

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 ENTJ 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.

References

- Barrett, L. & Connot, R. (1986). "Knowing Student Personality can Help School, Classroom, Activity Participation." *NASSP Bulletin*, February.
- Barrett, L., Sorensen, R., and Hartung, T. (1985). "Personality Type Factors of Faculty and Students — Implications for Agriculture College Teaching." *NACTA Journal*, Spring.
- Barrett, L. & Horner, J. (1986). "Profile of Rural Leadership." *Proceedings of the Thirteenth National Agricultural Education Research Meeting*, Dallas, Texas.
- Horner, J. & Barrett, L. (1986). "Personality Types of 500 Farm Couples — Implications for Agricultural Educators During Critical Economic Conditions." *Proceedings of the Thirteenth National Agricultural Education Research Meeting*, Dallas, Texas.
- Kiersey, D. & Bates, M. (1978). *Please Understand Me*. DelMar, California: Prometheus Nemesys Books.
- Lawrence, G. (1982). *People Types and Tiger Stripes — A Practical Guide to Learning Styles*. Gainesville, Florida: Center for Application of Psychological Type.
- Myers, I. (1980). *Gifts Differing*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Myers, I and M. McCaulley (1985). *Manual: A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.

A Critical Comment

Ethical Ramifications of Student Recruitment

Jeffrey C. Mosley

We read it in the sports pages with increasing frequency. Another college or university athletic department succumbs to the pressures to win and is subsequently cited for recruiting violations. To date these recruiting incidents have been largely confined to the sports arena, but is the academic arena soon to follow? Let's hope not. I do believe, however, the potential exists for problems in academic recruiting, especially in our nation's agricultural programs. The purpose of this paper is to stimulate thought and discussion concerning recruitment of students into agricultural programs.

One reason I believe these programs are vulnerable to recruiting problems is declining enrollments. According to data compiled by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC), undergraduate enrollment in agriculture declined nearly 25% from 1978 to 1985 (NASULGC 1986). Projections through the mid-1990's suggest a continuation of this trend (USDA 1985) which may precipitate decreases in the number of faculty members and support personnel at many institutions.

Declining enrollments have also caused some organizations to proclaim a national shortage of college-educated agricultural specialists. For example, in a combined effort NASULGC and the American Association of State Colleges of Agriculture and Renewable Resources developed a position paper entitled, "Human Capital Shortages: A Threat to American Agriculture". Furthermore, the Joint Council on Food and Agricultural Sciences named the development of "scientific and professional human capital" one of its five national priorities for 1987. This report claims that a lack of agricultural expertise threatens the security and well-being of this country and the United States' position as "the lead nation in agriculture" (USDA 1985).

Facing these pressures, agricultural educators may increasingly be asked to recruit students, just as coaches are pressured to attract athletes. How agricultural educators will respond to these recruiting pressures remains to be seen. One problem is that, unlike athletic recruiting, rules for academic recruiting are not well-delineated: the gray area between appropriate and inappropriate academic recruitment

Mosley is a research associate and lecturer, Department of Range Management, College of Agriculture, University of Arizona, Tuscon, AZ 85721.

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 judgement 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 in the College of Agricultural Sciences 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.

Literature Cited

- Gordon, V. N. 1984. "The Undecided College Student: An Academic and Career Advising Challenge." Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, IL.
- NASULGC. 1986. "Fall 1985 Enrollment Report." *NACTA J.* 29(1):6-13.
- Nelson, C.L., and R.K. Heritage. 1973. "Suburban Recruitment: A Development Function of a College of Agriculture." *NACTA J.* 17(2):32.
- Reisch, K. W. 1984 "Recruiting and Retention." *NACTA J.* 28(3):27-31.
- USDA. 1984 "Five-year Plan for the Food and Agricultural Sciences." Joint Council on Food and Agricultural Sciences.
- USDA. 1985. "Fiscal year 1987 Priorities for Research, Extension, and Higher Education: A Report to the Secretary of Agriculture." Joint Council on Food and Agricultural Sciences.

Mark
June 26-29



34th Annual Conference
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon