To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by George Michael Heiskell entitled "A Comparison of Selected Groups of County Leaders Perception of Selected Community Problems." I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Agricultural Extension.

Cecil E. Carter, Jr., Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Provost
and Dean of the Graduate School

# A COMPARISON OF COUNTY LEADERS' PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED COMMUNITY PROBLEMS IN TENNESSEE

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Science

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

George Michael Heiskell

June 1987

AG-VET-MED.
Thesis
87
.H436

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author acknowledges the assistance given by his graduate committee: Dr. Cecil Carter, Dr. Roy Lessly, and Dr. George Smith for their constructive criticism and helpful suggestions in reviewing this thesis.

Gratitude is expressed by the author to Dr. W. W. Armistead, Vice-President for Agriculture, Institute of Agriculture, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Dr. Lloyd Downen, Dean, Agricultural Extension Service, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Mr. Jesse Francis, District V Supervisor; and the Claiborne County Agricultural Extension Committee for encouragement and the granting of study leave.

The author also wishes to express special appreciation to a number of friends and family for their patience, support, and encouragement.

# ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to identify or disclose similarities or differences between county leaders perception of seven selected community problem areas. More specific objectives were to determine if: (1) the perception of community leaders from three audience groups differed; (2) community leaders perception changed over a time period; and (3) community leaders living in different areas differed in their perception of problem areas.

A study population of 3,903 county leaders belonging to 12 survey audience groups from 86 Tennessee counties comprised the initial survey audiences. These 12 groups were combined by similarities into the: (1) extension-related audience; (2) non-extension-related audience; and (3) bankers audience.

Tennessee counties were divided into three areas of residence by a combination of extension districts and geographic areas of Tennessee. The study areas of residence of community leaders were;(1) District I; (2) District II,III, and IV; and (3) District V.

Data were analyzed by computer facilities provided by The University of Tennessee, Knoxville Computer Center. The Chi-Square Test was used to test the significance of the difference in the ratings .

Major findings of the study included the following:

1. Significant differences did exist between the three audience groups ratings of five of seven community problem areas, in both 1980 and 1984. Additionally there was significant difference in the three audience groups ratings of one community problem area in 1980 but not in 1984.

The extension, professional, and bankers audience groups were rated significantly different for five of seven community problem areas in 1980. The extension audience rated local agriculture and community organizations lower than the professional or bankers audience groups. The bankers audience rated conservation of soil, water, and timber; family living conditions; and recreational opportunities higher than did the extension or professional audience groups.

Significant differences in four of seven community problem areas were found in 1984. The extension audience rated community organizations lower than either the professional or bankers audience groups. The bankers audience rated local agriculture and conservation of soil, water, and timber lower than either the extension or professional audience groups. Also, the bankers audience rated recreational opportunities higher than did the extension or professional audiences.

2. Significant differences were found between the 1980 and 1984 ratings of seven community problem areas. Findings imply that improvement was seen in three of seven community

problem areas. Condition of homes, recreational opportunities, and community organizations were perceived as being better in 1984 than in 1980. The problem areas of; local agriculture; conservation of soil, water, and timber; and family income were perceived as being a more serious problem in 1984 than in 1980. Little change was found in family living conditions.

3. Significant differences were found between the three areas of residence of community leaders in six of seven community problem areas in 1984. The professional and all community leaders audiences in district V rated conservation of soil, water, and timber higher than either the extension or bankers audiences. Family income was rated lower by the extension, bankers, and all community leaders groups in district I than did those leaders from the two other areas of residence. Family living conditions were rated higher by the bankers audience in district I. Condition of homes were rated lower by the extension audience in district I and by the all community leaders group from district II,III,and IV. Recreational opportunities were rated higher by district V leaders from the extension, professional, and the all community leaders groups. Condition of homes was rated lower by the all community leaders group from district II,III,and IV. There was no significant difference observed in ratings of local agriculture between the three areas of residence.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION
Background of the Study....1
Current and Future Implications....5
Need for the Study....7
Purpose of the Study....8
Limitations....8
Method of Investigation....9
Definition of Terms....11

II. REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES
Community Leaders Perception of Local Agriculture....13
Community Leaders Perception of Conservation of Soil, Water, and Timber....16
Community Leaders Perception of Family Income....19
Community Leaders Perception of Family Living Conditions....22
Community Leaders Perception of Condition of Homes....25
Community Leaders Perception of Recreational Opportunities....28
Community Leaders Perception of Community Organizations....30

III. RATINGS OF SEVEN COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS BY THREE AUDIENCE GROUPS
Ratings of Seven Community Problem Areas by Three Audience Groups in 1980....32
Ratings of Seven Community Problem Areas by Three Audience Groups in 1984....39

IV. RATINGS OF SEVEN COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS IN 1984 COMPARED TO THOSE IN 1980
Ratings of Seven Community Problem Areas by Community Leaders In 1984 Compared to 1980....48
Ratings of Seven Community Problem Areas by the Extension Audience In 1984 Compared to 1980....53
Ratings of Seven Community Problem Areas by the Professional Audience In 1984 Compared to 1980....58
Ratings of Seven Community Problem Areas by the Bankers Audience In 1984 Compared to 1980....63

V. RATINGS OF SEVEN COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS BY COMMUNITY LEADERS COMPARED BY AREA OF RESIDENCE IN 1984
Ratings of Seven Community Problem Areas by Community Leaders in 1984 Compared by Area of Residence....70
Ratings of Seven Community Problem Areas by the Extension Audience in 1984 Compared by Area of Residence....75
Ratings of Seven Community Problem Areas by the Professional Audience in 1984 Compared by Area of Residence....80
Ratings of Seven Community Problem Areas by the Bankers Audience in 1984 Compared by Area of Residence....86
VI. SUMMARY
Purpose and Specific Objectives....92
Method of Investigation....92
Major Findings....94
Implications....102
Recommendations....105
Recommendations for Further Study....106

BIBLIOGRAPHY....109

APPENDIX....112

VITA....114

# LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

1. Ratings Of Seven Community Problem Areas By Three Audience Groups In 1980.....33
2. Ratings Of Seven Community Problem Areas By Three Audience Groups In 1984.....40
3. Ratings By Community Leaders Of Seven Community Problem Areas In 1984 Compared To Those In 1980.....49
4. Ratings By The Extension Audience Of Seven Community Problem Areas In 1984 Compared To Those Of 1980.....54
5. Ratings By The Professional Audience Of Seven Community Problem Areas In 1984 Compared To Those Of 1980.....59
6. Ratings By Banker Audience Of Seven Community Problem Areas In 1984 Compared to Those Of 1980.....64
7. Ratings Of Seven Community Problem Areas By All Audiences Compared By Area Of Residence In 1984.....71
8. Ratings Of Seven Community Problem Areas By The Extension Audience Compared By Area Of Residence In 1984..... 76
9. Ratings Of Seven Community Problem Areas By The Professional Audience Compared By Area Of Residence In 1984..... .82
10. Ratings Of Seven Community Problem Areas By The Banker Audience Compared By Area Of Residence In 1984.....87

# CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION

## I. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

With the passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914, Congress funded the development of the Cooperative Extension Service. At that time more than 30% of all Americans lived on farms or in rural areas, and a substantial part of the nation's labor force worked on farms. Rural people were well below the national average in their educational level. The Cooperative Extension Service was charged with extending knowledge and educational opportunities to 1) farmers, 2) ranchers, 3) homemakers, and 4) young people. This information and education was intended to increase incomes, enhance the quality of life, and expand the developmental horizons of both adults and youth (9:4).

The Smith-Lever Act grew out of a recognized need for an informal educational service which would take the results of research "on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics" to people who could apply these results in

---

*Numbers in parenthesis refer to alphabetically listed items in the Bibliography; those after the colon are page numbers.

improving their welfare. Although farm families were targeted as the major audience, the act itself specifically recognized a broader audience to include rural non-farm residents.

The theory of the Smith-Lever Act was to extend the Cooperative Extension system to the entire country by providing for at least one trained demonstrator or itinerant teacher for each agricultural county, who in the very nature of things must give leadership and direction along all lines of rural activity-social, economic, and financial. He is to assume leadership in every movement, whatever it may be, the aim of which is better farming, better living, more happiness, more education, and better citizenship (2:19-20).

Community development has been a part of the Tennessee Agriculture Extension program since its founding.

> Community development as it now operates in Tennessee was begun in 1944 in the eastern part of the state under the name of the East Tennessee Improvement Program. It had as its purpose the helping of rural communities through organized community efforts, and to improve rural-urban relations (23:2).

As the community development organizations spread across Tennessee, Extension continued to provide leadership and guidance. Dickson noted that community development was started in Tennessee as a result of:

> (1) a broad concept of Extension's educational responsibilities and opportunities, by Tennessee's Extension leaders; (2) a desire to reach more people

> leaders; (2) a desire to reach more people with Extension's educational efforts; and (3) to help community groups understand and learn to use the problem solving approach as a means to improve their farms, their homes, and their communities" (8:2).

The Extension program in community development received added stimulus in 1958 as a result of the "Scope Report" which delineated Extension's educational responsibility in nine areas of program emphasis, among them was community improvement and resource development (22:8-12).

Over the years with a rapid pace of socio-economic change Extension has been called upon to provide educational assistance to a much broader audience. Increasing emphasis has been placed on an enlarged concept of community development (now called community resource development) which has focused attention on the county, or a larger area, as the community. However, Extension's first responsibility is to the farm family, but not them only (15:177).

In the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977, Congress set forth a broadened scope for Extension programs by emphasizing that states and counties must retain flexibility for scope of programs and definitions of Extension clientele. Ways must be found to reach more people with educational programs through the Cooperative Extension system. The dissemination of research knowledge and the application of that knowledge to practical problems is as

important now as it ever was. However, today's situations and conditions are much different than those of previous years. The rapid changes of the past decade necessitate a re-examination of the national mission and programs of Cooperative Extension (9:7).

The basic mission of Cooperative Extension is essentially the same as the previous 73 years of its existence. However, in carrying out this mission, the following program goals are central:

> (1) to provide information to farmers and agribusinesses that will help them strengthen U.S. agriculture through efficiencies in marketing, distribution, and production, assuring an abundant and safe supply of food and fiber for American consumers and for export, (2) to enhance the ability of individuals and groups in making decisions for wise use and management of the nation's natural, renewable, and non-renewable resources, while assuring a protected environment for an improved quality of life for all citizens, (3) to aid in strengthening the institutions of home and family and the development of individual life skills, attitudes, and values among adults and youth; these contribute to a self-directing, productive, and harmonious society, (4) to strengthen the capabilities of individuals, communities, and state and local governments in order that they may deal more effectively with public policy issues and local needs or problems, (5) to cooperate with other agencies and institutions of local, state, and federal governments and the private sector in the development and conduct of educational and informational programs for the public (9:7).

The factors outlined above and the interpretation of the significance of these factors to Extension and those it serves, constitute a most significant challenge to all directly concerned. Extension, as a public agency, needs to

examine these facts carefully, objectively, and conscientiously, with a determination to insure that its efforts today and tomorrow are carefully attuned to the most conspicuous needs.

## II. CURRENT AND FUTURE IMPLICATIONS

Eddman and Darow (11:120) report that many farm families are experiencing severe financial stress under conditions of low commodity prices, high debt loads, and high interest rates. As a result, many farm families experience emotional stress as they face the possibility of farm foreclosure, changing occupations and moving to a new location. If they are able to stay on the farm, they may face low family income and be unable to achieve their family goals unless they seek off-farm work.

Behm and Moore (11:126) report the lack of sufficient income to pay debts and maintain the family's usual style of living is obviously a major problem. However, the lack of income combined with limited prospects for improvement create a great variety of related problems facing farmers today.

Bradley and Faas (11:129) stated that in examining how rural communities are affected by human stress and adjustment in agriculture, two concerns stand out; (1) the ability of rural communities to survive under such stress,

and (2) their capability to create additional economic alternatives for people displaced from farm and other rural community employment.

Development of rural America has not been uniform and without problems. There are still many underdeveloped rural areas in America. Policies designed to improve the welfare of rural America are twofold. There are some rural problems that can be solved through developing national policies, but there are others that can only be solved through locally and regionally developed policies (10:81).

Underlying the current and future problems in agriculture are old questions concerning our national resources: to what extent are private landowners to be limited in the use of their lands for public good and how should public lands best be used for the good of all? These issues are involved in the competition for land between farming and housing, in the controversy over dumping of hazardous wastes, in logging our forest on both public and private lands, in the sharing of the water supply, and in many other areas as well. Soil erosion will require much more prudent targeting in the coming century if current conservation strategies are to be effective. Proper management of our forest demands comprehensive policies to balance recreational and commercial uses and to allow the market in forest products the freest possible pay (18:26).

# III. NEED FOR THE STUDY

In order to conduct an effective community resource development program, extension agents need to know what the Extension clientele and county leaders perceive as community problem areas and to what degree. If community leaders differ in their perception of what the community problems are (based on the area they live in or what audience group they are in), then this can have an impact on what problem areas are improved and how an extension agent goes about conducting a community resource development program.

Community resource development involves numerous problem areas, some of which are generally beyond the usual scope of Cooperative Extension programs. For this study, seven problem areas were selected which, in the opinion of this writer, are more closely related to the mission of the Tennessee Agriculture Extension Service.

This study can be used in improving and strengthening the overall ongoing Community Resource Development program of the University of Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service. At the county level this study will hopefully serve as an instrument to evaluate the success of past programs and provide benchmark data for developing future programs.

## IV. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The general purpose was to identify or disclose similarities or differences between county leaders perception of seven selected community problem areas.

More specific objectives were:

1. To determine if the perception of community leaders from three audience groups differed.

2. To determine if the perception of community leaders about seven community problem areas changed over a time period.

3. To determine if the perception of community leaders living in different areas differed, regarding seven community problem areas.

## V. LIMITATIONS

The scope of objectives one and three in this study was limited to data gathered in the 1984 Community Resource Development survey. The scope of objective two included both the 1980 and the 1984 surveys.

This state wide survey included 31 predetermined community problem areas in 1980 and 32 problem areas in 1984. For this study , problem areas were limited to seven, selected by this writer to be more closely related to the mission of Extension.

The distinction of "area of residence" was based on the five Extension District boundary lines and geographic areas of East, Middle, and West Tennessee. Extension district V being east, extension districts II, III, and IV being middle, and extension district I being West Tennessee.

The study audience was composed of twelve surveyed audience groups from Tennessee counties excluding four metropolitan areas and five counties not conducting surveys.

## VI. METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

The population of this study included selected county leaders belonging to twelve county leader groups in 86 Tennessee counties.

County Extension Agents collected the data through surveys (appendix ) and returned the completed surveys to the Agricultural Extension Education Office. The recommended survey groups for each county were:

1. County Rural Development Committee (all members)
2. County Government Officials (judge and four officials)
3. Homemaker Club Presidents (all)
4. Community Club Presidents (all)
5. Senior 4-H Club Presidents (all)
6. Service Club Presidents (all)

7. County Extension Advisory Committee (all members)
8. Ministers (five representatives)
9. Merchants (five representatives)
10. Bankers (all)
11. School Officials (all principals and superintendents)
12. Newspaper Editor

A study population of 3,903 county leaders belonging to 12 survey audience groups from 86 Tennessee counties comprised the initial survey audiences. These 12 groups were combined by similarities into the: (1) extension-related audience; (2) non-extension-related audience; and (3) bankers audience. County leaders included in the extension audience were: county rural development committee; homemaker club presidents; community club presidents; senior 4-H club presidents; and county extension advisory committee. County leaders included in the professional audience were: county government officials; service club presidents; ministers; merchants; school officials; and newspaper editors. County leaders included in the bankers audience were all county bankers.

The survey form was designed to obtain information regarding county leaders ratings of 31 (1980) and 32 (1984) problem areas with regard to Community Resource Development.

This survey instrument was developed by the specialist staff in the Agriculture Economics and Resource Development section of the Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service.

Data from the survey were coded and punched on computer cards. Computations were made by the University of Tennessee, Knoxville Computer Center. The Chi-Square Test was used to determine significance of relationships between variables. The 0.05 probability level was accepted as being significant.

## VII. DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. Bankers Audience.Refers to all financial institutions' managers that responded to the survey.

2. Community Leaders or County Leaders. Refers to selected people holding formal job responsibilities who are responsible for decision making in their respective areas. Their actions in some way affect the community.

3. District I. Refers to the 21 counties in the West Tennessee Extension District I.

4. District II,III,&IV. Refers to the 53 counties in the Central Tennessee Extension Districts of II,III,&IV.

5. District V. Refers to the 21 counties on the East Tennessee Extension District V.

6. Extension Audience or Extension Related Audience. Terms used to describe five groups of county leaders that are in some way Extension related. Groups that made up this audience were: County Rural Development Committee Members, Homemaker Club Presidents, Community Club Presidents, Senior 4-H Club Presidents, and County Extension Advisory Committee.

7. Non-Extension Audience or Non-Extension Related Audience or Professional Audience. Refers to six groups of county leaders, which traditionally are not in close working contact with the Extension Service. Groups making up this audience were: County Government Officials, Merchants, Ministers, Newspaper Editors, School Principals, and Service Club Presidents.

# CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES

In order to establish some generally accepted concepts and in an effort to identify differences that exist between community leaders perception of community problem areas, this chapter will be devoted to a review of related available literature. To facilitate the review, this chapter is divided into the following sections: (1) community leaders perception of local agriculture, (2) community leaders perception of conservation of soil, water, and timber, (3) community leaders perception of family income, (4) community leaders perception of family living conditions, (5) community leaders perception of condition of homes, (6) community leaders perception of recreational opportunities, and (7) community leaders perception of community organizations.

### I. COMMUNITY LEADERS PERCEPTION OF LOCAL AGRICULTURE

Beegle, Bryantt and Hathaway (3:174-198) reported that in the United States the rural farm population had a lower median income than did the rural non-farm population and the rural non-farm population had a lower median income than did the urban population. They further concluded that these

differences arose because of two reasons: 1) a larger portion of the urban labor force is employed in occupations in which earnings are higher, and 2) on the average, urban workers receive substantially higher earnings within all non-farm occupations than do rural workers.

Further study by Beegle, Bryantt and Hathaway (3:184-191) revealed the earnings level of professional, clerical, technical, and kindred occupations was higher in the earnings scale of occupations. For the United States, urban residents in these occupations had median earnings one-fifth above their rural non-farm counterparts and two-fifths above rural farm males in the same occupation groups. Their studies further conclude that males of the rural-farm population were,for the most part, employed as a farmer or farm laborer in agriculture. While on the other hand, when employed outside of agriculture, they were concentrated in the lower paying occupations that required less skill or education.

Bock and Burchinal (7:173) in their study of farm and non-farm families in two Iowa counties found that more non-farm wives were employed, proportionately, than farm wives (in off-farm occupations).

Hayes and Dunkelberger (16:1-4) conducted a study to explore the aspirations of rural youth in Alabama. They found that the majority of their sample was employed. The occupations were broken down into 35.8 percent professional,

technical and managerial occupations, 30.0 percent in clerical and craftsman jobs, 28.2 percent in low or limited skill jobs, and 1.4 percent in farming.

Ahmad (1:28-29) in a comparison study found that in 1984, local agriculture was rated good by leaders in both rural and urban counties. Further study by Ahmad (1:47-54) revealed no significant differences existed in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to local agriculture as rated by county leaders belonging to five extension related audiences. There were no differences found in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to local agriculture as rated by county leaders belonging to seven non-extension audiences, according to Ahmad's findings.

A comparison of ratings by community leaders between 1979 and 1984 of local agriculture revealed that rural counties rated local agriculture significantly higher in 1979 than in 1984. Ahmad (1:98) further concluded there were no significant differences in the urban counties leaders ratings of local agriculture in 1979 compared to 1984.

Amonett (2:36-39) reported that in 1979, local agriculture was rated good by leaders in both rural and urban counties. Amonett (2:64) further reported, no significant differences were found between rural and urban county leaders (from extension-related audiences) ratings of local agriculture. Similarly, Amonett (2:82) reported that no significant differences were found between rural and

urban leaders (from non-extension-related audiences) ratings of local agriculture. Even though no significant differences were found between the two groups' ratings of local agriculture, Amonett stated rural county leaders tended to rate local agriculture higher than did urban county leaders.

## II. COMMUNITY LEADERS PERCEPTION OF CONSERVATION OF SOIL, WATER, AND TIMBER

Carlson, Lasey and Lasey (6:69-70) indicated that rural areas have better environmental quality than urban areas. Dillman and Tremblay (8:115-129) also reported that rural areas have better environmental quality than urban areas.

Wilkening (10:20) reported that pollution occurring in rural areas originated in urban centers. Urban industries and energy plants essential to urban growth produce most of the rural environmental problems.

Lowe and Pinkey (13:114-128),in a study to find rural-urban differences in support of environmental protection, found that rural residents were less supportive than urban residents.

Johnson and Knop (11:544-548), in their study of community satisfaction found that the rural community was more satisfied with their general geographical surroundings than was the urban community.

Buntley and Vaigneur (18:TN018) reported that soil erosion resulting from improper land use and management is a major problem for Tennessee farmers and severe erosion problems exist in 60 percent of the counties. Uncontrolled soil erosion is seriously reducing crop yields, farm income, land values, and is contributing to water quality problems.

Hudson (18:TN046) reported that most farmers in Tennessee could increase their net farm income with the proper resource allocation, which normally involves farming the land intensively in the high profit row-crops. Soil erosion compounds the problem in West Tennessee because this area has one of the highest soil losses per acre in the nation.

Buntley (18:TN023) reported that Reelfoot Lake and its watershed is an area that has significant agriculture related water quality problems. These problems are contributing to the accelerated silting-in and eutrophication of the lake. The major agriculture related water quality problems in the lake are centered around siltation caused by excessive erosion from cropland within the watershed.

In "A Response to America's Critical Concerns," (19:14) it was stated that "one of the most critical challenges facing extension is educating farmers and nonfarmers about a nonrenewable resource-groundwater supplies." Renewable Resource Extension Program (17:17)

reported that most of the general public and many public policy makers do not realize the extent of the contribution of forest lands to national, state, and local economies. Nor do they understand the relationship of these lands to water supplies and water quality, wildlife and fisheries habitat, forage, and environmental quality. Because there are a wide variety of viewpoints, perspectives, and divergent goals, public policy education is critical to renewable resource management. Environmental management of renewable resources is more than a simple technical process. It cannot be successful without broad public involvement and support. People need to know why they should be involved, how they can become involved, and the legal and programmatic requirements of being involved in environmental management planning.

Ahmad (1:42) reported that no significant differences were found between the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to conservation of natural resources in 1984. Ahmad (1:71) further found there were no significant differences between rural and urban county leaders (from five extension-related audience groups) ratings of conservation of natural resources. Ahmad (1:93) additionally found there were no significant differences between non-extension related audience groups from rural versus urban counties with regard to conservation of natural resources. Ahmad's study (1:109) did however reveal

significant differences in rural county leaders ratings of conservation of natural resources in 1979 versus 1984. Rural county leaders rated conservation of natural resources higher in 1979 than they did in 1984. A significant difference was not found in the urban leaders ratings of 1979 versus 1984.

Amonett (2:51) reported there were no significant differences between rural and urban leaders ratings of conservation of soil, water, and timber in 1979. Amonett (2:69) further reported there were no significant differences between rural and urban leaders (from Extension-related audience groups) ratings of conservation of soil, water, and timber. However, Amonett (2:105) did find significant differences between rural and urban leaders (from non-extension-related audience groups) ratings of conservation of soil, water, and timber.

## III. COMMUNITY LEADERS PERCEPTION OF FAMILY INCOME

Ahmad (1:36) reported that urban counties were rated higher than rural counties with regard to family income. Ahmad (1:63) also found there were significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties within the county rural development committee, home demonstration club presidents, community club presidents, and county

agriculture extension committee audience groups with regard to family income. Urban county leaders in those audience groups rated family income higher than rural county leaders. Within the non-extension-related audience groups, Ahmad (1:86) reported there were significant differences. Urban county leaders rated family income higher than rural county leaders from the non-extension-related audience. Ahmad's (1:100) comparison of 1979 and 1984 ratings of family income showed significant differences within the rural counties whereas there were no significant differences within urban counties. Rural county leaders rated family income higher in 1979 than in 1984.

Amonett (2:39) reported there were significant differences between rural and urban county leaders ratings of family income. Urban county leaders rated its status higher than did rural county leaders. Amonett (2:63) reported that within the extension-related audience groups ratings of family income there were significant differences found between rural and urban counties. Amonett (2:85) further found significant differences in the ratings of family income by six of seven groups of county leaders (government officials, service club presidents, ministers, merchants, bankers, and school principals) in rural verses urban counties. Urban leaders in these groups rated the status of family income higher than did rural county leaders.

The 1984 Extension Progress Report (18:TN092) reported that Tennessee's per capita income in 1982 was $8,849. In comparison with the other 49 states, Tennessee ranks 46th.

Beegle, Bryantt and Hathaway (3:197-198) reported that the median income of rural residents in the United States was below the median income of urban residents. This pattern has persisted for several decades without any change. This difference was due to the low percentage of persons employed and low average income of rural residents. The gap was greater and more obvious in the southern States.

Fitzsimmons and Freedman (9:17) reported that in the late 1970's rural residents' incomes were catching up with the income of urban residents. During that time, rural residents' incomes were about 80 percent of urban residents' incomes.

Johnson and Knop (11:544-548) in their study, surprisingly found that rural residents were more satisfied with their salary scale than were the urban residents.

Dillman and Tremblay (8:115-129) reported in 1969 the average national family income was $9,590, with $7,615 for non-metropolitan families and $10,406 for metro families. Mugge and Eppley (4:46) reported that the United States, urban residents received more child welfare services (86.8 percent) than did rural residents (69.8 percent).

# IV. COMMUNITY LEADERS PERCEPTION OF FAMILY LIVING CONDITIONS

Ahmad (1:36) reported that urban counties were rated higher than rural counties with regard to family living conditions. Ahmad (1:64) further reported that home demonstration club presidents in urban counties rated family living conditions higher than their peer group from rural counties. No significant differences were found between rural and urban leaders in county rural development committee, community club presidents, senior 4-H club presidents, and county agriculture extension committee groups. With regard to the non-extension-related audience groups, Ahmad (1:87) reported there were significant differences between rural and urban leaders from non-extension-related audiences. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties in regard to family living conditions. Ahmad's comparison (1:106) of 1979 and 1984 ratings of family living conditions showed significant differences in the urban counties. Leaders in urban counties rated family living conditions higher in 1984 than in 1979. No significant differences were found in the ratings by leaders in rural counties ratings of family living conditions in 1979 and 1984.

Amonett (2:51) reported that urban county leaders rated the present status of family living conditions higher

than did rural county leaders. Amonett (2:63) further reported that within the extension-related audience groups ratings of family living conditions there were significant differences found between rural and urban counties. Further findings by Amonett (2:106) showed that government officials, service club presidents and merchants from urban counties rated family living conditions higher than did those from rural counties. No significant differences were found between rural and urban county leader's ratings of family living conditions by ministers, bankers, school principals, and editors.

Loomis and Beegle(12:69) reported that on the whole, rural families are more often larger than urban families. They state that this situation exists because the rural family is a production unit that needs workers (farm youth) whereas, the urban family needs to be mobile and rapidly adaptable to a changing society.

Saunders (15:86) describes traditional (rural) and modern (urban) values. He concludes that traditional values include such things as loyalty to family, land ownership as a sacred trust, conservatism, submission to nature and fatalism while urban values include individual rights, land as a commodity, progress, mastery over nature, efficient use of time and acceptance of the possibility of change. Loomis and Beegle (12:76-77) indicate that rural and urban people differ with regard of marriage, in that urban males are more

frequently married than rural males. Urban females, on the other hand, are less frequently married than rural females. They also note that the proportion of widowed or divorced persons, for both sexes, is higher for the urban population than for the rural population.

Roy (7:175) in a study of rural and town families found that rural families benefited from the employment of the mother. He also indicated that the children of working rural mothers show less delinquency, have more affection, more fairness and are more cooperative.

In a Detroit study, Copp (7:180) indicated farm and city wives had different beliefs about what children mean to parents. He further disclosed that with city wives, raising children meant emotional satisfaction, while on the other hand, farm wives believed that children provided parents with companionship, strengthen the home, provide security, and help for the parents.

## V. COMMUNITY LEADERS PERCEPTION OF CONDITION OF HOMES

Ahmad (1:35) reported that urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on condition of homes. Further research by Ahmad (1:49) showed that ratings of rural and urban counties were not significantly different in three audiences that were extension-related (county rural development committee, senior 4-H club presidents, and county agricultural extension committee) with regard to

condition of homes. Significant differences were found, however in two extension-related audience groups (home demonstration club presidents and community club presidents), urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on condition of homes by these two groups. Within the non-extension related audience groups Ahmad (1:86) reported significant differences between rural and urban county leaders. Non-extension-related leaders rated urban counties higher than rural counties with regard to condition of homes. In a comparison of 1979 ratings and 1984 ratings on condition of homes, Ahmad (1:106) reported that both rural and urban leaders rated condition of homes higher in 1984 than in 1979.

Amonett (2:49) reported that urban county leaders rated the present status of condition of homes higher than did rural county leaders. Further findings by Amonett (2:69) reported that within the extension-related audience groups' ratings of condition of homes there were significant differences between rural and urban leaders. Urban county leaders rated condition of homes higher than did rural county leaders. Further findings by Amonett (2:103) showed that there were significant differences between rural and urban county leaders' ratings of the present status of condition of homes in three of the seven county leader groups (government officials, service club presidents, and merchants). Urban county leaders in these groups rated

condition of homes higher than did rural county leaders. No significant differences were found between rural and urban county leaders' ratings of condition of homes in the remaining four remaining non-extension-related leader groups (ministers, bankers, school principals, and editors).

Carlson, Lasey and Lasey (6:70) reported a majority of federal housing funds went to metropolitan areas while lower quality housing was found in rural areas, where 59 percent of rural housing had inadequate kitchen facilities.

Fitzsimmons and Freedman (9:17) reported that rural housing was far behind its urban counterpart. Even though rural residents make up only 26 percent of the United States population, 44 percent of the inadequate housing is located in the rural areas.

Herbers (4:F1 and F6) reported in a news article that about 4.5 million houses were inadequate. High interest rates, increased prices of building materials,a depressed agricultural economy, and increased foreclosure rates on home mortgages will create a wider gap between rural and urban housing.

According to Dillman and Tremblay (8:115-129) even though non-metropolitan home ownership was 70 percent compared to 60 percent for metropolitan residents, their median property value was only $12,200 compared to $19,000 for metropolitan residents in 1970.

Major concerns in residential housing and equipment

include the high cost of obtaining and maintaining both the housing unit and the equipment and appliances used in the home (18:TN102). The "Agriculture Extension Service Progress Report," 1984 further reported a large segment of our population is finding that home ownership is an impossibility because their incomes are not sufficient to purchase even a modest house. It is estimated that 60 percent of the nations substandard housing is in rural areas.

## VI. COMMUNITY LEADERS PERCEPTION OF RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Ahmad (1:44) reported that the ratings of recreational opportunities for rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on recreational opportunities. Further research by Ahmad (1:73) showed that significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on recreational opportunities by four of five extension related audiences. Each of these audiences (county rural development committee, home demonstration club presidents, community club presidents, and county agriculture extension committee) rated urban counties higher than rural counties as to recreational opportunities. No significant differences were found in the ratings of senior 4-H club presidents.

Within the non-extension-related audience groups, Ahmad (1:95) reported that urban county leaders rated recreational opportunities higher than did rural leaders from the same non-extension-related professions. In a comparison of 1979 ratings and 1984 ratings of recreational opportunities, Ahmad (1:109-110) reported that rural counties rated recreational opportunities higher in 1984 than in 1979. No significant differences were found between the urban leaders ratings in 1979 and 1984.

Amonett (2:53) reported that urban county leaders rated the status of recreational opportunities higher than did rural county leaders. Additional findings by Amonett (2:69) reported that urban county leaders from extension related audiences rated recreational opportunities higher than did rural county leaders from extension-related audiences. Further findings by Amonett (2:108-109) showed there were significant differences in the ratings of recreational opportunities by rural and urban leaders in five of seven county leader groups (government officials, service club presidents, ministers, merchants, and school officials). Urban county leaders in these county leader groups rated recreational opportunities higher than did rural county leaders. No significant differences were found between rural and urban county leaders' ratings of the status of recreational opportunities by bankers or editors.

Carlson, Lasey and Lasey (6:69-70) indicated that in general, rural areas have better environmental quality than urban areas. There are more trees, open spaces, and accessible natural recreation sites, whereas urban recreational activities are mostly done indoors.

Rural residents have less leisure time as reported by Dillman and Tremblay (8:115-129). They reported that rural residents only have 91 activity days per year for recreation compared to 97 activity days per year for urban residents.

## VII. COMMUNITY LEADERS PERCEPTION OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

Ahmad (1:42) found significant differences between rural and urban county leaders ratings of community organizations. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties with regard to community organizations. Additional research by Ahmad found there were no significant differences between the ratings of rural and urban counties on community organizations by four of five of extension related audiences,(home demonstration club presidents, community club presidents, senior 4-H club presidents and county agricultural extension committee). While significant differences were found in the ratings of county rural development committee; leaders in this audience group rated

urban counties higher than rural counties as to community organizations. Within the non-extension audience group, Ahmad (1:92-93) reported significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban county leaders on community organizations. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties with regard to community organizations. In a comparison of 1979 and 1984 ratings, Ahmad reported that community organizations were rated higher in 1984 than in 1979 by rural county leaders. Whereas urban county leaders rated community organizations higher in 1979 than in 1984.

Amonett(2:53-54) reported that urban county leaders rated community organizations higher than did rural county leaders. Additional findings by Amonett (2:69) reported that urban county leaders from extension-related audiences rated community organizations higher than did rural county leaders from extension-related audiences. Further findings by Amonett(2:110) showed that there were significant differences between rural and urban county leaders' ratings of community organizations in three of seven county leader groups (government officials, service club presidents, and school principals). Urban county leaders in these leader groups rated community organizations higher than did rural county leaders. No significant differences were found between rural and urban leaders from four of seven county

leader groups (ministers, merchants, bankers, and editors).

Change is expected over a time period, but how much change, and in what direction, are questions a change agent must have answers to. A majority of literature sited, did not directly address the seven community problem areas considered in this study. Therefor, to provide bench-mark information for program planning and further study, this research will aid in determining what changes have taken place in recent years.

# CHAPTER III

## RATINGS OF SEVEN COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS BY THREE AUDIENCE GROUPS

The purpose of this chapter was to disclose whether or not the perception of community leaders from three audience groups differed in their ratings of seven community problem areas. Those audience groups being 1) the extension audience, 2) the professional audience, and 3) the bankers audience.This chapter is divided into sections by the year in which ratings were made, 1980 and 1984.

In Section I major findings are reported regarding differences between three audience groups ratings of seven community problem areas in 1980.

In Section II major findings are reported regarding differences between three audience groups ratings of seven community problem areas in 1984.

Ratings of the seven community problem areas were reported and compared by the use of tables. The Chi-Square test was used to compare the significance of the differences between the three audience groups ratings of poor, fair, and good. Ratings of the seven community problem areas by three audience groups in 1980 are reported in Table I.

Table I. Ratings Of Seven Community Problem Areas By Three Audience Groups In 1980.

| Problem Areas | Audience: Extension No. | Extension % | Professional No. | Professional % | Bankers No. | Bankers % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Local Agriculture | | | | | | |
| Poor | 36 | 2.0 | 29 | 1.6 | 4 | 1.4 |
| Fair | 707 | 40.0 | 612 | 33.3 | 98 | 33.7 |
| Good | 1025 | 58.0 | 1195 | 65.1 | 189 | 64.9 |
| Total | 1768 | 100.0 | 1836 | 100.0 | 291 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=20.79 | p=0.05 | | | | | |
| Conservation of Soil, Water, Timber | | | | | | |
| Poor | 299 | 17.0 | 245 | 13.4 | 38 | 13.3 |
| Fair | 1033 | 58.6 | 1076 | 58.9 | 162 | 56.6 |
| Good | 430 | 24.4 | 507 | 27.7 | 86 | 30.1 |
| Total | 1762 | 100.0 | 1828 | 100.0 | 286 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=13.78 | p=0.05 | | | | | |
| Family Income | | | | | | |
| Poor | 251 | 14.2 | 311 | 16.9 | 40 | 13.8 |
| Fair | 1231 | 69.6 | 1229 | 66.8 | 193 | 66.8 |
| Good | 286 | 16.2 | 300 | 16.3 | 56 | 19.4 |
| Total | 1768 | 100.0 | 1840 | 100.0 | 289 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=7.54 | p=0.11 | | | | | |
| Family Living Conditions | | | | | | |
| Poor | 60 | 3.4 | 74 | 4.0 | 6 | 2.1 |
| Fair | 1146 | 64.8 | 1226 | 66.7 | 163 | 56.8 |
| Good | 562 | 31.8 | 539 | 29.3 | 118 | 41.1 |
| Total | 1768 | 100.0 | 1839 | 100.0 | 287 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=17.99 | p=0.05 | | | | | |
| Condition of Homes | | | | | | |
| Poor | 90 | 5.1 | 75 | 4.1 | 10 | 3.5 |
| Fair | 1186 | 66.7 | 1286 | 70.0 | 192 | 66.7 |
| Good | 501 | 28.2 | 477 | 26.0 | 86 | 29.9 |
| Total | 1777 | 100.0 | 1838 | 100.0 | 288 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=6.59 | p=0.16 | | | | | |
| Recreational Opportunities | | | | | | |
| Poor | 626 | 35.7 | 644 | 35.4 | 89 | 30.7 |
| Fair | 724 | 41.3 | 808 | 44.4 | 124 | 42.8 |
| Good | 404 | 23.0 | 369 | 20.3 | 77 | 26.6 |
| Total | 1754 | 100.0 | 1821 | 100.0 | 290 | 100.0 |
| Chi Square=9.89 | p=0.05 | | | | | |
| Community Organizations | | | | | | |
| Poor | 253 | 14.3 | 202 | 11.0 | 32 | 11.1 |
| Fair | 851 | 48.2 | 921 | 50.1 | 140 | 48.6 |
| Good | 661 | 37.5 | 714 | 38.9 | 116 | 40.3 |
| Total | 1765 | 100.0 | 1837 | 100.0 | 288 | 100.0 |
| Chi Square=9.98 | p=0.05 | | | | | |

# I. RATINGS OF SEVEN COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS BY THREE AUDIENCE GROUPS IN 1980

Section I presents findings regarding differences in the extension audience, the professional audience, and the bankers audience ratings of seven community problem areas in 1980. This section is divided into seven sub-sections which include: present status of local agriculture, present status of conservation of soil, water, and timber, present status of family income, present status of family living conditions, present status of condition of homes, present status of recreational opportunities, and present status of community organizations.

## Present Status Of Local Agriculture

Approximately 58 percent of the extension audience rated the status of local agriculture as being good, while 65.1 percent of the professional audience rated its status as being good, and 64.9 percent of the bankers audience rated the status of local agriculture as being good.

Comparisons between the three audiences showed that a lower percentage of the extension audience rated the status of local agriculture as being good than did the professional or bankers audience.

When the Chi-Square test was applied to these data a significant difference was found in the ratings of local agriculture. The extension audience rated local agriculture lower than did either the professional audience or the bankers audience.

Present Status Of Conservation Of Soil,Water,And Timber

Approximately 59 percent of the extension audience rated the status of conservation of soil, water, and timber fair while only 24.4 percent rated the status of conservation good. Approximately 59 percent of the professional audience also rated the status of conservation of soil, water, and timber fair while 27.7 percent rated the status of conservation good. Of the bankers audience 56.6 percent rated the status of conservation of soil, water, and timber fair while 30.1 percent of the bankers audience rated the status of conservation of soil, water, and timber good.

Comparisons between the three audience groups showed that a larger percentage of bankers rated conservation of soil, water, and timber as being good than did either the professional or extension audiences.

Application of the Chi-Square test to these data showed there were significant differences between the three audience groups. Bankers rated the present status of

conservation of soil, water, and timber higher than did the extension or professional audiences.

## Present Status Of Family Income

Approximately 70 percent of the extension audience rated the present status of family income fair while 16.2 percent rated family income good. Approximately 67 percent of the professional audience rated family income fair and 16.3 percent rated family income good. The majority or 67 percent of the bankers rated family income fair and 19.4 percent rated family income good. Comparisons between the three audiences showed that a slightly higher percentage of bankers rated family income as being good than did the extension or professional audiences.

When the Chi-Square test was applied to these data, no significant differences were found between the three audience groups in their ratings of present status of family income ($p>.05$). These findings suggest that the extension, professional, and bankers audience groups were similar in their appraisal of status of family income and all three audiences regard it for the most part as being fair.

## Present Status Of Family Living Conditions

Family living conditions were rated fair by more than half of each audience group. Of the extension audience 64.8 percent rated family living conditions fair and 31.8 percent rated family living conditions good. Similarly, of the professional audience 66.7 percent rated family living conditions fair while 29.3 percent rated family living conditions good. Of the bankers audience 56.8 percent rated family living conditions fair while 41.1 percent rated it good.

Application of the Chi-Square test indicated there were significant differences in the ratings of family living conditions ($p<.05$). The bankers audience rated the present status of family living conditions higher than did the extension audience, but the most difference was shown between the bankers and professional audiences.

## Present Status Of Condition Of Homes

Condition of homes was rated fair by more than half of each audience group. Of the extension audience 66.7 percent rated condition of homes fair while 28.2 percent rated condition of homes good. Similarly, of the professional audience 70 percent rated condition of homes fair while 26 percent rated condition of homes good. Of the bankers

audience 66.7 percent rated conditions of homes fair while 29.9 percent rated condition of homes good.

Comparison by application of the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant differences ($p>.05$) in the ratings of condition of homes, between the three audience groups. A similar percentage of each audience group rated the condition of homes as being either poor, fair, or good.

## Present Status Of Recreational Opportunities

Recreational opportunities was rated fair by the highest percentage of each audience group. Of the extension audience 41.3 percent rated recreational opportunities fair while 23 percent rated recreational opportunities good. Of the professional audience 44.4 percent rated recreational opportunities fair and 20.3 percent rated it good. Of the bankers audience 42.8 percent rated recreational opportunities fair while 26.6 percent rated it good.

Application of the Chi-Square test indicated there were significant differences ($p<.05$) between the three audience groups ratings of recreational opportunities. Bankers rated the present status of recreational opportunities higher than did the extension audience but the

greatest difference was between the bankers and professional audiences.

Present Status Of Community Organizations

Community organizations were rated fair by the highest percentage of each audience group. Of the extension audience 48.2 percent rated community organizations fair while 37.5 percent rated them good. Of the professional audience 50.1 percent rated community organizations fair and 38.8 percent rated them good. Of the bankers audience 48.6 percent rated community organizations fair while 40.3 percent rated them good.

Comparison by application of the Chi-Square test indicated there were significant differences ($p<.05$) between the three audience groups ratings of community organizations. The extension audience rated community organizations lower than did either the professional or banker audiences.

## II. RATINGS OF SEVEN COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS BY THREE AUDIENCE GROUPS IN 1984

Section II (Table II) presents findings regarding differences in the Extension Audience, the Professional Audience, and the bankers audience ratings of seven

Table II. Ratings Of Seven Community Problem Areas By Three Audience Groups In 1984

| Problem Areas | Audiences: Extension No. | Extension % | Professional No. | Professional % | Bankers No. | Bankers % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Local Agriculture | | | | | | |
| Poor | 47 | 2.6 | 41 | 2.3 | 19 | 5.9 |
| Fair | 732 | 40.2 | 694 | 38.6 | 153 | 47.7 |
| Good | 1040 | 57.2 | 1062 | 59.1 | 149 | 46.4 |
| Total | 1819 | 100.0 | 1797 | 100.0 | 321 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=26.70 | p=0.05 | | | | | |
| Conservation of Soil, Water, Timber | | | | | | |
| Poor | 288 | 16.0 | 254 | 14.3 | 46 | 14.5 |
| Fair | 1104 | 61.5 | 1062 | 59.9 | 209 | 65.9 |
| Good | 404 | 22.5 | 458 | 25.8 | 62 | 19.6 |
| Total | 1796 | 100.0 | 1774 | 100.0 | 317 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=10.24 | p=0.05 | | | | | |
| Family Income | | | | | | |
| Poor | 315 | 17.4 | 347 | 19.3 | 65 | 20.6 |
| Fair | 1266 | 69.9 | 1215 | 67.6 | 214 | 67.9 |
| Good | 230 | 12.7 | 235 | 13.1 | 36 | 11.4 |
| Total | 1811 | 100.0 | 1797 | 100.0 | 315 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=3.91 | p=0.42 | | | | | |
| Family Living Conditions | | | | | | |
| Poor | 61 | 3.4 | 57 | 3.2 | 4 | 1.2 |
| Fair | 1165 | 64.3 | 1116 | 62.5 | 192 | 59.6 |
| Good | 586 | 32.3 | 614 | 34.4 | 126 | 39.1 |
| Total | 1812 | 100.0 | 1787 | 100.0 | 322 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=9.19 | p=0.06 | | | | | |
| Condition of Homes | | | | | | |
| Poor | 49 | 2.7 | 50 | 2.8 | 6 | 1.9 |
| Fair | 1064 | 58.4 | 1018 | 57.1 | 174 | 54.5 |
| Good | 709 | 38.9 | 716 | 40.1 | 139 | 43.6 |
| Total | 1822 | 100.0 | 1784 | 100.0 | 319 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=3.21 | p=0.52 | | | | | |
| Recreational Opportunities | | | | | | |
| Poor | 623 | 34.0 | 579 | 32.2 | 93 | 28.9 |
| Fair | 804 | 43.8 | 726 | 40.4 | 142 | 44.1 |
| Good | 407 | 22.2 | 492 | 27.4 | 87 | 27.0 |
| Total | 1834 | 100.0 | 1797 | 100.0 | 322 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=15.66 | p=0.05 | | | | | |
| Community Organizations | | | | | | |
| Poor | 203 | 11.1 | 151 | 8.4 | 30 | 9.4 |
| Fair | 866 | 47.4 | 835 | 46.5 | 151 | 47.3 |
| Good | 757 | 41.5 | 809 | 45.1 | 138 | 43.3 |
| Total | 1826 | 100.0 | 1795 | 100.0 | 319 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=9.74 | p=0.05 | | | | | |

community problem areas in 1984. This section is divided into seven sub-sections which include: Present status of local agriculture,present status of conservation of soil, water, and timber, present status of family income, present status of family living conditions, present status of condition of homes, present status of recreational opportunities, and present status of community organizations.

## Present Status Of Local Agriculture

Approximately 58 percent of the extension audience rated the status of local agriculture good, while 59.1 percent of the professional audience rated its status good, and 46.4 percent of the bankers audience rated the status of local agriculture good. Comparisons between the three audiences showed that a higher percentage of the extension and professional audiences rated the status of local agriculture good than did the bankers audience.

When the Chi-Square test was applied to these data a significant difference was found in the ratings of local agriculture. The bankers audience rated local agriculture lower than did either the extension audience or the professional audience.

## Present Status Of Conservation Of Soil,Water,And Timber

Approximately 62 percent of the extension audience rated the status of conservation of soil, water, and timber fair while only 22.5 percent rated the status of conservation good. Approximately 60 percent of the professional audience rated the status of conservation of soil, water, and timber fair while 25.8 percent rated the status of conservation good. Of the bankers audience 65.9 percent rated the status of conservation of soil, water, and timber fair while 19.6 percent of the bankers audience rated the status of conservation of soil, water, and timber good. Comparisons between the three audience groups showed that a lower percentage of bankers rated conservation of soil, water, and timber good than did either the professional or extension audiences.

Application of the Chi-Square test to these data showed there were significant differences between the three audience groups. Bankers rated the present status of conservation of soil, water, and timber lower than did the extension or professional audiences.

## Present Status Of Family Income

Approximately 70 percent of the extension audience rated the present status of family income fair while 12.7

percent rated family income good. Approximately 68 percent of the professional audience rated family income fair and 13.1 percent rated family income good. The majority or 68 percent of the bankers audience rated family income fair and 11.4 percent rated family income good. Comparisons between the three audiences showed that a slightly lower percentage of bankers rated family income good than did the extension or professional audiences.

When the Chi-Square test was applied to these data, no significant differences were found between the three audience groups in their ratings of present status of family income ($p>.05$). These findings suggest that the extension, professional, and bankers audience groups were similar in their appraisal of status of family income and all three audiences regard it for the most part as being fair.

## Present Status Of Family Living Conditions

Family living conditions were rated fair by more than half of each audience group. Of the extension audience 64.3 percent rated family living conditions fair and 32.3 percent rated family living conditions good. Similarly, of the professional audience 62.5 percent rated family living conditions fair while 34.4 percent

rated family living conditions good. Of the bankers audience 59.6 percent rated family living conditions fair while 39.1 percent rated it good.

Application of the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant differences in the ratings of family living conditions ($p>.05$). These findings suggest that the extension, professional, and bankers audience groups were similar in their appraisal of family living conditions and all three audiences regarded it for the most part as being fair.

## Present Status Of Condition Of Homes

Condition of homes was rated fair by more than half of each audience group. Of the extension audience 58.4 percent rated condition of homes fair while 38.9 percent rated condition of homes good. Similarly, of the professional audience 57.1 percent rated condition of homes fair while 40.1 percent rated them good. Of the bankers audience 54.5 percent rated conditions of homes fair while 43.6 percent rated condition of homes good.

Comparison by application of the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant differences ($p>.05$) in the ratings of condition of homes, between the three audience groups. A similar percentage of each audience rated condition of homes as being either poor, fair, or good.

## Present Status Of Recreational Opportunities

Recreational opportunities were rated fair by the highest percentage of each audience group. Of the extension audience 43.8 percent rated recreational opportunities fair while 22.2 percent rated recreational opportunities good. Of the professional audience 40.4 percent rated recreational opportunities fair and 27.4 percent rated it good. Of the bankers audience 44.1 percent rated recreational opportunities fair while 27 percent rated it good.

Application of the Chi-Square test indicated there were significant differences ($p<.05$) between the three audience groups ratings of recreational opportunities. Bankers rated the present status of recreational opportunities higher than did the professional audience but the greatest difference was between the bankers and extension audiences.

## Present Status Of Community Organizations

Community organizations were rated fair by the highest percentage of each audience group. Of the extension audience 47.4 percent rated community organizations fair while 41.5 percent rated them good. Of the professional audience 46.5 percent rated community organizations fair and 45.1 percent

rated them good. Of the bankers audience 47.3 percent rated community organizations fair while 43.3 percent rated them good.

Comparison by application of the Chi-Square test indicated there were significant differences ($p<.05$) between the three audience groups ratings of community organizations. The extension audience rated community organizations lower than did either the professional or bankers audiences, with the greatest difference being between the extension and professional audiences.

# CHAPTER IV

## RATINGS OF SEVEN COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS IN 1984 COMPARED TO THOSE IN 1980

The purpose of this chapter is to present findings and disclose whether or not the perception of community leaders about seven community problem areas changed over a time period (ie.1980-1984).

Chapter IV is divided into four sections by audience groups; Section I- all community leaders, Section II- the extension audience, Section III- the professional audience, Section IV- the bankers audience.

Ratings of seven community problem areas in 1984 compared to 1980 are reported in tables by audience groups. Section I contains ratings for both 1980 and 1984 by all community leaders. Section II contains ratings for both 1980 and 1984 by the extension audience. Section III contains ratings for both 1980 and 1984 by the professional audience. Section IV contains ratings for both 1980 and 1984 by the bankers audience. The Chi-Square test was used to compare the significance of the difference between the year of rating. A five percent level of probability was accepted as being significant.

# I. RATINGS OF SEVEN COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS BY COMMUNITY LEADERS IN 1984 COMPARED TO 1980

Section I (Table III) presents findings regarding differences in community leaders ratings of seven community problem areas in 1984 compared to 1980. This section is divided into seven sub-sections which include the present status of: 1) local agriculture, 2) conservation of soil, water, and timber, 3) family income, 4) family living conditions, 5) conditions of homes, 6) recreational opportunities, and 7) community organizations.

## Present Status Of Local Agriculture

Local agriculture was rated good by 56.7 percent of the community leaders in 1984, whereas in 1980, 61.5 percent of the community leaders rated local agriculture good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test showed there were significant differences ($p<.05$) between ratings of local agriculture in 1984 and 1980. The status of local agriculture was rated higher in 1980 than it was in 1984.

Table III. Ratings By Community Leaders Of Seven Community Problem Areas In 1984 Compared To Those In 1980

| Problem Areas | Year of Rating 1984 No. | 1984 % | 1980 No. | 1980 % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Local Agriculture | | | | |
| Poor | 127 | 2.8 | 70 | 1.7 |
| Fair | 1824 | 40.5 | 1517 | 36.8 |
| Good | 2554 | 56.7 | 2537 | 61.5 |
| Total | 4505 | 100.0 | 4124 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=27.99 | p=0.05 | | | |
| Conservation of Soil, Water, Timber | | | | |
| Poor | 708 | 15.9 | 620 | 15.1 |
| Fair | 2687 | 60.5 | 2402 | 58.7 |
| Good | 1048 | 23.6 | 1073 | 26.2 |
| Total | 4443 | 100.0 | 4095 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=7.92 | p=0.05 | | | |
| Family Income | | | | |
| Poor | 888 | 19.7 | 648 | 15.7 |
| Fair | 3023 | 67.3 | 2799 | 67.9 |
| Good | 582 | 13.0 | 676 | 16.4 |
| Total | 4493 | 100.0 | 4123 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=37.32 | p=0.05 | | | |
| Family Living Conditions | | | | |
| Poor | 149 | 3.3 | 156 | 3.8 |
| Fair | 2841 | 63.2 | 2670 | 64.8 |
| Good | 1504 | 33.5 | 1293 | 31.4 |
| Total | 4494 | 100.0 | 4119 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=5.07 | p=0.08 | | | |
| Condition of Homes | | | | |
| Poor | 177 | 3.9 | 189 | 4.5 |
| Fair | 2576 | 57.3 | 2817 | 68.2 |
| Good | 1748 | 38.8 | 1126 | 27.3 |
| Total | 4501 | 100.0 | 4132 | 100.0 |
| Ohi-Square=130.24 | p=0.05 | | | |
| Recreational Opportunities | | | | |
| Poor | 1532 | 33.9 | 1461 | 35.8 |
| Fair | 1900 | 42.0 | 1743 | 42.7 |
| Good | 1092 | 24.1 | 879 | 21.5 |
| Total | 4524 | 100.0 | 4083 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=8.90 | p=0.05 | | | |
| Community Organizations | | | | |
| Poor | 468 | 10.4 | 525 | 12.7 |
| Fair | 2179 | 48.3 | 2044 | 49.6 |
| Good | 1863 | 41.3 | 1549 | 37.6 |
| Total | 4510 | 100.0 | 4118 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=18.71 | p=0.05 | | | |

## Present Status Of Conservation Of Soil,Water,andTimber

Approximately 61 percent of community leaders in 1984 rated conservation of soil, water, and timber fair while 23.6 percent rated it good. Whereas in 1980, 58.7 percent of the community leaders rated conservation of soil, water, and timber fair and 26.2 percent rated conservation good.

Comparison of these data by the Chi-Square test indicated there was significant difference ($p<.05$) between ratings of conservation of soil, water, and timber in 1984 and 1980. The present status of conservation of soil, water, and timber was rated higher by community leaders in 1980 than it was in 1984.

## Present Status Of Family Income

Family income was rated fair by 67.3 percent of community leaders in 1984 and 13 percent rated family income good. Whereas in 1980, 67.9 percent of community leaders rated family income fair and 16.4 percent rated it good.

When compared by the Chi-Square test significant differences ($p<.05$) were found between ratings of family income in 1984 and 1980. The present status of family income was rated higher in 1980 than in 1984.

## Present Status Of Family Living Conditions

Approximately 63 percent of community leaders in 1984 rated family living conditions fair and 33.5 percent rated family living conditions good. Similarly, in 1980 64.8 percent of community leaders rated family living conditions fair and 31.4 percent rated family living conditions good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant differences ($p>.05$) between the ratings of family living conditions in 1984 and 1980. Family living conditions were rated for the most part as being fair.

## Present Status Of Condition Of Homes

Condition of homes was rated fair by 57.3 percent of community leaders in 1984 and 38.8 percent rated condition of homes good. Whereas in 1980, 68.2 percent of the community leaders rated condition of homes fair while 31.4 percent rated condition of homes good.

Application of the Chi-Square test to these data showed there were significant differences ($p<.05$) between the ratings of the condition of homes in 1984 and 1980. Condition of homes was rated higher in 1984 than in 1980 by community leaders.

Present Status Of Recreational Opportunities

Recreational opportunities were rated fair by 42 percent of community leaders while 24.1 percent rated them good. Whereas in 1980, 42.7 percent of the community leaders rated recreational opportunities fair and 21.5 percent rated them good.

When compared by application of the Chi-Square test significant differences were found between the ratings of recreational opportunities in 1984 and 1980. Community leaders rated recreational opportunities higher in 1984 than in 1980.

Present Status Of Community Organizations

Approximately 48 percent of community leaders in 1984 rated community organizations fair while 41.3 percent rated them good. Whereas in 1980, 49.6 percent rated community organizations fair and 37.6 percent rated them good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were significant differences ($p<.05$) between the ratings of community organizations by community leaders in 1984 and 1980. Ratings by community leaders of community organizations were higher in 1984 than in 1980.

## II. RATINGS OF SEVEN COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS BY THE EXTENSION AUDIENCE IN 1984 COMPARED TO 1980.

Section II (Table IV) presents findings regarding differences in the extension audience ratings of seven community problem areas in 1984 compared to 1980. This section is divided into seven sub-sections which include the present status of: 1) local agriculture, 2) conservation of soil, water, and timber, 3) family income, 4) family living conditions, 5) conditions of homes, 6) recreational opportunities, and 7) community organizations.

### Present Status Of Local Agriculture

Local agriculture was rated good by 57.2 percent of the extension audience in 1984, whereas in 1980, 58.0 percent of the extension audience rated local agriculture good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test showed there were no significant differences ($p>.05$) between ratings of local agriculture in 1984 and 1980. Local agriculture was rated, for the most part, as being good in both 1984 and 1980.

Table IV. Ratings By The Extension Audience Of Seven Community Problem Areas In 1984 Compared to Those Of 1980

| | Year Of Rating | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1984 | | 1980 | |
| Problem Area | No. | % | No. | % |
| Local Agriculture | | | | |
| Poor | 47 | 2.6 | 36 | 2.0 |
| Fair | 732 | 40.2 | 707 | 40.0 |
| Good | 1040 | 57.2 | 1025 | 58.0 |
| Total | 1819 | 100.0 | 1768 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=1.28 | p=0.53 | | | |
| Conservation of Soil, Water, Timber | | | | |
| Poor | 288 | 16.0 | 299 | 17.0 |
| Fair | 1104 | 61.5 | 1033 | 58.6 |
| Good | 404 | 22.5 | 430 | 24.4 |
| Total | 1796 | 100.0 | 1762 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=3.05 | p=0.21 | | | |
| Family Income | | | | |
| Poor | 315 | 17.4 | 251 | 14.2 |
| Fair | 1266 | 69.9 | 1231 | 69.6 |
| Good | 230 | 12.7 | 286 | 16.2 |
| Total | 1811 | 100.0 | 1768 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=13.29 | p=0.05 | | | |
| Family Living Conditions | | | | |
| Poor | 61 | 3.4 | 60 | 3.4 |
| Fair | 1165 | 64.3 | 1146 | 64.8 |
| Good | 586 | 32.3 | 562 | 31.8 |
| Total | 1812 | 100.0 | 1768 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=0.13 | p=0.94 | | | |
| Condition Of Homes | | | | |
| Poor | 49 | 2.7 | 90 | 5.1 |
| Fair | 1064 | 58.4 | 1186 | 66.7 |
| Good | 709 | 38.9 | 501 | 28.2 |
| Total | 1822 | 100.0 | 1777 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=53.91 | p=0.05 | | | |
| Recreational Opportunities | | | | |
| Poor | 623 | 34.0 | 626 | 35.7 |
| Fair | 804 | 43.8 | 724 | 41.3 |
| Good | 407 | 22.2 | 404 | 23.0 |
| Total | 1834 | 100.0 | 1754 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=2.42 | p=0.30 | | | |
| Community Organizations | | | | |
| Poor | 203 | 11.1 | 253 | 14.3 |
| Fair | 866 | 47.4 | 851 | 48.2 |
| Good | 757 | 41.5 | 661 | 37.5 |
| Total | 1826 | 100.0 | 1765 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=11.08 | p=0.05 | | | |

## Present Status Of Conservation Of Soil,Water,and Timber

Approximately 62 percent of the extension audience in 1984 rated conservation of soil, water, and timber fair while 22.5 percent rated it good. Whereas in 1980, 58.6 percent of the extension audience rated conservation of soil, water, and timber fair and 24.4 percent rated conservation good.

Comparison of these data by the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant difference ($p>.05$) between ratings of conservation of soil, water, and timber in 1984 and 1980. The present status of conservation of soil, water, and timber was rated fair by the majority of the extension audience in both 1984 and 1980.

## Present Status Of Family Income

Family income was rated fair by 69.9 percent of the extension audience in 1984 and 12.7 percent rated family income good. Whereas in 1980, 69.6 percent of the extension audience rated family income fair and 16.2 percent rated it good.

When compared by the Chi-Square test significant differences ($p<.05$) were found between ratings of family income in 1984 and 1980. Present status of family income was rated higher in 1980 than in 1984.

## Present Status Of Family Living Conditions

Approximately 64 percent of the extension audience in 1984 rated family living conditions fair and 32.5 percent rated family living conditions good. Similarly, in 1980 64.8 percent of community leaders rated family living conditions fair and 31.8 percent rated family living conditions good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant differences ($p>.05$) between the ratings of family living conditions in 1984 and 1980. Family living conditions were rated for the most part as being fair by the extension audience.

## Present Status Of Condition Of Homes

Condition of homes was rated fair by 58.4 percent of the extension audience in 1984 and 38.9 percent rated condition of homes good. Whereas in 1980, 66.7 percent of the extension audience rated condition of homes fair while 28.2 percent rated condition of homes good.

Application of the Chi-Square test to these data showed there were significant differences ($p<.05$) between the ratings of condition of homes in 1984 and 1980. Condition of homes was rated higher in 1984 than in 1980 by the extension audience.

## Present Status Of Recreational Opportunities

Recreational opportunities were rated fair by 43.8 percent of the extension audience while 24.1 percent rated them good. Whereas in 1980, 41.3 percent of the extension audience rated recreational opportunities fair and 23 percent rated them good.

When compared by application of the Chi-Square test no significant differences were found between the ratings of recreational opportunities in 1984 and 1980. The extension audience rated recreational opportunities fair to poor for the most part.

## Present Status Of Community Organizations

Approximately 47 percent of the extension audience in 1984 rated community organizations fair while 41.5 percent rated them good. Whereas in 1980, 48.2 percent of the extension audience rated community organizations fair and 37.5 percent rated them good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were significant differences ($p<.05$) between the ratings of community organizations by the extension audience in 1984

and 1980. Community organizations were rated higher by the extension audience in 1984 than in 1980.

## III. RATINGS OF SEVEN COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS BY THE PROFESSIONAL AUDIENCE IN 1984 COMPARED TO 1980.

Section III (Table V) presents findings regarding differences in the professional audience ratings of seven community problem areas in 1984 compared to 1980. This section is divided into seven sub-sections which include the present status of: 1) local agriculture, 2) conservation of soil, water, and timber, 3) family income, 4) family living conditions, 5) conditions of homes, 6) recreational opportunities, and 7) community organizations.

### Present Status Of Local Agriculture

Local agriculture was rated good by 59.1 percent of the professional audience in 1984, whereas in 1980, 66.1 percent of the professional audience rated local agriculture good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test showed there were significant differences ($p<.05$) between ratings of local agriculture in 1984 and 1980. Local agriculture was rated higher in 1980 than it was in 1984 by the professionals.

Table V. Ratings By The Professional Audience Of Seven Community Problem Areas In 1984 Compared To Those Of 1980

| | Year Of Rating | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1984 | | 1980 | |
| Problem Area | No. | % | No. | % |
| Local Agriculture | | | | |
| Poor | 41 | 2.3 | 29 | 1.6 |
| Fair | 694 | 38.6 | 612 | 33.3 |
| Good | 1062 | 59.1 | 1195 | 65.1 |
| Total | 1797 | 100.0 | 1836 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=14.63 | p=0.05 | | | |
| Conservation of Soil, Water, Timber | | | | |
| Poor | 254 | 14.3 | 245 | 13.4 |
| Fair | 1062 | 59.9 | 1076 | 58.9 |
| Good | 458 | 25.8 | 507 | 27.7 |
| Total | 1774 | 100.0 | 1828 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=1.93 | p=0.38 | | | |
| Family Income | | | | |
| Poor | 347 | 19.3 | 311 | 16.9 |
| Fair | 1215 | 67.6 | 1229 | 66.8 |
| Good | 235 | 13.1 | 300 | 16.3 |
| Total | 1797 | 100.0 | 1840 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=9.44 | p=0.05 | | | |
| Family Living Conditions | | | | |
| Poor | 57 | 3.2 | 74 | 4.0 |
| Fair | 1116 | 62.5 | 1226 | 66.7 |
| Good | 614 | 34.4 | 539 | 29.3 |
| Total | 1787 | 100.0 | 1839 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=11.51 | p=0.05 | | | |
| Condition Of Homes | | | | |
| Poor | 50 | 2.8 | 75 | 4.1 |
| Fair | 1018 | 57.1 | 1286 | 70.0 |
| Good | 716 | 40.1 | 477 | 26.0 |
| Total | 1784 | 100.0 | 1838 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=83.27 | p=0.05 | | | |
| Recreational Opportunities | | | | |
| Poor | 579 | 32.2 | 644 | 35.4 |
| Fair | 726 | 40.4 | 808 | 44.4 |
| Good | 492 | 27.4 | 369 | 20.3 |
| Total | 1797 | 100.0 | 1821 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=25.25 | p=0.05 | | | |
| Community Organizations | | | | |
| Poor | 151 | 8.4 | 202 | 11.0 |
| Fair | 835 | 46.5 | 921 | 50.1 |
| Good | 809 | 45.1 | 714 | 38.9 |
| Total | 1795 | 100.0 | 1837 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=17.02 | p=0.05 | | | |

## Present Status Of Conservation Of Soil,Water,and Timber

Approximately 61 percent of the professional audience in 1984 rated conservation of soil, water, and timber fair while 25.8 percent rated it good. Whereas in 1980, 58.9 percent of the professional audience rated conservation of soil, water, and timber fair and 27.7 percent rated conservation good.

Comparison of these data by the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant difference ($p>.05$) between ratings of conservation of soil, water, and timber in 1984 and 1980. The present status of conservation of soil, water, and timber was rated fair in both 1984 and 1980 by the professional audience.

## Present Status Of Family Income

Family income was rated fair by 67.6 percent of the professional audience in 1984 and 13.1 percent rated family income good. Whereas in 1980, 66.8 percent of the professional audience rated family income fair and 16.3 percent rated it good.

When compared by the Chi-Square test significant differences ($p<.05$) were found between ratings of family income in 1984 and 1980. Present status of family income was

rated higher in 1980 than in 1984 by the professional audience.

## Present Status Of Family Living Conditions

Approximately 63 percent of the professional audience in 1984 rated family living conditions fair and 34.4 percent rated family living conditions good. Similarly, in 1980 66.7 percent of the professional audience rated family living conditions fair and 29.3 percent rated family living conditions good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were significant differences ($p<.05$) between the ratings of family living conditions in 1984 and 1980. Family living conditions were rated higher in 1984 than 1980 by the professionals.

## Present Status Of Condition Of Homes

Condition of homes was rated fair by 57.1 percent of the professional audience in 1984 and 40.1 percent rated condition of homes good. Whereas in 1980, 70 percent of the professional audience rated condition of homes fair while 26 percent rated condition of homes good.

Application of the Chi-Square test to these data

showed there were significant differences ($p<.05$) between the ratings of condition of homes in 1984 and 1980. Condition of homes was rated higher in 1984 than in 1980 by the professional audience.

## Present Status Of Recreational Opportunities

Recreational opportunities were rated fair by 40.4 percent of the professionals while 27.4 percent rated them good. Whereas in 1980, 44.4 percent of the professional audience rated recreational opportunities fair and 20.3 percent rated them good.

When compared by application of the Chi-Square test significant differences were found between the ratings of recreational opportunities in 1984 and 1980. The professional audience rated recreational opportunities higher in 1984 than in 1980.

## Present Status Of Community Organizations

Approximately 46.5 percent of the professional audience in 1984 rated community organizations fair while 45.1 percent rated them good. Whereas in 1980, 50.1 percent rated community organizations fair and 38.9 percent rated them good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were

significant differences ($p<.05$) between the ratings of community organizations in 1984 and 1980. Ratings of community organizations were higher for the professional audience in 1984 than in 1980.

## IV. RATINGS OF SEVEN COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS BY THE BANKERS AUDIENCE IN 1984 COMPARED TO 1980.

Section IV (Table VI) presents findings regarding differences in the professional audience ratings of seven community problem areas in 1984 compared to 1980. This section is divided into seven sub-sections which include the present status of: 1) local agriculture, 2) conservation of soil, water, and timber, 3) family income, 4) family living conditions, 5) conditions of homes, 6) recreational opportunities, and 7) community organizations.

### Present Status Of Local Agriculture

Local agriculture was rated good by 47.7 percent of the bankers audience in 1984, whereas in 1980, 33.7 percent of the bankers audience rated local agriculture good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test showed there were significant differences ($p<.05$) between ratings of local agriculture in 1984 and 1980. Local agriculture was rated higher in 1980 than it was in 1984 by the bankers audience.

Table VI. Ratings By Banker Audience Of Seven Community Problem Areas In 1984 Compared to Those Of 1980.

| | Year Of Rating | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1984 | | 1980 | |
| Problem Area | No. | % | No. | % |
| Local Agriculture | | | | |
| Poor | 19 | 5.9 | 4 | 1.4 |
| Fair | 153 | 47.7 | 98 | 33.7 |
| Good | 149 | 46.4 | 189 | 64.9 |
| Total | 321 | 100.0 | 291 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=25.16 | p=0.05 | | | |
| Conservation Of Soil, Water, Timber | | | | |
| Poor | 46 | 14.5 | 38 | 13.3 |
| Fair | 209 | 65.9 | 162 | 56.6 |
| Good | 62 | 19.6 | 86 | 30.1 |
| Total | 317 | 100.0 | 286 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=9.04 | p=0.05 | | | |
| Family Income | | | | |
| Poor | 65 | 20.6 | 40 | 13.8 |
| Fair | 214 | 67.9 | 193 | 66.8 |
| Good | 36 | 11.4 | 56 | 19.4 |
| Total | 315 | 100.0 | 289 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=10.28 | p=0.05 | | | |
| Family Living Conditions | | | | |
| Poor | 4 | 1.2 | 6 | 2.1 |
| Fair | 192 | 59.6 | 163 | 56.8 |
| Good | 126 | 39.1 | 118 | 41.1 |
| Total | 322 | 100.0 | 287 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=1.02 | p=0.60 | | | |
| Condition Of Homes | | | | |
| Poor | 6 | 1.9 | 10 | 3.5 |
| Fair | 174 | 54.5 | 192 | 66.7 |
| Good | 139 | 43.6 | 86 | 29.9 |
| Total | 319 | 100.0 | 283 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=12.82 | p=0.05 | | | |
| Recreational Opportunities | | | | |
| Poor | 93 | 28.9 | 89 | 30.7 |
| Fair | 142 | 44.1 | 124 | 42.8 |
| Good | 87 | 27.0 | 77 | 26.6 |
| Total | 322 | 100.0 | 290 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=0.24 | p=0.88 | | | |
| Community Organizations | | | | |
| Poor | 30 | 9.4 | 32 | 11.1 |
| Fair | 151 | 47.3 | 140 | 48.6 |
| Good | 138 | 43.3 | 116 | 40.3 |
| Total | 319 | 100.0 | 288 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=0.80 | p=0.67 | | | |

Present Status Of Conservation Of Soil,Water,and Timber

Approximately 66 percent of the bankers audience in 1984 rated conservation of soil, water, and timber fair while 19.6 percent rated it good. Whereas in 1980, 56.6 percent of the bankers audience rated conservation of soil, water, and timber fair and 30.1 percent rated conservation good.

Comparison of these data by the Chi-Square test indicated there were significant differences ($p<.05$) between ratings of conservation of soil, water, and timber in 1984 and 1980. The present status of conservation of soil, water, and timber was rated higher in 1980 than it was in 1984 by the bankers audience.

Present Status Of Family Income

Family income was rated fair by 67.9 percent of community leaders in 1984 and 11.4 percent rated family income good. Whereas in 1980, 66.8 percent of the bankers audience rated family income fair and 19.4 percent rated it good.

When compared by the Chi-Square test significant differences ($p<.05$) were found between ratings of family income in 1984 and 1980. Present status of family income was rated higher in 1980 than in 1984 by the bankers audience.

## Present Status Of Family Living Conditions

Approximately 60 percent of the bankers audience in 1984 rated family living conditions fair and 39.1 percent rated family living conditions good. Similarly, in 1980 56.8 percent of the bankers audience rated family living conditions fair and 41.1 percent rated family living conditions good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant differences ($p>.05$) between the ratings of family living conditions in 1984 and 1980. Family living conditions were rated for the most part as being fair, by the bankers.

## Present Status Of Condition Of Homes

Condition of homes was rated fair by 54.5 percent of the bankers audience in 1984 and 43.6 percent rated condition of homes good. Whereas in 1980, 66.7 percent of the bankers audience rated condition of homes fair while 29.9 percent rated condition of homes good.

Application of the Chi-Square test to these data showed there were significant differences ($p<.05$) between the ratings of condition of homes in 1984 and 1980.

Condition of homes was rated higher in 1984 than in 1980 by the bankers audience.

## Present Status Of Recreational Opportunities

Recreational opportunities were rated fair by 44.1 percent of the bankers while 27 percent rated them good. Whereas in 1980, 42.8 percent of the bankers audience rated recreational opportunities fair and 26.6 percent rated them good.

When compared by application of the Chi-Square test no significant differences ($p<.05$) were found between the ratings of recreational opportunities in 1984 and 1980. The bankers audience rated recreational opportunities for the most part as being fair in both 1984 and 1980.

## Present Status Of Community Organizations

Approximately 47.3 percent of the bankers in 1984 rated community organizations fair while 43.3 percent rated them good. Whereas in 1980, 48.6 percent rated community organizations fair and 40.3 percent rated them good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant differences ($p<.05$) between the ratings of community organizations in 1984 and 1980. Ratings of community organizations were rated as being fair for the

most part by the bankers audience in both 1984 and 1980.

Based on these findings, it can be said that improvement was seen in some areas of community problems between 1980 and 1984. However, problem areas such as local agriculture; conservation of soil, water, and timber; and family income were perceived to become a more serious problem.

# CHAPTER V

## RATINGS OF SEVEN COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS BY COMMUNITY LEADERS COMPARED BY AREA OF RESIDENCE IN 1984

The purpose of this chapter is to disclose whether or not the perception of community leaders differed by area of residence on seven community problem areas. For this purpose community leaders were divided into three areas of residence; 1) District I, 2) District II,III,and IV, and 3) District V.

Chapter V is divided into four sections by audience groups; Section I- all community leaders, Section II- the extension audience, Section III- the professional audience, and Section IV- the bankers audience.

Ratings of seven community problem areas compared by audience's area of residence are reported in tables by audience groups. The Chi-Square test was used to compare the significance of differences between the three areas of residence of community leaders in their ratings of community problem areas.

# I. RATINGS OF SEVEN COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS BY COMMUNITY LEADERS IN 1984 COMPARED BY AREA OF RESIDENCE

Section I (Table VII) presents findings regarding differences in all community leaders ratings of seven community problem areas in 1984 compared by the leaders area of residence. The section is divided into seven sub-sections which include present status of: 1) local agriculture; 2) conservation of soil, water, and timber; 3) family income; 4) family living conditions; 5) condition of homes; 6) recreational opportunities; and 7) community organizations.

## Present Status Of Local Agriculture

Local agriculture was rated good by 57.7 percent of community leaders in district I, while 56.5 percent of the community leaders in district II, III, and IV rated local agriculture good, and 56.3 percent of the community leaders in district V rated local agriculture good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant differences ($p>.05$) between the areas of residence of community leaders ratings of local agriculture. The majority of community leaders, regardless of area of residence, rated local agriculture as being good.

TABLE VII. Ratings Of Seven Community Problem Areas By All Audiences Compared By Area Of Residence In 1984.

| Problem Area | Area of Residence | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | District 1 | | District 2,3,4 | | District 5 | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Local Agriculture | | | | | | |
| Poor | 33 | 3.1 | 75 | 2.8 | 19 | 2.2 |
| Fair | 415 | 39.2 | 1055 | 40.7 | 354 | 41.5 |
| Good | 610 | 57.7 | 1465 | 56.5 | 479 | 56.3 |
| Total | 1058 | 100.0 | 2595 | 100.0 | 852 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=2.34 | p=0.67 | | | | | |
| Conservation of Soil, Water, Timber | | | | | | |
| Poor | 168 | 16.1 | 410 | 16.1 | 130 | 15.2 |
| Fair | 670 | 64.1 | 1523 | 59.9 | 494 | 57.8 |
| Good | 208 | 19.8 | 609 | 24.0 | 231 | 27.0 |
| Total | 1046 | 100.0 | 2542 | 100.0 | 855 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=14.22 | p=0.05 | | | | | |
| Family Income | | | | | | |
| Poor | 199 | 18.8 | 531 | 20.6 | 158 | 18.5 |
| Fair | 746 | 70.4 | 1696 | 65.7 | 581 | 68.2 |
| Good | 115 | 10.8 | 354 | 13.7 | 113 | 13.3 |
| Total | 1060 | 100.0 | 2581 | 100.0 | 852 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=9.43 | p=0.05 | | | | | |
| Family Living Conditions | | | | | | |
| Poor | 32 | 3.0 | 88 | 3.4 | 29 | 3.4 |
| Fair | 686 | 64.7 | 1636 | 63.3 | 519 | 61.3 |
| Good | 343 | 32.3 | 862 | 33.3 | 299 | 35.3 |
| Total | 1061 | 100.0 | 2586 | 100.0 | 847 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=2.51 | p=0.64 | | | | | |
| Condition of Homes | | | | | | |
| Poor | 19 | 1.8 | 135 | 5.2 | 23 | 2.7 |
| Fair | 617 | 58.4 | 1487 | 57.4 | 472 | 55.5 |
| Good | 421 | 39.8 | 971 | 37.4 | 356 | 41.8 |
| Total | 1057 | 100.0 | 2593 | 100.0 | 851 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=30.46 | p=0.05 | | | | | |
| Recreational Opportunities | | | | | | |
| Poor | 403 | 38.0 | 884 | 33.9 | 245 | 28.6 |
| Fair | 428 | 40.3 | 1125 | 43.2 | 347 | 40.5 |
| Good | 230 | 21.7 | 597 | 22.9 | 265 | 30.9 |
| Total | 1061 | 100.0 | 2606 | 100.0 | 857 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=35.00 | p=0.05 | | | | | |
| Community Organizations | | | | | | |
| Poor | 98 | 9.2 | 289 | 11.2 | 81 | 9.5 |
| Fair | 500 | 47.0 | 1287 | 49.7 | 392 | 45.8 |
| Good | 466 | 43.8 | 1015 | 39.2 | 382 | 44.7 |
| Total | 1064 | 100.0 | 2591 | 100.0 | 855 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=12.83 | p=0.05 | | | | | |

## Present Status Of Conservation Of Soil,Water,And Timber

Conservation of soil, water, and timber was rated good by 19.8 percent of the district I community leaders, while 24 percent of the community leaders in district II, III, and IV rated conservation good, and 27 percent of the community leaders in district V rated conservation of soil, water, and timber good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were significant differences ($p<.05$) found between the areas of residence of community leaders ratings of conservation of soil, water, and timber. Community leaders in district V rated conservation higher than did the community leaders from district I or district II, III, and IV.

## Present Status Of Family Income

Family income was rated good by 10.8 percent of the district I community leaders, while 13.7 percent of the district II, III, and IV community leaders rated family income good, and 13.3 percent of the community leaders in district V rated family income good. Comparison between the three groups showed that a slightly lower percentage of community leaders from district I rated family income lower than did the other audiences.

When the Chi-Square test was applied to these data

significant differences were found ($p<.05$) between the three group's ratings of family income. For the most part family income was rated as fair but a slightly lower percentage of community leaders from district I rated family income as being good.

## Present Status Of Family Living Conditions

Family living conditions were rated good by 32.3 percent of the district I community leaders, while 33.3 percent of those from district II, III, and IV rated family living conditions good, and 35.3 percent of the community leaders from district V rated family living conditions good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant differences ($p>.05$) found between the community leaders area of residence and their ratings of family living conditions. The majority of community leaders, regardless of area of residence, rated family living conditions as being fair.

## Present Status Of Condition Of Homes

Condition of homes was rated good by 39.8 percent of district I community leaders, and by 37.4 percent of the district II, III, and IV community leaders, while 41.8

percent of the district V community leaders rated condition of homes good.

Application of the Chi-Square test to these data showed there were significant differences between the three audience groups ratings of condition of homes. Community leaders from district II, III, and IV rated condition of homes lower than did the other audience groups.

## Present Status Of Recreational Opportunities

Recreational Opportunities were rated good by 21.7 percent of the district I community leaders, while 22.9 percent of the district II, III, and IV community leaders rated recreational opportunities good, and 30.9 percent of the community leaders form district V rated recreational opportunities good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were significant differences between the ratings of recreational opportunities by the three audience groups. Community leaders from district V rated recreational opportunities higher than did the other audiences.

## Present Status Of Community Organizations

Community organizations were rated good by 43.7 percent of the community leaders from district I, while

39.2 percent of the community leaders from district II, III, and IV rated community organizations good, and 44.7 percent of the community leaders from district V rated community organizations good.

Comparison by application of the Chi-Square test showed there were significant differences between the three audience's ratings of community organizations. Community leaders from district II, III, and IV rated community organizations lower than did the other audience groups.

## II. RATINGS OF SEVEN COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS BY THE EXTENSION AUDIENCE IN 1984 COMPARED BY AREA OF RESIDENCE

Section II (Table VIII) presents findings regarding differences in the extension audience ratings of seven community problem areas in 1984 compared by the leaders area of residence. The section is divided into seven sub-sections which include present status of: 1) local agriculture; 2) conservation of soil, water, and timber; 3) family income; 4) family living conditions; 5) condition of homes; 6) recreational opportunities; and 7) community organizations.

Table VIII. Ratings Of Seven Community Problem Areas By The Extension Audience Compared By Area Of Residence In 1984.

| | Area of Residence | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | District 1 | | District 2,3,4 | | District 5 | |
| Problem Area | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Local Agriculture | | | | | | |
| Poor | 15 | 3.6 | 25 | 2.3 | 7 | 2.2 |
| Fair | 164 | 38.9 | 435 | 40.2 | 133 | 42.1 |
| Good | 243 | 57.5 | 621 | 57.4 | 176 | 55.7 |
| Total | 422 | 100.0 | 1081 | 100.0 | 316 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=2.63 | p=0.62 | | | | | |
| Conservation of Soil, Water, Timber | | | | | | |
| Poor | 68 | 16.1 | 176 | 16.7 | 44 | 13.8 |
| Fair | 277 | 65.6 | 633 | 60.1 | 194 | 60.6 |
| Good | 77 | 18.2 | 245 | 23.2 | 82 | 25.6 |
| Total | 422 | 100.0 | 1054 | 100.0 | 320 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=7.95 | p=0.09 | | | | | |
| Family Income | | | | | | |
| Poor | 75 | 17.7 | 202 | 18.9 | 38 | 11.9 |
| Fair | 311 | 73.3 | 720 | 67.4 | 235 | 73.9 |
| Good | 38 | 9.0 | 147 | 13.8 | 45 | 14.2 |
| Total | 424 | 100.0 | 1069 | 100.0 | 318 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=15.39 | p=0.05 | | | | | |
| Family Living Conditions | | | | | | |
| Poor | 12 | 2.8 | 39 | 3.6 | 10 | 3.2 |
| Fair | 293 | 68.6 | 685 | 63.8 | 187 | 59.9 |
| Good | 122 | 28.6 | 349 | 32.6 | 115 | 36.9 |
| Total | 427 | 100.0 | 1073 | 100.0 | 312 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=6.70 | p=0.15 | | | | | |
| Condition of Homes | | | | | | |
| Poor | 9 | 2.1 | 36 | 3.3 | 4 | 1.3 |
| Fair | 269 | 62.7 | 625 | 58.0 | 170 | 53.8 |
| Good | 151 | 35.2 | 416 | 38.6 | 142 | 44.9 |
| Total | 429 | 100.0 | 1077 | 100.0 | 316 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=11.67 | p=0.05 | | | | | |
| Recreational Opportunities | | | | | | |
| Poor | 169 | 39.6 | 377 | 34.7 | 77 | 24.1 |
| Fair | 175 | 41.0 | 474 | 43.6 | 155 | 48.6 |
| Good | 83 | 19.4 | 237 | 21.8 | 87 | 27.3 |
| Total | 427 | 100.0 | 1088 | 100.0 | 319 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=20.89 | p=0.05 | | | | | |
| Community Organization | | | | | | |
| Poor | 48 | 11.2 | 125 | 11.6 | 30 | 9.4 |
| Fair | 212 | 49.5 | 510 | 47.3 | 144 | 45.1 |
| Good | 168 | 39.3 | 444 | 41.1 | 145 | 45.5 |
| Total | 428 | 100.0 | 1079 | 100.0 | 319 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=3.57 | p=0.47 | | | | | |

## Present Status Of Local Agriculture

Local agriculture was rated as being good by 57.5 percent of the extension audience district I, while 57.4 percent of the extension audience in district II,III, and IV rated local agriculture good, and 55.7 percent of the extension audience in district V rated local agriculture good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant differences ($p>.05$) found between the areas of residence of community leaders ratings of local agriculture. The majority of the extension audience, regardless of area of residence, rated local agriculture as being good.

## Present Status Of Conservation Of Soil,Water,And Timber

Conservation of soil, water, and timber was rated good by 18.2 percent of the district I extension audience, while 23.2 percent of the extension audience in district II, III, and IV rated conservation good, and 25.6 percent of the extension audience in district V rated conservation of soil, water, and timber good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant differences ($p>.05$) found between the areas of residence of the extension audience ratings of

conservation of soil, water, and timber. The extension audience rated conservation for the most part as being fair in all districts.

## Present Status Of Family Income

Family income was rated good by 9 percent of the district I extension audience, while 13.8 percent of the district II, III, and IV extension audience rated family income good, and 14.2 percent of the extension audience in district V rated family income good. Comparison between the three groups showed that a lower percentage of the extension audience from district I rated family income lower than did the other audiences.

When the Chi-Square test was applied to these data significant differences were found ($p<.05$) between the three group's ratings of family income. For the most part family income was rated fair. However, a lower percentage of the extension audience from district I rated family income as being good.

## Present Status Of Family Living Conditions

Family living conditions were rated good by 28.6 percent of the district I extension audience, while 32.6 percent of those from district II, III, and IV rated family

living conditions good, and 36.9 percent of the extension audience from district V rated family living conditions good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant differences ($p>.05$) found between the extension audience area of residence and their ratings of family living conditions. The majority of the extension audience, regardless of area of residence, rated family living conditions as being fair.

## Present Status Of Condition Of Homes

Condition of homes was rated good by 35.2 percent of district I extension audience, and by 38.6 percent of the district II, III, and IV extension audience, while 44.9 percent of the district V extension audience rated condition of homes good.

Application of the Chi-Square test to these data showed there were significant differences between the three audience groups ratings of condition of homes. The extension audience from district I rated condition of homes lower than did the other audience groups.

## Present Status Of Recreational Opportunities

Recreational opportunities were rated good by 19.4 percent of the district I extension audience, while 21.8 percent of the district II, III, and IV extension audience rated recreational opportunities good, and 27.3 percent of the extension audience from district V rated recreational opportunities good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were significant differences between the ratings of recreational opportunities by the three audience groups. The extension audience from district V rated recreational opportunities higher than did the other audiences.

## Present Status Of Community Organizations

Community organizations were rated good by 39.3 percent of the extension audience from district I, while 41.1 percent of the extension audience from district II, III, and IV rated community organizations good, and 45.5 percent of the extension audience from district V rated community organizations good.

Comparison by application of the Chi-Square test showed there were no significant differences between the three audience's ratings of community organizations. The

extension audience from all three districts rated community organizations very similarly.

## III. RATINGS OF SEVEN COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS BY THE PROFESSIONAL AUDIENCE IN 1984 COMPARED BY AREA OF RESIDENCE

Section III (Table IX) presents findings regarding differences in the professional audience ratings of seven community problem areas in 1984 compared by the leaders area of residence. The section is divided into seven sub-sections which include present status of: 1) local agriculture; 2) conservation of soil, water, and timber; 3) family income; 4) family living conditions; 5) condition of homes; 6) recreational opportunities; and 7) community organizations.

### Present Status Of Local Agriculture

Local agriculture was rated good by 58.2 percent of the professional audience in district I, while 58.1 percent of the professional audience in district II, III, and IV rated local agriculture good, and 62.8 percent of the professional audience in district V rated local agriculture good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant differences ($p>.05$) found between the areas

Table IX. Ratings Of Seven Community Problem Areas By The Professional Audience Compared By Area Of Residence In 1984

| Problem Area | Area Of Residence: District 1 No. | District 1 % | District 2,3,4 No. | District 2,3,4 % | District 5 No. | District 5 % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Local Agriculture | | | | | | |
| Poor | 12 | 2.3 | 24 | 2.6 | 5 | 1.3 |
| Fair | 204 | 39.5 | 356 | 39.3 | 134 | 35.8 |
| Good | 301 | 58.2 | 526 | 58.1 | 235 | 62.8 |
| Total | 517 | 100.0 | 906 | 100.0 | 374 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=4.07 | p=0.40 | | | | | |
| Conservation of Soil, Water, Timber | | | | | | |
| Poor | 84 | 16.6 | 115 | 12.9 | 55 | 14.7 |
| Fair | 315 | 62.1 | 544 | 60.9 | 203 | 54.3 |
| Good | 108 | 21.3 | 234 | 26.2 | 116 | 31.0 |
| Total | 507 | 100.0 | 893 | 100.0 | 374 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=13.65 | p=0.05 | | | | | |
| Family Income | | | | | | |
| Poor | 108 | 20.8 | 177 | 19.6 | 62 | 16.6 |
| Fair | 349 | 67.1 | 609 | 67.4 | 257 | 68.7 |
| Good | 63 | 12.1 | 117 | 13.0 | 55 | 14.7 |
| Total | 520 | 100.0 | 903 | 100.0 | 374 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=3.29 | p=0.51 | | | | | |
| Family Living Conditions | | | | | | |
| Poor | 20 | 3.9 | 28 | 3.1 | 9 | 2.4 |
| Fair | 328 | 63.7 | 563 | 62.7 | 225 | 60.2 |
| Good | 167 | 32.4 | 307 | 34.2 | 140 | 37.4 |
| Total | 515 | 100.0 | 898 | 100.0 | 374 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=3.56 | p=0.47 | | | | | |
| Condition Of Homes | | | | | | |
| Poor | 10 | 2.0 | 31 | 3.4 | 9 | 2.4 |
| Fair | 293 | 57.3 | 525 | 58.3 | 200 | 53.6 |
| Good | 208 | 40.7 | 344 | 38.2 | 164 | 44.0 |
| Total | 511 | 100.0 | 900 | 100.0 | 373 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=6.09 | p=0.19 | | | | | |
| Recreational Opportunities | | | | | | |
| Poor | 198 | 38.3 | 285 | 31.5 | 96 | 25.5 |
| Fair | 201 | 39.0 | 380 | 42.0 | 145 | 38.5 |
| Good | 117 | 22.7 | 239 | 26.5 | 136 | 36.0 |
| Total | 516 | 100.0 | 904 | 100.0 | 377 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=27.63 | p=0.05 | | | | | |
| Community Organizations | | | | | | |
| Poor | 47 | 9.1 | 77 | 8.5 | 27 | 7.2 |
| Fair | 233 | 45.0 | 438 | 48.5 | 164 | 43.9 |
| Good | 238 | 45.9 | 388 | 43.0 | 183 | 48.9 |
| Total | 518 | 100.0 | 903 | 100.0 | 374 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=4.73 | p=0.32 | | | | | |

of residence of the professional audience ratings of local agriculture. The majority of the professional audience, regardless of area of residence, rated local agriculture good.

## Present Status Of Conservation Of Soil,Water,and Timber

Conservation of soil, water, and timber was rated good by 21.3 percent of the district I professional audience, while 26.2 percent of the professional audience in district II, III, and IV rated conservation good, and 31 percent of the professional audience in district V rated conservation of soil, water, and timber good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were significant differences ($p<.05$) found between the areas of residence of the professional audience ratings of conservation of soil, water, and timber. The professional audience in district V rated conservation higher than did the community leaders from district I or district II, III, and IV.

## Present Status Of Family Income

Family Income was rated good by 12.1 percent of the district I professional audience, while 13 percent of the district II, III, and IV professional audience rated family

income good, and 14.7 percent of the professional audience in district V rated family income good. Comparison between the three groups showed that a slightly lower percentage of the professional audience from district I rated family income lower than did the other audiences.

When the Chi-Square test was applied to these data no significant differences were found ($p>.05$) between the three group's ratings of family income. For the most part family income was rated fair by the professional audience in all three districts.

## Present Status Of Family Living Conditions

Family living conditions were rated good by 32.4 percent of the district I professional audience, while 34.2 percent of those from district II, III, and IV rated family living conditions good, and 37.4 percent of the professional audience from district V rated family living conditions good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant differences ($p>.05$) found between the professional audience's area of residence and their ratings of family living conditions. The majority of the professional audience regardless of area of residence, rated family living conditions fair.

## Present Status Of Condition Of Homes

Condition of homes was rated good by 40.7 percent of the district I professional audience, and by 38.2 percent of the district II, III, and IV professional audience, while 44 percent of the district V professional audience rated condition of homes good.

Application of the Chi-Square test to these data showed there were no significant differences between the three audience groups ratings of condition of homes. The professional audience rated condition of homes similarly in all three districts.

## Present Status Of Recreational Opportunities

Recreational Opportunities were rated good by 22.7 percent of the district I professional audience, while 26.5 percent of the district II, III, and IV professional audience rated recreational opportunities good, and 36 percent of the professional audience from district V rated recreational opportunities good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were significant differences between the ratings of recreational opportunities by the three audience groups. The professional audience from district V rated recreational opportunities higher than did the other audiences.

Present Status Of Community Organizations

Community organizations were rated as being good by 45.9 percent of the professional audience from district I, while 43 percent of the professional audience from district II, III, & IV rated community organizations as being good, and 48.9 percent of the professional audience from district V rated community organizations as being good.

Comparison by application of the Chi-Square test showed there were no significant differences between the three audience's ratings of community organizations. The professional audience rated community organizations similarly in all three areas.

## V. RATINGS OF SEVEN COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS BY THE BANKERS AUDIENCE IN 1984 COMPARED BY AREA OF RESIDENCE

Section IV (Table X) presents findings regarding differences in the bankers audience ratings of seven community problem areas in 1984 compared by the leaders area of residence. The section is divided into seven sub-sections which include present status of: 1) local agriculture; 2) conservation of soil, water, and timber; 3) family income; 4) family living conditions; 5) condition of homes; 6) recreational opportunities; and 7) community organizations.

Table X. Ratings Of Seven Community Problem Areas By The Banker Audience Compared By Area Of Residence In 1984.

| | Area Of Residence | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | District 1 | | District 2,3,4 | | District 5 | |
| Problem Area | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Local Agriculture | | | | | | |
| Poor | 6 | 6.8 | 11 | 6.3 | 2 | 3.4 |
| Fair | 39 | 44.3 | 82 | 46.9 | 32 | 55.2 |
| Good | 43 | 48.9 | 82 | 46.8 | 24 | 41.4 |
| Total | 88 | 100.0 | 175 | 100.0 | 58 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=2.11 | p=0.72 | | | | | |
| Conservation of Soil, Water, Timber | | | | | | |
| Poor | 13 | 15.1 | 24 | 13.9 | 9 | 15.5 |
| Fair | 61 | 70.9 | 110 | 63.6 | 38 | 65.5 |
| Good | 12 | 14.0 | 39 | 22.5 | 11 | 19.0 |
| Total | 86 | 100.0 | 173 | 100.0 | 58 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=2.76 | p=0.60 | | | | | |
| Family Income | | | | | | |
| Poor | 12 | 14.1 | 40 | 23.1 | 13 | 22.8 |
| Fair | 65 | 76.5 | 111 | 64.2 | 38 | 66.7 |
| Good | 8 | 9.4 | 22 | 12.7 | 6 | 10.5 |
| Total | 85 | 100.0 | 173 | 100.0 | 57 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=4.28 | p=0.37 | | | | | |
| Family Living Condition | | | | | | |
| Poor | 0 | 0 | 1 | .6 | 3 | 5.3 |
| Fair | 50 | 56.8 | 109 | 61.6 | 33 | 57.9 |
| Good | 38 | 43.2 | 67 | 37.8 | 21 | 36.8 |
| Total | 88 | 100.0 | 177 | 100.0 | 57 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=9.94 | p=0.05 | | | | | |
| Condition Of Homes | | | | | | |
| Poor | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 2.3 | 2 | 3.4 |
| Fair | 45 | 51.7 | 100 | 57.5 | 29 | 50.0 |
| Good | 42 | 48.3 | 70 | 40.2 | 27 | 46.6 |
| Total | 87 | 100.0 | 174 | 100.0 | 58 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=4.18 | p=0.38 | | | | | |
| Recreation Opportunities | | | | | | |
| Poor | 27 | 30.7 | 53 | 30.1 | 13 | 22.4 |
| Fair | 40 | 45.5 | 78 | 44.3 | 24 | 41.4 |
| Good | 21 | 23.8 | 45 | 25.6 | 21 | 36.2 |
| Total | 88 | 100.0 | 176 | 100.0 | 58 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=3.44 | p=0.49 | | | | | |
| Community Organizations | | | | | | |
| Poor | 2 | 2.3 | 21 | 12.1 | 7 | 12.1 |
| Fair | 43 | 49.4 | 82 | 47.1 | 26 | 44.8 |
| Good | 42 | 48.3 | 71 | 40.8 | 25 | 43.1 |
| Total | 87 | 100.0 | 174 | 100.0 | 58 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square=7.33 | p=0.12 | | | | | |

## Present Status Of Local Agriculture

Local agriculture was rated good by 48.9 percent of the bankers audience in district I, while 46.8 percent of the bankers audience in district II, III, and IV rated local agriculture good, and 41.4 percent of the bankers audience in district V rated local agriculture good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant differences ($p>.05$) found between the areas of residence of the bankers audience, ratings of local agriculture. The majority of the bankers audience, regardless of area of residence, rated local agriculture as being good.

## Present Status Of Conservation Of Soil,Water,and Timber

Conservation of soil, water, and timber was rated good by 14 percent of the district I bankers audience, while 22.5 percent of the bankers audience in district II, III, and IV rated conservation good, and 19 percent of the bankers audience in district V rated conservation of soil, water, and timber good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant differences ($p>.05$) found between the areas of residence of the bankers audience, ratings of conservation of soil, water, and timber. The bankers

audience rated conservation very similarly throughout the three districts.

## Present Status Of Family Income

Family income was rated good by 9.4 percent of the district I bankers audience, while 12.7 percent of the district II, III, and IV bankers audience rated family income good, and 10.5 percent of the bankers audience in district V rated family income good. Comparison between the three groups showed that a slightly lower percentage of the bankers audience from district I rated family income lower than did the other audiences.

When the Chi-Square test was applied to these data significant differences were found ($p<.05$) between the three groups' ratings of family income. For the most part family income was rated as fair by the bankers audience. However, a lower percentage of the Bankers audience from district I rated family income as being good.

## Present Status Of Family Living Conditions

Family living conditions were rated good by 43.2 percent of the district I bankers audience, while 37.8 percent of those from district II, III, and IV rated family living conditions good, and 36.8 percent of the bankers

audience from district V rated family living conditions good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were significant differences ($p<.05$) found between the bankers audience's area of residence and their ratings of family living conditions. The bankers audience from district I rated family living conditions higher than the other two audience groups.

## Present Status Of Condition Of Homes

Condition of homes was rated good by 48.3 percent of the district I bankers audience and by 40.2 percent of the district II, III, and IV bankers audience, while 46.6 percent of the district V bankers audience rated condition of homes good.

Application of the Chi-Square test to these data showed there were no significant differences between the three audience groups ratings of condition of homes. The bankers audience from each of the three areas of residence rated conditions of homes very similarly.

## Present Status Of Recreational Opportunities

Recreational opportunities were rated good by 23.8 percent of the district I bankers audience, while 25.6

percent of the district II, III, and IV bankers audience rated recreational opportunities as being good, and 36.2 percent of the bankers audience from district V rated recreational opportunities good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square test indicated there were no significant differences between the ratings of recreational opportunities by the three audience groups. The bankers audience rated recreational opportunities very similarly, regardless of area of residence.

## Present Status Of Community Organizations

Community organizations were rated good by 48.3 percent of the bankers audience from district I, while 40.8 percent of the bankers audience from district II, III, and IV rated community organizations good, and 43.1 percent of the bankers audience from district V rated community organizations good.

Comparison by application of the Chi-Square test showed there were no significant differences ($p>.05$) between the three audience's ratings of community organizations. The bankers audience from all three districts rated community organizations very similarly.

# CHAPTER VI

# SUMMARY

## I. PURPOSE AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

### Purpose

The main purpose of this study was to identify or disclose similarities or differences between county leaders perception of seven selected community problem areas.

### Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study were: (1) to determine if community leaders from three audience groups differed in their perception of seven community problem areas; (2) to determine if the perception of community leaders about seven community problem areas changed over a time period; and (3) to determine if community leaders living in different areas differed in their perception of seven community problem areas.

## II. METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

### Population and Sample

The population of this study included 3903 county leaders belonging of 12 groups of community leader groups in

86 Tennessee counties. The recommended sample group and size for each county was: (1) Bankers (all), (2) County Agricultural Extension Committee (all), (3)County Government Officials (judge and four officials), (4) County Rural Development Committee (all), (5)Community Club Presidents (all), (6) Home Demonstration Club Presidents (all), (7) Merchants (five representatives), (8) Ministers (five representatives), (9) Newspaper Editors (all), (10) School Principals (all), (11) Service Club Presidents (all), and (12) Senior 4-H Club Presidents (all).

## Data Collected

The instrument for data collection was a one-page survey designed to obtain information regarding county leaders ratings of potential community problem areas. This questionnaire included 31 (1980) and 32 (1984) problem areas, and was developed by specialist at the University of Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service.

Survey respondents were asked to complete the survey by rating each potential community problem area as either poor, fair, or good. County Extension Agents in each county were responsible for data collection.

## Data Analysis

The returned questionnaires were processes and entered

into the computer by the Extension Education Department of the University of Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service. Data were then analyzed on the basis of ratings of select community problems by audience group's year of rating, and area of residence. Significance of the differences were tested by the Chi-Square Test. Probability achieving the 0.05 level was considered significant.

## III. MAJOR FINDINGS

Major findings of this study are classified under three headings which are related to the specific objectives of this study. The first classification involves major differences between three audience groups' ratings of seven community problem areas. Under the second classification, major findings are reported regarding differences between 1984 and 1980 ratings by community leaders of seven community problem areas. In the third and final classification, major findings are reported regarding differences between the ratings of seven community problem areas as perceived by community leaders divided into three areas of residence.

Major Findings Between Three Audience Groups' Ratings Of Seven Community Problem Areas

Local agriculture. Findings revealed that in 1980 significant differences were found between three audience groups' ratings of local agriculture. The extension audience rated the present status of local agriculture lower than did the professional or bankers audiences.

Significant differences were also found between the three audience groups' ratings of local agriculture in 1984.

The bankers audience rated the present status of local agriculture lower than did the extension or professional audiences.

Conservation of soil, water, and timber. Major findings in 1980 revealed that significant differences did exist between the three audience groups' ratings of conservation of soil, water, and timber. The bankers audience ratings were higher than the extension or professional audiences'.

Significant differences were also found between the three audience groups ratings of conservation of soil, water, and timber in 1984. The bankers audience ratings were lower than either the extension or professional audiences'.

Family income. There were no significant differences found between the extension, professional, or bankers audiences' ratings of family income in either of the survey years (1980 and 1984). These results suggest that all

three audience groups were similar in their perception of the present status of family income.

Family living conditions. Findings revealed that in 1980 significant differences did exist between the three audience groups' ratings of family living conditions. The bankers audience ratings were higher than were the extension or professional audience groups' ratings of family living conditions.

Findings further revealed there were no significant differences found in the 1984 ratings of family living conditions by the three audience groups.

Condition of homes. There were no significant differences found between the extension, professional, and bankers audience groups' ratings of condition of homes in either of the survey years (1980 and 1984). The results suggest that all three audience groups were similar in their perception of the present status of condition of homes.

Recreational opportunities. Major findings in 1980 revealed that significant differences did exist between the three audience groups' ratings of recreational opportunities. The bankers audience rated the present status of recreational opportunities higher than did the extension or professional audience groups.

Major findings in 1984 also revealed that significant differences exist between the three audience groups' ratings of recreational opportunities. The bankers audience rated

the present status of recreational opportunities higher than did the extension and professional audience groups.

Community organizations. Findings revealed that significant differences did exist between the three audience groups' ratings of community organizations in both 1980 and 1984. The extension audience ratings were lower in both survey years than ratings were for either the professional or bankers audience.

## Major Findings Between The Ratings Of Seven Community Problem Areas In 1984 Compared To Those In 1980 By All Community Leaders

Local agriculture. Major findings revealed there were significant differences found between the 1984 and 1980 ratings of local agriculture by the professional and bankers audience groups as well as the ratings of all community leaders. These groups rated local agriculture higher in 1980 than they did in 1984.

No significant differences were found between the ratings of the extension audience group on 1980 versus 1984.

Conservation of soil, water, and timber. Findings revealed there were significant differences between the 1980 and 1984 ratings of conservation of soil,water,and timber by the bankers audience as well as the combination of all community leaders. These groups rated conservation of soil, water, and timber higher in 1980 than they did in 1984.

No significant differences were found between the ratings of the extension and professional audience groups' ratings of conservation of soil, water, and timber in 1984 versus 1980.

Family income. Major findings revealed there were significant differences found between the 1984 and 1980 ratings of family income by the extension, professional, and bankers and the combination of all community leaders audience groups. Family income was rated higher in 1980 than in 1984 by the four audience groups.

Family living conditions. Findings revealed there were significant differences between the 1984 and 1980 ratings of family living conditions by the professional audience. Family living conditions were rated higher in 1984 than in 1980 by the professional audience.

No significant differences were found between the ratings of family living conditions in 1984 and 1980 by the extension, bankers, and combination of all audience groups.

Condition of homes. Major findings revealed there were significant differences found between the 1980 and 1984 ratings of condition of homes by the extension, professional, bankers, and the combination of all community leaders' audience groups. Condition of homes was rated higher in 1984 than in 1980 by the four audience groups.

Recreational opportunities. Findings revealed there were significant differences found between the 1984

and 1980 ratings of recreational opportunities by the professional audience and the combination of all community leaders. Recreational opportunities were rated higher in 1984 than in 1980 by the professional audience and the combination of all audience groups.

No significant differences were found between the 1984 and 1980 ratings of recreational opportunities by the extension and bankers audience groups.

Community organizations. Major findings revealed there were significant differences found between the 1984 and 1980 ratings of community organizations by the extension and professional audiences as well as with the combination of all community leaders. Community organizations were rated higher in 1984 than in 1980 by the extension and professional audiences. The combination of all community leaders also rated community organizations higher in 1984 than in 1980.

No significant differences were found between the 1984 and 1980 ratings of community organizations by the bankers audience.

## Major Findings Between The Ratings Of Seven Community Problem Areas As Rated By Community Leaders Divided Into Three Areas Of Residence

Local agriculture. Findings revealed there were no significant differences found between the area of residence

of all community leaders' ratings of local agriculture. Thus, the extension, professional, and bankers audience groups' perception of local agriculture are very similar regardless of area of residence.

Conservation of soil, water, and timber. Significant differences were found within the area of residence comparison of community leaders perception of conservation of soil, water, and timber. All community leaders and the professional audience of district V rated conservation of soil, water, and timber higher than did the professional audience and all community leaders in district I and district II,III, and IV.

No significant differences were found in the area of residence comparison of either the extension or bankers audience groups in relation to conservation of soil, water, and timber.

Family income. Findings revealed there were significant differences within the area of residence comparison in three of four audience groups. Ratings of family income by the extension, bankers, and all community leaders audience groups from district I were lower than ratings from the same audience groups in district II, III, IV and district V.

No significant differences were found in the area of residence comparison of the professional audience group in their ratings of family income.

Family living conditions. Findings revealed there were no significant differences found within the area of residence comparison in three of four audience groups. Ratings of family living conditions by the extension, professional, and all community leaders audience groups regardless of area of residence were very similar.

Significant differences were found in the area of residence comparison of the bankers audience. The bankers audience from district I rated family living conditions higher than those from the other two districts.

Condition of homes. Findings revealed there were significant differences found within the area of residence comparison in two of four audience groups. Ratings of condition of homes by all community leaders from district II, III, and IV were lower than ratings in district I or district V. The district I extension audience rated condition of homes lower than did the extension audience from district II, III, and IV and district V.

There were no significant differences found in the area of residence comparison by the professional and bankers audience groups in their ratings of condition of homes.

Recreational opportunities. Findings of this study revealed there were significant differences within the area of residence comparison in three of four audience groups. Ratings of recreational opportunities by the extension, professional, and all community leader groups from district

V were higher than they were from either district I or district II, III, and IV.

No significant differences were found in the area of residence comparison of the bankers audience in relation to their ratings of recreational opportunities.

Community organizations. Findings revealed there were no significant differences within the area of residence comparison in three of four audience groups. Ratings of community organizations by the extension, professional, and bankers audience groups in all three areas of residence were very similar.

There were significant differences however in the all community leaders group. Community leaders from district II, III, IV rated community organizations lower than did community leaders from other areas of residence.

## IV. IMPLICATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the implications listed below were made:

1. The extension, professional, and bankers audience groups had significantly different perceptions on five of seven community problem areas in 1980. The extension audience rated local agriculture and community organizations lower than the professional or bankers audience groups. The bankers audience rated conservation of soil, water, and

timber; family living conditions; and recreational opportunities higher than did the extension or professional audience groups.

Significant differences in four of seven community problem areas were found in 1984. The extension audience rated community organizations lower than either the professional or bankers audience groups. The bankers audience rated local agriculture and conservation of soil, water, and timber lower than either the extension or professional audience groups. Also, the bankers audience rated recreational opportunities higher than did the extension or professional audiences.

These findings imply that the extension audience has a tendency to rate community problem areas lower than the other audience groups and the bankers audience has a tendency to rate community problem areas higher than the extension or professional audiences.

2. The 1984 and 1980 comparison of seven community problem areas was significantly different in all seven problem areas.

The 1980 ratings were higher in three of seven problem areas. Family income was rated higher in 1980 by all audience groups; local agriculture was rated higher by the professional, bankers, and all community leaders groups; and conservation of soil, water, and timber was rated higher by the bankers and all community leaders groups.

The 1984 ratings were higher in four of seven problem areas. Condition of homes was rated higher by all audience groups in 1984. Community organizations were rated higher by the extension, professional, and all community leaders groups. Recreational opportunities were rated higher by the professional and all community leaders groups. Family living conditions were rated higher in 1984 by the professional audience.

These findings imply that improvement was obtained in three of seven community problem areas. Condition of homes, recreational opportunities, and community organizations were perceived as being better in 1984 than in 1980. The problem areas of; local agriculture; conservation of soil, water, and timber; and family income were perceived as being a more serious problem in 1984 than in 1980. Little change was found in family living conditions.

3. The area of residence of community leaders did have some effect in their ratings of six of seven community problem areas in the 1984 survey. The professional and all community leaders audiences in district V rated conservation of soil, water, and timber higher than either the extension or bankers audiences. Family income was rated lower by the extension, bankers, and all community leaders groups in district I than did those leaders from the two other areas of residence. Family living conditions were rated higher by the bankers audience in district I.

Condition of homes were rated lower by the extension audience in district I and by the all community leaders group from district II, III, and IV. Recreational opportunities were rated higher by district V leaders from the extension, professional, and the all community leaders groups. Condition of homes was rated lower by the all community leaders group from district II, III, and IV. There was no significant difference observed in ratings of local agriculture between the three areas of residence.

The ratings of conservation of soil, water, and timber; and recreational opportunities imply that district V community leaders do not perceive these problem areas to be as serious as community leaders in the other two survey areas of residence. Family income and condition of homes was perceived to be a more serious community problem in district I and district II, III, and IV. Very little difference was found in community leaders perception of local agriculture, family living conditions, and community organizations by comparison in community leaders area of residence.

## V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and implications presented, this writer recommends that guidelines be reviewed and revised to more clearly define the targeted survey audience. Strong encouragement should be given to County Extension Agents to

follow the recommended guidelines when conducting surveys, to insure a random sampling. Surveying more of one particular audience than that audience makes up in the total population could give biased results. In this study the extension-related audience had a tendency to rate problem areas lower than the other audience groups, and if sampled too heavily could swing results to the low rating side of the scale. Likewise, the area of residence has a tendency to effect the severity of community problem areas. In a state wide survey, sampling one area more than another area could influence the outcome of survey results.

It is further recommended that an evaluation of on going community resource development programs be conducted to determine if they are directed toward areas of critical concerns. Various forces such as economic factors, weather conditions, government programs, education, and awareness influence change over a time period. Therefore, the Extension Service should pay close attention to changes in problem areas and determine if the change is a direct result of program emphasis or lack of program emphasis, or if the change is program related at all. Further attention should be given to a more localized summary of problem areas than a state wide report. Emphasis should be placed on surveying a random sample for each audience based on that audiences percentage of the total population. This would lower the possibility of obtaining biased results because of

surveying one audience or more audience groups too heavily.

These points can and will have a lot of influence on how a community development program should be developed and/or conducted in a particular county or area.

## VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This study provides superficial information on seven community problem areas as to how serious community leaders perceive them to be. And further targets areas of the state where these same problems tend to be more serious. It is suggested or recommended that other studies be made to aid in finding solutions for improvement of the identified problem areas. Additional studies could help determine if there have been shifts or changes in the perception of community leaders and to evaluate progress of on going community resource development programs as well as pin point newly developed problem areas.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ahmad, Shamsuddin bin. "A Comparison Of Tennessee Rural And Urban Counties Regarding 32 Problem Areas As Perceived By Selected Community Leaders", Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1986.

2. Amonett, David Kelly. "A Comparison Of Community Resource Development Problems As Perceived By Leaders In Rural And Urban Counties In Tennessee", Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University Of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1984.

3. Beegle, Allen J., Keith Bryantt and Dale E. Hathaway. People of Rural America, A 1960 Census Monograph, Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1968.

4. Bishop, C.E. and Fred A. Magnum. The Quality of Rural Living, Proceeding of a Workshop, Agricultural Board, Division of Biology and Agriculture, National Research Council, National Academy of Science, Washington, D.C.,1971

5. Carlson, J.E., and Lasseys. Rural Society and Environment in America, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1981.

6. Copp, James H., ed. Our Changing Rural Society: Perspectives and Trends. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1964.

7. Dillman, Don A. and Kenneth R Tremblay, Jr. "The Quality of Life in Rural America," The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 429, January 1977.

8. Dickson, Lewis Harper. "The Community Development Approach in Extension Work in Tennessee." Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 1959.

9. Extension In The '80s, A Report of the Joint U.S.D.A.-NASULGC Committee on the Future of Cooperative Extension. Cooperative Extension Service, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, May, 1983.

10. Farm Foundation. Increasing Understanding of Public Problems and Policies. Oak Brook, Ill., National Public Policy Education Committee, 1985.

11. Farm Foundation. Increasing Understanding of Public Problems and Policies. Oak Brook, Ill., National Public Policy Education Committee, 1986.

12. Fitzsimmons, Stephen J. and Abbey J. Freedman. Rural Community Development. A Program, Policy, and Research Model, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt. Bood, 1981.

13. Ford, Thomas R., (Ed.) Rural U.S.A. Persistence and Change, Ames: The Iowa State University Press, 1978.

14. Johnson, Ronald and Edward Knop, "Rural-Urban Differentials In Community Satisfaction," Rural Sociology, XXXV, (December, 1970), 544-548

15. Kelsey, Lincoln D., and Cannon C. Hearne. Cooperative Extension Work. Third Edition. Ithaca, New York: Comstock Publishing Company, 1963.

16. Loomis, Charles P., and J. Allen Beegle. Rural Sociology. Englewood Clifts: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1957.

17. Lowe, George D. and Thomas K. Pinkey. "Rural-Urban Differences In Support for Environmental Protection," Rural Sociology, Vol. 47 (Spring 1982), 114-128.

18. Rosenblum, John W., Agriculture in the Twenty-First Century. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1983.

19. "Rural Housing--Misery Persists as Federal Funds Slow To a Crawl," The Knoxville News-Sentinel, Sunday, September 22, 1985.

20. Sanders, Irwin T. , Rural Society. Englewood Clifts: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.

21. Southern Association of Agriculture Scientists. Rural Sociology In The South: 1980, A Collection of Papers from the 1980 Meeting of the Rural Sociology Section of the Southern Association of Agriculture Scientists, February 3-6, 1980, Hot Springs, Arkansas.

22. The Cooperative Extension Service--Today. A Statement of Scope and Responsibility. Federal Extension Service. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1958.

23. "The East Tennessee Community Improvement Program." East Tennessee Community Improvement Committee, Circular. Knoxville: March , 1960.

24. United States Department of Agriculture, Extension Service, "Renewable Resource Extension Program," Five-year Plan, 1986-90. 1986.

25. University of Tennessee, Agriculture Extension Service, Progress Report, 1984.

26. USDA, ECOP, and The University of Maryland, " A Response to America's Critical Concerns, 1986.

# APPENDIX

AE&RD Info 3

# University of Tennessee
# Agricultural Extension Service
# 1984 COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

Audience _____
County _____

As a community leader, you are being asked to help the county Agricultural Extension Service determine the major areas of local concern. Please complete the following checklist, as you believe the average resident sees our county, by circling poor, fair or good for each item. Add others we may have overlooked.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Local Agriculture<br>Poor Fair Good | Education<br>Poor Fair Good | Sewage Disposal<br>Poor Fair Good | Availability of Doctors and Dentists<br>Poor Fair Good | Condition of Homes<br>Poor Fair Good | Citizen Participation in Local Government<br>Poor Fair Good |
| Local Industry<br>Poor Fair Good | Public Libraries<br>Poor Fair Good | Water Supply<br>Poor Fair Good | Availability of Hospitals and Clinics<br>Poor Fair Good | Parks and Playgrounds<br>Poor Fair Good | General Community Appearance<br>Poor Fair Good |
| Local Stores<br>Poor Fair Good | School Buildings<br>Poor Fair Good | Garbage and Trash Disposal<br>Poor Fair Good | Nursing Homes<br>Poor Fair Good | Recreational Opportunities for All Ages<br>Poor Fair Good | Other _____<br>Poor Fair Good |
| Sources of Credit<br>Poor Fair Good | Public Buildings<br>Poor Fair Good | Road Maintenance<br>Poor Fair Good | Family Living Conditions<br>Poor Fair Good | Land Use Planning and Zoning<br>Poor Fair Good | Other _____<br>Poor Fair Good |
| Jobs Available<br>Poor Fair Good | Fire Protection<br>Poor Fair Good | Public Transportation<br>Poor Fair Good | Family Income<br>Poor Fair Good | Conservation of Natural Resources<br>Poor Fair Good | Other _____<br>Poor Fair Good |
| Job Training and Retraining<br>Poor Fair Good | Police Protection<br>Poor Fair Good | Availability of Public Health Services<br>Poor Fair Good | Children's Day Care<br>Poor Fair Good | Community Organizations<br>Poor Fair Good | Other _____<br>Poor Fair Good |

Please identify the top three specific problems: 1. _____, 2. _____, and 3. _____. This information will give us a basis for educational programs in community resource development. Please list the top three opportunities for Extension programs related to our county: 1. _____, 2. _____, and 3. _____. (Use the back of this form if you need more space to express your opinion on any item.) Thank you.

TAEE 416Q—Rev. 6/84

E12-2015-00-006-85

# VITA

George Michael Heiskell was reared in rural Maynardville, Union County, Tennessee, the son of Roscoe and Naomi Heiskell. He attended public school in Union County and graduated from Horace Maynard High in 1968.

He graduated from The University of Tennessee with a Bachelor of Science degree in Animal Husbandry in June 1973. He was employed as Extension Agent, with livestock responsibility in Burke and Jefferson counties, University of Georgia in January 1974. In January 1977 he accepted the position of Assistant Extension Agent,4-H, in Claiborne County, Tennessee. He was promoted to Associate Extension Agent in July 1981 and in September 1983 he was promoted to the adult agriculture and Extension Leader positions.

Through his participation in the Tennessee Association of Agriculture Extension Agents and Specialist, he received the Outstanding Young Agent Award.

He is a member of Epsilon Sigma Phi, an Honorary Extension Fraternity; Tennessee Association of Agricultural Extension Agents and Specialists; Tennessee Association of Extension 4-H Workers Association; Tennessee Farm Bureau; Tennessee Cattlemen's Association; and American Polled Hereford Association.

George attended auctioneering school in July 1976 at Superior School of Auctioneering in Decatur, Illinois, and is currently a licensed auctioneer.

He completed the requirements for the Master of Science degree in Agricultural Extension Education at the University of Tennessee in June 1987.