2001

Unethical practices in exhibiting animals as observed by West Virginia extension agents and high school agriculture teachers

Jared Nathaniel Nestor
West Virginia University

UNETHICAL PRACTICES IN EXHIBITING ANIMALS AS OBSERVED BY WEST VIRGINIA EXTENSION AGENTS AND HIGH SCHOOL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS

Jared N. Nestor

Thesis submitted to the
College of Agriculture, Forestry and Consumer Sciences
at West Virginia University
in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of

Master of Science
in
Agricultural and Environmental Education

Stacy A. Gartin, Ph.D., Chair
Layle D. Lawrence, Ph.D.
Jean M. Woloshuk, Ed.D.
Robert A. Dailey, Ph.D.

Division of Resource Management

Morgantown, West Virginia
2000

Keywords: Ethics, animals, exhibiting

ABSTRACT

Unethical Practices in Exhibiting Animals as Observed by West Virginia Extension Agents and High School Agriculture Teachers

Jared N. Nestor

The purpose of this study was to determine the frequency of unethical practices in exhibiting animals observed by West Virginia extension agents and high school teachers.

A researcher-created demographic sheet and a fifty-eight-statement Lickert type questionnaire were sent to all extension agents and high school agriculture teachers in West Virginia (N=154). Descriptive data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSSpc). Frequencies, t-values and means were used to describe and analyze the research results.

There are unethical practices in West Virginia concerning cruelty to animals but these practices are not a problem that has a high rate of occurrence. The practices that occur more often are those concerning adults and parents, whether they are talking about a judge or trying to buy a first place animal. Females observe unethical practices more frequently than do males, and extension agents observe unethical practices more frequently than do agriculture teachers. The most frequently observed unethical practices were: "Youth and adults questioning the integrity of the livestock judge;" "Parents or teachers getting animals ready to show;" and "Talking about the other children and judges (continuation of what they hear at home)."

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere thanks and deep appreciation to all the West Virginia agriculture teachers and county extension agents who, as respondents, made this study possible. A very special thanks is extended to Dr. Stacy Gartin, Advisor and Chairman of the Examining Committee for his patience, understanding, encouragement and advice throughout the course of the writer's graduate program. Your guidance throughout this process has been greatly appreciated and valued.

The writer is also indebted to the members of his Examining Committee: Dr. Layle Lawrence, Professor, Agricultural and Environmental Education; Dr. Jean Woloshuk, Extension Specialist; Dr. Robert Dailey, Professor, Animal and Veterinary Sciences; and Dr. K.S. Odell, Associate Professor, Agricultural and Environmental Education; for their advice and particularly their constructive comments throughout the study.

Finally, a most special thank you is extended to my wife, Kimberly Nestor, for her understanding, patience and support throughout this entire process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Man has been faced with the dilemma of distinguishing between right and wrong since the beginning of time. One of the first questions of ethics was a biblical report centered on the Garden of Eden. Since then, many theologians have given their thoughts on what they believe to be ethical. Aristotle was one of the first great philosophers to study the subject of ethics. Ethics have helped shape our society. One of the very first laws that were ever to be reported was the Code of Hammurabi, which made bribery a crime. Ever since then, there have been laws made that have ethical content.

Our ancestors realized that young people are the future. The 4-H and National FFA Organization programs are based on a learn by doing approach to educating their students. This learning by doing approach is based on sound managerial and ethical practices.

In the early 1900's, most 4-H clubs were organized as boys and girls agricultural clubs, which taught scientific methods in agricultural production (Wessel & Wessel, 1982). Since then, the 4-H program has taken great strides towards educating the youth in its program about making ethical decisions and the skills necessary for life long learning. 4-H's mission is to develop youth to reach their fullest potential through developing life skills, learning by doing and utilizing the knowledge of the land-grant university system (National 4-H, 2000). 4-H is a youth outreach program by the cooperative extension service. Cooperative extension is an extension of land grant universities. Each state in the United States has a land grant university. The Morrill Act of 1862 and the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 paved the way for the birth of the cooperative extension service. The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 provided federal funding for the cooperative extension service. The 4-H program caters to more than 6.6 million young people. It also has

over 600,000 youth and adult volunteers (National 4-H, 1999). There are 42,090 4-H members in West Virginia and over 8,500 volunteers (Price, 1999).

Another popular youth organization is the Future Farmers of America (FFA) or National FFA Organization. The FFA has been making positive differences in young peoples' lives for over 71 years. It has accomplished this by developing their potential for leadership, personal growth and career success (National FFA, 1999). National FFA Organization is an integral part of the high school agriculture program. In 1917 the Smith-Hughes National Vocational Education Act established vocational agriculture courses in high school. The high school agriculture curriculum educates students in the areas of animal science, agricultural mechanics, plant and soil science and leadership. The learning by doing concept requires students to be actively involved in a supervised agricultural experience program.

Clubs, later known as chapters, were being formed as early as the 1920's. This idea spread like wildfire across the nation. Currently there are 7,226 FFA chapters, which consists of 455,306 members through out the United States. In West Virginia there are approximately 4,494 members, which makes up 61 FFA chapters.

Some of the 4-H and FFA members have livestock projects or their experience programs, which allows them to participate in youth livestock exhibitions. The raising and exhibiting of livestock began more than 200 years ago when the Collings brothers and others first led their bovine beasts out onto the show ground of Smithfield, England. This practice was very valuable and purposeful for the advertising of their stock. People came great distances to view the results of man's efforts to produce a superior bullock that possessed the prepotency to pass his size, fleshing, and appearance on to his progeny. The fair or show was a prime area of communication (Dietrich 1967).

Since, there has been an increasing popularity surrounding livestock exhibitions. Because of this popularity, livestock exhibitors have recently been under close scrutiny due to some individuals who have been caught cheating. Cheating at livestock events continues to be of great concern. According to Jeff Goodwin (1995), people have let their competitiveness cloud their judgment of right and wrong. Goodwin is one of the leading experts on show ring ethics in the United States. He has conducted several research studies pertaining to ethics in livestock exhibitions. He has a well-respected video series that addresses some of the show ring unethical practices. In 1994 livestock show ethics gained public attention because residues of clenbuterol were found in several animals at major livestock shows in the United States. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) acted on concerns about possible adverse effects of clenbuterol on public health (Rodrigquez, 1995). Not all unethical practices involve drugs. A boy in Texas, whose pig was 10 pounds under the weight limit to be eligible to show, shoved a water hose down the pig's throat and turned on the water. The pig gained the 10 pounds it needed but died a few minutes later. Another example was in Ohio when the Grand Champion Lamb was found with vegetable oil residue in its glands. The boy did this to make the animal appear more muscular. Another instance occurred in Texas where a seventeen year old girl and her family were caught administrating a human tranquilizer to her market steer. The attempt was to make the animal calmer in the show ring. In another state there was a young man who had his picture put on the front page of the newspaper with his state prize-winning hog. The problem with the picture was that the boy did not raise the best hog in the state. In fact, he had never raised a hog in his life (Goodwin video series). Unethical practices also are being committed in West Virginia, but we cannot document to what extent.

Dr. Reita J. Marks, Professor Emeritus of Extension, was involved with youth livestock exhibitions for over 29 years and was closely involved with West Virginia's youth livestock exhibitions at the State Fair. She states that the youth livestock program as a whole is wonderful, but there is a fraction of individuals who are corrupt. Some of the things she was faced with were ownership of animals, steers with oil pumped under their hides, animal switching and animals being painted so they could show them in a different class. Marks also noted that adults are the major culprits concerning unethical behavior. She noted that the second reason for unethical behavior is money incentives. In her opinion youth livestock programs help teach discipline, confidence, responsibilities, education and self-reliance. Marks suggests that we keep the youth livestock programs but continue to educate the young people involved and their parents. In no case should these young people be blamed. They weren't endowed at birth with larcenous tendencies. Such unethical practices had to be learned and practiced (Dietrich 1967). The teaching or indoctrination to ethics is usually done at home. According to Dietrich (1967) wherever you find a youth showperson you will more than likely will find at least one or both parents instructing them.

Statement of the Problem

The main reasons that individuals give for showing animals are to teach children honesty, sportsmanship and wholesome morals just to name a few. Goodwin states in his video, A Question of Ethics, that kids who participate in junior livestock programs should learn about leadership, sportsmanship, responsibility, competition and honesty. Does the preceding examples help reinforce these concepts? For years, many 4-H and FFA programs have focused primarily on proper nutrition and treatment of animals. They have taught responsibility and production techniques to the children who had livestock projects. The children and their parents

need to understand all of the responsibilities of having an animal and competing in an ethical manner. They also need to understand the consequences that may follow unethical behavior. Not only could they be banned for life from exhibiting animals, but they may also be prosecuted for federal food and drug administration violations.

A large part of the success or failure of livestock agriculture depends upon the youth involved. There has been a lack of awareness when it comes to good moral actions. If those extension agents and agriculture teachers who work with livestock programs do not start raising awareness of the adults and youth who are involved then the stage is set for unethical behavior. The best type of teaching is by being an example and that is why the adults that are involved in teaching youth, including the extension agents and agriculture teachers, need good ethics training.

The first part of this study was designed to determine unethical practices each extension agent and agriculture teacher in West Virginia had observed at youth livestock exhibitions. The second part of this study was designed to determine each extension agents' and agriculture teachers' perceptions of how extensively identified unethical practices occur.

Objectives of the Study

1. To identify the unethical practices observed by extension agents and agriculture teachers at West Virginia livestock exhibitions.
2. To rate the unethical practices according to their seriousness.
3. To compare differences in the perceived seriousness of unethical practices by profession, gender.

Definition of Terms

Webster's dictionary, ninth collegiate edition, 1995 defines our selected terms as follows:

Ethical- involving or expressing moral approval or disapproval: of or relating to ethics.

Ethics- set of moral principles relating to right or wrong.

Thinking- the action of using one's mind to produce thoughts, opinions or judgments.

Livestock- animals kept or raised for use or pleasure; farm animals kept for use or pleasure.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Everyday, our society is faced with making ethical decisions, whether in dealing with families, jobs, and even friends. Kohlberg did not believe virtues could be taught didactically but rather that both the concept of justice as well as the individual's understanding of it were constructed through experiences with the moral world (Benninga, 1990). "Moral education is the leading of men upward, not the putting into the mind of knowledge that was not there before" (Kohlberg, 1970). Kohlberg (1984) also says that moral reasoning develops through a series of six stages. These stages are grouped into three major levels, the Preconventional (stages 1 and 2), the Conventional (stages 3 and 4), and the Postconventional. The Preconventional moral level is for those who are of the age 9 or under, some adolescents, and adolescent and adult criminals. The Conventional includes most of the adolescents and adults. The Postconventional is reached by a minority of adults and is usually reached after the age of 20. What this means is that an individual is more vulnerable at a young age. Goodwin (1995), in his video A Step Beyond: "A Question of Ethics", states, "adults are the reason cheating occurs." He says that children are born honest and that they learn to cheat by emulating adults. Ethics according to the Josephson Institute (1998) refers to standards of conduct. These standards indicate how one should behave based on moral duties and virtues which themselves are derived from principles of right and wrong. Many of our decisions are made with economic, social, and professional pressures involved. When these factors are involved, they tend to cloud moral or ethical judgment. Trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring and citizenship are the six ethical values the Josephson Institute refers to as the six pillars of character. The "Character Counts" program says that if everyone shares a common terminology, people can become more

consistent ethical decision makers who are better prepared to face the challenges of daily life. In "The Teaching of Ethics to Young People and Reminding of Ethics to Adults" by Jeff Goodwin, he says that without education about ethics, the livestock programs currently enjoyed by many may be taken away (LCI Technical Index, 2000). The National Livestock Ethics Council has implemented the show ring ethics program. Goodwin, Briers and Murphy (1996), conducted a study entitled Measuring the Ethical Cognition Effect of a Videotape Livestock Show Ethics Education Program. They found that a person who had not been exposed to an educational video dealing with show ring ethics was more likely to be involved in an unethical practice. However, the responses changed according to the nature of the activity that was in question. For example, a person was more likely to paint an animal a solid color than to give an animal an illegal drug or an illegal amount of drug.

Dr. Wayne Wagner is an Extension Livestock Specialist for West Virginia University Extension Service. Dr. Wagner has been the coach of the University livestock judging team for over five years and has been exposed to show animals since he was a young man. As early as the 1950s he recalls that there were unethical practices being performed. He states that at the Ohio State Fair a young man with a market steer altered the animal surgically. The young man and his family placed a steel plate inside the steer to make him weigh more. The young man and his family were caught and banned for life from showing at the Ohio State Fair. Another example that Wagner has witnessed also happened at the Ohio State Fair. Some individuals tried to show a dead lamb in a pen of three-lamb class. The lamb died the night before the show. Instead of withdrawing from the class they tied the dead lamb between two others. Wagner also has knowledge of unethical practices occurring here in West Virginia. He has witnessed everything from pumping fruit jelly underneath the hide of market animals to make them appear

fuller and more muscular, to overdosing with an antibiotic called LA-200, which makes the muscles contract, causing the to animal appear more muscular. In Dr. Wagner's opinion, 97% of the time parents are the source of unethical practices. One suggestion he presents is the 4-H and FFA programs should be educating or even just re-educating the adults so that we can minimize the amount that unethical practices occurring. Wagner feels that the mission of youth livestock exhibits is for the youngsters involved to gain experience, fellowship, knowledge and possibly to keep kids out of trouble (Wagner, 2000).

Dr. Jean Woloshuk is an Extension Specialist who coordinates with youth agriculture across the state of West Virginia. She has been involved directly with youth livestock shows for over 23 years. Woloshuk says that there have been few examples of unethical practices that have occurred since she has been involved. She has been forced to deal with issues of ownership of animals. She says that the number one unethical practice that she faces is the issue of ownership and animals being switched. Since she has been directly involved she has helped implement new ways of discouraging unethical practice. Some of those things are blood testing, termination of grand champion market animals and more recently computerized identification chips placed under the hide of the animals being exhibited. She believes that the parents are the biggest influence upon children. Woloshuk says that it is the responsibility of not only the extension agents and agriculture teachers to raise awareness to the children involved but also their parents (Woloshuk, 2000).

Chapter 3

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This study was designed to evaluate ethical practices in exhibiting animals as perceived by West Virginia extension agents and high school agriculture teachers. Descriptive research identifies and clarifies relationships among variables. Ary, Jacobs and Razavich (1985) state:

> Descriptive research studies are designed to obtain information concerning the current status of phenomena. They are directed toward determining the nature of a situation, as it exists at the time of the study. The aim is to describe, "what exists" with respect to variables or conditions in a situation. (p. 286)

The use of questionnaires or interviews is usually how descriptive research data are gathered. Descriptive research can also be used for documentary analyses, correlation studies and sometimes hypothesis testing (Ary, Jacobs and Razavich, 1985).

Descriptive research has many weaknesses as well as strengths. Some of the strengths of descriptive research are the collection of data from a wide variety of people and it is easy to conduct descriptive survey research. Descriptive survey research is also widely used because it is very affordable for the researcher. Weaknesses of descriptive survey research are that the researcher is limited to explanations and descriptions for data and sometimes has external validity problems. Some practices that can help offset some of the weaknesses are as follows. Frame error can be avoided by surveying the entire population. Using the entire data set provided by the population can control sampling error. To control measurement errors one can test for validity and reliability. The researcher can control sampling error by surveying the entire

population. By issuing a follow-up questionnaire a researcher controls non-response error that could occur.

The survey could not be conducted by personal interviews, because of the limited resources, time, and maintaining anonymity of participants. The use of descriptive research overcame this problem by allowing communication through a mailed survey form. Most of the research concerning social and social psychological issues has been conducted using descriptive survey research.

Population

In order to create a frame the researcher sent surveys to all extension agents and agriculture teachers (N=154) on the current mailing list from the West Virginia University Extension Service headquarters and the West Virginia University Agriculture Education mailing list (2000). Ninety-seven responded giving a 72.2% response rate. Of those 97, 27 did not have responsibilities for youth livestock exhibitions. Responses from those 27 were excluded. Responses from 37 agents and 33 teachers were analyzed (N=70).

Method

For the purpose of gathering information, the descriptive research method was used. Extension agents and agriculture teachers in the state of West Virginia who work with youth livestock exhibitions made up the population. A two-part questionnaire was developed to determine observations made by extension agents and agriculture teachers of unethical practices concerning youth livestock exhibits.

Information was collected from the population via a two-part mail questionnaire. The first mailing contained a letter of introduction explaining the purpose of the study and a survey form on which each extension agent and agriculture teacher was asked to identify the five most

unethical practices that they have witnessed at youth livestock exhibits. A self-addressed, postage paid return envelope was enclosed to encourage response. A follow up letter was mailed two weeks later to request information from those who had not yet responded.

Information obtained on the initial questionnaire was reviewed and sorted, similar responses were combined, and whenever needed, statements were edited without altering the meaning. The responses were grouped to form a second questionnaire, which included every statement that was mentioned by at least one respondent to be a major unethical practice that was witnessed at a youth livestock exhibit. The population evaluated these statements using the following scale:

1 = never observed.
2 = very seldom observed.
3 = occasionally observed.
4 = frequently observed.

The respondents were also asked to identify their years of service and gender, and to offer any comments they wanted. In an attempt to make an early-late respondent comparison, a phone call was made to non-respondents. The phone call simply asked those who had not responded to please return their questionnaire.

Data Collection

There were two types of questionnaires used to collect the information and data in this study. The first questionnaire asked each extension agent and agriculture teacher in the state of West Virginia to identify five of the most unethical practices they had observed at a youth livestock exhibition. This survey and cover letter were mailed on October 6, 2000.

There was then a second questionnaire sent on November 1, 2000. This questionnaire asked the respondents to rate 58 identified unethical practices on a Likert-type scale. The researcher and his advisor signed the letter. A postage paid, self-addressed envelope was

provided to encourage returns. The cover letter thanked those who participated and explained the importance of their responses. Due to lack of time, instead of sending a follow-up letter a phone call was made to those who had not responded as a reminder.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSpc) at West Virginia University. Descriptive data were analyzed in the form of percentages, measures of central tendency, and frequencies. The data were recorded and reported in tabular form based on standard deviations, frequencies, and means. A descriptive narrative was used in combination with the tabulated figures to explain the findings.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to determine observations made by extension agents and agriculture teachers of unethical practices concerning youth livestock exhibits.

The study was directed by the following research objectives:

1. To identify the unethical practices observed by extension agents and agriculture teachers at West Virginia livestock exhibitions.
2. To rate the unethical practices according to their seriousness.
3. To compare differences in the perceived seriousness of unethical practices by profession, gender.

The descriptive method of research was used to conduct this study. Data presented in this chapter were collected through a survey technique consisting of two different questionnaires administered through the mail.

The first survey asked one open-ended question in order to obtain a range of responses from the population. The question asked the population to identify the five most unethical practices that they had observed at a youth livestock exhibition.

After the questionnaires were returned, a review committee sorted, reviewed and combined like statements; and edited the statements for clarity without changing the intended meaning. The fifty-eight statements were then compiled to make the second questionnaire, which was then administered to the same population. The following rating scale was used for the fifty-eight statements:

1 = never observed
2 = very seldom observed
3 = occasionally observed
4 = frequently observed

Population

The respondents for this study (N=70) consisted of extension agents and high school agriculture teachers in West Virginia on the current mailing lists from the West Virginia University Extension Service headquarters and the West Virginia University Agriculture Education (2000) who have youth livestock responsibilities. There were 37 agents and 33 teachers who participated in the study.

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

Faculty members at West Virginia University examined the second phase mail questionnaire for content and face validity. Internal consistency was determined by calculating Cronbach's alpha. The reliability of the instrument was 0.94.

Utilizing the entire population of extension agents and agriculture teachers who have youth livestock responsibilities controlled frame, sampling and selection errors. According to Miller and Smith (1983), late respondents are similar to non-respondents. The statistician that assisted in computing the data said that, due to the low response rate of late respondents, there would be no significances in a late to non-respondents comparison.

Demographics

Data were collected regarding gender and years of experience as an extension agent or high school agriculture teacher. Nine respondents were female and fifty-seven were male as noted in Table 1. Four of the respondents did not report their gender. Mean years of experience for extension agents was 18.6 years and for high school agriculture teachers the mean was 12.9 years. Years of experience ranged from 0-32 years in both professions.

Table 1

Gender and Years of Experience of Extension Agents and Agriculture Teachers

Variables	Teachers		Agents	
	F	%	F	%
Gender (n=66)				
Female	1	3	8	27
Male	35	97	22	73
Missing Data	3		1	
Years of Experience (n=66)				
	M	SD	M	SD
Female	15.00	0.00	19.02	9.97
Male	10.75	4.65	18.14	8.42
Missing Data	3		1	

Mean Ratings of Unethical Practices Observed at Youth Livestock Exhibitions by West Virginia Extension Agents and Agriculture Teachers by Profession and by Gender

The most frequently observed unethical practices overall with mean scores above 3.00 were: "Adults and youth questioning the integrity of the livestock judge because he/she chose one breed over another, etc." (M=3.30); "Parents or teachers getting animals ready to show" (M=3.07); and "Talking about the other children and judges (continuation of what they hear at home)" (M=3.01). The three practices that received means of 3.00 or higher were issues related to people and their actions. These three practices were not related to unethical practices involving animal treatment.

There were six additional statements that had a mean score of 2.50 or higher. These ratings fell between the categories of "very seldom observed" and "occasionally observed." These statements ranged from "Youth knowing very little about the animal they take into the show ring" (M=2.91), to "Withholding feed and water from animal to lower weight and make animal appear trim" (M=2.51). Of the 58 statements, 16 received a mean of 1.49 or less. The

rating of 1.49 or lower falls between the categories of “very seldom observed” and “never observed.” These statements ranged from “Sewing weights into sheep’s blanket to make animal weigh more during weigh-in,” with a mean of 1.07, to “Glue on hair to cover up active ring worm and spray over with “show black”,” which received mean scores of 1.47.

Data in Table 2 indicate the overall mean ratings, standard deviations and t-test results from the extension agent and agriculture teacher respondents to the survey. Of the 58 statements listed, five of them were statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

Extension agents observed the following actions significantly more often than the agriculture teacher respondents: “Pulling a lamb’s head in the air to the point that its feet leave the ground even after being instructed not to;” “Using rubbing alcohol on market lambs after irritating the skin with a curry-comb to “Brace” lambs. This burning sensation caused lambs to “brace”;” “Steroid use to increase muscling;” “Parents or teachers getting animals ready to show;” and “Buying back animal in someone else’s name.”

Data were also analyzed to determine if significant differences between male and female teachers and agents existed. Table 2 also shows standard deviations and t-test results from the male and female respondents to the survey. Of the 58 statements listed, 12 were significant at the 0.05 level. In every case, females observed the following actions more often than did the male respondents: “Withholding feed and water from animals to lower weight and make animal appear trim;” “Sewing weights into sheep’s blanket to make animal weigh more during weigh-in;” “Alteration of the hair, hooves or skin by the use of paint, oils, powder, hair dye coloring, etc;” “Adults and youth questioning the integrity of the livestock judge because he/she chose one breed over another, etc.;” “Small animals, especially rabbits, being unattended for days at a time;” “Extreme tail docking;” “Pulling a lamb’s head in the air to the point that its feet leave the

ground after being instructed not to;" "Letting semi-professional groomers and trainers in the show area where they can influence the animal being exhibited;" "Youth showing animals which they do not actually own, showing for someone on a contractual basis;" "Retagging animals to replace with another animal that has been purchased;" "Registering all animals in farm name so kids have many to choose from, instead of owning and working with one that is their own;" and "Paying extreme prices for a feeder pig or calf just to win. This doesn't teach sound production agriculture."

There were 33 of the 58 (57%) statements that received mean ratings between 1.50 and 2.49. Of the 33 statements 7 were significantly different when analyzed by gender. The unethical practices were actions that concerned issues of professionals doing the work for the youth, youth showing animals that they did not own and mistreatment of lambs during exhibit time.

Table 2

Mean Ratings of Unethical Practices Observed at Youth Livestock Exhibitions by West Virginia Extension Agents and Agriculture Teachers by Profession and by Gender

Statements	Overall	Teacher n=37		Agent n=33			Male n=57		Female n=9		
	M	M	SD	M	SD	t*	M	SD	M	SD	t*
Adults and youth questioning the integrity of the livestock judge because he/she chose one breed over another, etc.	3.30	3.27	0.84	3.33	0.69	-0.34	3.21	0.79	3.73	0.47	-2.11**
Parents or teachers getting animals ready to show.	3.07	2.86	0.92	3.30	0.81	-2.11**	2.98	0.87	3.45	0.93	-1.63
Talking about the other children and judges (continuation of what they hear at home).	3.01	3.00	0.91	3.03	0.77	-0.15	2.91	0.84	3.45	0.69	-2.00
Youth knowing very little about the animal they take into the show ring (ex what it was fed, cost, medication given- It is just a way to make money).	2.91	2.78	0.82	3.06	0.83	-1.40	2.83	0.80	3.27	0.90	-1.66
Alteration of the hair, hooves or skin by the use of paint, oils, powder, hair dye coloring, etc.	2.80	2.65	1.14	2.97	0.98	-1.26	2.67	1.08	3.36	0.81	-2.01**
Paying extreme prices for a feeder pig or calf just to win. This doesn't teach sound production agriculture.	2.79	2.84	0.87	2.73	1.04	0.49	2.72	0.87	3.36	0.81	-2.25**
The grooming of show animals by professionals rather than youth.	2.69	2.73	0.87	2.64	1.11	0.40	2.64	0.91	3.09	1.22	-1.43
Having animal drink a great deal of water before weigh-in.	2.54	2.40	1.04	2.66	1.02	-0.95	2.45	0.99	3.00	1.18	-1.64
Withholding feed and water from animal to lower weight and make animal appear trim.	2.51	2.32	0.94	2.73	0.88	-1.84	2.40	0.88	3.09	1.04	-2.34**
Parents spend thousands of dollars for an animal, do all the work including at the fair, and the kid wins.	2.49	2.49	0.87	2.48	1.09	0.01	2.43	0.90	3.00	1.00	-1.89

Table 2 (continued)

Statements	Overall	Teacher n=37		Agent n=33			Male n=57		Female n=9		
	M	M	SD	M	SD	t*	M	SD	M	SD	t*
The exhibiting of as many different animals as possible solely to make money on them at livestock sale.	2.44	2.32	1.11	2.58	1.12	-0.94	2.38	1.06	3.00	1.10	-1.78
Hitting and abusing uncooperative animals during or after show.	2.41	2.30	0.81	2.55	0.87	-1.24	2.38	0.79	2.45	1.04	-0.28
Breaking animal to lead with tractor or 4-wheeler.	2.34	2.43	0.87	2.24	0.87	0.92	2.34	0.85	2.18	0.87	0.58
"Lobbying" judges.	2.31	2.14	1.06	2.52	0.83	-1.66	2.22	0.99	2.73	0.79	-1.59
Letting semi-professional groomers and trainers in the show area where they can influence the animal being exhibited.	2.26	2.16	0.96	2.36	1.17	-0.79	2.10	0.97	3.18	1.08	-3.33**
Buying back animal in someone else's name.	2.25	1.92	0.98	2.63	0.94	-3.03**	2.14	1.00	2.82	0.98	-2.07
Generally not caring for the animals during the fair shows that they didn't do it at home.	2.13	2.16	0.87	2.09	0.78	0.34	2.14	0.83	2.09	0.83	0.17
Deception regarding project animals age and identity.	2.13	2.08	0.83	2.18	0.88	-0.49	2.12	0.82	2.27	1.01	-0.54
Allowing hogs to lay in the heat without fans or water.	2.10	2.10	0.74	2.09	0.91	0.09	2.09	0.78	2.18	1.08	-0.35
Feeding of salt or salty feed to animals so they drink more water to make them weigh more.	2.07	2.19	0.97	1.94	1.00	1.06	2.03	0.92	2.09	1.22	-0.18
Exhibiting project animals that 4-Hers have not previously cared for or managed. E.g. Animals kept by a breeder or another adult prior to exhibition by youth.	2.06	1.89	0.77	2.24	0.97	-1.68	2.02	0.81	2.18	1.25	-0.57

Table 2 (continued)

Statements	Overall	Teacher n=37		Agent n=33			Male n=57		Female n=9		
	M	M	SD	M	SD	t*	M	SD	M	SD	t*
Youth showing animals which they do not actually own, showing for someone on a contractual basis.	2.06	1.84	0.99	2.30	1.16	-1.81	1.88	0.94	3.09	1.30	-3.68**
Pulling a lamb's head in the air to the point that its feet leave the ground after being instructed not to.	2.04	1.78	0.89	2.33	1.11	-2.30**	1.86	0.91	2.91	1.22	-3.32**
Exhibiting & showing animals which have not been cared for by the owner during the required period of time.	2.01	1.97	0.90	2.06	0.97	-0.40	2.03	0.84	2.09	1.22	-0.19
Politics, favoritism, extension agents and ag teachers showing preference for certain members.	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	0.94	0.00	1.97	0.94	2.27	1.10	-0.97
Extreme tail docking.	1.99	1.84	0.99	2.15	1.18	-1.21	1.84	0.97	2.64	1.43	-2.29**
Registering all animals in farm name so kids have many to choose from, instead of owning and working with one that is their own.	1.93	1.76	0.95	2.12	0.99	-1.57	1.83	0.92	2.64	0.92	-2.67**
Alcohol consumption by exhibitors.	1.93	1.78	0.95	2.09	1.10	-1.26	1.86	0.94	2.45	1.21	-1.82
Using sedative type drugs to calm show animals.	1.84	1.70	0.85	2.00	1.00	-1.35	1.78	0.86	2.18	1.25	-1.33
Switching animals immediately before fair date, this means they are showing an animal they didn't actually raise.	1.81	1.76	0.89	1.88	0.82	-0.59	1.81	0.85	1.73	0.90	0.30
Lambs standing in trimming chutes "blocked up in front" for hours.	1.81	1.76	0.80	1.88	0.89	-0.61	1.78	0.77	2.00	1.18	-0.81
Letting animals stand in the hot sun unattended for long periods of time.	1.79	1.81	0.84	1.76	0.75	0.28	1.78	0.80	1.82	0.87	-0.16

Table 2 (continued)

Statements	Overall	Teacher n=37		Agent n=33			Male n=57		Female n=9		
	M	M	SD	M	SD	t*	M	SD	M	SD	t*
Icing animals with cold packs and ice to firm fat.	1.77	1.70	0.88	1.85	0.94	-0.67	1.71	0.84	2.09	1.22	-1.29
Shrinking of fully grown animals to make them lose weight.	1.76	1.65	0.72	1.88	0.89	-1.20	1.78	0.75	1.55	1.04	0.88
Running animals to ensure they make weight limit prior to weigh in at the fair (animals too heavy).	1.73	1.78	0.95	1.67	0.74	0.57	1.67	0.80	1.91	1.04	-0.85
Retagging animals to replace with another animal that has been purchased.	1.71	1.65	0.72	1.79	0.86	-0.74	1.62	0.70	2.18	1.08	-2.23**
Changing hair color.	1.69	1.73	1.04	1.64	0.86	0.41	1.67	0.94	1.82	1.08	-0.46
Purchasing an animal at another county fair then entering that animal in own county fair as if you raised the animal. (This practice ceased after we started ear tagging animals).	1.61	1.54	0.80	1.70	0.98	-0.73	1.57	0.82	1.82	1.25	-0.85
Washing animals in cold water on cold nights.	1.61	1.65	0.82	1.58	0.83	0.37	1.62	0.81	1.64	0.92	-0.06
Small animals, especially rabbits, being unattended for days at a time.	1.61	1.57	0.69	1.67	0.85	-0.54	1.50	0.68	2.18	0.98	-2.82**
Covering-up (or masking) a sick animal in order to show and make the sale.	1.60	1.57	0.77	1.64	0.65	-0.40	1.60	0.72	1.55	0.69	0.25
Parent who was most knowledgeable about livestock and would not render aid to help a child with animal. The parent was washing his child's animal-while the child rested.	1.59	1.68	0.71	1.48	0.87	1.01	1.59	0.73	1.73	1.01	-0.55

Table 2 (continued)

Statements	Overall	Teacher n=37		Agent n=33			Male n=57		Female n=9		
	M	M	SD	M	SD	t*	M	SD	M	SD	t*
Glue on hair to cover up active ring worm and spray over with "show black".	1.47	1.30	0.74	1.67	0.92	-1.85	1.43	0.86	1.73	0.79	-1.06
Sprinkling dust and/or "wetting" on animals to increase weight.	1.43	1.51	0.80	1.33	0.54	1.09	1.43	0.68	1.45	0.82	-0.10
Steroid use to increase muscling.	1.40	1.57	0.92	1.21	0.42	2.02**	1.47	0.80	1.09	0.30	1.53
Extension agents allowing diseased animals in the show (e.g. Foot rot in sheep).	1.31	1.38	0.79	1.24	0.50	0.84	1.29	0.65	1.45	0.82	-0.73
Giving pop or beer to an animal to fill it out and make its conformation more correct.	1.29	1.35	0.68	1.21	0.48	0.98	1.31	0.63	1.18	0.40	0.65
Carding the wool on sheep. Actually have seen animals bleeding from the use of wool card.	1.27	1.24	0.49	1.30	0.68	-0.42	1.24	0.57	1.45	0.69	-1.10
Placing ice in sheep's rectum.	1.26	1.32	0.58	1.18	0.46	1.13	1.24	0.51	1.36	0.67	-0.70
Injection of mineral or vegetable oil under the hide to alter confirmation.	1.24	1.24	0.44	1.24	0.61	0.01	1.26	0.55	1.18	0.40	0.44
Switching of lamb's ear tags after showing in order to save a high quality grand champion from the butcher house and living to show another day.	1.24	1.22	0.63	1.27	0.63	-0.38	1.28	0.64	1.18	0.40	0.47
Switching animals after check-in.	1.21	1.14	0.42	1.30	0.64	-1.32	1.22	0.50	1.27	0.65	-0.28
Use of injectable fluids under the hide and in muscle.	1.20	1.22	0.48	1.18	0.46	0.03	1.24	0.51	1.00	0.00	1.57

Table 2 (continued)

Statements	Overall	Teacher n=37		Agent n=33			Male n=57		Female n=9		
	M	M	SD	M	SD	t*	M	SD	M	SD	t*
Using rubbing alcohol on market lambs after irritating the skin with a curry-comb to "Brace" lambs. This burning sensation caused lambs to "brace".	1.19	1.30	0.62	1.06	0.24	2.06**	1.17	0.46	1.27	0.65	-0.62
Switching animals between show and sale.	1.17	1.14	0.42	1.21	0.60	-0.63	1.21	0.52	1.09	0.30	0.71
Giving "nose candy" to another exhibitor's animal.	1.14	1.08	0.36	1.22	0.66	-1.09	1.17	0.57	1.00	0.00	1.00
Pumping air under hide.	1.09	1.08	0.28	1.09	0.46	-0.11	1.10	0.41	1.00	0.00	0.84
Sewing weights into sheep's blanket to make animal weigh more during weigh-in.	1.07	1.11	0.39	1.03	0.17	1.05	1.03	0.18	1.27	0.65	-2.40**

Rating Scale: 4=Frequently Observed, 3=Occasionally Observed, 2=Very Seldom Observed, 1=Never Observed

*df=68 **t-value significant at .05 level

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine frequency of unethical practices in exhibiting animals as observed by West Virginia extension agents and high school agriculture teachers. It also was conducted to provide information to all individuals who are involved with youth livestock exhibitions.

Methodology

Population of the Study

The respondents for this study (N=70) consisted of extension agents and high school agriculture teachers in West Virginia on the current mailing lists from the West Virginia University Extension Service headquarters and the West Virginia University Agriculture Education (2000) who have youth livestock responsibilities. There were 37 agents and 33 teachers that participated in the study.

Design, Instrumentation and Data Collection

The data were collected using the descriptive method of research. Information was collected from the population via a two-part mail questionnaire. The first mailing contained a letter of introduction explaining the purpose of the study and a survey form on which each extension agent and agriculture teacher was asked to identify the five most unethical practices that they have witnessed at a youth livestock exhibit.

Information obtained on the initial questionnaire was reviewed and sorted, similar responses were combined, and whenever needed, statements were edited without altering the meaning. The responses were grouped to form a second questionnaire, which included every

statement that was mentioned by at least one respondent to be a major unethical practice that was witnessed at a youth livestock exhibit. This second questionnaire asked the respondents to rate 58 identified unethical practices on a Lickert-type scale, (1= never observed, 2= very seldom observed, 3= occasionally observed and 4= frequently observed) for their observations of the 58 practices. The researcher and his advisor signed the personalized letter. A postage paid, self-addressed envelope was provided to encourage returns. The cover letter thanked those who participated and explained the importance of their responses.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSpc) at West Virginia University. Descriptive data were analyzed in the form of percentages, measures of central tendency, and frequencies. Based on standard deviations, frequencies and means, data were recorded and reported in tabular form. A descriptive narrative was used in combination with the tabulated figures to explain the findings.

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

Faculty members at West Virginia University examined the second phase mail questionnaire for content and face validity. Internal consistency was determined by calculating Cronbach's alpha. The reliability of the instrument was 0.94.

Summary and Conclusions

Demographics

The population consisted of seventy extension agents and agriculture teachers. Fifty-seven were male and nine were female. Four of the respondents did not report their gender. Mean years of experience for extension agents were 18.6 years and for high school agriculture teachers the mean 12.9 years. Years of experience ranged from 0-32 years in both professions.

Mean Ratings of Unethical Practices Observed at Youth Livestock Exhibitions by West Virginia Extension Agents and Agriculture Teachers by Profession and by Gender.

There were three statements that received an overall mean of 3.00 or higher. All three practices involved parents and adults. The adults either were talking about other exhibitors or doing the work for the child. Of the 58 statements, nine received mean scores of 2.51 ("very seldom observed" to "frequently observed") or higher. Sixteen of the statements received mean scores of 1.47 ("very seldom" to "never observed") or less by the respondents. Extension agents observed 33 practices at a higher frequency than agriculture teachers. Twelve statements were reported at a higher frequency by females than by males with a significance of 0.05 or less. The statements included things such as talking about judges, illegal ownership issues and parents paying high prices for animals.

Conclusion: There are unethical practices in West Virginia concerning cruelty to animals but these practices are not a problem that has a high rate of occurrence. The practices that occur more often are those concerning adults and parents, whether they are talking about a judge or trying to buy a first place animal. Females observe unethical practices more frequently than do males, and extension agents observe unethical practices more frequently than do agriculture teachers.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Extension Agents should conduct an educational workshop regarding livestock ethics for 4-H club leaders and parents that help with youth livestock projects.
2. 4-H leaders should educate 4-H members about unethical practices associated with preparing and exhibiting livestock.
3. Agriculture teachers should educate their students about unethical practices associated with preparing and exhibiting livestock.
4. Agriculture teachers should conduct an educational workshop regarding livestock ethics for parents of students with livestock supervised agriculture experience programs regarding unethical practices associated with preparing and exhibiting livestock.
5. An educational pamphlet should be constructed and provided to those who have any involvement with youth livestock projects or supervised agriculture experience programs.
6. State representatives of both 4-H and Agricultural Education should be informed about the existing unethical practices related to youth livestock exhibitions and potential problems.
7. The findings of this study should be presented in the *Journal of Agricultural Education*, the *Journal of Extension* or *The Agricultural Education Magazine*.
8. Results of this study should be presented at state, regional and national meetings and research conferences of both extension agents and agriculture teachers.
9. Findings of this study should be sent to all agriculture teachers and extension agents in West Virginia.

REFERENCES

Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., & Razavich, A. (1996). Introduction to research in education (5th ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Benniga, J.S. (1990). Moral character and civic education in the elementary school. Teachers College Press, 42-64.

Coffey, M., & Goodwin, J.L. (1995). Ethics in exhibiting and showing livestock--facing reality. The Agricultural Education Magazine, 68, 10-11.

Dietrich, I., (1967). Poor damn janeth. Middleton, WI: Bascom House Publishing Company, Incorporated.

Official Manual. National FFA Organization (1999-2000).

Goodwin, J., Briers, G., Murphy, T. (1999). Measuring the ethical cognition effect of a videotape livestock show ethics education program. National Agriculture Education Research Meetings, 26, 95-107.

Goodwin, Jeff (1994). A question of ethics [videotape]. (Available from Instructional Material Service, Mail Stop 2588, Texas A&M, College Station, TX 77843-2588, (409) 845-6601).

Goodwin, Jeff (1995). A step beyond: A question of ethics [videotape]. (Available from Instructional Material Service, Mail Stop 2588, Texas A&M, College Station, TX 77843-2588, (409) 845-6601).

Goodwin, Jeff (1996). The line in the sand [videotape]. (Available from Instructional Material Service, Mail Stop 2588, Texas A&M, College Station, TX 77843-2588, (409) 845-6601).

Josephson Institute [On-line] www.josephsoninstitute.org/

Kolberg, L. (1970). Education for justice: A modern statement of the platonic view. In N.F. Sizer & T.R. Sizer (Eds.) Moral education: Five lectures (pp. 57-83). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kolberg, L. (1984). The psychology of moral development. New York: Harper & Row.

LCI Technical Index [On – line] www.lcionline.org.html

Marks, R. (personal communication, November, 2000)

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (9th ed.). (1991). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.

Miller, L., & Smith, K. (1983) . Handling nonresponse issues. Journal of Extension, 21, 45-50.

National 4-H [On-line] www.4-h.org/members/index.html

Price, M. (personal communication, December, 2000)

Rodrigquez, R. (1995). The role of USDA in residue avoidance. National youth livestock program ethics symposium conference proceedings. (pp.114-117). Livestock Conservation Institute, 1910 Lyda Drive, Bowling Green, Kentucky 42104 5809.

Wagner, W. (personal communication, September, 2000)

Wessel, T. and Wessel, M. (1982) "4-H: An American idea, 1900-1980." A history of 4-H. Chevy Chase, MD. National 4-H Council. 1982.

Woloshuk, J. (personal communication, October, 2000)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Cover Letter to Extension Agents for First Questionnaire

Dear Extension Personnel (responsible for youth livestock exhibitions):

I am conducting a thesis study to determine the ethical practices in exhibiting animals as perceived by West Virginia extension agents and high school agriculture teachers. This research is in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's of Science degree in Agricultural and Environmental Education. In recent years unethical practices at animal exhibits has become a concern. My hope is to gather information that will be useful to agriculture teachers and extension agents as they educate their clientele.

I have enclosed a survey and ask that you identify, in your opinion, the five major unethical practices you have *personally observed* at West Virginia livestock exhibits by 4-H &/or FFA members. Your participation is completely voluntary and you may chose not to answer any question that makes you uncomfortable. The only responses that will be reported will be group responses. You may choose not to participate if you do so please indicate on the survey. Also, if you are not directly involved with the youth livestock shows in your area please return your survey blank. Your opinion will be combined with responses from other extension agents and agriculture teachers throughout the state of West Virginia, and the resulting list will then be sent back to you for your final evaluation and rating.

I would like to urge you to complete and return the survey to us by October 18, 2000. I thank you in advance for participating and sharing your insights with us.

Sincerely,

Jared Nestor
Graduate Student

Stacy A. Gartin
Professor
Agricultural and Environmental Education

Enclosure

APPENDIX B

Cover Letter to Agriculture Teachers for First Questionnaire

Dear (Name):

I am conducting a thesis study to determine the ethical practices in exhibiting animals as perceived by West Virginia extension agents and high school agriculture teachers. This research is in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's of Science degree in Agricultural and Environmental Education. In recent years unethical practices at animal exhibits has become a concern. My hope is to gather information that will be useful to agriculture teachers and extension agents as they educate their clientele.

I have enclosed a survey and ask that you identify, in your opinion, the five major unethical practices you have *personally observed* at West Virginia livestock exhibits by 4-H &/or FFA members. Your participation is completely voluntary and you may chose not to answer any question that makes you uncomfortable. The only responses that will be reported will be group responses. You may choose not to participate if you do so please indicate on the survey. Also, if you are not directly involved with the youth livestock shows in your area please return your survey blank. Your opinion will be combined with responses from other extension agents and agriculture teachers throughout the state of West Virginia, and the resulting list will then be sent back to you for your final evaluation and rating.

I would like to urge you to complete and return the survey to us by October 18, 2000. I thank you in advance for participating and sharing your insights with us.

Sincerely,

Jared Nestor
Graduate Student

Stacy A. Gartin
Professor
Agricultural and Environmental Education

Enclosure

APPENDIX C

First Phase Questionnaire

UNETHICAL PRACTICES IN EXHIBITING ANIMALS AS OBSERVED BY WEST VIRGINIA EXTENSION AGENTS AND HIGH SCHOOL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS

Please list below the major unethical practices that you have personally observed at West Virginia livestock exhibits by 4-H and FFA members.

1. _____
   _____
   _____
2. _____
   _____
   _____
3. _____
   _____
   _____
4. _____
   _____
   _____
5. _____
   _____
   _____

Please return this form in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope by October 16, 2000 your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

APPENDIX D

Cover Letter for Second Questionnaire to Extension Agents

Dear Extension Personnel (responsible for youth livestock exhibitions):

A few weeks ago, a questionnaire form was sent to you requesting that you identify the five major unethical practices you have personally observed at West Virginia livestock exhibits by 4-H &/or FFA members as part of my Masters thesis. When the survey forms were received from all respondents, statements were edited, condensed and combined into 58 statements, which make up the final questionnaire.

On the enclosed questionnaire we are asking you to circle the appropriate number which represents your opinion. Although your participation is voluntary, we are asking you to please take a few minutes of your time to complete the survey instrument. If you feel uncomfortable with any of the statements you may chose not to answer. You will notice a code number at the bottom of the questionnaire. This code will be used to facilitate additional mailings to you if necessary.

Enclosed with the questionnaire is a self-addressed stamped envelope for your convenience. If we might have your response by November 8, 2000, we would be most appreciative.

We thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Jared Nestor
Graduate Student

Stacy A. Gartin
Professor
Agricultural and Environmental Education

Enclosure

APPENDIX E

Cover Letter for Second Questionnaire to Agriculture Teachers

Dear (Name):

A few weeks ago, a questionnaire form was sent to you requesting that you identify the five major unethical practices you have personally observed at West Virginia livestock exhibits by 4-H &/or FFA members as part of my Masters thesis. When the survey forms were received from all respondents, statements were edited, condensed and combined into 58 statements, which make up the final questionnaire.

On the enclosed questionnaire we are asking you to circle the appropriate number which represents your opinion. Although your participation is voluntary, we are asking you to please take a few minutes of your time to complete the survey instrument. If you feel uncomfortable with any of the statements you may chose not to answer. You will notice a code number at the bottom of the questionnaire. This code will be used to facilitate additional mailings to you if necessary.

Enclosed with the questionnaire is a self-addressed stamped envelope for your convenience. If we might have your response by November 8, 2000, we would be most appreciative.

We thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Jared Nestor
Graduate Student

Stacy A. Gartin
Professor
Agricultural and Environmental Education

Enclosure

APPENDIX F

Second Questionnaire

UNETHICAL PRACTICES IN EXHIBITING ANIMALS AS OBSERVED BY WEST VIRGINIA EXTENSION AGENTS AND HIGH SCHOOL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS

Do you have responsibilities with youth livestock exhibitions in your area? No Yes

If you answered ***yes*** please complete the rest of the questionnaire. If you answered ***no*** please return the blank questionnaire.

PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH MOST ACCURATELY CORRESPONDS WITH YOUR OBSERVATION OF THE OCCURRENCES OF THE PRACTICES LISTED BELOW.

1. Never observed
2. Very seldom observed
3. Occasionally observed
4. Frequently observed

1.	Using sedative type drugs to calm show animals	1 2 3 4
2.	Having animal drink a great deal of water before weigh in	1 2 3 4
3.	Allowing hogs to lay in the heat without fans or water	1 2 3 4
4.	Withholding feed and water from animal to lower weight and make animal appear trim	1 2 3 4
5.	Feeding of salt or salty feed to animals so they drink more water to make them weigh more	1 2 3 4
6.	Icing animals with cold packs and ice to firm the fat	1 2 3 4
7.	Sewing weights into sheep's blanket to make animal weigh more during weigh-in	1 2 3 4
8.	Deception regarding project animals age and identity	1 2 3 4
9.	Alteration of the hair, hooves or skin by the use of paint, oils, powder, hair dye coloring, etc.	1 2 3 4
10.	Covering-up (or masking) a sick animal in order to show and make the sale	1 2 3 4
11.	Glue on hair to cover up active ring worm and spray over with "show black"	1 2 3 4
12.	Changing hair color	1 2 3 4
13.	Sprinkling dust and/or "wetting" on animals to increase weight	1 2 3 4
14.	Talking about the other children and judges (continuation of what they hear at home)	1 2 3 4

15. Adults and youth questioning the integrity of the livestock judge because he/she chose one breed over another, etc 1 2 3 4
16. "Lobbying" judges 1 2 3 4
17. Politics, favoritism, extension agents and ag teachers showing preference for certain members 1 2 3 4
18. Extension agents allowing diseased animals in the show (eg. Foot rot in sheep). 1 2 3 4
19. Carding the wool on sheep. Actually have seen animals bleeding from the use of wool card 1 2 3 4
20. Hitting and abusing uncooperative animals during or after show 1 2 3 4
21. Shrinking of fully grown animals to make them lose weight 1 2 3 4
22. Letting animals stand in the hot sun unattended for long periods of time 1 2 3 4
23. Small animals, especially rabbits, being unattended for days at a time 1 2 3 4
24. Washing animals in cold water on cold nights 1 2 3 4
25. Breaking animal to lead with tractor or 4-wheeler 1 2 3 4
26. Lambs standing in trimming chutes "blocked up in front" for hours 1 2 3 4
27. Extreme tail docking 1 2 3 4
28. Placing ice in sheep's rectum 1 2 3 4
29. Pulling a lamb's head in the air to the point that its feet leave the ground after being instructed not to 1 2 3 4
30. Running animals to ensure they make weight limit prior to weigh in at the fair (animals too heavy) 1 2 3 4
31. Using rubbing alcohol on market lambs after irritating the skin with a currycomb to "Brace" lambs. This burning sensation caused lambs to "brace" 1 2 3 4
32. Giving pop or beer to an animal to fill it out and make its conformation more correct 1 2 3 4
33. Steroid use to increase muscling 1 2 3 4
34. Injection of mineral or vegetable oil under the hide to alter confirmation 1 2 3 4
35. Use of injectable fluids under the hide and in muscle 1 2 3 4
36. Pumping air under hide 1 2 3 4
37. The grooming of show animals by professionals rather than youth 1 2 3 4
38. Parents or teachers getting animals ready to show. 1 2 3 4
39. Letting semi-professional groomers and trainers in the show area where they can influence the animal being exhibited 1 2 3 4
40. Youth showing animals which they do not actually own, showing for someone on a contractual basis 1 2 3 4
41. Switching animals immediately before fair date, this means they are showing an animal they didn't actually raise 1 2 3 4
42. Exhibiting project animals that 4-Hers have not previously cared for or managed. Eg. Animals kept by a breeder or another adult prior to exhibition by youth 1 2 3 4

43. Purchasing an animal at another county fair then entering that animal in own county fair as if your raised the animal. (This practice ceased after we started ear tagging animals) 1 2 3 4
44. Youth knowing very little about the animal they take into the show ring (ex what it was fed, cost, medication given- It is just a way to make money.) 1 2 3 4
45. Retagging animals to replace with another animal that has been purchased 1 2 3 4
46. Switching of lamb ear tags after showing in order to save a high quality grand champion from the butcher house and living to show another day. 1 2 3 4
47. Exhibiting & showing animals which have not been cared for by the owner during the required period of time 1 2 3 4
48. Switching animals after check-in 1 2 3 4
49. Switching animals between show and sale 1 2 3 4
50. Parent who was most knowledgeable about livestock and would not render aid to help a child with an impaired animal. The parent was washing his child's animal-while the child rested. 1 2 3 4
51. The exhibiting of as many different animals as possible solely to make money on them at livestock sale 1 2 3 4
52. Registering all animals in farm name so kids have many to choose from, instead of owning and working with one that is their own 1 2 3 4
53. Parents spend thousands of dollars for an animal, do all the work including at the fair, and the kid wins 1 2 3 4
54. Paying extreme prices for a feeder pig or calf just to win. This doesn't teach sound production agriculture 1 2 3 4
55. Alcohol consumption by exhibitors 1 2 3 4
56. Generally not caring for the animals during the fair shows that they didn't do it at home 1 2 3 4
57. Giving "nose candy" to another exhibitor's animal 1 2 3 4
58. Buying back animal in someone else's name 1 2 3 4

Demographics

Years of professional experience including 2000-2001: ____

MALE ( ) FEMALE ( )

Comments:

VITA

August 17, 1977 . . . . . .Born, Philippi, WV

June, 1995 . . . . . High School Graduation
Philip Barbour High School
Philippi, WV

May, 1999 . . . . . BSA in Animal and Veterinary Science
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV

May, 1999 – Present . . . . . Graduate Student
Agricultural and Environmental Education
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV

May 22, 1999 . . . . . Married, Kimberly L. Cooper

May, 1999 – Present . . . . . .Research Assistant I
Animal and Veterinary Science
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV