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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to develop a practical plan for coordinating the work of publicly-supported county agricultural agencies. The normative survey method was used to gather the data. Questionnaires were sent to the state agricultural agency heads in the twelve southern states. Counties most frequently recommended for the excellence of their coordination efforts were selected for this study. Twenty-one of the thirty-six counties chosen were recommended by two or more of their state agricultural agencies. A second questionnaire based on an analysis of the problem was mailed to 209 heads of agricultural agencies in the selected sample of 36 counties in the twelve southern states. Eighty-seven percent of the agencies replied.

All data were computed and presented in tabular and graphic form. This was followed by a descriptive analysis of all data.

It was found that eight major agricultural agencies were operating at the county level. In order of the frequency that they were found operating with the percentage of counties having operational units shown, they are: Agr. Ext. Service (100%), SCS (100%), ASC (100%), FHA (97%), Voc. Agr. (89%), The Forest Service (31%), PCA (25%), and the Federal Land Bank (22%).

It was found that agencies generally perform only those duties specified by enabling legislation.

Methods of agricultural coordination found in use and listed in the order they were rated for efficiency are: "a county agricultural program," "an agricultural workers' organization," "joint sponsoring of agricultural events," "sharing publicity and recognition," "informal
verbal agreements," "centralization of agencies offices," "interchanging use of facilities," "a master calendar of agricultural events," "planned social activities for agricultural workers," "formal memorandums of understanding," and "a county coordinator."

It was found that the following factors are indispensable to a successful county program for agricultural coordination: a county agricultural program, mutual assistance between agencies, joint enterprises by agencies, professional agricultural worker's ability to get along with people, and leadership by heads of agricultural agencies.

Six new proposals for county coordination were considered to possess a high degree of merit. They are functional memorandums of understanding at the state or national level, a farmer-elected county agricultural advisory board, training in coordination for prospective agricultural workers, planning boards at the national level, agency's farmer committee to be advisory only, and consolidating federal agricultural services into three divisions — education, action, and credit.

It was concluded that: (1) legislative amendments or changes in directives could greatly facilitate agricultural coordination, (2) coordination should be developed within the framework of a county agricultural program, (3) methods of coordination rated most highly should be adopted by counties, (4) professional agricultural workers should be highly qualified for their posts, (5) local coordination could be increased by more effort at the national level, (6) a farmer-elected county agricultural advisory board should be used.
(7) farmer committees of the agricultural agencies should be limited to an advisory capacity, and (8) one county agricultural agency providing all the agricultural services should minimize the problem of coordination.

A plan for county agricultural coordination was presented.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the past half century many public agricultural agencies have been organized to meet various needs and emergencies. Many of these agencies are within the framework of the United States Department of Agriculture. All of them receive public financial support; all of them extend their services to the community, family, or individual, either directly or indirectly.

Administering these agencies at the local level for reasonable efficiency in accomplishing their purposes demands a certain degree of cooperation and coordination.

John D. Black contends thus:

"It is the farm people who know that the development of this large organization has brought with it overlapping and disjointedness of effort and increasingly acute conflicts of power and jurisdiction. It would seem at times as if a third of the energies of the higher officers in agricultural agencies is devoted to fending off what they feel are encroachments of other agencies. The conflicts are most serious at federal and state levels, but they also appear in many of the counties. To the farmer this problem most often takes the form of having local representatives of different federal and state agencies calling upon him in the local press or at meetings, and often individually— all trying to interest him in the same or closely related measures for betterment of his farming or his family's living.

Conceivably, as the activities of government relating to agriculture increased at the different levels, each new line of action or new program
could have been fitted into the existing set of agencies and relationships so that the part each agency was to play in carrying out the program was clearly indicated. Or if a new agency were created at any level, because existing ones were not qualified to handle the new program, its sphere of action and relations to existing ones could have been carefully delineated. Rarely, however, has this ideal been achieved. The more normal experience with agricultural programs in the United States has been that any new line of action or agency is imposed upon the old ones with little thought as to integration of the new with the old.\(^1\)

From many other sources have come discussion and consideration of why existing agricultural activities of the agencies are not better coordinated. Recognition of the problem exists. Studies have been made to determine the degree and effectiveness of coordination and cooperation. Suggestions and recommendations for more effective cooperation and coordination have been offered. Specific examples will be presented in the following chapter. However, no study has been made to develop a feasible and functional plan for coordinating the work of publicly supported agricultural agencies operating at the county level. There is a need for such a plan evolved from systematic investigation.

1. The Problem

Statement of the Problem. To develop a suggested plan for coordinating the work of the state and federal agricultural agencies

at the county level.

Problem analysis:

1. What agencies and their representatives operate at the county level?

2. What are the primary activities and duties of each agency?

3. What methods are being used to promote cooperation and coordination in carrying out county agricultural activities of agencies?

4. How do existing methods rank as to efficiency of results?

5. What new proposals for coordinating activities may be made?

6. How do authorities in the field rate new proposals for coordination?

7. What factors accompany successful coordination?

8. Conclusions and a recommended plan.

Delimitations of the study. This study has been limited to an evaluation and analysis of methods and techniques used by county agricultural agencies highly successful in achieving efficient coordination of their work. Tax supported state and federal agricultural agencies operating in three counties of each of the twelve southern states - Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia will be included in the study. It is assumed that conditions determining the suggested plan for coordination will be general to the extent that with slight modification the plan can be adapted to any county in any of the forty eight states.
Hypotheses:

1. Effective coordination of county agricultural agencies' activities is desirable in that it lends itself to more efficient accomplishment of general agricultural goals for farm communities in a county.

2. All agencies, especially Agricultural Extension and Vocational Agriculture, may determine how their work in the county can be carried on without conflict, duplication, competition, or infringement on the duties and responsibilities of other agricultural agencies. Action at the national level could increase the effectiveness of work toward this goal.

3. Some form of agricultural program planning on a county wide basis would seem to be the basis for any plan for county coordination.

2. Definition of Terms Used

To avoid confusion and misinterpretation, the following definitions are listed:

1. To coordinate: to adjust or put in harmony; to harmonize, to regulate or combine in harmonious action, to bring into a common action, movement, or condition.

2. Cooperate: to act jointly with another or others.

3. County coordinating council: a voluntary coordinating organization composed of the workers (agency heads and assistants in tax supported state and federal agencies in a county).

4. Action Agency: A term used to describe those agricultural agencies which get direct results with farmers in accomplishing desirable
farm practices through subsidies, written agreements, loan contracts, technical services on the farm, etc.

5. Education Agency: An agricultural agency designed to educate farmers in the best farming practices, at the same time aiding them in developing the skills necessary to carry out those practices. It is the indirect method of getting the farmer to make desirable agricultural achievements.

Some abbreviations used in this study are:

Ext. = Extension Service

Voc. Agr. = Vocational Agriculture

SCS = Soil Conservation Service

FMA = Production Marketing Administration

FHA = Farmers' Home Administration

PCA = Production Credit Association

FCA = Farm Credit Administration

A.S.C. = Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Administration—replaces (P.M.A.)

3. Techniques and Procedures Used

The normative survey method was used in this study to gather the data needed for analysis in order

—to canvass present practice with respect to plans for dealing with such differences or to set up norms or central tendencies through testing and measurement against which the extent of differences
may be checked.  

To select the counties for the study, a questionnaire was formulated and mailed to 72 state heads of agricultural agencies known to be operating at the county level in the twelve states included in the study. Counties most frequently recommended for the excellence of their coordination program were selected.

From the total of 72 questionnaires mailed, 61 replies were received representing 85 percent of the total.

It was ascertained that many of the counties in a state were recommended by two or more of the state agencies operating in those counties.

Table I presents data showing the frequencies of recommendations that occurred for counties reported in the questionnaires returned.

**TABLE I**

**FREQUENCY OF COUNTIES RECOMMENDED FOR HAVING A SUPERIOR PROGRAM OF COORDINATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of counties recommended</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table I show that 121 of the counties were recommended by only one of their state agencies, 14 counties by two of their state agencies, and so on.

---

agencies, 6 counties by three agencies in a state, and only 1 county by as many as four agencies in a state. These statistics show that 21 counties included in the study were selected by two or more state agricultural agencies for having an outstanding program of agricultural coordination.

The remaining 15 counties included in the study were impartially chosen by drawings for individual states as necessary.

For each of the 36 counties selected, a letter was written to the county representative of the recommending agency or agencies requesting the names and addresses of all county agricultural agency heads. Replies were received from all counties and a complete mailing list was made.

A second questionnaire based on the analysis of the problem was devised and mailed to 209 heads of agricultural agencies in the selected sample of 36 counties. A reply of 87 percent was received. Eighty-three percent of the distributed questionnaires were returned in usable condition.

All data were computed and presented in tabular and graphic form. A descriptive analysis was made of each entry of tabulated and graphed data. The findings of the study were summarized, conclusions drawn, and a suggested plan for coordination of county agricultural agencies was presented.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Similar studies of agricultural agency coordination were not found in a review of the literature. Some limited studies, few comprehensive ones, have been made. Yet the available information is adequate to indicate the scope of the problem and to suggest possibilities for its solution.

Cooperation

Carleton E. Ball, Executive Secretary of the Coordinating Committee of the United States Department of Agriculture, studied the relationship of cooperation and coordination in agricultural agency activities. He stated that in each county there are usually ten to fifteen federal agencies whose activities reach down and touch the individual farm and farm family. As many of these agencies were created to meet problems and being impressed with the need to make rapid progress in their own particular programs, he concluded:
(1) that competition for the cooperation of county farmers is keen, sometimes for nothing more than an ambitious monthly report, (2) that the realization of the need for agricultural program planning is many times lost in the rush, and (3) that this increasing complexity of the relationships has made coordination a vital administrative necessity.

---

Ball maintained that cooperation is basic to coordination, and that an examination of the following principles of cooperation should precede any study of coordination.

Tentative principles:

1. Cooperativeness primarily is a mental attitude and, as such, may be inspired and developed in individual persons.

2. Most persons are reasonable and therefore are willing to undertake activities if the advantages are recognized.

3. Cooperation is an additional means to effective progress under many conditions, but not a panacea for the solution of all problems.

4. Cooperation presupposes essential equality between the agencies, rather than the relation of superior and subordinate. This principle does not require equal interest or contribution.

5. Cooperation, under proper conditions, has been observed to offer definite personal, technical, and financial advantages to the cooperating parties.

6. Cooperation is promoted (often unconsciously) by the mere fact of contact and conference by individuals, institutions, or organizations, on problems of common concern.

7. Cooperation is not universally desirable or expedient but only when advantages both to the principles (sic) and to their constituencies may be expected.

8. Cooperation, so far as it promotes personal harmony, increases individual efficiency, and avoids unnecessary competition, is an obligation upon the individual worker.

9. Cooperation, so far as it lowers costs and hastens effective progress toward planned objectives, is an obligation on the administrator.

10. Cooperation, to the extent that it increases individual efficiency, avoids unnecessary duplication, decreases costs, and hastens results to the constituency, is an obligation on organizations and institutions, especially those receiving public support....
Advantages Recognized:

The principal advantages of cooperation have been shown to lie in three major fields, namely, (a) the promotion of better institutional and individual spirit, (B) the more effective advancement of knowledge, and (C) the definite saving of time, money, and materials. The distinctive ways in which cooperation accomplishes its objectives in each of these fields are listed immediately below.

A. Cooperation promotes better institutional and individual spirit and morale:

1. By avoiding a divided allegiance of constituencies within the area covered;
2. By obtaining better publicity, public sentiment, and appropriations;
3. By permitting better use of the talents of individual workers;
4. By stimulating workers through broader contacts and perspectives;
5. By itself begetting more cooperation.

B. Cooperation promotes a more effective advancement of knowledge:

6. By making possible a more rapid and comprehensive study of problems;
7. By planning projects more completely;
8. By preventing duplications and by standardizing methods to insure comparable results;
9. By reducing the time period necessary for obtaining results.

C. Cooperation conserves time, money, and materials:

10. By making data available promptly to all agencies concerned;
11. By requiring smaller expenditures from individual agencies;
12. By conserving and distributing material not locally usable.2

2Ibid., p. 2.
Acting on the assumption that cooperation can be accepted as the basis for coordination, the need for an examination of cooperation and its implications becomes apparent.

Dr. H. M. Hamlin,\(^3\) member of a committee to study coordination of the extension and vocational agriculture programs in Iowa, states in a digest of the committee's report that all educational agencies working with rural people should realize the need for developing cooperation and good will among the agencies. Consequently, he maintains that they must coordinate their efforts fully. Some means of coordination he recommends include the following:

- a. Common objectives and programs.
- b. State, district, and county councils of workers in agricultural and home economics education.
- c. Joint training of teachers and extension workers.
- d. Use of extension specialists to give assistance with subject-matter to public school teachers.
- e. Use of 4-H clubs to supplement school program.
- f. Use of schools for extension meetings.
- g. Mutual promotion of each other's program.
- h. Joint development of an educational program for older farm youth.
- i. Cooperation in planning and conducting junior events at fairs.
- j. Participation of teachers in county program-planning meetings.

---

\(^3\)H. M. Hamlin, "Cooperation Between Schools and Extension Departments," *Agricultural Education Magazine*, VI (1933), 6, 7.
Every effort should be made to avoid even the appearance of duplication of the efforts of the various agencies for agricultural and home economics education. In general the various agencies should work with entirely different people.\(^2\)

In 1953, Louis S. Sasman,\(^5\) Chief of Agricultural Education in Wisconsin, reported that a cooperative statement had been drawn up between Agriculture and Home Economics Extension and Vocational Agriculture and Rural Homemaking in Wisconsin. Almost all of the recommendations made in the Iowa report twenty years before by Dr. Hamlin and his associates are embodied in this statement.

Rutherford came to the following conclusions in his study on relationships of agricultural agencies in California:

"In studying the relationships existing between the Agricultural Extension Service and the Smith-Hughes agricultural program in California, the thought has been to endeavor to establish a clearer basis for cooperation and coordination of the efforts of these two great forces in agricultural education. . . . .

A careful review of the Smith-Lever and Smith-Hughes laws leads to the conclusion that the cause for confusion lies in the laws themselves. However, there are parts of the laws upon which one may base a division of functions."\(^6\)

Rutherford stated further:

"There is so much educational service needed in rural areas that conflicts and overlappings should not be

---

\(^2\)Ibid.

\(^5\)Lewis S. Sasman, "We're Put Our Cards on the Table," Agriculture Leaders Digest, XXXIV, No. 2 (1953) 21, 22.

allowed to interfere with the efficiency of the work being done. Both organizations have more work than they can do. Due to the fact that forty-two percent of those returning questionnaires reported conflicts or overlappings, there is a definite need for a clearer understanding on the part of the employees of both organizations in regard to the functions and duties of each agency in order that more harmonious relationships may be effected. To this end, an agreement should be drawn up clearly defining the functions of each and providing a definite plan of cooperation. This agreement should consist of a plan of minimum essentials for the state, but the details of the understanding should be worked out in each county on a county unit basis. 

In his study of cooperation between county agents and teachers of vocational agriculture, Jefferies reports that a joint committee on Extension programs, policies, and goals, concluded that a close and harmonious operating relationship between Extension and Vocational Education is essential. Workers in both services are engaged in educational work, many times with the same individuals, and both services are maintained by public tax monies. He also stated that a later committee reviewing the 1928 memorandum of understanding between the two services made the following proposals in 1939:

(1) There should be a unified county educational program for agriculture and homemaking developed by the people of the county with the advice and assistance of the professional workers from both services.

(2) Representatives of both services should meet to determine methods of carrying out the program. Each agency's contribution should be consistent with its major and specific functions and approved by the respective administrative authorities.

---

7Ibid., p. 2.

(3) Cooperation might best be secured by frequent conferences of representatives from the two services at national, state, and county levels to develop common objectives.

Jeffries\(^9\) observed in his interviews with county agents and teachers of agriculture that the suggestion most frequently made was for more joint planning conferences. Another proposal, he reported, was that more joint enterprises by the two agencies with adult farmers in the county would foster a closer relationship. A large number of agricultural workers suggested that a closer working relationship between heads of the two services at the state and national level would help promote greater coordination and cooperation among workers in the field. Major obstacles to cooperation and coordination found by Jeffries were distance separating offices, too much self-interest, eagerness to get credit for work done, and not enough contact between workers of the services.

Anderson\(^10\) (in his article *Local Cooperation Pays*) reports experiences in his county which support Bell's\(^11\) statements concerning the advantages of coordination. For promoting cooperation Anderson\(^12\) suggests some means which had been found valuable in the agricultural agencies he worked with. They are as follows:

1. Use other agricultural agencies' services in your program.

\(^9\)Ibid., pp. 33-36.


\(^11\)Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

\(^12\)Anderson, *op. cit.*
2. Hold group meeting of agricultural agencies to plan annual master calendar of agricultural events.

3. Have two or more agencies participate in agricultural radio programs.

4. Understand purpose and operation of other agricultural agencies.

**Coordination**

Coordination deals with the fundamentals of democracy. Democracy demands equity, freedom, sharing, and respect for the individual and his opinions. Making the political-economic-educational agencies serve the needs and desires of those whom they are intended to serve is a major task. These agencies, it appears, must reflect the will of the people.

In regard to coordination Ball wrote:

Coordination is adjusting and harmonizing.

It is pertinent to inquiry why so many existing agricultural activities are not better coordinated, after these years of consideration and discussion. Some of the reasons are historical, some are organizational, and some are personal. As history is made by persons, and as organizations are formed and manned by persons, all the reasons are really personal, that is, grounded in the personnel.

Dean Call of Kansas, in presenting the results of a survey of limitations on cooperative research, reported three personnel limitations. These were (a) lack of coordinating leadership, (b) institutional pride and professional jealousy, and (c) problems of personal relationships. All that was said about personnel under cooperation applies with equal force to personnel relations in coordination.¹³

¹³Ball, op. cit., p. 10.
It would seem that a sound agricultural planning program for a county would be the first step in coordinating agricultural activities.

Quoting Ball further,

Professor Hummel suggests three possible solutions. One is to muddle along, with loss of time and efficiency. A second is for some administrative authority to do the coordinating. Each agency, however, hesitates to be coordinated unless it can be the coordinator. The third and only satisfactory method begins at the bottom, putting the primary emphasis on the farm, the farm family, and the community. This approach is a combination of simple local organization, adult education, self analysis, and rural planning. This procedure leaves the way open for as many state and national administrative agencies as may be necessary, but it clears the confusion from local situations and insures the participation of local people. It cannot be done from the top down but must begin at the grass roots.\textsuperscript{14}

Various attempts have been made and proposals have been offered to resolve the issues and conflicts preventing effective coordination.

\textbf{Informal Discussions.} The first attempts at coordination among agricultural agencies were probably informal discussions between heads of agencies. While not disparaging this excellent method, it is generally agreed that additional means are necessary.

\textbf{Memorandums of Understanding.} Among the early efforts to effect coordination were formal documents drawn up by agricultural agencies to prevent conflicts and to promote efficiency in their areas of operation. They were called memorandums of understanding.

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p. 17.
True⁵ states that frequently memorandums of understanding are entered into by two or more agencies at the state or national level. This type of memorandum was agreed upon by the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Board for Vocational Education to stop personal jealousies and antagonism between teachers of vocational agriculture and extension workers.

Section (ii)¹⁶ of this memorandum is as follows:

That in every case care be taken to see that work which is supported by federal funds under either of the aforementioned Acts (Extension and Smith-Hughes) will not in any way duplicate or overlap work being carried on in that same community when that work is supported in any part from another federal fund.

True¹⁷ reported that this memorandum improved relations, but that sufficient unrest remained regarding various phases of this problem to bring about other formal attempts at its solution.

In May of 1921 a committee of fourteen members representing the National Society for Vocational Education, the Rural Education Department of the National Education Association, the Association for the Advancement of Agricultural Teaching, and the Association of Land-Grant Colleges, joined in making a final report¹⁸ adopted by all organizations. It was based on the original memorandum between the Department of Agriculture and

¹⁶Ibid., p. 375.
¹⁷Ibid.
¹⁸Ibid., pp. 375-377.
and the Federal Board for Vocational Education cited above.

Sections 4, 5, and 6 are as follows:

4. (a) Where the school provides a comprehensive program of agricultural and home economics education which meets the needs of children through systematic instruction and supervised practice, the extension forces of the land-grant colleges shall not duplicate such work of the schools, but shall rather cooperate with the schools by providing, on request, subject matter, special lectures, conferences, and other similar services. This shall not be interpreted to limit the freedom of the extension forces to prosecute their extension work through local organizations of farmers.

(b) Where the school does not provide such a program of instruction, in agriculture and home economics, the extension service of the college should organize extension work. In such localities the school should give its fullest support and cooperation.

(c) It is recognized that some schools will be in the process of developing such educational programs. In these cases the following principles should apply: Extension workers should confine their work to children whom the school does not enroll in systematic vocational or pre-vocational project work accompanied by home practice unless requested by school authorities to enroll them. The school should organize its work with adults to provide systematic vocational instruction defined herein. The school should offer its facilities to the junior extension worker wherever the school has not, in reasonable operation, vocational or pre-vocational project work accompanied by supervised home practice.

5. Before undertaking junior extension work in any county, the extension agent should submit in writing to the county superintendent of schools, the plans for junior extension work in that county, and should endeavor to arrange for a basis of understanding and cooperation.

6. The state department of education should look to the land-grant colleges to furnish technical subject matter in agriculture and home economics in the form of outlines, leaflets, and bulletins for use in public schools. It is understood that no such material should be used in the schools until approved by the state department of education.

It was recognized that the functions, obligations, and responsibilities of the two services, as defined by law, may be similar, with possibility of overlapping and duplication.
in a number of fields. Nevertheless, the highest service in this field will spring from a spirit of co-partnership, or mutual respect, and from intimate association on a clearly defined basis, with the single purpose of serving the complete vocational needs of the community. There will be a large place for both agencies under these conditions.\textsuperscript{\text{19}}

In 1937, a coordinating unit was organized in the United States Department of Agriculture. Set up as a branch of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture with a small staff under the direction of Milton S. Eisenhower, it was named the Office of Land-Use Coordination.\textsuperscript{\text{20}} A disagreement had arisen concerning state administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration between AAA Administrator Tolley and the state extension directors. As a result, land-use coordination was pushed into the background as Secretary of Agriculture Wallace and Eisenhower worked out with the Policy Committee of the Land-Grant Colleges what has since been known as the Mount Weather Agreement.

After this, the Office of Land-Use Coordination continued to function but finally lost its identity in the staff of Charles F. Brennan, then Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

According to Black,\textsuperscript{\text{21}} under the Mount Weather Agreement of July 1938, the USDA was to continue operating the action programs from Washington, while jointly setting up state and county land-use planning committees in cooperation with the Land-Grant Colleges. State Extension Services would initiate setting up these committees as subcommittees.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{\text{19}}Ibid., p. 376.
  \item \textsuperscript{\text{20}}Black, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 13, 14.
  \item \textsuperscript{\text{21}}Ibid.
\end{itemize}
of their county extension committees.

Specifically, as detailed by Black:

"These committees were to be composed of at least ten farmers, of the representatives of the various action agencies in the county, and the county agent, who could serve as executive officer or secretary. There could also be community land-use planning committees within the counties. At the state level, the state director of extension was to serve as Chairman of a State Land-Use Planning Committee, which was to be composed of representatives of the various action agencies and a number of farm people.

Neither the chairman of these various committees nor the whole committees could give orders to the action agencies or supervise their work."

By means of a directive, Secretary of Agriculture Wallace in October, 1938, set up a similar procedure for coordination at the Washington level. An Agricultural Program Board, made up of representatives of the action agencies and bureaus of the USDA concerned, and a set of interbureau coordinating committees were formed to deal with special problems. The interbureau coordinating committees were organised under the direction of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (BAE), which assumed leadership in coordinating the planning of agricultural policy for the USDA. These policy proposals were supposed to be passed on, perhaps modified, by the Agricultural Program Board, approved by the Secretary and transmitted as instructions from the

---

22 Ibid.
23 Ibid., p. 15.
Secretary of Agriculture.

BAA at the federal level was put in complete charge of the state and county land-use planning program. It appointed state representatives to make planning and coordination a two-way process.

In two years land-use planning had reached 1900 counties when the war intervened (1941). As a result the program largely disappeared, even though some of its functions still remained in the counties of the states.

Black states the main reasons for this demise were:

"First, it was too audacious, and undertook to do too much all at once.

Second, the farm organizations - especially the American Farm Bureau Federation - did not like having strong policy and program-making committees develop in their counties independent of their own county organizations.

Third, it met too much opposition from the entrenched agencies in the USDA and in the states. Accordingly they resisted by mute non-cooperation. The opposition was often greatest out in the field.

Fourth, the states did not like the regional offices involved in the program.

Fifth, the war pushed into the foreground other activities.

The opposition of the second and third types took the form of open or underground attacks at budget hearings, and it was at this point that the death blows were finally struck."

Legislative Proposals. A number of legislative proposals designed

to deal with problems concerning coordination have been made in the past decade. Their common characteristic is that none were enacted into law.

According to Black,\(^25\) some of the proposals limited to narrow phases of the problem are:


**The Jensen Bill (July, 1947)** - proposed transfer of all land-use, soil, and related activities in the USDA to the Soil Conservation Service.

An attempt to clarify federal-state-local relations was made in the provisions of the Hope and Aiken Bills.\(^26\) However, these agricultural administrative sections were not enacted.

The Hope Bill is in many ways very similar to the Jensen Bill. A major provision was the addition that certain activities of the FMA concerned with soil conservation payments would be merged into the SCS. Black states that a major obstacle to any full-scale attempt to coordinate the activities of the various agricultural agencies is the existence of soil conservation committees and district boards set up under state law. The Hope Bill did not attempt to change this organization. On the whole, this bill tried to centralize direction and control of activities relating to land and water resources.

In contrast to the Hope Bill, the administrative provisions of the Aiken Bill (Senate Bill 2318) called for decentralization of action

\(^{25}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. } 17.\)

\(^{26}\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. } 18, 19.\)
programs at the state and county levels.

In 1948, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry went into a number of states to hold farm policy discussions with farmers. Throughout the field hearings held by the Committee, farmers demanded that they be given more responsibility in planning and directing farm programs to meet local needs and to avoid duplication of effort and unnecessary costs at local levels. This demand resulted in Senate Bill 2318, Providing for a Coordinated Agricultural Program. The bill was designed to coordinate the work with individual farmers at the local and state levels before existing agencies got further apart. It also provided for an election of community and county agricultural program committees by farmers. The county committee would elect a small executive committee from its membership to serve as an administrative group. The duties of the executive committee would be to direct local programs and carry out duties assigned to them by the state agricultural council in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Specific duties of this county committee would be (1) to secure personnel to perform the functions of the various county agricultural agencies, (2) to see that the present work of all agricultural agencies would be coordinated to prevent overlapping.


duplication, and infringement of one agency upon the duties of another, (3) to effect savings in administrative costs in terms of more effective service, and (4) to emphasise phases of work most essential to the county. This county executive committee would serve as a board of directors, employing workers to administer the program.

Most of the major provisions of Senate Bill 2318 were enacted into law by Public Act 897. However, specifications for elected community and county agricultural program committees and a state agricultural council were not included.

Green found that Rufus W. Stimson reported an attempt to establish cooperation and coordination between Vocational Agriculture and the Extension Service by law. Green relates:

"Smith-Hughes and Smith-Lever coordination and cooperation are provided for and carried on in three counties of Massachusetts, (13:5) namely: Bristol, Essex, and Norfolk. In each of these counties both lines of activity as relating to agriculture are administered by a single board of trustees, and the general management of both is vested in a single director."31

County Program Planning. In a 1952 study of county agricultural coordination in Mississippi, it was concluded that

29United States Statutes at Large (Washington, 1948), LXII, 1247-1259.


31Ibid.

32Louis S. Peek, "The Effectiveness of Coordination on the Work of Tax-Supported Agricultural Agencies at the County Level in Mississippi" (Master's Thesis, Mississippi State College, 1952), p. 90.
agricultural program planning seemed to increase significantly the amount of coordination achieved. It was suggested that possibly the first phase of coordination at the county level should be joint planning of a county agricultural program. To move governmental help to areas where it is most needed, this program should define the areas of responsibility of each agency.

North Carolina has taken very definite steps toward state-wide county program planning. The procedure for developing this project has been drawn up under the direction of the North Carolina Board of Farm Organizations and Agencies. This procedure is as follows:

A County can be no stronger nor more progressive than its citizens. The same is true for a State. Progress depends on many things, but particularly the interest, ingenuity and combined effort of the professional and lay leaders at the State, County and Community level. Needs and opportunities will vary between the counties and the communities, but the goal — to improve the economic, social and spiritual well-being of our people — remains the same.

The major objective for this State-wide Program is that it act as a stimulus, serve as a guide and indicate lines of action to the agricultural and other leaders in each of the counties in developing and carrying out a comprehensive program in their county. The county agricultural and home economics workers should take the initiative, but not the entire responsibility for developing a County Program. It should be a cooperative undertaking with local farm, home and business leaders actively participating and with assistance from State and District leaders, Specialists and other technically trained workers as needed.

The first step that the professional workers should take is to hold a meeting of the workers and decide whether or not they want to develop such a program on a county basis. If they decide to develop such a program, the following procedure should be considered:

1. **County Workers** — The members of the Agricultural Workers’ Council should tentatively agree upon the major
enterprises and adjustments both in farming and homemaking which they think should receive most emphasis during the next ten to fifteen years. They should set up worker committees for each of these subjects to assemble, study and analyze available factual data and other pertinent information pertaining to the subject or enterprise to determine the:

a. Situation  
b. Problems involved 
c. Possibilities  
d. Recommendations that, if carried out, will make for a sound, practical and economical enterprise.

Each of these worker committees should present their suggested report to their entire membership of the Agricultural Workers' Council.

2. Meet with Farm, Home and Business Leaders - When the professional workers have developed their tentative suggested program, they should arrange to meet with representative farm, home, business and other leaders interested in Agriculture. They should present the findings of their study to this group (this could be done through the use of slides and mimeographed copy of the workers suggested program).

Approximately fifteen leaders for each enterprise or major adjustment report should be invited to this meeting. These leaders should represent each community in the county and major enterprises, also, businesses associated with or interested in Agriculture. The workers should keep in mind that they are not presenting a program for adoption, but are presenting the results of their study. The entire group should then determine the pattern of farming and homemaking which seems most suitable for the farm families in the county.

After a general discussion at this meeting, this can be done by the leaders (working committees) meeting together at a later date or dates, by committees by enterprises or major adjustments in developing the final report for each enterprise or major adjustment with the assistance of the professional workers.

3. Steering Committee - After it has been decided that a program of this type is to be developed in the
county, it will be necessary to set-up a steering committee composed of agricultural, home economics, business, farm and home leaders to have the responsibility of guiding the development of the final program and recommending specific lines of action.

The professional worker part of this committee should be set-up as soon as the workers decide that they want to develop a program of this type. As far as professional workers are concerned, this committee should be composed of one worker from each agricultural agency in the county (counting home economics and home demonstration as separate agencies). The farm and business people on this committee should be the chairmen of each of the working committees after the working committees have been set-up.

4. Working Committees - The farm and business people invited into the general meeting, as suggested in Step 2, should be organized into enterprise or major adjustment committees which will be the working committees of lay people. Each of these committees should select a chairman from their group to represent their committee on the steering committee. Each of these committees should recommend in writing to the steering committee specific lines of action for their subject to be coordinated and incorporated into the final county program.

5. Carry The Program To The People - The County Program should be presented to the people through neighborhood and community meetings. Where necessary, make adjustments to fit the particular neighborhood or community. The presentation of subjects by the use of slides and charts has been very effective.

6. Community Organisations - Community or neighborhood organizations should be set-up as needed in the development of the County Program to help create and maintain interest in the Program.

7. Hold Progress Meetings - The agricultural and home economics workers should hold periodic meetings to evaluate progress and make plans for the activities that are timely and will receive emphasis for the next few months.

8. Reaction of People - Close attention should be paid to the reaction of the people which will aid in developing ways for community organizations to help carry out the program.
9. **Meetings of Steering and Working Committees** - The steering and working committees and agricultural and home economics workers should hold frequent meetings to evaluate accomplishments and consider changes and modifications in light of changing conditions and accomplishments.33

In a mimeographed supplement to "A Program for Every County" called "Study of the Situation" Crawford outlined a tentative plan for the organization and operation of Agricultural Workers' Council Committee. Crawford states:

If a good job of analyzing the situation is to be done, it will be necessary for these committees to hold several meetings of their own. We would suggest the following basic committees, then the council could add any others that might be needed.

1. A Committee on Land Use and Soil Conservation.
2. A Committee on Home Food Supply.
3. A Committee on Feed Crops.
4. A Committee on Cash Crops.
5. A Committee on Livestock.
6. A Committee on Poultry.
7. A Committee on Forestry.
8. A Committee on Home Improvement.
9. A Committee on Community Improvement.
10. A Committee on Marketing.

**Explanation of Committees**:

1. The Committee on Land Use and Soil Conservation should try to analyze the present situation in reference to land use. This should involve all land in the county -- cropland, woodland, idle land -- how it is being used, which land is producing and why or why not. The chart shown on page 7 of *The Challenge* may be used as a guide in developing the situation for this particular committee.

2. In analyzing the situation with respect to Home Food Supply, the committee should consider production.

---

conservation and preservation of the food supply. A determination of what kind of foods are being produced, how much and what kind of job of conserving there is being done. The chart on page 17 of The Challenge may serve as a guide in developing the situation.

3. The committee on Feed Crops should cover pastures, hay, corn, small grain and any other feeds produced in the County. This committee should determine the actual acreage devoted to these crops, yields being made and practices followed. If the county is beginning to think about a big livestock program, maybe some thought should be given to the cost of producing some of these crops following the present practices.

The Cash Crop Committee should deal with all cash crops being produced in the county. A determination should be made as to just what land is producing and how much, what kind of practices are being followed or not followed. In developing the situation the charts on pages 7, 8 and 15 of The Challenge may serve as a guide.

5. The Committee on Livestock should consider all livestock as a unit or the various types of livestock could be considered by sub-committees such as dairying, beef cattle, and other livestock. The question involved here is how much livestock is in the county, the kind of practices being followed including management practices, the productivity in the way of income of the various types of livestock. The part or the total farm income being derived from livestock, etc. The charts in The Challenge on pages 9 and 15 may be used as a guide in developing this situation.

6. The Committee on Poultry should deal with both the home supply and commercial angles including broilers, laying flocks and turkeys. The type enterprises that are being developed in the country should be considered and the amount of all types in the county, and what poultry is contributing to the total farm income. Also, the job that is being done with good or bad practices being followed or not followed. The chart on pages 10 and 15 in The Challenge may be considered in developing this situation.

7. The Committee on Forestry should consider this as a crop and the situation so developed, as approximately 50% of our total farm land in most counties is devoted to so-called woodland. What is the situation in your county? How much land is woodland? What is it producing?
What kind of job is being done in reference to recommended practices? What percent of the total farm income is being produced from this woodland?

8. The Home Improvement Committee will cover everything concerning home improvement such as screening, painting, remodeling, landscaping, storage, equipment, conveniences, etc. This should be broken down into several subheads or a number of workers should be assigned to this subject. This committee should include at least one person from each Agency in the county as it is felt that this particular subject is about one-half of the program that most counties hope to develop.

9. The Committee on Community Improvement should deal with those things that can be done on a community basis, with all the people in the community working together, such as mailbox improvement, roadside improvement, church and church ground improvement, recreation and school activities.

10. The Committee on Marketing should determine just what the situation is on marketing all commodities produced on a commercial scale in the county. It should deal not only with the products being produced, but also practices followed, etc.

In assigning workers to these various subjects, every worker in the county including all Home Economics teachers, Veteran Instructors, etc., should be assigned to at least one committee, and in some instances some workers will need to be assigned to two or three committees. These committees should definitely decide the present situation and when this is done tentatively decide on some of the major possibilities.

If each committee can do a thorough job and put their thinking on paper, we will be in a much better position to move along with the program when we start in the county.

It is felt that this particular job should be done by the paid workers themselves without the assistance of farm leaders and business people. These people should be brought in at a later step in the procedure. 34

In the booklet, "North Carolina Accepts the Challenge Through A United Agricultural Program"35 the North Carolina Board of Farm Organizations and Agencies has vividly set forth its state program. This booklet serves as a guide for North Carolina agricultural agencies and farm groups planning county programs.

Brown describes a very similar approach to program planning in Georgia. He states:

"...in this State the Agricultural Extension Service proceeds on the basis that there is but one fundamental agricultural program in the State and in the counties and communities and that is the program of the farm people. That is the program in which they are primarily interested. They are not interested in promoting an agency program. They are interested in agency programs as they contribute to the development of this great program for farm and home development.

In the light of this concept, the Georgia Agricultural Extension Service, through its specialists, district agents and county agents, assists local leaders in setting up community and county program planning committees composed principally of farm people but also having, particularly on the county level, representatives of the County Boards of Education, County Boards of Commissioners, Bankers, and other such leaders.

Then, acting in an advisory capacity to these planning committees, we have what we call the technical group, consisting of county representatives of all the agricultural agencies and other organizations working directly with farm people. These technicians provide the program planning committees with basic information needed in projecting the program for the coming year. They also advise the planning committee as to the way and the extent to which their respective agency or organization can contribute to the development of this program. They do not participate in the final decisions made by the planning committee in

regard to selection of projects, setting of goals, and other matters of this nature. As stated before, their function is advisory only.

The system of community and county program planning as outlined above, is working very effectively in this State. The participation of the technical group varies considerably from county to county.36

Another plan37 for a county agricultural program, although limited to soil and water conservation has many admirable features which might be easily adapted to an over-all county agricultural program. Stewart states:

"In 1950 all of the agricultural agencies in Tennessee at the state level developed a plan for coordinated action in the soil and water conservation phase of the state agricultural program. The plan was developed for the purpose of coordinating the work of all the agricultural agencies within the state at all levels of employment. I believe that a plan for coordinated action of agricultural agencies, has considerable merit. Our experience has been that a plan of coordinated action will work when representatives of each agency assume full responsibility for carrying out their particular phase of the coordinated action plan."38

Mount says, "It would seem practical for all of the civic and agricultural agencies to plan the broad aspects of their programs together. The subsequent program would be of greater value and more effective toward the improvement of good community living. All of the various agencies have specific responsibilities and problems to solve. Yet there are many areas within the reaches of these responsibilities where a greater coordinated utilization of man

36W. S. Brown, State Ext. Director, Unpublished Correspondence (Athens, Georgia: November 5, 1953).

37See Appendix D. Plan For Coordinated Action in the Soil and Water Conservation Phase of the State Agricultural Program.

power would be more effective in reaching desired goals.  

Davenport concurred in this view by strongly advocating county agricultural programs.

**Coordinating Councils.** From the preceding discussion of county agricultural programs it can be determined that county agricultural councils are possibly the main vehicles through which these programs are made to work.

These councils were found to be the strongest factor in making coordination effective in Mississippi counties. From this Mississippi study it was concluded that coordination needs to be made more effective by promoting agricultural workers' councils, mutual interest in other agencies programs, and centralisation of agencies offices, and by eliminating unnecessary competition between agencies.

Of five regularly planned joint programs of work found in operation by Jefferies four seemed to be a direct result of county agricultural councils which met monthly. These councils had a definite program of activities and were composed of all agricultural agencies in the county.

---


41Peek, op. cit., p. 90.

An example of the successful operation of an agricultural workers' coordinating council is reported by McCarty\(^3\) in the Agricultural Education Magazine. Composed of workers of the agricultural agencies in Hinds County, Mississippi, this council meets monthly. At each meeting there is a brief social period when refreshments are served. This is followed by a short progress report for the past month and a statement of plans for the coming month by each agency present. The meeting is concluded with an organised program presented by members of one of the agencies. The Hinds Council promotes specific projects. Among the most successful are a breeder production program; sweet potato production, marketing, and storage; and pasture development programs. Major civic organizations in the county support the efforts of the council. Civic organizations and commercial companies support the program wholeheartedly so long as various agencies in the county work together to effect a prosperous agriculture.

**Other Proposals.** Various proposals other than those previously treated in this review have been put forth over the years - many worthy of consideration. Some of these proposals are as follows:

1. County and state USDA committees\(^4\) - A USDA committee under the direction of Assistant Secretary Brannan presented to Congress in 1947

\(^4\)J. E. McCarty, "Effectiveness of Cooperation Among Agricultural Agencies Demonstrated by the Hinds County, Mississippi Coordinating Council", *Agricultural Education Magazine*, XXV (1953) 163.

\(^3\)Black, *op. cit.*, p. 21.
a plan for an administrative organization consisting of an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture with a staff of federal employees all the way down to the county level. State and county staffs of this organization would be assisted by farmer-elected county and state USDA committees.

The purpose of this arrangement was planning for better coordination of the activities of the different federal agencies at the county level. Another goal was correlation of the objectives of local programs with national food and agricultural objectives.

The Land-Grant College proposals\textsuperscript{145} - A special committee of the Land-Grant College Association in 1948 proposed to the agricultural committees of the Congress that the SCS program be turned over to the Agricultural Extension Service. It further suggested that the PMA (federal) be set up into separate state administrations.

Currently, these same proposals are reappearing from sources within the U. S. D. A. and the Land-Grant College Association.

Centralization of county offices - Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, in Memorandum No. 1278,\textsuperscript{146} February 15, 1951 directed that county office personnel of the Soil Conservation Service and of the Production and Marketing Administration should be moved into the same county offices as soon as practical. He also stated that it

\textsuperscript{145}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 21, 22.

would be the policy of the United States Department of Agriculture to invite other county agricultural agencies to locate their offices in a single building wherever possible.

Promotion of mutual understanding[^7] - a joint committee of the U. S. D. A. and the Land-Grant College Association in 1948 suggested that the federal director of extension and a responsible official of each agency in the Department of Agriculture meet monthly and discuss important developments in each agency's field.

The Hoover Commission Report[^8] - in 1947 Herbert Hoover submitted the first report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government of which he was the chairman. This commission was unable to conduct a detailed survey of activities at the county level; however, they made sampling inquiries in a number of states. It was reported that in many counties agency workers were frequently advising and assisting the same farmers on the same problems. In one Missouri county a farmer received from five different agencies varying advice on how to fertilize crops on his farm.

The Hoover Commission[^9] recommended tighter controls and lines of authority at the federal level and maintenance of specific lines of authority and responsibility down to the county level. State and

[^7]: Black, op. cit., p. 23.
county farmer committees would be advisory only. The Commission con-
demned the tendency of county advisory committees "to become local
administrators of uncoordinated activities instead of advisors" as one
of the worst evils of the present system. An additional recommendation
was that only one county council or board (farmer-elected) should advise
county agricultural agencies. Another was for the formation of county
agricultural councils of USDA workers to further coordination and
understanding among agencies.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Section 1

Agricultural Agencies Operating at the County Level

What agencies operate at the county level? In order to formulate a plan for coordinating the work of agricultural agencies in counties, the operating agencies must be determined. The kind and number of such agencies operating in counties should have a decided influence on the provisions of such a plan.

Data presented in Table II show the agencies found operating in 36 counties of the twelve southern states.

Table II reveals that the Agricultural Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration and Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee of the USDA were found operating in all of the 36 counties studied. Departments of Vocational Agriculture were found in 32 counties (89 percent). The other four agencies operating; Forest Service, Production Credit Administration, Federal Land Bank, and Indian Agency, were found in less than one third of the counties studied. Their representation is as follows: Forest Service in 11 counties (31 percent), Production Credit Administration in 9 counties (25 percent), Federal Land Bank in 8 counties (22 percent), and Indian Agencies (Agricultural Division) in 2 counties (5 percent).

It is probable that even though PCA and the Federal Land Bank had no establishments in a large number of counties, they could have
served these counties from centralized offices designed to serve two
or three counties as a unit.

TABLE II

AGENCIES OPERATING AT THE COUNTY LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey of Thirty-Six Counties</th>
<th>No. of counties</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Extension Service</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Conservation Service</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Stabilisation and Conservation Committee</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Home Administration</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Agriculture</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Service</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Credit Administration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Land Bank</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Agency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average - 5.7 agencies per county

Peek\(^1\), in his Mississippi study, reported four factors that seemed
to determine what agencies operate - the factors: (1) Legislative
authorization to operate, (2) Action by county administrative boards,
(3) Action by state and federal agency authorities, and (4) Public demand.
He also observed that as numbers of agencies increase coordination becomes

\(^1\)Peek, op. cit., p. 23.
more complex as a result of increased opportunities for duplication and conflict.

SUMMARY

The major agricultural agencies found operating at the county level, listed in order of the frequency of operation and showing the percentage of counties with operational units, are (1) the Agricultural Extension Service (100%), (2) SCS (100%), (3) ASC (100%), (4) FHA (97%), (5) Vocational Agriculture (89%), (6) The Forest Service (31%), (7) FCA (25%), and (8) the Federal Land Bank (22%). It is probable that a number of counties were served by FCA and Federal Land Bank units located in counties adjoining them.
Section 2

Primary Duties and Activities of County

Agricultural Agencies

For adequate guidance in formulating a plan for county agricultural coordination, each agency found operating in a minimum of 10 per cent of the counties was analyzed separately to determine its main functions as intended by federal, state, district, and local authority. The possibility existed that recommendations could be made for abolishing or transferring a function to another agency; however, the proposed plan for coordination was generally designed for operation within the existing framework of enabling authority.

The Agricultural Extension Service.\(^2\) This agency has been an integral part of the U. S. D. A. since the Smith-Lever Act became law in 1914. Four subsequent acts based on general provisions of the original act have extended the area of application of extension or authorized appropriation of additional funds, but did not alter the general purpose of the basic act. This Smith-Lever Act was designed "to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage application of same." The Agricultural Extension Service maintains that its enabling legislation clearly indicates

---

that work to be done is not to be restricted to a narrow interpretation of "agriculture and home economics." Agricultural Extension programs deal with a wide range of problems.

A typical county agricultural extension staff includes an agent for agricultural work, one for home demonstration work, and one for youth work. These agents do practically all of the direct extension teaching. This is accomplished by a number of methods: personal consultation, formulation of farm and home plans, group meetings, demonstrations, distribution of printed matter, and other means.

Volunteer local leaders are trained to assist in teaching. It is well to note that Agricultural Extension workers in the county are joint employees of the county, the State land-grant college and the U. S. D. A.

Agricultural Extension's proposed method of operation is flexible and based on the formation of a county extension program with the aid of an advisory program committee, made up of county farm people.

**Departments of Vocational Agriculture.** Enabling legislation for this agency is provided by the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 and other subsequent acts. One of the major provisions of these acts is for establishment of departments of vocational agriculture in rural high schools. These departments are to provide training in agriculture for students enrolled in high school, out-of-school youth, and adult farmers.

---

Section 10 of the Smith-Hughes Law states:

(1) Vocational agricultural education should be under public supervision or control.

(2) The controlling purpose of the education is to fit for useful employment.

(3) The education shall be of less than college grade.

(4) The education is designed to meet the needs of persons over 14 years of age who have entered upon or are preparing to enter upon the work of the farm.

(5) The state or local community, or both, shall provide the necessary plant and equipment.

(6) Such schools shall provide for directed or supervised practice in agriculture for at least 6 months per year.

According to administrative policies and regulations issued by the Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency, the complete program of vocational education in agriculture is to consist of (1) classes for in-school youth, (2) classes for out-of-school young farmers, and (3) classes for adult farmers. These classes should be organized and planned. Classes for out-of-school young farmers should be planned to assist them in securing training and aid on problems related to becoming established in farming. Also, organized classes should be held to aid established farmers in solving their farm problems. It was specified that there should be not less than ten meetings totaling 20 hours for adult farmer instruction each year.

The Future Farmers of America and New Farmers of America are recognized as an official part of the agricultural education program.

---

\cite{bid, pp. 38-41.}
In general terms the primary purpose of vocational education in agriculture is to increase proficiency in farming on the part of those engaged in farming and of prospective farmers.

**Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee (FMA)**

This committee, formerly FMA, was created by the Secretary of Agriculture's Memorandum 1118 of August 18, 1945. The Committee's organization was modified and its name changed from FMA to Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee in the autumn of 1953. This committee at the county level is responsible for administering programs concerned with agricultural conservation, production adjustments, price support and stabilization, and the school lunch program. Other functions such as market research, news, standardization and grading, and inspection are not administered at the county level.

Elected farmer committees administer all ASC programs that deal directly with the farmer. From among their own number, farmers select a community committee of not more than three members. They also send a delegate to a county convention, where delegates from the county communities elect a county committee of three farmers. Within the area of their responsibility, county committees adapt ASC programs to county needs, administer the programs through a hired administrator — the county chairman of ASC, and keep farmers informed of their activities.

**Soil Conservation Service.**

The Soil Conservation Service was

---


established according to provisions of the Soil Conservation Act which was approved April 27, 1935. The basic purposes of SCS are to aid and promote physical adjustments in use of land and water, to conserve natural resources, to establish a permanent and balanced agriculture, and to reduce hazards of floods and sedimentation.

The service's main operations take place in soil conservation districts, which are formed by farmers under state conservation laws. Usually these districts provide two or more soil technicians for each county. Using land capability surveys these technicians make conservation plans for individual farmers. These plans are used as a guide in applying and maintaining conservation practices on the different kinds of land according to the needs and capabilities shown by land capability surveys. It is important to note here that in February of 1951, the Secretary of Agriculture assigned to SCS the added responsibility for technical phases of the Agricultural Conservation Program of the ASC. Upon request, SCS technicians give farmers direct assistance in putting approved conservation practices on the land.

Activities such as conservation research, purchase and improvement of submarginal land and major water conservation or drainage projects may take place in a county, but they lie out of the area of responsibility of the county soil technician.

Farmers Home Administration. The Farmers Home Administration was established in 1946 according to provisions of the Farmers Home

\[\text{Ibid., pp. 252-253.}\]
Administration Act. Essentially it is a credit agency, designed to provide supervised credit for farmers who cannot get the credit at reasonable terms from other lending agencies. Credit is supplemented where necessary by direct assistance to borrowers in planning and expediting use of sound farming practices. This promotes more successful farming and enables farmers to repay the loans. At the county level a technically trained representative, called the FHA Supervisor, provides this service.

Loans to farmers are made through the Office of the County Supervisor, after a county committee of three persons, two of whom must be farmers, determines the applicants' eligibility. For farm ownership loans, this committee verifies the value of the farm.

Major types of loans made by the FHA are as follows: (1) Operating Loans, (2) Farm Ownership Loans, (3) Farm Housing Loans, (4) Water Facility Loans, (5) Insured Mortgage Loans, and (6) Disaster Loans. Percentage of repayment of all loans has been very high.

By far the greatest portion of the county FHA Supervisor's time is devoted to helping borrowers with farm and home plans, making advisory farm visits, and cooperating in bringing additional services from appropriate farm agencies in the county to the farm.

Another function of the county FHA office is collection of loan payments.

The Forest Service. As provided for by the Agricultural

---

8 Ibid., p. 237.
Appropriations Act of 1905, the "Forest Service" was established under that name. Many of its functions had previously been carried on under various other organizational titles.

The broad purpose of the Service is to (a) develop forest land and range resources and keep them productive, (b) prevent waste of these resources, and (c) use these lands to promote the social welfare of the nation.

Forest Service Activities at the county level are a result of cooperation between the federal, state and county governments. The county ranger is usually an employee of the State Forest Service, but he is also responsible to the county government, which is responsible for part of the County Forest Service Unit. Fire prevention, conservation practices, woodland management, farm forest planting, checking compliance with state forestry laws, and farm forestry education are some of the more important activities performed by the county ranger.

The Production Credit Associations. In 1933 twelve production credit corporations, one in each farm credit district, and local production credit associations were authorized by provisions of the Farm Credit Act. The purpose of this organization is to provide short-term credit for all types of farm and ranch operations.

The 500 local production credit associations, cooperative organizations of farmers, make and collect the loans. Production credit

---

9McCormick, op. cit., p. 68.

corporations furnish funds for capitalizing less than half the production credit associations. These remaining associations have paid off all government capital and are completely owned by member-borrowers. They hold stock and have one vote per member.

The size of an individual loan depends on the farmer-member’s financial requirements for farm operations, his ability to use it wisely, and his ability to repay. No loans are made for less than $50. Generally they are made on a budgeted basis for periods up to one year.

Federal Land Banks.\textsuperscript{11} The twelve Federal Land Banks, one in each farm credit district, were established by provisions of the Farm Loan Act of 1916. Subsequent legislation has broadened and amended the original provisions.

The Federal Land Bank system is cooperative, and all stock is completely owned by farmer-members, who are organized into National Farm Loan Associations. These associations operate at the county level. Land Bank loans are obtained only through National Farm Loan Associations. The associations endorse loans and elect borrowers to membership. The borrower purchases stock in the association equal to 5 per cent of his loan. Processing and collection of loans is handled by the county secretary-treasurer of the National Farm Loan Association. Loans may be made for not less than $100 or more than $100,000 to any one borrower, and cannot exceed 65 per cent of the appraised normal agricultural value of the farm offered as security. Federal Land Bank loans are long-term.

\textsuperscript{11}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 249.
low-interest-rate, amortised loans made to farmers who give first mortgages on their farm as security and agree to repay the loans in annual and semi-annual installments. They are made for the following purposes: to purchase land for agricultural use; to purchase stock, equipment and materials necessary for efficient operation of the mortgaged farm; to provide buildings; to liquidate previous indebtedness; and to provide funds for general agricultural use.

**SUMMARY**

Table III summarizes the major activities or duties performed by agricultural agencies in accomplishing their purposes. The Agricultural Extension Service disseminates agricultural information, furnishes agricultural training and education, provides agricultural leadership training, gives "on-the-farm" supervision, and assists farmers in making farm plans. Local departments of vocational agriculture have the same general activities as the Agricultural Extension Service; however, their methods of carrying them out are usually different. SCS furnishes agricultural training and education, gives "on-the-farm" supervision and assists farmers in making farm plans. In accomplishing these activities primary emphasis is placed on soil conservation. ASC supervises administration of agricultural conservation, production adjustment, and price support programs. FHA is concerned with "on-the-farm" supervision of the use of agricultural credit, which it has supplied in the form of long and short-term loans, and with collection of payments on these loans as they mature. The Forest Service engages in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity or Duty</th>
<th>Agr. Ext.</th>
<th>Voc. Agr.</th>
<th>SCS</th>
<th>ASC</th>
<th>FHA</th>
<th>Forest Service</th>
<th>Federal Land Bank</th>
<th>PCA</th>
<th>Number of agencies using</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disseminating agricultural information</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnish agricultural training and education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide agricultural leadership training (for youths and adults)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;On-the-Farm&quot; supervision (educational &amp; technical)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making on farm plans</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist farmers in making land use plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise administration of agr. conservation, produc tion adjustment, and price support programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply long-term farm loans</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply short-term farm loans</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect payments on agriculture loans</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise use of agriculture credit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest fire prevention and control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
forestry education, forest fire prevention and control, forest law enforcement, and "on-the-farm" supervision of forestry enterprises.

The Federal Land Bank and PCA operate as almost independent agencies outside the public framework. The Federal Land Bank supplies long-term mortgage loans to farmers, whereas the PCA provides short-term credit for the various types of farm and ranch operations.

Data concerning the number of agencies engaging in each activity indicate that approximately one-half of these activities are used by two or more agencies. It may be inferred that in some instances overlapping and duplication result. This suggests that a possible reorganization of agencies might increase efficiency.
Methods of Agricultural Coordination in Use and Their Efficiency

In seeking a usable and practical plan for agricultural coordination at the county level, this investigator went to the counties recommended by state heads of agricultural agencies as having the most efficient coordination. Agency heads were asked for information about the methods of coordination they used. They were also asked to evaluate the effectiveness of these methods. Fully realizing the difficulty of evaluating and interpreting frequency for this type data, it is believed that valuable implications may be made. Section 3 will supply such data and implications.

Methods Used by Counties to Promote Coordination of the Work of Agricultural Agencies. Data in Table IV present the primary coordinating methods used by 208 agricultural agencies in the twelve states studied. It gives the number and percent of agencies using each method. Usage was as follows: "informal verbal agreements" by one hundred and sixty-one or 77 percent of the agencies, "memorandums of understanding" by one hundred and two or 49 percent, "A county coordinator" by fourteen or 7 percent, "A county agricultural program" by one hundred and forty-four or 70 percent, "A county agricultural workers' organization" by one hundred and thirty-four or 64 percent, "inter-changing use of facilities" by one hundred and forty-eight or 72 percent, "master calendar of agricultural events" by one hundred and six or 50 percent, "sharing
**TABLE IV**

METHODS USED BY COUNTIES TO PROMOTE COOPERATION AND COORDINATION

OF THE WORK OF AGRICULTURAL AGENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Agencies Using</th>
<th>Percent Using</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Informal verbal agreements with other agencies</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A formal memorandum of understanding with another agency or agencies to avoid conflict and duplication</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A county coordinator</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A county agricultural program</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A county agricultural worker's organization, such as a council, association, etc.</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interchanging use of facilities, such as buildings, classrooms, and other equipment</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A master calendar of agricultural events in the county to prevent conflict of meeting dates</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sharing publicity and recognition for joint accomplishments</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Joint sponsoring of agricultural events when feasible (fairs, tours, etc.)</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Planned social activities for the agricultural workers' group</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Centralization of agencies' offices</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Miscellaneous methods used by less than 5 percent of all agencies</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
publicity and recognition" by one hundred and forty-nine or 72 percent, "joint sponsoring of agricultural events" by one hundred and sixty-two or 77 percent, "planned social activities" by ninety-nine or 43 percent, "centralisation of agencies offices" by one hundred and thirty or 63 percent, and "miscellaneous methods" used by less than 5 percent of all agencies by twenty-three or 11 percent.

On the basis of frequency it appears that agencies utilized all methods in Table III extensively except "a county coordinator" and various miscellaneous methods which are not specified in this report.

Within the framework of a plan for agricultural coordination which includes many of the methods found to be used in the counties studied with definite inclusion of those methods used by approximately fifty percent or more of all agencies reporting, it seems reasonable to expect coordination that facilitates a common movement toward achievement of general agricultural objectives in farm counties.

Evaluation of the Efficiency of Methods of Agricultural Coordination Used by Counties.

1. Informal Verbal Agreements. Data in Figure 1 portray the opinion valuations of 161 agricultural agency heads relative to the efficiency of "informal verbal agreements" in promoting agricultural coordination. Fifteen or 9.4 percent of the reporting agencies gave an appraisal of "Unimportant," sixty-four or 40 percent an appraisal of "Valuable," and eighty-one or 50.6 percent one of "Very Valuable."

This method apparently had a uniformly high evaluation for efficiency. It was appraised as "Valuable" or "Very Valuable" by a
**Figure 1**

Evaluation of Informal Verbal Agreements

- **Very Valuable:** 50.6%
- **Valuable:** 40.0%
- **Unimportant:** 9.4%
total of 90 percent of the agencies using this method.

Some agencies suggested that "informal verbal agreements" should not be limited to agricultural agencies, but that they could also be used profitably with civic clubs, business firms, and agricultural clubs in the county.

2. **Formal Memorandums of Understanding.** Data in Figure 2 express the evaluations of 102 agricultural agency heads concerning "formal memorandums of understanding". Forty-four or 43.1 percent assigned an evaluation of "Unimportant," forty-one or 40.2 percent an evaluation of "Valuable," and seventeen or 16.6 percent a valuation of "Very Valuable."

It appears that a large group had little regard for this method. This frame of mind is revealed in the following statement of an agency head:

"It is our opinion that written agreements are worth no more than the desire of the parties to the agreements to cooperate. In other words, unless there is a genuine desire to cooperate, all the written agreements in the world will not be of much help."

Nevertheless, 56.8 percent of the agencies reported "formal memorandums" as being "Valuable" or "Very Valuable." It follows that we may assume that specific situations could occur in which considerable utility could accrue to this method. It seems that "formal memorandums" should be used only when circumstances make it advantageous to do so; that is, when simpler, less formal procedures are not adequate.

3. **A County Coordinator.** Figure 3 reveals data showing opinion valuations relative to use of "a county coordinator". Fourteen or 57.1
FORMAL MEMORANDUMS OF UNDERSTANDING

FIGURE 2

EVALUATION OF FORMAL MEMORANDUMS OF UNDERSTANDING
A COUNTY COORDINATOR

FIGURE 3

EVALUATION OF A COUNTY COORDINATOR
percent of the reporting agencies gave an appraisal of "Unimportant," one or 7.1 percent a valuation of "Valuable," and five or 35.7 percent a weighting of "Very Valuable."

The data indicate two extremes of opinion regarding the utility of a "county coordinator" for effecting agricultural coordination. A probable explanation is that in Florida where most county coordinators were found operating, they were coordinators for only one agency (Vocational Agriculture). They were usually rated "Very Valuable" by teachers of agriculture, but "Unimportant" by other agency heads. This latter rating is likely to be correct from a county-wide, all-agency view point. Data collected did not indicate that a county coordinator for all agencies in a county was utilized in any of the counties studied. As a result, evaluation of this method can add little value to the findings of the study.

4. A County Agricultural Program. Opinion valuations relative to "a county agricultural program" are reflected by the data presented in Figure 4. Five or 3.4 percent of the reporting agencies were of the opinion that this method was "Unimportant" in promoting agricultural coordination. Twenty-four or 16.6 percent assigned an evaluation of "Valuable," and one hundred and fifteen or 80 percent appraised "county agricultural programs" as being "Very Valuable."

Apparently most of the agricultural agencies using a "county agricultural program" in their counties held it in high esteem. Another indication of its usefulness was the response to Item IV of the questionnaire used in this study. Item IV was a request for printed matter
COUNTY AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

VERY VALUABLE: 80.0%
VALUABLE: 16.6%
UNIMPORTANT: 3.4%

Percent of agencies reporting
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EVALUATION OF COUNTY AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS
concerning coordination methods used in the counties. The bulk of
the material returned dealt with the method under discussion.

Suggestions for improving a "county agricultural program" sent
in by reporting agencies are as follows:

(1) "Let the county program originate voluntarily
with county agricultural workers and farmers."

(2) "Set up a plan in which all agencies and
interested farmers participate, specify
responsibility of each agency in carrying
out the plan, and report results as a
coordinated effort."

(3) "Arrange for more farmers to participate in
planning the program."

In competition with forty-two other North Carolina counties in
1952, Rockingham County (included in the study) won the North Carolina
"County Progress Campaign."

Rockingham was able to win in 1952 because its
folks were all set to go when 1952 began. Its program
got under way in 1949 with formation of its County
Agricultural Workers Council. Representatives of the
Agricultural Extension Service, Farmers Home Adminis-
tration, Production Credit Association, FHA, Soil
Conservation Service, and vocational agriculture and
home economics teachers banded themselves together in
a long-range program for better farming and better
farm living. Basis for the program was a survey
which disclosed the following disturbing facts:
—92 percent of Rockingham's farm income was coming
from tobacco.
—Farm labor was fully used only during the tobacco-
harvesting season. From November to April farm families
had little profitable use for their time.

12William D. Poe (Associate Editor), "Rockingham-Tarheel
'County of the Year,'" The Progressive Farmer, Feb. (1953), Virginia-
Carolinas edition.
- Farm families were spending cash dollars for food they could have been growing at home. Farmers were failing to meet the town demand for milk, poultry, beef, and pork.

- Through concentrating on tobacco production alone, farmers were failing to produce enough income for good farm living and well rounded community life.

With these facts uncovered and the county's 28 agricultural workers all set to remedy the situation, next step was a dinner meeting called by the Reidsville Chamber of Commerce. Leading farmers and farm women from all sections of the county joined with agricultural workers and civic and businessmen in a plan for action. The following committees were appointed to complete the long-range program: (1) tobacco... (2) farm food... (3) farm and home conveniences... (4) dairying... (5) beef cattle... (6) swine... (7) feed production... (8) soil conservation, forestry, and wildlife.

After several months' work by the committees, the completed program appeared in an attractive booklet distributed to farmers early in 1950. Chief goals of the program were to (1) maintain high tobacco income, (2) add to it with income from poultry, beef cattle, dairy cattle, and hogs, (3) produce an adequate home food supply, (4) improve farm living conditions, and (5) create better-rounded communities. A community contest was announced with the top communities to get annual awards donated by civic and business organizations.

Organizing for Action

With the program completed, leaders pressed on to get the people wholeheartedly behind it. There were already three organized communities in the county, and 12 others were soon organized. Meetings were held in each community, officers elected, and action committees appointed.

Spirited competition for community prizes developed. Oregon Hill community won the top award in 1950 and 1951. Progress in Matrimony community was so outstanding in these two years that it won third and second place awards consecutively in the National Grange's annual "Community Service Contest" in competition with some 2,300 communities all over America. Community organization has proved itself the key to Rockingham's parade of progress. It has been the vehicle for translating plans into action.
With 15 dynamic communities united behind a sound program, progress was inevitable. What have been some of Rockingham’s accomplishments in three years or organized effort? Here are some achievements that are typical:

Tobacco is being balanced with livestock. The county now has 90 Grade A dairies as compared with 12, a few years ago. . . 1,000 cows a year are artificially bred. . . . More than 1,500 beef cattle have been added and 5,000 acres of improved pasture established. . . . 23 new commercial poultry flocks have been started and poultry now brings the county $200,000 in income annually. . . . An egg grading and marketing station and a commercial hatchery have been opened. . . . 999 soil conservation plans have been prepared and more than 200 farm ponds constructed. . . . Tobacco income has been increased while dollars from livestock and poultry have been added to it.

Social progress has kept pace with better farming. Five hundred Farm Bureau families have enrolled for Blue Cross-Blue Shield hospital and surgical insurance. . . Telephone lines have been extended all over the county, and soon 75 percent of farm families will have service as compared with 10 percent five years ago. . . More than 90 percent of farm homes are electrified. . . . A good network of rural roads has been blacktopped and several schools have fine new vocational agriculture buildings. . . 2 new community centers have been built, and several more are under construction. . . 10 communities have organized recreation programs.

Women are playing a vital role in the program. . . Banded together in 25 home demonstration clubs, farm women have pushed programs in which more than 335 families have installed water systems and more than 250 have installed bathrooms. . . 715 families have erected attractive mail boxes. . . 45 families have bought electric stoves; 640 families painted homes or out-buildings.

Youngfolks—boys and girls—are sparking the program of progress. Organized into 25 Four-H Clubs with a membership of 1,200, and 15 FFA and FHA chapters, they are setting the pace in livestock, mechanization, recreation, and better farm living.

Organized Support

Farmers, farm women, and farm youngfolks have actively created Rockingham’s progress. But behind
them has been magnificent organized support. Rockingham's 28 agricultural workers...the Farm Bureau and Orange...churches...bankers...chambers of commerce and junior chambers of commerce...county commissioners...and civic clubs have given the program financial and moral support without which it could not have succeeded. In Rockingham, people of town and country have proved themselves true "Partners in Progress."

From information secured from the agencies cooperating in the study, it has been determined that a larger number of the counties tend to follow the same plan for county program planning as Rockingham County. Summarized it is as follows:

(1) Organized planning by county agricultural agencies to promote support of a county program through community leaders.

(2) Committee organization with farmer chairmanship.

(3) Analysis of the agricultural problems of the county and recommendation of lines of action to constitute a "county agricultural program" by various committees.

(4) Formation of community organization to promote and create interest in carrying out the program.

(5) Program progress evaluation.

(6) Program modifications to meet local conditions.

From the counties with active "county agricultural programs" the following composite committee organization may be formulated:


Some committees were organized to handle a more consolidated problem area. An example is the organization of Colquitt County,
Georgia:

(1) Soil, water, forest and wildlife conservation.
(2) Livestock production and marketing.
(3) Crop production and marketing.
(4) Home and community improvement.
(5) Health, safety and nutrition.

It appears that the composite committee organization could utilize more farm people and provide greater opportunity for personal participation with possible accompanying interest. Action, it is said, evolves from interest.

5. A County Agricultural Workers' Organization. Data presented in Figure 5 represent the evaluation of a "county agricultural workers' organization". Only five or 3.7 percent appraised this method as "Unimportant," thirty-five or 26.1 percent gave it an appraisal of "Valuable," and ninety-four or 70.1 percent assigned an evaluation of "Very Valuable."

It appears that an "agricultural workers' organization" is highly respected for its' contribution to coordination in the using counties. From information presented in the discussion of "county agricultural programs" the implication is that to be effective the "program" should be implemented by an actively operating organization of "paid" county agricultural workers.

Reporting agencies suggested that their associations or councils could be improved by designing their program provisions to promote understanding of each agency's operations and planning for standard agricultural
A COUNTY AGRICULTURAL WORKERS' ORGANIZATION
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recommendations.

6. **Interchanging Use of Facilities.** Figure 6 presents data showing opinion valuations of the reporting agencies on "interchanging use of facilities." Seventeen or 11.5 percent regarded this interchange as "Unimportant," sixty-seven or 45.3 percent as "Valuable," and sixty-four or 43.2 percent as "Very Valuable."

Almost 90 percent of the reporting agencies credit this method as being an asset in promoting agricultural coordination. Probably those discrediting it by an "Unimportant" rating did so as a result of the inability of their agencies to interchange facilities due to inherent characteristics of their organization.

7. **A Master Calendar of County Agricultural Events.** Data presented in Figure 7 reveal the appraisals made by agricultural agency heads of the value of "a master calendar for county agricultural events." Twenty-two or 20.8 percent gave this method an evaluation of "Unimportant," fifty-three or 50.0 percent an evaluation of "Valuable," and thirty-one or 29.2 percent a valuation of "Very Valuable."

It appears that a consensus reflects considerable respect for the usefulness of a "master calendar" in facilitating agricultural coordination. Again a possible explanation for the "Unimportant" rating is that some agencies such as the Federal Land Bank and Production Credit Administration seldom seem to participate in such events.

The implication is that a "master calendar" should be utilized in counties attempting agricultural coordination.
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EVALUATION OF A MASTER CALENDAR FOR COUNTY AGRICULTURAL EVENTS
8. Sharing Publicity and Recognition for Joint Accomplishments.

Figure 8 presents data relative to an evaluation of "sharing publicity and recognition for joint accomplishments" in facilitating agricultural coordination at the county level. Six agencies or 4.0 percent gave a weighting of "Unimportant," fifty-three or 34.2 percent assigned an appraisal of "Valuable," and 106 or 61.8 percent gave an evaluation of "Very Valuable."

Prevalent opinions tend to imply that much credit is due this method and to indicate that it should be used in a county plan for agricultural coordination.

Information revealed by the data, portrayed situations in these well coordinated counties where relations seemed strained by an apparent lack of "sharing". The following examples express this lack:

a. "We meet and each agency agrees orally to do a certain part of the program with the — service taking all the credit."; "Sharing publicity and recognition for joint accomplishments could have been used to a better advantage if it had been used to show more credit for certain agencies. Too much credit given to one agency and not enough to others. — Service took most of the credit locally, but at the state level wanted it all (in a subtle sort of way), however outwardly in group meeting they wanted to share credit."

b. "Sharing publicity and recognition of joint accomplishments in my opinion would be the most valuable addition needed. In my opinion, this fault lies in the supervisory capacity over county agencies in pushing them to obtain as much publicity as possible on their own merits. A major portion of the accomplishments are made and brought about by joint efforts and in news articles and reports, contributions of each should be mentioned, or at least recognized."
SHARING PUBLICITY AND RECOGNITION
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EVALUATION OF SHARING PUBLICITY AND RECOGNITION
9. Joint Sponsoring of Agricultural Events. Data presented in Figure 9 present an appraisal of the value of "joint sponsoring of agricultural events" in making the goal of county agricultural coordination more accessible. Only three or 1.9 percent of the reporting agencies gave a valuation of "Unimportant", fifty-three or 32.7 percent gave an appraisal of "Valuable," and one hundred and six or 65.4 percent made an appraisal of "Very Valuable."

A large majority opinion endorses the use of "joint sponsoring" when feasible. The implication is that counties should use every opportunity to utilize this method and make it an asset in the program for county agricultural coordination.

A suggestion for improving the value of "joint sponsoring" at the county level was to secure cooperation of the various district or state agencies and their representatives at this level.

10. Planned Social Activities for the Agricultural Workers' Group. Data in Figure 10 show the opinion evaluation of "planned social activities for the agricultural workers' group." Thirty or 30.3 percent gave a weighting of "Unimportant", thirty-nine or 39.4 percent gave an appraisal of "Valuable," while thirty or 30.3 percent gave one of "Very Valuable."

A considerable number of the agencies are of the opinion that social activities for agricultural workers as a group are of no value in promoting coordination. Possible explanations for this valuation may be varying ages, improperly planned social functions, and absence of common interest.
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EVALUATION OF JOINT SPONSORING OF AGRICULTURAL EVENTS
No limitation on the scope of social activities was suggested in the evaluating instrument; however, agencies studied suggested that such amenities as coffee and cake in the initial phase of an agricultural workers meeting were desirable. It appears that we may imply that social activities can be utilized in many circumstances to pave the way for amicable relationships - the key to cooperation, the fore-runner to coordination.

11. Centralization of Agencies Offices. Figure 11 presents data showing the opinion evaluations of "centralization of county agricultural agencies offices" by heads of the agencies reporting. Eighteen or 13.8 percent valued "centralization of offices" as "Unimportant," forty-two or 32.3 percent as "Valuable," and seventy or 53.8 percent as "Very Valuable."

Plurality of opinion shows considerable respect for the effectiveness of this method in facilitating agricultural coordination. The data appear to imply that agricultural agency offices should be centralized whenever practicable.

12. Miscellaneous Methods. All miscellaneous methods were recommended by less than five percent of the reporting agencies. Most of these methods named were individual phases of the major methods already evaluated. However, two seemed worthy of listing. They are: (1) All agency heads are invited to other agencies' public meetings and (2) agricultural cooperation and coordination includes civic groups on an equal basis with farmer and agency groups in promoting county agricultural coordination.
PLANNED SOCIAL ACTIVITIES FOR THE AGRICULTURAL WORKERS' GROUP

Very Valuable: 30.3%

Valuable: 39.4%

Unimportant: 30.3%

FIGURE 10
EVALUATION OF PLANNED SOCIAL ACTIVITIES FOR THE AGRICULTURAL WORKERS' GROUP
CENTRALIZATION OF AGENCIES' OFFICES

FIGURE 11
EVALUATION OF CENTRALIZATION OF AGENCIES OFFICES
It appears that a knowledge of the extent to which the frequency of the use of methods of coordination correlates with valuations made of these methods may have some predictive value. Ranking the individual methods in order of merit by combining the "Valuable" (wt. 0.6) and "Very Valuable" (wt. 1.00) scores, and ranking according to frequency of use, the coefficient of correlation was computed. Rank order coefficient of correlation was found to be 0.73. An "r" of 0.73 denotes a high relationship between frequency of use and merit ratings of methods of coordination. Highly rated methods are most frequently used.

SUMMARY

Table V summarizes the opinion valuations of the major methods of agricultural coordination found used in the thirty-six counties studied. The methods in order of merit rank are as follows:


There was a marked tendency for frequently used methods of coordination to be given high merit ratings. This is indicated by a positive correlation of 0.73 between these two variables.
### Table V

**Evaluation of Methods of Agricultural Coordination by County Agricultural Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Rating by using agencies</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Agricultural Program</td>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Agricultural Workers' Organization</td>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Sponsoring of Agricultural Events</td>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Publicity and Recognition</td>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Verbal Agreements</td>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization of Agencies' Offices</td>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interchanging Use of Facilities</td>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Master Calendar of Agricultural Events</td>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Social Activities</td>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Memorandums of Understanding</td>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A County Coordinator</td>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4

Factors Influencing the Success of County Agricultural Coordination

It seems impossible to assume that a method of coordination effective in one county would, by itself, yield similar results in other counties. However, if the factors most closely related to successful coordination of agricultural activities are determined, the same method may be expected to give satisfactory results when these factors exist in the other counties.

Section 4 presents the factors found to be most closely related to successful coordination.

Data in Figure 12 reflect the evaluation of factors that heads of agencies believed might influence the success of county agricultural coordination. Their appraisals of these factors are shown as "Important" or "Unimportant".

1. "Individual agricultural worker's ability to get along with people" was evaluated by 96 percent of the rating agencies as "Important" and by four percent as "Unimportant". This seems to be a factor that should be labeled must be present.

2. "Mutual assistance between agencies" was assigned a valuation of "Important" by 91 percent of the rating agencies and one of "Unimportant" by nine percent. Apparently it would be justifiable to class this factor as must be present.

3. Seventy-six percent of the reporting agencies made an
FIGURE 12
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appraisal of "Important" on the value of "joint enterprises" in influencing successful coordination. Twenty-four percent gave an opinion valuation of "Unimportant". The inference was that this is a very necessary factor.

4. "A county agricultural program" was rated by 74 percent of the reporting agencies as being "Important" and by 26 percent as being "Unimportant" in influencing county agricultural coordination.

5. Seventy percent of the evaluating agencies assigned a value of "Important" to "leadership by heads of agricultural agencies" and 30 percent gave a value of "Unimportant". It seems that such leadership is a vital factor in successful coordination.

6. Sixty-two percent of the agency heads making evaluations appraised "lengthy tenure of agricultural workers" as "Important" and 38 percent appraised lengthy tenure as "Unimportant." These data seem to show that measures designed to increase tenure of agricultural workers would be valuable.

7. Fifty-six percent of the rating agencies evaluated "centralisation of agencies offices as "Important". However, 44 percent gave this factor a rating of "Unimportant" which is an instance of a factor that was given high rating for efficiency as a separate method, but a much lower rating as a factor influencing over-all county coordination.

8. "A functioning agricultural worker's organization" was given a value of "Important" by 52 percent of the reporting agencies, and one of "Unimportant" by 48 percent. These data appear to reflect a
much lower opinion of an agricultural workers organization as a factor in the over-all success of county agricultural coordination than was shown by 96.2 percent of the agencies rating it "Valuable" or "Very Valuable" as an efficient method of county coordination in the preceding section.

9. "Planning conferences to prevent conflicts" were evaluated as "Important" by 51 percent, as "Unimportant" by 49 percent of the agency heads. This "split" decision obviously precludes any positive or negative conclusion relevant to the probable value of "planning conferences" as a factor in successful coordination of agricultural activities.

10. "Influence of county officials" was rated "Important" by 42 percent and "Unimportant" by 58 percent of the reporting agency heads. This appears to imply a doubtful value for this factor.

11. "Influence of district or state agency heads was appraised by 42 percent of the rating agency heads as "Important" and by 58 percent as "Unimportant." This again is a factor where doubtful value is implied.

12. Only 28 percent of the agencies appraised "planned social activities" as "Important" while 72 percent gave it an appraisal of "Unimportant." Apparently social activities are not considered as very essential to successful coordination.

From the data presented in Figure 12 it may be inferred that any of the factors evaluated could be important causative agents in effecting successful coordination at the county level. On the basis
of the rating scale applied it may also be inferred that some of these
factors, namely: "a county agricultural program", "mutual assistance
between agencies", "joint enterprises", "individual agricultural worker's
ability to 'get along' with people," and "leadership by heads of agri-
cultural agencies" are indispenable and should be established, if not
already present, in the environment of any program for efficient agri-
cultural coordination.

Suggested Factors. Other factors most frequently suggested by
the evaluating agencies in order of frequency, are "understanding of
other agencies' work and problems," "cooperation of farm, civic, and
business groups", "mutual friendship and respect", and "desire to serve
farm people."

Correspondence from agency heads participating in the study
illustrate these suggested factors. Some pertinent excerpts are as
follows:

"—I feel that what little success we might have had
in this county in putting on a coordinating program is
due to the fact that the individual agriculture workers
have developed a feeling that the primary interest of
their activities is to help the farmer and not work
towards the advancement of any particular agency. Part
of this has been brought about by having a program of
work for the entire county, and the personalities of
the agriculture workers. ——"

"—The one and only one reason why we have achieved a
fairly satisfactory degree of coordination in Marion
County is that some three or four "Agency" workers
happened to be sufficiently interested in the welfare
of the farmers they were employed to serve to place
that interest, at least part of the time, ahead of their
own immediate personal interest and ahead of the interest
of the agency they represent.——"
"—We have a unique group of people in the separate agencies that put service to the farmer above personal and professional gain and each one works conscientiously toward the goal of achieving for Franklin Co. a bigger and better agricultural record each year. We believe that each agency was created for a specific purpose and that no one agency was meant to do the whole job. Each one of us feels that he has a specific job to do and a service to render to the farmers of the county, and we go about doing our own job without regard to who will get the credit for this and who will get the credit for that.—

"—The Coordinating Council along with the bankers, businessmen, preachers and teachers have an agreement to try to help farmers have a better living with no agency ahead of the other in the agricultural program.—"

SUMMARY

Data presented in Section 4 show those factors seemingly indispensable to a successful county program for coordinating agricultural activities. These factors are "a county agricultural program," "mutual assistance between agencies", "joint enterprises", "individual agricultural agency worker's ability to get along with people", and "leadership by heads of agricultural agencies".

Other factors that appear to be desirable but to a lesser degree than those listed above, are "lengthy tenure of agricultural workers", "a functioning agricultural workers organization," and "centralization of agencies offices."

Suggested factors appearing worthy of serious consideration were "understanding other agencies' work and problems," "cooperation of farm, civic and business groups," "mutual friendship and respect," and "a desire to serve farm people."
Section 5

New Proposals for Coordinating Activities of Agricultural Agencies at the County Level

In Section 5 the probable merit of relatively new or untried proposals for promoting county agricultural coordination will be considered. The purpose of this section is to analyze the opinion evaluations of proposed methods made by heads of agricultural agencies in the counties studied.

Proposals sent to the counties for opinion ratings were suggested by a study of the literature related to the problem studied. Additional methods recommended by agency heads are presented.

Table VI gives data showing how agricultural agency heads rated relatively new proposals for agricultural coordination. Methods are presented in order of merit rank.

1. Memorandums of Understanding between Heads of Agencies at the National or State Level, Followed by Functional Directions Down to the Respective County Agencies.

Of one hundred and forty-six agencies giving opinion evaluation on this method, twenty-four (16.4 percent) appraised it as "Unimportant", fifty-two (35.5 percent) as "Valuable," and seventy (48.0 percent) as "Very Valuable." Memorandums of understanding have long been used in attempts to improve agency relationships. The new element in this proposal is followed by functional directions down to the respective county agencies. The literature reviewed revealed a notable lack of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Method</th>
<th>Rating by agencies</th>
<th>Rating by agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum of understanding between agencies at the National level.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer elected county agricultural board to act in advisory capacity</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate training on agricultural agencies operations and relationships for prospective agency workers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning board at the national level to promote coordination among all agricultural agencies</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual agency committee limited to an advisory capacity</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural activities grouped into 3 agencies (1) education, (2) action, (3) credit</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County agricultural coordinator</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
success of formal memorandums conceived in the upper agency echelons. The data implied that top agency administrators should support their words with action. Agency heads at the county level apparently believe "memorandums" potentially are valuable.

2. Farmer-Elected County Agricultural Board to Assist in Setting Up a County Agricultural Program and to Act in an Advisory Capacity.

One hundred and thirty-nine agencies evaluated "a farmer-elected agricultural board." Twenty-one (15.1 percent) rated it as "Unimportant," fifty-seven (41 percent) as "Valuable," and sixty-one (43.9 percent) as "Very Valuable." The general tendency has been for agency workers or coordinating council committees to arbitrarily select farmers to advise them in formulating a general county agricultural program. Agency heads indicated a positive desire for an agricultural board elected to represent all county farmers in county agricultural planning.

3. Instruction on the Authorizing Acts, the Current Operations, and the Relationships of Federal and State Agricultural Agencies to be Provided by Colleges of Agriculture for Prospective Agricultural Workers as a Prerequisite for Graduation.

Of one hundred and thirty-nine agency heads appraising this proposal, fifteen (10.8 percent) gave it a valuation of "Unimportant," seventy-three (52.5 percent) gave a rating of "Valuable," and fifty-one (36.7 percent) rated it as "Very Valuable." The consensus of opinion appears to be that more instruction on agricultural agencies operations and relationships is needed by prospective agricultural agency workers in the agricultural colleges. These data are more significant in view of
the suggestion by a number of agencies\textsuperscript{13} that a vital factor influencing the success of coordination in their counties is "understanding of other agencies work and problems."

4. Planning Board (s) at the National Level for Coordination and Promotion of Understanding Among Agricultural Agencies.

One hundred and forty-five agency heads gave evaluations of the probable value of planning boards at the national level. Thirty-two (22.1 percent) of this group gave a rating of "Unimportant", fifty-three (36.5 percent) rated "Valuable", while sixty (41.4 percent) rated this proposal as "Very Valuable".

As indicated in Chapter II, Review of Related Literature, planning boards have been employed at the national level. Apparently they have had doubtful success in accomplishing their purposes. However, no information in the available literature indicated that a planning board with the sole aim of coordination and improvement of agency relationships has existed. The success of such a board, operating within the framework of the USDA and the U. S. Office of Education, could help effect desirable coordination at the county level. The data suggest this possibility.

5. Farmer Committee of Any Individual Agricultural Agency Limited to an Advisory Capacity with no Administrative Duties.

Of one hundred and thirty-eight agency heads rating the above proposal, thirty-two (23.1 percent) evaluated it as "Unimportant."

\textsuperscript{13}Chapter III, Section 4, pp. 82 of this manuscript.
fifty-six (40.6 percent) was "Valuable," and fifty (36.3 percent) gave it an appraisal of "Very Valuable." These data appear to show that approximately 75 percent of all the rating agencies believe coordination would be enhanced by restricting an individual agency's farmer committee to an advisory capacity.

The section of the Hoover Commission\(^{11}\) on agricultural activities urged that local farmer committees for county agencies should be purely advisory on the operation and formulation of programs. It may be inferred that coordination is limited to some degree by interaction of personalities. When fewer personalities are involved, the problem is less complex.

The head of an agency in one of the counties studied said,

"From past experience in various other counties in which I have worked, coordination has been impossible on a county basis due to a determined lack of coordination from higher levels. This was probably due to jealousies and interagency conflicts. This is a very regrettable condition when it exists."

6. Grouping the County Activities of the Federal Government Relating to Agriculture Under Three Main Heads: (1) Education and Related Services, (2) Action Agencies other than Credit, and (3) Agricultural Credit.

Thirty-three (23.6 percent) of the 140 agencies making appraisals of the proposed grouping of county agencies gave an opinion of "Unimportant",

forty-six (32.8 percent) made a valuation of "Valuable", while the remaining sixty-one agencies (43.6 percent) returned an evaluation of "Very Valuable."

To some this proposal may have appeared to be a radical step. Nevertheless, over 75 percent of the agencies thought it had considerable merit.

7. A County Coordinator.

Eighty-eight (61.3 percent) of 137 agency heads evaluating this relatively little-used method of coordination rated it "Unimportant", twenty (14.6 percent) as "Valuable," and twenty-nine (21.9 percent) gave a rating of "Very Valuable."

The implication is that agency heads in the main doubted that use of a county coordinator was of any appreciable value as a method of coordinating agricultural activities at the county level.

8. Other proposals.

Other proposals made by agencies in the counties studied and deemed worthy of consideration are the following:

1. One (and only one) agency serving farmers in a county, cooperatively financed and cooperatively controlled by county, state, and federal governments. All activities—education, action, and credit, would be administered from this central agency. The administrator, it seems, would be a 'county secretary of agriculture.'

2. Prerequisite for graduation of prospective agricultural workers—a minimum of 60 days field service with all public agricultural agencies in a county.
3. Amendments to revise and simplify the enabling acts of the respective agencies in order to reduce duplication and conflict of activities.

SUMMARY

Relatively new or untried proposals suggested in Section 5 and ranked according to the rating given them for probable merit are as follows:

1. Memorandums of understanding between heads of agencies at the national or state level, followed by functional directions down to the respective county agencies.

2. Farmer-elected county agricultural board to assist in setting up a county agricultural program and to act in an advisory capacity.

3. Instruction on the authorising acts, the current operations, and the relationships of federal and state agricultural agencies to be provided by colleges of agriculture for prospective agricultural workers as a prerequisite for graduation.

4. Planning boards at the national level for coordination and promotion of understanding among agricultural agencies.

5. Farmer committee of any individual agricultural agency to be limited to an advisory capacity with no administrative duties.

6. Grouping the county activities of the federal government relating to agriculture under three main heads: (1) Education and related services, (2) Action agencies other than credit, and (3) Agricultural credit.
7. A county coordinator.

All methods except "a county coordinator" were rated rather highly. There was little significant range in evaluations of the top six proposals. They were very close. However, between these six and "a county coordinator" there was an extremely wide range. There appeared to be little respect for a coordinator.

Other proposals suggested that seemed to have a high potential value were: (1) One agency to provide all agricultural services in a county, (2) Prospective agricultural workers to receive 60 days field service with agricultural agencies before college graduation, and (3) amend enabling acts of agricultural agencies to reduce duplication and conflict.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study is to develop a suggested plan for coordinating the work of public agricultural agencies at the county level.

SUMMARY

(1) Agencies Operating at the County Level.

It was found that eight major agricultural agencies were operating at the county level. Listed in order of the frequency that they were found to operate with the percentage of counties having operational units shown, they are (a) the Agricultural Extension Service (100%), (b) Soil Conservation Service (100%), (c) Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Administration (100%), (d) Farmers' Home Administration (97%), (e) Vocational Agriculture (39%), (f) The Forest Service (31%), (g) Production Credit Administration (25%), and (h) Federal Land Bank (22%). Counties failing to report PCA and Federal Land Banks units very likely may have been served by such units located in adjoining counties.

(2) Primary Duties and Activities of County Agricultural Agencies.

It was found that primary duties and responsibilities of agencies were as follows:

(a) Extension Service - Disseminates agricultural information, furnishes agricultural training and education, provides agricultural leadership training, gives "on-the-farm" supervision, and assists farmers in making farm plans.
(b) Vocational Agriculture - Local departments of vocational agriculture have the same general activities as the Extension Service; however, their methods of carrying them out are usually different.

(c) Soil Conservation Service - Furnishes agricultural education, gives "on-the-farm" supervision (educational and technical), provides technical services including assistance in making farm land-use plans.

(d) Agricultural Stabilisation and Conservation Committee - Supervises administration of agricultural conservation, production adjustment, and price support programs.

(e) Farmers' Home Administration - Provides "on-the-farm" supervision of the use of agricultural credit that it has supplied in the form of long and short-term loans.

(f) Forest Service - Engages in providing forestry education, forest fire prevention and control, forest-law enforcement, and "on-the-farm" supervision of forestry enterprises.

(g) Production Credit Administration - Provides short-term credit for all types of farm and ranch operations.

(h) Federal Land Bank - Supplies long-term mortgage loans to farmers.

The last two agencies listed, PCA and the Federal Land Bank, operate largely outside the public framework.

Implied duplication and overlapping of activities suggests a possible need to reorganize agencies operating at the county level to increase efficiency.

(3) Methods of Agricultural Coordination in Use and Their Efficiency.
Methods found to be used and listed in the order rated—high to low—are as follows:

(a) An overwhelming number of the agencies participating in the study (80 percent) expressed the opinion that a "county agricultural program" was "Very Valuable" in promoting agricultural coordination.

(b) Ninety-four or 70.1 percent of the agencies participating in an "agricultural workers' organization" gave an opinion of "Very Valuable" in regard to the coordinating effectiveness of such an organization.

(c) The major portion of 162 agencies, 65.4 percent reflected an opinion of "Very Valuable" as to the efficiency of "joint sponsoring of agricultural events" in promoting coordination at the county level.

(d) Ninety-two or 61.8 percent of one hundred and forty-nine agencies that had used "sharing of publicity and recognition" recognized it to be "Very Valuable" to a moderate degree in achieving desirable county agricultural coordination.

(e) Eighty-one or 50.6 percent of the agencies using "informal verbal agreements" reflected an opinion of "Very Valuable" while sixty-four or 40.0 percent gave a designation of "Valuable." It may be said that these agreements were "Very Valuable" to a slight degree or "Valuable" to a very high degree.

(f) "Centralization of agencies' offices" was given a rating almost identical to that of (e) above.

(g) For efficiency as a method for promoting coordination "interchanging use of facilities" was rated as "Valuable" by 45.3 percent of
the using agencies and as "Very Valuable" by 43.2 percent. By
interpretation it can be said that it was "Valuable" to an extremely
high degree.

(h) "A master calendar of agricultural events" was given an
opinion evaluation of "Valuable" by 50.0 percent of the agencies
utilising it for county agricultural coordination while 29.2 percent
rated it as "Very Valuable". On this basis it may be termed "Valuable"
to a high degree.

(i) "Planned social activities for agricultural workers" were
rated so as to make the over-all opinion evaluation equivalent to that
of "Valuable".

(j) For their effectiveness in promoting coordination of the
activities of the county agricultural agencies "formal memorandums of
understanding" were "Valuable" to a slight degree.

(k) The major portion of the using agencies assigned an opinion
of "Unimportant" to the use of a "county coordinator".

There was a definite tendency for the most frequently used
coordination methods to be given the highest evaluations. This is
confirmed by a positive correlation of .73 between these two variables.

(4) Factors Influencing the Success of County Agricultural Agency
Coordination.

It was found that certain factors seem to be indispensable to
a successful county program for coordinating agricultural activities.
These factors in order of their importance are:

(a) A county agricultural program.
(b) Mutual assistance between agencies.
(c) Joint enterprises by agencies.
(d) Individual agricultural agency worker's ability to get along with people.
(e) Leadership by heads of agricultural agencies.

Other factors that appear to be desirable but to a lesser degree than those above are the following:

(a) Lengthy tenure of agricultural workers.
(b) A functioning agricultural workers organization.
(c) Centralization of agencies offices.

Suggested factors appearing worthy of serious consideration were "understanding other agencies' work and problems," "cooperation of farm, civic, and business groups," "mutual friendship and respect," and "a desire to serve farm people."

(5) New Proposals for Coordinating Activities of Agricultural Agencies at the County Level and Their Probable Merit.

It was found that six relatively new or untried proposals were considered to possess a high degree of merit. These methods ranked in order of their probable merit are:

(a) Memorandums of understanding between heads of agencies at the national or state level, followed by functional directions down to the respective county agencies.

(b) Farmer-elected county agricultural board to assist in setting up a county agricultural program and to act in an advisory capacity.

(c) Instruction on the authorizing acts, the current operations, and the relationships of federal and state agricultural agencies to be provided by colleges of agriculture for prospective agricultural workers as a prerequisite for graduation.
(d) Planning boards at the national level for coordination and promotion of understanding among agricultural agencies.

(e) Farmer committee of any individual agricultural agency to be limited to an advisory capacity with no administrative duties.

(f) Grouping the county activities of the federal government relating to agriculture under three main heads: (1) Education and related services, (2) Action agencies other than credit, and (3) Agricultural credit.

Three suggested proposals that seemed to have a very high potential value for effecting desirable coordination were:

(a) One agency to provide all agricultural services in a county.

(b) Prospective agricultural agency workers to receive field training with agriculture agencies while completing their college training.

(c) Amend enabling acts for the respective agricultural agencies so as to promote reduction of conflict and duplication.
CONCLUSIONS

This study, undertaken to suggest a practical plan for agricultural agency coordination at the county level, advanced three hypotheses at the outset of the investigation of the problem. These hypotheses were: (1) Effective coordination of county agricultural agencies' activities is desirable in that it lends itself to more efficient accomplishment of general agricultural goals for farm communities in a county, (2) All agencies, especially agricultural extension and vocational agriculture, may determine how their work in the county can be carried on without noticeable conflict, duplication, competition, or infringement on the duties and responsibilities of other agricultural agencies. Action at the national level could increase the effectiveness of work toward this goal, (3) Some form of county-wide agricultural program planning would seem to be the basis for any plan for county coordination. Sufficient data were presented to substantiate these hypotheses. Since they appear to be true and because of additional evidence submitted, the following conclusions have been drawn which should serve to guide formulation of a suggested plan for coordination in a county.

1. Enabling legislation or USDA directives establishing the various county agricultural agencies have generally increased the problem of coordination. Legislative amendments or directive changes could greatly facilitate solution of the problem.

2. Desirable coordination should be developed within the framework of a county agricultural program initially promoted by a
county agricultural workers' organization with farm, civic, business, and agency groups participating in the planning and execution of general and specific objectives.

3. Joint sponsoring of agricultural events, sharing publicity and recognition, informal verbal agreements, centralization of agency offices, interchanging use of agency facilities, and a master calendar of county agricultural events are methods or procedures that should be used to facilitate accomplishment of agricultural objectives in a county.

4. The responsible authorities should select only dedicated agricultural agency workers who possess abilities for leadership, for 'getting along with people' and for cooperative action which will evoke reciprocal friendship and respect from the people they serve.

5. Definite action to promote cooperation and coordination between agricultural agencies at the national and state levels could increase the effectiveness of local coordination. Such action should be provided.

6. Farmer committees of the individual agricultural agencies should be limited to an advisory capacity with no administrative duties.

7. A farmer-elected county agricultural board should be selected to act in an advisory capacity in planning and executing a county agricultural program.

8. One county agricultural agency, a "county department of agriculture", designed to provide all the agricultural services authorized now or in the future and under the control of an administrator should be
able to minimise the problem of coordination of agricultural activities in a county.
A SUGGESTED PLAN FOR COORDINATING THE WORK OF PUBLIC
AGRICULTURAL AGENCIES AT THE COUNTY LEVEL

I. Guiding Principles

1. A county agricultural program designed to produce maximum income and make for better rural living must be formulated by local leadership from farms, homes, and business with only technical assistance and guidance from the professional workers.

2. Within an over-all county agricultural program, the agricultural agencies will develop plans to carry out their respective phases of this program.

3. Program determination and administrative integrity of individual agencies must be maintained with reference to the field covered by each agency.

II. Organization for Coordination

1. An over-all county agricultural program will be formulated and adopted.

2. A county agricultural board, to act as the county advisory committee on agricultural problems will be elected by farmers of the county.

3. A steering committee composed of all members of the county agricultural board, heads of agricultural agencies and of chairmen of "working committees" will be formed to assume responsibility for guiding the development of the over-all county agriculture program and for recommending specific lines of action. Professional agricultural workers will not serve as chairman of this committee.
4. **Working committees** will be organized from farm, home, and business leaders representing each community in the county. Working committees will be assigned on the basis of major agricultural problem areas found to exist in the county by the county agricultural board working in cooperation with the agricultural agency heads.

5. **Rural community centers** will be organized to create and maintain interest in the program and to furnish membership for the working committees.

6. A **county agricultural workers' council** will be organized - the chairmanship to rotate annually from one agency to another.

7. **Basic committees** will be set up within the agricultural workers council to analyze various agricultural problem areas (community development, beef cattle, farm food supply, etc.) in the county and to formulate a tentative long-time county agricultural program dealing with these problem areas.

   Note - frequent meeting of the steering and working committees will be held to evaluate progress and modify plans.

   Figure 13 shows the organizational chart for county coordination.

III. Achieving Public Support.

When the professional agricultural workers have completed their analysis of problem areas and developed their suggested program, they will arrange a meeting with the agricultural steering committee and community center leaders. They will present the finding of their study to this group for consideration of provisions that seem most suitable for farm families in the county. After general objectives are
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determined "working" committees will be selected by the steering committee.

When the steering and "working" committees have completed their recommendations and formulated a county agricultural program, they should take this program before the rural community centers for explanation and approval.

IV. Coordinated Action by the County Agricultural Agencies

1. From the over-all county agricultural program (cooperatively planned) each agency will develop plans for its appropriate phase of the county program.

2. Generally all measures recommended for use in accomplishing the county program will be based on results of the state experiment station, or other approved stations, or on results from proven farm and home experience in the county.

3. The legal responsibility of all agricultural agencies for various phases of the over-all county program is recognized. Responsibilities of an agency may be assumed by other agencies only through agreement or contract (informal agreements or formal memorandums of understanding).

4. The agricultural workers' council will meet monthly for the purpose of considering the progress of the over-all county program, understanding the activities of each agency, developing team-work, and evaluating accomplishments. Such activities should include the following:

a. Review the basic functions of each agency for the purpose of better understanding and working relationships.
b. Employ the following procedures in implementing the over-all county agricultural program:

(1) Joint sponsoring of agricultural events.
(2) Sharing publicity for joint achievements.
(3) Informal verbal agreements.
(4) Centralization of agencies offices.
(5) Interchanging use of agency facilities.
(6) Formulation of a master calendar of agricultural events.

e. Evaluate progress and recommend plans for the problems that are timely and should receive emphasis for the current period so as to rapidly meet the needs of county farmers.

d. Develop team-work solutions and agree on recommended practices.

e. Submit resolutions to appropriate authorities through the county agricultural board requesting transfer of any agricultural agency head refusing to cooperate and assume active leadership in the county agricultural program. Such action is also applicable to incompetent individuals.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The problem of achieving desirable coordination at the county level implies the necessity for some degree of reorganization of agencies. Such a reorganization could become exceedingly difficult as a result of accompanying political and legal manipulations. On the basis of the writers findings and experience with this problem two suggestions are offered for further study:

1. That a study be made to determine the feasibility of reorganising the separate agencies into one agency under the control of a county agricultural administrator which would provide all public agricultural services.

2. That a study be made to determine how enabling acts or U.S.D.A. directives establishing the county agricultural agencies could be amended or revised to reduce duplication of services and conflicts between county agricultural agencies.
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APPENDIX A
Agricultural workers for many years have been interested in and concerned with the coordination of the work of those agricultural agencies which operate at the county level.

Working in the Graduate School of Louisiana State University, I have begun a study in an attempt to find a feasible plan for county coordination that will be of practical value to the county agricultural agencies. Because of your contact and experience with such a problem, I am appealing to you for assistance in seeking a sound solution.

My immediate objective is to select from each of the southeastern states three counties that are making a definite and active approach to more effective cooperation and coordination among their agencies. You are one of the persons best qualified to make this selection because of your intimate knowledge of conditions in your state.

I will be grateful if you will name three of the counties in your state that have been most outstanding in their work toward coordination, giving the name and address of your representative in each.

A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience in replying.

Yours very truly,

Stanley Peek
Graduate Student
Louisiana State University

LSP:bp
Encl.
COUNTIES WITH SUPERIOR ACHIEVEMENT

IN COORDINATING ACTIVITIES OF THEIR AGRICULTURAL AGENCIES

By Written Agreements, County Agricultural Programs, County Agricultural Worker's Organization, etc.

Please list the counties in the order of excellence of their results in coordination.

1. County__________________________________________________
   Your Representative's Name________________________________
   His Address______________________________________________

2. County__________________________________________________
   Representative's Name_____________________________________
   Address__________________________________________________

3. County__________________________________________________
   Representative's Name_____________________________________
   Address__________________________________________________

Stanley Peek
Box 7092 LSU
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Dear Mr. __________;

Your state director, Mr. __________, sent me your address along with the statement that the county in which you work has one of the best coordinated agricultural programs in Georgia. To further our study of coordination, we urgently need the address of other agricultural agency heads in your county - only one for vocational agriculture (a teacher active in coordination).

I will be very grateful if you will send me this information.

Yours sincerely,

L. Stanley Peck
Graduate School
Louisiana State University

LSP/mb
Dear Sir:

Heads of the agricultural agencies in your state have told me that your county has an outstanding record for coordinating the activities of its agricultural agencies.

Working in the Graduate School of Louisiana State University, I am attempting to develop a plan for coordination that will be of practical value to county agricultural agencies. Because of your experience in making a successful approach to this problem, I am asking for your help in finding a solution that would be applicable to any county.

As a former county agricultural worker, I am aware of the urgent demands upon your time. However, if you could give me the benefit of your knowledge of county coordination by allotting the few minutes necessary to answer the questions I have enclosed, I shall be sincerely grateful.

Very truly yours,

Stanley Peek
Graduate School
Louisiana State University

LSP:bp

Encl.
A PLAN FOR COORDINATING THE WORK
OF STATE AND FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL AGENCIES AT THE COUNTY LEVEL

Date_________________ County_________________ State_________________

I. Activities and Duties of Agencies

A. List the major activities used in accomplishing the purpose or purposes of your agency - organized classes, providing short term loans, etc.

1._______________________________________________________________
2._______________________________________________________________
3._______________________________________________________________
4._______________________________________________________________
5._______________________________________________________________
6._______________________________________________________________

B. How can the duties of your agency be classified? Use a check mark to indicate the classification that applies to your agency. Check one or both (√)

- Action Agency - A term used to describe those agricultural agencies which get direct results with farmers in accomplishing desirable farm practices through subsidies, written agreements, loan contracts, technical services on the farm, etc.

- Education Agency - An agricultural agency designed to educate farmers in the best farming practices, at the same time aiding them in developing the skills necessary to carry out those practices. It is the indirect method of getting the farmer to make desirable agricultural achievements.

II. What methods or procedures have been used in your county to promote cooperation and coordination of the work of agricultural agencies?

A. Methods used in your county. Place a circle around the number to the left of each method that most nearly agrees with your opinion as to the value of the method in your county. Rate only methods used in your county. "0" = unimportant, "1" = valuable, "2" = very valuable.

0 1 2 Informal verbal agreements with other agencies.

0 1 2 A formal memorandum of understanding with another agency or agencies to avoid conflict and duplication.

0 1 2 A county coordinator.

0 1 2 A county agricultural program.
A county agricultural worker's organization, such as a council, association, etc.

Interchanging use of facilities, such as buildings, classrooms, and other equipment.

A master calendar of agricultural events in the county to prevent conflict of meeting dates.

Sharing publicity and recognition for joint accomplishments.

Joint sponsoring of agricultural events when feasible (fairs, tours, etc.)

Planned social activities for the agricultural workers' group.

Centralization of agencies' offices.

Other Methods (Specify and rate)

B. In the space provided below, list any method that you rated which could have been made more valuable in promoting coordination in your county and outline specific suggestions for its improvement.
C. Important factors influencing the success of agricultural coordination in your county. Check (✓) those you consider important.

___ Existence of a functioning agricultural workers organization.
___ A planned agricultural program for the county by all agencies.
___ Centralization of agencies' offices (except Voc. Agr.)
___ Lengthy tenure of agricultural workers in the county.
___ Mutual assistance by agencies.
___ Planning conferences to prevent conflict of activities.
___ Joint enterprises - fairs, etc.
___ Planned social activities for agricultural workers.
___ Individual agricultural worker's ability to get along with people.
___ Influence of county officials.
___ Influence of district or state agency heads.
___ Leadership by heads of agricultural agencies.
___ Others - specify
III. New Proposals for Coordinating Activities at the County Level

Note - It is our purpose to list here the relatively new or untried proposals for promoting county agricultural coordination and give you an opportunity to add new proposals not listed in section II that you may consider valuable. Please place a circle around the number at the left of each proposal that most nearly agrees with your opinion of its probable merit. "0" - unimportant, "1" - valuable, "2" - very valuable.

0 1 2 A county coordinator

0 1 2 Farmer-elected county agricultural board to assist in setting up a county agricultural program and to act in an advisory capacity

0 1 2 Farmer committee of any individual agricultural agency to be limited to an advisory capacity with no administrative duties.

0 1 2 Grouping the county activities of the federal government relating to agriculture under three main heads: (1) Education and related services, (2) Action agencies other than credit, and (3) Agricultural credit.

0 1 2 Memorandums of understanding between heads of agencies at the national or state level, followed by functional directions down to the respective county agencies.

0 1 2 Planning boards at the national level for coordination and promotion of understanding among agricultural agencies.

0 1 2 Instruction on the authorizing acts, the current operations, and the relationships of federal and state agricultural agencies to be provided by colleges of agriculture for prospective agricultural workers as a prerequisite for graduation.

Other Proposals - Specify and rate

0 1 2

0 1 2

0 1 2

IV. Enclosure of any available printed matter concerning your county coordination program would be greatly appreciated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Randolph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Gadsden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Colquitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Feliciana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Neshoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Caswell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chatham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Alfalfa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caddo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Dickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ( ) Number of recommendations for excellent agricultural coordination by heads of their state agricultural agencies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Cass (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guadalupe (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Navarro (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Botetourt (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chesterfield (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louisa (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
Continued development and maintenance of sound, profitable and permanent systems of farming is a matter of general public interest, and vital to the welfare of the nation, and to all national groups of farm and urban people.

National, state and local recognition of this interest has resulted in establishing various agencies and groups with responsibilities and authorizations contributing to or related to development and maintenance of a sound agriculture.

Voluntary or legal groups of farmers working together as organized entities and through their leaders may contribute to agricultural development. These farmer groups may utilize the assistance of various agencies or groups in facilitating such agricultural development. Examples of such legal or voluntary groups are West Tennessee Flood Control and Soil Conservation District Commissioners, Production and Marketing Administration Associations, Soil Conservation District Supervisors, County Erosion Control Associations, Community Improvement Clubs, County Community Councils and Planning Committees and others, all with legally prescribed or voluntarily adopted functions for contributing to improvement of farm and home conditions.

Organized groups of farm people have an opportunity to obtain and use the services, contributions and other means of assistance from local, state, and Federal agencies and other groups in effectuating their programs. Such joint action offers each agency or group added opportunity and greater assistance in more effectively discharging their responsibility.

Soil Conservation Districts organized under the Soil Conservation Districts Act of 1939 are authorized to prevent erosion and silting of streams and reservoirs in the interest of health, safety and public welfare. Such Districts are created by the State Soil Conservation Committee, and have certain powers, authorizations, and responsibilities, among which is the privilege of securing assistance and cooperation from Federal, State or local agencies or groups.

The State Soil Conservation Committee has recognized the opportunity and need for a better understanding and coordinated efforts between the agencies or groups working with Soil Conservation Districts. Representatives of the various agencies and groups of the state having responsibilities in this field were invited to meet and arrange for working out a program for most effectively and economically developing the soil and water conservation phase of the State Agricultural Program.

This meeting, held on March 20, 1950, was attended by representatives of the following agencies or organizations: Agricultural Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, State Department of Agriculture, State Department of Conservation, State Department of Vocational Agriculture, West Tennessee Flood Control and Soil Conservation District, Production and Marketing Administration, State Soil Conservation Committee, Farmers Home Administration, Tennessee Valley Authority, and Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation.
Those in attendance were unanimously of the opinion that a coordinated program was desirable, and necessary for most effectively and economically developing the soil conservation interests of the districts and of the agencies with responsibilities in this field. After lengthy discussion of the question, a committee was designated to consider the principles outlined, and develop program proposals based on these principles.

The committee, composed of E. C. McReynolds, Agricultural Extension Service; Carl Fry, Production and Marketing Administration; and W. M. Hardy, Soil Conservation Service, at subsequent meetings have outlined certain proposals and suggestions. In considering these proposals, it is suggested that the following important factors should be kept in mind:

1. The program for actual application of soil and water conservation effort must be determined and formulated by local leadership on a county basis.

2. There must be an over-all county agricultural program, within which the District Supervisors and other agencies or groups may develop plans to carry out their respective phases of the broad program.

3. Program determination and administrative integrity of all agencies or groups must be maintained with reference to the field covered by each agency or group.

Appropriate representatives of State and Federal agencies and other groups working with farm people in Tennessee agree to the following principles as a guide to more effective development of the soil and water conservation program of the State:

I. PUBLIC APPROACH

1. Develop a better understanding of agricultural problems, and their relationship to general public interest and the importance of the soil and water conservation phase of the county agricultural program.

2. Assist farm people in studying land use practices, and in developing appropriate soil and water conservation methods and practices to facilitate needed adjustments and assure permanency of production within the whole farm management system.

3. Assist non-farm people to understand and become interested in a prosperous agriculture and realize their long-time dependence on soil and water resources, and the public’s responsibility for same.

4. Teach young people the importance of a productive and permanent agriculture to insure and improve the future agricultural economy. This teaching to show how they may play their part in a balanced system of farming that provides for sound land use and the conservation of soil and water resources.
5. Provide educational and civic leadership with information as to the importance of a satisfactory system of agriculture, proper land use and the importance of soil and water conservation as related to our over-all economy.

II. FARMER APPROACH

1. Assist in studying present systems of land use, determining needed improvements in land use, considering sources of available assistance in improving such land use systems, and insuring more efficient conservation of the soil and water resources.

2. Review the possibilities of more efficient use of assistance provided by agencies and organized groups already established, and possibility of additional assistance provided through organization of additional legally or voluntarily established entities.

3. Assist with the organization of additional legal or voluntary entities when the farm leadership has determined such procedure is desirable and needed. These entities will be orderly developed through the medium of such committees or agency direction as is responsible in the particular field.

III. LEADERSHIP TRAINING

1. Develop procedures for leadership training whereby such leaders as Production and Marketing Administration Committeemen, Soil Conservation District Supervisors, Directors of Erosion Control Associations, Program Planning Committee members, farm organization leaders, and others may study and evaluate (1) balanced farming systems and accomplishments, (2) the place and responsibilities of each group in such systems, and (3) the relationships of the various groups in accomplishment of the entire job.

2. Provide former members of directing boards or committees of each group information defining and analyzing their individual responsibilities, and develop an understanding of the work of each specific group and its relationship to other groups.

IV. ASSISTANCE TO INDIVIDUAL AND GROUPS OF FARMERS

1. Use existing farm-home demonstrations and such additional demonstrations as may be practical and desirable to develop, and other information to show the value of balanced systems of farming, and as guides to widespread application of practices involved in such systems.

2. Representatives of various agencies or groups will make their appropriate contributions to working out plans for specific application of the phases of the balanced farming and sound land use systems to which they may contribute in keeping with agency or
group policies. Examples of such assistance are soil conservation plans, plans for application of Production and Marketing Administration assistance through practice payments or grants, desirable crop and livestock programs, etc.

3. General information and guidance will be furnished farmers for the common methods entering into land use and balanced farming practices.

4. Assistance on technical practices requiring professional judgment and ability will be furnished in keeping with availability of personnel as may be provided through contract or request of groups responsible in fields in which such assistance is needed.

5. Continued efforts will be made to assist farmers in maintaining and improving land use practices, which will assure the most satisfactory farm incomes and soil and water conservation.

6. Inform farmers as to credit facilities available to meet their needs.

7. Keep farmers currently informed as to available materials, conservation practice aids, and payments for materials and practices that may be used by him in making adjustments and developing sound land use plans.

8. Assist farmers in studying their soils and evaluating problem areas, in order that they may adjust their land use plans to meet the problems and adapt necessary practices to problem areas.

V. ADJUSTMENTS

1. Continue assistance to farmers in studying present and probable farm management situations growing out of economic trends and land use adjustments. Provide information on crop and livestock production, marketing facilities and utilization problems that will provide basis for sound farmer decisions on plans to meet economic and land use problems.

2. Assist farm leadership in studying and evaluating situations developing from economic trends and land use adjustments, and provide for meeting these problems through farmer understanding of adjustments of programs and work plans of various farm groups. Program and work plan adjustments will be in keeping with availability and policies of respective agencies.

3. Furnish guidance, and/or materials or payments for planting, fertilizing, harvesting, dirt moving, etc., not commonly available to local groups.

4. In keeping with needs and requests, assist in developing organizational efforts among farmers to make more effective available assistance.
VI. COUNTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

One farmer member from each of the following groups: County Court, County Program Committee, Production and Marketing Administration Committee, Soil Conservation District Supervisors, Soil Erosion Control Association Directors, Farmers Home Administration Advisory Committee, Vocational Agriculture Advisory Committee, and any other farmer groups, and in addition representative of the county banks will be requested to serve on a County Advisory Committee on agricultural programs. An individual shall represent only one group. In West Tennessee Counties these committees should be the same as the advisory committees to the West Tennessee Flood Control and Soil Conservation District Commission. These committees will be requested to assist with the following activities:

1. In Soil Conservation District Counties the State Soil Conservation Committee will request the County Advisory Committee to assist and represent the State Soil Conservation Committee in the disposition of the committees' responsibilities which require local attention and cannot be appropriately assigned to district supervisors or agency representation.

2. With advice and assistance of agency representatives define and recommend to the various agencies an over-all soil and water conservation program for the county from which each agency or group may develop plans for application of its appropriate phase of the over-all program.

3. To assist with plans for land problems that need specific attention.

4. To evaluate the results of the whole soil and water conservation program, and with agency representatives develop an over-all report of the combined contributions and accomplishments of all agencies and groups in soil and water conservation. Publicity material from this report should be used to reflect the work of all agencies involved.

VII. PLAN OF COOPERATIVE ACTION BY AGENCIES IN COUNTIES

The representatives of State and Federal agencies working with farmers in this County recognize our opportunities and obligations to assist farm people with their land use problems, and the need for coordinated and concerted efforts in attacking these problems.

There are set forth below guiding principles approved by our services that will form a basis for concerted action.

1. The County Advisory Committee on agricultural problems, with advice and assistance of agency representatives, will define and recommend to the various agencies an over-all soil and water conservation program for the county from which each agency or group may develop plans for application of its appropriate phase of the over-all program.
2. Soil and water conservation measures will be predicated on results of the Tennessee Experiment Station or other experimental results validated by the Tennessee Station, or demonstrated by good farming experience. Such recommendations will be applied in relation to the capability of the land and the needs of the people farming the land.

3. The responsibility of all agencies, groups or entities for various phases of soil and water conservation as may be established legally, or provided through voluntary agreement is recognized. Responsibilities of an agency or group may be assumed by other groups only through contract or agreement between the agencies or groups.

4. The integrity of farm plans, field tests and demonstrations established as part of an agency's functions will be recognized and maintained. Such educational, financial or technical assistance as is rendered to farmers carrying on such activities shall be in harmony with the purposes of these plans, tests, or demonstrations.

5. Appropriate personnel will serve as advisors to the County Advisory Committee as set forth in Section VI of the State Plan.

6. Soil and water conservation is a basic part of the county's agricultural program, and cannot be treated separate and apart from the whole farm management program, and use of land must be considered in the light of needs and abilities of the farm and home operation.

7. Agency representatives will meet periodically for the purpose of considering the whole county job, understanding activities of each agency, developing teamwork and evaluating accomplishments. These studies, plans and evaluations may include the following:

a. Review of the basic functions of each agency for the purpose of better working relations.

b. Study land use problems needing immediate attention. In approaching such problems, economic conditions of farmers in such areas, resources and understanding of the people and capability of the land will be considered in determining information to be presented and plans to be recommended.

c. Evaluate work being done in land use and develop ways of more effectively and rapidly meeting needs of farmers of the county.

d. Consider timely problems, develop teamwork solutions and agree on recommended practices.

e. The County Agent, in keeping with his responsibility to all farm people of the county, will assume the leadership in arranging for meetings of agency workers as set forth in Section 7 above and County Advisory Committee as set forth in Section VI of the State Plan.
VIII. GETTING THE PLAN ACTIVATED

State Directors of each agency will present work proposals to each administrative level, and arrange for periodic follow-up to assure current understanding and promote better working relationships. Directors will arrange for joint meetings of personnel at district and county levels for coordinated presentation of these plans.

IX. APPROVAL

Unanimous approval was given to a motion made by L. J. Strickland and seconded by Tom J. Hitch that this program be approved as edited.

X. COMMITTEE TO FACILITATE THE PLAN

Upon motion by Tom J. Hitch and seconded by R. W. Moore, a committee composed of E. C. McReynolds, Agricultural Extension Service; Carl Fry, Production and Marketing Administration; and W. M. Hardy, Soil Conservation Service, was appointed to facilitate putting the above proposals into operation and to keep the signatories advised of progress being made.

APPROVED:

9/5/50 (Sig.) J. H. MCLEOD 8/21/50 (Sig.) W. M. HARDY
Date Director, Date State Conservationist,
Agricultural Extension Service Soil Conservation Service.

8/22/50 (Sig.) EDWARD JONES 9/19/50 (Sig.) C. P. SWAN
Date Commissioner, Date Commissioner,
State Dept. of Agriculture State Dept. of Conservation.

8/22/50 (Sig.) G. E. FREEMAN 9/14/50 (Sig.) L. J. STRICKLAND
Date Director, Date Executio Secretary,
Vocational Education West Tennessee Flood Control
State Dept. of Agriculture & Soil Conservation District

8/21/50 (Sig.) CARL FRY, 9/5/50 (Sig.) J. HOWARD HORNSEY
Date Director, Date Chairman,
Production & Marketing Adm. State Soil Conservation Committee

8/21/50 (Sig.) E. S. BEASLEY 9/14/50 (Sig.) TOM J. HITCH
Date Director, Date President,
Farmers Home Administration Tennessee Farm Bureau

8/21/50 (Sig.) JOHN D. FINDLAY
Date Director,
State Game and Fish Commission
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Candidate: Louis Stanley Peek

Major Field: Vocational Agricultural Education


Approved:

R. H. Davenport
Major Professor and Chairman

Richard J. Russell
Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Harry Brand

J. Floyd

J. Barronwick Jr.

D. L. Scott

J. H.Svcin

Date of Examination:

2 July 1954

Rodney James