

A COMPARISON OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS
BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS SERVING AS
STUDENT TEACHING CENTERS
AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS
OF VOCATIONAL
AGRICULTURE IN
OKLAHOMA

By

RONALD KEITH LONG

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1970

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1975

Thesis
1975
L849c
cop. 2

SEP 12 1975

A COMPARISON OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS
BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS SERVING AS
STUDENT TEACHING CENTERS
AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS
OF VOCATIONAL
AGRICULTURE IN
OKLAHOMA

Thesis Approved:

Robert Long

Thesis Adviser

Robert L. Price

James P. Key

George E. Cook

D. N. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

916377

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is expressed to the many individuals who helped make this study possible.

The writer is indebted to Dr. Robert Terry, Dr. Jack Pritchard, and Dr. Jim Key for their guidance and encouragement throughout the course of this study. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Robert Price, for his advice and counseling through my years in Agricultural Education.

A very sincere thank you to the teachers of vocational agriculture who contributed to this study.

The author wishes to express grateful appreciation to his co-workers, Mr. Marvin Bicket and Mr. Jay Woodward for their patience during the course of this study.

Appreciation is also expressed to Mark McGuffin and Brenda Lewis for helping organize the data into a useful form.

The writer is sincerely appreciative to Kathy Gisinger for the valuable assistance and encouragement provided during this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose and Design of the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Definition of Terms	2
Purpose of the Study	3
Objectives of the Study	4
Limitations of the Study	4
Methods of Procedure	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	20
Comparison of Selected Characteristics of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture	20
Years Teaching Experience in Single Teacher Department	20
Years Teaching Experience in a Multiple-Teacher Department	22
Years Teaching in Present School	23
Number of Schools in Which Vocational Agriculture Teacher Has Taught	24
Years Teachers Served as Cooperating Teacher	26
Subjects Taught Other Than Vocational Agriculture	27
Involvement of Vocational Agriculture Teachers in Professional Organizations	27
Activities With Civic Groups of the Community	28
Individual Church Activities in the Community	30
Selected Characteristics of the Vocational Agriculture Program	32
Use of Advisory Committees	32
Young Farmer Activities	33
Number of FFA Degrees Earned by Students	35
Number of State and National Officers	38

Chapter	Page
National Chapter Awards	39
Livestock Show and Fair Entries . .	40
Competitive Events Other Than Livestock Shows	43
Selected Characteristics of the Vocational Agriculture Classroom . . .	45
Size of the Vocational Agriculture Classroom	45
Availability of Core Curriculum Student Materials	46
Number of Up-To-Date Text Books in the Vocational Agriculture Departments	48
Agriculture Magazines Available in the Classroom	49
Use of Audio Visual Aids in the Vocational Agriculture Classroom .	50
Size of the Vocational Agriculture Shop	51
Use of Curriculum Center Shop Plans	52
Shop Facilities for the Vocational Agriculture Program	53
Shop Equipment for the Vocational Agriculture Department	54
 IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	 55
Summarization of Characteristics	
Investigated	55
Conclusions	58
Recommendations	61
 A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	 63
APPENDIX A - COVER LETTER	64
APPENDIX B - QUESTIONNAIRES	66

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to Teaching Experience in a Single Teacher Department	21
II. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to Teaching Experience in a Multiple-Teacher Department	22
III. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to Total Number of Years Taught in the Present School System	24
IV. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to Number of Different Schools Taught	25
V. Distrubution of Cooperating Teachers by Tenure as Cooperating Teachers	26
VI. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to Membership in Professional Organizations	27
VII. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to Membership, Attendance, and Responsibilities Assumed in Civic Clubs	29
VIII. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to Membership, Attendance, and Responsibilities Assumed in Local Church	30
IX. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to the Use of Advisory Committees	33
X. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to Young Farmer Chapters in Their Communities	34
XI. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to the Number of FFA Degrees Earned by Their Students During the Past Three Years	36

Table	Page
XII. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to the Number of State and National Officers From Their Chapter During the Past Three Years	38
XIII. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to the Highest National Chapter Award Received During the Past Three Years	39
XIV. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to the Total Number of Livestock Entries in Shows and Fairs . . .	41
XV. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to Participation in Competitive Events Other Than Fairs and Livestock Shows	44
XVI. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to Classroom Size	46
XVII. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to the Number of Core Curriculum Student Material in the Vocational Agriculture Classroom	47
XVIII. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to Number of Sets of Up-To-Date Text Books in the Vocational Agriculture Department	48
XIX. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to the Number of Different Agricultural Magazines Coming into the Classroom	50
XX. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to Use of Audio Visual Aids in the Classroom	51
XXI. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to Size of Shop	52
XXII. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to the Use of Curriculum Center Shop Plans	53
XXIII. Comparison of Cooperating and Non-Cooperating Teachers as to Adequate Shop Facilities . .	54

Table	Page
XXIV. A Comparison of Numbers, Means and Differences Relative to Certain Characteristics of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Student Teaching Centers and Those in Other Departments	56
XXV. A Comparison of Numbers, Means and Differences Relative to Certain Characteristics of Programs of Vocational Agriculture as They Occur in Cooperating Student Teaching Centers and as They Occur in Other Departments	57
XXVI. A Comparison of Means and Differences Relative to Certain Characteristics of Physical Facilities of Vocational Agriculture Departments in Student Teaching Centers and Those of Other Departments	58

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Design of the Study

One of the chief aims of education is to develop abilities within an individual which will help him to solve the problems, both social and economic, which he may meet in life and to prepare him for a complete living. It should result in desirable changes in the learner through the development of effective abilities, attitudes, understandings, appreciation, ideals, and habit formation.

Since the beginning, teacher trainers in Vocational Agriculture have realized the training of prospective teachers of Vocational Agriculture cannot be completed on the university campus, but that the student must have some practical experience. This experience is gained through a student teaching, or apprentice teaching program. The program allows the prospective teacher to gain the additional training that will aid him in becoming a better teacher of vocational agriculture. The student teacher receives the participating experiences in teaching by spending a period of the time in the local vocational agriculture department under the supervision of a successful local teacher. The student teaching experience is probably

the most important phase of the prospective teacher's education.

Smith (8) points out the following:

The professional training of teachers of vocational agriculture is vital to the success of vocational education in agriculture. Providing adequate professional training for prospective teachers of vocational agriculture is of major concern to state supervisory and teacher training departments (p. 68).

It is essential that great care be taken in selecting the departments to be used as cooperating teacher centers.

Statement of the Problem

The vocational agriculture teachers who serve as cooperating teachers in Oklahoma are selected by the Agricultural Education Department of Oklahoma State University, upon the recommendation of the state supervisory staff. These teachers are said to be the "cream of the crop" as far as accomplishments as vocational agriculture teachers are concerned.

The central problem of this study was to determine what differences may exist between approved training centers and a random sample of other vocational agriculture departments of the state.

Definition of Terms

Co-operating Teacher - The cooperating teacher is a fully qualified, regularly employed vocational agriculture teacher who guides and supervises the observation,

participation, and teaching activities of a college student as he gains competence in performing the roles of a teacher (10).

Non-cooperating Teacher - The non-cooperating teacher is a fully qualified, regularly employed vocational agriculture teacher who does not participate in the student teaching program.

Supervising Teacher - The supervising teacher is a teacher of public school pupils who also directs the work of a student teacher. He is frequently referred to as a cooperating teacher, critic teacher, or cooperating school supervising teacher (3).

Student Teacher - The student teacher is a college student who is doing student teaching.

Student Teaching Center - A student teaching center is a public school system which has been approved by Oklahoma State University and the State Department of Vocational Technical Education for participation in the student teaching program.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if the vocational agriculture departments approved as student teaching centers in Oklahoma have characteristics that make them superior to a random sampling of other departments in the state for training prospective teachers of vocational agriculture.

Objectives of the Study

The following specific objectives were established in an effort to accomplish the purpose of the study:

1. To determine and compare selected personal and professional characteristics of the two teacher groups.
2. To determine and compare selected aspects of the vocational agriculture and FFA programs conducted by the two groups of teachers.
3. To determine and compare certain features of the classroom and shop facilities for the two teacher groups.

Limitations of the Study

The study was limited to the cooperating teaching centers approved by the Agricultural Education Department of Oklahoma State University.

The selection of the comparison group of non-cooperating departments was made by a random selection by districts. The same number of departments was selected in the sampling as there were approved departments from that district. In the cases of multiple-teacher departments, the head teacher was mailed the questionnaire. The same number of multiple-teacher departments was selected in the sampling as there were approved departments from that district.

The study was concerned only with information about the instructors, physical facilities, and programs which were considered important in determining the extent, quality, and diversity the student teachers could be expected to receive in these departments.

Methods of Procedure

The first step in making this study, was to secure a list of approved student teaching centers in each of the five vocational agriculture districts in Oklahoma.

Using the remaining departments, in each district, a list was compiled and a random selection was made, equal to the number of approved departments from that district.

A questionnaire was constructed from a review of available literature and mailed to each of the departments being studied.

The data received from the questionnaire were divided into three categories as follows: (1) that pertaining to the instructors; (2) that pertaining to the physical facilities; and (3) that pertaining to the vocational agriculture programs.

In order that a comparison of the two groups of departments could be made, they were divided into cooperating and non-cooperating departments. Tables were constructed and the data tabulated and analyzed and then certain conclusions drawn.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The writer found much current material available concerning student teaching in vocational agriculture in the United States. The majority of information obtained was in the form of magazine articles written by teacher trainers. The writer located a limited number of studies similar to the one attempted that were useful in completing this study.

Using the materials available, this review sought to outline the vocational agriculture student teaching programs as they are used to train prospective vocational agriculture teachers.

Many of the major responsibilities of the cooperating teacher are listed as the responsibilities of the student teacher as well as the teacher trainer.

The selection of the student teaching center is a major responsibility of the teacher trainer. To insure the student teacher receives the most benefit from his student teaching experience, the teacher training center in Oklahoma must meet the following criteria:

1. It is desirable to utilize centers in a variety of geographical locations.

2. A quality program of vocational instruction is conducted by the school.
3. The program provides a broad area of experience (teaching based on supervised training programs and the basic core curriculum).
4. Facilities are adequate for the types of instruction provided.
5. The program has been established for a minimum of five years.
6. The supervising teacher has a minimum of three years teaching experience with a minimum of two years experience in the cooperating school.
7. The supervising teacher consistently demonstrates effective teaching.
8. The supervising teacher has gained the respect of fellow teachers, the school administration, and residents of the community.
9. Student teachers are desired and the time can be budgeted for their supervision.
10. State and district supervisors recommend the school as a training center (9, pp. 2-5).

The Oklahoma State University Agricultural Education Department defines the responsibilities of the local administration, supervising teacher, and the college supervisor. These responsibilities are listed in the student teaching guidebook and manual "Student Teaching in Vocational Agriculture" (9). These include:

The Local School Administration Should:

1. Be willing to accept student teachers as a part of the total faculty.
2. Be willing for the student teachers to work with enough freedom to encourage growth.

3. Be willing to provide facilities that will enhance the training environment.
4. Be willing to give assistance and support to the student teacher in the development of appropriate professional relationships with the faculty, staff, students, and community.
5. Be willing to work with the college supervisor and supervising teacher in helping to meet the needs of trainees assigned (9, pp. 2-5).

The Supervising Teacher Should:

1. Exhibit a whole-hearted willingness to accept student teachers.
2. Possess at least three years teaching experience with two years in cooperating school.
3. Be willing to devote the time necessary for supervision, counseling, and evaluation of trainees.
4. Be helpful in letting student teachers use his classroom:
 - a. to teach
 - b. to try out educational innovations under his supervision
5. Assist student teachers to become personally acquainted with each vocational agriculture student and his home situation.
6. Be willing to provide opportunities for trainees to become acquainted with the faculty members in order to further development of a working professional relationship.
7. Be willing to provide opportunities for trainees to attend church services, civic organizations, and other community activities.
8. Agree to provide opportunities for student teachers to gain experience in all the different methods of instruction.

9. Be willing to provide student teachers enough freedom to enable them to develop their own confidence and initiative.
10. Be patient, but persistent in the direction of student teachers in the development of a positive attitude toward self-evaluation, determination, and improvement (9, pp. 2-5).

The College Supervisor Should:

1. Ensure that trainees are well-informed concerning the purpose and importance of student teaching.
2. Inform trainees in some detail concerning what is expected from them during, and as a result of, their student teaching experience.
3. Attempt to form a mutual friendship with trainees in order that they will feel more at ease during the college supervisor's visits to the training center.
4. Visit each training center at least two times during the student teaching assignment.
5. Keep supervising teachers and trainees informed of the visitation schedule.
6. Be willing to evaluate trainee's performance on an informal, yet thoroughly constructive basis.
7. Visit the superintendent and/or principal in each of the cooperating schools.
8. Establish rapport with each supervising teacher to the end that each has a thorough understanding and agreement concerning objectives and means of attainment for the student teaching program.
9. Be willing to give due consideration to the supervising teacher's evaluation of trainee performance and potential when determining final grades.
10. Facilitate the overall student teaching program in Agricultural Education by

functioning as a liaison person between the supervising teacher, the student teacher, the cooperating school, the Agricultural Education Department, and the State Department of Vocational Technical Education (9, pp. 2-5).

Student teaching in vocational agriculture began in January, 1929, at the University of Georgia when six seniors in the College of Agriculture began what was then a unique teacher education experiment.

The role of the student teacher and the cooperating teacher in this teaching experience is described in this statement by O'Kelly (6):

Those first six students were, according to available records, probably the first trainees in agricultural education in the nation to receive full-time, off-campus, supervised teaching experiences as a part of their college programs of study. They were assigned to four carefully selected schools within a radius of 40 miles of Athens and the university campus. One full quarter was spent living and working in the school communities where they had been assigned. During this period, they assumed full responsibility for selected areas of the vocational agriculture teaching program in the local school (p. 183).

The student teacher, under the daily supervision of the local vocational agriculture teacher, learns to teach boys and girls who are regularly enrolled in the high school vocational agriculture class. The student teaching experience also includes work with the young farmer chapter as well as assisting with all FFA activities in the local community.

Every day, the student teacher is expected to carry the responsibilities of a regular faculty member of the

local school faculty. As a fully accepted member of the local school faculty, the student teacher learns to conduct himself as a professional educator and a community leader.

Selecting a particular school and vocational agriculture department to serve as a student teaching center is often difficult. Several criteria have been developed to assist the teacher trainer in selecting the center which will be of the most benefit to the student teacher in agricultural education. These criteria, according to Kirkland (4) include:

1. The population and community activities are typical of those in which vocational agriculture teachers are employed.
2. The agricultural enterprises of that area are representative of those practiced in the state.
3. The school administration is actively interested in the vocational agriculture program.
4. A satisfactory relationship exists between the vocational agriculture teacher and the teacher of other subjects.
5. The school and community have a willingness to cooperate with the teacher training institution.
6. Adequate facilities are available.
7. The center is located so the teacher trainer can visit the student teacher several times.
8. The vocational agriculture department has been established long enough to become stabilized and meet the needs of the community.
9. The local vocational agriculture teacher is well qualified to serve as a cooperating teacher (p. 115).

The period of directed teaching is the teacher-training institution's best means of developing the competencies required for effective teaching of vocational agriculture (4, p. 115).

Kirkland also stated that:

If trainees are to be given an opportunity to develop the professional competencies required for projecting satisfactory programs of vocational agriculture, it seems imperative that the institutions select training centers in which well-qualified teachers are employed; in which complete programs of vocational agriculture are in operation; and in which physical facilities are available (4, p. 115).

The cooperating teacher may be the most important factor in developing the student teacher into a professional vocational agriculture teacher.

Binkly states:

What the on-campus teacher educator says may have little meaning compared to what the prospective teacher is caused to do and understand as a student teacher under the direction of the supervising teacher. What the supervising teacher does and how he does it speak louder than any decision arrived at in a class on-campus. Thus, the job of a supervising teacher is a most responsible and significant one--perhaps the most important job in teacher education (1, pp. 132-133).

The vocational agriculture teacher of the future must use modern techniques of educational leadership in developing and carrying out sound and up-to-date agricultural education programs in their communities. He must be skilled in teaching, directing, and supervising the learning process. He must be educated to get a deep and abiding satisfaction from teaching and he must have a

sustained interest in teaching. How the beginning teacher feels about, and the understanding he comes to have of the importance of these qualities are largely determined by the attitudes of the cooperating teacher.

The student teacher must learn the first responsibility of the vocational agriculture teacher is to teach agriculture. The teaching of agriculture is not limited only to farming, but includes all areas that are connected with agriculture. Sound programs of vocational agriculture are based upon the needs of the students and the opportunities for quality supervised training programs. The same type of program is essential if the student teacher is to secure the skills which are needed to become a successful vocational agriculture teacher.

Practice is essential to learning. Student teachers need to believe and understand this to the extent that the agriculture they teach their students is sound and that these students have practice in the agriculture taught through supervised training programs or other supervised occupational experience programs that are related to the classroom instruction.

Binkly states:

There must be quality in the supervised practice in agriculture if there is to be quality in the teaching of vocational agriculture and quality in the preparation of teachers (1, pp. 132-133).

The student teacher cannot learn everything he needs to know about teaching agriculture while he is student

teaching because the time is too short.

The supervising teacher realizes he has the important job of deciding what should be learned and learned well by the student teacher in order for him to succeed as a vocational agriculture teacher.

The student teacher must learn that unpreparedness results in failure. This failure, to a large extent, can be prevented through preparation. If the student teacher presents a lesson when he is unprepared, the lesson results in failure and poor teaching.

The supervising teacher must stress to the student teacher that success in teaching, and as a teacher, is based upon a habit of preparation. For the student teacher the habit of preparation for teaching and supervision is acquired, or fails to be acquired, under the direction of the supervising teacher. The supervising teacher who develops and causes the student teacher to develop a good lesson plan for each lesson to be taught will make a major contribution to forming the habit of preparation.

Another very important part of the student teaching experience is the daily supervising conferences. Sometimes because of the limited time factor, these supervisory conferences between the student teacher and the supervising teachers are often neglected. These conferences should be held daily, as soon as possible after teaching. This conference is important to determine those parts of the teaching procedure which were good and why; what parts were

not good and why; and what would be a better way to handle certain situations or matters. Pre-conferences and after-conferences for student teachers are fundamentals in good teacher preparation. The supervising teacher sets the standards and the quality of the conferences. As the student teacher develops, these conferences will usually grow shorter in length of time and of less detail.

Most supervising teachers will hold conferences on most of the activities he does in which the student teacher observes. This includes teaching in the classroom, giving a demonstration, project supervision, working with young farmers, and the various meetings the local agriculture teacher must attend.

According to Schumann:

The cooperating teacher plays a key role in providing the experiences necessary to become a successful teacher. Some cooperating teachers have a "sink or swim" philosophy; however, if the student teacher is to develop desirable teaching skills and personal habits, the guidance and supervision of the cooperating teacher is imperative (7, p. 156).

The student teaching experience can be divided into three steps. First, the student teacher should receive a thorough orientation to the local program of vocational agriculture. Next, student teachers should assume some of the responsibilities of the teacher. The final step is the maturation of the student teacher.

The orientation should begin as soon as the student teacher arrives at the school. The cooperating teacher

should explain the policies of the school and the vocational agriculture department. The student teacher must understand the importance of the following rules and regulations set forth by the local school board.

Orientation takes a great deal of time and energy on the part of the cooperating teacher.

The second step in the student teacher's professional growth involves active participation in the local vocational agriculture program. Before the student teacher is given the responsibility for teaching the lesson or other activities, the cooperating teacher should make it clear to the students that the student teacher will be their teacher. The students need to understand that the student teacher is their teacher and that they are expected to follow his instructions as they do the instructions of their regular teacher.

The cooperating teacher should observe the classes of the student teacher. The cooperating teacher should be an observer and not a participant. Only in extreme cases should he assume any control over the classes. This would only undermine the confidence of the students in their student teacher.

These first two steps require a great deal of time and effort on the part of the cooperating teacher. If he does the first two steps well, the reward will be the maturation of the student teacher.

The student teaching experience in vocational

agriculture is not perfect and is in need of constant revision. This experience is one of the most important elements in a future teacher's education.

Byram states:

Teachers' evaluations of the preservice professional education experience which they have undergone have consistently shown student teaching ranking at the top of importance or value (2, pp. 49-50).

This may be due in part to the theoretical nature of most campus-based courses. It is more likely due to the truly functional nature of student teaching. Without the student teaching experience, the teacher feels he could not have assumed the expected role of the beginning teacher. Which ever the situation may be, the improvement of student teaching is worthy of a major portion of the time and talents of any teacher education department in agriculture.

The population of America has changed from the rural area to the urban setting, and if vocational agriculture is to remain a part of the curriculum of the local high school, it too must change to meet the needs of the student and the community.

Lucas and Wright state:

Teachers of vocational agriculture have been compelled to change programs at the high school level to meet the needs of students in such areas as horticulture, forestry, and agriculture supplies. But the college curriculum for preparing these teachers is still primarily the traditional concept of preparation for teaching production agriculture. With the recognition that the "age of specialization" has come to vocational agriculture, and the continuing growth of multi-teacher

departments, there should be a change in the type of program for preparing teachers (5, p. 167).

The majority of the present day vocational agriculture teachers were taught traditional production agriculture in high school. When they enrolled in college, production agriculture was re-emphasized. When the prospective teacher begins his teaching career he often finds himself in multiple-teacher departments, where he is required to teach more than just the traditional production agriculture programs. Many of the teachers in the multiple-teacher departments find themselves teaching specialized courses. They find themselves being the specialist in an area in which their knowledge and skills are limited.

There are several things which could be implemented to help the teacher to become more specialized. These include:

1. Students in agricultural education should choose an area of special interest to enable them to better qualify to teach in an area of specialization in a multiple-teacher department.
2. Better communications should be developed between departments in the college of agriculture to bring about an increased awareness of the new picture in vocational agriculture.
3. Teachers who are teaching in specialized areas should be offered in-service training programs

to develop additional competencies in the specific areas in which they are working.

4. More emphasis should be placed on preparing teachers to teach the relationships between economics and management in production agriculture and other areas of specialization. These areas need to include records, accounting, business law, business management, and economics which are a vital part of agriculture as we know it today.

The cooperating teacher must remember that the student teacher sees the teaching profession through his eyes. Many of the practices that the cooperating teacher uses in his department will be used in the student teacher's department. The cooperating teacher more than anyone else influences the student teacher to become a superior teacher of vocational agriculture. The selection of these cooperating teachers must continue to meet the high standards of selection which they now undergo.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The following tables, analyses, and comments compose a presentation of data secured for this study. Forty-five vocational agriculture departments were included in this study. There were an equal number of cooperating and non-cooperating departments from each of the five supervisory districts in Oklahoma.

There was no attempt to determine teacher attitudes. For the purpose of this study, it was assumed that all teachers had attitudes which would qualify them as cooperating teachers.

Comparison of Selected Characteristics of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture

Years Teaching Experience in Single Teacher Department

Table I indicates mean years experience teaching vocational agriculture to be 14.96 for the cooperating teachers as compared to 12.86 for the non-cooperating teachers. A difference of 2.10 years was indicated in favor of the cooperating teachers. The table indicates that thirty-one percent of the non-cooperating teachers had

five or less years of teaching experience whereas the cooperating group had thirteen percent who had taught five years or less. From this information we must conclude the cooperating teachers have more experience in teaching vocational agriculture than do the non-cooperating teachers.

TABLE I
COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
TEACHERS AS TO TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN
A SINGLE TEACHER DEPARTMENT

Years in Single Teacher Department	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op Number	%	Non-Coop Number	%
1 - 5	3	13	7	31
6 - 10	5	22	5	23
11 - 15	5	22	2	9
16 - 20	2	9	2	9
21 - 25	5	22	1	5
26 - 30	2	9	4	18
31 - 35	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>
Totals	23	100	22	100
Note: Mean years by groups	14.96		12.86	
Difference between groups		2.10		
Mean years, total		13.91		

Years Experience Teaching in a
Multiple-Teacher Department

The information presented in Table II indicates that sixty-two percent of cooperating and sixty-four percent non-cooperating teachers have never taught in a multiple-teacher department. However, twenty-six percent of the cooperating teachers have from one to five years teaching experience in a multiple-teacher department compared to twenty-two percent of the non-cooperating teachers. The difference existing between the two groups as to teaching experience in multiple-teacher departments would not be a sound criterion in selecting student teaching centers.

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
TEACHERS AS TO TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN A
MULTIPLE-TEACHER DEPARTMENT

Years in Multiple- Teacher Department	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op		Non-Coop	
	Number	%	Number	%
0	14	62	14	64
1 - 5	6	26	5	22
6 - 10	1	4	2	9
11 - 15	0	0	1	5
16 - 20	1	4	0	0
21 - 25	1	4	0	0

TABLE II-(CONTINUED)

Years in Multiple- Teacher Department	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op Number	%	Non-Coop Number	%
26 - 30	0	0	0	0
31 - 35	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	23	100	22	100
Note: Mean years by groups	2.62		2.14	
Difference between groups		.48		
Mean years, total		2.38		

Years Teaching in Present School

The two groups showed some difference in the number of years teaching experience in the present school. Thirty-nine percent of the cooperating teachers had taught ten years or less in the present school compared with sixty-two percent of the non-cooperating teachers. Table III indicates the cooperating teachers had a mean of 15.26 years in the present school whereas the non-cooperating teachers had a mean of 13.0 years. The mean difference was 2.26 years.

TABLE III
 COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
 TEACHERS AS TO TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS TAUGHT
 IN THE PRESENT SCHOOL SYSTEM

Comparative Factors Years Taught	Distribution by Group			
	Co-op		Non-Coop	
	Number	%	Number	%
1 - 5	2	9	8	36
6 - 10	7	30	6	26
11 - 15	3	13	1	5
16 - 20	3	13	0	0
21 - 25	5	22	2	9
26 - 30	3	13	4	18
31 - 35	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>
Totals	23	100	22	100
<hr/>				
Note: Mean years by groups	15.26		13.0	
Difference between groups		2.26		
Mean years, total		14.13		

Number of Schools in Which Vocational
 Agriculture Teacher has Taught

Eighty-five percent of the cooperating teachers and eighty-one percent of the non-cooperating teachers indicated they had taught in no more than two different schools. The mean number of schools taught in is also very

close; 1.70 schools for the cooperating teacher and 1.95 for the non-cooperating teacher. The mean difference between the groups is only .25 which is considered insignificant. Table IV seems to bear out that vocational agriculture teachers in Oklahoma are stabilized and enjoy long tenure in their schools.

TABLE IV
COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
TEACHERS AS TO NUMBER OF DIFFERENT
SCHOOLS TAUGHT

Different Schools Taught in	Distribution by Group			
	Co-op Number	%	Non-Coop Number	%
1	10	42.5	8	36
2	10	42.5	10	45
3	3	13	3	14
4	0	0	1	5
5	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	23	100	22	100
Note: Mean schools by groups	1.70		1.95	
Difference between groups		.25		
Mean schools, total		1.83		

Years Teachers Served as Cooperating
Teacher

Table V indicates that fifty-seven percent of the cooperating teachers had been cooperating teachers five years or less. From this information it is evident that new cooperating teachers are constantly being brought into the program. The mean of 6.43 years as cooperating teachers supports this statement.

TABLE V
DISTRIBUTION OF COOPERATING TEACHERS BY
TENURE AS COOPERATING TEACHERS

Years Tenure	Number	%
1 - 5	13	57
6 - 10	6	26
11 - 15	2	9
16 - 20	1	4
21 - 25	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
Totals	23	100
Note: Mean years	6.43	

Subjects Taught Other Than Vocational

Agriculture

From the answers received in the questionnaire, two or nine percent of the cooperating teachers had taught subjects other than vocational agriculture as compared to three or fourteen percent for the non-cooperating teachers. All five teachers indicated that the subject they taught before teaching vocational agriculture was science.

Involvement of Vocational Agriculture

Teachers in Professional Organizations

By examining Table VI it was found that the majority of vocational agriculture teachers in Oklahoma are involved in teacher's professional organizations. It will be noted that the N.E.A. has the smallest percentage of vocational agriculture teacher memberships.

TABLE VI

COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
TEACHERS AS TO MEMBERSHIP IN
PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Professional Organizations	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op Number	%	Non-Coop Number	%
Local Education Groups	21	91	16	86

TABLE VI- (CONTINUED)

Professional Organizations	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op Number	%	Non-Coop Number	%
OEA	21	91	22	100
NEA	13	57	15	68
OVATA	23	100	22	100
NVATA	23	100	22	100
OVA	23	100	22	100
NVA	23	100	22	100

Activities With Civic Groups of the
Community

Ninety-six percent of the cooperating teachers as compared with seventy-seven percent of the non-cooperating teachers belonged to civic clubs in their communities. The majority of both groups attended the club meetings regularly. Table VII indicates that each cooperating teacher assumed 1.59 responsibilities in his club compared with 1.65 for the non-cooperating teacher. This is a mean difference of .06 which was not considered to be a major difference.

TABLE VII
 COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
 TEACHERS AS TO MEMBERSHIP, ATTENDANCE, AND
 RESPONSIBILITIES ASSUMED IN CIVIC CLUBS

Comparative Factors	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op Number	%	Non-Coop Number	%
<u>Civic Club Membership</u>	22	96	17	77
<u>Attendance</u>				
Regularly	13	59	11	64
Frequently	7	32	3	18
Often	0	0	2	12
Seldom	<u>2</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>
Totals	22	100	17	100
<u>Number of Responsibilities Assumed</u>				
0	3	14	3	18
1	9	41	8	46
2	6	27	2	12
3	2	9	1	6
4	2	9	2	12
5	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>
Totals	22	100	17	100
Note: Mean responsibility				
by groups	1.59		1.65	
Difference between groups		.06		
Mean responsibilities, total		1.62		

Individual Church Activities in the
Community

All of the cooperating teachers were members of a church in their community and only four of the non-cooperating were not members of a church. Data from Table VIII reveals that the greatest difference between the groups with regard to church activity was frequency of attendance. Four or twenty-two percent of the non-cooperating teachers indicated attendance as often or seldom, against one or four percent in the cooperating teacher group. The non-cooperating teachers seemed to be more in the forefront in church leadership with thirty-three percent assuming three or more major responsibilities, as compared to twenty-four percent for the cooperating teachers.

TABLE VIII

COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
TEACHERS AS TO MEMBERSHIP, ATTENDANCE, AND
RESPONSIBILITIES ASSUMED IN LOCAL CHURCH

Comparative Factors	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op Number	%	Non-Coop Number	%
<u>Church Membership</u>	23	100	18	82
<u>Attendance</u>				
Regularly	19	83	11	61
Frequently	3	13	3	17

TABLE VIII- (CONTINUED)

Comparative Factors	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op Number	%	Non-Coop Number	%
Often	1	4	2	11
Seldom	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11</u>
Totals	23	100	18	100
<u>Number of Responsibilities Assumed</u>				
0	3	14	8	44
1	7	31	2	11
2	7	31	1	6
3	2	8	4	22
4	2	8	2	11
5	<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>
Totals	23	100	18	100
Note:	Mean responsibility by groups			
	1.96		1.61	
	Difference between groups			
		.35		
	Mean responsibilities, total			
		1.66		

Selected Characteristics of the
Vocational Agriculture Program

Vocational Agriculture Department and
FFA Chapter Finances

From examination of the data from both cooperating and non-cooperating schools, all the vocational agriculture departments were financed by the local school board. Also, all FFA chapter activities were financed by some type of fund-raising activity. The majority of these activities included sausage sales, rodeos, operation of concessions, sale of shop projects, and sale of crops from school farm laboratories.

Use of Advisory Committees

By examining the data in Table IX, it is evident that the cooperating teachers are superior in the use of advisory committees for the operation of the vocational agriculture department. Sixteen, or seventy percent of the cooperating teachers used advisory committees as compared to eight, or thirty-six percent of the non-cooperating teachers.

TABLE IX
COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
TEACHERS AS TO THE USE OF
ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Use of Advisory Committee	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op Number	%	Non-Coop Number	%
Yes	16	70	8	36
No	<u>7</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>64</u>
Totals	23	100	22	100

Young Farmer Activities

Table X reveals that the seventy-eight percent of the cooperating teachers surveyed had young farmer chapters in their communities as compared with thirty-two percent of the non-cooperating teachers. The number of members for both groups was almost equal. The cooperating teachers' young farmer groups had a mean membership of 29.44 and the non-cooperating teachers' membership was 26.14. The difference between the groups was 3.30 members. The mean attendance for the cooperating teachers was 21.83 as compared to 15.14 for the non-cooperating group. The mean difference was 6.69. The young farmer chapter can be a valuable learning experience and is an important factor to consider in the selection of student teaching centers.

According to the information secured by questionnaire, all young farmer chapters in both groups conducted monthly meetings and their major activity was education and sponsoring local livestock shows.

TABLE X
COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
TEACHERS AS TO YOUNG FARMER CHAPTERS IN
THEIR COMMUNITIES

Young Farmer Organization	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op Number	%	Non-Coop Number	%
Yes	18	78	7	32
No	<u>5</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>68</u>
Totals	23	100	22	100
<u>Number Members</u>				
10 - 20	4		1	
21 - 30	6		4	
31 - 40	4		2	
41 - 50	2		0	
51 - 60	<u>2</u>		<u>0</u>	
Totals	18		7	
Note:	Mean membership by groups	29.44		26.14
	Difference between groups		3.30	
	Mean attendance, total		27.79	

TABLE X-(CONTINUED)

Young Farmer Organization	Distribution by Groups	
	Co-op Number %	Non-Coop Number %
<u>Average Attendance</u>		
10 - 20	11	6
21 - 30	3	1
31 - 40	2	0
41 - 50	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	18	7
Note: Mean attendance by groups	21.83	15.14
Difference between groups	6.69	
Mean attendance, total	18.49	

Number of FFA Degrees Earned by Students

The number of chapter farmer, state farmer, and American farmer degrees earned by a teacher's students serves as an indication of the involvement of the chapter in FFA activities.

Table XI shows that the cooperating teachers' students are superior to the non-cooperating teachers' students as to the number of degrees earned in the FFA. Ten chapters, or forty-three percent of cooperating teachers had over sixty-one chapter farmers during the past three years as

compared to six chapters or twenty-seven percent of the non-cooperating teachers. The cooperating teachers' group showed a mean of 51.0 chapter farmers whereas the non-cooperating group had 38.64. The mean difference is 12.36.

The cooperating teachers indicated a mean of 5.43 state farmers as compared to 2.82 for the non-cooperating teachers. The mean difference is 2.61.

The groups were more even on the number of American farmers, with the cooperating group having a mean of .39 and the non-cooperating group .27, a difference of .12.

TABLE XI

COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
TEACHERS AS TO THE NUMBER OF FFA DEGREES
EARNED BY THEIR STUDENTS DURING
THE PAST THREE YEARS

Degrees Earned	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op		Non-Coop	
	Numbers	%	Numbers	%
<u>Chapter Farmer</u>				
1 - 10	2	9	4	18
11 - 20	1	4	4	18
21 - 30	1	4	2	9
31 - 40	4	18	1	5
41 - 50	4	18	1	5
51 - 60	1	4	4	18

TABLE XI- (CONTINUED)

Degrees Earned	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op		Non-Coop	
	Number	%	Number	%
61 - --	<u>10</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>27</u>
Totals	23	100	22	100
Note: Mean chapter farmers				
by group	51.0		38.64	
Difference between groups		12.36		
Mean chapter farmers, total		44.82		
<u>State Farmers</u>				
1 - 5	13	57	19	86
6 - 10	6	26	3	14
11 - 15	<u>4</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	23	100	22	100
Note: Mean state farmers				
by group	5.43		2.82	
Difference between groups		2.61		
Mean state farmers, total		4.13		
<u>American Farmers</u>				
0	15	65	17	77
1	7	30	4	18
2	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>
Totals	23	100	22	100
Note: Mean American farmers				
by group	.39		.27	
Difference between groups		.12		
Mean American farmers, total		.33		

Number of State and National Officers

From the data presented in Table XII, there seems to be little difference between the number of state and national officers from the two groups' chapters. The cooperating teachers indicated their chapters had had six state officers as compared to five for the non-cooperating group. Neither group had any national FFA officers during the last three years.

TABLE XII

COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
TEACHERS AS TO THE NUMBER OF STATE AND
NATIONAL OFFICERS FROM THEIR
CHAPTER DURING THE PAST
THREE YEARS

Comparative Factor	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op		Non-Coop	
	Number	%	Number	%
State Officers	6	26	5	23
National Officers	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	6	26	5	23

National Chapter Awards

By examining the data in Table XIII, it was found that the superior chapter award was most frequently earned by both groups. The cooperating teachers showed seventeen or seventy-five percent of their group received this award as compared to sixteen or seventy-two percent of the non-cooperating teachers. The greatest difference between the groups was the number of gold medal awards. The cooperating teachers received four and the non-cooperating group received one.

TABLE XIII

COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
TEACHERS AS TO THE HIGHEST NATIONAL
CHAPTER AWARD RECEIVED DURING
THE PAST THREE YEARS

Chapter Award	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op Number	%	Non-Coop Number	%
Standard	1	4	4	18
Superior	17	75	16	72
Bronze	1	4	1	5
Silver	0	0	0	0
Gold	<u>4</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>
Totals	23	100	22	100

Livestock Show and Fair Entries

Competition in fairs and shows, as indicated in Table XIV, is an important activity of all the teachers involved in the study. As shown in the table, the cooperating teachers were more involved in livestock showing as far as total numbers were concerned than the non-cooperating teachers. The cooperating teachers exhibited three thousand seven hundred animals as compared to three thousand fifty-six for the non-cooperating teachers. The mean number of animals was 168.86 for the cooperating group and 138.90 for the non-cooperating group. A mean difference of 29.96 animals was found between the two groups. The only area where the non-cooperating teachers were superior to the cooperating teachers was in regional and national shows. The non-cooperating group exhibited one hundred thirty-five animals and the cooperating group had sixty-eight in shows of this type.

TABLE XIV
 COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
 TEACHERS AS TO THE TOTAL NUMBER OF
 LIVESTOCK ENTRIES IN SHOWS
 AND FAIRS

Types of Shows, Fairs, and Animals	Distribution by Groups	
	Co-op Number	Non-Coop Number
<u>Local Shows and Fairs</u>		
Swine	724	377
Beef	466	363
Sheep	<u>251</u>	<u>209</u>
Sub Total	1441	949
<hr/>		
Note: Mean animals by group	62.7	43.1
Difference between groups		19.6
Mean number of animals, total		52.9
<hr/>		
<u>County Shows and Fairs</u>		
Swine	508	476
Beef	500	423
Sheep	<u>231</u>	<u>276</u>
Sub Total	1239	1175
<hr/>		
Note: Mean animals by group	53.9	53.4
Difference between groups		.5
Mean number of animals, total		53.6
<hr/>		

TABLE XIV-(CONTINUED)

Types of Shows, Fairs, and Animals	Distribution by Groups	
	Co-op Number	Non-Coop Number
<u>District Shows and Fairs</u>		
Swine	176	133
Beef	196	137
Sheep	<u>94</u>	<u>57</u>
Sub Total	466	327
Note: Mean animals by group	19.4	14.8
Difference between groups		4.6
Mean number of animals, total		17.1
<u>State Shows and Fairs</u>		
Swine	190	151
Beef	183	193
Sheep	<u>113</u>	<u>126</u>
Sub Total	486	470
Note: Mean animals by group	21.1	21.3
Difference between groups		.2
Mean number of animals, total		21.2
<u>Regional or National Shows</u>		
Swine	32	43
Beef	16	80
Sheep	<u>20</u>	<u>12</u>
Sub Total	68	135
Note: Mean animals by group	2.9	6.1
Difference between groups		3.2
Mean number of animals, total		4.5

TABLE XIV-(CONTINUED)

Types of Shows, Fairs, and Animals	Distribution by Groups	
	Co-op Number	Non-Coop Number
GRAND TOTAL NUMBER OF ANIMALS EXHIBITED	3700	3056
Note: Mean animals by group	168.86	138.90
Difference between groups	29.96	
Mean number of animals, total	153.88	

Competitive Events Other Than Livestock

Shows

From examination of data in Table XV, it is evident that both the cooperating and non-cooperating teachers' chapters participate in competitive events. In the district contest, the cooperating teachers had a mean total of 4.96 teams and the non-cooperating group had 3.50 teams. On the state level, the cooperating teachers had a mean total of 3.45 teams and the non-cooperating group had 2.0. In national competition, the cooperating group had a mean total of .17 teams as compared to .23 teams for the non-cooperating group. From the data it can be seen that the two groups are about equal in this respect.

TABLE XV
 COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
 TEACHERS AS TO PARTICIPATION IN COMPETITIVE
 EVENTS OTHER THAN FAIRS AND
 LIVESTOCK SHOWS

Competitive Event	Distribution by Groups and Level					
	District		State		National	
	Co-op	N-Coop	Co-op	N-Coop	Co-op	N-Coop
Livestock Judging	19	12	18	8	3	2
Dairy Cattle Judging	9	7	8	3	1	1
Meats Judging	5	3	4	3	0	0
Dairy Products Judging	1	2	0	1	0	0
Horticulture Judging	4	5	4	4	0	0
Land Judging	13	11	7	7	0	1
Pasture Judging	7	6	3	4	0	2
Wheat Contest	1	0	3	1	0	0
Crops Judging	5	2	3	1	0	0
Public Speaking	19	11	9	4	0	0
Farm Structure Judging	2	1	1	0	0	0
Soil Conservation Contest	6	3	3	1	0	0
Cotton Improvement Contest	0	0	1	1	0	0
Entomology Contest	2	1	1	1	0	0
Farm Shop Contest	11	10	7	3	0	0
Farm Survey Contest	4	1	2	1	0	0
Chapter Meeting Contest	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	114	77	76	44	4	5

TABLE XV- (CONTINUED)

Competitive Event	Distribution by Groups and Level					
	District		State		National	
	Co-op	N-Coop	Co-op	N-Coop	Co-op	N-Coop
Note: Mean teams by groups	4.96	3.50	3.45	2.0	.17	.23
Difference between groups		1.46		1.45		.06
Mean teams, total		4.23		2.73		.20

Selected Characteristics of Vocational

Agriculture Departments

Physical Plants

Size of the Vocational Agriculture

Classroom

From an examination of the data found in Table XVI, it is evident that the non-cooperating teacher departments are somewhat superior to the cooperating departments as far as classroom size is concerned. The non-cooperating group reported a mean square feet area of 1014.32 as compared to 898.91 square feet for the cooperating group. The square footage difference between the two groups is 115.41.

TABLE XVI
COMPARISON OF FACILITIES OF COOPERATING AND NON-
COOPERATING TEACHERS AS TO CLASSROOM SIZE

Square Feet	Distribution by Groups	
	Co-op Number	Non-Coop Number
0 - 500	1	6
500 - 1000	15	6
1001 - 1500	6	6
1501 - 2000	1	3
2001 - 2500	0	0
2501 - 3000	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
Totals	23	22
<hr/>		
Note: Mean square footage	898.91	1014.32
by groups		
Difference between groups	115.41	
Mean square footage, total	956.65	

Availability of Core Curriculum

Student Materials

As indicated in Table XVII, the cooperating teachers had 47.35 sets of core curriculum material available for use by students as compared to 35.27 for the non-cooperating teachers. The mean difference between the two groups is 12.08 sets of core curriculum material.

By using information obtained from the questionnaire, the majority of the cooperating teachers had core curriculum material for all their students.

TABLE XVII

COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
TEACHERS AS TO NUMBER OF CORE CURRICULUM
STUDENT MATERIAL IN THE VOCATIONAL
AGRICULTURE CLASSROOM

Sets of Student Materials	Distribution by Groups	
	Co-op Number	Non-Coop Number
0	1	7
1 - 25	5	3
26 - 50	9	6
51 - 75	5	2
76 - 100	2	3
101 - 125	0	0
126 - 150	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Totals	23	22
Note: Mean curriculum materials by groups	47.35	35.27
Difference between groups		12.08
Mean curriculum material, total		41.31

Number of Up-To-Date Text Books in the
Vocational Agriculture Departments

The data presented in Table XVIII shows that the majority of vocational agriculture departments in both groups had five or more sets of up-to-date text books for use in the classroom. The non-cooperating teachers had a mean total of 10.77 text books as compared to 7.22 for the cooperating teachers. The mean difference between the two groups is 3.55 in favor of the non-cooperating group.

TABLE XVIII

COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
 TEACHERS AS TO NUMBER OF SETS OF UP-TO-DATE
 TEXT BOOKS IN THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE
 DEPARTMENT

Sets of Text Books	Distribution by Groups	
	Co-op Number	Non-Coop Number
0	2	7
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	2	0
4	2	0
5	2	3
6	2	2
7	1	1

TABLE XVIII-(CONTINUED)

Sets of Text Books	Distribution by Groups	
	Co-op Number	Non-Coop Number
8	2	0
9	1	1
10	3	3
more	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>
Totals	23	22
Note: Mean text books by groups	7.22	10.77
Difference between groups		3.55
Mean text books, total		9.0

Agricultural Magazines Available in
the Classroom

As indicated in Table XIX, both groups had an adequate number of agricultural magazines coming into the classroom. The cooperating group had a mean total of 10.93 and the non-cooperating group had 8.55 magazines. The mean difference was found to be 2.38.

TABLE XIX
 COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
 TEACHERS AS TO THE NUMBER OF DIFFERENT
 AGRICULTURAL MAGAZINES COMING
 INTO THE CLASSROOM

Number of Magazines	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op		Non-Coop	
	Number	%	Number	%
0 - 5	3	13	9	41
6 - 10	12	52	8	37
11 - 15	4	18	3	14
16 - 20	3	13	1	4
21 - 25	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
Totals	23	100	22	100
<hr/>				
Note: Mean magazines by groups	10.93		8.55	
Difference between groups			2.38	
Mean magazines, total			9.74	

Use of Audio Visual Aids in the
 Vocational Agriculture Classroom

From an examination of data found in Table XX, it is evident that both groups of teachers have available and use audio visual aids in their classrooms. It is interesting to note that thirty percent of the cooperating teachers and thirty-two percent of the non-cooperating teachers use video tape as a means of instruction for their students.

From answers received in the questionnaire, it was determined that a larger percentage of the cooperating group used audio visual equipment.

TABLE XX
COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
TEACHERS AS TO USE OF AUDIO VISUAL
AIDS IN THE CLASSROOM

Types of Audio Visual Equipment	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op Number	%	Non-Coop Number	%
Overhead Projector	22	96	19	86
16 mm Sound Projector	23	100	20	91
Slide Projector	23	100	20	91
Tape Recorder	22	96	15	68
Video Tape	7	30	7	32

Size of the Vocational Agriculture Shop

As indicated in Table XXI, both the cooperating and the non-cooperating teacher groups were nearly equal as far as shop size was concerned. The mean square feet of the non-cooperating teachers' shop was 2374.32 as compared to 2282.43 square feet for the cooperating group. The mean difference between the groups was 91.89 square feet.

TABLE XXI
COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
TEACHERS AS TO SIZE OF SHOP

Square Feet	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op Number	%	Non-Coop Number	%
0 - 500	0	0	0	0
501 - 1000	1	5	1	5
1001 - 1500	3	13	4	18
1501 - 2000	4	17	5	23
2001 - 2500	3	13	5	23
2501 - 3000	4	17	2	8
3001 - 3500	2	9	0	0
3501 - 4000	3	13	1	5
4001 - more	<u>3</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>18</u>
Totals	23	100	22	100

Note: Mean square footage	2283.43	2374.32
by groups		
Difference between groups	91.89	
Mean square footage, total	2328.88	

Use of Curriculum Center Shop Plans

From the data presented in Table XXII, it is evident that both groups made good use of the shop plans provided by the curriculum center. The cooperating teachers

indicated they all used the shop plans whereas eighty-six percent of the non-cooperating group used the plans.

TABLE XXII
COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
TEACHERS AS TO THE USE OF CURRICULUM
CENTER SHOP PLANS

Comparison Factor	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op.		Non-Coop.	
	Number	%	Number	%
Shop plans available	23	100	19	86

Shop Facilities for the Vocational

Agriculture Program

By examining the data in Table XXIII, it is evident that the cooperating teachers are superior as far as shop facilities are concerned.

TABLE XXIII
COMPARISON OF COOPERATING AND NON-COOPERATING
TEACHERS AS TO ADEQUATE SHOP FACILITIES

Type Facilities	Distribution by Groups			
	Co-op Number	%	Non-Coop Number	%
Storage Facilities	20	87	14	64
Locker Facilities	19	83	13	59
Wash-up Facilities	21	91	11	50

Shop Equipment for the Vocational
Agriculture Department

By using the information from the questionnaire, it was determined that all vocational agriculture department shops had adequate equipment for instructional purposes. The adequacy of this equipment was probably due to the amount of matching funds available to the local vocational agriculture department.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summarization of Characteristics Investigated

The stated purpose of this study was to determine if the vocational agriculture departments approved as student teaching centers in Oklahoma had characteristics that make them superior to a random sampling of other departments in the state for training prospective teachers of vocational agriculture.

Selected characteristics for consideration were grouped as follows: (1) those pertaining to the instructors; (2) those pertaining to the vocational agriculture program; and (3) those pertaining to the physical facilities.

A condensation of the results obtained in the investigation is presented in three summaries, Tables XXIV, XXV, and XXVI.

TABLE XXIV

A COMPARISON OF NUMBERS, MEANS AND DIFFERENCES RELATIVE
TO CERTAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL
AGRICULTURE IN STUDENT TEACHING CENTERS AND
THOSE IN OTHER DEPARTMENTS

Teacher Characteristics	Vocational Agriculture Teachers		
	Co-op Number or Mean	Non-Coop Number or Mean	Number or Mean Differ- ence Favor- ing Co-op Group
Mean years teaching ex- perience in a single teacher department	14.96	12.86	2.10
Mean years teaching ex- perience in a multiple- teacher department	2.62	2.14	.43
Mean years tenure in present school	15.26	13.0	2.26
Mean different schools taught in	1.70	1.95	- .25
Mean years served as cooperating teacher	6.43	0	6.43
Number of civic group members	22.	17.	5.
Number assuming responsi- bilities of leadership in civic groups	19.	14.	5.
Number of church members	23.	18.	5.
Number attending regularly	19.	11.	8.
Number assuming responsi- bilities of leadership in a church	20.	10.	10.

TABLE XXV

A COMPARISON OF NUMBERS, MEANS AND DIFFERENCES RELATIVE TO CERTAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAMS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE AS THEY OCCUR IN COOPERATING STUDENT TEACHING CENTERS AND AS THEY OCCUR IN OTHER DEPARTMENTS

Program Characteristics	Vocational Agriculture Departments		
	Co-op Number or Mean	Non-Coop Number or Mean	Number or Mean Difference Favoring Co-op Group
Number with functioning advisory committees	16.	8.	8.
Number with active young farmer chapters	18.	7.	11.
Mean membership of young farmer chapters	29.44	26.14	3.30
Mean attendance at young farmer meetings	21.83	15.14	6.69
Mean number State Farmers during last three years	5.43	2.82	2.61
Mean number American Farmers during last three years	.39	.27	.12
Number state and National officers during last three years	6.	5.	1.
Number of gold emblem chapters during the last three years	4.	1.	3.
Mean entries in shows and fairs	168.86	138.90	29.96
Mean other competitive events entered	8.58	5.73	2.85

TABLE XXVI

A COMPARISON OF MEANS AND DIFFERENCES RELATIVE TO CERTAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS IN STUDENT TEACHING CENTERS AND THOSE OF OTHER DEPARTMENTS

Physical Plant Characteristics	Vocational Agriculture Departments		
	Co-op Mean	Non-Coop Mean	Mean Difference Favoring Co-op Group
Mean classroom square feet	898.91	1014.32	-115.41
Mean sets core curriculum material	47.35	35.27	12.08
Mean sets up-to-date textbooks	7.22	10.77	- 3.55
Mean number agricultural magazines in classroom	10.93	8.55	2.38
Mean shop square feet	2283.43	2374.32	- 91.89

Conclusions

Based upon an analysis of data, presented in this study, certain conclusions can be suggested as to the differences which can be expected in the characteristics of cooperating teachers who teach in approved student teaching centers as compared to the non-cooperating teacher group. Analysis of the findings led the investigator to conclude that:

1. The two groups of teachers were basically the same with regard to years taught in single or multiple teacher departments, number of years tenure in present school, and the number of schools taught in.
2. The teachers who serve as cooperating teachers are more involved in community activities than the non-cooperating group.
3. Cooperating teachers, as a group, were members of a church in their local community and have assumed more responsibilities of leadership in their churches during the past year.
4. The cooperating teacher group more completely serves the needs of their local community because twice as many teachers in this group use advisory committees than does the non-cooperating group.
5. The cooperating teacher group is superior as far as young farmer chapters are concerned. This group had almost three times as many young farmer chapters than does the non-cooperating group. Also the cooperating group has an average of three more members than the other group. They had an average attendance of six more than the non-cooperating group.
6. The cooperating group excels in the number of State Farmers during the last three years.

However, practically no difference existed between the number of American Farmers from either group.

7. Both groups were nearly equal in producing state and national FFA officers.
8. The cooperating teacher group's chapters are recognized more often on the national award level due to the fact that four times as many of the cooperating group indicated that their chapters received the gold emblem award than did the non-cooperating group.
9. The cooperating teacher's chapters have a more extensive fair and livestock show program than the other group. The research indicated that the cooperating group was superior to the non-cooperating group in other competitive events other than shows and fairs.
10. The non-cooperating group excels as far as classroom and shop facilities are concerned. Their groups' vocational agriculture departments are larger, with more storage facilities than the cooperating group.
11. The cooperating departments make better use of the core curriculum material and have more agricultural magazines coming into the classroom than the non-cooperating group.

Based upon the findings of the study, it is evident that an effort is made by the Agricultural Education

Department to select vocational agriculture departments which serve as student teaching centers in Oklahoma which have well balanced programs, rather than those which are very strong in one or two areas at the expense of being very weak in some others. In analyzing all the departments included in the non-cooperating group in this study, it can be reported that while each may have exhibited at least one or two characteristics that would make them a definite asset to the student teaching program, they were also almost always individually weak in some other important area. Often these weaknesses were of an extreme nature.

It should be pointed out again that no effort was made to determine teacher attitudes. The teacher trainers who select the student teaching centers must realize the competency of the local supervising teacher and his ability to use a variety of teaching methods effectively. Also of major importance is the interest of the local cooperating teacher in filling the role of a true teacher to the student teacher while he is in the center. He must be truly interested in developing these young men into effective teachers and must be willing to spend the time and effort necessary to achieve these ends.

Recommendations

It is the author's suggestion that further study be conducted to determine the departments in the state which are especially strong in certain specific areas, such as

livestock showing, public speaking, farm mechanics, VAOT, horticulture, competitive judging, young farmers and others. The seniors in agricultural education should have the opportunity to visit these departments to observe and receive first hand information why these departments are so successful in serving the needs of their particular community. It is felt that a program such as this would be a valuable supplement to the present student teaching program.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Binkley, Harold. "The Supervising Teacher." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. XXXIX (December, 1966), pp. 132-33.
- Byram, Harold M. "Critical Problems in Providing Student Teaching in Vocational Agriculture." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. XXV (August and September, 1962), pp. 49-50.
- Cardozier, V.R. Teacher Education in Agriculture. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1967.
- Kirkland, J. Bryant. "Selecting Student Teaching Centers." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. XX (December, 1947), p. 115.
- Lucas, Tom M. and Bobby Wright. "Is Teacher Education Up-To-Date?" Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. XXXXII (January, 1970), p. 167.
- O'Kelly, G.L. "Twenty-five Years of Apprentice Teaching." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. XXVIII (February, 1956), p. 183.
- Schuman, Herbert. "The Cooperating Teacher's Role in Student Teaching." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. XXXII (January, 1969), p. 156.
- Smith, Clodus R. "The Professional Training of the Vocational Agriculture Teacher." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. XXXII (September, 1959), p. 68.
- Student Teaching in Vocational Agriculture. Agricultural Education Department, (Oklahoma State University, 1973), pp. 2-5.
- Updyke, G.W. "The Attitude Changes of Student Teachers in Agricultural Education at New Mexico State University During Student Teaching." (Unpublished M.S. Thesis, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1968.)
- Wiggins, Lloyd L. "Study of Attitudinal Changes of Student Teachers in Agricultural Education." (Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1971.)

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

November 8, 1974

Dear Friend:

To secure information for a graduate study, I am asking you to fill out the enclosed questionnaire. The answers are short and will not take much of your time.

It is hoped this study will aid in selecting student teaching centers for future use in training vocational agriculture teachers.

Your cooperation in filling out this questionnaire and its immediate return will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Ron Long

RL/ba

APPENDIX B
QUESTIONNAIRES

Questionnaire No. _____

The Vocational Agriculture Instructor:

1. How many years have you taught Vocational Agriculture in a single teacher department? _____ in a multiple-teacher department? _____. How many years have you been in the present school? _____.
2. In how many different schools have you taught Vocational Agriculture? _____.
3. How many years have you been a cooperating teacher? _____.
4. Have you taught any subjects besides Vocational Agriculture? yes _____ no _____. If so, what? _____.
5. Which of the following professional organizations do you belong?
 - A. Local teachers organization _____
 - B. OEA _____
 - C. NEA _____
 - D. OVATA _____
 - E. NVATA _____
 - F. OVA _____
 - G. NVA _____
 - H. Others (please list) _____.

Community Activities:

1. Are you a member of a civic club in your community? yes _____ no _____. How often do you attend? regularly _____ frequently _____ often _____ seldom _____.
2. How many offices and responsibilities have you assumed in this organization during the past year? _____.
3. Are you a member of a church in your community? yes _____ no _____. How often do you attend? regularly _____ frequently _____ often _____ seldom _____.
4. How many offices and responsibilities have you assumed in your church during the past year? _____.

The Vocational Agriculture Program

1. How is your Vocational Agriculture program financed? _____.
2. How are your FFA chapter activities financed? _____.
3. Do you have an advisory committee? yes _____ no _____.
4. Do you have a young farmer program? yes _____ no _____. If so . . .
 - A. When was it organized? _____. How many members? _____.
 - B. How often are meetings? _____.
 - C. What is the average attendance? _____.

- D. What is the major activity of the young farmer chapter in your community? _____.
5. How many members of your chapter have obtained the following degrees during the past three years?
Chapter Farmer _____ State Farmer _____ American Farmer _____.
6. Give the following information concerning your chapter's participation in fairs and livestock shows during the past year.
- | Competition Level | Barrows | Gilts | Steers | Heifers | Lambs |
|----------------------|---------|-------|--------|---------|-------|
| Local Level | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| County Level | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| District Level | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| State Level | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Regional or National | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
7. Give the following information concerning your chapter's participation in other competitive events.
- | Activity | County | District | State | National |
|-------------------------|--------|----------|-------|----------|
| Livestock Judging | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Dairy Cattle Judging | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Meats Judging | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Dairy Products Judging | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Horticulture Judging | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Land Judging Contest | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Pasture Judging | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Wheat Judging | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Crops Judging | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Public Speaking Contest | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Farm Structures Contest | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Soil Conservation | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Cotton Improvement | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Entomology Contest | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Farm Shop Contest | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Farm Survey Contest | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Other Contest (List) | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
8. How many FFA offices in each of the following levels were held by members of your chapter during the last three years?
District _____ State _____ National _____.
9. Indicate the highest National Chapter Award received by your chapter during the last three years.
Standard _____ Superior _____ Bronze _____ Silver _____ Gold Medal _____

Classroom and Shop Facilities:

- How many square feet of floor space are in the classroom? _____.
- How many square feet are in the office? _____.
- Do you have rest room facilities for both male and female students? yes _____ no _____.

4. Do you have a sink with running water in the classroom?
yes _____ no _____.
5. How many of each of the following items do you have:
 - A. Core curriculum student material _____.
 - B. Up-to-date agricultural bulletins _____.
 - C. Sets (ten or more) up-to-date agricultural text books _____.
 - D. Number of different agricultural magazines coming into the classroom _____.
 - E. Additional up-to-date reference books _____.
 - F. Sets of up-to-date slides and film strips _____.
6. Do you have an overhead projector in the classroom?
yes _____ no _____.
7. Do you make use of a (1) 16mm sound projector? yes _____
no _____, (2) slide projector? yes _____ no _____, (3)
tape recorder? yes _____ no _____, (4) video tape?
yes _____ no _____, as a teaching aid?
8. How many square feet of floor space are in the shop?
_____.
9. Do you have copies of the shop plans provided by the
curriculum center available to your shop students?
yes _____ no _____.
10. Do you have adequate storage facilities for tools and
shop supplies? yes _____ no _____.
11. Are adequate locker facilities and wash-up areas
available for shop students? yes _____ no _____.
12. How many of the following pieces of equipment do you
have in your shop?
 - A. Electric welders _____
 - B. Acetylene welders _____
 - C. Curring torches _____
 - D. Drill presses _____
 - E. Power grinders _____
 - F. Portable electric drills _____
 - G. Metal cut-off saws _____
 - H. Metal bender _____
 - I. Power wood saws _____
 - J. Small engine tools _____
 - K. Adequate sets of hand tools _____
 - L. Inert gas welders _____
 - M. Air compressor _____

VITA

Ronald Keith Long

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: A COMPARISON OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS SERVING AS STUDENT TEACHING CENTERS AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN OKLAHOMA

Major Field: Agricultural Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born at Chickasha, Oklahoma, December 16, 1946, the son of Keith and Mildred Long.

Education: Attended Fletcher, Oklahoma, Public Schools and graduated from Fletcher High School in 1965; received the Bachelor of Science degree from Oklahoma State University with a major in Agricultural Education in January, 1970, completed requirements for the Master of Science degree in May, 1975.

Professional Experience: Undergraduate research assistant, Oklahoma State University Agronomy Department 1965-1970; Vocational Agriculture instructor, Lawton, Oklahoma, 1970 to present.