States Vary in Information Support for Extension and Research Programs

William L. Carpenter

THERE IS CONSIDERABLE VARIATION among the states in the personnel resources allotted to the information function. This variation shows up when the number of editors is compared to the number of other professional employees (specialists or researchers and administrators) on a state college of agriculture staff.

In the extension area the range is from a ratio of one editor to 6.5 other professional employees in Kansas to a ratio of more than 30 other employees to each editor in several states.

In the research area there are fewer editors in relation to the total staff, but still a wide disparity among the states.

The information contained in the tables shown here was developed from the publication *Professional Workers in State Agricultural Experiment Stations and Other Cooperating State Institutions, 1972-73,* published by the Cooperative State Research Service, USDA, December 1972. The figures were verified, in-so-far as possible, by *Agricultural Information Staffs in State Land Grant Universities,* published by Information Services, Extension Service, USDA, March 1973.

The numbers in each column (Tables 1-4) represent not a number of individuals but the number of full-time worker equivalents. The majority of professional staff members in colleges of agriculture hold joint appointments. If an individual was listed as holding a singular appointment, his position was given a weight of 1.0; if holding a dual appointment, a weight

Table 1
Ratio of Editors to Other Professional Employees (Specialists and Administrators) on State Extension Staffs

State	Number Editors	Number Non-Editors	Ratio Editors—Non-Editors
Alabama	9.0	119.0	13.2
Alaska	1.0	11.0	11.0
Arizona	2.3	38.8	16.9
Arkansas	5.0	98.8	19.8
California	10.0	133.2	13.3

State	Number Editors	Number Non-Editors	Ratio Editors—Non-Editors
Colorado	2.2	50.7	23.0
Connecticut	1.3	37.2	28.6
Delaware	1.3	20.0	15.4
Florida	5.0	105.0	21.0
Georgia	7.0	130.4	18.6
Hawaii	2.5	33.7	13.5
Idaho	0.8	36.0	45.0
Illinois	14.0	107.1	7.6
Indiana	7.3	110.0	15.0
Iowa	16.3	141.5	8.7
Kansas	21.5	140.8	6.5
Kentucky	9.5	149.6	15.7
Louisiana	9.0	91.0	10.1
Maine	1.7	36.0	21.2
Maryland	5.3	79.3	15.0
Massachusetts	0.3	41.8	139.3
Michigan	7.0	115.3	16.5
Minnesota	7.0	96.2	13.7
Mississippi	5.0	117.0	23.4
Missouri	5.3	118.7	22.4
Montana	2.0	42.0	21.0
Nebraska	7.7	103.0	13.4
Nevada	2.0	16.8	8.4
New Hampshire	1.3	24.5	18.8
New Jersey	3.8	56.6	14.8
New Mexico	3.5	38.3	10.9
New York	13.8	145.4	10.5
North Carolina	7.8	203.2	26.0
North Dakota	4.5	49.3	11.0
Ohio	10.3	132.0	12.8
Oklahoma	8.5	85.2	10.0
Oregon	6.0	88.5	14.7
Pennsylvania	7.3	73.2	10.0
Puerto Rico	7.0	52.4	7.5
Rhode Island	0.3	22.3	74.3
South Carolina	5.5	78.9	14.3
South Dakota	4.5	58.3	13.0
Tennessee	6.8	86.6	12.7
Texas	13.5	220.8	16.4
Utah	2.5	46.0	18.4
Vermont	2.2	32.9	15.0
Virginia	4.8	180.0	37.5
Washington	5.5	62.3	11.3
West Virginia	5.3	68.7	12.9
Wisconsin	3.5	90.9	26.0
Wyoming	2.5	26.0	10.4

of 0.5 was given; if holding an appointment in three or more divisions, a weight of 0.3 was given. (Only extension and experiment station activities were included in these tabulations.)

All personnel listed were included in the tabulation if it appeared that they were daily or routinely involved in the affairs of the agricultural extension and research programs. Not included were university presidents, vice presidents for academic affairs, and business officers.

An attempt was made to eliminate from the tabulation persons in emeritus status, and to avoid duplication where an individual was listed in more than one place.

An exercise of this type can be fraught with error, and of this the reader should be aware.

First, it is assumed that all states followed the same reporting system in preparing the data to go into the source book which was used.

Second, when an individual holds a joint appointment it is assumed that he spends equal time in each area, which we know would not always be the case. But the further assumption is made that across a total state staff (particularly if it is a large one) the total number of person equivalents would equal out to a reasonably accurate presentation of the situation.

Third, although considerable checking and rechecking was done, when this much data is involved there is the possibility of mathematical and other errors creeping in.

How much confidence, then, might we place in this data?

To say that New York (ranked 10 in table 2) has more editorial support for the Extension program than does New Mexico (ranked 11) would not be proper use of this data. But certainly, New York provides more editorial support for the extension program than does California (ranked 20).

Without question, this tabulation establishes the fact that there is considerable disparity in editorial support for the state programs, when measured in terms of the ratio of editors to other professional personnel.

This study was stimulated by a chance remark from a new specialist on our staff who commented that for the size of our extension staff we didn't have nearly as many editors as the state from which he had just come. The study revealed that the state with shich he had compared us was considerable higher ranked than was North Carolina.

What about potential use for this data? If I were a representative of one of the higher ranking states, I would quietly put it away. But if I were in one of the low-ranking states I would certainly call this information to the attention of my administrators. I believe this data helped us obtain an additional editorial position in North Carolina.

Table 2

Relative Ranking of States, Ratio of Editors to Other Professional Employees on State Extension Staffs

Rank	State	Ratio	Rank	State	Ratio
1.	Kansas	6.5	26.	New Jersey	14.8
2.	Puerto Rico	7.5	27.	Indiana	15.0
3.	Illinois	7.6	28.	Maryland	15.0
4.	Nevada	8.4	29.	Vermont	15.0
5.	Iowa	8.7	30.	Delaware	15.4
6.	Oklahoma	10.0	31.	Kentucky	15.7
7.	Pennsylvania	10.0	32.	Texas	16.4
8.	Louisiana	10.1	33.	Michigan	16.5
9.	Wyoming	10.4	34.	Arizona	16.9
10.	New York	10.5	35.	Utah	18.4
11.	New Mexico	10.9	36.	Georgia	18.6
12.	Alaska	11.0	37.	New Hampshire	18.8
13.	North Dakota	11.0	38.	Arkansas	19.8
14.	Washington	11.3	39.	Florida	21.0
15.	Tennessee	12.7	40.	Montana	21.0
16.	Ohio	12.8	41.	Maine	21.2
17.	West Virginia	12.9	42.	Missouri	22.4
18.	South Dakota	13.0	43.	Colorado	23.0
19.	Alabama	13.2	44.	Mississippi	23.4
20.	California	13.3	45.	North Carolina	26.0
21.	Nebraska	13.4	46.	Wisconsin	26.0
22.	Hawaii	13.5	47.	Connecticut	28.6
23.	Minnesota	13.7	48.	Virginia	37.5
24.	South Carolina	14.3	49.	Idaho	45.0
25.	Oregon	14.7	50.	Rhode Island	74.3
			51.	Massachusetts	139.3

Table 3

Ratio of Editors to Other Professional Employees (Researchers and Administrators) on State Experiment Station Staffs

State	Number Editors	Number Non-Editors	Ratio Editors—Non-Editors
Alabama	3.5	166.4	47.5
Alaska	0.0	16.0	*
Arizona	2.3	189.3	82.3
Arkansas	1.5	175.8	117.2
California	8.0	434.2	54.3
Colorado	2.5	148.3	59.3
Connecticut	2.0	139.7	69.9
Delaware	0.8	41.5	51.9
Florida	3.0	331.3	110.4
Georgia	1.5	244.0	162.7
Hawaii	1.0	110.5	110.5
Idaho	0.8	103.0	128.8
Illinois	7.5	193.2	25.7
Indiana	6.3	221.3	35.1
Iowa	4.3	192.8	44.8
Kansas	1.5	202.2	134.8
Kentucky	1.5	128.0	85.3
Louisiana	3.0	267.5	89.2
Maine	1.7	75.8	44.6
Maryland	1.3	69.5	53.4
Massachusetts	0.3	55.5	185.0
Michigan	5.0	176.0	35.2
Minnesota	6.0	189.2	31.5
Mississippi	2.0	171.5	85.8
Missouri	4.8	137.7	28.7
Montana	4.0	117.5	29.4
Nebraska	3.2	147.0	46.0
Nevada	2.0	35.0	17.5
New Hampshire	0.3	30.0	100.0
New Jersey	1.3	125.8	96.8
New Mexico	1.5	54.8	36.5
New York	7.3	360.3	49.4
North Carolina	4.3	270.3	62.9
North Dakota	3.5	100.2	28.6
Ohio	2.3	377.8	164.3
Oklahoma	5.5	111.0	20.2
Oregon	2.5	247.3	98.9
Pennsylvania	2.8	161.8	57.8
Puerto Rico	0.0	189.7	*
Rhode Island	0.3	47.5	158.3
South Carolina	2.5	102.0	40.8

*No editorial personnel on station listing

State	Number Editors	Number Non-Editors	Ratio Editors—Non-Editors
South Dakota	3.0	140.7	46.9
Tennessee	3.8	196.3	51.7
Texas	9.0	385.3	42.8
Utah	2.0	92.8	46.4
Vermont	2.2	30.2	13.7
Virginia	0.8	181.0	226.2
Washington	1.5	217.0	144.7
West Virginia	2.5	67.7	27.1
Wisconsin	4.3	198.0	46.1
Wyoming	0.5	49.3	98.6

Table 4

Relative Ranking of States, Ratio of Editors to Other Professional Employees on State Experiment Station Staffs

Rank	State	Ratio	Rank	State	Ratio
1.	Vermont	13.7	26.	California	54.3
2.	Nevada	17.5	27.	Pennsylvania	57.8
3.	Oklahoma	20.2	28.	Colorado	59.3
4.	Illinois	25.7	29.	North Carolina	62.9
5.	West Virginia	27.1	30.	Connecticut	69.9
6.	North Dakota	28.6	31.	Arizona	82.3
7.	Missouri	28.7	32.	Kentucky	85.3
8.	Montana	29.4	33.	Mississippi	85.8
9.	Minnesota	31.5	34.	Louisiana	89.2
10.	Indiana	35.1	35.	New Jersey	96.8
11.	Michigan	35.2	36.	Wyoming	98.6
12.	New Mexico	36.5	37.	Oregon	98.9
13.	South Carolina	40.8	38.	New Hampshire	100.0
14.	Texas	42.8	39.	Florida	110.4
15.	Maine	44.6	40.	Hawaii	110.5
16.	Iowa	44.8	41.	Arkansas	117.2
17.	Nebraska	46.0	42.	Idaho	128.8
18.	Wisconsin	46.1	43.	Kansas	134.8
19.	Utah	46.4	44.	Washington	144.7
20.	South Dakota	46.9	45.	Rhode Island	158.3
21.	Alabama	47.5	46.	Georgia	162.7
22.	New York	49.4	47.	Ohio	164.3
23.	Tennessee	51.7	48.	Massachusetts	185.0
24.	Delaware	51.9	49.	Virginia	226.2
25.	Maryland	53.4	50.	Alaska	*
			51.	Puerto Rico	*

*No editorial personnel on station listing