THE RELATIONSHIP OF STUDENTS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE OKLAHOMA STATE FFA INTERSCHOLASTIC CONTESTS DURING 1967-69 AND THEIR CHOICE FIELD OF STUDY AT TRADE, TECHNICAL, JUNIOR COLLEGE, COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY LEVEL

By

PHILIP F. FUSS

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1966

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate College
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1970

THE RELATIONSHIP OF STUDENTS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE OKLAHOMA STATE FFA INTERSCHOLASTIC CONTESTS DURING 1967-69 AND THEIR CHOICE FIELD OF STUDY AT TRADE, TECHNICAL, JUNIOR COLLEGE, COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY LEVEL

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his deep appreciation to Dr. Jack Pritchard, major adviser and Assistant Professor of Agricultural Education, for the constant help and supervision throughout the writing of this report.

Appreciation is extended to Dr. Robert Price, Professor and Head, Dr. James Key, and Dr. Robert Terry, Assistant Professors, Agricultural Education Department, for the assistance and advice they contributed toward this study.

Indebtedness is also acknowledged to the Agricultural Departmental staff members for their help in collecting contest participant data, and for the reassurance they offered to the writer.

Appreciation is also extended to the vocational agriculture teachers who cooperated in this study.

Acknowledgments would not be complete without a sincere thanks to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Franklyn Fuss, for their support and encouragement throughout my college career.

To my wife, Linda, without her assistance, this study could not have been completed.

To my son, Paul, this work is dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE AND DESIGN OF STUDY

Introduction

Each year in April, FFA members come from all parts of the state of Oklahoma to engage in competitive activities in the State FFA Interscholastic Contests at Stillwater, Oklahoma. Much preparation and planning is done in carrying out these various contests by the sponsors of the various agricultural departments on the Oklahoma State University campus.

Contest activities are a very important segment of the Vocational Agriculture and the Future Farmers of America program. The Oklahoma Future Farmers of America are recognized throughout the United States for their accomplishments in contest activities on a national level.

Some educators in Oklahoma question the justification of contest activities. The author feels that further study is needed allowing a more accurate evaluation of contests.

Statement of the Problem

This study deals primarily with the relationship between contest participation at the state level and the contest participants choice field of study in higher education.

Research Objective

The research objective formulated for this study is stated thusly: To be determined if a relationship in the students experience in State FFA Interscholastic Contests was related to their selected field of study upon entering higher education at trade, technical, junior college, college, or university level.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose is twofold. The first being -- to further determine the value of contest participation; second -- to provide information to vocational agriculture teachers, school counselors and administrators for preparing students for higher education.

Need for the Study

The author realizes that many FFA chapters have not participated in the State FFA Interscholastic Contests competition. This study will help to determine the value of the Interscholastic Contests as tools of learning and career choice. Results of the study will be a valid guidance tool which can increase the vocational agriculture teachers' knowledge in carrying out his guidance responsibilities.

Since educators of Oklahoma, and across the nation, have shown a great concern about contest activities, the author feels that there is a definite need for further studies on contests. With all indications pointing toward a greater concern about contests, the author feels this study will create more interest in competitive contest training.

Scope of the Study

Ninety-three vocational agriculture departments in Oklahoma whose teams have placed sixth or higher in various State FFA Interscholastic Contests during the period 1967 through 1969 inclusive were used as the population for this study.[1] The Chapter Meeting Contest and FFA Public Speaking Contest is limited to fifth or higher. All of the State FFA Interscholastic Contests are included in this problem.[2]

Students from these vocational agriculture departments who qualify for this study were students who: (1) had been enrolled in vocational agriculture and FFA for at least three years; (2) placed in the upper six placings as a team member in any of the State FFA Interscholastic Contests, except chapter meeting contests and FFA public speaking contests which were limited to the upper five placings, during 1967 through 1969; (3) graduated from high school during 1967 through 1969; (4) enrolled in trade, technical, junior college, college or university. The total number of students used in the study was 266.

Procedure of Investigation

The instruments used to determine the relationship between contest participation and choice field of study in higher education were questionnaires which were prepared and sent to participating vocational agriculture departments.[3] Names of students and the contest(s) they

---

[1] See Appendix A for listing of schools.

[2] See Appendix B for listing of contests.

[3] See Appendix C for questionnaire.

participated in at the State FFA Interscholastic Contests during 1967 through 1969 were previously recorded on the respective questionnaire sent to the teachers of the selected vocational agriculture departments. Vocational agriculture teachers receiving questionnaires were asked the major field of study in higher education of each of their students who qualified for this study.

Names of students participating in the various State FFA Interscholastic Contests were taken from the score sheets used in the contests during 1967 through 1969. The contest score sheets were obtained from the various departments on the Oklahoma State University campus who hosted the contests.

During the last week of January packets were sent through the mail to all vocational agriculture departments selected for this study. Included in the packets were: (1) cover letter to the teacher;[1] (2) questionnaire with participating contest members names previously written in by the investigator; and (3) self-addressed stamped envelope. The first follow-up letter was sent out three weeks later as a reminder to those vocational agriculture teachers who had not responded to the questionnaire.[2] A second follow-up letter with questionnaire was sent out during the first week in March.[3] The total number of questionnaires returned was 77 with 266 qualified students on their questionnaires. This represented 83 percent of the selected vocational agriculture departments.

---

[1]See Appendix D for cover letter.

[2]See Appendix E for the first follow-up letter.

[3]See Appendix F for the second follow-up letter.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations of this study recognized by the writer were: (1) only vocational agriculture departments placing sixth or higher in the State FFA Interscholastic Contest except for chapter meeting contest and FFA public speaking contest which was limited to the top five placings were used; (2) all of the participating contestants' names were not available to the writer for 1967 through 1969 Chapter Meeting Contests, 1968 Entomology Contest, 1968 Meats Contest, 1968 Farm Management Contest, 1968 Land, Pasture and Range Contest, 1968 Farm Structures Contest, and the 1968 Farm Survey Contest (The Cooperating vocational agriculture teachers were asked to furnish this information from their records.); (3) many students who enroll in a given field or major in higher education change fields or majors, or completely drop out of school; (4) high school graduates entering the armed services before enrolling in higher education could not be used.

Definition of Terms

Participating Students. FFA members who were a member of a team whose team placed in the upper six placings in the State FFA Interscholastic Contests during 1967 through 1969 except for chapter meeting contests and FFA public speaking contests which was limited to the top five placings, and who were enrolled in higher education.

Higher Education. Education beyond the high school level.

College. An institution of higher education to include junior college, senior college, or university.

Technical School. An institution of higher education designed to

prepare post-high school students for employment in business and industry at a level between the skilled craftsman and engineer.

Trade. Is referred to the Vocational Trade and Industrial programs in the post-high school levels which prepare students for employment in one of the industrial skilled trades.

Abbreviations used in study. AGEC - agricultural economics; AGED - agricultural education; AGEN - agricultural engineering; AGJOURN - agricultural journalism; AGRON - agronomy; ANSI - animal science (not to include dairy or poultry); BIOCHEM - biochemistry; Bldg. Const. - building construction; ENTO - entomology; FFA - Future Farmers of America; FOR - forestry; GENAG - general agriculture; HORT - horticulture; POUL - poultry; Pre-Vet - pre-veterinary science.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Contests hold a conspicuous place in vocational education in agriculture and in the program of the FFA. An article by Burger (1) on pages 183-185, stated that contests should be the outgrowth of sound training programs. Burger also stated that contests are a training device and should be used in the general pattern of instruction. Gillette (2) on pages 187-190, writing in 1950 was under the opinion that most teachers wanted to give their students the following training through contests:

(1) To distinguish between breeds and varieties

(2) To gain the ability to recognize grades of crops and livestock to improve their marketing ability

(3) To recognize ideal type

(4) To provide an experience pattern upon which to build other lessons

(5) To motivate the boy's interest in agriculture

(6) To promote good sportsmanship, teamwork and cooperation.

According to a thesis prepared by Watkins (3) on page 47, rankings by 46 vocational agriculture teachers in Oklahoma as to what they consider the greatest value of contests are:

1st. Helping the individual student derive a sense of purpose through accomplishment

2nd. Training the individual youth for leadership

3rd. Training the individual youth for cooperation and teamwork

4th. Promotion of vocational agriculture through favorable publicity.

Horton (4) on page 213, feels that contests are good opportunities for students to meet other people. They are also faced with new situations and problems dealt with in other communities.

The purpose of this study is designed to show the relationship between contests and educational objectives. An article written by Jones (5) on page 140, emphasized that judging teams should be selected in those areas that essential skills, knowledge, and abilities are developed as a result of the instructional program to meet educational objectives, not for the purpose of winning a contest.

Gray (6) on pages 206-207, stated that one of the most important reasons for a contest is to give the student an opportunity for the development of individual abilities. He also emphasized that regardless of the ability or interest of the student that there is probably a contest in which he can develop his abilities.

Wilson (7) on page 196, complained that we should cease trying to improve something that, when improved, is still not good and should not be a part of an educational program. He further said, "Winning contests has become the objectives in many cases rather than a means of evaluation."

Many teachers of vocational agriculture put a lot of emphasis on winning a contest. Can the time needed to win a contest be justified?

Hershey (8) on page 224, a teacher of vocational agriculture in Missouri, mentions two important factors which can be accomplished by

training contest teams.

(1) "By spending time to train a team reasonably well, you are developing a group spirit in your FFA chapter"

(2) "When the local team is reasonably successful, the classes who study that enterprise the following year will work harder trying to match or surpass their record."

Hershey, (8) on page 224, also emphasizes that as teachers we should meet the educational objectives by including all of our students in the preparation of our teams.

It is the feeling of many school administrators that FFA contests and other vocational agriculture and FFA activities require students to miss non-agriculture classes. Complaints are frequently voiced that FFA and vocational agriculture activities interfere with the teachers regular teaching duties (9) on page 180.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Data presented in this chapter represents the data obtained from 77 vocational agriculture departments in Oklahoma. To qualify for this study these schools must have placed sixth or higher in at least one of the State FFA Interscholastic Contests during 1967 through 1969, except chapter meeting and FFA public speaking contests which are limited to the top five placings. Contestants from these departments must have been enrolled in vocational agriculture for at least three years and presently engaged in higher education at trade, technical, junior college, college or university level. Two hundred and sixty-six students are included in this study. Data presented is based upon a total population of 292 individuals, because twenty of these students qualified in two contests, while three students qualified in three contests. Questionnaires were used as an instrument for collecting the data.

The State FFA Interscholastic Contests were grouped into five categories for ease of presenting the findings. The author chose to group the contests as follows: (1) leadership related contests including chapter meeting and FFA public speaking; (2) agricultural mechanics related contest including farm shop, farm electrification, farm structures, and farm survey; (3) agronomy related contest

including crop judging, and land, pasture and range[1]; (4) animal sciences and industry related contest including dairy cattle judging, dairy product judging, livestock judging, meat judging and identification, and poultry judging, and (5) specialized area contests including agricultural economics, entomology, and horticulture.

Fields of study in higher education discussed in this study are divided into the following three categories: (1) majors in agriculture; (2) trade and/or technical courses; and (3) the Colleges of Arts and Science, Business, Education, and Engineering.

The major concern of the study was to determine if possible the answer to the question -- does contest participation have any influence on an individual's selection of his field of study in higher education? As a general guide to tabular analysis of data, it should be noted that both the total number of participants and the total percentages in each contest by major study are indicated in the tables. This chapter discusses the comparison of participants in the various contests by selection of study area in higher education.

Data compiled in Table I portrays the comparison of leadership oriented contest by agricultural major selected. It is noted that there was a wide range of majors selected by the chapter meeting participants in agriculture. Animal science with 14 percent and agricultural education with 12 percent represented the greatest number of participants in this contest. It is also interesting to note that four of the seven chapter meeting participants who majored in animal

---

[1]Starting in 1969 land judging was separated from the pasture and range judging; however, the author chose to combine the two contests for the purpose of this study.

TABLE I

PARTICIPANTS IN LEADERSHIP RELATED CONTESTS
BY AGRICULTURAL MAJOR SELECTED

Agricultural Major	TYPE OF CONTEST					
	Chapter Meeting N=50		FFA Public Speaking N=7		Total N=57	
		% n		% n	Total by Majors	
	n	of N	n	of N	n	% n of N
AGEC	-	-	-	-	-	-
AGED	6	12.0	-	-	6	10.5
AGEN	3(1)	6.0	-	-	3(1)	5.3
AGJOURN	1	2.0	2	28.6	3	5.3
AGRON	1(1)	2.0	-	-	1(1)	1.7
ANSC	7(4)	14.0	-	-	7(4)	12.3
BIOCHEM	1	2.0	-	-	1	1.7
DAIRY	2(2)	4.0	-	-	2(2)	3.5
ENTO	-	-	-	-	-	-
FOR	-	-	-	-	-	-
GENAG	4(1)	8.0	1	14.3	5(1)	8.8
HORT	-	-	-	-	-	-
POUL	-	-	-	-	-	-
PRE-VET	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	25(9)	50.0	3	42.9	28(9)	49.1

NOTE:

n = Number of contest participants by agricultural major selected.

N = Total number of contest participants by contest categories.

() = Number of participants qualifying in more than one contest.

science also qualified in other contest. Two of the four participants repeating in other contest qualified in livestock judging.

Other majors within agriculture selected by the chapter meeting contestants were agricultural engineering, agricultural journalism, agronomy, biochemistry, dairy, and general agriculture. General agriculture carried a substantial margin of 8 percent.

FFA public speaking contestants showed a lesser degree of interest in agriculture; however, as might be expected, many of the participants selected agricultural journalism (28.6 percent). The remainder of these participants selected general agriculture which is represented by 14.3 percent.

In Table II the comparison of chapter meeting contests shows a fairly wide selection of trade and/or technical programs but no measurable indication of interest was detected in any single field.

Diesel mechanics recorded 12 percent of the chapter meeting participants. Other courses selected were data processing, drafting, electrification and electronics.

Findings collated in Table III is the summary of leadership related contests. This table presents all of the major fields of study. In the chapter meeting contest column we see that 50 percent of the participants selected agriculture. Following this is the trade and/or technical courses with 24 percent of the participants. The participants also enrolled in all other major study areas except engineering.

Table III further suggests that FFA public speaking participation has less influence on students selecting the field of agriculture as compared to the other contest in this study. Only 42.8 percent of these participants majored in agriculture. Both arts and science and

TABLE II

PARTICIPANTS IN LEADERSHIP RELATED CONTESTS
BY TRADE AND/OR TECHNICAL COURSE SELECTED

Trade and/or Technical Course	TYPE OF CONTEST					
	Chapter Meeting N=50		FFA Public Speaking N=7		Total N=57	
	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	Total by Majors n	Total by Majors % n of N
Auto Mechanics	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barber	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bldg. Const.	-	-	-	-	-	-
Data Processing	2	4.0	-	-	2	3.5
Diesel Mechanics	6(1)	12.0	-	-	6(1)	10.5
Drafting	1	2.0	-	-	1	1.7
Electrification	1(1)	2.0	-	-	1(1)	1.7
Electronics	2(1)	4.0	-	-	2(1)	3.5
Printing	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sheet Metal	-	-	-	-	-	-
Welding	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	12(3)	24.0	0	.0	12(3)	21.0

NOTE:

n = Number of contest participants by trade and/or technical course selected.

N = Total number of contest participants by contest categories.

() = Number of participants qualifying in more than one contest.

TABLE III

PARTICIPANTS IN LEADERSHIP RELATED CONTESTS
BY MAJOR STUDY AREA SELECTED

Major Study Area	TYPE OF CONTEST					
	Chapter Meeting N=50		FFA Public Speaking N=7		Total N=57	
					Total by Majors	
	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N
Agriculture	25(9)	50.0	3	42.8	28(9)	49.1
Arts and Science	6	12.0	2	28.6	8	14.0
Business	4(2)	8.0	-	-	4(2)	7.0
Education	3(1)	6.0	2	28.6	5(1)	8.8
Engineering	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trade and Technical	12(3)	24.0	-	-	12(3)	21.0
Total	50(15)	100.0	7	100.0	57(15)	100.0

NOTE:

n = Number of contest participants by major study area selected.

N = Total number of contest participants by contest categories.

() = Number of participants qualifying in more than one contest.

education recruited 28.6 percent each of these participants.

Table IV denotes the relationship of participants in agricultural mechanic related contests by agricultural majors selected. These findings suggest that students trained in these skill areas showed less interest in agricultural majors as compared to other contest participants in this study.

Twenty-five percent of the farm electrification participants each selected agricultural education and animal science. Farm electrification may not be as indicative as other contests in this study, since only four of the 266 participants in this study were farm electrification participants.

Farm shop participants selected three majors in agriculture. There were 14.4 percent of these participants selecting general agriculture. Agricultural education and animal science both received only 7.1 percent each of these participants.

Table IV might also suggest that farm structures have but little influence on participant's selection of agriculture majors. There were 22.2 percent of these participants who selected animal science while only 11.1 percent selected agricultural education. No other major listed any response.

Another agricultural mechanic area, farm survey, showed greatest interest in general agriculture with 21.5 percent. Agricultural engineering followed with 14.3 percent while animal science trailed with 7.1 percent of the participants.

It is somewhat surprising to note in Table V that only a small percentage of the agricultural mechanic participants selected trade or technical courses.

TABLE IV

PARTICIPANTS IN AGRICULTURAL MECHANIC RELATED CONTESTS
BY AGRICULTURAL MAJOR SELECTED

Agricultural Major	TYPE OF CONTEST									
	Farm Shop N=14		Farm Electrification N=4		Farm Structure N=9		Farm Survey N=14		Total N=41	
									Total by Majors	
	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N
AGEC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AGED	1	7.1	1	25.0	-	-	-	-	2	4.9
AGEN	-	-	-	-	1	11.1	2	14.3	3	7.3
AGJOURN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AGRON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ANSC	1	7.1	1(1)	25.0	2	22.2	1	7.1	5(1)	12.2
BIOCHEM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DAIRY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ENTO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FOR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GENAG	2	14.4	-	-	-	-	3	21.5	5	12.2
HORT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
POUL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PRE-VET										
Total	4	28.6	2(1)	50.0	3	33.3	6	42.9	15(1)	36.6

NOTE:

n = Number of contest participants by agricultural major selected.

N = Total number of contest participants by contest categories.

() = Number of participants qualifying in more than one contest.

Farm electrification participants did select electrification as their chief study area with 25 percent of the participants, and also electrification was the only course selected in this category. This might seem to indicate that farm electrification had a somewhat great influence on the selection of electrification as the field of study.

The farm shop participants selected a wider range of courses than did other agricultural mechanic participants. Electronics appeared to have registered the greatest percent with 14.4 percent of these students. Other courses selected in this area were building construction, sheet metal, and welding. It was surprising to note that only 7.1 percent enrolled in welding courses. However, this might seem to suggest that our welding instructions in farm mechanics in vocational agriculture is adequate for training students for direct employment in the welding field.

In farm structures 11.1 percent selected diesel mechanics. The meaningfulness of this finding could suggest that farm structure has no influence in the participant's selection of field of study.

Farm survey participation as noted in Table V further suggests diminutive influence on the selection of field of study in the trade and/or technical areas. The only course selected was barbering which accounts for only 7.1 percent of the participants.

Data in Table VI reflects the total summary of participants in agricultural mechanic contests by selection of major field of study.

Fifty percent of the farm electrification participants selected agricultural majors which was a greater percentage than any other contest in the agricultural mechanic category. Arts and science and trade and/or technical both collected 25 percent each of these

TABLE V

PARTICIPANTS IN AGRICULTURAL MECHANIC RELATED CONTESTS
BY TRADE AND/OR TECHNICAL COURSE SELECTED

Trade and/or Technical Course	TYPE OF CONTEST									
	Farm Shop N=14		Farm Electrification N=4		Farm Structure N=9		Farm Survey N=14		Total N=41	
	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	Total by Majors n	% n of N
Auto Mechanics	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barber	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	7.1	1	2.4
Bldg. Const.	1	7.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2.4
Data Processing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diesel Mechanics	-	-	-	-	1	11.1	-	-	1	2.4
Drafting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Electrification	-	-	1(1)	25.0	-	-	-	-	1(1)	2.4
Electronics	2	14.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	4.9
Printing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sheet Metal	1	7.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2.4
Welding	1	7.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2.4
Total	5	35.7	1(1)	25.0	1	11.1	1	7.1	8(1)	19.5

NOTE:

n = Number of contest participants by trade and/or technical courses selected.

N = Total number of contest participants by contest categories.

() = Number of participants qualifying in more than one contest.

participants.

Farm shop participants selected trade and/or technical education by a very slight margin of 35.7 percent as compared to 28.6 percent selecting agriculture and arts and science respectively. Education enrolled 7.1 percent of these students.

As shown in Table VI, 44.5 percent of the farm structures participants enrolled in arts and science, which is a slight margin over the other study areas. Agriculture enrolled 33.3 percent while business and trade and/or technical areas both recorded 11.1 percent each of these participants.

Farm survey participants were represented in all major study areas except engineering. Agriculture collected the most response with 42.9 percent of the participants. The next leading major study area selected was arts and science with 35.8 percent. Business and education both received 7.1 percent each. It again is interesting to note that only 7.1 percent of the farm survey participants selected trade or technical courses.

Data in Table VII represents the comparison of agronomy related contests by selection of majors in agriculture. As the table indicates there is a fairly wide range of majors selected.

The majority of the crop contestants selected agricultural education, agricultural engineering, agronomy, animal science, general agriculture and pre-veterinary science. Noting also, no one area completely dominated the other. It is somewhat disappointing to note that only 9.5 percent majored in agronomy.

TABLE VI

PARTICIPANTS IN AGRICULTURAL MECHANIC RELATED CONTESTS
BY TRADE AND/OR TECHNICAL COURSE SELECTED

Major Study Area	TYPE OF CONTEST									
	Farm Shop N=14		Farm Electrification N=4		Farm Structure N-9		Farm Survey N=14		Total N=41	
	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	Total By Majors n	Total By Majors % n of N
Agriculture	4	28.6	2(1)	50.0	3	33.3	6	42.9	15(1)	36.6
Arts and Science	4	28.6	1	25.0	4(1)	44.5	5	35.8	14(1)	34.1
Business	-	-	-	-	1	11.1	1	7.1	2	4.9
Education	1	7.1	-	-	-	-	1	7.1	2	4.9
Engineering	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trade and Technical	5	35.7	1(1)	25.0	1	11.1	1	7.1	8(1)	19.5
Total	14	100.0	4(2)	100.0	9(1)	100.0	14	100.0	41(3)	100.0

NOTE:

n = Number of contest participants by major study area selected.

N = Total number of contest participants by contest categories.

() = Number of participants qualifying in more than one contest.

TABLE VII

PARTICIPANTS IN AGRONOMY RELATED CONTESTS
BY AGRICULTURAL MAJOR SELECTED

Agricultural Major	TYPE OF CONTEST					
	Crops N=21		Land and/or Pasture and Range N=22		Total N=43	
					Total by Majors	
	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N
AGEC	-	-	-	-	-	-
AGED	2	9.5	2	9.1	4	9.3
AGEN	3(1)	14.3	-	-	3(1)	7.0
AGJOURN	-	-	1	4.5	1	2.3
AGRON	2	9.5	4(1)	18.2	6(1)	14.0
ANSC	1(1)	4.8	2	9.1	3(1)	7.0
BIOCHEM	-	-	-	-	-	-
DAIRY	-	-	-	-	-	-
ENTO	-	-	-	-	-	-
FOR	-	-	-	-	-	-
GENAG	1	4.8	1	4.5	2	4.7
HORT	-	-	-	-	-	-
POUL	-	-	-	-	-	-
PRE-VET	2	9.5	3	13.7	5	11.5
Total	11(2)	52.4	13(1)	59.1	24(3)	55.8

NOTE:

n = Number of contest participants by agricultural major selected.

N = Total number of contest participants by contest categories.

() = Number of participants qualifying in more than one contest.

Land, pasture and range judging participation shows more favorable influence toward the selection of agronomy than crops with 18.2 percent. Other areas selected were agricultural education, agricultural journalism, animal science, general agriculture and pre-veterinary science.

Sixty-two percent of the total participants majoring in pre-veterinary science in this study were participants from the agronomy related contests.

Findings presented in Table VIII reveal the trade and/or technical courses selected by agronomy related contest participants. There were 9.5 percent of the participants who selected auto mechanics. Other courses selected were drafting, electrification, and printing.

Only 4.5 percent of the land, pasture and range participants selected a trade or technical course which may advise no measurable influence.

Summarizing in Table IX we find that 52.5 percent of the crop participants selected agriculture as their study area. All other major fields were selected except business, but none report any measurable dominance in the selection.

We might say that the land, pasture and range judging contest shows a recognizable influence on the selection of agricultural majors with 59.1 percent of these participants selecting this field. Arts and science exhibited some interest with 18.2 percent. Other study areas represented were business, education, and trade and/or technical. Trade and/or technical was the weakest area of response.

Moving on to Table X, we seem to find a more symbolic indication of contest participation carrying over to an individual's selection of field of study. Here the animal science and industry related contests

TABLE VIII

PARTICIPANTS IN AGRONOMY RELATED CONTESTS BY TRADE AND/OR TECHNICAL COURSE SELECTED

Trade and/or Technical Courses	TYPE OF CONTEST					
	Crops N=21		Land and/or Pasture and Range N=22		Total N=43	
					Total by Majors	
	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N
Auto Mechanics	2	9.5	-	-	2	4.7
Barber	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bldg. Const.	-	-	-	-	-	-
Data Processing	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diesel Mechanics	-	-	-	-	-	-
Drafting	1	4.8	-	-	1	2.3
Electrification	1(1)	4.8	1(1)	4.5	2(2)	4.7
Electronics	-	-	-	-	-	-
Printing	1	4.8	-	-	1	2.3
Sheet Metal	-	-	-	-	-	-
Welding	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	5(1)	23.8	1(1)	4.5	6(2)	14.0

NOTE:

n = Number of contest participants by trade and/or technical course selected.

N = Total number of contest participants by contest categories.

() = Number of participants qualifying in more than one contest.

TABLE IX

PARTICIPANTS IN AGRONOMY RELATED CONTESTS
BY MAJOR STUDY AREA SELECTED

Major Study Area	TYPE OF CONTEST					
	Crops N=21		Land and/or Pasture and Range N=22		Total N=43	
					Total by Majors	
	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N
Agriculture	11(2)	52.3	13(1)	59.1	24(3)	55.8
Arts and Science	3	14.3	4(1)	18.2	7(1)	16.3
Business	-	-	2(2)	9.1	2(2)	4.7
Education	1	4.8	2	9.1	3	7.0
Engineering	1	4.8	-	-	1	2.3
Trade and Technical	5(1)	28.8	1(1)	4.5	6(2)	14.0
Total	21(3)	100.0	22(5)	100.0	43(8)	100.0

NOTE:

n = Number of contest participants by major study area selected.

N = Total number of contest participants by contest categories.

() = Number of participants qualifying in more than one contest.

by selection of majors in agriculture show more recognizable results.

There were 41 percent of the dairy cattle judging participants to major in dairy. Six of the nine participants in dairy cattle judging also qualified in another contest. It is interesting to note that two of these six qualified in dairy products judging. We find that the other majors in agriculture selected were agricultural education, agronomy, animal science, and general agriculture.

The bulk of the participants in dairy cattle judging majored in dairy (50 percent). Agricultural education, animal science, forestry, and general agriculture respectively collected 8.3 percent of the participants. This could be interpreted to indicate that both dairy cattle judging and dairy product judging manifested a somewhat great influence on the participant's selection of their field of study.

Livestock judging participants overwhelmingly selected animal science as their major with 47.1 percent. Agricultural education also faired well with 11.8 percent selecting that major. It is also noted that these participants showed a wider selection of majors in agriculture than did participants from other contests within this category. Other agricultural majors selected were agricultural economics, agricultural engineering, general agriculture and pre-veterinary science.

Meat judging and identification participants showed considerable interest in animal science with 33.3 percent majoring in that field. Dairy and general agriculture were the only other majors selected. One of the two participants majoring in dairy also qualified in dairy cattle judging.

Since only 6.7 percent of the poultry participants majored in poultry it might lead one to believe that poultry judging is not a

TABLE X

PARTICIPANTS IN ANIMAL SCIENCES AND INDUSTRY RELATED CONTESTS
BY AGRICULTURAL MAJOR SELECTED

Agricultural Major	TYPE OF CONTEST											
	Dairy Cattle N=22		Dairy Products N=12		Livestock N=34		Meats N=18		Poultry N=15		Total N=101	
											Total by Majors	
	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N
AGEC	-	-	-	-	2	5.9	-	-	-	-	2	2.0
AGED	2	9.1	1	8.3	4	11.8	-	-	-	-	7	6.9
AGEN	-	-	-	-	1	2.9	-	-	-	-	1	1.0
AGJOURN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	6.7	1	1.0
AGRON	1	4.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.0
ANSC	1	4.5	1	8.3	16(2)	47.1	6(1)	33.3	-	-	24(3)	23.8
BIOCHEM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DAIRY	9(6)	41.0	6(2)	50.0	-	-	2(1)	11.1	-	-	17(9)	16.8
ENTO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FOR	-	-	1	8.3	-	-	-	-	2	13.3	3	3.0
GENAG	1(1)	4.5	1	8.3	3	8.8	3(2)	16.7	3(2)	20.0	11(5)	10.9
HORT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
POUL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	6.7	1	1.0
PRE-VET	-	-	-	-	1	2.9	-	-	-	-	1	1.0
Total	14(7)	63.6	10(2)	83.3	27(2)	79.4	11(4)	61.1	7(2)	46.7	69(17)	68.3

NOTE:

n = Number of contest participants by agricultural major selected.

N = Total number of contest participants by contest categories.

() = Number of participants qualifying in more than one contest.

strong stimulus for creating an interest in the poultry field.

Twenty percent of the poultry participants majored in general agriculture. Also, noting here that two of the three participants qualified in other contest. One of the two participants qualified in dairy cattle judging and the other in meat judging and identification.

It is interesting to note that 13.3 percent of the poultry contestants selected forestry as their major.

Agricultural journalism was another major selected by the poultry participants.

Data presented in Table XI reveals that very little interest was developed for trade and/or technical courses with the animal sciences and industry related contest participants.

Dairy cattle judging participants selected barbering, data processing and welding as their study areas but only a small percentage of 4.5 percent respectively selected such courses.

Dairy product judging participants did not enroll in any of the trade or technical courses.

Diesel mechanics was the only course selected (2.9 percent) by the livestock judging participants.

There were 5.6 percent of the meat judging and identification participants selecting the area of auto mechanics.

Although 20 percent of the poultry participants selected trade or technical courses we find that three different courses were selected. The three courses included building construction, data processing, and electronics. The investigator does not interpret any important dominant influence.

Table XII seems to indicate a strong motivating influence as

TABLE XI

PARTICIPANTS IN ANIMAL SCIENCES AND INDUSTRY RELATED CONTESTS
BY TRADE AND/OR TECHNICAL COURSES SELECTED

Trade and/or Technical Courses	TYPE OF CONTEST											
	Dairy Cattle N=22		Dairy Products N=12		Livestock N=34		Meats N=18		Poultry N=15		Total N=101	
											Total by Majors	
	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N
Auto Mechanics	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	5.6	-	-	1	1.0
Barber	1	4.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.0
Bldg. Const.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	6.7	1	1.0
Data Processing	1	4.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	6.7	2	2.0
Diesel Mechanics	-	-	-	-	1(1)	2.9	-	-	-	-	1(1)	1.0
Drafting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Electrification	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Electronics	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	6.7	1	1.0
Printing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sheet Metal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Welding	1	4.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1 0
Total	3	13.6	0	.0	1(1)	2.9	1	5.6	3	20.0	8(1)	7.9

NOTE:

n = Number of contest participants by trade and/or technical course selected.

N = Total number of contest participants by contest categories.

() = Number of participants qualifying in more than one contest.

evidenced by the participants and their selection of major fields of study within agriculture.

Looking at the total picture, 63.6 percent of the dairy cattle participants selected agriculture, followed by 13.6 percent selecting trade and/or technical courses. Other fields of lesser importance to the participants was arts and science, business, and education.

Dairy product participants overwhelmingly selected agriculture with 83.3 percent. This seems to suggest more favorable influence in the selection of agriculture as the major field of study than any other single contest studied. Arts and science and business each received only 8.3 percent of the participants.

Participants from the livestock judging contest chose majors in each major field of study except engineering. As displayed in Table XII 79.4 percent of these participants selected agriculture. Education was selected by 11.8 percent of these participants. Arts and science, business, and trade and/or technical fields was also selected but by only a small percentage.

There were 61.1 percent of the meat judging and identification participants picking agriculture as their major. Business captured 22.2 percent of these participants which was a considerable larger percentage than any other contest in the study. Arts and science, education, and trade and/or technical education was represented but with only a minute percentage.

Again in Table XII we find that the selection of agriculture from participants in the poultry contests held a substantial lead over the other major study areas. However, arts and science, and trade and/or technical education each received 20 percent of the poultry judging

TABLE XII

PARTICIPANTS IN ANIMAL SCIENCES AND INDUSTRY RELATED CONTESTS
BY MAJOR STUDY AREA SELECTED

Major Study Area	TYPE OF CONTEST											
	Dairy Cattle N=22		Dairy Products N=12		Livestock N=34		Meats N=18		Poultry N=15		Total N=101	
	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	Total by Majors n	% n of N
Agriculture	14(7)	63.6	10(2)	83.3	27(2)	79.4	11(4)	61.1	7(2)	46.7	69(17)	68.3
Arts and Science	2	9.1	1(1)	8.3	1	2.9	1	5.6	3	20.0	8(1)	7.9
Business	1	4.5	1	8.3	1	2.9	4	22.2	-	-	7	6.9
Education	2	9.1	-	-	4(1)	11.8	1	5.6	1	6.7	8(1)	7.9
Engineering	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	6.7	1	1.0
Trade and Technical	3	13.6	-	-	1(1)	2.9	1	5.6	3	20.0	8(1)	7.9
Total	22(7)	100.0	12(3)	100.0	34(4)	100.0	18(4)	100.0	15(2)	100.0	101(20)	100.0

NOTE:

n = Number of contest participants by major study area selected.

N = Total number of contest participants by contest categories.

() = Number of participants qualifying in more than one contest.

participants. Education was also represented with 6.7 percent.

In the last contest category areas we find the comparisons of the specialized area contest (entomology, agricultural economics and horticulture) with selection of majors in agriculture. In Table XIII it is interesting to note that 30.8 percent of the entomology participants majored in entomology. The other majors selected in agriculture were agricultural education, agricultural engineering, agricultural journalism, and general agriculture none of which seem to show any meaningful importance.

Agricultural economics contestants indicated a wide selection of agricultural fields. Agriculture economics was selected as one of the leading choices but with only 15 percent of the participants selecting that major. However, overshadowing this figure is general agriculture with 20 percent. Other majors selected were agricultural education, agronomy, animal science, and pre-veterinary science.

Participants from the horticulture contest favored horticulture as their major with 17.6 percent. This rather low percentage however, may not be of any meaningful importance. There were 11.8 percent of these participants each majoring in agricultural education and animal science. It might be noted, as shown in Table XIII, that the one horticulture participant selecting the dairy major also qualified in the dairy cattle judging contest. General agriculture was also represented but only with 5.9 percent.

Data seen in Table XIV might indicate that the specialized area contests have but little, if any, influence on an individual's selection of trade or technical training. It is seen, however, that 5 percent of the agricultural economics contest participants did respond to the

TABLE XIII

PARTICIPANTS IN SPECIALIZED AREA CONTESTS
BY AGRICULTURAL MAJOR SELECTED

Agricultural Major	TYPE OF CONTEST							
	Ento N=13		Agri Econ N=20		Hort N=17		Total N=50	
	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	Total by Majors n	Total by Majors % n of N
AGEC	-	-	3	15.0	-	-	3	6.0
AGED	1	7.7	1	5.0	2	11.8	4	8.0
AGEN	1	7.7	-	-	-	-	1	2.0
AGJOURN	2	15.3	-	-	-	-	2	4.0
AGRON	-	-	1	5.0	-	-	1	2.0
ANSC	-	-	1	5.0	2	11.8	3	6.0
BIOCHEM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DAIRY	-	-	-	-	1(1)	5.9	1(1)	2.0
ENTO	4	30.8	-	-	-	-	4	8.0
FOR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GENAG	1	7.7	4	20.0	1	5.9	6	12.0
HORT	-	-	-	-	3	17.6	3	6.0
POUL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PRE-VET	-	-	2	10.0	-	-	2	4.0
Total	9	69.2	12	60.0	9(1)	53.0	30(1)	60.0

NOTE:

n = Number of contest participants by agriculture selected.

N = Total number of contest participants by contest categories.

() = Number of participants qualifying in more than one contest.

TABLE XIV

PARTICIPANTS IN SPECIALIZED AREA CONTESTS
BY TRADE AND/OR TECHNICAL COURSE SELECTED

Trade and/or Technical Courses	TYPE OF CONTEST							
	Ento N=13		Agri Econ N=20		Hort N=17		Total N=50	
							Total by Majors	
	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N	n	% n of N
Auto Mechanics	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barber	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bldg. Const.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Data Processing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diesel Mechanics	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Drafting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Electrification	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Electronics	-	-	1	5.0	-	-	1	2.0
Printing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sheet Metal	-	-	-	-	1	5.9	1	2.0
Welding	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	0	.0	1	5.0	1	5.9	2	4.0

NOTE:

n = Number of contest participants by trade and/or technical course selected.

N = Total number of contest participants by contest categories.

electronics course and 5.9 percent of the horticulture participants responded to the sheet metal course.

Reflecting the composit in Table XV we see that agriculture is also the major field of study with participants in the specialized contest category.

Only two major study areas were selected by the entomology participants with 69.2 percent chosing agriculture and with 30.8 percent chosing arts and science.

The agricultural economics contestants depicts a broad selection of study areas but the bulk of the participants selected agriculture (60 percent) and arts and science (25 percent). All other major study areas were selected except engineering, but no important dominance is noted.

Horticulture participants also had a broad selection of major study areas with business the only field not chosen. A lesser percentage (52.9 percent) selected agriculture as compared to the other contests in this category. Here education and arts and science seemed favorably strong with 17.6 percent each.

The foregoing analyses, which admittedly have been somewhat perfunctorily structured, do point out rather clearly the pattern of selection of study areas taken by the participants in the State FFA Interscholastic Contest during 1967 through 1969. When these findings are considered in light of their total findings, certain conclusions are possible.

TABLE XV

PARTICIPANTS IN SPECIALIZED AREA CONTESTS
BY MAJOR STUDY AREA SELECTED

Major Study Area	TYPE OF CONTEST							
	Ento N=13		Agri Econ N=20		Hort N=17		Total N=50	
		% n		% n		% n	Total by Majors	
	n	of N	n	of N	n	of N	n	% n of N
Agriculture	9	69.2	12	60.0	9(1)	52.9	30(1)	60.0
Arts and Science	4	30.8	5(1)	25.0	3(1)	17.6	12(2)	24.0
Business	-	-	1	5.0	-	-	1	2.0
Education	-	-	1	5.0	3	17.6	4	8.0
Engineering	-	-	-	-	1	5.9	1	2.0
Trade and Technical	-	-	1	5.0	1	5.9	2	4.0
Total	13	100.0	20(1)	100.0	17(2)	100.0	50(3)	100.0

NOTE:

n = Number of contest participants by major study area selected.

N = Total number of contest participants by contest categories.

() = Number of participants qualifying in more than one contest.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary and Conclusion

As previously stated, the primary purpose of this study was to determine, as accurately as feasible within the scope of the study, the relationship of contest participation with choice field of study in higher education.

Information presented in this study was obtained from questionnaires. These questionnaires were completed and returned by teachers representative of 77 vocational agriculture departments and 266 students. Students selected were students presently enrolled in trade, technical, junior college, college or university levels of higher education, and who qualified in one or more of the State FFA Interscholastic Contests during 1967 through 1969. Participants must also have completed at least three years of vocational agriculture in high school.

Tables included in this study consisted of comparisons of contest participation at the state level and selected field of study in higher education.

Generally speaking, it was noted that the College of Agriculture drew the majority of the participants studied (56.9 percent). Also, it was evident that participants, in several of the contests studied, selected the field of study in higher education that was closely

associated with the contest in which they were participants.

According to the findings the contests which were most[1] influencial in the selection of majors in the College of Agriculture were: dairy products (83.3 percent), livestock (79.4 percent), entomology (69.2 percent), dairy cattle (63.6 percent), meats (61.1 percent), agriculture economics (60.0 percent), land, pasture and range (59.1 percent), horticulture (52.9 percent), crops (52.3 percent), chapter meeting (50.0 percent), and farm electrification (50.0 percent). Contests which are considered to be in the intermediate range[2] of influence were: poultry (46.7 percent), farm survey (42.9 percent), and FFA public speaking (42.8 percent). Contests which showed the least[3] influence were the farm structures (33.3 percent) and farm shop contest (28.6 percent).

Courses or majors selected by participants in this study which the investigator feels are most closely associated with the various contests illustrated as follows:

Contest	Course or Major
Agriculture Economics	Agricultural Economics
Crops	Agronomy
Dairy Cattle	Dairy
Dairy Products	Dairy
Entomology	Entomology
Farm Electrification	Electrification
Farm Shop	Welding
Farm Structures	Building Construction
Horticulture	Horticulture
Land, Pasture and Range	Agronomy
Livestock	Animal Science
Meats	Animal Science
Poultry	Poultry

---

[1] Percentages above 50 percent.

[2] Percentages of 40 to 50 percent.

[3] Percentages less than 40 percent.

Chapter meeting, FFA public speaking and farm survey can not be defined with any single course or major in higher education. However, one might say that agricultural mechanic related contests are indirectly oriented toward agricultural engineering.

Individual contests which reported the greatest[1] percentage of its participants selecting the major which was most closely associated with that contest were: dairy products (50.0 percent), livestock (47.1 percent), dairy cattle (41.0 percent), meats (33.3 percent), and entomology (30.8 percent). Contests which were considered to be in the intermediate range[2] of influence were: farm electrification (25.0 percent), land, pasture and range (18.2 percent), horticulture (17.6 percent), and agriculture economics (15.0 percent). Contests which reported the least[3] percentage of its participants selecting the major which was most closely linked with that contest were: farm structures (.0 percent), poultry (6.7 percent), farm shop (7.1 percent), and crops (9.5 percent).

Also as seen from the data presented in Chapter III, all of the categories, except the agricultural mechanic related contests, equally shared with the percentages of its participants selecting agricultural education. The investigator felt that this would be interesting to note, since this study was done within the Agricultural Education Department.

The contests which revealed the greatest percentage of partici-

---

[1]Percentages above 30 percent.

[2]Percentages of 15 to 30 percent.

[3]Percentages less than 15 percent.

pants selecting trade or technical courses, as compared to the other contests were: farm shop (35.7 percent), crops (28.8 percent), farm electrification (25.0 percent), chapter meeting (24.0 percent), and poultry (20.0 percent). Most of the other contests studied showed very little interest in this area.

The contests which showed the greatest percentage of participants selecting the College of Arts and Science, as compared to other contests, were the agricultural mechanic related contests (34.1 percent), the entomology contest (30.8 percent), and the FFA public speaking contest (28.6 percent).

The study also revealed that the most interest shown in the College of Education were participants from the FFA public speaking contest (28.6 percent).

It was found that there was very little interest in the College of Engineering as a major field of study.

It can be concluded from this study that the crops contest, farm shop contest, farm structures contest, farm survey contest, poultry judging contest, and chapter meeting contest in high school were not influencial in the selection of field of study in higher education.

Other contests which were not considered high or low as to the influence they have upon a high school student selecting a field of study in higher education were: farm electrification, land, pasture and range, agriculture economics, horticulture, and FFA public speaking.

Finally, in conclusion, the study suggests that dairy cattle judging, dairy products judging, livestock judging, and meat judging and identification contests in high school has a bearing on the

influence of students selecting a field of study in higher education. Since the entomology major was selected only by entomology contestants in this study, the investigator also concludes that this contest is influencial in the selection of the entomology major.

Recommendations

The opinion of the writer is expressed in the following suggestions and recommendations, based on the data presented in this study, for consideration by those who are involved in teaching vocational agriculture students.

(1) Contests can be used as a tool for influencing major study areas in higher education in most vocational agriculture programs. The basic information and practice necessary in preparing students for various contests could be taught within the plan course of study in vocational agriculture. Students who have developed an interest in any particular contest should be encouraged to further develop his skills in that area for competitive participation in that contest. The teacher should further motivate, inspire, and challenge the student to place a high value of achievement, recognizing that this would be a potential area of study to be pursued later.

(2) Vocational agriculture teachers should not specialize in only one or two contests but utilize time teaching in the area of several contests in order that such activities may benefit a greater number of students.

(3) The curriculum plan, especially for the first and second year students, in any vocational agriculture department should be scheduled in order to teach the various contest subjects prior to the different

contest activities giving those students with the greatest interest time to prepare themselves for contest competition.

(4) Since this was a cursory study of the problem identified, further studies related to the problem might well include an investigation on the influence that contest participation has on an individual's selection of occupation. Also a follow-up of the participants used in this study might be investigated to determine if stability exists in their first selected field of study as depicted by this study.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Burger, A. R., "Functions of State FFA Contest", Agriculture Education Magazine, April, 1948, pp. 183-185.

2. Gillette, C. C., "Change Judging Contest to Suit Vocational Training Needs", Agricultural Education Magazine, February, 1950, pp. 187-190.

3. Watkins, Wesley W., "Practices and Procedures Used by Selected Teachers in Preparing Vocational Agriculture Students for Competition in State FFA Interscholastic Contests in Oklahoma", Thesis, August, 1961, Oklahoma State University, p. 47.

4. Horton, Chestey, "State FFA Contest and Chapter Morals", Agriculture Education Magazine, March, 1951, p. 213.

5. Jones, Robert C., "Are Contests Over-emphasized in the FFA Program?", Agriculture Education Magazine, January, 1963, p. 140.

6. Gray, Jarrell D., "Contest Have Value", Agriculture Education Magazine, May, 1947, pp. 206-207.

7. Wilson, Bonard S., "Contest Must Go", Agriculture Education Magazine, March, 1958, p. 196.

8. Hershey, Kenneth, "FFA Contests: How to Win One", Agriculture Education Magazine, April, 1961, p. 224.

9. Meaders, Donald, "FFA and Vo-Ag Activities can Cause Conflicts", Agriculture Education Magazine, February, 1957, p. 180.

APPENDIX A

OKLAHOMA SCHOOLS SELECTED FOR THE STUDY

Adair
Afton
Alex
Altus
Anadarko
Arnet
Beggs
Big Pasture
Boise City
Boynton
Broken Arrow
Buffalo
Burlington
Butner
*Calvin
Canadian
Carl Albert
Carnegie
Central High (Muskogee)
*Checotah
Collinsville
Cushing
Custer City
Cyril
Dacoma-Carmon
Dale
Dewey
Drumright
*Elk City
Empire
Fletcher
Gans
Glencoe
Granite
*Grove
Guthrie
*Hardesty
Holdinville
Hydro
*Jet-Nash
Keota
Lindsay
Madill
Marlow
Maysville
Meeker
Miami
Morris
*Morrison
*Moss
*Mountain View
Ninnekah
Noble
*Norman
Nowata
*Okarche
Okemah
Omega-Lomega
Owasso
Pauls Valley
Perkins
Ponca City
Prague
Pryor
Purcell
Quapaw
Romona-Ochelata
Ripley
Salina
Sallisaw
Sasakwa
Shattuck
Spiro
Springer
Stillwater
Stilwell
Stratford
*Stuart
Tahlequah
Texhoma
*Vinita
*Wakita
Warner
Watonga
Waynoka
Webbers Falls
Welch
Wellston
Westville
Wetumka
*Woodward
Yale
*Yukon

---

*Those schools which did not respond to the study.

APPENDIX B

STATE FFA INTERSCHOLASTIC CONTESTS

Agriculture Economics	Farm Structures
Chapter Meeting	Farm Survey
Crops	FFA Public Speaking
Dairy Cattle	Horticulture
Dairy Products	Land, Pasture and Range[2]
Entomology	Livestock
Farm Electrification[1]	Meats
Farm Shop	Poultry

[1]Electrification was part of the farm shop contest until 1968.

[2]Starting in 1969 land judging was separated from the pasture and range judging; however, the author chose to combine the two contests for the purpose of this study.

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MASTER'S DEGREE STUDY

Name of School _____

Name of Teacher _____

This questionnaire will include your students with the following qualifications:

(1) Graduated from high school during 1967 through 1969.
(2) Enrolled in Vocational Agriculture and FFA for at least three years.
(3) Participated in one or more of the State FFA Interscholastic Contest during 1967 through 1969 and who placed as a team member in the upper six placings.
(4) Enrolled in junior college, college, university, trade or technical school. (Any institution above high school level)

SECTION A

Listed below are your students name's who qualified as a team member in at least one of the State FFA Interscholastic Contest in 1967-1969.

Would you please list any additional individual or team member which I have not placed on the form?

SECTION B

Indicate major field of study by adding the students initial from Page 1 to the appropriate area he has enrolled in.

Junior College, College or University

——— Agricultural Economics	——— Agricultural Engineering	——— Forestry
——— Agricultural Journalism	——— Agriculture Education	——— Agronomy
——— General Agriculture	——— Arts and Sciences	——— Entomology
——— Pre-Veterinary Science	——— Animal Science	——— Biochemistry
——— Business	——— Dairy Science	——— Botany
——— Poultry Science	——— Horticulture	——— Education

Other

——— _____
——— _____
——— _____
——— _____
——— _____

Trade or Technical School

——— Welding	——— Building Traits	——— Electrification
——— Auto Mechanics	——— Electronics	——— Diesel Mechanics

Others

——— _____
——— _____
——— _____
——— _____
——— _____

APPENDIX D

89-9 South University Place
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

January 27, 1970

Vocational Agriculture Instructor
High School
, Oklahoma

Dear Sir:

The attached questionnaire is concerned with the relationship of contest participation and choice field of study at trade, technical, junior college, college or university level. The results of this study will help to provide information for vocational agriculture teachers, school counselors and administrators in preparing students of higher education. This material will be used in my report for the Master's Degree.

It will be appreciated if you will complete the questionnaire prior to February 9th and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope that I am enclosing. Your prompt attention to this matter will be greatly appreciated, as I do need your response.

I thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Philip F. Fuss

Philip F. Fuss
Graduate Student
Agriculture Education
Oklahoma State University

PFF:ljf
Enclosures

APPENDIX E

89-9 South University Place
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

February 17, 1970

Vocational Agriculture Instructor
High School
, Oklahoma

Dear Sir:

This is a reminder to you concerning the questionnaire associating contest participation with choice field of study in higher education, sent to you on January 27, 1970.

I realize that this is a very busy season for you. Your time and information to this matter is greatly appreciated as your response is very necessary for my report. Even if none of your students listed on the questionnaire qualify for this study, I still will need your returned questionnaire.

It will be appreciated if you will complete the questionnaire as soon as possible and send it to me in the self-addressed envelope previously sent to you.

Sincerely yours,

Philip F. Fuss

Philip F. Fuss
Graduate Student
Agriculture Education
Oklahoma State University

PFF:ljf

APPENDIX F

March 4, 1970

Dear Sir:

I am sending you another questionnaire concerning the State F.F.A. Interscholastic Contest held in Stillwater with participating students choice field of study in higher education. Possibly you have misplaced the questionnaire that was previously sent to you.

I realize that this is a very busy time of the year for you, but if you would please take five minutes of your time and complete the needed information and return it to me as soon as possible it will be deeply appreciated. I am in such great need for your information in order to complete the M.S. Degree in May, 1970.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Philip F. Fuss

Philip F. Fuss
Graduate Student
Agriculture Education
Oklahoma State University

PFF:ljf
Enclosure

VITA

Philip Franklyn Fuss

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: THE RELATIONSHIP OF STUDENTS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE OKLAHOMA STATE FFA INTERSCHOLASTIC CONTESTS DURING 1967-69 AND THEIR CHOICE FIELD OF STUDY IN TRADE, TECHNICAL, JUNIOR COLLEGE, COLLEGE, OR UNIVERSITY LEVEL.

Major Field: Agricultural Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born at Pawnee, Oklahoma, March 7, 1943, the son of Franklyn and Carmelita Fuss.

Education: Attended grades one through five at Lone Chimney, Oklahoma; grade six at Glencoe, Oklahoma; grades seven through nine at Maramec, Oklahoma, and completed high school at Glencoe, Oklahoma, in 1961; received the Associate of Science degree in Agriculture from Murray State College in May 1964; received the Bachelor of Science degree from Oklahoma State University, with a major in Agricultural Education in May 1966.

Professional Experience: Completed student teaching at Adair, Oklahoma in January 1966; employed as Vocational Agriculture teacher in Unified School District 389 at Eureka, Kansas, August 1966 through May 1968.

Military Record: The writer served with the Oklahoma National Guard for four and one-half years, and the Kansas National Guard for one and one-half years, and the Active Army for sixteen months. The writer was discharged from the U.S. Army in September 1969.