

THE RELATIONSHIP OF SELECTED FACTORS TO JOB
PERFORMANCE OF LOUISIANA HOME DEMON-
STRATION AGENTS IN WORKING WITH
LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

By

PATSY RUTH ALEXANDER

Bachelor of Arts
Centenary College
Shreveport, Louisiana
1951

Bachelor of Science
Northwestern State College
Natchitoches, Louisiana
1953

Master of Science
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
1965

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1968

OCT 24 1968

THE RELATIONSHIP OF SELECTED FACTORS TO JOB
PERFORMANCE OF LOUISIANA HOME DEMON-
STRATION AGENTS IN WORKING WITH
LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Thesis Approved:

June Cozine

Thesis Adviser

Elizabeth C. Hillier

Honora McKinney

H. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

688179

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have made valuable contributions toward making this study possible and to each deep appreciation is expressed:

Dr. June Cozine, Professor of Home Economics Education, for her guidance and assistance in directing this study as major professor and chairman of my committee. Her patience and encouragement during the process of writing were an immeasurable contribution. Dr. Elizabeth Hillier, Associate Professor of Home Economics Education and Dr. Florence McKinney, Professor Home Management, for their assistance and guidance as members of my committee.

Mr. John A. Cox, Director of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service of Louisiana State University, Mr. A. C. Smith, Northern District Agent and Mr. Emmitt Cummings, Bossier Parish Chairman, for recommending and approving time for my graduate study, and the Board of Supervisors of Louisiana State University for granting me Sabbatical Leave.

State and District personnel of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service for recommending and approving the study to be conducted in Louisiana and the District Program Specialists in Home Economics, for their valuable time in evaluating the parish extension programs and their assistance in collecting the data. The cooperation of the 84 Home Demonstration Agents in Louisiana who provided the information for the study is deeply appreciated.

Dr. Grace Spivey, State Home Economist, and District Home

Economists of the Oklahoma State University Extension Division for their sustaining interest and encouragement throughout my stay in Oklahoma.

Acknowledgment is expressed to the Science Research Associates of Chicago, Illinois, for granting permission to use copyrighted materials.

Appreciation is expressed to Miss Eloise Dreessen for her skillful typing of the manuscript.

Acknowledgments would be incomplete without expressing appreciation to members of my family for their understanding and patient encouragement during the long periods of absence from home. Special appreciation is expressed to the memory of my parents, Mr. and Mrs. C. R. Alexander and to whom this thesis is dedicated: for their belief in the worthwhileness of educational endeavors; for their encouragement in my desire to pursue additional graduate study; and for exemplifying that through the programs of the Cooperative Extension Service people throughout their adult years can continue to learn and improve their way of life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Purposes of the Study.	5
Significance of the Study.	5
Delimitation	6
Procedure.	7
Definition of Terms.	8
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	10
Cooperative Extension Work	10
Historical Development.	10
Organizational Structure.	11
Philosophy.	14
Program Development Method.	15
Forces Influencing the Development of Extension Programs	17
Evaluation.	23
Personnel Training and Development.	25
New Directions in Home Economics Extension Programs.	30
Work With Low-Income People.	34
Defining Poverty.	34
Characteristics of Poverty.	36
Consumer Practices Contributing to Financial Insecurity.	37
Philosophical Basis for Working With Low-Income Families	39
Methods of Improving Financial Conditions of Low-Income Families	42
Summary.	46
III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.	49
Selection of Respondents	50
Development of the Instruments	50

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter	Page
Collection of Data	53
Organization of Data For Analysis.	54
Summary, Conclusions, and Implications	55
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	57
Part I: Personal Characteristics.	58
Part II: Educational Experiences.	64
Part III: Experience in Working With Different Cultural Groups.	69
Part IV: Respondent Evaluations	73
Part V: Staff Evaluations	76
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	86
Summary of Findings.	86
Conclusions.	92
Guidelines for Selecting and Training Home Demonstration Agents to Work With Low- Income Families.	94
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.	98
APPENDICES	103

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Comparison of Respondents As To High, Medium, and Low Job Performance Rating of Low-Income Programs	58
II. Comparison of Personal Characteristics of Respondents By Job Performance Rating of Low-Income Programs	60
III. Comparison of Social Class Background of Respondents By Job Performance Rating of Low-Income Programs	63
IV. Comparison of Formal Education of Respondents By Job Performance Rating of Low-Income Programs	65
V. Comparison of Educational Experiences Perceived and Interpreted By Respondents As Planned Primarily As Preparation For Work With Low-Income Families By Job Performance Rating of Low-Income Programs	67
VI. Comparison of Respondents as to The Most Predominant Racial Group Within The Parish By Job Performance Rating of Low-Income Programs	70
VII. Comparison of Respondents As To Those Having a Working Knowledge of a Foreign Language By Job Performance Rating of Low-Income Programs	71
VIII. Comparison of Experience of Respondents In Working With Other Ethnic Groups By Job Performance Rating of Low-Income Programs	72
IX. Comparison of Low-Income Program Self-Evaluation of Respondents By Job Performance Rating of Low-Income Programs	74
X. Comparison of Areas of Felt Needs of Respondents For Additional Training in Working With Low-Income Families By Job Performance Rating of Low-Income Programs	75
XI. Comparison of Low-Income Program Evaluation of All Respondents By Job Performance Rating of Low-Income Programs	77

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
XII. Comparison of Individual Program Evaluation Items of High Job Performers By Job Performance Rating of Low-Income Programs	79
XIII. Comparison of Individual Program Evaluation Items of Medium Job Performers By Job Performance Rating of Low-Income Programs	81
XIV. Comparison of Individual Program Evaluation Items of Low Performers By Job Performance Rating of Low-Income Programs.	82
XV. Comparison of Overall Job Performance Quartile Ranking of Respondents By Job Performance of Low-Income Programs	84

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The history of the growth and development of the Cooperative Extension programs throughout the fifty states and the territory of Puerto Rico reflect the endless efforts on the part of the Extension Service personnel to help people to identify their own problems and work toward their solution. As in the past, the development of future extension programs will be determined by the problems of the clientele served.

The family living area of the Cooperative Extension Service aims toward education which will enable all people to enjoy a satisfying home and a congenial relationship among members of the family and the community. Technological, sociological, and economical changes in recent years have affected patterns in family living within the United States. Extension programs have become broader in scope to encompass the emerging new needs of people in all areas related to home and family living. As extension workers endeavor to reach more people with specific needs, it becomes increasingly necessary that increased effort is exerted to use effective teaching methods in diffusing the most current information.

The educational needs and interests of families are affected by many factors such as socio-economic class and stages in the family life cycle. Important home economics extension clientele groups include:

young married couples; families with young children; low-income families; and working women. There is a need for more information on how to interpret and disseminate the findings of research so that people of various cultural, economic, and social groups can and will use it.¹

Hansen points up the need for programs that will especially aid the low-income family in the utilization of its limited resources and concurrently help members of such families raise the expected goals of their children.²

Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service administrators and supervisors attest that there exists variation among Home Demonstration Agents in that area as to the extent and nature of their involvement in and development of programs with low-income families. This situation indicates the need for research which may account for these differences in this aspect of job performance.³

A review of literature disclosed several conclusions which appeared to have implications that provided the framework for exploring this problem. The childhood background of an agent might have some influence on the attitudes he acquires and the way in which he learns to relate to people of various types of background.⁴ The social class status of a family may be determined by factors such as occupation, source of

¹ECOP, Extension Home Economics Focus. November, 1966.

²Viola Hansen, "Frontiers in Home Economics", Journal of Cooperative Extension, III(Spring, 1965).

³Conference with Louisiana District Supervisors and State Administrators held in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, February 6, 1967.

⁴John McCollum, "Adult Education and the Development of Human Resources", Adult Leadership, XIII(December, 1964).

income, neighborhood and the type of house lived in.⁵ Agents who have had some type of experience in parishes of different ethnic and cultural background might have a better basis for understanding low-income people.⁶ Home Demonstration Agents who have had educational experience in home economics education degree programs may have had training which helps them understand the conditions contributing to effective learning.⁷ Certain inservice training experiences of agents might have enabled them to develop specific competencies needed to work with low-income families.⁸

Agents should consider the goals and values of low-income people and look to the program development process for needed guidance in planning effective programs with this audience.⁹ Home economics research is needed in the area of pilot programs to point up methods of working successfully with this clientele group.¹⁰

Personal characteristics important for superior job performance may be identified by studying the work of the most successful agents.¹¹

⁵ Evelyn Millis Duval, Family Development. (New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., second ed., 1962).

⁶ Alvin L. Bertrand, "The French and Non-French in Rural Louisiana". (Reviewed in the LSU Agrinaut, December, 1965).

⁷ Ralph W. Tyler, "Education in a World of Change", Journal of Home Economics, LIV(September, 1962).

⁸ Irene Beavers, "Contributions Home Economics Can Make to Low-Income Families". Journal of Home Economics, LVII(February, 1965).

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Irene Wolgamot, "Home Economists Gear for 1964 Challenge: Low-Income Groups". Journal of Home Economics, LVI(January, 1964).

¹¹ E. R. Ryden, "Predicting Successful Performance". Journal of Cooperative Extension, III(Summer, 1965).

Studies are needed in Cooperative Extension work which will help determine the basis for recruiting, employing, training, and evaluating staff.¹²

Consideration of the above factors led to the selection of certain ones to be investigated in relation to job performance of agents in working with low-income families. These factors included the following: personal characteristics relating to age, social class background, and experience in living and working with people of various ethnic backgrounds; and educational experience and training.

Statement of the Problem

This study involved: (1) the selection of certain factors appearing to contribute to successful working with low-income families. Factors selected from reviewing current literature included: personal characteristics relating to age, social class background, and experiences in living and working with people of various ethnic background; and educational experiences and training; (2) the investigation of the relationship existing between these factors and job performance of Home Demonstration Agents in working with low-income families; and (3) the development of guidelines to be used in the selection and training, both preservice and inservice, of agents in working with low-income families.

¹²Edgar J. Boone and James Duncan, "Needed Research in Extension Administrative Organization". National Extension Research Seminar Report ER&T-55(Washington: U. S. Department of Agriculture, March, 1962).

Purposes of the Study

The following purposes were identified for giving direction to the study:

- (1) to select from current literature factors which appeared to relate to successful working with low-income families;
- (2) to determine the level of job performance of Home Demonstration Agents in working with low-income families;
- (3) to determine the extent to which each of the selected factors was possessed by the agents;
- (4) to determine if there existed a relationship between level of job performance and the selected factors;
- (5) to draw conclusions regarding the relationship between job performance level of Home Demonstration Agents and the selected factors; and
- (6) to develop guidelines regarding selecting and training of Home Demonstration Agents to work with low-income families based upon the findings from the study.

Significance of the Study

This study appeared to relate to several areas of specific need of extension personnel involved in the development of appropriate educational programs with low-income audiences. These areas of need were identified: (1) an evaluation of parish extension programs and specifically the programs and methods used by the agents in working with low-income families; (2) the identification of areas where staff members needed to become more competent in developing work with low-income families; and (3) the development of a framework around which might be

organized personnel selection, inservice training, and graduate education for extension personnel.

Delimitation

This study was limited to Louisiana and the Cooperative Extension Service personnel within the state. The respondents included two separate populations: (1) the district staff members of all three extension districts who evaluated the programs and methods of home demonstration agents assigned to work in their respective districts and determined the job performance rating assigned to each agent; and (2) home demonstration agents responsible for the adult phase of the family living area within each parish who provided data concerning the factors appearing to relate to job performance which were selected for the study. All 64 parishes in Louisiana were represented in the study and all home demonstration agents having major or full responsibility for the adult phase of the extension program were included. The factors studied were limited to: personal characteristics relating to age, social class background, and experience in living and working with people of various ethnic backgrounds; and educational experiences and training.

Methods of collecting data were limited to the use of two instruments: one used by the district staff members in evaluating the programs and methods of agents in working with low-income families and one to collect data from the agents relating to the personal, educational, and training factors selected for use in the study. All instruments were mailed to the respondents in the populations. In the development of the guidelines for selecting and training of personnel,

only those factors which seemed to indicate some definite relationship to job performance and particularly to working with low-income families, were included.

Procedure

A list of factors which seemed to be closely related to job performance were selected from a review of current and related literature.

Factors selected included:

- (1) personal characteristics relating to age, years of employment in extension, social class background, and experience in living and working with people of various ethnic backgrounds;
- (2) formal educational experiences at both the undergraduate and graduate levels; and
- (3) preservice and inservice training.

An instrument was developed for use by the district program specialists to evaluate the program content and methods used by agents in order to determine the level of job performance of each agent in working with low-income families. A questionnaire was formulated to collect data from the home demonstration agents regarding the factors selected for the study. The questionnaires and evaluation instruments were mailed to the respective populations for completion. The data from the evaluations made by the district program specialists were used to determine the job performance level of each agent according to high, medium, or low level of performance. The questionnaires returned from the agents were divided according to the job performance rating given by the District Program Specialists. The data were totaled, reduced to

percentages, and placed in tabular form for analyses. After the data were analyzed conclusions were made regarding existing relationships between the selected factors and job performance level of the agents in working with low-income families. Guidelines were formulated regarding the selection and training of home demonstration agents to work with low-income families.

Definition of Terms

From the educational literature reviewed as background information relating to the study, definitions were formulated for use within the scope of this study. Specific attention was given to identifying terms that had unique and accepted meaning for the Cooperative Extension Service. For the purposes of this study, the following terms have been defined.

Audience: usually used with reference to a group of people sharing a common need or interest of particular concern to extension workers. Low-income people as a group may be referred to as a specific audience for whom extension workers have a concern.

Clientele: usually means all people in general who are served by the educational efforts of extension personnel; the people with whom extension personnel work who participate voluntarily.

District: a territory consisting of approximately twenty-one parishes grouped to facilitate administrative and supervisory responsibilities. Louisiana is divided into three extension districts.

District Staff Members: include the district agent and the district program specialists in Agriculture, Home Economics, and 4-H Work assigned to work with agents within a district territory.

Extension, Extension Service, Cooperative Extension Service: all refer to the off-campus educational programs in agriculture, home economics, and related areas sponsored jointly by the federal, state, and county governments and administered through the Land-Grant college.

Home Demonstration Agent: in Louisiana an experienced home economics trained person assigned to direct cooperative extension programs at the parish level. In other states she may be referred to as a Home Economist in Extension, or Extension Home Economist. Each State Extension Service independently determines the official titles to be used in reference to personnel.

Job Performance: refers to the way in which an extension worker identifies, plans, executes, and evaluates the responsibilities assigned to his position.

Low-Income: refers to families who have annual incomes of \$3,000 or less.

Parish: the same as a county in any other state. Louisiana is the only state that uses the term. Its usage originated with the early settlement of the French people within the state.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Cooperative Extension Work

Cooperative Extension work is basically an informal system of education which provides adults and youth the opportunity to learn through experience. It exists uniquely as a partnership relationship among the government, the Land-Grant institutions and the people for the purpose of providing service and educational opportunities planned to meet the needs of people. Its primary objective is to develop people.¹

Historical Development

Organized agricultural education in the United States had its inception in 1785 with the development of an agricultural society at Philadelphia. The idea of organizing agricultural societies spread rapidly resulting in the chartering of many state societies designed to promote educational activities related to agriculture. At the federal level agricultural work originated with the establishment of the patent office in 1790 and was reinforced by a law providing for a commissioner of patents in 1836. A department of agriculture was established from a recommendation made by President Lincoln in 1862 and within a few weeks

¹Lincoln David Kelsey and Cannon Chiles Hearne, Cooperative Extension Work, (third ed.). (Ithaca, New York: Comstock Publishing Associates, 1963), Chapter 1.

the Morrill Act was passed providing for federal support to agricultural education through the creation of Land-Grant colleges. Extension work was authorized by congress through the passage of the Hatch Act of 1887 which provided for the establishment of an agricultural experiment station in connection with at least one of the colleges in each state which had been established under the Morrill Act.

The development of highly successful farm-demonstration work by Seaman A. Knapp proved the effectiveness of teaching through the use of demonstration farms as a means of influencing farmers to adopt new practices. The organization of corn clubs for boys and tomato clubs for girls led to the need for employing trained men and women to supervise work within counties. The work with girls eventually led to the development of work with rural women.

As the possibility and opportunity for a nationwide informal educational system developed, concensus regarding federal support for such a system increased, culminating in the passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914, authorizing Cooperative Extension work in agriculture and home economics.²

Organizational Structure

The organizational structure of the Cooperative Extension Service is determined by several factors: needs of the people to be served; federal, state, and county laws; policies of the Land-Grant universities; and certain other organizations.

²H. C. Sanders et al., (ed.), The Cooperative Extension Service. (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966), Chapter 1.

Needs of the people to be served. One of the original bases for determining the purposes and objectives of Cooperative Extension work was consideration for the needs of the people to be served. The main purpose of assisting rural people to obtain information and develop skills needed for problem solving in farming has more recently been extended to include home economics, youth work, public affairs, and development of rural areas. In 1959 the scope and responsibilities of the Cooperative Extension Service were described to include the areas of: production; marketing; conservation; management; family; youth development; leadership development; community improvement; and public affairs.³

Federal, State, and County Laws. The two federal laws structuring the pattern of organization of the Cooperative Extension Service are the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, and the Memorandum of Understanding adopted by each state separately. The Smith-Lever Act authorizes the establishment of the organization: "In order to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics and to encourage the application of the same--"⁴ The Memorandum of Understanding which has been adopted by all but two states, provided for "---agricultural extension work which shall be carried on in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture---" and additionally that "---this work shall be carried on in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the

³ B. E. Kearl and O. B. Copeland, (ed.), A Guide to Extension Programs of the Future. (Raleigh: Agricultural Extension Service, North Carolina State College, 1959).

⁴ Sanders, p. 426.

secretary of agriculture and the state agricultural colleges or territory or possession receiving the benefits of this act."⁵ This document establishing the cooperative framework between the United States Department of Agriculture and the Land-Grant institutions provided the basis for the title of the Cooperative Extension Service.

State laws in general authorize the governing board of the Land-Grant institution to assume full responsibility for expenditure of appropriated funds and all action necessary for implementing the purposes of the Cooperative Extension Service. State and county laws are concerned primarily with membership and functions of a county governing unit, areas of program emphasis, local financing, staffing, and reporting policies.⁶

Sources of Institutional Policies. Policies determining the relationships of teaching, research and extension functions differ among Land-Grant institutions. The administrator of the Federal Extension Service and the directors of state extension services jointly assume responsibilities for planning Cooperative Extension work in agriculture and home economics which involves expenditures of federal funds.⁷

Organizations. The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges provides a framework through which the Land-Grant institutions can work with each other and with the United States Department of Agriculture in determining national extension programs and policies. The Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) of

⁵Ibid., p. 429

⁶Ibid., Chapter 4.

⁷Ibid.

this organization is a channel through which problems of concern identified by the administrator of the Federal Extension Service or by national farm organizations and commodity groups may be brought to attention for study and action at the regional or state level.⁸

Philosophy

The Cooperative Extension Service was organized for the purpose of providing information in agriculture and home economics and related subjects for the benefit of people throughout the United States. It recognizes the stabilizing influence of agriculture on the economy of the country and the importance of the home as an effective social and economic unit of society. A belief in the soundness of a cooperative sponsorship relationship at the federal, state, and local levels is a distinguishing feature. The acknowledgment of the need for preparing citizens to live in a democracy is an underlying principle of the program designed to develop people for leadership responsibilities. The organization aims toward improved family living for all people by helping them identify and solve their own problems. Instruction, which is informal and taught outside the classroom is based on the principles that adults can be taught and that experience is an important aspect of learning.

In the future as in the past, the Cooperative Extension Service will contribute largely to maintaining these elements: "an abundance of food and fiber; a family system that involves the home as an

⁸Ibid.

effective social and economic unit; and a systematic process of leadership development."⁹

Program Development Method

Fundamental to the Cooperative Extension Service is the process of program development which delineates the educational work of the organization. Included within the process are a series of steps involving planning the program, preparing teaching plans, implementing the plans, and evaluating results. Its objective is to answer four fundamental questions basic to developing any curriculum and plan of instruction:

1. What educational purposes should the school (the extension service) seek to attain?
2. What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes?
3. How can these educational experiences be effectively organized?
4. How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?¹⁰

The process of program development is a continuous, cooperative activity which involves lay people and the extension staff in identifying problems, establishing objectives, and initiating action to reach these objectives. Eight specific steps are included in the process: collecting the facts; analyzing the situation; identifying problems; determining objectives; developing a plan of work; executing the plan; determining progress; and reconsidering for the future.¹¹

Consideration should be given to the clientele to be reached and

⁹Sanders, p. 3.

¹⁰Ralph W. Tyler, Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950), pp. 1-2.

¹¹Federal Extension Service, Program Development Process. (U.S.D. A. ER&T-348, December 1956) (Mimeographed).

the subject matter content to be taught. Although the Scope Report¹² identified extension audiences as being still primarily rural, the organization has extended its outreach to embrace many other individuals and groups who have agricultural or home economics problems. Nine major areas for extension work were then outlined. They are the following:

1. efficiency in agricultural production
2. conservation, development, and wise use of natural resources
3. efficiency in marketing, distribution, and utilization
4. management on the farm and in the home
5. family living
6. youth development
7. leadership development
8. community improvement and resource development
9. public affairs.

Lay people are involved through advisory groups in making decisions about educational objectives because it is believed that involvement of lay people: expedites the process of educational change among people; results in more representative decisions; and serves as a beneficial learning experience.¹³

In selecting objectives the educational philosophy of extension and the principles of the psychology of learning are considered. Principles of psychology appropriate for use in determining objectives are: selection of the objectives appropriate to and attainable by the clientele; the possibility of the desired behavior change being practiced by

¹²Kearl and Copeland.

¹³Sanders.

the clientele; and the building of new learning experiences on previous experience.¹⁴

Forces Influencing the Development of Extension Programs

Cooperative extension programs are developed on the identified existing problems of the clientele served. Three areas of current adult problems are those concerned with conditions effected by the changing patterns of family life, industrialization, and the development of a new social structure.¹⁵ Other influencing factors are the new attitudes toward education for adults, increased role of the federal government in financing higher education, and technological development in the expansion of mass media.

Changing Patterns of Family Life. The twentieth century has effected many changes in American family life. These changes may be summarized as trends toward an increased number of: men and women getting married at younger ages; families having three or four children; individuals living to complete their family life cycle; women working outside the home; families moving from the farms and into the cities and suburbs; families changing from production to consumption of goods and services; families having more resources; individuals having more leisure, better education, and more freedom. Family roles have changed as family instability has increased.¹⁶ These many changes have brought about the need for educational opportunities which will enable adults

¹⁴Tyler.

¹⁵John I. Goodlad, (ed.), The Changing American School. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966).

¹⁶Duvall.

as family members to respond to new needs, conditions, and challenges, and adjust creatively to the numerous demands inflicted by today's world.

Family life education should be concerned with: the interpersonal relationships of the family as a unit; the relationships of parents and children; and the skills and insights of homemaking as they contribute to better family living.¹⁷

Industrialization. These changes may be summarized as trends developing as a result of industrialization.

More rural people are seeking employment in urban and suburban areas.¹⁸

Automation is replacing more of the skilled and unskilled labor resulting in increased unemployment.¹⁹

More women with children under 18 years of age are seeking employment although they lack adequate training and preparation for available jobs.²⁰

Efficiency in farm operations has reduced the number of employees in agricultural operations.²¹

The increased number of school dropouts is causing more young

¹⁷Cyril O. Houle, "Adult Education and Family Life". The Journal of Cooperative Extension, I(Fall, 1965).

¹⁸Business Week, "University of California Extension Keeps the Pros Up to Date", (March 12, 1966).

¹⁹U. S. Department of Agriculture, A Place to Live. The Yearbook of Agriculture. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963).

²⁰Alice Scates, "Women Moving Ahead", American Education, II(1966).

²¹U. S. Department of Agriculture, A Place to Live.

people to enter the work force at a time when the number of unskilled jobs in the economy is rapidly decreasing.²²

The rapid obsolescence of knowledge acquired in college is of great concern to industries.²³ Over half of the jobs of today did not exist ten years ago and one-half of the information acquired today will be obsolete in a few years.²⁴

Adults need educational opportunities to help them keep abreast of scientific and technological developments, qualify for new or different areas of employment, bridge the gap between their formal education and training and present day educational needs for job qualifications, and ultimately remain productive members of society.²⁵

Development of a New Social Structure. Efforts to bring about improved living for all Americans includes the problem of upgrading through education the disadvantaged persons who constitute one-fifth of the American society. Included within this are: families of low income; aging or older adults; individuals with physical and/or mental handicaps; and people of different races or cultural groups. The Great Society requires greater understanding and participation on the part of all citizens.²⁶ Adult educators must provide imaginative and effective education programs and develop competent lay leadership in order to

²² Robert D. Strom, "The Dropout Problem in Relation to Family Affect and Effect", *Journal of Home Economics*. LVI(May, 1964).

²³ Neil W. Chamberlain, "The Corporation as a College". Atlantic Monthly (June, 1965).

²⁴ Business Week.

²⁵ Sanders, Chapter 8.

²⁶ Glenn E. Holmes, "Upgrading Through Education". Adult Leadership, XV(June, 1966).

more effectively educate all Americans and help them understand the changes that must come, the roles they must play, and the contributions they must make.²⁷

New Attitudes Toward Education for Adults. Two specific traditional beliefs regarding education that have formerly served as obstacles to the development of programs for adults are that education takes place only within the classroom and is limited to a specific number of years in the life of an individual.²⁸ However, research supports the belief that adults can continue to learn effectively throughout their entire lifetime.²⁹ Research findings substantiate the generalization that ability in thinking, problem solving, and imagination tend to increase with age throughout adulthood. Usefulness of the information to the adult tends to be the standard for determining the level of instruction.³⁰

Certain conditions associated with adulthood which may explain the adult's unique learning behavior relate to physical declination, underestimation of self as a learner, repeated antagonistic experiences, and a growing concern for immediacy of application. These conditions represent a real challenge which, when properly understood and accepted by

²⁷ Leon H. Keyserling, Progress or Poverty. Conference on Economic Progress, (Washington, D. C.: December, 1964).

²⁸ John W. Gardner, "Live and Learn". Expanding Horizons, Golden Anniversary Publication, National University Extension Association, Stanley J. Drazek, (ed.). Washington: North Washington Press, 1965).

²⁹ Wayne L. Schroeder, "Adults Can and Must Learn". Journal of Cooperative Extension, IV(Winter, 1966).

³⁰ Howard L. Kingsley and Ralph Garry, The Nature and Conditions of Learning (rev. ed.). (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1957).

adult educators, may result in highly enriched continued learning experiences.³¹

In the past American educational policy has been founded on the belief that an individual can acquire as a young person, the major portion of the knowledge and skill he will need to live adequately for the rest of his life. However, the current idea held by educators is that adults must continue to learn, for learning like breathing, is a basic requirement for living. The fact of life responsible for the assumption that learning is a life-long process is the realization of the accelerating pace of social change.³²

Role of the Federal Government in Financing Higher Education. The interest of the federal government in higher education has increased in recent years, largely because of the crucial importance of higher education to national security, technological progress, and economic growth. Federal funds are provided to universities through direct grants to the institution for support of research carried on within the institution, assistance to the students directly, construction of campus buildings, and the development of federal educational institutions.³³

Trends Toward Coordination of University Extension Efforts. The great expansion of various continuing education programs emphasizes the need for effective coordination of extension efforts within the university as a unit as well as among other institutions of higher

³¹Shroeder.

³²Sanders.

³³Alice M. Rivlin, The Role of the Federal Government in Financing Higher Education. (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1961).

learning within a state. Coordination within the university may be achieved through a merger of cooperative and general extension efforts or through promoting close working relationships between the two extension systems with the specific responsibilities for each clearly defined. There seems to be much logic for enlarging the scope of cooperative extension to function as the educational arm of the total Land-Grant university in the organization of informal educational programs closely resembling those already developed in agriculture and home economics.³⁴ The cooperative extension organization may be adapted to the urban areas as a means of expanding in both depth and quality the offerings the university provides the urban population in an effort to make the extended classroom more related to the needs of the community.³⁵

Expansion of Mass Media. Within the past century the need for broader means of communication has greatly increased. Since the invention of the printing press the first mass communication medium, five other media have evolved including the telegraph, telephone, motion picture, radio, and television. Each new invention has increased the opportunities to reach more and more people. Research shows that Americans watch 56.3 million television sets.³⁶ The extensive use of communication media within the United States effectively contributes to group cohesion comparable to the direct personal contact which suffices

³⁴E. T. York, "Coordinating Extension". Journal of Cooperative Extension. IV(Summer, 1966).

³⁵Russell D. Robinson, "University Roles in Adult Education". Adult Leadership. XV(June, 1966).

³⁶Dorothy Westby-Gibson, Social Perspectives on Education. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965).

for much simpler societies. Mass media has become a powerful agency for reinforcing, transmitting, and influencing existing value systems, and in a democratic society, conveys information and opinion that ultimately enable citizens to make decisions.³⁷

Evaluation

Extension evaluation is a process used for determining the behavioral changes which take place in people as a result of extension educational programs.³⁸ Certain basic assumptions are recognized by educators as being basic to developing an evaluation program. These are stated as the following:

Education is a process which seeks to change the behavior of individuals. The kind of changes in behavior which extension workers seek to bring about in their clientele are the educational objectives for their program or project. The extension program is appraised by finding out how far the objectives of the program are actually being realized. Human behavior is so complex that it cannot be adequately described or measured by a single term or a single dimension. The way in which an individual organizes his behavior pattern is an important aspect to be appraised. The methods of evaluation are not limited to one device but that any device which provides valid evidence regarding the progress of individuals toward educational goals is appropriate. The nature of the appraisal influences teaching and learning. Evaluation should be a cooperative process.³⁹

The major purpose of an educational evaluation program in extension is to determine the effects of teaching under known conditions, on the knowledge, attitudes, and practices of those being taught, in order to provide a basis for improving, justifying, or discontinuing the

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Sanders, Chapter 33.

³⁹ Tyler, and Mimeographed material received as a part of Home Economics Education 563, "Evaluation in Homemaking", Oklahoma State University (Spring, 1966), June Cozine, Professor.

teaching activity. The techniques developed for evaluation experiences may also serve other educational purposes if certain conditions have been met in developing the evaluation program. These conditions include the following: clarifying educational objectives; establishing a benchmark; communicating to learners the desired behavioral change; sharing evaluation results with learners; and using evaluation results as a means of effecting an objective, experimental and creative approach to teaching.⁴⁰

Four possible barriers to effective evaluation in extension program development relate to the following beliefs held by some extension workers: it is easier to prove educational experiences which are repeated year after year; job security seems to be derived from established habits and programs; the extension worker may not recognize when learning has taken place; and the extension worker may avoid anxiety and failure by refusing to critically evaluate his activities.⁴¹ Other reasons are given as explanations why little time is devoted to evaluation by extension workers: lack of self-confidence in skills related to the use of evaluation techniques; pressures of routine activities; inability of the worker to see evaluation as a part of the educational process; negative attitudes toward record-keeping; and inadequate training in evaluation.⁴²

The importance of realistic evaluation in the development of

⁴⁰Frank D. Alexander, "A Critique of Evaluation". Journal of Co-operative Extension, III(Winter, 1965).

⁴¹Patrick G. Boyle and George F. Aker, "Take The Evaluation Attitude". Extension Service Review. (April, 1962).

⁴²E. J. Brown, "Build in Evaluation". Extension Service Review. (August, 1959).

extension programs is summarized in these words:

The final step in the development of a program is that of evaluating what progress has been made toward attaining the objectives which were specified in the beginning. Basically, the success of the action that is taken must be examined in the light of the progress that was made toward the objectives. In extension work today, success cannot be measured in terms of the number of counties visited, miles traveled, bulletins written, etc., all of which add up to a concept of busyness. Being busy is usually a necessary condition of success but rarely a sufficient one.⁴³

Personnel Training and Development

The development and maintenance of the kinds of competencies that will enable extension workers to contribute the most is one of the major challenges facing extension today. While extension is unique in its educational emphasis, basic philosophy, university affiliation, and wide range of technical fields, the adequacy of personnel competence must be measured in terms of the problems and needs of the clientele served. Several areas of competencies appear to be basic needs in all extension responsibilities. These competencies may be identified as the following: special insight in some technical field needed by the clientele; ability to identify and analyze the problems of people; skill to lead people through problem-solving situations; ability to motivate people to change; skill in communications; and dedication to visualize and actualize dreams.⁴⁴

Additional generalized areas of competence appropriate to the job of the extension worker at all levels include the following: complete

⁴³Jean C. Evans, Program Planning. (Mimeographed). Vice President Oklahoma State University Extension, January, 1966.

⁴⁴Lloyd H. Davis, "On Being Professional". Journal of Cooperative Extension, I(Winter, 1963).

understanding of the organizational and administrative aspects of the Cooperative Extension Service; proficiency in the application of the principles of programming; high degree of competence in the selection and use of teaching methods; understanding of the structure and dynamics of human society; skill in human relations; proficiency in applying the principles of management; knowledge of current affairs; understanding of the principles of administration and supervision; and proficiency in the use of evaluation techniques.⁴⁵

The following guidelines have been proposed for consideration in maintaining the competence needed by extension workers: clear understanding of program objectives; adequate job descriptions; high level of technical preparation in subject matter for area and state specialists; identification of potential administrative and supervisory personnel in adequate time to allow them to develop needed competencies; increased knowledge about research in adult education; completion of Master's degree and Doctor's degree for county personnel and state specialists respectively; and supplementing agriculture and home economics staff competencies through cooperative arrangements with other facets of the Land-Grant Institution.⁴⁶

Job Performance. The effectiveness of any extension program is determined largely by the competence of personnel in implementing assigned responsibilities. Administrators and supervisors at all levels are concerned with identifying any factors which might relate to successful job performance. Personal characteristics, education, and

⁴⁵George Hyatt, Jr., "Staff Competence". Journal of Cooperative Extension, I(Winter, 1963).

⁴⁶Ibid.

training appear to be important aspects contributing to both success on the job as well as to tenure.

Studies revealed that the most successful agents tended to give more consideration to: (1) the development of a program that encompassed all aspects of the situation affecting clientele; (2) the attributes of local people affected by a particular phase of the program; (3) an interpretation of policies as being flexible; and (4) viewing their job as contributing to the objectives of extension by dealing with more complex interdisciplinary problems. Those agents who perceived themselves primarily as technicians tended to impose preconceived solutions to problems.⁴⁷

Efforts to develop methods of predicting successful agent performance have led to studies related to four categories of human characteristics: mental ability; interest; personality; and attitudes. While prediction of job performance has not been perfected, adaptability, vocational interest, and grade point average tended to relate significantly to successful job performance.⁴⁸

Among men 4-H club agents, success on the job was attributed to these factors: (1) high school athletic participation; (2) FFA activities; (3) satisfaction with promotion methods used; (4) grade point average in social science; (5) graduate grade-point average; and

⁴⁷ Alan P. Utz, Jr., "Agent Performance in Programming". Journal of Cooperative Extension, III(Fall, 1965).

⁴⁸ Ryden.

(6) satisfaction with the amount of night work or overtime.⁴⁹

Maslow's motivation theory related to need hierarchy was felt to have relevance for stimulating extension agents to successful job performance. The inability to satisfy basic needs through successful work experience may result in: symptoms of frustration; anxiety; a sense of failure; inner conflict; and ultimately, an inferior job performance. Need satisfactions of employees and work climate provided by supervisors and administrators were both considered important aspects of successful performance.⁵⁰

Professional people were felt to be more successful when a working climate emphasizing factors specifically related to job responsibility was provided.⁵¹

Extension Training For the Future. Proposals for future training programs for extension personnel include the following: development of a sound training curriculum reflecting the needs of extension programs; inclusion of courses in the broad areas of arts and sciences; formulation of plans for a program of study leading to a degree developed early by the new extension worker; increased depth and breadth in specialized training; development of training programs that are intensified, in focus with the times, and of a continuous nature; and

⁴⁹ Edward W. Gassie, "Factors Associated With Job Performance of Assistant and Associate County Agents Doing 4-H Club Work, Louisiana, 1964". Unpublished doctor of philosophy dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1965.

⁵⁰ Denzil D. Clegg, "Motivational Theory in Practice". Journal of Cooperative Extension, V(Spring, 1967).

⁵¹ _____, "Work as a Motivator". Journal of Cooperative Extension, I(Fall, 1963).

reevaluation of the number of graduate schools of extension education.⁵²
 In addition, the training process should conform to the general requirements for good training and incorporate the principles of learning.⁵³

In 1966 states offering college work in extension education did so with 8 colleges offering undergraduate majors, 25 offering the Master's degree while the Doctor's degree was granted by 4 institutions. In-service training programs throughout the United States were held in all areas of needed competencies, with the number of meetings held in program development skills almost doubling the number held in any other area. Communication skills and leadership development were the next two highest, while training in research and evaluation methods were among the lowest in number in the nation.⁵⁴

Forty states reported having a coordinator of training and 31 had a state training committee. Cooperative Extension personnel on study leave were 673 of which 431 were working on Master's degrees and 138 were completing Doctor's degrees. At the Master's level over one-half were majoring in education followed by agriculture, home economics, and social science; while at the Doctoral level the largest percentage majored in education, followed in order by social science, agriculture, and home economics.⁵⁵

⁵²Training Extension Workers for the Future, Proceedings of the National Training Conference, April 18-20, 1962, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

⁵³Ibid.

⁵⁴Division of Extension Research and Education, Report of Programs In Extension Education For Professional Extension Workers. (Washington: U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1967) ER&E - 48.

⁵⁵Ibid.

Training goals for the future may be "to guide workers to greater depth, more flexibility in choice of basic fields, more precise definition of training needed, and more maturity in the science of extension."⁵⁶

The writer concludes that it is desirable for the undergraduate education of extension workers to be concentrated in an area related to agriculture or home economics rather than in the specialized area of extension education. Courses in history and philosophy of cooperative extension work at the undergraduate level may help potential extension workers critically evaluate the Cooperative Extension Service as their choice for a future profession.

Considering that a graduate program for extension workers will vary from one institution to another, a general framework for developing such a program within any institution has been proposed. This proposal is summarized in the following statement: that the graduate education program for extension workers be available at the Master's and/or Doctor's level as an interdepartmental program within the units of agriculture or home economics with emphasis on effective extension educational methods and administered under the general direction of the faculty of the graduate school.⁵⁷

New Directions in Home Economics Extension Programs

Home economics is a field of knowledge which is concerned with

⁵⁶Sanders, p. 401.

⁵⁷Betty Jean Brannan, "A Study of Selected Programs in Home Economics Resident Instruction and Agricultural-Home Economics Extension In Land-Grant Institutions and Proposals For The Further Development of These Programs". Unpub. Ed.D. Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1961.

strengthening family life. Home economics brings together knowledge from its own research and from related fields in various areas of family living. These areas are broadly grouped as the following: textiles and clothing; housing and household equipment; food and nutrition; family relations and child development; family economics and home management; and art. Home economics is concerned with the interrelationship of these aspects of living and the emphasis given each is determined by the needs of individuals and families in the social environment of the time. Home economics seeks to identify changing needs of families and individuals and to improve consumer goods and services as a means of bringing more satisfactions into the lives of people. Home economics provides professional education and employment opportunities for purposes of carrying out its objectives.⁵⁸

Included within the statement of the scope and responsibilities of the Cooperative Extension Service is the area of family living. Education for family living aims toward the development of a satisfying home and a congenial relationship among members of family and the community. In recent years family living has been strongly influenced by the rising economy, technological advances, and changing community patterns which have been effected since the World War II days. New trends in program development and experimentation have evolved in the areas of family finance, home management, buying, human relations, food and nutrition, clothing, housing, citizenship, health, safety, and conservation. All families have become equated in their wants, desires,

⁵⁸"Home Economics New Directions", A statement of philosophy and objectives of home economics prepared by the Committee on Philosophy and Objectives of the American Home Economics Association, June 1959.

and living standards as a result of many forces at work within the American society. All families must be considered extension clientele although it must be left to each state to determine its own priorities in terms of need, demand, and available resources.⁵⁹

In the past much of the family centered extension work has been done through homemakers' groups organized specifically for that purpose. However, there are clear indications that the home economics extension program of the future will not be planned for organized groups alone, but will be a specific program planned to meet the needs of a defined audience. Teaching will be effected on the level of the learning of the audience and with reference to specific needs.⁶⁰

Future home economics extension programs must reflect the identification of the needs of the clientele; an understanding of the forces effecting these needs; a determination of priorities in program emphases; and planning for multi-method approaches in teaching methods. Areas in home economics identified as being of national concern are: family stability; consumer competence; family health; family housing; and community and resource development. The identification of these five areas of concern gives organization to the emerging problems which serve as areas of program emphases.⁶¹

Multidimensional programs must be developed to meet the needs of specific audiences within both rural and urban areas. These specific

⁵⁹Kearl and Copeland.

⁶⁰Ibid.

⁶¹Home Economics Subcommittee of ECOP, Extension Home Economics Focus. American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, November, 1966.

audiences include: young married families; families with young children; low-income families; working women; youth and youth leadership; business and industry personnel; and professional home economists. Instructional approaches must include effective methods of the past reinforced by intensive programs such as short courses, workshops, television series, and home study courses. Women's organizations will continue to be effective in developing leadership and implementing important community and resource development activities. Programs will include cooperation with other segments of the university in expanding extension programs and the utilization of community resources which can be used in program implementation.⁶²

Program and clientele priorities will determine patterns of staffing which will include both professional and non-professional workers. Highly competent personnel and additional specialists will be required on the resident staff, in the county, or in a multi-county organized unit.⁶³

Demands of the future require a solid belief in the potential of home economics extension workers to be equal to the task. This belief has been expressed in the following words with regard to Oklahoma:

The future will bring new challenges, new demands, new frustrations, new programs, new complexities, but I believe that we can, by working diligently and cooperatively, meet the challenges with pride and satisfaction and with appropriate benefit to the different age groups in our fine citizenry of the state of Oklahoma.⁶⁴

⁶²Ibid.

⁶³Ibid.

⁶⁴Lela O'Toole, "Looking Ahead in Family Living". A talk given at the Annual Extension Conference, Oklahoma State University, November 9, 1965. (Mimeographed).

Work With Low-Income People

President Johnson in his 1964 State of the Union Address declared

This administration, today, here and now, declares unconditional war on poverty in America.... The richest nation on earth can afford to win it. The program I shall propose will help that one-fifth of all American families with incomes too small to even meet their basic needs. Our chief weapons in a more pin-pointed attack will be better schools and better health, better homes, better training and better job opportunities. ... Our aim is not only to relieve the symptom of poverty, but to cure it, and above all to prevent it.⁶⁵

A recent study showed that extension directors, state leaders, specialists, and lay home economics leaders believed that home economics extension programs should be focused on meeting the educational needs of the homemaker. These leaders felt that more attention should be given particularly to programs that will aid the low socio-economic family in management of its limited resources and at the same time help members of such families raise the expected goals of their children.⁶⁶ One of the major problems of establishing programs with the low socio-economic family has been developing a working definition of poverty. Other problems have been: identifying their needs; planning adequate educational experiences; understanding their value systems; implementing program plans; and evaluating results.

Defining Poverty

Poverty currently is defined in the United States by reference to

⁶⁵ Time Magazine, "The Presidency State of the Union Address delivered by President Johnson". LXXXIII (January 17, 1964) pp. 10-11.

⁶⁶ Hansen.

annual income and specifically of that less than \$3,000 per family unit.⁶⁷ However, part of the problem in defining poverty results from using money income as the sole measure of family resources. Consideration should be given to the following other factors as indices of poverty: the stage of the family life cycle; family resources; community services; personal resources;⁶⁸ family size and composition; place of residence; amount of installment buying;⁶⁹ and level of living of a family.⁷⁰

The level of living and social class status of a family may be closely related. Occupation, source of income, neighborhood in which lived, and the type of home lived in are considered factors which determine a family's social class status.⁷¹ The United States is considered to be divided into six well-defined social classes, each with specific characteristics. These are the following class groups: upper-upper; lower-upper; upper-middle; lower-middle; upper-lower; and lower-lower. The characteristics of the lower-lower class are described as the following:

⁶⁷Helen L. Witmer, "Children and Poverty". Children, II(November-December, 1964).

⁶⁸Barbara B. Reagan, "Consumer Economics Research and the Definition of Poverty". Journal of Home Economics, LIX(April 1967).

⁶⁹President's Committee on Consumer Interest, The Most for Their Money. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, O-775-172 (June 1965).

⁷⁰Lydia Strong, Consumer Education for Low-Income Families. Mount Vernon, New York: Consumers Union of U. S., Inc. (Second Printing) 1964.

⁷¹W. Lloyd and Mildren Hall Warner, What You Should Know About Social Class. (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1963).

The lower-lower class is made up of families who live in the least desirable parts of town, in slums or slum-like dwellings. The family income comes from wages earned by the father, and usually the mother, at unskilled jobs that alternate with unemployment and being on relief. There is not always enough money to go around, and the family lives from day to day. Children of lower-lower class families drop out of school earlier than do members of other classes and are sooner in the labor force.⁷²

Characteristics of Poverty

Personal characteristics of the poor are related to color, sex, education, and training, while economic characteristics are influenced by unemployment, wages received during the time of employment, the nature of the occupation, age, and the state of health. An analysis of the 34 million poor people in the United States reveals that: 52 per cent reflect deficient education; 44 per cent live in the South; 40 per cent are excessively unemployed; 29 per cent are female family heads; 27 per cent are aged family heads; 25 per cent are non-white; and 15 per cent live on farms.⁷³ In general, meager education, large families, substandard housing and limited job skills are associated with low-income people.⁷⁴

Factors in the American society that act to sustain poverty are identified as being: ecological and demographic trends; limited opportunity structure for the poor; patterns of racial discrimination; deficiencies in community resources for the poor in the areas of health, housing, legal aid, and consumer credit; and poor agency-client

⁷²Duvall, pp. 71-72.

⁷³Keyserling.

⁷⁴Wolgamot.

relationships.⁷⁵

Major contributors to poverty include: prolonged illnesses and death of the family breadwinner; old age and retirement; and lack of education resulting in low ability combined with obsolete education.⁷⁶

Poverty has many profiles which differ from nation to nation, sub-culture to sub-culture, and among families and individuals. Its existence is determined by the nature and extent of the gap between an individual's observation and evaluation of the situation and his concept of necessary requirements. It may be viewed either by an individual or by society as a whole, as being a chronic condition which falls short of its potential for measuring up to a prescribed standard of living. Poverty may exist as inadequacies or deficiencies in human physical, biological, or psychic needs, and may be manifested in economical impoverishment.⁷⁷

Consumer Practices Contributing to Financial Insecurity

The net worth of a family may be determined by assessing the difference between current liabilities and current value of assets. A family that enjoys financial security is able to meet its current needs and also make some provision for the future. Major problems related to financial security include: meeting emergencies which may occur at any

⁷⁵Mollie Orshansky, "Counting the Poor: Another Look at the Poverty Profile". Poverty in America, Louis A. Ferman et. al. (ed.) (Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1965).

⁷⁶Rudolph Trenton, Basic Economics. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts Division of Meredith Publishing Co., 1964).

⁷⁷Margaret I. Liston, "Profiles of Poverty". AAUW Journal (October, 1964).

time in the life cycle; providing income for the family in case of a premature death of the breadwinner; and providing for income for the breadwinner and his family in the event of his retirement and old age. The problem of providing for financial security is a serious one requiring a period of time during which funds for this purpose may be accumulated.⁷⁸

The frugality of the low-income consumer in the use of his available resources will determine largely the amount of cash he can accumulate for future security measures. Too often, however, the low-income consumer engages in practices which prevent his receiving maximum value from his money spent thus requiring his paying more for services and goods.

Studies indicate that the poor are consumers of expensive commodities resulting from the rapidly expanding installment plan practice.⁷⁹

A study of spending patterns revealed that the poorer the family the greater the proportion of the total expenditures that were devoted to the provision of food, shelter, and medical care. A smaller percentage was spent for clothing, furnishings, equipment, transportation, and other items.⁸⁰

⁷⁸Irma H. Gross and Elizabeth W. Crandall, Management for Modern Families. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963).

⁷⁹David Caplovitz, "Special Consumer Problems of Low-Income Families" A paper prepared for the Home Management and Family Economics Workshop, Center for Continuing Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, October 1, 1964.

⁸⁰Emma G. Holmes, "Spending Patterns of Low-Income Families", Talk presented to Consumer and Food Economics Research Division, 42nd Annual Agricultural Outlook Conference, Washington, D. C., November 17, 1964.

Low-income shoppers evidence less deliberation in buying, limit their shopping scope to the use of nearby stores, rely on relatives as a source of information, and tend to frequently use some form of credit and installment buying. Regarding family budgets and spending plans, education tends to be a major factor in the ability of individuals to think of money as a long-range abstract value. The poor are less often covered by insurance, either medical, hospital, or life insurance. The prevalence of low-income families meeting some needs through home production tends to be related to home ownership and to the extent to which family members possess certain skills acquired through special training or experience. Low-income families seemingly do not take advantage of consumer benefits available to them because of apathy or lack of communication although they might ease their income situation in this way.⁸¹

Because of the unwise use of credit, low-income people frequently must spend too large a portion of their money for credit. In addition, their lack of education makes it difficult for them to read and understand contracts which obligate them in the use of credit.⁸²

Philosophical Basis for Working with Low-Income Families

Many low-income families do not know or believe that education is a means of improving their situation. A disadvantaged family who has failed often and been insecure clings to what it knows and has, because

⁸¹Louise G. Richards, "Consumer Practices of the Poor", Low-Income Life Styles, Lola M. Ireland, (ed.). Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office Welfare Administration Publication No. 14, OF-210-072, 1966.

⁸²Esther Peterson, "Consumer Problems of Low-Income Families". Working With Low-Income Families, Proceedings of the AHEA Workshop, University of Chicago, March 15-19, 1965. (Washington, D.C.: AHEA, 1965).

a change might mean a risk of losing too much. Learning experiences for these families must first reach the individual to help him gain respect, hope, and faith. Then the family needs the acquisition of knowledge and skills in addition to the opportunities to increase its income.⁸³

Motivation. One of the difficult aspects of working with low-income people is that of creating a desire on their part for change. Educators adhere to the theory that change is effected in people only if they themselves feel the need for this change. An important theory of relevance to effecting change in low-income people is that concerning human needs. Human need is arranged in a hierarchy of prepotency with the need for satisfying physiological needs of food, clothing, and shelter being of primary importance. After this need is met, then other needs emerge with equal importance related to: security; love and belongingness; esteem; and self-realization.⁸⁴ Low-income people usually are found at the level of still attempting to satisfy the basic physiological needs and educators need to remember this when planning educational experiences for these audiences. In addition, factors that influence learning, especially in adults, should be considered of special importance.⁸⁵

Values. Values are anything--ideas, beliefs, practices, things, that are important to people for any reason. The system of values

⁸³U. S. Department of Agriculture, Training Home Economics Program Assistants to Work With Low-Income Families. PA-681(Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965).

⁸⁴A. H. Maslow, Motivation and Personality. (New York: Harper and Brother Publishers, 1954).

⁸⁵U. S. Department of Agriculture, PA-681.

developed or adopted by individuals influences decisions which they make regarding all aspects of life. While values are learned aspects of behavior resulting from cultural background, educational experience, and associations, they may be changed or altered in the same way. It is important for educators working with low-income people to understand that individuals can be influenced to change their way of thinking.⁸⁶

Program Development. A program recently developed for working with low-income families is based on the following principles:

1. Through small but successful learning experiences the learner can change a self-image of defeat and failure to one of confidence.
2. The long-range goal is the development of the individual and his family. The teaching of useful skills is one means of achieving this goal.
3. Some individuals may not be interested in attending meetings. For them learning experiences should begin through personal contacts.
4. The learning experiences should have immediate and practical application related to problems each family faces.
5. A sequence of personal contacts will reveal interests and needs of the learner, will provide opportunity to try and practice newly learned skills and will move the learner to participate in a group of two or three, and finally in a larger group.
6. It is important to motivate the learner to group experiences.
7. The real focus must be on education. Donations are not the same as helping a family learn how to acquire the same thing. Service to the learner and his family should be given in terms of learning experiences.
8. Working intensively with learners in this audience is necessary for their personal development.

⁸⁶Ina C. Brown, Understanding Other Cultures. (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964).

9. Small evidence of change in people will be the marks of real progress.⁸⁷

Methods of Improving Financial Conditions of Low-Income Families

Five possible ways by which families can reduce pressure on money income and thereby improve their financial condition include the following: (1) increase the amount available by increasing the money income; (2) make the money income go farther by increased home production or frugality in consumption practices; (3) reduce wasteful expenditure through better allocation of funds; (4) decrease the birth rate and thus the size of the family; (5) and lower the aspirations of families in an effort to diminish felt poverty.⁸⁸ Specific measures may be taken through education and public services; economic policies and programs; employment; educational programs; and consumer protection.

Education and Public Services. Legislation may be passed to provide additional funds to pre-schools and schools in low-income areas; increase funds for research in education; and initiate a program of general federal aid for all schools. Local public health services may provide comprehensive family care clinics in predominately low-income neighborhoods to improve early care, maternal and child care, rehabilitation, and reduce the length of hospitalization time. Community planning councils may be organized to coordinate hospitals and other health facilities and services as a means of effecting better health care on a more economical basis. Hospital insurance for the aged and state

⁸⁷U. S. Department of Agriculture, PA-681, pp. 7-8.

⁸⁸Hazel Kyrk, The Family in the American Economy. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953).

legislation for compulsory temporary disability benefits are other possible courses of action.⁸⁹

Economic Measures. Measures to improve social insurance are related to more adequate unemployment and old-age insurance programs to equate benefits with the current level of wages and prices. Research has shown that many of the families now receiving relief and public assistance might become self-supporting. Rehabilitation programs could be expanded through increased federal grants for more than two million adults suffering from physical disabilities. Employee benefits might be extended by companies employing people at lower incomes to include sickness benefits and in-service training and retraining. Specific programs designed to effect full employment include: training the unemployed through vocational educational education programs; Manpower Development and Training Act; Economic Opportunity Act; Area Redevelopment Administration which has brought jobs into areas of unemployment through industrial and commercial loans; and work projects for public facilities.⁹⁰

Vocational education programs have provided funds for occupational training in agriculture, trades and industry, home economics, merchandising, marketing, practical nursing, and technical education. The primary aim of these programs is to raise the economic productivity of human beings.⁹¹

⁸⁹Charles I. Schottland, "Government Economic Programs and Family Life". Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXIX(February, 1967).

⁹⁰Schottland.

⁹¹Schottland.

Vocational Rehabilitation programs are designed to train the physically handicapped person to become productive and a wage earning member of society thereby achieving a degree of financial security. Because disability is a major cause of economic insecurity the extent to which the disabled can be rehabilitated and become self-supporting determines his economic security for himself and his family.⁹²

Major income maintenance programs are grouped as: unemployment insurance; programs of the Social Security Administration; Public Assistance; workmen's compensation; government retirement and miscellaneous benefit programs; voluntary pensions and related programs; and other miscellaneous programs and policies.⁹³

Measures which might be taken for preventing poverty before it occurs include the following: provide a job and adequate wage for every person willing and able to work with guaranteed replacement income; make available to everyone guaranteed and experimental social services; and initiate a new way of thinking about income, particularly with regard to current methods of providing it as well as supplementing assistance to those who need it.⁹⁴

Educational Programs. One particular type of educational program being developed is that of training homemakers as program assistants to work with low-income families. These program assistants are either paid or volunteer nonprofessional leaders who work directly with low-income homemakers. These programs aim to help low-income families

⁹²Schottland.

⁹³Schottland.

⁹⁴Elizabeth Wickenden, "The Legal Right to a Minimum But Adequate Level of Living". Journal of Home Economics, LIX(January, 1967).

accomplish the following objectives: raise aspirations; develop pride in homemaking; improve homemaking skills; have a more satisfying home and family life; improve family health; gain knowledge to help children develop; and increase understanding of their community and its resources. These programs provide opportunities for homemakers from families of limited incomes and who need to work, to become program assistants and increase their own family financial resources as well as improve their leadership and homemaking skills.⁹⁵

Educational programs on shopping for credit and family financial management have been among those sponsored by Cooperative Extension Workers.⁹⁶ Several different organizations are active in educating or organizing low-income consumers for action. These include: Public Housing Authorities; Welfare Departments; health agencies; local unions and local AFL-CIO Councils; and Voluntary Social Agencies. Assistance given through these groups include: classes on credit buying; legal assistance; assistance in the establishment of credit unions; literacy classes; and health clinics.⁹⁷

Consumer Protection. Legislation might control the practice of pressuring low-income consumers into credit commitments, establish by law minimal credit requirements that must be met by all consumers, or enact laws regulating prices.⁹⁸

The consumer needs reliable information in order to perform the

⁹⁵U. S. Department of Agriculture, FES PA-681.

⁹⁶ECOP.

⁹⁷Strong.

⁹⁸David Caplovitz, The Poor Pay More. (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963).

buying function efficiently. Particularly is this true for the low-income consumer. Informative labeling provided by producers of goods and services; informative advertising; general consumer information disseminated through government agencies; and the maintenance of commercial product standards are sources of help to all consumers and especially to low-income consumers who know how to benefit from these aids.⁹⁹

Summary

The Cooperative Extension Service was authorized through the adoption of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 as an informal educational system for diffusing information related to agriculture and home economics. The organizational structure is determined by: the needs of the people to be served; federal, state and county laws; government policies of the Land-Grant University; and certain other cooperating organizations. Its ultimate objective is directed toward the development of more fruitful lives and a better living for all people.

The program development method which delineates the educational work includes a series of steps involving planning the program, preparing teaching plans, implementing plans and evaluating results. Forces influencing the nature of extension programs relate to sociological, economical, and technological changes taking place within society concomitant with the emerging new attitudes toward adult education, the increased role of the federal government in financing higher education, trends coordinating all university extension efforts, and the expansion

⁹⁹ David Hamilton, Consumer Economy. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962).

of mass media communication.

Evaluation of extension programs is a means of appraising the extent to which educational objectives are being actualized in an effort to determine future goals.

Personal characteristics, education, and training relate to the effectiveness of an extension worker in performing his job responsibilities. A continuous training program for personnel is essential for the development of staff competencies required to meet new clientele and program needs.

Areas of national concern which are determining multidimensional home economics extension programs of the future relate to family stability, consumer competence, family health, family housing, and community and resource development. Audiences presenting specific areas of need for extension programming include young married families, families with young children, low-income families, working women, youth and youth leadership.

The presidential address to Congress in 1964 reflected the extent to which attention would be focused on alleviating some of the problems related to poverty. A major problem in developing educational programs with this audience has been the tendency to use money income as the sole measure of poverty when all available family resources should additionally be considered.

Characteristics of poverty may be physical, economical, and educational in nature. A primary contributor to financial insecurity relates to family practices of consumption of goods and services. Financial conditions of low-income families may be improved through education and public services, specific economic measures, educational programs,

and consumer protection efforts. Learning experiences for low-income people must aim to motivate such individuals to change attitudes, establish new value systems, and develop saleable occupational skills.

The major challenge in working with low-income people is that of preventing poverty conditions before they develop in addition to alleviating those which already prevail. A challenge to extension is the development of personnel at all levels of employment who are knowledgeable and empathetic in their educational efforts among clientele of this audience.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Increased efforts by Cooperative Extension Service personnel to broaden their area of concern have focused attention on the special needs of many groups of people, including those of low-income families. The fact that there exists variation among Home Demonstration Agents as to the extent and nature of their involvement in and development of programs with low-income families indicated the need for research which might account for these differences in job performance.

This study involved: (1) the selection of certain factors appearing to contribute to successful working with low-income families; (2) the investigation of the relationship existing between these factors and job performance of Home Demonstration Agents in working with low-income families; and (3) the development of guidelines to be used in the selection and training, both preservice and inservice, of agents to work with low-income families.

Factors selected for investigation in the study included: personal characteristics relating to age, years of employment in the Cooperative Extension Service, and social class background; educational experiences and training; and experiences in living and working with people of various ethnic background. It was assumed that these factors: (1) would relate to the different levels of job performance in such a way as to clearly identify those characteristics possessed by the agents who

evidenced success in working with low-income families; and (2) serve as a basis for the development of guidelines to give direction to the selection, preservice, and inservice training of agents to work with low-income families.

Selection of Respondents

This study was conducted in Louisiana and limited to Cooperative Extension Service personnel within the state. The respondents included two separate populations. The first group consisted of the District Program Specialists of all three extension districts who evaluated the programs and methods of Home Demonstration Agents assigned to work in their respective districts and determine the job performance rating to be assigned to each agent. The second population was comprised of Home Demonstration Agents responsible for the adult phase of the family living area within each parish who provided data concerning the factors which appeared to relate to job performance and were selected for the study. In the instances where the extension agent responsible for the adult program held a title other than that of Home Demonstration Agent (such as Associate or Assistant) she was included in the study. In parishes where more than one agent had full responsibility for adult work, both or all such agents were selected.

Development of the Instruments

In order to collect the data needed for the study two instruments were required: one to be used by the District Program Specialists in evaluating the programs and methods of the respondents in their work with low-income families and another one to collect factual data from

the respondents regarding the factors selected for the study.

The first instrument developed was a criteria to be used in evaluating programs and methods used by agents in working with low-income families. The various steps involved in the program development process formed the basis for developing this instrument. (See Appendix A.) In general these steps related to: collecting the facts; analysis of the situation; identification of the problem; decisions on objectives; development of the plan of work; execution of the plan of work; determination of progress; and reconsideration for future planning.¹ It was believed that all phases of the program development process should be represented in the program adequately planned to meet the needs of low-income families and consequently, all phases should be included in the evaluation of the programs and methods used in working with these families. These program development steps were stated in the form of conditions which should be met by the Home Demonstration Agent in developing her program with low-income families.

Each condition was additionally explained as to the type of behavior which the agent might be expected to exhibit in meeting the condition, with specific reference to work with low-income audiences.

The types of educational experiences included in the evaluation were those which were identified as being specific needs of low-income families.² The areas of subject matter were those recognized by the

¹Sanders, Chapter 8.

²School of Home Economics and Extension Division, Understanding the Disadvantaged. University of Missouri, Miscellaneous Publication #8, 1965.

American Home Economics Association.³ The educational methods considered for evaluation included all of those used in general by any extension worker, and more specifically, by Home Demonstration Agents.⁴

The instrument was designed to provide internal evaluation of various aspects of each condition as well as external appraisal of the condition as an entity. A quantitative scale was included at the bottom of each separate condition which was the only evaluation used in arriving at the job performance score. This scale included the descriptive terms of "low, medium, and high" and corresponding quantitative values ranging from 1 to 9. The appraisal of each condition was intended to be made by the circling of one of the numerical ratings assigned to the separate conditions of the instrument.

An instrument developed for use in evaluating overall county programs in Oklahoma was used in planning the general framework for the instrument.⁵ Job performance ratings have been determined by other methods such as the paired-comparison technique used in Louisiana to appraise the work of agents assigned to do 4-H Club work.⁶

The instrument developed for collecting data from Home Demonstration Agents was in the form of a check-type questionnaire which could be answered by each respondent in a minimum amount of time. (See

³ AHEA, Home Economics: New Directions.

⁴ Meredith C. Wilson and Gladys Gallup, Extension Teaching Methods. Federal Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, ESC 495. (Washington: August 1955).

⁵ Harold Casey, "The Development and Evaluation of An Instrument For the Performance Review of County Extension Agents". Unpublished doctor of education dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1961.

⁶ Gassie.

Appendix B.) Questions were designed to obtain information from the respondents relating to: personal characteristics of age, employment in the Cooperative Extension Service, and social class background; education and training experiences at both the undergraduate and the graduate levels and inservice training; experiences in working with different ethnic groups and fluency in a foreign language; areas of recognized need for assistance or additional training in order to improve the low-income work; and a self-evaluation of the low-income program in the parish.

All items were formulated by the investigator with the exception of one relating to social class background. For this information Lloyd and Warner's scale developed for this purpose was used by permission obtained from the publisher. (See Appendix C.) The scale was incorporated into the body of the questionnaire in its original form except for the omission of the numerical values used in computing the score which determined the social class of the respondent. This was omitted in an effort to eliminate a possible area of bias.

Collection of Data

It was recommended by the state and district extension personnel that the identity of the respondents providing the information for the study remain anonymous to the investigator⁷ because of her status as a Home Demonstration Agent and a coworker of the respondents.

In order to accomplish this, a range of numbers was delegated to each District Program Specialist, who in turn, made individual

⁷Conference with Louisiana District Supervisors and State Administrators held in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, February 6, 1967.

numerical assignments among the respondents within her district. District numerical assignments were the following: Northern District, 1 through 30; Central-Southwest District, 31 through 59; and Southeast District, 60 through 84.⁸ Identical numbers appeared on both instruments used in collecting data.

The evaluation instruments were packaged in sufficient numbers for each district and mailed to the respective District Program Specialists. The questionnaires for collecting information from the respondents were also packaged by districts and mailed to the program specialists who then mailed them to the respondents. A cover letter explaining the purpose of the questionnaire and requesting cooperation from the respondent was written jointly by the district personnel (see Appendix D), and a copy accompanied each instrument. Upon completion of the questionnaire each respondent was instructed to return it to her District Program Specialist, and after all questionnaires had been returned to the respective district offices, they were mailed back to the investigator.

Organization of Data For Analysis

The evaluation instruments returned from the District Program Specialists were examined and the job performance score computed for each respondent. A high, medium, or low job performance rating for each was determined by considering the following numerical evaluations: low performance, 1.0 - 3.5; medium performance, 3.51 - 6.5; and high performance, 6.51 - 9.0.

⁸Letter received from Ada W. Hanchey, Northern District Program Specialist, March 11, 1967.

When the questionnaires from the respondents were received the job performance rating for each was indicated on the heading of the form. Questionnaires were grouped according to the high, medium, or low job performance rating assigned to each respondent. The data were then tabulated from the questionnaires, totaled, and converted to percentages. For analysis they were arranged in tabular form according to high, medium, and low job performance rating.

For purposes of analyses the data were organized into five parts. These parts were the following: part I, personal characteristics of age, years of employment in the Cooperative Extension Service, number of years of service in the present position, and social class background; part II, area of specialization at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and educational experiences (both formal course work and non-credit agent training meetings) planned as preparation for work with low-income families; part III, knowledge of a foreign language, predominant racial group within the parish, and experiences in working with other ethnic groups; part IV, respondent evaluations including self-evaluation of low-income programs and areas of felt need for additional training; and part V, district staff evaluations, including over-all job performance evaluation and evaluation items from all respondents, and of respondents by high, medium, and low job performance rating.

Summary, Conclusions, and Implications

Major findings from the study were summarized and conclusions were drawn regarding the relationship which existed between the factors selected for the study and job performance in working with low-income

families. Those factors which seemed to relate to successful job performance of Home Demonstration Agents in working with low-income families were used for the basis for developing guidelines for training of agents. Proposed guidelines were formulated for both preservice and inservice training of agents to work with low-income families and special attention was given to the areas of competency which appeared to indicate the greatest weakness in the preparation and training of Home Demonstration Agents.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study was concerned with an evaluation of the educational programs with low-income families of Home Demonstration Agents who work primarily with adults. Data were obtained from the respondents regarding: selected personal characteristics; social class background; educational and training experiences; experiences in working with people of various ethnic groups; and felt needs for additional training as a means of improving their work with low-income families. These data were collected by questionnaires mailed out by and returned to the respective District Program Specialists of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service in Baton Rouge. All questionnaires were returned. Both data sheets indicated only numbers assigned by district personnel to the respondents whose identity remained anonymous to the investigator. The data were totaled and placed in tabular form for analysis by high, medium, and low job performance rating. Table I indicates the number and percentage of respondents who fell in each performance group.

For purposes of analyses the data were organized into the following five parts: part I, personal characteristics of age, years of employment in the Cooperative Extension Service, number of years of service in the present position, and social class background; part II, area of specialization at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and educational experiences (both formal course work and non-credit

agent training meetings) planned as preparation for work with low-income families; part III, knowledge of a foreign language, predominant racial group within the parish, and experiences in working with other ethnic groups; part IV, respondent evaluations including self-evaluation of low-income programs and areas of felt need for additional training; and part V, district staff evaluations including program evaluation items of overall respondents, and those of the high, medium, and low job performers, and over-all job performance.

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF RESPONDENTS AS TO HIGH, MEDIUM, AND LOW JOB PERFORMANCE RATING OF LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS

Performance Rating	Number	Percentage
High Performers	14	16
Medium Performers	45	54
Low Performers	<u>25</u>	<u>30</u>
	84	100

Part I

A study of personal characteristics of the respondents may answer some questions as to why certain Home Demonstration Agents are more successful than others in their work with low-income families. Age may indicate maturity or lack of maturity to develop new programs. Years of employment in the Cooperative Extension Service may determine the amount of skill in the use of program methods of an individual. The number of years of employment within the same parish may help determine the familiarity of the agent with all types of groups needing help.

Her social class background may influence her sensitivity to the needs of special groups and her ability to identify with families found within these groups.

Age

The largest percentage of all respondents (32%) was found to be between the ages of 50 to 59 years (Table II). The smallest percentage (7%) fell in the 60 years and over group, although only a slightly higher percentage (12%) were 30 years or under. More agents were between 40 and 59 years of age (56%) than were between 30 and 49 (49%). Almost half (43%) of the high performers were between 50 and 59, although only about a third of medium performers (33%) and a fourth (24%) of low performers were in the same age grouping. Although no high performer was under 30 years (0%), 11 per cent of medium performers and 20 per cent of low performers were in the younger age bracket. While no low performer was 60 years or older (0%), 9 per cent of medium performers and 15 per cent of high performers were agents of more mature years.

Years of Employment in the Cooperative Extension Service

It was generally observed that almost half of the total group of respondents had worked between 11 and 20 years (46%), as indicated by Table II. Approximately the same percentage of all respondents had worked for 10 years and under (28%) as had worked for 21 years and over (26%). This same trend held true for the medium performers where slightly over half (52%) had been employed between 11 and 20 years and the remaining half was equally divided between the other two age groupings (24%). Among the low performers the percentages were more nearly

TABLE II
 COMPARISON OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS BY
 JOB PERFORMANCE RATING OF LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS

Characteristics	High N=14		Medium N=45		Low N=25		Total N=84	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Age:								
Under 30 years	0	0	5	11	5	20	10	12
30 - 39 years	3	21	12	27	6	24	21	25
40 - 49 years	3	21	9	20	8	32	20	24
50 - 59 years	6	43	15	33	6	24	27	32
60 years and over	<u>2</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Total	14	100	45	100	25	100	84	100
Years Employed in Extension Service:								
10 years and under	5	36	11	24	8	32	24	28
11 - 20 years	6	43	23	52	9	36	38	46
21 years and over	<u>3</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>26</u>
Total	14	100	45	100	25	100	84	100
Years of Service in Present Position								
10 years and under	9	64	23	51	10	40	42	50
11 - 20 years	3	21	14	32	9	36	26	31
21 years and over	2	15	6	13	4	16	12	14
No response	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	14	100	45	100	25	100	84	100

equated among the three age groupings (8%, 9%, and 8%, respectively), while a greater difference showed up within the medium performers (24%, 52%, and 24%, respectively). A smaller percentage of high performers (21%) had worked for 21 years and over than was found in either the medium group (24%) or the low performance group (32%).

Years of Employment in the Present Position

While half of the total group had worked in the same position for 10 years or less (50%), more than a fourth had remained in the same position between 11 and 20 years (31%), according to Table II. The remaining fourth included the respondents having 21 or more years of service to their credit (14%) and those who failed to respond to the question (5%). The preponderance of high performers (64%) had been in the same position for 10 years or less, although the percentages for the two other rating groups were less. This difference was indicated by 51 per cent of medium performers and 40 per cent of the respondents falling in the low performance group. Among those working in the same position for 21 years or more the percentage was approximately the same among high (15%), medium (13%), and low (16%) performance groups. The largest percentage who failed to respond to the question was among low performers (8%) with a smaller percentage (4%) found among medium performers and none (0%) within the high performance group.

Social Class Background

The classification of respondents by social class background (Table III) was determined by the use of the Lloyd and Warner

Scale.¹ The findings were then related to the model of six social classes as defined by Duvall².

It has long been the concensus that most Home Demonstration Agents are of a middle class background, an opinion which would seem to be confirmed by the findings of this study regarding Home Demonstration Agents in Louisiana. The overwhelming majority of all respondents (75%) were of the middle class, as comprised by 25 per cent within the upper-middle and 49 per cent within the lower-middle classes (Table III). Approximately the same percentage was found to be within the two upper groupings (10%), as fell within the two lower class groups (11%). No respondent fell within the extreme upper group (0%), while only one individual was placed in the extreme lower class (1%). In each case, the adjacent class contained almost all of the respondents classified generally as being of the upper or lower social class.

Among the three performance groups the largest percentage of respondents consistently was found within the two middle class groupings, which tended to parallel a similar finding for the group as a whole. Those respondents falling within the lower-middle class of high (50%), medium (44%), and low (52%), comprised a larger group in each case, than those falling within the upper-middle class (29%, 29%, and 32%, respectively). No respondents fell within any performance group of the upper-upper class, as has been pointed out earlier, and the one

¹"Chart for Determining Social Class", p. 22 and Scale, p. 25. From What You Should Know About Social Class, by W. Lloyd Warner and Mildred Hall Warner. Copyright 1953 by Science Research Associates, Inc., Reprinted by permission of the publisher. (See Appendix C).

²Duvall, pp. 71-72.

respondent classified in the lower-lower bracket was found to be a medium performer. More medium performers were in the two lower classes (13%) than were either the high (7%) or low (8%) performance agents, for the same class levels.

TABLE III
COMPARISON OF SOCIAL CLASS BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS BY
JOB PERFORMANCE RATING OF LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS

Social Class Background	High N=14		Medium N=45		Low N=25		Total N=84	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Upper-Upper Class	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lower-Upper Class	2	14	4	9	1	4	7	10
Upper-Middle Class	4	29	13	29	8	32	25	26
Lower-Middle Class	7	50	20	44	13	52	40	49
Upper-Lower Class	1	7	5	11	2	8	8	10
Lower-Lower Class	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1
No Response	0	0	2	5	1	4	3	4
Total	14	100	45	100	25	100	84	100

Summary

The largest percentage of all agents as well as those classified as high and medium performers, was found to be between the ages of 50 to 59 years. Among low performers more respondents were found to be between 40 to 49 years of age.

Almost a half of all agents as well as those in high, medium, and low categories had worked in the Extension Service from 11 to 20 years.

Regarding employment in the present position, a larger percentage

of all agents as well as those of the three performance ratings had been employed for 10 years or under.

The majority of agents were of a middle class background and a larger portion of agents at all three performance levels were from the lower-middle class rather than the upper-middle.

Part II

The educational experiences of an individual enable him to obtain specific knowledge, acquire or change certain attitudes, and develop particular skills. Whether the educational experiences are formal classroom instruction or informal agent-training meetings, and whether at the undergraduate or graduate level they may in some way relate to the effectiveness with which the individual is able to work with low-income families.

Undergraduate Education

The preponderance of all respondents (90%) specialized in home economics education at the undergraduate level (Table IV). Approximately the same percentage of respondents at the high (86%), medium (91%), and low (88%) performance levels made this response when they were asked. The same percentage of high performers (7%) had majored in either agricultural extension education or some phase of home economics subject matter. The percentage majoring in home economics subject matter at both the medium (5%) and low (8%) performance levels was greater than that indicated for agricultural extension education (2%). However, the number seemed to be too small to be very meaningful or representative of training.

TABLE IV
COMPARISON OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS BY JOB
PERFORMANCE RATING OF LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS

Area of Specialization	High N=14		Medium N=45		Low N=25		Total N=84	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Undergraduate:								
Home Economics Education	12	86	41	91	22	88	75	90
Agricultural Extension Education	1	7	1	2	1	4	3	3
Home Economics Subject Matter	1	7	2	5	2	8	5	6
Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	14	100	45	100	25	100	84	100
Graduate:								
Home Economics Education	1	7	7	15	7	28	15	17
Agricultural Extension Education	11	79	32	72	15	60	58	69
Home Economics Subject Matter	1	7	0	0	1	4	2	3
None	1	7	5	11	2	8	8	10
Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	14	100	45	100	25	100	84	100

Graduate Education

A very large majority of respondents indicated they had pursued work toward a degree in agricultural extension education (69%), while less than a fifth (17%) had chosen home economics education at the graduate level. Only two individuals (3%) had majored in some phase of home economics subject matter, while eight others (10%) indicated having taken no graduate course work. Although only 7 per cent of the high performers took their graduate education in home economics education, slightly over a fourth (28%) of the low performers pursued this area of study, as revealed in Table IV. On the other hand, more than three-fourths (79%) of the high performers majored in agricultural extension education as compared with 60 per cent of the low performers. About the same percentage of high (7%), medium (11%), and low (8%) performers indicated they were not working toward a graduate degree. Louisiana State University does offer a master's degree in agricultural extension education through the department of agricultural education, although no course work of this nature is offered at the undergraduate level.

Educational Experiences

Educational experiences were grouped by subject matter content, communication skills, leadership development, and evaluation methods for both formal and informal training (Table V). The purpose was to try to determine which types of educational experiences the respondents felt were actually planned for the primary purpose of improving their work with low-income families.

TABLE V

COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES PERCEIVED AND INTERPRETED BY
RESPONDENTS AS PLANNED PRIMARILY AS PREPARATION FOR WORK WITH
LOW-INCOME FAMILIES BY JOB PERFORMANCE RATING OF
LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS

Educational Experience	High N=14		Medium N=45		Low N=25		Total N=84	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
FORMAL COURSE WORK:								
<u>Subject Matter:</u>								
Clothing and Textiles	0	0	7	15	1	4	8	9
Foods and Nutrition	0	0	8	18	3	12	11	13
Housing and Furnishings	0	0	6	13	0	0	6	7
Family Relations	0	0	9	20	4	16	13	15
Home Management	1	7	10	22	2	8	13	15
Sociology	1	7	19	42	9	36	29	31
Psychology	0	0	14	31	5	20	19	22
Anthropology	1	7	1	2	1	4	3	3
<u>Communication Skills:</u>								
Demonstration Tech.	0	0	6	13	2	8	8	9
Mass Media	1	7	7	15	4	16	12	14
Visual Preparation	1	7	6	13	1	4	8	9
<u>Leadership Development</u>	1	7	3	7	2	8	6	7
<u>Evaluation Methods</u>	0	0	3	7	1	4	1	5
AGENT TRAINING MEETINGS:								
<u>Subject Matter:</u>								
Clothing and Textiles	12	86	37	82	22	88	71	84
Foods and Nutrition	12	86	39	87	21	84	72	86
Housing and Furnishing	11	79	28	62	13	52	52	62
Family Relations	9	64	22	49	18	72	49	58
Home Management	12	86	32	72	19	76	63	75
Sociology	0	0	8	18	1	4	9	10
Psychology	0	0	3	12	1	4	4	5
Anthropology	0	0	1	2	1	4	2	2
<u>Communication Skills:</u>								
Demonstration Tech.	7	50	33	73	14	56	54	64
Mass Media	7	50	20	44	15	60	42	50
Visual Preparation	9	64	28	62	1	4	37	45
<u>Leadership Development</u>	8	57	18	40	14	56	40	47
<u>Evaluation Methods</u>	6	43	20	44	11	44	37	44

On the whole, agents indicated having had some training in all areas at both levels of course work and agent training meetings. In formal course work the largest percentage reported some work in sociology (31%), while a smaller percentage indicated having studied psychology (22%), with the smallest number listing anthropology (3%). In areas of home economics subject matter the largest percentages were indicated in family relations (15%) and home management (15%), followed by foods and nutrition (13%), clothing and textiles (9%) and housing and furnishings (7%). With the exception of home management, no high performer indicated having had any home economics subject matter course work, although between 10 and 20 per cent of medium performers listed these courses. In all instances the percentages having had subjects in home economics were consistently lower among the low performance group when compared with the medium level performance group. No high performer indicated formal course work in either demonstration techniques or evaluation methods, while only a single individual made this indication with reference to mass media and visual preparation.

A look at the agent training meetings shows a different picture (Table V). More than half of all agents had training in all areas of home economics subject matter with the largest percentage (86%) reporting work in foods and nutrition, and the smallest percentage (58%) in family relations. Among the other types of skills, training in demonstration techniques ranked highest with 64 per cent reporting some training, as compared to only 44 per cent indicating any work in evaluation methods. On the whole, a large percentage of all agents reported having attended agent training meetings in most of the training areas listed. It was noticeable that fewer than half of the agents reported

training in the areas of visual preparation (45%), leadership development (47%) and evaluation methods (44%).

Summary

At the undergraduate level almost all agents including those in each of the three job performance rating groups had majored in home economics education.

The larger percentage of all agents as well as those in the job performance groupings, had majored in agricultural extension education at the graduate level.

A small percentage of all agents indicated having had formal course work in areas of subject matter, communication skills, and leadership development, and evaluation methods, while a considerably larger percentage indicated informal training in all of these areas. There did not seem to be a striking difference among the three performance groups as to their areas of training at either the formal course work or informal agent training level.

Part III

The racial composition of Louisiana is rather unique in the United States³ and is an important factor to bear in mind with regard to work involving low-income people. Fluency in a second language and experience in working with other ethnic groups may be of considerable importance to some Home Demonstration Agents who are attempting to develop work with low-income people.

³Refer to Appendix E for a more detailed explanation regarding the racial composition of Louisiana.

Predominant Racial Group

On the whole only 53 per cent of the respondents reported working in parishes that are predominantly white English-speaking, while the remaining portion (47%) worked in areas dominated in population by other cultural groups (Table VI). Among the respondents working in predominantly white-English speaking areas, the smallest percentage (36%) was classified as high performers, while the largest percentage (64%) was of the low performance group. On the other hand, among the respondents assigned to parishes classified as predominantly English-French or French speaking only the largest percentage (36%) was among the high performers while only 16 per cent of the low performers worked in similar areas. Higher performers were rather evenly distributed among the three groups, while sharper contrasts were noted percentage-wise, within both the medium and low performance groups.

TABLE VI

COMPARISON OF RESPONDENTS AS TO THE MOST PREDOMINANT
RACIAL GROUP WITHIN THE PARISH BY JOB PERFORMANCE
RATING OF LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS

Predominant Racial Group (50 per cent or more of total population of Parish)	High N=14		Medium N=45		Low N=25		Total N=84	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
White, English-speaking	5	36	24	53	16	64	45	53
White, English-French or French speaking only	5	36	13	29	4	16	22	27
Negro	4	28	6	13	4	16	14	17
No Response	0	0	2	5	1	4	3	3
Total	14	100	45	100	25	100	84	100

Respondents With A Working Knowledge of a Foreign Language

When the respondents were asked if they had a working knowledge of some language other than English, slightly more than 10 per cent of the total group indicated they did (Table VII). Both French and Italian were listed as languages spoken by respondents in addition to English. Almost no difference was observed among the high (14%), medium (13%), and low (12%) performers indicating fluency in a second language.

TABLE VII

COMPARISON OF RESPONDENTS AS TO THOSE HAVING A WORKING KNOWLEDGE OF A FOREIGN LANGUAGE BY JOB PERFORMANCE RATING OF LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS

Response Indicated by Respondent	High N=14		Medium N=45		Low N=25		Total N=84	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	2	14	6	13	3	12	11	12
No	12	86	39	87	22	88	73	87
Total	14	100	45	100	25	100	84	100

Experience in Working With Other Ethnic Groups

A preponderance of all agents (74%) indicated having had very much or some experience in working with various ethnic groups, and among the high performers the percentage (43%) was the same for those indicating either amount of experience (Table VIII). However, among both the medium and low performers a smaller percentage (9% and 16%) indicated having had very much experience, while the respondents reporting some experience were comparatively greater percentage-wise (60% and 64%). Among those reporting little or no experience were 14 per cent of the

high performers, 30 per cent of the medium, and 20 per cent of the low performance group.

TABLE VIII

COMPARISON OF EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENTS IN WORKING WITH OTHER
ETHNIC GROUPS BY JOB PERFORMANCE RATING OF
LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS

Amount of Experience Indicated	High N=14		Medium N=45		Low N=25		Total N=84	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very Much	6	43	4	9	4	16	14	16
Some	6	43	27	60	16	64	49	58
Little or None	2	14	13	30	5	20	20	24
No Response	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2
Total	14	100	45	100	25	100	84	100

Summary

More than half of all agents and those of medium and low performance ratings worked in parishes in which the predominant racial group was classified as white and English-speaking. Fewer within these groups worked in predominately Negro parishes. High performers were more evenly divided among the three parish types.

Over a tenth of all agents and those of the three performance groups indicated they did have a working knowledge of a foreign language.

A large percentage of all agents had some experience in working with other ethnic groups. A considerably larger percentage of high performers reported very much experience, than did either medium or

low performers.

Part IV

It is important that Home Demonstration Agents evaluate their own programs as a means of recognizing areas where they need to improve. This evaluation should include an appraisal of the overall program as well as the different aspects which may require various specific skills.

Respondents were asked to indicate how well they felt their programs were meeting the needs of low-income clientele within their respective parishes. These self-evaluations were then viewed in light of the job performance rating given by the respective District Program Specialists. In addition, respondents were asked to indicate the type of training they felt they needed in order to improve their work with low-income families.

Overall Evaluation

Approximately two-thirds (64%) of the respondents felt they were doing a fair job with their low-income programs as indicated by Table IX. While slightly over a fifth (21%) rated themselves in the "good" group, 13 per cent felt they were doing a "poor" job. Among the high performers, 79 per cent rated their programs as being "fair" while 68 per cent of the low performers gave themselves the same rating. Fifty-eight per cent of the medium performers rated their low-income programs as being "fair" which represented the largest percentage coinciding their own evaluation with that of the district staff.

TABLE IX

COMPARISON OF LOW-INCOME PROGRAM SELF-EVALUATION OF RESPONDENTS
BY JOB PERFORMANCE RATING OF LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS

Evaluation Indicated By Respondent	High N=14		Medium N=45		Low N=25		Total N=84	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Good	3	21	13	29	2	8	18	21
Fair	11	79	26	58	17	68	54	64
Poor	0	0	6	13	5	20	11	13
No Response	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	2
Total	14	100	45	100	25	100	84	100

Areas of Felt Need for Additional Training

Respondents requested additional help in all areas of developing programs for low-income families, as indicated in Table X. Among all of the respondents the largest percentage requested additional help in developing leadership (84%) followed next in order by requests in the areas of: program development (75%); evaluation methods (65%); teaching methods (52%); developing understandings (41%); and subject matter (25%).

The highest percentage of high performers (86%) requested help in evaluation methods while more of the low performers (96%) felt they needed assistance in techniques for developing leadership among low-income people. High performers indicated they needed the least help in subject matter (14%) while the smallest percentage among the low performers requested teaching methods (12%). Requests for program development instruction were about the same for all three groups (70%,

75%, and 72%), as were similar requests in the area of developing understandings of low-income people and their needs (43%, 40%, and 40%). A sharp contrast was found among high performers requesting help in teaching methods (64%) as compared with medium (23%) and low performers (12%) making the same request. A similar type of contrast showed up in requests for training in evaluation methods among the three respective groups (86%, 49%, and 44%).

TABLE X

COMPARISON OF AREAS OF FELT NEEDS OF RESPONDENTS FOR ADDITIONAL TRAINING IN WORKING WITH LOW-INCOME FAMILIES BY JOB PERFORMANCE RATING OF LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS

Area of Training	High N=14		Medium N=45		Low N=25		Total N=84	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Teaching Methods	9	64	23	51	12	48	44	52
Program Development	10	70	34	75	18	72	62	75
Developing Understanding	6	43	18	40	10	40	34	41
Developing Leadership	10	70	37	82	24	96	71	84
Evaluation Methods	12	86	22	49	11	44	55	65
Subject Matter	2	14	14	31	5	20	21	25
No Response	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1

Summary

The larger percentage of all agents and those receiving high, medium, and low ratings, evaluated their programs with low-income families as being "fair". The percentages of high performers evaluating their programs as "good" and low performers evaluating their program

as "poor" were almost equated.

All agents felt a need for additional training in working with low-income families, especially in areas of developing leadership and program development. High, medium, and low performers expressed great need for additional training in program development and leadership development, and high performers expressed their greater training need to be in evaluation methods.

Part V

The instrument used by the district staff members was developed with consideration for all aspects of the process used in developing programs for any extension group. Special emphasis was placed on indicating some specific methods that were especially appropriate for work with low-income families. (See Appendix A.) District personnel rated each agent within a range of "high, medium, and low" performance on each separate phase, which together formed the basis for the overall job performance rating assigned.

Rating of Evaluation Items of All Job Performers

Among all respondents fewer than a third scored high on any one criteria for low-income program development (Table XI). The largest percentage to score "high" was in the area of cooperation with other agencies (30%). No respondent was rated "high" on evaluation of results and only 12 per cent of the total group scored that on "involvement of the clientele in developing objectives".

In most instances the largest percentage of respondents was considered to be doing a "medium" job, which might be interpreted to mean

TABLE XI

COMPARISON OF LOW-INCOME PROGRAM EVALUATIONS OF ALL RESPONDENTS
BY JOB PERFORMANCE RATING OF LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS*

Program Element and Criterion	High		Medium		Low		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Identification of clientele needs	22	27	40	46	22	27	84	100
2. Program developed on specific needs	22	27	40	46	22	27	84	100
3. Selection and use of appropriate teaching methods	28	33	34	40	22	27	84	100
4. Clientele objectives considered in plan of work	21	26	30	36	33	38	84	100
5. Cooperation with other agencies	25	30	34	40	25	30	84	100
6. Involvement of clientele in developing objectives	10	12	27	32	47	56	84	100
7. Clientele situation developed on factual data	17	20	42	50	25	30	84	100
8. Evaluation of results	0	0	24	29	60	71	84	100

*See Appendix A for complete instrument used in determining the evaluation.

about average. Fewer respondents were rated "medium" in evaluation of results (29%) and only slightly more (32%) received the same rating in involvement of clientele in developing objectives.

The largest percentage receiving a "low" rating was in "evaluating results" (71%) and over half seemed to be doing a poor job in "involvement of clientele in developing objectives" (56%). The smallest percentage receiving a low rating on any program aspect was in the area of: identification of clientele needs (27%); developing programs on specific needs (27%); and selecting and using appropriate teaching methods (27%).

Rating of Evaluation Items of High Job Performers

As one might anticipate, a large percentage of high job performers scored high on many of the evaluation criterion, according to Table XII. In fact, better than 90 per cent of this group consistently scored high on half of the items: identification of clientele needs; selecting and using appropriate teaching methods; considering clientele objectives in plan of work; and cooperating with other agencies. More than half scored high on the remaining criteria with the exception of one: no respondent was considered to be doing a high level of performance in evaluating results of low-income programs. While the preponderance (86%) was rated as doing about average, nevertheless 14 per cent of this highest rating group received a low rating in evaluating results. No high performance individual received a low rating in any other criteria. In general, the high performers tended to be rated as either high or medium performers on the majority of the criteria items.

TABLE XII

COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM EVALUATION ITEMS OF HIGH JOB
 PERFORMERS BY JOB PERFORMANCE RATING OF
 LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS*

Program Element and Criterion	High		Medium		Low		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Identification of clientele needs	13	93	1	7	0	0	14	100
2. Program developed on specific needs	11	79	3	21	0	0	14	100
3. Selection and use of appropriate teaching methods	14	100	0	0	0	0	14	100
4. Clientele objectives considered in plan of work	14	100	0	0	0	0	14	100
5. Cooperation with other agencies	13	93	1	7	0	0	14	100
6. Involvement of clientele in developing objectives	7	50	7	50	0	0	14	100
7. Clientele situation developed on factual data	8	57	6	43	0	0	14	100
8. Evaluation of results	0	0	12	86	2	14	14	100

*See Appendix A for complete instrument used in determining the evaluation.

Rating of Evaluation Items of Medium Job Performers

In general, the largest percentage of medium performers received a medium rating on all but one of the evaluation criteria as may be observed in Table XIII. The smallest percentage received this rating on evaluation of results (29%). A very large majority was rated about average on each of these criteria items: developing clientele situations on factual data (73%); selecting and using appropriate teaching methods (71%); developing program on specific needs (71%); and identifying clientele needs (71%). While only slightly more than a fourth rated high on any single item, the largest percentage receiving this rating did so on these criteria: cooperation with other agencies (29%); selecting and using appropriate teaching methods (29%); and developing the program on specific needs (27%). The largest percentage of agents rated as medium performers received low ratings in evaluating results (71%) and involving clientele in developing objectives (52%). No medium job performer received a high rating in evaluating results.

Rating of Evaluation Items of Low Job Performers

Low job performers consistently tended to score low on each evaluation criteria (Table XIV). All of these respondents received a low rating on evaluating results, and over ninety per cent were rated the same on: cooperating with other agencies (94%) and involving clientele in developing objectives (96%). Approximately a fifth rated about average on: identifying clientele needs (25%); developing the clientele situation on factual data (20%). No low job performer received a high rating on any of the items included in the criteria used by the district personnel to evaluate their low income programs.

TABLE XIII
 COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM EVALUATION ITEMS OF MEDIUM JOB
 PERFORMERS BY JOB PERFORMANCE RATING OF
 LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS*

Program Element and Criterion	High		Medium		Low		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Identification of clientele needs	10	22	32	71	3	7	45	100
2. Program developed on specific needs	11	27	32	71	2	2	45	100
3. Selection and use of appropriate teaching methods	13	29	32	71	0	0	45	100
4. Clientele objectives considered in plan of work	7	14	28	63	10	23	45	100
5. Cooperation with other agencies	13	29	29	64	3	7	45	100
6. Involvement of clientele in developing objectives	3	6	19	42	23	52	45	100
7. Clientele situation developed on factual data	8	18	33	73	4	9	45	100
8. Evaluation of results	0	0	13	29	32	71	45	100

*See Appendix A for complete instrument used in determining the evaluation.

TABLE XIV

COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM EVALUATION ITEMS OF LOW PERFORMERS
BY JOB PERFORMANCE RATING OF LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS*

Program Element and Criterion	High		Medium		Low		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Identification of clientele needs	0	0	6	24	19	76	25	100
2. Program developed on specific needs	0	0	5	20	20	80	25	100
3. Selection and use of appropriate teaching methods	0	0	4	16	21	84	25	100
4. Clientele objectives considered in plan of work	0	0	3	12	22	88	25	100
5. Cooperation with other agencies	0	0	2	6	23	94	25	100
6. Involvement of clientele in developing objectives	0	0	1	4	24	96	25	100
7. Clientele situation developed on factual data	0	0	5	20	20	80	25	100
8. Evaluation of results	0	0	0	0	25	100	25	100

*See Appendix A for complete instrument used in determining the evaluation.

The Quartile Evaluation of All Respondents

Annually district personnel evaluate the overall work of all parish personnel and divide them into four groups, a process referred to in Louisiana as quartiling. The quartile ranking of any agent is an indication of his overall job performance. The evaluation serves many purposes, one of which is to indicate areas of needed assistance to enable the agent to improve his work in the parish. One might be inclined to assume that any agent ranking in the first quartile could also be expected to do a first class job in any given area of his parish. The correlating of quartile ranking of Home Demonstration Agents to their job performance rating in working with low-income families was done to see if this assumption might be correct.

Although respondents were fairly evenly distributed among the four quartile ranks a larger percentage (31%) were ranked in the second group, while only 19 per cent fell in the fourth group (Table XV). Less than half (43%) of the respondents in the first quartile were also rated as high performers when their low-income programs were appraised. Concurrently, only 20 per cent of the low performers were in the fourth quartile, representing the same percentage of the same group ranking in the first quartile. Among the medium and low performers the percentages within each quartile were fairly evenly distributed, while a sharp contrast was observed between high performers in the first quartile (43%) and those in the fourth quartile (7%).

Summary

More of all respondents rated high in selecting and using appropriate teaching methods, medium in developing the clientele situation

on factual data, and low in involvement of clientele in developing objectives.

TABLE XV

COMPARISON OF OVERALL JOB PERFORMANCE QUARTILE RANKING OF RESPONDENTS
BY JOB PERFORMANCE RATING OF LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS

Quartile Rank	High N=14		Medium N=45		Low N=25		Total N=84	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
First	6	43	11	24	5	20	22	26
Second	5	36	13	30	8	32	26	31
Third	2	14	11	24	7	28	20	24
Fourth	1	7	10	22	5	20	16	19
Total	14	100	45	100	25	100	84	100

High performers tended to rate high on most evaluation criteria, but rated lowest in involving clientele in developing objectives, developing the clientele situation on factual data, and evaluation of results.

Medium performers tended to rate medium on all evaluation criteria although more than half of the group rated low in involving clientele in developing objectives and in evaluating results.

Low performers tended to rate low on all evaluation criteria although about a fourth rated medium on identifying clientele needs, developing programs on specific needs, and developing clientele situations on factual data. All rated low in evaluation of programs.

Less than half of the first quartile agents were found to be high performers and only a fifth of those in the fourth quartile were rated

as low job performers in their work with low-income families. More than half of the respondents consistently fell within the second and third quartiles at all three performance levels.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Findings

This study conducted in Louisiana was concerned with the evaluation of the educational programs with low-income families as planned and implemented by 84 Home Demonstration Agents who work primarily with adults. From a review of literature factors which seemed to closely relate to job performance were selected for the study. Factors selected were: Personal characteristics related to age, work experience in extension, and social class background; educational and training experiences; and experiences in working with people of various ethnic groups. It was felt that these factors were especially relevant to work with low-income families.

Two instruments were developed to collect information from the two populations: (1) a criteria was developed for use by District Program Specialists in evaluating the low-income programs of the agents within their respective parishes. Job performance ratings of high, medium, and low performance were determined by computing a mean score from the summation of the criterion scores assigned to each of the eight criteria which were concerned with the various steps in the program development process; and (2) a questionnaire was formulated to obtain information from the respondents which related to the factors selected for the study. The data were collected through questionnaires mailed by and

returned to the respective district program specialists of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service in Baton Rouge. All questionnaires were returned. Both instruments were identifiable by numbers only, assigned by the district personnel to the respondents whose identity remained anonymous to the investigator. The data were totaled and organized into tables for analysis by high, medium, and low job performance ratings. The factors studied which related to job performance were: personal characteristics; work experience; educational and training experiences; experience in working with different ethnic groups; agent self-evaluations of low-income programs; and district staff evaluations of the agents' programs. The findings from this study are now summarized.

1. Most agents seemed to be engaged in developing low-income programs, although there appears to exist considerable variation as to the extent of their involvement in this area of their work, as well as the proficiency with which they perform. This finding tends to substantiate the general feeling expressed by district personnel. The extent of the variation is indicated by the distribution of agents classified as high, medium, and low performers: 14 received high ratings; 45 received medium ratings; and 25 received low ratings.
2. Approximately one-half of the agents appeared to be doing an average job with low-income work; less than a fifth a superior job; and a third seemed to be performing below average.
3. The most successful agents appeared to possess these characteristics: were between the ages of 50 to 59 years of age; had worked between 11 and 20 years in extension; and had been employed in

the same position under 10 years. Ryden suggested that personal characteristics important for superior job performance might be identified by studying the work of the most successful agents.¹

4. The largest portion of the agents of all three performance levels were of the middle class. This finding tends to substantiate the general impression held by extension workers in Louisiana that most of the personnel are from the middle class background, which made it impossible to determine from this sample if there was a relationship between social class background and job performance of home demonstration agents in working with low-income families.
5. Although the majority of home demonstration agents were found to be of the general middle class, a larger percentage in each case was from the lower-middle grouping rather than the upper-middle.
6. Most agents majored in home economics education at the undergraduate level and agricultural extension education at the graduate level. Although no undergraduate degree in agricultural extension education is offered in the state, Louisiana State University is one of the 25 institutions granting a Master's degree in this area of study.² The homogeneity found to exist among the agents as to the selection of an undergraduate and graduate major makes impossible a positive verification of educational background as a definite factor relating to job performance.
7. The preponderance of agents appeared to be weak in areas of formal course work and strong in informal agent training meetings,

¹Ryden.

²Division of Extension Research and Education, ER&E - 48.

particularly in subject matter. The evidence of only a slight variation existing among the three groups of respondents as to educational experiences related to preparation for work with low-income families invalidates this factor as one positively identified as contributing to successful job performance.

8. While the evidence is not conclusive, there is indication of a possible relationship between the racial composition of the parish in which an agent works and her job performance rating. This tends to parallel a similar conclusion made by Bertrand in a previous study conducted in Louisiana.³
9. Among the high performers a smaller percentage worked in a predominately white English-speaking parish than was found within the other two performance groups. However, in each case a higher percentage of high performers worked in areas of mixed cultural groups than did those of either the medium or low performance levels.
10. A working knowledge of a foreign language did not appear to contribute directly to a high level of job performance. However, as has previously been pointed out, in some predominately French parishes a knowledge of French may be desirable and even advantageous.⁴
11. The amount of experience of a Home Demonstration Agent in working with other ethnic groups does appear to relate in some degree to her effectiveness in working with low-income groups. A

³Bertrand, "The French and Non-French in Rural Louisiana".

⁴Appendix E.

considerably larger percentage of high performers indicated having had "very much" experience when compared with the other two performance groups. Number-wise, more high performers indicated having had "very much" experience, although the actual size of the performance group was considerably smaller than that for the other two groups.

12. Only about one-half of the agents seemed to be knowledgeable of their quality of performance as it was perceived by the district staff. Higher performers tended to rate their programs lower and low performers rated their programs higher than the staff evaluation. This finding is congruent with other research findings which indicate that extension workers tend not to realistically evaluate their work.⁵ Inadequate training in evaluation methods has been found to account for this in other studies.⁶ This might possibly be a reason in Louisiana as well, since the findings from this study indicate that fewer than one-half of the agents had received any kind of training in evaluation methods. Other research findings revealed that the number of training meetings conducted in evaluation methods for extension workers in 1966 was among the lowest of all inservice training meetings held in the United States.⁷
13. High performing agents appeared to be more cognizant of their need for training in evaluation methods than did agents in the other

⁵Boyle and Aker.

⁶E. J. Brown.

⁷Division of Extension Research and Education, ER&E - 48.

two groups. In all other program areas the three groups seemed to be fairly equated in their expression of felt needs. Among half or more of all agents there appeared to be an awareness of the need for additional training in the areas of: developing leadership; program development; evaluation methods; and teaching methods, particularly as they relate to the needs of low-income people. Beavers stressed the importance of considering the goals and values of low-income people when developing programs for this audience.⁸

14. According to the opinion of district personnel the greatest need for training for all agents appeared to be in methods of evaluation, as indicated by the low rating received by almost three-fourths of all agents. Involvement of clientele in developing objectives appeared to be a training area need for over half of the group.
15. High performers appeared to indicate specific need for additional training in evaluation of results, according to the appraisal of the district personnel. This seems to parallel remarkably well the self-evaluation made by these same agents.
16. Medium performers appeared to have more need for training in evaluation and involvement of clientele in developing objectives.
17. Low performers appeared to have need for additional training in all areas of competence needed in working with low-income families.
18. Successful performance by an agent in the total extension program appeared to be little indication that she would be equally as

⁸Beavers.

successful in her work with low-income families. Agents in the first quartile evaluation fell in all three performance groupings, as did agents in the fourth quartile.

19. In summary these factors appear to have some relationship to successful job performance in working with low-income families:
- a. age;
 - b. years of experience in extension;
 - c. number of years in the present position; and
 - d. experience in working with other ethnic groups.

Other studies have revealed a definite relationship between job performance and the additional factors of education and training.⁹ The writer believes that both education and training in addition to certain personal characteristics are important factors related to successful job performance in working with low-income families, although this belief was not definitely substantiated by her study.

Conclusions

This study which proposed to evaluate programs and methods of Home Demonstration Agents in working with low-income families, substantiated the belief that some agents were apparently doing a better job than others in this area of their responsibility. Although the data were not treated statistically to prove areas of significant differences, general observations indicate trends which have relevance for future selection and training of home demonstration agents in Louisiana to work with low-income families.

⁹ Davis.

From the findings of this study the investigator concludes the following:

- (1) that certain home demonstration agents can be expected to perform more effectively than others in developing work with low-income people;
- (2) that these agents should be selected because of specific qualities which they possess and be given intensive training in areas related to competencies needed for working with low-income families; and
- (3) that these agents then should be assigned as specialists to areas where the need for low-income work is highly concentrated.

These conclusions are substantiated by certain recent recommendations related to home economics extension personnel selection and development for the future, as discussed in Chapter II. The recommendations include the following summarizations: (1) that programs be developed for specific clientele; (2) that a higher level of training be effected to increase staff competencies; and (3) that a delineation of personnel responsibilities be on a broader and more specialized basis to extend beyond county lines where it might seem expedient to do so.¹⁰

Additionally, the investigator concludes that similar studies should be made of low-income work by extension personnel in other states. While the two instruments used in this study were especially developed for the specific situation existing in Louisiana, it is possible that they might be adapted for use in other states.

¹⁰ECOP and Sanders.

Guidelines for Selecting and Training Home Demonstration Agents
in Louisiana to Work With Low-Income Families

Within the framework of the previously generalized statements the following guidelines are proposed for selecting and training home demonstration agents in Louisiana to work with low-income families.

1. These agents should have completed at least the Master's degree, which is a recommendation in accordance with the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service requirements for position appointments.
2. These agents should be among the more mature and experienced agents, preferably at least 40 years of age and with a minimum of 10 years working experience in the Cooperative Extension Service.
3. In predominately French populated parishes, these agents should, if possible have a working knowledge of French.
4. Consideration should be given to the racial composition of the parishes in which these agents have worked. Previous work experience in those parishes of high percentages of mixed racial groups might be highly desirable for these agents.
5. Specialized training through informal agent training meetings should be given by extension specialists in all areas of subject matter. Specialists should develop the training programs with primary consideration for specific needs of low-income people. Areas of specific concern for low-income families relate to family stability; consumer competence; family health; family housing; and community and resource development.¹¹
6. Specialized training through formal graduate course work should be

¹¹ECOP

provided these agents in areas of extension teaching methods. These should specifically include those methods which have been found to be the most effective in developing work with low-income families. Consideration should be given to providing learning experiences to these agents which would increase their understanding of the value systems of low-income families¹² and principles of motivation related to learning and effecting change in behavior.¹³

7. Specialized training through formal graduate course work should be provided these agents in areas of extension program development which are pertinent to working with low-income families.¹⁴ Special emphasis should be given to: identifying low-income clientele needs; involving low-income clientele in planning; developing low-income clientele leadership; and evaluating results of programs with low-income families.
8. These agents should be encouraged to enroll in formal course work in those areas related to increasing knowledge and understanding of people in general and specifically low-income families, their needs and problems. Specific attention should be given to helping the agents become cognizant of methods which may be used in improving financial conditions of low-income families.¹⁵ Suggested courses might include: sociology; anthropology; psychology;

¹²Ina C. Brown.

¹³U. S. Department of Agriculture, PA - 681.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Kyrk.

family development; and family finance. It is felt that more study in depth such as that which is usually a part of formal course work would be more beneficial to these agents than would the same information presented in short term agent training meetings.

9. These agents should be brought together periodically for purposes of evaluation and group discussion which might contribute to the continuous growth and development of low-income work throughout the state. The major purpose of the evaluation should be to determine the effectiveness of the educational methods in bringing about desired behavior changes in low-income families in order to provide a basis for improving, justifying, or discontinuing the educational program.¹⁶
10. This program should be started as a pilot project which would initially involve a limited number of agents. Additional agent appointments should be planned for as soon as it might be felt advisable to do so.
11. A specialist in human resource development with special training in working with low-income audiences should be appointed to the state extension staff. The specialist should be the general coordinator of and adviser to all work with low-income families throughout the state extension program. In addition, the specialist should have specific responsibilities in the development of the training program for agents in their preparation for work with low-income families. The individual selected for this position

¹⁶Alexander.

should have completed the doctor's degree, which is a recommendation in keeping with the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service requirements for position appointments at the state level, corresponding with similar recommendations for adoption nation wide.¹⁷

¹⁷Hyatt.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Frank D., "A Critique of Evaluation". Journal of Cooperative Extension, III(Winter, 1965).
- Beavers, Irene, "Contributions Home Economics Can Make to Low-Income Families". Journal of Home Economics, LVII(February, 1965).
- Bertrand, Alvin L., Louisiana's Human Resources, Part I, "Number Distribution and Composition of the Population, 1960". Department of Rural Sociology, Louisiana State University. Bulletin 548, November 1961.
- _____. "The French and Non-French in Rural Louisiana". (Reviewed in the LSU Agrinaut, December, 1965).
- _____. The Many Louisianas. Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 496 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1955).
- Boone, Edgar J. and Duncan, James, "Needed Research in Extension Administrative Organization". National Extension Research Seminar Report ER&T - 55 (Washington: U. S. Department of Agriculture, March 1962).
- Boyle, Patrick G. and Aker, George F., "Take The Evaluation Attitude". Extension Service Review. (April, 1962).
- Brannan, Betty Jean, "A Study of Selected Programs in Home Economics Resident Instruction and Agricultural-Home Economics Extension in Land-Grant Institutions and Proposals for the Further Development of These Programs". Unpublished Ed.D. Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1961.
- Brown, E. J., "Build in Evaluation". Extension Service Review, (August, 1969).
- Brown, Ina C., Understanding Other Cultures. (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964).
- Business Week, "The University of California Extension Keeps the Pros Up to Date". (March 12, 1966).
- Caplovitz, David, "Special Consumer Problems of Low-Income Families". A paper prepared for the Home Management and Family Economics Workshop Center for Continuing Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, October 1, 1964.

- _____. The Poor Pay More. (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963).
- Casey, Harold, "The Development and Evaluation of an Instrument For The Performance Review of County Extension Agents". Unpublished doctor of education dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1961.
- Chamberlain, Neil W., "The Corporation as a College". Atlantic Monthly, (June, 1965).
- Clegg, Denzil D., "Motivational Theory in Practice". Journal of Cooperative Extension, V(Spring, 1967).
- _____. "Work as a Motivator". Journal of Cooperative Extension, I(Fall, 1963).
- Davis, Lloyd H., "On Being Professional". Journal of Cooperative Extension, I(Winter, 1963).
- Division of Extension Research and Education, Report of Programs in Extension Education For Professional Extension Workers. (Washington: U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1967) ER&E - 48.
- Duwall, Evelyn Millis, Family Development. (New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., (second ed.), 1962).
- ECOP, Extension Home Economics Focus. (November, 1966).
- Evans, Jean C., Program Planning. Vice President, Oklahoma State University Extension, (January, 1966) Mimeographed.
- Federal Extension Service, Program Development Process. (Washington: U. S. Department of Agriculture, December 1956) Mimeographed.
- Garner, John W., "Live and Learn". Expanding Horizons, Golden Anniversary Publication, National University Extension Association, Stanley J. Drazek (ed.) (Washington: North Washington Press, 1965).
- Gassie, Edward W., "Factors Associated With Job Performance of Assistant and Associate County Agents Doing 4-H Club Work, Louisiana, 1964". Unpublished doctor of philosophy dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1965.
- Goodlad, John I., (ed.), The Changing American School. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966).
- Gross, Irma H. and Crandall, Elizabeth W., Management for Modern Families. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963).
- Hamilton, David, Consumer Economy. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962).

- Hansen, Viola, "Frontiers in Home Economics". Journal of Cooperative Extension, III(Spring, 1965).
- Home Economics New Directions, A statement of philosophy and objectives of home economics prepared by the Committee on Philosophy and Objectives of the American Home Economics Association, June 1959.
- Home Economics Subcommittee of ECOP, Extension Home Economics Focus. American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, November, 1966.
- Holmes, Emma G., "Spending Patterns of Low-Income Families". Talk presented to the Consumer and Food Economics Research Division at the 42nd Annual Agricultural Outlook Conference, Washington, D. C., November 17, 1964. Mimeographed.
- Holmes, Glenn E., "Upgrading Through Education". Adult Leadership, XV-(June, 1966).
- Houle, Cyril O., "Adult Education and Family Life". The Journal of Cooperative Extension, I(Fall, 1965).
- Hyatt, George, Jr., "Staff Competance". Journal of Cooperative Extension I(Winter, 1963).
- Kearl, B. E. and Copeland, O. B., (ed.), A Guide to Extension Programs of the Future. (Raleigh: Agricultural Extension Service, North Carolina State College, 1959).
- Kelsey, Lincoln David and Hearne, Cannon Chiles, Cooperative Extension Work. (third ed.) (Ithaca, New York: Comstock Publishing Associates, 1963).
- Keyserling, Leon H., Progress or Poverty. Conference on Economic Progress, Washington, D. C., December, 1964.
- Kingsley, Howard L. and Garry, Ralph, The Nature and Conditions of Learning. (rev. ed.) (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957).
- Kyrk, Hazel, The Family in the American Economy. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953).
- Liston, Margaret I., "Profiles of Poverty". AAUW Journal, (October, 1964).
- Lloyd, W. and Warner, Mildred Hall, What You Should Know About Social Class. (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1963).
- Lonie, Mansfield, "Voluntary Product Standards: What They Mean To The Consumer". Journal of Home Economics, LVIII(January, 1966).
- Maslow, A. H., Motivation and Personality. (New York: Harper and Brother Publishers, 1954).

- McCollum, John, "Adult Education and the Development of Human Resources". Adult Leadership, XIII(December, 1964).
- Orshansky, Mollie, "Counting the Poor: Another Look At The Poverty Profile". Poverty in America, Louis A. Ferman et. al. (ed.). (Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1965).
- O'Toole, Lela, "Looking Ahead in Family Living". A talk given at the Annual Extension Conference, Oklahoma State University, November 9, 1965. Mimeographed.
- Peterson, Esther, "Consumer Problems of Low-Income Families". Working With Low-Income Families, Proceedings of the AHEA Workshop, University of Chicago, Center for Continuing Education, March 15-19, 1965. (Washington, D. C.: AHEA, 1965).
- President's Committee on Consumer Interest, The Most for Their Money. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, June, 1965), 0-775-172.
- Reagan, Barbara B., "Consumer Economics Research and the Definition of Poverty". Journal of Home Economics, LIX(April, 1967).
- Richards, Louise G., "Consumer Practices of the Poor". Low-Income Life Styles, Lola M. Irelan, (ed.). (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966), Welfare Administration Publication No. 14, OF-210-072.
- Rivlin, Alice M., The Role of the Federal Government in Financing Higher Education. (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1961).
- Robinson, Russell D., "University Roles in Adult Education". Adult Leadership, XV(June, 1966).
- Ryden, E. R., "Predicting Successful Performance". Journal of Cooperative Extension, III(Summer, 1965).
- Sanders, H. C., et. al. (ed.), The Cooperative Extension Service. (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966).
- School of Home Economics and Extension Division, Understanding the Disadvantaged. University of Missouri, Miscellaneous Publication No. 8, 1965.
- Schottland, Charles I., "Government Economic Programs and Family Life". Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXIX(February, 1967).
- Schroeder, Wayne L., "Adults Can and Must Learn". Journal of Cooperative Extension, IV(Winter, 1966).
- Strom, Robert D., "The Dropout Problem in Relation to Family Affect and Effect". Journal of Home Economics, LVI(May, 1964).

- Strong, Lydia, Consumer Education for Low-Income Families. (Mount Vernon, New York: Consumers Union of U. S., Inc., 1964). (Second Printing).
- Time Magazine, "The Presidency State of the Union Address delivered by President Johnson". LXXXIII(January 17, 1964).
- Training Extension Workers for the Future, Proceedings of the National Training Conference, April 18-20, 1962, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.
- Trenton, Rudolph, Basic Economics. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts Division of Meredith Publishing Co., 1964).
- Tyler, Ralph W., Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950).
- _____. "Education in a World of Change". Journal of Home Economics, LIV(September, 1962).
- _____, and Cozine, June, Mimeographed material received as a part of Home Economics Education 563, "Evaluation in Homemaking", Oklahoma State University, (Spring, 1966).
- U. S. Department of Agriculture, A Place to Live, The Yearbook of Agriculture. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963).
- _____. Training Home Economics Program Assistants to Work With Low-Income Families. (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1965), PA - 681.
- Utz, Alan P., Jr., "Agent Performance in Programming". Journal of Cooperative Extension, III(Fall, 1965).
- Westby-Gibson, Dorothy, Social Perspectives on Education. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965).
- Wickenden, Elizabeth, "The Legal Right to a Minimum But Adequate Level of Living". Journal of Home Economics, LIX(January, 1967).
- Wilson, Meredith C. and Gallup, Gladys, Extension Teaching Methods. Federal Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, (Washington, D. C.: August, 1955), ESC 495.
- Witmer, Helen L., "Children and Poverty". Children, II(November-December, 1964).
- Wolgamot, Irene, "Home Economists Gear for 1964 Challenge: Low-Income Groups". Journal of Home Economics, LVI(January, 1964).
- York, E. T., "Coordinating Extension". Journal of Cooperative Extension, IV(Summer, 1966).

APPENDIX A

CRITERIA TO BE USED BY DISTRICT STAFF MEMBERS FOR EVALUATING
METHODS AND CONTENT OF EXTENSION PROGRAMS
WITH LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Schedule Number _____

District: N _____

C _____

S _____

Job Performance Rating _____

Directions

The purpose of this instrument is to serve as a guide in evaluating the program content and methods of Home Demonstration Agents in working with low-income families. The instrument consists of eight conditions related to good program development principles which should be used by the agent in developing any phase of a Parish program, and an explanation of how each principle should be adapted to the needs of low-income clientele. Specific examples of each program content are suggested under each condition to clarify how the conditions might be found in reports.

1. Read each condition and the described expected behavior of the agent in meeting the condition.
2. Read the suggested ways in which the behavior might be reflected in the work of the agent as reported in quarterly, monthly, and/or annual reports.
3. If you wish to evaluate each listed type of behavior, the column marked "very much, some, little/none" is provided for your convenience.
4. Using the numerical scale given at the bottom of each condition, rate the agent according to how well you think she has met the condition, according to reports, first hand knowledge, or any other information which you may have.
5. The job performance rating will be determined by computing a mean score based on the individual scores given for each condition.

It is important that you realize that only the numerical score which you give under each condition will be used in determining the overall job performance rating.

When completed return to:

Patsy R. Alexander
508 North Bellis
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

Condition 1: Sound program development is based on analysis of the facts of the situation. The program reflects the efforts of the agent to identify problem areas of low-income families related to home economics which indicate need for improvement such as:

- | | Very
much | Some | Little/
None |
|--|--------------|------|-----------------|
| a. Improving managerial abilities | | | |
| b. Improving the levels of living and/or aspirations for improvement | | | |
| c. Increasing the ability of low-income families to make maximum use of resources available to them | | | |
| d. Improving home and surroundings | | | |
| e. Furthering the development of children | | | |
| f. Improving facilities for adequate care of children where: mothers work outside the home, are ill, or there is no mother | | | |
| g. Improving opportunities of low-income women to be employed | | | |
| h. Improving the health of low-income families through more adequate nutrition | | | |
| i. Other(specify) | | | |

(Circle only one)

1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9
low	medium	high

Condition 2: Sound program development points up problems based on needs of people served. The program reflects efforts of the agent to recognize specific needs of low-income families which relate to home economics and provide educational experiences aimed at meeting these needs such as:

- | | Very
much | Some | Little/
None |
|---|--------------|------|-----------------|
| <u>Food and Nutrition:</u> | | | |
| a. Basic food needs of the body | | | |
| b. Skills in food buying | | | |
| c. Preparing, serving low-cost family meals | | | |
| d. Use of commodity foods | | | |
| e. Food needs of different family members | | | |
| f. Reading, understanding, following recipes | | | |
| g. How to serve food attractively | | | |
| h. Proper care and storage of food | | | |
| i. Sanitary habits in food preparation, service | | | |
| j. Other(specify) | | | |

Very		Little/
much	Some	None

Housing:

- a. How to make the home safe and secure
- b. Improving the inside appearance of the home
- c. What to look for in choosing a home to buy or rent
- d. How to make simple home repairs
- e. Providing storage and simple home furnishings
- f. Improving cleanliness and attractiveness of premises of homes and community
- g. Developing skill in repairing and building that could lead to employment
- h. How to buy furnishings
- i. How to make or improvise furnishing items
- j. Other(specify)

Management:

- a. Knowledge concerning ways of achieving financial security (savings, credit, insurance, etc.)
- b. Consumer buying
- c. How to manage financial resources
- d. Understanding financial help available from community resources
- e. Helping children learn management skills
- f. How to clean and care for the home
- g. How to eliminate or avoid home accidents
- h. How to make a budget, will, etc.
- i. How to improve skills in home-making tasks
- j. Other(specify)

Family Life:

- a. Sex information for all ages
- b. Understanding emotional, physical, mental and social needs of all people
- c. Understanding and determining family goals.
- d. Understanding the developmental tasks of the family life cycle
- e. Planning family activities
- f. Home care of sick people

- | | Very
much | Some | Little/
None |
|--|--------------|------|-----------------|
| g. Simple first aid care | | | |
| h. Improving personal qualities of individual family members | | | |
| i. Developing skills that might lead to employment | | | |
| j. Other(specify) | | | |

Clothing:

- a. How to buy used clothing
- b. How to sew by hand
- c. How to make simple repairs in garments
- d. How to make alterations and/or remodel
- e. How to make a simple garment
- f. Personal grooming
- g. Choosing a garment that is becoming to the individual
- h. How to wash and iron a garment properly
- i. How to read and understand label information
- j. Other(specify)

(Circle only one) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
 low medium high

Condition 3: The judgment exercised in selecting the most appropriate methods for the particular teaching situation and the skill with which the working tool is used have a direct bearing upon the amount and quality of the learning resulting from the teaching effort. The agent selects those methods which seem most appropriate for use with low-income audiences.

Mass Media:

Bulletins, leaflets, circular letters and news stories of low(easy) readability, clear and suitable illustrations, pertaining to a single topic or idea

Visuals, exhibits, posters, motion pictures, charts, slides that tell a single story in a simple easy-to-understand language.

Radio programs built around a single theme or idea presented in clear and distinct manner using simple words, phrases, ideas.
 (Consider availability of medium)

	Very much	Some	Little/ None
--	--------------	------	-----------------

Television programs including use of clear illustrations that are easy to understand, words known by most people on topics of need and interest to low-income people. (Consider availability of medium)

Very Little/
much Some None

Group Contacts or Methods:

Demonstrations, training meetings, lectures, conferences planned with smaller groups of people in mind, held in locations easily accessible to low-income people, preferably within their own neighborhoods, on topics of particular need and interest to audience of low-income

Individual Contacts:

Home visits, office calls, telephone calls, personal letters, result demonstrations: all planned specifically to meet the expressed need of the low-income individual

(Circle only one) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
 low medium high

Condition 4: A good program has a definite plan of work. The agent shows evidence of having and using a plan of work that has been developed after considering the objectives of low-income people.

Very Little/
much Some None

(Circle only one) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
 low medium high

Condition 5: Program building is a coordinating process and involves efforts of all interested leaders, groups, and agencies. The program reflects efforts of the agent to cooperate with other agencies working with low-income families such as:

Very Little/
much Some None

Welfare
 Public Health
 Public Housing Agencies
 Churches
 Utility Companies
 Civic Groups

Professional Organizations
 Other(specify) Very Little/
much Some None

(Circle only one) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
 low medium high

Condition 6: Program building is a teaching opportunity, and may be used as a means of teaching leaders the knowledge, skills, and attitudes they need to best serve the community. The program reflects participation of low-income individuals in identifying problems and developing objectives, as members of:

Overall Parish Advisory Council
 Advisory Committees
 Subject Matter or Commodity Committees
 Other(specify) Very Little/
much Some None

(Circle only one) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
 low medium high

Condition 7: Sound program building is based on analysis of the facts of the situation. The program shows evidence that the agent has collected and analyzed factual data related to low-income people within her parish through various methods such as:

Systematic studies
 Informal studies
 Surveys
 Census
 Social trend studies
 Planning-board reports
 First-hand knowledge or observation
 Other(specify) Very Little/
much Some None

(Circle only one) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
 low medium high

Condition 8: Good program building provides for evaluation of results. There is evidence that the agent has planned for and used evaluation built on clear objectives, especially suited for the program content and methods designed to meet the needs of low-income people, with recorded evidence of results, including evidence of:

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE TO COLLECT DATA FROM LOUISIANA HOME DEMONSTRATION

AGENTS REGARDING WORK AND EXPERIENCE

WITH LOW-INCOME PEOPLE

Schedule Number _____
 District: N _____
 C _____
 S _____

1. What is your age? Under 30 _____ 30-39 _____ 40-49 _____ 50-59 _____ 60 and over _____
2. How many years have you been employed by the Cooperative Extension Service? _____
3. How long have you worked in your present position? _____
4. What is your major area of study for your undergraduate training?
 Home Economics Education _____
 Agricultural Extension Education _____
 Subject Matter(clothing, etc.) Specify what _____
 Other, Specify what _____
5. What is your major for your graduate study?
 Home Economics Education _____
 Agricultural Extension Education _____
 Subject Matter(clothing, etc.) Specify what _____
 Other, Specify what _____
6. In each of the following categories check the one that best describes your family background when you were a child or teenager.
 - a. FATHERS OCCUPATION:
 - Professionals and owners of large business(such as doctors and factory owners) _____
 - Semiprofessionals and smaller officials of large business(such as lab. technician or manager) _____
 - Clerk and similar workers(secretaries, bookkeepers, etc.) _____
 - Skilled workers(bakers, carpenters, etc.) _____
 - Owners of small business(groceries, restaurants, etc.) _____
 - Semiskilled workers(bus drivers, cannery workers, etc.) _____
 - Unskilled workers(such as warehousemen or ditch diggers) _____
 - b. SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME
 - Inherited wealth _____
 - Earned wealth _____
 - Profits and fees _____
 - Salary _____
 - Wages _____
 - Private relief _____
 - Public relief and "nonrespectable" incomes (gambling, etc.) _____

c. HOUSE TYPE LIVED IN

- Large house in good condition _____
- Large house in medium condition; medium-sized house
in good condition _____
- Medium-sized house in medium condition; apartments
in regular apartment house _____
- Small house in good condition; small house in medium
condition; dwellings over stores _____
- Medium-sized houses in bad condition; small houses
in bad condition _____
- All houses in very bad condition; dwellings in
structures not originally intended for homes _____

d. AREA LIVED IN

- Very exclusive; Gold Coast, etc. _____
- The better suburbs and apartment house areas, houses
with spacious yards, etc. _____
- Above average; areas all residential; larger than
average space around house; apartment areas in
good condition _____
- Average; residential neighborhoods, no deterioration
in area _____
- Below average; area not quite holding its own,
beginning to deteriorate; business entering, etc. _____
- Low; considerably deteriorated, run-down, and
semislum _____
- Very low; slum _____

7. (a) To what extent have you had any experience in working with ethnic groups other than your own? (An ethnic group is a racial group of people who have the same traits and customs.)
Very much _____ Some _____ Little/none _____.

(b) Specify in what capacity you have worked or associated with ethnic groups other than your own. (Such as fraternal groups, civic organizations, professional organizations, church groups, Extension groups, etc.) _____

8. Considering the total population of your parish, what is the most predominate racial group (51% or more of the residents)
- White, English speaking only _____
- White, English-French speaking or French speaking only _____
- Negro _____
- Other, Specify what _____

9. Indicate the types of educational experiences you have had that were planned primarily to help you work more effectively with low-income families, specifying whether they were classwork or Agent Training Meetings.

	<u>Classwork</u>	<u>Agent Training</u>
a. <u>Subject Matter Content:</u>		
Clothing and Textiles	_____	_____
Foods and Nutrition	_____	_____
Housing and Furnishings	_____	_____
Family Relations and Child Development	_____	_____
Management and Family Economics	_____	_____
Sociology	_____	_____
Psychology	_____	_____
Anthropology	_____	_____
Other(Specify what)_____	_____	_____
b. <u>Methods of Communication:</u>		
Demonstration Techniques	_____	_____
Mass Media Techniques(Radio, T.V., Journalism)	_____	_____
Preparation of visuals and illustrative material	_____	_____
Other(Specify what)_____	_____	_____
c. Developing leadership among low-income people	_____	_____
d. Evaluating programs with low-income families	_____	_____
10. In which of the following areas do you feel you need assistance or more training in order to improve your work with low-income families?		
Methods of teaching low-income people		_____
Developing programs to reach low-income families		_____
Developing understandings of low-income families and their problems		_____
Developing Leadership among low-income people		_____
Methods of evaluating results		_____
Subject matter(specify in which areas)_____		_____
<hr/>		
11. Do you have a working knowledge of a language other than English?		
NO _____ If <u>yes</u> , specify which _____		
12. Considering the percentage of low-income people within your parish, how would you rate your own Extension programs which you have developed to reach low-income audiences?		
		Good _____
		Fair _____
		Poor _____
<hr/>		
<u>RETURN TO YOUR DISTRICT PROGRAM SPECIALIST</u>		

Patsy R. Alexander
 508 North Bellis
 Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

APPENDIX C

CHART FOR DETERMINING SOCIAL CLASS*

CHART FOR DETERMINING SOCIAL CLASS*

Characteristics	Score
OCCUPATION	
Professionals and proprietors of large businesses (such as doctors and factory owners)	4
Semiprofessionals and smaller officials of large businesses (such as lab technicians or managers)	8
Clerks and similar workers (secretaries, bookkeepers, etc.)	12
Skilled workers (bakers, carpenters, etc.)	16
Proprietors of small businesses (owners of small groceries, restaurants, etc.)	20
Semiskilled workers (bus drivers, cannery workers, etc.)	24
Unskilled workers (such as warehousemen or ditch diggers)	28
SOURCE OF INCOME	
Inherited wealth	3
Earned wealth	6
Profits and fees	9
Salary	12
Wages	15
Private relief	18
Public relief and "nonrespectable" incomes (e.g., gambling)	21
HOUSE TYPE	
Large houses in good condition	3
Large houses in medium condition; medium-sized houses in good condition	6
Large houses in bad condition	9
Medium-sized houses in medium condition; apartments in regular apartment buildings	12
Small houses in good condition; small houses in medium condition; dwellings over stores	15
Medium-sized houses in bad condition; small houses in bad condition	18
All houses in very bad condition; dwellings in structures not originally intended for homes	21
AREA LIVED IN	
Very exclusive; Gold Coast, etc.	2
The better suburbs and apartment house areas, houses with spacious yards, etc.	4
Above average; areas all residential, larger than average space around house; apartment areas in good condition, etc.	8

*From W. Lloyd and Mildred Hall Warner, What You Should Know about Social Class (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1953), pp. 22, 25.

Characteristics	Score
Average; residential neighborhoods, no deterioration in the area	8
Below average; area not quite holding its own, beginning to deteriorate, business entering, etc.	10
Low; considerably deteriorated, run-down, and semislum	12
Very low; slum	14

SCORING

Social Class	Total Score
Upper class	12-17
Upper class probably, with some possibility of upper-middle class	18-22
Indeterminate: either upper or upper-middle class	23-24
Upper-middle class	25-33
Indeterminate: either upper-middle or low-middle class	34-37
Lower-middle class	38-50
Indeterminate: either lower-middle or upper-lower class	51-53
Upper-lower class	54-62
Indeterminate: either upper-lower or lower-lower class	63-66
Lower-lower class probably, with some possibility of upper-lower class	67-69
Lower-lower class	70-84

APPENDIX D

Appendix D



Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service

Louisiana State University and A&M College, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and Louisiana Parishes Cooperating

KNAPP HALL UNIVERSITY STATION
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70803

April 17, 1967

RETURN COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE TO YOUR
PROGRAM SPECIALIST (HOME ECONOMICS)
BY MAY 8, 1967

TO: SELECTED AGENTS

Dear Agent:

You are one of the Louisiana agents selected to assist in a study concerning evaluation of methods and content of Extension programs with low-income families. Attached is your questionnaire to collect data regarding work and experience with low-income people. This is a study being made by Patsy Alexander at Oklahoma State University; the findings will be incorporated in her dissertation.

Your participation in this study has been approved by the District Agents, the Director, his Associate and Assistant. The information obtained from the study will be beneficial to you as agents as you move into the "Extend Extension" program and to program specialists as we provide training for your future needs.

It is important that you answer all questions fully and accurately and return them by May 8 so that they can be mailed to reach Patsy by May 12. Please be assured that the information you give will be identifiable by a code number, known only to the program specialist in your district.

If you have any questions, please contact your program specialist (home economics) immediately.

Sincerely,

Valmae S. Robertson
District Program Specialist
Home Economics

Rogenia G. Trotter
District Program Specialist
Home Economics

Ada W. Hanchey
District Program
Specialist (Home Ec.)

AWH:jam

Attachment

cc: District Agents
Parish Chairmen

A Progressive Agriculture for a Permanent Republic



APPENDIX E

THE RACIAL COMPOSITION OF THE LOUISIANA POPULATION

In 1960 approximately 32 per cent of the state's population was classified as non-white. At that time non-whites totaled 1,045,307 persons, of whom 1,039,207 were Negroes and 6,100 members of other races. These other races included people of Indian, Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, and Korean descent. In the same year only Mississippi (42.3%) and South Carolina (34.9%) reported a higher percentage of non-whites than Louisiana, and were among the six states recording more than a million Negroes.¹

In addition the white population in Louisiana is further divided into the French cultural group found predominately in South Louisiana and people of Anglo-Saxon descent who tend to inhabit North Louisiana parishes.² A large percentage of the French people speak English as a secondary language and many do not speak it at all. Some authorities tend to associate low-income with people of different cultural backgrounds and especially with difficulty in communicating in the English language.³

Many extension workers assigned to French parishes find it to be advantageous to be able to speak French although this is not a requirement to work within those parishes.

¹ Alvin L. Bertrand, Louisiana's Human Resources, Part I, "Number Distribution, and Composition of the Population, 1960". Department of Rural Sociology, Louisiana State University. Bulletin 548, November 1961.

² _____, The Many Louisianas, Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 496 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1955).

³ _____, "The French and Non-French in Rural Louisiana".

VITA

Patsy Ruth Alexander

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE RELATIONSHIP OF SELECTED FACTORS TO JOB PERFORMANCE OF LOUISIANA HOME DEMONSTRATION AGENTS IN WORKING WITH LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Major Field: Home Economics Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Mineola, Texas, November 5, 1929, daughter of Clarence Roberson Alexander and Emmie Ruth LaGrone (both deceased).

Education: Graduated from Ouachita Parish High School in 1947 and Northeast Junior College (now Northeast Louisiana State College) in 1949, both in Monroe; received Bachelor of Arts degree in Spanish from Centenary College, Shreveport, Louisiana, 1951; Bachelor of Science degree in Vocational Home Economics Education from Northwestern State College, Natchitoches, Louisiana, 1953; completed a year of graduate study in Foreign Missions and Anthropology at Scarritt College for Christian Workers, Nashville, Tennessee; Master of Science degree in Agricultural Extension Education, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1965; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in May, 1968.

Professional Experience: Dietitian for Church of All Nations in the low-income immigrant area of New York City, summers: 1953 and 1954; taught home economics and Spanish, Vashti School, Thomasville, Georgia (a Methodist school for girls of a problem home environment), 1953-54; commissioned an educational missionary by the Woman's Division of Christian Service of the Methodist Board of Missions, January 1955; served as teacher of home economics at Crandon Institute, Montevideo, Uruguay, 1955-1956; served as a rural worker to Cuba 1956-1959 with appointments as school principal, rural church pastor, professor of nutrition at the Union Theological Seminary, and wrote a manual on basic nutrition and foods in Spanish; appointed Associate Home Demonstration Agent, Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service, 1959; promoted to Home

Demonstration Agent, Bossier Parish, 1961; promoted to Home Demonstration Agent-Special Programs for urban work, 1967.

Professional Organizations: National and Louisiana Associations of Extension Home Economists; American and Louisiana Home Economics Associations; American Association of University Women; LSU Alumni Association; Home Economics Alumni Association of OSU; Business and Professional Women's Club; Omicron Nu (national honorary home economics fraternity). Elected as one of top ten students at Northeast Junior College for leadership ability; received the Esther Cooley Home Economics Award for scholarship and leadership in home economics at Northwestern State College.