

## Missouri AgrAbility Evaluation

September 1, 2009



## Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Methods.....	5
Review of Literature.....	5
Findings.....	9
Conclusions.....	37
References.....	40
Appendix A.....	41

---

## Executive Summary

---

AgrAbility is a federally funded project that supports people who sustain farm-related injuries/disability. The primary goal of Missouri AgrAbility is to assist people with disabilities employed in small and large agriculture operations. The Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis conducted an assessment of Missouri AgrAbility's impact, using a client survey, focused interviews, and telephone interviews.

The study questions addressed by the evaluation are organized into three objectives that reflect national AgrAbility goals:

- AgrAbility clients are able to remain in production agriculture.
- AgrAbility clients are able to continue living on their farm/ranch.
- AgrAbility clients increase their quality of life.

Data collection strategies used to evaluate AgrAbility implementation included:

- Paper and pencil survey
- Focus groups
- Telephone survey

The analyses show that Missouri AgrAbility implementation to be successful and perceived as successful by clients.

### **Missouri AgrAbility clients report being more able to remain in production agriculture**

- AgrAbility increased knowledge of adaptations that can be made for farm equipment and vehicles for 58 percent of the respondents.
- AgrAbility increased knowledge of vocational rehabilitation resources for 55 percent of the respondents.
- Clients 64 years old or younger were significantly more likely than those 65 and older to report that they were able to continue in farming and receive vocational rehabilitation (VR) support as a result of the AgrAbility involvement.
- Clients with a physical disability were significantly more likely than those with a chronic disease or a sensory disability to indicate that their participation in AgrAbility helped them improve the accessibility of equipment, do their work better, resolve a farming barrier, and manage their farm.

- Clients who were owner/operators were significantly more likely than non-owners to report direct technical assistance, receiving information about funding, finding funding, improving the accessibility of farm buildings, completing chores, operating machinery, continuing to farm, doing their work better, resolving a farming barrier, implementing a farm modification, increasing farm financial return, managing their farm independently, and, improving their quality of life.
- Twenty-eight percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they could complete chores on the farm before AgrAbility; fifty-three percent could complete chores after services from AgrAbility.
- Twenty percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they could operate machinery before AgrAbility; seventy-one percent could operate machinery after services from AgrAbility.
- Forty-two percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they could manage their farm before AgrAbility; Sixty-four percent could manage their farm after receiving services from AgrAbility.
- Twenty-four percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they could access workspaces on their farm before AgrAbility; forty-nine percent could access workspaces after services from AgrAbility.
- Twenty-three percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they could modify machinery to accommodate their needs before AgrAbility; fifty-three percent could modify machinery after services from AgrAbility.

#### **Missouri AgrAbility clients report being able to continue living on their farm/ranch**

- Sixty-one percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were able to live in their farm home before AgrAbility; eighty-two percent could live in their farm home after services from AgrAbility.

#### **Missouri AgrAbility clients report improved quality of life**

- About fifty-seven percent of all respondents reported improved quality of life as a result of their AgrAbility experience.
- Owner/operators were more likely to report that their AgrAbility experience resulted in improved quality of life than non-owner/operators.
- Around 28 percent of all respondents reported increased interactions in the community.
- Respondents reported emotional and motivational support from AgrAbility.
- AgrAbility staff treated clients with respect and courtesy.

## Project Goal Statement

The primary goal of the Missouri AgrAbility evaluation is to provide impact data that documents project assistance to people with disabilities employed in small and large agriculture operations.

## Methods of Evaluation

The evaluation used a mixed methods approach. The collection strategies that were used to evaluate Missouri AgrAbility included a perception survey, four focus groups, and a telephone interview.

### *Perception Survey*

An AgrAbility Survey was mailed to 288 people who had received services in the past four years. Forty-nine were undeliverable, leaving 239. Of the 239 mailed surveys, sixty-two responded, for a 26 percent response rate. The survey consisted of twenty questions, six of which were open-ended.

### *Focus Groups*

Four group interviews were conducted with Vocational Rehabilitation Staff, Extension Specialists, and AgrAbility clients. Interview questions and exercises were designed to capture description and characteristics of the 'local' implementation in order to validate and give context to the more categorical process measurement tools used.

### *Telephone Interviews*

Telephone interviews were conducted with 15 (or 6 percent of the total population). The 15 were selected at random. The telephone interviews were used to understand the experience of people who have used AgrAbility and the meaning they made of their experience. The information gained from the telephone interviews helped provide a clearer understanding of any underlying cause of dissatisfaction with AgrAbility services, as well as discovering areas where improvement is desirable.

## Review of Related Literature

Agriculture work is one of the most dangerous occupations in the nation (Purschwitz 1997). According to the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (2009), approximately 1,750,000 full-time workers were employed in production agriculture in the U.S. in 2007. Every day, about 243 agricultural workers suffer lost-work-time injury. Five percent of these injuries result in permanent impairment (NIOSH, 2009).

Molyneaux-Smith et al. (2003) state that for most individuals with disabilities, the family is the principal source of security and support. Yet, the farmer and family may experience a shrinking social world due to the extra time required for occupational performance, appointments with health professionals, physical barriers, or societal attitudes. The authors contend that farmers with disabilities are highly vulnerable to long term occupational disruption. It is often difficult for disabled people to farm and live active lives in the community

In its introduction, the National AgrAbility Project writes that:

“The National AgrAbility Project Staff, in cooperation with their disability partner, provide training, technical assistance, and information on available resources to the State AgrAbility Project staffs. The

State AgrAbility staff provides training, site visits, on-farm assessments, technical assistance, and other information directly to the farmer or rancher with a disability.”

The State AgrAbility project helps disabled farmers/ranchers ease their problems (Meyer & Fetsch 2006). AgrAbility helps any farmer, regardless of what form of agriculture he or she works in -- dairy, greenhouse, pig, chicken, sheep, orchards, aqua, or crop (Stains, 2009). Twenty-one states have federally funded AgrAbility projects.

There are some empirical studies that assessed the impact of AgrAbility projects in the farming communities. In field research, Baggett et al. (2007) found that the support extended by the AgrAbility program was able to make changes in the lives of people who sustained farm-related injuries in Pennsylvania. The AgrAbility staff in Pennsylvania worked with 207 clients with minor and major injuries: joint (25%), back (17%), amputations (13%) and arthritis (11%). These people had problems with tractor accessibility/operation, feeding, and farm mobility. The staff assisted in making changes in operation tools, made equipment handier, and farm and home accessible.

By the end of the Pennsylvania project, 60 percent of the farmers reported their problems were resolved and they were able to perform as they used to do before the accident. Twenty-one of 46 farmers had difficulty performing feeding-related tasks. After the intervention the same farmers reported no difficulty in performing tasks. Regarding farm mobility tasks, 33 of the 46 farmers had difficulty performing 36 farm mobility tasks. Utility vehicles such as Polaris Rangers, John Deere Gators, gate opening systems, etc., were recommended by the AgrAbility staff. By the end of project cycle, the same farmers reported no difficulty in performing 27 of the 36 farm mobility tasks (Baggett et al. 2007).

Meyer and Fetsch (2006) did a comprehensive field study of people who sustained injuries/disabilities. They examined the nature of disabilities and inquired whether the farmers were able to remain in farming. In their 496 valid responses, 48.2 percent reported a chronic health related condition, 17.9 percent reported cause as agricultural-related machinery incidents, 13.1 percent reported cause as non-agriculture related motor vehicle incidents, 7.3 percent reported cause as agriculture-related falls, 3.8 percent reported cause as agriculture-related motor vehicle incident, 3.4 percent reported cause as livestock-related injuries, 3.4 percent reported cause as non-farm related motor vehicle incidents, 1.6 percent reported cause as agricultural-related chemical or pesticide, and 1.2 percent reported cause as non-agricultural recreational.

Interestingly, the authors reported that 88 percent of the respondents continued working on the farm. After the onset of their disability most farmers continue to operate field machinery, tend to farm office activities, repair and maintain machinery, and perform general farm maintenance. They were able to get a variety of support that helped them to continue their work. This study also inquired about assistance received and from what sources. The clients most commonly recalled receiving assistance related to funding (in most cases, this refers to funding for assistive technologies like mobility aids), followed closely by technical assistance with modifications that might be needed on their machinery (such as hand controls or added steps on tractors). The researchers mention that 47.6 percent had reported that it was possible to continue to farm because of home modification, 44.2 percent reported assistive devices, 19.2 percent reported access to transportation,

15.5 percent reported access to medical assistance, 14.9 percent reported access to care providers, and 29.2 percent reported others<sup>1</sup>.

It is also common that, after the injuries, people experience changes in their work environment (Molyneaux-Smith et al. 2003). In the study, of those who continued to farm since their disability, 39 percent had a change in the type of farm they own, operate, or work on. As well, 47 percent experienced a change in the size of their farm with most reporting an increase in the size of farm -- they became farm managers. On the other hand, there were reports of family breakups after sustaining injuries.

In Missouri, farmers who sustain disability also get support from different sources. Missouri is ranked second in the nation for number of farms. Missouri AgrAbility Project (MAP) has received continuous USDA funding since 1994. Despite the large number of farms here MAP strives to provide services to farmers with disability throughout the state, and to their families. This includes assisting migrant/seasonal farm workers and their families (AgrAbility Quarterly 2006). MAP is able to provide services that include farmhouse accessibility surveys, agricultural worksite assessments, and assistive technology resources including equipment modification, educational programs, independent living resources, and technical support.

The publication *AgrAbility Quarterly's* winter 2006 issue cites the case of David Hofstetter, a farmer in central Missouri for 31 years. In 1998, David noticed stiffness in his legs. During the fall of 2000, David's doctor referred him to neurologist where he was diagnosed with Primary Lateral Sclerosis (PLS). David experienced muscle stiffness and tension to the point where it was difficult to walk without assistance, significantly affecting his farm work. David contacted MAP and an assessment was performed at his farm and house.

Through the Assistive Technology loan closet from Services for Independent Living, MAP provided David with a folding walker, a rolling walker for the barn, and, as the disease progressed, a powered wheelchair. MAP also referred David to the Missouri Vocational Rehabilitation (MVR) program. MVR provided home modifications that included relocating a door and installing a short ramp for bathroom accessibility. As time passed, David's symptoms worsened, so additional modifications were required to help compensate for his limited mobility. David considered platform lifts to access his tractors, but due to the progressive nature of PLS decided on the seated style. A utility vehicle, equipped with hand controls, enabled him to move from house to barns to fields more efficiently. A gravity flow cube feeder mounted on the utility vehicle eliminated the need for David to carry feed. MVR funded the tractor lifts, utility vehicle, cube feeder, and a scooter.

The customized scooter has an elevating chair that can be raised to a height of six feet. This feature allows David to access higher shelves in his office or to record hog information above the pens. Other modifications included tractor hand controls for clutch and brake applications, a pickup-mounted wheelchair lift, hand-held walkie-talkies, and a wheelchair lift equipped van with hand controls. These modifications help David both on and off the farm.

---

<sup>1</sup> Multiple responses

## Evaluation Study Questions

The study questions addressed by the evaluation are organized into three categories that reflect the primary objectives of the Missouri AgrAbility program.

- AgrAbility clients are able to remain in production agriculture.
- AgrAbility clients are able to continue living on their farm/ranch.
- AgrAbility clients increase their quality of life.

### Objective 1: Missouri AgrAbility clients more able to remain in production agriculture

The AgrAbility Project assists Missouri farmers and ranchers with disabilities. The project links the Cooperative Extension Service at a land-grant university with a private, nonprofit disability service organization to provide practical education and assistance that promote independence in agricultural production and rural living. The AgrAbility Project assists people involved in production agriculture, be it small or large scale operations.

Increased ability to remain in production agriculture is one of the primary objectives of the AgrAbility program. The methods used to measure this objective were an analysis of a client survey, focus groups, and telephone interviews.

### Findings - AgrAbility Survey Results

Several potential variables could have served as independent variables. Only age and role in farm operation proved suitable for statistical analysis. Of the 62 respondents only ten were females and two were non-white. Therefore disaggregation of gender and race would not be meaningful. The final independent variable used in the analysis was a collapsing of the response for eligibility for AgrAbility services into whether or not the respondent had a physical disability, or sensory disability and chronic disease. The three variables used as independent variables in the analysis were: **presence of a physical disability; age, less than 65 and 65 and older;** and **owner/operator status.**

There were numerous dependent variables contained within the survey and used in the analysis. A simple accounting of them takes place here. A full breakdown of the dependent variables used in the analysis can be found in Appendix A.

- Seven variables comprised the question asking what **AgrAbility services a respondent may have used.**
- Three variables comprised the question asking what **AgrAbility services a respondent was eligible for** (this is the same variable that was used as an independent variable, but for the age and operator status analysis it was a dependent variable).
- Ten variables comprised the question asking for the **best description of the respondent's farm.**
- Nine variables comprised the question asking **if you are not currently engaged in farming which best describes your situation.**
- Eight variables comprised the question asking what **AgrAbility services increased the respondent's knowledge.**
- Thirteen variables comprised the question asking how **AgrAbility has worked with the respondents.**



- Seven variables comprised the question asking what **the results of the respondent's AgrAbility experience had been.**
- Twelve variables comprised the question asking what **respondents could do now -- after services from AgrAbility and back -- before AgrAbility.**
- One variable asked respondents **if working with AgrAbility has led to increased resources** and to give their best estimate of a dollar value for these resources.
- One variable asked respondents if their **use of what they learned in the AgrAbility program led to any new farm enterprise(s).**
- Five variables comprised the question **if the respondents had not made any changes since their contact with AgrAbility, why?**
- One variable asked respondents **what impact the assistance they received had on their farm's financial return?**
- One variable asked respondents to what extent they were **able to manage their farm independently.**

Depending upon the level of measurement of the dependent variable, two tests were used to determine statistical significance. The majority of the statistical relationships compare a nominal independent variable with a nominal dependent variable. The appropriate test of statistical significance is the Phi coefficient. The other test of statistical significance compares a nominal independent variable with an ordinal dependent variable. The appropriate test of statistical significance is the Somer's d test. Both the Somer's d and the Phi coefficient are significant when values are .05% or lower, which asserts that given a normal distribution of events these results would be the same 95% of the time this survey was administered. Also, the values associated with the test of significance for Somer's d and the Phi coefficient is similar to a correlation coefficient. Therefore, squaring this value will inform the percent of variance explained by the association of the variables involved, the higher the value the more explanative.

Findings are only reported on those relationships that were statistically significant.

### Age

Table 1 illustrates the distribution of responses by age of the respondent and whether or not they would continue farming in part or whole. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of respondents age 64 or younger (41%) were more likely to report that AgrAbility has worked with them to continue their farming operation in part or whole than were respondents age 65 or older (14%). The Phi test of statistical significance score of .024 meets the requirements for significance and the value of -.292 indicates a low strength relationship.

**Table 1 Crosstabulation of Age by Able to continue my farming operation in part or whole after AgrAbility services**

		Continue my farming operation in part or whole			
			No	Yes	Total
Age	Less than 65	Count	19	13	32
		% within Age	59.4%	40.6%	100.0%
	65 or Older	Count	24	4	28
		% within Age	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	43	17	60
		% within Age	71.7%	28.3%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.292	.024
	Cramer's V	.292	.024
N of Valid Cases		60	

Table 2 illustrates the distribution of responses by age of the respondent and whether or not as a result of their AgrAbility experience had they received VR services and support. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of respondents age 64 or younger (50%) were more likely to report that their experience with AgrAbility has allowed them to receive VR services and support than were respondents age 65 or older (21%). The Phi test of statistical significance score of .022 meets the requirements for significance and the value of -.296 indicates a low strength relationship.

**Table 2 Crosstabulation of Age by Received VR services and support**

		Received VR services and support			
		No	Yes	Total	
Age	Less than 65	Count	16	16	32
		% within Age	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	65 or Older	Count	22	6	28
		% within Age	78.6%	21.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	38	22	60
		% within Age	63.3%	36.7%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.296	.022
	Cramer's V	.296	.022
N of Valid Cases		60	

**Eligibility**

Table 3 illustrates the distribution of responses by the respondents’ eligibility and whether or not AgrAbility has worked with them to improve the accessibility of their equipment. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of respondents with a physical disability (36%) were more likely to report that AgrAbility has worked with them to improve the accessibility of their equipment than were respondents without a physical disability (10%). The Phi test of statistical significance score of .034 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .269 indicates a low strength relationship.

**Table 3 Crosstabulation of Physical disability by Improved the accessibility of equipment after AgrAbility services**

		Improve the accessibility of equipment			
		No	Yes	Total	
Physical disability	No	Count	18	2	20
		% within Physical disability	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	27	15	42
		% within Physical disability	64.3%	35.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	45	17	62	
	% within Physical disability	72.6%	27.4%	100.0%	

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.269	.034
	Cramer's V	.269	.034
N of Valid Cases		62	

Table 4 illustrates the distribution of responses by the respondents' eligibility and whether or not AgrAbility has worked with them to make it possible to do their farm work better or more easily than before working with AgrAbility. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of respondents with a physical disability (41%) were more likely to report that AgrAbility has worked with them to do their farm work better than were respondents with a non-physical disability (15%). The Phi test of statistical significance score of .045 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .255 indicates a low strength relationship.

**Table 4 Crosstabulation of Physical disability by Do my farm work better after AgrAbility services**

		Do my farm work better			
		No	Yes	Total	
Physical disability	No	Count	17	3	20
		% within Physical disability	85.0%	15.0%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	25	17	42
		% within Physical disability	59.5%	40.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	42	20	62
		% within Physical disability	67.7%	32.3%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.255	.045
	Cramer's V	.255	.045
N of Valid Cases		62	

Table 5 illustrates the distribution of responses by the respondents' eligibility and whether or not as a result of their AgrAbility experience they took action to resolve a farming barrier. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of respondents with a physical disability (45%) were more likely to report that their experience with AgrAbility had allowed them to take action to resolve a farming barrier than were respondents with a non-physical disability (15%). The Phi test of statistical significance score of .020 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .295 indicates a low strength relationship.

**Table 5 Crosstabulation of Physical disability by Took action to resolve a farming barrier after AgrAbility services**

		Took action to resolve a farming barrier			
		No	Yes	Total	
Physical disability	No	Count	17	3	20
		% within Physical disability	85.0%	15.0%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	23	19	42
		% within Physical disability	54.8%	45.2%	100.0%
Total	Count	40	22	62	
	% within Physical disability	64.5%	35.5%	100.0%	

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.295	.020
	Cramer's V	.295	.020
N of Valid Cases		62	

Table 6 illustrates the distribution of responses by the respondents' eligibility and whether or not as a result of receiving AgrAbility services they were better able to manage their farm. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of respondents with a physical disability (77%) were more likely to report that after having received AgrAbility services they were better able to manage their farm than were respondents without a physical disability (30%). The Somer's d test of statistical significance score of .025 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .322 indicates a moderate strength relationship.

**Table 6 Crosstabulation of Physical disability by After AgrAbility services I am able to manage my farm**

			Now After Able to manage my farm						
			Does not apply	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Indifferent	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Physical disability	No	Count	4	0	1	2	1	2	10
		% within Physical disability	40.0%	.0%	10.0%	20.0%	10.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	5	1	0	0	5	15	26
		% within Physical disability	19.2%	3.8%	.0%	.0%	19.2%	57.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	9	1	1	2	6	17	36
		% within Physical disability	25.0%	2.8%	2.8%	5.6%	16.7%	47.2%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Ordinal	Somer's d	.322	.025
N of Valid Cases		36	

## Owner/Operator

Table 7 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and whether or not AgrAbility provided direct technical assistance. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (40%) were more likely to report that AgrAbility provided direct technical assistance than were non-owner/operator respondents (4%). The Phi test of statistical significance score of .002 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .393 indicates a moderate strength relationship.

**Table 7 Crosstabulation of Owner/Operator by Direct technical assistance provided by AgrAbility services**

		Direct technical assistance			
		No	Yes	Total	
Owner / Operator	No	Count	23	1	24
		% within Owner / Operator	95.8%	4.2%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	23	15	38
		% within Owner / Operator	60.5%	39.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	46	16	62
		% within Owner / Operator	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%

### Test of Statistical Significance

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.393	.002
	Cramer's V	.393	.002
N of Valid Cases		62	



Table 8 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and whether or not AgrAbility provided information about funding. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (45%) were more likely to report that AgrAbility provided information about funding than were non-owner/operator respondents (17%). The Phi test of statistical significance score of .023 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .289 indicates a low strength relationship.

**Table 8 Crosstabulation of Owner/Operator by Information about funding provided by AgrAbility services**

		Information about funding			
		No	Yes	Total	
Owner / Operator	No	Count	20	4	24
		% within Owner / Operator	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	21	17	38
		% within Owner / Operator	55.3%	44.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	41	21	62
		% within Owner / Operator	66.1%	33.9%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.289	.023
	Cramer's V	.289	.023
N of Valid Cases		62	

Table 9 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and whether or not agribusiness best described their farm. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (24%) were more likely to report that their farm was best described as being agribusiness than were non-owner/operator respondents (0%). The Phi test of statistical significance score of .010 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .327 indicates a moderate strength relationship.

**Table 9 Crosstabulation of Owner/Operator by Farm/ranch is an agribusiness**

		Agribusiness			
		No	Yes	Total	
Owner / Operator	No	Count	24	0	24
		% within Owner / Operator	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	29	9	38
		% within Owner / Operator	76.3%	23.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	53	9	62
		% within Owner / Operator	85.5%	14.5%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.327	.010
	Cramer's V	.327	.010
N of Valid Cases		62	

Table 10 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and whether or not beef cattle best described their farm. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (55%) were more likely to report that their farm was best described as being a beef cattle one than were non-owner/operator respondents (17%). The Phi test of statistical significance score of .003 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .383 indicates a moderate strength relationship.

**Table 10 Crosstabulation of Owner / Operator by Farm/ranch is a beef cattle operation**

		Beef cattle			
		No	Yes	Total	
Owner / Operator	No	Count	20	4	24
		% within Owner / Operator	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	17	21	38
		% within Owner / Operator	44.7%	55.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	37	25	62
		% within Owner / Operator	59.7%	40.3%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.383	.003
	Cramer's V	.383	.003
N of Valid Cases		62	

Table 11 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and whether or not other livestock best described their farm. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (26%) were more likely to report that their farm was best described as being one of other livestock than were non-owner/operator respondents (0%). The Phi test of statistical significance score of .006 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .349 indicates a moderate strength relationship.

**Table 11 Crosstabulation of Owner/Operator by Farm/ranch is an "other livestock" operation**

		Other livestock			
		No	Yes	Total	
Owner / Operator	No	Count	24	0	24
		% within Owner / Operator	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	28	10	38
		% within Owner / Operator	73.7%	26.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	52	10	62
		% within Owner / Operator	83.9%	16.1%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.349	.006
	Cramer's V	.349	.006
N of Valid Cases		62	

Table 12 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and whether or not hay/forage best described their farm. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (55%) were more likely to report that their farm was best described as being one of hay/forage than were non-owner/operator respondents (40%). The Phi test of statistical significance score of .000 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .520 indicates a substantial strength relationship.

**Table 12 Crosstabulation of Owner/Operator by Farm/ranch is a hay/forage operation**

		Hay/forage			
		No	Yes	Total	
Owner / Operator	No	Count	23	1	24
		% within Owner / Operator	95.8%	4.2%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	17	21	38
		% within Owner / Operator	44.7%	55.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	40	22	62
		% within Owner / Operator	64.5%	35.5%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.520	.000
	Cramer's V	.520	.000
N of Valid Cases		62	

Table 13 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and whether or not AgrAbility has worked with them to improve the accessibility of their farm buildings. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (16%) were more likely to report that AgrAbility worked with them to improve the accessibility of their farm buildings than were non-owner/operator respondents (0%). The Phi test of statistical significance score of .041 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .260 indicates a low strength relationship.

**Table 13 Crosstabulation of Owner/Operator by AgrAbility services improved the accessibility of farm building**

		Improve the accessibility of farm building			
		No	Yes	Total	
Owner / Operator	No	Count	24	0	24
		% within Owner / Operator	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	32	6	38
		% within Owner / Operator	84.2%	15.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	56	6	62
		% within Owner / Operator	90.3%	9.7%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.260	.041
	Cramer's V	.260	.041
N of Valid Cases		62	

Table 14 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and whether or not AgrAbility has worked with them to find funding. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (24%) were more likely to report that AgrAbility worked with them to find funding than were non-owner/operator respondents (0%). The Phi test of statistical significance score of .010 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .327 indicates a moderate strength relationship.

**Table 14 Crosstabulation of Owner/Operator by AgrAbility helped find funding**

		Find funding			
		No	Yes	Total	
Owner / Operator	No	Count	24	0	24
		% within Owner / Operator	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	29	9	38
		% within Owner / Operator	76.3%	23.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	53	9	62
		% within Owner / Operator	85.5%	14.5%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.327	.010
	Cramer's V	.327	.010
N of Valid Cases		62	

Table 15 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and whether or not AgrAbility has worked with them to continue their farming operation in part or whole. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (40%) were more likely to report that AgrAbility worked with them to continue their farming operation in part or whole than were non-owner/operator respondents (8%). The Phi test of statistical significance score of .007 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .340 indicates a moderate strength relationship.

**Table 15 Crosstabulation of Owner/Operator by Continue my farming operation in part or whole after AgrAbility services**

		Continue my farming operation in part or whole			
			No	Yes	Total
Owner / Operator	No	Count	22	2	24
		% within Owner / Operator	91.7%	8.3%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	23	15	38
		% within Owner / Operator	60.5%	39.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	45	17	62
		% within Owner / Operator	72.6%	27.4%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.340	.007
	Cramer's V	.340	.007
N of Valid Cases		62	



Table 16 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and whether or not their AgrAbility experience resulted in them taking action to resolve a farming barrier. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (47%) were more likely to report that their AgrAbility experience did help them take action to resolve a farming barrier than were non-owner/operator respondents (17%). The Phi test of statistical significance score of .014 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .313 indicates a moderate strength relationship.

**Table 16 Crosstabulation of Owner / Operator by Took action to resolve a farming barrier after AgrAbility services**

		Took action to resolve a farming barrier			
		No	Yes	Total	
Owner / Operator	No	Count	20	4	24
		% within Owner / Operator	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	20	18	38
		% within Owner / Operator	52.6%	47.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	40	22	62
		% within Owner / Operator	64.5%	35.5%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.313	.014
	Cramer's V	.313	.014
N of Valid Cases		62	

Table 17 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and whether or not their AgrAbility experience resulted in them obtaining funding to implement a modification. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (45%) were more likely to report that their AgrAbility experience did help them to obtain funding to implement a modification than were non-owner/operator respondents (4%). The Phi test of statistical significance score of .001 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .435 indicates a moderate strength relationship.

**Table 17 Crosstabulation of Owner/Operator by Obtained funding to implement a modification after AgrAbility services**

		Obtained funding to implement a modification			
		No	Yes	Total	
Owner / Operator	No	Count	23	1	24
		% within Owner / Operator	95.8%	4.2%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	21	17	38
		% within Owner / Operator	55.3%	44.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	44	18	62
		% within Owner / Operator	71.0%	29.0%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.435	.001
	Cramer's V	.435	.001
N of Valid Cases		62	

Table 18 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and whether or not as a result of receiving AgrAbility services they were better able to complete chores on their farm. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (58%) were more likely to report that after having received AgrAbility services they were better able to complete chores on their farm than were non-owner/operator respondents (40%). The Somer's d test of statistical significance score of .010 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .328 indicates a moderate strength relationship.

**Table 18 Crosstabulation of Owner/Operator by Now able to complete chores on my farm after AgrAbility services**

		Now After Able to complete chores on my farm							
		Does not apply	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Indifferent	Agree	Strongly agree	Total	
Owner / Operator	No	Count	4	1	0	1	4	0	10
		% within Owner / Operator	40.0%	10.0%	.0%	10.0%	40.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	3	3	2	2	2	12	24
		% within Owner / Operator	12.5%	12.5%	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%	50.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	7	4	2	3	6	12	34
		% within Owner / Operator	20.6%	11.8%	5.9%	8.8%	17.6%	35.3%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Ordinal	Somer's d	.328	.010
N of Valid Cases		34	

Table 19 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and whether or not as a result of receiving AgrAbility services they were better able to operate machinery. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (71%) were more likely to report that after having received AgrAbility services they were better able to complete chores on their farm than were non-owner/operator respondents (20%). The Somer's d test of statistical significance score of .010 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .328 indicates a moderate strength relationship.

**Table 19 Owner/Operator by Now able to operate machinery after AgrAbility services**

		Now After Able to operate machinery						
		Does not apply	Strongly disagree	Indifferent	Agree	Strongly agree	Total	
Owner / Operator	No	Count	5	1	2	2	0	10
		% within Owner / Operator	50.0%	10.0%	20.0%	20.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	2	3	2	4	13	24
		% within Owner / Operator	8.3%	12.5%	8.3%	16.7%	54.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	7	4	4	6	13	34
		% within Owner / Operator	20.6%	11.8%	11.8%	17.6%	38.2%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Ordinal	Somer's d	.328	.010
N of Valid Cases		34	

Table 20 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and whether or not as a result of receiving AgrAbility services they were better able to manage their farm. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (85%) were more likely to report that after having received AgrAbility services they were better able to manage their farm than were non-owner/operator respondents (10%). The Somer's d test of statistical significance score of .000 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .567 indicates a substantial strength relationship.

**Table 20 Crosstabulation of Owner/Operator by Now able to manage my farm after AgrAbility services**

		Now After Able to manage my farm							
		Does not apply	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Indifferent	Agree	Strongly agree	Total	
Owner / Operator	No	Count	7	1	0	1	0	1	10
		% within Owner / Operator	70.0%	10.0%	.0%	10.0%	.0%	10.0%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	2	0	1	1	6	16	26
		% within Owner / Operator	7.7%	.0%	3.8%	3.8%	23.1%	61.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	9	1	1	2	6	17	36
		% within Owner / Operator	25.0%	2.8%	2.8%	5.6%	16.7%	47.2%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Ordinal	Somer's d	.567	.000
N of Valid Cases		36	

Table 21 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and whether or not before receiving AgrAbility services they were better able to manage their farm. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (63%) were more likely to report that before receiving AgrAbility services they were better able to manage their farm than were non-owner/operator respondents (0%). The Somer's d test of statistical significance score of .000 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .480 indicates a moderate strength relationship.

**Table 21 Crosstabulation of Owner/Operator by Before needing AgrAbility services I was better able to manage my farm**

		Back Before Able to manage my farm							
		Does not apply	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Indifferent	Agree	Strongly agree	Total	
Owner / Operator	No	Count	4	1	1	3	0	0	9
		% within Owner / Operator	44.4%	11.1%	11.1%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	1	2	2	4	7	8	24
		% within Owner / Operator	4.2%	8.3%	8.3%	16.7%	29.2%	33.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	5	3	3	7	7	8	33
		% within Owner / Operator	15.2%	9.1%	9.1%	21.2%	21.2%	24.2%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Ordinal	Somer's d	.480	.000
N of Valid Cases		36	

Table 22 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and what impact the AgrAbility assistance they received had on their farm’s financial return. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (41%) were more likely to report that the AgrAbility assistance they received increased their farm’s financial return than were non-owner/operator respondents (0%). The Somer’s d test of statistical significance score of .001 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .361 indicates a moderate strength relationship.

**Table 22 Crosstabulation of Owner/Operator by AgrAbility services impacted financial return**

			Impact on financial return					
			Reduced greatly	Reduced	No impact	Increased	Increased greatly	Total
Owner / Operator	No	Count	1	1	9	0	0	11
		% within Owner / Operator	9.1%	9.1%	81.8%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	0	2	17	7	6	32
		% within Owner / Operator	.0%	6.3%	53.1%	21.9%	18.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	1	3	26	7	6	43
		% within Owner / Operator	2.3%	7.0%	60.5%	16.3%	14.0%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Ordinal	Somer's d	.361	.001
N of Valid Cases		43	

Table 23 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and whether or not they were able to manage their farm independently. As can be seen from the table a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (70%) were more likely to report that they were able to manage their farm independently than were non-owner/operator respondents (8%). The Somer's d test of statistical significance score of .000 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .498 indicates a substantial strength relationship.

**Table 23 Crosstabulation of Owner/operator by Can manage farm independently after AgrAbility services**

		Can manage farm independently						Total	
		Does not apply	Strongly agree	Disagree	Indifferent	Agree	Strongly agree		
Owner / Operator	No	Count	6	1	2	2	1	0	12
		% within Owner / Operator	50.0%	8.3%	16.7%	16.7%	8.3%	.0%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	1	2	4	3	12	11	33
		% within Owner / Operator	3.0%	6.1%	12.1%	9.1%	36.4%	33.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	7	3	6	5	13	11	45
		% within Owner / Operator	15.6%	6.7%	13.3%	11.1%	28.9%	24.4%	100.0%

**Test of Statistical Significance**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Ordinal	Somer's d	.498	.000
N of Valid Cases		43	

**Findings: Focus Group Results**

Focus group findings supported the results of the survey. Participants indicated that they were able to continue farming thanks to the advice and technical assistance from AgrAbility. They were grateful to know about products that make it easier or possible to accomplish farm tasks.

**Findings: Telephone Interviews**

The telephone interviews supported the findings of the survey and the focus groups. Participants indicated that AgrAbility helped them remain in production agriculture. The help received included adaptive equipment. Help cited included: hand controls, gate openers, mules, machinery lifts, all terrain vehicles, post drivers, and calf catchers.

**Objective 2: Missouri AgrAbility clients able to continue living on their farm/ranch**

One of the main National AgrAbility objectives is to facilitate farmers staying in their homes. Survey results indicate that 82 percent of respondents were able to live in their home on the farm after services of AgrAbility, compared to 61 percent who could before AgrAbility.



## Findings: AgrAbility Survey Results

**Table 24 After receiving AgrAbility services able to live in my home on farm**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does not apply	5	8.1	14.7	14.7
	Indifferent	1	1.6	2.9	17.6
	Agree	6	9.7	<b>17.6</b>	35.3
	Strongly agree	22	35.5	<b>64.7</b>	100.0
	Total	34	54.8	100.0	
Missing	System	28	45.2		
Total		62	100.0		

**Table 25 Before receiving AgrAbility services was able to live in my home on farm**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does not apply	5	8.1	15.2	15.2
	Strongly disagree	1	1.6	3.0	18.2
	Disagree	1	1.6	3.0	21.2
	Indifferent	6	9.7	18.2	39.4
	Agree	7	11.3	<b>21.2</b>	60.6
	Strongly agree	13	21.0	<b>39.4</b>	100.0
	Total	33	53.2	100.0	
Missing	System	29	46.8		
Total		62	100.0		

## Findings: Focus Group Results

Only one of the four focus groups mentioned housing needs. In that discussion it was stated that people who have lived on a farm for an extended period of time often wish to remain in their home. To the general agreement of the group, it was stated that there was a need for someone to help maneuver the system to advocate for this.

## Findings: Telephone Interviews

Telephone interviews reinforced the need for keeping clients in their farm home. One client said, “We’ve had wonderful people help us. . . You know, we don’t want to sell our home, but that’s the only option we have if we can’t find some way to continue what we’re doing – to sell – and it will go to a developer.” The client went on to say that an Extension specialist and AgrAbility employee came to the house and spent the whole day. They came prepared with resources and suggestions that would be helpful. Another client said that

Vocational Rehabilitation did not appreciate the attachment to their home. The client reported she was told, “You just need to sell your home” and we said, “Well, that won’t happen.”

### Objective 3: Missouri AgrAbility clients improve quality of life

Survey results indicate an improved quality of life for participants, as illustrated in Table 26, 27 and 28.

#### Findings - AgrAbility Survey Results

**Table 26 AgrAbility improved your quality of life**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	27	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Yes	35	56.5	56.5	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

Table 27 illustrates the distribution of respondent responses by owner/operator status and whether or not their AgrAbility experience resulted in improved quality of life. As can be seen from the table, a statistically significant larger percentage of owner/operator respondents (71%) were more likely to report that their AgrAbility experience resulted in their improved quality of life than were non-owner/operator respondents (33%). The Phi test of statistical significance score of .004 meets the requirements for significance and the value of .371 indicates a moderate strength relationship.

**Table 27 Crosstabulation of Owner/Operator by AgrAbility services improved quality of life**

			Improved your quality of life		
			No	Yes	Total
Owner / Operator	No	Count	16	8	24
		% within Owner / Operator	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	11	27	38
		% within Owner / Operator	28.9%	71.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	27	35	62
		% within Owner / Operator	43.5%	56.5%	100.0%

#### Test of Statistical Significance

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.371	.004
	Cramer's V	.371	.004
N of Valid Cases		62	

**Table 28 Increased interactions in community**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	45	72.6	72.6	72.6
	Yes	17	27.4	27.4	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

From the open-ended questions on the survey, a farmer relayed the most valuable result gained from the AgrAbility program:

***Independence. I'm not dead weight. With your help, I can contribute help and not be dead weight and a cash flow drain on my family. Living with a chronic illness is not cheap. . . There's always something to do. . . This gets me out of the house sometimes when the MS is bothering me and after I'm out there for awhile, I feel better than if I hadn't been out. I have a purpose in life.***

---

### **Findings: Focus Group Results**

A benefit theme in all four focus groups was that AgrAbility is customer focused. AgrAbility staff respect the farming lifestyle and its importance to their quality of life to remain in agriculture. To the general agreement of the group, one participant in the Vocational Rehabilitation focus group said that he rated AgrAbility high on customer focus: "From my past experience, they focus on that person and give them what they need." In St. Joe, a person said that someone to help maneuver the system was a great benefit: "Unless you work in one of those systems, you don't know the others exist." In the words of two Extension staff:

***AgrAbility provides hope and a future.***

***AgrAbility has been very innovative in working with people on farms in Missouri.***

---

Another person described the importance of customer focus and advocacy for services to help farmers in time of need:

***I think that we're kind of the forgotten people, so I'm really glad to see that there are services for farmers.***

---

This customer focus of AgrAbility staff was vital in advocating for clients. One client talked about others "trying to steer me away [from agriculture], into some different field, a whole different way of making a living." He continued:

***I grew up on a farm and I still want to continue. I have a couple of children that I figured to pass the farm to someday.***

---

The client said that an AgrAbility staff person “straightened her out.” And that client is still farming today.

### **Findings: Telephone Interviews**

Customers’ judge quality by comparing their expectations with the service experienced. Customer satisfaction is defined by the service and the quality of employees and thus is inseparable from the service provided. Personal behavior is an integral part of the service (willingness and ability to serve customer). “If I called and had a question or concern, he called me on the weekend if he wasn’t able to talk to me on Friday. He made several trips down here to be sure everything worked alright and it has.”

The quality of communication between client and service provider can be described as excellent in 13 of the 15 interviews. AgrAbility staff treated clients with respect and kindness. Three clients relay their experience:

***Very much so, you know a lot of help and understanding. They had lots of understanding.***

***It was just like it was someone in their family they were trying to help. We’ve never had anyone to do anything for us and we’re not the kind of people that can ask. I’m so glad [I asked for help].***

***I recommend them a hundred percent and I’m not just bird-doggin’ you because they treated me so well. It’s no joke. They really helped. I recommended several other people around here and they helped them, too.***

---

Two of the interviews described the communication as custodial. One client said, “Oh, they talked nice. They just had a job to do.”

## Conclusions

The results of the survey indicate numerous statistically significant findings. Respondents that were 64 years old or younger were significantly more likely to report that the AgrAbility program resulted in their being able to continue farming and receive VR support. Unfortunately, no statistically significant findings were uncovered for farmers 65 years old and older.

The eligibility of the respondent, which made the reception of AgrAbility services possible, was also found to be related to several of the survey questions. The eligibility of the respondent was collapsed into a binary variable comprised of one group of respondents that had a physical disability contrasted to those that had either a sensory disability or a chronic disease (ex. heart disease, diabetes, dementia, etc.) The results of the analysis regarding physical disability eligibility indicated that participation in the AgrAbility program helped the farmers improve the accessibility of equipment, do their farm work better, resolve a farming barrier, and to manage their farm.

The owner/operator status of the respondent was found to have the most numerous statistically significant relationships to the variables in the survey. Like the eligibility variable, the owner/operator status variable was collapsed into a binary variable comprised of one group of respondents that were owner/operators contrasted to those that were either a family member or were no longer farming. There were 38 respondents that fell into the category of owner/operator and 24 respondents that fell into the non-owner/operator category. The quick summary of the results of the analysis regarding owner/operator status indicates that owner/operators benefit more from the AgrAbility program than do family members and those no longer farming.

Owner/operators were statistically significantly more likely to use AgrAbility services dealing with direct technical assistance and information about funding than were non-owner/operator respondents. The owner/operator respondents were also found to be involved in farming activities characterized by agribusiness, beef cattle, other livestock and hay/forage. Owner/operators worked with AgrAbility to improve accessibility of their farm buildings, find funding, continue farming, and, do their farm work better or more easily than before working with AgrAbility.

As a result of their experience with the AgrAbility program, owner/operators had taken action to resolve a farming barrier, obtain funding to implement a farming modification and improve their quality of life. After having received services from AgrAbility, owner/operators were now able to complete chores on their farm, operate machinery, and manage their farm. Owner/operators were also found to respond that AgrAbility assistance had increased their farms' financial return and help them manage their farm independently.

It was clear in focus groups that AgrAbility was using different methods for promoting the program, including fliers in doctors' offices, Extension offices, displays, word of mouth, emails from agency partners, and, press releases. However, in all of the focus groups, participants indicated that AgrAbility could have more visibility in the community, with staff, and with its agency partners. For example, a number of attendees at the Pain Clinic indicated that they knew very little about AgrAbility and had not worked with them in the past.

AgrAbility might consider exploring different ways of communication. In addition to mailings, emails, or phone contacts, Marshfield focus group participants suggested that AgrAbility advertise and promote their

services using broadcast and print media. Extension specialists recommended having updates at regional staff meetings and at annual conference. Communication recommendations included presentations at Missouri Medical Association meetings and a DVD distribution. Indicating a need for Extension staff to be more aware of criteria for using the program is a finding from an Extension focus group. Responses from the same region on the estimate of how many people there could benefit from AgrAbility ranged from 2 to 300.

All four groups identified as an area for improvement the need to recognize the fact that the vocational rehabilitation process is inconvenient. One person in the Vocational Rehabilitation staff focus group said: "With AgrAbility and this whole process, it's going to be cumbersome; it's going to take some time and effort and patience on both my part and my client's part to get it done." This finding was echoed in the other three groups. In working with clients, AgrAbility might consider advising clients that the process takes time, possibly giving an expected timeline.

## References Cited

AgrAbility Quarterly. (2006). Focus-hog operation and industry changes. *AgrAbility Project*, 6(2), 1-20.

Baggett, C., Radhakrishna, R., & Fetzer, L. (2007). AgrAbility Program: Saving Farms and Helping Farmers to Stay in Farming. In Briers, G., & Roberts, T. (eds) AAEE Research Conference.

Field, W., & Purschwitz, M. (1987). Cost of farm and rural injuries. *Public Health Reports (1974)*, 642-644.

Grisso, R., & Ballin, K. 2005. AgrAbility Virginia Project - Service Case Study. Written for presentation at 2005 Summer Conference of the NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR FARM SAFETY INC. Wintergreen Resort, Wintergreen, VA, USA, JUNE 26 - 30, 2005.

Molyneaux-Smith, L., Townsend, E., & Guernsey, J. (2003). Occupation disrupted: Impacts, challenges, and coping strategies for farmers with disabilities. *Journal of Occupational Science*, 10(1), 14-20.

National AgrAbility Project. <http://www.agrabilityproject.org/purpose.cfm>

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). Downloaded May 14 2009 from <http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/aginjury/>

Purschwitz, M. 1997. Summary: Farm Injury Facts. Downloaded May 1, 2009 from <http://www.wiscash.uwex.edu/Pages/StatisticsAndMiscDocuments/MiscDocuments/FarmInjuryFactsSummary.htm>

Schuler, R., Adams, L., Specialist, E., Meyer, R., Student, G., & Tampa, F. (2005). National AgrAbility Project Demographic Analysis: Serving Farmers and Ranchers with Disabilities. *ASABE Paper*, 55014.

Stains, A. 2009. AgrAbility helps keep them down on the farm. *The Record Herald*.

## Appendix A

### AgrAbility services used: On farm assessment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	35	56.5	56.5	56.5
	Yes	27	43.5	43.5	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

### AgrAbility services used: Direct technical assistance

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	46	74.2	74.2	74.2
	Yes	16	25.8	25.8	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

### AgrAbility services used: Adaptive or assistive technology

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	39	62.9	62.9	62.9
	Yes	23	37.1	37.1	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

### AgrAbility services used: Support for caregivers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	57	91.9	91.9	91.9
	Yes	5	8.1	8.1	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

### AgrAbility services used: Information about products resources

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	35	56.5	56.5	56.5
	Yes	27	43.5	43.5	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	



**AgrAbility services used: Information about funding**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	41	66.1	66.1	66.1
	Yes	21	33.9	33.9	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**AgrAbility services used: Educational programs**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	55	88.7	88.7	88.7
	Yes	7	11.3	11.3	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Eligible for services as a result of Sensory disability**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	51	82.3	82.3	82.3
	Yes	11	17.7	17.7	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Eligible for services as a result of Chronic disease**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	51	82.3	82.3	82.3
	Yes	11	17.7	17.7	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Eligible for services as a result of Physical disability**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	20	32.3	32.3	32.3
	Yes	42	67.7	67.7	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Sex of respondents**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	10	16.1	17.2	17.2
	Male	48	77.4	82.8	100.0
	Total	58	93.5	100.0	
Missing	System	4	6.5		
Total		62	100.0		

**Age of respondents**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	35-54	17	27.4	28.3	28.3
	55-64	15	24.2	25.0	53.3
	65+	28	45.2	46.7	100.0
	Total	60	96.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	3.2		
Total		62	100.0		

**Race of respondents**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Native American	1	1.6	1.7	1.7
	White	58	93.5	96.7	98.3
	Asian	1	1.6	1.7	100.0
	Total	60	96.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	3.2		
Total		62	100.0		

**Role in farm operation**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Owner/operator	38	61.3	67.9	67.9
	Family member	8	12.9	14.3	82.1
	No longer farming	10	16.1	17.9	100.0
	Total	56	90.3	100.0	
Missing	System	6	9.7		
Total		62	100.0		

**Farm Description: Agribusiness**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	53	85.5	85.5	85.5
	Yes	9	14.5	14.5	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Farm Description: Field/row crop**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	49	79.0	79.0	79.0
	Yes	13	21.0	21.0	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Farm Description: Beef cattle**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	37	59.7	59.7	59.7
	Yes	25	40.3	40.3	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Farm Description: Dairy**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	59	95.2	95.2	95.2
	Yes	3	4.8	4.8	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Farm Description: Swine**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	59	95.2	95.2	95.2
	Yes	3	4.8	4.8	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Farm Description: Poultry**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	57	91.9	91.9	91.9
	Yes	5	8.1	8.1	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Farm Description: Other livestock**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	52	83.9	83.9	83.9
	Yes	10	16.1	16.1	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Farm Description: Nursery vegetable or fruit**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	58	93.5	93.5	93.5
	Yes	4	6.5	6.5	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Farm Description: Hay/forage**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	40	64.5	64.5	64.5
	Yes	22	35.5	35.5	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Farm Description: Other specialized crop**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	61	98.4	98.4	98.4
	Yes	1	1.6	1.6	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Not currently engaged in farming as I have changed careers**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	61	98.4	98.4	98.4
	Yes	1	1.6	1.6	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Not currently engaged in farming as I retired**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	56	90.3	90.3	90.3
	Yes	6	9.7	9.7	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Not currently engaged in farming as I stopped for economic reasons/market**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	61	98.4	98.4	98.4
	Yes	1	1.6	1.6	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Not currently engaged in farming as I stopped farming home not accessible**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	61	98.4	98.4	98.4
	Yes	1	1.6	1.6	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Not currently engaged in farming as the cost of modifications too high**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	60	96.8	96.8	96.8
	Yes	2	3.2	3.2	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Not currently engaged in farming as my disability prevents involvement**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	47	75.8	75.8	75.8
	Yes	15	24.2	24.2	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Not currently engaged in farming as my disability has worsened**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	52	83.9	83.9	83.9
	Yes	10	16.1	16.1	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**AgrAbility increased knowledge of adaptations to equipment and vehicles**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	4	6.5	10.5	10.5
	Very little	5	8.1	13.2	23.7
	Some	7	11.3	18.4	42.1
	Quite a bit	11	17.7	28.9	71.1
	Extensively	11	17.7	28.9	100.0
	Total	38	61.3	100.0	
Missing	System	24	38.7		
Total		62	100.0		

**AgrAbility increased knowledge of adaptations to farm buildings**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	12	19.4	36.4	36.4
	Very little	2	3.2	6.1	42.4
	Some	6	9.7	18.2	60.6
	Quite a bit	7	11.3	21.2	81.8
	Extensively	6	9.7	18.2	100.0
	Total	33	53.2	100.0	
Missing	System	29	46.8		
Total		62	100.0		

**AgrAbility increased knowledge of adaptations to home**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	13	21.0	39.4	39.4
	Very little	4	6.5	12.1	51.5
	Some	6	9.7	18.2	69.7
	Quite a bit	6	9.7	18.2	87.9
	Extensively	4	6.5	12.1	100.0
	Total	33	53.2	100.0	
Missing	System	29	46.8		
Total		62	100.0		

**AgrAbility increased knowledge of relevant health resources**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	8	12.9	24.2	24.2
	Very little	8	12.9	24.2	48.5
	Some	6	9.7	18.2	66.7
	Quite a bit	7	11.3	21.2	87.9
	Extensively	4	6.5	12.1	100.0
	Total	33	53.2	100.0	
Missing	System	29	46.8		
Total		62	100.0		

**AgrAbility increased knowledge of University Extension resources**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	7	11.3	21.2	21.2
	Very little	5	8.1	15.2	36.4
	Some	9	14.5	27.3	63.6
	Quite a bit	5	8.1	15.2	78.8
	Extensively	7	11.3	21.2	100.0
	Total	33	53.2	100.0	
Missing	System	29	46.8		
Total		62	100.0		

**AgrAbility increased knowledge of Independent Living Resources**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	9	14.5	28.1	28.1
	Very little	6	9.7	18.8	46.9
	Some	6	9.7	18.8	65.6
	Quite a bit	6	9.7	18.8	84.4
	Extensively	5	8.1	15.6	100.0
	Total	32	51.6	100.0	
Missing	System	30	48.4		
Total		62	100.0		

**AgrAbility increased knowledge of Vocational Rehabilitation Resources**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	7	11.3	20.6	20.6
	Very little	4	6.5	11.8	32.4
	Some	5	8.1	14.7	47.1
	Quite a bit	11	17.7	32.4	79.4
	Extensively	7	11.3	20.6	100.0
	Total	34	54.8	100.0	
Missing	System	28	45.2		
Total		62	100.0		

**AgrAbility increased knowledge of availability of community assistance**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	9	14.5	26.5	26.5
	Very little	10	16.1	29.4	55.9
	Some	4	6.5	11.8	67.6
	Quite a bit	5	8.1	14.7	82.4
	Extensively	6	9.7	17.6	100.0
	Total	34	54.8	100.0	
Missing	System	28	45.2		
Total		62	100.0		

**AgrAbility has worked with me to improve the accessibility of equipment**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	45	72.6	72.6	72.6
	Yes	17	27.4	27.4	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**Improve the accessibility of farm building**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	56	90.3	90.3	90.3
	Yes	6	9.7	9.7	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	



**AgrAbility has worked with me to apply for Vocational Rehabilitation services**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	44	71.0	71.0	71.0
	Yes	18	29.0	29.0	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**AgrAbility has worked with me to develop a farm business plan**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	56	90.3	90.3	90.3
	Yes	6	9.7	9.7	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**AgrAbility has worked with me to consider alternate enterprises and employment**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	60	96.8	96.8	96.8
	Yes	2	3.2	3.2	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**AgrAbility has worked with me to continue to live on the farm/other occupation**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	60	96.8	96.8	96.8
	Yes	2	3.2	3.2	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**AgrAbility has worked with me to improve the accessibility of my home**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	54	87.1	87.1	87.1
	Yes	8	12.9	12.9	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**AgrAbility has worked with me to continue to live in my home independently**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	54	87.1	87.1	87.1
	Yes	8	12.9	12.9	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**AgrAbility has worked with me to obtain assistive technology devices**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	43	69.4	69.4	69.4
	Yes	19	30.6	30.6	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**AgrAbility has worked with me to find funding**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	53	85.5	85.5	85.5
	Yes	9	14.5	14.5	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**AgrAbility has worked with me to develop a peer network**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	62	100.0	100.0	100.0

**AgrAbility has worked with me to continue my farming operation in part or whole**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	45	72.6	72.6	72.6
	Yes	17	27.4	27.4	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**AgrAbility has worked with me to do farm work better or more easily than before AgrAbility**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	42	67.7	67.7	67.7
	Yes	20	32.3	32.3	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**As a result of AgrAbility I have increased interactions in community**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	45	72.6	72.6	72.6
	Yes	17	27.4	27.4	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**As a result of AgrAbility I have used the knowledge from on farm assessment**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	38	61.3	61.3	61.3
	Yes	24	38.7	38.7	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**As a result of AgrAbility I have taken action to resolve a farming barrier**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	40	64.5	64.5	64.5
	Yes	22	35.5	35.5	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**As a result of AgrAbility I have obtained funding to implement a modification**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	44	71.0	71.0	71.0
	Yes	18	29.0	29.0	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**As a result of AgrAbility I have received VR services and support**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	40	64.5	64.5	64.5
	Yes	22	35.5	35.5	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**As a result of AgrAbility I have improved your quality of life**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	27	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Yes	35	56.5	56.5	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**After Services from AgrAbility I am able to complete chores on my farm**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does not apply	7	11.3	20.6	20.6
	Strongly disagree	4	6.5	11.8	32.4
	Disagree	2	3.2	5.9	38.2
	Indifferent	3	4.8	8.8	47.1
	Agree	6	9.7	17.6	64.7
	Strongly agree	12	19.4	35.3	100.0
	Total	34	54.8	100.0	
Missing	System	28	45.2		
Total		62	100.0		

**Before AgrAbility I was able to complete chores on my farm**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does not apply	6	9.7	18.8	18.8
	Strongly disagree	6	9.7	18.8	37.5
	Disagree	11	17.7	34.4	71.9
	Indifferent	3	4.8	9.4	81.3
	Agree	6	9.7	18.8	100.0
	Total	32	51.6	100.0	
Missing	System	30	48.4		
Total		62	100.0		

**After Services from AgrAbility I am able to operate machinery**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does not apply	7	11.3	20.6	20.6
	Strongly disagree	4	6.5	11.8	32.4
	Indifferent	4	6.5	11.8	44.1
	Agree	6	9.7	17.6	61.8
	Strongly agree	13	21.0	38.2	100.0
	Total	34	54.8	100.0	
Missing	System	28	45.2		
Total		62	100.0		

**Before AgrAbility I was able to operate machinery**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does not apply	5	8.1	15.6	15.6
	Strongly disagree	7	11.3	21.9	37.5
	Disagree	8	12.9	25.0	62.5
	Indifferent	3	4.8	9.4	71.9
	Agree	7	11.3	21.9	93.8
	Strongly agree	2	3.2	6.3	100.0
	Total	32	51.6	100.0	
Missing	System	30	48.4		
Total		62	100.0		

**After Services from AgrAbility I am able to manage my farm**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does not apply	9	14.5	25.0	25.0
	Strongly disagree	1	1.6	2.8	27.8
	Disagree	1	1.6	2.8	30.6
	Indifferent	2	3.2	5.6	36.1
	Agree	6	9.7	16.7	52.8
	Strongly agree	17	27.4	47.2	100.0
	Total	36	58.1	100.0	
Missing	System	26	41.9		
Total		62	100.0		

**Before AgrAbility I was able to manage my farm**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does not apply	5	8.1	15.2	15.2
	Strongly disagree	3	4.8	9.1	24.2
	Disagree	3	4.8	9.1	33.3
	Indifferent	7	11.3	21.2	54.5
	Agree	7	11.3	21.2	75.8
	Strongly agree	8	12.9	24.2	100.0
	Total	33	53.2	100.0	
Missing	System	29	46.8		
Total		62	100.0		

**After Services from AgrAbility I am able to access workspaces on farm**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does not apply	10	16.1	28.6	28.6
	Strongly disagree	4	6.5	11.4	40.0
	Disagree	2	3.2	5.7	45.7
	Indifferent	2	3.2	5.7	51.4
	Agree	5	8.1	14.3	65.7
	Strongly agree	12	19.4	34.3	100.0
	Total	35	56.5	100.0	
Missing	System	27	43.5		
Total		62	100.0		

**Before AgrAbility I was able to access workspaces on farm**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does not apply	9	14.5	27.3	27.3
	Strongly disagree	5	8.1	15.2	42.4
	Disagree	7	11.3	21.2	63.6
	Indifferent	4	6.5	12.1	75.8
	Agree	4	6.5	12.1	87.9
	Strongly agree	4	6.5	12.1	100.0
	Total	33	53.2	100.0	
Missing	System	29	46.8		
Total		62	100.0		

**After Services from AgrAbility I am able to live in my home on farm**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does not apply	5	8.1	14.7	14.7
	Indifferent	1	1.6	2.9	17.6
	Agree	6	9.7	17.6	35.3
	Strongly agree	22	35.5	64.7	100.0
	Total	34	54.8	100.0	
Missing	System	28	45.2		
Total		62	100.0		

**Before AgrAbility I was able to live in my home on farm**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does not apply	5	8.1	15.2	15.2
	Strongly disagree	1	1.6	3.0	18.2
	Disagree	1	1.6	3.0	21.2
	Indifferent	6	9.7	18.2	39.4
	Agree	7	11.3	21.2	60.6
	Strongly agree	13	21.0	39.4	100.0
	Total	33	53.2	100.0	
Missing	System	29	46.8		
Total		62	100.0		

**After Services from AgrAbility I am able to change or modify machinery**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does not apply	9	14.5	28.1	28.1
	Strongly disagree	3	4.8	9.4	37.5
	Indifferent	3	4.8	9.4	46.9
	Agree	3	4.8	9.4	56.3
	Strongly agree	14	22.6	43.8	100.0
	Total	32	51.6	100.0	
Missing	System	30	48.4		
Total		62	100.0		

**Before AgrAbility I was able to change or modify machinery**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does not apply	7	11.3	22.6	22.6
	Strongly disagree	6	9.7	19.4	41.9
	Disagree	6	9.7	19.4	61.3
	Indifferent	5	8.1	16.1	77.4
	Agree	3	4.8	9.7	87.1
	Strongly agree	4	6.5	12.9	100.0
	Total	31	50.0	100.0	
Missing	System	31	50.0		
Total		62	100.0		

**Dollars**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	\$0	1	1.6	6.7	6.7
	\$500	1	1.6	6.7	13.3
	\$700	1	1.6	6.7	20.0
	\$1,500	1	1.6	6.7	26.7
	\$6,000	1	1.6	6.7	33.3
	\$8,000	2	3.2	13.3	46.7
	\$8,500	1	1.6	6.7	53.3
	\$10,000	1	1.6	6.7	60.0
	\$15,000	1	1.6	6.7	66.7
	\$19,000	1	1.6	6.7	73.3
	\$25,000	1	1.6	6.7	80.0
	\$30,000	2	3.2	13.3	93.3
	\$50,000	1	1.6	6.7	100.0
	Total	15	24.2	100.0	
Missing	System	47	75.8		
Total		62	100.0		

**AgrAbility led to new enterprise**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	56	90.3	90.3	90.3
	Yes	6	9.7	9.7	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**No changes made since AgrAbility contact because not interested in doing anything**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	57	91.9	91.9	91.9
	Yes	5	8.1	8.1	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**No changes made since AgrAbility contact because I don't believe it will have any effect**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	48	77.4	77.4	77.4
	Yes	14	22.6	22.6	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	



**No changes made since AgrAbility contact because I have not had the financial resources**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	59	95.2	95.2	95.2
	Yes	3	4.8	4.8	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**No changes made since AgrAbility contact because I have not enough time to get started**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	58	93.5	93.5	93.5
	Yes	4	6.5	6.5	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**No changes made since AgrAbility contact because additional manpower is needed**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	58	93.5	93.5	93.5
	Yes	4	6.5	6.5	100.0
	Total	62	100.0	100.0	

**AgrAbility Impact on financial return**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Reduced greatly	1	1.6	2.3	2.3
	Reduced	3	4.8	7.0	9.3
	No impact	26	41.9	60.5	69.8
	Increased	7	11.3	16.3	86.0
	Increased greatly	6	9.7	14.0	100.0
	Total	43	69.4	100.0	
Missing	System	19	30.6		
Total		62	100.0		

**Can manage farm independently**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does not apply	7	11.3	15.6	15.6
	Strongly disagree	3	4.8	6.7	22.2
	Disagree	6	9.7	13.3	35.6
	Indifferent	5	8.1	11.1	46.7
	Agree	13	21.0	28.9	75.6
	Strongly agree	11	17.7	24.4	100.0
	Total		45	72.6	100.0
Missing	System	17	27.4		
Total		62	100.0		