

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

JOHN ALVAN LEFFEL for the MASTER OF SCIENCE
(Name) (Degree)

in AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION presented on May 8, 1967
(Major) (Date)

Title: GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A LIVESTOCK
PROGRAM FOR PART-TIME FARMERS

Abstract approved: Redacted for Privacy
Dr. Henry Ten Pas

The part-time farmer is becoming an increasing important part of the American Way of Life. The Cooperative Extension Service should be prepared to work with these people and help fulfill their educational needs.

The purpose of this study is to provide some guidelines that can be used in developing an effective livestock extension program for the part-time farmer. Some of the findings of this paper might also be used in developing extension programs in other areas besides livestock.

A questionnaire was mailed to extension service personnel doing livestock work west of the Cascade mountains in Washington and Oregon. Most of the counties sampled had some urban and suburban developments. From the information secured in the questionnaire, the guidelines were developed.

The main findings from the study are:

1. Even with parts of Oregon and Washington sparsely populated, 60 percent of the counties in the study have over 40 percent of their farmers that are part-time.
2. Forty-eight percent of the agents actually spent less than ten percent of their time with part-time farmers.
3. Livestock operations make up the largest percent of part-time farms. Of the 25 counties in the study, 11 estimated that 70 percent of their part-time operations were livestock and 17 estimated over 50 percent were livestock operations.
4. Educational meetings that are most successful in terms of participation for part-time operators are: Tours, Lecture and Demonstration, Field Days, Method Demonstrations and Plots.

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made.

1. Agriculture Extension Agents located where there is a vast influx of part-time farmers, should organize a committee to help plan the program and work with these people. Programs planned for part-time farmers should follow procedures similar to programs for full-time farmers.
2. College staff personnel and extension specialists should be available for planning and presenting programs for part-time farmers as well as full-time farmers.

3. Fact sheets or small bulletins would be more useful for part-time operators than many present materials. The majority of the agents felt that materials should not be prepared in the field.
4. Agents should explore the possibility of evening radio and T. V. programs for part-time farmers.
5. Agents should hold tours and method demonstrations meetings for part-time farmers, preferably on Saturdays.

Guidelines for the Development of a Livestock
Extension Program for Part-time Farmers

by

John Alvan Leffel

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Science

June 1968

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Head of Department of Agriculture Education and Professor
in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

State Extension Training Leader

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented

May 8, 1967

Typed by Gwendolyn Hansen for

John Alvan Leffel

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his appreciation to the following staff members of Oregon State University: to Dr. Henry Ten Pas and Dr. Phil Davis of the Agriculture Education Department for their assistance and invaluable guidance throughout my graduate program and in preparation of this thesis; and, to Dr. Cliff Smith, State Extension Training Leader for his assistance on the thesis.

Sincere appreciation is expressed to my wife, Marlene, for her help, patience, and encouragement throughout this period of study.

Appreciation is extended to the Extension Staff of Washington County for their encouragement and assistance in making it possible for me to complete my studies and thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study	3
History and Background	4
Hypotheses	8
Procedures	9
Definition of Terms	12
Limitations to the Study	14
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	15
Part-time Farming in Early 1930	15
The Post War Period	16
Summarization of Related Literature	20
PRESENTING AND INTERPRETING DATA	22
Background Information Related to the Study	23
Committee Development and Program Planning	33
Program Presentation	38
Evaluation	44
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	46
Summary	46
Conclusions	48
Recommendations	50
BIBLIOGRAPHY	52
APPENDIX I. Covering Letters for Questionnaire	54
APPENDIX II. Questionnaire	57

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. 1960 to 1980 Population Changes by Counties, Urban Portions, Standard Metropolitan Area	24
2. The Amount of Extension Service Experience and the Length of Time in the Present Position	26
3. Population Figures, the Number of Towns and Cities Over 2,500 People and the Locations of These Communities	27
4. The Number of Farms, Number of Part-Time Farms, the Percent of Part-Time Farms and Agents Estimates of Those That are Part-Time Livestock Operations	28
5. The Acres in Farms, Acres of Cropland, and Acres Suitable Only to Grazing	29
6. Amount of Time that Agents Feel Should Be Spent and the Time Actually Spent with Part-Time Operators	30
7. The Estimated Livestock Income in the Counties, the Percent of this Income From Part-time Operations and the Percent of Assistance Requested on Livestock from Part-time Operations	32
8. Summary of Agents' Responses to Program Planning Questions	33
9. Methods Used in Appointing Members Serving on the Part-time Planning Committees	34
10. Methods Used in Planning the Extension Program for Part-Time Farmers When There was No Committee	35
11. The Composition of a Committee for Planning a Part-Time Livestock Program	35
12. The Nomination of Members for the Committee	36

Table	Page
13. Agents' Opinions Regarding Printed Materials for Part-time Operators	39
14. The Various Types of Educational Meetings Used by Agriculture Extension Agents	40
15. The Use of Radio and Television by Extension Agents, and The Effect on the Livestock Program	42
16. Livestock Enterprises Agents Have Found to be Most Satisfactory	42
17. Subject Matter Areas that Extension Agents Feel Should Receive Major Attention	43
18. To What Extent do Extension Agents Feel the Program Objectives Are Being Met	45

GUIDELINES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LIVESTOCK EXTENSION PROGRAM FOR PART-TIME FARMERS

INTRODUCTION

Many counties throughout the United States are rapidly changing from a rural to an urban or suburban atmosphere. This change is especially true in areas near metropolitan centers. A paradox to this migration is the large number of people who work in the city, yet live outside and commute daily. Many families own small acreages from which they desire to earn some income. Others may be interested in having a hobby project, or wish the quiet country surroundings. These people are referred to as part-time, suburban, or hobby farmers.

These part-time farmers are a part of the American way of life. With the rapid increase in total population, the opportunity for various types of employment, and the background of the people has been instrumental in an increase of part-time operations. The sociological tendencies of the past where the rural and urban people had separate interests are diminishing. We now see a blending of rural-urban civilization with many people having common interests. Some of this blending has been brought about by the increasing numbers of part-time farmers. The trend to the part-time operation is evident

throughout the United States and not confined to any one given section of the country. From 1929 to 1964, the percentage of all farm operators working at least 100 days off the farm increased from 11.5 to 30.1 percent. Not only are the once full-time farmers becoming part-time operators, but the people who have had very little or no farm background are trying to become successful part-time farmers.

The people with these operations, and those interested in obtaining information on small scale farming are going to continue to become more prevalent and needful. They have been with us for years, but not in the numbers that they are today or will be in the future.

Statement of the Problem

Those persons in agriculture, as well as industry and other professional business, must adjust to the changing technology if they are to survive in today's economy. It often is necessary for proprietors of such businesses to continue their education to meet the present economic challenge.

Since the beginning of the Cooperative Extension Service one of the prime objectives has been to assist in fulfilling the educational needs of the people which they serve.

The part-time farmer has definite educational needs to become

more successful and satisfied with his operation. Up-to-date information is needed on new types and varieties of grains and grasses for pastures; improved feeds and methods and amounts to feed; types and amounts of fertilizer and where to use them; methods, amounts and materials to use in insect control; improved methods of management for both livestock and crops; markets for his products; and others.

The livestock extension program has worked toward answering many of these needs. However, looking back, it is realized that the majority of the work has been with full-time operations. This is understandable as the largest percentage of the rural population made its living from farming, but now these goals must be changed. The problem which precipitated this study is to determine the ways the Extension Service can provide assistance to part-time livestock farmers.

Purpose of the Study

The basic purpose of this study is to develop a plan for conducting an effective livestock extension program for the part-time farmers. This program will be aimed at the suburban part-time farm operators.

In order to accomplish the objectives of this paper, answers need to be found to some of the special problems of reaching this audience. Some of these problems are:

1. The work schedules commonly followed by part-time operators make it difficult for the Extension Agent to contact them during the agent's normal office hours.
2. Educational meetings held just for full-time operators often do not apply to the part-time farmers.
3. Meetings held just for the part-time operator are often poorly attended because of conflicting interests.
4. Part-time farmers often lack even the basic knowledge of agriculture.

If answers to these problems can be found and shared, then this paper will be of special significance to the extension agent who is faced with developing a program of work for the part-time farmer.

History and Background

People are continuing to leave the farm for the city or suburban area. It has been estimated that by 1980 there will be only one-half the number of farmers that there are today. As the trend continues the influx of more urban and suburban part-time farmers could become greater. Many of our rural areas today, located where industry and growth are a certainty, must be ready to cope with the change. The Extension Service also must be geared to assist these people if the urban influx intensifies.

The author is working in an area where the above mentioned is happening. A look at Washington County, not because it may be typical, but to show how the change develops, should further set the stage for the need of this paper.

Washington County is known for bountiful crops, scenic beauty, and dynamic population growth. The county comprises the drainage area of the Tualatin River and its tributaries. From these streams sixteen thousand acres of land are irrigated, mostly by sprinkler.

The eastern part of the county is located only ten minutes from downtown Portland. Portland is Oregon's largest city and the hub of the state's export and import activity. The city is the head of ocean transportation. It is located at the confluence of the Willamette and Columbia Rivers. These rivers make it possible for several trans-oceanic and inter-coastal steamship carriers to use the port of Portland. This port helps provide access to ocean transportation for those products in the county which have to be sold on an export market or laid down by water on the east coast. Adequate transportation systems are available with railroads and main truck highways throughout the county. These highways help provide easy entry to the terminal facilities in Portland.

Washington County is described as Portland's gateway from town to country. Hillsboro, the county seat, is located near the center of the county. However, it is not the center of trade for the area as

it is only twenty miles from the business section of Portland.

According to the 1964 U. S. census, Washington County had a population of 112,246. Since the 1964 census, estimates by the Oregon State Board of Census of July 1, 1966 indicate that the county now has 120,000 or an increase of 8 percent. Hillsboro, alone, has increased over 1,000 people, yet this is not the area of fastest growth. During the past two decades the eastern portion of the county, adjacent to Portland, has rapidly become an urbanized and suburban residential area. Since 1960, when the population was 5,937 people, the city of Beaverton has grown to about 12,000 in 1966 or about 100 percent increase. All of the land east of Hillsboro is rapidly becoming an urban area.

The 1964 census also indicates that there are 721 square miles in the county with a total land area of 458,240 acres. Of this amount, 200,343 acres are of farmland with 99,313 acres in harvested cropland. Since the 1959 census, acreage in farms has decreased nearly 11,000 acres and over 6,000 acres was harvested cropland. Total farms have decreased 317. This decrease has been largely in the part-time classification. These farms have decreased 265. It is possible that this decrease has been brought about by the change in the census definition. There actually has been a decrease of 282 farms in the "other farm" section of the census. These include part-time, part retirement, and abnormal farms. We do, however, find an

increase in the class VI farms (sales of \$50 to \$2,499) by 82. This trend seems very consistent in the areas covered by the questionnaire. Even with this decrease in part-time farms, they still make up 35 percent of all the county farms; and farms in the "other farm" classification make up 49 percent. The remaining acres of Washington County are in pasture of all types, and timberland. These are located in the Western end of the county in the coast range and its foothills.

Agriculture is a basic wealth producing enterprise. According to the 1964 census county farm income was estimated at 20 and 1/2 million dollars. Thirty-six percent of this income came from livestock and 64 percent from field crops, horticulture, and speciality crops. This income was produced on 2,468 farms of which, approximately 1,420 were 49 acres or smaller. These small farms are mostly rural non-farm homes which have some production of poultry, livestock, vegetables, and horticulture. The larger farms produce the abundance of dairy products, small fruits, seed and grains, vegetables, and tree fruits and nuts. In addition to agriculture, food processing and a variety of manufacturing industries also are major wealth producing enterprises of the county.

The climate conditions are ideal for many agriculture crops. Maximum temperature rarely reaches 90 degrees and minimum winter temperatures will drop below freezing for only a few days

each winter.

The annual rainfall averages 45 inches. The growing season is approximately 200 days long for the hardy crops and the frost-free period is usually over 120 days. This short frost-free season limits the production of certain crops such as melons, sorghums, and soybeans. However, even with this limitation the Willamette Valley, in which Washington County is located, is one of the most diversified areas in our country.

One of the largest growing agriculture industries in the county is the nursery business. There are over 100 acres of glass houses and an annual income of over two and one-half million dollars. This industry has grown along with the population. Two reasons why it has grown may be the large demand for landscaping materials and the need to get more net income per acre.

Hypotheses

To better understand the nature of the problem that faces agents when working with part-time farmers, and to provide a basis for a solution, it will be determined whether the following are true.

The following hypotheses are formulated:

1. A committee of suburban livestock operators is necessary for planning an extension program for part-time farmers. The committee members should be selected by the county agent, the livestock association executive committee, and

the committee itself.

2. The Program Planning Committee and other available resource people should be involved in presenting the Extension Program for part-time livestock operators.
3. The University Extension Specialist should be available to help identify program opportunities for the part-time livestock operator.
4. The part-time livestock operator should be encouraged to attend special interest group meetings, as well as regular Extension programs if the subject matter pertains to them.
5. Agriculture bulletins, special literature, and other educational information would be used if prepared especially for the part-time livestock operators.
6. Radio and television are a successful means of reaching many part-time livestock operators.
7. Enterprises that are neither time consuming nor large are the most successful for the part-time livestock operator.

Procedures

A number of personal interviews were conducted with county agents and specialists before actually starting the research on the paper. In these interviews particular attention was given to the type of information that it was felt would be needed in developing a program

for part-time farmers and to find a satisfactory solution to the problems.

The primary source of information used in this study was from the questionnaire. A copy is included in the appendix.

The questionnaire was mailed to livestock agents or agents doing livestock work in counties located in the western parts of Washington and Oregon. It was felt that these counties would give a good cross-sectional view of the problems of part-time farmers, as most of these counties have some urban and suburban developments in them.

A letter was sent to the Directors of Extension in Washington and Oregon explaining the purpose of the study and asking their permission to send out the questionnaire to their agents. The State of Washington has a number of area agents, working both in livestock and dairy. Because of this condition the director was asked to submit the names of the agents and counties in which they work to prevent duplicate mailings. Consequently, not all counties in Western Washington received questionnaires.

The following counties were contacted through the help of the Directors and the State Extension Supervisor of Washington and the State Extension Training Leader in Oregon.

Washington

Clark
Cowlitz
Jefferson
King
Kitsap
Lewis
Mason
Pierce
San Juan
Skagit
Snohomish
Thurston

Oregon

Benton
Clackamas
Clatsop
Columbia
Coos
Curry
Douglas
Hood River
Jackson
Josephine
Klamath
Lane
Lincoln
Linn
Marion
Multnomah
Polk
Tillamook
Yamhill

Follow-up letters and additional questionnaires were sent as reminders to those failing to return the questionnaire within three

weeks. The response and interest shown in the study were very encouraging. Seventy-eight percent of the questionnaires were returned. A summary will be sent to those indicating an interest in the study.

The data collected were tabulated and the tables and analysis of the data are included in Chapter III.

From these data, a summary of the findings and conclusions was prepared as a basis for determining to what extent the Hypotheses of this writer were supported.

Definition of Terms

The following are explanations of terms as used in this study.

Cooperative Extension Service: A Federal, State and County supported off-campus organization of Oregon State University which has the responsibility of carrying out the educational program of the University. The offices are mostly located in counties.

Part-time Farmers: A person less than 65 years old with an acreage of any size and a gross farm income from \$50 to \$2,499 who works off the farm 100 days or more per year, or if other income exceeds farm income.

Agriculture Extension Agents (Livestock): A professional educator employed by the Cooperative Extension Service and working out

of an extension office in a county. This particular agent would have the responsibility of working with livestock producers.

Directors of Extension: A professional educator employed at the State University. He is in charge of the Cooperative Extension Service in a given state.

Extension Training Leader: A professional educator employed at the State University. He is in charge of advanced training for agents and specialists in the counties and central staff.

Metropolitan Area: An area corresponding roughly to a 20 mile radius from a city center. This is an area that is becoming thickly populated but still has thousands of rural families with farm and/or off-farm agriculture interests.

Urban: Incorporated cities or towns that have a population of over 2,500 people living within its city limits.

Suburban: Area that surrounds an urban city or town that is located just outside the city limits.

Rural: All people living in the open country outside of urban places of less than 2,500 people where the farm is the central point of interest.

Sprawl: Areas that are widely scattered and built-up into housing that were established without any planning or wise use of sections of land.

Limitations to the Study

This study is limited because:

1. The questionnaire was circulated to county agents located west of the Cascade Mountains in Oregon and Washington. Only area agents with livestock responsibilities in Washington were asked to respond.
2. The information from some of the agents may have been limited because they may not have dealt with part-time operators.
3. The questionnaire was limited mainly to answering specific questions posed by the hypotheses. Many aspects of the problem of Extension work with the part-time livestock operators could not be considered in this study.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The bulk of the studies and reports written on part-time farmers were done during the depression years when a large percent of our farm population worked off the farm. Most of the recent work has been done by Michigan State University. This chapter will be divided into two periods of time, the depression of the 1930's and the post World War II. All studies are on the part-time farming in general and not on enterprises.

Part-time Farming in Early 1930

Robert L. Adams (1934), stated that there are no distinguishing features that single out part-time farmers, the only requirement being that the land owned or purchased normally must be within commuting distance to employment in cities and/or principle towns.

The majority of the part-time farms were twenty acres or less with most of the land carrying a high tax base, because of its location to subdivisions. When Adams interviewed the part-time farmers on their reasons for selecting the farm, enterprises and desires he obtained the following answers: 1) They were leaning to livestock (eggs, poultry, fryers, cows, etc.) for enterprises; 2) Marketing of product was through co-ops; 3) Most made money, and hired little outside labor; 4) and they chose to have part-time

operations for personal rather than economic reasons.

During 1929 to 1934, 18 to 20 percent of the United States farmers had outside employment. This ran as high as 60 percent in some areas of the nation. A fair estimate was that two out of every ten farmers had outside employment. Clackamas County in Oregon was one of the surveyed areas. The reported farm figures showed 6,200 farms of which 2,940 or 47.4 percent were in control of operators who worked off the farm for pay in 1934. Of 2,300 classified outside occupations, 76.9 percent were nonagriculture, according to the U. S. Census, (1935).

Kuhlum, Flippin and Nierderfrank (1935) reported that 25 percent of all Oregon Farmers were part-time, and the average part-time farm was ten acres, of which four were cultivable.

The Post War Period

Part-time farms, according to Shultis (1944) of California, are those with some agriculture produce for sale, but income too small to maintain a family. Its success depends on the reliability of outside income, whether from investments, pensions, or employment away from home.

Many part-time farms today are purchased originally with the mistaken idea that they are adequate for family income, and are being resold on that basis.

There is a definite place for the part-time farmers, said Shultis, (1944a) providing the buyer realizes what he is getting and is aware of its possibilities and limitations. Part-time farming should not be undertaken by an owner who is fully employed off the farm unless other members of the family have time and the ability to carry on the agriculture production, or unless the owner is willing to devote his few free hours to an enterprise that fits his daily schedule.

George Douglas and Arthur D. Mackie (1957), indicate that part-time farming is a phenomenon which has been increasing steadily in the United States. Contrary to popular thought, part-time farming is not a new development. It is an aspect of an area transition from an agricultural to an industrial economy. The problems that arise from the rural community's adjustment to industrialization and part-time farming cannot be overlooked.

Reasons given by people going into part-time farming were:

1. It was a cheaper way to live.
2. It has protected many from total unemployment when there was no off-farm work.
3. The country is a better place to rear children; and
4. The farm is a place they could retire.

Agents beginning to organize a program for part-time farmers should consider what Douglas (1957a) mentioned. The nature of

agriculture programs designed to help part-time farmers use their farm resources more efficiently should consider whether farm families look upon farming as a supplementary enterprise to off-farm work or as a future full-time occupation. Hence, agriculture programs for part-time farmers should consider the needs, aspirations, resources, family attitudes, and educational level of the farm family toward whom the programs are directed.

Work done on program development by Hardee (1963), North Carolina also states that the obstacles of planning and holding meetings for the part-time operators will compete with wide variations in off-farm work schedules. They found demonstrations were the most effective teaching method used in their special five-year study. Mass media communication was also very effective in carrying out program plans. Seventy-five percent of the part-time people in the survey reported reading and referring to the bulletins and newsletters. Hardee (1963a) further found that a long-range program will be more effective than a program of limited span.

Ralph A. Loomis (1965) states that part-time farmers are dual-job holders that involve a combination of farm and off-farm use of their labor resources. The part-time farm grew to 29.8 percent of all farms in 1959. The Pacific Division which excludes Alaska and Hawaii had the third highest percentage of part-time farming in 1959 with 29.8 percent. In the three Pacific States two out of five farmers

worked 100 or more days off the farm. When one considers all off-farm work, the highest proportion is in the Western Region.

Part-time farming in terms of number of farms is important, but another indicator is production. Part-time farms comprised nearly one-fourth of the 3.7 million farms in the United States in 1959, but sold only 2.3 percent of the farm products. The average value of products sold from part-time farms was \$800. Part-time farmers operate only six percent of the farm land resources.

The part-time farmer has farm enterprises that use labor less intensively. The land is used more extensively for grazing or grain crops that do facilitate mechanized production and harvest. Part-time farmers feel a prestige in owning farm machinery, said Loomis (1965a).

Educators are not entirely in agreement on developing programs for part-time farmers. Douglas (1957b) feels investigations should be made to determine such attributes of part-time operators as:

1. Managerial ability
2. Learning capacity
3. Desire or motivation for improvement in level of living
4. Attitude toward farming and acceptance of technical aid, and
5. The availability of resources

Dixon Hubbard (1967) also feels that research for the part-time farmer to better develop programs is needed, he indicates the need

for:

1. Budgets to show the land, labor and management levels required along with the economic aspects of producing a particular class of livestock or crop; and
2. Time schedules to show peak seasons for labor and management.

Evaluation is also an important step when considering the value of an Extension part-time farming program, stated Mullins (1964). Some suggested points that can be used are:

1. Production and sales of farm products.
2. Amount of off-farm income.
3. Level of learning.
4. Participation in Organized Groups
5. Knowledge of Extension Program
6. Acceptance of improved practices.

Summarization of Related Literature

Several other studies reviewed by the author contained similar information to that already reported so they are not included in this report. These studies are, however, listed in the bibliography.

Part-time farmers have no distinguishing features that single them out. During the depression days the number of part-time farmers was approximately 20 percent, but ran as high as 60 percent

in some areas of the country.

Many part-time farms today are being purchased with the mistaken idea that they will provide adequate family income. A buyer must realize what he is getting, and should be aware of its possibilities and limitations.

People have given some of the following reasons for going into part-time farming:

1. It is a cheaper way to live.
2. It has protected many from unemployment.
3. The country is a better place to rear children.
4. The farm is a place to retire.

Part-time farms in terms of numbers are important, but in terms of production they are not. In 1959 approximately one-fourth of the 3.7 million farms were part-time.

When organizing an educational program for the part-time farmers, agents should consider whether they are looking to farming as a supplementary enterprise to off-farm work or full-time farming. The needs, aspirations, resources, family attitudes and educational levels should be considered.

PRESENTING AND INTERPRETING DATA

The information and data used in this study were obtained from a questionnaire that was circulated to 31 Extension Agents in the states of Washington and Oregon.

The Agents selected were from the western half of both states because of the concentration of part-time farmers in this area.

Twenty-five of 31 agents completed the questionnaire. All of these were usable and are summarized on the following pages. Some agents did not answer all of the questions, therefore a few tables may show a number smaller than 25. Some questions also had two or more items checked. These when added to the total make the responses on some tables larger than 25.

Data that were collected and used in the study are in the areas of:

1. Background information on the counties which is related to the study;
2. Program development information in regard to committee selections and make up;
3. Methods used in selection and presenting educational programs, and
4. The types of enterprises most desirable.

This chapter will be devoted to the data in the order listed above.

Background Information Related to the Study

The extension service must be prepared to cope with the rapid influx of people into the Northwest. This large influx, according to census estimates, will be in the western halves of the states of Oregon and Washington. Many of these people may become part-time farmers, of which the largest percent will run some livestock.

The Willamette Basin Region, which is composed of nine counties in Western Oregon, has only 12 percent of the state's total area, but 67 percent of Oregon's population. This area has a population concentration of approximately 300 persons per square mile. This concentration is naturally higher in the urban centers. However, there is a pattern of low-density urban growth which is sometimes called the "sprawl." The projections are that by 1985 the over-all densities of the valley will reach over 500 people per acre.

In bringing this down to an even smaller area, Washington County will again be used solely as an example. This county is expected to have the highest population growth rate in the four-county Portland Metropolitan area in the next 15 years. The population will more than double between 1960 and 1980, increasing from 92,000 to 191,000.

The population now requires an area of 23,000 acres for home units. By 1980, an additional 16,000 acres or 26.5 square miles of vacant or agriculture lands will be needed for housing development.

More than 75 percent of the future growth is expected to occur within the urban portions of the county.

In July 1962, the Portland Metropolitan Planning Commission published a detailed population projection for the areas of Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington Counties in Oregon and Clark County in Washington. This projection is only for the "Urban Area" and is shown in Table 1 to reveal the trends of growth.

Table 1. 1960 to 1980 Population Changes by Counties, Urban Portions, Standard Metropolitan Area

	1960	1980	Net Increase	Percent Increase	Growth Factor
Multnomah Urban	517,939	632,911	114,972	24	1.24
Clackamas Urban	76,974	155,689	78,715	104	2.04
Washington Urban	53,504	128,900	75,396	143	2.43
Clark Urban	63,826	121,500	57,674	91	1.91
Total Urban Area	712,243	1039,000	326,757	48	1.48

The city of Portland's population has decreased slightly, but the metropolitan area has grown substantially. In 1960, the three county area population was 728,000, while the Salem urban area was 77,000 and the Eugene-Springfield urban area 99,000.

Population projections of the U. S. Public Health Service indicate that by 1985 the basin population will increase 85 percent to 2,131,000. The Salem urban area is projected to 178,000; the Eugene-Springfield urban area should increase to 160,000; and the Portland Metropolitan area to 1,380,000. Another 174,000 people are expected in the Corvallis, Albany area. By using these figures for comparison, one can further see the trends of population in the western parts of Oregon and Washington by looking at the Willamette Basin. With this projected increase there will be enough new residents to form a city one-half larger than the present Portland urban area.

With this growth information and background in mind one might now look at the counties from which agents responded to the questionnaires.

As shown in Table 2, 80 percent of the county agents have 11 or more years' experience and 60 percent have 16 years or over.

One may assume that with their experience, these respondents are well qualified. As far as tenure in their county is concerned, 64 percent have been in the same position six years or over, and 52 percent of the agents 11 years or more. With this length of

service one may assume they are very familiar with the trends and changes that are occurring.

Table 2. The Amount of Extension Service Experience and the Length of Time in the Present Position

	Number Returned	Years					Over 26
		0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	
Number of Agents by Years in Extension	25	4	1	5	4	6	5
Number of Agents by Years in Present Position	25	9	3	6	3	3	1

The population of the counties and the distribution of the population is shown in Table 3. In the opinion of the respondents, 40 percent of the counties had employment opportunities outside of their boundaries. In other words, people lived in and owned small acreages in one county and worked in an adjoining county. Eighty-four percent of the counties surveyed had five or less towns with a population of 2,500 people or more. This would indicate that the western halves of the states of Oregon and Washington are still not densely populated and that there are many small towns of less than 2,500 people. Table 4 indicates that of the 25 counties surveyed, 15 have over 40 percent part-time farmers, and all but one county had over 30 percent in this category. Agents estimated that in 11 counties, 70 percent of the part-time farmers are livestock operators

and in 17 of the counties, over 50 percent are livestock operators.

Table 3. Population Figures, the Number of Towns and Cities Over 2,500 People and the Locations of These Communities

County	County Population	Number Towns & Cities Over 2,500	Population of Largest City in Co. or Area	In the Respondent's Opinion is a Large City in Area Where People are Employed that Influences Suburban Population in County	
				Yes	No
Benton	47,000	1	29,500		x
Clackamas	137,000	5	384,000	x	
Clark	100,000	4	384,000	x	
Clatsop	28,000	2	10,700		x
Columbia	25,000	1	384,000	x	
Coos	55,000	4	14,200		x
Curry	13,000	1	2,600		x
Douglas	76,000	5	15,000		x
Jackson	96,000	3	29,300		x
Jefferson-Clallam*	39,000	2	18,000		x
Josephine	34,000	1	12,500		x
King	1,250,000	8	600,000		x
Kitsap	90,000	3	35,000	x	
Klamath	48,000	1	17,700		x
Lane	201,000	3	75,300		x
Lincoln	25,000	3	5,750		x
Linn	66,000	3	29,500	x	
Marion	140,000	6	66,200		x
Mason	18,000	1	6,000		x
Multnomah	600,000	2	384,000	x	
Pierce	1,070,000	8	500,000	x	
Polk	33,000	3	66,200	x	
San Juan	3,100	None	850		x
S. W. Washington*	66,360	3	19,600	x	
Yamhill	37,000	2	8,900	x	

* Two or more counties.

Table 4. The Number of Farms, Number of Part-Time Farms, the Percent of Part-Time Farms and Agents Estimates of Those That are Part-Time Livestock Operations

County	Number* of Farms	Number of* P. T. Farms	Percent* of Farms That are Part-Time	Estimate of Agents as to Percent of Part-Time Farmers That are Livestock Operators
Benton	858	374	45	75
Clackamas	4,116	1,910	46	70
Clark	2,610	1,328	50	30
Clatsop	486	201	43	80
Columbia	1,149	559	48	60
Coos	1,058	427	40	75
Curry	263	90	34	No estimate
Douglas	1,922	904	48	80
Jackson	1,556	605	38	50
Jefferson-Clallam**	932	458	49	60
Josephine	823	343	41	40
King	1,825	703	39	90
Kitsap	845	505	59	30
Klamath	1,072	235	21	10
Lane	2,893	1,426	49	80
Lincoln	504	252	50	65
Linn	2,434	912	37	50
Marion	3,388	927	33	55
Mason	297	160	57	10
Multnomah	918	307	33	20
Pierce	2,054	890	43	80
Polk	1,235	415	33	70
San Juan	166	65	40	80
S. W. Washington**	4,538	2,106	46	85
Yamhill	2,056	740	36	60

* 1964 U. S. Census

** Two or more counties

Table 5. The Acres in Farms, Acres of Cropland, and Acres Suitable Only to Grazing

County	Acres In Farms	Acres of Cropland	Acreage Suitable Only to Grazing and Not Cultivable
Benton	207,633	91,266	81,376
Clackamas	261,812	143,059	76,147
Clark	179,577	92,782	53,338
Clatsop	39,501	14,775	15,046
Columbia	94,988	35,052	35,474
Coos	248,716	40,227	147,065
Curry	109,878	16,521	80,637
Douglas	528,304	114,761	357,847
Jackson	643,386	85,462	520,905
Jefferson-Clallam *	85,228	34,728	26,289
Josephine	75,948	26,059	18,623
King	82,355	43,707	21,316
Kitsap	50,907	8,916	7,994
Klamath	1,091,929	275,545	782,384
Lane	416,195	138,967	204,366
Lincoln	68,378	12,352	40,327
Linn	467,279	261,825	166,041
Marion	333,624	33,454	58,891
Mason	36,802	7,609	9,355
Multnomah	66,728	33,045	22,806
Pierce	132,249	39,973	67,608
Polk	215,054	137,899	46,376
San Juan	37,912	13,516	9,605
S. W. Washington *	509,462	196,052	178,051
Yamhill	254,970	139,852	78,265

* Two or more counties

From this study, one might then assume that as part-time farms increase in the surveyed area, at least one-half of these should be operated by livestock owners.

One will also note from Table 5 that in the counties that had a large percentage of part-time livestock farms, they had a large acreage of land suitable only for grazing.

A number of Extension Agents would like to spend more time with part-time farmers than they actually do. Table 6 indicates that eight agents feel they should spend less than ten percent of their time while 12 believe they should spend 11 to 20 percent of their time. However, 12 actually spend less than ten percent and eight spend 11 to 20 percent of their time.

Table 6. Amount of Time that Agents Feel Should Be Spent and the Time Actually Spent with Part-Time Operators

Number of Responses		Percentages of Time Agents Feel Should Be Spent				
		0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	Over 40
25	No. Agents	8	12	2		3
		Percentages of Time Agents Do Spend				
		0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	Over 40
25	No. Agents	12	8	2	1	2

A number of the agents indicated that the time they were able to spend on their regular livestock program was shrinking. These

agents wondered how they could spend more time with a part-time program. Others stated that they should show no difference between part-time and full-time operators, but treat them all the same.

Part-time farmers desire to utilize land with as little labor as possible and are in hopes of having some additional income. As indicated in Table 7, only four counties had 50 percent or more of their county livestock income from part-time operations. Twelve of the counties had income from part-time farmers accounting for 25 percent or less of the total livestock income.

These figures are interesting when one looks back to Table 4, where 16 of the counties had 40 percent or more part-time farmers. Eleven of these counties had more than 70 percent part-time farmers that were livestock operators. This study indicates that part-time livestock operators have proportionately smaller income than the average of all livestock operations in the counties.

Also revealed in Table 7 is that ten counties or 40 percent had part-time income of less than 25 percent of their totals. Eleven or 52 percent of the counties had more than 25 percent of the requests to the County Extension Office on livestock from part-time operators. This indicates that far more questions are being asked of the County Agent by the part-time operator than the full-time farmer in relation to their percent of the county income.

Table 7. The Estimated Livestock Income in the Counties, the Percent of this Income from Part-Time Operations and the Percent of Assistance Required on Livestock from Part-Time Operations

Counties	Estimated Income in County From Livestock	Percent of Estimated Income From Part-Time Livestock Operations	Estimated Percent of Request to Ext. Office on Livestock by Part-Time Operators
Benton	3,000,000	15	No estimate
Clackamas	3,587,000	No estimate	50
Clark	2,000,000	80	1
Clatsop	1,800,000	25	60
Columbia	3,000,000	12	25
Coos	1,852,000	No estimate	50
Curry	1,300,000	20	50
Douglas	3,000,000	10	10
Jackson	2,488,000	No estimate	40
Jefferson-Clallam*	3,616,619	10	75
Josephine	4,085,000	20	5
King	3,500,000	15	10
Kitsap	500,000	75	75
Klamath	17,000,000	25	25
Lane	3,000,000	50	90
Lincoln	792,000	35	5
Linn	8,272,000	15	No estimate
Marion	12,000,000	No estimate	5
Mason	No estimate	No estimate	5
Multnomah	739,000	35	2
Pierce	2,440,000	28	70
Polk	3,500,000	15	5
San Juan	300,000	60	10
S. W. Washington*	354,000	42	95
Yamhill	9,000,000	15	40

* Two or more counties

Committee Development and Program Planning

Twenty-one of the agents do not have a regularly planned live-stock program for the part-time operator, according to Table 8.

However, 14 of the agents indicated that they included the part-time operator as part of the regular program. Table 8 also shows that ten of the agents use a committee to help plan the livestock program for the part-time operators. However, 16 of the responding agents said that a Planning Committee should be used to plan the program.

Table 8. Summary of Agents' Responses to Program Planning Questions

	Number of Responses	Agents' Responses	
		Yes	No
Do you have a regular program for part-time operator?	25	4	21
Should the part-time operator be included in regular program?	25	14	11
Do you use a committee to plan the part-time program?	25	10	15
Do you feel a committee should be used to plan the program?	25	16	9

The ten agents that do use a committee to plan the part-time program indicated that their members were chosen to serve as appears in Table 9.

Table 9. Methods Used in Appointing Members Serving on the Part-Time Planning Committees

Individuals, committees or organization appointing committeemen	Number of counties
County Extension Agent	2
County Extension Council	1
County Farm Organization	1
Other	
County Livestock Association	3
Combinations of the above	3
Total responses	10

The largest percent of the members selected to serve were appointed by the County Livestock or Stockman's Association, and the County Extension Agent.

Twelve agents indicated that they planned the part-time program themselves. However, they do ask for guidance from others part of the time. (Table 10)

Agents were asked to give their opinions on the composition of a committee, who should nominate these members, and who should decide how often the committee should meet. The indications of the agents are shown in Tables 11 and 12. One should remember that only 16 agents felt that they should work with part-time planning groups, but all respondents were asked to answer these questions.

Over 16 (61 percent) of the respondents felt the committee

should have both part-time and full-time livestock farmers and a representation from the County Livestock Association. Twenty of the agents indicated that the largest delegation should be part-time operators. Only seven of the agents thought Business Leaders and Agency Personnel should be included.

Table 10. Methods Used in Planning the Extension Program for Part-Time Farmers When There Was No Committee

Those That Plan or Help Plan the Program	Number of Times Agent Indicated They Were Used
County Extension Agents	5
County Extension Agents and Livestock Specialists	1
County Livestock Association	2
County Extension Agents and Key People	2
County Extension Agents and Planning Council or Committees	2
Total Responses	12

Table 11. The Composition of a Committee for Planning a Part-Time Livestock Program

The Individual Make Up of the Committee	The Number of Agent Responses
Part-time Livestock Operators	4
Livestock Association Representatives	2
Either or both of the above along with combinations of full-time farm operators, local business leaders and agency representatives	16
Total Responses	22

Table 12. The Nomination of Members for the Committee

The Nomination Group	The Number of Agents that Feel These Groups and Individuals Should Nominate the Committee
Organized Livestock Groups	4
Organized Livestock Groups and Others	(7)*
County Extension Advisory Group	3
County Extension Advisory Group and Others	(7)
County Extension Agent	5
County Extension Agent and Others	(7)
Steering Committee of Part-time Operators	2
Any Combinations of the Above	8
	22
Total Responses	22

* () Indicates Combinations

Over 40 percent of the agents thought they should nominate or have a say in the nomination. Almost as many agents felt that the County Livestock Association should be involved in nominations.

When questioned on how often the committee should meet, 13 of the agents thought this should be a committee decision. Ten of the agents agreed to having the chairman and the Extension Agent decide when to meet. However, neither the agent nor the chairman of the committee should decide when to meet without consulting the other.

When the agents were asked if they thought University

Livestock Specialists or Staff Personnel should serve as resource persons when planning the part-time program, 21 of the respondents stated yes, if they could beneficially be used.

To help further plan a program for the part-time farmers, respondents were asked whether it would be better to integrate the part-time livestock operator with the full-time operator in educational programs or whether they should be treated separately.

Twenty of the agents indicated the best way to handle the part-time operator was to include them where feasible, with the regular extension livestock program.

Some of the agents gave the following reasons for their answer:

1. Combining the programs will permit the agents' time to be more efficiently used.
2. A part-time operator would have the advantage of associating with full-time operators.
3. Both operations are similar, except that the part-time operations may be on a smaller less efficient and profitable scale.
4. As long as the same basic principles apply, they should be combined.
5. Separate only when level of experience or knowledge caused a different need.

Program Presentation

The preferences of people causes one to look carefully at the various methods used in instructional presentations, and the selection of enterprises for the part-time farmer. By considering these two points agents and committees can better develop the Extension Program. It is easy for a person to find some reason for not attending a meeting or event; therefore, programs should be developed to meet the desires of the people. The most reliable way this can be done is to determine and then present what they prefer.

The use of lay persons as well as professionals in presenting educational information has long been accepted by county agents. They were asked if extension specialists, soil conservation personnel, company field men, local full-time farmers, and others should be used in presenting subject matter to part-time farmers.

It was the feeling of 20 of the agents that resource people could be used in presenting program material to the part-time farmer as long as the material they had to offer would fit into the program.

The respondents were asked their opinions on the printed materials that are available and whether they would use these or whether they would develop their own. The responses are found in Table 13. It is found that 18 (72 percent) of the agents thought that the printed materials the Universities now have are satisfactory for the part-time farmer. Nineteen (76 percent) of the respondents

indicated that they would use literature from commercial firms as well, if the materials were suitable.

Even though 18 of the agents said the bulletins the University now produces are satisfactory, 16 of the agents said fact sheets would be of more value than regular bulletins. Fourteen (56 percent) of those answering said the agents in the counties should not take the time to develop educational materials suitable to the part-time live-stock operator.

Table 13. Agents' Opinions Regarding Printed Materials for Part-time Operators

	Number of Responses	Agents' Responses	
		Yes	No
Is Present University Material Suited to the Part-time Farmer?	25	18	7
Would you Use Materials from Commercial Firms?	25	19	6
Are Fact Sheets of More Value Than Regular Bulletins	25	16	9
Should the Agent Develop Materials Suited for Part-time Operators	25	11	14

The types of educational meetings that agents have found most successful are shown in Table 14. One can assume if these are the most successful, that these are also an indication of the preference of the people. The respondents were asked to rank those showing the most successful as number one, etc., however, many of the agents only checked the answers so the table has been set up to show both the ranking and the total respondents.

Table 14. The Various Types of Educational Meetings Used by Agriculture Extension Agents

Types of Meeting	Number of Responses That Gave Ranking	Number of Responses Ranking the Success of the Meeting					Total Possible Points by Ranking	Total Responses
		1	2	3	4	5		
		Field Meeting to Observe						
Demonstration Plot	7	2	0	4	0	1	23	11
Method Demon.	9	2	1	0	4	2	24	14
Lecture and Discussion	11	2	3	0	3	3	31	16
Tours	10	3	4	3	0	0	37	18
Field Days	8	3	2	1	1	1	29	13
Others:								
Personal		2						
Contests		1						
Short Courses		1						

To rank these methods, points were given as follows: first-place votes five points, second-place votes four points, etc., through to the end. By this method, agents indicated that they felt tours were the most successful method of presenting information to the part-time livestock farmer. Tours also had the most responses if one counts those that were not ranked. The rest of the methods, in order are: Lecture and Discussion, Field Days, Method and Demonstration, and Observations of Demonstration Plots. The agents suggested that the tours and field days are more successful if held on a Saturday.

Radio and, more recently, television have been used by Extension Personnel in bringing rural people up to date on farm information. Agents were asked how effective they thought these two communication systems were and how much they used them in reaching part-time farmers.

Eighteen of the agents have regular radio or T. V. programs. Only five of these programs are television presentations. Of these regularly scheduled programs the agents only plan about 15 percent of them directly for the part-time operator. The agents were split 12-11 on the effectiveness of the programs. They also felt the program time was wrong to reach the majority of the part-time operators.

Agents, however, did rate the effect that the radio or television programs have had on telephone calls, literature requests, and farm calls through their offices. Of the 18 responses to the question, eight (45 percent) indicated there was an increase in requests, nine said they remained the same and one reported television and/or radio programs reduced the requests from the number he had had before. One can summarize by saying that the effect of the radio and television program geared toward part-time farmers has helped almost one-half of the offices to get an increase in requests. One-half the offices have seen no change. This pattern coincides with the same reports on their effectiveness the agents gave in Table 15.

Table 15. The Use of Radio and Television by Extension Agents, and Their Effect on the Livestock Program

Responses	Agents that Have Regular Radio or T. V. Programs		Are These Programs T. V. or Radio			Percent of Time to P. T. Farmer	Is It An Effective Method of Presentation		
	Yes	No	T. V.	Radio	Both		Yes	No	Fair
	25	18	7	5	16		3	15 - 20%	12

The agents felt the best enterprises for part-time farmers is a ewe flock and a cow-calf operation. Eighty-seven percent of the agents felt ewes should be kept instead of feeders and 73 percent thought cows were more suitable than feeders. The rest of the possible livestock enterprises did not receive a great deal of support.

Table 16. Livestock Enterprises Agents Have Found to be Most Satisfactory

Number of Responses	Types of Livestock	Percentages of Total by Enterprises		
		Breeding	Feeding	Hens
23	Sheep	87	13	
22	Beef	73	23	
6	Swine	50	50	
6	Dairy	16	83 (Vealers)	
7	Poultry			100
3	Rabbits	100		
5	Horses	100		

The agents were asked to indicate the subject areas of most importance for part-time farmers. Points were given in the same manner as Table 14, to rank these subject areas. First-place votes each received five points, fourth place each received four points, and so forth. Using this method, agents indicated that fertilizers and pasture management was the most important with feeding second. Others in order were Farm Records and Management, Marketing and Buying, and Breeding. All the agents responded for both fertilizers and pastures and feeding.

Table 17. Subject Matter Areas that Extension Agents Feel Should Receive Major Attention

Subject Matter Areas	Number of Responses That Gave Ranking	Number of Responses Ranking the Need for the Subject						Points Possible Thru Ranking
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
Feeding	25	10	7	2	2	4	0	92
Fertilizers & Pasture Improvement	25	11	6	7	1	0	0	102
Farm Records and Management	20	5	6	3	3	3	0	67
Breeding	20	0	2	2	9	6	1	38
Marketing and Buying	23	4	2	10	3	4	0	58
Others:								
Health	1	1						5

Evaluation

In order to begin an evaluation, the agents were asked to list some of the objectives of their part-time extension livestock program. These objectives were grouped as follows in the order the agents indicated.

1. To provide supplemental income for the individual part-time farmer.
2. To increase the quality and quantity of livestock and forage produced.
3. To help keep county land occupied and income up.
4. Supplement the family food supply.
5. Provide a desirable form of recreation for the part-time operator.
6. To make the best educational information available in an understandable and useable form.

Agents that now have a program for part-time farmers indicated that they evaluate it on some of the following information:

1. Program participation and office use by part-time livestock operators.
2. Increased net return to the part-time farmer.
3. The wise and maximum use of grass and fertilizer in the county.
4. The increase weight of lambs and calves sold and the percentage of those born marketed.

How well the agents feel the program for the part-time farmers is meeting its objectives is shown in Table 18.

Table 18. To What Extent do Extension Agents Feel the Program Objectives Are Being Met

Responses	To a Great Extent	To a Considerable Extent	To a Limited Extent	Not at all	Too Soon
22	1	4	16	0	1

Seventy-three percent of the agents felt that they were accomplishing the objectives of the part-time program to a limited extent.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The part-time farmer is becoming an increasingly important part of the American way of life. The trend to part-time farming is evident throughout the United States. In the past 25 years there has been an 18.6 percent increase in farm operators working at least 100 days off the farm. The big change to part-time farming has been in the areas near metropolitan centers. People work in the cities, yet live outside and commute daily. Many of these families own small acreages from which they desire to earn some income, have hobby projects, or want the quiet country surroundings.

The Cooperative Extension Service is the educational off-campus arm of the State University. It has assisted in fulfilling the educational needs of the people in the country. A great deal of its work in the field of agriculture has been with full-time farmers. The Extension Service also has the responsibility of providing educational assistance to the part-time operator. They should determine how they are best going to meet these needs.

The purpose of this study is to provide some guidelines that can be used in developing an effective livestock extension program for part-time farmers. It is also possible, that some of the findings

of this paper might be used in developing extension programs in other areas beside livestock.

To help understand the nature of the problem that Extension Agents must face when working with part-time farmers, questions like the following were considered: Since work schedules of part-time farmers are different from agents, how can contacts best be made? Do educational meetings held for full-time farmers apply to part-time farmers? Will conflicting interests of part-time farmers cause poor attendance at meetings held solely for them? These questions along with others were considered, and to provide a basis for a solution, a number of hypotheses were formulated.

Interviews were also held with county agents and specialists to determine the type of information needed and the procedures to be used. A questionnaire was mailed to livestock agents in Washington and Oregon located west of the Cascade Mountains. This area was selected because it would give a good cross-sectional view of the problems of part-time farmers. Most of the counties in the sample area had some urban and suburban developments.

Much of the related literature pertaining to part-time farmers was written during the depression years when so many people needed income of any kind. There has been some work since then, but these were studies done near the end of World War II to assist returning veterans. The most recent and up-to-date studies were those

conducted by Michigan State University. These reports are being used to a great extent as resource materials by the Federal Extension Service in developing its report on Extension responsibilities to farmers and ranchers with gross yearly incomes of less than \$10,000. This report will not be available for several months.

Conclusions

The conclusions of this study are based on data secured through the questionnaire. The main findings are listed below:

1. Part-time farming is increasing. Even with parts of western Oregon and Washington sparsely populated, 60 percent of the counties in the study have over 40 percent of their farmers that are part-time.
2. Livestock operations make up the largest percent of part-time farms. Of the 25 counties in the study, 11 estimated that 70 percent of their part-time operations were livestock and 17 estimated over 50 percent were livestock operations.
3. Forty-eight percent of the agents actually spent less than ten percent of their time with part-time farmers. Thirty-two percent do spend up to 20 percent.
4. Eighty-four percent of the Extension Agents indicated they do not have a program for part-time farmers. Fifty-six

percent of the agents said they used or thought a planning committee should be used.

5. The State Extension Livestock Specialist or other staff personnel should be used as resource persons when developing the part-time program according to over 90 percent of the agents.
6. Ninety percent of the agents thought that the part-time farmers should be included in the regular extension livestock program when feasible.
7. Over 80 percent of the agents said Extension Specialists, resource people and full-time farmers all should be used in presenting programs to part-time farmers.
8. Fact sheets would be better than other printed material according to 64 percent of the agents. However, 72 percent said they would use all pertinent information from both University and private industry.
9. Educational meetings that are most successful in terms of participation for part-time operators are in order of ranking: Tours, Lecture and Demonstrations; Field Days, Method Demonstrations and Plots.
10. Agents were about equally divided in their opinions as to whether or not radio and television educational programs are effective for part-time livestock operators.

11. Over 75 percent of the agents said that ewe flocks or small beef cow herds are most successful for part-time farmers.
12. The following subjects are the most needed, in order, for part-time farmers: fertilizer and pasture improvement, feeding and nutrition, farm records and management, marketing and buying, and breeding.

It is then concluded that hypotheses one, two, three, four, and seven are supported, while five was not supported and six was neither supported or refuted by the findings of this study.

Recommendations

The following recommendations based on the conclusions of this study, are presented as suggestions to improve the agriculture extension livestock program for the part-time livestock farmer.

1. Agriculture Extension Agents located where there is a vast influx of part-time farmers, should organize a committee to help plan the program and work with these people. Programs planned for part-time farmers should follow procedures similar to program planning for full-time farmers.

2. College staff personnel and extension specialists should be available for planning and presenting programs for part-time farmers as well as full-time farmers.
3. Fact sheets or small bulletins would be more useful for part-time operators than many present materials. These materials should not be prepared by agents in the field.
4. Agents should explore the possibility of evening radio and television programs for part-time farmers.
5. Agents should hold tours and method demonstration meetings for part-time farmers, preferably on Saturdays.
6. Further study is recommended to; A) determine the needs of the part-time livestock operator from his own view, B) determine how the part-time farmer feels the Agriculture Extension Service can best assist him, C) develop budgets to show the land, labor, and management required, along with possible economic return on enterprises that are feasible for the part-time operator, D) determine when the part-time operator can best meet for educational programs, and E) determine more effective ways of using radio and television for part-time farmers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, R. L. and J. L. Wann. 1934. Part-time farming for income. Berkeley, California. 46 p. (California. University. College of Agriculture. Bulletin no. 581)
- Colcord, Joanna C. 1947. Your community. 3d ed. New York, Russell Sage Foundation. 249 p.
- Douglas, George V. and Arthur D. Mackie. 1957. Some social and economic implications of part-time farming. Knoxville, Tennessee. 27 p. (Tennessee Valley Authority. Report no. T 57-1AE)
- Hardee, J. Gilbert. 1963. Evaluation of an educational program with part-time farm families, Transylvania County, North Carolina, 1955-1960. Raleigh, North Carolina. 123 p. (North Carolina. State University. Agriculture Extension Service. Progress report RS-43)
- Hathaway, Dale E. and Arley D. Waldo. 1964. Multiple jobholding by farm operators. East Lansing, Michigan. 79 p. (Michigan. State University. Agriculture Experiment Station. Research bulletin 5)
- Hittalmani, V. C. 1963. Urban and rural differentials in change in the agriculture phase of 4-H boys' club work in selected Tennessee counties, 1941-1961. Master's thesis. Knoxville, University of Tennessee. 120 numb. leaves.
- Hubbard, Dixon D. 1967. Extension animal Scientist, Federal Extension Service. Personal communication. Washington, D. C. March 23, 1967.
- Kuhlman, G. W., T. J. Flippin and E. J. Niederfrank. 1935. Part-time farming in Oregon. Corvallis. 49 p. (Oregon. State Agriculture College. Agriculture Experiment Station. Station bulletin 340)
- Loomis, Ralph A. 1965. A profile of part-time farming in the United States. East Lansing, Michigan. 19 p. (Michigan. State University. Department of Agriculture Economics. Report no. 15)

Metropolitan Planning Commission. 1962. Growth factors, 1960 to 1980. Portland, Oregon. 103 p.

Mullins, Samuel Estel. 1964. Urban and rural differentials in change in the agriculture phase of adult extension work in selected Tennessee counties. Master's thesis. Knoxville, University of Tennessee. n.p.

Oregon. State Board of Census. 1963. Population estimates of counties and incorporated cities in Oregon. Portland, Oregon, Portland State College. 9 p.

Pericins, Brian and Dale Hathaway. 1966. Movement of labor between farm and non-farm jobs. East Lansing, Michigan. 48 p. (Michigan. State University. Agriculture Experiment Station. Research bulletin 13)

Pulliam, A. L. 1947. County Agent-at-Large, Oregon State College. Unpublished paper on part-time farming in the five county Portland area. Corvallis, Oregon.

Shultis, Arthur. 1944. Farming in California for the newcomer. Berkeley, University of California, College of Agriculture. 25 p.

Taylor, Carl C. et al. 1952. Rural life in the United States. New York, Alfred A. Knopf. 549 p.

U. S. Bureau of Census. 1935. Census of agriculture. Part-time farming in Oregon. Washington, D. C. 205 p.

U. S. Bureau of Census. 1964. Preliminary report of Oregon. Washington, D. C. 6 p.

U. S. Department of the Interior. Bureau of Reclamation. Region 1. 1962. Tualatin project, Oregon. Boise, Idaho. Various paging.

Washington County, Oregon. City-County Joint Planning Department. 1965. Patterns of development. Hillsboro.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

COVERING LETTERS FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

December 1, 1966

Mr. Gene Lear
Director Agriculture Ext. Service
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon

Dear Mr. Lear:

I hope to complete my Masters Degree this spring at Oregon State University. I am now in the process of writing my thesis.

The subject for my paper is "The Development of an Extension Program for the Part-time Livestock Operation." I would like to ask your permission to circulate a questionnaire to our livestock agents west of the Cascade Mountains.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Leffel
Washington County Extension Agent

JAL:ams

John A. Leffel
P. O Box 59
Hillsboro, Oregon 97123

December 1, 1966

Mr. C. A. Svinth
Director Agriculture Extension Service
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington

Dear Mr. Svinth:

I am working on my Masters Degree at Oregon State University and will soon be preparing to send out a questionnaire to a number of Extension Agents in the states of Oregon and Washington. My thesis is being written on "The Development of an Extension Program for Part-time Livestock Operators."

I would like to ask your permission to circulate this to the agents in the western part of Washington.

Since western Washington has a number of area agents, if you would supply me with the names of the people who are responsible for the livestock and dairy work this would be helpful.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Leffel
Washington County Extension Agent

JAL:ams

John A. Leffel
P. O. Box 59
Hillsboro, Oregon

November 29, 1966

Dear Friends:

I am soliciting your help and help of other Extension Agents in gathering information for a Master Thesis on "Part-time Livestock Farmers." I am making this study at Oregon State University.

I hope that you will find the questions interesting. It should take no more than 15 to 20 minutes to answer. Answer all questions to the best of your ability and add any remarks you care to make.

Please return the completed form to me in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope at your earliest opportunity.

Your name appears on the form only for the purpose of categorizing in terms of length of service, size of staff, general information of your county, and other background information.

If you are interested, I will be happy to send you a summary of the findings when they are completed.

Sincerely yours,

John Leffel

APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE

To help in the development of a livestock Extension Program for part-time farmers. (Livestock)

1. Your Name _____ Position _____
2. Name of the County or Area _____ State _____
3. How long have you been in the Extension Service _____
4. How long have you been in your present position? _____
5. How many agents are there on the staff in your county? _____
6. What is the size of your county or area?
 - A. Population _____
 - B. Acres of crop land _____
 - C. Acres of land suited for grazing but not well adapted to cropping _____
7. How many towns or cities within your county or area have a population of over 2,500? _____
8. What is the population of the largest city in your area? _____
 If it is not in your county, do many of the people who work there own small tracts of land in your county? Yes _____ No _____
9. Is there a thickly populated area in or adjacent to your county that influences the number of suburban people who live in your county? Yes _____ No _____
10. What percent of the farms in your county are classified as part-time farms? (The census defines a farm as a place less than 10 acres and an income for the year of at least \$250 with farms of more than 10 acres the yearly income would have to amount to at least \$50.)
 - _____ A. 0 to 9 percent
 - _____ B. 10 to 19 percent
 - _____ C. 20 to 29 percent
 - _____ D. 30 to 39 percent
 - _____ E. 40 percent and over
11. What percent of these part-time farmers are livestock operators? _____
12. If your county does not have an agent to work with the part-time livestock operator, what percent of your time should be spent with them?
 - _____ A. Less than 10 percent
 - _____ B. 11 to 20 percent
 - _____ C. 21 to 30 percent
 - _____ D. 31 to 40 percent
 - _____ E. Over 40 percent

13. What is the background of most people who want part-time livestock units?
14. What is the estimated livestock income in your county or area? _____
What percent from part-time units? _____
15. Do you have a regular planned livestock extension program for part-time farmers?
Please Explain.
16. What percent of requests to your County Extension Office come from part-time livestock operators? _____
17. Program Development:
- A. Do you have a committee to help plan the extension program for the part-time livestock operator?
- _____ Yes _____ No
1. If yes, how was this committee appointed?
- _____ County Extension Agent
_____ County Extension Council
_____ County Farm Organization (Farm Bureau,
Farmers Union, etc.)
_____ Others (Please Specify)
2. If no, how is your program for the part-time livestock operator planned?
- _____ County Extension Agent
_____ Livestock Specialist
_____ Others (Please Specify)
- B. Do you think the Extension Agent should work with a committee in helping plan the Extension Program for the part-time livestock operator?
- _____ Yes _____ No
- C. Assuming that you believe an Advisory Committee should be used to develop the part-time livestock program, what should be the composition of this committee?
- _____ Part-time livestock operators
_____ Full-time livestock operators
_____ Livestock Association Representatives
_____ Local Business Leaders
_____ Agency Representatives

D. Who should nominate the members for such a committee?

- _____ Organized Livestock groups
 _____ County Extension Advisory Committee
 _____ County Extension Agent
 _____ Others (Please Specify)

E. Who should decide when and how often the program planning committee should meet?

- _____ The County Extension Agent
 _____ The Committee Chairman
 _____ The Chairman and the County Extension Agent
 _____ The Program Planning Committee as a Group

F. Should the University Livestock Specialist or other University staff personnel serve as a resource person in planning the Extension Program for the part-time livestock operators?

_____ Yes _____ No

G. Should the University Livestock Specialist Assist in presenting educational materials, teaching programs, or taking part in tours, etc. for the part-time livestock operator?

_____ Yes _____ No

H. Would it be better to integrate the part-time livestock operator with the full-time operator in educational programs or should they be treated by themselves, and why?

18. Program Methods:

A. Should individual resource people as A. S. C. S., S. C. S., Chemical Companies, Feed Companies, etc. be asked to assist in educational meetings for the part-time livestock operators?

_____ Yes _____ No

B. Would you use local full-time farmers to assist in some meetings?

_____ Yes _____ No

C. Do you feel that most of the printed materials that are available through Universities are suitable for the part-time livestock operator?

_____ Yes _____ No

D. Would condensed fact sheets be of more value than regular bulletins?

_____ Yes _____ No

E. Do you feel that you should develop educational materials suitable for the part-time livestock operator?

_____ Yes _____ No

F. Would you use printed materials from commercial firms for an Extension Meeting?
 _____ Yes _____ No

G. What types of educational meetings do you find most successful with the part-time operators? (Please Rank)

_____ Field meetings to observe demonstration plots

_____ Method demonstration meetings

_____ Lecture and discussion meetings

_____ Tours

_____ Field Days

_____ Others

If you have found other approaches and methods successful, please comment.

H. Do you have regular scheduled radio and/or television programs?

_____ Yes _____ No

Approximate number per year. Radio _____ T.V. _____

I. How often is your radio programs aimed at the part-time livestock operator?

_____ Number of times

J. Do you believe a radio program is an effective method of presenting educational information to the part-time livestock operator?

_____ Yes _____ No

K. Do you think that as a result of your radio or television program your phone calls and requests for livestock literature and farm calls have:

_____ Increased

_____ Remained the Same

_____ Reduced

L. Do you feel that an area agent (Multi-County) could be successful in working with part-time livestock operators?

_____ Yes _____ No

M. What types of livestock enterprises have you found most satisfactory for the part-time livestock operators?

_____ Sheep

_____ Feeding

_____ Breeding

_____ Swine

_____ Feeding

_____ Breeding

_____ Beef

_____ Feeding

_____ Breeding

_____ Poultry

_____ Turkeys

_____ Hens

_____ Fryers

