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Background of the Study

- Early judging research focused on individuals' efficacy in grain judging and ability to evaluate yields (Hughes, 1917; Wallace, 1923).

- Later and recent research has focused on horse and livestock judging contestants’
  - development of psychological and assessment skills
  - personality types
  - coaching influence
  - life-skill development

(Boyd et al., 1992; McCann et al., 1988, 1991; McCann and McCann, 1992; Nash and Sant, 2005; Phelps and Shanteau, 1978; Rusk et al., 2002; Shanteau, 1978)
Livestock evaluation is a learned skill set. Therefore, training and instruction has a clear impact on success (Shanteau, 1978).

Human behavior is developed through the observation of others (Bandura, 1977).

“A strong sense of efficacy enhances personal accomplishment in many ways. People with high efficacy approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided.” (Bandura, 1993)

People with low efficacy are less motivated and reluctant to perform because they think they have no chance at succeeding (Bandura, 1993).

Aside from skill set, successful livestock judges possess the ability to maintain and control concentration, confidence, and motivation (Meyers et al., 2015).
Problem & Purpose

• A need to understand:
  • in which aspects of livestock evaluation youth feel least confident in
  • what training methods are currently used
  • what type of training programs are of most interest to youth

• Information from this study allows universities to meet the needs and expectations of participants through relevant and effective educational content and platforms.
Objectives

• Describe the selected characteristics (age, sex, state of residence, size of hometown, organizational affiliation, ownership of livestock, and interest in collegiate judging) of participants’ of the 2016 OSU ANSI Big 3 Field Days.

• Identify participants’ self-reported confidence level in judging livestock (sheep, cattle, swine, and goats).

• Identify participants’ most frequently used training methods.

• Identify types of training opportunities of interest to youth.
Methodology

• A survey design method with a researcher-developed instrument was used to gain an understanding of self-reported confidence levels youth have in evaluating livestock.

• To evaluate face validity, a pilot test was conducted using a similar demographic group at the 2016 OSU Livestock Judging Camp.

• A Cronbach’s alpha was calculated as the reliability measure for each construct:
  • sheep (6 items; $a = .804$)
  • cattle (6 items; $a = .910$)
  • swine (6 items; .871)
  • goats (6 items; $a = .893$)
  • tools (7 items; $a = .859$)
Methodology

• OSU IRB analyzed the application; corrections were made, and the study was approved.

• The population \((N = 1,501)\) included all 4-H- and FFA-affiliated youth livestock judging contestants present on the last day of the 2016 OSU ANSI Big 3 Field Days (July 21, 2016).
Findings: Demographics

- 51.8% male
- 73.6% from Oklahoma, 6.7% Texas, 3.1% Arkansas
  - other states represented: California, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, and Oregon
- 72.1% from rural area
- 41.6% involved with 4-H
- 71.4% involved with FFA
- 93.7% own livestock
- 74.3% interested in judging livestock at the collegiate level
Findings: Confidence Levels in Evaluating Sheep ($n = 430$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Severely lacking confidence</th>
<th>Moderately lacking confidence</th>
<th>Slightly lacking confidence</th>
<th>Slightly confident</th>
<th>Moderately confident</th>
<th>Extremely confident</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying structural correctness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualizing proper balance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating appropriate muscle definition</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimating appropriate fat thickness in market lambs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing volume in breeding sheep</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examining growth</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings: Confidence Levels in Evaluating Cattle ($n = 430$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Severe</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying structural correctness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualizing proper balance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating appropriate muscle definition</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimating appropriate fat thickness in market lambs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing volume in breeding sheep</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examining growth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Findings:

Confidence Levels in Evaluating Swine ($n = 430$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Severe Lack</th>
<th>Mod Lack</th>
<th>Slight Lack</th>
<th>Slight Conf</th>
<th>Moder Conf</th>
<th>Extrem Conf</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying structural correctness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualizing proper balance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating appropriate muscle definition</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimating appropriate fat thickness in market lambs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing volume in breeding sheep</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examining growth</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings:
Confidence Levels in Evaluating Goats \((n = 430)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Severely lacking confidence</th>
<th>Moderately lacking confidence</th>
<th>Slightly lacking confidence</th>
<th>Slightly confident</th>
<th>Moderately confident</th>
<th>Extremely confident</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying structural correctness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualizing proper balance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating appropriate muscle definition</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimating appropriate fat thickness in market lambs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing volume in breeding sheep</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examining growth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings:
Confidence Levels in Evaluating Goats \((n = 430)\)
Findings:

Frequently Used Training Methods

- Coach's Personal Knowledge: 74.4%
- High School Judging Manual: 17.4%
- Collegiate Judging Manual: 23.5%
- Live Animal Evaluation: 55.6%
- Coach's Personally Recorded Video: 6.5%
- DVD Tools: 13.0%
- Online Videos: 46.7%
- Livestock Evaluation Camps: 42.1%
- Other: 17.7%
Findings: Training Methods of Interest

Percent respondents were very or extremely interested in these training methods.

- Collegiate Judging Manual: 58%
- DVD Tools: 36%
- Online Videos: 49%
- Livestock Evaluation Camps: 70%
- Comprehensive Judging Seminar/Clinic: 57%
- Specie-Specific Seminar/Clinic: 54%
- Reasons-Specific Judging Seminar/Clinic: 54%
Conclusions

• Typical respondent:
  
  • 15- to 17-year-old male from rural Oklahoma who is involved in FFA, owns livestock, and is interested in judging at the collegiate level

• Respondents are
  
  • slightly to moderately confident in evaluating sheep and goats
  
  • moderately to extremely confident in evaluating swine and cattle

• In terms of species, respondents are least confident in evaluating goats.

• In terms of livestock characteristics, respondents are
  
  • least confident in examining growth in livestock and estimating appropriate fat thickness in market animals
  
  • most confident in assessing volume in breeding animals
Conclusions

• The most frequently used training methods used by youth are their coach’s personal knowledge and live animal evaluation.

• For additional training, respondents were very interested in:
  • livestock evaluation camps
  • comprehensive judging seminar/clinic
  • reason-specific judging seminar/clinic
  • specie-specific judging clinics

• Respondents are interested in improving their abilities to be competitive at the next level (junior or senior college).
Recommendations

- Animal science departments should provide training opportunities to improve youth contestants' livestock evaluation abilities through programs focusing on:
  - examining growth in livestock
  - estimating fat thickness in market animals
  - using evaluation techniques specific to sheep and goats

- These departments should offer these topics specifically through:
  - livestock evaluation camps
  - comprehensive judging seminar/clinic
  - reason-specific judging seminar/clinic
  - specie-specific judging clinics
Recommendations

• Considering a majority of respondents rely heavily on coaches’ knowledge, universities should offer training for coaches.

• Future researchers should consider:
  • incorporating a method to compare self-reported confidence levels to respondents’ judging contest results
  • extending the study to other university programs within other regions of the country
  • incorporating a pre- and post-test (before and after a training event) to assess improvement in confidence from training
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