

THE RELATIONSHIP OF CERTAIN PERSONALITY TRAITS TO
SELECTED PROFESSIONAL AND SOCIAL ATTRIBUTES OF
OKLAHOMA MALE COUNTY FIELD EXTENSION PERSONNEL

By

DEV RAJ BAJAJ

Bachelor of Science
University of Rajputana
Jaipur, India
1955

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1962

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, 1969

SEP 29 1969

THE RELATIONSHIP OF CERTAIN PERSONALITY TRAITS TO
SELECTED PROFESSIONAL AND SOCIAL ATTRIBUTES OF
OKLAHOMA MALE COUNTY FIELD EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Thesis Approved:

Robert M. Mason

Thesis Adviser

Robert L. Price

Harry K. Brooks

L. A. Parker

D. D. Nunban

Dean of the Graduate College

724744

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher wishes to express his appreciation for the valuable assistance and guidance rendered by the many persons cooperating in this study. Special recognition is due the county field extension personnel of Oklahoma who provided the data for this study. The inter-departmental cooperation of the Department of Agricultural Education, University Extension, and the University Computer Service and their staff is also recognized.

The researcher is particularly appreciative of Dr. Robert R. Price, Head of the Department of Agricultural Education, for his constant and untiring encouragement. For the thoughtfulness and valuable criticism provided throughout this study by Dr. Robert Meisner, Doctoral Committee Chairman, the writer is deeply indebted. Appreciation is also extended to committee members Dr. Harry K. Brobst and Dr. Loris A. Parcher for their interest and guidance in completing this manuscript.

The researcher is grateful to Dr. J. C. Evans, Vice-President of University Extension at Oklahoma State University, for providing financial assistance during the course of this study. An indebtedness to the late Dr. George E. Stroup and his successor, Dr. Harold Casey, Director of Personnel Development, Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service, for their inspiration and genuine interest is acknowledged.

The researcher is also appreciative of his wife, Bimla, and son, Akshay, for their forbearance and understanding during the entire time spent in achieving the doctoral degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Nature of the Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	8
Significance of the Study	11
Definition of Terms	12
Scope of the Study	13
Underlying Assumptions of the Study	14
Limitations of the Study	15
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	16
Definitions of Personality	16
Theories of Personality	18
Selected Variables in the Study	27
The California Psychological Inventory	35
III. METHODOLOGY	41
Introduction	41
The Population	41
Instrumentation	42
Statistical Treatment	44
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	48
Personality Trait Scores	49
CPI Classes	55
Personality Traits and Professional and Social Variables	59
Personality Traits and Job Involvement	131
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	133
Introduction	133
Methods and Procedures of the Study	134
Summary of Findings and Conclusions	135
Recommendations and Implications	147
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	150
APPENDIX A	157

Chapter	Page
APPENDIX B	160
APPENDIX C	164
APPENDIX D	166
APPENDIX E	168
APPENDIX F	170
APPENDIX G	172

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. County-Affiliated Extension Personnel Respondents by Title	48
II. Mean Personality Scores of Oklahoma County Extension Personnel as Measured by CPI	50
III. Number and Percentage Distribution of County Extension Personnel Having Scores Average or Above the CPI Norms	52
IV. Rank Order of Traits According to the Number of Scores Average or Above CPI Norms Obtained by Oklahoma County Extension Personnel	53
V. Percentage of Oklahoma County Extension Personnel Obtaining Scores Below the CPI Norms	54
VI. Range of Personality Scores of County Extension Personnel in the CPI Traits	56
VII. Standard Deviation From Scores Obtained by All County Extension Personnel in CPI Traits	57
VIII. Number and Percentage Distribution of County Extension Personnel Having Scores Average or Above in Four Classes of the CPI Norms	59
IX. Relationship of Personality Trait Dominance to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	61
X. Relationship of Personality Trait Dominance to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	63
XI. Relationship of Personality Trait Capacity for Status to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	66
XII. Relationship of Personality Trait Capacity for Status to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	67

Table	Page
XIII. Relationship of Personality Trait Sociability to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	70
XIV. Relationship of Personality Trait Sociability to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	71
XV. Relationship of Personality Trait Social Presence to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	74
XVI. Relationship of Personality Trait Social Presence to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	76
XVII. Relationship of Personality Trait Self-Acceptance to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	79
XVIII. Relationship of Personality Trait Self-Acceptance to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	81
XIX. Relationship of Personality Trait Sense of Well-Being to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	83
XX. Relationship of Personality Trait Sense of Well-Being to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	85
XXI. Relationship of Personality Trait Responsibility to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	87
XXII. Relationship of Personality Trait Responsibility to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	88
XXIII. Relationship of Personality Trait Socialization to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	91
XXIV. Relationship of Personality Trait Socialization to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	92
XXV. Relationship of Personality Trait Self-Control to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	95

Table	Page
XXVI. Relationship of Personality Trait Self-Control to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	97
XXVII. Relationship of Personality Trait Tolerance to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	99
XXVIII. Relationship of Personality Trait Tolerance to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	100
XXIX. Relationship of Personality Trait Good Impression to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	102
XXX. Relationship of Personality Trait Good Impression to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	104
XXXI. Relationship of Personality Trait Communalilty to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	107
XXXII. Relationship of Personality Trait Communalilty to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	108
XXXIII. Relationship of Personality Trait Achievement Via Conformance to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	110
XXXIV. Relationship of Personality Trait Achievement Via Conformance to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	112
XXXV. Relationship of Personality Trait Achievement Via Independence to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	114
XXXVI. Relationship of Personality Trait Achievement Via Independence to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	115
XXXVII. Relationship of Personality Trait Intellectual Efficiency to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	117
XXXVIII. Relationship of Personality Trait Intellectual Efficiency to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	119

Table	Page
XXXIX. Relationship of Personality Trait Psychological-Mindedness to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	121
XL. Relationship of Personality Trait Psychological-Mindedness to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	123
XLI. Relationship of Personality Trait Flexibility to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	125
XLII. Relationship of Personality Trait Flexibility to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	127
XLIII. Relationship of Personality Trait Femininity to Professional-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	129
XLIV. Relationship of Personality Trait Femininity to Social-Related Variables of County Extension Personnel	130
XLV. Relationship of Job Involvement to Personality Traits of County Extension Personnel	132

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Nature of the Problem

The Cooperative Extension Service is one of the most effective educational agencies in America. It has been said that the Cooperative Extension Service is a saga of achievement in America which cannot be matched by its counterpart in any other part of the world. The Cooperative Extension Service has always provided a significant and meaningful leadership role and will continue to exercise a more significant and meaningful contribution to the welfare of the people of America as well as other people of the world.

The Extension Service had its beginning at a time when farm people, as a whole, were a definitely disadvantaged group. The Country Life Commission Report of 1908 characterized the conditions of that time in such terms:

. . . poor farming methods, soil depletions, lack of labor saving devices in the farm home, poorly prepared and monotonous diet, isolation of farm people, restraint of trade, poor health conditions, unequal educational opportunity, lack of recreation, and inadequate organizations for farm people. (92)

It was in response to this situation that the Smith-Lever Act was enacted in 1914 creating the Cooperative Extension Service in agriculture and home economics. The out-of-school educational program of the Extension Service has been distinctive and unique throughout its entire

history. However, the America of today is quite different than it was fifty years ago. The outstanding characteristic of the America of fifty years ago was the slow rate of change. America's outstanding characteristic today is the rapid and accelerating rate of change. These changes have brought a deep and profound effect upon the individuals, families and members of communities--whether it be local, regional, state, national, or international. These changes have also brought forth new problems. Ahlgren (4) emphasized this when he said:

The need continues--and the pressure mounts--for new and pioneering research in our endless quest to advance the frontiers of science. We are increasingly confronted with the technological and sociological problems of a society which is becoming more and more interdependent and urbanized--of a nation that once had a population which was 90 per cent rural and 10 per cent urban to one which now has the reverse distribution of people--or as one noted historian has said: 'The United States was born in the country and has moved to the city'--and of problems which defy the imagination in space exploration.

In the past fifty years the Cooperative Extension Service has grown in size of staff and scope of program. Wirtz (93) indicated that employment of the Extension Service workers in the United States grew to 15,000 in 1967. The Extension Service of today no longer fulfills its mission from a generalist base. The Extension Service is now concerned about serving more people and providing them with more meaningful and useful programs in order to serve the specialized needs and interests of many different audiences and clientele groups. Ahlgren (3) indicated that the Extension Service over the years has been called upon to provide educational assistance encompassing the following groups:

1. Farm families--youth and adults
2. Non-farm rural residents--youth and adults

3. Urban residents--youth and adults
4. Farm and commodity groups and related organizations
5. Individual firms and organizations which purchase, process, and distribute farm produce and provide farm people with essential services and supplies such as credit, fertilizer, feed, and many others.

The clientele of the present day Extension Service are all the people of the United States. Counterparts of the Cooperative Extension Service are being established in many countries, and the Extension Service personnel have often been requested to help initiate and organize programs in many countries of the world. The present day extension programs are anchored to a "clientele" oriented base rather than to a "generalist" oriented base. Mead (61) emphasized that "we must educate people in what nobody knew yesterday, and prepare people for what nobody knows yet, but what some people must know tomorrow."

Miller (64) used other words to express the same thought a few years ago when he said:

One consistent characteristic of Extension work has been the necessity to shift programs and methods to meet ever changing conditions and Extension workers have been acutely aware of this need from the beginning. The tempo of such changes has been accelerated dramatically during the past decade. Every evidence points to an even faster acceleration in the decade ahead.

The problems confronting the people, and thus the Extension Service today, are greater in number and far more complex and inter-related than they were a few decades ago. The extension worker's role as an educator has and continues to undergo a great deal of changes. The professional and technical demands placed on the extension worker have increased and will continue to increase. The need for development

and maintenance of a high level of professional competence among the extension workers will require the Extension Service to take advantage of every opportunity that can be provided for the professional improvement of the extension workers. An authority from industry (70) recommended the following responsibilities of the organization, which can be achieved through an effective training program:

To build continuously and systematically to the maximum degree and in proper proportions, that knowledge and those skills and attitudes which contribute to the welfare of the organization and the employee.

It is a paradox that in spite of notable and significant past accomplishments, the Extension Service of today is facing critical appraisals regarding its program role and effectiveness. Anderson (8) suggested some of these in critical statements which included ". . . out of step with the time, . . . losing leader status," and ". . . competence has not kept pace with size."

Comments like these reflect that the Extension Service must face the new challenge and the impact of change in order to have stimulating programs to meet the needs of the people. In implementing the programs of the Extension Service, the county field extension personnel as employees of the Cooperative Extension Service not only comprise the largest group of professional workers numerically but also are the individuals who have the most frequent primary contact with the clientele of the Extension Service. McCormick's (57) study revealed that there has been a recognition of the extension workers' need for additional training on account of their many and varied responsibilities. Furthermore, the description of the extension worker's role as an educator makes it obvious that the future worker will need unusual abilities to satisfy the requirements of his assignment.

Importance of Professional Training

Professional training programs are ideal situations in which to discover new ideas that would result in improving methods and techniques that can enhance the effectiveness of the extension workers. This is particularly true in the modern society as indicated by Emmerich (24):

For a modern society to carry out its many complex tasks, it is essential for most of its members to retain a certain amount of potential for personality change throughout much of life. Without continued socialization during adolescence and adulthood, it would be impossible for persons to adopt to the multiple, intricate, and often new role requirements that accompany age-related changes in status and responsibility in the family, occupational world, and other settings. Such demands upon personal flexibility involve not only the acquisition of new technical skills and knowledge, but also requires changes in attitudes, ways of relating to others, and altered perceptions of oneself.

Training must be conducted with an attitude of genuine intellectual curiosity. It must be based on the findings of psychology, biology, and sociology to help the Extension Service actually realize its objectives by adapting them to the needs, capacities, abilities, and potentialities of each extension worker. Nye (67) studied the relationship of such variables as attitude, vocational interest, background factors and personality characteristics to the success of the county extension agents. He found that personality was the most important variable in explaining the success of the county extension agents. Nye, however, did not make a detailed study of the personality traits of the extension workers, but his study did reveal the implications of personality to a county extension worker's success.

Training in the Extension Service should be considered as an integral part of the administration in furnishing opportunities of

guidance and counseling to the extension workers. Conant (18) indicated that ". . . really effective counseling is the keystone of the arch of a widespread educational system dedicated to the principle of equality of opportunity." Strang (85) emphasized guidance as a "continuous process of interaction in which every individual is helped, through his own efforts, to discover and develop his best potentialities for his personal happiness and social usefulness." Curran (19) explained counseling as "a process of personal reorientation by which a person is aided in acquiring new self-understanding and integration and better modes of action."

The program of training in the Extension Service is a cooperative endeavor. The job of county field extension personnel training is the responsibility of every administrative member of the Extension Service. The state leader of training offers professional leadership in organizing resources required to provide training. It is generally recognized in the Extension Service that the district supervisors play a key role in training staff members they supervise. An example is VandeBerg's (90) study which indicated that counseling and working with new personnel during the first year of employment was considered by county agents to be the most important function of their supervisors. In contrast, these same agents ranked the rating of their performance by supervisors, twelfth. Likert (52), after reviewing research of the effectiveness of different methods of supervision, reached the following conclusion:

Supervision is, therefore, always an adaptive process. A leader, to be effective, must always adapt his behavior to fit the expectations, values, and interpersonal skills of those with whom he is interacting.

With regard to supervision in the Cooperative Extension Service, Rogers and Olmsted (73) also emphasized the following recommendations:

The better the supervisor knows his subordinates, the better he will understand their behavior and, correspondingly, the better he will be able to carry out the supervisory functions. The supervisor must realize that each employee is unique and that no supervisor can function effectively without a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the individuals working under his guidance.

To emphasize the importance of understanding the behavior of the extension workers as a prerequisite of their effectiveness, Vandenberg (90) indicated the need of a close personal knowledge of the personality variations of each extension worker on the part of the supervisor. The importance of understanding individual behavior in a learning situation has been well explained in Galiler's words: "You cannot teach a man anything; you can only help him find it within himself." (27)

To determine the training needs of extension workers, McCormick (57) indicated that the National Task Force on Cooperative Extension Inservice Training suggested psychological tests as one of the ways of identification of training needs of extension workers. Landis (49) indicated that in a society of invention and rapid change the patterns of personality are inherent in segmentations of social experiences. Personality, according to Adorno and others (2) is mainly a potential; it is readiness for behavior rather than behavior itself.

The Extension Service has the background and experience to make an outstanding contribution to the economic and social development of the nation. The changing conditions in the American scene are inevitable consequences of rapid advancement of technology, urbanization, and mobility. The contemporary Extension Service is confronted with new

challenges. There are several psychological, sociological, and biological forces that play a vital part in the development of the personality of the individuals. In order to improve the professional competencies needed by the extension workers to implement the programs of the Extension Service, it seems imperative that the Extension Service must develop the abilities of its county field extension personnel. The problem of determining the personality traits of the county field extension personnel and their relationship to selected background factors is a key to the future success of the contemporary Extension Service.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose for making this study was to examine the personality traits of the county extension personnel and to determine their relationship to selected factors related to the professional as well as social aspects of the county extension personnel. To indicate more clearly the purposes of the study, specific objectives were formulated. These objectives were:

1. To identify and discuss the eighteen personality traits of county extension personnel as measured by The California Psychological Inventory (CPI). These traits were:
 - (i) Dominance (Do)
 - (ii) Capacity for status (Cs)
 - (iii) Sociability (Sy)
 - (iv) Social presence (Sp)
 - (v) Self-acceptance (Sa)
 - (vi) Sense of well-being (Wb)

- (vii) Responsibility (Re)
- (viii) Socialization (So)
- (ix) Self-control (Sc)
- (x) Tolerance (To)
- (xi) Good impression (Gi)
- (xii) Communality (Cm)
- (xiii) Achievement via conformance (Ac)
- (xiv) Achievement via independence (Ai)
- (xv) Intellectual efficiency (Ie)
- (xvi) Psychological-mindedness (Py)
- (xvii) Flexibility (Fx)
- (xviii) Femininity (Fe)

2. To determine the percentage of male county extension personnel who obtained scores average or above the norms established by the CPI on the eighteen personality traits.
3. To determine the number of male field extension personnel obtaining scores above the norms established by the CPI in the four classes. These four classes included the following personality traits as measured by the CPI:

- Class I. MEASURES OF POISE, ASCENDANCY, AND SELF-ASSURANCE
Traits included: Do, Cs, Sy, Sp, Sa, and Wb.
- Class II. MEASURES OF SOCIALIZATION, MATURITY, AND RESPONSIBILITY
Traits included: Re, So, Sc, To, Gi, and Cm.
- Class III. MEASURES OF ACHIEVEMENT POTENTIAL AND INTELLECTUAL EFFICIENCY
Traits included: Ac, Ai, and Ie.
- Class IV. MEASURES OF INTELLECTUAL AND INTEREST MODES
Traits included: Py, Fx, and Fe.

4. To determine the relationship between personality traits of the male field extension personnel and variables:
 - (i) Age
 - (ii) Present title or position in the Extension Service
 - (iii) Tenure in the present position in the Extension Service
 - (iv) Tenure in the Cooperative Extension Service
 - (v) Formal education
 - (vi) Major field of study
 - (vii) Job experience other than in the Extension Service
 - (viii) Length of job experience other than in the Extension Service
 - (ix) Place where lived most of the life
 - (x) Place where like to live
 - (xi) Length of time lived on the farm
 - (xii) Participation in organizations other than the Extension Service
 - (xiii) Family size
 - (xiv) Birth order in family
 - (xv) Father's occupation
5. To determine the relationship between the personality traits of male field extension personnel and job involvement.

Hypotheses of the Study

To achieve the fourth and fifth specific objectives, as stated in the purpose of the study, the following hypotheses were formulated to give specific direction to the analysis of data. The hypotheses are

stated in the null form.

Hypothesis 1. There is no relationship between any of the selected professional and social related variables and the personality traits of the county extension personnel. (The variables and personality traits investigated under Hypothesis 1 are listed under objectives number four and one above).

Hypothesis 2. There is no relationship between the degree of job involvement and the personality traits of the county extension personnel.

Significance of the Study

The continued effectiveness of the organization is dependent upon (a) its being examined periodically in an objective and scientific manner, and (b) upon the willingness of the administration of the organization to effect changes in the light of the findings of such appraisal. Clark and Evans (16) emphasized that "Organization is the medium through which individuals and groups collectively seek to attain stated objectives." The importance of the development of the individuals working in the organization was well explained by Francis (27) when he said:

I believe the greatest assets of an organization are its human assets and that the improvement of their value is both a matter of material advantage and moral obligation; I believe, therefore, that employees must be treated as individuals, justly rewarded, encouraged in their progress, fully informed, properly assigned and that their lives must be given meaning and dignity on the job as well as off of it.

Today, the sciences of Man, no less than the sciences of things, are receiving unprecedented public support. Men of affairs, government administrators, heads of labor and industry, cultural and religious

leaders, military leaders, and others are ready to seek out the findings of social sciences in order to deal with problems related to human beings.

The Extension Service is dedicated not only to the people whom it serves but also is concerned in the development of the staff so as to make them happy individuals in their work, home, and community. The Extension Service has employed many ways to determine the training needs of county extension personnel. In comparison with the research that has been carried out in the determination of training needs, very little empirical work has been done in the United States using psychological tests. Mahboob (59) made a study to determine the personality characteristics of the male county agents in Wisconsin. He found that many environmental and attitudinal variables of the county agents were related to their personality traits. Mahboob used The California Psychological Inventory test to determine the personality characteristics of the male county agents of Wisconsin. Tyler (89) pointed out that, although no single source of information is adequate to provide a basis for wise and comprehensive decisions about educational objectives, the study of the learners by themselves was a very important source for educational objectives.

Definition of Terms

County extension personnel. This term is meant to include only the male professional field extension workers who are employed at the county level to implement the programs of the Extension Service. It includes male county extension directors, male extension agents - specialized programs, and male extension agents - 4-H programs.

County extension director. This title is used to designate the male field extension worker in each county who is directly responsible for the agricultural and other programs. He is also chairman of the county staff having major administrative responsibilities.

Extension agents - specialized programs. This title is used for those male county extension personnel who are employed for the primary responsibility in a field of specialty, such as dairy, forestry, farm management, et cetera. The term specialized extension agents is synonymous with the title, Extension agents - specialized program.

Extension agent - 4-H program. The title is used to designate all male county extension personnel whose major efforts are in the field of 4-H Club work.

Personality trait. A term meant to indicate the enduring characteristic of the individual which is manifested in a consistent way of behaving in a wide variety of situations.

Score. A synonym for raw scores obtained by the county extension personnel as measured by The California Psychological Inventory.

Scope of the Study

In March, 1968, when this study was undertaken, the seventy-seven counties in Oklahoma employed 265 professional extension workers designated as "county field extension personnel." A further breakdown shows that the counties employed 77 county extension directors, 52 extension agents - 4-H programs, 42 extension agents - other specialized programs, and 94 extension home economists. The subjects of this study were all male county field extension personnel. They were 77

county extension directors, 41 extension agents - 4-H program, and 42 extension agents - other specialized programs.

There are several methods useful in determining the personality traits of an individual. They are interviews, rating scales, questionnaires, inventories, projective techniques, and direct observations. However, for the purpose of this study, the determination of personality traits of the county extension personnel was limited to the inventory method. This technique of personality assessment has been recognized by Allport (7), Coleman (17), Goldschmid (31), Gough (32), Griffin (35), Hurlock (44), Johnson (45), Korn (48) and Shaffer (77). The inventory technique was chosen because it has several advantages. The data obtained by this method are free of bias as well as being quantitative and thus useful for drawing scientific inferences. The inventory measures multi-dimensional aspects of personality traits. Furthermore, the inventory test provides opportunity for the individual to answer questions at his convenience. The inventory test is generally standardized, based on empirical findings. Coleman (17) indicated that the inventory test was of vital importance as it measured the personality traits of the individual as he himself recognized them.

Procedures Used

The detailed methodology used in this study in regard to collection of data and statistical treatment of data follow in Chapter III.

Underlying Assumptions of the Study

A major assumption in the study was that the subjects selected in the investigation were a part of an on-going and changing population.

The field extension personnel represented in the study are often promoted to different ranks in the Cooperative Extension Service. Furthermore, additional employees are needed for expansion and/or attrition in the organization.

Limitations of the Study

The investigator recognizes that the science of human behavior has not yet attained the same level of accuracy as the physical sciences. The acquiring of scientific information about the personality traits of individuals is quite complex because of certain unique qualities in each individual. The problem of delineating personality traits continues to be the focus of several researchers in the field of human behavior. Because of these limitations, caution in generalizing from the findings of the study should be heeded.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review selected studies and literature pertinent to this study. The major divisions are (1) Definitions of Personality, (2) Theories of Personality, (3) Selected Variables in the Study, and (4) The California Psychological Inventory.

Definitions of Personality

The word "personality" is interesting in its origin. It originated from the Latin word, persona, meaning "mask." Among the ancient Greeks actors wore masks to conceal their identity, thus enabling them to represent the characters they were depicting in the play. This dramatic technique was later adopted by the Romans, and from them the modern term "personality" has been transmitted.

To the Romans, persona meant "as one appears to others"; not as one actually is. From this connotation the popular idea of personality as the effect one has on others has been derived. Personality, then, is not one definite, specific attribute; rather, it is the quality of the individual's total behavior. Some of the definitions of personality written by various writers will be discussed in this chapter.

Cameron (14), the behavior pathologist, defined personality as:

. . . the dynamic organization of interlocking behavior systems that each of us possesses as he grows from a biological newborn to a biosocial adult in an environment of other individuals and cultural products.

Cameron thus indicated that man begins life as a biological organism and enters into an environment which is already an organization of other human beings. According to Cameron, man must learn the established patterns of satisfaction, denial, delay, and punishment which exist in the society from the time of the birth of man. Cameron believed that these patterns become a related set of behaviors as the child grows from infancy to adulthood.

Lundin (55) expressed the same thoughts when he stated that: "Personality is that organization of unique behavior equipment an individual has acquired under the special conditions of his development."

Prince (72) placed a potential emphasis on the inner aspect of the usefulness of the personality when he said, "Personality is the sum total of all the biological innate dispositions, impulses, tendencies, appetites, and instincts of the individual, and the acquired dispositions and tendencies."

Gattell (15) offered a more general definition that stressed the predictive power of the concept of personality. According to Gattell: ". . . the personality of an individual is that which enables us to predict what he will do in a given situation."

Hilgard (42) stressed in his definition the need to study individual differences. He declared:

. . . the term personality is used to mean the configuration of individual characteristics and ways of behaving which determines an individual's unique adjustment to his environment. We stress particularly those personal traits that affect the individual's getting along with other people and with himself. Hence, personality includes any characteristics that are important in the individual's personal adjustment, in his maintenance of self-respect.

Shaffer and Shoben (78) regarded the personality as a product of social learning, acquired through experiences with other human beings. They stated, "The personality of an individual may be defined as his persistent tendencies to make certain kinds and qualities of adjustment."

Havighurst (39) emphasized that personality was not dependent on intellect but was interdependent with intellect. He said:

Personality is the valuing aspect of human behavior, while intellect is the knowing aspect. Personality includes such traits or abilities as altruism, social loyalty, social sensitivity, esthetic sensitivity, self-acceptance; and a subgroup of characteristics which combine value with will, such as self control, responsibility, honesty, and personal independence.

Allport (6) defined personality as ". . . the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychological systems that determine his unique adjustment to his environments."

The definition given by Allport (6) covered many aspects of human development. It recognized the changing nature of personality (a dynamic organization); it focused on the inner aspect rather than on superficial manifestations; and it established the basis for the social stimulus value of personality (unique adjustment to the environment). Allport in his definition indicated his conviction that it was personality that mediated between the individual and his physical and psychological environment, sometimes submitting to it, sometimes mastering it. Thus, personality was to Allport of crucial functional or adaptive significance.

Theories of Personality

A theory which attempts to deal with all behavioral phenomena of

demonstrated significance may be referred to as a general theory. Such a theory which restricts its focus on certain classes of behavioral events is called single-domain theory. Generally, most of the personality theories fall into the first category, as they depict the general theory of behavior. Personality theory is a set of related assumptions about which behavior is accompanied by a group of empirical findings of data concerning that behavior. The personality theory should enable the workers in the field of behavioral science to make predictions adequate enough to deal with a wide range of human behavior. The theory should also generate a body of relevant research. Hall and Lindsey (37) discussed in great detail the major contemporary theories of personality. Some of the personality theories relevant to the thesis of this investigation are discussed in this chapter.

Freud's Psychoanalytic Theory

Freud conceived the process of personality development as a continuous process. The most critical stages of development occur during the first five years of man's life. Freud believed that the permanent structure of personality was largely established during the first five years of man's life. Freud believed that there was a characteristic sequence of psychosexual stages such as oral stage, anal stage, phallic stage, latency period and genital stage. The child passes through these several stages; and the individual differences in adult personality, according to Freud, may be traceable to the specific manner in which the person experienced and handled the conflicts arising in these stages.

Personality, according to Freud, was made of three major systems:

id, ego and superego. Hall and Lindsey (37) indicated that Freud stressed that behavior was the product of an interaction among the three systems. Rarely one system operates to the exclusion of the other two systems. The "id" was thought of as the biological component of personality, the "ego" as the psychological component, and the "superego" as the social component.

Jung's Analytic Theory

Jung rejected Freud's pansexualism. He established his own method of psychotherapy which became known as analytical psychology. The most salient feature of Jung's theory of personality was the emphasis that he placed upon the forward-going character of personality development. Jung believed that man was constantly progressing from a less complete stage of development to a more complete one. He also believed mankind, as a species, was constantly evolving more differentiated forms of existence. Jung (46) stated:

Every reduction, every digression from the course that has been laid down for the development of civilization does nothing more than turn the human being into a crippled animal.

The ultimate goal, according to Jung, could be summed up by the term self-actualization. Jung indicated a great concern for the future of man. Jung maintained that man looked into one's past in order to account for his present behavior. He emphasized that the present was not only determined by the past, but it was also determined by the future. Jung stressed that in order to understand man one has to be Janus-faced, that is, one face to look into man's past, the other to look into man's future. Jung indicated that the two views when combined could yield a complete picture of man.

Adler's Social Psychological Theory

Adler assumed that man was motivated primarily by social urges. He gave stress to social determinants of the behavior of man. Adler also stressed the concept of the creative self. Ansbacher (9) indicated that Adler's contribution to this new trend of recognizing the self as an important cause of behavior was considered to be a very significant one.

Adler considered each person to be a unique configuration of motives, traits, interests, and values. Adler made consciousness the center of personality. He fashioned a humanistic theory of personality which was the antithesis of Freud's conception of man. By endowing man with altruism, humanitarianism, cooperation, creativity, uniqueness, and awareness, Adler restored to man a sense of dignity and worth. Adler's conception of the nature of personality coincided with the popular idea that man can be the master, and not the victim, of his fate.

Fromm's Social Psychological Theory

The essential theme of Fromm's writings was that man had felt lonely and isolated because he had been separated from nature and other men. The condition of isolation, according to Fromm, was a distinctive human situation not found in any other species of animal. Fromm (29) developed the thesis that as man has gained more freedom throughout the ages he has also felt more alone. Freedom was considered a negative condition in the views of Fromm. He indicated that man would try to escape from this condition.

The problem of man's relations to society was one of the greatest concerns to Fromm. He proposed the possibility of creating an ideal society. Fromm also suggested a name for such a perfect society which he called "Humanistic Communitarian Socialism." In such a society everyone would have equal opportunity to become fully human. There would be no loneliness, no feelings of isolation and no despair. Man would find a new home, the one suited to the "human situation."

Horney's Theory of Personality

Horney gave emphasis to anxiety. She indicated that anything that disturbed the security of the child in relation to his parents would produce basic anxiety. Horney further declared that all conflicts in regard to personality development were avoidable or resolvable if the child was raised in a home where there was security, trust, love, respect, tolerance and warmth. Horney emphasized that conflicts arose out of social conditions. Horney (43) indicated that "the person who is likely to become neurotic is one who has experienced culturally determined difficulties in an accentuated form, mostly through the medium of childhood experience."

Sullivan's Theory of Interpersonal Psychiatry

The major tenet of Sullivan's theory (86), as it related to personality, maintained that the personality was "the relatively enduring pattern of recurrent interpersonal situations which characterize a human life." Sullivan considered personality as a hypothetical entity which could not be isolated from interpersonal situations; and interpersonal behavior was all that could be observed as personality.

Consequently, Sullivan emphasized the individual as the object of study, because the individual existed with the relations of other people.

Sullivan viewed personality from the perspective of definite stages of development. He delineated six stages in the development of personality prior to the final stage of maturity. These six stages were (a) infancy, (b) childhood, (c) the juvenile era, (d) preadolescence, (e) early adolescence, and (f) late adolescence.

Although Sullivan firmly rejected any hard and fast instinct doctrine as determiners of development, yet he did acknowledge the importance of heredity in providing certain capacities, chiefly the capacities for receiving and elaborating experiences. He also accepted the principle that training cannot be effective before maturation has laid the structural groundwork. Sullivan did not believe that personality was set at an early age. He indicated that personality could change at any time as new interpersonal situations arose, since the human organism was extremely plastic and malleable. He recognized that the forward thrust of learning and development predominated, but regressions could and had occurred when pain, anxiety, and failure became intolerable.

Murray's Personology

The focus of Murray's theory was upon the individual in all his complexity. He emphasized consistently the organic quality of behavior, indicating that a single segment of behavior was not to be understood in isolation from the rest of the functioning person. Murray placed emphasis upon the importance of environmental determinants and developed an elaborate set of concepts designed to represent these

environmental forces. Murray indicated that the past or history of the individual was as important as the present individual and his environment. A further feature of Murray's theory was the consistent emphasis upon the coexisting and functionally linked physiological processes which accompany all psychological processes. The major elements of this theory are contained in the definition of personality stated by Murray (66): "Personality is the governing organ of the body, an institution, which from birth to death, is ceaselessly engaged in transformative functional operations."

Murray recognized the brain as the seat of the organizing and executive functions of the personality. He emphasized that the study of man's directional tendencies would hold the key in understanding human behavior. Murray placed heavy emphasis upon the importance of motivational analysis while discussing certain related concepts such as need, press, tension reduction, thema, need integrate, unity-thema, and regnancy. Murray, however, did not devote enough attention to the learning process; and, as a result, his theory suffered from an inability to account for the manner in which motives become transformed and developed.

Lewin's Field Theory

The principal characteristics of Lewin's field theory were (a) behavior was a function of the field which existed at the time the behavior occurred; (b) analysis was thought to begin with the situation as a whole from which were differentiated the component parts; and, (c) the concrete person in a concrete situation could be represented mathematically.

Lewin (50) also emphasized underlying forces as determiners of behavior and expressed a preference for physiological descriptions of the field. A field was defined as "the totality of coexisting facts which are conceived of as mutually interdependent."

Allport's Theory of Personality

Hall and Lindzey (37) have given a comprehensive summary of Allport's theory of the psychology of the individual. In the case of Allport's theory, personality structure was primarily represented in terms of traits; and, at the same time, behavior was motivated or driven by traits. Thus, structure and dynamics were viewed, for the most part, one and the same.

In the most detailed statement of his theory, Allport (7) suggested that each of the following concepts possessed some utility: conditioned reflex, habit, attitude, trait, self, and personality. Although all of these concepts have been conceded a certain importance, the major emphasis of Allport's theory was upon traits, with attitudes and intentions given an almost equivalent status. In Allport's theory traits occupied the position of the major motivational construct.

Allport (7) defined the trait as:

. . . a generalized and focalized neuropsychic system (peculiar to the individual), with the capacity to render many stimuli functionally equivalent, and to initiate and guide consistent (equivalent) forms of adaptive and expressive behavior.

The reference to "neuropsychic systems" pointed to the affirmative answer provided by Allport to the question of whether traits were "really there." Contrasting the biosocial viewpoint (treating traits as existing only in the observations made by some person other than the

subject) with the biophysical viewpoints (which held that traits were not dependent upon the observer but had real existence in the subject) Allport clearly adopted the second point of view. Allport's theory has been often referred to as a "trait psychology." He suggested that traits were "the ultimate realities of psychological organization." Allport (7) further elaborated by stating:

A trait . . . has more than nominal existence; it is independent of the observer; it is really there . . . this view does not hold that every trait-name necessarily implies a trait; but rather that behind all confusion of terms, behind the disagreement of judges, and apart from errors and failures of empirical observation, there are none the less bona fide mental structures in each personality that account for the consistency of behavior.

Allport insisted that in reality no two individuals ever have exactly the same traits. Although there may be similarities in the trait structures of different individuals, there were always unique features as to the way in which any particular trait operated for any one person that distinguished it from all similar traits in other persons. Thus, in the most important sense, all traits considered by Allport were individual traits, unique and applicable only to the single individual. Allport still admitted that because of the common influences involved in a shared culture and species similarities, individuals do develop ". . . a limited number of roughly comparable modes of adjustment."

Allport (7) thus suggested that a researcher might construct measures that could get at common aspects of individual traits and that possessed a certain crude predictive power--the common or nomothetic traits. Allport indicated that for the sake of efficiency and convenience a procedure to investigate traits had justification. It is clear that the inferences involved in identifying a trait imply consistency.

A trait is known only by virtue of certain regularities or consistencies in the manner in which an individual behaves.

Dollard and Miller's Learning Theory of Personality

Dollard and Miller, unlike Freud, did not conceive of personality as evolving from the operation of a sexual drive through a predetermined sequence of developmental stages. Their conception was that the child, as he matures, learns important habits which mold his personality. The child acquires habits when he encounters the frustration imposed by authority, or when he learns to be affectionate or aggressive. He acquires habits during feeding experiences, toilet training, and social situations in which the parents of the child and his siblings play major roles.

The review of theories of personality supports the notion that each type of personality theory tends to have certain distinctive features. In each theory of personality it was found that certain concepts required explication. It is important to mention that one can make the best use of personality theories by comparing the individuality and distinctiveness of each theory.

Selected Variables in the Study

In the development of the personality, it must be recognized that the personality includes patterns of reflexes, motivations, attitudes, values, ideals, habits, goals, beliefs and other factors related to the biological, sociological, and psychological aspects of the individual. Sanford (75) stated:

. . . the present organization of the system has evolved over time as the motivated biological organism has engaged, in accordance with its own capacities and in response to its changing needs, in the psychological process of interacting with its environment.

Some of the factors which have been chosen for this investigation that might be related to the development of personality are discussed in this section.

Heredity

Man has been well aware of his inherited characteristics. Darwin (21) felt that behavioral characteristics as well as physical characteristics had a genetic background. Darwin wrote:

So, in regard to mental qualities, their transmission is manifest in our dogs, horse, and other domestic animals. Besides special tastes and habits, general intelligence, courage, bad and good temper, etc., are certainly transmitted. With man, we see similar facts in almost every family; and we now know through the admirable labors of Mr. Galton that genius, which implies a wonderfully complex combination of high faculties, tends to be inherited; and on the other hand, it is, too, certain that insanity and deteriorated mental powers likewise run in the same families.

Some decades ago the so-called heredity-environment question was the center of lively controversy. It is now generally conceded that both heredity and environmental factors enter into all behavior. The reacting organism is considered to be a product of its genes and its past environment, while present environment provides the immediate stimuli for current behavior.

Family

In spite of radical changes in the pattern of family life in the past several years, the family is still the most significant part in the development of the personality. The home is the child's first

environment, and, therefore, it sets the pattern for the child's attitude toward people, things, and life in general. Furthermore, because the child identifies with the members of the family he loves, he imitates their patterns of behavior and thus learns to adjust to life as they tend to adjust. Phillips (68) stated: "While the pattern established in the home will be changed and modified as the child grows older, it will never be completely eradicated."

Super (87) also emphasized that "the family is frequently thought of as determining the careers of its members through its economic interests, affiliations, and values." Green (34) also indicated the importance of family in regard to personality development when he said, "it is here that one's basic traits, attitudes, loyalties, prejudices, and points of view are established."

Size of the Family

The family is a complex of interactional systems made up of the different members of the family. Many personal relationships are learned during early childhood by way of interaction between siblings. The larger the family, the larger the number of interactional systems. To determine how many interactional systems there would be in a given family, Henry and Warson (40) have suggested the following formula, wherein "n" is the number of members in the family.

$$2^n - n - 1$$

Each interactional system has its own unique emotional quality which affects the personality and behavior of all the members of the family. Vogel and Lauterbach (91) found that the incidence of neuroses and character disorders was higher among "only" children than among the

normal child population. This may suggest that "only" children undergo "strains and stresses" which are not experienced by the individual who has brothers and sisters.

Birth Order in the Family

Schachter (76) investigated the relationship between birth order and sociometric choice. Although first-borns were found to choose more popular people and to exhibit greater similarity of sociometric choice than were later-borns, yet, the later-borns were much more popular with their peers than were the first-borns. Sampson (74) conducted three studies in which he used three samples of subjects. Based on the findings, Sampson suggested that (a) first-borns did have a higher need for achievement than did later-born children; (b) first-born females did exhibit greater resistance to influence than did later-born females; and (c) first-born males did exhibit less resistance to influence than did later-born males.

Bossard and Boll (12) identified and classified eight different roles of children. Three of them showed a relationship to the birth order. These three were (a) the responsible child who many times was the first-born; (b) the sociable, well-liked child who often was the second-born; and (c) the spoiled child who was many times the last-born. Allen (3) clearly emphasized the fact when he said, "The position of the child in the family and his relationship with the members of his family have a great deal to do with his success in later life."

Parental Occupation

The father's occupation is important to a young child only insofar

as it has a direct bearing on the child's welfare. For the older child, however, the father's occupation has a cultural significance in that it affects the child's social prestige. Hurlock (44) said:

The father's occupation affects the child indirectly in that it influences the father's standards for the child. From his experiences in work, the father knows what attitudes, skills, and qualities are essential to success. He then tries to foster them in the child.

Miller and Swanson (63) reported that:

Within the middle class, the offspring of individual entrepreneurs are encouraged to develop some traits of personality that are quite different from those impressed upon the children of men who work in large and bureaucratically organized corporations. Specifically, it appears that initiative and aggressive striving are considered more virtuous by the entrepreneurs, while the "organization men" place a greater premium upon the ability of their children to adapt to and cooperate with other people.

Age

In regard to the age and nature of human beings, Linden and Courtney (53) indicated:

The human being is never static. From the moment he is conceived to the time of his death, he is undergoing constant changes. At every age, some of these changes are just beginning, some are at their peak, and some are in the process of decline.

Feldman (25) expressed similar thoughts when he said:

Human life proceeds by stages. The life periods of the human individual are no less real and significant than the geological ages of the earth or the evolutionary stages of life. . . . Each stage is distinguished by a dominant feature, a leading characteristic, which gives the period its coherence, its unity, and its uniqueness.

Schaie (79) conducted a study on 500 subjects, half men and half women, ranging in age from 20 to 70 years. He divided the subjects into ten five-year age intervals and rank-ordered them in terms of a

composite score on rigidity. The ten most flexible and ten most rigid individuals in each group were examined with respect to certain personal characteristics. Significant differences in favor of the flexible group on the measures of years of education, income level, occupational level, self-ratings of happiness, success and social responsibility were found. Significant differences and interaction were also found between rigidity-flexibility and age on a measure of mobility (change of residence) with the young flexible and the old rigid being the more mobile groups.

Aaronson (1) conducted an investigation in an attempt to assess personality change as a function of aging and to determine whether regular, orderly changes do take place in personality as a function of the aging process. He found that the processes of maturation continue to function with regard to personality phenomena during the adult years. An important dimension of personality change seems to be the transition from concern with the control of one's impulses to concern with one's physical and mental health. Aaronson proposed a concept of psychological age as a unifying factor against which to evaluate the diverse phenomena of ongoing personality change.

Place of Living

The place where people like to live or have lived most of their life provides a very important determiner influencing the personality of the people. Kolb and Brunner (47) indicated that in regard to certain traits of rural and urban people, that differences did exist and would continue to exist. Mangus (60) indicated:

Compared with children from urban areas, rural children have been reported to be superior in both self-adjustment and social adjustment. In general, rural children are more self-reliant, have a greater sense of personal worth and of belonging, and have greater freedom from nervous symptoms and withdrawing tendencies. On the whole, they receive better ratings from their teachers and fewer unfavorable ratings from their peers than urban children.

It is observed that individuals adopt only those attitudes and values which would help them achieve desired ends and which are normally sanctioned by the community in which they live. Dressel and Lehmann (23) found that students from the rural areas had higher mean traditional-value scores than those from urban areas. Sorokin and Zimmerman (83) tentatively proposed that rural and urban people differ in perceptions, recollections, and associations. They indicated:

We must expect that on the whole, in comparison with the bulk of the city population, the farmer-peasant personality is less soft and feminized and more stern and astute or puritanic.

Participation in Organizations

Bonner (11) described the importance of participation in group activities when he said ". . . although we are unique individuals in important ways, our personality is always anchored in a social matrix determined by the groups with which we closely identify ourselves."

Formal Education

Axinn (10) conducted a study to determine the relationship of personal characteristics such as education, age, rank, and other factors to salary and performance of extension workers. He found that more of the county extension agents with Master's degrees had higher performance ratings.

Major Field of Formal Education

Goldschmid (31) conducted a study by giving certain psychological tests in order to predict college majors by personality tests. He found that personality characteristics were related to choice of major field in either science or humanities. Teevan (88), in his study to determine whether or not personality factors were correlated with choice of major field in college, concluded "that correlation between personality and vocation for professional groups can also be demonstrated during the period preceding entrance into a profession."

Korn (48) used The California Psychological Inventory and Strong Vocational Interest Blank tests to determine the differences in the personality between majors in engineering and physical sciences. Korn did find that certain personality traits were related to choice of major subject. Morrill (65) and Pietrofesa (69) also found that individual personality traits influence the choice of major area of specialization and occupational interest.

Past Work Experience

It is generally viewed that present personality dispositions and behaviors are partially determined by past experiences. In the field of psychology labeled as "personality and perception," Brunner (13) and Postman (71) conducted separate investigations related to the expectancy theory of perception. In this theory, the concept of expectancy is regarded as a highly generalized state of readiness in the perceiver to respond selectively to certain classes of events in his environment. Brunner and Postman have demonstrated experimentally that frequency of past confirmation is a major determinant of the strength of perceptual

theory of expectancy.

Job Involvement

Lodahl and Kejner (54) defined job involvement as the degree to which a person's work performance affects his self-esteem. Gurin, Veroff and Feld (36) found that "feelings of inadequacy among the employed men interviewed were linked to job satisfaction." Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson and Capwell (41), with regard to performance of the job and the worker, stated:

The satisfied worker is in general a more flexible, better adjusted person, who has come from a superior family environment, or who has the capacity to overcome the effects of an inferior environment. He is a realist about his own situation and about his goals. The worker dissatisfied with his job, in contrast, is often rigid, inflexible, unrealistic in his choice of goals, unable to overcome environmental obstacles, generally unhappy and dissatisfied.

Title or Position of the Job

Harsh and Schrickel (38) in regard to an individual's job said "the individual identifies not only with the norms of the occupational group of which he is a member but also with the job he is performing." The statement of Harsh and Schrickel indicate that the personality of people having some particular title would be related to some extent to certain personality traits.

The California Psychological Inventory

The idea of systematic personality assessment is at least as old as Plato, who, in The Republic, suggested that efforts be made to place the right man in the right job. The term "personality inventory" is a collective term which serves as a useful umbrella to cover a collection

of measures purporting to appraise, among many others, such diverse psychological constructs as attitudes, beliefs, values, temperament, character, appreciations, motivation, needs, persistence, adjustment and independence.

The initiation of the inventory method could be appropriately attributed to R. S. Woodworth who developed it during World War I. Woodworth experimented with the idea of giving every man an interview by asking him, through printed material, the kinds of questions that would have typically been asked by psychologists. In view of its origin, the personality inventory should be regarded as a form of interview, although less personal than a face-to-face interview. McClelland (56) emphasized the importance of measuring personality when he said that "although it is rather easy to construct theories of personality, what does lead to progress in science is the development of specific methods of measuring our theories and abstractions."

There are three types of tests which measure personality in terms of the assessment of specified traits, adjustment to the environment and classify individuals into clinical groups. These inventories are the California Psychological Inventory, the Bell Adjustment Inventory, and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), respectively.

The CPI consists of 480 questions that are answered true or false by the individual being tested. Each question on the inventory is related to one of eighteen different trait scales such as dominance, etc. (supra, pp. 8-9). In interpreting the inventory, the total profile of scores on all of the scales relative to each other must be taken into consideration.

Development of the CPI

The basic method of scale construction, as advanced by Gough (32), has come to be called the "empirical technique." In this method a criterion dimension which one seeks to measure is first defined, personal dominance being an example. Second, inventory statements which seem to bear a psychological relevance to the criterion dimension are assembled in a preliminary scale. These questions are then administered to persons who can be shown by some procedure entirely independent of the test to be strongly characterized by this trait or dimension. Eleven of the CPI scales were developed in this general fashion. These scales are Do, Cs, Sy, Re, So, To, Ac, Ai, Ie, Py, and Fe. Four additional scales, Sp, Sa, Sc, and Fx, were created by the technique of internal consistency analysis. The three scales developed to detect faking were Wb, a scale following the empirical procedure in its development; the Gi scale, constructed with research samples; and, the Gm scale developed by observing several samples.

Reliability of the CPI

Two reliability studies using the test-retest method are available. In one of these two high school junior classes took the CPI in the fall of 1952, and a year later as seniors. Two hundred male prisoners took the other test twice with a lapse of 7 to 21 days between testings. Questions were read aloud to half the subjects on the first administration; the second time they read questions silently to themselves; for the other half, the procedure was reversed. No measurable differences resulted from the oral administration. In general, Gough (32) concluded that the consistency of measurement was high enough to permit

use of the scales in both group and individual testing. He further concluded that two scales, the Cm (communality) and Py (psychological-mindedness) fall rather low on the reliability check.

Validity of the CPI

Gough (32) pointed out that the articles and reports listed in the bibliography of his Manual of CPI provided the fullest and most accurate picture of the validity of each scale. Gough documented the validity, reliability and usefulness of the CPI in more than 200 studies. Gough indicated that in every instance the evidence presented was drawn from cross-validated studies of the CPI inventory.

In reviewing research using the CPI, several studies are cited below.

The CPI and Leadership Abilities

Johnson and Frandsen (45) used the CPI with the hope that it would differentiate student leaders from students in general. All the 50 leader and 50 nonleader subjects of their study attended Utah State University in 1959. A comparison of the CPI profiles of the subjects revealed that the CPI scales could differentiate the leader and the nonleader subjects in the investigation.

The CPI and Intelligence and Other Related Variables

Liddle (51) conducted a study using the CPI with the purpose of exploring the relationship between the CPI and certain other variables, namely, social status, intellectual talent, leadership ability, friendship, aggressiveness, and withdrawness in a high school population.

In almost every instance it was found that there were statistically significant relationships between the CPI and its subsections including such variables as socioeconomic status, intelligence, and leadership ability. Further, the self-reports of adolescents on the CPI correlated with ratings of their psychological adjustment as seen by their teachers and peers.

The CPI and Cross-Cultural Studies of Achievement

Gough (33) conducted a study of academic achievement in Italy by testing 204 males and 137 females from four high school in three cities by use of the CPI. It was found that the CPI had validity in other cultures on certain trait scales.

The CPI and Academic Abilities

Fink (26), Datel and others (22), and Griffin and others (35) conducted separate studies on separate subjects and found certain CPI traits very useful in predicting the academic performance of the subjects.

The CPI and Athletic Abilities

Schudel (80) used the CPI in determining the psychological differences between athletes and nonparticipants in athletes at three educational levels. He found the CPI helpful in determining psychological differences found in the traits.

The CPI and the Interests of Individuals

Springob (84) used the CPI as an instrument to measure personality

traits, while interests were measured by the Kuder Preference Record - Vocational. The CPI was found to be a valid instrument in determining the relationships between certain traits and the interests of individuals.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter contains a description of the methodological procedures used in the study. As stated previously, the purpose of the study was to obtain information that would (1) determine the personality traits as measured by the CPI, (2) measure the relationships of certain personality traits to selected professional and social variables, and (3) provide a basis for setting training program objectives for Oklahoma county extension personnel.

As a result of a personal conference held with the late Dr. George E. Stroup, Director of Personnel Development of Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service, it was learned that no study employing a psychological technique for determining the training needs of county extension personnel had been done in Oklahoma. It was mutually agreed at the time that there was a definite need for such a study.

With the understanding that the investigation would enhance the competence of county extension personnel as well as the effectiveness of the Cooperative Extension Service an impetus for the study was provided.

The Population

The data were obtained from seventy-seven county extension

directors, forty-one extension agents - 4-H program, and forty-two extension agents - other specialized programs. The 160 respondents of the study included all the male county field extension personnel employed in the seventy-seven counties of Oklahoma. The data were obtained from questionnaire sent to each of the subjects. A letter explaining the purpose of the study, and the instructions relative to the completion of questionnaires, were also enclosed.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire designed to obtain information related to the professional and social background of the county extension personnel included in the study was developed. The questionnaire provided specific information related to independent variables in order to determine the degree of association between these variables and each personality trait as measured by the CPI. Dailey (20) has emphasized the importance of obtaining a historical background of persons when he said:

The life history, as the focus of assessment, provides a structure of facts, a backbone of specific observations on which to hang the flesh and garments of psychological interpretation and inference. The history records the facts as they occur without artificially dissolving the natural integration of behavior within its situational and social context.

Job Involvement

The instrument used for measuring the job involvement was developed by Lodahl and Kejner (54). Verbal permission to use the instrument was granted by the authors by telephone.

Job involvement, the degree to which a person is identified

psychologically with his work was measured by an instrument containing 20 statements to which the respondents indicated their agreements as well as disagreements. The instrument determined the degree of job involvement as a consequence of the internalization of values about the goodness of work or the importance of work in the worth of the person.

The California Psychological Inventory

The CPI, a test designed by Gough (32) for normal people, is intended for non-clinical use. The CPI booklets along with the CPI Answer Sheets were received from Dr. Harrison G. Gough, Professor of Psychology, and Associate Director, Institute of Personality Assessment and Research, University of California, Berkeley.

Fuller (30) has emphasized that "truly to understand a man who is sick you must understand a man who is well." The ultimate goal of the CPI and similar tests is to develop descriptive contents which possess broad personal and social relevance--those characteristics of a wide and pervasive applicability to human behavior and related to favorable and positive aspects. Liddle (51) indicated that "the CPI is a relatively new self-report instrument intended to determine favorable and positive aspects of personality rather than the morbid or pathological."

Shaffer (77) has also commented that "the CPI appears to be a major achievement." The importance of the CPI in assessing personality traits related to social living and social interaction has been expressed by Siegel (81):

The California Psychological Inventory may appear at first blush to be just another addition to the already tedious listing of paper-and-pencil personality inventories yielding multivariate scores in smorgasbord fashion.

The Inventory should not, however, be dismissed in such summary fashion. It makes a unique contribution to personality assessment because of its focus upon traits related to effective social interaction. It should prove to be extremely valuable whenever the goal of testing is to ascertain the adequacy with which an individual is relating to his social environment.

Scoring. The GPI is a true-false test containing a series of 480 statements. The scores obtained by each extension worker for each trait were hand tabulated by placing a scoring template on the GPI answer sheet. The X's (check marks) seen through the template were counted and the total score was entered in the proper cell at the bottom of the GPI answer sheet for each individual. The scores thus obtained were transferred to IBM sheets for machine computation. The scores of each individual were carefully examined regarding the faking of data. Gough (32) said:

Deliberate dissimulation, misrepresentation, or faking on a psychological test is probably a much less common phenomenon than many people think, yet it cannot be ignored in a test designed for use in a variety of situations, some of which may introduce motivations for presenting a particular impression - either good or bad.

The detection of faking could be ascertained if a person had received a very low score on trait Wb, a very high score on trait Gi, or a very low score on trait Cm as measured by the GPI.

The scores for job involvement as well as the professional and social variables related to the study were also directly entered on the IBM sheets. All data were analyzed by the University Computer Service of Oklahoma State University.

Statistical Treatment

Contingency tables were set up for cross-tabulation of the data. Appropriate statistical measures including Chi-square, the corrected

coefficient of contingency and correlation coefficient were used in determining significant differences and the degree of association between each of the personality traits and selected variables.

Chi-square Test

The Chi-square test was used to determine the significance of differences. Siegel (82) indicated that the Chi-square test was applicable to data in a contingency table only if the expected frequencies were sufficiently large. In order to meet this requirement, the adjacent classifications were collapsed and thereby the number of cells was reduced. This was carefully done so that combining of data was meaningful. However, in presenting data the observed frequencies were entered in each cell in order to indicate the trend of data.

Results at 0.05 level of significance were accepted as the basis for rejecting the null hypothesis. Results at the 0.01 to 0.10 level of significance are indicated where a trend is suggested.

Whenever the results were statistically significant, the corrected coefficient of contingency for qualitative variables and the coefficient of correlation for quantitative variables were calculated.

Corrected Coefficient of Contingency

In determining the strength of correlation of qualitative variables, the contingency coefficient (C) is generally calculated. McCormick (58) indicated that the coefficient of contingency had one defect in that it understates the amount of correlation actually present in inverse proportion to the number of cells in the table. For a 3 by 3 table having perfect correlation, the C would not be 1.00,

as it should be, but 0.816. McCormick (58) indicated that it was possible to correct C to some extent for the fault of underestimating the amount of correlation actually present between two variables. He recommended the following formula to correct this fault (see Appendix D):

$$\bar{C} = \frac{C}{t_r \cdot t_c}$$

Where \bar{C} is corrected coefficient of contingency

C is coefficient of contingency

t_r is the value given in the table of factors for
correcting C for broad grouping, for number rows

t_c is the value given in the table of factors for
correcting C for broad grouping, for number of columns

Correlation Coefficient

In determining the relationship between job involvement and personality traits, the value of coefficient of correlation (r) was calculated. The r measures the strength of relationship between two variables. Since the scores on job involvement and each personality trait were discrete, the value of r was calculated directly without grouping the data.

In determining the value of r of quantitative variables from grouped data, the method recommended by Freund (28) was used. Freund emphasized that when r had been calculated from grouped data, the value of r is somewhat less than the actual value of r calculated without grouping the data. Although it was understood that whenever the data were grouped, there was chance of losing some information; yet the

nature of the study was so extensive that it was preferred to determine the value of r from the grouped data. Furthermore, it was recognized that the larger the calculated value of Chi-square, the stronger would be the relationship between the variables.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The findings of this study are reported under four major divisions: (1) Personality Trait Scores, (2) CPI Classes, (3) Personality Traits and Professional and Social Variables, and (4) Personality Traits and Job Involvement.

As stated earlier, this study involved the male field county extension personnel in Oklahoma. Data in Table I indicate that all of the 160 county extension personnel of Oklahoma participated in the study.

TABLE I
COUNTY-AFFILIATED EXTENSION PERSONNEL
RESPONDENTS BY TITLE

Title	Number Requested	Number Responded	Per Cent of Response
County extension directors	77	77	100
Extension agents - 4-H program	41	41	100
Extension agents - other specialized programs	42	42	100

Personality Trait Scores

The CPI instrument used in the study measures eighteen personality traits. The mean scores for county extension directors, 4-H extension agents and extension agents - specialized programs are shown in Table II by personality trait.

Data in Table II indicate that county extension directors scored somewhat higher than other county extension personnel in the traits Ai and Fx, while extension agents - 4-H program scores slightly higher in traits So, Sc, and Sa, as compared with other county extension personnel. In contrast, extension agents - specialized programs scores highest in traits Do, Sy, Re, Gi, and Ac.

Gough (32) has demonstrated that raw scores of each trait can directly be converted to standard scores. He has further established the mean standard score of each trait at fifty, i.e., standard scores of fifty or above are considered as average or above average (see Appendix F).

Based on a conversion to standard scores, data in Table II reveal that the county extension directors scored above the established CPI norms for traits Do, Sa, Wb, Re, So, Sc, To, Cm, Ac, Ai, Py, and Fx. The same group scored slightly below the norms in traits Sy and Sp. Their scores were approximately average for traits Cm, Gi, Ie, and Fe.

The 4-H extension agents scored above the established CPI norms for traits Do, Sy, Sa, Wb, Re, So, Sc, To, Gi, Cm, Ac, Ai, and Py. The same group scored below the norms in traits Sp, Ie, and Fx. Their scores were nearly equal to the norms in traits Cs and Fe.

TABLE II
 MEAN PERSONALITY SCORES OF OKLAHOMA COUNTY
 EXTENSION PERSONNEL AS MEASURED BY CPI

Trait of CPI	County Extension Director N=77	Extension Agent-4-H Program N=41	Specialized Extension Agent N=42	All County Extension Agents N=160
Dominance (Do)	29.5	29.6	31.7	30.1
Capacity for Status (Cs)	20.0	20.2	20.5	20.2
Sociability (Sy)	24.8	25.5	26.4	25.4
Social presence (Sp)	33.9	33.5	32.9	33.5
Self-acceptance (Sa)	20.6	21.5	20.9	20.9
Sense of well- being (Wb)	39.6	40.2	40.2	39.9
Responsibility (Re)	33.5	32.9	34.5	33.6
Socialization (So)	39.1	40.7	39.6	39.7
Self-control (Sc)	35.2	36.4	35.5	35.6
Tolerance (To)	25.3	24.9	24.8	25.1
Good Impression (Gi)	20.9	23.1	23.7	22.2
Communality (Cm)	26.8	26.8	26.4	26.7
Achievement via conformance (Ac)	30.4	30.7	31.7	30.8
Achievement via independence (Ai)	21.2	20.2	20.3	20.7
Intellectual efficiency (Ie)	40.0	39.2	39.5	39.7
Psychological- mindedness (Py)	13.2	12.4	13.0	12.9
Flexibility (Fx)	9.7	7.3	8.0	8.6
Femininity (Fe)	16.9	16.9	16.9	16.9

The extension agents - specialized programs scored above the established CPI norms in traits Do, Sy, Sa, Wb, Re, So, Sc, To, Gi, Cm, Ac, Ai and Py. The same group scored below the norms in traits Sp, Ie and Fx. Their scores were about equal to the norms for traits Cs and Fe.

The mean scores for all county extension personnel indicate that they scored above the established CPI norms in traits Do, Sy, Sa, Wb, Re, So, Sc, To, Gi, Cm, Ac, Ai and Py. The combined groups scored below the norms in traits Sp, Ie and Fx, while their scores approximated the CPI norms in traits Cs and Fe.

County Extension Personnel Above CPI Norms

The mean scores for the three groups of county extension personnel on CPI traits have been given in Table II. It was the investigator's intention to determine the number and percentage of county extension personnel groups scoring average or above in each of the traits.

The data in Table III indicate that the county extension directors, based on a percentage distribution, scored above the other two groups in traits Ai, Ie and Fx. The 4-H extension agents scored highest of the three groups in traits Sp, Sa, Sc, To, Cm and Ac. The extension agents - specialized programs scored highest in traits Do, Cs, Sy, Wb, Re, So, Gi, Py and Fe.

Rank Order of the CPI Traits

The investigator considered it important to rank the traits according to the number of scores average or above the CPI norms. The results for all county extension personnel involved in the study are

revealed in Table IV.

TABLE III
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF COUNTY
EXTENSION PERSONNEL HAVING SCORES AVERAGE
OR ABOVE THE GPI NORMS

Traits of GPI	County Extension Directors N=77		4-H Extension Agents N=41		Specialized Extension Agents N=42	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Do	56	72.7	32	78.0	37	88.0
Gs	44	57.1	28	68.2	30	71.4
Sy	42	54.5	26	63.4	32	76.1
Sp	40	51.9	23	56.0	19	45.2
Sa	54	70.1	32	78.0	27	64.2
Wb	61	79.2	33	80.4	34	80.9
Re	63	81.8	33	80.4	38	90.4
So	62	80.5	34	82.9	35	83.3
Sc	59	76.6	37	90.2	34	80.9
To	63	81.8	34	82.9	32	76.1
Gi	45	58.4	31	75.6	32	76.1
Gm	67	87.0	36	87.8	32	76.1
Ac	61	79.2	37	90.2	37	88.0
Ai	62	80.5	29	70.7	30	71.4
Ie	47	61.0	23	56.0	24	57.1
Py	66	85.7	34	82.9	39	92.8
Fx	48	62.3	15	36.5	17	40.4
Fe	43	55.8	21	51.2	24	57.1

TABLE IV
 RANK ORDER OF TRAITS ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER
 OF SCORES AVERAGE OR ABOVE CPI NORMS
 OBTAINED BY OKLAHOMA COUNTY
 EXTENSION PERSONNEL

CPI Trait	Rank Order	Number of Extension Agents Scored Average or Above CPI Norms	Percentage N=160
Py	1	139	87
Gm	1.5	135	84
Ac	1.5	135	84
Re	4	134	83.75
So	5	131	82
Sc	6	130	81.25
To	7	129	81
Wb	8	128	80
Do	9	125	78
Ai	10	121	75
Sa	11	113	71
Gi	12	108	67.5
Cs	13	102	64
Sy	14	100	62.5
Ie	15	94	59
Fe	16	88	55
Sp	17	82	51
Fx	18	80	50

The data in Table IV indicate that a majority of all county extension personnel scored above the CPI norms in traits Py, Cm, Ac, Re, So, Sc, To and Wb. The proportion of county extension personnel obtaining scores above the CPI norms was moderate in traits Do, Ai, Sa, Gi, Cs, and Sy. In the remaining traits, namely, Fx, Sp, Fe, and Ie, the proportion of county extension personnel scoring above CPI norms was considerably less.

These results suggest that it would be advisable to reflect the traits and corresponding percentage of county extension personnel who obtained scores below the CPI norms.

Data in Table V show that almost half of the county extension personnel have scored below the CPI norms in traits Fx, Sp, Fe and Ie.

TABLE V
PERCENTAGE OF OKLAHOMA COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL
OBTAINING SCORES BELOW THE CPI NORMS

Percentages	Name of Traits
11-15 per cent	Py
16-20 per cent	Wb, Re, So, Sc, To, Cm, Ac
21-25 per cent	Do, Ai
26-30 per cent	Sa
31-35 per cent	Gi
36-40 per cent	Cs, Sy
41-45 per cent	Ie, Fe
46-50 per cent	Sp, Fx

Range of Personality Scores

The mean personality scores of county extension personnel previously presented in Table II did not reflect the distribution of scores in corresponding CPI traits. The investigator considered it essential that the variability of data would provide additional insight relative to the dispersion of scores from the mean. Two statistical indices, namely, range and the standard deviation, were calculated.

The data in Table VI show the range for each group of county extension personnel. The data also show that the range was greatest in traits Re, Sc, Ac, Ie and Fx.

Standard Deviation

The standard deviation, as a measure of variability, is included in Table VII. This measure reflects the distribution of scores obtained by all county extension personnel in each of the CPI traits.

An examination of the data in Table VII reveals that the greatest amount of variation was found in traits Sc, Gi, Do and Sp, respectively; whereas, the smallest amount of variation was found in traits Cm, Py and Sa, respectively.

CPI Classes

Each of the eighteen personality traits included in the CPI instrument is intended to encompass one important facet of interpersonal psychology. The total set of eighteen traits is meant to provide a comprehensive survey of an individual from his social interaction point of view. Gough (32) has grouped the eighteen traits into four broad classes, seeking to emphasize some of the psychological and

TABLE VI

RANGE OF PERSONALITY SCORES OF COUNTY
EXTENSION PERSONNEL IN THE CPI TRAITS

Traits of CPI	County Extension Directors	4-H Extension Agents	Specialized Extension Agents
Do	38-17 = 21	41-20 = 21	38-19 = 19
Cs	28-11 = 17	25-14 = 11	27-13 = 14
Sy	31-16 = 15	32-13 = 19	35-17 = 18
Sp	44-24 = 20	42-21 = 21	44-24 = 20
Sa	27-14 = 13	28-12 = 16	28-15 = 13
Wb	44-28 = 16	44-31 = 13	44-33 = 11
Re	40-23 = 17	38-23 = 15	40-29 = 11
So	45-32 = 13	47-32 = 15	47-31 = 16
Sc	47-19 = 28	48-24 = 24	46-14 = 32
To	31-14 = 17	31-11 = 20	31-12 = 19
Gi	36-9 = 27	38-14 = 24	37-11 = 26
Cm	28-24 = 4	28-22 = 6	28-20 = 8
Ac	37-20 = 17	35-25 = 10	37-22 = 15
Ai	27-13 = 14	27-12 = 15	29-11 = 18
Ie	49-30 = 19	48-26 = 22	48-32 = 16
Py	18-7 = 11	17-6 = 11	18-8 = 10
Fx	19-2 = 17	13-2 = 11	18-1 = 17
Fe	24-8 = 16	22-9 = 13	24-10 = 14

TABLE VII
STANDARD DEVIATION FROM SCORES OBTAINED BY ALL
COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL IN CPI TRAITS

Traits of CPI	Standard Deviation
Do	4.8
Cs	3.0
Sy	3.9
Sp	4.6
Sa	2.9
Wb	3.0
Re	3.2
So	3.5
Sc	6.2
To	3.8
Gi	6.1
Cm	1.4
Ac	3.2
Ai	3.2
Ie	3.8
Py	2.3
Fx	3.9
Fe	3.1

psychometric clusterings which exist among them. The four classes are:

Class I.--Measures of Poise, Ascendancy, and Self-Assurance.

Class I has six traits, Do, Cs, Sy, Sp, Sa, and Wb.

Class II.--Measures of Socialization, Maturity and Responsibility.

The traits included in Class II are Re, So, Sc, To, Gi, and Cm.

Class III.--Measures of Achievement Potential and Intellectual Efficiency. Three traits, Ac, Ai and Ie, are included in Class III.

Class IV.--Measures of Intellectual and Interest Modes. The traits Py, Fx and Fe are included in Class IV.

Gough (32) indicated that the test interpreter must look for high or low scores of an individual in the above four classes of the CPI. For example, if the scores of an individual in Class I tend to be higher than, say, Class III, it may be interpreted that the social skills of the individual are highly developed; but his intellectual and academic drives are weaker.

Table VIII provides data grouped in the four classes based on those county extension personnel having scored average or above the CPI norms (see Appendix F).

The data in Table VIII reveal that of the 160 county extension personnel in Oklahoma 109 scored average or above the CPI norms in Class I, 132 in Class II, 121 in Class III, and 98 in Class IV. In Class III and Class IV the percentage of county extension directors was higher than for the other two groups. The percentage of 4-H extension agents was higher than other groups in Class I and Class II. However, the percentage for extension agents - specialized programs was nearly as high in Class II and Class III.

TABLE VIII
 NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF COUNTY
 EXTENSION PERSONNEL HAVING SCORES AVERAGE OR
 ABOVE IN FOUR CLASSES OF THE CPI NORMS

Classes of CPI	County Extension Directors N=77		4-H Extension Agents N=41		Specialized Extension Agents N=42	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Class I	48	62.3	31	75.6	30
Class II	61	79.2	36	87.8	35	83.3
Class III	59	76.6	30	72.9	32	76.2
Class IV	51	66.2	22	53.6	25	59.5

Personality Traits and Professional
and Social Variables

Gough (32) has presented a detailed description of the purpose of each trait of the CPI. He has provided meaningful interpretive material relative to the high and low scores as measured by the CPI.

In contrast, selected variables, identified by the researcher for use in the study, were divided into two categories in order to facilitate the understanding of the relationship of the CPI personality traits and the selected variables. The first grouping, considered professional, included those variables related to job, work experience and education of the county extension personnel. The second grouping contained variables related to the family and social environments. The variables included in the second grouping were called

social-related variables.

In investigating the relationship between each personality trait of the CPI and the various selected variables, it was considered important to examine each trait of the CPI separately.

Dominance*

The trait, dominance, assesses factors of leadership ability, persistence, and social initiative.

Dominance and Professional-Related Variables. The data in Table IX show the relationship between the personality trait dominance and the professional-related variables of the county extension personnel.

An examination of the data in Table IX reveals that there was a significant difference between the trait dominance and the title of the county extension personnel at the .05 level. The extension agents - specialized programs scored higher than extension agents - 4-H programs and county extension directors.

The data in Table IX indicate that county extension directors scored lower in trait dominance than the other two groups of county extension personnel. It seems that the administrative responsibilities associated with county extension directors inhibited certain characteristics of the trait dominance. The specialized agents have shown

*High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Aggressive, confident, persistent, and planful; as being persuasive and verbally fluent; as self-reliant and independent; and as having leadership potential and initiative.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Retiring, inhibited, commonplace, indifferent, silent and unassuming; as being slow in thought and action; as avoiding of situations of tension and decision; and as lacking in self-confidence.

TABLE IX
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT DOMINANCE TO
 PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			χ^2	P	\bar{C} or r
		Low	Middle	High			
<u>Present Title</u>							
C.E. Director	77	0	51	26	6.53	.05	0.29
4-H Agent	41	0	26	15			
Specialized Agent	<u>42</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>24</u>			
N =	160	0	95	65			
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>							
Less than 1 year	17	0	10	7	1.47	N.S.	
1-9 years	90	0	52	38			
10-19 years	36	0	24	12			
20 years and more	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>			
N =	159	0	94	65			
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>							
Less than 1 year	9	0	5	4	0.45	N.S.	
1-9 years	34	0	21	13			
10-19 years	74	0	45	29			
20-29 years	41	0	23	18			
30 years and more	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>			
N =	160	0	95	65			
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>							
Teaching related	60	0	36	24	3.70	N.S.	
Industrial related	45	0	24	21			
Other occupations	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>			
N =	118	0	64	54			
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>							
Less than 1 year	47	0	33	14	3.69	N.S.	
1-5 years	63	0	36	27			
6-10 years	32	0	16	16			
11 years and more	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>			
N =	160	0	95	65			
<u>Formal Education</u>							
B.S.	51	0	33	18	0.93	N.S.	
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	0	6	4			
M.S.	<u>99</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>43</u>			
N =	160	0	95	65			
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>							
Animal Science	80	0	50	30	5.79	N.S.	
Plant Science	42	0	27	15			
Education, Agriculture related	32	0	17	15			
Economics, Agriculture related	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>			
N =	160	0	95	65			

characteristics of being self-confident. It seems their knowledge in their areas of specialization has developed the trait of being self-reliant and independent. In comparison, there was little difference in the extension agents - 4-H program and the county extension directors scores, although the former scored better than the latter.

The data in Table IX also show a large value of chi-square for the undergraduate major field of study. The education and economics majors scored higher in comparison to animal science and plant science majors. The data in Table IX also show that there was a slight positive relationship between the length of previous experience other than in Extension work and the trait dominance.

Dominance and Social-Related Variables. The relationship between the variables related to family and social environment to the trait dominance is provided in Table X.

An examination of the data in Table X reveals that a negative relationship exists between the trait dominance and the length of living on the farm. For those who reported living on a farm over ten years, dominance tended to lessen. The data in Table X also indicate that a difference attributable to the father's occupation existed. The county extension personnel whose father's occupation was related to farming and structural work scored low.

The data in Table X reveal that types of organizations participated in was also significant at the .10 level. The county extension personnel who indicated their first preference for participation in fraternal and religious organizations scored highest in dominance.

A study of the data in Table X further reveals that the place where county extension personnel preferred to live resulted in a large

TABLE X
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT DOMINANCE
 TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Size of Family</u>									
None	8	0	3	5	4.24	N.S.			
1-2 children	49	0	26	23					
3-4 children	45	0	28	17					
5-6 children	30	0	18	12					
7 and over children	28	0	20	8					
N =	160	0	95	65					
<u>Birth Order</u>									
First-born	57	0	32	25	2.80	N.S.			
Second-born	34	0	21	13					
Third-born	23	0	17	6					
Fourth-born	12	0	7	5					
Fifth and later born	30	0	16	14					
N =	156	0	93	63					
<u>Father's Occupation</u>									
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	0	3	6	7.38	N.S.			
Clerical and sales	5	0	2	3					
Service related	5	0	1	4					
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	0	78	45					
Structural work	18	0	11	7					
N =	160	0	95	65					
<u>Age</u>									
20-29 years	20	0	15	5	3.15	N.S.			
30-39 years	39	0	21	18					
40-49 years	63	0	35	28					
50-59 years	33	0	21	12					
60 years and over	5	0	3	2					
N =	160	0	95	65					
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>									
On a farm-ranch	87	0	58	29	4.77	N.S.			
In open country	7	0	4	3					
Town	22	0	11	11					
Small city	30	0	16	14					
Medium-sized city	14	0	6	8					
Large city	0	0	0	0					
Metropolis	0	0	0	0					
N =	160	0	95	65					
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>									
Metropolis	6	0	2	4	7.65	N.S.			
Large city	1	0	0	1					
Medium-sized city	28	0	13	15					
Small city	40	0	28	12					
Town	4	0	3	1					
In open country	26	0	15	11					
On a farm/ranch	51	0	32	19					
N =	156	0	93	63					
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>									
Less than 1 year	2	0	2	0	6.52	.05		-.02	
1-9 years	18	0	7	11					
10-19 years	62	0	42	20					
20 years and more	74	0	42	32					
N =	156	0	93	63					
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>									
Civic/business	63	0	41	22	7.91	.10	.29		
Fraternal	20	0	8	12					
Professional	47	0	30	17					
Religious	20	0	10	10					
Recreational	2	0	0	2					
N =	152	0	89	63					

value of chi-square. County extension personnel who wanted to live in large populated areas scored higher in comparison to those who preferred to live in small communities. It was also found that county extension personnel who lived most of their lives in small communities scored low in dominance.

A further examination of the data in Table X reveals that there was a slight positive relationship between dominance and age. The county extension agents within the age groups of 30 to 49 years scored highest in dominance. The data further revealed that the size of the family was negatively related to the dominance. A family with one or two children was highest in dominance.

Based on data in Tables IX and X, the null hypothesis of no significant differences between the trait dominance and professional as well as social-related variables was not rejected except for the variables title of the present position and length of living on the farm.

Capacity for Status*

This trait serves as an index of an individual's capacity for status (not his actual or achieved status). The scale attempts to measure the personal qualities and attributes which underlie and lead

* High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Ambitious, active, forceful, insightful, resourceful, and versatile; as being ascendant and self-seeking; effective in communication; and as having personal scope and breadth of interests.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Apathetic, shy, conventional, dull, mild, simple, and slow; as being stereotyped in thinking; restricted in outlook and interests; and as being uneasy and awkward in new or unfamiliar social situations.

to status.

Capacity for Status and Professional-Related Variables. The relationship of capacity for status and variables related to job, experience and education of the county extension personnel is shown in Table XI.

The data in Table XI reveal no significant differences in any of the variables, yet, certain large chi-square values were observed. The length of tenure in the present position was negatively related to capacity for status. County extension personnel with 10-19 years of tenure in extension service scored highest.

The data in Table XI reveal that a large value of chi-square was observed for major field of study. The county extension agents with education majors scored higher in comparison to county extension agents with majors in animal and plant science.

Capacity for Status and Social-Related Variables. The relationship of capacity for status and social-related variables is shown in Table XII.

The data in Table XII indicate that there was a strong association between the trait, capacity for status, and the variable, birth-order. The second, third and, especially, the fourth-born county extension agents scored low. The first-born and fifth and later born scored high. It was also observed that there was a positive relationship between capacity for status and the size of the family.

The data in Table XII also indicate that capacity for status was related to the father's occupation. The county extension personnel whose father's occupation was farm-related scored low in comparison to other occupations of fathers.

TABLE XI
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT CAPACITY FOR STATUS
 TO PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			χ^2	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Present Title</u>									
C.E. Director	77	1	52	24	2.07	N.S.			
4-H Agent	41	0	26	15					
Specialized Agent	42	0	25	17					
N =	160	1	103	56					
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>									
Less than 1 year	17	0	11	6	3.69	N.S.			
1-9 years	90	0	58	32					
10-19 years	36	1	24	11					
20 years and more	16	0	10	6					
N =	159	1	103	55					
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>									
Less than 1 year	9	0	6	3	3.30	N.S.			
1-9 years	34	0	23	11					
10-19 years	74	0	47	27					
20-29 years	41	1	26	14					
30 years and more	2	0	1	1					
N =	160	1	103	56					
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>									
Teaching related	60	0	37	23	1.71	N.S.			
Industrial related	45	0	32	13					
Other occupations	13	0	7	6					
N =	118	0	76	42					
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>									
Less than 1 year	47	1	29	17	2.81	N.S.			
1-5 years	63	0	41	22					
6-10 years	32	0	22	10					
11 years and more	18	0	11	7					
N =	160	1	103	56					
<u>Formal Education</u>									
B.S.	51	0	34	17	0.92	N.S.			
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	0	7	3					
M.S.	99	1	62	36					
N =	160	1	103	56					
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>									
Animal Science	80	0	56	24	5.75	N.S.			
Plant Science	42	1	26	15					
Education, Agriculture related	32	0	17	15					
Economics, Agriculture related	6	0	4	2					
N =	160	1	103	56					

TABLE XII
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT CAPACITY FOR STATUS
 TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			χ^2	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Size of Family</u>									
None	8	0	5	3	4.73	N.S.			
1-2 children	49	0	33	16					
3-4 children	45	0	29	16					
5-6 children	30	1	19	10					
7 and over children	28	0	17	11					
N =	160	1	103	56					
<u>Birth Order</u>									
First-born	57	0	35	22	15.85	.01	.40		
Second-born	34	0	23	11					
Third-born	23	0	15	8					
Fourth-born	12	1	10	1					
Fifth and later born	30	0	18	12					
N =	156	1	101	54					
<u>Father's Occupation</u>									
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	0	4	5	8.37	.10	.29		
Clerical and sales	5	0	3	2					
Service related	5	0	2	3					
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	1	86	36					
Structural work	18	0	8	10					
N =	160	1	103	56					
<u>Age</u>									
20-29 years	20	0	15	5	3.98	N.S.			
30-39 years	39	0	22	17					
40-49 years	63	1	42	20					
50-59 years	33	0	21	12					
60 years and over	5	0	3	2					
N =	160	1	103	56					
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>									
On a farm/ranch	87	1	60	26	4.31	N.S.			
In open country	7	0	5	2					
Town	22	0	12	10					
Small city	30	0	19	11					
Medium-sized city	14	0	7	7					
Large city	0	0	0	0					
Metropolis	0	0	0	0					
N =	160	1	103	56					
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>									
Metropolis	6	0	3	3	6.66	N.S.			
Large city	1	0	0	1					
Medium-sized city	28	0	17	11					
Small city	40	1	24	15					
Town	4	0	3	1					
Open country	26	0	17	9					
On a farm/ranch	51	0	36	15					
N =	156	1	100	55					
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>									
Less than 1 year	2	0	1	1	5.79	N.S.			
1-9 years	18	0	9	9					
10-19 years	62	1	38	23					
20 years and more	74	0	54	20					
N =	156	1	102	53					
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>									
Civic/business	63	1	41	21	5.68	N.S.			
Fraternal	20	0	13	7					
Professional	47	0	33	14					
Religious	20	0	9	11					
Recreational	2	0	1	1					
N =	152	1	97	54					

The data in Table XII reveal that age was positively related to capacity for status. The county extension personnel within the age group, 20-29 years, scored lowest.

A large value of chi-square was observed in Table XII for the variable place of living. County extension personnel who lived mostly in small communities scored low in capacity for status. County extension personnel who preferred to live in large populated areas generally scored high in capacity for status. The variable, length of living on the farm, had a negative relationship to capacity for status.

The data in Table XII also reveal that those county extension personnel who gave their first preference for participation in civic/business type organizations scored lowest in capacity for status.

The data shown in Tables XI and XII indicate that the null hypothesis of no significant differences between the personality trait capacity for status and selected professional-and social-related attributes was not rejected except for variables, father's occupation and birth-order of the county extension personnel.

Sociability*

The purpose of this trait is to identify persons of outgoing, sociable, participative temperament.

*High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Outgoing, enterprising, and ingenious; as being competitive and forward; and as original and fluent in thought.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Awkward, conventional, quiet, submissive, and unassuming; as being detached and passive in attitude; and as being suggestible and overly influenced by other's reactions and opinions.

Sociability and Professional-Related Variables. The relationship of sociability and professional-related variables is shown in Table XIII.

The data in Table XIII show that sociability scores were related to the title of the county extension personnel. The county extension directors scored low in comparison to the other two groups of the county extension personnel. Extension agents - specialized program scored highest in sociability.

An examination of the data in Table XIII reveals that there were large values of chi-square for variables tenure in present position and total tenure in extension service. In both cases the relationship was slightly negative. The data suggest that county extension personnel start lessening in sociability after a period of about ten years.

Sociability and Social-Related Variables. The relationship of sociability and variables related to social environment of county extension personnel is presented in Table XIV.

The data in Table XIV indicate that sociability was significantly related to place where county extension personnel preferred to live. County extension personnel who preferred living in large populated areas scored high in comparison to those county extension personnel who indicated a preference to live in less populated areas. County extension personnel who liked living in a town or small city scored lowest in the sociability trait.

A study of data in Table XIV reveals that a large value of chi-square was observed for the variable, size of family. A negative relationship was found between sociability and size of the family. County extension personnel who came from families larger than two children

TABLE XIII
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT SOCIABILITY TO
 PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			χ^2	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Present Title</u>									
C.E. Director	77	0	35	42	5.45	.10	.27		
4-H Agent	41	0	15	26					
Specialized Agent	<u>42</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>32</u>					
N =	160	0	60	100					
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>									
Less than 1 year	17	0	8	9	3.24	N.S.			
1-9 years	90	0	28	62					
10-19 years	36	0	16	20					
20 years and more	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>					
N =	159	0	59	100					
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>									
Less than 1 year	9	0	3	6	3.59	N.S.			
1-9 years	34	0	10	24					
10-19 years	74	0	28	46					
20-29 years	41	0	19	22					
30 years and more	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>					
N =	160	0	60	100					
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>									
Teaching related	60	0	19	41	1.13	N.S.			
Industrial related	45	0	17	28					
Other occupations	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>					
N =	118	0	42	76					
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>									
Less than 1 year	47	0	18	29	0.05	N.S.			
1-5 years	63	0	23	40					
6-10 years	32	0	12	20					
11 years and more	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>11</u>					
N =	160	0	60	100					
<u>Formal Education</u>									
B.S.	51	0	18	33	0.49	N.S.			
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	0	3	7					
M.S.	<u>99</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>60</u>					
N =	160	0	60	100					
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>									
Animal Science	80	0	30	50	1.23	N.S.			
Plant Science	42	0	17	25					
Education, Agriculture related	32	0	12	20					
Economics, Agriculture related	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>					
N =	160	0	60	100					

TABLE XIV
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT SOCIABILITY
 TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Size of Family</u>									
None	8	0	1	7	4.48	N.S.			
1-2 children	49	0	21	28					
3-4 children	45	0	14	31					
5-6 children	30	0	11	19					
7 and over children	28	0	13	15					
N =	160	0	60	100					
<u>Birth Order</u>									
First-born	57	0	22	35	1.43	N.S.			
Second-born	34	0	12	22					
Third-born	23	0	10	13					
Fourth-born	12	0	3	9					
Fifth and later born	30	0	10	20					
N =	156	0	57	99					
<u>Father's Occupation</u>									
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	0	3	6	4.32	N.S.			
Clerical and sales	5	0	2	3					
Service related	5	0	0	5					
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	0	50	73					
Structural work	18	0	5	13					
N =	160	0	60	100					
<u>Age</u>									
20-29 years	20	0	7	13	2.67	N.S.			
30-39 years	39	0	15	24					
40-49 years	63	0	20	43					
50-59 years	33	0	16	17					
60 years and over	5	0	2	3					
N =	160	0	60	100					
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>									
On a farm/ranch	87	0	34	53	1.95	N.S.			
In open country	7	0	4	3					
Town	22	0	8	14					
Small city	30	0	10	20					
Medium-sized city	14	0	4	10					
Large city	0	0	0	0					
Metropolis	0	0	0	0					
N =	160	0	60	100					
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>									
Metropolis	6	0	1	5	16.27	.01	.40		
Large city	1	0	0	1					
Medium-sized city	28	0	5	23					
Small city	40	0	20	20					
Town	4	0	4	0					
In open country	26	0	8	18					
On a farm/ranch	51	0	19	32					
N =	156	0	57	99					
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>									
Less than 1 year	2	0	0	2	2.89	N.S.			
1-9 years	18	0	8	10					
10-19 years	62	0	27	35					
20 years and more	74	0	25	49					
N =	156	0	60	96					
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>									
Civic/business	63	0	28	35	7.30	N.S.			
Fraternal	20	0	6	14					
Professional	47	0	18	29					
Religious	20	0	3	17					
Recreational	2	0	0	2					
N =	152	0	55	97					

generally scored low. With regard to father's occupation the data in Table XIV indicate that county extension personnel whose father's occupation was farm-related scored lowest in sociability.

The data in Table XIV show that county extension personnel who gave their first preference for participation in religious organizations scored highest in the trait sociability. Both of the county extension agents who gave preference for recreational organizations also scored high. County extension personnel who gave their first preference for participation in civic/business organizations scored lowest.

Based on the data in Tables XIII and XIV, the null hypothesis of no significant differences between trait sociability and selected professional-and social-related variables was not rejected except for attributes related to the title of the position and the preference of place for living.

Social Presence*

The trait social presence assesses factors such as poise, spontaneity, and self-confidence in personal and social interaction.

Social Presence and Professional-Related Variables. The relationship between social presence and each variable related to the

*High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Clever, enthusiastic, imaginative, quick, informal, spontaneous, and talkative; as being active and vigorous; and as having an expressive, ebullient nature.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Deliberate, moderate, patient, self-restrained, and simple; as vacillating and uncertain in decision; and as being literal and unoriginal in thinking and judging.

professional aspects of county extension personnel is presented in Table XV.

The data in Table XV reveal that the variable, previous experience other than extension work by the county extension personnel, was significant at the .10 level. County extension personnel who had previous experience other than in occupations related to teaching or industry scored highest in social presence. Such county extension personnel had most of their previous experience in jobs such as military service.

The data in Table XV also indicate that the formal education variable was significant at the .10 level. County extension personnel who have or are working towards a graduate degree scored highest in social presence. County extension personnel who had completed a Master's degree also scored better than county extension personnel who had completed Bachelor's degree. It seems higher education beyond the first degree level has developed the trait of social presence among county extension personnel.

A study of data in Table XV reveals a large value of chi-square for variables related to tenure in present position and total tenure in extension service. The relationship in both variables was slightly negative to the trait social presence. County extension personnel tended to score lower after a tenure of ten years in both tenure-related variables. It seems that after a period of ten years with the extension service, the trait social presence among the county extension personnel tends to lessen.

The data in Table XV further reveal a slight negative correlation between social presence and length of previous experience other than extension service by county extension personnel. County extension

TABLE XV

RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT SOCIAL PRESENCE
TO PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			χ^2	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Present Title</u>									
C.E. Director	77	0	73	4	3.26	N.S.			
4-H Agent	41	1	37	3					
Specialized Agent	<u>42</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>2</u>					
N =	160	1	150	9					
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>									
Less than 1 year	17	0	17	0	3.55	N.S.			
1-9 years	90	1	82	7					
10-19 years	36	0	34	2					
20 years and more	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>					
N =	159	1	149	9					
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>									
Less than 1 year	9	0	9	0	3.47	N.S.			
1-9 years	34	0	31	3					
10-19 years	74	1	68	5					
20-29 years	41	0	40	1					
30 years and more	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>					
N =	160	1	150	9					
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>									
Teaching related	60	1	58	1	5.89	.10	.32		
Industrial related	45	0	43	2					
Other occupations	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>2</u>					
N =	118	1	112	5					
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>									
Less than 1 year	47	0	43	4	3.45	N.S.			
1-5 years	63	1	59	3					
6-10 years	32	0	30	2					
11 years and more	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>					
N =	160	1	150	9					
<u>Formal Education</u>									
B.S.	51	0	49	2	4.84	.10	.25		
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	0	8	2					
M.S.	<u>99</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>5</u>					
N =	160	1	150	9					
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>									
Animal Science	80	0	76	4	5.43	N.S.			
Plant Science	42	0	40	2					
Education, Agriculture related	32	1	28	3					
Economics, Agriculture related	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>					
N =	160	1	150	9					

personnel with no experience other than extension service or less than one year previous experience scored high in social presence.

The data in Table XV indicate a large value of chi-square for the variable undergraduate major field of county extension personnel.

County extension personnel who had educational-related subjects as their major field of study scored highest in social presence. County extension personnel having animal or plant science as a major field of study scored about equal; whereas all the county extension personnel with economics-related majors scored lowest. It seems that county extension personnel with education majors scored highest in comparison to other majors.

Social Presence and Social-Related Variables. The relationship of the trait, social presence, to each of the family and social environmental related variables is given in Table XVI.

The data in Table XVI show that the variable, size of family, was significant at the .02 level. A negative correlation value was found between the variable and the trait social presence. The county extension personnel who was an "only child" scored highest in social presence. A large chi-square value was observed for the variable birth-order of the county extension personnel. The first-born county extension personnel scored highest in social presence.

An examination of Table XVI indicates a large value of chi-square for the variable, father's occupation. County extension personnel whose father's occupation was related to professional, technical and managerial jobs scored highest in social presence.

The data in Table XVI reveal that age had a negative relationship to social presence. County extension personnel in the age group of

TABLE XVI
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT SOCIAL PRESENCE
 TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C} or r
		Low	Middle	High			
<u>Size of Family</u>							
None	8	0	6	2	12.92	.02	-.21
1-2 children	49	1	43	5			
3-4 children	45	0	44	1			
5-6 children	30	0	29	1			
7 and over children	28	0	28	0			
N =	160	1	150	9			
<u>Birth Order</u>							
First-born	57	0	51	6	7.57	N.S.	
Second-born	34	1	32	1			
Third-born	23	0	22	1			
Fourth-born	12	0	12	0			
Fifth and later born	30	0	29	1			
N =	156	1	146	9			
<u>Father's Occupation</u>							
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	0	7	2	5.68	N.S.	
Clerical and sales	5	0	5	0			
Service related	5	0	5	0			
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	1	116	6			
Structural work	18	0	17	1			
N =	160	1	150	9			
<u>Age</u>							
20-29 years	20	0	19	1	11.49	.05	-.16
30-39 years	39	0	33	6			
40-49 years	63	1	60	2			
50-59 years	33	0	33	0			
60 years and over	5	0	5	0			
N =	160	1	150	9			
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>							
On a farm/ranch	87	1	83	3	16.23	.01	.37
In open country	7	0	7	0			
Town	22	0	21	1			
Small city	30	0	29	1			
Medium-sized city	14	0	10	4			
Large city	0	0	0	0			
Metropolis	0	0	0	0			
N =	160	1	150	9			
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>							
Metropolis	6	0	5	1	5.16	N.S.	
Large city	1	0	1	0			
Medium-sized city	28	0	26	2			
Small city	40	1	37	2			
Town	4	0	4	0			
In open country	26	0	24	2			
On a farm/ranch	51	0	49	2			
N =	156	1	146	9			
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>							
Less than 1 year	2	0	2	0	10.78	.01	-.13
1-9 years	18	1	15	2			
10-19 years	62	0	57	5			
20 years and more	74	0	72	2			
N =	156	1	146	9			
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>							
Civic/business	63	1	61	1	6.09	N.S.	
Fraternal	20	0	19	1			
Professional	47	0	42	5			
Religious	20	0	18	2			
Recreational	2	0	2	0			
N =	152	1	142	9			

30-39 years scored highest.

A study of data in Table XVI reveals that there is significant difference at the .01 level with regard to the variable place where county extension personnel lived. County extension personnel who lived in small communities scored low while county extension personnel who lived in a medium-sized city scored the highest in social presence. A further study of the results reveals that county extension personnel who preferred living in large populated areas scored higher in comparison to county extension personnel who chose the smallest populated areas.

The data in Table XVI also reveal that the length of time lived on a farm has a negative correlation to social presence. County extension personnel who had lived ten years or more on a farm scored lower in social presence.

The data in Table XVI further reveal that a large value of chi-square for variable, preference for participation in organizations other than extension service, existed. County extension personnel who gave their first preference for professional organizations scored high in social presence. County extension personnel who gave their first preference for civic/business organizations scored lowest in social presence.

An inspection of data included in Tables XV and XVI indicates that the null hypothesis of no significant differences between social presence and selected professional-and social-related variables of county extension personnel was not rejected except for variables related to size of family, age, place where mostly lived and length of living on the farm.

Self-Acceptance*

The trait, self-acceptance, assesses factors such as sense of personal worth and capacity for independent thinking and action.

Self-Acceptance and Professional-Related Variables. The relationship of self-acceptance to those variables related to job, work experience and formal education of county extension personnel is presented in Table XVII.

The data in Table XVII indicate that no statistical difference was found in the variables related to the professional background of county extension personnel. However, certain large chi-square values were observed.

An examination of the data in Table XVII shows that the variable, total tenure in extension service, had a negative correlation to the trait, self-acceptance. County extension personnel who had a total tenure of about ten years in extension service scored highest in self-acceptance.

The data in Table XVII also show a large value of chi-square when related to the variable undergraduate major field. County extension personnel who had educational-related subjects as their major field of study scored highest in self-acceptance.

*High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Intelligent, outspoken, sharp-witted, demanding, aggressive, and self-centered; as being persuasive and verbally fluent; and as possessing self-confidence and self-assurance.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Methodical, conservative, dependable, conventional, easygoing, and quiet; as self-abasing and given to feelings of guilt and self-blame; and as being passive in action and narrow in interests.

TABLE XVII
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT SELF-ACCEPTANCE TO
 PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			χ^2	P	\bar{C} or r
		Low	Middle	High			
<u>Present Title</u>							
C.E. Director	77	0	66	11	1.12	N.S.	
4-H Agent	41	0	32	9			
Specialized Agent	42	0	35	7			
N =	160	0	133	27			
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>							
Less than 1 year	17	0	12	5	2.22	N.S.	
1-9 years	90	0	76	14			
10-19 years	36	0	30	6			
20 years and more	16	0	14	2			
N =	159	0	132	27			
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>							
Less than 1 year	9	0	6	3	6.07	N.S.	
1-9 years	34	0	25	9			
10-19 years	74	0	63	11			
20-29 years	41	0	37	4			
30 years and more	2	0	2	0			
N =	160	0	133	27			
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>							
Teaching related	60	0	51	9	0.53	N.S.	
Industrial related	45	0	37	8			
Other occupations	13	0	10	3			
N =	118	0	98	20			
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>							
Less than 1 year	47	0	40	7	0.75	N.S.	
1-5 years	63	0	53	10			
6-10 years	32	0	25	7			
11 years and more	18	0	15	3			
N =	160	0	133	27			
<u>Formal Education</u>							
B.S.	51	0	39	12	2.47	N.S.	
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	0	9	1			
M.S.	99	0	85	14			
N =	160	0	133	27			
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>							
Animal Science	80	0	66	14	3.15	N.S.	
Plant Science	42	0	38	4			
Education, Agriculture related	32	0	24	8			
Economics, Agriculture related	6	0	5	1			
N =	160	0	133	27			

Self-Acceptance and Social-Related Variables. The relationship of self-acceptance and social-related variables is shown in Table XVIII.

The data in Table XVIII show that variable related to the place where county extension personnel preferred to live is significant at .05 level. County extension personnel who liked to live in a medium-sized city scored highest in self-acceptance.

An examination of the data in Table XVIII shows that large values of chi-square were observed for the variable size of the family. Size of family had a negative correlation to self-acceptance. County extension personnel who came from families having more than two children scored lowest in self-acceptance. The "only-child" county extension personnel scored highest in self-acceptance.

The data in Table XVIII also reveal that county extension personnel whose father's occupation was farm-related scored lowest in self-acceptance. The variable age was found to have a negative correlation to self-acceptance. County extension personnel in age groups 30 to 49 years scored highest in self-acceptance.

The data in Table XVIII suggest that county extension personnel who generally lived in a medium-sized city scored highest in self-acceptance. The data further reveal a large value of chi-square for the variable, preference and participation by type of organization. The fraternal, religious and recreational preference groups scored equally high in self-acceptance as compared to county extension personnel whose preference for participation was in civic/business and professional organizations.

Based on the data in Tables XVII and XVIII, the null hypothesis of no significant differences between the self-acceptance trait and

TABLE XVIII
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT SELF-ACCEPTANCE
 TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			χ^2	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Size of Family</u>									
None	8	0	5	3	4.02	N.S.			
1-2 children	49	0	39	10					
3-4 children	45	0	39	6					
5-6 children	30	0	25	5					
7 and over children	28	0	25	3					
N =	160	0	133	27					
<u>Birth Order</u>									
First-born	57	0	45	12	1.94	N.S.			
Second-born	34	0	29	5					
Third-born	23	0	21	2					
Fourth-born	12	0	10	2					
Fifth and later born	30	0	25	5					
N =	156	0	130	26					
<u>Father's Occupation</u>									
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	0	7	2	5.18	N.S.			
Clerical and sales	5	0	3	2					
Service related	5	0	3	2					
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	0	106	17					
Structural work	18	0	14	4					
N =	160	0	133	27					
<u>Age</u>									
20-29 years	20	0	17	3	6.10	N.S.			
30-39 years	39	0	28	11					
40-49 years	63	0	53	10					
50-59 years	33	0	30	3					
60 years and over	5	0	5	0					
N =	160	0	133	27					
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>									
On a farm/ranch	87	0	74	13	5.57	N.S.			
In open country	7	0	7	0					
Town	22	0	19	3					
Small city	30	0	24	6					
Medium-sized city	14	0	9	5					
Large city	0	0	0	0					
Metropolis	0	0	0	0					
N =	160	0	133	27					
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>									
Metropolis	6	0	5	1	11.80	.05			
Large city	1	0	0	1					
Medium-sized city	28	0	20	8					
Small city	40	0	36	4					
Town	4	0	4	0					
In open country	26	0	24	2					
On a farm/ranch	51	0	42	9					
N =	156	0	131	25					
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>									
Less than 1 year	2	0	1	1	2.50	N.S.			
1-9 years	18	0	15	3					
10-19 years	62	0	54	8					
20 years and more	74	0	60	14					
N =	156	0	130	26					
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>									
Civic/business	63	0	54	9	6.29	N.S.			
Fraternal	20	0	15	5					
Professional	47	0	43	4					
Religious	20	0	15	5					
Recreational	2	0	1	1					
N =	152	0	128	24					

professional-and social-related variables was not rejected except for the variable, place where county extension personnel liked to live.

Sense of Well-Being*

The trait, sense of well-being, identifies persons who minimize their worries and complaints, and who are relatively free from self-doubt and disillusionment.

Sense of Well-Being and Professional-Related Variables. The relationship between sense of well-being and the variables related to the professional background of county extension personnel is shown in Table XIX.

The data in Table XIX indicate that the variable, total tenure in extension service, was significant at the .05 level. A negative relationship was found between the variable total tenure in extension service and the trait sense of well-being. In general, county extension personnel scored highest when their total tenure in extension service was up to nineteen years or so. Thereafter, they scored low in the trait, sense of well-being. Tenure in present position had a negative correlation to the trait sense of well-being. County extension personnel with less than nine years of tenure in their present position scored highest.

* High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Energetic, enterprising, alert, ambitious, and versatile; as being productive and active; and as valuing work and effort for its own sake.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Unambitious, leisurely, awkward, cautious, apathetic, and conventional; as being self-defensive and apologetic; and as constricted in thought and action.

TABLE XIX
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT SENSE OF WELL-BEING
 TO PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			χ^2	P	\bar{C} or r
		Low	Middle	High			
<u>Present Title</u>							
C.E. Director	77	0	8	69	0.50	N.S.	
4-H Agent	41	0	3	38			
Specialized Agent	<u>42</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>39</u>			
N =	160	0	14	146			
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>							
Less than 1 year	17	0	0	17	5.19	N.S.	
1-9 years	90	0	6	84			
10-19 years	36	0	6	30			
20 years and more	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>14</u>			
N =	159	0	14	145			
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>							
Less than 1 year	9	0	0	9	8.81	.05	-.21
1-9 years	34	0	1	33			
10-19 years	74	0	5	69			
20-29 years	41	0	8	33			
30 years and more	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>			
N =	160	0	14	146			
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>							
Teaching related	60	0	9	51	1.16	N.S.	
Industrial related	45	0	4	41			
Other occupations	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>12</u>			
N =	118	0	14	104			
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>							
Less than 1 year	47	0	0	47	7.72	.10	-.10
1-5 years	63	0	9	54			
6-10 years	32	0	4	28			
11 years and more	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>17</u>			
N =	160	0	14	146			
<u>Formal Education</u>							
B.S.	51	0	3	48	2.12	N.S.	
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	0	2	8			
M.S.	<u>99</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>90</u>			
N =	160	0	14	146			
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>							
Animal Science	80	0	5	75	2.83	N.S.	
Plant Science	42	0	6	36			
Education, Agriculture related	32	0	3	29			
Economics, Agriculture related	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>			
N =	160	0	14	146			

An examination of data in Table XIX reveals that length of previous experience was significant at the .10 level. The relationship between variable length of previous experience and the trait sense of well-being was found to be negative. All the county extension personnel with none or less than one year of previous experience in jobs other than extension service scored highest in trait sense of well-being.

Sense of Well-Being and Social-Related Variables. The relationship of the trait, sense of well-being, and social-related variables is shown in Table XX.

The data in Table XX reveal that the variable age was significant at the .01 level. A negative relationship was found between the variable age and sense of well-being. County extension personnel between the age of 30-39 years scored highest in the trait. In general their score was comparatively better up to age 49 years. The score for age group 50-59 years was lowest.

A study of data in Table XX reveals a large value of chi-square for the variable size of family. A negative relationship was found between size of family and sense of well-being. County extension personnel who came from families having five to six children and "only child" families scored highest.

Based on the data in Tables XIX and XX, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between the sense of well-being trait and professional-and social-related variables was not rejected except for variables, total tenure in extension service and age.

TABLE XX
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT SENSE OF WELL-BEING
 TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Size of Family</u>									
None	8	0	0	8	5.92	N.S.			
1-2 children	49	0	4	45					
3-4 children	45	0	6	39					
5-6 children	30	0	0	30					
7 and over children	28	0	4	24					
N =	160	0	14	146					
<u>Birth Order</u>									
First-born	57	0	6	51	1.84	N.S.			
Second-born	34	0	3	31					
Third-born	23	0	1	22					
Fourth-born	12	0	2	10					
Fifth and later born	30	0	2	28					
N =	156	0	14	142					
<u>Father's Occupation</u>									
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	0	1	8	1.58	N.S.			
Clerical and sales	5	0	1	4					
Service related	5	0	0	5					
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	0	11	112					
Structural work	18	0	1	17					
N =	160	0	14	146					
<u>Age</u>									
20-29 years	20	0	1	19	13.07	.01			-.20
30-39 years	39	0	1	38					
40-49 years	63	0	4	59					
50-59 years	33	0	8	25					
60 years and over	5	0	0	5					
N =	160	0	14	146					
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>									
On a farm/ranch	87	0	6	81	2.46	N.S.			
In open country	7	0	1	6					
Town	22	0	1	21					
Small city	30	0	4	26					
Medium-sized city	14	0	2	12					
Large city	0	0	0	0					
Metropolis	0	0	0	0					
N =	160	0	14	146					
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>									
Metropolis	6	0	0	6	1.83	N.S.			
Large city	1	0	0	1					
Medium-sized city	28	0	3	25					
Small city	40	0	3	37					
Town	4	0	0	4					
Open country	26	0	2	24					
On a farm/ranch	51	0	6	45					
N =	156	0	14	142					
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>									
Less than 1 year	2	0	0	2	0.38	N.S.			
1-9 years	18	0	2	16					
10-19 years	62	0	5	57					
20 years and more	74	0	7	67					
N =	156	0	14	142					
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>									
Civic/business	63	0	4	59	1.69	N.S.			
Fraternal	20	0	3	17					
Professional	47	0	4	43					
Religious	20	0	2	18					
Recreational	2	0	0	2					
N =	152	0	13	139					

Responsibility*

The trait, responsibility, identifies persons of conscientious, responsible, and dependable disposition and temperament.

Responsibility and Professional-Related Variables. The relationship between responsibility and professional-related variables of county extension personnel is shown in Table XXI.

The data in Table XXI indicate that the variable, formal education, was significant at the .10 level. The ten county extension personnel who were pursuing an academic program leading to a Master's degree scored highest in responsibility. County extension personnel with a Bachelor's degree scored lower than county extension personnel with a Master's degree.

A study of data in Table XXI reveals a large value of chi-square for the variable, total tenure in extension service. A negative relationship was found between trait, responsibility, and the variable, total tenure. In general county extension personnel scored lowest in responsibility after a total tenure of about 19 years in extension service.

Responsibility and Social-Related Variables. The relationship of the personality trait, responsibility, to the social-related variables is shown in Table XXII.

*High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Planful, responsible, thorough, progressive, capable, dignified, and independent; as being conscientious and dependable; resourceful and efficient; and as being alert to ethical and moral issues.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Immature, moody, lazy, awkward, changeable, and disbelieving; as being influenced by personal bias, spite, and dogmatism; and as under-controlled and impulsive in behavior.

TABLE XXI
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT RESPONSIBILITY
 TO PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			χ^2	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Present Title</u>									
C.E. Director	77	0	14	63	1.93	N.S.			
4-H Agent	41	0	8	33					
Specialized Agent	<u>42</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>38</u>					
N =	160	0	26	134					
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>									
Less than 1 year	17	0	4	13	0.91	N.S.			
1-9 years	90	0	14	76					
10-19 years	36	0	5	31					
20 years and more	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>13</u>					
N =	159	0	16	133					
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>									
Less than 1 year	9	0	3	6	4.21	N.S.			
1-9 years	34	0	4	30					
10-19 years	74	0	10	64					
20-29 years	41	0	9	32					
30 years and more	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>					
N =	160	0	26	134					
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>									
Teaching related	60	0	8	52	1.24	N.S.			
Industrial related	45	0	5	40					
Other occupations	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>10</u>					
N =	118	0	16	102					
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>									
Less than 1 year	47	0	10	37	2.58	N.S.			
1-5 years	63	0	7	56					
6-10 years	32	0	5	27					
11 years and more	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>14</u>					
N =	160	0	26	134					
<u>Formal Education</u>									
B.S.	51	0	12	39	4.64	.10	.25		
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	0	0	10					
M.S.	<u>99</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>85</u>					
N =	160	0	26	134					
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>									
Animal Science	80	0	12	68	2.48	N.S.			
Plant Science	42	0	5	37					
Education, Agriculture related	32	0	8	24					
Economics, Agriculture related	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>					
N =	160	0	26	134					

TABLE XXII
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT RESPONSIBILITY
 TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Size of Family</u>									
None	8	0	0	8	3.37	N.S.			
1-2 children	49	0	6	43					
3-4 children	45	0	8	37					
5-6 children	30	0	7	23					
7 and over children	28	0	5	23					
N =	160	0	26	134					
<u>Birth Order</u>									
First-born	57	0	7	50	3.35	N.S.			
Second-born	34	0	5	29					
Third-born	23	0	4	19					
Fourth-born	12	0	4	8					
Fifth and later born	30	0	5	25					
N =	156	0	25	131					
<u>Father's Occupation</u>									
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	0	0	9	1.91	N.S.			
Clerical and sales	5	0	1	4					
Service related	5	0	1	4					
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	0	21	17					
Structural work	18	0	3	15					
N =	160	0	26	134					
<u>Age</u>									
20-29 years	20	0	4	16	0.69	N.S.			
30-39 years	39	0	5	34					
40-49 years	63	0	10	53					
50-59 years	33	0	6	27					
60 years and over	5	0	1	4					
N =	160	0	26	134					
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>									
On a farm/ranch	87	0	14	73	0.13	N.S.			
In open country	7	0	1	6					
Town	22	0	4	18					
Small city	30	0	5	25					
Medium-sized city	14	0	2	12					
Large city	0	0	0	0					
Metropolis	0	0	0	0					
N =	160	0	26	134					
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>									
Metropolis	6	0	1	5	5.88	N.S.			
Large city	1	0	0	1					
Medium-sized city	28	0	4	24					
Small city	40	0	4	36					
Town	4	0	0	4					
In open country	26	0	3	23					
On a farm/ranch	51	0	13	38					
N =	156	0	25	131					
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>									
Less than 1 year	2	0	0	2	0.89	N.S.			
1-9 years	18	0	2	16					
10-19 years	62	0	11	51					
20 years and more	74	0	13	61					
N =	156	0	26	130					
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>									
Civic/business	63	0	12	51	3.08	N.S.			
Fraternal	20	0	3	17					
Professional	47	0	4	43					
Religious	20	0	4	16					
Recreational	2	0	0	2					
N =	152	0	23	129					

The data in Table XXII reveal that no significant differences in the social-related variables and responsibility were found. However, a large value of chi-square was observed for variable place where county extension personnel liked to live. County extension personnel who preferred living on a farm or ranch scored lowest in responsibility.

An examination of data in Table XXII reveals that a negative relationship was found for size of the family. In general county extension personnel who came from families of less than two children scored highest in responsibility. For the birth-order variable, the first-born scored highest in responsibility.

A study of data in Table XXII also indicates that county extension personnel who gave their first preference for participation in professional and recreational organizations scored comparatively higher than other county extension personnel.

Based on the data in Tables XXI and XXII, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between responsibility and professional-and social-related variables of the county extension personnel was not rejected except for the variable, formal education.

Socialization*

The trait, socialization, indicates the degree of social maturity,

*High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Serious, honest, industrious, modest, obliging, sincere, and steady; as being conscientious and responsible; and as being self-denying and conforming.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Defensive, demanding, opinionated, resentful, stubborn, headstrong, rebellious, and undependable; as being guileful and deceitful in dealing with others; and as given to excess, exhibition, and ostentation in their behavior.

integrity, and rectitude which the individual has attained.

Socialization and Professional-Related Variables. The relationship between socialization and the professional-related variables is shown in Table XXIII.

The data in Table XXIII indicate that the variable, total tenure in extension service, was significant at the .01 level. A negative relationship was found between the variable, total tenure in extension service and the trait, socialization. County extension personnel having nine years or less tenure in the extension service scored highest in socialization.

A study of the data in Table XXIII reveals a large value of chi-square for the variable title of the county extension personnel. Extension agents of the 4-H club program scored highest in the trait, socialization.

Socialization and Social-Related Variables. The relationship between socialization and social-related variables is shown in Table XXIV.

The data in Table XXIV show that the variable, father's occupation, was significant at the .02 level. The data revealed that county extension personnel whose father's occupations were related to professional, technical and managerial occupations scored highest in socialization. County extension personnel whose father's occupation was related to structural work scored lowest.

An examination of data in Table XXIV also shows that the variable, age, exhibited a negative correlation to socialization. County extension personnel in age group 20-29 years scored highest in socialization.

TABLE XXIII
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT SOCIALIZATION TO
 PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Present Title</u>									
C.E. Director	77	0	42	35	3.58	N.S.			
4-H Agent	41	0	15	26					
Specialized Agent	<u>42</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>23</u>					
N =	160	0	76	84					
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>									
Less than 1 year	17	0	7	10	2.32	N.S.			
1-9 years	90	0	39	51					
10-19 years	36	0	20	16					
20 years and more	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>7</u>					
N =	159	0	75	84					
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>									
Less than 1 year	9	0	2	7	12.37	.01			-.21
1-9 years	34	0	10	24					
10-19 years	74	0	39	35					
20-29 years	41	0	25	16					
30 years and more	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>					
N =	160	0	76	84					
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>									
Teaching related	60	0	33	27	1.23	N.S.			
Industrial related	45	0	20	25					
Other occupations	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>					
N =	118	0	59	59					
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>									
Less than 1 year	47	0	21	26	0.62	N.S.			
1-5 years	63	0	30	33					
6-10 years	32	0	17	15					
11 years and more	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>					
N =	160	0	76	84					
<u>Formal Education</u>									
B.S.	51	0	24	27	1.39	N.S.			
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	0	3	7					
M.S.	<u>99</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>50</u>					
N =	160	0	76	84					
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>									
Animal Science	80	0	35	45	2.40	N.S.			
Plant Science	42	0	19	23					
Education, Agriculture related	32	0	18	14					
Economics, Agriculture related	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>					
N =	160	0	76	84					

TABLE XXIV
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT SOCIALIZATION
 TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			χ^2	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Size of Family</u>									
None	8	0	4	4	4.59	N.S.			
1-2 children	49	0	24	25					
3-4 children	45	0	16	29					
5-6 children	30	0	18	12					
7 and over children	28	0	14	14					
N =	160	0	76	84					
<u>Birth Order</u>									
First-born	57	0	24	33	5.54	N.S.			
Second-born	34	0	21	13					
Third-born	23	0	8	15					
Fourth-born	12	0	7	5					
Fifth and later born	30	0	15	15					
N =	156	0	75	81					
<u>Father's Occupation</u>									
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	0	4	5	12.08	.02	.35		
Clerical and sales	5	0	5	0					
Service related	5	0	3	2					
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	0	51	72					
Structural work	18	0	13	5					
N =	160	0	76	84					
<u>Age</u>									
20-29 years	20	0	6	14	8.49	.05		-.20	
30-39 years	39	0	17	22					
40-49 years	63	0	28	35					
50-59 years	33	0	21	12					
60 years and over	5	0	4	1					
N =	160	0	76	84					
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>									
On a farm/ranch	87	0	33	54	13.81	.01	.37		
In open country	7	0	5	2					
Town	22	0	17	5					
Small city	30	0	16	14					
Medium-sized city	14	0	5	9					
Large city	0	0	0	0					
Metropolis	0	0	0	0					
N =	160	0	76	84					
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>									
Metropolis	6	0	2	4	4.32	N.S.			
Large city	1	0	1	0					
Medium-sized city	28	0	10	18					
Small city	40	0	19	21					
Town	4	0	2	2					
Open country	26	0	13	13					
On a farm/ranch	51	0	28	23					
N =	156	0	75	81					
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>									
Less than 1 year	2	0	0	2	3.60	N.S.			
1-9 years	18	0	10	8					
10-19 years	62	0	32	30					
20 years and more	74	0	31	43					
N =	156	0	73	83					
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>									
Civic/business	63	0	36	27	9.45	.05	.32		
Fraternal	20	0	13	7					
Professional	47	0	16	31					
Religious	20	0	7	13					
Recreational	2	0	1	1					
N =	152	0	73	79					

The data in Table XXIV also reveal that the variable place where county extension personnel mostly lived was significant at the .01 level. County extension personnel who lived in a medium-sized city and farm/ranch scored highest in the socialization trait.

The data in Table XXIV indicate that the variable, first preference for participation in organizations of county extension personnel, was significant at the .05 level. County extension personnel who gave a first participation preference for religious organizations scored highest in socialization.

The data in Table XXIV show a large chi-square value for variable size of family. A slightly negative correlation was found between the socialization trait and size of the family. County extension personnel who came from families of three to four children scored highest in socialization. The data in Table XXIV further reveal that county extension personnel who were first-born scored highest in socialization.

A large value of chi-square was observed for the variable, place where county extension personnel liked to live. County extension personnel who preferred living on a farm/ranch scored lowest in socialization. The data in Table XXIV also reveal that length of time lived on a farm was slightly related to the trait socialization. County extension personnel who had lived 20 years or more on a farm scored highest in socialization.

The data in Table XXIV indicate that the variable, first preference for participation in organization, had large value of chi-square. County extension personnel who gave their first preference as religious scored highest in socialization.

Based on data in Tables XXIII and XXIV the null hypothesis of no

significant difference between the trait socialization and professional- and social-related variables was not rejected except for variables total tenure in extension service, father's occupation, age, and first preference for participation in organizations other than extension service.

Self-Control*

The trait, self-control, assesses the degree and adequacy of self-regulation and self-control and freedom from impulsivity and self-centeredness.

Self-Control and Professional-Related Variables. The relationship of self-control and professional-related variables is shown in Table XXV.

The data in Table XXV indicate that the variable length of previous experience was significant at the .05 level. A positive relationship between the length of previous experience and self-control was found. A further study of data reveals that county extension personnel having one to five years of previous experience scored highest in the trait, self-control.

A study of data in Table XXV further indicates that a negative relationship existed between trait, self-control, and total tenure in extension service. County extension personnel who have none or less

*High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Calm, patient, practical, slow, self-denying, inhibited, thoughtful, and deliberate; as being strict and thorough in their own work and in their expectations for others; and as being honest and conscientious.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Impulsive, shrewd, excitable, irritable, self-centered, and uninhibited; as being aggressive and assertive; and as overemphasizing personal pleasure and self-gain.

TABLE XXV
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT SELF-CONTROL TO
 PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Present Title</u>									
C.E. Director	77	0	27	50	2.96	N.S.			
4-H Agent	41	0	14	27					
Specialized Agent	<u>42</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>28</u>					
N =	160	1	54	105					
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>									
Less than 1 year	17	0	5	12	1.92	N.S.			
1-9 years	90	1	31	58					
10-19 years	36	0	14	22					
20 years and more	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>12</u>					
N =	159	1	54	104					
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>									
Less than 1 year	9	0	2	7	3.01	N.S.			
1-9 years	34	0	11	33					
10-19 years	74	1	26	47					
20-29 years	41	0	15	26					
30 years and more	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>					
N =	160	1	54	105					
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>									
Teaching related	60	1	20	39	1.28	N.S.			
Industrial related	45	0	13	32					
Other occupations	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>					
N =	118	1	37	80					
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>									
Less than 1 year	47	0	21	26	9.67	.05			+ .04
1-5 years	63	0	15	48					
6-10 years	32	1	12	19					
11 years and more	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>12</u>					
N =	160	1	54	105					
<u>Formal Education</u>									
B.S.	51	0	19	32	1.74	N.S.			
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	0	2	8					
M.S.	<u>99</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>65</u>					
N =	160	1	54	105					
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>									
Animal Science	80	1	27	52	1.81	N.S.			
Plant Science	42	0	14	28					
Education, Agriculture related	32	0	10	22					
Economics, Agriculture related	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>					
N =	160	1	54	105					

than one year of tenure in extension service scored high in self-control.

Self-Control and Social-Related Variables. The relationship of self-control and social-related variables is shown in Table XXVI.

The data in Table XXVI show that the variable, father's occupation, was significant at the .01 level. It is interesting to note that county extension personnel whose father's occupations were related to structural work and farming scored highest in self-control. County extension personnel whose father's occupation was professional, technical and managerial related scored lowest in trait, self-control.

The data in Table XXVI also show that the variable, place where county extension personnel liked to live, was significant at the .01 level. County extension personnel who liked to live in small communities scored lowest in self-control.

The data also show that age has a positive correlation to self-control. County extension personnel over 60 years of age scored highest in self-control. County extension personnel who gave their first preference for participation in professional organizations also scored highest in self-control.

Based on data in Tables XXV and XXVI, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between self-control trait and professional-and social-related variables was not rejected except for the variables, length of previous experience, father's occupation, and place where like to live.

TABLE XXVI
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT SELF-CONTROL
 TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			χ^2	P	\bar{C} or r		
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Size of Family</u>									
None	8	0	3	5	3.29	N.S.			
1-2 children	49	0	17	32					
3-4 children	45	1	14	30					
5-6 children	30	0	9	21					
7 and over children	28	0	11	17					
N =	160	1	54	105					
<u>Birth Order</u>									
First-born	57	1	19	37	2.64	N.S.			
Second-born	34	0	12	22					
Third-born	23	0	8	15					
Fourth-born	12	0	3	9					
Fifth and later born	30	0	12	18					
N =	156	0	54	101					
<u>Father's Occupation</u>									
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	0	6	3	41.37	.01	.60		
Clerical and sales	5	0	3	2					
Service related	5	1	1	3					
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	0	42	81					
Structural work	18	0	2	16					
N =	160	1	54	105					
<u>Age</u>									
20-29 years	20	0	7	13	4.59	N.S.			
30-39 years	39	0	15	24					
40-49 years	63	1	17	45					
50-59 years	33	0	14	19					
60 years and over	5	0	1	4					
N =	160	1	54	105					
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>									
On a farm/ranch	87	1	30	56	2.49	N.S.			
In open country	7	0	2	5					
Town	22	0	7	15					
Small city	30	0	12	18					
Medium-sized city	14	0	3	11					
Large city	0	0	0	0					
Metropolis	0	0	0	0					
N =	160	1	54	105					
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>									
Metropolis	6	0	0	6	17.02	.01	.41		
Large city	1	0	1	0					
Medium-sized city	28	0	8	20					
Small city	40	0	11	29					
Town	4	0	0	4					
In open country	26	0	15	11					
On a farm/ranch	51	1	19	31					
N =	156	1	54	101					
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>									
Less than 1 year	2	0	0	2	2.60	N.S.			
1-9 years	18	0	5	13					
10-19 years	62	0	22	40					
20 years and more	74	1	26	47					
N =	156	1	53	102					
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>									
Civic/business	63	1	19	43	5.57	N.S.			
Fraternal	20	0	10	10					
Professional	47	0	14	33					
Religious	20	0	9	11					
Recreational	2	0	1	1					
N =	152	1	53	98					

Tolerance*

The trait, tolerance, identifies persons with permissive, accepting, and non-judgmental social beliefs and attitude.

Tolerance and Professional-Related Variables. The relationship between tolerance and the professional-related variables is shown in Table XXVII.

The data in Table XXVII indicate that none of the professional variables were statistically significant. However, a large value of chi-square was observed for the variable undergraduate major field. Educational-related majors scored slightly higher than the other groups of county extension personnel.

Tolerance and Social-Related Variables. The relationship of tolerance and the social-related variables is shown in Table XXVIII.

The data in Table XXVIII indicate that the variable, age, was significant at the .05 level. A negative relationship existed between age and tolerance. A further study of data reveals that county extension personnel in age groups 30-49 years scored highest in trait, tolerance.

The data in Table XXVIII also show a large value of chi-square in connection with the father's occupation. It is interesting to note that county extension personnel whose father's occupation was related

*High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Enterprising, informal, quick, tolerant, clear-thinking, and resourceful; as being intellectually able and verbally fluent; and as having broad and varied interests.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Suspicious, narrow, aloof, wary, and retiring; as being passive and overly judgmental in attitude; and as disbelieving and distrustful in personal and social outlook.

TABLE XXVII
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT TOLERANCE TO
 PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			χ^2	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Present Title</u>									
C.E. Director	77	0	13	64	0.10	N.S.			
4-H Agent	41	0	6	35					
Specialized Agent	42	0	7	35					
N =	160	0	26	134					
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>									
Less than 1 year	17	0	2	15	1.18	N.S.			
1-9 years	90	0	14	76					
10-19 years	36	0	6	30					
20 years and more	16	0	4	12					
N =	159	0	26	133					
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>									
Less than 1 year	9	0	1	8	3.93	N.S.			
1-9 years	34	0	3	31					
10-19 years	74	0	12	62					
20-29 years	41	0	10	31					
30 years and more	2	0	0	2					
N =	160	0	16	134					
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>									
Teaching related	60	0	12	48	0.40	N.S.			
Industrial related	45	0	7	38					
Other occupations	13	0	2	11					
N =	118	0	21	97					
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>									
Less than 1 year	47	0	5	42	1.59	N.S.			
1-5 years	63	0	12	51					
6-10 years	32	0	6	26					
11 years and more	18	0	3	15					
N =	160	0	26	134					
<u>Formal Education</u>									
B.S.	51	0	7	44	2.80	N.S.			
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	0	0	10					
M.S.	99	0	19	80					
N =	160	0	26	134					
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>									
Animal Science	80	0	12	68	5.45	N.S.			
Plant Science	42	0	7	35					
Education, Agriculture related	32	0	4	28					
Economics, Agriculture related	6	0	3	3					
N =	160	0	26	134					

TABLE XXVIII
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT TOLERANCE
 TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			χ^2	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Size of Family</u>									
None	8	0	1	7	4.88	N.S.			
1-2 children	49	0	5	44					
3-4 children	45	0	9	36					
5-6 children	30	0	8	22					
7 and over children	28	0	3	25					
N =	160	0	26	134					
<u>Birth Order</u>									
First-born	57	0	10	47	3.24	N.S.			
Second-born	34	0	4	30					
Third-born	23	0	3	20					
Fourth-born	12	0	4	8					
Fifth and later born	30	0	5	25					
N =	156	0	26	130					
<u>Father's Occupation</u>									
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	0	1	8	5.65	N.S.			
Clerical and sales	5	0	1	4					
Service related	5	0	0	5					
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	0	24	99					
Structural work	18	0	0	18					
N =	160	0	26	134					
<u>Age</u>									
20-29 years	20	0	3	17	10.88	.05			-.18
30-39 years	39	0	2	37					
40-49 years	63	0	9	54					
50-59 years	33	0	11	22					
60 years and over	5	0	1	4					
N =	160	0	26	134					
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>									
On a farm/ranch	87	0	15	72	3.81	N.S.			
In open country	7	0	0	7					
Town	22	0	2	20					
Small city	30	0	5	25					
Medium-sized city	14	0	4	10					
Large city	0	0	0	0					
Metropolis	0	0	0	0					
N =	160	0	26	134					
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>									
Metropolis	6	0	1	5	1.54	N.S.			
Large city	1	0	0	1					
Medium-sized city	28	0	6	22					
Small city	40	0	7	33					
Town	4	0	0	4					
In open country	26	0	4	22					
On a farm/ranch	51	0	8	43					
N =	156	0	26	130					
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>									
Less than 1 year	2	0	0	2	2.74	N.S.			
1-9 years	18	0	2	16					
10-19 years	62	0	8	54					
20 years and more	74	0	16	58					
N =	156	0	26	130					
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>									
Civic/business	63	0	10	53	3.45	N.S.			
Fraternal	20	0	5	15					
Professional	47	0	8	39					
Religious	20	0	1	19					
Recreational	2	0	0	2					
N =	152	0	24	128					

to structural work scored highest in trait, tolerance. It should be noted also that county extension personnel who lived in small communities scored higher than county extension personnel who lived in large populated communities with respect to the trait, tolerance.

A further study of data in Table XXVIII indicates a large chi-square value for the variable, organizational participation preferences. County extension personnel who gave their first preference for religious organizations scored highest in tolerance.

Based on the data in Tables XXVII and XXVIII, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between the tolerance trait and professional- and social-related variables was not rejected except for the variable, age.

Good Impression*

The trait, good impression, identifies persons capable of creating a favorable impression and who are concerned about how others react to them.

Good Impression and Professional-Related Variables. The relationship of good impression and professional-related variables is shown in Table XXIX.

*High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Co-operative, enterprising, outgoing, sociable, warm, and helpful; as being concerned with making a good impression; and as being diligent and persistent.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Inhibited, cautious, shrewd, wary, aloof, and resentful; as being cool and distant in their relationships with others; and as being self-centered and too little concerned with the needs and wants of others.

TABLE XXIX
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT GOOD IMPRESSION
 TO PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			χ^2	P	\bar{C} or r
		Low	Middle	High			
<u>Present Title</u>							
C.E. Director	77	8	52	17	5.92	N.S.	
4-H Agent	41	0	33	8			
Specialized Agent	<u>42</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>12</u>			
N =	160	11	112	37			
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>							
Less than 1 year	17	1	15	1	8.72	N.S.	
1-9 years	90	6	63	21			
10-19 years	36	4	25	7			
20 years and more	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>7</u>			
N =	159	11	112	36			
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>							
Less than 1 year	9	0	8	1	9.07	N.S.	
1-9 years	34	2	24	8			
10-19 years	74	5	53	16			
20-29 years	41	4	27	10			
30 years and more	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>			
N =	160	11	112	37			
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>							
Teaching related	60	6	39	15	4.92	N.S.	
Industrial related	45	2	31	12			
Other occupations	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>1</u>			
N =	118	8	82	28			
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>							
Less than 1 year	47	3	35	9	10.47	N.S.	
1-5 years	63	2	47	14			
6-10 years	32	5	21	6			
11 years and more	<u>18</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>			
N =	160	11	112	37			
<u>Formal Education</u>							
B.S.	51	3	39	9	3.44	N.S.	
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	0	6	4			
M.S.	<u>99</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>24</u>			
N =	160	11	112	37			
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>							
Animal Science	80	7	56	17	5.98	N.S.	
Plant Science	42	4	30	8			
Education, Agriculture related	32	0	21	11			
Economics, Agriculture related	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>			
N =	160	11	112	37			

The data in Table XXIX do not support any variable as being statistically significant. However, certain large values of chi-square were noted. In regard to title of the job, specialized extension agents, scored highest in good impression.

The data also show that the variable, tenure in present position, has a positive correlation with good impression. County extension personnel with twenty years or more in their present position scored highest in good impression.

The data in Table XXIX reveal that the variable, total tenure in extension service, was also positively related to good impression. County extension personnel with a total tenure of more than twenty years in extension service scored highest. The data further reveal a positive relationship between good impression with the variable length of previous experience. County extension personnel with eleven years or more of previous experience scored highest.

A study of data in Table XXIX shows a large value of chi-square for variable undergraduate major field. County extension personnel with an educational-related major field of study scored highest in comparison with other groups.

Good Impression and Social-Related Variables. The relationship of trait, good impression, with the social-related variables is shown in Table XXX.

The data in Table XXX show that the variable, age, was significant at the .05 level. A positive relationship existed between the variable, age, and good impression. County extension personnel scored highest after the age of 50 years or so.

TABLE XXX

RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT GOOD IMPRESSION
TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Size of Family</u>									
None	8	1	5	2	5.48	N.S.			
1-2 children	49	3	39	7					
3-4 children	45	2	29	14					
5-6 children	30	2	20	8					
7 and over children	28	3	19	6					
N =	160	11	112	37					
<u>Birth Order</u>									
First-born	57	5	38	14	4.65	N.S.			
Second-born	34	2	26	6					
Third-born	23	1	14	8					
Fourth-born	12	1	10	1					
Fifth and later born	30	2	22	6					
N =	156	11	110	35					
<u>Father's Occupation</u>									
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	0	8	1	6.57	N.S.			
Clerical and sales	5	1	4	0					
Service related	5	1	3	1					
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	8	83	32					
Structural work	18	1	14	3					
N =	160	11	112	37					
<u>Age</u>									
20-29 years	20	1	17	2	12.78	.05		+.14	
30-39 years	39	0	30	9					
40-49 years	63	8	41	14					
50-59 years	33	2	22	9					
60 years and over	5	0	2	3					
N =	160	11	112	37					
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>									
On a farm/ranch	87	8	60	19	5.90	N.S.			
In open country	7	0	7	0					
Town	22	1	16	5					
Small city	30	2	19	9					
Medium-sized city	14	0	10	4					
Large city	0	0	0	0					
Metropolis	0	0	0	0					
N =	160	11	112	37					
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>									
Metropolis	6	0	4	2	11.25	.10	.33		
Large city	1	0	1	0					
Medium-sized city	28	1	16	11					
Small city	40	4	25	11					
Town	4	0	3	1					
In open country	26	2	22	2					
On a farm/ranch	51	4	38	9					
N =	156	11	109	36					
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>									
Less than 1 year	2	0	2	0	2.28	N.S.			
1-9 years	18	1	12	5					
10-19 years	62	3	44	15					
20 years and more	74	7	51	16					
N =	156	11	109	36					
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>									
Civic/business	63	6	40	17	6.28	N.S.			
Fraternal	20	3	13	4					
Professional	47	1	36	10					
Religious	20	1	15	4					
Recreational	2	0	2	0					
N =	152	11	106	35					

A further examination of the data reveals that a positive relationship existed between the variable, size of family, and the trait, good impression. County extension personnel whose parental family was small scored lowest in the trait, good impression.

A large value of chi-square for the variable father's occupation is disclosed by data in Table XXX. County extension personnel whose father's occupation was related to professional jobs scored highest in the trait good impression.

The data also reveal that county extension personnel who lived in small communities and also preferred living in small communities scored lowest in the trait good impression.

Those county extension personnel who gave their first preference for participation in religious organization scored highest in good impression.

A study of the data in Tables XXIX and XXX indicates that the null hypothesis of no significant differences between the trait good impression and professional- and social-related variables of county extension personnel was not rejected except for the variable, age.

Communality*

The trait, communality, indicates the degree to which an

* High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Dependable, moderate, tactful, reliable, sincere, patient, steady, and realistic; as being honest and conscientious; and as having common sense and good judgment.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Impatient, changeable, complicated, imaginative, disorderly, nervous, restless, and confused; as being guileful and deceitful; inattentive and forgetful; and as having internal conflicts and problems.

individual's reactions and responses correspond to the modal ("common") pattern established for the inventory.

Communality and Professional-Related Variables. The relationship of communality with the professional-related variables is shown in Table XXXI.

The data in Table XXXI indicate that the variable, length of previous experience, was significant at the .10 level. A positive relationship existed between the length of previous experience and trait, communality.

A large value of chi-square for present title of county extension personnel was observed. All the county extension directors scored high in trait communality. A slight positive correlation existed between the variable, tenure in present position, and communality. The county extension personnel with 10-19 years of tenure in present position scored highest in communality.

Communality and Social-Related Variables. The relationship between communality trait and social-related variables is shown in Table XXXII.

The data in Table XXXII disclose that no variable was statistically significant. However, certain large values of chi-square were observed.

A study of the data in Table XXXII shows that a positive correlation existed between the variable, size of family, and the trait, communality. All county extension personnel who came from families having seven or more children scored highest in communality. The data revealed, too, that a positive correlation with age existed. All county extension personnel beyond age 50 scored high in communality.

TABLE XXXI

RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT COMMUNALITY TO
PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Present Title</u>									
C.E. Director	77	0	0	77	5.14	N.S.			
4-H Agent	41	0	2	39					
Specialized Agent	<u>42</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>39</u>					
N =	160	0	5	155					
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>									
Less than 1 year	17	0	1	16	2.10	N.S.			
1-9 years	90	0	3	87					
10-19 years	36	0	0	36					
20 years and more	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>15</u>					
N =	159	0	5	154					
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>									
Less than 1 year	9	0	0	9	1.31	N.S.			
1-9 years	34	0	2	32					
10-19 years	74	0	2	72					
20-29 years	41	0	1	40					
30 years and more	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>					
N =	160	0	5	155					
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>									
Teaching related	60	0	1	59	0.29	N.S.			
Industrial related	45	0	1	44					
Other occupations	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>13</u>					
N =	118	0	2	116					
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>									
Less than 1 year	47	0	4	43	6.61	.10	.17		
1-5 years	63	0	1	62					
6-10 years	32	0	0	32					
11 years and more	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>18</u>					
N =	160	0	5	155					
<u>Formal Education</u>									
B.S.	51	0	1	50	0.82	N.S.			
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	0	0	10					
M.S.	<u>99</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>95</u>					
N =	160	0	5	155					
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>									
Animal Science	80	0	3	77	5.09	N.S.			
Plant Science	42	0	0	42					
Education, Agriculture related	32	0	1	31					
Economics, Agriculture related	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>					
N =	160	0	5	155					

TABLE XXXII
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT COMMUNALITY
 TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			χ^2	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Size of Family</u>									
None	8	0	1	7	4.78	N.S.			
1-2 children	49	0	1	48					
3-4 children	45	0	1	44					
5-6 children	30	0	2	28					
7 and over children	28	0	0	28					
N =	160	0	5	155					
<u>Birth Order</u>									
First-born	57	0	3	54	2.39	N.S.			
Second-born	34	0	0	34					
Third-born	23	0	1	22					
Fourth-born	12	0	0	12					
Fifth and later born	30	0	1	29					
N =	156	0	5	151					
<u>Father's Occupation</u>									
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	0	1	8	2.76	N.S.			
Clerical and sales	5	0	0	5					
Service related	5	0	0	5					
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	0	3	120					
Structural work	18	0	1	17					
N =	160	0	5	155					
<u>Age</u>									
20-29 years	20	0	2	18	4.38	N.S.			
30-39 years	39	0	1	38					
40-49 years	63	0	2	61					
50-59 years	33	0	0	33					
60 years and over	5	0	0	5					
N =	160	0	5	155					
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>									
On a farm/ranch	87	0	3	84	4.26	N.S.			
In open country	7	0	0	7					
Town	22	0	2	20					
Small city	30	0	0	30					
Medium-sized city	14	0	0	14					
Large city	0	0	0	0					
Metropolis	0	0	0	0					
N =	160	0	5	155					
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>									
Metropolis	6	0	0	6	3.12	N.S.			
Large city	1	0	0	1					
Medium-sized city	28	0	0	28					
Small city	40	0	1	39					
Town	4	0	0	4					
Open country	26	0	2	24					
On a farm/ranch	51	0	2	49					
N =	156	0	5	151					
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>									
Less than 1 year	2	0	0	2	1.73	N.S.			
1-9 years	18	0	1	17					
10-19 years	62	0	3	59					
20 years and more	74	0	1	73					
N =	156	0	5	151					
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>									
Civic/business	63	0	2	61	0.63	N.S.			
Fraternal	20	0	1	19					
Professional	47	0	1	46					
Religious	20	0	1	19					
Recreational	2	0	0	2					
N =	152	0	5	147					

A further examination of data in Table XXXII reveals that all county extension personnel who lived in large communities or who preferred living in large populated areas scored highest in the trait, communality.

Based on the data in Tables XXXI and XXXII, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between trait communality and professional- and social-related variables was rejected except for variable, length of previous experience.

Achievement Via Conformance*

This trait identifies those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where conformance is a positive behavior.

Achievement Via Conformance and Professional-Related Variables.

The relationship of trait achievement via conformance and professional-related variables is shown in Table XXXIII.

Indications based on data in Table XXXIII are that none of the professional-related variables were statistically significant. However, a large value of chi-square was observed for the variable, total tenure in extension service. A negative relationship existed between trait, achievement via conformance, and the variable, total tenure in

*High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Capable, co-operative, efficient, organized, responsible, stable, and sincere; as being persistent and industrious; and as valuing intellectual activity and intellectual achievement.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Coarse, stubborn, aloof, awkward, insecure, and opinionated; as easily disorganized under stress or pressures to conform; and as pessimistic about their occupational futures.

TABLE XXXIII
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT ACHIEVEMENT VIA CONFORMANCE
 TO PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			χ^2	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Present Title</u>									
C.E. Director	77	0	16	61	3.06	N.S.			
4-H Agent	41	0	4	37					
Specialized Agent	<u>42</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>37</u>					
N =	160	0	25	135					
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>									
Less than 1 year	17	0	2	15	1.84	N.S.			
1-9 years	90	0	12	78					
10-19 years	36	0	8	28					
20 years and more	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>13</u>					
N =	159	0	25	134					
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>									
Less than 1 year	9	0	0	9	4.68	N.S.			
1-9 years	34	0	3	31					
10-19 years	74	0	13	61					
20-29 years	41	0	9	32					
30 years and more	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>					
N =	160	0	25	135					
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>									
Teaching related	60	0	13	47	3.37	N.S.			
Industrial related	45	0	4	41					
Other occupations	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>10</u>					
N =	118	0	20	98					
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>									
Less than 1 year	47	0	6	41	1.34	N.S.			
1-5 years	63	0	9	54					
6-10 years	32	0	7	25					
11 years and more	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>					
N =	160	0	25	135					
<u>Formal Education</u>									
B.S.	51	0	10	41	2.48	N.S.			
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	0	0	10					
M.S.	<u>99</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>84</u>					
N =	160	0	25	135					
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>									
Animal Science	80	0	14	66	0.65	N.S.			
Plant Science	42	0	5	37					
Education, Agriculture related	32	0	5	27					
Economics, Agriculture related	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>					
N =	160	0	25	135					

extension service. County extension personnel after having worked about ten years in the extension service tended to score lower in the trait, achievement via conformance.

Achievement Via Conformance and Social-Related Variables. The relationship between the trait achievement via conformance and social-related variables is shown in Table XXXIV.

The data in Table XXXIV indicate that none of the professional-related variables were statistically significant. However, a large value of chi-square was observed for variable, age of the county extension personnel. A negative correlation existed between age and the trait achievement via conformance. The county extension personnel up to the age of 49 years generally scored highest.

Data in Table XXXIV show a negative relationship existed between the variable, size of family, and trait, achievement via conformance. Also revealed by the data was that county extension personnel who lived mostly in small communities scored low in achievement via conformance.

Based on data in Tables XXXIII and XXXIV, the null hypothesis of no significant differences between achievement via conformance and the professional as well as social-related variables was not rejected.

TABLE XXXIV

RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT ACHIEVEMENT VIA CONFORMANCE
TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C} or r
		Low	Middle	High			
<u>Size of Family</u>							
None	8	0	1	7	3.04	N.S.	
1-2 children	49	0	5	44			
3-4 children	45	0	7	38			
5-6 children	30	0	5	25			
7 and over children	28	0	7	21			
N =	160	0	25	135			
<u>Birth Order</u>							
First-born	57	0	9	48	0.23	N.S.	
Second-born	34	0	6	28			
Third-born	23	0	3	20			
Fourth-born	12	0	2	10			
Fifth and later born	30	0	5	25			
N =	156	0	25	131			
<u>Father's Occupation</u>							
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	0	2	7	3.97	N.S.	
Clerical and sales	5	0	1	4			
Service related	5	0	1	4			
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	0	21	102			
Structural work	18	0	0	18			
N =	160	0	25	135			
<u>Age</u>							
20-29 years	20	0	2	18	7.36	N.S.	
30-39 years	39	0	2	37			
40-49 years	63	0	11	52			
50-59 years	33	0	9	24			
60 years and over	5	0	1	4			
N =	160	0	25	135			
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>							
On a farm/ranch	87	0	15	72	7.05	N.S.	
In open country	7	0	2	5			
Town	22	0	1	21			
Small city	30	0	7	23			
Medium-sized city	14	0	0	14			
Large city	0	0	0	0			
Metropolis	0	0	0	0			
N =	160	0	25	135			
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>							
Metropolis	6	0	0	6	2.72	N.S.	
Large city	1	0	0	1			
Medium-sized city	28	0	4	24			
Small city	40	0	7	33			
Town	4	0	0	4			
In open country	26	0	4	22			
On a farm/ranch	51	0	10	41			
N =	156	0	25	131			
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>							
Less than 1 year	2	0	0	2	1.29	N.S.	
1-9 years	18	0	3	15			
10-19 years	62	0	8	54			
20 years and more	74	0	14	60			
N =	156	0	25	131			
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>							
Civic/business	63	0	11	52	1.30	N.S.	
Fraternal	20	0	2	18			
Professional	47	0	7	40			
Religious	20	0	4	16			
Recreational	2	0	0	2			
N =	152	0	24	128			

Achievement Via Independence*

The trait, achievement via independence, seeks to identify those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where autonomy and independence are positive behaviors.

Achievement Via Independence and Professional-Related Variables.

The relationship between trait achievement via independence and the professional-related variables is shown in Table XXXV.

Data in Table XXV indicate that none of the professional-related variables was statistically significant.

Achievement Via Independence and Social-Related Variables. The relationship between achievement via independence and social-related variables is shown in Table XXXVI.

The data in Table XXXVI show that the variable, age, was significant at the .05 level with a negative relationship existing between the variable, age, and the trait achievement via independence. It is also obvious from the data that county extension personnel within the age groups 30-49 years scored highest.

The data in Table XXVI indicate a large value of chi-square for the size of family variable. A negative relationship existed revealing that county extension personnel who was an "only-child" generally scored high in the trait, achievement via independence.

*High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Mature, forceful, strong, dominant, demanding, and foresighted; as being independent and self-reliant; and as having superior intellectual ability and judgment.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Inhibited, anxious, cautious, dissatisfied, dull, and wary; as being submissive and compliant before authority; and as lacking in self-insight and self-understanding.

TABLE XXXV

RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT ACHIEVEMENT VIA INDEPENDENCE
TO PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C} or r
		Low	Middle	High			
<u>Present Title</u>							
C.E. Director	77	0	40	37	2.85	N.S.	
4-H Agent	41	0	27	14			
Specialized Agent	<u>42</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>15</u>			
N =	160	0	94	66			
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>							
Less than 1 year	17	0	9	8	1.00	N.S.	
1-9 years	90	0	54	36			
10-19 years	36	0	20	16			
20 years and more	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>5</u>			
N =	159	0	94	65			
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>							
Less than 1 year	9	0	5	4	2.61	N.S.	
1-9 years	34	0	21	13			
10-19 years	74	0	40	34			
20-29 years	41	0	26	15			
30 years and more	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>			
N =	160	0	94	66			
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>							
Teaching related	60	0	39	21	1.62	N.S.	
Industrial related	45	0	27	18			
Other occupations	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>			
N =	118	0	72	46			
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>							
Less than 1 year	47	0	25	22	0.89	N.S.	
1-5 years	63	0	38	25			
6-10 years	32	0	20	12			
11 years and more	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>			
N =	160	0	94	66			
<u>Formal Education</u>							
B.S.	51	0	33	18	1.16	N.S.	
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	0	6	4			
M.S.	<u>99</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>44</u>			
N =	160	0	94	66			
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>							
Animal Science	80	0	44	36	2.13	N.S.	
Plant Science	42	0	26	16			
Education, Agriculture related	32	0	19	13			
Economics, Agriculture related	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>			
N =	160	0	94	66			

TABLE XXXVI

RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT ACHIEVEMENT VIA INDEPENDENCE
TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Size of Family</u>									
None	8	0	2	6	5.54	N.S.			
1-2 children	49	0	33	16					
3-4 children	45	0	25	20					
5-6 children	30	0	17	13					
7 and over children	28	0	17	11					
N =	160	0	94	66					
<u>Birth Order</u>									
First-born	57	0	30	27	6.15	N.S.			
Second-born	34	0	24	10					
Third-born	23	0	10	13					
Fourth-born	12	0	8	4					
Fifth and later born	30	0	20	10					
N =	156	0	92	64					
<u>Father's Occupation</u>									
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	0	6	3	1.05	N.S.			
Clerical and sales	5	0	2	3					
Service related	5	0	3	2					
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	0	73	50					
Structural work	18	0	10	8					
N =	160	0	94	66					
<u>Age</u>									
20-29 years	20	0	16	4	10.68	.05		-.14	
30-39 years	39	0	17	22					
40-49 years	63	0	34	29					
50-59 years	33	0	24	9					
60 years and over	5	0	3	2					
N =	160	0	94	66					
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>									
On a farm/ranch	87	0	53	34	4.17	N.S.			
In open country	7	0	2	5					
Town	22	0	12	10					
Small city	30	0	20	10					
Medium-sized city	14	0	7	7					
Large city	0	0	0	0					
Metropolis	0	0	0	0					
N =	160	0	94	66					
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>									
Metropolis	6	0	4	2	2.78	N.S.			
Large city	1	0	1	0					
Medium-sized city	28	0	15	13					
Small city	40	0	27	13					
Town	4	0	2	2					
Open country	26	0	14	12					
On a farm/ranch	51	0	30	21					
N =	156	0	93	63					
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>									
Less than 1 year	2	0	1	1	0.65	N.S.			
1-9 years	18	0	9	9					
10-19 years	62	0	37	25					
20 years and more	74	0	44	30					
N =	156	0	91	65					
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>									
Civic/business	63	0	38	25	0.37	N.S.			
Fraternal	20	0	12	8					
Professional	47	0	26	21					
Religious	20	0	12	8					
Recreational	2	0	1	1					
N =	152	0	89	63					

Further investigation of the data in Table XXXVI reveals that first-born and third-born county extension personnel scored higher than other county extension personnel.

Based on the data in Tables XXXV and XXXVI, the null hypothesis of no significant differences between achievement via independence trait and professional-related as well as social-related variables was not rejected.

Intellectual Efficiency*

The trait, intellectual efficiency, indicates the degree of personal and intellectual efficiency which the individual has attained.

Intellectual Efficiency and Professional-Related Variables. The relationship of intellectual efficiency trait and professional-related variables is shown in Table XXXVII.

A study of the data in Table XXXVII reveals that the variable, tenure in present position, was significant at the .05 level. A negative relationship existed between the trait, intellectual efficiency, and tenure of county extension personnel in their present position. County extension personnel tended to score lower after working for about nine years in their present position. The data also revealed that the total tenure of county extension personnel in extension

*High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Efficient, clear-thinking, capable, intelligent, progressive, planful, thorough, and resourceful; as being alert and well-informed; and as placing a high value on cognitive and intellectual matters.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Cautious, confused, easygoing, defensive, shallow, and unambitious; as being conventional and stereotyped in thinking; and as lacking in self-direction and self-discipline.

TABLE XXXVII
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT INTELLECTUAL EFFICIENCY
 TO PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Present Title</u>									
C.E. Director	77	0	37	40	3.86	N.S.			
4-H Agent	41	1	23	17					
Specialized Agent	<u>42</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>20</u>					
N =	160	1	82	77					
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>									
Less than 1 year	17	0	9	8	9.34	.05			-.04
1-9 years	90	0	45	45					
10-19 years	36	0	20	16					
20 years and more	<u>16</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>					
N =	159	1	82	76					
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>									
Less than 1 year	9	0	5	4	6.80	.10			-.10
1-9 years	34	0	16	18					
10-19 years	74	0	35	39					
20-29 years	41	1	24	16					
30 years and more	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>					
N =	160	1	82	77					
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>									
Teaching related	60	0	28	32	11.46	.01	.44		
Industrial related	45	0	27	18					
Other occupations	<u>13</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>					
N =	118	1	59	58					
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>									
Less than 1 year	47	0	26	21	5.08	N.S.			
1-5 years	63	1	29	33					
6-10 years	32	0	20	12					
11 years and more	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>11</u>					
N =	160	1	82	77					
<u>Formal Education</u>									
B.S.	51	0	30	21	2.82	N.S.			
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	0	6	4					
M.S.	<u>99</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>52</u>					
N =	160	1	82	77					
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>									
Animal Science	80	1	41	38	1.63	N.S.			
Plant Science	42	0	21	21					
Education, Agriculture related	32	0	16	16					
Economics, Agriculture related	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>					
N =	160	1	82	77					

service was significant at the .10 level. Total tenure also showed a negative relationship. County extension personnel after working about nineteen years scored lower in intellectual efficiency.

The data in Table XXXVII also revealed that experience in other jobs was significant at the .01 level. County extension personnel who had experience in teaching scored highest in intellectual efficiency. A further study of the data reveals that a positive relationship existed between trait, intellectual efficiency, and length of previous job experience.

Intellectual Efficiency and Social-Related Variables. The relationship between intellectual efficiency and certain social-related variables is shown in Table XXXVIII.

The data in Table XXXVIII indicate that variable, size of family, was significant at the .01 level. A negative relationship existed between trait, intellectual efficiency, and variable, size of family. Those personnel who were an "only-child" scored highest in trait intellectual efficiency.

In Table XXXVIII data reveal that the variable, age, was significant at the .05 level. A negative relationship existed between the variable, age, and trait intellectual efficiency. County extension personnel within the age groups 30-49 years scored highest in intellectual efficiency.

The data also indicate that variable, place where like to live, was significant at the .05 level. County extension personnel who liked to live in large populated areas scored highest in intellectual efficiency.

The data in Table XXXVIII also reveal a large value of chi-square

TABLE XXXVIII
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT INTELLECTUAL EFFICIENCY
 TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			x ²	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Size of Family</u>									
None	8	0	0	8	15.19	.01			-.05
1-2 children	49	0	30	19					
3-4 children	45	0	23	22					
5-6 children	30	0	15	15					
7 and over children	28	1	14	13					
N =	160	1	82	77					
<u>Birth Order</u>									
First-born	57	0	25	32	7.09	N.S.			
Second-born	34	0	19	15					
Third-born	23	0	12	11					
Fourth-born	12	0	8	4					
Fifth and later born	30	1	16	13					
N =	156	1	80	75					
<u>Father's Occupation</u>									
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	0	5	4	2.62	N.S.			
Clerical and sales	5	0	3	2					
Service related	5	0	1	4					
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	1	63	59					
Structural work	18	0	10	8					
N =	160	1	82	77					
<u>Age</u>									
20-29 years	20	0	14	6	10.53	.05			-.01
30-39 years	39	0	17	22					
40-49 years	63	0	28	35					
50-59 years	33	1	20	12					
60 years and over	5	0	3	2					
N =	160	1	82	77					
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>									
On a farm/ranch	87	1	44	42	1.48	N.S.			
In open country	7	0	4	3					
Town	22	0	10	12					
Small city	30	0	16	14					
Medium-sized city	14	0	8	6					
Large city	0	0	0	0					
Metropolis	0	0	0	0					
N =	160	1	82	77					
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>									
Metropolis	6	0	1	5	11.77	.05	.35		
Large city	1	0	1	0					
Medium-sized city	28	0	12	16					
Small city	40	0	20	20					
Town	4	0	4	0					
In open country	26	0	16	10					
On a farm/ranch	51	1	27	23					
N =	156	1	81	74					
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>									
Less than 1 year	2	0	1	1	1.18	N.S.			
1-9 years	18	0	9	9					
10-19 years	62	0	31	31					
20 years and more	74	1	38	35					
N =	156	1	79	76					
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>									
Civic/business	63	0	32	31	3.19	N.S.			
Fraternal	20	0	12	8					
Professional	47	1	24	22					
Religious	20	0	9	11					
Recreational	2	0	1	1					
N =	152	1	78	73					

for the variable, birth-order. The first-born county extension personnel scored highest, and the later-born scored lowest in intellectual efficiency.

Based on the data in Tables XXXVII and XXXVIII, the null hypothesis of no significant differences between intellectual efficiency and professional as well as social-related variables was not rejected except for variables, tenure in present position, total tenure in extension service, previous experience other than extension, size of family and age.

Psychological-Mindedness*

The trait, psychological-mindedness, measures the degree to which the individual is interested in, as well as responsive to, the inner needs, motives, and experiences of others.

Psychological-Mindedness and Professional-Related Variables. The relationship of the psychological-mindedness trait and professional-related variables is shown in Table XXXIX.

The data in Table XXXIX indicate that the variable, length of previous experience other than extension service, was significant at the .02 level. A positive relationship existed between the variable, length of previous experience, and the trait, psychological-mindedness.

*High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Observant, spontaneous, quick, perceptive, talkative, resourceful, and changeable; as being verbally fluent and socially ascendant; and as being rebellious toward rules, restrictions, and constraints.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Apathetic, peaceable, serious, cautious, and unassuming; as being slow and deliberate in tempo; and as being overly conforming and conventional.

TABLE XXXIX
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT PSYCHOLOGICAL-MINDEDNESS
 TO PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Present Title</u>									
C.E. Director	77	3	53	21	3.37	N.S.			
4-H Agent	41	1	33	7					
Specialized Agent	<u>42</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>11</u>					
N =	160	4	117	39					
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>									
Less than 1 year	17	1	10	6	4.38	N.S.			
1-9 years	90	1	70	19					
10-19 years	36	1	26	9					
20 years and more	<u>16</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>4</u>					
N =	159	4	117	38					
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>									
Less than 1 year	9	0	6	3	3.59	N.S.			
1-9 years	34	0	27	7					
10-19 years	74	2	53	19					
20-29 years	41	2	29	10					
30 years and more	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>					
N =	160	4	117	39					
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>									
Teaching related	60	3	44	13	5.15	N.S.			
Industrial related	45	0	30	15					
Other occupations	<u>13</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>5</u>					
N =	118	4	81	33					
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>									
Less than 1 year	47	0	38	9	11.09	.02			+ .14
1-5 years	63	4	44	15					
6-10 years	32	0	25	7					
11 years and more	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>					
N =	160	4	117	39					
<u>Formal Education</u>									
B.S.	51	1	40	10	1.73	N.S.			
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	0	8	2					
M.S.	<u>99</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>27</u>					
N =	160	4	117	39					
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>									
Animal Science	80	2	62	16	2.52	N.S.			
Plant Science	42	1	28	13					
Education, Agriculture related	32	1	22	9					
Economics, Agriculture related	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>					
N =	160	4	117	39					

County extension personnel who had more than eleven years of previous experience scored highest in psychological-mindedness.

An examination of data in Table XXXIX also reveals that a large value of chi-square was observed for the variable related to tenure in present position. A negative relationship existed between the variable and the trait, psychological-mindedness.

The variable, total tenure in extension service, also had a negative correlation with the trait, psychological-mindedness. County extension personnel scored lower in the trait after working for about twenty years in extension service.

The data in Table XXXIX suggest that county extension personnel who had previous experience working in industry scored highest in psychological-mindedness.

Psychological-Mindedness and Social-Related Variables. The relationship of trait, psychological-mindedness, and social-related variables is shown in Table XL.

The data in Table XL show that variable, place where liked to live, was significant at the .10 level. County extension personnel who liked to live in small communities scored lowest in trait, psychological-mindedness. It was also revealed that county extension personnel who lived in a smaller community scored lowest in psychological-mindedness.

The size of family variable had a positive correlation with the psychological-mindedness trait. County extension personnel who came from families having seven or more children scored highest.

The data in Table XL also show that age was positively correlated with psychological-mindedness. County extension personnel within age group 20-29 years scored lowest in psychological-mindedness.

TABLE XL
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT PSYCHOLOGICAL-MINDEDNESS
 TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Size of Family</u>									
None	8	0	5	3	4.57	N.S.			
1-2 children	49	1	39	9					
3-4 children	45	2	32	11					
5-6 children	30	0	23	7					
7 and over children	28	1	18	9					
N =	160	4	117	39					
<u>Birth Order</u>									
First-born	57	1	41	15	4.84	N.S.			
Second-born	34	2	25	7					
Third-born	23	0	17	6					
Fourth-born	12	0	11	1					
Fifth and later born	30	1	21	8					
N =	156	4	115	37					
<u>Father's Occupation</u>									
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	0	5	4	5.62	N.S.			
Clerical and sales	5	0	5	0					
Service related	5	0	4	1					
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	4	88	31					
Structural work	18	0	15	3					
N =	160	4	117	39					
<u>Age</u>									
20-29 years	20	0	18	2	7.32	N.S.			
30-39 years	39	0	29	10					
40-49 years	63	2	42	19					
50-59 years	33	2	24	7					
60 years and over	5	0	4	1					
N =	160	4	117	39					
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>									
On a farm/ranch	87	3	64	20	4.04	N.S.			
In open country	7	0	6	1					
Town	22	0	18	4					
Small city	30	1	19	10					
Medium-sized city	14	0	10	4					
Large city	0	0	0	0					
Metropolis	0	0	0	0					
N =	160	4	117	39					
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>									
Metropolis	6	0	3	3	10.75	.10	.33		
Large city	1	0	1	0					
Medium-sized city	28	1	21	6					
Small city	40	0	29	11					
Town	4	0	4	0					
In open country	26	1	23	2					
On a farm/ranch	51	2	34	15					
N =	156	4	115	37					
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>									
Less than 1 year	2	0	2	0	3.38	N.S.			
1-9 years	18	0	15	3					
10-19 years	62	1	43	18					
20 years and more	74	3	53	18					
N =	156	4	113	39					
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>									
Civic/business	63	1	46	16	5.35	N.S.			
Fraternal	20	0	16	4					
Professional	47	3	32	12					
Religious	20	0	16	4					
Recreational	2	0	1	1					
N =	152	4	111	37					

Based on the data in Tables XXXIX and XL, the null hypothesis of no significant differences between psychological-mindedness and professional as well as social-related variables was not rejected except for variable, length of previous experience.

Flexibility*

The trait, flexibility, indicates the degree of flexibility and adaptability of a person's thinking and social behavior.

Flexibility and Professional-Related Variables. The relationship of flexibility and professional-related variables is given in Table XLI.

The data in Table XLI indicate that variable, present title, was significant at the .05 level. County extension directors scored highest in flexibility.

The data also reveal that the variable, undergraduate major field of study, was significant at the .10 level. A further study of data reveals that county extension personnel having an educational major scored highest in flexibility.

The data in Table XLI also indicate that the variable, total tenure in extension service, has a negative relationship with flexibility. County extension personnel, after working about twenty years in

*High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Insightful, informal, adventurous, confident, humorous, rebellious, idealistic, assertive, and egoistic; as being sarcastic and cynical; and as highly concerned with personal pleasure and diversion.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Deliberate, cautious, worrying, industrious, guarded, mannerly, methodical, and rigid; as being formal and pedantic in thought; and as being overly deferential to authority, custom, and tradition.

TABLE XLI

RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT FLEXIBILITY TO
PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Present Title</u>									
C.E. Director	77	26	39	12	11.48	.05	.35		
4-H Agent	41	19	22	0					
Specialized Agent	<u>42</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>3</u>					
N =	160	68	77	15					
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>									
Less than 1 year	17	5	10	2	3.43	N.S.			
1-9 years	90	42	41	7					
10-19 years	36	13	20	3					
20 years and more	<u>16</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>					
N =	159	68	77	14					
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>									
Less than 1 year	9	3	6	0	7.91	N.S.			
1-9 years	34	15	18	1					
10-19 years	74	29	35	10					
20-29 years	41	19	18	4					
30 years and more	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>					
N =	160	68	77	15					
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>									
Teaching related	60	24	29	7	4.30	N.S.			
Industrial related	45	23	20	2					
Other occupations	<u>13</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>					
N =	118	52	57	9					
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>									
Less than 1 year	47	19	22	6	4.66	N.S.			
1-5 years	63	23	35	5					
6-10 years	32	18	12	2					
11 years and more	<u>18</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>2</u>					
N =	160	68	77	15					
<u>Formal Education</u>									
B.S.	51	24	24	3	1.37	N.S.			
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	4	5	1					
M.S.	<u>99</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>11</u>					
N =	160	68	77	15					
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>									
Animal Science	80	39	38	3	11.08	.10	.32		
Plant Science	42	16	19	7					
Education, Agriculture related	32	9	18	5					
Economics, Agriculture related	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>					
N =	160	68	77	15					

extension service, tended to score lowest in flexibility.

Flexibility and Social-Related Variables. The relationship of flexibility to social-related variables is shown in Table XLIII.

The data in Table XLIII indicate that none of the professional-related variables were statistically significant. Some large values of chi-square, however, did appear. A negative relationship existed between variable, size of family, and flexibility.

An examination of data in Table XLIII indicates that second-born county extension personnel scored highest in flexibility. Age was found to be negatively correlated with the flexibility trait. County extension personnel within age group 40-49 years scored highest in flexibility. Lowest scores were attributed to the 60 years and over group. A similarly low score in flexibility was found in the 20-29 age group.

The data reveal that county extension personnel who had lived most of their life on the farm or ranch scored lowest in flexibility. In general county extension personnel who liked to live in open country were more flexible than other groups of county extension personnel.

Based on the data in Tables XLI and XLII, the null hypothesis of no significant differences between flexibility and professional- and social-related variables was not rejected except for variables, present title and major field of study.

TABLE XLII
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT FLEXIBILITY
 TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Size of Family</u>									
None	8	2	5	1	7.77	N.S.			
1-2 children	49	19	26	4					
3-4 children	45	23	18	4					
5-6 children	30	14	11	5					
7 and over children	28	10	17	1					
N =	160	68	77	15					
<u>Birth Order</u>									
First-born	57	22	31	4	13.08	N.S.			
Second-born	34	12	18	4					
Third-born	23	10	8	5					
Fourth-born	12	9	2	1					
Fifth and later born	30	13	16	1					
N =	156	66	75	15					
<u>Father's Occupation</u>									
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	5	3	1	3.46	N.S.			
Clerical and sales	5	2	3	0					
Service related	5	2	3	0					
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	53	59	11					
Structural work	18	6	9	3					
N =	160	68	77	15					
<u>Age</u>									
20-29 years	20	10	10	0	8.55	N.S.			
30-39 years	39	14	22	3					
40-49 years	63	24	29	10					
50-59 years	33	17	14	2					
60 years and over	5	3	2	0					
N =	160	68	77	15					
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>									
On a farm/ranch	87	39	42	6	9.45	N.S.			
In open country	7	1	5	1					
Town	22	7	12	3					
Small city	30	17	11	2					
Medium-sized city	14	4	7	3					
Large city	0	0	0	0					
Metropolis	0	0	0	0					
N =	160	68	77	15					
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>									
Metropolis	6	3	3	0	7.49	N.S.			
Large city	1	1	0	0					
Medium-sized city	28	15	11	2					
Small city	40	13	23	4					
Town	4	3	1	0					
In open country	26	10	13	3					
On a farm/ranch	51	22	23	6					
N =	156	67	74	15					
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>									
Less than 1 year	2	1	1	0	2.69	N.S.			
1-9 years	18	9	7	2					
10-19 years	62	22	33	7					
20 years and more	74	33	36	5					
N =	156	65	77	14					
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>									
Civic/business	63	29	28	6	0.74	N.S.			
Fraternal	20	8	10	2					
Professional	47	19	23	5					
Religious	20	8	10	2					
Recreational	2	1	1	0					
N =	152	65	72	15					

Femininity*

The trait, femininity, assesses the masculinity or femininity of interests. High scores indicate more feminine interests; low scores, more masculine.

Femininity and Professional-Related Variables. The relationship of femininity and professional-related variables is shown in Table XLIII.

The data in Table XLIII indicate that none of the variables were statistically significant.

Femininity and Social-Related Variables. The relationship of femininity and social-related variables of county extension personnel is shown in Table XLIV.

The data in Table XLIV indicate that the trait, femininity, and father's occupation, was significant at the .01 level. County extension personnel whose father's occupation was professional, technical and managerial scored lowest.

A large value of chi-square was observed in Table XLIV for the variable, age. A positive correlation existed between age and femininity. County extension personnel in age group 20-29 years scored highest in femininity. It seems important to note that none of the county extension personnel scored high in the trait, femininity.

*High Scorers Tend to be seen as: Appreciative, patient, helpful, gentle, moderate, persevering, and sincere; as being respectful and accepting of others; and as behaving in a conscientious and sympathetic way.

Low Scorers Tend to be seen as: Outgoing, hard-headed, ambitious, masculine, active, robust, and restless; as being manipulative and opportunistic in dealing with others; blunt and direct in thinking and action; and impatient with delay, indecision, and reflection.

TABLE XLIII
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT FEMININITY TO
 PROFESSIONAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Present Title</u>									
C.E. Director	77	7	70	0	0.52	N.S.			
4-H Agent	41	3	38	0					
Specialized Agent	42	5	37	0					
N =	160	15	145	0					
<u>Tenure in Present Position</u>									
Less than 1 year	17	2	15	0	0.38	N.S.			
1-9 years	90	9	81	0					
10-19 years	36	3	33	0					
20 years and more	16	1	15	0					
N =	159	15	144	0					
<u>Total Tenure in Extension Service</u>									
Less than 1 year	9	1	8	0	0.67	N.S.			
1-9 years	34	4	30	0					
10-19 years	74	7	67	0					
20-29 years	41	3	38	0					
30 years and more	2	0	2	0					
N =	160	15	145	0					
<u>Previous Experience Other than Extension</u>									
Teaching related	60	6	54	0	0.08	N.S.			
Industrial related	45	4	41	0					
Other occupations	13	1	12	0					
N =	118	11	107	0					
<u>Length of Previous Experience</u>									
Less than 1 year	47	6	41	0	1.09	N.S.			
1-5 years	63	5	58	0					
6-10 years	32	3	29	0					
11 years and more	18	1	17	0					
N =	160	15	145	0					
<u>Formal Education</u>									
B.S.	51	6	45	0	1.38	N.S.			
B.S. plus graduate credits	10	0	10	0					
M.S.	99	9	90	0					
N =	160	15	145	0					
<u>Undergraduate Major Field</u>									
Animal Science	80	9	71	0	1.76	N.S.			
Plant Science	42	2	40	0					
Education, Agriculture related	32	3	29	0					
Economics, Agriculture related	6	1	5	0					
N =	160	15	145	0					

TABLE XLIV
 RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAIT FEMININITY
 TO SOCIAL-RELATED VARIABLES OF
 COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Name of Variable	N	Scores Obtained			X ²	P	\bar{C}	or	r
		Low	Middle	High					
<u>Size of Family</u>									
None	8	1	7	0	1.41	N.S.			
1-2 children	49	5	44	0					
3-4 children	45	5	40	0					
5-6 children	30	3	27	0					
7 and over children	28	1	27	0					
N =	160	15	145	0					
<u>Birth Order</u>									
First-born	57	5	52	0	2.95	N.S.			
Second-born	34	3	31	0					
Third-born	23	4	19	0					
Fourth-born	12	0	12	0					
Fifth and later born	30	3	27	0					
N =	156	15	141	0					
<u>Father's Occupation</u>									
Professional, technical, and managerial	9	4	5	0	14.59	.01	.38		
Clerical and sales	5	0	5	0					
Service related	5	0	5	0					
Farming, fishery, forestry, and agriculture related	123	10	113	0					
Structural work	18	1	17	0					
N =	160	15	145	0					
<u>Age</u>									
20-29 years	20	1	19	0	5.59	N.S.			
30-39 years	39	7	32	0					
40-49 years	63	4	59	0					
50-59 years	33	2	31	0					
60 years and over	5	1	4	0					
N =	160	15	145	0					
<u>Place Where Mostly Lived</u>									
On a farm/ranch	87	9	78	0	2.82	N.S.			
In open country	7	0	7	0					
Town	22	2	20	0					
Small city	30	4	26	0					
Medium-sized city	14	0	14	0					
Large city	0	0	0	0					
Metropolis	0	0	0	0					
N =	160	15	145	0					
<u>Place Where Like To Live</u>									
Metropolis	6	0	6	0	3.59	N.S.			
Large city	1	0	1	0					
Medium-sized city	28	1	27	0					
Small city	40	4	36	0					
Town	4	0	4	0					
In open country	26	2	24	0					
On a farm/ranch	51	7	44	0					
N =	156	14	142	0					
<u>Length of Living on Farm</u>									
Less than 1 year	2	0	2	0	0.75	N.S.			
1-9 years	18	1	17	0					
10-19 years	62	7	55	0					
20 years and more	74	7	67	0					
N =	156	15	141	0					
<u>First Preference for Participation in Organizations</u>									
Civic/business	63	5	58	0	5.35	N.S.			
Fraternal	20	1	19	0					
Professional	47	4	43	0					
Religious	20	3	17	0					
Recreational	2	1	1	0					
N =	152	14	138	0					

Based on the data in Tables XLIII and XLIV, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between trait, femininity, and professional- as well as social-related variables was not rejected except for variable, father's occupation.

Personality Traits and Job Involvement

It was stated in Chapter I that one of the purposes of the study was to determine the relationship between the degree of job involvement and the personality traits of county extension personnel.

The relationship between personality traits and the degree of job involvement by the county extension personnel is shown in Table XLV.

The data in Table XLV demonstrate that the degree of job involvement has a positive correlation with personality traits, sociability, sense of well-being, self-control, good-impression and achievement via conformance. A negative relationship, however, existed between degree of job involvement and the trait, flexibility.

In regard to the study of job involvement and personality traits, it may be said that county extension personnel who are highly involved in their jobs may be described as outgoing, enterprising, energetic, alert, ambitious, productive, active, and valuing work. They also possess calm, patient, practical, thoughtful, honest, and conscientious dispositions. Other characteristics include those of being capable, organized, responsible, stable, sincere, industrious, cautious, mannerly, methodical and rigid.

Based on the data in Table XLV, the null hypothesis of no significant differences between the degree of job involvement and the personality traits was not rejected except for the traits, sociability, sense of

well-being, self-control, good-impression, achievement via conformance and flexibility.

TABLE XLV
RELATIONSHIP OF JOB INVOLVEMENT TO PERSONALITY
TRAITS OF COUNTY EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Traits of CPI	Coefficient of Correlation N=159
Dominance	.18
Capacity for status	.08
Sociability	.25*
Social presence	.02
Self-acceptance	.11
Sense of well-being	.20*
Responsibility	.16
Socialization	.14
Self-control	.23*
Tolerance	.04
Good impression	.26*
Communality	.06
Achievement via conformance	.30*
Achievement via independence	-0.13
Intellectual efficiency	-0.04
Psychological-mindedness	.15
Flexibility	-0.29*
Femininity	.14

*Statistically significant at the .05 level.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The Cooperative Extension Service has evolved into a significant adult and youth educational system. The extension service has always provided leadership of the highest quality needed to serve extension's clientele. The opportunities facing the contemporary extension service are unlimited in view of the growing and changing scene in American society. In order to continue working effectively with the people, county extension personnel will need to develop a higher level of professional competency than has heretofore been achieved.

There is a great deal of supporting evidence that extension personnel do recognize the need for developing their own leadership capabilities. Furthermore, there is a growing concern within the extension service relative to the development of human resources within the organization by means of psychological-based techniques. Psychological approaches used with judgement, as one example, could be useful in identifying specific needs of county extension personnel.

This study was undertaken in view of the great emphasis being directed toward the professional development of county extension personnel. The purpose of this study was to assess the personality traits of Oklahoma field extension personnel and to determine their

relationship to certain predetermined professional- and social-related attributes as well as job involvement.

Methods and Procedures of the Study

The subjects for this study were the male field county extension personnel employed in the seventy-seven counties in Oklahoma. The number of the subjects included 77 county extension directors, 41 extension agents - 4-H program and 42 extension agents - specialized programs. All of the subjects (160) involved in the study responded.

In this study three instruments were relied upon. The personality inventory used was the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) designed by Gough. The CPI instrument, designed for normal people, was used to assess characteristics of personality which have a wide and pervasive applicability to human behavior. The CPI measured eighteen personality traits, grouped into four broad categories, which seek to emphasize the psychological and psychometric clusterings that exist among them. The CPI, a true-false test, contained 480 statements.

The job involvement instrument, designed by Lodahl and Kejner of Cornell University, was used to determine the degree to which a person was identified psychologically with his work. It contained 20 statements to which the respondents indicated their agreement or disagreement.

The third instrument, a questionnaire designed by the investigator, was used to obtain particulars related to the professional and social attributes of the county extension personnel.

Statistics Used

Certain statistical indices, namely, mean, percentage distribution, range, standard deviation, and rank order were used to describe the personality traits of county extension personnel. The chi-square test was used to determine the statistical differences as related to the selected attributes of the county extension personnel. Whenever the difference was statistically significant, a corrected coefficient contingency and correlation coefficient were calculated to measure the degree of association between the personality trait and the selected attributes.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

CPI Traits and Classes

It was found that the percentage of county extension personnel having scores average or above the CPI norms ranged as follows: psychological-mindedness, 87 per cent; communality, 84 per cent; achievement via conformance, 84 per cent; responsibility, 83.75 per cent; socialization, 82 per cent; self-control, 81.25 per cent; tolerance, 81 per cent; sense of well-being, 80 per cent; dominance, 78 per cent; achievement via independence, 75 per cent; self-acceptance, 71 per cent; good-impression, 67.5 per cent; capacity for status, 64 per cent; sociability, 62.5 per cent; intellectual efficiency, 59 per cent; femininity, 55 per cent; social presence, 51 per cent; and flexibility, 50 per cent.

Percentages above CPI norms for the four classes ranged as follows: Class I (measures poise, ascendancy, and self-assurance),

68 per cent; Class II (measures socialization, maturity, and responsibility), 83 per cent; Class III (measures achievement potential and intellectual efficiency), 75 per cent; and Class IV (measures intellectual and interest modes), 61 per cent.

The findings indicate that the majority of the county extension personnel scored average or above on the CPI test. It is important to note, however, that the CPI norms used in this study are those recommended for college graduates. Most of the subjects of this study had formal education beyond the Bachelor's degree. The county extension personnel were provided induction as well as in-service training. Notwithstanding, the researcher concluded that a percentage of county extension personnel should have scored above the CPI norms. These findings clearly support the propriety of the original questions raised in the study relative to the need for additional professional improvement.

Based on the above findings, the investigator concluded that an appraisal of the personality traits of all county extension personnel at regular intervals would enable the extension organization to better develop their professional competency and work effectiveness in a social-interaction setting. This conclusion would, it seems, support the use of the CPI or a comparable measure in identifying prospective employees for the extension service.

CPI Traits and Selected Professional and Social Variables

The association of each of the eighteen CPI traits to each of the professional and social attributes used in the study are summarized below.

Dominance. There was a significant difference between the trait, dominance, and the title of the county extension personnel. County extension agents - specialized programs scored highest in trait, dominance, while county extension directors scored lowest.

The county extension personnel whose father's occupation was related to professional, technical and managerial work scored highest in dominance. The county extension personnel whose father's occupation was related to farming or structural work scored lowest in dominance.

The county extension personnel who gave their first preference for participation in recreational and fraternal organizations scored highest in dominance. County extension personnel who gave their first preference for participation in civic/business and professional organizations scored lowest in dominance.

The investigator concluded from the findings that as county extension personnel increased in age they tended to become more confident and planful. The county extension personnel whose father occupied a higher status occupation tended to be more reliant and independent. The preference for participation in the fraternal organizations also tended to play a vital role in the development of leadership potential and initiative. However, as county extension personnel tended to occupy positions with more administrative duties, it tended to inhibit the tendency towards aggressiveness. Furthermore, the longer that county extension personnel had lived on a farm, the greater the tendency to be more retiring in nature as well as slow in thought and action.

Capacity for Status. There was difference in the trait, capacity for status by father's occupation. The county extension personnel whose father's occupation was related to farming scored lowest in

capacity for status.

There was also a difference in trait, capacity for status, and the birth order of the county extension personnel. The first, fifth, and later-born county extension personnel scored highest in capacity for status. The fourth-born county extension personnel scored lowest in capacity for status.

The investigator concluded, based on findings, that county extension personnel whose father's occupation was related to agriculture and farming might tend to feel uneasiness in new or unfamiliar social situations. The first and later-born county extension personnel tended to be more ambitious and self-seeking than the middle-born who tended to be more restricted in outlook as well as interests.

Sociability. The present title of county extension personnel, as well as the place they preferred to live, were significant. The extension agents - specialized programs scored highest in sociability. The county extension personnel who preferred to live in highly populated areas scored highest in sociability. The group of county extension personnel who gave as their first preference, participation in religious organizations, scored highest in sociability.

Based on these findings the investigator concluded that county extension personnel assigned as specialists tended to be more competitive and forward looking. County extension personnel who preferred to live in highly populated areas tended to be more outgoing and enterprising. County extension personnel who preferred to participate in religious organizations seemed to be more original and fluent in thought.

Social Presence. The variables related to formal education, past experience, place where mostly lived, and birth order were all statistically significant. County extension personnel who were pursuing graduate programs scored highest in social presence, whereas those who had experience in teaching scored lowest. County extension personnel who had past experience in military-related occupations also scored highest. County extension personnel who lived in small areas scored lowest; however, those who lived in large populated areas scored highest. The first-born county extension personnel were likewise highest in social presence.

There was a negative relationship between social presence and those variables related to age, length of living on a farm and size of the family.

The investigator concluded, based on the findings, that county extension personnel who were pursuing graduate studies tended to be more enthusiastic and imaginative. County extension personnel with experience in teaching tended to be self-restrained and patient. The first-born county extension personnel tended to be more active. Extension personnel who had lived in small communities tended to show simplicity. It was further concluded that as the county extension personnel advanced in age the tendency to become more moderate was enhanced. Long periods of stay on the farm tended to result in uncertainty in decision-making. The tendency toward unoriginal thinking and judging on the part of county extension personnel who came from large families was supported.

Self-Acceptance. The variable where county extension personnel liked to live was significant. County extension personnel who

preferred living in large areas scored highest in self-acceptance. There was a slight negative correlation between the trait self-acceptance with age and the total tenure of the county extension personnel.

Based on these findings, the investigator concluded that county extension personnel who preferred to live in large areas had a tendency to be demanding, aggressive and possessed self-assurance. As county extension personnel advanced in age beyond fifty years they tended to be more easygoing, quiet and conservative. Also, county extension personnel with a longer tenure in extension service tended to become methodical and conventional.

Sense of Well-Being. The variables related to age, total tenure in extension service and length of previous experience of the county extension personnel were negatively related to sense of well-being. With regard to age, the county extension personnel scored highest between ages 30-49 years. They scored highest for up to ten years of total tenure in extension service and lowest after nineteen years of tenure. The county extension personnel with none or less than one year of previous experience other than extension service scored highest in sense of well-being.

The investigator concluded that the most productive years of county extension personnel tended to be between the ages 30 to 50 years. During this period personnel tended to be more energetic, enterprising and active. County extension personnel as they advanced in age showed a tendency to be more unambitious, cautious, and leisurely. County extension personnel tended to be more productive and valued work more if their total tenure had been less than twenty years.

Thereafter, the tendency was to become more conventional, self-defensive and apologetic. County extension personnel, with no previous experience, tended to be more ambitious and alert. The tendency to become constricted in thought and action went along with a longer period of past experience other than extension.

Responsibility. The variable, formal education of the county extension personnel, was statistically significant. All the county extension personnel who were pursuing graduate programs scored highest in responsibility. County extension personnel with Bachelor's degree scored lowest in responsibility.

Based on the findings, it was concluded that county extension personnel having a higher education tended to be more planful, responsible, progressive, capable, resourceful and efficient.

Socialization. The variables, place where county extension personnel had lived, father's occupation and first preference for participation in organizations were all statistically significant. County extension personnel who had mostly lived on the farm scored highest in trait socialization. County extension personnel whose father's occupation was related to farming also scored highest in socialization. In regard to participation, county extension personnel who gave their first preference as religious organizations scored highest in socialization.

A negative relationship was found between socialization and variables age and total tenure in extension service.

On the basis of these findings, the investigator concluded that county extension personnel who had mostly lived on the farm, participated in religious organizations, or had fathers whose occupation was

related to agriculture and farming tended to be more serious, honest, industrious, obliging, and steady. As county extension personnel increased in age, especially beyond fifty years, or had a longer tenure in extension service, they tended to become more defensive, resentful, and stubborn in their behavior.

Self-Control. The trait, self-control, was statistically significant for variables father's occupation as well as living preference. It is interesting to note here that county extension personnel whose father's occupation was related to professional, technical, and managerial jobs scored lowest in self-control. The county extension personnel whose father's occupation was structural work scored highest in self-control. County extension personnel who preferred to live in open country scored lowest in self-control.

The trait had a positive correlation to the length of previous experience.

The investigator concluded that county extension personnel whose father's occupation was high status had a greater tendency to be shrewd, excitable, self-centered, aggressive and assertive. County extension personnel who preferred to live in open country tended to be more impulsive and might overemphasize personal pleasure and self-gain. County extension personnel whose father's occupation was lower in status tended to be inhibited, calm, patient and slow. County extension personnel with greater length of previous experience tended to be more strict, conscientious and thorough in their work.

Tolerance. A negative relationship was found between tolerance and age of the county extension personnel. County extension personnel who were over 49 years old scored lowest in tolerance.

The investigator concluded that as county extension personnel advanced in age they tended to become more suspicious, retiring, passive and overly judgmental in attitude.

Good Impression. A positive relationship was found between the trait, good impression, and variables age, tenure in present position, total tenure in extension service and length of previous experience other than extension. The variable where county extension personnel preferred to live was also significant. County extension personnel who liked to live in large cities scored highest in good impression.

Based on these findings, it was concluded that as county extension personnel advanced in age, worked longer in extension service as well as in their present position, or had a longer length of previous experience other than extension, they tended to be more cooperative and concerned with making a good impression. County extension personnel who preferred living in populated areas were considered more outgoing, diligent and persistent.

Communality. A slight positive relationship was found between the trait communality with age, length of previous experience and size of family.

From the findings, it was concluded that as age, length of previous experience and size of the family of county extension personnel increased, there was a tendency to become more moderate, tactful, patient, steady and realistic.

Achievement Via Conformance. A slight negative relationship with the age of the county extension personnel was found.

Based on the findings the investigator concluded that as county extension personnel advanced in age they tended to become somewhat more

pessimistic about their occupational futures.

Achievement Via Independence. A negative relationship with the trait, age, was found.

Based on these findings it may be stated that as county extension personnel advanced in age they tended to be more cautious and inhibited.

Intellectual Efficiency. The trait was statistically significant for variables past work experience, birth-order and place preferred to live. County extension personnel having past experience in industry scored lowest. County extension personnel having had experience in teaching and other occupations scored highest (almost equal) in intellectual efficiency. The first-born respondents scored highest in intellectual efficiency. Also, county extension personnel who indicated a preference to live in large cities scored highest in intellectual efficiency.

A negative relationship was found between the trait and age, tenure in present position, total tenure in extension service and size of the family.

The investigator concluded from the findings that county extension personnel with past experience in teaching tended to place a higher value on cognitive and intellectual matters. The first-born county extension personnel tended to be more progressive and resourceful. County extension personnel who preferred living in large populated areas were considered to be more alert and well-informed. The more advanced in age of the county extension personnel (especially beyond 50 years) tended to exhibit more caution and conventionalism. As their length in present position, as well as total tenure in extension increased, the county extension personnel showed a tendency to be more

easygoing, defensive and stereotyped in their thinking. The larger the family, the greater the tendency for lacking in self-direction and self-discipline.

Psychological-Mindedness. A positive relationship was found between the trait and the length of previous experience. It was also found that county extension personnel who liked to live in large cities scored highest in this trait.

Based on findings the investigator concluded that the length of previous experience of county extension personnel would influence being more observant, talkative, and resourceful. County extension personnel who preferred to live in large areas tended to be more spontaneous, quick, perceptive, verbally fluent and socially ascendent.

Flexibility. The variables related to present title of the county extension personnel and their major field of study were statistically significant. County extension directors scored highest in flexibility. The county extension personnel having education as their major field of study also scored highest in flexibility. The animal science and economics-related majors scored lowest in flexibility. The plant science majors were also low in flexibility.

A very slight negative relationship was found between the trait flexibility and the age and total tenure of county extension personnel.

The investigator concluded that county extension personnel who have administrative duties tended to be more insightful, assertive and confident. County extension personnel with pure sciences majors were considered more industrious, mannerly, methodical and rigid. It may be further concluded that the longer the tenure of extension service, the greater the tendency to be overly deferential to authority, custom, and

tradition.

Femininity. The trait was statistically significant with the variables related to father's occupation. It should be noted that county extension personnel whose father's occupation was structural work scored highest in femininity. County extension personnel whose father's occupation was related to professional, managerial and technical scored lowest in this trait.

There was a slight positive relationship between the trait femininity and age.

Based on the findings the investigator concluded that county extension personnel whose father's occupation was higher in status tended to be more ambitious, manipulative and opportunistic in dealing with others. County extension personnel whose father's occupation was lower in status were considered to be more appreciative, helpful, respectful and accepting of others. As county extension personnel advanced in age they tended to become more gentle, moderate, conscientious and show sympathetic behavior.

Job Involvement. The degree of job involvement was positively related to traits, sociability, sense of well-being, self-control, good impression and achievement via conformance. However, a negative correlation was found between degree of job involvement and the trait flexibility.

Based on these findings the investigator concluded that county extension personnel who are most involved in their job tended to be more outgoing, enterprising, ingenious, competitive, forward looking, energetic, alert, ambitious, productive and active. They had valued work as well as efforts for its own sake. They tended to be calm,

thoughtful, honest, conscientious, and strict as well as thorough in their work. They tended to be cooperative, helpful, diligent, persistent, capable, efficient, organized, responsible, stable, valuing intellectual activity, along with being cautious, mannerly and methodical.

Recommendations and Implications

Based on the findings and the review of literature, certain recommendations and implications drawn from the study are suggested.

Recommendations

The study of the personality traits of county extension personnel was limited by the method used in identifying personality traits. Because the extension personnel assessed themselves, it is suggested that the personality traits of the county extension and their attitude towards job involvement be rated by their supervisors and other persons related to their work. This technique would provide additional bases for drawing conclusions relative to the personality traits of extension personnel.

There also is a need for conducting a longitudinal-type study on the personality traits of county extension personnel in order to provide further knowledge about the changes in personality traits. Furthermore, this data would enable the extension service to evaluate its training efforts.

The investigator limited the number of attributes in this study. It is suggested that certain other attributes like: attitude towards the extension service; attitude towards graduate studies; immediate size of the subject's family; economic status of father; mother's

occupation; and other aspects related to the professional, social, and economic environment of the county extension personnel might be studied.

There is a growing tendency on the part of the county extension personnel to pursue graduate programs. The use of regression analysis on the attained grade point average might be used to predict the success of the county extension personnel in further academic work.

Implications

The growing emphasis in recent years on the behavioral sciences has provided new knowledge related to the sciences of man. The psychological approach used in this study could be helpful in evolving new principles and concepts about the development of professional improvement programs for county extension personnel.

This study has major implications for the selection as well as the promotion of the county extension personnel in the most suitable positions within the Cooperative Extension Service. The study has revealed that county extension personnel are products of several biological, sociological and psychological related factors.

The study has also provided information about certain personality traits as well as professional and social attributes of the county extension personnel which may help in better characterizing them as more effective workers. For example, the high scores in the traits, sociability, sense of well-being, self-control, good impression, and achievement via conformance by the county extension personnel included in the study tended to be traits favorable to their job involvement.

The study also has implications in that county extension personnel having certain professional and social attributes tended to score

highest in virtually all of the personality traits of the CPI. Such attributes included advanced formal education, knowledge of social sciences, specialization in technical subject matter, previous experience in teaching, high status of father's occupation, preference for living in medium-sized populated communities and preferences for participation in fraternal as well as religious organizations.

County extension personnel having attributes as described above along with the ability to plan, organize and communicate were seen to be the most effective workers.

Finally, the Cooperative Extension Service, because of the many changes taking place, must be alert to these changes and how best to develop the capabilities of county extension personnel--both in breadth and depth--to accommodate changes and still meet the needs of its clientele. The continued professional development of the county extension personnel is seen as very vital in providing the highest quality Cooperative Extension Service program.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Aaronson, B. S. "A Dimension of Personality Change with Aging." Journal of Clinical Psychology, XVI (January, 1960), 63-65.
- (2) Adorno, T. W., Else Frenkel-Brunswick, D. J. Levinson, and R. Nevitt Sanford. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950, p. 7.
- (3) Ahlgren, H. L. "Toward The Greater End." Paper presented at Annual Extension Conference, Madison, Wisconsin, October 12, 1965. (unpublished material).
- (4) _____ . "Extension in Transition." Paper presented at Annual Extension Conference, Madison, Wisconsin, October 12, 1962. (unpublished material).
- (5) Allen, P. J. "Childhood Background of Success in a Profession." American Sociological Review, XX (April, 1955), 186-190.
- (6) Allport, G. W. Personality. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1941, p. 48.
- (7) _____ . Personality: A Psychological Interpretation. New York: Holt, 1937.
- (8) Anderson, M. A. "Reporting Our Accomplishments With Implications." Quoted in Measuring Our Progress in a Changing Society. A Report of 1963 Annual Extension Conference, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, 42-49.
- (9) Ansbacher, H. L. and R. Rowena (eds.). The Individual-Psychology of Alfred Adler. New York: Basic Books, 1956.
- (10) Axinn, G. H. "The Relationship of Personnel Selection and Salary Administration to Organizational Effectiveness in the Cooperative Extension Service in Michigan." (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1957, p. 278).
- (11) Bonner, H. Psychology of Personality. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1961.
- (12) Bossard, J. H. S. and E. S. Boll. "Personality Roles in the Large Family." Child Development, XXVI (March, 1955), 71-78.

- (13) Bruner, J. S. "Personality Dynamics and the Process of Perceiving." Perception: An Approach to Personality. Eds. R. R. Blake and G. V. Ramsey. New York: Ronald, 1951, pp. 121-147.
- (14) Cameron, N. The Psychology of Behavior Disorders. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1947.
- (15) Cattell, R. B. Description and Measurement of Personality. New York: World Book, 1946.
- (16) Clark, R. C. and Jean C. Evans. "Guidelines for Extension Administrative Organization." Administration in Extension. Selected papers presented at the Sixth National Cooperative Extension Administrative Seminar. Eds. Robert C. Clark and Roland Abrahm. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1959, pp. 74-96.
- (17) Coleman, James C. Personality Dynamics and Effective Behavior. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1960, p. 399.
- (18) Conant, James Bryant. Quoted in C. Gilbert Wrenn. "An Overview." NEA Journal, XLVIII (January, 1959), 16-18.
- (19) Curran, C. A. Counseling in Catholic Life and Education. New York: Macmillan Co., 1952, p. 9.
- (20) Dailey, C. A. "The Life History Approach To Assessment." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVI (March, 1958), 456-460.
- (21) Darwin, Charles. Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1837, pp. 106-107.
- (22) Datel, W. E., Forrest D. Hall, and Charles P. Rufe. "Measurement of Achievement Motivation in Army Security Agency Foreign Language Candidates." Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXV (Summer, 1965), 539-545.
- (23) Dressel, P. L. and Irvin J. Lehmann. "The Impact of Higher Education on Student Attitudes, Values, and Critical Thinking Abilities." The Educational Record, XLVI (Summer, 1965), 248-258.
- (24) Emmerich, W. "Stability and Change in Early Personality Development." Young Children, XXI (March, 1966), 233-243.
- (25) Feldman, S. "Origin of Behavior and Man's Life Career." American Journal of Psychology, LIV (January, 1941), 53-63.
- (26) Fink, M. B. "Objectification of Data Used in Underachievement-Self Concept Study." California Journal of Educational Research, XIII (May, 1962), 105-112.

- (27) Francis, Clarence. Quoted in Richard E. Sullivan. "Human Relations in Personal Management." Middle Management in the Cooperative Extension Service. National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study in Cooperation with State Extension Services and the Federal Extension Service. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1957, pp. 66-73.
- (28) Freund, John E. Modern Elementary Statistics, 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964, pp. 339-344.
- (29) Fromm, E. Escape From Freedom. New York: Rinehart, 1941.
- (30) Fuller, Edmund. Quoted in Georgia B. Perkins. "Improving the Health of Children of School Age." Children, V (September-October, 1958), 169-174.
- (31) Goldschmid, M. L. "Prediction of College Majors by Personality Tests." Journal of Counseling Psychology, XIV (July, 1967), 302-308.
- (32) Gough, Harrison G. California Psychological Inventory Manual. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., Revised 1964.
- (33) _____. "A Cross-Cultural Study of Achievement Motivation." Journal of Applied Psychology, XLVIII (June, 1964), 191-196.
- (34) Green, Arnold W. Sociology: An Analysis of Life in Modern Society, 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964, p. 128.
- (35) Griffin, M. L. and Sister M. Rita Flaherty. "Correlation of CPI Trait with Academic Achievement." Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXIV (Summer, 1964), 369-372.
- (36) Gurin, G., J. Veroff, and S. Feld. Americans View Their Mental Health. Quoted in H. Alan Robinson and Ralph P. Connors. "Job Satisfaction Research of 1961." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI (November, 1962), 243.
- (37) Hall, Calvin S. and Gardner Lindsey. Theories of Personality. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.
- (38) Harsh, C. M. and H. G. Schrickel. Personality Development and Assessment. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1959, p. 247.
- (39) Havighurst, Robert J. "Personality As a Goal of Education." The Education Digest, XIX (October, 1953), 22-24.
- (40) Henry, J. and S. Warson. "Family Structure and Psychic Development." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXI (January, 1951), 59-73.

- (41) Herzberg, F., Bernard Mausner, Richard O. Peterson, and Dora F. Capwell. Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957, p. 20.
- (42) Hilgard, E. R. Introduction to Psychology, 3rd ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962, p. 447.
- (43) Horney, Karen. Neurotic Personality of Our Time. New York: Norton, 1939, p. 290.
- (44) Hurlock, Elizabeth B. Child Development. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964, p. 676.
- (45) Johnson, Richard T. and Arden N. Frandsen. "The California Psychological Inventory Profile of Student Leader." The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI (December, 1962), 343-345.
- (46) Jung, C. G. Analytical Psychology. New York: Moffat, Yard, 1916, p. 225.
- (47) Kolb, J. H. and Edmund de S. Brunner. A Study of Rural Society: Its Organization and Changes. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, The Riverside Press, 1940, pp. 270-277.
- (48) Korn, H. A. "Differences Between Majors in Engineering and Physical Sciences on CPI and SVIB Scores." Journal of Counseling Psychology, IX (Winter, 1962), 306-312.
- (49) Landis, Paul H. "Living With Change." Journal of the American Association of University Women, XLIX (January, 1956), 75-77.
- (50) Lewin, K. Field Theory in Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers. Ed. D. Cartwright. New York: Harper, 1951, p. 240.
- (51) Liddle, Gordon. "The California Psychological Inventory and Certain Social and Personal Factors." Journal of Educational Psychology, XLIX (June, 1958), 144-149.
- (52) Likert, R. "Effective Supervision: An Adaptive and Relative Process." Personnel Psychology, XI (Autumn, 1958), 317-332.
- (53) Linden, M. E. and D. Courtney. "The Human Life Cycle and Its Interruptions." American Journal of Psychiatry, CIX (June, 1953), 906-915.
- (54) Lodahl, Thomas M. and Mathilde Kejner. "The Definition and Measurement of Job Involvement." Journal of Applied Psychology, XLIX (February, 1965), 24-33.
- (55) Lundin, Robert W. Personality. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961, p. 8.

- (56) McClelland, D. C. Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1951, p. xiii.
- (57) McCormick, Robert W. "An Analysis of Training Needs of County Extension Agents in Ohio." (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1959, pp. 5-6).
- (58) McCormick, Thomas C. Elementary Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1941, pp. 205-207.
- (59) Mahboob, S. G. "Personality Characteristics of Male County Extension Personnel in Wisconsin." (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1966).
- (60) Mangus, A. R. "Personality Adjustment of Rural and Urban Children." American Sociological Review, XIII (October, 1948), 566-575.
- (61) Mead, Margaret. Quoted in Henry L. Ahlgren. "Extension in Transition." A paper presented at the Annual Extension Conference, Madison, Wisconsin, October 12, 1962. (unpublished material).
- (62) Merriman, J. Burton. "Relationship of Personality Traits to Motor Ability." Research Quarterly, III (May, 1960), 163-173.
- (63) Miller, D. R. and G. E. Swanson. The Changing American Parent. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- (64) Miller, Paul A. The Cooperative Extension Service Today--A Statement of Scope and Responsibility. Extension Bulletin. East Lansing: Michigan State University, April, 1958, p. 5.
- (65) Morrill, W. H. "The Relationship of Student Personality, Area of Concentration and College Environment." (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia, 1966).
- (66) Murray, H. A. "Toward a Classification of Interaction." Toward a General Theory of Action. Eds. T. Parsons and E. A. Shils. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951, p. 436.
- (67) Nye, Ivan. "The Relationship of Certain Factors to County Agent Success." Missouri Experimental Station Research Bulletin 498. Columbia, Missouri; 1952.
- (68) Phillips, E. L. "Parent-Child Similarities in Personality Disturbances." Journal of Clinical Psychology, VII (January, 1951), 188-190.

- (69) Pietrofesa, J. J. "A Comparison of the Need Structure of College Students Enrolled in Different Academic Majors." (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, Coral Gables, 1967).
- (70) Planty, Earl G., et al. Training Employees and Managers. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1948, p. 25.
- (71) Postman, L. "Toward a General Theory of Cognition." Social Psychology at the Crossroads. Eds. J. H. Rohrer and M. Sherif. New York: Harper, 1951, pp. 242-272.
- (72) Prince, Morton. The Unconscious, 2nd ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924.
- (73) Roger, F. E. and Ann G. Olmsted. Supervision in the Cooperative Extension Service. National Agricultural Extension Center For Advanced Study, Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1957, pp. 73-90.
- (74) Sampson, Edward E. "Birth Order, Need Achievement, and Conformity." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXIV (February, 1962), 155-159.
- (75) Sanford, Fillmore H. Psychology: A Scientific Study of Man. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1965, p. 450.
- (76) Schachter, Stanley. "Birth Order and Sociometric Choice." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXVIII (April, 1964), 453-456.
- (77) Shaffer, L. F. "California Psychological Inventory." The Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook. Ed. O. K. Buros. Highland Park, N. J.: Gryphon, 1959.
- (78) Shaffer, L. F. and E. J. Shoben. The Psychology of Adjustment. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1956.
- (79) Schaie, K. W. "Differences in Some Personal Characteristics of Rigid and Flexible Individuals." Journal of Clinical Psychology, XIV (January, 1958), 11-14.
- (80) Schendel, J. "Psychological Differences Between Athletes and Non-participants in Athletics at Three Educational Levels." The Research Quarterly, XXXVI (March, 1965), 52-67.
- (81) Siegel, Laurence. "Test Reviews: Harrison G. Gough, California Psychological Inventory." Journal of Counseling Psychology, V (Winter, 1958), 314.
- (82) Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956, p. 46.

- (83) Sorokin, Pitirim and Carle C. Zimmerman. Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1929, pp. 290-301.
- (84) Springob, H. Karl. "Relationship of Interests as Measured by the Kuder Preference Record to Personality as Measured by the California Psychological Inventory Scales." The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI (March, 1963), 624-628.
- (85) Strang, Ruth. The Role of the Teacher in Personnel Work, 4th ed. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, 1953, p. 31.
- (86) Sullivan, H. S. The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry. New York: Norton, 1953, p. 111.
- (87) Super, D. E. The Psychology of Careers. New York: Harper, 1957.
- (88) Teevan, Richard C. "Personality Correlates of Undergraduate Field of Specialization." Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII (June, 1954), 212-214.
- (89) Tyler, Ralph W. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950, p. 4.
- (90) VandeBerg, Gale L. "Role of the Supervisor." Western Region Seminar in Extension Supervision. National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1958, p. 6.
- (91) Vogel, W. and C. G. Lauterbach. "Sibling Patterns and Social Adjustment Among Normal and Psychiatrically Disturbed Soldiers." Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXVII (June, 1963), 236-242.
- (92) Wileden, A. F. "Cooperative Extension." An unpublished paper. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, undated, p. 1.
- (93) Wirtz, W. Occupational Outlook Handbook, 1968-69 ed. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, p. 629.

APPENDIX A

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Office of the Vice President
For Extension

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

P. O. Box 1008, Stillwater - 74074
405 - FRontier 2-6211, Ext. 212

March 27, 1968

Dear Mr.

I know how busy you are but please bear with us in completing this questionnaire. This questionnaire is related to a doctoral study of Dev Raj Bajaj. Mr. Bajaj has been working in the Agricultural Extension Service in India for several years. He is currently pursuing his graduate program at Oklahoma State University to learn about our Extension programs and their potential applications for the growth and development of Agricultural Extension programs in India.

The primary purpose of this study is to determine the personality characteristics of all the male field Extension personnel in Oklahoma. The results of this study shall be used as the basis for planning the in-service training programs for all the field Extension personnel in Oklahoma. This study is not the least concerned about your performance in your present job. The results of the study shall be kept strictly confidential, and the data shall be presented without any identification of the respondent. For this purpose, you have been assigned a Questionnaire Code # _____.

The following instructions are given to fill in this questionnaire:

1. The copy of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) is enclosed herewith. The CPI has 480 statements designed by Dr. Harrison G. Gough. In the CPI booklet, you will find an answer sheet bearing your Code # _____. Please read each statement and decide how you feel about it. If you agree with a statement or feel that it is true about you, please check (X) in the True box of the appropriate question. If you disagree with a statement or feel that it is not true

WORK IN AGRICULTURE, HOME ECONOMICS AND RELATED FIELDS

USDA - OSU AND COUNTY COMMISSIONERS COOPERATING

Page 2
March 27, 1968

about you, please check (X) in the False box of the appropriate question. Please be sure that you answer all the statements contained in the CPI booklet.

2. Please return the CPI booklet along with your Coded Answer Sheet.
3. You will also find a separate questionnaire along with this letter. This questionnaire is designed to get some background information about you. Your questionnaire has the Code # . Please answer all the questions in this questionnaire and return the same to me along with the CPI booklet and CPI Answer Sheet.

Once again, I would like to emphasize that this study has great importance in planning our future in-service training programs. You are requested to answer all the questions and return the filled-in questionnaires to me at your earliest convenience.

Your cooperation in this behalf shall be highly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ George E. Stroup

George E. Stroup
Director of Personnel
Development

GES:ar

Enclosures

APPENDIX B

Cooperative Extension Service
 212-A Gardiner Hall
 Oklahoma State University
 Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDY OF PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS
 OF MALE FIELD EXTENSION PERSONNEL IN OKLAHOMA

NOTE: Please verify that the Code number of this questionnaire corresponds to your Code number.

Your Questionnaire Code # _____.

Please answer all the questions. Thank you!

1. Age _____
2. Marital status _____
3. What is your present position in the County Extension Service?
 _____ County Extension Director
 _____ County Extension Agent - 4-H Program
 _____ County Extension Agent - Other Specialized Program
 _____ Indian Program
 _____ Horticulture
 _____ Area Agronomist
 _____ Area Farm Management
 _____ Area Livestock
 _____ Area Community Resource Development
 _____ Other (please specify) _____
4. How long have you been employed in your present position in the Cooperative Extension Service? _____ years
5. How many years have you been employed in the Cooperative Extension Service? _____ years
6. What is your highest educational degree?
 _____ Bachelor
 _____ Master's
 _____ Doctorate
 _____ Other (please specify) _____

7. Indicate your major field of study (e.g., Agronomy, Horticulture, Dairy Science, etc.)

<u>Degree</u>	<u>Major Field of Study</u>
Bachelor	_____
Master's	_____
Doctorate	_____
Other (please specify)	_____

8. Did you have any full-time work experience (e.g., teaching, farming, salesman, technician, non-academic work, agricultural industry, etc.) prior to your joining the Cooperative Extension Service?

_____ Yes _____ No

If your answer to question #8 is yes, please indicate the job you held and duration of each job.

<u>Title or Position</u>	<u>Duration of Employment</u>
_____	_____ Years
_____	_____ Years
_____	_____ Years

9. Which represents best where you have lived most of your life?
(Check One Only)

_____ On a farm or ranch
 _____ In open country (small acreage)
 _____ Town, under 2,500 population
 _____ A medium-sized city, 2,500-9,999
 _____ City, 10,000-49,999
 _____ City, 50,000-99,999
 _____ A metropolis, 100,000 and over

10. If you have ever lived on a farm, please indicate as to how many years you have lived on the farm altogether? _____ years

11. Your Father's occupation (please be specific) _____
 (If retired or deceased, indicate what his occupation was most of his life)

12. How many brothers and sisters are/were in your family?

_____ brothers
 _____ sisters

13. What was your birth status? _____ First child _____ Second child _____ Third child _____ Please specify.

14. Indicate by name the three organizations and clubs (e.g., professional, fraternal, etc.) that you have the greatest interest in and have participated in most. Please list these in order of your preference:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

15. If you are given a choice, in what type of community would you like to live? (Check One Only)

_____ A metropolis, 100,000 and over population
 _____ A large city, 50,000-99,999
 _____ A medium-sized city, 10,000-49,999
 _____ A small city, 2,500-9,999
 _____ A town, under 2,500
 _____ In open country (small acreage)
 _____ On a farm or ranch

APPENDIX C

Below you will find a number of statements dealing with the attitudes toward work. Please indicate your attitudes toward your own present work by giving your degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement. Write the number 1, 2, 3, or 4 on the line just before the number of each statement.

1 means you Strongly agree,

2 means you Mildly agree,

3 means you Mildly disagree,

4 means you Strongly disagree, with the statement.

- ___ 1. I'll stay overtime to finish a job, even if I'm not paid for it.
- ___ 2. You can measure a person pretty well by how good a job he does.
- ___ 3. The major satisfactions in my life come from my job.
- ___ 4. For me, mornings at work really fly by.
- ___ 5. I usually show up for work a little early, to get things ready.
- ___ 6. The most important things that happen to me involve my work.
- ___ 7. Sometimes I lie awake at night thinking ahead to the next day's work.
- ___ 8. I'm really a perfectionist about my work.
- ___ 9. I feel depressed when I fail at something connected with my job.
- ___ 10. I have other activities more important than my work.
- ___ 11. I live, eat, and breathe my job.
- ___ 12. I would probably keep working even if I didn't need the money.
- ___ 13. Quite often I feel like staying home from work instead of coming in.
- ___ 14. To me, my work is only a small part of who I am.
- ___ 15. I am very much involved personally in my work.
- ___ 16. I avoid taking on extra duties and responsibilities in my work.
- ___ 17. I used to be more ambitious about my work than I am now.
- ___ 18. Most things in life are more important than work.
- ___ 19. I used to care more about my work, but now other things are more important to me.
- ___ 20. Sometimes I'd like to kick myself for the mistakes I make in my work.

APPENDIX D

TABLE FOR FACTORS FOR CORRECTING C FOR BROAD GROUPING

Number	Correction Factor (t_r , t_c)
2.	0.798
3.	0.859
4.	0.915
5.	0.943
6.	0.959
7.	0.970
8.	0.976
9.	0.981
10.	0.985
11.	0.987
12.	0.989
13.	0.991
14.	0.992
15.	0.993

APPENDIX E

SCALE FOR DIVIDING RAW SCORES OF EIGHTEEN
 TRAITS OF CPI INTO THREE CATEGORIES,
 LOW, MIDDLE AND HIGH

Name of Trait	Low Score Range	Middle Score Range	High Score Range
Do	2-16	17-31	32-46
Cs	1-11	12-21	22-32
Sy	0-11	12-24	25-36
Sp	8-23	24-40	41-56
Sa	1-11	12-23	24-34
Wb	18-26	27-35	36-44
Re	7-18	19-30	31-42
So	9-23	24-39	40-54
Sc	0-16	17-33	34-50
To	0-10	11-21	22-32
Gi	0-13	14-26	27-40
Cm	15-19	20-23	24-28
Ac	5-15	16-27	28-38
Ai	0-10	11-21	22-32
Ie	16-27	28-40	41-52
Py	0-7	8-14	15-22
Fx	0-7	8-14	15-22
Fe	0-12	13-25	26-38

APPENDIX F

SCALE FOR DETERMINING PERSONS OBTAINING SCORES
BELOW, AVERAGE OR ABOVE CPI NORMS ON EIGHTEEN
PERSONALITY TRAITS AND FOUR CLASSES

Traits and Classes	Scores Below Norms		Scores Average or Above Norms	
	Raw Scores*	Standard Scores	Raw Scores	Standard Scores
<u>Class I</u>				
Do	26	48	27	50
Cs	19	49	20	52
Sy	24	49	25	51
Sp	33	48	34	50
Sa	19	49	20	52
Wb	<u>37</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>51</u>
	158	292	164	306
<u>Class II</u>				
Re	30	48	31	50
So	36	49	37	51
Sc	30	49	31	50
To	22	48	23	50
Gi	19	48	20	50
Cm	<u>25</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>54</u>
	162	291	168	305
<u>Class III</u>				
Ac	27	49	28	51
Ai	18	48	19	51
Ie	<u>39</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>52</u>
	84	147	87	154
<u>Class IV</u>				
Py	10	46	11	50
Fx	8	47	9	50
Fe	<u>16</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>52</u>
	34	142	37	152

*Raw Scores are equivalent to Standard Scores established by CPI.

APPENDIX G

RAW SCORES OBTAINED BY ALL SUBJECTS OF THE STUDY ON PERSONALITY TRAITS OF CPI

Person	Do	Gs	Sy	Sp	Sa	Wb	Re	So	Sc	To	Gi	Cm	Ac	Ai	Ie	Py	Fx	Fe
1	28	16	22	28	17	40	33	39	32	22	16	27	28	18	39	12	10	20
2	36	19	28	34	17	40	37	37	41	28	26	28	34	23	41	13	10	18
3	33	21	21	30	23	38	34	39	36	25	19	28	32	21	34	14	10	20
4	35	25	28	35	23	41	32	34	33	30	15	28	31	21	42	13	7	10
5	19	19	22	34	20	40	30	36	34	25	24	24	27	23	38	11	12	15
6	25	24	24	40	18	39	30	38	29	28	16	27	24	19	41	15	10	13
7	31	23	24	37	20	34	33	35	24	27	12	28	28	24	40	12	12	19
8	29	23	25	31	18	42	34	33	32	28	22	23	30	24	42	11	4	14
9	21	14	21	28	15	35	36	43	23	24	16	25	22	20	38	11	7	19
10	17	19	17	24	16	35	31	41	29	20	14	27	25	18	39	7	10	20
11	34	22	19	29	22	41	33	39	35	25	19	28	25	21	42	13	10	17
12	30	18	25	31	19	39	37	39	40	27	22	26	31	18	35	10	11	21
13	28	22	22	32	20	43	33	41	43	25	21	28	30	17	40	13	4	11
14	34	17	25	32	23	40	34	35	34	24	21	28	31	21	42	12	4	14
15	32	24	30	38	18	42	33	40	43	27	32	24	31	21	41	11	13	20
16	38	21	29	40	21	43	38	39	43	29	30	28	37	27	43	13	12	20
17	34	21	28	34	26	42	35	42	37	28	22	27	31	25	46	12	9	12
18	34	21	29	36	24	42	35	42	34	26	20	28	31	19	39	17	7	16
19	41	21	24	27	21	37	31	36	33	17	24	26	27	22	36	15	10	18
20	37	24	31	38	20	41	35	37	34	25	26	27	34	19	43	13	7	16
21	28	24	22	31	19	39	30	38	40	25	33	20	31	25	38	14	15	19
22	31	15	25	31	19	39	29	32	30	17	21	28	26	11	32	12	3	20
23	30	16	24	24	19	41	34	43	43	26	29	28	32	19	40	11	4	19
24	33	22	24	31	22	42	36	37	35	29	21	27	32	26	41	14	11	19
25	27	18	30	35	25	38	33	37	34	27	20	28	32	17	39	10	4	16
26	29	28	24	29	19	40	37	42	40	23	23	28	33	22	38	14	4	18
27	25	14	21	30	15	32	29	37	35	21	17	28	30	19	30	13	10	23
28	22	19	24	37	19	39	28	44	42	25	31	26	33	23	35	16	11	20
29	34	17	23	24	18	44	38	40	43	23	27	28	34	18	37	12	4	18
30	20	20	18	29	20	40	32	36	38	27	28	26	29	27	41	16	10	21
31	31	21	24	27	22	39	32	42	33	25	19	28	33	20	36	12	12	19
32	26	16	21	24	18	36	28	40	35	21	18	28	29	17	39	9	5	16
33	29	25	30	43	20	44	38	40	40	29	28	25	31	26	43	16	19	15
34	31	19	28	25	25	33	31	39	34	12	23	28	33	16	38	9	1	18
35	35	27	35	44	26	43	36	41	35	30	21	27	34	21	45	15	10	14
36	28	20	25	38	20	38	33	38	32	20	19	27	30	19	41	16	8	20
37	23	22	24	40	19	43	30	41	30	26	18	25	30	24	42	14	17	8
38	27	18	30	40	21	42	30	41	33	26	22	26	28	22	42	14	10	16
39	29	22	26	39	25	37	30	36	30	29	15	26	33	21	44	14	12	18
40	30	26	31	40	25	44	35	39	41	30	29	25	37	24	43	11	9	15

<u>Person</u>	<u>Do</u>	<u>Cs</u>	<u>Sy</u>	<u>Sp</u>	<u>Sa</u>	<u>Wb</u>	<u>Re</u>	<u>So</u>	<u>Sc</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Gi</u>	<u>Cm</u>	<u>Ac</u>	<u>Ai</u>	<u>Ie</u>	<u>Py</u>	<u>Fx</u>	<u>Fe</u>
41	27	18	23	37	21	43	31	39	38	26	21	27	26	24	40	13	6	16
42	37	19	29	29	23	43	40	43	46	28	37	24	37	23	42	14	7	18
43	34	18	28	35	26	41	38	47	32	23	12	28	31	18	44	15	4	15
44	32	21	30	31	19	42	37	45	42	23	25	28	33	18	42	13	3	16
45	29	21	24	39	23	42	32	42	39	28	25	28	34	23	40	13	10	19
46	19	16	21	32	14	41	28	39	39	27	15	27	26	23	35	14	8	13
47	33	23	23	38	26	43	35	44	39	29	18	28	30	22	45	17	10	15
48	38	20	27	40	21	36	34	37	29	27	18	25	34	25	44	12	14	18
49	23	19	20	34	20	42	31	46	31	27	17	21	28	20	40	12	11	12
50	31	13	22	30	22	37	35	43	28	19	17	28	30	19	32	13	6	18
51	31	22	25	36	24	39	36	44	40	29	24	28	35	22	42	14	9	15
52	28	20	26	39	20	43	36	41	37	27	20	27	30	22	44	15	17	15
53	26	14	21	28	18	42	32	44	40	21	21	28	32	15	34	12	4	18
54	31	20	28	33	22	41	37	42	38	24	26	28	32	17	41	10	3	19
55	22	14	16	31	16	35	34	34	26	25	12	27	25	23	38	11	16	12
56	36	24	27	35	20	43	40	41	47	31	36	25	34	24	46	17	7	22
57	25	17	19	30	19	37	27	36	27	14	9	27	25	17	36	8	12	17
58	28	22	26	32	26	38	30	40	31	26	14	27	31	20	37	14	6	15
59	30	20	18	37	25	39	23	45	33	20	17	26	28	20	42	14	16	14
60	30	18	28	32	22	41	35	43	34	23	19	28	32	20	38	12	6	18
61	34	21	28	33	20	44	37	39	41	30	30	24	36	27	44	14	12	21
62	19	20	27	31	16	39	33	43	37	24	20	27	31	19	40	12	7	23
63	36	25	31	40	21	43	36	42	42	30	29	28	35	27	49	16	10	22
64	37	23	30	38	23	40	34	42	29	27	21	28	30	23	45	15	11	11
65	35	22	29	32	22	43	37	38	42	27	29	27	35	24	44	17	15	19
66	22	15	19	30	20	43	34	37	43	27	22	28	30	24	40	12	4	19
67	34	22	25	28	18	39	34	32	31	26	23	28	31	21	42	13	6	10
68	23	11	19	25	19	37	27	43	40	19	12	28	31	18	31	9	6	19
69	28	20	24	29	23	31	34	39	30	22	15	25	29	24	28	10	10	22
70	31	20	25	37	22	35	29	41	28	19	18	28	26	18	43	7	6	14
71	35	20	26	37	23	39	31	35	32	24	20	26	31	16	35	9	8	16
72	34	19	30	44	22	43	34	38	31	29	15	28	34	23	41	16	11	17
73	28	21	24	37	24	42	36	37	40	28	21	27	33	24	45	17	8	20
74	38	22	30	37	23	43	36	40	28	23	24	28	35	20	38	11	5	20
75	23	24	20	34	24	33	31	32	20	23	10	27	20	24	36	9	12	14
76	36	21	29	35	23	36	30	39	32	21	19	26	30	21	43	13	12	15
77	37	21	27	44	23	42	40	36	37	30	22	27	32	24	41	18	11	19
78	22	20	24	34	20	40	38	45	38	25	25	28	35	21	37	15	8	22
79	28	18	23	34	22	34	35	37	21	18	10	26	26	20	35	10	14	17
80	36	21	31	38	24	43	35	45	40	27	32	28	34	21	43	14	3	15

<u>Person</u>	<u>Do</u>	<u>Cs</u>	<u>Sy</u>	<u>Sp</u>	<u>Sa</u>	<u>Wb</u>	<u>Re</u>	<u>So</u>	<u>Sc</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Gi</u>	<u>Cm</u>	<u>Ac</u>	<u>Ai</u>	<u>Ie</u>	<u>Py</u>	<u>Fx</u>	<u>Fe</u>
81	31	24	28	33	23	41	35	41	36	28	21	26	35	24	45	13	9	18
82	33	18	26	34	27	36	30	41	30	26	19	27	27	22	44	14	2	18
83	28	14	13	21	12	36	38	43	35	19	23	27	27	15	33	12	5	21
84	29	22	25	33	22	42	36	40	42	30	29	24	32	22	44	15	11	19
85	35	24	34	32	23	42	36	45	41	26	30	28	33	20	41	14	1	16
86	33	26	27	40	28	37	29	31	14	22	11	28	27	18	41	10	7	18
87	29	18	20	25	18	41	32	46	41	23	28	28	30	19	38	13	3	19
88	31	21	23	24	19	39	36	42	41	23	21	28	31	16	41	14	10	21
89	23	18	23	37	16	42	31	38	35	25	18	27	28	21	35	14	15	15
90	23	17	16	25	20	39	31	43	40	19	24	27	27	15	31	14	5	18
91	31	21	27	33	15	42	32	45	41	24	28	27	33	17	38	13	4	19
92	26	19	24	30	24	41	39	44	44	23	22	26	33	21	37	11	7	17
93	35	18	26	32	22	40	38	41	39	28	23	25	36	23	41	16	11	17
94	38	22	32	38	24	43	40	40	36	30	23	27	35	24	42	15	10	16
95	36	19	30	30	21	34	31	37	33	20	25	28	30	15	35	8	6	17
96	30	21	31	35	23	43	37	41	41	23	26	28	28	17	41	14	6	19
97	37	16	23	31	22	38	38	40	39	24	23	28	33	17	35	13	3	24
98	34	20	32	41	28	36	30	32	26	23	14	27	29	21	37	10	8	15
99	29	20	20	36	20	37	28	34	34	24	17	27	23	20	37	7	15	18
100	29	17	27	30	22	36	32	35	33	27	20	24	27	23	40	16	14	21
101	28	21	21	28	18	36	30	37	32	20	29	24	26	17	32	11	12	16
102	28	19	25	33	22	35	36	44	41	28	27	28	32	20	40	13	7	17
103	38	22	28	39	25	38	33	38	22	17	14	26	31	15	37	11	7	14
104	34	24	33	31	21	44	38	41	43	28	37	24	33	19	42	15	3	15
105	26	23	26	36	15	39	35	43	34	31	23	28	30	20	41	12	13	13
106	30	20	25	29	17	40	34	38	41	25	29	28	32	23	38	11	5	11
107	34	23	31	35	23	43	38	44	42	30	32	26	37	21	45	15	7	17
108	25	17	24	33	22	35	23	34	24	11	19	27	27	12	26	6	7	14
109	28	22	25	35	23	43	33	37	40	27	24	28	33	22	38	13	16	16
110	33	20	28	32	19	43	35	41	35	28	26	23	35	23	40	12	14	20
111	37	25	32	32	19	43	37	43	40	22	33	28	35	15	37	12	7	16
112	22	18	25	36	21	41	34	42	43	30	28	28	34	25	45	14	11	16
113	32	20	24	33	22	40	33	39	32	24	20	28	30	19	38	15	9	9
114	23	18	24	32	18	43	38	39	37	26	22	27	28	21	41	12	7	22
115	25	19	25	36	21	44	36	37	41	28	23	26	31	26	42	13	9	18
116	31	21	28	34	22	44	35	44	41	27	27	28	34	16	42	9	4	18
117	33	17	24	30	19	40	34	41	38	28	20	27	34	23	40	17	9	19
118	30	25	30	41	21	42	33	41	34	29	25	27	34	27	41	11	8	15
119	35	28	30	38	20	44	33	42	42	28	28	27	35	26	42	16	13	13
120	35	20	26	41	22	41	39	40	44	28	30	26	35	29	42	18	16	24

<u>Person</u>	<u>Do</u>	<u>Cs</u>	<u>Sy</u>	<u>Sp</u>	<u>Sa</u>	<u>Wb</u>	<u>Re</u>	<u>So</u>	<u>Sc</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Gi</u>	<u>Gm</u>	<u>Ac</u>	<u>Ai</u>	<u>Ie</u>	<u>Py</u>	<u>Fx</u>	<u>Fe</u>
121	35	24	31	42	25	43	30	36	27	28	20	27	31	21	48	13	6	15
122	26	17	25	31	22	40	36	41	39	23	22	27	31	25	37	14	10	18
123	35	20	25	32	23	42	32	42	32	22	18	28	32	17	37	11	6	14
124	27	22	25	36	23	43	26	44	35	24	23	28	31	18	40	11	8	21
125	35	19	30	34	22	39	34	41	36	27	25	27	31	21	39	15	5	12
126	28	23	31	32	20	43	38	42	48	31	34	28	34	23	44	14	8	16
127	31	16	20	29	20	28	36	35	30	25	12	26	28	20	43	12	5	23
128	29	20	26	39	24	43	35	42	33	30	22	26	30	23	42	14	11	11
129	33	21	31	35	23	38	32	38	22	20	16	26	27	13	40	14	4	10
130	34	21	30	36	23	39	32	43	32	23	24	27	33	20	40	14	5	18
131	35	22	26	36	23	41	36	42	40	28	23	26	37	26	48	15	10	12
132	37	23	31	39	20	43	37	37	40	29	31	28	32	21	43	14	8	13
133	33	22	27	37	22	40	32	36	32	24	23	27	30	20	36	16	12	14
134	31	23	26	35	20	40	34	38	43	25	34	25	35	18	42	15	9	16
135	35	20	26	36	26	38	31	34	19	21	9	28	23	21	42	11	9	16
136	26	17	24	35	14	42	34	38	43	27	33	24	33	22	42	18	16	22
137	23	20	25	35	20	42	32	47	40	23	19	27	30	17	37	9	3	21
138	31	22	26	36	23	39	32	35	27	19	16	26	31	19	38	12	13	12
139	37	15	27	28	21	44	31	37	38	27	21	27	33	19	37	14	4	17
140	21	23	20	36	16	41	35	37	46	28	28	26	30	23	42	17	16	20
141	28	21	17	33	17	42	34	44	43	29	23	28	30	22	37	16	13	17
142	26	13	18	24	19	37	31	39	20	14	11	28	23	12	32	12	5	16
143	27	20	28	32	17	43	35	42	37	26	18	27	35	19	42	13	11	13
144	30	22	28	35	19	42	33	45	43	31	38	22	34	23	44	12	12	17
145	30	18	22	31	22	39	26	35	34	21	21	27	28	20	39	14	4	18
146	29	21	25	35	20	40	34	44	38	27	26	26	31	24	42	12	10	15
147	31	18	27	28	20	44	34	43	38	29	25	28	33	18	42	15	3	19
148	32	21	28	35	22	39	35	37	40	25	25	25	34	22	42	14	8	19
149	34	22	25	34	25	37	33	34	24	27	14	27	28	21	37	13	7	19
150	29	19	30	33	19	41	31	45	38	27	22	26	34	21	45	16	14	16
151	34	22	26	33	23	38	36	35	35	25	16	26	29	20	34	11	6	21
152	31	22	25	34	24	43	33	46	42	25	31	25	31	20	39	11	8	16
153	33	23	29	29	20	41	40	43	44	24	29	26	32	23	40	13	11	14
154	32	23	28	38	25	41	34	38	32	26	17	26	32	22	42	11	10	15
155	25	18	19	25	15	37	33	38	39	23	26	26	31	18	38	10	4	16
156	20	20	19	28	19	40	32	46	43	27	26	27	29	20	35	11	7	20
157	32	19	25	43	21	38	33	39	30	28	16	28	30	22	39	13	17	15
158	21	18	21	33	17	41	36	38	37	27	17	27	28	24	39	14	4	16
159	32	23	26	33	22	39	37	40	31	25	20	27	30	17	40	14	2	21
160	29	22	26	39	21	40	35	33	35	28	23	26	29	23	43	16	18	18

VITA

3
Dev Raj Bajaj

Candidate for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE RELATIONSHIP OF CERTAIN PERSONALITY TRAITS TO SELECTED
PROFESSIONAL AND SOCIAL ATTRIBUTES OF OKLAHOMA MALE COUNTY
FIELD EXTENSION PERSONNEL

Major Field: Agricultural Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born at Ferozepore City, India, July 24, 1933, the son of Bhagwan Dass and Lal Devi Bajaj.

Education: Graduated from Sanatan Dharam High School, Ferozepore City, India in 1950; received the Bachelor of Science degree in Agriculture from Rajputana University, Jaipur, in 1955, with a major in General Agriculture; received the Master of Science degree from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in 1962 with a major in Agricultural Education; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1969.

Professional Experience: Served as Teacher of Agriculture, Government Multi-purpose Higher Secondary School, Bharatpur, Rajasthan state, India, 1955-1956; worked as Agricultural Extension Officer, Rajasthan state, India, 1956-1961; also worked as Assistant Director of Agricultural Research, The Larsen Company, Green Bay, Wisconsin from 1966-1967; Graduate Research Assistant in the Department of Agricultural Education of Oklahoma State University, 1968-1969.

Professional Organizations: Indian Behavioral Scientists, and honorary member of Future Farmers of America.