to college because it is perceived to be not practical. However, they do major in agriculture, 31 percent at UNL. They are Ag college’s “non-traditional” students. If the unique learning needs of sensing students (75% at UNL) are left unmet, the continual drop-out of capable students will continue.

For Recruitment

Not only do we want to continue to attract the practical, realistic sensing types but we also need to attract the more imaginative intuitives. When considering a recruitment effort the data on personality types from this study may provide some evidence not only as to who we do attract, but who we do not attract.

Of the eight intuitive personality types, only two types, the INTP and ENTP are equal to the CAPT college student data base. All other six are significantly less represented. Why do Ag colleges not attract more intuitive types? A study by Barrett and Horner (1986) showed that an unusually high number of intuitives were in 4-H and FFA leadership.

Many of those students were extraverted intuitives, the change agent types. We hypothesize that these types see agriculture as less than dynamic and slow to change. The ENF’s may see agriculture as not requiring their people skill orientation.

Another possibility is that other intuitives, especially the NT temperament, may not clearly see the potential orientation of agriculture as a science.

Recommendations

1. Other agriculture campuses should establish a profile of their majors.
2. For maximum effectiveness, Ag faculty should learn to teach for differing learning styles especially sensing types.
3. Recruitment strategies should be designed that will attract more intuitive students without “turning off” the more traditional sensing types.
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appears large. And whereas the NCAA and other similar organizations regulate athletic recruiting, no regulatory agency exists for academics. Rather, educators — teachers, advisers, and administrators — must regulate themselves. This is why frank discussion on these issues is important.

Perhaps the key to maintaining ethical recruiting practices in agricultural programs is for educators not to lose sight of their role. It is my belief that some agricultural educators feel obligated to give glowing advice about agriculture, when in fact their true purpose is not to persuade or proselytize their students or potential students. The proper role of the educator is to help students think through their goals, clarify values and feelings, and understand the occupational implications of a given major (Gordon 1984). Thus, the ethical considerations of competitive academic recruitment may hinge on an important distinction between “enrollment development programs” and what might be termed “enrollment accretion programs.”

Enrollment development programs are those designed to enhance the image or perception of agricultural careers with an increasingly non-rural populace. Although student enrollment is a potential outcome of these programs, education and public relations are the primary goals (Nelson and Heritage 1973, Reisch 1984). These programs attempt to alter the public’s unidimensional “production” image of agriculture and focus on the professional nature of agricultural careers, thereby encouraging prospective students to concomitantly consider agriculture with other professional disciplines such as medicine, law, and engineering (USDA 1984, 1985). Enrollment development programs can also extoll the academic virtues of an agricultural education. Few other disciplines can better develop a student’s ability to think and reason, for solving most agricultural problems requires practical decision-making based on sound judgment and extensive technical knowledge. This type of education should enhance a student’s ability to successfully adapt to many professional situations and enable him to learn new skills and new roles in a rapidly changing world. Properly administered enrollment development programs should be encouraged. For example, the Ambassadors for Agriculture and Agri-Techsan programs at Texas Tech University provide student speakers to civic clubs, business groups, high school assemblies, and elementary school classes.

However, in contrast with enrollment development programs, enrollment accretion programs are designed primarily to persuade students to choose agriculture over other majors. It is these latter programs to which I am vehemently opposed. Educators cannot allow themselves to succumb to the pressures of declining enrollments and begin recruiting students to meet quotas. I agree that agricultural colleges should actively promote their programs to those students interested in studying agriculture, but they should not organize aggressive campaigns to persuade students to choose agriculture over other majors. This is not the proper role of a college of university.

In summary, pressures exist for increased student recruitment by agricultural educators. As these recruiting efforts intensify, a fine, but nevertheless crucial, distinction must be upheld between recruitment programs for enrollment development and those programs aimed at capturing student registration hours. Recruitment efforts centered on information concerning an agricultural education and career should be supported, but campaigns designed to proselytize students should not be condoned. Let us benefit from the embarrassing lessons in athletics and proceed with caution. Let’s watch our step and not cross the fine line of ethical recruiting.
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