

thwest Ohio Regional Depository



M	Sect	Shlf	Tray	Item
1	330	07	01	09

*A Study*

of Problems and Practices of  
Cooperative and General Extension Services  
in Land-Grant Colleges and Universities  
and non-Land-Grant State Universities

SENATE COMMITTEE on PROBLEMS of URBAN EDUCATIONAL EXTENSION  
for the ASSOCIATION of LAND-GRANT COLLEGES and UNIVERSITIES

378.13  
4s78

November, 1954

## INTRODUCTION

The Executive Committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities is confronted with the problem of greater demands for Federal appropriations to the several colleges and universities for Cooperative Extension Services. A great deal of this increase in work load is caused by the shifting of population in some states, and the demands from urban groups to secure the services of Cooperative Extension.

At the same time, General Extension throughout the country is being called upon to render its services in the smaller rural areas that require more funds than are now available. Since no Federal funds are available for General Extension, the problem is magnified because of the possible request in the future for the Federal Government to make appropriations for this purpose.

This situation has become serious enough to require a study by the Executive Committee to determine where there is a duplication of effort on the part of the two extension services, and where its problems are common.

In order to begin such a study, a Committee representing the two services was appointed, with the directive to determine the problems that are common, the phases of the work that may require further study because of the tendency of each service to work into the field normally covered by the other, and to recommend to the Executive Committee any solutions to our present conditions that may be discovered by such a study. This joint committee was later formalized by the Senate of the Association.

The Senate committee formulated as its purpose...."to explore the problems and practices of extension in the Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, and to recommend areas of development and coordination, including methods of finance."

This report should be considered as a preliminary step in a broader study to be made later, with the understanding that these data are submitted for the purpose of provoking discussion by the presidents of the colleges and universities, and to aid in the answers to the problems that have been raised.

Later, a broader survey should be made to bring out more specific information that could help the members of the Association do a better job within their states. The fact that the members of the State Universities Association agreed to cooperate on this study indicates that they, too, are interested in determining where the common ground lies and what may be done about it in the future.

These universities do not have those problems common to Cooperative Extension Service, but they do have the responsibility of working with the Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, which requires a closer cooperative movement than now exists. In both cases, public funds are used, and this will call for closer relationship because of the demand on these funds.

It is hoped by the Committee that this may be the beginning of a growing relationship between the Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension within the colleges and universities that can more efficiently serve both groups, and also, the beginning of a relationship between the Land-Grant Colleges and the Separated State Universities in doing a better job of presenting their services to the people.

These data were analyzed by Dr. M. E. John, Head, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology; Dr. E. J. Brown, Assistant

Professor of Rural Sociology; and Dr. Rose M. Cologne, Associate Professor of Adult Education and Specialist in Community Adult Education, all of The Pennsylvania State University. This preliminary report was prepared jointly by the committee and these consultants, and is submitted to the Executive Committee for review and further directions.

Respectfully submitted,

Miss Gertrude Humphreys, State Leader, Home Demonstration  
Work, Cooperative Extension Service, West Virginia  
University, Morgantown, West Virginia

Louis C. Williams, Director, Agriculture Extension,  
Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kansas

Herbert A. Berg, Assistant Director, Cooperative  
Extension, Michigan State College, East Lansing,  
Michigan

\*Lindley G. Cook, Associate Director, Extension Service in  
Agriculture and Home Economics, Rutgers University,  
New Brunswick, New Jersey.

L. H. Adolfson, Director, University Extension Division,  
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin

E. A. Lowe, Director, Division of General Extension,  
University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia

H. B. Stevens, Director, Division of General Extension,  
University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire

E. L. Keller (Chairman), Director, General Extension,  
The Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pennsylvania

\* Replaced Robert Hepburn, University of Connecticut (deceased)

## METHOD

The first job facing the joint committee on Agricultural and General Extension was to decide on the information needed to answer the basic questions assigned to it by the Executive Committee of the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities.

Having completed this task a questionnaire was formulated and tested by applying it to the institutions represented by members of the joint committee. After analyzing the resulting data, a few changes were made on the questionnaire, after which it was sent to 73 institutions.\* These included 22 universities, 21 state colleges, and 30 state colleges and universities. In the first group, only General Extension services were conducted by the institutions; in the second group, 11 institutions conducted only Cooperative Extension Services while 10 had both services; and in the third group, both Cooperative Extension and General Extension Services were carried on by all on the same campus.

Replies to the questionnaire were received from 16 of the 22 in the University group; 15 of 21 in the State College group; and 28 of the 30 in the State College and University group.

The questionnaire was built on questions of the open-end type, with the exception of one concerning the budget. Therefore, the answers given were in terms of issues that came to mind to the respondent, and of the extent of the individual's understanding of the two services.

Failure to give a certain answer may mean only that certain aspects of the question were not recalled by the respondent. Frequency of replies may therefore not be as significant as the ideas that are given. A few of the questionnaires were not returned, and occasionally questions were not answered. Analysis of the questionnaires was made at The Pennsylvania State University.

A summary was made of the titles of persons sending the cover letters with returned questionnaires. For the State College and University category, almost one-half were signed by the president or his assistant; about one-fourth by the head of Cooperative Extension Service or an assistant; and one-fourth by the head of General Extension or an assistant. About one-half stated the questionnaires had been prepared by some joint arrangements between General Extension and Cooperative Extension Service.

For the State Colleges, presidents signed the letter of transmittal accompanying the returning questionnaires in all but three cases—one by an assistant, and two by the director and assistant director of Cooperative Extension Services. About one-half indicated the answers were prepared by the director or assistant director of the Cooperative Extension Services, and, in a few cases, in collaboration with the director of General Extension or his assistant.

Replies from the Universities were signed by presidents or their assistants in about one-third of the cases; by deans in another one-third; and by directors of General Extension or assistants in the remaining one-third. The director of General Extension was mentioned as preparing a few of the reports, but no indication was given as to who prepared the others.

---

\*See Appendix I for a copy of the questionnaire, and Appendix II for a list of institutions to which it was sent.



## FINDINGS

### What Activities or Services Are Currently Provided to Urban People by the Cooperative Extension Service?

In states where both Cooperative and General Extension Services are on the same campus, the information and services of the Cooperative Extension Service were generally available to urban as well as rural people. It was reported in all but five of these states that the same staff served urban as well as rural residents. In these five states, urban agents have been hired to carry on a home economics program for urban women. This suggests that in most states the staff of the Cooperative Extension Service serves urban groups if requested.

In some states with a large urban population, 4H Club membership has a larger percentage of urban boys and girls than rural boys and girls. Many urban homemakers participate in home demonstration groups. In a few states urban people are served through such organizations as women's clubs, consumer and marketing clubs, and men's civic and business organizations. The information is distributed by mass media and no indications were given as to the extent to which the urban people of the area were reached.

The kinds of information given by county agents included gardening, marketing, landscaping, care of lawns, floriculture, ornamental horticulture, insect and rodent control, home improvement, and in a few cases pomology.

In the field of home economics, it was indicated that the urban homemakers received information concerning foods and nutrition, health, clothing, safety, family living, consumer education, food preparation, home decoration, upholstery, sewing, child development, home and community improvement and citizenship.

As one would guess, no state mentioned all of the above, and in no case was it inferred that all of the urban people desiring the information were served. The methods used in providing information to urban people were in general the same as for rural people. Greater emphasis was placed on press, radio, and television by a few states in serving urban people, and less time was devoted to personal contacts and assistance.

#### State Colleges

Replies from Cooperative Extension Services in states where State Colleges provided extension education indicate a diversity of services rendered

to urban people. Although the Cooperative Extension Services purport to serve the total population, urban people are interested only in certain parts of the program because of differences in occupation and pattern of living.

In only a few states have the Extension Services hired personnel for the specific purpose of serving urban people. In most states the shifts in population from rural to urban and from farm to non-farm occupations have resulted in Cooperative Extension Services providing services to more and more urban people. Especially is this true in the rural-urban fringe area and in the smaller cities.

In most of the states, 4H Club work includes many urban boys and girls. The nature of their projects was not explained very precisely, although it was suggested that crafts and recreation, and poultry and rabbits, were selected more frequently by urban children. Since the Cooperative Extension Service has personnel residing in most of the counties, these staff members give teachers and groups advice and assistance.

No discrimination is made between rural and urban in meeting the requests. The nature of the program, however, in terms of service and information rendered, has been formulated with needs of the rural person in mind. Therefore, while the program is available to urban people, it is not particularly tailored to meet their needs.

### What Additional Cooperative Extension Service Programs are Desirable for Urban People? For What Specific Groups?

#### State Colleges and Universities

Approximately one-half of the respondents indicated that a program on consumer education was desirable for urban people. The home economics program and 4H Clubs were mentioned by more than one-quarter of those replying. A few felt that certain other areas of agriculture should be extended to urban areas. In general, a program of this nature was expected to be available to all people and not restricted to specific groups.

#### State Colleges

The suggestions given as to the additional programs that should be extended to urban residents were about the same as those given by State Colleges and Universities. Considerable stress was placed upon increasing the emphasis on public policies. Very few indicated what groups should be reached specifically by the various programs. In a few cases, fringe area homemakers,



retailers, distributors, wholesalers, national organizations, P.T.A.'s, young people, and part-time farmers were especially singled out.

What Problems are Encountered by the Cooperative Extension Service in Extending its Program to Urban People?

State Colleges and Universities

The problem mentioned most frequently by the Cooperative Extension Service in extending its program to urban people was the lack of staff and finances. Approximately three-fourths felt that money and personnel would solve the problem.

Other problems mentioned by a few pertain to the difficulty of adapting the traditional cooperative extension program to the needs of urban people. A few felt that the staff was inadequately trained to work with urban people. One respondent said that the rural people would not want to share extension staff with urban residents. A few respondents recognized a problem in channeling a program to large masses of people.

State Colleges

In this group, as in the previous one, lack of staff and personnel was given as the primary obstacle in extending the services to the urban people. Two reported the feeling that the traditional 4H program would not interest urban boys and girls because of lack of facilities for conducting 4H projects. In one case, lack of training or interest of the staff in serving urban people was given as an obstacle. In other cases, lack of suitability of the program in meeting urban needs was stressed. A fear was expressed that use of mass media in extending the program to urban areas would result in much greater demand for personal visits and consultation.

What Activities are Currently Conducted for Rural People by General Extension?

State Colleges and Universities

Many different activities were mentioned as being provided for rural people by General Extension. However, none was listed by more than seven of the 28 institutions. The activities stressed were as follows: conference service, audio-visual aids, package libraries, and community development projects. Various methods were used in teaching rural people, the most prevalent being correspondence courses. Short courses, extension classes, lectures, and institutes were used in serving rural people by approximately one-third of the institutions reporting. Radio, workshops, publications, television, and personal consultation were mentioned occasionally.

State Colleges

Eight of the 16 colleges have no General Extension Divisions. The others reported such activities for rural people as short courses, correspondence courses, credit and non-credit classes, exhibits, workshops, and demonstrations. These activities are part of the normal General Extension programs for urban people, but rural people participate.

Approximately half the questionnaire indicated that General Extension services to rural schools, for administrators. A few professional groups, and rural areas.

Most states report people in home study classes. General Extension rural people by providing visual services, and drama loan libraries.

Other services and activities mentioned by two states included program planning, counselling, guidance services, journalism clinics, debate and discussion tournaments, consultative services to school students, adult education, music, art, crafts, health financial training, book study groups, concerts, recreation management, dance institutes, social etiquette, a tax clinic, community service, and community fund. No state provided all of these, and in no case was mentioned that the service to rural people was complete.

The methods of serving rural people are the same as those used to reach urban people, emphasizing extension classes, correspondence courses, short courses, conferences, radio, and television. A few states mention speakers' bureaus and specialists who are available by call.

What Additional Types of General Extension Programs Are Desirable for Rural People? For What Special Groups?

State Colleges and Universities

The type of program mentioned most often as desirable for rural people was that of general extension emphasizing the social and cultural subjects, as music, history, political science, and international relations.

Several felt that more emphasis is needed on business and technical subjects, as industrial management, business education, and vocational skills. Leadership training and community development were mentioned in a few cases. Conferences and institutes, formal classes, correspondence courses, television, and lectures directed toward meeting the needs of rural people were also mentioned.

Very little information was given as to the specific groups needing services. A few mentioned womens clubs, older youth, resort owners, and local government employees.

#### State Colleges

Approximately one-third reporting indicated that no additional programs were needed for rural areas. The type most often mentioned was again general education. Leadership training, industrial labor relations, and citizenship training were mentioned in a few cases. 4H Club leaders, interest groups, farmers, homemakers, farmers' clubs, and men's clubs were reported as potential recipients of this type of program.

#### Universities

About one-third mentioned community development, creative arts, visual aids, and programs on family living as needing emphasis. Other specific suggestions, such as programs on international relations, health, laws, library services, vocational skills, citizenship education and public affairs, were reported by no more than two institutions. Some replies suggested that rural people should be more involved in the already existing programs.

#### What Problems are Encountered by General Extension in Extending its Programs to Rural People?

##### State Colleges and Universities

The most common problem encountered is lack of funds and personnel. This was mentioned by slightly over one-half of the respondents. In fact, almost one-half presented no other problems.

The fact that the rural population is sparsely distributed over the geographic area was the greatest barrier mentioned to effective organization of groups adequate in size to permit efficiency in programming. Travel distance to rural meeting places was seen as a barrier by one-fourth of those replying. A few stressed the lack of interest of rural people in the type of program offered by General Extension, and the difficulty of publicizing the program in rural areas.

Other problems mentioned occasionally were: the seasonality of the farmers' work preventing him from attending meetings at certain times of the year; lack of well developed techniques of working with rural groups; present administrative arrangements for working with Cooperative Extension Service has not been worked out; and, the lack of communication between General Extension and Cooperative Extension Service.

#### State Colleges

The lack of funds and personnel was mentioned by about one-half of those responding as the most common problem in serving rural people. Three respondents pointed out that rural people are accustomed to a free educational program from the Cooperative Extension Service and much difficulty is encountered in explaining why fees must be charged by General Extension. Other problems were the dispersion of the rural population, lack of time to train staff for rural programming, and lack of organization for conducting programs in rural areas.

#### Universities

Again the lack of finances and staff were stressed. A little less than one-half of those reporting felt that the low density of population in rural areas would not permit the formation of large enough groups for efficient financing of programs. About the same proportion felt that the distance required for rural people to travel was a serious barrier to extending the program.

Other problems stressed by a few universities were lack of interest on the part of rural people, difficulty in obtaining adequate meeting places, and in publicizing the program. Two universities indicated they were not interested in reaching rural people.

#### What Demands are Experienced by the Cooperative Extension Service for Subject Matter Programs or Methods of Instruction (Such as Correspondence Study) Normally Offered by General Extension?

##### State Colleges and Universities

About one-half of the institutions indicated that the Cooperative Extension Service received none or very few demands for subject matter or methods of instruction normally offered by General Extension. Two respondents stated that any requests that did occur were immediately channeled to General Extension.

In answering this question most people evidently were unduly influenced by the phrase, "such as correspondence study", for approximately one-third made specific reference to no or little demand for correspondence courses, while 3 replies mentioned correspondence courses as being already provided. In one state, rural school teachers have inquired about correspondence courses.



Information on subject matter training and night classes were requested in another.

One respondent said that the requests to the Cooperative Extension Service were "primarily for subject matter in the various fields of agriculture and home economics", but that there is also considerable interest in programs involving art or adult study classes of the sort conducted by General Extension. Reference was made to limited requests for programs in citizenship and current history. There is a growing demand in one state by rural people for formal class instruction in agriculture.

#### State Colleges

Of the 16 State Colleges replying to the question, one-half specifically stated that they either received no or very few demands for subject matter programs or methods of instruction normally offered by General Extension. Six specifically indicated that they either have correspondence courses or have had no request for them.

There was some indication that the workshop approach used by General Extension would be of interest for it was mentioned as a need in dealing with subject matter material concerning seed, fertilizer, pest control, gardening, and landscaping. None of the illustrations was mentioned more than once. One reply referred to a request from special interest groups for formal classroom instruction.

#### What Types of Cooperation Currently Exist Between the Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension?

##### Introduction

The various types of cooperation were compiled on the basis of the three types of institutions. These data have been tabulated and appear on page 13. An analysis of this table shows that some institutions did not report many of the cooperative activities in which they were known to be engaging. This was due to the fact that the questions were open-end and not categorized.

Every one of the major categories of cooperation was mentioned by one or more of each of the types of institutions, except legislative and research. They were mentioned by but one institution each.

The analysis of the material indicates that the question was differently interpreted by various institutions. This summary presents an analysis of the types of cooperation expressed in the answers and indicates the extent to which they are practiced.

Quotations from the replies reflect not only the reasoning, but also the attitudes about cooperation. Therefore, in reporting their answers to this question, quotations are used. There was indicated a wide range

in point of view, such as, that there appears occasion for a great deal of cooperation other which might be expected from the two divisions of the same university. Others expressed a readiness to cooperate if need arises and stronger ties be established. Still others pointed out that cooperation is fragmentary, but that they know each other's activities to get better cooperation to serve the state.

One director indicated that the lack of cooperation was not due to lack of good will, but because of the extent to which the services are separated, and the "Actual chances for cooperation have been small." One director states, "With the growing demand for service for each Division to serve the other people, it becomes necessary to review the methods of cooperation."

One director reflected a very optimism concerning the level of cooperation by stating that they have the finest kind of relationships."

Some reported that very little cooperation exists not for lack of good will, but because their interests do not cross. Another respondent felt that, "It is understood that in those states where the land-grant college and the university are the same, the line of general education will inevitably be developed by the one institution."

Another state replied, "We feel it would be a serious mistake at this time for closer legislative scrutiny of duplication to have either school or college excursions away from the traditional response." "The University recognizes that the land-grant college would always have some interest in General Extension but for the land-grant college to develop a General Extension program at this stage would produce much duplication and real friction. The University would oppose this and would make the case on the grounds of duplication."

Another respondent expressed an opposition to his University cooperating by stating, "It is a mistake to definitize the operation by the divisions by attempting to coordinate the work. If by coordination, each would help in their actions or in their present ability to help each other."

##### Types of Cooperation

Present types of cooperation are reflected in the replies, and are classified. In this classification is made to separate the specific replies from the types of institutions. For this information is given for types of institutions from which the replies came. The following headings group the replies by subject areas as follows:



## Administrative Policy

Twelve institutions reported some form of policy decision which defines the field of operation for the two services. This has been usually accomplished by memorandum which defines the fields of operation by conferences and close liaison between the two directors, by tradition which, "Over the years there has developed a relatively clear division of responsibility in extension work between the two services."

"It has always been assumed in all matters relating to agriculture and home economics the State College had the full responsibility (although the University also has a school of home economics), on the other hand, in matters relating to medical extension work, oil and gas, as well as general mineral field, services to state and local governments, law, business and journalism, the University has had the major if not exclusive responsibility."

Another institution expresses the same idea. "The extension services of the land-grant institution have the sole responsibility for work in the fields of agriculture and home economics and related activities."

General Extension works principally in the general cultural and professional fields, including among the latter those of medicine, education, engineering, law, and business administration." Another institution reports limited formal cooperation. Another institution expresses the non-competitive nature of its relationship which resulted from "the division of the field by population areas and subject matter."

Two other institutions mentioned the "border-line" areas where the two groups have cooperated freely to get the job done. Another institution pointed out, "Duties and responsibilities are separated, but no difficulty would be experienced in collaborating or cooperating where such joint effort was feasible or required." One institution reported cooperation in determining teaching procedures and standards.

One institution raised the pertinent question about long-range cooperative planning -- "Relationships are splendid, however, there has never been any continuous cooperative long-range educational projects or services worked out between the two divisions. We frequently work together in conducting spot programs and services to take care of immediate needs."

## Finance

Five institutions reported cooperative arrangements for paying salaries of people employed on joint projects such as: The salary of the director of theatre is split three ways; one-fourth Cooperative

Extension Service, one-fourth Law School, and one-half General Extension. Cooperative Extension contributes \$900 annually to travel budget of the Extension Department of Music. Professor of Extension Law financed cooperatively by the Law School, General Extension and College of Agriculture.

The salary of the head of Visual Instruction Department is divided evenly between General Extension and Cooperative Extension Service. For General Extension he serves as head of Film Library in charge of educational programs for use of films generally, and for Cooperative Extension Service he is extension specialist in films. He works with county agents and home demonstration agents.

Rural Sociology has provided a one-fourth-time teaching assistant to the Rural Writers Program. Cooperative Extension Service funds are used to pay expenses for speakers and resource people from General Extension. Some work has been done on landscaping, flowers, and vegetables. General Extension Center is responsible for the organization of the program. Cooperative Extension Service furnished the personnel and is reimbursed for travel and a portion of the salary cost of such personnel. One institution reports cooperating in setting of fees.

## Personnel

Historically in one state, General Extension leadership has been selected from Cooperative Extension Service, which may be one factor contributing to the informal person-to-person cooperation which exists between some of the personnel of the two Services. In exchange of personnel, many institutions reported instances wherein personnel from one Service was used for projects conducted by the other.

This exchange of personnel was mentioned on such projects as: Extension Schools for Town and County Superintendent of Highways, County Treasurers, County Clerks, Rural Bankers, Community Recreation Workshops, Community Development, 4H Club group camps, and Leadership conferences, and in such areas as audio-visual service, specialists in industrial management, speech, and psychology.

## Staff Conferences

Two institutions reported joint staff conferences with a comment, such as, "The College of Agriculture, the Department of Home Economics and General Extension personnel confer frequently concerning how General Extension can meet some of the needs as experienced by agriculture and home economics."

## Representation on Councils and Committees

Seven institutions reported joint representation on various councils and committees as one effective means of bringing about a better understanding that may lead to more cooperation.

Some reported that a Cooperative Extension Service member serves on the Advisory Council of General Extension, and the dean of General Extension serves as a member of the College of Agriculture, and attributed their good relationship to this kind of joint participation on boards and committees which has provided opportunities for frequent exchange of ideas.

Both services reported cooperation in the work of the Council on Adult Education and in the Council of the Higher Regents.

#### Facilities

Five institutions reported the following ways in which facilities were shared: In regional centers and/or on campus where such facilities are available, they are shared. The Cooperative Extension Service has been making some use of facilities at General Extension centers and "it seems advisable that this activity be stepped up as much as possible."

County agents have extended the use of their offices and farm assembly rooms for extension classes and conferences; on campus, joint planning in housing groups; "continuing education service employs a coordinator who schedules space and assists in all of the details incidental to arranging agricultural conferences, program printing, publicizing, registration, hosting, reporting, etc."

One institution offered pre-engineering courses and used facilities of the other institution. (Services at separate institutions). One institution reported that the sponsoring jointly of an extension center is now under consideration. (Extension Services at separate institution)

#### Scheduling Events

In scheduling events, one institution reported, "From time to time the University Extension Service and the Cooperative Extension Service join in scheduling various events."

#### Publicity

"The Cooperative Extension Service makes suggestions concerning needs that General Extension can supply. In fact, several of the offerings scheduled for General Extension have been arranged through the suggestions of the Cooperative Extension Service leadership." "The Cooperative Extension Service makes use of its state-wide organization in the promotion of General Extension extra-mural programs of interest to rural people."

#### Equipment

General Extension duplicating services supplement the operations of the Agriculture Bulletin

Service. The Cooperative Extension Service has contributed several items of equipment for the Audio-Visual Center.

#### Informal Cooperation --Person-to-Person Basis

Five institutions reported that most of their cooperative relations have been on a person-to-person basis rather than on a top-policy level. This kind of cooperation is going on "through an informal organization of extension directors where plans are discussed with consequent elimination of most duplication," as well as on many other staff levels where individuals both services have seen the value of cooperation in meeting the needs of people.

#### Materials and Prepared Programs

Publications: three institutions reported exchange of publications. "Close relationship between personnel of the two services, although located at separate institutions, through the exchange of information and common areas of interest." "Home demonstration agents freely use General Extension materials, especially those of the Family Life Institute."

One institution reported co-authorship and/or review of publication by the Cooperative Extension Service and the resident home economics staff. No one from General Extension mentioned the use of Agriculture publications in their work. It is obvious from an informal questioning of a few people that they are used.

Exhibits: one institution mentioned exhibits as one medium of cooperation. Both Services exhibit at the State Fair and at the State Education Association Convention.

Audio-Visual Aids: ten institutions reported some form of cooperation between the two Services in the area of Audio-Visual Aids. (One institution reported this as the only area of cooperation) This cooperation included: (1) joint use of the service, films, recordings, etc.; (2) joint financing of the service (as reported above under Finance); (3) teaching aids provided by Cooperative Extension, and, (4) help in technical problems of production are given by General Extension.

According to one institution, "The Audio-Visual Center which is administered by General Extension, actually is a multi-purpose unit which serves the interest of residence teaching, Cooperative Extension Service, and General Extension. The Cooperative Extension Service is officially the depository for certain USDA films."

Another institution reported, "One person, part-time from the Cooperative Extension Service, works in the Audio-Visual Aids Center which is administered by General Extension. He consults frequently with

members of the center's staff because of their more specialized training in the utilization of teaching materials. Similarly, members of the Audio-Visual Center staff act as consultants to members of the Cooperative Extension Service staff where technical problems of production are involved."

#### Television and Radio

Six institutions reported cooperation between the two Services in the development of their television and radio programs. This cooperation includes: (1) functional arrangements in the production of films for use in TV; (2) pooling of equipment, personnel, finances (cooperative extension pays the salary of the director of farm programs and his secretary, although Radio Program Service is under General Extension); (3) development of a state-wide educational television service..."While this project (educational TV) involves the entire facilities of both institutions and could accurately be said to represent cooperation only between the extension services, nevertheless, the extension organizations in most cases take the lead in these activities which normally have expression as extended services;" (4) joint production of radio and TV programs such as "morning chapel, classroom broadcasts, School of the Air, music, art, drama, and university events."

#### Referral Service and Speakers

Four institutions reported a reciprocal referral service. This includes inquiries pertaining to the agricultural economy, such as establishing turf on a playground or athletic field in an urban area; courses and institutes conducted by General Extension of interest to rural people; credit courses; speakers, etc.

Speakers: "Representative of both services appear on community group programs." "Resident faculty in the College of Home Economics are speakers at Cooperative Extension meetings." General Extension has supplied speakers for Farm and Home Program, Feed Dealers Institutes.

#### Courses

Credit Courses: six institutions reported cooperation in the credit-course area. One institution reported that the Services work together in the development of new courses to meet the requests of both rural and urban people. Three other institutions reported the following: "Staff members from Agriculture and Home Economics teach regular university courses in some of the rural and urban communities throughout the state. If General Extension had additional money, this type of activity could be expanded. For years we have had

more requests for these courses than we have been able to furnish."

"In all appropriate programs and activities, agriculture professors are used as resource personnel by General Extension. For example, in a special class program for nurses, bacteriology is taught by the Department of Agricultural Bacteriology for an appropriate fee." "Courses are sometimes offered with instruction being provided by the two institutions and with students being permitted to enroll in either institution for credit."

"Cooperative summer teaching-training programs are carried on by both institutions." "Occasionally, a formal course in Agriculture or Home Economics is conducted by the University Extension Division." "Every effort is made to avoid offering extension classes for teachers in the same community by both institutions."

Non-Credit Courses: one institution reported a non-credit milk inspection course for urban health inspectors under General Extension with help from Cooperative Extension Service personnel. In another institution, "General Extension cooperates in setting up off-campus credit and non-credit courses in agriculture." "The courses where we cooperate are for the further development of the field staff of the Cooperative Extension Service and for representatives of other state or federal agencies concerned with agriculture."

#### Correspondence Courses

One institution reported that correspondence courses given by General Extension were used by both rural and urban people. Another institution reported that General Extension is responsible for this service, including the School of Home Economics, as well as all courses in agriculture offered by the United States Armed Forces Institute.

#### Organized Programs

Short Courses: In one institution short courses in agriculture are cooperatively sponsored and a fee is charged. General Extension undertakes primary responsibility for the mechanics of administration, including publicity, local facilities arrangements, registration and information to students, financial responsibility, publication and distribution of syllabus materials, and evaluation.

The College of Agriculture undertakes academic responsibility, including the selection of faculty, instruction and its supervision, while Cooperative Extension Service's responsibility includes the diagnosing of needs and follow-up instruction and local assistance by county agents in the publicizing of these short courses. Another institution reports that personnel of all colleges and universities (in the state) work together on short courses and conferences.

Conferences, Institutes, Workshops, Forums: Fifteen institutions reported some form of cooperation between the two Services in conducting conferences, institutes,



workshops, and forums such as Marriage and Family Life Institute, with General Extension; Home and Family Life; Homemaking; Child Development and Parent Education; Gerontology; 4H Club Week; State Home Demonstration Council Meeting, and other similar functions where farm people come to the campus; Annual Adult Education Conference.

Adult Education Workshops; School Administrators Workshop (student may apply the credit at any institution of higher learning); Governor's Conferences on Better Education; Ice Cream Makers; Editors of daily and weekly newspapers; Community recreation; Arranging for Scholarships; Industrial and Labor Relations (General Extension has utilized some Agriculture and Home Economics teachers); turf grass interests; Forums on Farm Policy; Wild Life and Range Management Programs, with both Services sharing responsibility.

#### Areas of Content

Five institutions reported cooperation in some phase of community, regional or state development plans. "We have had fine cooperation in the Community Development Program." "It seems desirable, first, that each operate in its own field and avoid duplicating services which the other is prepared to render. This should mean, second, that each should feel free to call upon the other for assistance which it is peculiarly adapted to give. An excellent example is in the field of community organization and leadership training. This is done very well by the Cooperative Extension Service and demands are being made on General Extension to get into the field."

Advisory service to community groups: When a request for assistance comes to General Extension, the county agent or some other representative of the Cooperative Extension Service is notified if there seems to be a common interest or concern. In one state, both institutions (Land-Grant and State University) co-sponsor the bureau of Community Services.

"In a regional development program, two county agents have assumed county leadership in the activities of the organization. County agents in all of the counties concerned have been consulted and have aided materially in local planning; faculty members from the campus have served as consultants and speakers on several programs." "The two Services have definitely cooperated in a study of the human and natural resources of our state which has resulted in planning for more efficient development of industry and agriculture."

Child Development and Parent Education: One institution reported that the two Services (although in separate institutions) work together in promoting a state-wide program in child development and parent education.

Health: Three institutions reported cooperative work in the field of health on such projects as an annual rural health conference, helping to promote programs of health service through the Bureaus of Dental Hygiene, Maternal and Infant Hygiene, and Services for Crippled Children. Both services, as reported by one institution, participate on boards and committees such as a Council on Health and Medical Care.

Homemaking: One institution reported a Home Economist on the General Extension staff to work on programs for women, both rural and urban.

Recreation: One institution reported leadership training work in recreation developed preponderately by Cooperative Extension Service workers.

Art: Three institutions reported cooperative projects in the field of art. (1) "General Extension is responsible for the art portion of the Farm and Home Week Program;" (2) "Framed pictures are made available to farm homes through the home demonstration agent and General Extension jointly;" (3) the principal channel for promoting participation of rural amateur artists is through home demonstration agents, as is the scheduling of the traveling art exhibit."

One institution reported staff assistance to the Cooperative Extension Service through the use of specialists in speech.

One institution reported staff assistance to the Cooperative Extension Service through use of specialists in psychology; another reported staff assistance to the Cooperative Extension Service through use of specialists in industrial management. Two institutions reported that the two services have been working together in the field of international relations.

Legislative: One institution reported working together in the matter of legislation.

Research: One institution reported cooperation in this area. A consumer research project was administered jointly by the Department of Home Economics, General Extension, and the residence Department of Economics.

In spite of the wide range of cooperative activities and methods here summarized from the questionnaires, the way in which the question was answered indicates that we are far from the knowledge of the extent of cooperation which is taking place.

# Types of Cooperation Existing Between the Cooperative Extension Services and General Extension

		Number of Comments			
		A*	B*	C*	Total
I	Administrative				
1.	Policy	4	5	3	12
2.	Finance	3	2		5
3.	Personnel				
A.	Exchange of personnel	1	3		4
B.	Staff Conferences	2			2
C.	Representation on Councils and Committees	3	1	3	7
4.	Facilities	3	1	1	5
A.	Scheduling events			1	1
B.	Publicity	1			1
5.	Equipment	2			2
II	Informal Cooperation - Person-to-Person Bases	4		1	5
III	Materials and Prepared Programs				
1.	Publications			3	3
2.	Exhibits			1	1
3.	Audio Visual	4	5	1	10
4.	Television and Radio	3		3	6
IV	Referral Service and Speakers				
1.	Referral Service	1	1	2	4
2.	Speakers	1			1
V	Courses				
1.	Credit Courses	3		3	6
2.	Non-Credit Courses	1			1
VI	Correspondence	1		1	2
VII	Organized Programs				
1.	Short Courses	1	1	1	3
2.	Conferences, Institutes, Workshops, Forums	2	5		7
VIII	Areas of Content				
1.	Child Development and Parent Education			1	1
2.	Health			3	3
3.	Homemaking		**1		1
4.	Recreation	1			1
5.	Art	1	2		3
6.	Speech	1			1
7.	Psychology	1			1
8.	Industrial Management	1			1
9.	International Programs			2	2
IX	Legislative			1	1
X	Research	1			1

\* A - State College and University  
 B - State College  
 C - University

\*\* - In a state where both services are in one institution but there is also a state University

What are the Problems Involved in Cooperation Between  
The Cooperative Extension Services and General  
Extension? Note Especially the Problems Created  
by the Different Methods of Financing

The above question has two aspects, each actually a separate question. The first, a more general one will be treated first in the following summary.

While the impact of problems of cooperation are found to be affected by whether or not the two Services are on the same campus, nevertheless a careful analysis revealed that many of the types of problems received come both from states in which the two Services are on the same campus, and from states in which they are on different campuses.

This question is therefore presented with emphasis upon the types of problems raised rather than primarily in relation to the source of the questionnaire expressing the problem. A wide variety of causes for problems in cooperation are brought out. Many state, however, that there are no problems.

#### Philosophy and Practices

Replies from two institutions where both services are located on the same campus stressed differences in philosophy and practice as fundamental difficulties in cooperative activities.

"The fundamental differences seem to be in the philosophy of each which is derived from necessity." "With practices so opposite, it is difficult to inter-mix activities."

#### Administrative Practices

Difficulties stemming from administrative practices were stressed by respondents from all three types of campuses. These difficulties include differences in policy, structure, facilities, personnel, geographic areas, persons served, subject matter and methodology of teaching. Some responses indicated that the very separateness of the services and the preoccupation of the personnel of each with their own problems and areas of work, kept them basically apart.

Policy differences were stressed by two State Colleges. One stated, "Difference in basic policy stemming from type of institution. Difference in financial setup causing uneven teacher promotion, expenditures on classes, and home study courses." Another stated, "Some classes cannot be mutually approved since they are not offered on both campuses in the regular curriculum."

Structure differences were stressed by replies from the three kinds of campuses and included a

variety of approaches. One mentioned: "The historic dichotomy between the two Services," another, "lack of an official or national pattern of cooperation." One stated that each division was organized and developed for services directly opposite in pattern.

From a State University came the comment that there was little opportunity for cooperation. Further statements on divergences in policy were: "Absence of clean-cut lines of authority, finance, and objectives. Program people are handicapped in hammering out practical procedures." "There seems to be a notion on the part of both Continuing Education Service and Cooperative Extension Service personnel that each has certain areas of interest even though these have not been clearly spelled out in all instances."

A different kind of difficulty was expressed as a lack of stable administrative and personnel practices. From one State College campus came the complaint: "When the continuing education service prints the programs for the various special courses and conferences held on the campus, the Cooperative Extension Service frequently complains that insufficient recognition is given their service in connection with the events that are really a continuation of a program started under Cooperative Extension Service sponsorship years ago."

Facilities on one campus, which located the two groups of personnel at some distance from each other, were thought to hamper cooperation.

On one campus, personnel relationship, problems of communication, and differences in personnel policy were mentioned. "Many problems which exist are largely those of personnel relationships which would be eliminated with additional staff time devoted to discussions and planning of cooperative ventures."

Another indicated problems from a lack of understanding, communication, and joint planning procedures. One stated: "Through faulty communication, in part, there seems to be a lack of understanding of the programs and problems of the respective services. This is true especially on the part of lower echelon personnel." Included was a comment that the General Extension staff is on a more rigid schedule. One suggested staffing cooperative projects -- using staff members of one agency for the other. Discrepancies in personnel policies in the two services was a reason for difficulties in cooperation.

#### Geographic Delineations

Some stressed delineation of areas for the two services and of people served. "Cooperative Extension Service has a tendency to feel that all work in the rural



areas should be their responsibility alone. This is not true so far as the General Extension program is concerned." "General Extension has greater area to cover, but is restricted by budget."

The desire of some to duplicate services rather than to spread them to more people was brought out. "In General Extension there are the usual problems which emerge from the desire to offer the same services to the same clientele."

In one state it was reported that this problem is somewhat accentuated by some differences in standards and objectives. "Usually there is a difference in the persons who use these services, although the highly technical means of living today is closing the gap." "The somewhat different character of clientele served represent problems." "People who have dealt primarily with either rural or urban groups tend to have different evaluations of 'basic' needs of the people with whom they are working."

#### Subject Matter Areas and Methodology

The problems involved in cooperative action between the two Services are primarily in the area of non-credit courses, according to replies from several institutions.

Several factors of dissimilarity of activities insofar as techniques and subject matter were brought out. It was pointed out that the Cooperative Extension Service is organized to work closely with individuals and groups on an informal basis in subject matter fields related rather exclusively to rural farm activities, although more recently the rural non-farm groups are asking for these same services. Many times it was pointed out that the two Services cover two distinct fields. "General Extension works extensively with groups along more formal training lines in subject matter fields usually related to urban and city employed persons."

#### Separateness of the Services

Carried through a number of the replies was the idea of the basic separateness of the two Services. One commented that each Service is individually occupied with its own program. Another feels that there is a lack of interest or need in each others program. Neither Service has anywhere near reached the saturation point of its effectiveness within the fields of primary responsibility, and one comments that, "Our available resources are already committed."

While some of the institutions discussed the problem of cooperation in very considerable detail, a larger number reported that there are few or no problems of cooperation between the Services.

(It should be noted that some of the institutions making clear cut statements as to lack of problems in reference to question 9 gave some discussion of problems in other parts of the questionnaire.)

The reasons given for the statements that there are few or no problems of cooperation fall into three groups: (a) Each service has a clear understanding of the areas in which it operates; (b) Each has clearly defined objectives; and (c) Each stays within its own area. The statements that few or no problems exist are summarized in the following table.

Answers Indicating Few or No Problems in Cooperation Between the Two Extension Services	A*	B*	C*
"No problems"	6	4	1
"No special problems"	1		
"No particular problems"	2	1	
"No serious problems"	1		1
"No serious difficulty"	1		
"No problem of consequence"	1		
"None have developed "			1
"No particular problem has arisen"		1	
"None are apparent"			1
"We are not conscious at this time of any particular problem"			1
"None that I know of"		1	
"No problem to our knowledge"		1	
"Few problems exist"		1	
"We have encountered few problems, if any"			1
"No friction in 20 years"	1		
"Problems will resolve themselves by mutual understanding"	1		
"None so long as our understandings are clear"		1	
"Distinctly separate fields of operation - no problem"	2		
"Question not applicable because services are at separate institutions"		1	
"No particular area where cooperation is needed"	1		
"No problems except finance"	1		
"No problem as long as General Extension program is not expanded beyond its present scope. There will be many more problems if they continue to grow,"	1		
"At the present time there are no problems involved in cooperation. These may develop as we continue to grow, particularly if Cooperative Extension is requested to go more into urban areas,"	1		
"No problems unless the Land-Grant institution undertakes to provide services without reference to existing programs"			1

\* A - State College and University  
 B - State College  
 C - University

## PROBLEMS STEMMING FROM DIFFERENT METHODS OF FINANCING

The problems created by differences in financing were analyzed in considerable detail on many of the questionnaires. Because of major structural and source differences in the financing, the problems fall under several major headings:

### Creates a Public Relations Problem

"Because our Cooperative Extension Service program is by far the larger, and because the needs it serves are never adequately met, it will be difficult for the Office of General Extension to get the state support which it must have if important areas, such as public affairs and community organization, are to be served. In the meantime, the latter must attempt to maximize its fee income. Since the Cooperative Extension Service relies on fees to a minor extent only, a problem in public relations is created."

"There is confusion in the minds of people being served as to whether they are required to pay for services or whether the services are rendered free by the College. It is difficult to explain to people why General Extension must make a charge for all its services."

### Causes Problems at the Community Level

"The present plan of financing makes for awkward administration at the community level. It is difficult for a community to understand why certain occupational groups can receive, free of charge, splendid services from the University while the same services are denied other members in the same community."

"General Extension charges fees for persons enrolled in our offerings. In both Agricultural and Industrial Extension, little or no money is collected from those who are directly receiving the services. The communities seem to feel that if we can educate farmers free, we ought to provide some training for teachers, bus drivers, engineers, bookkeepers, clerks, and many others on a similar basis. Our present plan of financing doesn't make sense to many of the people who pay taxes to support the University."

### Produces Difficulties in Intermixing Activities

It was brought out in several questionnaires that in planning for cooperation in many joint ventures of the two Services, the problem of finance would be involved. Which service would pay for what? Specifically, questions would arise about expenditures for reimbursement of personnel salaries, travel, printing, mailing, facilities, equipment, etc.

## Introduces the Element of Competition Between the Two Services

This problem was brought up in several ways. One emphasized it in terms of difficulties in securing funds. "Insofar as funds of state origin from the University are at stake, the different methods of financing introduce some element of competition. In previous years the Board of Trustees took the position that the Cooperative Extension Service had been sufficiently well organized so that any money available from this source should be used in building up the newer service, particularly in fields where fees are difficult to obtain."

In one questionnaire, emphasis was placed on the difficulty of "selling" General Extension Service. "It is difficult for General Extension to 'sell' its services in a market where the Cooperative Extension Service distributes its services free of charge." Another questionnaire stresses the difficulties resulting from requirement of fees from one Service and not from the other.

"Since Cooperative Extension Service is furnished to consumers without cost, there is natural tendency for people to seek the services of Cooperative Extension instead of services from General Extension where fees are required to pay a part of the cost of the services. This, in my opinion, is not a serious problem as long as the General Extension program is not expanded beyond its present scope."

However, one institution sees no possibility of being competitive. "We of course, are not equipped to operate as extensively in the rural field as the Cooperative Extension Service. Because of that we cannot be competitive. However, they might improve their programs by calling upon us for assistance in areas in which we are better equipped than they to serve."

### Leads to Dissatisfaction Because of Double Standard in Personnel Policies

"The personnel in the Cooperative Extension Services feel that it is somewhat unfair for the folks in General Extension to be paid additional salary and funds over and above their regular salaries."

"Employees of the Agricultural Extension Service are engaged on a full-time basis and do not receive extra remuneration for each extra teaching assignment whereas General Extension finds it necessary to pay University teachers for all extra teaching."

"In general, the Cooperative Extension Service assignments are thought of as part of a total job. In many cases the General Extension assignment is in



addition to regular job. As an additional assignment General Extension frequently pays something in addition to the contract salary. "For example, agriculture professors are expected to give off-campus lectures as part of their regular university duties. Liberal arts professors expect added remuneration for off-campus lectures. Which policy does General Extension adopt when it 'employs' a General Extension staff member? Smith-Lever Funds cannot be put to 'classroom use', General Extension funds can."

"Problems are created through differences in policy regarding the payment of faculty or staff for off-campus services. Cooperative Extension Service employees are full-time employees on a twelve-month basis. They receive no extra compensation for extra duties. The other employees can be reimbursed for teaching off-campus courses."

#### Raises Questions about the Desirability of Offering All Cooperative Extension Free

"There has been some feeling expressed at the county level that certain types of agricultural and home economics meetings might well involve a charge. Some of the large farms, in poultry, for example, are now built up practically to the factory level, and it would seem that free service is more difficult to justify. In any case, however, it would no doubt be best for land-grant college administrative officials to face this problem and reconcile it, rather than to let the matter drift and be faced perhaps later by reconciliation from the outside."

#### Limits the Kind of General Extension Programs

The following quotations pointed out that the present methods of financing make it impossible for General Extension to pursue activities that are not self supporting.

"Since General Extension receives but small subsidies from the University (the balance is collected from fees), this almost prohibits the pursuit of any extension activity that is not able to support itself."

"General Extension, with small state appropriations, has found it necessary to support itself by fees from students. Thus, its practice is to conduct classes when financially possible."

"While our General Extension funds are not restricted on a rural-urban basis, our greatest handicap is due to limitations of budget. General Extension is broader in that it serves many occupational groups, yet the offerings are more restricted due to various requirements, including that of credit."

#### Points up Need for State and Federal Support for General Extension Activities

"The experience of Agricultural Extension has been that only through extensive public support can an informal education activity be broad enough and rich enough to serve adequately the individuals and groups with the most pressing education needs. Continued General Extension progress would seem, therefore, to hinge on the extent to which state and national governments and other agencies will find it possible to invest in extension education. This matter is coming to sharp focus in the problem of the financing of educational television, which General Extension looks upon as an intimate and essential aspect of its operations in the years ahead."

#### Legally Restricts Use of Funds

Many institutions reported the legal restrictions which prohibit the use of Cooperative Extension Service funds which come from three government levels; Federal, State, and County. However, one institution reported, "The 1914 Act itself does not limit or prescribe the scope of service. Many functions now assumed by General Extension could be legally assumed by an augmented Cooperative Extension Service."

"Cooperative Extension is responsible not only to the University, but also to County and Federal Governments. This limits the flexibility of these cooperative funds and personnel in any cooperative project."

"Cooperative Extension Service faces difficulties in expanding Federal funds outside the accepted pattern of cooperative extension activities and administration."

One institution reported, "the major problem involved in cooperation is the legislative restriction which prohibits one state institution of higher learning from paying another state institution for services rendered."

#### Other Problems

One institution stated that there are problems created by the differences in financing the educational programs, especially when participants in the respective programs do not understand when they are expected to pay for the services received, and further stated, "The Cooperative Extension Service is financed largely by appropriated public funds, and the services are free to participants."

"The Continuing Education Service is financed nominally by funds allotted by the College. A higher percentage of the total program must be on a self-

sufficient basis which necessitates the charging of registration and other fees. All conferences, workshops, and the like, held on the college campus must now be arranged through the Department of Courses and Conferences of Continuing Education Service.

"Many of these events are renewals which have been conducted for many years under the sponsorship of the Cooperative Extension Service. Included are the Annual Extension Conferences and the Annual Homemakers' Week. Formerly, arrangements could be made for facilities by the Cooperative Extension Service. Now arrangements must be made through the Continuing Education Service and a registration fee must be paid."

To What Extent Have The Field Offices Of The Cooperative Extension Services (County and Home Demonstration Agents) Been Used As "Field Offices" Of General Extension?

- A. WHAT ARE THE PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN SO USING THEM?
- B. IS IT DESIRABLE TO COORDINATE IN THE FIELD THE "TOTAL" EXTENSION SERVICES OF YOUR INSTITUTION? IF SO, HOW?

(See pages 20 to 22 for types of institutions from which the specific replies come).

**State Colleges and Universities**

From the reports, Cooperative Agricultural Extension offices are seldom used as field offices of General Extension. In only one case were they reported as extensively used by the State College and University group. In this case, "All University personnel considered the County Agent's office as their base of operation when they are in a given county. No formal arrangement, but they work that way as a matter of good procedure."

Only one Institution replied to the question concerning the extent to which they should be used. In this instance it was felt that "they very well could serve as information points particularly in serving the urban areas. General Extension information could be available there and be used by the urban agent."

As to the problems involved in using the County Cooperative Extension Services as field offices for General Extension, many were listed. It was emphasized that General Extension was called upon in a different manner in that it operates through schools and organizations and does not serve persons on an individual basis. Another limitation stated was the inadequacy of the County Cooperative Extension Service

facilities. In many cases they are located in old Court Houses where the rooms available are not now adequate. It was also indicated that a change in "memorandum of understanding" is necessary, which would involve the County Farm Bureau. In some states, differences in historical background of the programs and in the basic philosophy is a real obstacle to integration in the use of facilities.

Of the 28 institutions answering the second part of the question, 13 indicated that it was desirable to coordinate the total extension services of the institution. Of these 13, seven were institutions with state college and university on the same campus, and six were state colleges with separated state universities. One state felt that it was particularly desirable to "coordinate the determination of policies both as to field activities and methods of operation." Another state emphasized the importance of coordination because they serve, in many instances, the same people.

Thirteen institutions were in opposition to further coordination. Of these, 12 were on campuses with both services, and one was a state college with a separated state university. They disapproved of coordination because of the nature of the sponsorship of the two services and the method of financing each. Two institutions with both services on the same campus gave a neutral answer.

**State Colleges**

The replies given by the State Colleges are very similar to those given by the university group. In reply to the question, "To what extent have the field offices of the Cooperative Extension Service been used as field offices of the General Extension Service?", the most frequent reply was, "Not at all."

In ~~one~~ case it was stressed that the state agent of the Cooperative Extension Service promotes attendance at general extension groups. While this is done, no attempt has been made to use the agents office as headquarters. Again, limited facilities was given as a reason and the difficulties of keeping administrative lines straight.

There was a feeling, however, that coordination was desirable. It was stressed that after all they are part of the same institution, and that the use of common facilities brings personalities together and aids in the development of understanding.

IS IT DESIRABLE TO COORDINATE IN THE FIELD THE TOTAL "EXTENSION" SERVICES  
OF YOUR INSTITUTION? IF SO, HOW?

PART I

Replies analyzed by types of institutions and by statements on desirability of cooperation, are as mentioned, how it may be achieved, and by problems created or avoided.

Type of Institution	Those Institutions Which Considered Coordination Desirable			
	Statements on Desirability	Areas Mentioned	How it may be done and Problems	
			Method	Problems Created or Avoided
A* **B				
A	"It is desirable to coordinate the work of the two divisions, and we believe such coordination can be effectuated by ----"		"The determination of policy both as to field of activity and methods of operation, and through frequent consultation"	
A	"As an opinion, yes."			"Chief problems-personnel relationships and adequate budget."
A		"Community organization & leadership training. "This is done very well by Cooperative Extension; and demands are being made on General Extension to get into the field,"	"Call upon each other for assistance which it is peculiarly adapted to give."	
A	"Would seem desirable because of the growing problems of serving the same persons or groups. It is becoming more and more difficult to segregate the urban and rural persons, simply because there is a finer and finer line being drawn between the two."		"Greater subsidy for General Extension. Fee charged for some of the Cooperative Extension Services, particularly where the work is being given to non-farm people."	
A	"They should be coordinated to a point that one would complement the other."		"Better understanding of programs, policies and procedures."	
A	One state reports that the procedure used has worked out satisfactorily.		"Cooperative Extension Service handles virtually all of the field activities."	
A	"Some coordination is desirable."		"Can be obtained through coordination at the top administrative level of the two organizations."	
B	"Desirable to a certain degree"		"Keeping mutually informed on programs in progress"	"This objective is fairly well accomplished at present."



Type of Institution	Those Institutions Which Considered Coordination Desirable			
	Statements on Desirability	Areas Mentioned	How it may be done and Problems	
			Method	Problems Created or Avoided
*A **B				
B	"Coordination of programs in the field would appear to be desirable. Educational programs should meet the needs of people in the communities in which they live."		"If community needs were the accepted basis for planning Extension programs, then a good deal of coordination could be achieved. This type of coordination is of greater potential benefit than mere administrative coordination."	"Bad public relations if two programs from the same institution are overlapping or are at cross purposes."
B	"Very desirable."		"Close working relationships between college and county staff."	"Prevents complications or misunderstandings as to the type of program and courses suitable for the group requesting assistance."
B	"Coordination of the Extension programs are desirable. Both Services are more valuable as they can be used more completely."		"A close relationship between the county agent and the General Extension Division field representative can provide clearing houses in the field for questions which deal with the total university."	"Cooperation which tends to avoid wasteful duplication is always desirable."
B	"In our opinion this is quite desirable and in certain of the smaller communities shared offices are highly desirable."		"Keep each other informed of the services offered. Not nearly enough of this being done."	
B	"Yes."		"-as long as administrative lines are kept straight."	"Undue determination by any one party could be undesirable and would create friction."

\* - Institutions with State College and University on same campus.  
 \*\* - Institutions with State College only.

## PART II

Replies analyzed by type of institution and by statements of undesirability of cooperation, with reasons or problems involved.

Type of Institution		Those Institutions which Considered Coordination Undesirable	
*A	**B	Statement of Undesirability	Reasons or Problems Involved
A		"It appears undesirable to coordinate in the field the total Extension Services of our institution."	"...Until or unless the sponsorship and method of financing are changed."
A		"It is felt that the total "Extension efforts" of the University are being well coordinated now."	"Further coordination might tend to confuse the situation and break down the identity of the two groups."
A		"Probably inadvisable."	"Varying service phases of the two programs."
A		"Matter of opinion, but I doubt it."	
A		"Under normal conditions, it would seem that those in charge of both Services can coordinate the work at headquarters."	"In a small state the necessity of coordinating in the field, although desirable, is not so great as it may be in a large state."
A		"Not much if at all."	
A		"Until Extension is coordinated at home base, it would be foolhardy to even attempt to coordinate in the outfield on anything approaching a formal basis."	"Since it is highly unlikely that Cooperative Extension and General Extension will ever be completely integrated on the mother campus, the solution of field coordination would seem to be in the area of informal cooperation, drawing its impetus, inspiration, and ground rules from campus cooperation."
A		"It would be undesirable."	
A			"There is more mutual interest on the part of schools and other agencies at the local level which are more effective in getting General Extension before the people. Actually, there are two or three cases where county Extension agents have stimulated activities that led to development of General Extension projects in the community."
A		"Coordination in the field appears at the moment to be of doubtful value and possibly undesirable in the sense of total coordination of Extension activities."	"The work involved is so different...it seems there might be no resultant saving in staff. Whatever was saved in the field staff-wise might be more than used up by additional staff on the campus to provide for the necessary coordination. It is not apparent that the work could be continued without two staffs because of the cited differences in programs."
A		"See no need for coordination."	"The two fields are quite different."
A		"I do not think so."	
B		"No, not at the present time."	

There were also the following two neutral answers, both of which were from institutions with the State College and University on the same campus:

"This is a subject to which I would have to devote considerable thought before venturing a comment"; and, "Possibility should be considered."

- \* - Institutions with State College and University
- \*\* - Institutions with State College only.

What Areas of Cooperation Between the Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension Appear Desirable?

The response to this question, as to the question concerning the types of cooperation which currently exist between the two Services, fall into two groups;

(1) Those who believe that the future will demand more cooperation, and that such cooperation is desirable. The material from this group falls into categories similar to those brought out in the question on current cooperation between the two services, hence, the material dealing with this group of replies will be handled in a similar manner;

(2) Those who feel that little or no cooperation between the Services is needed or is desirable.

The opinions of those from this latter group not desiring nor feeling the need for further cooperation follow:

problems in helping to meet peoples' needs.

Many specific areas of problems were mentioned, such as administrative, policy, finance, personnel, communication, representation on councils and committees, facilities, informal cooperation, materials and prepared program referral service, interpreting each others' services, need for improving teaching methods, leadership training, community organization, evaluation, courses, correspondence, short courses, institutes, cultural programs, community development and other areas.

The Present and Future Needs for Cooperation

"Assuming that in the future there may be an expansion of work in urban areas which would naturally fall in the field of responsibility of the College of Agriculture and more specifically the responsibility of the Cooperative Extension Service, it would automatically follow that there should be cooperation existing between the two extension divisions of the University."

One land-grant institution with both services raises the

Comments	<u>Types of Institutions</u>		
	State College & University A	State College B	University C
"None at present"	1		
"None at present, we cooperate as much as either institution can conceive"			1
"Never encountered the need"			1
"Our fields of operation appear distinctly separate"	1		
"Our present level of cooperation appears to be sufficient and adequate"	1		
"If funds are available for cooperative projects, plans can usually be worked out"	1		
"Other than mentioned previously we see no particular need for cooperation in any areas. We have pleasant relations, but no special cooperation"	1		
"At present, the areas of cooperation between the two services are very few."	1		

Among those who see present and future need for cooperation between the two services, and who believe that the development of cooperation is desirable, some (1) gave reasons for present or future needs; (2) expressed goals; (3) saw the interrelatedness of the two Services; (4) recognized the needs for working in overlapping geographic areas and the problems involved; (5) expressed the willingness and need to cooperate; and (6) showed an appreciation for each others' contribution and

questions: "It remains to be seen whether the field staff of the Cooperative Extension Service will begin to identify needs which ought to be dealt with by the office of General Extension, and whether County Extension Councils will begin to consider such needs in developing their extension program on the county basis."

## Goals

Some expressed the goals of cooperation and the problems of defining them as follows:

"It is almost impossible to single out any most important area of future cooperation between University Extension and College Extension at A. & M. Much could be said for some effort to cooperatively develop objectives which would lead away from competitive duplication and toward an emphasis on an extension of the dominant historical functions of the two institutions."

Another states the desirability of sitting down together and talking over plans and possibilities of combining activities, pooling services, still another states: "The best safeguard for a long range plan seems to be to work and plan together to meet the problems as they come."

"Close relationship is the best answer. Knowing what each department is doing by being prepared to consult and act jointly wherever the need arises or opportunity affords." One institution points up the ultimate objective of both Services - "service to all the people." While another says, "In the long run all extension work should be aimed toward the establishment of better understanding of all people regardless of occupation, residence, color, age or station of life." Still another says, "Services have been supplied as a part of the regular duties of the persons involved and in the spirit of service to the college as a whole."

## The Interrelatedness of the Two Services

Two institutions expressed clearly the inter-relatedness of the Services: "The so-called farm problem will not be solved or understood until more and more people know that Agricultural Economics not only affect the farmer, but the city dweller as well. The Cooperative Extension Service needs to take more of its information to urban dwellers in order to better solve the problems of the rural people. General Extension in turn needs to aid in the upgrading of the understanding of the rural people in matters of general education."

"The fact that conditions of modern life have greatly diminished differences in standards of living between rural and urban groups. For this reason, state universities and land-grant colleges should cooperate in all areas of work in their extension programs. Such cooperation is essential if large segments of the total state population are to be served in an economical and efficient manner."

Another, a land-grant institution with no General Extension, sees no inter-relatedness and answers the question of cooperation as follows:

"The question is not applicable since the two services are located at different institutions."

In order to bring about better communication, "joint conferences in which there would be an exchange as to the needs of people in each group involved were suggested. This would aid each in trying to do his job better." "A better understanding by the personnel of each service of the work, objectives, and available services of each is needed."

## Overlapping Areas

The problems which were analyzed in relation to overlapping areas were brought out as follows:

"Those areas of overlapping jurisdiction should be carefully cataloged and cooperation sought in everything that is done in them." "Certainly there should be more cooperation in the planning and carrying out of meetings that fall in the 'overlapping' area of responsibilities. It would seem desirable to expand the areas of cooperation between the two Services except in those areas dealing with community and school development in rural areas and in small farms."

Others thought of community development as falling in the area which overlaps and requires the cooperation of both services. Nine institutions in the University group expressed some of the needs as: (1) clarification of each others responsibilities, (2) a division of labor, and, (3) recognition of each other competencies.

"There is a need to determine the respective and proper areas of responsibility of the two institutions." "Separation of functions into: Agricultural Extension and all to be done by land-grant college and General Extension, all to be managed by the university."

"The Extension Service in our state would probably be more effective if one institution was responsible for all Agricultural Extension and one institution responsible for all General Extension." "The desirability of dividing responsibility between the two organizations insofar as technical programs in agriculture and home economics are concerned. For example, one might work with primary producers; the other with secondary users, such as processors."

"Each institution has recognized competencies in certain specialized fields and recognition of these factors needs to be given. As programs expand this becomes increasingly important in order to avoid needless duplication." "Whether a principle can be found for dividing responsibility in the public policy field remains to be seen."

"In the area where both schools jointly offer better programs than could either separately, cooperation would be evidenced unquestionably. In areas where either



institution could offer the course, the demand of the group wanting the program probably would be the determiner."

Two universities reported clearly defined areas of operation. "Since the State College operates in the area of Agricultural Extension and not in the area of General Extension, and we just the opposite, we have never encountered the need for cooperative efforts." "We feel that there is a clear and good understanding as to the major responsibilities in extension work of the two institutions. From this university's point of view, at least, we are happy over the relationship"

#### The Willingness and Need to Cooperate

Some believe that both the need and the willingness to cooperate go hand in hand.

"Where opportunities for cooperation have presented themselves, the units concerned have taken advantage of them." "If General Extension is able to expand its program, Cooperative Extension Service personnel would encourage participation and counsel with General Extension on the needs for organized institutes in rural areas." "Cooperative Extension Service personnel should be able to assist General Extension groups in a specialized way by presenting either subject matter or program aids to the extent of their ability in a special field and limited by their available time. (Legal complications could be an impediment.)"

One university reported "both services would like to cooperate in order to cover subject matters for which the land-grant college lacks personnel."

#### Appreciation for Each Others Contribution and Problems

Both the need for an existence of appreciation and recognition of the special values of each of the services were stated:

"Each institution has recognized competencies in certain specialized fields and recognition of these factors need to be given as programs expand. This becomes increasingly important in order to avoid needless duplication." "Our feeling is that the Cooperative Extension Service of our land-grant institution is well organized and is most effective, and it has rendered and is rendering a most valuable service not only to the farmers and their wives and agriculture generally, but indirectly to the people of the State as a whole."

"We (General Extension) need to copy from the Cooperative Extension Service in bringing more of our offerings on a level that will profit a larger number of adults."

Cooperative Extension Service expressed appreciation of the problems General Extension faces in financing its program.

#### SPECIFIC AREAS OF PROBLEMS MENTIONED

##### Administrative

A variety of structural factors in cooperation and areas for cooperation were suggested.

One institution reported a deep awareness of the difficulties encountered in cooperation and points up the need for support from top administration of both institutions of higher learning. It stated, "to evolve a cooperative pattern involves real problem because it is difficult, if not impossible, to merge particular educational programs without considerable degree of mutual understanding and support from top administration of both institutions."

##### Policy

The importance of policy determination for development of cooperative programs was emphatically stated. Cooperation at the policy-making level was expressed as a great need by institutions that have both Services on the campus. "It is when policies are determined that cooperative endeavors can best be assured."

"The areas of cooperation between the Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension should be clearly defined in a policy statement developed by the individual institutions." "Not since 1915 has the Board of Regents formally announced the roles of its two extension units. Out of the present Extension Committee might well come a new expression which would serve to orient all tacital efforts at cooperation. Such a memorandum of agreement is a minimum step toward collaboration."

##### Finance

Although the problem of finance was thoroughly discussed in the other parts of the questionnaire, one institution makes a proposal for consideration: "If Agricultural Extension will, wherever possible, underwrite a share of the cost of General Extension programs in rural areas, the self-support pressure on General Extension is thereby considerably relieved."

Another institution again raises the question of confusion which results from the charging of fees. However, in spite of the different methods of financing, some institutions envisioned a closer working relationship in the future.

A series of varied proposals of an administrative and informal kind were made as regards personnel joint appointments. One university's experience indicates that cooperation comes when program directors owe formal allegiance both to General Extension and Agricultural Extension." The pattern already used for one project might well be extended to many other departments and bureaus in the judgment of this university.

According to several institutions, if the areas of cooperation are to be worked out, the following recom-

mendations were reported:

- (1) "Sharing personnel which would supplement each other's competencies."
- (2) "Both services would like to cooperate in order to cover subject matter from which the Land-Grant college lacks personnel."
- (3) "Cooperative Extension personnel should be able to assist General Extension groups in a specialized way by presenting either subject matter or program aids to the extent of their ability in a special field and limited by their available time."
- (4) "We, of course, are not equipped to operate as extensively in the rural field as the Cooperative Extension Service. Because of that, we cannot be competitive. However, they might improve their programs by calling upon us for assistance in areas in which we are better equipped than they."
- (5) "Through General Extension, the staff of the University in these fields could be encouraged to participate in this effort and the Cooperative Extension Service could arrange for informal meetings with interested urban and rural groups."
- (6) "It was considered desirable to get the cooperation of county agents with University Extension activities, such as classes, use of faculty lecturers, etc. Use of expert consultants in certain areas interchanging faculties from each school, on conferences, institutes, etc., in farm program."
- (7) "Closer contacts are needed between the staff of the University Extension Service and the staff of both the Cooperative Extension Service and the General Extension."

One institution states: "We do make use of specialists and county agents when possible," while another suggests making use of specialists and county agents when possible. One institute states: "We do make use of specialists and county agents when possible." While another suggests making use of them.

#### Communication

Several institutions suggested the need for keeping informed as to each others progress and programs. "Our present close relationship is the best answer to this question of cooperation. By knowing what each department is doing, we have been able to avoid conflicts in our programs, and we are prepared to consult and act jointly wherever the need arises or opportunity affords."

"There are areas of cooperation between Cooperative Extension that would seem desirable immediately, such as a better understanding by the personnel of each Service of the work, objectives, and available services of each."

"We see no difficulty in this matter of cooperation provided those in charge sit down frequently and consult with each other and work out programs that are mutually suitable. Lines of communication between the Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension must be kept open. We must keep each other informed of our plans relative to serving the people who make the university possible. We know each other, we understand each other, and therefore our cooperation in this university has been and is of the best."

"Exchange as to the needs of the people in each group involved for complete understanding at all times. Better communication and joint conferences would aid each in trying to do the job better." "Through personal conferences and consultation, better cooperation can be maintained. It should be emphasized, however, that there has been no difficulty with problems of any serious nature as far as cooperation between the Extension Services is concerned at our university."

#### Representation on Councils and Committees

"The fine cooperation between the Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension would be made even better if it were possible for our Agricultural Extension people to sit as members of the Extension Council of the Higher Regents. The line between rural and urban is becoming less definitive through the years, and consequently, the chances for cooperation are increasing. The round table discussions which occur during the Council meetings would provide an excellent opportunity for the exchange of ideas and information in this area. At present, all other kinds of extension are represented in this State Council, and I hope that the Cooperative Extension Service may be given an opportunity to join us in the future."

One institution reported, "The General Extension Committee is made up of representatives from the Cooperative Extension Service, Industrial Extension, and General Extension. This arrangement seems to be particularly desirable since all three branches of extension can work and plan the total service. The best safeguard for a long range plan seems to be work and plan together, and to meet the problems as they come."

Another institution reported; "The pattern of the inter-disciplinary committee is well established and might well be the means for bringing together Agri-

cultural and General Extension administration on at least a semi-formal basis."

### Facilities

Several suggestions for helping to solve the facilities' problem were given:

1. Establishing a Continuation Center. "In the near future, General Extension will have a building adjacent to the Cooperative Extension Service and the physical aspects will be greatly improved." "In the development of a continuation center by General Extension, the opportunities for institutes and conferences should be cooperatively explored."
2. Sharing of Facilities. "We believe that our groups of agricultural leaders and home demonstration workers should have access to much of the faculties and talent provided in General Extension of the University and other institutions." (From a land-grant institution with no General Extension Service) "Areas of cooperation which appear desirable between Cooperative Extension and General Extension would appear to be those suggested, i.e., exploring the possibilities of sharing the facilities, and keeping informed as to each other's progress and program."
3. Locating Extension Units Side by Side. "Where possible, appropriate extension units might well be located side by side. By living and working together, extension people may develop a co-cooperative philosophy and method which can seldom successfully be "legislated" into existence." "Use of those facilities which one institution does have by the other on a co-operative basis (audio-visual bureau, for instance.)" "In the years since the school was placed under the University proper, a handicap has been the distance which separates the two units. In the near future, General Extension will have a building adjacent to the Cooperative Extension Service and physical aspects will be greatly improved."

### Importance of Informal Cooperation

One institution reported: "Because of the different methods of financing, programming can become effective only through informal cooperation and joint planning, with whatever cooperation is indicated from time to time."

### Materials and Prepared Programs

A few suggestions of ways in which materials and prepared programs which lend themselves to a cooperative approach were mentioned. These included publications, audio-visual aids, television, etc.

"In the joint sponsorship of campus conferences and off-campus courses, in making available to the people practical publications, and in developing programs of community service for rural and urban use, opportunities for cooperation are seen." "Cooperation in the area of film service, plus general good will and a readiness to cooperate informally are needed." "Various aspects of adult education in which each institution is prepared to make a special contribution especially through the medium of television are desirable areas of cooperation between the Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension."

### Referral Service

The development of a cooperative referral service was among the suggestions. "A cross referral of inquiries, potential areas of service, and groups desiring or needing services." "An easily operated channel which will permit directing inquiries to the proper division both on the main campus and with respect to the field offices."

### Interpreting Each Other's Services

"A willingness in both divisions to become familiar with the other's program and to promote it where it can be done effectively." "A greater effort on the part of the personnel of each division to see that the people they serve are made aware of the services of the other division which might be of help to them." "The use of both extension divisions to announce activities of the other."

"It appears to us that the many meetings and group conferences arranged by Cooperative Extension Service workers could well consider some of the programs offered by General Extension. Some of these areas would include cultural subject matter, international understanding, cost of government studies, taxation, geology, and resources studies which have been made by the university."

"County agents could receive all literature advertising offerings by General Extension and could bring them to the attention of their people. In some cases, the county agent might find a group interested in a class that could be conducted in the rural cooperative school or grange hall. He would have to be the means of communication, informing the University of the wishes and desires of the rural people."

### The Need for Improving Teaching Methods of Both Services

"Both agencies are committed without reservation to promotion of understanding and use of the methods of education. Effective interpretation of the meaning and advantages of these methods is a mutual problem with which each should assist the other in every way possible at all times."

"General Extension needs to use more of the methods so successfully developed by the Cooperative Extension

Services in discharging its educational obligations in the cities. These include the techniques of meetings and demonstrations, particularly. The difficulty, of course, is that these methods do not lend themselves well to charging tuition fees so that the self-support responsibilities of General Extension are not compatible to the extensive use of them."

"Similarly, we think a great deal more use of General Extension methods could effectively be brought to bear in the rural areas. For example, conferences, demonstrations, and field days often stimulate farmers and rural homemakers to want to know more about a subject. For these people to become intensely interested, a follow-up class going deeper into the subject would be very helpful and would supply another dimension to their education."

"In the program planning area, if a representative of General Extension were to meet with the program planning groups of agricultural extension and vice versa, a good deal better mutual understanding and service would result."

"We (General Extension) need to copy from the Cooperative Extension Service in offering more of our offerings on a level that will profit a larger number of adults."

Leadership Training for both services was stated as a possible area of cooperation by one institution.

Evaluation of Extension programs was mentioned by one institution as another possible area of cooperation between the two services.

#### Courses

One institution reported that off-campus courses carried on by General Extension, in fields not covered by the Cooperative Extension Service, lend themselves to a cooperative venture, but sounded a note of warning that "care should be taken to see that the agent is not burdened with too much work and responsibility as a result of such cooperation."

It appears that the Cooperative Extension Service and the Continuing Education Service can operate effectively in the joint sponsorship of campus conferences and off-campus courses; in making available to the people practical publications, and in developing programs of community service for rural and urban use.

#### Correspondence

"In the field of correspondence and off-campus instruction, some cooperation is possible in the county, and the state staff could serve in the advisory capacity."

#### Short Courses

One institution reported that many short courses

could be carried on cooperatively.

#### Institutes

One institution sees many possibilities for cooperation between the two services in conducting on-campus institutes for various state groups.

#### Cultural Programs

Many institutions reported that the cultural as well as the social and economic areas, should become a cooperative venture in serving both rural people and urban people. In the cultural aspects were included music, art, drama, crafts.

"These two divisions of the university could well work together in meeting cultural and social needs for both urban and rural people. Through General Extension, the staff of the university in these fields could be encouraged to participate in this effort, and the Cooperative Extension Service could arrange for informal meetings with interested urban and rural groups."

"In both home demonstration and 4H Club work it would appear that there is quite a reaching-out for further assistance in the field of liberal arts. Programs that blanket the field, covering both urban and rural areas, should be developed in the close cooperation between the two Services."

"The farming community is as interested in international understanding, social problems, the fine arts, economics and many other like fields, as the urbanite. If the university is to serve all the people of its state, a way must be found to serve the rural area not only in the means of making his living, but in ways of making that living more enjoyable."

"University Extension believes that the university should make available programs in the liberal and fine arts in rural communities. At present, financial conditions do not allow such a program." "Classes located in certain city areas do offer limited opportunities to rural people, but in no way is a direct approach made to interest these people."

#### Community Development

"Planning an over-all program for the improvement of living conditions in the various regions of the state, both urban and rural. This would include a unified attack along the 'Community Improvement' plan as experimentally developed in Montana, Washington, Illinois, and elsewhere and might produce desirable results for the state."

"Both the Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension could do more in this state on a community development program. It would be highly desirable for the university and colleges of



the state to cooperate on a basis whereby extension classes would carry credit in all institutions concerned."

"While there is no legal limit on the size community in which the Cooperative Extension Service operates, in practice it does not often give this type of service in towns over 3,000 population. If a community development program were organized by General Extension in the larger towns and cities, it should be possible to make use of the experts and specialists available in the Cooperative Extension Service as consultants and short-time assistants. Similarly, the Cooperative Extension Service should be able to call upon the field service and specialized instructors of General Extension to do the things they are best qualified to do in any part of the state."

"In community development programs it is possible to call upon resources of the university as well as many other state institutions for assistance in making and carrying out plans for better communities. More opportunity for participation in informal group situations could be directed toward citizenship education, as in international relations, and those giving experience in the creative arts, such as music, drama, painting, and the crafts, and in other activities contributing to personal development, in the development of rural business and industrial activities, and with respect to problems related to family welfare, health, recreation, education, and other similar interests."

#### Health and Sanitary Engineering

"General Extension is also equipped to provide complete information in health and sanitary engineering. In short, we believe that our groups of agricultural leaders and home demonstration workers should have access to much of the facilities and talent provided in General Extension of the university and in other institutions."

#### Additional Areas reported which lend themselves to Cooperation

1. Special sciences, political, national and international problems, public affairs, and citizenship education.
2. Agriculture and home economics, such as family life, interior decoration, nutrition, consumer economics (to both urban and rural groups).
3. Recreation.
4. Development of rural businesses and industrial activities.
5. Flood control and conservation.
6. Wildlife conservation.

\*This question from Supplement A, applies only to member institutions of the association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities in states having a separated state university.

7. Leadership training for community leaders.

8. In-service training of extension personnel.

9. Evaluation of Extension programs.

#### What Types of Cooperation Currently Exist Between You Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension of the Separated State University?\*

##### State Colleges

Of the 16 schedules returned, six did not answer this question and another one was not applicable. Three people indicated that there was no cooperation, and two stated that it was of a limited nature. One reply was: "good relationship, no definite type."

The specific cases of cooperation were listed as (1) "Cooperation by county agents in providing a Labor-Farm-Industry Forum;" (2) "Personnel of the two frequently confer. Both cooperate in such organizations as the Council on Health and Medical Care, and the Adult Education Association;" (3) "Cooperate through membership of personnel on Council of Adult Education;" (4) "An occasional exchange of printed material, and an occasional appearance of Cooperative Extension Service personnel on General Extension programs;" and, (5) "Both services hold membership in several educational organizations, specialists of one have appeared on programs sponsored by the other, and both have worked together in committees concerned with adult education of the state."

These replies indicate relatively little formal or continuous cooperation between Cooperative Extension Service at State Colleges and General Extension at the separated State University.

#### What Types of Cooperation Currently Exist Between You General Extension Division and The General Extension Division of Your Separated State University?\*

##### State Colleges

Of the 16 schedules from State Colleges, five did not answer this question and three said it was not applicable to their situations. Two said there was no cooperation, two that it was limited, and four gave illustrations of quite a bit of cooperation.

In one state the two Extension Services were jointly involved in a World Affairs annual state conference and in efforts to organize a council on world affairs.

In the same state, plans have been developed for a television station to be jointly operated by the college and the university. Another state reports that a close relationship, both a formal one through reports, and an informal personal one, has been developed,

and as a result duplication has been quite successfully avoided. "Students and teachers are traded freely in order to render the best service possible to each community...a close interchange of information with regard to fees and salaries is maintained so that there is no special difference in the two programs."

In one case, the two Extension Services have divided the state geographically and each respects the other's area. They confer frequently on matters of general program and policy. Another state reported cooperation in such activities as conferences and programs conducted at respective campuses; both permit enrollment in Extension (credit) classes so that grades can be directly applied to either institution; both support lay and professional organizations interested in adult education; both participate on the College Field Service Committee of the Council on Adult Education; and, both cooperate in study of possible areas of duplication of services.

What Are The Problems (Especially Finance) Involved In Cooperation Between Your Cooperative Extension Service And General Extension Of The Separated State University?\*

Of the 16 schedules, six did not answer this question; one said it was not applicable; one said he didn't know because no analysis had been made of the problem; five replied that there were no problems; and three mentioned various problems.

One said there was perhaps some competition for funds from the state sources; in another instance the location of the state university is 226 miles from headquarters of the Cooperative Extension Service, rendering contacts difficult and expensive; the other problem concerned differences between fees charged by the State College and the University so that the legislature began to raise questions.

What Are The Problems (Especially Finance) Involved In Cooperation Between Your General Extension And General Extension Of The Separated State University?\*

State Colleges

Six of the 16 did not answer this question; it was not applicable to three others; three said there was no cooperation between the two organizations; one that it was limited; and, three described specific problems.

Lack of resources with which to develop a program comparable to that undertaken by the University is felt to be a problem by one State College. Some differences exist in regulations pertaining to student courses, grades, and schedules in another state. The distance between one of the State Colleges and local communities in which classes are held results in greater unit cost for extension classes than at the University which is situated in a large city.

\*This question from Supplement A, applies only to member institutions of the association of Land-Grant Colleges and universities in states having a separated state university.

Another reply refers to the following problems: apparent conflict and duplication of courses, conferences, and special programs (however, it was reported that no duplication existed according to a study conducted by the institution); competition for cooperative relationships with community colleges; developing criteria for deciding which institution is best fitted for specific programs; competitive athletic relationships overshadow genuine cooperative relations; and, institutions tend to regard certain geographic areas of the state as the province of one institution or the other.

What Areas of Cooperation Between Both Extension Services Of Your Institution And General Extension Of The Separated State University Appear Desirable?

State Colleges

Only six of the 16 schedules described specific cases of desirable cooperation. Five did not answer the question; it was not applicable to two others; and indicated no cooperation was desirable.

One suggestion was for cooperation to provide maximum service to voluntary associations in public affairs programs. Another desired cooperation to prevent duplication of courses or programs offered. Cooperation with regard to fees, student load, contact hours per credit hour, general recognition of the inclusive areas of operation, and a free interchange of credits were cited as being desirable by another.

One respondent thought there should be better cooperation between the University and State College in an extensive program of community development. Another answer suggested areas of cooperation to include increased emphasis on joint publications planning so that sequences of courses can be organized and offered, increased exchange of facilities, and cooperative research facilities. These responses indicate the most common need for cooperation to be in formulating policies concerning credit classes offered by both Extension Services located at separate state institutions.

SOURCES OF FUNDS

Each institution was asked to submit data on the following: "State your sources of funds by percentages of total expenditures for (1) Cooperative Extension Service in terms of (a) Federal Government Grants, (b) Direct State Appropriations, (c) University Allocations, (d) The Counties, and (e) Other (please specify); (2) General Extension in terms of (a) Direct State Appropriations, (b) University Allocation, (c) Fees, and (d) Other Sources (please specify).

Replies were received from 42 Cooperative

Extension Services and 37 General Extension Divisions.

#### Cooperative Extension Service

The Cooperative Extension Service in the "State College" and "University" groupings obtained about two-fifths of their total funds from Federal sources, one-fourth from the State, one-seventh from the University, one-fifth from the Counties, and a very small proportion from Other Sources.

In the "State College" grouping, the same extension organization had a similar proportionate distribution for sources of funds...about one-third from Federal sources, one-third from State, one-fourth from County, and a very small proportion from the University or Other Sources. (Table I)

All states received Federal funds, ranging from an amount equal to 17 per cent of the total expenditures of the Cooperative Extension Service in one state to 59.1 per cent in another.

Approximately one-half of the Cooperative Extension Services obtained 20 to 39 per cent of their funds from Federal sources; also, about one-half received 20 to 39 per cent from the State.

About one-fourth of the institutions with a State College and University (both on same campus) reported no funds from the State for the Cooperative Extension Service. The range for those who did receive State funds varied from three to 62 per cent of their total expenditures. (Table II) All State Colleges received some State funds for their Cooperative Extension Service, ranging from 15 to 56 per cent of their total expenditures. (Table III)

Only one case was found where the Cooperative Extension Service did not receive County funds. The percentage of expenditures contributed by Counties in all other states varied from 0.6 per cent to 56.3. In the "State College and University" grouping, 88 percent of the Cooperative Extension Services did not receive funds from Other Sources; in the "State College" grouping, 31 per cent did not receive funds from Other Sources. It is fairly evident that the Cooperative Extension Service is financed almost entirely by Federal, State, and County funds.

#### General Extension Divisions

General Extension divisions obtained about two-thirds of their total funds from fees; this proportion is true for all three groupings of institutions. Next in order of importance as a

source of funds was the University, and then the State. Only a very small proportion of General Extension divisions received funds from other sources; in fact, eight of the 37 reported any funds from other sources. (Table IV)

The State is a more important source of funds to General Extension at those institutions in the "State College" grouping than in the "State College and University" grouping. The University is a more important source of funds to those in the "University" grouping than in the two other groupings.

Fees represent 80 to 100 per cent of the total expenditures for 41 per cent of General Extension divisions in the "State College and University" grouping, 12 per cent in the "State College" grouping, and 14 per cent in the "University" grouping. On the other hand, three institutions reported no funds from fees, while five obtained all of their funds from fees. (Tables II - III - V)

The State provided no funds for General Extension divisions at over one-half the institutions. Two institutions reported 100 per cent of their funds coming from the State.

The University allocated no funds for General Extension at 16 of the 37 institutions. However, in one case the University was the entire source of funds. A little more than one-third of General Extension divisions received 20 per cent or more of their funds from the University.

The major source of income for General Extension divisions was fees, with direct State appropriations and University allocations being a minor source of income.

**Table - V Sources Of Funds By Percentages Of Total Expenditures for Individual Institutions  
"University" grouping**

**GENERAL EXTENSION SERVICES**

<b>State</b>	<b>University</b>	<b>*Other Sources</b>	<b>Fees</b>	<b>Total</b>
24.0	0.	0.	76.0	100%
22.5	22.5	23.0(1)	32.0	100%
5.7	20.3	17.3(2)	56.7	100%
0.	52.2	8.0(3)	47.2	100%
0.	33.0	1.0(4)	66.0	100%
0.	0.	0.	100.0	100%
0.	50.0	0.	50.0	100%

**\* Other sources of funds described in individual footnotes.**

**(1) From State and Federal vocational funds, allocated by State Board for Vocational Education 18.0; From Grants-in-aid supplied by business and industry 5.0.**

**(2) Short courses, conferences, films, lectures, concerts, and others.**

**(3) Scholarship funds from industry, etc.**

**(4) Grants-in-aid.**



What is the Basic Organization of the Cooperative Extension Service and of General Extension in Your Institution?

No indication is given from the organization charts received of the extent to which people on the various administrative and operational levels of the two services meet together regularly to discuss their common problems. Likewise, no indication is given of the extent to which people in the two Services having the same area of interest have their offices near one another.

There is very little evidence from the small per cent of charts sent in that the organizational structure of the two Services would facilitate cooperation and/or coordination. About one-third of the institutions submitted organizational charts.

In all but two institutions, all charts were made with complete disregard for the other Service, even when found in the same institution. In only one institution are both services sketched on the same organizational chart. However, even in that institution, no structural lines are drawn at the operational level. Evidently, whatever cooperation is going on is limited to those individuals in both Services who have seen the need for it.

Each organizational chart of the Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension is a separate entity, related only to the Board of Trustees and the President. In the charts received, no other lines of communication are shown at any other level.

Only five of the institutions, where both services are found, sent in structural charts of both organizations. With that limited number, no generalization can be drawn. Before further implications can be drawn from the limited number of charts received, it would be desirable to request organizational charts from all institutions interested in participating in the study. However, these five charts may be indicative of present practices.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This study throws much light on attitudes toward cooperation between the Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension. But it does not indicate the extent to which the problems and methods of cooperation are existent in the various institutions.

Thus, by the nature of the data, those factors thought to be most important by each respondent are the ones which are brought out. This follows of necessity because questions were of the open-end type, except those which dealt with sources of funds.

From the wealth of data supplied by this preliminary survey, the basis for a categorized study is now available.

Attitudes toward cooperation could be grouped into three broad classifications: (1) those who feel that further cooperation is neither needed nor desirable; (2) those who would like to develop "minor devices" to improve existing relationships; and, (3) those who believe that the public demands upon the two services is becoming so great that an appraisal of their inter-relationship is necessary.

In the third category, a number gave reasons for this need such as: (a) the rapid growth of the rural-urban fringe; (b) greater demands by both rural and urban people for programs offered by both services, and, (c) expansion of the services, and the growth in their complexity.

### Nature of the Cooperative Relationship of the Two Extension Services

In describing existing cooperation the following points were made:

1. In those states where the report was prepared jointly by the two services, many more aspects of the problem of cooperation were seen. Hence, the answers seem to give a clearer picture of the situation as it presently exists. Practically all activities or methods of cooperating which were recommended as desirable by some institutions are already underway in others.
2. While the Cooperative Extension Service uses mass media to a great extent in reaching urban areas, reports indicate that General Extension usually uses correspondence courses, formal classes, short courses, and conferences in reaching rural areas.
3. There is much variation in the patterns and degree of cooperation among the institutions reporting. The various types of cooperation ranged from merely a speaking acquaintance from directors to staff members, to joint discussion of each other's program. They included: (a) referral of inquiries; (b) exchange of publications; (c) keeping informed about each other's programs through various means; (d) publicizing through various media each other's programs; (e) sharing some facilities and equipment; (f) pooling some financial resources; (g) working on legislative programs; (h) using each other's personnel as speakers for a specific meeting or project (sometimes sponsored jointly); and, (i) basic planning for a specific meeting or project.
4. However, there is little mention of some of the more fundamental types of cooperation such as: (a) working together in determining teaching procedures and standards (mentioned by only one institution); (b) establishing the type of organizational relationships that facilitate working together

(shown only in one organizational chart, and whether or not such structures exist is not known from this study); and, (c) making analyses and studies of people's wants and needs in both rural and urban areas, and developing cooperative programs which require the combined services, if people's immediate and long-range needs are to be met.

5. The potential for cooperation between the two services seems to be greatest in those activities associated with group or community development or public policy (agricultural, labor and management, health and welfare, consumer education, and international relations).

6. Where the request is for specialized information which does not traditionally fall within the training of the personnel of one service, a co-operative method is used in bringing the knowledge to the people who seek it. Such cooperation is often achieved as evidenced in the referral service mentioned in some of the questionnaires. Example, music for rural people, lawns for urban people.

7. There seems to be much more concern about cooperating in order not to duplicate each other's services than about extending the services. Duplicating here applies to subject-matter rather than to people.

8. According to the responses to this questionnaire, the Cooperative Extension Service receives very few requests for programs of the nature offered by General Extension.

9. Those who report no problem in cooperating with each other also frequently see no interrelationship between the programs of the two services. Lines are drawn and each stays on his own side. Others, however, report their interrelatedness rather than their mutual exclusiveness.

#### Obstacles to Cooperation

1. The Cooperative Extension Service has extended programs to urban areas to a greater extent than General Extension has extended programs to rural areas. It seemed to be regarded as "more proper" for the Cooperative Extension Service to reach into urban areas than for General Extension to serve rural areas.

2. There were several responses which indicated that cooperation should start with an analysis of people's needs to determine how each service could contribute toward meeting them. It was further indicated that this might be done in some circumstances if the programs were so established that each service supplemented and reinforced the work of the other. Most of those reporting considered the problem of cooperation to be largely one of deciding where the division of subject matter taught by the two services should be made. Some felt that the force which contributed to cooperation usually came from the many requests for services by the people of their respective states.

3. Cooperation was affected by whether or not the two services were in one institution or in different institutions. When the two services are on the same campus, they operate either on a *tacit modus vivendi*, with little contact and no dynamic cooperation, or with considerable contact and organized cooperation. While the opportunity was always available to facilitate informal interpersonal cooperation, personalities usually determined its extent.

4. An analysis of all the replies appears to indicate that when the two services are on different campuses, the problem of relationship was different from that which existed when both services were on the same campus. In

the former, relationships existed largely at the top administrative levels of the institutions; at the campus level there is not the opportunity for the informal person-to-person contact. However, there may sometimes be possibilities out in the state for this kind of association.

5. The major sources of funds for the Cooperative Extension Service are Federal, State, and County appropriations. For most of the General Extension programs, fees are the major source, and funds from the University and State comprise a minor fraction of the total. Many indicated that frustration resulted among General Extension personnel because of the limitations in the kinds and extent of programs offered due to the system of fee-financing.

6. The problems which are a barrier to further extending the program of the Cooperative Extension Service to urban areas, or General Extension programs to rural areas, are primarily lack of finances and staff personnel. Lack of finances is a greater problem for General Extension than for the Cooperative Extension Service.

7. In some states the dispersion of the rural population is so great that the cost of conducting General Extension programs makes the service prohibitive under present methods of financing.

8. There seems to be a keen awareness among some of the institutions reporting of the problems created by inequality resulting from differences in methods of financing which handicap the fullest cooperative effort in programming. Many institutions attributed the lack of cooperation entirely to differences in financing the programs. A few felt that the difficulties arising from difference in financial support may be magnified in the future if something is not done about it.

9. The present formal organizational patterns of the two services are not conducive to cooperative effort. Cooperation between the two services is rather limited and spasmodic. Few formal channels of communication exist.

10. Some of the reports suggested that concepts of leadership and of administrative roles tend to become institutionalized, and fail to change with changing conditions and changing needs. This condition prevents cooperation between the two services. Also, in some cases, feelings of loyalty and expectations on the part of people or occupational organizations served as obstacles to cooperation.

11. A few reported that one major limitation of the Cooperative Extension Service as reported was that its traditional method of programming does not meet urban needs.

12. Some, contrary to others, believed that General Extension in its efforts to get its program before the people would be more effective by working with the public schools and other local agencies than by working with the Cooperative Extension Service.

13. The offices of the Cooperative Extension Service are rarely used by General Extension. This condition exists because of limitation of facilities, differences in programming, methods, philosophies, and administrative channels.

#### Needs and Methods for Improving Cooperation

Those indicating the need for cooperation stressed the following points:

1. A greater realization of the need for cooperation because of lessening

rural-urban differences and, more specifically, because of the growth of the rural-urban fringe.

2. A program to include 4H Club work, consumer education, gardening, landscaping, and the home economics program was regarded by the Cooperative Extension Service as desirable activities for urban people; programs in community development, creative arts, visual aids' services, family living, and general education were considered by General Extension to be desirable for rural people. It was felt that the criteria for division of responsibilities must in the future be defined less in terms of rural-urban categories and more in terms of services each is best qualified to provide.

3. Among other suggestions for improving cooperative relationships were the following:

- a. Development of an over-all policy statement on cooperation of the two services by regents or trustees of each institution.
- b. Better understanding and liaison between the two staffs through joint committees and conferences in order to keep informed of each other's services and to talk over plans.
- c. More of the informal person-to-person type of cooperation.
- d. Joint-staff appointments.
- e. Housing personnel of both services in close proximity.
- f. Additional staff time devoted to discussion and planning of cooperative ventures.
- g. Joint offering of conferences for rural and urban groups.
- h. Discovering of possibilities of combining activities offered by both services.
- i. Sharing costs of related programs.
- j. Greater effort in interpreting each other's programs to assure public awareness of the contribution of both services.
- k. Clarification of overlapping jurisdictional authority.
- l. Expanding the referral service.
- m. Making available all extension publications for rural and urban people.

### CONCLUSIONS

The need for cooperation becomes greater as the programs of the two services expand. In considering the problem of cooperation in its broadest sense, those whose experiences deal with a General Extension program of a very limited nature see very few possibilities for cooperation. Those whose experience is drawn from a program of wide and diversified nature, give two extreme types of responses.

On the one hand, some believe that it is time to draw more "clear cut" lines of responsibility and to differentiate the services to prevent friction and overlap. These lines, according to them, should be drawn on the basis of subject matter covered, teaching methods used, and/or geographic population groups (rural-urban).



On the other hand, some believe that a new basis of service is being demanded from the public. They believe further that to meet this demand, an integrated, cooperative program between the two services must be developed. To achieve this kind of cooperation, they envision a need for fundamental administrative and financial changes as bases for such a program.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The report of this Committee contains rich and diverse data on the activities of the Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension in most of our states including those in which General Extension is conducted also by separate state universities.

These data indicate clearly that the combined extension stake in our institutions is tremendous. For example, in such states as California, Texas, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Georgia, the combined Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension budgets average at least five million dollars per state. The combined contacts with farmer, homemaker, teacher, industrialist, businessman, banker, lawyer, minister, doctor, labor leader, and others carry a massive impact upon adult thought and action in the United States.

Your committee believes it to be imperative that these services be geared even more effectively to meeting the needs of adults in the states they serve. The problem takes its significance and urgency from the fact that the adults of this country today are facing tremendous questions on which our institutions of higher learning are equipped to throw considerable light.

The urgent need is for us to create the kinds of cooperation between the Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension which will result in (a) supplementing each other's services in a mutually helpful way for the enrichment of both services as they work to meet the needs of our total state constituencies; (b) increasing the number of extension leaders willing to participate and guide the inevitable trend toward more cooperation; and, (c) sharing credit for a job well done. Your committee is unanimous in the belief that our two great organizations can work together.

In order to achieve these desirable goals, your committee believes our current survey has shown the need for a continuing study--a scientifically planned and executed research project by a joint committee, augmented by serious investigation on each campus. Consequently, we seek action now by this Association and the administrations of the institutions we represent. Our immediate and long-run recommendations are as follows:

For immediate action: That the administrations of the Land-Grant Colleges and Universities review in their own institutions the respective organizations, the Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension, and consider how best to define and allocate responsibilities in terms of the total extension needs of the people of our day.

At the same time, we respectfully suggest that, even within the limits of present financing, cooperation between the two Services should be considered in terms of such activities as the use of common offices and facilities, joint appointments on common programs, teamwork on programming, collaboration on television and radio programs, and, wherever appropriate, joint sponsorship of conferences and other activities.

It is our belief that a positive effort to find grounds for cooperation between the two Services under present programs and policies will yield suprisingly felicitous results.

Further Studies: On the basis of the studies conducted during the past year by this committee, further more intensive studies along the following lines seem desirable:

1. A study of the respective philosophies of the Cooperative and General Extension Services that will bring out (a) the essence of the philosophies in themselves, (b) the differences in philosophies, and, (c) the points of compatibility and incompatibility.
2. An intensive study of administrative channels and structures of authority in order to determine the best possible practical lines of cooperation between the two Services.
3. A study of the various types of programs particularly of General Extension, in order to determine possible inter-relationships between these programs and the Cooperative Extension Service. It is desirable, also, to clarify the sources of program ideas and how they are developed in both services.
4. Methods of instruction in each of the services should be carefully investigated.
5. The training and selection of personnel in each of the services should be carefully investigated in order (a) to clarify the personnel problems of each that tend to hamper cooperation at this time, and, (b) to discover ways of increasing the stability and effectiveness of the personnel in both services.
6. Intensive study of the methods of financing the two services is required. Differences in sources of income and budget structure appear to be one of the most serious obstacles to cooperation between the services.

While more funds are clearly needed for each of the services in order to provide more effective extension education for the people of the United States, there appears to be a special necessity to explore ways and means of securing more public funds for General Extension. A whole congerie of problems is involved here which go to the heart of financing of our major institutions through public appropriations. But clearly, the key to the adequate expansion of both the Cooperative and General Extension Services lies in this problem of finance. Further studies here are therefore imperative.

An experimental demonstration project: The committee suggests, also, that at least one state be encouraged to initiate an experimental-demonstration-action-research project to help determine (1) the most common problems involved in cooperation between the two services; (2) the areas in which cooperation can be most fruitful; and, (3) possible solutions to the problems of cooperation in the light of:

- a. The extent to which one service may be willing to be the interpreter and promoter for the other, and the areas in which this type of cooperation could be mutually beneficial.
- b. The extent to which the problem of over-lapping areas could be approached cooperatively through the technique of discussion.
- c. The extent to which differences in administrative structure might, on the one hand, facilitate the development of creative, mutually helpful, cooperative programs, or, on the other hand, become a stricture and destroy creativity.

d. The extent to which funds might become inter-changeable.

Continuation of a committee: This committee believes that the common problems of the Cooperative and General Extension Service are so great that continuing study should be given to them. It recommends, therefore, that the present Senate committee be continued for the coming year with the responsibility to pursue some of the studies recommended in this report.

It recommends, further, that funds necessary for the initiation of these studies, approximately \$2500, should be provided by the Association, and additional funds for furthering and completing the studies (tentatively in the amount of \$20,000) should be sought from a foundation or similar source.

## Appendix I

### SURVEY OF MEMBER INSTITUTIONS Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities

#### Instructions

This information is being requested by the Senate Committee on Urban and Rural Extension Problems. It would be appreciated if you would return this questionnaire on or before July 1, 1954, to E. L. Keller, Director, General Extension, The Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pennsylvania. Your attention is called to Supplement "A" if it applies to your situation.

1. What activities or services are currently provided to urban people by the Cooperative Extension Service?
2. What additional Cooperative Extension Service programs are desirable for urban people? For what specific groups?
3. What problems are encountered by the Cooperative Extension Service in extending its programs to urban people?
4. What activities are currently conducted for rural people by the General Extension?
5. What additional types of General Extension programs are desirable for rural people? For what specific groups?
6. What problems are encountered by General Extension in extending its programs to rural people?
7. What demands are experienced by the Cooperative Extension Service for subject matter programs or methods of instruction (such as correspondence study) normally offered by General Extension?
8. What types of cooperation currently exist between the Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension?
9. What are the problems involved in cooperation between the Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension? Note especially the problems created by the different methods of financing.
10. To what extent have the field offices of the Cooperative Extension Service (county and home demonstration agents) been used as "field offices" of General Extension?
  - a. What are the problems involved in so using them?
  - b. Is it desirable to coordinate in the field the total "extension" services of your institution? If so, how?
11. What areas of cooperation between the Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension appear desirable?
12. State your sources of funds by percentages of total expenditures for
  1. Cooperative Extension Service in terms of
    - a. Federal Government

- b. Direct State appropriations
  - c. University allocations
  - d. The Counties
  - e. Other sources (please specify)
2. General Extension in terms of
- a. Direct State appropriations
  - b. University allocation
  - c. Fees
  - d. Other sources (please specify)
13. What is the basic organization of the Cooperative Extension Service and of General Extension in your institutions?
- a. What implications do these organizational arrangements have for cooperation between and/or coordination of the two "extension" services?
14. Please attach a recent annual report of the Cooperative Extension Service and of General Extension, if available.

SUPPLEMENT "A"

PLEASE NOTE: In States in which there is a separated State University, please answer the following questions

- 1. What types of cooperation currently exist between your
  - a. Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension of the Separated State University?
  - b. Between your General Extension and General Extension of your Separated State University?
- 2. What are the problems (especially finance) involved in cooperation between your
  - a. Cooperative Extension Service and General Extension of the Separated State University?
  - b. Between your General Extension and General Extension of the Separated State University?
- 3. What areas of cooperation between both Extension Services of your institution and General Extension of the Separated State University appear desirable?



SURVEY OF MEMBERS OF THE STATE UNIVERSITIES ASSOCIATION  
in cooperation with the  
ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Instructions

This information is being collected as a result of a preliminary study by a committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. Your Association has agreed to cooperate in a more complete study and therefore it would be appreciated if this questionnaire could be returned to E. L. Keller, Director, General Extension, The Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pennsylvania, by July 1, 1954.

1. What activities are currently conducted for rural people by General Extension?
2. What additional types of General Extension programs are desirable for rural people? For what specific groups?
3. What problems are encountered by General Extension in extending its programs to rural people?
4. What types of cooperation currently exist between your Extension Division and the Land-Grant institution in your State in terms of
  - a. Cooperative Extension Service
  - b. General Extension, if any.
5. What are the problems involved in cooperation between the Extension Services of your institution and those of the Land-Grant institution of your State?

Please state in terms of - (note especially the problems of finance)

- a. Cooperative Extension Service
  - b. General Extension, if any
6. What areas of cooperation between the Extension Service of your institution and those of the Land-Grant institution of your State appear desirable in terms of
  - a. Cooperative Extension Service
  - b. General Extension
7. What is the basic organization of General Extension in your institution? Please enclose a recent report, if available.

Appendix II

INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGE AND STATE UNIVERSITY ARE NOT SEPARATED\*

Group A

University of Arkansas  
Fayetteville, Arkansas

University of Arizona  
Tucson, Arizona

University of California  
Berkeley, Los Angeles & other  
Campuses in California

University of Connecticut  
Storrs, Connecticut

University of Delaware  
Newark, Delaware

University of Florida  
Gainesville, Florida

University of Georgia  
Athens, Georgia

Georgia Institute of Technology  
Atlanta, Georgia

University of Idaho  
Moscow, Idaho

University of Illinois  
Urbana, Illinois

University of Kentucky  
Lexington, Kentucky

Louisiana State University  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

University of Maine  
Orono, Maine

University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland

University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, Massachusetts

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, Massachusetts

University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, Minnesota

University of Missouri  
Columbia, Missouri

University of Nebraska  
Lincoln, Nebraska

University of Nevada  
Reno, Nevada

University of New Hampshire  
Durham, New Hampshire

Oregon State System of Higher Education  
Portland, Oregon

The Pennsylvania State University  
State College, Pennsylvania

University of Rhode Island  
Kingston, Rhode Island

Rutgers University (The State  
University of New Jersey)  
New Brunswick, New Jersey

University of Tennessee  
Knoxville, Tennessee

University of Vermont  
Burlington, Vermont

West Virginia University  
Morgantown, West Virginia

University of Wisconsin  
Madison, Wisconsin

University of Wyoming  
Laramie, Wyoming

\* 28 of the 30 institutions participated in the study.

**LAND-GRANT COLLEGE WITH SEPARATED STATE UNIVERSITY\***

**Group B**

Alabama Polytechnic Institute  
Auburn, Alabama

North Dakota Agricultural College  
Fargo, North Dakota

Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical  
College  
Fort Collins, Colorado

The Ohio State University  
Columbus, Ohio

Cornell University  
Ithaca, New York

Oklahoma Agricultural and  
Mechanical College  
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Clemson Agricultural College  
Clemson, South Carolina

Oregon State College  
Corvallis, Oregon

Iowa State College  
Ames, Iowa

Purdue University  
Lafayette, Indiana

Kansas State College  
Manhattan, Kansas

South Dakota State College  
Brookings, South Dakota

Michigan State College  
East Lansing, Michigan

Texas Agricultural and Mechanical  
College System  
College Station, Texas

Mississippi State College  
State College, Mississippi

Utah State Agricultural College  
Logan, Utah

Montana State College  
Bozeman, Montana

Virginia Polytechnic Institute  
Blacksburg, Virginia

New Mexico College of Agricultural  
and Mechanic Arts  
State College, New Mexico

State College of Washington  
Pullman, Washington

North Carolina State College  
Raleigh, North Carolina

\* 16 of the 21 institutions participated in the study.

NON-LAND-GRANT STATE UNIVERSITY\*

Group C

University of Alabama  
University, Alabama

University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

University of Colorado  
Boulder, Colorado

University of North Dakota  
Grand Forks, North Dakota

Indiana University  
Bloomington, Indiana

Ohio University  
Athens, Ohio

The State University of Iowa  
Iowa City, Iowa

University of Oklahoma  
Norman, Oklahoma

University of Kansas  
Lawrence, Kansas

University of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon

Miami University  
Oxford, Ohio

University of South Carolina  
Columbia, South Carolina

University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, Michigan

University of South Dakota  
Vermillion, South Dakota

University of Mississippi  
University, Mississippi

University of Texas  
Austin 12, Texas

Montana State University  
Missoula, Montana

University of Utah  
Salt Lake City, Utah

University of New Mexico  
Albuquerque, New Mexico

University of Virginia  
Charlottesville, Virginia

State University of New York  
Albany, New York

University of Washington 4  
Seattle 5, Washington

\* 16 of the 22 institutions participated in the study.