

Disengaged Farmers: The Land Grant System's Overlooked Clientele

S. Christian Mariger
Graduate Research Associate
464 Agricultural Hall
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078-6031
(405) 744-6942
FAX: (405) 744-5176
mariger@okstate.edu

Kathleen D. Kelsey, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
466 Agricultural Hall
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078-6031
(405) 744-8137
FAX: (405) 744-5176
kelseyk@okstate.edu

Abstract

The land-grant university was founded to promote equality in American society by educating the common man, developing knowledge to solve problems, and by disseminating that knowledge to all who need it. The Cooperative Extension Service (CES) offers research based information and non-formal education to the public, and serves as a link between the universities' researchers and the citizen: However, some in the population are not benefiting from the land-grant system. The focus of this study was to describe the differences between Oklahoma wheat producers who knew about extension programs and those who did not know about extension programs. The theoretical framework for the study was Rogers' model for the diffusion of innovation. The hypothesis was that those who did not know about extension programs would fit the profile of laggards/late adopters described in the literature. The findings of the study strongly supported the hypothesis and implied that the university must become more proactive in reaching this group. The findings also illustrate a need for more research in this area to better understand and serve all of the land-grant university's stakeholders.

Introduction/Theoretical Framework

The land-grant university system was intended to provide opportunity and equality in American society by educating the common man. American land-grant universities serve three basic functions in our society teaching, research, and extension (Seevers, Graham, Gamon, & Conklin, 1997). The Cooperative Extension Service (CES) has a long history of service to Americans as a link between research and teaching faculty at land-grant universities and the public. The principle function of CES is to make scientific information available to all who need it, (Seevers, et al., 1997). Extension work is guided by three principles. The first principle is reaching people at their level of need, interest, and understanding. The second principle is teaching people to determine their own priorities. And the third principle is teaching people to help themselves, (Seevers, et al, 1997). However, a 2001 study in Oklahoma found that approximately 10 percent of the wheat producers in the state did not know about extension programs (Kelsey & Mariger, 2002). The problem is the findings of that study are an indication that a considerable proportion of the land-grant university's clientele are not aware of the bounty of information gleaned from the findings of research professionals within the land grant university system.

Much of the theory of extending the knowledge base generated at land-grant universities is based on the diffusion of innovations advanced by E. M. Rogers (Seevers, et al. 1997, and van den Ban, & Hawkins, 1996). Diffusion is the process by which an innovation is communicated to members of a social system over time. Diffusion is a special type of communication concerned with the spread of new ideas (Rogers, 1995). The ultimate goal concerning the diffusion of ideas is their consideration and adoption by members of a particular group. Adoption is the decision to accept or use new ideas or technologies, (Severs, et al, 1997). The adoption process consists of five steps including: awareness, interest, evaluation, trial, adoption. It is the role of the change agent (CES) to inform, influence, and facilitate the adoption of new ideas. The relative speed at which individuals in a group move through the adoption process and adopt new ideas can be used to categorize them into one of five groups including: innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, and laggards, (Rogers, 1995). It is the later category, laggards, which is the focus of this study. Laggards or later adopters are described as traditionalists or "diehards"; they are the last in a social group to adopt new ideas, (Rogers, 1995). Laggards are socially isolated and tend to only interact with others with traditional views. Late adopters tend to have little involvement in formal groups and most of their contacts are confined to their immediate social group such as friends and relatives. Laggards or late adopters do use general farm literature and mass media such as radio as a source of farming information. However, laggards generally do not use agricultural agencies as a source of information. Not only are county agents not used by this group, late adopters are likely to hold unfavorable views of them as a source of agricultural information. Instead laggards/late adopters are most likely to consult neighboring farmers and local farm dealers who are personally known to them (Lionberger, 1960). Laggards differ from earlier adopters on several important characteristics; laggards are generally less educated, have smaller and less specialized farms, smaller social networks, fewer contacts outside their social networks, less contact with change agents and tend to be less likely to seek information than earlier adopters. Perhaps the key characteristic of laggards is their orientation to the past as their knowledge base for problem solving, (Rogers, 1995).

Purpose & Objectives

The purpose of this study was to describe the differences between wheat producers who knew about extension programs and those who did not. The researchers' working hypothesis was that wheat producers who did not know about extension programs fit the profile of laggards. The specific objectives of this study were to:

1. Identify differences in the demographic and operational characteristics of wheat producers who knew about extension programs and those who did not.
2. Describe the differences in the agricultural problems, challenges and concerns of wheat producers who knew about extension programs and those who did not.
3. Identify differences in the factors, wheat producers who knew about extension programs and those who did not, consider when making production-related decisions.
4. Identify differences in the informational sources preferred by wheat producers who knew about extension programs and those who did not.
5. Describe the best alternatives for establishing communication between the university and wheat producers who did not know about extension programs.

Methods and Procedures

The study was an *ex post facto*, descriptive design with data collection via a self-administered mail survey. There were approximately 15,000 Oklahoma wheat producers in the population according to the 1997 Census of Agriculture. A proportionally stratified random sample based on the population of wheat producers in each of the state's 77 counties was drawn (Ary, Jacobs, & Rasavieh, 1996). A sample size of 375 would have been adequate at the 95 percent confidence level, (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970); however, it was decided to take a 100 percent over sample of the population, ($n=750$) to address a predicted low response rate of about 20 percent.

The draft instrument was circulated among the Wheat Research (WR) faculty, as well as to a panel of experts comprised of researchers experienced in surveying agricultural populations and extension educators and specialists who work extensively with the state's wheat producers. Both the WR faculty and the panel of experts expressed satisfaction with the face and content validity of the instrument.

The instrument was pilot tested with a random sample of wheat producers ($n=100$). The data from the 20 returned surveys were analyzed and revisions made to the instrument. The revised instrument was then mailed to the sample of 750 wheat producers. The reliability was determined using Cronbach's alpha (Ary, et al, 1996). The reliability coefficient was 0.94 for all scale items.

The mail survey used a modified tailored design method (Dillman, 2000). Mailings included an initial mailing that contained a survey, cover letter, and postage-paid return envelope. A reminder postcard was mailed one week later. A second survey, cover letter and postage-paid return envelope followed one week later to nonrespondents. Finally a second

reminder postcard was mailed to all nonrespondents. A 29.2 percent useable response rate was achieved with this procedure.

Control for nonresponse error was addressed through four separate procedures. First, the effort was made to achieve the highest response rate possible by using the (Dillman, 2000) multiple mailing approach. Second, several demographic characteristics of the respondents were compared to the characteristics of the population from the 1997 Census of Agriculture (Miller & Smith, 1983). No significant differences were found at the 95 percent confidence level. Third, a comparison was made between early and late respondents. The first 25 percent of the respondents were compared to the last 25 percent to respond (those who responded after one mailing and those who did not respond until they had been contacted four times) (Lindner, Murphy, & Briers, 2001). Again, no significant differences were found between the groups. Fourth, a random sample of ten percent of nonrespondents were drawn ($n=50$); of these, 33 were reached by telephone to complete a portion of the instrument, (Lindner, et al, 2001). A comparison was made between the respondents and the nonrespondents' age and the proportion of land they owned using an independent sample *t-test*. Respondents and nonrespondents were also compared based on their ethnicity and educational attainment using a *Chi-square* test. No significant differences were found between respondents and nonrespondents on any of the variables at the 0.05 alpha level.

Parametric inferential statistics such as *t-tests* have five assumptions that must be met in order to yield valid results. First the data must be interval or ratio type measurements. Second the sample must be random. Third the observations must be independent. Fourth the observations must be normally distributed on the dependent variable. Fifth there must be homogeneity of variance between groups (Stevens, 2002). While the data in this study meets the assumptions of interval/ratio measurements, randomness and independence; the small size of the group of those who did not know about extension programs ($n=24$) threatens the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance. The authors used two separate strategies to correct for the small size and lack of balance in the analysis. The *t-test* is robust with regard to Type I errors as long as the sample size is greater than 12 (Keppel, 1991). Because the distributions of the dependent variables were not normal and asymmetric, the alpha level of 0.05 was adjusted to a more conservative 0.025 to account for any distortions that occur under these conditions (Keppel, 1991). Because there were fewer respondents who did not know about extension programs, than those who did, the samples were unbalanced. When sample sizes differ greatly (when the larger group is more than one and a half times the size of the smaller group) between groups or treatment conditions homogeneity of variance should not be assumed, (Stevens, 2002). With the *t-test*, the solution to this problem is to simply not assume equal variance and use the Satterthwaite's approximation of the standard error and estimated degrees of freedom (Steel, Torrie, Dickey, 1997).

In contrast to parametric tests, non-parametric tests require few if any assumptions about the population under study. Non-parametric tests assume only independence of observations, mutually exclusive categories and observations measured in frequencies to yield valid results, (Ary, Jacobs, & Razaveih, 1996). *Chi-squared* tests were used extensively in this study to test for differences between groups on nominal and ordinal variables.

There are many misconceptions about the use of inferential statistics; one of the most serious misinterpretations is to equate statistical significance with practical importance (Wiersma, 2000). It is almost always necessary to include some index of effect size with the results of inferential tests. For this study, Cohen's *d* was calculated for *t*-tests and *Cramer's V* was calculated for *Chi-square* tests as recommended in (Lowry, 2002).

The alpha level of 0.05 was set *a priori* and was used for all statistical tests and procedures, except as noted in the *t*-tests. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 8.0, computer software, was used for all statistical analyses.

Results & Findings

For ease of reading those who knew about extension programs and could have used them are referred to as engaged respondents, while those who were not aware of extension programs are labeled as disengaged respondents. In-order to identify differences between engaged and disengaged respondents, the groups were compared using either a *t*-test for interval and ratio data, and *Chi-square* for nominal and ordinal variables.

The first objective of this study was to identify differences in the demographic and operational characteristics of engaged versus disengaged wheat producers. The results of the *t*-tests indicated that disengaged respondents did not differ significantly in age, the percent ownership of land, or hours spent farming per week. As presented in Table 1 only the acres of wheat planted in the 2000-2001 crop season (an indicator of farm size) and the number of agricultural organizations to which they belong differ significantly between the groups. Disengaged respondents (*n*=24) planted an average of 279 acres as compared to an average of 697 acres for engaged respondents (*n*=140). Membership in agricultural organizations was also significantly lower among disengaged respondents (*n*=24) with a mean of 1.13 organizations compared with a mean of 1.81 organizations for the engaged respondents (*n*=144).

Table 1

Differences in engaged versus disengaged wheat producers' demographic characteristics.

Demographic	t	df	Significance	Cohen's d	Effect size
Acres planted 2000-2001	4.491	63.767	0.000	1.1247	Large
Number of Agricultural organizations	2.934	34.541	0.006	0.9984	Large

Note: Equality of variance not assumed (standard error based on Satterthweight's approximation and df)

In-addition to the interval and ratio variables the two groups were compared on nominal and ordinal variables including; gender, county, ethnicity, primary source of income, off-farm employment, educational attainment, expansion plans, retirement plans, government farm payments, short-term loans, long-term loans, crop insurance, wheat check-off funding, type of operation, crops raised and livestock raised. Disengaged respondents differed significantly on five of the 17 variables in the analysis. The data in Table 2, indicated the most notable difference between engaged farmers (*n*=145) and disengaged farmers (*n*=24) was their level of formal education. The engaged respondents had a median educational level of some college while disengaged respondents had a median level of high school graduate. The ethnicity of the two groups also differed significantly, the vast majority of all respondents were white non-Hispanic.

However only four of 147 (2.7%) of the engaged respondents were not white non-Hispanics, while three of 23 (13%) of the disengaged farmers were not white non-Hispanic. In addition all the black respondents ($n=2$) were engaged respondents, while most native Americans two out of three (66%) were disengaged respondents. The data also showed that disengaged respondents had fewer long term loans, wheat was less frequently their principle agricultural enterprise, and they collected on crop insurance policies less frequently than engaged respondents.

Table 2
Demographic differences between engaged and disengaged farmers.

Demographic	Chi-Square	df	Sig	Cramer's V	Strength of association
Educational attainment	24.508	8	0.002	0.382	Moderate
Ethnicity	14.322	4	0.006	0.290	Moderate
Long term loans	7.048	1	0.008	0.204	Moderate
Principle enterprise is wheat	6.340	1	0.012	0.193	Weak
Collect on crop insurance	5.050	1	0.025	0.178	Weak

The second objective of this study was to describe the differences in the agricultural problems, challenges, and concerns between engaged and disengaged farmers. The section of the survey instrument addressing wheat production problems included 43 summated scale items. The survey asked respondents to rate the items regarding various potential wheat production problems on a four-point scale: "not a problem", "less serious problem", "serious problem", and "very serious problem." Table 3 showed that disengaged respondents differed significantly on seven of the 43 wheat production problems. It is notable that six of the items that were significantly different were among the ten wheat disease items. In all cases, disengaged respondents rated these wheat diseases as less problematic than engaged respondents. Disengaged respondents only differed significantly on one other scale item; Russian wheat aphids. Disengaged respondents rated Russian wheat aphids as less problematic than the engaged respondents.

Table 3
Differences in wheat production problems between engaged and disengaged farmers

Wheat production problem	Chi-Square	df	Sig	Cramer's V	Strength of association
Tan spot	11.615	2	0.003	0.326	Moderate
Wheat rusts	9.923	3	0.019	0.283	Moderate
Bunts and smuts	9.333	3	0.025	0.293	Moderate
Wheat streak virus	9.210	3	0.027	0.283	Moderate
Russian wheat aphid	8.149	3	0.043	0.272	Moderate
Soil born mosaic virus	8.095	3	0.044	0.264	Moderate
Septoria leaf blotch	7.769	2	0.021	0.271	Moderate

The third objective of this study was to identify differences in the factors engaged and disengaged farmers consider when making production-related decisions. The wheat producer survey instrument included ten summated scale items about decision-making factors considered by producers when making production decisions. The survey asked respondents to rate each

decision making factor on its "importance" using a three-point scale: "not at all important", "somewhat important", and "very important". Disengaged respondents did not differ significantly from the other respondents in five of the ten decision-making factors including: maximizing income, commodity prices, minimizing costs, cost of inputs, and the terms of lease agreements. However, Table 4 revealed that disengaged respondents rated long term sustainability, maximizing yield, crop insurance, government commodity program funds, and interest rates as significantly less important factors influencing decision making than engaged farmers.

Table 4
Differences in decision making factors for engaged versus disengaged farmers.

Decision making factor	Chi-Square	df	Sig	Cramer's V	Strength of association
Long term sustainability	24.486	2	0.000	0.441	Relatively strong
Maximizing yield	15.232	2	0.000	0.332	Moderate
Crop insurance	14.094	2	0.001	0.332	Moderate
Government commodity program funds	12.881	2	0.002	0.312	Moderate
Credit interest rates	7.343	2	0.025	0.240	Moderate

The fourth objective of this study was to identify differences in the information sources preferred by engaged and disengaged farmers. The wheat producer survey instrument contained 16 summated scale items concerning their use of sources of wheat production information. The survey asked respondents to indicate how frequently they used various sources of information on a four point-scale described as: "always", "frequently", "sometimes" and "never". Engaged respondents and disengaged respondents did not differ significantly on their use of non-extension faculty, the Noble Foundation, trade or technical journals, scientific journals, friends/family/other farmers, newspapers, television/radio, government agencies, farm organizations, crop consultants, the internet, or public libraries. However, as can be seen in Table 5, extension publications, cooperative extension, other universities, and businesses/suppliers were used significantly less by disengaged respondents.

Table 5
Sources of information that differed between engaged and disengaged respondents.

Sources of wheat production information	Chi-Square	df	Sig	Cramer's V	Strength of association
Extension publications	33.797	3	0.000	0.499	Relatively strong
Extension	26.372	3	0.000	0.439	Relatively strong
Other universities	8.775	3	0.032	0.269	Moderate
Businesses and suppliers	8.060	3	0.045	0.243	Moderate

In-addition to the scale items on sources of information, respondents were asked to write in three publications and three non-written sources of information they most often used for wheat production information. The publications most frequently used by disengaged respondents are

listed in Table 6. The general farm publications listed most frequently were: Progressive Farmer, Farm Journal, High Plains Journal, and the Farmer Stockman.

Table 6
Publications utilized by disengaged farmers

Publications	Frequency	Percent
Progressive Farmer	5	20.83
Farm Journal	4	16.67
High Plains Journal	4	16.67
Farmer Stockman	3	12.50
Furrow	1	4.17
University publication	1	4.17
Test Plot Results	1	4.17
South West Farm Press	1	4.17
Successful Farmer	1	4.17

(n=24)

The most frequently used non-written sources of information listed by disengaged respondents were friends/family/other farmers and Agricultural dealers (see Table 7).

Table 7
Other sources of information utilized by disengaged farmers

Source of information	Frequency	Percent
Friends family or other farmers	7	29.16
Agricultural dealers	3	12.50
Common sense	1	4.17
Coop	1	4.17
Grain buyers	1	4.17
Internet	1	4.17

(n=24)

The fifth objective of this study was to describe the best alternatives for establishing communication between the university and wheat producers who did not know about extension programs. The respondents were asked a series of questions regarding their relationship with the university including if they attended the university, if a family member attended the university, if they served on advisory boards or committees, if they cooperated with faculty on research projects, or if they have direct communication with faculty or staff. Disengaged respondents did not differ significantly from engaged respondents on board service, participation in research projects, or direct communication with faculty. However, as can be seen in Table 8, disengaged respondents were significantly less frequently graduates of the university and less frequently or had a close family member who attended the university.

Table 8

Differences in engaged versus disengaged respondents connections to the university.

Connection to the university	Chi-Square	df	Sig	Cramer's V	Strength of association
Family member attended the university	5.480	1	0.019	0.178	Weak
University graduate	5.318	1	0.021	0.176	Weak

In-addition to the questions about their connections to the university, respondents were asked to respond to the open-ended question: *"How could communication between you and the university be improved?"* Of the 24 disengaged respondents, nine answered the item. The most frequently listed recommendations for improving communication between the university and disengaged respondents were to mail information directly to farmers ($n=2$) or to produce a newsletter to convey information to farmers ($n=2$). Other responses to this item were: "communication should be more frequent", "I don't know how to improve communication", "provide information on what help is available", "I am a small farmer I don't need the university", and "the university only helps large farmers with money" each with one response.

Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations

This study was based on a random sample of wheat producers in Oklahoma. The authors make no claims or inference beyond this population of wheat producers. Readers may note certain parallels between the findings of this study and other populations, but should exercise caution in interpreting for or extending these findings to other groups.

The findings of this study support the hypothesis that disengaged respondents fit the classification of laggards described by Rogers (1995). The findings of this study revealed that disengaged farmers fit the profile of laggards in terms of demographic characteristics and information seeking behavior. Disengaged respondents had farms about half the size of the engaged respondents. The lower educational attainment of disengaged respondents also fits the profile of laggards. Laggards or late adopters have fewer contacts in formal organizations according to, Lionberger (1960). This is mirrored by the results of this study where it was found that disengaged respondents belonged to about half as many organizations as the engaged respondents.

The information seeking behavior of disengaged farmers also supports the laggard hypothesis. Lionberger (1960) stated that late adopters read general farm literature, and use mass media, but do not use government agents. The findings of this study support this statement. Analysis of the sources of information used by the respondents indicated that disengaged respondents did not use cooperative extension, extension publications or other universities as much as the engaged respondents. However, disengaged respondents did not differ in their use of trade/technical journals or newsletters and listed the same publications as the engaged respondents did as sources of wheat information. The most frequently cited non-written source of information among this group were friends, family and other farmers which is also a characteristic of laggards/late adopters according to, Lionberger (1960). Over all, disengaged respondents sought information less frequently and employed fewer sources of information than

engaged farmers in the study. Again Rogers (1995), states this is one of the defining characteristics of laggards.

The findings showed disengaged respondents did not differ from other respondents on 36 of 43 selected production problems and challenges. However it was apparent that they did differ significantly and consistently was wheat diseases. Furthermore the analysis revealed that of the seven wheat production problem areas, where disengaged respondents differed from the engaged respondents, were wheat diseases. One possible explanation for this finding is that disengaged respondents did not know how to recognize the presence of wheat pathogens or how to identify the symptoms of specific pathogens (James Key, personal communication July 16, 2002). To test this theory, the university wheat disease specialist was asked if he thought the idea had merit. The wheat disease specialist agreed that it was possible that disengaged farmers did not know how to recognize wheat pathogens. However, the specialist also gave an alternative explanation in which differences in tillage practices could account for this situation. The state specialist concluded that if those disengaged producers were laggards and had not adopted "no till" or "minimum till" farming practices or were still burning their crop residue; it would impact the behavior of pathogens in their fields which could account for the differences between the two groups. (Robert Hunger personal communication August 2, 2002).

It was apparent that the disengaged farmers differed significantly from the engaged farmers on the factors they consider when making production decisions. The disengaged respondents did not consider credit and interest rates an important in making production decisions. This finding making makes sense when one considers that disengaged respondents had a significantly fewer long-term loans. It was also apparent that disengaged farmers did not consider long-term sustainability important when making wheat production decisions. The data show that engaged respondents particularly those who use extension frequently consider long-term sustainability to be "very important." This supports the findings of (Dillman, Engle, Long, & Lamiman, 1989), who found that farmers' use of extension was highly correlated to their adoption of low impact farming technology. It was also found that disengaged farmers also considered maximizing yields to be less important than engaged farmers. A logical conclusion drawn from these findings is that disengaged farmers are risk adverse, and complacent in terms of their farming practices. This group appears to be unaware of the economic and environmental benefits of adopting best management practices.

It was concluded that disengaged respondents were less connected to the university on all levels, not just extension. While it was predictable that disengaged respondents were less likely to be university alumni, it is important to note that they were also less frequently related to someone who attended the university. Laggards/late adopters are thought to rely on smaller social networks composed of people with similar views and sources of information (Rogers, 1995 and Lionberger, 1960). The implication is that a close family member who attended the university could have been a conduit or connection between the university and the disengaged farmer. However, a conclusion of this study is that this group of farmers is isolated from the university with little chance of making a connection with out an active effort on the part of the university. Furthermore the antidotal evidence about how the university can better serve this group indicated disengaged farmers are not going to seek help from the university. Of the nine responses to the question, "how can communication between you and the university be

improved", four suggested that the university should simply mail information directly to farmers. It then becomes apparent that the passive nature of these recommendations supports the idea that in-order to serve these farmers the university will have to seek them out and market information to them.

The literature on the diffusion and adoption of innovations, provides some guidance to extension agents, planners, and specialists on approaching clientele in each adopter category. The implication for the practice of extension is importance of extension professionals' recognition people in each of the adopter categories and their ability assume the appropriate role to extend research-based information to their clientele, (Seevers, et al, 1997). In recent years extension theory has focused on mass media approaches that reach larger audiences. It could be concluded that the mass media is an effective way to raise awareness; however, laggards are thought to be suspicious of change agents and mass media is not effective method of changing strongly held beliefs, (Rogers, 1995). Creative solutions to address this problem will be required if the university is going to engage with this group. The barriers between disengaged farmers and the land-grant university may be breached with greater personal contact between these farmers and CES agents but strategies for reaching disengaged must be developed.

The literature on the diffusion and adoption of innovations also raises questions about laggards/late adopters. Two theories have been proposed as to why people fall in to the various adopter categories; one being the individual blame hypothesis, and the other being the system blame hypothesis. The individual blame hypothesis holds that it is the characteristics of the individual such as traditional or conservative attitudes that cause them to be laggards. However, in contrast the system blame hypothesis holds that individuals become laggards do to the contextual factors of their situation such as limited resources(van den Ban, & Hawkins, 1996).

One of the studies supporting the system blame hypothesis was conducted by *Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo* (CIMMYT) or International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center located in Mexico City. Economists and scientists working for the CIMMYT studied the adoption patterns of farmers in the Mexican altiplano. The conclusions of that study were that the agroclimatic and socioeconomic circumstances of farmers were better predictors of adoption patterns than the characteristics of individual farmers (Byerlee, & Hesse de Polanco, 1982). The farmers who did not adopt a technology were acting rationally because the technology did not fit their circumstances. Farm size was the only individual characteristic found to be important in the CIMMYT study. However even smaller farmers adopt the same technologies as large farmers after an initial lag time, so farm size appears to be only a temporary factor in adoption (Byerlee, & Hesse de Polanco, 1982). According to Rogers (1995), it is a mistake to imply that laggards are to blame for their relatively late adoption of innovations, because the system blame hypothesis may better describe the reality of the laggards situation.

According to van den Ban, & Hawkins (1996), each case should be tested with both hypotheses to determine which best fits,. Furthermore, both hypotheses can contribute to a better understanding of how to better serve disengaged farmers. Clearly, more information is needed about the barriers between disengaged farmers and the university. Further research should be conducted with regard to disengaged farmers. Perhaps a qualitative case study of disengaged

farmers who fit this profile would provide answers as to how the university could better connect with this particular group.

References

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L., & Razavieh, A. (1996). *Introduction to research in education*. (5th ed.). Ft. Worth: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- Byerlee, D., & Hesse de Polanco, E. (1982). *The rate and sequence of adoption of improved cereal technologies: the case rainfed barley in the Mexican altiplano*. Economics working paper No. 82/4, CIMMYT, Mexico.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method*. New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Dillman, D. A., Engle, C. F., Long, J. S., & Lamiman, C. E. (1989). Others influencing others. *Journal of Extension*, 27(1), Available [On-line] <http://www.joe.org>.
- Kelsey, K. D., & Mariger, S. C. (2002). *A survey-based model for setting research, education, and extension priorities at the land-grant university*. Unpublished research report. Oklahoma state university, Stillwater, OK.
- Keppel, G., (1991) *Design and analysis a researcher's handbook*. (3rd ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). *Educational and psychological measurement*. Danville, IL: Interstate Printers and Publishers.
- Lindner, J. R., Murphy, T. H., & Briers, G. E. (2001). Handling nonresponse in social science research. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 42(4), 43-53.
- Lionberger, H. F. (1960) *Adoption of new ideas and practices*. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press.
- Lowry, R. (2002) *VassarStats* Web-site Available [On-line] <http://faculty.vassar.edu/lowry/VassarStats.html>
- Miller, L. E., & Smith, K. L. (1983). Handling nonresponse issues. *Journal of Extension*, 21(5), 45-50.
- Rogers, E. M. (1995) *Diffusion of innovations*. (4th ed) New York: The Free Press.
- Seevers, B., Graham, D., Gamon, J., & Conklin, N. (1997). *Education through Cooperative Extension*. Delmar Publishers, Albany NY.

- SPSS 8.0, (1997). *SPSS 8.0 graduate pack for windows* [Computer Program] Chicago, Ill: SPSS Inc.
- Steel, R. G., Torrie, J. H., & Dickey, D. A. (1997). *Principles and procedures of statistics a biometrical approach*. (3rd ed). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Stevens, J., (2002) *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. (4th ed). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- van den Ban, A. W., & Hawkins, H. S., (1996). *Agricultural extension*. (2nd ed). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Science, Inc.
- Wiersma, W. (2000). *Research methods in education an introduction*. (7th ed). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.