



EXTENSION SERVICE

REVIEW

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE * OCTOBER 1967



The Extension Service Review is for Extension educators—in County, State, and Federal Extension agencies—who work directly or indirectly to help people learn how to use the newest findings in agriculture and home economics research to bring about a more abundant life for themselves and their communities.

The Review offers the Extension worker, in his role of educational leader, professional guideposts, new routes and tools for speedier, more successful endeavor. Through this exchange of methods, tried and found successful by Extension agents, the Review serves as a source of ideas and useful information on how to reach people and thus help them utilize more fully their own resources, to farm more efficiently, and to make the home and community a better place to live.

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN
Secretary of Agriculture

LLOYD H. DAVIS, Administrator
Federal Extension Service

Prepared in
Information Services
Federal Extension Service, USDA
Washington, D. C. 20250

Director: *Walter John*
Editor: *W. J. Whorton*
Assistant Editor: *Mary Ann White*

The Extension Service Review is published monthly by direction of the Secretary of Agriculture as administrative information required for the proper transaction of the public business. Use of funds for printing this publication approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (July 1, 1963).

The Review is issued free by low to workers engaged in Extension activities. Others may obtain copies from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 20402, at 15 cents per copy or by subscription at \$1.50 a year, domestic, and \$2.25, foreign.

Reference to commercial products and services is made with the understanding that no discrimination is intended and no endorsement by the Department of Agriculture is implied.

EXTENSION SERVICE

REVIEW

Official monthly publication of Cooperative Extension Service; U. S. Department of Agriculture and State Land-Grant Colleges and Universities cooperating.

CONTENTS	Page
Partners in Progress	3
Serving the Commercial Farmer	4
Marketing Recreation	6
Cultivating Dollars	8
Public Relations Bonanza	10
Work Smarter—Not Harder	12
“Listenability Test”	14
Opportunities for Professional Improvement	15
From the Administrator’s Desk	16

The Indispensable Extension Tool

We give many reasons to explain the phenomenal successes of Extension in helping people solve their many and varied problems. Those most often used include our access to the knowledge bank created by our research colleagues; the interdisciplinary expertise that Extension can bring to bear; and local identity through the county agent system.

We don’t often explain it by pointing to the communication skills of the Extension staff. Yet, any reason given for Extension successes that does not include communications ability doesn’t tell the whole story. We are quick to point out that we use newspapers, radio, television, and newsletters to spread the “good word”. But these are only the tools of communication for reaching mass audiences. It’s the abilities behind the use of these tools that counts—the ability to time the message; the ability to make it understandable; the ability to relate it to the issue, the problem, the need, and the interests.

No matter how much we, as Extension workers, know about animal husbandry, home management, community development, or marketing, we’re not likely to gather many bouquets unless we garnish this subject-matter knowledge with communication skills. All successful Extension workers possess these skills, whether learned through formal training or through the hard knocks of experience.

Communications skill is the indispensable tool for effective Extension work. Opportunities to improve these skills—whether through in-service training or reading materials—should be given top priority by all Extension workers. The AAACE Communications Handbook is a good starter in reading materials if you haven’t already read it. Your State Extension editor can get one for you.—WJW

FARM AND CITY

1955



1967

Partners in Progress

in Salem County, New Jersey

by
H. Russell Stanton
*Associate Director of Communications
Rutgers-The State University
of New Jersey*

Alarm clocks all over Salem County, New Jersey, jangle at 6:30 on a crisp October morning. One by one the residents pry open reluctant eyelids to meet another working day.

Meanwhile, over at the Grange Hall, Dixieland jazz rattles the crockery, and there's a tantalizing symphony of fragrances from the kitchen. The 300 people lucky enough to have been invited are cheerfully, noisily awake and eager to take part in another Salem farm-city breakfast.

There were those who said that county agent Bob Gardner had holes in his head to even consider such an event. But let's see what happened.

Gardner set up a farm tour and

lunch in 1959 in a determined effort to do something about Farm-City Week. He netted 18 "influential" citizens for what he realistically labels another ho-hum lunch.

The next year he decided to have a breakfast, mainly because of the novelty, and 30 men attended. Since then, the event has grown and grown. But 300 breakfasters is the limit, and if you want to go, you'd better get in line. And a special line at that, because Gardner must limit his guests to representatives of organizations, of which there are many in Salem County.

Here's a sampling of the kinds of people on the invitation list: heads of industries, agricultural organizations,

school officials, school guidance directors, presidents of student councils, foreign exchange students, and representatives of unions, the clergy, service clubs, PTA's, and of course, the press.

The program is always slanted toward the non-farmer. Topics have been varied, and keyed to current headlines. One year it was water; in others, farm-city cooperation, taxation, and contributions of businessmen to agriculture.

Bob knows he has to rely on more than strong coffee to keep his audience alert. That's why he has an unrestrained three-piece brass band or a pianist with a heavy touch to bang out noisy tunes.

Last year, though, the clang and clatter were hardly necessary in the face of a Gardner-inspired production that educated while it amused. To drive home the point about the modern housewife's dependence on convenience foods, he had volunteers from the audience prepare a Sunday dinner.

He had one man husking and shelling corn for the corn bread, a girl churning butter, another cutting up a whole chicken. Still others attacked a hard-shelled pumpkin with a knife to make the pie, squeezed tomatoes into a jar to make juice, and peeled potatoes.

This extravaganza served to introduce Miss Jean Judge, Extension food marketing specialist at Rutgers. She made the point that what the housewife saves in time and work she spends for convenience.

Gardner runs the affair on a financial shoestring. Last year, 12 sponsoring organizations each put up \$21.66. This set a new high for expense.

On the menu were eggs, sausage, milk, and pancakes, all of which could have come from Salem farms. There were pitchers of milk, farm-style, on the tables.

Each guest took with him a basket of Salem County vegetable products, nursery stock, and flowers, together with a few pieces of informational material.

The Salem County farm-city breakfast is definitely not ho-hum! □



John Roberts began serious development of his purebred Angus herd in 1961, when the Extension farm management program showed him that this would be a good way to expand his business. The herd is under the Extension performance testing program.

Extension's Continuing Responsibility - -

Serving The Commercial Farmer

by
H. H. Carter
*County Extension Agent
Poinsett County, Arkansas*

The success of Extension's work with one Arkansas farmer has implications for the future responsibilities of Extension to commercial agriculture.

This story of past and present service to a commercial farmer accentuates Extension's need to continue to serve commercial agriculture with the same effort and dedication that has helped "make" both Extension and American agriculture.

John Roberts is one of 1,125 farmers in Poinsett County, Arkansas. This is a county where the struggle to survive in farming, especially since 1950, has been acute and where the burden of adjustment to excess resources in agriculture, to the cost-price squeeze, and to the necessity for applying avail-

able technology has been heavy—disastrous for many.

Between 1950 and 1967, farm numbers decreased by 75 percent. During this period of adjustment, farming in Poinsett County has become highly commercialized. Average farm size increased from 86 to 365 acres. The percentage of farmers with gross annual sales of \$10,000 or over increased from 8.8 to 74 percent.

Let's take a look at John Roberts' advancement and at Extension's contribution. In his own words, he is a "great fan and supporter" of Extension, and gives Extension major credit for his progress. He has used Extension's resources through the tenure of six county agents.

John started his farming career in 1935 as a \$50 a month manager of what was the foundation of his present farm operation. The farm, consisting of 900 acres with about 400 cleared, was owned by his father and two uncles but was mortgaged for more than its market value.

The enterprises included 200 acres of fruit, 40 acres of cotton, a few beef cattle and hogs, and some pasture and feed crops for the livestock and mules.

In 1939 he secured from his father a one-third interest in the heavily mortgaged farm. By "trading" with the other owners, he gained ownership of 600 acres in 1953. Since then John has expanded his ownership to 1,400 acres. About 1,000 acres of the farm is hill land. The other 400 acres is level terrace soil, all in cultivation. Another 300 acres of terrace cropland is rented.

In addition to having practically full equity in his 1,400 acres, John now owns a purebred Angus herd of 210 brood cows and bred heifers which was started with 10 heifers and a bull purchased with borrowed money in 1948. Since then 600 acres of improved pasture has been developed on hill land.

Other present enterprises include a 216-acre base cotton allotment, 275 acres of soybeans, 40 acres of sorghum silage, 20 acres of grain sorghum, and about 300 acres double-cropped with wheat, oats, and rye-grass for cash sales, feed grain, and winter pasture.

Because he had no previous farm experience or training, Roberts says it was natural for him to rely on Extension at first, but that the invaluable service and information he received caused him to continue his close association.

John studied engineering in college, but feels he has gained the equivalent of a degree in agriculture through the Extension Service. His training in engineering has given him an analytical approach to solving problems. As a result he has been eager to demonstrate and apply new recommended practices; he has served as one of Extension's best cooperators and as a valuable example to his neighbors.

John received the most Extension assistance in the late forties following a switch from fruit to cotton because of a declining local market. This involved an increase not only in cotton acreage, but also in mechanization—a change from mules and hoe to tractor power, chemicals, and irrigation. The University of Arkansas soil testing program began about this time, and John has used the program diligently from its beginning.

He was one of the first in the county to start using herbicides for weed control, and has relied heavily upon Extension for information regarding recommended herbicides,

methods and timing of application, and selection and calibration of equipment.

In 1956, with the planning assistance of the State Extension engineer, the farm's first irrigation system was installed—a sprinkler system with a capacity of 70 acres, still in use. In 1959, again with the help of Extension, the remainder of the cotton crop was irrigated.

Major Extension assistance has been provided in insect control. John has participated in the University Extension cotton scouting program each summer since its inception in the mid-1950's. In this program, cooperating farmers hire college youth, trained by the University entomology department and supervised by local county agents, to make weekly insect counts in each field.

John has helped himself, other Poinsett County farmers, and the county Extension program through the many result demonstrations conducted on his farm over the years. These have included demonstrations on such things as wheat varieties, cotton fertilizer placement, cotton preemergence herbicide, and effect of minor elements on cotton.

The farm's cotton yields have increased from about 250 pounds to an average of 656 pounds per acre for

the 5-year period 1962-66. Average county yields for this period were 458 pounds.

Although the purebred Angus herd was started in 1948, serious development of herd and pastures did not begin until 1961. "This came about as a result of my participation in the Extension farm management program," John said. "Record keeping and analysis of my farm business pointed out my need for a larger volume of business. My large acreage of hill land was a resource that could be tapped."

In 1964, performance testing of the herd was started under the Arkansas Extension program in which weaning-age calves are weighed and graded by county Extension agents. This data is then adjusted and prepared by the State livestock specialists for use in culling less desirable cows from the herd, in selecting replacement heifers, and in helping to prove the herd sires.

John buys and uses herd sires performance-tested by the University. Calves are sold for breeding purposes or are marketed through the White River Feeder Calf Association, an Extension-sponsored organization in an adjoining county.

Discussing his rather heavy reliance upon Extension personnel, John said, "They've been of terrific help through the years. They've been particularly valuable—both local agents and State specialists—in helping me develop a livestock program in an area where there has been little experience. It means much to have competent technical advice just as close as the telephone."

Extension's relationship with John Roberts has not been a one-way street. He serves on the seven-man County Extension Committee, which helps guide Extension policy in the county. He has served on Extension program-planning committees and will soon be an adult leader to a 4-H photography group.

In an ever-changing and increasingly complex agriculture, Extension must continue to effectively serve commercial farmers like John Roberts—in Poinsett County and throughout the United States. □



John Roberts, left, and county Extension agent H. Carter check soil moisture prior to irrigating cotton.

Marketing Recreation

a new cash 'crop'
for commercial farmers

by
P. Curtis Berryman
W. James Clawson
and
Ralph D. Smith *



San Luis Obispo County rancher Donn Bonnheim, right, shows Farm Advisor Jim Clawson the quail guzzler he built to help spread out his gamebird population. The drum holds a two-month supply of water, and a float valve keeps the water level constant.

Growing urban size and congestion have created a market for a new cash "crop" for San Luis Obispo County (Calif.) farmers.

Commercial farmers in many areas of the country are finding that they have space which can profitably be used for recreation, and are calling on Extension to provide the technical information necessary for making the new enterprise pay.

One of Extension's jobs is to help farmers determine how, and for how much, they can sell hunting and fishing, scenery, clear air, and open space.

Recreation is part of the economic base of San Luis Obispo County. Recreation enterprises exist mainly on average-size ranches—the combination cattle ranches and farms on the brushy, wooded hills of this central California coast area.

Some of the ranches now offer both hunting and fishing. Several have built dams, creating lakes for both irrigation and fishing. Some offer horseback riding; some are attractive to hikers and rock-hounds.

They all have scenery: not formal pine and fir forests but grassy hills and scattered oaks. Especially, for people from California's growing cities, the ranches offer air you can't see.

For the hunter, a 6,000-acre ranch may offer deer, wild pigs, wild turkeys, quail, doves, pigeons, pheasants, chukkers, and even ducks—not to mention their predators, the cougars, bobcats, coyotes, and foxes.

** Berryman, County Director and Clawson, Farm Advisor, San Luis Obispo County; Smith, Communications Specialist, California Extension Service, Berkeley.*

For the fisherman, some all-year streams offer native trout. One rancher has built a 27-acre lake and stocked it with Kamloops trout from British Columbia. Other lakes have bass and bluegill.

Camping, hiking, or just riding with four-wheel-drive vehicles over ranch roads can be ample attraction for other recreation seekers.

What to charge is always a problem, though. What is the privilege of hunting worth?

Ten or fifteen years ago, a number of ranchers in the county charged for pigeon hunting on a day basis at \$1 a gun. Last year they charged \$3 to \$5 and found plenty of takers.

This has started the ranchers thinking seriously. An exploratory meeting brought out 10 ranchers interested in promoting recreation as a source of income.

The Extension wildlife specialist, Dick Teague, was called in, and then Extension forester Jim Gilligan, who is concerned with recreational use of the forests. Each rancher estimated what he had to sell to the recreation consumer. The whole group took a two-day tour of all the ranches involved. Since that start, six or eight more ranch owners have joined the group.

The next need was to bring in a farm management specialist. Extension economist Phil Parsons began looking into the costs of recreation as a ranch enterprise. Teague went into biological problems.

The activities grew. A series of luncheon meetings in Paso Robles brought out 16 or 18 ranchers each time. The wildlife specialist came down from Davis again to talk about private ranch recreation development.

The county planning director talked about zoning and related problems; the county health officer, about aspects of sanitation for camps and dude ranches; insurance people, about risks associated with paid-for recreation; attorneys, about legal responsibilities and contracts. Another Extension economist, Bill Wood, talked about the new State Land Conservation Act.

Recreation is an area where you can't assume you know anything. It isn't like raising wheat or cattle, where the problems of one ranch are just about like those of any other. You can tell a rancher what it costs to grow an acre of wheat—about \$30. You can tell him what equipment he will need, what he'll have to do with it, and when.

But every ranch and every recreation activity is different from all the others. To begin, you have to like people and recognize that they have interests different from yours. You have to ask yourself what kind of host you are going to be.

You have to recognize, too, that farm or ranch income from recreation is not all velvet. One of the ranchers, Donn Bonnheim, who has a good private club enterprise going on his place, puts it this way:

"It costs more than it looks. For one thing, there was the cost of putting in culverts, so vehicles can get over the ranch roads. And I didn't want to get into the garbage business. But with campers I had to, and put in a dump. We're putting in a water line. We've planted bass and bluegill, and we're going to try some trout in a stream.

"At first I tried to stay out of the group. But you can't do that. You've got to talk to people and have them talk to you."

Managing game takes some investment. Bonnheim has built quail guzzlers to spread out the birds between natural watering places. He builds a guzzler out of a quarter of an old hot water tank, fed by a 50-gallon drum. This holds water for almost two months.

The guzzler goes in the shade of a live oak, which gives the quail a roost tree. Bonnheim piles some brush nearby so the birds can escape from hawks, and he builds a fence around the area to keep out livestock.

Marketing is probably a rancher's biggest stumbling block. There is a market—the people in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and some interior cities who want to get out in the open, to

hunt, to fish, to camp and hike, and just enjoy scenery.

But there is no established method of marketing these recreational values. One rancher may get \$1,000 a year from each of a dozen hunters and have a substantial source of income. At day hunting rates another rancher will have to handle a lot more people. And he doesn't know what he should charge.

So, the job is to find out first what the break-even point is. The rancher has a cost of production for recreation just as he has for any other crop he grows and markets. For recreation, he has labor, repair, cleanup, and construction costs. He can attach some of his land costs and taxes to the recreation enterprise.

There may be some excellent opportunities for graduate research in the marketing of recreation privileges. This might take the form of a study of 1,000 families in San Francisco or Los Angeles. How many like to hike and camp? How many are rock hounds? How many would like to spend a vacation on a farm? How many miles will they travel for recreation? And how do they learn about recreation opportunities?

Research could well go into other areas besides marketing. There is a lot to learn about ground covers and brush for browse and plant breeding with feed for wildlife as the objective. Trial plantings of wild rice in some of the man-made reservoirs look good. So does an experimental seeding of duckwheat, another good wildfowl feed imported from the northern Middlewest.

There's a lot to learn about recreation as a farm product. But this is known:

People in urban areas are going to demand recreation space and be willing to pay for it.

It can't all be on public land.

So private land owners should be thinking about developing their land, improving wildlife habitat, and building recreation facilities to meet the demand. Extension, in turn, should be prepared to give them the assistance they need. □

The 20 or so county agents who descended on the Hershel Pyree farm near Independence, Oregon, this summer weren't there to tell him how to grow sugar beet seed better. They were asking questions about his management program so they could do their own homework better.

It was all part of the Western Regional Farm Management Workshop at Oregon State University where county agents and Extension specialists from the 13 Western States and British Columbia come for six weeks in the summer to help them tool up for the problems brought on by agriculture's cost-price squeeze.

This summer was the third year for the workshop, which is headed by Manning Becker, OSU Extension farm management specialist. The course was planned by a subcommittee of the Western Farm Management Extension Committee and grew out of a report of the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy on "Extension's Responsibility to Commercial Farmers and Ranchers."

The report concluded that the number of farms and ranches will decline and that farms will become larger in size and more highly specialized. "More precise management and technical information will be required from educational and commercial institutions," it stated.

Becker and crew, which includes Fred Smith, OSU Extension farm management specialist, Grant Blanch, professor of agricultural economics, and Philip Parsons, University of California farm management specialist, immediately set out to provide Extension workers with economic backgrounds to cope with farm management.

Becker, who won the OSU School of Agriculture's 1967 outstanding teacher award, has carried the same philosophy into the course that he deals out to his OSU students and the State's farmers—that dollars need to be cultivated just as carefully as the land, and that modern economic tools are just as important as the latest mechanical gadget in a farm operation.

**Summer course
in farm management
sharpens agents' economic tools for...**

Cultivating Dollars

by
James E. Williams
*Extension Information Specialist
Oregon State University*

The summer workshops provide an opportunity for agents and specialists to devote six weeks of concentrated effort in the field of farm management. Emphasis is on economic principles, concepts, and procedures basic to management competence and the techniques and skills essential in the practical application of these to the solution of management problems.

Major areas of subject matter include decisionmaking, the tools of management, farm business analysis, organization of farm resources, development of local farm management data, and developing and strengthening county Extension farm management programs.

What all this means is, as one agent put it after completing the

course, "You worked us hard, Manning, and made us like it."

The students live together in one of the campus dormitories and as Becker puts it, "live, sleep, eat, and play economics." The group is divided into teams which compete strongly in two categories. Teams make farm tours and, with additional data supplied by Becker, work up a 30-to 40-page report on how their particular farm can improve its management.

The teams are divided again to play a farm management game where computers are used to evaluate information for a simulated farm operation. Teams compete to see who can make the most on an operation over a 10-year period.

"We had some fun with this year's group by awarding the low team with



Looking at a crop of sugar beet seed during one of the farm tours are, left to right, Ray Hunte of Washington; Dez Hazlett of British Columbia; instructor Manning Becker; Ed Parson of Montana; and Ray Cogburn of Colorado.

a 1920 farm account book," quipped Becker. A typical day in the school, according to Becker, includes a 20-minute presentation by one of the students followed by a critique and about a 3-hour lecture-recitation period. Afternoons are devoted to seminars and problem solving.

The real test comes when the agents return home. Most barely have time to clear their desks before growers begin asking for management help. One agent returned to his Northern California county after the first workshop and used his knowledge to show the potential of Grade B dairying to farmers who faced large debts from a devastating flood.

A New Mexico agent began a crop cost study with farm and bank person-

nel, while a Washington agent assembled input-output information to judge alternatives of feeding cow-calf herds.

Other agents are talking to certified public accountants about the advantages of having some farmers close their accounting period in January or February rather than December 31; developing cost data for deep well irrigation; helping ranchers analyze the economic consideration of purchasing additional property; and putting on their own management schools for farmers.

Becker feels that although computers are making farmers more aware of the need for management, the overall economic situation is responsible for the pressure being put on by farmers for information to better their management.

This in turn puts pressure on agents and specialists. "County agents feel frustrated because they are unable to provide the management help farmers are demanding," says Sam Doran, a Washington State University farm management specialist who took the OSU course as a refresher after completing his advanced degree work in economics.

"Credit people have forced an awareness of management on farmers and they go to Extension for help," he continued. "After taking the farm management course, agents no longer have to feel guilty about avoiding their obligations to the farmers. They see the positive things they can do, and feel more comfortable and capable about doing it."

Doran attributes much of the success of the course to Becker's willingness to teach management any time, any place, to anybody who will listen. "He gives students real tools by showing them how to use basic principles and methodology to solve specific types of problems that he has faced himself at one time or another," Doran added.

After completing the summer course, several students have come back to take advanced degree work in farm management. A good example is John Pancratz of British Columbia, who took the 1966 course.

"I had planned to get more training in economics in four or five years," said Pancratz, who did his undergraduate work in animal husbandry, "but Manning got me so enthusiastic about economics I decided to go right into it."

Three more Canadian agents followed Pancratz to the course this summer after Becker made a talk at a farm management meeting in British Columbia. "District agents have felt they were offering a piecemeal program to farmers for years because there are many other agencies that can give competent information on cultural practices," Pancratz observed "With farm management training, the agent can look at a grower's operation in its totality and offer help that no other agency can." □

A short term project which taught teenagers automotive safety and care has turned into a public relations bonanza for the Kentucky Extension Service.

Duncan Sanford, Lexington area Extension 4-H youth agent, was looking for a program which would involve a high percentage of Fayette County teenagers for about 10 weeks.

He established two criteria—the program had to meet a serious need head-on, and it had to merit the involvement of the community's leadership. The 4-H Automotive program, with a strong emphasis on safety and designed for boys and girls 14-19 years of age, looked promising.

Sanford reviewed 4-H automotive literature, compiled statistics on motor vehicle accidents in the city and county during 1965, and consulted with Fred Brockman of the State 4-H staff, his area director, and his colleagues.

Sanford built his plan on the suggestions given in "Guidelines for Organizing the Kentucky 4-H Automotive Program." Prepared by the 4-H automotive leader in McCracken County and the State 4-H staff, the guidelines included general recommendations, a suggested plan, and a list of key people by title.

The guidelines suggested that the Extension staff contact key people in the community, explain the program, and invite them to a first meeting for further explanation and a final decision by the group.

Sanford personally contacted the presidents of all major civic and service clubs, officials of city and county government, and presidents of insurance associations, safety council, automotive dealers' association, and PTA's.

He called on managers of the radio and television stations, managing editors of the newspapers, and the school superintendents. His personal contacts brought 55 of the community's most active leaders to the information meeting.

Before the meeting, he mailed to each person a copy of the 4-H Automotive Bulletin, a four-page publica-

Public Relations Bonanza

Short term 4-H project
puts Kentucky Extension
in the spotlight

by
James T. Veeder
Director of Information
National 4-H Service Committee

tion highlighting the numerous successful 4-H Automotive programs across the country.

To avoid the possibility of the meeting of community leaders becoming stalemated in the selection of a workable steering committee, Sanford invited several of the most logical choices to a breakfast meeting.

Several of these individuals agreed to accept committee chairmanships for leader recruitment, member enrollment, and leader training, as well as the chairmanship of the steering committee.

The meeting of 55 community leaders provided opportunities for additional good public relations for 4-H, Extension, and the University of Kentucky. Following the presentation by Extension personnel, the community leaders were invited to express their

personal evaluations of the suggested program. They immediately endorsed the plan and promised their support.

They elected a chairman and co-chairman of the steering committee, who in turn selected additional committee chairmen and asked them to serve on the steering committee.

At this point, the 4-H Automotive Safety program became a community action program. To provide greater acceptance, an honorary Advisory Committee of 36 of Lexington's leading citizens was formed with the general manager of the newspaper company as chairman.

Sanford and the steering committee moved the program into high gear in an effort to recruit 350 leaders to handle clubs or groups of up to 25 teenagers. Speakers were dispatched to

radio-TV programs and to meetings of civic clubs, PTA's, and professional groups.

The 4-H office followed through with bulletins to presidents of these organizations giving qualifications needed by leaders and the amount of time such leadership would involve.

A barrage of publicity hit the radio and television stations and the newspapers. They responded with front page stories and prime time broadcasts, editorials, and a full-page cooperative newspaper ad.

Television stations aired the 4-H automotive film, "The Paducah Story." During this period of more than three weeks, as well as throughout the run of the short term project, 4-H enjoyed a high visible exposure through news media.

By the first orientation meeting in early January, some 275 leaders had been recruited. Members of the women's organizations of Lexington, in a "Dial for Safety Campaign," called each one to remind him of the meeting. The State commissioner of public safety, in his keynote speech, endorsed the program and challenged the volunteer leaders to work for automotive safety.

Kentucky Governor Breathitt praised the program and persons connected with it at a huge banquet on the eve of enrollment. News coverage of each event was extensive.

January 24 was proclaimed "E" Day (enrollment day) by the county judge and mayor. Fifteen enrollment teams moved into school assemblies to explain the program, encourage participation, and sign up enrollees. This was the real test—would the teenagers respond?

By noon on "E" Day about 5,600 of an estimated 6,000 eligible 14-19 year-olds had enrolled. City firemen and members of the placement committee assigned leaders and participants to specific groups. In early February, the 10 weeks of instruction began in each of 125 groups.

Throughout the course of the instruction the 4-H office, with the help of firemen and other interested persons, mailed information bulletins to



Automotive program participants learned the fundamentals of car operation as well as safety. For nearly all leaders and participants, the program was their first involvement in 4-H, and they enjoyed it.

leaders. The steering committee continued to function, and news of the progress of the program continued to appear in newspapers and on the air.

About 3,000 teens were active participants. The program was climaxed by a recognition event at the University of Kentucky's Agricultural Science Center Auditorium, attended by a capacity audience. The following day the local Sports Car Club sponsored a roundup event testing automotive safety knowledge and skills of the 4-H participants.

Evaluation showed that nearly all leaders expressed a desire to see the program continued another year. Most of the leaders also enjoyed working with the young people, and the teens themselves felt they gained much from their first involvement as participants in a 4-H program.

In Lexington and Fayette Counties, the Extension Service and its professional staff have gained stature in the community. Their public relations and the image of 4-H have never been better.

Extension again has proved that 4-H programs are timely, tuned to the needs of modern youth, and are quickly and readily implemented by community leadership.

Word of this successful 4-H Automotive Safety program has spread to other counties within and beyond the borders of Kentucky. It has prompted added interest in the program nationwide.

With the Lexington 4-H Automotive Safety program success as a guide, the educational and public relations potentials of the program for Extension are limitless. □

by
Dorothy A. Wenck
Home Advisor
Orange County, California



The need for most ironing can be prevented by wise buying and careful laundering. At right, homemakers examine children's clothing which was worn and washed for a year without being ironed. Above, homemakers explore laborsaving methods to simplify necessary ironing.

Work Smarter—Not Harder

Today's homemakers, in spite of all their laborsaving devices, easy care clothing, and convenience foods, find lack of time or poor time management to be their most difficult homemaking problem.

This was the finding of a questionnaire survey of 445 Orange County, California, homemakers—all recipients of the Extension home economics newsletter.

"Not enough hours in the day" . . . "Lack of time to spend with children and husband" . . . "Extreme anxiety that I will never get the whole house clean ever!" were typical answers to the question, "What is your most difficult homemaking problem?"

Nearly two-thirds of the women indicated that they lacked time for special projects; over half said they had difficulty finding free time for relaxation and personal development; almost half said they were dissatisfied with "fitting essential cleaning tasks into time available," "organizing work so there are few peak loads," "having

unhurried time alone with each child," or "finding timesaving methods."

The purpose of the survey was to find out if employed homemakers had special homemaking problems which an Extension program might help solve. But the results of the mailed questionnaire, answered by 183 employed and 262 nonemployed homemakers, showed that their problems were the same. The differences were merely a matter of degree.

On the basis of these results, Extension developed a three-meeting short course, "Work Smarter—Not Harder," to help both employed and nonemployed homemakers—especially young mothers of preschool children—find ways to save time and energy.

Since saving time was such an obvious need, a great deal of information was condensed into the three 2-hour meetings.

The first meeting, "The Household Executive," dealt with the principles of good management, particularly the importance of establishing goals based

on the individual family's values; the reasons time is wasted and how it might be saved; ways to combat physical and psychological fatigue; and basic work simplification principles.

Ways to simplify house care were discussed at the second meeting, "Down With Dirt," which emphasized preventive housekeeping (ways to avoid cleaning) and encouraged homemakers to consider their own housecleaning personality when buying home and furnishings.

"Meals in Minutes" was the topic of the third meeting, in which time and energy saving methods for the kitchen were discussed. Again, good management principles, particularly planning ahead, were emphasized. The agent demonstrated many inexpensive ways to improve kitchen storage and discussed ideas for creative use of convenience foods. Selection, use, and care of kitchen equipment was touched on briefly with emphasis on safety.

An overhead transparency served to



illustrate a quick time and motion study of a "before and after" method for making sandwiches. The "before" method was exaggeratedly inefficient, but one homemaker confessed that was exactly the way she made sandwiches and that this one change saved her "several miles" a week.

At each meeting the agent encouraged homemakers to develop a questioning attitude towards the what, why, who, where, when, and how of every job and to realize that being "lazy" by using timesaving methods is intelligent. "True laziness is the conservation of energy by means of intelligence. Laziness at its best results in the conservation of physical effort when brought about by planning and the use of relevant knowledge." ("On the Merits of Being Lazy," John Mulholland and George N. Gordon, Los Angeles Times, March 19, 1967.)

The need for constant evaluation in terms of the family needs and the individual homemaker's goals was stressed. Ways to involve other family

members, particularly children, in home management were also suggested at each meeting.

Visual aids played an important part in each meeting. Overhead transparencies illustrated and emphasized the points discussed. A cartoon series of transparencies used at each meeting illustrated the work simplification principles—omit steps, combine tasks, easy reach, good posture, etc.

Examples of products and equipment for laundering, ironing, house care, food preparation, and kitchen storage were displayed and discussed. Special emphasis was given to money-saving materials.

Because of the confusing array of commercial products on the market, the homemakers had many questions to ask. University of California Extension pamphlets on simplifying housework, house care, kitchen storage, and equipment were available to the audience for supplementary reading.

A fourth meeting, "It's Your Turn to Talk," was sometimes scheduled if

time was available. At this informal meeting, homemakers shared their ideas for short cuts, discussed products and equipment they used, and asked many additional questions.

To reach as many employed homemakers and mothers of preschool children as possible, the series was scheduled in the evening as well as during the day. The course was first presented three times at the Extension office.

Subsequent courses were at county branch libraries, churches, and YWCA's under the sponsorship of various organizations who publicized the program and usually also provided daytime child care facilities.

Extension publicized the meetings by means of newspaper releases and an attractive flyer which was mailed to homemakers on the home economics mailing list as well as to the members of the sponsoring organizations.

The turnout of Orange County homemakers for this course did indeed indicate that time management was an area where they needed help. The course was repeated 10 times between October 1966 and May 1967 with as many as 200 women attending some of the meetings. Total attendance was over 3,700.

Audience response to the course was highly enthusiastic. Written evaluations of how the course helped them included statements such as:

"Helped me think through my goals as a homemaker and tailor them to my family" . . . "It's given me more confidence" . . . "Stimulated me to try again to get cooperation from the children in lending a helping hand."

Response to Orange County short courses which were not based on an interest survey has been good, but not nearly as extensive as the response to "Work Smarter—Not Harder."

Organizations in other areas of the county are still asking to sponsor the short course, and plans are now underway to present the course in other California counties.

Here's another proof of the validity of the Extension policy of programs geared to the needs of the people. □

'Listenability' Test

Can your oral presentations pass it?

by
J. Cordell Hatch
*Extension Radio-Television Editor
The Pennsylvania State University*

An article in the *Journal of Broadcasting*, 1966-67 winter issue, reports a breakthrough that, at the least, provides an embryo of a system to help Extension workers, and all others, measure the effectiveness of oral communications.

The breakthrough is called the "Easy Listening Formula" (ELF) and was described by Irving E. Fang. It is designed to do the same thing for oral communications that readability formulas have done to simplify written communications.

Extension workers at all levels are spending an increasing amount of time on the telephone, speaking before groups, and appearing on radio and television. Yet, they have had no way of estimating in advance just how effective their message would be.

Concern with simple, easy-to-read writing has long been emphasized in Extension in-service training. Concern with simple, easy-to-understand oral communications has developed

more recently for the reasons stated above.

Irving says the ELF is less complicated than readability formulas, but it does not have the benefit of extensive research to support it. Yet, its correlation with Flesch's Reading Ease formula is +.96, almost perfect. ELF is not claimed to meet all listenability criteria. It has not yet been related to listener comprehension, retention, and interest.

Nevertheless, it can serve as an easily remembered and easily applied guide to writing materials for the "ear". Moreover, it can be applied before the message is ever spoken.

ELF works this way: *In each sentence of the speech, script, or story to be checked for listenability, count only those syllables above one per word. The average per sentence should be less than 12.*

For example, the first sentence (italicized) above has an ELF score of 11: "sentence," "story," "only," and "above" score one each; "sylla-

ble," two; and "listenability," five. The second sentence has an ELF score of three. Only "average" and "sentence" have more than one syllable per word. Thus, the average for the two sentences is seven.

This formula may sound rigidly prescriptive. In operation, it needn't be. The writer is free to graduate his own scale of listenability based on the above guide.

However, he should do so with the knowledge that the most highly rated network television news writers use a style that averages less than 12. ELF average scores for Huntley-Brinkley scripts range from 9.9 to 12.0; Walter Cronkite, 9.6 to 11.9; and Peter Jennings, 8.7 to 10.7—none above 12.

This does not mean that all sentences should have no more than 12 syllables above one per word. A sentence with 20 or more may be perfectly clear. It depends on the structure of the statement and the nature of the concepts expressed.

In this regard Fang says: "The Easy Listening Formula does not discourage the long sentence, provided the sentence contains short words, which usually means simple words. Nor does it discourage the use of long and complex words, provided the thought in which a complex word is nested (i.e., sentence) is short.

"What ELF does discourage is precisely what confuses a listener, who lacks the . . . reader's opportunity to review, digest, and mull over a sentence. It discourages the rush of long words. It discourages the long sentence containing several concepts, possibly using subordinate clauses and several prepositional phrases."

In fact, the syllables above one per word in each sentence can be counted at the same time the material is being checked for spelling and punctuation. If the average per sentence is much above 12, this can be a cue that some sections or sentences may need to be rewritten.

Since results from this method of calculating style difficulty are highly correlated to readability measures, it seems that writers for the print media might also find ELF a useful tool.

Extension Winter School

Several factors emphasize the need for and value of "listenability" formulas as a companion to readability formulas for written messages. Although they have had the benefit of more research and testing, readability formulas are not conducive to easy recall and occasional use.

Second, for the writer of speeches or of radio, television, or film scripts, the "readability" formulas make no claims of "listenability." Most writers know that copy for the eye is not necessarily suitable copy for the ear, and vice versa.

The two senses have their own peculiar differences. When it comes to how they decode messages, each makes its own unique demands. The channels which carry "eye" and "ear" verbal messages also are vastly different. The environment in which written and spoken messages are received is still another point of dissimilarity.

Three problems face the writer of "audio messages" in regard to readability formulas: 1. Are they acceptable measures of listenability? 2. Are they unnecessarily complicated? 3. Can new formulas be developed which apply more specifically and appropriately to spoken messages?

In regard to the relationship of readability scores to listenability criteria, research findings are inconsistent. In some of the few studies conducted the relationship is positive; in as many others it is negative.

It is generally agreed, however, that easy material is somewhat easier and hard material somewhat harder when heard than when read. This "exaggeration effect" makes style difficulty of extreme importance in material written for speech, radio, television, or film.

The ELF should be a welcome addition to each Extension worker's "kit of communication tricks." All effective Extension workers—no matter what other expertise they may claim—possess one common skill. They all have the ability to communicate—that is, to relate their subject-matter information bank to their audience in an understandable fashion through either the written or oral word. □

The Seventh Western Regional Extension Winter School will take place January 29 to February 16 at the University of Arizona.

Courses will include Agricultural Policy; Program Planning and Evaluation; Farm and Ranch Management;

National Science Foundation Graduate Fellowships

The National Science Foundation Act of 1950 authorizes graduate fellowships for study or work leading to master's or doctoral degrees in the physical, social, agricultural, biological, engineering, mathematical and other sciences.

The following fields are included in agriculture: general agriculture, agronomy, animal husbandry, forestry, horticulture, soil science and others. Economics, sociology, political science and psychology are among the other fields of specialization that qualify for fellowships.

Fellowships will be awarded only to U. S. citizens who have demonstrated ability and aptitude for advanced training and have been admitted to graduate status or will have been admitted prior to beginning their fellowship tenures.

Awards will be made at three levels: (1) first-year level, (2) intermediate level, and (3) terminal level. The basic annual stipend will be \$2,400 for the first-year level, \$2,600 for intermediate level, and \$2,800 for terminal level graduate students. In addition, each fellow on a 12-month tenure will be provided a \$500 allowance for a dependent spouse and each dependent child.

Application materials may be obtained from the Fellowship Office, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20418. Applications must be received not later than December 8, 1967.

Agricultural Communications; 4-H Leadership Development; Modern Concepts of Farm Machinery Management; and Cultural Implications of Technological Change.

Total fees will be \$62.50 for two courses. Two courses comprising a total of three semester credits is the maximum load.

Ford Foundation Scholarships of \$100 are available to those enrolling in Agricultural Policy. Applications should be submitted through State Extension Directors.

For the Winter School Brochure giving more detailed information, write to: Kenneth S. Olson, Director, Western Regional Extension Winter School, Room 303-H Agriculture Building, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721. □

Kenneth F. Warner Grant For Extension Secretaries

Mu Chapter of Epsilon Sigma Phi is again offering one or more awards, not to exceed \$70 each, for professional improvement of Cooperative Extension Service secretaries.

The secretary must submit, with her application for the Warner award, a copy of the notification from the Institute for Certifying Secretaries that she is qualified to take the Certified Professional Secretary examination.

This means that prior to December 1, 1967 the secretary must (1) obtain CPS examination application forms from the Institute for Certifying Secretaries, 1103 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Missouri 65106; and (2) complete and return those forms to the Institute.

Applications for the Warner grant may be obtained from the Staff Development Office, FES, and must be submitted no later than February 1, 1968.

From The Administrator's Desk by Lloyd H. Davis

On the Use of Volunteers

We pride ourselves in the way we involve volunteers in our programs.

4-H Club work is almost completely dependent on volunteers who give most generously of their time, talents, facilities, and money. They are farmers, homemakers, businessmen, young people only recently 4-H members—busy people in many walks of life. They lead and teach clubs, conduct and supervise 4-H events, provide facilities, equipment, supplies, recognition, and awards.

Similarly in the adult home economics Extension work the program depends on volunteers—volunteers who take special training to pass the knowledge on to their neighbors—volunteers who help less well off families improve their home life—volunteers who work together to improve their communications.

In our agricultural program farmers volunteer their land, labor, and equipment to test and demonstrate new ideas for the benefit of their neighbors. They voluntarily provide information about their farming operations. They volunteer in many ways to contribute their time and talents to the success of Extension programs.

In our community resource development work, all with whom we work are contributing their minds and energies to the common cause of a better community.

Volunteers contribute generously in helping plan Extension programs.

Some observers have said Extension makes greater use of more volunteers than any other organization or program.

But are we really using volunteers?

A part of our conventional philosophy is that we "help people help themselves." This indeed we do. And in the process of solving his own problems and developing his own opportunities a person develops his abilities to help others with similar problems and opportunities. As we encourage and help people serve as volunteers in Extension programs, we are really "helping people to help others"—and reap for themselves the great satisfactions this brings.

Helping our less fortunate neighbor to become a success in his struggles to make his own progress is basic to our American tradition—to our traditional social and economic structure—to the religious beliefs on which our society is based—to the great international role our Nation has assumed.

No! We do not "use" volunteers. We help people exercise their desire and responsibility to help others—and thus contribute to the continuation and growth of an essential feature of our great society. □