

**IDENTIFICATION OF PROBLEMS IN IMPLEMENTING
AN AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATIONS PROGRAM IN
TWENTY-EIGHT SELECTED VOCATIONAL
AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS**

By

CLEO A. DUPY

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1942

**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, 1966**

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

NOV 8 1966

IDENTIFICATION OF PROBLEMS IN IMPLEMENTING
AN AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATIONS PROGRAM IN
TWENTY-EIGHT SELECTED VOCATIONAL
AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS

Thesis Approved:

William L. Hull

Thesis Adviser

Robert L. Price

JH Bragg

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express appreciation to the following persons for their assistance in completing this master's study and thesis:

To Dr. William L. Hull for his guidance and patience in working with me during the study and writing of my thesis.

To Dr. Robert R. Price for his encouragement and guidance as my major adviser, and also for making it possible for me to work as part of the Agricultural Education staff as a graduate assistant during the 1965-66 school year.

To the vocational agriculture teachers who attended the 1965 institute for their cooperation in working with this study.

To Professor White, Professor Cook, Harry Frank, Carl Westbrook, Bill Stevenson, Professor Orr, Professor Angerer, and others of the Agricultural Education Department for their guidance and pleasant association during the year.

To my wife, Lena, and daughters, Jane, Jean, and Joan, this work is sincerely dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. DESIGN OF THE STUDY.	1
Introduction.	1
Purposes and Objectives of the Study.	3
Need for the Study.	4
Method of Procedure	4
Definitions of Terms.	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.	16
A Description of the Population	18
Organization of the Classes	22
The Business Community.	24
Student Placement in Businesses	27
Implementation Difficulties	30
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	37
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	40
APPENDIX A.	42

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Mean Number of Students Placed in Agricultural Businesses Compared to the Number of Agricultural Businesses Located in the Community by the Teachers. . . .	19
II. Mean Number of Students Placed in Agricultural Businesses Per Teacher Compared to the Total Number of Students Enrolled in Vocational Agriculture.	20
III. Mean Number of Students Placed in Agricultural Businesses By Percentage of Non-Farm Students.	21
IV. Mean Number of Students Placed in Agricultural Businesses by Type of Program and Tenure of the Vocational Agriculture Teacher in the Present System . . .	22
V. Mean Number of Students Placed in Agricultural Businesses by Type of Program and Size of Community. . . .	23
VI. Number of Agricultural Businesses and Mean Number of Employees Which Were Contacted and Participating as Training Stations by Type of Business Ownership.	24
VII. Number of Students Placed in Agricultural Businesses, Mean Wage Earned, and Number of Hours Employed by Type of Business	25
VIII. Number of Students Placed in Agricultural Businesses by Type of Business and Type of Ownership.	26
IX. Number of Students Working at Different Times in Agricultural Businesses by Type of Business.	27
X. Factors Affecting Student Placement in Businesses.	28
XI. Mean Ranking of Problem Areas in Securing Training Stations as Perceived by the Institute Teachers.	30
XII. Mean Ranking of Other Persons' Attitudes Toward the Program as Perceived by the Institute Teachers	32
XIII. Mean Ranking of Problems in Securing Students as Perceived by the Institute Teachers.	32

Table	Page
XIV. Mean Ranking of Problems in Securing Administrative Approval as Perceived by the Institute Teachers.	33
XV. Mean Rank of Problem Area Groups as Perceived by Teachers of the Institute by Kind of Departments.	35

CHAPTER I

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The past century has brought about a striking change in the number of people living on the land. The gradual but continuously diminishing percentage of people in our nation engaged in production agriculture has effected a steadily increasing shift from a rural population to an urban population.

In the past, the occupation in which our rural population was engaged was often referred to as "agriculture" or "farming." Both of these terms were used interchangeably, and this led to the idea that agriculture was solely farming. This is a misconception, however, as farming or "production agriculture" is only one phase of agriculture. It is the basic root from which all phases of agriculture grow-- distribution, processing, and service occupations.

Previously our vocational agriculture training has been aimed in the direction of the older conception of the term agriculture in that it was primarily for the training of future farmers. More recently, in view of the diminishing number of students entering production agriculture, the need to broaden vocational agriculture training to include all phases of agriculture has been recognized. Teachers of vocational agriculture are preparing students to enter occupations which distribute, process, and service agricultural commodities.

To better prepare their students for a wide variety of agricultural occupations involving sales and service, thirty teachers of vocational agriculture attended a training institute during the summer of 1965 at Oklahoma State University. The institute was financed by federal funds under the provisions of Section 4 (c) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963¹ and the project was administered by the Agricultural Education Department. The teachers received six weeks of training so that they could develop an agricultural occupations training program for their departments. The objectives of the training institute were as follows:

1. To upgrade teachers of vocational agriculture in the distributive phases of vocational education.
2. To acquaint teachers of vocational agriculture with methods of conducting supervised training in agricultural businesses.
3. To help rural area high schools to have vocational teachers qualified to conduct broader vocational programs in distributive education.
4. To adopt existing teaching materials in distributive education to meet the needs of training programs in off-farm agricultural occupations.²

The institute was taught by a guidance counselor with a distributive education background and a distributive education coordinator from a large high school. The vocational agriculture teachers participated in the training program by giving seminar reports, doing outside research

¹Vocational Act of 1963 (P. L. 88-210).

²Oklahoma State University Research Project No. OE-5-85-077.

and committee assignments, preparing merchandise manuals, and by taking field trips to various agricultural businesses.

Teachers of vocational agriculture have been trained in the past to supervise a farm training program conducted by students in their classes. Training and supervising students in occupations that are closely associated with agriculture creates new problems and experiences for the teachers involved. This study was concerned with the problems related to training stations, student selection, and administration.

Purposes and Objectives of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify the problems encountered by the institute teachers in establishing a vocational agriculture occupations training program. These problems were documented in the order of their importance so that solutions can be established that will hasten the adoption of this program in Oklahoma and in the nation.

In recognition of the need for information concerning implementation of the new program, vocational agriculture occupations training, this study was made to achieve the following basic objectives:

1. To make a comparison between departments that set up separate vocational agriculture occupations training classes with those that taught the traditional class in all of the problem areas.
2. To identify and document vocational agriculture occupations program implementation difficulties in three areas: securing students, securing training stations, and securing administrative approval.

Need for the Study

A second group of thirty vocational agriculture teachers will attend a similar six-weeks training institute during the summer of 1966. Teachers in Oklahoma and in other states will be attempting to start similar programs in occupational training. Identification of the problems encountered by the teachers that attended the institute could point to ways of solving these problems. To identify problems encountered by the institute, teachers of 1965 could point out new material to be covered in the 1966 institute. Many of the problems encountered could be overcome if properly identified before teachers attempted a program in occupational training in vocational agriculture. Thus it is hoped this study will be an aid in establishing successful programs.

Method of Procedure

The survey method of research was used in this study by means of a personal interview with each of the teachers. The director of the project assisted in making the interviews. The questionnaire was designed to identify problems of implementation of the agricultural occupations training program. The main areas of problems centered around administrative approval, securing students, securing training stations, and student placement.

The interviews were made during the months of October, November, and December of 1965. The teachers were asked all of the questions during the interview and their answers were recorded on the questionnaire. Locations of those schools participating in this study are shown on

page 16 of this study. The median test³ was used for testing whether two independent groups differ in central tendencies. The t test was used to test difference between two groups that were unequal in size.⁴

Definitions of Terms

1. Administration - The people that make up the school personnel such as the board of education, superintendent, principal, and counselor of the institute schools.
2. Farm boy - A student whose father owns or manages a farm regardless of size.
3. Institute - A training program funded by the 1963 Vocational Act to train thirty teachers during the school years of 1965 and 1966 in agriculture distribution.
4. Institute schools - Schools whose teachers of vocational agriculture participated in the institute.
5. Separate class agricultural occupations - Schools that set up a separate class in agricultural occupations or converted a total class into an agricultural occupations class but still called it Vocational Agriculture IV.
6. Students - Students in occupational classes or those in regular vocational agriculture classes placed in training stations.
7. Teachers - Vocational agriculture teachers who attended the 1965 institute or will attend the 1966 institute.

³Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York, 1956), p. 111.

⁴James E. West, Charles O. Neidt, and J. Stanley Akmann, Statistical Methods in Educational and Psychological Research (New York, 1954), p. 132.

8. Traditional class - Regular vocational agriculture classes with agricultural occupations units integrated as a part of the course of study.
9. Training stations - Businesses where students are placed for cooperative occupational training.

1

<
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

An innovative type of training was started at Oklahoma State University during the summer of 1965 for thirty teachers of vocational agriculture. Research Project Number OE-5-85-077¹ funded under the provision of Section 4 (c) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (88-210) provided the funds to the University. The project title, "Training Institute to Upgrade Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Distributive Education and Supervised Training in Off-Farm Agricultural Occupations," is an excellent summary of its objectives. The training was innovative from two points of view: first, it was for a six-week period and, second, the teacher participants received a stipend to cover all of their expenses during the summer institute.

The use of the summer institute to upgrade teachers has been recognized by many leading authorities in education. Dr. Conant stated, "The use of summer institutes for bringing teachers up to date in a subject-matter field has been perhaps the single most important improvement in recent years in the training of secondary school teachers."² This institute provided for the training of sixty teachers of vocational agriculture during the two summers, 1965 and 1966. The 1965 institute was attended by twenty Oklahoma teachers and ten teachers from other states.

Several acts in the early 1900's provided for the training of our youth. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 provided that the training of youth

be for useful employment, that such education shall be of less than college grade and be designed to meet the needs of persons over fourteen years of age who have entered upon or who are preparing to enter upon the work of the farm or of the farm home.³ The George-Barden's Act of 1946 provided for further development of the Smith-Hughes Act in several states and territories.⁴ The Vocational Education Act of 1963 (88-210) provides for agriculture for vocational education in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in agricultural subjects, whether or not such occupations involve work of the farm or of the farm home, and such education may be provided without direct or supervised practice on a farm.⁵

The research project⁶ objectives were innovations to teachers of vocational agriculture. These objectives can be found in Chapter I of this study and they point to a new phase of vocational agriculture. It will be important to Oklahoma and the nation to implement these objectives.

Immediate research was needed to identify the occupations that did not involve work of the farm so twenty-six states conducted surveys in 1964 to determine the need for off-farm agricultural occupations. They were summarized at The Center for Research and Leadership Development in Vocational and Technical Education at Ohio State University. The findings indicated a great need for agriculturally-trained employees in agricultural supplies, sales and services; agricultural machinery, sales and services; ornamental horticulture; and livestock and crop food products, marketing and distribution.⁷ This report on a national basis confirmed what was found on a state basis by the Oklahoma study published in 1965. The 719 businesses interviewed showed that 38 percent of all

the employees in the off-farm agricultural businesses needed competencies in agriculture.⁸

Vocational agriculture teachers have always worked with students seeking an occupation, but not necessarily in the field of distribution. Gardner states:

We tend to think of innovators as those who contribute to a new way of doing things. Many far-reaching changes have been touched off by those who contribute to a new way of thinking about things.⁹

To teachers this would be a new experience, thinking and working as closely with business people as they have with farmers in the past. To implement a new innovation, teachers will encounter problems as pointed out by Carlson:

An educational innovation has a natural history and, in a sense, a live cycle of an innovation is the story of its invention, development and promotion, adoption, diffusion, and demise, along with an accounting of the problems encountered and solutions developed in introducing and maintaining the innovations in specific settings, and unanticipated consequences growing out of its use.¹⁰

An evaluation of the programs implemented under provisions of the Vocational Act of 1963¹¹ will take place in 1968. The changes must be more rapid than those that usually occur in education innovations in order to be of importance at the time of the 1968 evaluation. Mort in his study describes the problem of "lag" in diffusion of change. He states:

Change in the American school system comes about through a surprisingly slow process and follows a predictable pattern. Between insight into a need and the introduction of a way of meeting the need that is destined for general acceptance, there is typically a lapse of a half-century. Another half-century is required for the diffusion of the adaptation. During that half-century of diffusion, the practice is not recognized until it has appeared in 3 percent of the systems of the country. By that time, fifteen years

of diffusion--or independent innovation--have elapsed. Thereafter, there is a rapid twenty years of diffusion, accompanied by much fanfare, and then a long period of slow diffusion through the last small percentage of school systems.¹²

To prevent this typical "lag" in diffusion and rejection of changes in education, identification and classifying of problems are important. Many reasons for rejection of change have been given by Eicholz and Rogers. They are as follows:

1. Rejection through ignorance was assumed to exist when a given innovation was unknown, or its complexity led to misunderstanding.
2. Rejection through default was expressed by admitting a knowledge of the innovation without any interest in its usage.
3. Rejection by maintaining the status quo was expressed when the teacher did not accept an innovation because it had not been in use in the past.
4. Rejection through societal mores was expressed when the teacher thought her society did not find an innovation acceptable, and therefore did not use it herself.
5. Rejection through interpersonal relationships was expressed by indicating that friends did not use an innovation, or that a particular school environment made using an innovation unacceptable.
6. Rejection through erroneous logic was expressed by giving "rational" but unfounded reasons for the rejection of a worthy innovation.
7. Rejection through substitution was expressed when a teacher spoke of using one practice over another that would have required the use of a particular innovation.
8. Rejection through fulfillment was expressed when a teacher was certain she knew the "best" or "only" way to teach, making any innovation completely unnecessary.
9. Rejection through experience was expressed by telling of some incident when an innovation was tried and failed.¹³

The characteristics of an innovation determine its rate of diffusion.

Those characteristics and their definitions as pointed out by Rogers are:

1. Relative advantage is the degree to which an innovation is superior to the idea it supersedes.
2. Compatability is the degree to which an innovation is consistent with existing values and past experiences of the adopters.
3. Complexity is the degree to which an innovation is relatively difficult to use.
4. Divisibility is the degree to which an innovation may be tried on a limited basis.

5. Communicability is the degree to which the results of an innovation may be diffused to others.¹⁴

Carlson states:

The results of the adoption of an innovation go beyond those which were anticipated or intended. This is the case because a new practice is not accepted in a vacuum. Rather, it is superimposed on, or merged or nested with on-going practices, structures, ideologies, and ways of doing things. It is the interaction of the new and old which, in past, gives use to unanticipated consequences.¹⁵

The chances of success of this program is greater in a school system where personnel is highly trained and no mores are held in the school and community against change or advancement. Its success is dependent upon support by the administration and acceptance by people of the community. This is brought out by Mort in his statement:

Early studies gave considerable information on the place of the teacher, administrator, and the public in bringing about innovations. School systems with high adaptability, were those where teachers were more highly trained and more accepting of modern educational practices and where administrators provided active support for adoption rather than remaining neutral.¹⁶

Mason and Haynes brought out that the selection of training stations, selecting of students, and securing administrative approval are all important points that will confront the teacher of vocational agriculture because these are the major problems of the distributive education coordinators.¹⁷ The teachers will be selecting training stations in agricultural businesses similar to the method in which coordinators would use in distributive education. Approval and adoption of a training station should be based on mutual understanding and agreement among the employer, the school administration, the coordinator, and the prospective student-learner. Everyone concerned must understand that the training station is to serve primarily as a training medium rather than merely as

an opportunity for remunerative employment for the student or for an employer to obtain part-time help.

The selection of students is equally important and Mason and Haynes point out that one of the best methods of selecting students is inherent in the curriculum pattern that utilizes a preparatory subject prior to the cooperative experience.¹⁸ The school administrators need to justify every aspect of a curriculum and to give fiscal evidence to the local board, to the State Department of Public Instruction, and to every other agency that funds the program.¹⁹ These will be new problems for the teacher of vocational agriculture.

Several studies in the nation have been conducted to train the teacher in subject matter in relation to agricultural distribution. One was carried out by Sparrow which was a three year exploration program for off-farm agricultural occupations.²⁰ Hoover and Weyant reported on a program that had as a major goal to determine the amount and kind of training needed by vocational agriculture instructors to enable them to prepare students for positions in marketing and distribution.²¹ The Wilson and Witten study was designed to meet the vocational needs of those students interested in preparing for career opportunities in agriculturally related distributive business.²² It is for those individuals whose needs are not being met by the regular high school vocational agriculture and/or distributive education courses.

The question is, "What are the problems involved in setting up a program of this type?" When we know the problem, we can find the answer.

Static times and change cannot be had at the same time. Robinson states:

A time of solid faith is a static time; a time of change and innovation is a period of doubt and heresy. We cannot have it both ways at once. We cannot have, as some people seem to wish, innovations accompanied by stability or adherence to traditional values along with acceptance of new standards dictated by a changing world.²³

¹Oklahoma Research Project No. OE-5-85-077, "Training Institute to Upgrade Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Distributive Education and Supervised Training in Off-Farm Agricultural Occupations," (Oklahoma State University, 1965).

²James Bryant Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York, 1963), pp. 207-208.

³Smith-Hughes Act of 1917.

⁴George-Barden Act of 1936.

⁵The Vocational Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210), Eighty-eighth Congress (H.R. 4955).

⁶Oklahoma Research Project No. OE-5-85-077, "Training Institute to Upgrade Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Distributive Education and Supervised Training in Off-Farm Agricultural Occupations," (Oklahoma State University, 1965).

⁷Summary of Research Findings in Off-Farm Agricultural Occupations The Center for Research and Leadership Development in Vocational and Technical Education (The Ohio State University, 1965).

⁸William W. Stevenson, "A Study of Employment Opportunities and Training Needs in Off-Farm Agricultural Occupations in Oklahoma," (Oklahoma State University, 1965).

⁹John W. Gardner, Self Renewal, the Individual and the Innovative Society (New York, 1963), p. 30.

¹⁰Richard O. Carlson, Adoption of Educational Innovations The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration (University of Oregon, 1965), p. 4.

¹¹The Vocational Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210), Eighty-eighth Congress (H.R. 4955).

¹²Paul R. Mort, "Studies in Educational Innovations From the Institute of Administrative Research," Innovations in Education, ed. Matthew B. Miles (New York, 1964), p. 318.

¹³Gerhard Eicholz and Everett M. Rogers, "Resistance to the Adoption of Audio-Visual Aids by Elementary School Teachers: Contrasts and Similarities to Agricultural Innovations," Innovations in Education, ed. Matthew B. Miles (New York, 1964), pp. 306-309.

¹⁴Everett M. Rogers, Diffusion of Innovations (New York, 1962), pp. 124-133.

¹⁵Richard O. Carlson, Adoption of Educational Innovations The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration (University of Oregon, 1965), pp. 74-75.

¹⁶Paul R. Mort, "Studies in Educational Innovations From the Institute of Administrative Research," Innovations in Education, ed. Matthew B. Miles (New York, 1964), p. 318.

¹⁷Ralph E. Mason and Peter G. Haines, Cooperative Occupational Education and Work Experience in the Curriculum (Danville, Illinois, 1965), p. 183.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 356.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 149.

²⁰Richard L. Sparrow, "Exploring Farm Related Occupations," The Agricultural Education Magazine, April, 1964, p. 278.

²¹Norman K. Hoover and Thomas J. Weyant, "An Agri-Business Pilot Project," The Agricultural Education Magazine, September, 1965, p. 55.

²²E. F. Wilson and Morris Witten, "Training Provided in Agricultural Distribution," The Agricultural Education Magazine, September, 1965, p. 54.

²³Don W. Robinson, Phi Delta Kappa Journal, Volume XLVII, No. 3, November, 1965, p. 157.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Data presented in this chapter represent the opinion and responses of the twenty-eight institute teachers as recorded on a questionnaire in a personal interview by the investigator and the director of the research project.

The tables in this chapter are grouped in accordance with their area of investigation so that findings and comparisons may serve as an aid in fulfilling the purposes of this study.

The following schools were represented by their teacher in the 1965 summer institute grouped according to Oklahoma schools and out-of-state schools.

Oklahoma agriculture departments whose teachers participated in the 1965 summer institute are as follows:

<u>Name of Department</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Approximate Size of Community</u>
Altus	Altus, Oklahoma	21,000
Broken Arrow	Broken Arrow, Oklahoma	9,000
Collinsville	Collinsville, Oklahoma	3,000
Durant	Durant, Oklahoma	13,000
El Reno	El Reno, Oklahoma	14,012
Guthrie	Guthrie, Oklahoma	10,000
Hobart	Hobart, Oklahoma	6,000
Hooker	Hooker, Oklahoma	2,000
Latta	Latta, Oklahoma	Less than 1,000
Leedey	Leedey, Oklahoma	Less than 1,000
Madill	Madill, Oklahoma	3,000
Minco	Minco, Oklahoma	1,200

Norman	Norman, Oklahoma	44,000
Ponca City	Ponca City, Oklahoma	28,000
Poteau	Poteau, Oklahoma	6,100
Purcell	Purcell, Oklahoma	5,000
Roland	Roland, Oklahoma	Less than 1,000
Vinita	Vinita, Oklahoma	7,000
Watonga	Watonga, Oklahoma	3,400

Out-of-state agriculture departments whose teachers participated in the 1965 summer institute were as follows:

Allegan	Allegan, Michigan	6,000
Bald Knob	Bald Knob, Arkansas	2,096
Bradley	Cleveland, Tennessee	17,000
George Wythe	Wytheville, Virginia	6,000
Kimberly	Kimberly, Idaho	1,250
Louisiana	Louisiana, Missouri	5,400
Midway	Waco, Texas	100,000
Polk County	Benton, Tennessee	1,000
Yuma	Yuma, Colorado	2,100

As shown above this study covers nineteen teachers from Oklahoma and nine teachers from eight other states. Other states represented were: Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Michigan, Missouri, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. The size of communities as shown above ranges from a low of 500 to a high of 100,000.

The mean area of the twenty-eight school districts is 213.5 square miles with a median of 131.5 square miles. The range was from over 1,000 square miles to a low of 43 square miles. The assessed evaluation of the districts had a mean of 9.6 million dollars with a median of 7 million dollars. The range was from a low of .5 million dollars to a high of 45 million dollars. The mean number of mills charged for school purposes was 37.6 mills per thousand dollars evaluation.

The teachers had a mean of 11.4 years of total experience with a mean of 6.1 years in their present system. Eleven of the teachers held an M.S. degree with the mean age of the teachers being thirty-four years of age.

Pertinent information about the communities was needed for the teachers to implement the placement of students in their communities. The attitude of other people toward a new program is important to the teacher. Eighty-five percent of the teachers perceived the attitude of the businessmen and administrators as being good or excellent toward this program. The mean wage for student labor in all twenty-eight communities was \$.91 per hour with a range from \$.50 to \$1.30 per hour. Eighteen teachers made a detailed survey of their communities locating agricultural businesses that needed employees with agricultural competencies. Eight teachers formed advisory councils to assist them in starting their vocational agricultural occupations training program.

Vocational educators have been studying new roles in agriculture for training the vocational agriculture student. These roles are in occupations other than farming that require agricultural competencies. For teachers of vocational agriculture to be able to recognize businesses employing individuals who need agricultural competencies, a community survey should be taken.

A Description of the Population

Student placement for occupational training is one criteria for determining the success of a program. This study is primarily designed to document the problems encountered by the teacher in setting up his curriculum and placing students for supervised occupational experiences.

TABLE I
 MEAN NUMBER OF STUDENTS PLACED IN AGRICULTURAL BUSINESSES
 COMPARED TO THE NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL BUSINESSES
 LOCATED IN THE COMMUNITY BY THE TEACHERS

Number of Agricultural Businesses in Community	Number of Departments	Mean Number Students Placed
Under 10	7	1.9
11-20	14	4.9
21-30	4	5.5
Over 30	3	2.7

Table I shows the number of agricultural businesses in a community and the number of students placed per department. One teacher located no agricultural businesses; of course, he had no students placed for occupational training. The teachers identified from none to a high of seventy-five businesses in their respective communities. The three departments which located more than thirty businesses had only a mean of 2.7 students placed. Two of these departments were in or near large cities and one was located in a state which de-emphasized placement of students in agricultural businesses for vocational agriculture occupational training.

TABLE II
 MEAN NUMBER OF STUDENTS PLACED IN AGRICULTURAL BUSINESSES
 PER TEACHER COMPARED TO THE TOTAL NUMBER OF
 STUDENTS ENROLLED IN VOCATIONAL
 AGRICULTURE

Total Students Per Teacher	Number of Schools	Mean Number Students Placed
Under 30	4	2.0
30-60	17	3.8
61-90	5	4.0
Over 90	2	8.0

The enrollment per department varied in number of students per teacher as shown in Table II. They varied from a high of 117 to a low of 22 students. The higher mean number of students placed were in departments with the larger number of students. Some of the smaller departments were in small agricultural communities with limited opportunities or in schools that were very selective in students that enrolled in vocational agriculture. One of the departments with over ninety students per teacher had more than one teacher and had placed eleven students.

TABLE III
MEAN NUMBER OF STUDENTS PLACED IN AGRICULTURAL BUSINESSES
BY PERCENTAGE OF NON-FARM STUDENTS

Percent Non-Farm Students	Number of Departments	Mean Number Students	Mean Number Non-Farm Students	Mean Number Students Placed
Under 25	8	68	8	4.6
25-50	11	45	18	3.8
51-75	7	50	32	2.9
Over 75	2	58	51	4.5

Table III shows that the teachers had a total of 1,498 students in their departments. The non-farm total was 574, which was 38 percent of the enrollment. The off-farm placement did not increase with the greater total non-farm students. The non-farm students were apparently in vocational agriculture for reasons other than agriculture occupational training.

Organization of the Classes

TABLE IV

MEAN NUMBER OF STUDENTS PLACED IN AGRICULTURAL BUSINESSES BY
TYPE OF PROGRAM AND TENURE OF THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE
TEACHER IN THE PRESENT SYSTEM

Tenure of Teacher (Years Experience)	Separate Class Agricultural Occupations		Traditional Class Agricultural Occupations Integrated	
	Number of Departments	Mean Number Students Placed	Number of Departments	Mean Number Students Placed
10 or More	4	4.5	2	0.0
5 to 9	3	10.6	6	1.0
0 to 4	<u>4</u>	4.5	<u>9</u>	3.8
Totals	11	6.2*	17	2.4*

*The difference between 6.2 and 2.4 students placed was significant at the five percent level using the median test.

Some of the departments set up a separate class in vocational agriculture occupations training or converted a senior class into their program, while other departments maintained the traditional program of vocational agriculture. In Table IV a comparison was made between these two types of programs and the tenure of the teacher in the system. The tenure ranged from a low of no years to a high of fifteen years in the present system. Eleven departments had separate or converted classes with a mean number of 6.2 students placed for occupational training. The seventeen departments with traditional programs had a mean number of 2.4 students placed for occupational training.

One out-of-state teacher had a tenure of more than ten years and he had a separate class. No out-of-state teachers had tenure from five to

nine years. Teachers from eight out-of-state schools were included in the none-to-four year tenure range. Two of these teachers organized separate classes.

TABLE V
MEAN NUMBER OF STUDENTS PLACED IN AGRICULTURAL BUSINESSES
BY TYPE OF PROGRAM AND SIZE OF COMMUNITY

Size of Community	Separate Class Agricultural Occupations		Traditional Class Agricultural Occupations Integrated	
	Number of Departments	Mean Number of Students Placed	Number of Departments	Mean Number of Students Placed
10,000 or More	3	4.0	5	2.6
6,000 to 9,999	3	5.7	3	2.7
Less than 6,000	<u>5</u>	7.8	<u>9</u>	2.1
Totals	11	6.2*	17	2.4*

*The difference between 6.2 and 2.4 students placed was significant at the five percent level using the median test.

Table V shows a comparison between separate classes and the integrated classes in relationship to the size of the community. The community size varied from a high of 100,000 to a low of 500 population. The mean number of students placed decreased as the size of the community increased in departments with separate classes. In departments with traditional classes, the mean number of students placed varied slightly in reverse of the separate classes.

The Business Community

TABLE VI

NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL BUSINESSES AND MEAN NUMBER OF
EMPLOYEES WHICH WERE CONTACTED AND PARTICIPATING
AS TRAINING STATIONS BY TYPE OF
BUSINESS OWNERSHIP

Type of Ownership	Number of Businesses			Mean Number Employees in Business	
	Contacted N	Participating N	%	Contacted	Participating
Family-Owned	177	61	34	8.8	6.3
Partnership	35	5	14	6.0	6.9
Governmental	16	3	19	4.6	4.4
Corporation	81	20	25	13.4	1.8
Cooperatives	<u>16</u>	<u>5</u>	31	6.6	7.3
Totals	325	94	29	9.3	8.8

Data in Table VI reveal that teachers of vocational agriculture tend to seek training stations in family-owned businesses. This may be due to the fact that more of this type existed in their communities. The number of employees per business did not vary greatly in all types of businesses indicating no large businesses either participated or were contacted.

TABLE VII
 NUMBER OF STUDENTS PLACED IN AGRICULTURAL BUSINESSES,
 MEAN WAGE EARNED, AND NUMBER OF HOURS EMPLOYED
 BY TYPE OF BUSINESS

Type of Business	Number of Businesses Participating	Number of Students Placed	Mean Wage Earned Per Hour	Mean Number Hrs. Worked Per Week
Farm Employment (Production Agriculture)	8	11	\$0.87	16
Agricultural Supply (Feed, Seed & Fertilizer)	17	19	1.12	15
Farm Machinery Dealers	13	14	0.91	18
Horticulture Businesses	7	9	1.15	19
Other Types	<u>49</u>	<u>55</u>	1.05	16
Totals	94	108	1.03	16

The totals in Table VII show that ninety-four businesses are participating with the twenty-eight departments. They have 108 students working an average of sixteen hours per week at the average rate of \$1.03 per hour.

The average amount received by the student was above the minimum wage that could be paid for student labor in the community, thus indicating that employers thought the student should earn more than the minimum wage. The variation in wages paid in different types of businesses was slight.

The student of vocational agriculture working the average number of hours per week at the average wage would receive an annual gross labor income of \$856.96 in occupational training.

TABLE VIII

NUMBER OF STUDENTS PLACED IN AGRICULTURAL BUSINESSES BY
TYPE OF BUSINESS AND TYPE OF OWNERSHIP

Type of Ownership	Kinds of Businesses					Total ^a
	Farm Empl.	Agri. Supply; Feed, Seed, & Fertilizer	Farm Impl.	Horti- culture	Others	
Family Ownership	11	10	11	7	29	68
Partnership	0	1	0	0	4	5
Governmental	0	0	0	0	3	3
Corporation	0	3	3	2	19	27
Cooperatives	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>
Totals	11	19	14	9	55	108

^aTotal number of students placed by type of business ownership does not agree with the number of businesses listed in Table VI because more than one student worked in a business.

Data presented in Table VIII show that of the 108 students placed, 68 are placed in family-owned businesses. The eleven students placed for farm employment were all family-owned farms. Corporations accounted for the placement of twenty-seven students with the lowest placement with governmental agencies. The smallest number of students are working in horticulture with the largest number working in businesses classified as "others." Businesses classified as "others" include all businesses not included in those listed in the above table. Some of them are as follows: hardware stores, rendering plants, filling stations, wholesale dairies, electric supply stores, training stables, governmental jobs, and grocery stores. The students working in governmental jobs were in city

government rather than United States Department of Agriculture work. Some of the businesses employing students may not need employees with agricultural competencies, but the teachers felt justified in placing the students in these businesses for work experience.

Student Placement in Businesses

TABLE IX
NUMBER OF STUDENTS WORKING AT DIFFERENT TIMES IN
AGRICULTURAL BUSINESSES BY TYPE OF BUSINESS

Time Worked	Production Agriculture	Agricultural Supply	Farm Mach.	Horti- culture	Other	Total
With Released School Time	0	1	6	1	14	22
No Released School Time	<u>11</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>86</u>
Totals	11	19	14	9	55	108

Table IX presents data showing that twenty-two students received released time from school for occupational experience. This is 20.4 percent of the total 108 students placed for training in agricultural businesses. The greatest number of students were working after school and on weekends. The time of day students could work shows up as a problem for all teachers in securing training stations. If the students had more released school time, time of day to work might not be a problem. The teacher either did not ask or was not granted released time from school for more students to work.

TABLE X
FACTORS AFFECTING STUDENT PLACEMENT IN BUSINESSES

Factors	Number of Departments	Mean Number Students Placed Per Department
Number of Agriculture Teachers		
Multiple	8	6.6*
Single	20	2.8*
Number of Agriculture Related Businesses		
Largest	5	3.4
Smallest	5	1.8
Size of Enrollment in Vocational Agriculture Per Teacher		
Largest	5	6.0
Smallest	5	1.6
Type of Agriculture Students		
Schools (Highest % of Farm Students)	5	4.6
Schools (Highest % of Non- Farm Students)	5	2.8
Size of Community		
Largest	5	4.4
Smallest	5	5.2
Distributive Education		
With	11	4.5
Without	17	3.4
Advisory Committee		
With	8	3.1
Without	20	4.1

*The difference between 6.6 and 2.8 students placed was significant at the five percent level using the t test.

In Table X several factors were considered to see if these factors influenced the placement of students. Student placement being the major criteria for measuring the degree of acceptance of the agricultural

occupations training program, the mean numbers placed were given as a comparison. In comparing different factors it was found that the number of teachers per department and the size of enrollment per teacher are the major factors studied that influenced student placement.

The comparison of other extreme factors, number of businesses, type of student, size of community, other programs, and selection of advisory committee had less effect on number of students placed. It is obvious that teachers have partial control over factors listed in Table X.

Implementation Difficulties

TABLE XI

MEAN RANKING OF PROBLEM AREAS IN SECURING TRAINING STATIONS
AS PERCEIVED BY THE INSTITUTE TEACHERS

Problem Area	Placement of Students in Business	
	<u>Less Than Four Placed</u>	<u>Four or More Placed</u>
	17 Departments	11 Departments
	Mean Rank of Problem Areas	
Wages too high	1.7	1.0
Seasonal business	3.6	3.5
Insurance on students	1.2	0.9
Reports on students	0.2	0.1
Ability of students	1.4	1.2
Labor laws for students	1.2	1.6
Extra help not needed	2.6	3.7
Employer could not understand	0.1	0.2
Resentment of employees	0.0	0.1
Students too young	0.5	0.4
Time of day students could work	2.4	2.2
Failure of students to secure Social Security number	0.0	0.0

0-No Problem, 5-Greatest Problem

Table XI compares the perceived problems of the teachers in establishing training stations. The teachers were asked to rank in order of importance the five problems which they considered most difficult to overcome in establishing the training stations. A mean ranking of the problems is shown in this table making a comparison between departments

that had placed four or more students with those that had placed less than four students. In the group of teachers placing zero to three students, seven of the seventeen teachers placed no students.

Teachers placing less than four students ranked the problem areas in the following order: (1) Seasonal business, (2) Extra help not needed, (3) Time of day students could work, (4) Wages too high, and (5) Ability of students. Teachers placing four or more students ranked the problem areas in the following order: (1) Extra help not needed, (2) Seasonal business, (3) Time of day students could work, (4) Labor laws for students, and (5) Ability of students. The problems of both groups were basically the same. The greatest problems and problems of little or no importance were perceived as being equal by both groups. It appears that problems perceived by the teacher in securing training stations could be overcome if he desired this program become a part of his total vocational agriculture program. The data indicate that the success in securing training stations is determined by the initiative of the individual teacher.

TABLE XII

MEAN RANKING OF OTHER PERSONS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE PROGRAM
AS PERCEIVED BY THE INSTITUTE TEACHERS

Problem Area	Placement of Students in Businesses	
	<u>Less Than Four Placed</u>	<u>Four or More Placed</u>
	17 Departments	11 Departments
	Mean Rank of Problem Areas	
Parents do not see the value of the program	0.2	0.5
Guidance counselor's attitude toward the program	0.1	0.5
Scheduling teachers' time for the additional class	2.0	3.3
Teacher cannot work the new program into his present program of vocational agriculture	1.8	1.3
0-No Problem, 5-Greatest Problem		

TABLE XIII

MEAN RANKING OF PROBLEMS IN SECURING STUDENTS AS PERCEIVED
BY THE INSTITUTE TEACHERS

Problem Area	Placement of Students in Businesses	
	<u>Less Than Four Placed</u>	<u>Four or More Placed</u>
	17 Departments	11 Departments
	Mean Rank of Problem Areas	
Other school activities interfere with student's time	3.2	2.4
Student's supervised farming programs are too large to allow time for work	1.2	0.8
Outside school activities interfere with student's time	1.2	0.8
Students are busy at home	1.0	1.8
0-No Problem, 5-Greatest Problem		

TABLE XIV

MEAN RANKING OF PROBLEMS IN SECURING ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL
AS PERCEIVED BY THE INSTITUTE TEACHERS

Problem Area	Placement of Students in Businesses	
	<u>Less Than Four Placed</u>	<u>Four or More Placed</u>
	17 Departments	11 Departments
	Mean Rank of Problem Areas	
Board of Education policy	0.3	0.0
The administration does not see the need for the agricultural occupations program	0.5	0.7
School's schedule could not be arranged to allow time for work or class	1.6	2.5
Money is not available for books or supplies	0.6	1.4

0-No Problem, 5-Greatest Problem

Tables XII, XIII, and XIV were set up to show information found in one question of the questionnaire. Both groups of teachers rated the scheduling of the teacher's time for the additional class as the greatest problem. The problem of the teacher working the new program into his present program of vocational agriculture was the second most difficult problem. The guidance counselor's attitude and the parents' attitude were rated as their least problem.

Table XIII shows the ranking of problems in securing students for placement as perceived by the teachers. Other school activities interfering with the student's time was rated to be the greatest single problem. Schools which placed four or more students revealed that the

student's being busy at home was a greater problem than those placing less than four students.

As shown by Table XIV, again the greatest problem was the same for both groups. The problem, "The school's schedule could not be arranged to allow time for work or class," was found to be the most difficult problem. The fact that teachers returned to their communities after the school schedules were already made out could have had some bearing on the problem. However, some of the teachers seemed to overcome this problem. The board of education policy proved to be the least problem for both groups.

From data shown on Tables XII, XIII, and XIV, the five most difficult problems as perceived by the teachers placing less than four students were found to be as follows: (1) Other school activities interfere with student's time, (2) Scheduling teacher's time for the additional class, (3) Teacher cannot work the new program into his present program of vocational agriculture, (4) School's schedule could not be arranged to allow time for work or class, and (5) Student's supervised farming programs are too large to allow time for work, and Outside school activities interfere with the student's time. Those teachers placing four or more students perceived the problems in this order: (1) Scheduling teacher's time for the additional class, (2) School's schedule could not be arranged to allow time for work or class, (3) Other school activities interfere with student's time, (4) Students are busy at home, and (5) Money is not available for books or supplies.

TABLE XV

MEAN RANK OF PROBLEM AREA GROUPS AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS
OF THE INSTITUTE BY KIND OF DEPARTMENTS

Kind of Department	Number of Departments	Problem Area		
		Securing Training Stations	Securing Administrative Approval	Securing Students
<hr/>				
		Number of Teachers		
<hr/>				
Multiple Teacher	8	1.4	2.7	1.9
Single Teacher	20	1.6	2.6	1.8
<hr/>				
		Existence of Other Cooperative Placement Programs		
<hr/>				
Other Cooperative Placement Programs	11	1.4	2.6	2.0
No Other Programs	17	1.6	2.6	1.8
<hr/>				
		Student Placement		
<hr/>				
Students Placed (Four or more)	11	1.5	2.9	1.6
Students Placed (Three or less)	17	1.6	2.5	1.9
<hr/>				
Mean Rank ALL Departments	28	1.6	2.6	1.8

1-Greatest Problem, 3-Least Problem

Table XV shows a mean ranking of the three major problem areas in the different kinds of departments. The number of teachers in a department, the existence of other cooperative placement programs, and the number of students placed had no effect on the ranking. They all ranked the problems in the same order. The number one problem was securing

training stations, with this problem having a mean rank of 1.6 in all departments. Second ranked problem was the securing of students, with a mean rank of 1.8. The third ranked problem was securing administrative approval, with a mean ranking of 2.6.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The placement of students for occupational training in business is the number one criteria for evaluation in this study. For the vocational agriculture occupations training to remain vocational it is imperative, in the opinion of the writer, that some form of placement for occupational experience takes place. No attempt was made in this study to try to evaluate the curriculum being taught due to the short length of time teachers had been working with this type of program.

Some of the teachers who had placed no students were waiting until later in the school year to do so. Some of the other teachers who were classified in the group placing between zero and four students had not really gone into the program in depth and their placements for training were merely incidental.

The conclusions drawn from the study as being of greatest importance are as follows:

1. The problems as perceived by the teacher in setting up the program in order of their difficulty are: (1) Securing training stations, (2) Securing students, and (3) Securing administrative approval.
2. In securing training stations, it appears that to a great extent the success is determined by the initiative of the individual teacher.

3. In securing students the greatest problem was found to be that of other school activities interfering with the student's time.
4. In securing administrative approval, the arranging of the school's schedule to allow time for the student's participation in the program was the greatest problem.
5. The multiple teacher departments placed a mean of 6.6 students per department as compared to a mean of 2.8 students for single teacher departments. This would indicate that the multiple teacher departments have more time to add new programs to the curriculum of vocational agriculture than single teacher departments.
6. In this study the teachers placed 55 out of 108 students in businesses other than farm machinery, horticulture, and agricultural supply, which have been shown by other studies to need the greatest number of employees. These businesses were either not available in the community or were not recognized by the teacher.

The implications of this study are as follows:

1. That a greater number of multiple teacher departments need to be established to carry out effectively the vocational agriculture occupational training program.
2. That teachers of vocational agriculture need additional training in working with business people.
3. That teachers need to be more aware of employment opportunities in off-farm agricultural occupations in order to select more appropriate training stations.

4. That in most situations, problems, regardless of difficulty, can be overcome and students placed for training.
5. That the teacher of vocational agriculture, if properly motivated and trained, will embark upon an innovative venture.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Carlson, Richard O. Adoption of Educational Innovations. The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration. University of Oregon, 1965.
2. Conant, James Bryant. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.
3. Eicholz, Gerhard, and Everett M. Rogers. "Resistance to the Adoption of Audio-Visual Aids by Elementary School Teachers: Contrasts and Similarities to Agricultural Innovations." Innovations in Education. Ed. Matthew B. Miles. Columbia University: Bureau of Publications, 1964.
4. Gardner, John W. Self Renewal, The Individual and the Innovative Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
5. George-Barden Act of 1917.
6. Hoover, Norman K., and Thomas J. Weyant. "An Agri-Business Pilot Project." The Agricultural Education Magazine, (September, 1965), 55.
7. Mason, Ralph E., and Peter G. Haines. Cooperative Occupational Education and Work Experience in the Curriculum. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1965.
8. Mort, Paul R. "Studies in Educational Innovations From the Institute of Administrative Research." Innovations in Education. Ed. Matthew B. Miles. Columbia University: Bureau of Publications, 1964.
9. Oklahoma Research Project No. OE-5-85-077. "Training Institute to Upgrade Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Distributive Education and Supervised Training in Off-Farm Agricultural Occupations." Oklahoma State University, 1965.
10. Robinson, Don W. Phi Delta Kappa Journal, XLVII, No. 3. (November, 1965), 157.
11. Rogers, Everett M. Diffusion of Innovations. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.
12. Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1965.

13. Sparrow, Richard L. "Exploring Farm Related Occupations." The Agricultural Education Magazine, (April, 1964), 278.
14. Stevenson, William W. "A Study of Employment Opportunities and Training Needs in Off-Farm Agricultural Occupations in Oklahoma." Oklahoma State University, 1965.
15. "Summary of Research Findings in Off-Farm Agricultural Occupations." The Center for Research and Leadership Development in Vocational and Technical Education. The Ohio State University, 1965.
16. The Vocational Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210), Eighty-eighth Congress (H.R. 4955).
17. West, James E., Charles O. Neidt, and J. Stanley Akmann. Statistical Methods in Educational and Psychological Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Croft, Inc., 1954.
18. Wilson, E. F., and Morris Witten. "Training Provided in Agricultural Distribution." The Agricultural Education Magazine, (September, 1965), 54.

AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATIONS TRAINING PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE

Date _____ Investigator _____

School _____ Teacher _____

1. Total number of high school students in grades 9 through 12. _____
2. Total number of teachers in high school grades 9 through 12. _____
3. Assessed evaluation of the high school district. \$ _____
4. Total tax rate for education (in mills). _____
5. Total number of square miles in the high school district. _____

(A farm boy is one whose father owns or manages a farm.)
1965

- | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| 6. Total enrollment, Vo. Ag. | _____ | Farm boys | _____ |
| 7. Total Freshman class | _____ | Farm boys | _____ |
| 8. Total Sophomore class | _____ | Farm boys | _____ |
| 9. Total Junior class | _____ | Farm boys | _____ |
| 10. Total Senior class | _____ | Farm boys | _____ |
| 11. Total Adult class | _____ | Farmers | _____ |
12. Did you make a community survey of agriculturally oriented businesses?
 Yes _____ No _____ What kind? _____
 13. How many agriculturally oriented businesses (businesses with job titles requiring agricultural knowledge) are there in your community?

 14. How many personal contacts did you make to secure training stations?

 15. How were these contacts made? _____
 16. How many businesses were contacted the second time? _____
 17. How many presentations have you given at civic clubs about this program? _____
 18. Approximately how many students' parents have you talked with about this program? _____

19. Do you have an organized advisory council? Yes _____ No _____
 No. of members _____ What are the occupations of its members?

20. Information about businesses and employees contacted:

Type of Ownership	Tot. Businesses Contacted			Firms not Participating			Students Placed for Pay			Students Placed for Obs.		
	No. of Bus.	Avg. Emp. Per Bus.	No. of Bus.	No. of Bus.	Avg. Emp. Per Bus.	No. of Bus.	Avg. Emp. Per Bus.	No. of Bus.	Avg. Emp. Per Bus.	No. of Bus.	Avg. Emp. Per Bus.	No. of Bus.
Family-owned	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Partnership	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Governmental Agencies	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Corporation	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Farm Cooperatives	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Others	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

21. Why did potential training stations not participate? (Give the number of nonparticipants for each reason.)

_____ Wages too high
 _____ Seasonal business
 _____ Insurance on students
 _____ Reports on students
 _____ Ability of students
 _____ Labor laws for students
 _____ Extra help not needed
 _____ Employer could not understand the program
 _____ Resentment of employees
 _____ Students too young
 _____ Time of day students could work
 _____ Failure of students to secure Social Security number

22. Students placed for pay:

When do students find
time to work in a train-
ing station?

<u>Name of Business</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>No. of Students</u>	<u>Avg. Rate /hr.</u>	<u>Avg. Hrs. /wk.</u>	<u>When do students find time to work in a train- ing station?</u>				
					<u>A.M.</u>	<u>P.M.</u>	<u>Dur- ing Sch.</u>	<u>After Sch.</u>	<u>Week- ends</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

23. Students placed for exploratory work or observation without pay:

When do students find time to
observe in a business?

<u>Name of Business</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>No. of Students</u>	<u>When do students find time to observe in a business?</u>				
			<u>A.M.</u>	<u>P.M.</u>	<u>During School</u>	<u>After School</u>	<u>Week- ends</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

24. What is the average rate of pay (\$/hr.) for high school student
labor in local businesses?

25. Appraise your administrator's attitude toward the new program.

Excellent Good Fair Poor

26. Rate the business people's attitude toward the occupational training program.

Excellent Good Fair Poor

27. What part of your last year's program have you cut down to include preparation for agriculture business employment? _____

28. When do you visit students on the job in agricultural businesses? _____

29. What reference books have you purchased and the number of each? _____

30. Rate the following in order of difficulty:

_____ Board of education policies.

_____ Other school activities interfere with the students' time.

_____ The administration doesn't see the need for the agricultural occupations program.

_____ Students' supervised farming programs are too large to allow time for work.

_____ Guidance counselor's attitude toward program.

_____ Parents do not see the value of the program.

_____ School's schedule could not be arranged to allow time for work or class.

_____ Outside school activities interfere with the students' time.

_____ Students are busy at home.

_____ Scheduling teacher's time for the additional class.

_____ Teacher cannot work the new program into his present program of vocational agriculture.

_____ Money is not available for books and supplies.

31. Rate the following problem areas in order of difficulty in setting up your occupational training program:

_____ Securing training stations.

_____ School administration's approval.

_____ Securing students.

32. Vocational agriculture teacher's schedule:

<u>Period</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Name of Class</u>
1	_____	_____
2	_____	_____
3	_____	_____
4	_____	_____
5	_____	_____
6	_____	_____
7	_____	_____

33. Describe the agricultural outlook in the community. _____

34. Describe the employment trends in the area. _____

VITA

Cleo A. Dupy

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: IDENTIFICATION OF PROBLEMS IN IMPLEMENTING AN AGRICULTURAL
OCCUPATIONS PROGRAM IN TWENTY-EIGHT SELECTED VOCATIONAL
AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS

Major Field: Agricultural Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born at Billings, Oklahoma, May 2, 1920, the son
of Fred and Alice Dupy.

Education: Attended grade school at Fairview Rural School in
Garfield County; graduated from Billings High School in 1938;
graduated from Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College,
Stillwater, Oklahoma, in May, 1942, with a Bachelor of Science
degree in Animal Husbandry; attended the Pennsylvania State
University and the Ohio State University during the summer of
1965; attended the Oklahoma State University during the 1965-
66 school year; completed requirements for the Master of Science
degree in May, 1966.

Experience: Served in the United States Army from May, 1942, until
November, 1945; taught vocational agriculture at Lamont,
Oklahoma, from 1947 to 1956; taught vocational agriculture at
Okeene, Oklahoma, from 1956 to 1965; served as research assis-
tant at Oklahoma State University during the school year
1965-66.

Professional Organizations: Member of Oklahoma Vocational Associ-
ation; member of American Vocational Association; member of
Alpha Zeta; past president of Oklahoma Vocational Association;
past president of Oklahoma Vocational Agriculture Association;
past president of Oklahoma Shorthorn Breeders Association.