study of the TV Dairy Cattle Feeding School,  
 Special Report No. 6, February 19, 1962, pp. 45

Longest, James W. and Frank D. Alexander.  
Farm Business Factors Affecting Income Change for 87 Pair-matched  
 Participants and Nonparticipants,  
 Report No. 11, February 15, 1962, pp. 86<sup>1</sup>

Alexander, Frank D. and James W. Longest.  
Evaluation of the Farm Management Phase of the Farm and Home  
 Management Program in New York State,  
 Extension Study No. 1, June, 1962, pp. 59

Longest, James W., Frank D. Alexander, and Jean Harshaw.  
Sociometric Formation and Effectiveness of Groups in a Farm  
 Management Program,  
 Extension Study No. 2, July, 1962, pp. 12

Spencer, John F., Frank D. Alexander, and Chester H. Freeman.  
Audience Evaluation of Films Produced for Television,  
 Communications Research Bulletin 5, August, 1964, pp. 54<sup>2</sup>

Alexander, Frank D.  
Evaluation of Induction and Early Training of New Assistant  
 Agricultural Agents in New York Extension Service,  
 Extension Study No. 7, October, 1964, pp. 83

<sup>1</sup>This is one of a series of 12 preliminary reports issued under the general title, "Evaluation Study of Farm and Home Management Program in New York State."

<sup>2</sup>This is a joint report of the Department of Communication Arts (Extension Teaching and Information) and OES.

Longest, James W. and William H. Gengenbach.  
Otsego County Experimental Program for Testing Methods of Forming Farm Management Study Groups,  
 Extension Study No. 8, February, 1965, pp. 78

Burke, Agnes C. and Frank D. Alexander.  
Study of Herkimer County Home Demonstration Newsletter,  
 Special Report No. 8, January, 1966, pp. 20

Alexander, Frank D.  
Study of the Syracuse City 4-H Program,  
 Special Report No. 9, May, 1966, pp. 20

Alexander, Frank D., Emilie Stuhlmiller, and Adabelle Shinabarger.  
Bulletin and Leaflet Distribution of Young Homemakers by Letters, Warren and Washington Counties: An Evaluation,  
 Extension Study No. 13, September, 1966, pp. 100

Hull, Karen B.  
A Viewing Panel Evaluates "Table Talk," A Series of Home Economics Television Programs,  
 Special Report No. 10, October, 1966, pp. 12

Personal and Academic Adjustment of Foreign Graduate Students with Views of Their Faculty Advisers, College of Agriculture and Veterinary College, Cornell University,  
 Preliminary--not for distribution, March, 1967, pp. 135

Alexander, Frank D.  
Evaluation of 4-H Veterinary Science Project in Three Counties of New York State,  
 Special Report No. 11, August, 1967, pp. 23

Alexander, Frank D.  
Evaluation of 4-H Veterinary Science Project in Three Counties of New York State: Instruments Used and Data on Test Items,  
 Supplemental Report to Special Report No. 11, August, 1967, pp. 14<sup>1</sup>

Alexander, Frank D.  
Farm Labor Opinions of Farmers Participating in Farm Labor Study Groups in Two New York Counties: Steuben and Seneca (a paper),  
 Special Report No. 12, September, 1967, pp. 25

Alexander, Frank D.  
Evaluation of Family Service Program of Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension, Clinton County, New York,  
 Extension Study No. 15, September, 1967, pp. 143

---

<sup>1</sup>A supplementary report not included in Table 1, page 22, (see footnote a).



Alexander, Frank D.  
Evaluation of Family Service Program of Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension, Clinton County, New York,  
 Supplement to Extension Study No. 15, February, 1968, pp. 32<sup>1</sup>

Alexander, Frank D.  
Farm Labor Opinions of Farmers Participating in Farm Labor Study Groups in Nine Counties in New York State,  
 Special Report No. 14, May, 1968, pp. 48

Alexander, Frank D.  
Evaluation of Selected Aspects of the Homemaking Service Program in the City of Rochester, New York,  
 Extension Study No. 17, October, 1968, pp. 161

Alexander, Frank D.  
The National Seminar on Curriculum Development for Extension Workers as Seen by Participants,  
 Special Report No. 17, October, 1968, pp. 67

Alexander, Frank D., Marjorie B. Washbon, and Linda Morrow.  
Evaluation by Professional Health, Social and Educational Workers of Leaflets Received from Home Economics Agents in Four Selected Counties of New York State, Comments and Tables,  
 Special Report No. 18, November, 1968, pp. 31

Alexander, Frank D.  
Evaluation of Family Service Program, Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension, Essex County, New York,  
 Extension Study No. 19, November, 1968, pp. 147

Alexander, Frank D.  
Relevance to Their Jobs of Topics Taught in Early Training School for New Agricultural Agents: An Evaluation,  
 Special Report No. 20, December, 1968, pp. 12

-----  
 Alexander, Frank D.  
An Evaluation of the Use of the 4-H Game, "Let's Eat,"  
 Special Report No. 21, December, 1968, pp. 66<sup>2</sup>

Cheney, Martha A., Eleanor J. Wages and Frank D. Alexander.  
Evaluation of TV Series "Beginning Sewing," Albany Area, New York Cooperative Extension,  
 Special Report No. 24, March, 1969, pp. 38<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> A supplementary report not included in Table 1, page 22, (see footnote a).

<sup>2</sup> This report is not included in Table 1, page 22, (see footnote c).

Agency (Organizational)

Alexander, Frank D.  
Study of Women Enrolled in Home Demonstration Work in 1958, New York State,  
 Membership Report No. 58, June 1, 1959, pp. 102<sup>1</sup>

Alexander, Frank D.  
Study of Agents Leaving Employment in the New York Extension Service During 1958 and 1959,  
 Special Report No. 5, September 15, 1961, pp. 34

Alexander, Frank D.  
A Study of Home Demonstration Units in a Sample of 27 Counties in New York State,  
 Extension Study No. 3, May 1, 1964, pp. 21

Alexander, Frank D.  
Preservice Training of Cooperative Extension Service County Employees Employed in 1959 and 1960 Presently Employed by the Extension Service, New York State,  
 Extension Study No. 4, May, 1964, pp. 41

Coolican, Patricia M. and Frank D. Alexander.  
Study of Dropouts in Chautauqua County Home Demonstration Membership in 1959-60,  
 Extension Study No. 5, June, 1964, pp. 55

Alexander, Frank D. and Jean Harshaw.  
In-service Training of Agricultural Agents in New York State: 1963,  
 Extension Study No. 6, September, 1964, pp. 70

Spencer, John F. and Frank D. Alexander.  
TV Educational Function of the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics,  
 Extension Study No. 9, Part I "As Seen by the Faculty,"  
 September, 1965, pp. 86<sup>2</sup>

Alexander, Frank D.  
TV Educational Function of the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics,  
 Extension Study No. 9, Part II "As Seen by Extension Agents,"  
 September, 1965, pp. 141<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>In addition to this state report, there were 55 county and two city reports which are not included in Table 1, page 22, (see footnote b).

<sup>2</sup>This part of Extension Study No. 9 is not included in Table 1, page 22, (see footnote b).

Alexander, Frank D.  
TV Educational Function of the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics,  
 Extension Study No. 9, Part III "As Seen by College Administrators," September, 1965, pp. 34<sup>1</sup>

Alexander, Frank D.  
TV Educational Function of the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics,  
 Extension Study No. 9, Part IV "As Seen by State Extension Leaders," September, 1965, pp. 42<sup>1</sup>

Lawrence, James E.  
TV Educational Function of the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics,  
 Extension Study No. 9, Part V "As Related to Commercial TV Stations," September, 1965, pp. 55<sup>1</sup>

Lawrence, James E.  
TV Educational Function of the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics,  
 Extension Study No. 9, Part VI "As Implemented by Grouping Counties for Participation in Educational Television," September, 1965, pp. 15<sup>1</sup>

Alexander, Frank D.  
TV Educational Function of the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics,  
 Extension Study No. 9, Part VII "Summary of Findings and Implications," September, 1965, pp. 73

Alexander, Frank D.  
Input on Low-Income Work of the New York State Extension Staff, Specialists and Agents,  
 Extension Study No. 10, January, 1966, pp. 73

Alexander, Frank D. and Kay Shipman.  
Input on Community and Resource Development of the New York State Extension Staff,  
 Extension Study No. 11, February, 1966, pp. 36

Alexander, Frank D.  
Study of First-Year 4-H Leaders in New York State: Tenure, Characteristics of Leaders and Evaluation of Job Performance by 4-H Agents,  
 Extension Study No. 12, March, 1966, pp. 176

---

<sup>1</sup>This part of Extension Study No. 9 is not included in Table 1, page 22, (see footnote b).

Alexander, Frank D.  
Study of First-Year 4-H Leaders in a Sample of Counties of New York State: 1960-61,  
 Supplement to Extension Study No. 12, March, 1966, pp. 92<sup>1</sup>

Alexander, Frank D.  
Readiness of New York Cooperative Extension to Undertake a Farm Labor Program,  
 Extension Study No. 16, November, 1967, pp. 119

Alexander, Frank D.  
An Examination of the Personnel Function in New York Cooperative Extension,  
 Special Report No. 13, February, 1968, pp. 52

Alexander, Frank D.  
Fees for Home Economics Leader Training and Teaching of Special Interest Groups, County Home Economics Divisions, New York Cooperative Extension,  
 Special Report No. 16, August, 1968, pp. 22

#### Situation

Van Meter, Jerry R.  
Land Use Patterns and Characteristics of Rural Landowners in Broome County, New York,  
 Cooperative Study No. 1, June, 1966, pp. 18

Barry, William M. and Frank D. Alexander.  
Beef Cattle Farming in the Capital District of New York State,  
 Extension Study No. 14, October, 1966, pp. 34

Hannan, Jesse B.  
Survey of 76 Dairy Farms in Seneca County,  
 Cooperative Study No. 2, June, 1967, pp. 34

-----

Alexander, Frank D., Richard E. Eschler, Joseph C. Dell, Jr. and William Menzi, Jr.  
Survey of Dairy Farmers Having 20 or More Cows--Findings with Program Implications, Chemung, Schuyler, Tioga and Tompkins Counties,  
 Special Report No. 22, March, 1969, pp. 34<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>A supplementary report not included in Table 1, page 22 (see footnote b).

<sup>2</sup>This report is not included in Table 1, page 22, (see footnote c).

Alexander, Frank D., Richard E. Eschler, Joseph C. Dell, Jr.  
and William Menzi, Jr.  
Survey of Dairy Farmers Having 20 or More Cows--Findings with  
Program Implications, Chemung, Schuyler, Tioga and Tompkins  
Counties,  
Supplement to Special Report No. 22, March, 1969, pp. 86<sup>1</sup>

### Methodology

Howe, William G. and Frank D. Alexander.  
A Report of a Demonstration in Using Survey Information in  
Program Planning in Cattaraugus County, New York,  
Special Report No. 2, June 16, 1958, pp. 51

Harshaw, Jean L.  
Bibliography of Materials Relating to Program Projection in  
Extension,  
Special Report No. 3, June 25, 1958, pp. 17

Alexander, Frank D.  
How to Plan and Conduct Extension Studies, with Special Atten-  
tion to Their Use for Program Planning,  
Special Report No. 7, May 31, 1962, pp. 18

### Evaluation and Agency

Alexander, Frank D.  
Volunteer Study Groups--Characteristics and Educational Func-  
tions, Home Demonstration Units in Onondaga County,  
Extension Study No. 18, October, 1968, pp. 198

-----

Alexander, Frank D.  
Office of Extension Studies, New York Cooperative Extension--  
A Case Study,  
Special Report No. 23, March, 1969<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>This supplement is not included in Table 1, page 22, (see footnote c).



Evaluation and Methodology

Longest, James W. and Frank D. Alexander.  
Adequacy of Sample and Control Group,  
Report No. 1, May 15, 1958, pp. 67<sup>1</sup>

Longest, James W. and Frank D. Alexander.  
Design and Methodology,  
Report No. 9, September 30, 1961, pp. 50<sup>1</sup>

Miscellaneous

Alexander, Frank D., Kay Shipman and Martha Cheney.  
The War on Poverty: Twenty-Four Skirmishes,  
Special Report No. 15, July, 1968, pp. 70

Alexander, Frank D. and Frank A. Santopolo.  
A Socio-drama Relating Sociological Concepts to County Agents'  
Behaviors,  
Special Report No. 19, November, 1968, pp. 25

---

<sup>1</sup>This is one of a series of 12 preliminary reports issued under the general title, "Evaluation Study of Farm and Home Management Program in New York State."

APPENDIX B

LIST OF ARTICLES AND PAPERS BY OES STAFF

76/78

In addition to the 57 reports which are considered in some detail in this study and the reports mentioned in footnote (c) of Table 1, the Office of Extension Studies has also produced the following:

Journal articles and other articles

Longest, James W., Frank D. Alexander, and Jean L. Harshaw.  
The Function of the Neighborhood in the Farm and Home Management Program: A Case Study,  
Research note, Rural Sociology, Vol. 26, No. 2, June, 1961

Eschler, Richard E., Joseph C. Dell, Jr. and Frank D. Alexander.  
Evaluating Television for Extension Teaching,  
Extension Service Review, September, 1962

Alexander, Frank D., Richard E. Eschler, and Joseph C. Dell, Jr.  
A Field Experiment in Diffusion of Knowledge of Dairy Cattle Feeding Through a TV School,  
Research note, Rural Sociology, Vol. 28, No. 4, December, 1963

Longest, James W.  
Group Formation for Teaching,  
Journal of Cooperative Extension, Fall, 1964

Alexander, Frank D.  
A Critique of Evaluation,  
Journal of Cooperative Extension, Winter, 1965

Mimeographed papers

Alexander, Frank D.  
Studying the Decision-Making Process,  
(paper read at Rural Sociological Society meeting),  
Office of Extension Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.,  
1958

Alexander, Frank D. and Emory J. Brown.  
Analysis of Current Functions of Extension Rural Sociologists in Relation to Present-Day Rural Problems,  
(paper read at Rural Sociological Society meeting),  
Office of Extension Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.,  
1960

Alexander, Frank D.  
Research and Evaluation Conducted to Date on Farm and Home Development Program,  
Office of Extension Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.,  
1961

Longest, James W. and Frank D. Alexander.

Evaluation Study of the Farm and Home Management Program in New York State: Design and Methodology,

(paper used to present substance of Report No. 9, Design and Methodology, Evaluation of Farm and Home Management Program in New York State at Purdue National Extension Research Seminar in 1961)

Alexander, Frank D.

Some Crucial Alternatives in the Organization of the New York Extension Service,

Office of Extension Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., 1962

Alexander, Frank D., Richard E. Eschler, and Joseph C. Dell, Jr.

Measurement of Induced Change in Knowledge of Dairy Cattle Feeding Through TV Teaching,

(paper read at Rural Sociological Society meeting),  
Office of Extension Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., 1963

Suggested Procedural Model for Graduate Curriculum Development for the Purpose of Designating Relevant Research,

prepared by Frank D. Alexander, chairman, and members of research committee,

Office of Extension Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., 1964

Alexander, Frank D.

Pretest of Critical Incident Technique with County Extension Agents,

Office of Extension Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., 1965

Alexander, Frank D.

Research Proposal: Identification of Job Competencies Needed by Cooperative Extension Educators (Adult Educators),

Office of Extension Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., 1966

Alexander, Frank D.

Critical Behaviors and Attitudes from Critical Incident Study of Cooperative Extension Agents in New York State (A Preliminary Report),

Office of Extension Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., 1967

Alexander, Frank D.

Fields of Sociology in Relation to Foundation or Undergirding Behavior of County Extension Agents (An Assignment Paper),

Office of Extension Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., 1967

Alexander, Frank D.

Farm Labor Opinions of Farmers Participating in Farm Labor Study  
Groups in Nine Counties in New York State,

(paper read at Rural Sociological Society meeting),  
Office of Extension Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.,  
1968

