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The typical undergraduate student in the Animal Sciences Department at The Ohio State University is female, has limited commercial livestock experience and aspires to enroll in Veterinary School after graduating with a bachelor’s degree. However, she is unlikely to be admitted to Veterinary School and will be forced to make an alternate career choice.

Employability of these students should be a major concern of college administrators. Alumni studies indicate the belief that communication skills and decision-making ability are two of the most important attributes for career success. To ensure career success, reflective of these studies, the Animal Sciences curriculum should be broad-based, emphasizing classes and programs that improve and develop employability traits, as well as those that increase technical expertise.
Judging programs are an effective method of improving communication skills and analytical ability. Students with livestock experience are more likely to participate on collegiate judging programs, because of their existing interest. Students without livestock experience do not typically participate. The stigma of judging programs not providing technical, science-based information, and thus providing limited educational benefit, permeates the psyches of many faculty advisors. Unfortunately, their academic guidance may limit the personal development of students that may very well need communication and analytical skills the most. Administration must switch paradigms and encourage, if not require, participation in judging programs for the personal development and employability of all Animal Sciences' students at The Ohio State University.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Agriculture, as a field of science, is constantly evolving. Rapidly developing technologies will create the need for a new breed of agricultural worker in the 21st century. Students must develop the skills which will enable them to be successful in their careers. These traits include the ability to write and speak with clarity and to improve decision-making skills. Courses offered at The Ohio State University and its Department of Animal Sciences have the responsibility to develop these skills for their majors.

Objectives

The objectives of this thesis study are the following:

1) To determine the demographic make-up of undergraduate students majoring in Animal Sciences at The Ohio State University with regard to background, career plans and personality type.

2) To determine if a relationship exists between personality type and the background or career choice of these students.
3) To comparatively examine through historical research the importance of communication and decision making skills for students that will need to adapt to changing technology and job responsibilities in the 21st century.

4) To comparatively examine through historical research the usefulness of collegiate judging programs for developing communication and decision making skills.

Definition of Terms

Definitions

Reasons

“A good judge can accurately and concisely describe an animal or group of animals so that an audience knows exactly what the judge saw” (Bryan, 1994). Oral or written reasons is the term given to the process of explaining the decision-making process for a placing on a class of live animals or animal products. In livestock, dairy and horse judging, students are given approximately 15 minutes to prepare a two-minute “reasons” presentation to an instructor or judge. In a judging contest as many as eight sets of reasons may be given. In meats judging, the “set of reasons” is written instead of given orally.
Farm Background

For this survey, the respondents gave their own perception of their farm background. Farm background was defined as the level of farm experience and the answers were defined as the following: lived or grew-up on a farm, worked on a relative’s or friend’s farm, or no farm experience.

Livestock Experience

Livestock experience is the level of experience with the production of meat animals, dairy animals, poultry or their by-products. Commercial horse operations, designed to be profitable instead of for entertainment, were included as a commercial livestock enterprise. Questionnaire answers were divided into four classifications:

1) Commercial Livestock Operation: the production of meat animals, dairy products and animals, poultry products and animals, and commercial horse operations. Included within this category was the production of club/show animals for sale to 4-H / FFA members.

2) 4-H / FFA Projects Only: the raising of animals only for the purpose of junior projects for 4-H and FFA members. These projects included market and breeding animals.

3) Both Commercial Livestock and 4-H / FFA Projects

4) No Livestock Experience
Judging Programs at The Ohio State University

The collegiate judging programs available at The Ohio State University include dairy, general livestock, horse and meats. A requirement for involvement on a collegiate judging program at Ohio State is enrolling and completing the judging class associated with that program prior to participation. In that class, students are taught to judge livestock and/or livestock products based on industry standards. Additionally, students use oral or written reasons to defend their placing of the class. Through repetition and intensive hands-on instruction, students are able to improve their decision making and communication skills. Although it is a requirement for participation in a judging program, these classes are open and available to all students at Ohio State and the class does not require continued participation in the program.

Animal Sciences Student Survey

Students majoring in Animal Sciences at Ohio State were surveyed to determine their backgrounds, student activities, and career path. Additionally, the students were given a personality test for the purpose of determining if a relationship exists between the personal traits listed above and their personality type. The personality test used for the study was the Enneagram Personality Profile (EPP) (Leatherman & Thompson, 1996a). This personality test uses a series of 162 questions to group individuals into one of nine personality type categories. The EPP personality types will be described in Chapter 2.
Limitations of the Study

Mailing questionnaires to college students presented the challenge of finding accurate, deliverable mailing addresses, particularly at the beginning of the school year when many student campus addresses are not changed or updated in the school data base. To insure a deliverable address, the questionnaire mailing was sent to the student’s home address. The questionnaires were sent to the students during their winter holiday break, but because the length of the break was just more than three weeks, only one mailing of the instrument was possible.

Basic Assumptions

The hypotheses of this thesis included the following:

1) A significant percentage of the Animal Sciences students at Ohio State will not have farm or livestock backgrounds.

2) A significant percentage of the students will plan to attend Veterinary school.

3) There will be a low to moderate relationship between student backgrounds or activities and their personality type.

4) Collegiate judging programs and classes, emphasizing oral or written communication skills, do assist in developing communication and decision making skills.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Enneagram Personality Profile (EPP)

In The Enneagram Personality Portraits, Aspell and Aspell (1997) list the benefits of the EPP as the following:

1) Provides an objective framework of human behavior.
2) Recognizes the value of individual differences.
3) Identifies the strengths and limitations of different professional types.
4) Is understood clearly and easily.
5) Builds understanding regarding aspects of an organization.
6) Helps to optimize the fit between a person and his or her professional position.
7) Has profitable applications for areas such as communication, conflict management, motivation, ways of thinking, interpersonal relationships, team building, problem solving, and time management.
8) Helps people discover and empower their personalities and professional styles.
9) Builds a stable framework for emotional issues.
10) Helps people to be more effective in relationships.
11) Enables people to improve their motivation levels.
The EPP describes nine different personality types and styles of thinking, feeling, acting and relating. Professional style flows from personality (Aspell & Aspell, 1997). The Enneagram can be used by individuals to better understand themselves and their leadership type. Conversely, employers can use this tool to better understand their employees or perspective employees to gauge their leadership or work styles. According to the EPP, all individuals have mixed personality types.

**EPP Types**

**Type One: Organizer (Leatherman & Thompson, 1996b)**

This personality type is organized, conscientious and principled. They need to have structure and to improve themselves and the world. They act by setting high standards and doing things right.

**Type Two: Empathizer (Leatherman & Thompson, 1996b)**

This personality type is helpful, considerate, and concerned about others. They need to be recognized, needed and valued. They act by helping and pleasing others.

**Type Three: Facsimilator (Leatherman & Thompson, 1996b)**

This personality type is competitive, charming, persuasive and productive. Facsimilators need to be productive, achieve success, and be praised. They act by taking on the persona required and working hard.

**Type Four: Architect (Leatherman & Thompson, 1996b)**

This personality type is sensitive, creative and passionate, Architects need to feel unique, be understood, and have aesthetic surroundings. They act by working alone and taking on cutting edge projects.
Type Five: Analyzer (Leatherman & Thompson, 1996b)

Analyzers are observers, researchers and theorists. They need to be self-sufficient, perceive causes and effects, and have information. They act by withdrawing to think first and initially observing and reading.

Type Six: Team Player (Leatherman & Thompson, 1996b)

This personality type is responsible, loyal, practical and fair. Team Players need to be secure, have certainty, and conform. They act by taking action under adversarial conditions and playing the devil's advocate.

Type Seven: Multi-Tasker (Leatherman & Thompson, 1996b)

Multi-Taskers are optimistic, energetic and adventurous. They need to have variety, feel free, and have challenging work. They act by taking risks and shortcuts, moving from project to project, and planning what will be done next.

Type Eight: Pilot (Leatherman & Thompson, 1996b)

Pilots are leaders, strong and assertive. The need to be powerful, in control, and to avoid weakness. They act by taking charge and taking the initiative.

Type Nine: Mediator (Leatherman & Thompson, 1996b)

This personality type is easy-going, peaceful and ambivalent. They need to be in harmony, to avoid conflict, and to conserve energy. They act by reconciling differences and maintaining routine.
Factors Students Consider in Selecting a University or College

Riesenber (1987) surveyed 109 new and/or transfer students at the University of Idaho. The purpose of the study was to develop a marketing strategy to recruit students for their undergraduate agriculture and home economics departments. The study analyzed student backgrounds and their reason for attending the University of Idaho. Of the incoming students into the College of Agriculture at Idaho, 45% reported living on a farm or ranch.

The incoming students were asked to rate 34 factors that students may consider in choosing a college. They were asked to rate how important they regarded each factor using a scale from one to five, with one being very important and five being not important. The top three reasons given for attending the University of Idaho were the following: Specific Academic Majors (1.703); Cost (1.787); Employment Opportunities After Graduation (2.045).

A study by Reese, Burson, Gilster, Kinder, Owen and Brink (1987) surveyed students majoring in Animal Science at the University of Nebraska to determine the importance of various factors for their choice of a major. An interest in the area (97.2%) was listed as a major influence for their choice. Additional high ranking major influences included a perceived aptitude to succeed (65.7%) and potential employment opportunities (33.0%).
Demographic Trends of Students Majoring in Animal Sciences

Farm and Livestock Background

In the Reese et al. (1987) study, students were queried for their backgrounds and livestock experience. His findings were that 86% of the Animal Science majors were from rural backgrounds and that 92.5% had livestock or poultry experience prior to entering college. His numbers differ from a similar study conducted at the University of Missouri (Mollett & Leslie, 1986). That study found that only 48% of the students majoring in Animal Science were reared on a farm prior to starting college. Reese et al. (1987) concluded that the percentage of students with farm background was decreasing, but varied between universities. Meyer (1990) conducted a phone survey with 11 other animal science departments and found that all were experiencing an increase in non-farm background students, some as high as 80%. A Virginia report by Wood and Beal (1988) also corroborated this increase.

Taylor and Kauffman (1983) indicated that one-half of the students enrolled in animal science in 1960 came from farm or ranch backgrounds, while in 1980 it had dropped to about one-third. There was considerable variation among universities in 1980, with several including Arkansas, California, Maine, Massachusetts and West Virginia having only 5 to 10% with livestock experience. However, other universities including Purdue, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska and Oklahoma State enrolled more than 60% with livestock backgrounds.
Meyer (1990) surveyed the freshman class majoring in animal science at the University of California-Davis in the fall of 1985. The students indicated an interest in multiple animal species. Only 15% of the students indicated an interest in livestock and another 23% were interested in horses. Thus, Meyer concluded, that only 38% of the animal science student body was interested in the species commonly taught in most animal science curriculums. An interest in companion animals received the highest response with 34%.

Gender

Meyer (1990) also surveyed 1,398 alumni who graduated from the University of California-Davis, Department of Animal Science, during the years 1956 to 1987, with 49% of the alumni responding to the survey. Meyer found that the percentage of women increased throughout the period. In the 50's, 12% of the animal science alumni were women. The percentages increased gradually in the 80's, finally reaching 71% of the graduates. Additionally, 71% percent of the students seeking advanced degrees were also women. These findings were corroborated in that same study as 71% of incoming freshman majoring in Animal Science were female.
Taylor and Kauffman (1983) reported that there has been an increase in the number of female students majoring in animal science since 1960. The percentage of female students majoring in animal science doubled from 1970 (22%) to 1980 (46%). Female enrollment throughout the United States was highly variable in 1980, from over 70% at California, Cal Poly, Delaware, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Virginia Polytechnical Institute down to 25% or less at Montana, Nebraska and South Dakota.

**Advanced Degrees and Careers**

Meyer (1990) found that 61% of the students academically achieved more than a bachelor's degree in animal science. The study indicated that most alumni as undergraduates planned for graduate or professional school and planned to become veterinarians, professors, or school educators. Approximately half of the alumni were in one of the following three careers: veterinarian, laboratory or medical scientist, or business owner or manager. The business owners or managers ranged from real estate to accountants and truckers. The percentage of ranch owners or managers was only 8%.

**Developing Important Personality Traits for Career Success**

Meyer (1990) gave the alumni a list of personal attributes and they were asked to rank them with regard to importance for career success. The most important trait given was analytical ability (24%) followed by communication skills with 18%. Dr. Scott Schaeke, Assistant Professor in the Department of Animal Science at Kansas State University, stated that the ability to make decisions and to communicate the reasons behind those decisions is an essential trait sought after by the businesses that discuss
employment issues with him (Davis & Martinez, 1998). “A student can complete the
catalog requirements and meet grade-performance standards for the B.S. degree and yet
be undereducated. To meet employer expectations, to compete in the workplace and to be
perceived as an ‘educated’ person, the Animal Science graduate must be able to think
critically, to communicate effectively and to lead.” (Smith, 1989)

Animal Science Curriculum

Brand’s Philosophy on Education

In a speech to the North Central Agricultural Administrative Symposium, The
Ohio State University Provost, said it was no longer sufficient to prepare students for
entry level positions in the 80’s. Nor was it sufficient to prepare them just for the 1990’s,
because most of their working years will be in the 21st century. “We must provide an
education that looks to the future, not one based on technologies and theories of the past.
We must educate our students for tomorrow” (Brand, 1988)

Brand believed that individuals must be teachable and adaptable to an ever-
changing environment. The following is his reading from an excerpt from a report by a
campus-wide Special Committee on Education’s attempt to summarize the important
attributes found in an educated person:

“To achieve the aims of education, there are certain capacities and understandings,
certain qualities, abilities, and characteristics, which are part of what we
understand as the liberating process a university is particularly suited to develop,
nourish and hone. Primary among these capacities is the ability to write and speak
with clarity and precision; to read and listen critically and with comprehension. Of
the same order is the ability to engage in careful logical thinking and critical
analysis, including the abilities that permit intelligent responses to problems and
arguments which involve quantitative data.
An understanding of and appreciation for the important modes of human thought and inquiry are crucial characteristics of a liberal education. An understanding of the methods of modern science and social science, the effect of science and technology on the natural and social environment, and the nature of mathematical knowledge constitutes part of this knowledge. The development of a refined historical, artistic, and literary consciousness is a further part. A liberal education should also develop and sharpen the capacity and confidence to make informed and discrimination ethical and aesthetic judgements.

We believe that a liberal education in a university in our own nation today should foster an understanding of American institutions and the pluralistic nature of American society. It should also promote an understanding of the global interdependence of the modern world and should ensure facility with at least one language other than English. Finally, we think that an American university should seek to develop a deep appreciation for the cultural traditions that have formed and informed our nation and to develop a sense of the place of other cultures in world history.”

The educational direction from this speech can be found as an emphasis in the current curriculum at The Ohio State University. Brand’s goal of having Ohio State’s “educated students” more capable of writing with clarity and precision led to the inclusion of writing requirements in most classes in the Animal Sciences Department at The Ohio State University (Turner, 1998).

The Challenge of Teaching Animal Science

Taylor and Kauffman (1983) presented a paper at the Diamond Jubilee meetings of the American Society of Animal Scientists entitled Teaching Animal Science: Changes and Challenges. In that paper, they mention the philosophical rhetoric about teaching in the early days is similar to that of today. Topics such as basics vs. application, thinking vs. memorization, decision making, improving communications and stimulating students with
enthusiastic teachers. They give an example from 1932 saying "Knowledge has one great function and apparently only one. It is used in thinking." (p. 171)

Within the paper, they describe the challenges that will occur in teaching animal science, particularly plateauing enrollments, increasing enrollments of female students, more transfer students and fewer students with livestock experience. They believed these changes would lead to an increased need for computer integration, more hands-on experience including internships, improved communication skills, and the integration of business and economics skills into management systems.

Taylor and Kauffman (1983) sent a questionnaire to universities with Animal Science Departments in the United States and Canada. Forty-two land grant and 18 non-land grant colleges in the United States, plus five Canadian universities responded to the questionnaire. In the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to give the strengths and weaknesses of career preparation for graduates. In the 1960's, one of the most given weaknesses was that students lacked business, economics and communication preparation. The same was reported in the 1970's. In the 1980's. The weaknesses included a lack of communication skills, plus the need for more original thinking experiences.

Ironically, Meyer (1990) listed the need for more practical courses and hand-on experience as the most important needs for modification of the University of California-Davis Animal Science’s program. However, technical knowledge finished a distant fourth on the question for the most important personal attribute for career success, well behind analytical ability and communication skills.
Curriculum Design for the 21st Century

Taylor and Kauffman (1983) listed the weaknesses found in undergraduate Animal Sciences programs from the sixties through the eighties. The one common thread is the need for improving the communication skills of students. Coorts (1987) believed that the move to prepare college graduates for "high tech" fields has led to an increase in the requirement for basic science courses, thus leading to more specialization. Specialization at the expense of a broader-based education and training that is required by the working world.

Coorts (1987) listed seven curricula needs for students in the future. Among these needs is the improvement of both verbal and written communication skills. Additionally, he suggests that curricular adjustments may need to be made for students who lack practical agricultural experience. He also believes that curriculum should stress less specialization in order to produce graduates who are more broadly trained to meet the job market of the future. His reasoning is that industry will provide the specialized training needed by new employees.
Blank (1987) surveyed the alumni of 15 agribusiness and agriculture economics programs, seeking their opinions related to what areas should be emphasized in student curriculum. The alumni stressed the need for emphasis on basic education leading to more effective written and spoken communication skills. Additionally, alumni identified decision making as the third most important area of emphasis for students. In addition to his survey of alumni, Blank surveyed the heads of 51 Agriculture Economics Departments asking them to rate the anticipated student demand for classes and curriculum. Surprisingly, they did not consider decision making skills to be a high demand area, even though their alumni considered it to be very important for the future success of college students.

Meyer (1990) proposed that two distinct undergraduate majors should be offered in undergraduate animal science departments. The first being a discipline-oriented major emphasizing sciences and the application of science to animal biology. The second would be a professional-oriented major emphasizing the application of science to animal agriculture and management skills for the animal industries. The alumni from his survey believed that whatever the career goal, personal attributes such as analytical ability, communication skills, the ability to work with people, technical knowledge and managerial ability must be emphasized in the teaching program.
Veterinary School Admissions

Taylor and Kauffman’s (1983) study of colleges and universities with animal sciences departments listed dealing with pre-veterinarian students who are not accepted into veterinary school as a concern, particularly with the changing student composition which includes fewer students with farm backgrounds. The data from The Ohio State University College of Veterinary Medicine Admissions Committee Report (1998) indicated that only 131 out of 753 applicants were admitted to veterinary school (17.4%). The average grade point average of students admitted was 3.576 and the average length of pre-veterinary study was 4.8 years.

The Benefits of Livestock Judging Programs

Logical Thinking and Critical Analysis

In Brand’s speech (1988), he stressed the importance of developing students that have the ability to engage in careful logical thinking and critical analysis, including the ability to respond intelligently to problems and arguments. According to The Oxford Desk Dictionary (Urdang, 1995), the definition of “critical” is fault-finding. Critical analysis involves studying the facts, determining the faults, and making a decision once careful thought has been given.
A study conducted by Shanteau (1978) with the Department of Psychology at Kansas State University, suggests that livestock judges typically make more effective decisions than experts in other fields. The study lead to two main conclusions. First, that many of the inadequacies of experts do not apply to livestock judges. There was little indication in any of the work of the psychological limitations reported from other types of judges. Compared with experts in medicine, law, etc., livestock judges appear to have unusual abilities to make complex judgements.

Secondly, the training program used to develop livestock judges had a clear impact on the students. This contrasts sharply with previous findings for other types of experts where training and experience were found to have relatively little influence. Judging programs have the unique ability to develop these skills due the nature of the training. Decisions are made with more hands-on critique than any other curricular activity. Due to this hands-on teaching, the decision making process of gathering facts and making confident decisions based upon facts is honed to a higher level than other teaching programs can provide.
In addition to improving decision making skills, judging programs improve communication skills, either written or oral depending upon the program. Again, the training process of making decisions and then having to defend those decision to an instructor allows for continual critique for improvement. Unlike many college-level speech classes that require just a few speeches, judging programs require students to speak or write on a more constant basis. Through repetition and constant feedback, students can develop the communication skills, analytical ability and self-confidence to be successful in the ever-changing working world, no matter what career is chosen.

According to Smith (1989), critical thinking is acquired in formal courses that emphasize application of previously ingrained facts/knowledge, use of logic in problem solving, and application of systems analyses and not those that encourage simplistic rhetoric and memorization. Ability to think critically can also be achieved in courses and in co-curricular activities that involve selection, evaluation, grading and/or judging because comparative reasoning and application of memory standards are integrally involved in the decision making processes.
Communication Skills

"In another era, abilities to read and write were the near singular indices for identifying an ‘educated’ person; lessened emphasis on these skills in primary/secondary schools have resulted in many semi-literates presently entering universities. Communication skills are formally taught in speech, technical writing and seminar courses and further developed through meat judging (written reasons), and/or livestock or wool judging (oral reasons), academic quadrathlons (oral and written presentations) and student clubs (if speaking/written opportunities prevail),” according to Smith (1989).

Myles Brand’s goal for the educated student included the need to improve writing and speaking skills. According to Mr. Jerry Hawkins (Davis, 1998), Clarendon College Judging Coach, extemporaneous speaking skills are a must in today’s business world. "Business people are required everyday to stand up and give speeches and presentations with very little warning.” Meyer’s (1990) study of alumni listed communication skills as one of the top two attributes for career success.

The Value of Judging Programs

McCann and McCann (1992) nationally distributed a 35 item questionnaire to judging team alumni (1,291 participants) to determine the value of judging team programs. The respondents judged livestock, meats, dairy, horses and/or wool. The respondents most often selected “communication skills” (34.8%) as the way that judging programs helped them most. Other frequently given answers included “confidence” (17.3%), “animal evaluation skills” (16.6%) and “decision-making skills”(13.2%).
The questionnaire was developed to determine, among other things, the influence of the team experience on personal growth, the value of the judging experience relative to other courses and activities, and the opinions on the future of judging teams in light of changes in agriculture.

Personal growth was assessed by individually ranking nine personal attributes that may have influenced the respondent’s character. The scores had the following range: 1 = not influential at all, 2 = mildly influential, 3 = moderately influential, 4 = highly influential, and 5 = almost essential to the ultimate development of the attribute. Ninety-seven percent of the respondents indicated that the judging team experience benefitted their personal character. Livestock, meat, dairy, horse and wool evaluation skills received the highest score of 4.18 ($P < .05$). Second in importance were communication skills, with confidence and decision-making skills being third. These attributes were scored a "highly influential." The remaining attributes were organization skills, self-discipline, self-motivation, ability to accept criticism and competitiveness all averaged at least moderately influential.

The value of judging programs was generally rated by alumni as more positive than other college courses and activities. Of the 99.5% of students who completed other agriculture courses, 66.6% and 31.2% said it was "more" or "equally" valuable, respectively. The judging team experience was rated as "more valuable" than other extracurricular activities by 76% of the alumni while 22% said it was "equally" as important. Of the 1,291 respondents to this survey, 1283 felt judging programs were worthy of departmental support and would be either "more" (47.4%) or "equally" (43.8%) important to agricultural students in the future.
According to Mr. Kim Brock (Davis, 1998), Swine Herd Manager and Former Livestock Judging Coach at Oklahoma State University, “In addition to improving communication skills, judging programs assist students with building confidence and self-esteem. I have never had a student at the collegiate level say that they have regretted participating on a judging team.” “Participating in the judging program at Ohio State was one of the most influential things that I have done in my life. It taught me to make decisions and to stand behind them. I use those skills everyday” (Wendt, 1999).

The Goal of Education

In Brand’s speech to the North Central Agricultural Administrative Symposium (1988), he closed with the following:

“What will be the outcome of the implementation of a well-designed and integrated agriculture general education curriculum? First, the agriculture schools that will be the most successful will be those whose administrators and faculty show keen insight into the future. These schools will attract the highest caliber faculty and students. The graduates from these schools will go on to productive and influential careers in the academy, business, government, and research.

Second, universities should not be preparing students for entry level jobs, but rather for careers. Students must develop analytical and critical thinking skills and good oral and written communication that will enable them to spend a lifetime learning as they move from entry level to increasingly more responsible positions.

And third, this country needs a strong, articulate leadership in agriculture. Today, we have the opportunity to educate this leadership. The vision tomorrow’s agricultural leaders will have – will depend on how well we do our job. If we provide a broadly based education that emphasizes social responsibility, that shows relationships between disciplines, that inculcates a sense of importance of international orientation, we will have succeeded.
Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University from 1902 - 1945, observed that there are three kinds of people: Those who don’t know what is happening, those who do know what is happening; and those who make what is happening. My challenge to you today is to be among those making what is happening in curriculum revision at each of your universities.”

Smith’s (1989) abstract closes by emphasizing that administrators must insist that student clubs and intercollegiate competitions are available, to serve as an integral part of the process of developing student leadership skills among baccalaureate-level students in Animal Science.
CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES

Population and Sampling

The population used for the study included all undergraduate students majoring in Animal Sciences at The Ohio State University during Autumn Quarter, 1998. A questionnaire was sent to all 443 undergraduate students. The questionnaires were sent to the student’s home address to increase address accuracy. One hundred nine (109) questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 25 percent.

Instrumentation

The instrumentation used consisted of a mailed questionnaire and a EPP personality test. The questionnaire consisted of seven different sections for a total of 15 questions. The number of questions varied between sections of the questionnaire. The questions initially surfaced in a meeting with Dr. Thomas B. Turner, Assistant Professor, The Ohio State University (Personal Communication, 1998). The final questions were reviewed by Ms. Lori Keller and Mr. John Crites, both Ohio State University 4-H Youth Development Agents.
The personality test used was the Enneagram Personality Profile (EPP). The EPP consists of a series of 162 questions that are used to group the respondents into one of nine personality categories. The EPP was used by permission of the International Training Consultants, Inc., Richmond, VA.

Data Collection

The questionnaires were mailed to the population on December 17, 1998. The deadline for return was January 2, 1999. Due to the procedure chosen for mailing, which was to have only one mailing sent to the student’s home address during winter holiday break, every questionnaire that was returned was date stamped to compare early with late returns. The personality profiles were scored within three days, so the results of the personality profile could be returned quickly to the students. The questionnaires were returned to the Warren County Extension Office in self-addressed stamped envelopes.

Data Analysis

Results were tabulated utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 6.1 (S.P.S.S., 1994). The system has the capability to calculate frequency tables and correlation coefficients, which are necessary for data analysis in this thesis. The questionnaire answers were treated as the following with regard to level of measurement: Nominal: Gender, Farm Background, Livestock Background, Career Plans, Judging Team Participation, Leadership Positions, and Reasons for Choosing Ohio State. Ordinal: Class Rank, Grade Point Average, Number of Clubs and Enneagram Personality Type.
Frequency tables were used to display survey results for the respondents with regard to their personal data and answers. Interpretation of the correlation coefficients will be expressed using the commonly accepted set of descriptors proposed by Davis (1971).

Those descriptors for correlation coefficients are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.70 or higher</td>
<td>Very strong association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 - .69</td>
<td>Substantial association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 - .49</td>
<td>Moderate association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 - .29</td>
<td>Low association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01 - .09</td>
<td>Negligible association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Phi correlation coefficient that was used for the statistical comparisons, and each relationship explored was expressed using Cramer's V.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Demographics and Information from the Survey Respondents

Farm and Livestock Background

The largest percentage of the respondents (61%) were raised on a farm and another 16% reported some farm experience. However, nearly 24% of the Animal Science majors reported having no farm background. Additionally, a total of 40% of the respondents have no livestock experience. Commercial livestock experience consisted of just 33% of the respondents. The remaining 27% of the respondents have only 4-H/FFA livestock experience. The numbers for farm and livestock experience are very similar to those found in the studies done by Meyer (1990) and Taylor and Kauffman (1983).

Gender

The gender of the respondents was overwhelmingly female with 74%. The actual percentage of females within the full population is approximately 65%. Those numbers also compare favorably with those reported by Meyer (1990) and Taylor and Kauffman (1983). Their studies indicated an increase in female students from the 60's through the 80's, reaching up to 80% at some universities.
Grade Point Average (GPA)

Thirty-one percent of the respondents reported a GPA from 3.5 to 4.0. Thirty-seven percent of the respondents had a GPA 2.99 or less (See Figure 4.1). In Meyer's (1990) study of freshman at UC-Davis, the average GPA was 2.6 for students who remained in Animal Science, 2.8 for those who changed majors, and 2.1 for those who dropped out or transferred schools.

Figure 4.1 - Grade Point Average

Student Activities

Club Membership

Nearly 85% of the respondents belonged to at least one university club or organization, with the majority belonging to one or two clubs. Clubs or organizations include Saddle and Sirloin Club (largest membership of any on campus), University 4-H, Ag. Ed. Society, etc.
Fraternity or Sorority Membership

Seventy-eight percent of the respondents do not belong to a fraternity or sorority.

Leadership Positions in Clubs, Fraternities or Sororities

Nearly 34% of the respondents have held a leadership position in a college club, fraternity or sorority. The definition of a leadership position for this survey was serving as an officer or a committee chairperson in one of the organizations mentioned.

Judging Team Participation

Only 10% of the respondents have participated on a collegiate judging team. That number is not entirely surprising considering that the respondents were evenly distributed throughout the four class ranks. No class rank had more than 29% of the respondents and none had less than 22%. Freshman and sophomores have had less opportunity for participation. Another 34% of the respondents indicated that they do plan to participate on a college judging team.
Career Plans After Graduation

Nearly 48% of the respondents indicated that they plan to apply to veterinary school after completing their undergraduate degrees and 12% plan to attend graduate school. In other words, 60% of the respondents plan to continue their education beyond the bachelor’s degree level. This finding upholds the previous study conducted by Meyer (1990). His survey of freshman at the University of California - Davis found that approximately 55% intended to achieve a post-baccalaureate degree. That percentage was lower than the number found from his survey of the alumni, which indicated that 60% had achieved a higher educational degree.

The respondents that listed their career plan as “other” were instructed to list their choice. Answers included attending law school, working for a zoo, pharmaceutical sales and raising a family. Agriculture industry, for this study included employment with a business providing service or supplies to agricultural producers or businesses involved in producing food or fiber (See Figure 4.2).
Figure 4.2 - Plans After Graduation

Reasons for Attending Ohio State

The survey requested that students list their top three reasons for choosing Ohio State. The table gives the percentage of respondents listing the answer as one of their reasons (See Figure 4.3).

Overwhelmingly, the two highest reasons for attending Ohio State were related to the area of interest for the respondent's future career. Riesenber (1987), in his study of University of Idaho students, also found that the primary reason that students made their college choice was area of interest. Additionally, his study also indicated that cost was the next most important reason for their choice, which mirrored this thesis study.
Figure 4.3 - Reasons for Attending Ohio State

EPP Percentages

Two distinctive personality types were most often found in the study respondents. The largest percentage were Organizers (33%), followed by Empathizers with 22%. The next closest personality types were Team Players and Pilots, both with just under 10%. Mediators were the least prevalent group with less than 5% (See Figure 4.4).
The only substantial association was between Farm Background and Livestock Experience (Cramer’s $V = .59$). Seven other association were moderate (Cramer’s $V = .30$ to .49). They were the following: Class Rank and Leadership Positions; Farm Background and Personality Type; Gender and Grade Point Average; Grade Point Average and Leadership Positions; Judging Team Participation and Livestock Experience; Judging Team Participation and Personality Type; and Leadership Positions and Number of Clubs / Organizations.

The association between Farm Background and Livestock Experience is obviously because the two demographics are related, Farm Background is usually essential for Livestock Experience. Respondents with higher class ranks were more likely to have held a leadership position in a club or organization due to more time and opportunity.
Respondents with Livestock Experience were more likely to participate on a collegiate judging teams. The higher number of clubs belonged to indicated more likeliness of holding a leadership position in a club, fraternity or sorority.

A moderate association existed between Gender and Grade Point Average, with a higher percentage of females having higher grade point averages than males. Additionally, respondents with higher grade point averages were less likely to have held a leadership position in a club, fraternity or sorority. (See Figure 4.5)
Figure 4.5
Association Between Variables (Cramer’s V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
1 = Class Rank
2 = Date Returned
3 = Farm Background
4 = Fraternity / Sorority Membership
5 = Gender
6 = Grade Point Average
7 = Judging Team Participation
8 = Leadership Positions
9 = Livestock Experience
10 = Number of Clubs / Organizations
11 = Personality Type
12 = Plans After Graduation
Negligible Associations

Seven associations were negligible (Cramer’s $V < .10$). They included: Class Rank and Gender; Date Returned and Livestock Experience; Farm Background and Leadership Positions; Fraternity / Sorority Membership and Judging Team Participation; Gender and Judging Team Participation; Judging Team Participation and Leadership Positions; and Judging Team Participation and Number of Clubs.

Personality Type and Survey Information

The data from the respondents indicated that a low association (Cramer’s $V < .30$) existed between personality type and the following questions: Gender, Class Rank, Grade Point Average, Farm Background, Livestock Experience, the Number of Clubs, Fraternity/Sorority Membership, Leadership Positions Held and Plans After Graduation. Meaning the personality type of the student had a low relationship with any of the answers given to the questions listed above.

Judging team participation and personality type were the only questions that the data indicated that a moderate relationship existed (Cramer’s $V = .35$). A much higher than the average percentage of Organizers and Empathizers were not planning to participate on a college judging team. Architects, at a much higher percent than the average, were planning to participate.
Time of Response and Survey Information

The questionnaires were date stamped when they were returned to compare the responses from the beginning to the end. The return times were grouped into four categories: returned within one week after mailing, between one and two weeks, between two and three weeks, and after the deadline for return. A correlation coefficient was completed to determine if an association existed between when the questionnaire was returned and the questions. The data indicated a low association (Cramer’s V < .30) for every variable, except livestock experience which had a negligible association (Cramer’s V < .10). With low and negligible association established between the time of response and the questions, the study assumes that answers from non-respondents will not differ significantly from the respondents (Ludwig, 1995).

Livestock Experience and Plans After Graduation

The data indicate a low association (Cramer’s V = .29) between livestock experience and plans after graduation. Worth noting is nearly 70% of the Animal Sciences majors without livestock experience planned to apply to Veterinary School after completing their undergraduate degrees.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Objectives

The objectives of this study were:

1) To determine the type of undergraduate students majoring in Animal Sciences at The Ohio State University with regard to background, career plans, and personality type.

2) To determine if a relationship exists between personality type and background or career choice of these students.

3) To comparatively examine through historical research the importance of communication and decision making skills for students that will need to adapt to changing technology and job responsibilities in the 21st century.

4) To comparatively examine through historical research the usefulness of collegiate judging programs for developing communication and decision making skills.
Summary

The Animal Sciences Student Body

Similar to studies conducted at other universities by Meyer (1990), Taylor and Kauffman (1983), and Reese et al. (1987), the population of Animal Sciences majors at The Ohio State University has a majority of females and a significant population of students with non-farm backgrounds. These students select their major because of their interest in animals, an interest which increasingly reflects companion animals rather than general livestock. The students overwhelmingly listed their interest in attending veterinary school as the reason for attending Ohio State and nearly half are still planning to attend veterinary school after receiving a bachelor’s degree in Animal Sciences.

Taylor (1983) was concerned about handling non-farm students and pre-veterinary students that are not accepted to veterinary school. The 1998 Admissions Report from The Ohio State University College of Veterinary Medicine revealed that only 18% of the students who applied to veterinary school were admitted and their grade point average was 3.576. Forty-eight percent of the respondents to this survey indicated their intention to attend veterinarian school, but only 31% have a GPA that is 3.5 or above. Additionally, over 55% of the veterinary school hopefuls do not have any livestock experience.

Personality Type as a Career Indicator

Briggs-Myers (1993) stated that all personality types can be found making a contribution in every career field. However, her opinion is that people tend to be attracted to careers that allow them to use their most comfortable personality traits. The data from
this survey indicates that only a low association exists between career choice and personality type. Additionally, the data also indicate a low association between most activities and personality type, including leadership in clubs or organizations. Therefore, leadership ability is not inherent to just personality type.

"Behavior patterns do not happen by accident" (Bennett, 1987). Behavior is a direct result of values, upbringing and personality. Covey (1990) believes there are traits common among successful leaders including the ability to continually learn. Covey (1989) says character is a direct result of our habits. They are consistent, often unconscious patterns that express our character and effectiveness. By understanding your habits, you can determine your leadership style, your strengths and weaknesses, and what should be done for self-improvement. Covey stresses that these traits can be improved to make yourself a more effective person.

Developing Communication and Decision-Making Skills

Taylor and Kauffman (1983) listed the weaknesses of undergraduate Animal Sciences programs since the 1960's as poor communication skills. Coorts (1987) believed that curriculum should be developed to assist undergraduate students with the development of their personal skills. He believed a broad based education that develops communication skills and decision making ability best prepares all students for the working world. This theme is universally found in this study, as suggested in numerous studies conducted by other researchers. Overwhelmingly, the alumni surveyed strongly believed that communication skills and analytical ability are keys for career success.
The study by Smith (1989) detailed the importance of developing critical thinking, communication skills and leadership in Animal Science students through the use of judging programs and extra-curricular clubs and organizations. Eighty-four percent the respondents to this survey were members of at least one extra-curricular student organization, but less than 34% served as an officer or committee chairperson. Additionally, only 10% of the respondents had participated on a collegiate judging team and more than half responded that they did not ever intend to participate in a judging program.

The study conducted by Shanteau (1978) suggests that livestock judges typically make more effective decisions than experts in other fields. The study led to two main conclusions. First, that many of the inadequacies of experts do not apply to livestock judges, and secondly, the training program used to develop livestock judges had a clear impact on the students. This contrasts sharply with previous findings for other types of experts where training and experience were found to have relatively little influence. Judging programs have the unique ability to develop these skills due the nature of the training. Decisions are made with more hands-on critique than any other curricular activity. Due to this hands-on teaching, the decision making process of gathering facts and making confident decisions based upon facts is honed to a higher level than other teaching programs can provide.
McCann and McCann (1992) reinforced those findings with their study in which the respondents most often selected “communication skills” (34.8%) as the way that judging programs helped them most. Other frequently given answers included “confidence” (17.3%), “animal evaluation skills” (16.6%) and “decision-making skills” (13.2%). In fact, the respondents generally rated the value of judging programs as more positive than other college courses and activities. Of the 99.5% of students who completed other agriculture courses, 66.6% and 31.2% said it was “more” or “equally” valuable, respectively. The judging team experience was rated as “more valuable” than other extracurricular activities by 76% of the alumni while 22% said it was “equally” as important.

Conclusions

The demographic make-up of Animal Sciences majors at The Ohio State University is similar to Animal Sciences Departments at other universities, as corroborated by the literature review. The typical Animal Sciences undergraduate student is female, has limited commercial livestock experience and plans to apply to veterinary school. Additionally, the data also indicate a low association between personality type and background or career choice for undergraduate Animal Sciences students at The Ohio State University.
Historical research indicated a weakness in the communication skills of undergraduate Animal Sciences students from the 1960's through the 1980's (Taylor & Kauffman, 1983). Alumni surveyed strongly believed that communication skills and analytical ability are important for career success, as corroborated by numerous alumni studies found in the literature review. Coorts (1987) believed that the curriculum needed to be changed to improve those skills for undergraduate Animal Sciences majors.

Judging programs have the ability to improve student communication skills and analytical ability, in fact, they train students more effectively than programs available to law or medical professionals (Shanteau, 1978). The value of judging program participation can be found throughout its' alumni. Improving communication skills and analytic ability are the main benefits of the program, but certainly not the only ones. Unfortunately, the value of judging programs is often underestimated by faculty. Judging programs in the total undergraduate curriculum are viewed as elective and are seen by some as unnecessary. A shift in paradigms is needed by faculty, staff and administration regarding the value and importance of judging programs for the personal development of undergraduate Animal Sciences majors at The Ohio State University.

"To achieve the aims of education, there are certain capacities and understandings, certain qualities, abilities, and characteristics, which are part of what we understand as the liberating process a university is particularly suited to develop, nourish and hone. Primary among these capacities is the ability to write and speak with clarity and precision; to read and listen critically and with comprehension. Of the same order is the ability to engage in careful logical thinking and critical analysis, including the abilities that permit intelligent responses to problems and arguments which involve quantitative data." (Brand, 1988)
Recommendations for Future Study

1) Conduct an Animal Sciences Alumni study regarding the value of judging programs at The Ohio State University.

2) Study the level of importance and competency of analytical ability and communication skills in Animal Sciences alumni and undergraduates.

3) A faculty study about their perception of the value of judging programs at The Ohio State University. The study could include only Animal Sciences faculty or every faculty member in the College of Food, Agriculture and Environmental Sciences.
APPENDIX A.: ANIMAL SCIENCES STUDENT SURVEY

I. Background

1. Gender
   A. Male
   B. Female

2. Class Rank (as of September, 1998)
   A. Freshman
   B. Sophomore
   C. Junior
   D. Senior

3. Grade Point Average
   A. 3.50 - 4.00
   B. 3.00 - 3.49
   C. 2.50 - 2.99
   D. 2.00 - 2.49
   E. Under 2.00

4. What is your farm background?
   A. I grew up on a farm.
   B. I did not grow up on a farm, but have worked on a farm.
   C. I do not have any farm background.

5. If you have farm experience, what type of livestock enterprises were on those farms.
   A. 4-H / FFA Projects
   B. Commercial Livestock Operation (including club Animal production for sale to other 4-H / FFA members)
   C. Both 4-H / FFA Projects and Commercial Livestock
   D. None
II. Future Plans

1. After the completion of your undergraduate studies, please choose the answer that best fits your future plans:
   A. Extension Agent
   B. Graduate School
   C. Production Agriculture Job (Sales, Production Supervisor, Management, etc.)
   D. Self-Farmer or Family Farm
   E. Veterinary School
   F. Other: ____________________

III. Collegiate Judging Teams

1. Have you participated on a collegiate judging team (livestock, meats, dairy, horse, poultry, etc.)?
   A. Yes
   B. No

2. If no, do you intend to participate on a collegiate judging team?
   A. Yes
   B. No

IV. University Clubs and Organizations

1. How many university clubs or organizations are you a member of (ie. Saddle & Sirloin, Pre-Vet, Ag Council, University 4-H, etc.)?
   A. None
   B. One
   C. Two
   D. Three
   E. Four or more

2. Have you held a leadership position in a university club or organization (officer or committee chairperson)?
   A. Yes
   B. No
V. Fraternities / Sororities

1. Are you a member of a fraternity or sorority?
   A. Yes
   B. No

2. If no, do you intend to join a fraternity or sorority?
   A. Yes
   B. No

3. If you are a member of a fraternity / sorority, have you held a leadership position (officer or committee chairperson)?
   A. Yes
   B. No

VI. College Choice

1. Please rank the top three reasons why you chose to attend Ohio State (1 - 3), starting with 1 for the most important:
   A. Academic Reputation
   B. Affordable Cost
   C. Family Tradition
   D. Friends
   E. High School Visit
   F. Judging Programs
   G. Location
   H. Major
   I. Modern Facilities
   J. Scholarships
   K. Size of University
   L. Social Opportunities
   M. Up-to-Date Technology
   N. Veterinary School / Pre-Vet Program
   O. Other: ____________________

VII. Would you like the results of your Enneagram profile mailed back to you?
   A. Yes
   B. No
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