

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO COPY

In presenting this paper in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this paper for scholarly purposes may be granted by my major professor, or, in his absence, by the Director of Libraries. It is understood that any copying or publication of this paper for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature Charles E. Egan
Date June 7, 1976

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PROCEDURES AND ATTITUDES OF PARTICIPANTS IN
4-H BEEF PROJECTS IN STILLWATER COUNTY

by

CHARLES EVANS EGAN

A professional paper submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Agricultural Education

Approved:

Max L. Anderson
Chairperson, Graduate Committee

Max L. Anderson
Head, Major Department

Henry L. Parsons
Graduate Dean

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

June, 1976

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper is dedicated to the authors wife, Carolyn, who offered encouragement and understanding throughout the process of completing the requirements of the Master of Science degree at Montana State University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.	vi
ABSTRACT.	viii
 Chapter	
1. THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING	1
INTRODUCTION.	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.	1
NEED FOR THE STUDY.	2
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY.	4
DEFINITIONS	4
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	5
DESIGN OF THE STUDY	10
COLLECTION AND MEASUREMENT.	11
ANALYSIS OF DATA.	11
TIME SCHEDULE	11
OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	12
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES	12
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.	13
 2. PRESENTATION OF DATA.	14
RESPONDENTS INVOLVEMENT IN THE 4-H	
BEEF PROJECTS	14
MANAGEMENT FACTORS OF THE BEEF PROJECT.	16
THE BEEF BREEDING PROJECT	25
THE MARKET BEEF PROJECT	29
STILLWATER COUNTY 4-H CARCASS PROGRAM	32
EVALUATION OF THE 4-H BEEF PROJECTS AT THE	
4-H FAIR.	36
 3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	50
 APPENDIXES	
A. Comments About Lack of Participation in Carcass	
Program.	55
B. Comments About Judging Systems	56
C. Comments About Show Order by Respondents	57

Appendixes	Page
D. Transmittal Letter	59
E. Questionnaire.	60
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	69

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1	The Respondents Involvement in Years in the Beef Project.	15
2	Respondents Involvement with Beef Projects.	15
3	Future Planning of Projects by Respondents.	17
4	Basis for Selection of Animals.	17
5	Selection or Designation Date	18
6	Respondents Views About Positive Identification	19
7	Factors that Influence Feeding Programs	20
8	Respondents Views About Treatment of Unmanageable Animals	21
9	How Respondents View our Current Beef Records	22
10	Breeding Beef Record Content.	23
11	Views About Participation in Showmanship.	24
12	Length of Breeding Beef Projects.	25
13	Respondents Opinion of Exhibit Size	26
14	Views About the Use of Tranquilizers.	27
15	Importance of Prior Measurements for Breeding Beef. . .	28
16	What Should be the Basic Requirement of a Market Beef Project.	29
17	Number of Animals to Include in the Market Beef Project	30
18	Environmental Factors Effecting Gain.	31
19	Use of Tranquilizers for Market Beef.	32

TABLE		Page
20	Reasons for Nonparticipation in Carcass Program	33
21	When Should Carcass Animals be Designated	34
22	Usefulness of Carcass Data.	35
23	Use of Live Placing in Final Carcass Placing.	35
24	Necessity of Live Placing for Carcass Animals	36
25	Judging System Preference	37
26	Factors of Selection for Market Beef Animals.	39
27	Factors of Selection for Breeding Beef Animals.	41
28	Respondents Opinion of People Used as Judges.	42
29	Experience and Qualities of Judges.	44
30	Respondent Views About Selecting Champion Market Beef Animals.	45
31	Respondent Views About Selecting Champion Breeding Beef Animals.	46
32	Show Order for Market Beef Animals.	47
33	Need for Prior Measurements	48
34	Respondents Views of Awards Program at the Stillwater 4-H Fair.	49

ABSTRACT

"An analysis of the Procedures and Attitudes of Participants in 4-H Beef Projects in Stillwater County," serves as a summary of how 4-H members select, manage, evaluate and show 4-H beef animals.

The study was conducted by questionnaire asking response from the total population involved in 4-H beef projects in 1971.

Results of the study indicate members plan their projects on an annual basis with selection of animals guided by personal research as well as influence of others. Nutritional aspects of the feeding period were set up according to feed availability and past experience.

Participants supported the existing record keeping system suggested for use in Montana 4-H market and breeding projects. Those sections of the record thought to be most important were feed records, profit and loss statements, individual production records and a project narrative.

Prior measurements for breeding animals that could be considered during fair evaluation were individual production, yearling weight, weaning weight, birth date, feeding program and nursing index.

Respondents had previous experience with the single judge, team judging and multi-station judging. A majority favored the multi-station system as a way of involving more people to lessen the chances of individuals influencing final placings and promote fairness in evaluation. Selection factors thought to be important when evaluating market beef animals were size, length, structural soundness, growthiness, muscling of the round and finish. Factors of selection considered important for breeding beef animals were composition, structural soundness, growth, general appearance, functional efficiency, size and age.

Data suggests program emphasis should encourage long range planning that would involve family members, leaders, and extension agents to promote further experience and knowledge for the 4-H member.

Educational programs integrated into existing activities that stress research findings in genetics, nutrition, and management would help members increase skill throughout the total project experience.

Respondents favored livestock specialists, meats specialists, or county agents as qualified judges to evaluate livestock at the county fair. They felt judges should have experience, knowledge of the subject, training and be familiar with the method of judging.

The summary of data has been used as a guide for 4-H leaders in Stillwater County as they analyze and develop 4-H beef projects.

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

INTRODUCTION

4-H is a youth organization oriented toward learning by doing under the direction and supervision of volunteer leaders. Various projects serve as learning tools to practice suggested ways of selection, production, and evaluation.

One project area is livestock including marketing and breeding. The program specialists of the Montana Cooperative Extension Service suggest evaluation programs in order to properly develop new programs and maintain existing ones.

The intent of this study is to contact participating leaders, parents, and members actively involved in the market and breeding beef projects in Stillwater County during a specified time and through a mailed questionnaire, determine their views about planning, selection of animals, management and the project and evaluation at the Stillwater County Fair.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

4-H members in Stillwater County have completed market and breeding beef projects since 1923. Aside from project evaluation at the county fair, planning committees had not undertaken a formal evaluation. The

purpose of the 4-H projects is to encourage members to own and care for one or more animals while learning the processes of production, record keeping and marketing. Eventhough members are encouraged, they have the option to change selection and management of each project.

This study will determine the views of leaders, parents, and members involved in the 1971 4-H beef projects in Stillwater County about their project activity and provide direction that may be helpful for the development of the member and his future participation in projects.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

Limited research has been conducted relative to the 4-H beef project in Montana. Fifteen thousand young people belong to 4-H in Montana with 2886 choosing beef as their major project in the 1975 project year. Educational programs for members provide experience in selection, nutrition, management, veterinary science, fitting, showing evaluation and marketing of animals. Parents and volunteer leaders through their education and experience provide this guidance. Planning committees composed of 4-H leaders, parents, and representatives of the industry develop ways of improving methods of teaching skills helpful for the future participation in the livestock industry.

One factor influencing change in selection of livestock is the method of evaluation used at county fairs. Three methods have been used

to express the views of the consumer, the industry, the economist and the researcher. Traditionally, a single judge has been used with results being based on one man's ability and opinion. A number of persons associated with the cattle industry have suggested the system be expanded to include a team effort involving more than one person, each contributing to the final result. The 1969 International Cattleman's Expo, Las Vegas, Nevada introduced the multi-station system. The system faced some problems as to level of acceptance. Use of the system did offer a broad spectrum of experience being injected into the final placing. It did improve the solidarity and unity and allowed leaders to feel more secure in their efforts. The new system involved several qualified individuals with final placing based on subjective measurements and subjective evaluation of live animals. The method was a radical change from the traditional method which considered the merits of the animal by visual appraisal alone. Breeders were reluctant about the system as there was a risk of exposure of weaknesses that normally would be overlooked.

Montana first used the multi-station system of judging at the 1970 Montana Winter Fair at Bozeman, Montana. Exhibitors goals became ambiguous as they wanted to win and also wanted the truth about their animals. Modifications of the system were used at the Stillwater 4-H Fair and the Carbon County Youth Fair in 1970. Since that time, variations of the original system have been used at the State Fair in Great Falls, Midland

Empire Fair in Billings, Northern International Livestock Exposition in Billings and various county fairs in Montana.

There has been no definite pattern of evaluation established for Montana. Planners rely on experiences of the single judge and validity of information they view at other livestock shows for the basis for change. Dissatisfaction and lack of continuity clearly indicate the need for "An Analysis of the procedures and attitudes of participants in 4-H beef projects in Stillwater County."

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to determine how 4-H members select, manage, evaluate, and show 4-H market and breeding beef projects in Stillwater County and how parents and leaders involved in the 4-H beef project view these facets of the project.

DEFINITIONS

4-H beef project: A market or breeding beef enterprise recognized by the Montana Cooperative Extension Service.

4-H beef program: The over all market or breeding beef project including all aspects from selection to market.

Market beef: Beef animals fed and marketed for slaughter.

Breeding beef: Beef animals fed and managed for reproduction purposes.

1971 Club Year: The regular 4-H club year beginning October 1, 1970 and ending September 30, 1971.

Member: A 4-H member between ages 10 - 21 actively enrolled in a 4-H beef project.

Leader: A volunteer adult designated as a 4-H beef leader.

Leader-parent: A mother or father of a 4-H member who serves as a 4-H beef leader.

Parent: Mother or father of a 4-H member enrolled in the 4-H beef project.

Multi-station: System of livestock evaluation including several groups each evaluating on criteria of the animal.

Team judging: Two judges working together to make final decision about livestock placings.

Single judge: One judge alone making final decision about livestock placings.

Carcass program: The selection, management, care and data collection of animals to determine lean meat production.

Management: Those factors dealing with planning, selection, feeding, identification, handling and records.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Livestock production is a major part of the economy of Montana giving support to the numbers of 4-H members enrolled in beef projects.

Livestock projects vary considerably according to the interest of individual members. N. A. Jacobsen, Extension Livestock Specialist, states "The basic concept of the project is to provide the experience in feeding and marketing of market beef and understanding the practical methods of producing and marketing breeding beef cattle (1).

The type of livestock now being exhibited by 4-H members has changed. An article in National 4-H News points out that "We are now getting the industry-preferred trim, meaty type, both in straight and cross breeds, including exotics" (2).

Club literature indicates there are several requirements the Montana Extension Service suggest as needed for the projects (3). Each member enrolled in the market project will:

1. Own or have available one or more good type steers or spayed heifers.
2. Develop leadership, initiative, self reliance and sportsmanship through club activity.
3. Learn to accept responsibility by having an animal to care for regularly.
4. Learn the principles of livestock nutrition and how to balance rations to feed your animals.
5. Learn to train and handle animals safely.
6. Learn how to take care of equipment.
7. Learn to search for improved methods of doing a job.
8. Learn to evaluate several methods of doing a job.
9. Gain an appreciation and understanding for research and how to use it.
10. Learn to accept the results of one's work and how to use this in management and planning the next goal.
11. Develop an inquiring mind and a desire to seek out the scientific principles involved in raising and marketing livestock.
12. To stimulate interest among Montana youth in the livestock industry.

13. To provide an opportunity for members to establish livestock businesses of their own.

14. To provide an opportunity to earn money while learning a business.

Certain restrictions by some county policies prevent older members from showing more than 1 or 2 animals, however, these may be sold on the open market if the member chooses.

Breeding projects also must meet minimum requirements in order for members to gain as much experience as possible. This project is best suited to farms and ranches with plenty of pasture or range and hay where cattle can be made profitable. The objectives include (4):

1. Own or have available one or more good female calves, heifers, or cows.
2. Other additional work a member may do after some experience is gained involves expansion of project size.
 - In beef breeding, arrange to continue on a partnership basis with parents and develop own herd.
 - Exhibit calves produced.
 - Exhibit breeding animals owned.
 - Get registration papers in members name on purebred stock and maintain papers on desirable animals. Breed to a purebred sire.
 - Keep a complete record of the amount of feed fed, expenses and receipts on all beef cattle on the farm or ranch. Consult with a local livestock creditor about an annual statement.
 - Expand into a self-determined project.
 - Study other factors involved, in addition to visual, in the selection of breeding animals.

Selection of the project becomes difficult for beef producers if they do not have the knowledge and experience necessary to analyze available data and make a decision as to the most desirable animal for their situation. Grant M. Esplin, Livestock Specialist, Utah State

University, suggests heifers be selected from a large number of high producing cows. The process of final selection then comes after the animal has produced a calf and proves being capable of reproducing those characteristics important to the producer (5).

The factors that determine the rate of improvement we can make from selection are (6):

1. How accurately we can observe and measure these traits.
2. The heritability of the trait.
3. How much selection pressure we can expect for any one trait. In other words, how much better is the individual selected than the herd average?

The records 4-H members are expected to keep are designed to provide a basis for decision making. The following are functions of decision making (7):

1. Observation--This involves gathering ideas, getting facts, identifying the situation or problem and drawing on past experience.
2. Analysis--Facts alone are useless. They must be appraised and put in a useful framework.
3. Decision--Based upon an analysis of the facts, a decision is made. The most desirable way to achieve the goal is selected.
4. Action--The project is carried out by putting the decision into effect.
5. Accept responsibility for your decision and evaluate accomplishments.

Franklin Baker in a USDA Handbook for County Agents suggests the record keeping system is only as good as the information recorded. The system cannot replace good feeding and sound management programs. He should realize: (1) It is as accurate as the dates and measurements taken; (2) It is intended only to help select between cattle raised on

a given farm or ranch under the same environment and management practices, and should not be used to compare cattle raised under other conditions; and (3) the results come not from getting the facts, but from using them in a sound selection and breeding system (8). This study deals in part with what is important as selection factors and what records should be kept.

The Extension educational procedure is a series of steps or events leading toward an end. It emphasizes assisting people through educational means to analyze, appraise, and take action to bring about desired solutions (9). One of the times for evaluation each year comes with the exhibit at the fair. Some people question the validity of the fair program claiming it is inappropriate to use the traditional ways for livestock selection. Dr. A. D. Weber, Educator from Kansas State University, presented a challenge to the administrators of livestock shows when he said, "Now is the time to shift to a new decision-making process in beef cattle shows; one having both subjective and objective components, and attuned to modern beef production as influenced by science and technology" (10).

The Stillwater 4-H program has incorporated new innovations into the selection and evaluation programs. This study attempts to gather the views of respondents about some of these new concepts.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to survey the attitudes and judgment of those involved in the 4-H breeding and market beef projects in Stillwater County. The study was implemented December 21, 1971 with mailing of a survey to 198 participants in the beef program.

The survey was made with a questionnaire designed to cover the planning, selection, nutrition, care and handling, record systems and final project evaluation of the 4-H market and breeding beef projects in Stillwater County. The questionnaire was developed with the advice of the 4-H beef committee which included leaders of the beef projects. A series of questions was formulated. These were tested by choosing six people familiar with the 4-H program and asking them to complete the questionnaire. Each made comments about parts that were not clear.

It seemed appropriate to survey all people who actively participated as the number was manageable. Data gathering was done by mailing the questionnaire to 198 people or the total population which included the leaders, leader-parents, and members. The initial mailing was done November 29, 1971 using the mailing list and records of the Stillwater Extension Office. Respondents were asked to return the data by December 10, 1971. Chapter 2 gives a detailed analysis of the responses received. The questionnaire is included in the appendix.

COLLECTION AND MEASUREMENT

The source of data was the questionnaire. Respondents had opportunity to express opinion about questions by adding their comments in open end questions. The comments were included in the analysis of data. Respondents were not limited to the choices offered by the questionnaire. A scale of 1 - 5 was chosen as a continuum for the questions dealing with feeling about specific points of interest. A response of 1 on the scale meant not needed; 2 meant not important; 3 was undecided; 4 meant important; and 5 needed.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The questionnaires were returned to the Stillwater Extension Office. Each questionnaire was dated without identification of respondent. The data were tabulated and placed on tables that would allow review. Each type data were analyzed to indicate respondents views or opinion about issues effecting the 4-H beef projects. The summary of data served as a tool in the decision making process which did effect change in the Stillwater County 4-H beef project. There was no inter class or between class correlation attempted in this study.

TIME SCHEDULE

This study was timely in terms of development of the new techniques and setting priorities in program. The 4-H leaders in Stillwater County

were open to change but needed to know the opinion of parents and members before introducing new programs. The data from each phase of the study were carefully reviewed and analyzed before decisions about changing programs were made. Data collected using the above procedure will be presented in tabular form and described in some detail in Chapter 2.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study is intended to evaluate the attitudes and procedures from participants in 4-H market and breeding beef projects in Stillwater County.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

1. To determine how parents, members, and leaders view planning, selection, management, nutrition, care and evaluation of beef projects.
2. To evaluate the effectiveness of existing methods of project evaluation at the Stillwater 4-H fair.
3. To determine weaknesses in procedures used in conducting 4-H beef projects that may be improved through program emphasis and research in specific areas of interest.
4. To provide a basis for policy decisions relative to the 4-H beef program in Stillwater County.

5. To offer suggestions for programs in other counties in Montana.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Knowledge of the project is based on experience. When measuring feelings of people it is difficult to obtain a true indication of feeling over time as the response will be influenced by the latest experience and views at the given period of time.

There is some indication that parents probably influence the thoughts of their children on issues which they may not be totally familiar.

Chapter 2

PRESENTATION OF DATA

Data are divided into six major categories to facilitate presentation and analysis. These were: (1) the respondents involvement in 4-H beef projects, (2) management factors of the beef projects, (3) the breeding beef project, (4) the market beef project, (5) Stillwater County 4-H carcass program, and (6) evaluation of the 4-H beef projects at the fair.

The data provided a summary of how respondents viewed phases of the market and breeding beef program as it existed during the 1971 4-H club year. Additional comments were made by respondents to some of the questions were added when applicable.

RESPONDENTS INVOLVEMENT IN THE 4-H BEEF PROJECTS

The data collected provided necessary information about the respondents. This allowed the views to be categorized for analysis. Comparisons of views were made available through completion of the data.

Parents represented 66.2 percent of the respondents having 1 - 5 years experience with the 4-H beef project. Eighty-five and seven tenths percent of those involved as leaders but having no children enrolled in 4-H beef projects chose to participate in this study.

TABLE 1

THE RESPONDENTS INVOLVEMENT IN YEARS IN THE BEEF PROJECT
N=113

Years of involvement	Leader	Leader Parent	Parent	Member
Not shown		2	4	1
1 - 5 years	2	3	22	27
6 - 10 years	1	4	15	18
11 - 15 years		1	7	
16 - 20 years	1	1	1	
20 and over	2	1		
Respondents	6	12	49	46
Population questioned	7	28	74	89
Percent response	85.7	42.8	66.2	51.6
Ave.No. of years	13.0	10.0	6.06	4.6

The study involved both market and breeding projects. Data presented in Table 2 indicate how they were involved and the projects they were familiar with.

TABLE 2

RESPONDENTS INVOLVEMENT WITH BEEF PROJECTS
N=113

Type of Project	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Market Beef only	1	16.6	22	44.9	2	16.6	25	54.3	50	44.2
Breeding Beef only	2	33.3	3	6.1	-	-	2	4.3	7	6.2
Both projects	3	50.0	24	48.9	10	83.3	18	39.1	55	48.7
No indication							1	2.1	1	.8
Number responding	6		49		12		46		113	
Percent of total		5.3		43.3		10.6		40.7		99.9

Further review indicates 55 or 48.7 percent of all respondents were involved in both market and breeding beef projects. Fifty or 44.7 percent of the respondents were associated with the market beef projects.

Forty-nine or 43.3 percent of the parents responded to the questionnaire while 46 or 40.7 percent of the 4-H members responded.

MANAGEMENT FACTORS OF THE BEEF PROJECT

Management as related to this study deals with planning, selection, feeding, identification, handling and records. These factors depend on decisions made by the member with the help of parents, leaders and experience.

Planning of the beef project was a basic part of the total program for members. The members are encouraged to establish goals for both short term and long range operation of their beef enterprises. Respondents were asked to indicate the amount of time span they included in the project planning process.

Figures displayed in Table 3 indicate that 68 or 69.3 percent of the respondents plan on a yearly basis. Thirty-three or 80.0 percent of the members and 67.4 percent of the parents supported the year to year planning. All leaders indicated they encouraged planning two or more years in advance.

TABLE 3

FUTURE PLANNING OR PROJECTS BY RESPONDENTS
N=98

Planning period	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
year to year	-	-	29	67.4	6	60.0	33	80.0	68	69.3
two or more years	4	100.0	11	25.5	4	40.0	7	17.0	26	26.5
limited basis	-	-	3	6.9	-	-	1	2.0	4	4.0
Number responding	4		43		10		41		98	99.8
Mode	two or more		yearly		yearly		yearly		yearly	

The planning process is followed by the selection of an animal. The factors influencing the selection of animals appear in Table 4 with accompanying responses.

TABLE 4

BASIS FOR SELECTION TO ANIMALS
N=191

Selection Methods	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A Research on own	1	20.0	22	28.9	4	19.0	14	16.0	41	21.4
B Trial & Error			11	14.4	2	9.5	15	17.2	28	14.6
C Carcass Program			5	6.5	2	9.5	7	8.0	16	8.3
D Suggestion-other			10	13.1	3	14.2	24	27.5	37	19.3
E Fair Evaluation			15	19.7	5	23.8	17	19.5	37	19.3
F All of above	4	80.0	12	15.7	5	23.8	10	11.4	31	16.2
G None of above			1	1.3						
Number of responses	5		76		21		87		191	99.7
Mode	F		A		E - F		D		A	

The data in Table 4 shows 41 or 21.4 percent of all respondents base project selection on research they have done. Twenty-four or 22.5 percent of the members used the suggestions of others as the procedure they followed. Four or 80 percent of the leaders said they used all of the suggested factors of selection. It is interesting to note that 28.9 percent of the parents utilized research of their own for selecting 4-H beef projects for their children.

Respondents were asked when they felt animals should be designated as those to be shown at the 4-H fair as a part of the beef project.

TABLE 5
SELECTION OR DESIGNATION DATE
N=124

Designation Date	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A November 1			6	12.2			3	6.3	9	7.2
B January 1	13	50.0	39	79.5	6	50.0	17	36.1	65	52.4
C March 1	3	50.0	4	8.1	6	50.0	26	55.3	49	39.5
D July 1							1	2.1	1	.8
Number	6		49		12		47		124	99.9
Mode	B - C		B		B		C		B	

Data in Table 5 show that 65 or fifty-two and four tenths percent of the 124 responses indicated January 1 would be a desirable time. Twenty-six or 55.3 percent of the members favored the March 1 date,

however, 39 or 79.5 percent of the parents felt January 1 would be best.

Competitive events and market beef sales require some kind of animal identification. The respondents were asked to give their opinion as to which animals should be tagged for positive identification.

TABLE 6
RESPONDENTS VIEWS ABOUT POSITIVE IDENTIFICATION
N=119

Animals to be Identified	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A All Breeding Beef Only	1	14.2	4	7.5			3	6.0	8	6.7
B All Market Beef Only			21	39.6	6	50.0	17	36.0	44	36.9
C Market & Breeding	6	85.7	28	52.8	6	50.0	26	55.0	66	55.4
D Not at all							1	2.1	1	.8
Responses	7		53		12		47		119	99.8
Mode Responses	C		C		B - C		C		C	

As data in Table 6 shows, 66 or 55.4 percent of the responses favored some sort of positive identification of all market and breeding animals. This choice was made by a majority in each category. The two written responses favored identification with one pointing out that breeding animals were marked with tatoo assuming they were registered or this was practiced by each owner.

Feeding programs vary between projects. An effort was made to determine how rations were formulated and what influenced the choice of ingredients as a source of nutrition for the animals involved in the project.

TABLE 7
FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE FEEDING PROGRAMS
N=147

Influences on feeding	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A past experience	2	100.0	32	59.2	8	50.0	28	37.3	70	47.6
B feed analysis & ration building			8	14.8	5	31.2	11	14.6	24	16.3
C dads' ideas			5	9.2	1	6.2	29	38.6	35	23.8
D information of dealers & other			9	16.6	2	12.5	7	9.3	18	12.2
Number Responses	2		54		16		75		147	
Mode	A		A		A		C		A	

The most important factor influencing feed programs as shown by data in Table 7 was past experience. This was indicated by 70 or 47.6 percent of those responding. Leaders, parents, and leader-parents likewise felt this was an important factor. Twenty-nine or 38.6 percent of the members said they were influenced by "dads' ideas."

Unmanageable animals cause problems in the show ring and around spectators during the 4-H fair. Data in Table 8 presents the views of

respondents about the treatment of animals which may be difficult to handle while in the show ring. Respondents were not sympathetic toward the unmanageable animal. Fifty-three or 26.2 percent of all respondents felt they should not be brought to the Stillwater 4-H Fair. Leaders and those responding as leader-parents felt the animals should be sent home if they could not be managed by the members. Additional comments pointed out that respondents felt animals should be sent home if they could not be settled with time or by tranquilizers administered during the fair program. Many pointed out they did not wish to have unruly animals tied in the barn with tame animals.

TABLE 8
RESPONDENTS VIEWS ABOUT TREATMENT OF UNMANAGEABLE ANIMALS
N=202

Treatment of unmanageable animals	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A tranquilize			9	10.2	2	10.0	14	16.0	25	12.3
B handle best way possible	2	28.5	12	13.6	2	10.0	10	11.4	26	12.8
C not be brought to the fair	2	28.5	27	30.6	5	25.0	19	21.8	53	26.2
D send home	3	42.8	16	18.1	6	30.0	12	13.7	37	18.3
E show in pens			7	7.9	2	10.0	11	12.6	20	9.9
F conformation not showmanship			4	4.5			7	8.0	11	5.4
G not tied in beef barn with others			13	14.7	3	15.0	14	16.0	30	14.8
Number of response	7		88		20		87		202	99.7
Mode	D		C		D		C		C	

Record keeping is considered an important segment of the 4-H experience. Members are expected to maintain a record system as part of the requirements of the livestock project. A standard form was used in Stillwater County by 4-H members. Respondents were asked how they viewed the records for beef breeding.

TABLE 9
HOW RESPONDENTS VIEW OUR CURRENT BEEF RECORDS

Views of records	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A complete enough	4	80.0	18	39.2	5	38.4	23	41.0	50	41.3
B good to submit			6	12.7	2	15.3	4	7.1	12	9.9
C not complete			2	4.2	3	23.0	6	10.7	11	9.0
D explains project			15	31.9	2	15.3	18	32.1	35	28.9
E not inclusive	1	20.0	1	2.1	1	7.6	2	3.5	5	4.1
F too hard			3	6.3			3	5.3	6	4.9
G other			2	4.2					2	1.6
Number responses	5		47		13		56		121	99.7
Mode	A		A		A		A		A	

A review of data in Table 9 points out the fact that respondents were satisfied with the record system used in Stillwater County. Among the 480 responses, 50 or 41.3 percent said the records were complete enough. In support of this 18 or 32.1 percent of the member responses viewed the records as good enough to explain the project.

The advisory committee was concerned about the content of the breeding beef records. The questionnaire included a request for views on several items that were or could be included in the record sheet used by the members upon completion of their project each year. Data in Table 10 presents a summary of how respondents felt.

TABLE 10
BREEDING BEEF RECORD CONTENT
N=480

Content of records	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A labor (hours)	4	12.9	9	4.3	4	7.1	11	5.9	28	5.8
B cost estimate	2	6.4	20	9.6	7	12.5	21	11.2	50	10.4
C inventory	6	19.3	25	12.0	7	12.5	26	13.9	64	13.3
D feed record	5	16.1	39	18.8	10	17.8	37	19.8	91	18.9
E production	4	12.9	35	16.9	7	12.5	23	12.3	69	14.3
F depreciation	2	6.4	11	5.3	4	7.1	10	5.3	27	5.6
G profit & loss	5	16.1	34	16.5	9	16.0	30	16.1	78	16.2
H profit & narrative	3	9.9	28	13.5	7	12.1	22	11.8	60	12.5
I contract			3	1.4	1	1.7	4	2.1	8	1.6
J other			3	1.4			2	1.0	5	1.0
Respondents	31		207		56		186		480	99.6
5 chosen most often	CDGEA		DEGHC		DGBCE		DGCEH		DGECH	

The analysis of the content of the beef breeding records in Table 10 shows variation in opinion about what should be included. Respondents could select more than one item. Ninety-one or 18.9 percent choose feed records, 78 or 16.2 percent--profit and loss statement, 69

or 14.3 percent--individual production records, 64 or 13.3 percent inventory records and 60 or 12.5 percent--a project narrative. Written comments of the respondents included the idea of more advanced records for older members carrying the beef project.

The final part of the management section of this study dealt with the showmanship contest and whether or not the respondents felt a member should participate in the showmanship events with other members during the fair. These data appear in Table 11.

TABLE 11
VIEWS ABOUT PARTICIPATION IN SHOWMANSHIP
N=138

Participation	Leader		Parent		Leader parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A required	1	11.1	2	3.3	1	6.6	5	9.9	9	6.5
B not required			6	10.1			2	3.0	8	5.7
C have a choice	3	33.3	39	66.1	7	46.6	26	47.0	75	54.3
D need experience	5	55.5	12	20.3	7	46.6	22	40.0	46	33.3
Number responses	9		59		15		55		138	
Mode	D		C		C - D		C		C	

Seventy-five or 54.3 percent of the respondents felt the contestants should be able to choose if they wished to enter the showmanship contest. On the other hand, 46 or 33.3 percent of the respondents felt members needed the experience gained from showing their livestock.

The showmanship also required considerable exercise in grooming the animals.

THE BEEF BREEDING PROJECT

The breeding beef project consists of management and care of a male or female breeding animal. Emphasis is on production of offspring with consideration given to selection, nutrition, and management. This section deals primarily with management and display of projects.

The length of time a breeding beef animal stayed in the 4-H project varied from the one year selected as a heifer project to projects involving several beef animals on a range situation. Data in Table 12 indicates 70 to 70.0 percent of the respondents felt the project should be carried until a female had calved. Written comments indicated the project should be carried on a long term basis allowing time for evaluation of production.

TABLE 12
LENGTH OF BREEDING BEEF PROJECTS
N-100

Project Tenure	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A one year with a different animal	1	25.0	2	4.4	1	8.3	3	7.0	7	7.0
B until a female has a calf	3	75.0	36	80.0	6	50.0	25	64.0	70	70.0
C other			7	15.5	5	41.6	11	28.0	23	23.0
Number responses	4		45		12		39		100	
Mode	B		B		B		B		B	

The exhibit at the Stillwater 4-H Fair was of interest to the groups who allocate exhibit space. An analysis of respondents views about size of exhibits is shown in Table 13.

TABLE 13
RESPONDENTS OPINION OF EXHIBIT SIZE
N-106

Exhibit size	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A cow, calf and yearling	2	33.3	33	68.7	7	58.3	22	55.0	64	60.3
B one exhibit only	1	16.6	4	8.3	1	8.3	4	10.0	10	9.4
C limit of 5 head	3	50.0	5	10.4	1	8.3	10	25.0	19	17.9
D other			6	12.5	3	25.0	4	10.0	13	12.2
Number responses	6		48		12		40		106	
Mode	C		A		A		A		A	

Sixty-four or 60.3 percent of the 106 responses indicated the exhibit should be limited to a cow, calf and yearling. The added comments supported this suggestion as there was a lack of space in the existing facilities.

TABLE 14
VIEWS ABOUT THE USE OF TRANQUILIZERS
N=106

Use of tranquilizer	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A not used under any circumstances	2	33.3	23	48.9	1	9.0	15	35.7	41	38.6
B under supervision of vet. & com.	4	66.6	23	48.9	8	72.2	25	59.5	60	56.6
C doesn't matter			1	2.1	2	18.1	2	4.7	5	4.3
Number responses	6		47		11		42		106	
Mode	B		A - B		B		B		B	

Data in Table 14 points out that 60 or 56.6 percent of all respondents endorsed the use of tranquilizers if under the supervision of a veterinarian and the beef committee. Forty-seven parents responded to this question with 23 or 48.9 percent not in favor of the use of tranquilizers and an equal number allowing the use of tranquilizers under supervision.

Measurements of live animals taken at various stages of growth has been introduced as a tool in selection and management of livestock. The question of importance of various measurements was presented the respondents. A choice of 1 - 5 for each measurement was used. One meant no value; 2--little value; 3--undecided; 4--valuable; 5--important.

TABLE 15

IMPORTANCE OF PRIOR MEASUREMENTS FOR BREEDING BEEF
N=871

Measurements	Leader					Parent					Leader Parent					Member					TOTAL				
	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	
birth weight				2	4	4.6	8	5	9	16	3.6	1	2	3	4	4.0	3	4	11	16	3.9	3.9			
weaning weight				6	5.0		2	3	8	24	4.4		2	9		4.8	2	2	14	20	4.2	4.2	4.4		
yearling weight				6	5.0		1	2	8	25	4.5		1	10		4.9	2	2	4	12	19	4.1	4.4		
nursing index				6	5.0		4	16	12		4.1		2	3	3	4.1	2	3	8	11	15	3.8	4.0		
birth date	1		1	4	4.3	2	1	5	9	22	4.2			1	9	5.0	1	3	4	14	19	4.1	4.2		
body measurement	2		1	1	3.2	2	6	6	8	11	3.6	1	2	2	2	1	3.1	4	2	4	14	13	3.8	3.6	
calving ease	1		3	4.2	1	2	7	3	18		4.1			4	3	3.7	3	4	8	9	15	3.7	3.9		
ancestors	1		1	1	3.6		6	6	9	16	3.9	1		4	3	4.0	3	4	6	13	13	3.7	3.8		
individual production				5	5.0			5	7	25	4.5			1	9	4.9	1	2	6	29	4.5	4.6			
feeding program			1	3	4.7		3	4	13	16	4.1		1	4	4	4.3	2	4	3	15	17	4.0	4.1		
medical problems			2	1	4.3	1	4	7	8	14	3.8	1	2	3	2	3.6	3	2	6	13	16	3.9	3.9		
sonic measurements	1	2				2.6	3	9	14	6	2	2.8	1	2	4	1	2.7	4	4	13	8	8	3.3	3.0	

Choice scale: 1--no value 2--little value 3--undecided 4--valuable 5--important

The importance of prior measurements are reported by data in Table 15. Measurements considered most valuable were individual production (4.6), yearling weight (4.4), weaning weight (4.4), birth date (4.2), feeding program (4.1), and nursing index (4.0). The lowest rating was that of sonic measurements rated as 3.0. Leaders and parents felt this was of little value when evaluating breeding beef.

THE MARKET BEEF PROJECT

The largest number of respondents, as indicated in Table 2, of respondents to this study were familiar with the market beef project. This selection includes that portion of the beef project involving the finishing of animals for slaughter.

The respondents gave their views about the criteria that constituted a market beef project. These data appear in Table 16.

TABLE 16
WHAT SHOULD BE THE BASIC REQUIREMENT OF A MARKET BEEF PROJECT
N=367

Requirements	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A owning project	4	28.5	38	22.6	8	22.8	34	22.6	84	22.8
B full response	4	28.5	39	23.2	9	25.7	32	21.3	84	22.8
C feed with dad			4	2.3			2	1.3	6	1.6
D feed with 4-Her			1	.5	1	2.8	5	3.3	7	1.9
E complete record	4	28.5	40	23.8	8	22.8	38	25.3	90	24.5
F show at fair	2	14.2	37	22.0	9	25.7	32	21.3	80	21.7
G coop.feed lot			5	2.9			2	1.3	7	1.9
H other			4	2.3			5	3.3	9	2.4
Response	14		168		35		150		367	
Mode	A-B-E		E		B-F		E		E	

The most favored requirement for the market beef project as shown by data in Table 16 were the completion of the project records. Ninety or 24.5 percent considered records important. One hundred sixty-eight persons indicated that other factors of importance were owning the animal and being responsible for care, feeding and management. Eighty or 21.7 percent thought the project should be shown at the fair, eventhough, a previous question said numbers should be limited due to lack of space. Five respondents said they felt it was important for the members to meet requirements keeping in mind parents should be available for assistance.

In keeping with the requirements of the market beef project the study reviewed the issue about the number of animals a 4-H member should be able to carry as a market beef project. This relates to the selection for the fair program in Stillwater County.

TABLE 17
NUMBER OF ANIMALS TO INCLUDE IN THE MARKET BEEF PROJECT
N=109

Size of Market Beef Projects	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A one for sale one carcass	6	85.7	33	68.7	9	75.0	21	50.0	69	63.3
B select 3 and designate 2	1	14.2	5	10.4	1	8.3	8	19.0	15	13.7
C select more than 3 designate 2			2	4.1	1	8.3	3	7.0	6	5.5
D one animal car- cass or sale			6	12.5			7	16.0	13	11.9
E other			2	4.1	1	8.3	3	7.0	6	5.5
Responses	7		48		12		42		109	
Mode	A		A		A		A		A	

Sixty-nine or 63.3 percent of the respondents indicated members should carry one animal for the market stock sale and one for the carcass contest. This idea follows the existing practice in Stillwater County. The 6 or 5.5 percent included in the category of other felt that member should be able to carry as many as he wished and be able to choose an animal at a designated time prior carcass contest or sale.

The ability of an animal to gain well and react to the show ring as promoted in 4-H may have to do with the environment he is subjected to during the feeding period. Data in Table 18 shows that all categories of responses said animals would gain better if fed with 2 or more animals. Two or 1.6 percent felt there should be no handling of the animals. It was pointed out in written response that some parents do not have space for animals to be fed individually and that family members often are required to feed all of their animals together.

TABLE 18
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS EFFECTING GAIN
N=121

Animal Treatment	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A fed as an individual	1	25.0	20	37.0	2	14.2	8	16.3	31	25.6
B individual as good as group							6	12.2	6	4.9
C fed with other 4-H projects			2	3.7	1	7.1	1	2.0	4	3.3
D gain better if fed with 2 or 3	3	75.0	31	57.4	11	78.5	33	67.3	78	64.4
E no leading or handling			1	1.8			1	2.0	2	1.6
Responses	4		54		14		49		121	
Mode	D		D		D		D		D	

Market beef animals sometimes become unmanageable when exposed to large numbers of people such as happens at a fair. Tranquilizers have been administered in an effort to prevent accidents. Respondents were asked how they felt about this action. Data in Table 19 shows the response.

TABLE 19
USE OF TRANQUILIZERS FOR MARKET BEEF
N=111

Tranquilizer use	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A not used for any reason			15	31.9	2	16.6	10	21.7	27	24.3
B used under supervision	6	100.0	31	65.9	9	75.0	33	71.7	79	71.1
C doesn't matter			1	2.1	1	8.3	3	6.5	5	4.5
Responses	6		47		12		46		111	
Mode	B		B		B		B		B	

Data summarizing respondents feelings in Table 19 indicate they condone the use of tranquilizers. Seventy-nine or 71.1 percent said they could use them under the supervision of a veterinarian and the 4-H beef committee, however, further clarification was mentioned in written statements which supported use in conformation classes only.

STILLWATER COUNTY 4-H CARCASS PROGRAM

The Stillwater County 4-H carcass program has been a part of the market beef program since 1961. The program includes the selection, feeding, care, exhibiting and collection of data relative to the lean

meat production of the animals. A federal grader has been utilized to measure the carcasses to determine the carcass conformation, ribeye size, cutability, carcass grade, and fat thickness.

This portion of the study includes participation, selection time, reactions to data gathered and use of live placings as a part of final carcass placings. Participation in the carcass program included 12-15 members per year with the sale of the live market. With this in mind the respondents were asked why they did not participate. Data in Table 20 shows that 31 or 43.7 percent gave other reasons. (Summary in Appendix 1.) Seven did participate with others saying there was a disadvantage in income and they preferred the production of market beef for the 4-H market stock sale. Reason for not participating according to 16 or 22.5 percent said that of the expenses involved with the purchase of two animals, one for the sale and one for carcass. The carcass animals sell at market price which is less than the live market 4-H sale prices.

TABLE 20
REASONS FOR NONPARTICIPATION IN CARCASS PROGRAM
N=71

Reasons	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A criteria is unfair			6	16.6	1	11.1	2	8.0	9	12.6
B expenses too great			9	25.0	1	11.1	6	24.0	16	22.5
C animals low quality					3	33.3	1	4.0	4	5.6
D familiar with cattle										
E lack attention at fair			6	16.6			5	20.0	11	15.4
F other reasons	1	100.0	15	41.6	4	44.4	11	44.4	31	43.7
Responses	1		36		9		25		71	
Mode	F		F		F		F		F	

4-H members desiring to participate in the carcass program begin the feeding period with two animals and make their choice as to which animal will be shown for sale and which for carcass data purposes. Data in Table 21 summarize the views of respondents about the time of selection.

TABLE 21
WHEN SHOULD CARCASS ANIMALS BE DESIGNATED?
N=107

Time of Designation	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
by March 1	3	50.0	30	65.2	4	33.3	27	62.7	64	58.9
June 1	2	33.3	5	10.8	2	16.6	6	13.9	15	14.0
July 15	1	16.6	1	2.1	1	8.3	1	2.3	4	3.7
Fair time			10	21.7	5	41.6	9	20.9	24	22.4
Responses	6		46		12		43		107	
Mode	1st		1st		3rd		1st		1st	

Data in Table 21 indicate 64 or 58.9 percent favored the selection of beef animals by March 1. The members, leaders, and parents favored the earlier selection time, but 5 or 41.6 percent of the leader-parents felt the members should be able to make their choice at the fair. One respondent commented that unruly animals could be shifted to the carcass contest rather than have them in the show ring.

Data in Table 22 deals with the usefulness of the carcass data collected during the carcass contest. Sixty-one or 37.6 percent found the information interesting while 59 or 35.8 percent found it helpful. Less than one percent found the information to be of little value.

TABLE 22
USEFULNESS OF CARCASS DATA
N=162

Attitude about carcass data	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A Helpful	2	33.3	24	33.8	6	27.2	27	42.8	59	35.8
B Interesting	4	66.6	26	36.6	7	31.8	24	38.0	61	37.6
C Confusing			7	9.8	4	18.1	4	6.3	15	9.2
D Of little value							1	1.5	1	0.6
D Costly in terms of dollar ret.			13	18.3	5	22.7	6	9.5	24	14.8
F. Of no value			1	1.4			1	1.5	2	1.2
Number	6		71		22		63		162	99.2
Mode	B		B		B		A		B	

Criteria for placing carcasses has been controversial in Stillwater County. The live placing has been used as 25 percent of the final score for carcass placings. This policy existed as a method of associating the live animal with the carcass.

TABLE 23
USE OF LIVE PLACING IN FINAL CARCASS PLACING
N=105

Respondents Reaction	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
yes	2	40.0	20	41.6	5	41.6	11	27.0	38	36.1
no	3	60.0	18	37.5	5	41.6	25	62.0	51	48.5
uncertain			10	20.8	2	16.6	4	10.0	16	15.2
Responses	5		48		12		40		105	
Mode	no		yes		yes-no		no		no	

Of the 105 responses to the question of use of live placing, 38 or 48.5 percent of the respondents felt it should not be used for final carcass placing as shown in Table 23. A question followed which is tabulated in Table 24 that shows the live placing to be necessary and for comparison only. Forty-four or 44.1 percent favored live placing and 52 or 48.5 percent felt it should be used for comparison.

TABLE 24
NECESSITY OF LIVE PLACING FOR CARCASS ANIMALS
N=107

Respondents Reaction	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Necessary	4	66.6	19	38.7	8	66.6	13	32.0	44	44.1
Not necessary			5	10.3	1	8.3	5	12.0	11	10.2
Comparison only	2	33.3	25	51.0	3	25.0	22	55.0	52	48.5
Responses	6		49		12		40		107	
Modal Res.	nec.		comp.		nec.		comp.		comp.	

EVALUATION OF THE 4-H BEEF PROJECTS AT THE 4-H FAIR

Evaluation of the 4-H beef projects refers to the judging of live-stock at the county fair. This was the only opportunity for many of the 4-H members to have their animals and work officially checked for quality and opinion about progress. This section gives consideration to systems of judging, factors of judging, qualifications of judges, measurements and showing animals at the fair.

Stillwater County 4-H leaders and members have participated in three systems of judging. These being; the single judge, team approach and multi-station judging. Criteria has been from one persons opinion with reasons to the more specific factors of importance based on research and experience by livestock specialists. Respondents were asked which system they preferred. These data appears in Table 25.

TABLE 25
JUDGING SYSTEM PREFERENCE
N=111

Respondent Preference	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A single judge			1	2.0	3	27.2	5	10.8	9	8.1
B team judging	1	16.6	10	20.8	1	9.0	13	28.2	25	22.5
C multi-station	5	83.3	37	77.0	7	63.6	28	60.8	77	69.3
Responses	6		48		11		46		111	
Mode	C		C		C		C		C	

Seventy-seven or 69.3 percent of the respondents indicated they were in favor of the multi-station judging system. Appendix B provides comments made by respondents about the different systems of judging which indicate that 14 favored the multi-station judging system because they liked the idea of more than one persons opinion. Others said it was the fairest system, 9 said it reduced favoritism and partiality,

8 liked the idea that it reduced exposure time to heat and 6 thought the multi-station system to be more discriminative.

The selection which people decide to use in evaluating animals depends on the factors thought to be important by the judges. The respondents were asked about the importance of several factors used in the selection of beef animals. The evaluation of the selection factors appear in Table 26.

Factors suggested as being important were size, length, structural soundness, growthiness, muscling of the round and finish. These factors relate to the animal as he is presented in the market beef show. Each received a mean category response of more than 4. Factors rating as 3 or undecided by the respondents were color, weight per day of age, and prior measurements. Familiarity with prior measurements and weight per day of age was less among respondents because they have not been exposed to these measurements in the Stillwater 4-H programs. It is pointed out that measurements have been used with selection programs but no effort was made to determine which respondents had this experience.

The importance scale used in the question included in Table 26 ranged from 1 to 5. One indicated not needed, 2 was not important, 3 was undecided, 4 was important, and 5 needed.

Breeding beef projects are designed to teach some of the basics of the livestock industry. An important part of this segment of the program is the selection of the animals. Respondents were asked the

TABLE 26

FACTORS OF SELECTION FOR MARKET BEEF ANIMALS
N=107

Selection factors	Leader					Parent					Leader Parent					Member					Total		
	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	MEAN				
size				3	3	4.5	9	23	17	3.9	1	1	6	3	4.0	1	3	3	19	23	4.2	4.1	
color	1	5				1.8	1330	2	1	1.8	2	9	1		2.0	19	25	1	1	1	1.7	1.8	
length				3	3	4.5	3	1	31	14	4.1	1	1	6	4	3.3		1	31	15	4.2	4.2	
structural soundness	1		2	3	4.1			1	26	20	4.4		7	5	4.4			4	30	14	4.2	4.3	
growthiness			3	3	4.5			1	30	18	4.4		7	5	4.4			1	32	15	4.2	4.3	
muscling of round			3	3	4.5			1	24	23	4.4		1	6	5	4.3		2	28	18	4.2	4.3	
carcass quality			3	3	4.5		1	2	26	11	4.3		7	4	4.3	1		2	26	19	4.2	4.3	
weight per age	1		2	3	4.1	4	2	6	18	14	3.9		2	6	3	3.7	2	7	18	11	3.6	3.8	
finish			3	3	4.5		2	1	32	14	4.1		1	6	5	4.3		1	3	30	14	4.1	4.2
prior measurements		2	1	2	3.6	5	6	10	13	8	3.3	2	2	1	3	3.1	6	7	11	14	8	3.2	3.2

Choices: (1) not needed (2) not important (3) undecided (4) important (5) needed

importance of factors of selection. Data in Table 27 classifies the responses according to the mean category rating. The choices were a range of 1 - 5. One was not needed, 2--not important, 3--undecided, 4--important, and 5--needed. Factors with a mean category response of 4.0 or more, considered important, were composition, structural soundness, growth, general appearance, functional efficiency, size and age. Color was considered not important.

The factors of selection considered in Table 27 are those used in the multi-station system of judging. Functional efficiency, size, color and age were added as those were factors that some of the advisory committee felt were important when selecting an animal for production. Very little was known about functional efficiency as no special effort was made to introduce this into the Stillwater 4-H program. A small number of leaders and parents had participated in the programs sponsored by the Montana Stockgrowers Association presented by Dr. Bonsma, an authority on the subject.

People with varied backgrounds in the livestock industry have been invited to judge livestock at the Stillwater 4-H fair. These have judged as individuals using the single judging system, as members of a team, and as a part of the committee using the multi-station system. Data in Table 28 gives the views of the respondents about acceptance of people as judges.

TABLE 27

FACTORS OF SELECTION FOR BREEDING BEEF ANIMALS
N=104

Selection factors	Leader					Parent					Leader Parent					Member					Total							
	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	MEAN									
Composition				3	3	4.5			1	24	15	4.3						10	1	4.0				3	24	16	4.3	4.3
Structural soundness				3	3	4.5				20	23	4.5						7	4	4.3			1	1	23	18	4.3	4.3
Growth				3	3	4.5			1	27	16	4.3						7	4	4.3					28	20	4.4	4.4
General appearance				4	2	4.3			2	24	16	4.2		1				8	2	4.0		1	4	3	17	17	4.0	4.0
Functional efficiency				1	3	4.7			1	2	24	11	4.1					1	5	4	4.3		1	2	18	22	4.4	4.3
Color	1	3			2	2.8	9	17	2	8	3	2.4	1	5	1	3	1	2.8	16	15	3	7	1	2.1				2.3
Size				2	3	4.6			3	1	24	12	4.1		1	1	6	3	4.0					1	23	19	4.4	4.2
Age				2	1	3	3.2	1	4	1	23	11	3.9		1		5	5	4.2				5	1	19	15	4.1	4.0

Choices: (1) not needed (2) not important (3) undecided (4) important (5) needed

TABLE 28

RESPONDENTS' OPINION OF PEOPLE USED AS JUDGES
N=107

Respondents Opinion	Leader					Parent					Leader Parent					Member					TOTAL											
	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	TOTAL	
Commercial Producer			4	2	4.3	2	3	4	22	15	3.9		1	5	3	4.2	4	2	3	22	12	3.8	3.9									
Registered Producer	1		2	3	4.1	5	6	4	15	15	3.6		2	1	4	3	3.8	5	3	6	19	9	3.5	3.6								
4-H member with exp.	1		3	4.2	6	5	9	11	9	3.3	2		2	4	1	3.2	6	9	5	15	6	3.1	3.2									
4-H leader	1		3	4.2	7	5	6	7	14	3.4	2	1	2	3	1	3.0	7	7	7	13	8	3.1	3.8									
Veterinarian	1	2	1	2	3.0	6	10	6	10	7	3.0	2	1	1	4	1	3.1	7	7	5	18	6	3.2	3.1								
Agri-bus. Represent.	1	2	1		2.0	7	9	10	7	6	2.8	3	1	2	3	2.5	6	11	10	9	5	2.9	2.9									
Feed dealer (nut.)	1	2	1		2.0	5	13	9	5	6	2.8	2	1	3	1	2.5	6	14	10	9	3	2.7	2.7									
Order buyer	1		1	4	4.3	2	1	3	24	17	4.1				5	6	4.5	3	3	8	18	10	3.7	3.3								
Qualified relative	3	1			1.2	21	6	6	3	2	1.9	3	1	1	2	1.1	19	12	4	2	2	1.8	1.8									
Livestock special.			3	3	4.5	5	2	4	10	21	3.9	1	1	1	3	5	4.0	1	1	2	28	12	4.1	4.0								
Meat processor	1		2	3	4.1			6	17	15	4.1				5	6	4.5	4		5	20	13	3.8	4.0								
Wo-Ag. Instructor	1		2	3	4.1	1	6	5	16	12	3.8	1			5	3	4.0	4	8	9	16	5	3.2	3.5								
County agent			3	3	4.5		1	3	16	20	4.3	1		1	4	4	4.0	6	2	6	13	17	3.7	4.0								
Qualified parents	1		1	2	2.6	18	6	4	5	5	2.2	2			3	1	3.1	14	4	11	7	5	2.6	2.5								

Choices: (1) not needed (2) not important (3) undecided (4) important (5) needed

The results tabulated in Table 28 indicate that respondents considered livestock specialists, meat processors and county agents as most appropriate people to have as judges. Agri-business representatives, feed dealers and qualified parents were considered least appropriate. Members viewed livestock specialist as the only important people to judge. The range of choice was 1 - 5. One being not needed, 2--not important, 3--undecided, 4--important and 5--needed.

The information in Table 28 provides a useful guide for selection of judges for the multi-station system used in some counties. Fifteen judges serve as committee members and as a part of the final score. This study can provide ideas for people to contact to serve on the various stations.

Subsequent to the idea of the background of judges, the study asked for a view of experiences and qualifications of judges. This would give added criteria for consideration when choosing judges for a fair. One would assume that the people who responded to this question were most familiar with livestock selection and probably had this in mind when they indicated their wishes.

Data in Table 29 summarizes experience and qualities of judges. The scale of choices about each quality was: 1--not important, 2--little consideration, 3--undecided, 4--needs consideration and 5--real important.

TABLE 29

EXPERIENCE AND QUALITIES OF JUDGES
N=107

Experience and qualities of judges	Leader					Parent					Leader Parent					Member					TOTAL									
	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN
Knowledge of subject					6	5.0			1	3	4	3							12	5.0										
Years experience	1			1	4	4.1	2	2	1	19	20	4.2							2	6	4.7									
Kind of experience				1	5	4.8	1		2	16	23	4.4							4	5	4.5	2								
Is consistent				4	5.0	2	3	3	5	30	4.3								1	8	4.8	4	3	5	9	20	3.9	4.2		
Has training	1			1	4	4.3	3	3	3	12	21	4.0							3	7	4.7	2	1							
Knows system				6	5.0				2	9	31	4.6							3	7	4.7									
Non-bias				4	5.0	1			3	5	32	4.6	2						1	7	4.1	5								
Lives in county	4				1.0	38			1	2		1.1	7	1					2		1.7	29	4	3	6	2				
Is objective	1			2	4.0	6	1	6	8	15	3.6								1	2	5	4.5	6	1	7	17	11	3.6	3.7	
Enrolled in 4-H	1	3			1.7	34	3	1			1.1	6							3			1.6	25	7	6	3	3	1.9	1.5	
Influential	1	1		3	3.6	26	4	3	3	2	1.7								1	5	4	4.2	20	8	6	6	3	2.1	2.2	
Considers effort	1	1	2		3.0	6	1	3	12	19	4.0								1	5	4	4.2	13	6	4	11	11	3.0	3.5	
Is a leader	4				1.0	31	5	2	2		1.3	6							4			1.8	25	9	5	2	2	1.7	1.5	
Is a parent	3	1			1.2	29	6	2	2		1.4	6							4			1.8	28	7	4	5		1.6	1.5	
Buys cattle	2			4	3.6	8	6	2	10	17	3.5	3	1	1	5	2			3	1	6	3.1	6	2	5	14	16	1.5	3.5	
Feeds cattle	2			1	3	3.5	6	5	1	15	15	3.6	2	1	2	2			2	2	3	3.3	7	1	7	15	14	3.6	3.6	
Raises cattle	1			1	4	3.3	8		2	16	16	3.9	3	1	1	4			1	4	1	3.3	7	1	7	16	15	3.5	3.5	
Age of judge	3			1	1.7	28	6	1	4	2	1.6	4	4	2							1.8	26	2	8	7	1	1.9	1.8		

Choices: (1) not important (2) little consideration (3) undecided (4) needs consideration (5) real important

Knowledge of the subject, years experience, kind of experience, consistency, has training, knows the system and is non-bias were those qualities the respondents felt needed consideration. Those not important were; lives in the county, enrolled in 4-H, is a leader or parent, and the age of the judge. Respondents preferred judges from out of county not connected with the local 4-H program.

Data summarizing the views about selecting champion market beef animals is in Tables 30 and 31. Data in Table 30 deals only with market beef animals and relates to the methods used in Stillwater County. An alternative choice of selecting a top 5 group of animals was offered.

TABLE 30
RESPONDENT VIEWS ABOUT SELECTING CHAMPION MARKET BEEF ANIMALS
N=118

Respondents Method	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
highest index	3	50.0	14	25.4	5	38.4	13	29.5	35	29.6
chosen from top in each wt.	1	16.6	33	60.0	5	38.4	24	54.5	63	53.3
no champion select top 5	1	16.6	5	9.0	1	7.6	5	11.3	12	10.1
other	1	16.6	3	5.4	2	15.3	2	4.5	8	6.8
Responses	6		55		13		44		118	

Sixty-three or 53.3 percent of the respondents in Table 30 indicate they desired the selection of champion of market beef animals from each

weight division. The weight divisions traditionally used were light, medium and heavy. The champion and reserve champion in each weight class when judged with the single judge system were called to a final show ring for competition for the over-all championship.

Champion breeding beef animals were chosen within each breed. The respondents were asked how this should be done and if they were in favor of choosing a champion over all breeds shown at the Stillwater 4-H fair.

TABLE 31
RESPONDENT VIEWS ABOUT SELECTING CHAMPION
BREEDING BEEF ANIMALS
N=119

Respondents	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
be chosen in each breed	3	50.0	31	56.3	6	42.8	19	43.0	59	49.5
be chosen over all breeds	2	33.3	23	41.8	6	42.8	21	47.7	52	43.6
not chosen	1	16.6							1	.8
other			1	1.8	2	14.2	4	9.0	7	5.8
Responses	6		55		14		44		119	

Data in Table 31 indicates that 59 or 49.5 percent of the 119 responses liked the method of selecting champions from each breed. Fifty or 43.5 percent favored selection from all breeds.

The order of showing market beef animals at judging events was important to planning committees as it effected the scores of animals

as they progressed through the multi-station judging system. Participants in the Stillwater 4-H fair indicated that the lighter animals did not have a fair evaluation when followed by the medium and heavy animals. The respondents in this study chose between several combinations of show order provided in the questionnaire. The results are summarized in Table 32.

TABLE 32
SHOW ORDER FOR MARKET BEEF ANIMALS
N=121

show order	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
-light-medium-heavy	2	33.3	21	4.2	3	23.0	23	46.0	49	40.0
-medium-light-heavy							1	2.0	3	2.4
-heavy-med.-light			2	4.0	1	7.6			3	2.4
-heavy-light-medium										
-no particular order	2	33.3	6	12.0	2	15.3	8	16.0	18	14.8
-exhibitor number			8	16.0	3	23.0	7	14.0	18	14.8
-by ear tag number	1	16.6	9	18.0	3	23.0	4	8.0	17	14.0
-other	1	16.6	4	8.0	1	7.6	7	14.0	13	10.7
Responses	6		50		13		50		121	

The sequence of light--medium--heavy weight animals as a show order was chosen by 49 or 40.0 percent of the respondents as shown in Table 32. There was some interest in having no particular order of showing by exhibit number as indicated by 18 or 14.8 percent of the respondents. (Appendix 3.)

The question of the need for prior measurements was asked. Forty-six or 42.0 percent of the 109 responses shown in Table 33 were not in favor of using prior measurements as a part of the 4-H livestock evaluation program in Stillwater County.

TABLE 33
NEED FOR PRIOR MEASUREMENTS
N=109

Respondent opinion	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	2	50.0	11	22.4	2	16.6	11	25.0	26	23.8
No	1	25.0	19	38.7	7	58.3	19	43.1	46	42.2
undecided	1	25.0	19	38.7	3	25.0	14	31.8	37	33.9
Responses	4		49		12		44		109	

The awards program tends to emphasize programs or parts of programs depending on kinds and amounts of ribbons, money, and trophies offered. The Stillwater 4-H breeding beef division offers ribbons and rosettes within the breed classes and trophies for overall and specific breed champions.

Data in Table 34 indicate that 83 or 73.4 percent of the respondents were satisfied with the awards program as it exists. There were no suggestions for change or emphasis.

TABLE 34
RESPONDENTS VIEWS OF AWARDS PROGRAM
AT THE STILLWATER 4-H FAIR
N=113

Respondent opinion	Leader		Parent		Leader Parent		Member		Summary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Too great	1	16.6	10	20.8	3	23.0	4	8.0	18	15.9
About right	4	66.6	36	75.0	6	46.1	37	80.4	83	73.4
Not enough	1	16.6	2	4.1	4	30.0	5	10.8	12	10.6
Responses	6		48		13		46		113	

Chapter 3

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study covered the major aspects of the 4-H market and breeding beef projects in Stillwater County. Some observations were made about segments of the program that may be beneficial in planning future programs and making additions to existing programs. Planning committees play a major role in maintaining the standards set forth in the 4-H club program. They must provide the guidance and leadership to young people in order to help prepare them for a fruitful way of life. The following conclusions and recommendations are submitted in order to point out some of the strengths and weaknesses of the livestock program in Stillwater County.

1. Members plan livestock projects on a short term basis. This is probably due to feed, facilities, and availability of livestock at a price the family can afford along with many other family influences. It is evident that a system of long range planning is needed with emphasis on economics and management rather than winning.

Leaders, parents, and Extension Agents need to designate specific time to analyze individual situations and develop long-range plans.

2. Selection is kept in mind throughout the total program. Evaluation at the fair, livestock judging events, carcass evaluation, leader influence, parent influence, and member initiative are all part of the educational effort that helps a member do a more desirable job of

selecting animals. More effective use of resources could be utilized to help members form a sounder base for decision making.

The 4-H program must avoid confusion in selection programs and develop continuity in the total program. Educational activities designed to work toward a total objective would help members have a clearer understanding of selection of animals.

3. Most were satisfied with the record keeping system as they had used or understood its function. A single page summary of expenses and receipts is completed at the end of each project year. Less than 10 percent indicated concern about the system yet record books continue to be a problem with a majority of members when submitted to 4-H leaders for checking. The researcher is concerned that members prolong records until the project is completed and as a result submit a form that may or may not be accurate, complete or tell the story of their experience.

A priority must be established in county programs that utilize the member records more often during the club year. The members would have more complete and usable records if they needed to update for a worthwhile reason.

4. The mechanical functions of the Stillwater 4-H livestock project and the fair program followed closely the wishes to the people involved. There was no great expression of discontent about how various events were handled and what was available to the members.

The results suggest the continued use of those involved to do planning and implement program.

5. Prior measurements have been used in various forms as a tool to improve or upgrade breeding animals. This study lends little support to such activity. More effort could be made to emphasize those factors found to be highly heritable and advantageous to producers.

Livestock researchers have found traits and desirable characteristics that have advantage in production and economics. These ideas and facts need to be presented as educational programs at fixed days and fairs.

6. Participation in the carcass contest in Stillwater County is voluntary. Members obtain detailed information about the carcass they enter in the contest. Most observers would agree that change has been noted in the quality of livestock over time, however, there is still question about not accepting overly finished beef animals. Somehow, the idea of carcass evaluation hasn't made a lasting impression. There may be other ways of handling this program to cause more change and have greater impact on the livestock projects in 4-H.

This researcher suggests a seminar be held including all those involved in preparing and presenting carcass programs with emphasis on indepth evaluation of the system to offer alternative ways of evaluating carcass animals.

7. Livestock judges may be the single most important influence we have that effects change in livestock selection programs. The range of people the participants perceived to be qualified judges was reduced considerably by the results of this study.

Leaders, parents and members have some notions about people who are qualified to give final evaluation. The most talked about concerns are fairness, trust, knowledge and experience which can be built into a training program for judges in order to relieve pressure on the few that are available to judge livestock. An attitude change is needed on the part of some 4-H families to promote a greater degree of education and lesser reliance on high sale price and premium.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

Comments About Lack of Participation in Carcass Program

comments	L	P	L-P	M
Do participate	3	1	2	4
Too costly		1		
Don't care for it		1		
Takes too much time		3		
Prefer market stock sale		4		
Have never entered		4		2
Too long a feeding period		1		
Not enough profit		1		3
Participate with satisfactory animal		1		
No real benefit in 4-H		1		
Have breeding project		2		
All for it--where is the positive side?			1	
Too young for two calves				1
Animal got sick				1
Not interested				5
Don't have two steers				2
Lack of feed and facilities				1
Live placing is accurate enough				1
No fat has been my project				1
Steer wouldn't have done much				1
Live placing shouldn't be considered				1

APPENDIX B

Comments About Judging Systems

Comments by respondents	Number				Total
	L	P	L-P	M	
<u>Single Judging:</u>					
Too much individual discussion				2	
Disadvantage to one persons opinion		1			
Biased and set in their ways (judges)				1	
There are individuals who do good job		1			
Too long a procedure				1	
<u>Team Judging:</u>					
Judges have own ideas and discuss them	2				
Should have 4 judges		1		1	
May be unfair to a good animal				1	
Should have 3 judges		1			
Like a long line of fat steers		1			
Two can do as good as 40				1	
Judge by weight and finish (according to dad)				1	
Use college judging team members				1	
<u>Multi-Station Judging:</u>					
Like more than one persons opinion		5		9	14
Fairest way to judge		3	3	6	
Reduces favoritism and partiality		4	1	4	
Must have qualified judges	2	1	3	2	
Reduces time exposure to heat		2		6	
More selective approach		3		3	
Weight classes are important	1	2		2	
Judging time too little		4			
Judges shouldn't talk while judging		3			
Room for error		1		2	
Promotes change and understanding		2			
Animals are all treated equal		1		1	
More effective and educational		1		1	
Disappointed with the results	1				
Smaller animals lacked equal chance		1			
Change judges each year		1			
Member identification by number		1			
Animals should be shown as a group		1			
Don't like station judging		1			
Don't like confusion		2			
Partial to heavier animals				1	
Unfair system for breeds		1		1	

APPENDIX C

Comments About Show Order by Respondents

Comments by respondents	Number			
	L	P	L-P	M
A. Light-Medium-Heavy				
Use two classes - light and heavy	1	1		
Consistency and easier to judge		5		1
Light weights would have more chance		2		7
Worked OK before		2		2
Uncertain		1		2
Champion from each weight class then overall		3		
Best way		2		1
Most fair		2		1
Should be done this way				2
This is the way it is done				2
Same weights are judged together				1
Judge by breeds				1
B. Medium-Light-Heavy				
Judge sees medium and can go up or down				1
C. Heavy-Medium-Light				
Heavy weights have been shown a preference		1		
Can establish conformation and finish		1		
D. Heavy-Light-Medium				
No comment				
E. No particular order				
Mix the order	1			
Fairer to all weights of animals		1		
Eliminates heavy animals from winning		2		
Treat everyone fair		2		1
Doesn't matter		1		2
By weight classes				1
Might make a difference to the judges				1
Judges would give it to heaviest animal				1
F. By member exhibit number				
Give members a better break		1		
If not be weight by exhibitor number		1		
No weight classes		1		

Appendix C - Continued

Comments by respondents	Number			
	L	P	L-P	M
F. (continued)				
Good judges shouldn't need weight classes		1		
Judges may know members but not numbers		1		
Variety		1		
Let judges decide			1	1
Judges would work harder	1	1		
Fairer to all				1
Yes in conformation				1
Less confusion				2
They should know this is the way				1
Judge will look more closely at individuals				1
G. By ear tag number				
Only two classes	1			
Fairest		1		
No particular order by weight		1		1
Look at each individual		1		
Less confusion		1		
Judge doesn't know what is coming		1		
Don't care for weight divisions		1		
Have variety of weights		1		
Not enough for three weight divisions	1	1		
Let judges decide	1	1		1
Crowd can't say heavier are best				1
H. Other				
Similar weights together		1		
Heavy animals get preference			1	
Judge by breed--more interesting				1
Mixed weights--judges will consider each				1
Light, medium, heavy in separate classes				1
Don't need an order. Orders are traditional				1

APPENDIX D

November 29, 1971

TO: Beef Project Members, Leaders, and Parents

RE: Evaluation of Stillwater 4-H Beef Project.

Enclosed is a questionnaire prepared for the purpose of evaluating the total 4-H beef project in Stillwater County. We realize every detail has not been covered so we have allowed space for your comments at the end.

We are supplying mother, dad, and members of those families who participated in the beef project this past year with a questionnaire. Beef leaders are also asked to fill them out.

Please return the completed questionnaire by December 10, 1971 so that we can summarize the information. With no identification, it will not be possible to mail reminders to those not responding.

Your time and thought relative to the 4-H Beef project will be appreciated. This is one way of getting everyone's opinion before decisions are made. The questions include comments made and questions asked about various parts of the program. Please tell us what you think.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Egan
County Extension Agent

CEE/rp

APPENDIX E
QUESTIONNAIRE

December 1971

4-H BEEF STUDY-STILLWATER COUNTY

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the market and breeding beef program in Stillwater County. This questionnaire is being sent to all members, parents and leaders associated with the 4-H beef project. There is no personal identification so be frank about your thoughts.

Please circle the letter that precedes your choice. Some may have more than one choice.

1. I have been involved in the 4-H Beef Program for ____ years.
2. My major part during recent years has been a-
 - (a) Leader
 - (b) Parent (Ba) mother (Bb) dad
 - (c) Member
3. My area of interest is with-
 - (a) Market Beef
 - (b) Breeding Beef
 - (c) both
4. I have attempted to improve my selection of animals through-
 - (a) research on my own
 - (b) trial and error
 - (c) carcass programs
 - (d) suggestions of others
 - (e) evaluation of animals at fairs
 - (f) all of above
 - (g) none of above
5. I plan or encourage planning on a-
 - (a) year to year basis when outlining projects
 - (b) two or more year basis when outlining projects
 - (c) limited basis when outlining projects

Appendix E - Continued

6. The data gathered from the carcass contest has been-
 - (a) helpful
 - (b) interesting
 - (c) confusing
 - (d) of little value
 - (e) costly in terms of dollar return
 - (f) of no value
7. The final placing for the carcass contest should include the live placing?
 - (a) yes
 - (b) no
 - (c) not sure
8. Should we have a live placing for carcass animals?
 - (a) yes
 - (b) no
 - (c) for comparison only
9. I don't encourage or do not participate in the carcass contest because-
 - (a) the criteria for final placing isn't fair
 - (b) it is too expensive
 - (c) my animals may not make it
 - (d) I know what my cattle will do
 - (e) not enough attention is given to the carcass animals at the fair
 - (f) other reasons _____
10. My feeding program is based on
 - (a) past experience
 - (b) feed analysis and ration building
 - (c) my dad's ideas
 - (d) information from dealers and others
11. The records for the beef project are-
 - (a) complete enough for my needs
 - (b) good enough to submit to county
 - (c) not complete enough for my own satisfaction
 - (d) good enough to explain my project
 - (e) disappointing to me as they are not inclusive
 - (f) too hard
 - (g) other _____

Appendix E - Continued

12. The individual animals should be ear tagged for positive identification
 - (a) for all breeding animals
 - (b) for all market animals
 - (c) for both market and breeding animals
 - (d) not at all
13. Animals should be selected for market beef projects by-
 - (a) Nov. 1
 - (b) Jan. 1
 - (c) Mar. 1
 - (d) June 1
 - (e) July 1
 - (f) just before the fair
14. Carcass animals should be selected by or designated by
 - (a) March 1 or earlier
 - (b) June 1
 - (c) July 15
 - (d) fair time
15. Members should be able to carry market beef projects by-
 - (a) feeding one for sale & one for carcass
 - (b) selecting 3 animals and designating two at a later date
 - (c) selecting more than 3 and designating two at a later date
 - (d) feeding one animal only for either carcass or sale
 - (e) other _____
16. Market beef animals-
 - (a) do well if fed as individuals if given good care
 - (b) feed as well as a group of animals
 - (c) should be fed with other 4-H projects
 - (d) will gain better if fed with 2 or 3 animals
 - (e) should not be halter broke or worked with
17. What criteria constitute a market beef project (circle the ones you think important)
 - (a) owning the animal
 - (b) complete responsibility for care, feeding, and managing the project
 - (c) feeding in a feed lot with dad
 - (d) feeding with other 4-H projects
 - (e) filling out the record book
 - (f) showing at the fair
 - (g) placing the animals in a cooperative lot with other members from other families
 - (h) other _____

Appendix E - Continued

18. How do you feel about tranquilizers for market beef animals at the fair?
- (a) they should not be used under any circumstance
 - (b) Used only under supervision and approval of beef committee and a veterinarian
 - (c) doesn't matter
19. Animals that are extremely difficult to handle should-
- (a) be tranquilized
 - (b) handled the best way possible
 - (c) not be brought to the fair
 - (d) sent home
 - (e) evaluated in special built pens
 - (f) shown in conformation classes but not showmanship
 - (g) not be tied in the beef barn with other animals
20. Every member-
- (a) should be required to participate in showmanship
 - (b) should not have to enter showmanship
 - (c) should have a choice
 - (d) needs the experience of showmanship
21. The most effective way to show breeding beef projects is
- (a) with a halter
 - (b) in pens by project (cow, calves, yrkg.)
 - (c) through special built alley ways
 - (d) at the ranch for larger herds
 - (e) other _____
22. How do you feel about tranquilizers for breeding beef animals at the fair?
- (a) they should not be used under any circumstances
 - (b) Used only under supervision and approval of beef committee and a veterinarian
 - (c) doesn't matter
23. The tenure of a beef breeding project should be-
- (a) one year with a different animal each year
 - (b) Until a female has a calf or there is offspring
 - (c) other _____

Appendix E - Continued

24. The breeding beef records should include (circle the important points)
- (a) labor (family and own)
 - (b) estimate of costs at beginning of each year
 - (c) inventory
 - (d) feed records
 - (e) individual animal production
 - (f) equipment, facilities (depreciation)
 - (g) profit & loss statement
 - (h) narrative about the project
 - (i) signed contract with parent or guardian
 - (j) other _____
25. The system of livestock judging for the fair that I like best is
- (a) single judging
 - (b) team judging (2 people do it all)
 - (c) multi-station (several people--several stations)

WHY?

26. How important are these factors of Market Beef Judging?

not needed	not im- portant	unde- cided	impor- tant	needed	
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	SIZE
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	COLOR
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	LENGTH
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	STRUCTURAL SOUNDNESS
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	GROWTHINESS
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	MUSCLING OF ROUND
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CARCASS QUALITY
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WEIGHT PER DAY OF AGE
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	FINISH
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	MEASUREMENT (Prior)

Appendix E - Continued

27. How important are these factors of breeding beef judging?

not needed	not important	undecided	important	needed	
					COMPOSITION(MUSCLING)
					STRUCTURAL SOUNDNESS
					GROWTH
					GENERAL APPEARANCE
					FUNCTIONAL EFFICIENCY
					COLOR
					SIZE
					AGE

28. How important are these people for the evaluation of animals at the fair?

not needed	not im- portant	unde- cided	impor- tant	needed	
					COMMERCIAL PRODUCER
					REGISTERED BREEDER
					4-H MEMBER (WITH EXPERIENCE)
					4-H LEADER
					VETERINARIAN
					AGRI-BUS. (AG. REPRESENTATIVE)
					FEED DEALER (NUTRI- TIONIST)
					ORDER BUYER
					RELATIVES (IF QUALI- FIED)
					LIVESTOCK SPECIALIST (UNIVERSITY)
					MEAT PROCESSOR
					VO-AG INSTRUCTOR
					COUNTY AGENT
					PARENTS (IF QUALIFIED)

Appendix E - Continued

29. The champion market beef animal should-
- (a) be the animal with the highest index
 - (b) be chosen from the animals in each weight division that are chosen as top
 - (c) not have a champion--select the top 5
 - (d) other _____
30. The champion breeding animals should
- (a) be chosen in each breed
 - (b) be chosen over all breeds
 - (c) not be chosen
 - (d) other _____
31. The breeding project exhibit
- (a) should be limited to one cow, calf, yearling
 - (b) should be limited to one exhibit only
 - (c) should be limited to five head
 - (d) other _____
32. How important are these qualities for a person who is judging?

not im- portant	little consider- tion	un- decided	needed con- sideration	real im- portant	
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	YEARS OF EXPERIENCE
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	KIND OF EXPERIENCE
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	IS CONSISTANT
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	HAS TRAINING
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	KNOWS THE SYSTEM
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	NON-BIAS(INCLUDES
					MEMBERS, LIVESTOCK,
					FAMILIES)
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	LIVES IN STILLWATER
					CO.
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	OBJECTIVE
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	IS ENROLLED IN 4-H
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	IS INFLUENTIAL
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CONSIDERS MEMBERS
					EFFORTS
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	IS A LEADER
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	IS A PARENT
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	BUYS CATTLE

Appendix E - Continued

not im- portant	little consider- tion	un- decided	needed con- sideration	real im- portant	
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	FEEDS CATTLE
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	RAISES CATTLE
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	AGE

33. The order for showing animals for multi-station judging should be

- (a) light, medium, heavy weight
- (b) medium, light, heavy
- (c) heavy, medium, light
- (d) heavy, light, medium
- (e) no particular order
- (f) by member exhibit number
- (g) by ear tag numbers (consecutive)
- (h) other _____

Why did you chose the above order for showing?

34. Prior measurements are needed at the Stillwater 4-H fair

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

35. The emphasis on ribbons and trophies in Stillwater County is

- (a) too great
- (b) about right
- (c) not enough

36. How important are these prior measurements for breeding beef?

no value	little value	unde- cided	valuable	important	
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	BIRTH WEIGHT
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WEANING WEIGHT
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	YEARLING WEIGHT
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	NURSING INDEX
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	BIRTH DATE
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	BODY MEASUREMENTS
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CALVING EASE
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	ANCESTORS
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INDIVIDUAL PRODUCTION
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	FEEDING PROGRAM
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	MEDICAL PROBLEMS
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	SONIC MEASUREMENTS

Appendix E - Continued

37. Please explain any of your thoughts either not expressed in previous questions or in addition to the questionnaire that you are concerned about. (Grievances, complaints, criticism, good things, suggestions for improvement.)

Please fill out the enclosed card and mail to our office separate from your questionnaire if you would desire serving on a committee.

We appreciate your effort and time in answering the questionnaire. Your answers will be most helpful.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Egan
County Extension Agent

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Jacobsen, N. A., Fattening 4-H Beef, Extension Service Bulletin, 325, pp 3, June, 1964.
2. Bieberle, Animal Sciences go Beyond Food Production, National 4-H News, pp 18, October, 1973.
3. NN, Montana 4-H Projects, pp 9, Extension Service Bulletin, 326, June, 1975.
4. See pp 9 of Ref. (3).
5. Esplin, G., Tips for Selecting Heifers, 61-3, pp 46, Montana Farmer Stockman, October 4, 1973.
6. NN, Tips on Selecting Steers and Heifers, The Young Cattleman, pp 1, Extension Service Bulletin, Form 159, July, 1973 Reprint.
7. NN, Montana 4-H Livestock Record, pp 1, Extension Service Bulletin, Form 159, July 1973 Reprint.
8. Baker, Franklin H., The use of Performance Data, pp 5, Beef Cattle Improvement--Handbook for County Agents, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Handbook 299.
9. See pp 1 of Ref. (8).
10. Linford, L., Are Stock Shows Worth Saving, 61-5, pp 44, Montana Farmer Stockman, November 1, 1973.