LONG TERM STUDY

An Assessment of Intercollegiate Meat Judging From 1926 to 1989

G. W. Davis, M. F. Miller, D. M. Allen, and K. L. Dunn

Abstract

One thousand, four hundred and seventy former judging team members from twenty-four universities were questioned to measure the positive and negative aspects of Intercollegiate Meat Judging. Intercollegiate Meat Judging improved writing ability, decision making skills, exposed students to animal agriculture, developed concentration ability and provided an opportunity for the pursuit of excellence through competition. The number of regional or national meat judging contests necessary to maximize the benefits from participation was approximately 4.0. Participants believe meat judging is not too competitive and the positive educational benefits should merit continued strong departmental, local, state and national support. Justification exists to obtain additional local and national support to improve a sound educational program which has served animal agriculture well since 1926.

The objective of all animal scientists as instructors should be to educate students in the most efficient manner possible and to constantly evaluate the success or failure of present and past programs (Kinsman, 1982). The following study was undertaken to measure the opinions both positive and or negative responses from former Intercollegiate Meat Judging team members (1926-1989). The need exists to evaluate the Intercollegiate Meat Judging program (Romans, 1982). The results from this evaluation may help strengthen the present program and might help to make better use of budgeted funds (National Livestock and Meat Board, Meat and Livestock Industry and Universities) for support of Intercollegiate Meat Judging (Huston, 1982). Results obtained from questions concerning awards and the educational and industrial value obtained from meat judging would be invaluable to Instructors and Administrators in Animal Science (Carr, 1982). The objective of this study was to assess the perceived values obtained from participation in Intercollegiate Meat Judging and to develop recommendations based on these data.

Davis and Miller are in the Department of Animal Science, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409; Allen is with Excel Corporation, Wichita, KS 67201; and Dunn is with Flavorite Labs Inc., P.O. Box 1315, Memphis, TN 38101.

The authors wish to thank the persons who responded to this survey and the support they have given to intercollegiate meat judging. The authors would especially like to thank Dr. D. H. Loveday, Dr. T. R. Carr, Dr. D. M. Stiffler, Dr. M. L. Riley, J. C. Filiatreau and Dr. W. R. Jones for helping develop the survey.

Materials and Methods

A questionnaire (Table 1) was developed by a special committee of the Intercollegiate Meat Coaches Association to facilitate an assessment of meat judging by former team members. The questionnaire was distributed to a representative of all schools who have previously competed in Intercollegiate Meat Judging between 1926 and 1989. Five Coaches Association representatives served as coordinators for each region. The regions and schools which participated in the present study are presented in Table 2. The questionnaires were summarized and the data was segmented according to decade, region, sex and occupation. Suggestions and comments for individual and team awards, continued support and suggestions for new classes were also summarized (available on request).

Results and Discussion

Mean values for responses to certain questions (Table 3), indicate that those who participated in Intercollegiate Meat Judging felt that it improved writing ability, decision making skills, exposed students to animal agriculture, improved concentration ability and provided an opportunity for the pursuit of excellence through competition (Carr, 1982). The respondents "disagree" when asked: is meat judging too competitive? Ratings form respondents representing six decades were surprisingly similar (Table 3) and little difference was evidenced between male and female respondents.

The number of regional or national meat judging contests necessary to maximize the benefits from participation was 4.0 with a high standard deviation of 1.4. Respondents who had judged between 1926 and 1949 indicated 3.5 contests were adequate, but persons judging in the 1970's and 1980's recommended 4.3 contests were necessary to maximize the benefits form this activity. These data indicate approximately four contests are needed to maximize improved writing ability, decision making qualities, exposure to animal agriculture and the improved concentration ability obtained from meat judging. Participants indicated that meat judging was not too competitive and ample education merit exists for continued strong departmental, local, state and national support. One of the most common criticisms concerning the college curriculum and training that students received was the lack of confidence and ability to judge and make accurate and competent decisions (Bernthal, 1982). Results from the survey clearly indicate that participants believed that meat judging trains students to make decisions

Table 1. Intercollegiate Meat Judging Evaluation Form

1. Intercollegiate meat judging improved your writing ability.
2. If yes, improvement in writing ability aided your career.
3. Meat judging improved your ability to make logical decisions.
4. Meat judging provided you exposure to animal agriculture.
5. Meat judging aided in developing your ability to concentrate under pressure.
6. Meat judging provided you an opportunity to pursue excellence through competition.
7. Meat judging is too competitive.
8. The annual expenditure of $1,000 to $5,000 (per idem and transportation costs) per university (Dept. of An. Sci., Food Sci. or Food Tech. teaching budget funds) for the meat judging program is justifiable for the benefit of only 6 to 20 students per school.
9. The annual expenditure of $10,000 (judges expenses, supplies, awards) from the National Livestock and Meat Board for support of intercollegiate meat judging is justifiable for the benefit of approximately 300 college students representing 25 to 30 universities.
10. Meat judging helped you form close and lasting associations with others.
11. Sufficient (number and quality) awards are presented at the Meat Board Sponsored contests, present awards are as follows: Individual overall (plaque for 1st, ribbons 2nd through 10th); individual divisions (plaque for 1st, ribbons 2nd thru 5th); team overall (plaque for 1st, ribbons 2nd through 5th); other plaques (team placings high team and individual overall beef).
12. If funds were available, list any additional individual or team awards you would like to see presented.
    Individual:
    Team:
13. Would the educational value of intercollegiate meat judging be improved by addition of one or two new classes. If yes, please list your suggestions.
    Yes or No.
14. How many regional or national meat judging contests would have been necessary for you to have received the maximum benefits from participation?
    Circle one. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. Please circle any of the following employment areas which your meat judging experience helped make available to you.
    a) Meat Industry
    b) USDA
    c) Teaching-Research-Extension
    d) Meat Animal production
    e) Meat science graduate program
    f) Other (specify)
16. Would you suggest continued support for such a program from University administrations, industry and organizations such as The National Livestock and Meat Board. Yes or No, please comment.
17. Please rank the following traits of meat judging according to the level of importance to you.

Trait	Rank (1 - highest)
Travel	_____
Writing Skill	_____
Decision making	_____
Concentration development	_____
Exposure to meats industry	_____
Team competition	_____
Individual competition	_____
Relating to people	_____

18. Compare the following college activities according to over-all educational, personal or career benefit obtained.

Activity	Rank
Block and Bridle Club	_____
College course work	_____
College field trips	_____
Meat Judging team	_____
Living group (fraternity, dorm, other)	_____
Intramural sports	_____
Other department clubs	_____

19. Other comments.

Table 2. Regions and Schools Participating in the Intercollegiate Meat Judging Survey (N = 1470)

Western (n = 102)	n	Eastern (n = 432)	n
University of Wyoming	38	Auburn University	12
Colorado State University	27	Virginia Poly. & State U	87
Montana State University	37	University of Kentucky	67
Southwestern (n = 259)		University of Florida	51
Texas A & M University	129	Penn State University	94
Oklahoma State University	58	University of Tennessee	58
Mississippi State Univ.	16	N. C. State University	4
Texas Tech University	56	Western Mid West (n = 463)	
Eastern Mid West (n = 214)		University of Nebraska	87
Michigan State University	27	Kansas State University	191
The Ohio State University	35	University of Missouri	42
University of Illinois	90	North Dakota State Univ.	73
University of Minnesota	62	Iowa State University	70

Table 4. Question 15. Numerical and percentage frequency for certain areas of employment which were made available from participation in meat judging.

Employment Area[a]	n	Frequency among all respondents (%)
Meat industry	677	47.5
USDA	398	28.1
Teaching - Research - Extension	537	37.9
Meat animal production	664	46.5
Graduate school (meat science)	326	22.2

[a]Some respondents identified more than one employment area.

Table 3. Mean Values and Standard Deviations of the Meat Judging Survey Segmented by Decade and Sex

Question Number	1926-89 (N=1470)	1926-29 (n=16)	1930-39 (n=64)	1940-49 (n=54)	1950-59 (n=212)	1960-69 (n=389)	1970-89 (n=735)	female (n=233)	male (n=1237)
1	4.4 (1.1)[a]	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4
2	4.3 (1.1)	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3
3	5.2 (.9)	5.4	5.4	5.2	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.2
4	5.4 (.9)	4.8	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.5	5.3
5	5.3 (.8)	5.4	5.3	5.4	5.3	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.3
6	5.2 (.9)	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.4	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.3
7	1.7 (1.0)	1.9	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.8	1.9	1.7
8	5.2 (1.1)	5.1	4.8	5.0	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.1	5.2
9	5.4 (.9)	5.4	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.2	5.4
10	5.0 (1.2)	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.7	4.8	5.3	5.0	4.9
11	4.8 (1.1)	5.1	5.0	5.2	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8
14	4.0 (1.4)	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.8	4.3	4.3	3.9

[a]Parenthetical values are standard deviations.

Table 5. Question 17. Mean values for certain traits of meat judging ranked according to to level of importance to former team members

Trait	Overall (n=1470) Mean value[a]	Rank[b]	1926-49 (n=134) Mean value[a]	Rank[b]	1950-89 (n=1336) Mean value[a]	Rank[b]
Travel	5.9	8	5.8	7T	6.0	8
Writing skill	5.8	7	5.8	7T	5.8	7
Decision making	2.7	1T	2.3	1	2.7	1T
Concentration Dev.	3.7	3	3.3	3	3.7	3
Meat industry Expo.	2.7	1T	2.7	2	2.7	1T
Team competition	5.1	5	4.7	5T	5.1	5
Individual competition	5.2	6	4.5	4	5.3	6
Relating to people	4.2	4	4.7	5T	4.2	4

[a]1 = highest. [b]T = Tie in rank.

based on facts and clearly enhances their decision making and judgmental skills. Respondents indicated that the ability of students to receive a job offer after graduation and their ability to successfully meet the requirements of their employer were clearly related to the level of meat judging a student was able to achieve.

Individual and team awards suggested by respondents indicated that a total of 371 individual and 285 team award suggestions were listed. Based on these data, justification exists for individual and team awards for reasons. The presentation of additional plaques and awards for beef grading also merits consideration.

Suggestions for additional meat judging classes were also given to the Meat Judging Coaches Association of the American Meats Science Association who may wish to consider the inclusion of one of more of these classes in future contests (Bray, 1982). However, 64.9% of the respondents indicated that the educational value of meat judging could not be improved by the addition of new classes.

Results in Table 4 indicate areas of employment made most available to students through meat judging were meat industry (47.5%) and meat animal production (46.5%). A significant percentage (22.2%) of the respondents were encouraged to enter meat science graduate school programs through their meat judging experience, which in many cases led them to professional positions (USDA, teaching, law school, medical school, research and extension).

Presented in Table 5 are data which further support the benefits, (decision making, exposure to the meat industry, concentration development, relating to people) obtained from meat judging. Writing training was more important to University personnel and graduate students than to other occupational groups. Exposure to the meats judging was perceived as very important to respondents who are employed in the livestock and meat industry. Travel was ranked low by all occupational groups.

From among seven collegiate activities, the respondents ranked meat judging second to course work according to overall educational, personal or career benefit obtained (Table 7). However, based on the excellent response to this questionnaire, justification exists to obtain additional local and national support to improve a sound educational program which has served animal agriculture well since 1926.

Quotes by participants indicate that many positive feelings are developed between students from other universities and is an invaluable experience and may be the most important benefit obtained from meat judging. These quotes give an indication that there are many benefits obtained from meat judging. The suggestions for improvement of meat judging mainly were positive in their intention and indicate a way for meat judging to become an improved teaching tool.

Table 6. Question 17. Mean values for certain traits of meat judging ranked according to level of importance to former team members segmented by occupation.

Trait	University (n=273)	Professional (n=109)	Livestock Industry (n=78)	Agri-business (n=116)	Meat industry (n=149)	Extension/ Vo. Ag. (n=119)	Farming/ Ranching (n=344)	Grad. students (n=137)	Undergrad. students (n=145)
Travel	5.9 (8)	6.0 (8)	6.4 (8)	6.1 (8)	6.2 (8)	5.8 (7)	6.0 (7T)	5.6 (6T)	5.9 (7)
Writing skill	5.2 (5)	5.7 (7)	5.9 (7)	5.6 (7)	5.7 (7)	5.9 (8)	6.0 (7T)	5.6 (6T)	6.2 (8)
Decision making	2.8 (2)	2.7 (1)	2.8 (2)	2.4 (1)	2.9 (2)	2.4 (1)	2.7 (2)	3.3 (2)	3.1 (2)
Concentration development	3.9 (3)	3.4 (2T)	3.7 (3)	3.6 (3)	3.7 (3)	3.8 (3)	3.6 (3)	4.0 (4)	3.8 (4)
Exposure to meats industry	2.4 (1)	3.4 (2T)	2.0 (1)	3.3 (2)	2.0 (1)	2.6 (2)	2.5 (1)	2.5 (1)	2.9 (1)
Team competition	5.4 (6)	4.7 (5)	4.7 (5T)	5.1 (6)	5.4 (6)	5.2 (5)	5.0 (5)	5.3 (5)	4.8 (5)
Individual competition	5.5 (7)	1.9 (6)	4.7 (5T)	4.9 (5)	3.1 (5)	5.7 (6)	5.3 (6)	5.9 (8)	5.2 (6)
Relating to people	4.6 (4)	4.1 (4)	4.1 (4)	4.3 (4)	4.4 (4)	4.2 (4)	4.1 (4)	3.6 (3)	3.5 (3)

Miscellaneous occupations listed by 207 respondents were not summarized. Professional - dentist, doctor, attorney and executive.

Table 7. Question 18. Mean values for certain collegiate activities ranked according to overall educational, personal or career benefit obtained.

Activity	Overall Mean value[a]	(n=1470) Rank	1926-49 Mean value[a]	(n=134) Rank[b]	1950-89 Mean value[a]	(n=1336) Rank
Block and Bridle Club	3.8	4	4.0	5	3.7	3
College course work	2.0	1	1.5	1	2.0	1
College field trips	3.9	5	3.4	4	4.0	5
Meat judging team	2.3	2	2.7	2	2.3	2
Living group	3.7	3	3.2	3	3.8	4
Intramural sports	6.0	7	5.8	6T	6.0	7
Other departmental clubs	5.7	6	5.8	6T	5.7	6

[a]1 = highest [b]T = Tie in rank

A LONGITUDINAL STUDY

Effect of Scholarships on Student Retention

Robert G. Brown and Joseph G. Cvancara

Abstract

A survey of College of Agriculture and Home Economics (CAHE) students at Washington State University illustrates that scholarships have an effect on the retention of students within a given college. Regardless of whether a scholarship was granted or not had little effect on student retention within the CAHE. On the other hand, students that were granted a larger scholarship were more inclined to remain enrolled in the CAHE at Washington State University.

Introduction

Funding for a college education is very important for many individuals who are seeking enrollment or others who are currently in college. Many sources of funding exist, aid ranging from personal loans, self or parental funds, financial aid and scholarships. Federal aid is received by 51% of all college students enrolled in public and private schools (Williams, Weathers, Sandza, Burns & Maier, 1985). Scholarships are awarded on the basis of two criteria:

1. Need scholarships that are awarded on the financial status of the individual.
2. No-need or merit scholarships that are awarded based on the academic standing of the individual, regardless of the financial situation.

The real fact is that colleges must bring students to their university in order to continue to function. Scholarships have been used to recruit or to bring students to an institution. A study conducted at Rutgers University showed that 69 percent felt that the scholarship was a very important or extremely important factor in their decision to attend the university (Kanerek, 1986).

Recruiting and retaining students to a college is a prime concern. The purpose of this article is to illustrate how students felt about how they were approached and how they were encouraged to remain in the CAHE at Washington State University.

Method of Investigation

This article will discuss only the portion pertaining to scholarships. Additional information gained through the survey instrument is available from the authors.

In a survey produced by the authors, students who had applied for scholarships from the CAHE from 1985 to 1987 were contacted. The students were surveyed using the following format:

1. An introductory letter was sent to each respondent explaining the purpose of the survey, granting their anonymity and allowing them to receive results if they were interested.
2. The survey instrument was a combination of multiple choice questions which lead to questions with opened ended answer possibilities.
3. A stamped, addressed return envelope was enclosed to improve the chances for a quick survey return.

Of the 127 surveys sent via mail, 94 completed surveys (74 percent) were returned. Non-deliverable and non-response was 1.6 percent and 24.4 percent respectfully.

Results

Applications for scholarships were made by 175 individuals, but 41 never attended Washington State University after applying and 7 students had left school with no forwarding addresses. Figure 1 illustrates the number of applicants, current students, no shows and the number of applicants that have left school for reasons unknown.

The information gathered in the study allowed the au-

Brown is a graduate student and Cvancara is a professor of Agricultural Education in the Department of Adult and Youth Education, Washington State University, Pullman, WA 99164-6236.

(DAVIS continued.)

In conclusion, the value of Intercollegiate Meat Judging cannot be measured in dollars or the amount of time spent by each person. The only measure of meat judging is by the benefit each individual receives. The benefits may be different for each person and may not be the same for everyone. Therefore, the constant attempt to improve the quality of Intercollegiate Meat Judging must be continued so animal science departments may continue to help students to be prepared to meet the challenges which face them in the twenty-first century.

References

Bemthal, P. H. Comments of an Undergraduate Travel Award Winner. 1982. Proc. 35th Annual Reciprocal Meat Conference.

Bray, R. W. Panel discussion on Meat Judging. 1982. Proc. 35th Annual Reciprocal Meat Conference.

Carr, T. R. Meat Judging. 1982. Proc. 35th Annual Reciprocal Meat Conference.

Huston, J. L. A Sponsor's Perspective. 1982. Proc. 35th Annual Reciprocal Meat Conference.

Kauffman, R. G. Judging Team Activities. 1982. Proc. 35th Annual Reciprocal Meat Conference.

Kinsman, D. M. Meat Judging Panel - Opening Remarks. 1982. Proc. 35th Annual Reciprocal Meat Conference.

Romans, J. R. Meat Judging as viewed by a department head. 1982. Proc. 35th Annual Reciprocal Meat Conference.