Research in Brief

MASON E. MILLER, editor

FARM OPEN HOUSE?

It's not unusual in America to have farm tours—where a caravan cars, buses, and trucks carries farmers from one farm to another, with stops at each place to see and hear about a new or interesting feature. But what about having an "open house," where anyone can visit selected farms at any time during a given day?

This free-choice "Open Day" was tried on six grain and drying storage demonstration farms in North Buckinghamshire, England. Visitors couldrop in between 10:30 A.M. and 3:30 P.M. Agricultural Land Service and National Agricultural Advisory Service staff members present each farm answered questions and showed the installations.

Who attended? Mostly medium-to-large-scale cereal growers. The usually came the greatest distance, primarily because of a desire to kee aware of technological advancement rather than because of a need for

new equipment.

Most of them, 77 per cent, found out about the Open Day via a poscard invitation. They also tended to visit farms in either the same or reverse order as the places were listed on the card.

Of what value was the Open Day? Nearly a fourth of the participanhad already decided to adopt the storage or drying installations, or both So the day was mainly a reinforcer for their existing ideas and decision to adopt.

Another group, the majority of participants, was considering to equipment and evaluating its worth. Probably the Open Day was mobeneficial for this group. In making their decisions, they could get personal advice and help from an expert. They were active information seekers.

Another group, about a fourth of the farmers, was not considering the equipment but attended to "keep up-to-date." Most of these men alreading and adequate equipment and were the larger cereal growers. Their presence and motivation thus point to another aspect of the adoption process. People can become aware of some new idea or practice not continued.

MASON E. MILLER is Director, Institute for Extension Personnel Development, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48823. BARBANN JUDY, Graduate Assistant, Michigan State University, assisted in paring these abstracts.

because of a felt need, but also because they have a need to keep up-todate and a real desire to learn.

One interesting sidelight: an increase in attendance at the Open Day would have had to have come from among the smaller cereal growers, ance most of the larger growers in the area attended. The smaller grow-who did attend accounted for the largest proportion of persons at the considering" stage. Probably the demonstrations held during Open Day ere most effective for people at this stage. Thus, finding ways to increase the attendance of these smaller growers at such a Day would increase the effectiveness of the Day.

Gwyn E. Jones and Jeremy Howell, "A Farm 'Open Day' on Grain Drying and Storage—an Assessment of an Advisory Method." University of Reading Agricultural Extension Centre, Reading, England, June, 1966.

BETTER THAN YOU VS. EVERYONE WINS!

Workers in 4-H have long debated: Is competition a good thing as basis of a club program, or is there an alternative? One alternative the straight strive-for-awards-and-recognition competition (CE) oritation in many state 4-H programs is an approach called Individual materials.

In a study in four Michigan counties, these two approaches—CE and E—were analyzed to see whether youth operating under one system more accepting of self (AS) and accepting of others (AO) than were under the other system. The study was based on the presumpthat the more "adequate" person is both AS and AO. If 4-H strives below young people grow into effective adults, then measurement of well a 4-H program helps youth become AS and AO would be one under the program success.

CE, the member's entry behavior (his attitudes, skills, and knowlat the beginning of the learning experience) is informally assessed leader, or is taken for granted by the project outline he is to fol-Members' needs and inadequate entry behaviors are not explored. In all behavior goals (ends the learner is to achieve) are set by the and explained in the project—and are the same for everyone. The are evaluated via competition against other members and/or mards set by someone outside the local club structure.

th IME, members work closely with their leader to assess: (1) enchavior level for each individual, and (2) terminal behavior goals, on entry behavior level. Thus members have a real hand in asthemselves and setting realistic and desirable learning goals.

dings indicated that CE was perceived as threatening to some thers, and a challenge to others. Youth with higher acceptance of the less likely to perceive competition as a threat, and so were the less likely to be found in a CE club. Members with lower acceptance tended to be found in clubs that used IME. These tendencies truer for girls than for boys, possibly because in our culture boys to compete more than girls are.

The author makes a case for grouping members on the basis of their levels of AS and AO. Those who accept others but don't accept self, need more individual attention in project teaching. Those who accept themselves but reject others need to work with members who accept both self and others. Persons in the latter group are likely to be challenged in either group or individual work—and so can be offered a choice.

Thelma Howard, "An Exploratory Study of a Comparison of Expressed Acceptance of Self and Others between 4-H Members Involved in Two Types of Project Evaluation." Unpublished Master's thesis, Institute for Extension Personnel Development, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1966.

ATTITUDES TOWARD ANTI-POVERTY PROGRAMS

What are the attitudes of Extension staff members and local support groups toward anti-poverty programs in Extension? Cebotarev and King asked Extension state and county staff, county Extension executive committee members and leaders, county government officials, and county welfare agency managers in a rural Pennsylvania county what they

thought about Extension getting into low-income programs.

One group opposed any change in present Extension programs. They would support getting into anti-poverty programs only if it would not interfere with already existing programs. If the poor were interested they had the same right as anyone to take part in Extension programs. But there was no point in putting together a special program. As far as this change-opposing group was concerned, present programs, with minor changes, fit the requirements of low-income groups. Yearly ne income below \$3000 per family is generally used as a measure of poverty. However, rather than defining poverty by this standard, the change-opposing group thought of poverty as a distinctive pattern of behavior different from the middle-class way of life. They saw the causes of poverty as lack of initiative, reluctance to change and improve, and aversion to hard work on the part of the poor—as well as indifference to supposedly helpful programs. Slightly over half the 52 persons interviewee felt this way.

A second group, about a quarter of those interviewed, favored change in Extension programs to fit the needs of low-income groups. They had a different view of poverty and its causes. Whereas the change-opposing groups tended to blame poverty on the poor, this group tended to blame the circumstances in which the poor found themselves for causing both poverty and the personal characteristics resulting from poverty. The change-favoring group saw a need for special programs for the poor, taking into account their situations, values, and frames of reference. The group felt that the poor are unable to overcome these circumstance without outside help. This view means that higher socioeconomic groups in society—rather than the poor themselves—must be responsible for

alleviating poverty.

A third group, 19 per cent, included those indifferent to the idea, and hose who had no opinion.

The authors conclude that if changes advocated by the change-favorgroup are to be made, Extension personnel must take firm action and rect an intensive educational program toward local support groups. Therwise, it appears that Extension will continue its traditional proams with only occasional specific poverty-ameliorating efforts on the of individual Extension staff members.

Eleonora A. Cebotarev and Gary W. King, "Attitudes toward Anti-Poverty Programs in the Extension Service: A Case Study." Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, Miami Beach, Florida, August 26-29, 1966.

INFERENCE ANXIETY

People attending a several-day conference are more anxious on some than on others. This was the major finding of a study of two "residual conferences"—where participants live at the same place as their ference is held. Fales studied a six-day executive seminar in sales agement held at Michigan State University, and the five-day Ameridome Economics Association Workshop, "Working with Low-In-Families," at the University of Chicago.

pattern of anxiety—roughly M-shaped—was similar for both of conferences, despite their different content, audience, and structure anxiety was low at the beginning of the conference, rose to point on the second full day, dropped somewhat on the third day,

mose again one day before the last day.

- Liysis

are intriguing. Psychological findings indicate that arousal and some level of anxiety may be beneficial and necessary for a perlearn. In other words, we may have to be "shaken" out of our before we're ready to learn something new. Certainly anximong learners can get so high that no learning can take place. But it that with a "reasonable" level of anxiety (whatever that may be arners are the most ready to learn.

if the M-shaped anxiety pattern holds for many types of longer ces, planners of meetings might want to plan for the most learning the "peaks" of anxiety. And rather than worrying about how tension and anxiety in a conference, planners might well spend on creating the right kind of tension and taking advantage of tension pattern evolves in the conference.

Wohlleben Fales, "The Pattern of Anxiety in Residential Conferences."

Linear Straining Education Report No. 11, University of Chicago, Chicago, Chicago, 1966.