OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE, TENURE AND SELECTED ASPECTS OF THE EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS OF MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY GRADUATES QUALIFYING TO TEACH VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

By

ELDON EUGENE HEATHCOTT II

Bachelor of Science in Agriculture
Murray State University
Murray, Kentucky
1959

Master of Arts in Education
Murray State University
Murray, Kentucky
1960

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
December, 1974

OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE, AGRICULTURAL KNOWLEDGE, AND SELECTED

ASPECTS OF THE EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS OF

MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY GRADUATES

QUALIFYING TO TEACH VOCATIONAL

AGRICULTURE

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

James P. Key

John B. Tate

Robert R. Price

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Indebtedness is acknowledged to the many individuals whose cooperation helped make this study possible. Special appreciation is given to Dr. H. Robert Terry for his guidance and continuous encouragement throughout the graduate program and the dissertation study.

Additional appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Robert R. Price, Head, Department of Agricultural Education, Dr. James P. Key, and Dr. John B. Tate, members of the investigator's graduate committee, whose encouragement, wise counseling, and practical suggestions were always given consideration.

Appreciation is also expressed to the graduates of Murray State University who were included in this study, without whose cooperativeness and promptness in completing and returning the questionnaire this study would not have been possible.

Special recognition is given to Mrs. Mary Rhoads for her typing efforts from the early stages of the study through typing of the dissertation.

Additional appreciation is also expressed to Mr. and Mrs. Chris White for their encouragement to complete this study.

Appreciation is expressed to the Agricultural Department at Murray State University for their encouragement to complete this study.

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to his wife, Earldora, daughter, Donna, and son, David, without whose support,

understanding, and sacrifice this program could never have been completed.

The investigator would like to dedicate this study to his father, Robert V. Heathcott, and to his late mother, Martha Erle Heathcott, who passed away prior to the time this study was initiated. She was always a source of encouragement, inspiration, and assistance during her life and will always continue to be throughout my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

V. (CONTINUED)

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

On July 1, 1967, Murray State University in Kentucky began an agricultural education program to qualify teachers. Prior to this time, all graduates of Murray State University transferred to the University of Kentucky for student teaching and subsequent certification in vocational agriculture. The University of Kentucky was the only school in the state that offered the professional education courses that would qualify students to teach vocational agriculture. However, graduates who have received their B.S. Degree in Agriculture from Murray State University and have qualified to teach vocational agriculture in Kentucky have not only made their marks as teachers of vocational agriculture and leaders in agriculture but also as leaders in agriculturally related businesses.

For each of the years that the program has existed, the Kentucky State Department of Vocational Education has been calling for an evaluation of the agricultural education division at Murray State University. However, in recent months they have begun using the term accountability in the same framework as evaluation has been used in past years. The accountability being advocated may be defined in relationship to meeting the needs of people being served by the educational program. The university and the agricultural education division are accountable to

the taxpayer, Board of Regents, State Board of Education, State Department of Education, and students they are serving.

From an accountability standpoint the university and the agricultural education division will be in a much stronger position when they have secured specific information from former graduates. Graduates who have completed the program are much more knowledgeable and therefore better qualified to offer an opinion after they have graduated and know the employment opportunities to which they have been availed since qualifying to teach vocational agriculture. It is doubtful that any agricultural education department should be judged only on the number of graduates that begin teaching vocational agriculture immediately upon graduation. Perhaps, from an accountability standpoint, a better way of judging a department is by surveying former graduates and finding out how successful they have been in using their training. Accountability is one way patrons communicate with university systems to let them know they want the evaluations to be more meaningful and to help keep education in tune with society needs.

One of the more recent and comprehensive studies dealing with occupational choice of agricultural education graduates was a staff study by Woodin (28) in 1972. Woodin studied by questionnaire all 81 institutions in the United States preparing teachers in vocational agriculture as well as head state supervisors.

This study showed that 1,759 persons were qualified for teaching vocational agriculture in 1972. This is the largest number that has been qualified in the past eight years. In 1972, the number qualifying to teach vocational agriculture increased while the number actually entering the teaching profession decreased. Only 54.8 percent of those

qualified to teach vocational agriculture chose to enter the profession, while in 1965, 65 percent of those qualified accepted teaching positions. During the past school year there was an average turnover of 9.5 percent in vocational agriculture teaching positions. The turnover of vocational agriculture teachers has ranged from 9 to 12 percent for each of the past eight years. This turnover in teachers is comparative to that of other teachers but helps to contribute to the shortage of good qualified teachers of vocational agriculture.

Woodin's eight-year comparison study 1965-1972 (28) showed that the number of teaching positions has ranged from a low of 10,221 in 1969 to a high of 10,716 in 1972. The 1972 teaching positions do not include 953 positions in community colleges and technical institutes.

This study showed that 89 percent of all teaching positions were in general or comprehensive high schools and only 7.9 percent were employed in area vocational schools. The number of multiple teacher departments has steadily increased over the years and has reached a high of 41 percent. Approximately two-thirds of all teaching positions involved the teaching of young farmers or adults. About half of all teachers were offering specialized programs in many different areas, such as Agricultural Mechanics, Agricultural Business and Supply, and Ornamental Horticulture in 1972. Most teachers that were offering these programs were also teaching agricultural production courses.

The agricultural education field has had a shortage of teachers for the past eight years. There were 272 teachers who held emergency certification in 1972.

As of August 18, 1972, there were 128 teachers needed by not available; and 74 departments could not operate during the 1972-73 year

because of the lack of a teacher.

Last year 39.5 percent of those qualified to teach chose to enter other occupations such as farming, farm sales and service, and graduate work. Five percent of the 1972 graduates entered the Armed Forces.

At Murray State University in the 1971-72 school year, Woodin's study (28) showed that 25 teachers qualified with 9 teaching vocational agriculture and 16 graduates otherwise employed. It is believed that from the proposed study the author will find some of the factors why some of the young men who have qualified to teach do teach, while others seek other employment. This information would be helpful in making changes in teacher preparation and in counseling with present and prospective students in agricultural education.

It is believed that there is a very urgent problem facing agricultural education departments today. In some cases, the value of vocational agriculture to the school population is being questioned throughout the state. Many teachers are leaving the profession. If the factors that determine the occupational choices and tenure of agricultural education graduates could be better understood, teacher education programs would be better prepared to face this ever-challenging problem. At no time in the history of vocational agriculture has the program been more severely challenged as to its value. So it is inevitable that we need to understand the most important component of the program, the instructor, and why he continues to teach or leaves the field for other employment. It is doubtful that anyone can justify saying an agricultural education program is not a successful program because graduates seek advancement in many areas and are successful.

Statement of the Problem

This study was undertaken because of the lack of information on graduates who have received the B.S. Degree in Agriculture from Murray State University and qualified to teach vocational agriculture since July 1, 1967. Any department that is interested in its direction and in having a quality program must provide for evaluation. That is, it must be held accountable for its program.

Murray State University is a member of the Southern Association of Colleges and Universities and was evaluated by a visiting committee from this organization during the spring of 1973. It was found to be strong in many areas, and the results of this evaluation should lead to several improvements at the institution. However, this type of evaluation does not give enough breakdown for specific improvements in each department. For example, competencies needed by beginning teachers of vocational agriculture are constantly changing and many changes have been made since the beginning of the agricultural education program. The real question was to determine if changes that have been made and should be made are developing the competencies needed by beginning teachers of vocational agriculture and qualified teaching graduates who seek employment in other areas.

To evaluate the quality of the agricultural education program at Murray State University it appeared only reasonable to survey the former graduates.

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to compile information on graduates who have received their B.S. Degree in Agriculture from Murray

State University and qualified to teach vocational agriculture. This study determined the different occupations that graduates had selected, their tenure, and other selected aspects of their employment patterns.

This study also solicited a sincere opinion from each student concerning certain portions of the Agricultural Education Program at Murray State University.

Objectives of the Study

In order to accomplish the purposes of the study, the following specific objectives were formulated:

1. To provide a general description of graduates with regard to residence and college attendance.
2. To determine persons having the greatest influence on the students' enrollment in agriculture at Murray State University.
3. To determine initial and current employment, length of tenure, how graduates made contact with their employers, factors that influenced graduates to enter and remain in employment, and gross income from first and present employment. In effect, this will help determine a complete job history of agricultural education graduates.
4. To determine the opinions of former students toward selected functions of the Agricultural Education Division at Murray State University.
5. To determine the factors that influenced graduates who had taught vocational agriculture to leave the field.
6. To determine the advanced degrees that graduates have received or have in progress as of June 30, 1973, and the number of

professional organizations relating to graduates' occupational areas in which they are a member.

Rationale for the Study

Many Murray graduates who have qualified to teach vocational agriculture in the state of Kentucky never enter the teaching profession or leave after but a very short period. This helps to contribute to a serious shortage of good qualified vocational agriculture teachers. This situation may also discourage many outstanding teaching prospects from entering the field of agricultural education at Murray State University. The decision could be made because of the lack of sound information on former graduates and factors influencing them to teach or to seek other employment areas.

The basic rationale behind this study was the belief that graduates who have received their B.S. Degree in Agriculture from Murray State University and have qualified to teach vocational agriculture can and will provide helpful information on the quality of the agricultural education training they received. Many new ideas and approaches have been implemented in the agricultural education program at Murray State University. The Agriculture Department and Agricultural Education Division staffs wanted the follow-up and feed-back of the graduates who were putting their training into practice. This will enable the programs to make sound changes on what graduates say is needed to strengthen the program.

Assumptions, Limitations, and Definitions

Assumptions

For the purpose of this study, the following assumptions were accepted:

A. In the use of the questionnaire it is assumed that all information in the graduates' responses is correct.

B. It is assumed that graduates of the agricultural education program are best qualified to make an evaluation of the training they received because of their employment after graduation.

Limitations

Some limitations that have been recognized by the investigator would include the following:

A. This study included only those graduates from July 1, 1967, to June 30, 1973.

B. In this study, no effort was exerted to study the graduates on factors such as:

   1. Parental background
   2. High school background
   3. Highest degree attained in the FFA

Definitions

Evaluation -- The process of making value judgments on the basis of information gathered about the educational program.

Accountability -- The process of holding an educational program responsible for its intended purposes and functions. The process

focuses on the needs of students in an effort to enable them to take full advantage of the choices available to them upon successful completion of their educational programs.

Graduate -- An individual receiving his B.S. Degree in Agriculture and qualifying to teach vocational agriculture at Murray State University.

Employment tenure -- Refers to time employed in occupational area.

Development of the Study

The author becamse interested in evaluating the agricultural education program while the Agriculture Department at Murray State University was making a self-study in the fall of 1972 preparing for a visit from the evaluating team of the Southern Association of Colleges and Universities. The author's major responsibility toward the agriculture department has been as a faculty member for the past five years in the Agricultural Education Division. During each semester the graduates are asked how the program could be made more relevant. It has been the author's belief that until graduates sought employment and had been employed they really could not make a sound evaluation of the program.

A questionnaire was developed, with the approval of a steering committee, and tested on teachers now teaching vocational agriculture. The same questionnaire was mailed to former agricultural education students who had graduated during the period July 1, 1967, to June 30, 1973. The questionnaire measured the years the graduates were enrolled at Murray State University, other colleges attended, hours transferred, year receiving teaching certificate, person making the largest contri-

bution toward influencing graduate to enroll in agriculture at Murray State University, first employment after graduation, income from first year salary, employment pattern, sincere opinion of the agricultural education division, present employment, their 1973 employment, yearly income from their 1973 employment, if a graduate had taught vocational agriculture and had chosen to leave what factors influenced his decision, and educational status. The questionnaire measured how graduates are using their training in agricultural education.

A review of literature and research relating to this study was made and will be presented in Chapter II.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

While doing research on this problem the author found that few studies have been completed that deal directly with occupational choice of agricultural education graduates. Several studies have been made relating to factors influencing vocational choice of graduates of colleges of agriculture and the influence of high school vocational agriculture on success in college and occupational choice after graduation. There has been very little research completed dealing directly with the factors that influence agricultural education graduates to enter the teaching profession, remain in the teaching profession, leave the teaching profession, and seek other employment. From an accountability standpoint, the author did not locate a single study that dealt directly with the following four areas--(1) occupational choice, (2) tenure, (3) selected aspects of employment, and (4) employment patterns--which graduates who have qualified to teach vocational agriculture select after graduation. The author does not wish to imply that this is the only literature related to the topic.

Literature Dealing With Occupational Choice, Tenure, and Selected Aspects

One of the most recent and comprehensive studies dealing directly with occupational choice of agriculture education graduates was

completed by Hoerner (14) in 1965. Hoerner studied by questionnaire 1,022 Bachelor of Science graduates from Iowa State University from January 1, 1940, to July 1, 1964. The primary objective of his study was to determine the factors that influenced the employment tenure of a graduate who qualified to teach vocational agriculture. Some of the major findings were as follow: Eighty-nine percent of the graduates had lived on a farm, and 86.4 percent of their parents were farmers. Approximately 15.8 percent were renters, whereas 59 percent of the parents were farm owner-operators.

More of the fathers (61.6 percent) than mothers (40.5 percent) had obtained less than a high school education. Twenty-one percent of the fathers and 30.3 percent of the mothers had obtained educational training beyond the high school level. Only 7.3 percent of the fathers, compared to 26.8 percent of the mothers, had completed a B.S. degree.

The largest percentage of the graduates (90.4 percent) attended Iowa High Schools, and approximately 60.9 percent enrolled in college within one academic year.

Approximately 47 percent of the graduates, during the period of study, had completed no high school vocational agriculture, but 33.4 percent had completed from seven to eight semesters. Almost 58 percent of the graduates had attended high schools offering a vocational agriculture program.

Family members were responsible for 44.5 percent of the graduates' attendance at college. Twenty-six percent reported that attending Iowa State University was their idea. Approximately 11 percent reported that they were influenced by their high school vocational agriculture teacher. The G. I. or Korean Bill served as the major source of income for college graduates.

Almost 75 percent of the graduates had enrolled at Iowa State University during their freshman year in college. Approximately 53.5 percent of the graduates listed agricultural education as initial curriculum enrollment at Iowa State University.

Approximately 42.3 percent felt they had participated less than average, and 17.4 percent indicated that they had participated more than average in extracurricular college activities.

Only 43 percent of the sample were aware of the vocational agricultural teaching profession prior to college enrollment; 25 percent were not aware until their sophomore year in college. There were 28 percent of the graduates who had not completed any vocational agriculture who indicated an awareness of the teaching profession.

For those teachers who entered the teaching profession directly out of college, the mean tenure was 5.4 years, while the average tenure for all graduates was 3 years.

In the Hoerner (14) study, the factors having the greatest influence on the graduate's decision to enter the first employment area (for all employment areas) were as follow: felt best trained, freedom and independence on the job, working closely with people, and salary. The factors having the least amount of influence on the graduate's decision to enter the first employment area were as follow: ownership of home, evening free, farming opportunity available, close to parental home, good recreational facilities, and health. The graduates that entered the teaching profession listed felt best trained, working closely with people, and salary as having the greatest influence on their decisions to enter their first employment area. The group entering the teaching profession listed two factors as having the least amount of influence;

these were owning of a home and evenings free.

The selected factors listed by graduates as having the greatest influence on their leaving the teaching profession were as follow: long hours and evening responsibilities, salary and advancement opportunity, community factors, interpersonal problems, and failure to adjust to teaching assignment.

Graduates who had qualified to teach vocational agriculture during a 25-year period (January 1, 1940, to July 1, 1964) at Iowa State University indicated that 36 percent had never practiced the profession for which they were trained.

One of the most recent and comprehensive studies dealing directly with factors that related to the tendency of agricultural education graduates of Iowa State University not to enter or to leave the teaching profession was completed by Froehlich (9) in 1966. This study covered the period January 1, 1940, to July 1, 1964. Froehlich studied by questionnaire 823 Bachelor of Science nonteaching graduates. The major purpose of this study was to survey possible environmental factors which had a tendency to influence agricultural education graduates not to enter or to leave the vocational agriculture teaching profession. Some of the major findings were as follow: (1) 86 percent of the nonteaching graduates had lived on a farm; (2) 67 percent of their parents were landowners; (3) 62 percent of fathers had not achieved a high school education; (4) 40 percent of the mothers had not achieved a high school education; (5) 20.6 percent of the fathers and 30.7 percent of the mothers had education beyond the high school level; (6) 33 percent of the nonteaching graduates had completed seven to eight semesters of high school vocational agriculture; (7) 88 percent were graduates of

high schools in the state of Iowa; (8) 40 percent of the graduates listed mothers and fathers as influence for attending college; (9) 27 percent reported attending college was their own idea; (10) 9.4 percent reported they were influenced by their vocational agriculture instructor; (11) 28 percent reported their major reason for attending Iowa State University was because it was the only agriculture college in the state; (12) 21.6 percent reported they attended school at Iowa State University because it offered agricultural education; (13) 15.1 percent reported attending because of Iowa State University's academic prominence; (14) 29 percent reported that enrollment in agricultural education was their own idea; (15) 25 percent reported that they were influenced by their former vocational agriculture teacher; (16) 57 percent of the graduates reported they were married while attending Iowa State University; (17) 77 percent of the graduates reported they were members of the Agriculture Education Club from two to four years, while 13.7 percent reported they were never members; (18) 41 percent reported they had participated less than average, while 17.8 percent reported they had participated more than average, in extracurricular activities; (19) approximately 43 percent of the nonteaching graduates were aware of vocational agriculture teaching profession prior to enrollment in college, while 26.4 percent reported they were not aware of vocational agriculture teaching profession prior to their sophomore year at Iowa State University; (20) the mean tenure of nonteaching graduates was 2.15 years; (21) 43.2 percent of the graduates had never taught; (22) 11.4 percent reported they had taught more than five years, while only 3.4 percent had taught more than ten years; (23) 25 percent of the nonteaching graduates had taught one or two years, while 20.8 percent

reported they had taught from three to five years.

This study found that from 1940 to 1952 nonteaching graduates taught a mean of 3.21 years, whereas the 1953 to 1963 nonteaching graduates taught only a mean of 1.45 years of vocational agriculture. Approximately 50.8 percent of nonteaching graduates reported vocational agriculture teaching as their first employment. Areas with more than 5 percent of the graduates were G.I., on farm training, extension service, and farming.

Listed as the major factors for leaving the teaching profession after teaching from one to five years were the following: (1) lack of advancement opportunity, (2) salary, (3) too many evening responsibilities, (4) long hours, (5) state reports. Factors with least influence were (1) failure of the graduate to adjust to the school schedule, (2) poor rapport with other teachers in school, and (3) religious and ethnic factors.

Major factors listed for leaving after having taught vocational agriculture for more than five years were (1) lack of advancement opportunities, (2) salary, (3) too many evening responsibilities, (4) long hours, (5) lack of opportunity to specialize, and (6) community attitude toward vocational agriculture.

Some of the major implications of this study concerning graduates who were qualified to teach vocational agriculture but who did not enter the profession or left after a short tenure (9) were as follow: (1) The high school vocational agriculture teacher's opinion of the potential student should be gathered in an organized manner and used in counseling and advisement of a student considering studying, and to become qualified, to teach vocational agriculture; (2) what will be

expected of him as a vocational agriculture teacher; (3) why teachers with highest grade point average leave the teaching profession; (4) years of high school vocational agriculture and years membership in Agricultural Education Club was found to be significant to tenure in teaching vocational agriculture; (5) professional attitude of teachers is important if young graduates are to enter and remain in teaching; (6) some problems that must be overcome are lack of freedom and independence in the job, discipline problems, lack of opportunities to specialize, salary, poor community attitude toward vocational agriculture, and other factors.

In 1970 "A Study to Determine Why Oklahoma Agriculture Instructors Changed Their Profession During the 1968-70 School Years and Their New Occupations" was completed by Fenton (8). Fenton studied by questionnaire and opinionnaire 42 teachers who had left the teaching profession and their new occupations. Only 27 of the 42 teachers who were mailed a questionnaire replied, and this gave a 64.3 percent return. Some of the major findings were as follow: (1) Eighteen (40.9 percent) left during the 1968-69 school year; (2) 26 (59.09 percent) left during the 1969-1970 school year; (3) 13 teachers left the Northwest District, 7 left the Central District, and the Southwest and Southeast Districts were left by six each; (4) the list of new vocations for the 42 former vocational agriculture teachers were (a) agriculture-related business, 13, (b) vocational-technical education, 9, (c) farming, 5, (d) high school administration, 4, (e) continuing education, 4, (f) non-related agriculture businesses, 3, (g) retirement, 2, (h) unknown, 2, (i) college teacher, 1, and (j) undecided, 1.

The factor that was checked most often by the teachers that influenced them to leave the teaching profession was the limited chance for promotion. Two other factors that were checked often were insufficient salary and excessive and inconsistent hours.

Personal conflict with administration did not appear very often, but when it did, it was ranked high by the teachers who had left the teaching profession. Of the 27 teachers who returned the questionnaire, only eight teachers felt that being overloaded with work was an influence in their decision to leave the teaching profession. Six teachers indicated that an inadequate retirement plan was important in selecting a new occupation. Two other areas in this study that appeared to have had little influence in teachers' decisions to change occupation were insecurity and excessive reports and paper work.

From this study (8) many of our outstanding vocational agriculture teachers are leaving the teaching profession because of the lack of a chance for advancement. If we are going to keep more of these outstanding vocational agriculture teachers, salary, retirement plan, work schedule, personal business, social life, and chance of advancement must be improved.

In 1970 a study was made in Oklahoma by Harrison (12) which was concerned with "An Identification of Factors Influencing Teachers of Vocational Agriculture to Terminate or Continue High School Teaching."

This study was limited to Agricultural Education graduates of Oklahoma State University who started teaching during the years 1948-1951 in the Northwest, Southwest, and Central Supervisory Districts of Oklahoma. Harrison only used teachers who had completed five or more years of teaching but less than 18 before termination was considered.

The second group consisted of those teachers who continued to teach after 18 or more years. Some of the major findings were as follow: (1) group terminated, salary received; (2) group continuing to teach, salary adequate for the work expected; (3) group terminated, limited chance of promotion; (4) group continuing to teach, feeling of accomplishment and 12 months employment; (5) group terminated, work fewer hours and more time with family; (6) group continuing to teach, stay settled in a rural life situation; (7) group terminated, teaching situation was of little importance; (8) group continuing to teach, teaching situation as the most important factor; (9) group terminated, policies and practices in administration and supervision did not appear important as factors in termination; (10) group continuing to teach, pride in professional status; (11) group terminated, of little influence was community situation; (12) group continuing to teach, benefits of personal freedom and the appreciation of public acclaim was important.

A study by Thompson (23) was concerned with those factors which contributed to the career development of a selected group of former Agricultural Education graduates of Michigan State University. The selected group graduated in Agricultural Education during the years 1952, 1956, 1958, 1960, and 1961. During the five-year period 206 persons qualified to teach vocational agriculture. Sixty-two percent (129) began to teach immediately; 36 percent (47) of the 129 are still teaching and 9 percent (11) were unaccounted for.

Thompson (23) found that former teachers had very stable careers. They did not change teaching jobs frequently and were likely to have only one or two jobs after leaving the agriculture classroom. Most of their families were rural, blue collar workers and usually had a high

school or less education. The majority of the former teachers did not decide to become vocational agriculture teachers until they were enrolled in college. He also found that teachers have high self-expression and people-oriented values and teaching satisfied these values.

A study by Lamberth (17) concerned reasons why teachers of vocational agriculture continued to teach in Tennessee. Some of the major factors were (1) school conditions, (2) school officials should give good teachers the opportunity to transfer to the better teaching positions, (3) attitude and skills developed, and (4) that young men entering the teaching profession must be guided so as to become aware of the many advantages and satisfactions and therefore be more apt to continue teaching vocational agriculture.

Wiegers (26) completed a study in 1965 entitled "A Focus on Agricultural Education Majors Who Graduated From the College of Agriculture, University of Tennessee." The study began with majors who had graduated at the end of the 1955 Summer Quarter and continued through the 1964 Summer Quarter. There were 153 graduates who were studied by questionnaire. Some of the major findings were as follow: (1) Eighty-six percent completed at least one year of vocational agriculture. (2) One hundred of the graduates responded that they decided to major in agricultural education in high school (32 percent), between high school and college (25 percent), or in college (43 percent). (3) The major reasons for majoring in agricultural education were desire to teach boys (70 percent), broad training experience provided in agricultural education curriculum (64 percent), availability of jobs (41 percent), salary (25 percent), social status (25 percent), desire to teach adults (20 per-

cent), and others (25 percent). (4) Persons influencing the graduates' decision to major in agricultural education were vocational agriculture teacher (44 percent), parent or relative (20 percent), college advisor (11 percent), county agent (5 percent), other high school teachers (4 percent), and others (17 percent). (5) It was found in this study that the average grades of graduates now teaching vocational agriculture were slightly lower than non-teaching graduates. (6) It was found that 54 percent of the graduates had taught vocational agriculture at some time, first job was teaching vocational agriculture 52 percent and now teaching vocational agriculture 35 percent. (7) In answer to the question as to why some graduates remained in teaching the following responses were obtained: enjoyed teaching vocational agriculture (94 percent), free to make own plans (61 percent), can earn a satisfactory living (58 percent), like to live in community (56 percent), supplement salary with other income (39 percent), wife works in community (25 percent), and others (14 percent). (8) Reasons why some graduates entered occupations other than teaching vocational agriculture were higher salary (80 percent), advancement and security (69 percent), teaching situation (22 percent), less politics involved (17 percent), more personal freedom (12 percent), family situation (11 percent), community situation (9 percent), too long a work day (7 percent), too much "red tape" (6 percent), image of agriculture (6 percent). (9) Some of the suggested changes given by graduates to make agricultural education more inviting were as follow:

Higher salaries	51 percent
Revised high school curriculum	27 percent
Better facilities and equipment	19 percent
Better public relations	17 percent
Lower pupil load	12 percent

Less politics involved	6 percent
Revised vocational agriculture objectives	6 percent
More chance for advancement	6 percent

This study found more chance for advancement of little value, while other studies found it to be very important.

A study by Lamberth (18) in 1959 was concerned with "Why Teachers of Vocational Agriculture Leave the Profession." Eighty-nine percent of the teachers indicated that salary levels influenced their decision to quit teaching vocational agriculture. Almost 75 percent listed limited chance for promotion as the reason for leaving the teaching profession; approximately 46 percent said it was a major reason and approximately 28 percent reported it was a minor reason. Some other factors that influenced teachers to leave were lack of support of school administrators, lack of suitable schedule for teaching vocational agriculture, lack of community awareness of the job a teacher of vocational agriculture is expected to do, and lack of advancement within the profession.

Similar to Lamberth's (18) and Bryan's (5) findings, Vossler (25) reported that reasons most often mentioned in his study of "Why Former Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in North Dakota Left the Profession" were (1) limited opportunity for advancement, (2) salary, (3) desire for more permanent home, (4) too many extracurricular activities, (5) uncertainty of employment, and (6) lack of adequate facilities for vocational agriculture.

Factors Which Affect Retention of Vocational Agriculture Instructors

A very recent study was completed in 1973 by Brown and Shinn (4) on

the factors which affect retention of vocational agriculture instructors in the southeastern United States. The states included in the study were Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

A total of 257 teachers of vocational agriculture were selected by using a sampling procedure described by Hauskin (15).

The Brown and Shinn study (4) reported the following findings. When the teachers under 40 years of age and over 40 years of age were asked to select a person or persons who had the most influence on their actions as teachers of vocational agriculture, there was a significant difference between the two groups' replies as shown below.

Under-Forty Age Group	Over-Forty Age Group
1. Advisory committee	1. University agricultural education department
2. University agricultural education department	2. Co-worker in system - other teacher
3. Co-worker in system - other teacher	3. Other vocational agriculture instructors
4. Other vocational agriculture teachers	4. Advisory committee
5. Supervisor - state and district	5. Supervisor - state and district
6. Local school administrators	6. Local school administrators

The Brown and Shinn study (4) showed there was not a practical difference between the answers given when the under-forty years of age and the over-forty years of age groups were answering the question, what general areas influence your decision to remain in vocational agriculture teaching.

Under-Forty Age Group	Over-Forty Age Group
1. Security and advancement	1. Security and advancement
2. Administration and supervision	2. Administration and supervision
3. Salary	3. Community situation

Under-Forty Age Group	Over-Forty Age Group
4. Community situation	4. Salary
5. Teaching situation	5. Teaching situation and family and home situation
6. Family and home situation	

There were significant differences between the under-forty years of age group and the over-forty years of age group on 18 of the 31 variables which the teachers reported influenced their decisions to remain teachers of vocational agriculture (4). Listed below are the 18 variables that encouraged the over-forty years of age group to continue to teach.

1. Own home in community
2. Enjoyment of working with young and adult farmers
3. Farming interest in the community
4. Salary adequate for work expected
5. Other business interest in community
6. Enjoyment of teaching high school students
7. Desire a rural life situation
8. Family desires to stay settled
9. Appreciate public acceptance and acclaim
10. Opportunity to develop own program
11. Security in job
12. Teaching load
13. Benefit of personal freedom
14. Provides time for other interests
15. Provides opportunity to move to better job in vocational agriculture
16. Facilities constantly improving
17. Advantages of year-round employment
18. Feeling of accomplishment and success

The following recommendations were drawn from the findings of the Brown and Shinn study (4) and have implication for everyone who is interested in improving the retention of vocational agriculture instructors in the southeastern United States:

1. Agricultural education departments must develop an effective inservice education program for teachers of vocational agriculture.
2. Every department should consider setting up and using advisory committees.
3. Co-worker and other agriculture instructors are important in determining the activities in a vocational agriculture department.

4. School administrators and boards of education should encourage teachers of agriculture to own their own home, live in the school community, receive an adequate salary, twelve-month employment, and take a paid vacation every year.
5. Local administrators should encourage vocational agriculture teachers to teach young or adult farmers because he will be a much more practical teacher of vocational agriculture.
6. Teachers should be encouraged to belong and attend professional meetings.

Summary of Review of Literature

In summary, the literature reviewed made evident that major factors influencing graduates in agricultural education to enter their first employment were (1) felt best trained, (2) freedom and independence on the job, (3) working closely with people, and (4) salary. Among those influencing factors evident for graduates in a decision to leave the teaching profession those most prominent were (1) lack of advancement opportunities, (2) salary, (3) too many evening responsibilities, and (4) long hours.

Teacher educators, state directors of vocational agricultural education, district supervisors, and school administrators must constantly evaluate the educational and in-service programs in agricultural education to encourage more outstanding teachers of vocational agriculture to enter and to remain in the teaching profession and to aid in securing gainful employment in related areas for those electing not to teach.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the design and conduct of this study. The design and conduct of the study were dictated by the main purpose of study, which was to determine the occupational choice, tenure, and selected aspects of the employment patterns of recent Agricultural Education graduates from Murray State University. In order to accomplish the purpose of the study, the following specific objectives were formulated:

1. To provide a general description of graduates with regard to residence and college attendance.
2. To determine persons having the greatest influence on the students' enrollment in Agriculture at Murray State University.
3. To determine initial and current employment, length of tenure, how graduates made contact with their employers, factors that influenced graduates to enter and remain in employment, and gross income from first and present employment. In effect, this will help determine a complete job history of agricultural education graduates.
4. To determine the opinions of former students toward selected functions of the Agricultural Education Division at Murray State University.

5. To determine the factors that influenced graduates who had taught vocational agriculture to leave the field.
6. To determine the advanced degrees that graduates had received or had in progress as of June 30, 1973, and the number of professional organizations relating to graduates' occupational areas.

To collect information on the recent Agricultural Education graduates from Murray State University, the author had to accomplish the following tasks:

1. Determine the population for the study.
2. Develop the instrument for collecting data.
3. Develop the procedure for collecting data.
4. Select the method for analysis of data.

The Study Population

This study was a descriptive research effort and included all the Agricultural Education graduates from Murray State University from July 1, 1967, to June 30, 1973. During the above period 124 graduates qualified to teach vocational agriculture at Murray State University. Any graduate in the above population who did not receive his B. S. Degree in Agriculture from Murray State University was not included. There have been five transfer students who have qualified to teach vocational agriculture; therefore, the population for the study consisted of 119 graduates who were potential teaching candidates.

Development of the Instrument

In formulating the statements used on the instrument the investigator reviewed related literature and instruments that had been used by

previous investigators. In developing a questionnaire, Best (2) listed eight characteristics of a good questionnaire which should be observed in constructing such instruments as follows:

1. It deals with a significant topic, a topic the respondent will recognize as important enough to warrant spending his time in completing. The significance should be clearly and carefully stated on the questionnaire, or in the letter that accompanies it.

2. It seeks only that information which cannot be obtained from other sources such as school reports or census data.

3. It is as short as possible, only long enough to get the essential data. Long questionnaires frequently find their way into the wastebasket.

4. It is attractive in appearance, neatly arranged, and clearly duplicated or printed.

5. Directions are clear and complete, important terms are defined, each question deals with a single idea, all questions are worded as simply and as clearly as possible, and the categories provide an opportunity for easy, accurate, and unambiguous responses.

6. The questions are objective, with no leading suggestions as to the responses desired. Leading questions are just as inappropriate on a questionnaire as they are in a court of law.

7. Questions are presented in good psychological order, proceeding from general to more specific responses. This order helps the respondent to organize his own thinking so that his answers are logical and objective. It may be well to present questions that create a favorable attitude before proceeding to those that may be a bit delicate or intimate. If possible, annoying or embarrassing questions should be avoided.

8. It is easy to tabulate and interpret. It is advisable to preconstruct a tabulation sheet, anticipating how the data will be tabulated and interpreted, before the final form of the question is decided upon. This working backward from a visualization of the final analysis of data is an important step in avoiding ambiguity in questionnaire form.

A mailed questionnaire type instrument was used to collect the majority of the data for this study because it was felt that (1) this type instrument would furnish the necessary data to fulfill the objectives and (2) collecting data by interview would have been impossible because of the energy crisis and the expense involved in interviewing the graduates who were located in several states. This study did not involve sampling. Because of the relatively small number of graduates over the six-year period from July 1, 1967, to June 30, 1973, the entire population was surveyed.

An instrument was developed by adapting parts of those developed by Hoerner (13), Froehlich (9), Hodges (13), and Updyke (24) for securing follow-up information from students. Some additions and deletions were made on these instruments so the investigator could secure certain types of relevant information. Six major areas were covered by the instrument including the following:

1. Position of person influencing student to enroll in agriculture at Murray State University
2. Employment after graduation
3. Employment record
4. Agricultural education program assessment
5. Present employment

6. Educational status

When the instrument was formulated it was placed into the hands of agricultural education teachers, faculty members, and graduate students for review and evaluation. Interview with the above-mentioned individuals were conducted, and necessary changes, deletions, and additions were made for clarity. It was then submitted to the investigator's doctoral advisory committee for their critical review and suggestions. Suggestions were made by the advisory committee, and these were incorporated into the final form of the instrument.

Collection of the Data

The instrument was completed in late November, 1973, with the conduct of a pilot test among graduate students at Oklahoma State University. This group reported no difficulties in understanding and/or completing the instrument; so it was finalized.

On December 1, 1973, each respondent selected for the study was mailed an instrument along with a cover letter and a personal note from the investigator written on the cover letter. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was enclosed for the graduate to return the completed instrument. By December 20, 1973, 82 completed instruments had been returned. Because of the Christmas holidays and the resulting "backlog" of mail, the decision to mail a follow-up letter was delayed in favor of a personal telephone call to the individuals who had not returned their completed instruments. The investigator traveled to Murray State University on December 27, 1973, and worked the following two days telephoning non-respondents. This resulted in obtaining survey forms from all but eight of the graduates.

On January 14, 1974, the eight non-respondents were mailed new instruments with further encouragement from the investigator on the cover letter. On January 28, 1974, the remaining non-respondents received a telephone call from the Agricultural Education Division at Murray State University encouraging them to complete and mail the instrument. By Monday, February 11, 1974, the last instrument had been returned, thus yielding a 100 percent return.

Analysis of the Data

The following description of the analysis procedure is included to provide an overview of the statistical treatment of the data collected from the 119 graduates for the period from July 1, 1967, to June 30, 1973. In analyzing one part of the instrument, a Likert-type scale which was a continuum from very much influence through no influence was used. To permit statistical treatment of data, numerical values were assigned to the response categories in the following pattern:

Response Categories	Numerical Value	Range of Actual Limits for Categories
Very Much Influence	4	3.5 - 4.00
Much Influence	3	2.5 - 3.49
Some Influence	2	1.5 - 2.49
Little Influence	1	0.5 - 1.49
No Influence	0	0.0 - 0.49

The establishment of the foregoing pattern facilitated interpretation of the findings. For example, if the mean numerical response of the graduates to a certain question was computed to be 2.64, then according to the range of numerical values set up, the graduates' mean response to the statement in question would be "much" influence.

In another part of the instrument a Likert-type scale which was a continuum from Excellent through Poor was used. For statistical treatment of these data, numerical values were assigned to the response categories in the following pattern:

Response Categories	Numerical Value	Range of Actual Limits for Categories
Excellent	5	4.50 and above
Good	4	3.50 - 4.49
Satisfactory	3	2.50 - 3.49
Fair	2	1.50 - 2.49
Poor	1	1.49 and below

In this case, if the mean numerical response of the graduates was computed to be 3.54, then according to the range of numerical values the graduates' mean response to the statement in question would be "good."

The data were compiled and tabulated in a manner designed to disclose findings related to the purpose and objectives of the study. Since this research effort was primarily of a descriptive nature, statistics such as arithmetic averages, percentages, and mean responses were selected as appropriate means of describing the findings.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The primary purpose of this study was to compile information on graduates who had received the Bachelor of Science Degree in Agriculture from Murray State University and qualified to teach vocational agriculture. This study determined the different occupations that graduates had selected, their tenure, and other selected aspects of their employment patterns.

After data were collected through a mailed-type instrument, they were tabulated and analyzed by appropriate techniques to describe the findings. Since this research effort was primarily of a descriptive nature (a follow-up study) only descriptive statistics were applied to the findings.

Findings of the Study

Findings of the study are presented according to the manner in which they apply to the specific objectives of the study.

Data in Table I indicate that 98 (82.4 percent) of the graduates were Kentucky residents, while 21 (17.6 percent) were from out-of-state. It can be observed that in 1967 only one graduate was from out-of-state and, therefore, he was the only transfer student of the group. In 1968 there were three transfer students, with two being out-of-state junior college transfers while the other transferred from a Kentucky

TABLE I

STATUS OF GRADUATES IN TERMS OF RESIDENCE, TRANSFER HOURS, AND TIME OF GRADUATION

Items of Transfer	Distribution of Graduates by Year														Total N = 119	
	1967 N = 7		1968 N = 19		1969 N = 20		1970 N = 16		1971 N = 15		1972 N = 29		1973 N = 13			
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent
Transfer of Credits																
Non-Transfer	6	86.0	16	84.0	13	65.0	14	87.5	6	40.0	23	79.3	8	61.5	86	72.3
In-State																
Junior College	--	--	1	5.0	1	5.0	--	--	4	26.7	2	6.9	4	30.8	12	10.1
Other College	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	12.5	2	13.3	--	--	--	--	4	3.4
Out-of-State																
Junior College	--	--	2	11.0	2	10.0	--	--	3	20.0	2	6.9	1	7.7	10	8.4
Other College	1	14.0	--	--	4	20.0	--	--	--	--	2	6.9	--	--	7	5.9
Hours Transferred																
1-20	1	100.0	--	--	1	14.3	1	50.0	3	33.3	1	16.7	--	--	7	21.2
21-40	--	--	2	75.0	4	5.7	1	50.0	1	11.1	2	33.3	--	--	10	30.3
41-60	--	--	1	25.0	2	28.6	--	--	2	22.2	1	16.7	--	--	6	18.2
61-80	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	33.3	2	33.3	5	100.0	10	30.3
Residence																
Kentucky	6	86.0	13	68.0	15	75.0	16	100.0	10	80.0	25	86.2	11	84.6	98	82.4
Out-of-State	1	14.0	6	32.0	5	25.0	--	--	3	20.0	4	13.8	2	15.4	21	17.6

junior college. In 1969 there were seven transfer students, with six being out-of-state, two being junior college and four being other college transferees, while the other transferred from a Kentucky junior college. It can be observed that in 1970 only two graduates were transfer students from Kentucky colleges, and, therefore, they were the only transfer students of the group. In 1971 there were nine transfer students, with three from out-of-state junior colleges, four from Kentucky junior colleges, and two from other colleges in Kentucky. There were six transfer students in 1972, with four being from out-of-state, two from junior colleges and two from other college transfers, while two transferred from a Kentucky junior college. Of those who did transfer, 17 (51.5 percent) transferred from 1 to 40 hours, while the remaining 16 (48.5 percent) of the graduates transferred from 41 to 80 semester hours.

Data in Table I also reveal that by year of graduation there were 6 non-transfers in 1967, 16 non-transfers in 1968, 13 non-transfers in 1969, 14 non-transfers in 1970, 6 non-transfers in 1971, 23 non-transfers in 1972, and 8 non-transfers in 1973. Thus, a grand total of 86 (72.3 percent) of the graduates surveyed were non-transfers.

As determined by a summary of data presented in Table II, persons having the greatest influence on students' enrollment at Murray State University, in order, as established by overall frequency of responses were (1) vocational agriculture teachers, named by 46 (38.7 percent) of the graduates. (2) It was their "own idea" as indicated by 32 (26.9 percent). (3) Father or guardian was listed by 12 (10.1 percent) of the graduates. (4) A friend presently enrolled was most influential for 11 (9.2 percent) of the graduates. (5) A relative other than parents

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF GRADUATES BY YEAR OF GRADUATION AS TO THE PERSON HAVING THE GREATEST INFLUENCE ON ENROLLMENT IN AGRICULTURE AT MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY

Person Influencing Enrollment	1967 (N = 7)		1968 (N = 19)		1969 (N = 20)		1970 (N = 16)		1971 (N = 15)		1972 (N = 29)		1973 (N = 13)		Overall (N = 119)	
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent
Father or guardian	1	14.3	1	5.3	3	15.0	2	12.5			4	13.8	1	7.7	12	10.1
Mother or guardian					1	5.0									1	.84
Vo-Ag instructor	3	42.9	10	52.6	5	25.0	10	62.5	6	40.0	7	24.1	5	38.5	46	38.7
College counselor											1	3.5			1	.84
Relative other than parents	1	14.3	1	5.3					1	6.7	5	17.2			8	6.7
College agriculture faculty member									1	6.7			1	7.7	2	1.7
Other college representative									1	6.7	1	3.5			2	1.7
Friends			4	21.1	1	5.0	1	6.3	1	6.7	4	13.8			11	9.2
Own idea	1	14.3	2	10.5	10	50.0	3	18.8	4	26.7	6	20.7	6	46.2	32	26.9
Other*	1	14.3	1	5.3					1	6.7	1	3.5			4	3.4

*Other reasons included "Murray is my home," "enjoyed agriculture," "wife's idea," and "own idea farming."

influenced eight (6.7 percent) of the respondents. (6) Other influences such as "Murray is my home," "enjoy agriculture," "wife's idea," and "own idea farming" were reasons given by four (3.4 percent) graduates. (7) College agriculture faculty members and other college representatives influenced two (1.7 percent) persons. (9) Mother or guardian and college counselor each influenced one (0.84 percent) graduate's enrollment in agriculture at Murray State University. While the vocational agriculture instructors' influence was first in most cases, it can be observed that in 1969 ten (50.0 percent) and in 1973 six (46.2 percent) of the graduates responded that it was their "own idea" to enroll in agriculture at Murray State University. It is noteworthy that friends presently enrolled at Murray State University and father or guardian received almost equal responses from graduates.

Employment Patterns of Graduates

In order to provide a comparison of practices used by graduates in contacting their first employer, Table III was developed. It was found that practices followed most often and the proportion of graduates utilizing a method were (1) made inquiry requesting employment 49 (41.2 percent); (2) college counselor 42 (35.2 percent); (3) farming 14 (11.8 percent); (4) teacher placement service 5 (4.2 percent); (5) friend or others informed you of the opportunity and presently in graduate school 3 (2.5 percent); (7) college of agriculture placement service, contacted by employer, and other, specify "job interview" at Murray State University 1 (0.84 percent). It should be noted in Table III that the practice "made inquiry requesting employment" was first for all groups of graduates except those for the years 1967 and 1973. These graduates

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF PRACTICES USED BY GRADUATES TO CONTACT THEIR FIRST EMPLOYER

Practices Used	Distribution of Graduates by Years and Practices Used														Total by Practices Used	
	1967		1968		1969		1970		1971		1972		1973			
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent
College of Agriculture Placement Service			1	5.3											1	0.8
Teacher Placement Service							4	25.0	1	6.7					5	4.2
College counselor	6	85.7	6	31.6	7	35.0	4	25.0	6	40.0	8	27.6	5	38.5	42	35.3
Answered an ad or listing																
Made inquiry requesting employment	1	14.3	10	52.6	10	50.0	6	37.5	7	46.7	11	37.9	4	30.5	49	41.2
Contacted by employer									1	6.7					1	0.8
Friend or others informed you of the opportunity					1	5.0					1	3.4	1	7.7	3	2.5
State employment agency																
Private employment agency																
Other, specify--Job interview at MSU			1	5.3											1	0.8
Presently in military service																
Presently in graduate school					1	5.0					1	3.4	1	7.7	3	2.5
Farming			1	5.3	1	5.0	2	12.5			8	27.6	2	15.4	14	11.8
Totals	7		19		20		16		15		29		13		119	

most frequently used college counselors. It is interesting that in 1972 eight (27.6 percent) of the graduates returned to farming, while no graduates returned to farming during 1967 and 1971. None of the graduates reported answered an ad or listing, state employment agency private employment agency, and presently in military service as practices in contacting their first employer.

To analyze responses regarding the factors which influenced graduates to enter their first employment, a Likert-type scale which was a continuum from very much influence through no influence was used. To permit statistical treatment of data, numerical values were assigned to the response categories in the following pattern:

Response Categories	Numerical Value	Range of Actual Limits for Categories
Very Much Influence	4	3.5 - 4.00
Much Influence	3	2.5 - 3.49
Some Influence	2	1.5 - 2.49
Little Influence	1	0.5 - 1.49
No Influence	0	0.0 - 0.49

Inspection of data in Table IV reveals the factors influencing 1967 graduates' decisions to enter their first employment. The factors which had "much" influence on the graduates' decisions as determined by mean responses, listed after the factors, were felt best trained in this area, 3.29; working closely with people, 2.86; freedom and independence of the job and security, 2.71. The factors which had "some" influence on the graduates' decisions to enter their first employment and their mean responses were salary, 2.43; wife happy with line of employment, 2.00; educational facilities, 1.86; opportunity for advancement, 1.71; close to parental home, 1.57. "Little" influencing factors on the

TABLE IV

FACTORS INFLUENCING 1967 GRADUATES TO ENTER THEIR FIRST EMPLOYMENT (N = 7)

Influencing Factors	Distribution of Graduates by Factor of Influence										Mean Response*
	Very Much		Much		Some		Little		None		
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	
Salary	1	14.3	2	28.6	3	42.9	1	14.3			2.43
Working closely with people	2	28.6	3	42.9	1	14.3	1	14.3			2.86
Freedom and independence of the job	2	28.6	2	28.6	2	28.6	1	14.3			2.71
Security	3	42.9	1	14.3	1	14.3	2	28.6			2.71
Felt best trained in this area	3	42.9	3	42.9	1	14.3					3.29
Farming opportunity available							1	14.3	6	85.7	0.14
Good hours					3	42.9	2	28.6	2	28.6	1.14
Opportunity for advancement	1	14.3	1	14.3			5	71.4			1.71
Evenings free			1	14.3			3	42.9	3	42.9	0.86
Close to parental home	2	28.6			1	14.3	1	14.3	3	42.9	1.57
Own my own house					1	14.3			6	85.7	0.29
Wife happy with line of employment			4	57.1	1	14.3			2	28.6	2.00
Good recreational facilities in area			1	14.3	1	14.3	2	28.6	3	42.9	1.00
Educational facilities	1	14.3	1	14.3	3	42.9			2	28.6	1.86
Prestige of position					4	57.1			3	42.9	0.57
Health factors					2	28.6			5	71.4	0.29

*Mean response based on following scale: Very Much = 4; Much = 3; Some = 2; Little = 1; None = 0.

graduates' decisions to enter their first employment area and the respective mean responses were good hours, 1.14; good recreational facilities in area, 1.00; evening free, 0.86; and prestige of position, 0.57. Health factors, owning homes, and farming opportunities were factors having slightly more than "no" influence on graduates' decisions to enter their first employment. It should be noted there were no mean responses in the "very much influence" category.

Reported in Table V are the findings regarding factors influencing 1968 graduates' decisions to enter their first employment. The factors which had "much" influence on the graduates' decisions to enter their first employment area and corresponding mean responses were working closely with people, 2.89; freedom and independence of the job, 2.74; farming opportunity available, 2.68; security, 2.63; felt best trained in this area, 2.53. The factors which had "some" influence on the graduates' decisions to enter their first employment as determined by mean responses indicated with each were opportunity for advancement, 2.11; good hours and prestige of position, 1.95; salary, 1.84; wife happy with line of employment, 1.79; and educational facilities, 1.53. The factors which had "little" influence on the graduates' decisions to enter their first employment were health factors, 1.42; evenings free, 1.26; close to parental home, own my own house, and good recreational facilities in the area, 1.16. There were no factors in the "very much" and "no" influence categories for this group of graduates.

Table VI provides a summary of factors influencing 1969 graduates' decisions to enter their first employment. The factor which had "much" influence, with a 3.00 mean response, on the graduates' decisions to enter their first employment was felt best trained in this area. The

TABLE V

FACTORS INFLUENCING 1968 GRADUATES TO ENTER THEIR FIRST EMPLOYMENT (N = 19)

Influencing Factors	Distribution of Graduates by Factor of Influence										Mean Response*
	Very Much		Much		Some		Little		None		
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	
Salary	2	10.5	1	5.3	10	52.6	4	21.1	2	10.5	1.84
Working closely with people	6	31.6	6	31.6	6	31.6	1	5.3			2.89
Freedom and independence of the job	5	26.3	6	31.6	6	31.6	2	10.5			2.74
Security	3	15.8	9	47.4	4	21.1	3	15.8			2.63
Felt best trained in this area	3	15.8	7	36.8	7	36.8	1	5.3	1	5.3	2.53
Farming opportunity available	2	10.5	6	31.6	3	15.8	1	5.3	7	36.8	2.68
Good hours	2	10.5	4	21.1	6	31.6	5	26.3	2	10.5	1.95
Opportunity for advancement	4	21.1	5	26.3	5	26.3	3	15.8	2	10.5	2.11
Evenings free	1	5.3	3	15.8	3	15.8	5	26.3	7	36.8	1.26
Close to parental home	1	5.3	3	15.8	3	15.8	3	15.8	9	47.4	1.16
Own my own house	3	15.8	1	5.3	3	15.8	1	5.3	11	57.9	1.16
Wife happy with line of employment	4	21.1	4	21.1	3	15.8			8	42.1	1.79
Good recreational facilities in area	3	15.8			3	15.8	4	21.1	9	47.4	1.16
Educational facilities	2	10.5	3	15.8	4	21.1	4	21.1	6	31.6	1.53
Prestige of position	2	10.5	2	10.5	9	47.4	5	26.3	1	5.3	1.95
Health factors	1	5.3	3	15.8	5	26.3	4	21.1	6	31.6	1.42

*Mean response based on following scale: Very Much = 4; Much = 3; Some = 2; Little = 1; None = 0.

TABLE VI

FACTORS INFLUENCING 1969 GRADUATES TO ENTER THEIR FIRST EMPLOYMENT (N = 20)

Influencing Factors	Distribution of Graduates by Factor of Influence										Mean Response*
	Very Much		Much		Some		Little		None		
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	
Salary	3	15.0	2	10.0	12	60.0	2	10.0	1	5.0	2.20
Working closely with people	2	10.0	6	30.0	6	30.0	2	10.0	4	20.0	2.00
Freedom and independence of the job	4	20.0	4	20.0	3	15.0	4	20.0	5	25.0	1.90
Security	6	30.0	3	15.0	7	35.0	2	10.0	2	10.0	2.45
Felt best trained in this area	7	35.0	9	45.0	2	10.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	3.00
Farming opportunity available	3	15.0	5	25.0	5	25.0	1	5.0	6	30.0	1.90
Good hours	5	25.0	2	10.0	6	30.0	3	15.0	4	20.0	2.05
Opportunity for advancement	1	5.0	5	25.0	4	20.0	8	40.0	2	10.0	1.75
Evenings free	2	10.0	4	20.0	3	15.0	6	30.0	5	25.0	1.60
Close to parental home	6	30.0	1	5.0	3	15.0	4	20.0	6	30.0	1.85
Own my own house	3	15.0	3	15.0	2	10.0	2	10.0	10	50.0	1.35
Wife happy with line of employment	5	25.0	6	30.0	2	10.0	1	5.0	6	30.0	2.15
Good recreational facilities in area	1	5.0			6	30.0	5	25.0	8	40.0	1.05
Educational facilities	1	5.0	3	15.0	7	35.0	3	15.0	6	30.0	1.50
Prestige of position	2	10.0	3	15.0	3	15.0	8	40.0	4	20.0	1.55
Health factors			2	10.0	4	20.0	3	15.0	11	55.0	0.85

*Mean response based on following scale: Very Much = 4; Much = 3; Some = 2; Little = 1; None = 0.

factors which had "some" influence on the graduates' decisions to enter their first employment and their mean responses were security, 2.45; salary, 2.20; wife happy with line of employment, 2.15; good hours, 2.05; working closely with people, 2.00; freedom and independence of the job and farming opportunity available, 1.90; close to parental home, 1.85; opportunity for advancement, 1.75; evenings free, 1.60; prestige of position, 1.55; and educational facilities, 1.50. The factors and mean responses for each which had "little" influence on the graduates' decisions to enter their first employment were own my own house, 1.35; good recreational facilities in the area, 1.05; and health factors, 0.85. It should be noted that there were no mean responses in the "very much" or "no" influence categories.

Table VII was developed to illustrate the factors influencing 1970 graduates' decisions to enter their first employment. The factor which had "much" influence on the graduates' decisions to enter their first employment was felt best trained in this area, with a 2.81 mean response. The factors which had "some" influence on the graduates' decisions to enter their first employment were freedom and independence of the job, 2.31; security, 2.25; working closely with people, 2.19; farming opportunity available, 2.00; wife happy with line of employment, prestige of position, and good hours, 1.88; opportunity for advancement and evenings free, 1.81; salary and close to parental home, 1.69; and educational facilities, 1.56. The factors which had "little" influence on the graduates' decisions to enter their first employment and their computed mean responses were good recreational facilities in the area, 1.00; health factors, 0.56; and own my own house, 0.50. No mean responses in the "very much" and "no" influence categories were found among this group.

TABLE VII

FACTORS INFLUENCING 1970 GRADUATES TO ENTER THEIR FIRST EMPLOYMENT (N = 16)

Influencing Factors	Distribution of Graduates by Factor of Influence										Mean Response*
	Very Much		Much		Some		Little		None		
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	
Salary	1	6.3	2	10.5	7	43.8	3	18.8	3	18.8	1.69
Working closely with people	3	18.3	1	6.3	9	56.3	2	10.5	1	6.3	2.19
Freedom and independence of the job	4	25.0	4	25.0	4	25.0	1	6.3	3	18.8	2.31
Security	1	6.3	6	37.5	5	31.3	4	25.0			2.25
Felt best trained in this area	3	18.8	10	62.5	1	6.3	1	6.3	1	6.3	2.81
Farming opportunity available	5	31.3	2	10.5	2	10.5	2	10.5	5	31.3	2.00
Good hours	2	10.5	3	18.8	5	31.3	3	18.8	3	18.8	1.88
Opportunity for advancement	1	6.3	2	10.5	8	50.0	3	18.8	2	10.5	1.81
Evenings free	1	6.3	4	25.0	5	31.3	3	18.8	3	18.8	1.81
Close to parental home	2	10.5	3	18.8	4	25.0	2	10.5	5	31.3	1.69
Own my own house	1	6.3			1	6.3	2	10.5	12	75.0	0.50
Wife happy with line of employment	2	10.5	4	25.0	5	31.3			5	31.3	1.88
Good recreational facilities in area			3	18.8	1	6.3	5	31.3	7	43.8	1.00
Educational facilities	1	6.3	3	18.8	3	18.8	6	37.5	3	18.8	1.56
Prestige of position	1	6.3	4	25.0	5	31.3	4	25.0	2	10.5	1.88
Health factors					1	6.3	7	43.8	8	50.0	0.56

*Mean response based on following scale: Very Much = 4; Much = 3; Some = 2; Little = 1; None = 0.

A summary of responses presented in Table VIII reveals details about factors influencing 1971 graduates to enter their first employment. The factors which had "much" influence on the graduates' decisions to enter their first employment and their respective mean responses were good hours, 2.87, and security, 2.60. The mean responses calculated for some factors indicated these had "some" influence on the graduates' decisions to enter their first employment. These were freedom and independence of the job and felt best trained in this area, 2.33; working closely with people, 2.27; salary, 2.20; wife happy with line of employment, 1.93; evenings free and prestige of position, 1.80; educational facilities, 1.67; farming opportunity available and close to parental home, 1.53. The factors which had "little" influence on the 1971 graduates' decisions to enter their first employment and their mean responses were opportunity for advancement, 1.47; health factors, 1.40; and good recreational facilities in area and own my own house, 1.33. The "very much" and "no" influence categories received no responses from this group for any factor listed.

In Table IX are factors influencing 1972 graduates' decisions to enter their first employment. Mean responses of this group disclosed factors which had "some" influence on the graduates' decisions to enter their first employment as being salary, 2.31; freedom and independence of the job, 2.28; farming opportunity available, 2.21; felt best trained in this area, 2.17; security, 2.14; close to parental home, 2.10; educational facilities, 2.00; good hours and opportunity for advancement, 1.90; wife happy with line of employment, 1.83; working closely with people, 1.79; prestige of position, 1.72; and evenings free, 1959. The factors which had "little" influence on the graduates'

TABLE VIII

FACTORS INFLUENCING 1971 GRADUATES TO ENTER THEIR FIRST EMPLOYMENT (N = 15)

Influencing Factors	Distribution of Graduates by Factor of Influence										Mean Response*
	Very Much		Much		Some		Little		None		
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	
Salary	2	12.5	3	20.0	6	40.0	4	26.7			2.20
Working closely with people	4	26.7	4	26.7	6	40.0			1	6.7	2.27
Freedom and independence of the job	3	20.0	4	26.7	4	26.7	3	20.0	1	6.7	2.33
Security	4	26.7	4	26.7	5	33.3	1	6.7	1	6.7	2.60
Felt best trained in this area	5	33.3	2	12.5	4	26.7	1	6.7	3	20.0	2.33
Farming opportunity available	3	20.0	1	6.7	2	12.5	4	26.7	5	33.3	1.53
Good hours	4	26.7	7	46.7	3	20.0			1	6.7	2.87
Opportunity for advancement			3	20.0	4	26.7	5	33.3	3	20.0	1.47
Evenings free	3	20.0	2	12.5	2	12.5	3	20.0	5	33.3	1.80
Close to parental home	3	20.0	2	12.5	2	12.5	1	6.7	7	46.7	1.53
Own my own house	2	12.5	2	12.5	2	12.5			9	60.0	1.20
Wife happy with line of employment	3	20.0	3	20.0	4	26.7			5	33.3	1.93
Good recreational facilities in area	1	6.7	1	6.7	5	33.3	3	20.0	5	33.3	1.33
Educational facilities	1	6.7	1	6.7	8	53.3	2	12.5	3	20.0	1.67
Prestige of position	1	6.7	4	26.7	5	33.3	1	6.7	4	26.7	1.80
Health factors	1	6.7	4	26.7	2	12.5	1	6.7	7	46.7	1.40

*Mean response based on following scale: Very Much = 4; Much = 3; Some = 2; Little = 1; None = 0.

TABLE IX

FACTORS INFLUENCING 1972 GRADUATES TO ENTER THEIR FIRST EMPLOYMENT (N = 29)

Influencing Factors	Distribution of Graduates by Factor of Influence										Mean Response*
	Very Much		Much		Some		Little		None		
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	
Salary	6	20.7	5	17.2	13	44.8	2	6.9	3	10.3	2.31
Working closely with people	4	13.8	5	17.2	9	31.0	7	24.1	4	13.8	1.79
Freedom and independence of the job	7	24.1	7	24.1	6	20.7	5	17.2	4	13.8	2.28
Security	5	17.2	6	20.7	10	34.5	4	13.8	4	13.8	2.14
Felt best trained in this area	8	27.6	5	17.2	5	17.2	6	20.7	5	17.2	2.17
Farming opportunity available	11	37.9	4	13.8	3	10.3	2	6.9	9	31.0	2.21
Good hours	3	10.3	7	24.1	8	27.6	6	20.7	5	17.2	1.90
Opportunity for advancement	2	6.9	9	31.0	7	24.1	6	20.7	5	17.2	1.90
Evenings free	4	13.8	4	13.8	6	20.7	6	20.7	9	31.0	1.59
Close to parental home	7	24.1	6	20.7	6	20.7	3	10.3	7	24.1	2.10
Own my own house	5	17.2	3	10.3	3	10.3	3	10.3	15	51.7	1.31
Wife happy with line of employment	4	13.8	7	24.1	7	24.1	2	6.9	9	31.0	1.83
Good recreational facilities in area	2	6.9	4	13.8	7	24.1	6	20.7	10	34.5	1.38
Educational facilities	5	17.2	6	20.7	7	24.1	6	20.7	5	17.2	2.00
Prestige of position	2	6.9	4	13.8	12	41.4	6	20.7	5	17.2	1.72
Health factors	2	6.9	4	13.8	7	24.1	5	17.2	11	37.9	1.34

*Mean response based on following scale: Very Much = 4; Much = 3; Some = 2; Little = 1; None = 0.

decisions to enter their first employment according to mean response levels were good recreational facilities in the area, 1.38; health factors, 1.34; and own my own house, 1.31. There were no mean responses in the "very much" and "much" influence categories. Most of the mean responses were included in the "some" influence category.

The data in Table X are offered to summarize the factors influencing 1973 graduates' decisions to enter their first employment. The two factors which had "much" influence on the graduates, and the accompanying mean responses, were freedom and independence of the job, 2.77, and felt best trained in this area, 2.69. The factors which mean responses indicated had "some" influence on the graduates' decisions to enter their first employment were working closely with people and educational facilities, 2.31; opportunity for advancement, 2.23; good hours, 2.15; security, 2.08; farming opportunity available and evenings free, 1.92; wife happy with line of employment, 1.77; salary and good recreational facilities in the area, 1.62. The mean responses of the group toward four factors disclosed these had "little" influence on the graduates' decisions to enter their first employment. Included in this category were close to parental home, 1.46; own my own house and prestige of position, 1.38; and health factors, 1.23. None of the factors included on the survey form received "very much" or "no" influence responses from any group members.

Table XI is a summary of the mean response of all graduates for the period from July 1, 1967, to June 30, 1973, as to the influence of selected factors on their selection of first employment. It should be noted that when a comparison was made between the total group mean response and a given year, the factor which had "much" influence on the

TABLE X

FACTORS INFLUENCING 1973 GRADUATES TO ENTER THEIR FIRST EMPLOYMENT (N = 13)

Influencing Factors	Distribution of Graduates by Factor of Influence										Mean Response*
	Very Much		Much		Some		Little		None		
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	
Salary	1	7.7	3	23.1	5	38.7	1	7.7	3	23.1	1.62
Working closely with people	2	15.4	5	38.7	3	23.1	1	7.7	2	15.4	2.31
Freedom and independence of the job	3	23.1	5	38.7	4	30.8	1	7.7			2.77
Security	1	7.7	4	30.8	4	30.8	3	23.1	1	7.7	2.08
Felt best trained in this area	6	46.2	1	7.7	4	30.8			2	15.4	2.69
Farming opportunity available	4	30.8			4	30.8	1	7.7	4	30.8	1.92
Good hours	4	30.8	2	15.4	2	15.4	2	15.4	3	23.1	2.15
Opportunity for advancement	1	7.7	5	38.7	5	38.7			2	15.4	2.23
Evenings free	3	23.1	3	23.1	1	7.7	2	15.4	4	30.8	1.92
Close to parental home	3	23.1	1	7.7	2	15.4			7	53.9	1.46
Own my own house	3	23.1	1	7.7	1	7.7	1	7.7	7	53.9	1.38
Wife happy with line of employment	2	15.4	2	15.4	4	30.8	1	7.7	4	30.8	1.77
Good recreational facilities in area	2	15.4	2	15.4	3	23.1	1	7.7	5	38.7	1.62
Educational facilities	4	30.8	3	23.1	2	15.4	1	7.7	3	23.1	2.31
Prestige of position			4	30.8	2	15.4	2	15.4	5	38.7	1.38
Health factors			3	23.1	3	23.1	1	7.7	6	46.2	1.23

*Mean response based on following scale: Very Much = 4; Much = 3; Some = 2; Little = 1; None = 0.

TABLE XI

COMPARISON OF MEAN RESPONSES TO FACTORS INFLUENCING GRADUATES TO ENTER THEIR FIRST EMPLOYMENT

	Mean Response by Year															
	1967 N = 7		1968 N = 19		1969 N = 20		1970 N = 16		1971 N = 15		1972 N = 29		1973 N = 13		Total Group N = 119	
Influencing Factors	Mean Response		Mean Response		Mean Response		Mean Response		Mean Response		Mean Response		Mean Response		Mean Response	
Salary	2.43	Some	1.84	Some	2.20	Some	1.69	Some	2.20	Some	2.31	Some	1.62	Some	2.08	Some
Working closely with people	2.86	Much	2.89	Much	2.00	Some	2.19	Some	2.27	Some	1.79	Some	2.31	Some	2.32	Some
Freedom and independence on the job	2.71	Much	2.74	Much	1.90	Some	2.31	Some	2.33	Some	2.28	Some	2.77	Much	2.38	Some
Security	2.71	Much	2.63	Much	2.45	Some	2.25	Some	2.60	Much	2.14	Some	2.08	Some	2.37	Some
Felt best trained in this area	3.29	Much	2.53	Much	3.00	Much	2.81	Much	2.33	Some	2.17	Some	2.69	Much	2.60	Much
Farming opportunity available	0.14	No	2.68	Much	1.90	Some	2.00	Some	1.53	Some	2.21	Some	1.92	Some	1.82	Some
Good hours	1.14	Little	1.95	Some	2.05	Some	1.88	Some	2.87	Much	1.90	Some	2.15	Some	2.03	Some
Opportunity for advancement	1.71	Some	2.11	Some	1.75	Some	1.81	Some	1.47	Little	1.90	Some	2.23	Some	1.90	Some
Evenings free	0.86	Little	1.26	Little	1.60	Some	1.81	Some	1.80	Some	1.59	Some	1.92	Some	1.57	Some
Close to parental home	1.57	Some	1.16	Little	1.85	Some	1.69	Some	1.53	Some	2.10	Some	1.46	Little	1.68	Some
Own my own house	0.29	No	1.16	Little	1.35	Little	0.50	Little	1.20	Little	1.31	Little	1.38	Little	1.12	Little
Wife happy with line of employment	2.00	Some	1.79	Some	2.15	Some	1.88	Some	1.93	Some	1.83	Some	1.77	Some	1.90	Some
Good recreational facilities in area	1.00	Little	1.16	Little	1.05	Little	1.00	Little	1.33	Little	1.38	Little	1.62	Some	1.24	Little
Educational facilities	1.86	Some	1.53	Some	1.50	Some	1.56	Some	1.67	Some	2.00	Some	2.31	Some	1.76	Some
Prestige of position	0.57	Little	1.95	Some	1.55	Some	1.88	Some	1.80	Some	1.72	Some	1.38	Little	1.69	Some
Health factors	0.29	No	1.42	Little	0.85	Little	0.56	Little	1.40	Little	1.34	Little	1.23	Little	1.12	Little

Mean response based on scale: Very Much Influence = 3.5-4.0; Much Influence = 2.5-3.49; Some Influence = 1.5-2.49; Little Influence = 0.5-1.49; No Influence = 0.0-0.49.

graduates' decisions to enter first employment was felt best trained in this area, with a mean response of 2.60. Upon comparison of the groups of graduates by years, it was found that the mean responses ranged from a low of 2.17 for the 1972 group to a high of 3.29 for the 1967 group. Freedom and independence on the job was second in the total group mean response with a 2.38 mean response of "some" influence. When comparing among groups by years, it was found that the mean responses ranged from a low of 1.90 for the 1962 group to a high of 2.77 for the 1973 group. Groups indicated by years that security was third in the total group response, with a 2.37 mean response of "some" influence. Through comparisons among groups by years of graduation, it was found that the mean responses ranged from a low of 2.08 for the 1973 group to a high of 2.71 for the 1967 group. Groups ranked working closely with people fourth with an overall mean response of 2.32--"some" influence. Upon comparison of all groups by years, it was found that the mean response ranged from a low of 1.79 for the 1972 group to a high of 2.89 for the 1968 group. The graduates rated salary fifth with a 2.08 mean response--"some" influence. All groups rated it as having "some" influence, with mean responses ranging from a low of 1.62 for the 1973 group to a high of 2.43 for the 1967 group. Further inspection of Table XI revealed that good hours rated sixth, with a total group response of 2.03, or "some" influence. It should be noted that upon comparison of graduates' responses by years it was found that the mean responses ranged from a low of 1.14 for the 1967 group to a high of 2.87 for the 1971 group. Opportunity for advancement and wife happy with line of employment both received mean group responses of 1.90--"some" influence. When comparing mean responses of graduates by year of graduation for opportunity for

advancement, it was found that these ranged from a low of 1.47 for the 1971 group to a high of 2.23 for the 1973 group. When a comparison of group mean response by year of graduation was made regarding wife happy with line of employment, it was found that the mean responses ranged from a low of 1.77 for the 1973 group to a high of 2.15 for the 1969 group. Upon comparison of the groups of graduates by years on farming opportunity available, it should be noted that the mean responses ranged from a very low 0.14 for the 1967 group to a high of 2.68 for the 1968 group, with a group mean response of 1.82 for all groups, ranking ninth. Educational facilities were ranked tenth, with an overall group mean response of 1.76. Considering mean responses of groups by years of graduation it was found that the range was from a low of 1.50 for the 1969 group to a high of 2.31 for the 1973 group. Prestige of position ranked elventh, with an overall mean response of 1.69. Further inspection of prestige of position revealed that the mean responses ranged from a very low of 0.57 for the 1967 group to a high of 1.95 for the 1968 group. Close to parental home ranked twelfth, with an overall mean response of 1.68. By years of graduation comparisons, the mean responses ranged from a low of 1.16 for the 1968 group to a high of 2.10 for the 1972 group. Evenings free, with a mean response of 1.57, ranked thirteenth in the overall mean response area. The range of mean responses was from a low of 0.86 for the 1967 group to a high of 1.92 for the 1973 group. Three areas according to the data had "little" influence on the groups' decisions to enter their first employment. These areas were good recreational facilities in area, with an overall mean response of 1.24; own my own house, with an overall mean response of 1.12; and health factors, with an overall mean response of 1.12.

Table XII was developed to provide a comparison of practices used by graduates to contact their 1973 employer by year of graduation. Analysis of the data revealed that practices followed most often and the proportion of graduates utilizing a method were as follow: (1) friend or other person informed you of the opportunity, 18 (15.1 percent); (2) made inquiry requesting employment, 14 (11.8 percent); (3) contacted by employer, 12 (10.1 percent); (4) private employment agency and (5) other specify, 4 (3.4 percent) each; (6) college of agriculture placement service, 2 (1.7 percent); and (7) college counselor, 1 (0.8 percent). It was found that 64 graduates (53.7 percent) were on the same job in 1973 that they first began working in. None of the graduates reported teacher placement service, job and listing, and state employment agency as practices for contacting their 1973 employers. When compared by years, there appeared to be no consistent patterns of practices or procedures utilized by graduates in contacting their 1973 employers, nor were there any major differences indicated among groups.

Data compiled in Table XIII revealed that of the 119 graduates 55 (46.2 percent) selected teaching vocational agriculture as their initial employment at annual salary levels ranging from $7,067 for the 1967 group to $8,738 for the 1971 graduates. Fourteen former Murray State students (11.8 percent) became high school teachers in areas other than vocational agriculture, for which they received salaries ranging from $5,400 to $6,338 per year. Farming was the first type of employment selected by 13 graduates (10.9 percent). Because of the variance in information received from these respondents, no mean salary levels could be determined.

TABLE XII

COMPARISON OF PRACTICES USED BY GRADUATES TO CONTACT 1973 EMPLOYER BY YEAR OF GRADUATION

Practices Used	Distribution of Graduates by Practices Used														Total by Practices Used	
	1967		1968		1969		1970		1971		1972		1973			
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent
College of agriculture placement service	2	28.6													2	1.7
Teacher placement service																
Answered job ad listing																
Made inquiry requesting employment	1	14.3	1	5.3	4	20.0	2	12.5	2	13.3	3	10.4	1	7.7	14	11.8
College counselor											1	3.4			1	0.8
Contacted by employer	2	28.6	3	15.8	2	10.0	1	6.3	3	20.0			1	7.7	12	10.1
Friend or other person informed you of the opportunity	1	14.3	7	36.8	2	10.0	3	18.7	1	6.7	3	10.4	1	7.7	18	15.1
State employment agency																
Private employment agency			1	5.3	1	5.0	1	6.3	1	6.7					4	3.4
Other, specify					1	5.0	1	6.3	1	6.7	1	3.4			4	3.4
Present job is same as first	1	14.3	7	36.8	10	50.0	8	50.0	7	46.7	21	72.4	10	76.9	64	53.7
Total	7		19		20		16		15		29		13		119	100.0

TABLE XIII

DISTRIBUTION OF GRADUATES BY FIRST EMPLOYMENT, MEAN SALARY, TYPES OF EMPLOYMENT, AND YEAR OF GRADUATION

	Number of Graduates and Mean Salary by Year of Graduation															
	1967		1968		1969		1970		1971		1972		1973			
Employment Area	No.	Mean Salary	No.	Mean Salary	No.	Mean Salary	No.	Mean Salary	No.	Mean Salary	No.	Mean Salary	No.	Mean Salary	Totals	Per-cent
Vo-Ag Instructor	6	$7,067	10	$7,113	9	$7,189	10	$7,640	8	$ 8,738	6	$ 8,567	6	$8,300	55	46.2
High school teacher other than Vo-Ag*			4	5,425	4	6,338	3	5,400	1	6,000	2	5,900			14	11.8
Farming*			1	---	1	---	2	---			7	---	2	---	13	10.9
Cooperative Extension Service	1	6,500			1	7,000									2	1.7
Governmental or nonprofit agency			1	7,000	1	9,100					1	6,800			3	2.5
Fertilizer business											1	7,500			1	0.8
Feed and seed business													1	7,500	1	0.8
Vocational center coordinator																
College teaching or research work																
Banking or farm credit																
Insurance			1	7,200					1	7,800					2	1.7
Elementary teacher **			1	6,100	2	7,100									3	2.5
Machinery company			1	7,200											1	0.8
Lab technician					1	8,000			1	12,000			1	8,000	3	2.5
Farm manager							1	7,200			1	11,000	1	6,500	3	2.5
Vocational center teacher									3	8,533	2	8,700	1	9,800	6	5.0
Other teacher									1	7,500					1	0.8
Railroad											1	8,900			1	0.8
Presently in graduate school*					1	---					4	---	1	---	6	5.0
Tire companies											3	8,367			3	2.5
Others											1	5,900			1	0.8
Totals	7		19		20		16		15		29		13		119	

*Because of the varied information reported, no mean salary could be computed.

**Nine and one-quarter month employee.

Six graduates chose vocational center teaching as their first employment at mean annual salaries ranging from $8,533 to $9,800, while another six were found to be presently in graduate school. For the latter group it was not possible to determine mean salaries.

Government or non-profit agencies, elementary school teaching, laboratory technician work, farm management, and tire companies each attracted three of the graduates for a total of 15 graduates at respective mean salary ranges of $6,800 to $9,100; $6,100 to $7,100; $8,000 to $12,000; $6,500 to $11,000; and $8,367.

The Cooperative Extension Service and the insurance business became the initial employment for two graduates each. The salary range for the extension workers was $6,500 to $7,000, while that for the insurance employees was $7,200 to $7,800.

The lowest computed mean annual salary was $5,400 for the three graduates who began their careers as teachers of high school subjects other than vocational agriculture. The highest mean salary reported was $12,000 for a laboratory technician who graduated in 1971.

The graduates of 1968, 1969, 1971, 1972, and 1973 were quite varied in the types of first employment they selected. It is noteworthy, however, that for every year except 1972 more graduates first entered the vocational agriculture teaching profession as their initial employment than any other type of position.

Findings presented in Table XIV disclosed that the 1973 employment areas for the 119 graduates in order of the number of graduates by type of employment were vocational agriculture instructor, 48 (40.3 percent), with annual salaries ranging from $8,300 for the 1973 group to $10,738 for the 1968 graduates. Farming was the 1973 employment of 17 (14.3

TABLE XIV

1973 EMPLOYMENT: INCOME AND DISTRIBUTION OF GRADUATES BY TYPES OF EMPLOYMENT AND YEAR OF GRADUATION

Type of Employment	Number of Graduates and Mean Income by Period of Graduation															
	1967		1968		1969		1970		1971		1972		1973			
	No.	Mean Salary	No.	Mean Salary	No.	Mean Salary	No.	Mean Salary	No.	Mean Salary	No.	Mean Salary	No.	Mean Salary	Totals	Per-cent
Vo-Ag instructor	4	$10,000	7	$10,738	7	$ 8,921	11	$ 8,700	7	$ 9,700	6	$ 8,987	6	$ 8,300	48	40.3
High school teacher other than Vo-Ag			2	7,600	3	8,667					2	6,625			7	5.9
Farming*					2	---	1	---	2	---	10	---	2	---	17	14.3
Cooperative Extension Service					1	8,600									1	0.8
Governmental or nonprofit agency			2	12,750	1	10,300	1	10,200	1	8,800	1	7,000			6	5.0
Fertilizer business																
Feed and seed business			1	9,500	1	9,500							1	7,600	3	2.5
Vocational center coordinator	2	10,756													2	1.7
College teaching or research work			1	14,000	1	9,300									2	1.7
Banking or farm credit											1	9,600			1	0.8
Insurance			3	10,233	1	14,100			1	7,800					5	4.2
Elementary teacher			1	7,200	1	8,500					1	7,000			3	2.5
Machinery company																
Lab technician													1	8,000	1	0.8
Farm manager	1	9,100					1	7,800			1	11,000	1	6,500	4	3.4
Vocational center teacher									2	9,200	2	10,240	1	9,800	5	4.2
Other teacher									1	7,800					1	0.8
Railroad																
Salesman, ag products									1	9,000					1	0.8
Presently in graduate school**											1	---	1	---	2	1.7
Tire companies											3	9,000			3	2.5
Others							1	8,400			1	7,300			2	1.7
Administrator			1	13,500	2	10,250	1	7,600							4	3.4
Manager, department store			1	11,000											1	0.8
Totals	7		19		20		16		15		29		13		119	

*Because of the varied reported information, no mean salary for farming will be reported.

**Because of the varied reported salary, no mean salary for graduate school will be reported.

percent) of the graduates. Because of the variance in information received from these respondents, no mean salary levels could be determined. Seven former graduates of Murray State (5.9 percent) were high school teachers in areas other than vocational agriculture, for which they were receiving salaries ranging from $6,625 for the 1972 group, up to $8,667 for the 1969 group. Six (5 percent) of the graduates chose governmental or non-profit agencies for their present employment and were receiving salaries ranging from $7,000 for the 1972 graduates up to $12,750 for two graduates. Insurance and vocational center teaching was the present employment for five graduates each. The salary range for the insurance representatives was $7,800 to $14,100, while that for the vocational center teacher was $9,200 to $10,200. Farm manager and administrator was the 1973 employment of four graduates each. The salary reported for the farm manager varied from $6,500 to $11,000, while that for the administrator was somewhat similar, $7,600 to $13,500. Elementary teacher, feed and seed business, and tire company each attracted three of the graduates for a total of nine at the respective mean salary ranges of $7,000 to $8,500; $7,600 to $9,500; and $9,000. Vocational center coordinator college teaching or research work, others, and presently in graduate school was the present employment for two graduates each. The mean salary for the two vocational center coordinators was $10,756; college teaching or research work salaries ranged from $9,300 to $14,000. Others mean salary ranged from $7,300 to $8,400, while for the graduates presently in graduate school it was not possible to compute mean salaries. Cooperative extension service, banking or farm credit, lab technician, other teacher, salesman, ag products, and department store manager were the present employment for

seven former Murray State graduates. The salaries ranged from $7,800 for the category "other teacher" to $11,000 for the department store manager.

The lowest computed mean annual salary was $6,500 for one graduate who began his career as a farm manager. The highest mean salary reported was $14,100 for an insurance representative who graduates in 1969.

The graduates for all years, except the 1967 graduates, were quite varied in their present employment. It should be noted that more graduates are presently employed as teachers of vocational agriculture, with the exception of the 1972 graduates of whom six were presently teaching vocational agriculture and ten were farming, than any other position.

To analyze response regarding the factors which influence graduates to remain in their present employment a Likert-type scale which was a continuum from very much influence through no influence was used. To facilitate interpolation of the findings regarding these influencing factors, the same scale to identify the range of actual limits for categories was that used on Table IV previously.

Inspection of the data in Table XV reveals the factors influencing 1967 graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment. The factor which had "very much" influence on the graduates' decisions as determined by the mean response listed after the factor was the prestige of the position--3.53. The factors which had "much" influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment and their mean responses were freedom and independence of the job and felt best trained in this area, both with 3.29 mean responses, and security, 3.14.

TABLE XV

FACTORS INFLUENCING 1967 GRADUATES TO REMAIN IN THEIR PRESENT EMPLOYMENT (N = 7)

Influencing Factors	Distribution of Graduates by Factor of Influence										Mean Response*
	Very Much		Much		Some		Little		None		
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
Salary	2	28.6			4	57.1	1	14.3			2.43
Working closely with people	1	14.3	3	42.9	2	28.6			1	14.3	2.43
Freedom and independence of the job	2	28.6	5	71.4							3.29
Security	3	42.9	2	28.6	2	28.6					3.14
Felt best trained in this area	3	42.9	3	42.9	1	14.3					3.29
Farming opportunity available	1	14.3					4	57.1	2	28.6	1.14
Good hours	1	14.3			1	14.3	2	28.6	3	42.9	1.14
Opportunity for advancement			1	14.3	3	42.9	2	28.6	1	14.3	1.57
Evenings free			1	14.3			2	28.6	4	57.1	1.71
Close to parental home					2	28.6	2	28.6	3	42.9	1.39
Own my own house			1	14.3	1	14.3	1	14.3	4	57.1	1.86
Wife happy with line of employment	2	28.6			2	28.6	1	14.3	2	28.6	1.86
Good recreational facilities in area	1	14.3			2	28.6	1	14.3	3	42.9	1.29
Educational facilities			3	42.9	1	14.3	1	14.3	2	28.6	1.71
Prestige of position	1	14.3	1	14.3	1	14.3	2	28.6	2	28.6	3.53
Health factors	1	14.3	1	14.3					5	71.4	1.00

*Mean response based on following scale: Very Much = 4; Much = 3; Some = 2; Little = 1; None = 0.

The factors which had "some" influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment and their mean responses were salary and working closely with people, 2.43; own my own house and wife happy with line of employment, 1.86; evenings free and educational facilities in area, 1.71; and opportunity for advancement, 1.57. "Little" influencing factors on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment according to mean response levels were close to parental home, 1.39; good recreational facilities in area, 1.29; farming opportunity available and good hours, 1.14; and health factors, 1.00.

Data presented in Table XVI are the findings regarding factors influencing 1968 graduates to remain in their present employment. The factors which had "much" influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment and their computed mean responses were freedom and independence of the job, 3.21; working closely with people and security, each with a 3.05 mean response; salary, 2.74; felt best trained in this area, 2.63; and opportunity for advancement, 2.58. The factors which had "some" influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment were prestige of position, 2.42; wife happy with line of employment, 2.32; good hours and own my own house, both with 2.16; farming opportunity available and evenings free, 1.79 each; health factors, 1.68; and educational facilities, 1.58. The factors which had "little" influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment were close to parental home and good recreational facilities in area, each with a 1.42 mean response. There were no factors in the "very much" and "no" influence categories for this group of graduates.

TABLE XVI

FACTORS INFLUENCING 1968 GRADUATES TO REMAIN IN THEIR PRESENT EMPLOYMENT (N = 19)

Influencing Factors	Distribution of Graduates by Factor of Influence										Mean Response*
	Very Much		Much		Some		Little		None		
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
Salary	4	21.1	7	36.8	7	36.8	1	5.3			2.74
Working closely with people	7	36.8	6	31.6	6	31.6					3.05
Freedom and independence of the job	8	42.1	7	36.8	4	21.1					3.21
Security	7	36.8	8	42.1	3	15.8	1	5.3			3.05
Felt best trained in this area	5	26.3	3	15.8	10	52.6	1	5.3			2.63
Farming opportunity available	3	15.8	5	26.3	2	10.5	3	15.8	6	31.6	1.79
Good hours	2	10.5	5	26.3	7	36.8	4	21.1	1	5.3	2.16
Opportunity for advancement	5	26.3	7	36.8	4	21.1			3	15.8	2.58
Evenings free	1	5.3	6	31.6	4	21.1	4	21.1	4	21.1	1.79
Close to parental home	2	10.5	2	10.5	5	26.3	3	15.8	7	36.8	1.42
Own my own house	6	31.6	2	10.5	4	21.1	3	15.8	4	21.1	2.16
Wife happy with line of employment	4	21.1	6	31.6	4	21.1	2	10.5	3	15.8	2.32
Good recreational facilities in area	3	15.8			6	31.6	3	15.8	7	36.8	1.42
Educational facilities	2	10.5	2	10.5	5	26.3	6	31.6	4	21.1	1.58
Prestige of position	3	15.8	5	26.3	7	36.8	2	10.5	2	10.5	2.42
Health factors	1	5.3	4	21.1	7	36.8	2	10.5	5	26.3	1.68

*Mean response based on following scale: Very Much = 4; Much = 3; Some = 2; Little = 1; None = 0.

Table XVII was developed to illustrate the factors influencing 1969 graduates to remain in their present employment. The factors and mean responses for each which had "much" influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment were felt best trained in this area, 3.25; security, 3.00; salary and freedom and independence of job, 2.75. The factors which had "some" influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment according to mean response levels were own my own home, 2.45; wife happy with line of employment, 2.40; opportunity for advancement, 2.35; working closely with people, 2.30; close to parental home, 2.05; good hours, 2.00; farming opportunity available, 1.90; educational facilities, 1.80; evenings free, 1.70; and prestige of position, 1.65. The computed mean responses and the factors which had "little" influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment were good recreational facilities in area, 1.20, and health factors, 0.95. No mean responses in the "very much" and "no" influence categories were found among this group.

The data in Table XVIII are offered to summarize the factors influencing the 1970 graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment. The four factors which had "much" influence on the graduates and the accompanying mean responses were felt best trained in this area, 2.69; security, 2.63; and freedom and independence of the job and wife happy with line of employment, 2.56 each. The factors which mean responses indicated had "some" influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment were working closely with people, 2.44; salary, 2.19; opportunity for advancement, 2.13; good hours and prestige of position, 2.06; farming opportunity available,

TABLE XVII

FACTORS INFLUENCING 1969 GRADUATES TO REMAIN IN THEIR PRESENT EMPLOYMENT (N = 20)

Influencing Factors	Distribution of Graduates by Factor of Influence										Mean Response*
	Very Much		Much		Some		Little		None		
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	
Salary	6	30.0	7	35.0	4	20.0	2	10.0	1	5.0	2.75
Working closely with people	5	25.0	4	20.0	5	25.0	4	20.0	2	10.0	2.30
Freedom and independence of the job	8	40.0	5	25.0	3	15.0	2	10.0	2	10.0	2.75
Security	9	45.0	5	25.0	4	20.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	3.00
Felt best trained in this area	8	40.0	9	45.0	3	15.0					3.25
Farming opportunity available	7	35.0			4	20.0	2	10.0	7	35.0	1.90
Good hours	3	15.0	7	35.0	1	5.0	5	25.0	4	20.0	2.00
Opportunity for advancement	6	30.0	2	10.0	8	40.0	1	5.0	3	15.0	2.35
Evenings free	2	10.0	3	15.0	4	20.0	6	30.0	5	25.0	1.70
Close to parental home	5	25.0	5	25.0	1	5.0	4	20.0	5	25.0	2.05
Own my own house	6	30.0	5	25.0	4	20.0	2	10.0	3	15.0	2.45
Wife happy with line of employment	6	30.0	5	25.0	4	20.0	1	5.0	4	20.0	2.40
Good recreational facilities in area	2	10.0			5	25.0	6	30.0	7	35.0	1.20
Educational facilities	3	15.0	2	10.0	8	40.0	2	10.0	5	25.0	1.80
Prestige of position	2	10.0	3	15.0	5	25.0	6	30.0	4	20.0	1.65
Health factors	1	5.0	2	10.0	3	15.0	3	15.0	11	55.0	0.95

*Mean response based on following scale: Very Much = 4; Much = 3; Some = 2; Little = 1; None = 0.

TABLE XVIII

FACTORS INFLUENCING 1970 GRADUATES TO REMAIN IN THEIR PRESENT EMPLOYMENT (N = 16)

Influencing Factors	Distribution of Graduates by Factor of Influence										Mean Response*
	Very Much		Much		Some		Little		None		
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
Salary	2	10.5	2	10.5	9	56.3	3	18.8			2.19
Working closely with people	2	10.5	5	31.3	7	43.8	2	10.5			2.44
Freedom and independence of the job	2	10.5	7	43.8	5	31.3	2	10.5			2.56
Security	2	10.5	8	50.0	4	25.0	2	10.5			2.63
Felt best trained in this area	5	31.3	6	37.5	2	10.5	1	6.3	2	10.5	2.69
Farming opportunity available	5	31.3	2	10.5	1	6.3	2	10.5	6	37.5	1.88
Good hours	2	10.5	6	37.5	2	10.5	3	18.8	3	18.8	2.06
Opportunity for advancement	3	18.8	3	18.8	4	25.0	5	31.3	1	6.3	2.13
Evenings free	3	18.8	3	18.8	2	10.5	4	25.0	4	25.0	1.81
Close to parental home	2	10.5	3	18.8	4	25.0	3	18.8	4	25.0	1.75
Own my own house	4	25.0	1	6.3	3	18.8	1	6.3	7	43.8	1.63
Wife happy with line of employment	5	31.3	5	31.3	3	18.8			3	18.8	2.56
Good recreational facilities in area			2	10.5	3	18.8	4	25.0	7	43.8	1.00
Educational facilities	1	6.3	1	6.3	6	37.5	4	25.0	4	25.0	1.44
Prestige of position	2	10.5	3	18.8	5	31.3	6	37.5			2.06
Health factors					4	25.0	5	31.3	7	43.8	0.81

*Mean response based on following scale: Very Much = 4; Much = 3; Some = 2; Little = 1; None = 0.

1.88; evenings free, 1.81; close to parental home, 1.75; and own my own house, 1.63. The factors which had "little" influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment and their mean responses were educational facilities, 1.44; good recreational facilities in area, 1.00; and health factors, 0.81. There were no factors in the "very much" and "no" influence categories for this group of graduates.

Table XIX provides a summary of factors influencing 1971 graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment. The factors which had "much" influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment were freedom and independence of the job, 3.33; good hours, 3.07; and security and felt best trained in this area, 2.73. Mean responses of this group disclosed factors which had "some" influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment were salary, wife happy with line of employment, and prestige of position, 2.27; working closely with people and evenings free, 2.20; opportunity for advancement, 2.13; close to parental home, 2.07; farming opportunity available, 2.00; educational facilities, 1.93; own my own house, 1.80; and good recreational facilities in area and health factors, 1.60. The "very much," "little," and "no" influence categories received no responses from this group for any factor listed.

A summary of responses are presented in Table XX revealing details about factors influencing 1972 graduates to enter their first employment. The mean responses calculated for some factors indicated these had "much" influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment. These were freedom and independence of the job and felt best trained in this area, each rating a 2.59 mean response. The factors which mean responses indicated had "some" influence on the

TABLE XIX

FACTORS INFLUENCING 1971 GRADUATES TO REMAIN IN THEIR PRESENT EMPLOYMENT (N = 15)

Influencing Factors	Distribution of Graduates by Factor of Influence										Response*
	Very Much		Much		Some		Little		None		
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	
Salary	1	6.7	5	33.3	6	40.0	3	20.0			2.27
Working closely with people	2	12.5	4	26.7	5	33.3	3	20.0	1	6.7	2.20
Freedom and independence of the job	6	40.0	8	53.3	1	6.7					3.33
Security	6	40.0	1	6.7	7	46.7			1	6.7	2.73
Felt best trained in this area	5	33.3	4	26.7	4	26.7	1	6.7	1	6.7	2.73
Farming opportunity available	3	20.0	3	20.0	4	26.7	1	6.7	4	26.7	2.00
Good hours	4	26.7	9	60.0	1	6.7	1	6.7			3.07
Opportunity for advancement	3	20.0	4	26.7	3	20.0	2	12.5	3	20.0	2.13
Evenings free	3	20.0	6	40.0	1	6.7	1	6.7	4	26.7	2.20
Close to parental home	4	26.7	3	20.0	3	20.0			5	33.3	2.07
Own my own house	5	33.3	1	6.7	2	12.5			7	46.7	1.80
Wife happy with line of employment	3	20.0	4	26.7	5	33.3			3	20.0	2.27
Good recreational facilities in area	1	6.7	1	6.7	7	46.7	3	20.0	3	20.0	1.60
Educational facilities	2	12.5	1	6.7	8	53.3	2	12.5	2	12.5	1.93
Prestige of position	3	20.0	5	33.3	3	20.0	1	6.7	3	20.0	2.27
Health factors	2	12.5	2	12.5	5	33.3			6	40.0	1.60

*Mean response based on following scale: Very Much = 4; Much = 3; Some = 2; Little = 1; None = 0.

TABLE XX

FACTORS INFLUENCING 1972 GRADUATES TO REMAIN IN THEIR PRESENT EMPLOYMENT (N = 29)

Influencing Factors	Distribution of Graduates by Factor of Influence										Mean Response*
	Very Much		Much		Some		Little		None		
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	
Salary	9	31.0	4	13.8	10	34.5	3	10.3	3	10.3	2.45
Working closely with people	5	17.2	7	24.1	11	37.9	4	13.8	2	6.9	2.31
Freedom and independence of the job	8	27.6	8	27.6	7	24.1	5	17.2	1	3.5	2.59
Security	4	13.8	9	31.0	9	31.0	3	10.3	4	13.8	2.21
Felt best trained in this area	10	34.5	7	24.1	6	20.7	2	6.9	4	13.8	2.59
Farming opportunity available	11	37.9	6	20.7	3	10.3	1	3.5	8	27.6	2.38
Good hours	4	13.8	9	31.0	3	10.3	8	27.6	5	17.2	1.97
Opportunity for advancement	6	20.7	6	20.7	8	27.6	5	17.2	4	13.8	2.17
Evenings free	5	17.2	3	10.3	7	24.1	4	13.8	10	34.5	1.62
Close to parental home	7	24.1	6	20.7	7	24.1	2	6.9	7	24.1	2.14
Own my own house	6	20.7	3	10.3	4	13.8	2	6.9	14	48.3	1.48
Wife happy with line of employment	3	10.3	9	31.0	6	20.7	2	6.9	9	31.0	1.83
Good recreational facilities in area	1	3.5	4	13.8	8	27.6	7	24.1	9	31.0	1.34
Educational facilities	6	20.7	5	17.2	8	27.6	6	20.7	4	13.8	2.10
Prestige of position	2	6.9	7	24.1	12	41.4	6	20.7	2	6.9	2.03
Health factors	3	10.3	6	20.7	7	24.1	5	17.2	8	27.6	1.69

*Mean response based on following scale: Very Much = 4; Much = 3; Some = 2; Little = 1; None = 0.

graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment were salary, 2.45; farming opportunity available, 2.38; working closely with people, 2.31; security, 2.21; opportunity for advancement, 2.17; close to parental home, 2.14; educational facilities, 2.10; prestige of position, 2.03; good hours, 1.97; wife happy with line of employment, 1.83; health factors, 1.69; and evenings free, 1.62. The two factors which had "little" influence on the 1972 graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment and their mean responses were own my own house, 1.48, and good recreational facilities in area, 1.34. It should be mentioned that there were not any mean responses in the "very much" and "no" influence categories.

Findings presented in Table XXI disclose the factors influencing 1973 graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment. The two factors and mean responses for each which had "much" influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment were freedom and independence of the job, 2.85, and felt best trained in this area, 2.54. The factors which had "some" influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment were working closely with people, 2.31; opportunity for advancement, 2.23; good hours and evenings free, 2.15; farming opportunity available and educational facilities, 2.08; wife happy with line of employment, 1.92; security, 1.85; salary and good recreational facilities in area, 1.69; and close to parental home, 1.62. There were three factors which had "little" influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment. These were prestige of position, 1.46; own my own house, 1.38; and health factors, 1.31. There were no mean responses found in the "very much" and "no" influence categories for the 1973 group.

TABLE XXI

FACTORS INFLUENCING 1973 GRADUATES TO REMAIN IN THEIR PRESENT EMPLOYMENT (N = 13)

Influencing Factors	Distribution of Graduates by Factor of Influence										Mean Response*
	Very Much		Much		Some		Little		None		
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	
Salary	1	7.7	4	30.8	3	23.1			5	38.7	1.69
Working closely with people	2	15.4	5	38.7	3	23.1	1	7.7	2	15.4	2.31
Freedom and independence of the job	4	30.8	4	30.8	4	30.8	1	7.7			2.85
Security			4	30.8	5	38.7	2	15.4	2	15.4	1.85
Felt best trained in this area	5	38.7	1	7.7	5	38.7			2	15.4	2.54
Farming opportunity available	4	30.8	1	7.7	4	30.8			4	30.8	2.08
Good hours	3	23.1	3	23.1	3	23.1	1	7.7	3	23.1	2.15
Opportunity for advancement	1	7.7	5	38.7	5	38.7			2	15.4	2.23
Evenings free	4	30.8	2	15.4	2	15.4	2	15.4	3	23.1	2.15
Close to parental home	3	23.1	1	7.7	3	23.1			6	46.2	1.62
Own my own house	3	23.1	1	7.7	1	7.7	1	7.7	7	53.9	1.38
Wife happy with line of employment	3	23.1	1	7.7	4	30.8	2	15.4	3	23.1	1.92
Good recreational facilities in area	2	15.4	2	15.4	4	30.8			5	38.7	1.69
Educational facilities	2	15.4	3	23.1	5	38.7			3	23.1	2.08
Prestige of position			3	23.1	4	30.8	2	15.4	4	30.8	1.46
Health factors			2	15.4	5	38.7	1	7.7	5	38.7	1.31

*Mean response based on following scale: Very Much = 4; Much = 3; Some = 2; Little = 1; None = 0.

Table XXII is a summary of the mean responses of all graduates for the period from July 1, 1967, to June 30, 1973, as to the influence of selected factors influencing graduates to remain in their present employment. When a comparison was made between the total group mean response by year of graduation the factors which had "much" influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment were freedom and independence of the job, with a mean response of 2.87. Comparison among the groups by years disclosed that the mean responses ranged from a low of 2.56 for the 1970 group to a high of 3.33 for the 1971 group. Felt best trained in this area was second in the total group mean response, with a 2.77 mean response. When comparing between groups by years, it was found that the mean responses ranged from a low of 2.54 for the 1973 group to a high of 3.29 for the 1967 group. Security was third, by years, in the total group response, with a 2.62 mean response. While comparisons between groups by years of graduation were made, it was found that the mean responses ranged from a low of 1.85 for the 1973 group to a high of 3.14 for the 1967 group. Further inspection of data indicates, upon comparison of groups by years, that 11 mean responses were in the "some" influence category. The mean response highest in the "some" influence category was working closely with people, ranking fourth by years in the total group response, with a 2.44 mean response. In comparing groups, it was found that the mean responses ranged from a low of 2.20 for the 1971 group to a high of 3.05 for the 1968 group. Salary was fifth, by years, in the total group response, with a 2.40 mean response. With group comparison, it was found that the mean responses ranged from a low of 1.69 for the 1973 group to a high of 2.75 for the 1969 group of graduates. Opportunity

TABLE XXII

COMPARISON OF MEAN RESPONSES TO FACTORS INFLUENCING GRADUATES TO REMAIN IN THEIR PRESENT EMPLOYMENT

	Mean Response by Year													
	1967 N = 7		1968 N = 19		1969 N = 20		1970 N = 16		1971 N = 15		1972 N = 29		1973 N = 13		Total Group N = 119	
Influencing Factors	Mean Response		Mean Response		Mean Response		Mean Response		Mean Response		Mean Response		Mean Response		Mean Response	
Salary	2.43	Some	2.74	Much	2.75	Much	2.19	Some	2.27	Some	2.45	Some	1.69	Some	2.40	Some
Working closely with people	2.43	Some	3.05	Much	2.30	Some	2.44	Some	2.20	Some	2.31	Some	2.31	Some	2.44	Some
Freedom and independence of the job	3.29	Much	3.21	Much	2.75	Much	2.56	Much	3.33	Much	2.59	Much	2.85	Much	2.87	Much
Security	3.14	Much	3.05	Much	3.00	Much	2.63	Much	2.73	Much	2.21	Some	1.85	Some	2.62	Much
Felt best trained in this area	3.29	Much	2.63	Much	3.25	Much	2.69	Much	2.73	Much	2.59	Much	2.54	Much	2.77	Much
Farming opportunity available	1.14	Little	1.79	Some	1.90	Some	1.88	Some	2.00	Some	2.38	Some	2.08	Some	1.98	Some
Good hours	1.14	Little	2.16	Some	2.00	Some	2.06	Some	3.07	Much	1.97	Some	2.15	Some	2.13	Some
Opportunity for advancement	1.57	Some	2.58	Much	2.35	Some	2.13	Some	2.13	Some	2.17	Some	2.23	Some	2.23	Some
Evenings free	1.71	Some	1.79	Some	1.70	Some	1.81	Some	2.20	Some	1.62	Some	2.15	Some	1.74	Some
Close to parental home	1.39	Little	1.42	Little	2.05	Some	1.75	Some	2.07	Some	2.14	Some	1.62	Some	1.82	Some
Own my own house	1.86	Some	2.16	Some	2.45	Some	1.63	Some	1.80	Some	1.48	Little	1.38	Little	1.76	Some
Wife happy with line of employment	1.86	Some	2.32	Some	2.40	Some	2.56	Much	2.27	Some	1.83	Some	1.92	Some	2.17	Some
Good recreational facilities in area	1.29	Little	1.42	Little	1.20	Little	1.00	Little	1.60	Some	1.34	Little	1.69	Some	1.35	Little
Educational facilities	1.71	Some	1.58	Some	1.80	Some	1.44	Little	1.93	Some	2.10	Some	2.08	Some	1.83	Some
Prestige of position	3.53	Very Much	2.42	Some	1.65	Some	2.06	Some	2.27	Some	2.03	Some	1.45	Little	1.95	Some
Health factors	1.00	Little	1.68	Some	0.95	Little	0.81	Little	1.60	Some	1.69	Some	1.31	Little	1.35	Little

Mean response based on scale: Very Much Influence = 3.5 - 4.0; Much Influence = 2.5 - 3.49; Some Influence = 1.5 - 2.49; Little Influence = 0.5 - 1.49; No Influence = 0.0 - 0.49.

for advancement was sixth, by years, in the total group's response, with a 2.23 mean response. Upon comparison between groups it was found that the mean responses ranged from a low of 1.57 for the 1967 group to a high of 2.58 for the 1968 group. The factor in seventh position was wife happy with line of employment, by years, with a 2.17 mean response. When comparison was made between groups, it was found that the mean response ranged from a low of 1.86 for the 1967 group to a high of 2.56 for the 1970 group. Good hours was eighth, by years, in the total group response, with a 2.13 mean response. While comparing groups, it was found that the mean responses ranged from a low of 1.14 for the 1967 group to a high of 3.07 for the 1971 group. Farming opportunity available was ninth, by years, in the total group response, with a 1.98 mean response. The variation between groups' mean responses ranged from a low of 1.14 for the 1967 group to a high of 3.07 for the 1971 group. Farming opportunity available was ninth, by years, in the total group response, with a 1.98 mean response. The variation between groups' mean responses ranged from a low of 1.14 for the 1967 group to a high of 2.38 for the 1972 group. In tenth position was prestige of position, by years, with a total group mean response of 1.95. Groups' mean responses ranged from a low of 1.46 for the 1973 group to a high of 3.53 for the 1967 group. Educational facilities was eleventh, by years, in the total group response, with a 1.83 mean response. The mean responses between groups ranged from a low of 1.44 for the 1970 group to a high of 2.10 for the 1972 group. Close to parental home was twelfth, by years, in the total group response, with a 1.82 mean response. Groups' mean responses ranged from a low of 1.39 for the 1967 group to a high of 2.14 for the 1972 group. Own my own house, by years, was thirteenth in the

total group response with a 1.76 mean response. Between groups, the mean responses ranged from a low of 1.38 for the 1973 group to a high of 2.45 for the 1969 group. Evenings free was fourteenth, by years, in the total group response, with a 1.74 mean response. Groups by year of graduation varied in their mean responses from a low of 1.62 for the 1972 group to a high of 2.15 for the 1973 group.

Good recreational facilities in area and health factors were in the "little" influence category, with a total group response of 1.35. When comparison was made of the groups on good recreational facilities in area, the mean responses ranged from a low of 1.00 for the 1970 group to a high of 1.69 for the 1973 group. It was found that the groups' mean responses for health factors ranged from a low of 0.95 for the 1969 group to a high of 1.68 for the 1968 group.

No mean responses in the "very much" and "no" influence categories were found among the groups in Table XXII.

Initial and Current Employment Patterns

Table XXIII was developed to describe selected aspects of the employment patterns of 1967 graduates. Six of this group were Kentucky residents, while one was from out-of-state. Relative to initial employment, it was found that five of the graduates became vocational agriculture teachers in Kentucky, while another taught out-of-state. The other graduate served with the Kentucky Cooperative Extension Service. The range of distance from home county was from 50 miles for two graduates up to 301-400 miles for another graduate. Four of these graduates are still teaching; one taught for one year; and another taught for three years. The cooperative extension employee spent just one year in the service.

TABLE XXIII

DISTRIBUTION OF 1967 GRADUATES AS TO INITIAL AND CURRENT EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS
(N = 7)

Type of Employment by Period	Residence		Place of Employment			Miles From Home County									Years in Occupation					
	Kentucky	Out-of-State	Kentucky	Home State	Out-of-State	0	1-50	51-100	101-150	151-200	201-250	251-300	301-400	401-1,000	1	2	3	4	5	6
INITIAL																				
Vo-Ag instructor	5	1	5		1		2			1	1	1	1		1	1				4
Cooperative Extension Service	1		1					1							1					
TOTALS	6	1	6		1		2	1		1	1	1	1		2	1				4
CURRENT																				
Vo-Ag instructor	3	1	4					2			1		1							4
Vocational center coordinator	2		2			1						1			1	1				
Farm manager	1		1				1								1					
TOTALS	6	1	7			1	1	2			1	1	1		2	1				4

Regarding 1973 employment, three Kentucky residents and three out-of-state residents were teaching vocational agriculture in Kentucky. Two of the graduates who had taught vocational agriculture were vocational center coordinators, while one graduate was a farm manager. The range of distances from home county varied from one graduate who was living in his home county to another who lived 301-400 miles from his home county. Four of these graduates have taught six years, while two were vocational center coordinators, one for one year and the other for two years, while still another has been a farm manager for one year.

Inspection of data in Table XXIV reveals that of the 1968 graduates 13 were Kentucky residents while 6 were from out-of-state. In relation to their initial employment, it was found that ten of the graduates became vocational agriculture teachers; eight taught in Kentucky and two taught out-of-state, one in his home state while the other taught out-of-state. Another graduate's initial employment was with a government or non-profit agency in Kentucky, while one out-of-state graduate was employed by a machinery company out-of-state. Also, there were four high school teachers other than vocational agriculture; three were Kentucky residents and one was an out-of-state resident. Further breakdown revealed that one graduate was farming, one was employed in insurance, and one was an elementary teacher--all in Kentucky. There were six graduates living and working in their home county, while two graduates lived 301-400 miles from their home counties. Five of the graduates were still teaching vocational agriculture, two taught one year, two taught two years, and one taught three years. Another graduate has been employed by a government or non-profit agency for five years, while another graduate, employed by a machinery company,

TABLE XXIV

DISTRIBUTION OF 1968 GRADUATES AS TO INITIAL AND CURRENT EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS (N = 19)

Type of Employment by Period	Residence		Place of Employment			Miles From Home County									Years in Occupation					
	Kentucky	Out-of-State	Kentucky	Home State	Out-of-State	0	1-50	51-100	101-150	151-200	201-250	251-300	301-400	401-1,000	1	2	3	4	5	6
INITIAL																				
Vo-Ag instructor	6	4	8	1	1	2		2	1	1	1	2	1		2	2	1		5	
Government or non-profit agency	1		1										1						1	
Machinery company		1			1				1						1					
High school teacher other than Vo-Ag	3	1	4			2	1	1							1		2		1	
Farming	1		1			1										1				
Insurance	1		1							1								1		
Elementary teacher	1		1			1													1	
TOTALS	13	6	16	1	2	6	1	3	2	2	1	2	2		4	3	3	1	8	
CURRENT																				
Vo-Ag instructor	4	3	5	2		2		1	3			1			1	1		1	4	
Government or non-profit agency	2		2					1			1						1		1	
Administrator		1			1				1								1			
High school teacher other than Vo-Ag	2		2			1	1											1	1	
Insurance	3		3			1		1		1						2		1		
Manager, department store		1		1			1											1		
Feed and seed business		1	1				1											1		
Elementary teacher	1		1			1													1	
College teaching or research work	1		1						1						1					
TOTALS	13	6	15	3	1	5	3	3	5	1	1	1			2	3	2	5	7	

worked one year. Of the four graduates who were employed as high school teachers other than vocational agriculture, one taught one year, two taught three years, and one taught five years. It should be mentioned that another graduate farmed two years, one had been employed in insurance for four years, and one had worked as an elementary teacher for five years.

Information on the graduates' 1973 employment was as follows: Four Kentucky residents and three out-of-state residents were teaching vocational agriculture, five in Kentucky and two in their home states. The range in distances from home county for the seven graduates was as follows: Two graduates were living in their home county, while another graduate lived 251-300 miles from his home county. Four of these graduates have taught five years, one for one year, one for two years, and another for four years. There were two Kentucky residents employed in government or non-profit agencies in-state. The range in distances from graduate's home county was 51-100 miles for one graduate to 201-250 for another graduate. One graduate has been employed by the government or a non-profit agency for three years, while another has been employed for five years. One out-of-state graduate was employed out-of-state as an administrator, some 101-150 miles from his home county, and was employed for a period of three years. It was found that two Kentucky residents were employed as high school teachers other than vocational agriculture in the state of Kentucky, while one was employed in his home county. The other graduate was employed 51-100 miles from his home county. One of the graduates has taught for four years and the other for five years. In 1968 there was only one employed in insurance, but in 1973 there were three Kentucky residents employed and

living in Kentucky. The range in distance from their home county was one living in his home county, one was 51-100 miles away, and another was employed 151-200 miles away. Two of the graduates had been employed for two years and one for four years. In 1973 one out-of-state graduate was employed as a department store manager in his home state within 50 miles from his home county, and he has been in his present position for four years. One out-of-state resident was working in Kentucky at a feed and seed business within 50 miles of his home county. The data revealed the graduate has been in his present occupation for three years. Elementary teacher was the occupation shown for one Kentucky resident teaching in Kentucky and living in his home county. This graduate has been employed for five years as an elementary teacher. There was one graduate employed in college teaching or research work; he was a Kentucky resident, lived in Kentucky, and was employed less than 150 miles from his home county. This graduate has been in college teaching or research work for one year.

Information in Table XXV reveals the initial and current employment patterns for the 1969 graduates. Eight Kentucky residents and one out-of-state resident began their employment as vocational agriculture instructors in Kentucky. The range in distance from home county was from teaching in their home county for two graduates to another graduate who began more than 401 miles from his home county. Three of the graduates had taught for five years, two for four years, two for three years, one for two years, and one for only one year. The cooperative extension service attracted one Kentucky resident, who was employed in Kentucky 101-150 miles from his home county. He had been employed for only one year. It was found that four of the graduates became high

TABLE XXV

DISTRIBUTION OF 1969 GRADUATES AS TO INITIAL AND CURRENT EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS (N = 20)

Type of Employment by Period	Residence		Place of Employment			Miles From Home County									Years in Occupation					
	Kentucky	Out-of-State	Kentucky	Home State	Out-of-State	0	1-50	51-100	101-150	151-200	201-250	251-300	301-400	401-1,000	1	2	3	4	5	6
INITIAL																				
Vo-Ag instructor	8	1	9			2	1	1	1				3	1	1	1	2	2	3	
Cooperative Extension Service	1		1						1						1					
High school teacher other than Vo-Ag	2	2	3	1		3								1		1	1	2		
Presently in graduate school	1				1									1				1		
Elementary teacher		2		2		1	1											1	1	
Government or non-profit agency	1		1									1				1				
Lab technician	1		1				1								1					
Farming	1		1			1											1			
TOTALS	15	5	16	3	1	7	3	1	2			1	3	3	3	3	5	6	3	
CURRENT																				
Vo-Ag instructor	6	1	6	1		5		2							2			2	3	
Cooperative Extension Service	1		1											1		1				
High school teacher other than Vo-Ag	2	1	2	1		3												3		
Farming	1	1	1	1		2										1	1			
College teaching or research work	1				1									1				1		
Administrator	1	1	1	1		1	1								2					
Feed and seed business	1		1			1									1					
Elementary teacher		1		1		1										1				
Government or non-profit agency	1		1									1				1				
Insurance	1		1			1										1				
TOTALS	15	5	14	5	1	14	1	2				1		2	5	4	2	6	3	

school teachers other than vocational agriculture; two were Kentucky residents and two were from out-of-state. Three were employed in Kentucky, with one teaching in his home state. Three were teaching in their home counties, while one graduate was between 401 and 1,000 miles from his home county. The years employed for the above graduates was found to be as follows: one for two years, one for three years, and two for four years. Only one of the Kentucky residents was presently in graduate school out-of-state. He was living some 401-1,000 miles from his home county and has been enrolled in graduate school for four years. In 1969, two out-of-state graduates were elementary teachers in their home state, and one was teaching in his home county, while the other graduate was only 1-50 miles away. The two graduates have been employed for three and four years, respectively. Government or non-profit agency was the employment area for one Kentucky resident living in Kentucky some 251-300 miles from his home county and having been employed in this area for two years. Laboratory technician was the area of employment chosen by one Kentucky resident employed in Kentucky. This graduate was living within 50 miles from his home county and has been working in a lab for one year. Farming was the occupation selected by one Kentucky resident, who was farming in Kentucky in his home county and had been farming for three years.

The current employment patterns for the 1969 graduates as of June 30, 1973, included vocational agriculture instructors--six Kentucky residents and one out-of-state resident. Six were in Kentucky and one was out-of-state. The range in distance varied from five teaching in their home county to two being employed some 51 to 100 miles from their home county. Two graduates had been teaching one year, two for four

years, and three for five years. Cooperative extension service, government or non-profit agency, and insurance each had one Kentucky resident employed in Kentucky. The distance from their home counties varied from one living in his home county to another graduate living some 401 to 1,000 miles away. One graduate has been with the cooperative extension service for one year, while the other two graduates have been employed two years. Two Kentucky residents and one out-of-state graduate listed high school teacher other than vocational agriculture as their current employment. Two of the above graduates were teaching in Kentucky. The other graduate selected his home state. All three graduates were living in their home counties, and all three had been teaching for four years. Farming was listed by one Kentucky resident and one out-of-state resident as their current employment. The above graduates were employed in their home states and in their home counties. One graduate has been farming for two years, while the other has been farming for four years. College teaching or research work was listed for one Kentucky resident who was employed out-of-state. The data further revealed that he was more than 401 miles from his home county and had been there for four years. One Kentucky resident and one out-of-state resident were employed in their home states as administrators. One graduate was living in his home county, while one was 1-50 miles away. Both graduates have been employed as administrators for one year. One of the Kentucky residents, working in Kentucky and employed in his home county, had only been working in a feed and seed business for one year. One out-of-state resident selected his home state and home county in which to work and has been employed three years as an elementary teacher.

In analyzing Table XXVI, the initial employment of the 1970 graduates was revealed, and there were ten residents who chose to teach vocational agriculture, eight who chose to teach in Kentucky and two who chose out-of-state employment. The range of distance from home county varied from one teaching in his home county up to 251-300 miles from home for two graduates. Of the ten graduates, three had taught for two years, four for three years, and three for four years. Three Kentucky residents who were employed in Kentucky chose high school teaching other than vocational agriculture as their initial employment. Two of the graduates were teaching in their home counties, and one was within 50 miles of his home county. The data revealed that one has taught one year and two for two years. Farming was the initial employment for two Kentucky residents, and farm management was the initial employment for another. The data showed that all three were employed in Kentucky, with the two graduates who chose farming in their home counties and the farm manager 1-50 miles from his home county. The data also reveals that all three had been employed for three years.

The data in Table XXVI revealed that in 1973 11 Kentucky residents were employed as vocational agriculture instructors, while 9 were employed in Kentucky. Two graduates were employed out-of-state. There was a varied range in miles from home county: three were living in their home counties, while another graduate was more than 251 miles away from his home county. There were three graduates who had taught for two years, five graduates who had taught for three years, and three graduates who had taught for four years. Government or non-profit agency, other, administrator, farming, and farm manager was the current employment for five Kentucky residents each, and these were all employed

TABLE XXVI

DISTRIBUTION OF 1970 GRADUATES AS TO INITIAL AND CURRENT EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS (N = 16)

Type of Employment by Period	Residence		Place of Employment			Miles From Home County								Years in Occupation					
	Kentucky	Out-of-State	Kentucky	Home State	Out-of-State	0	1-50	51-100	101-150	151-200	201-250	251-300	301-400	401-1,000	1	2	3	4	5	6
INITIAL																				
Vo-Ag instructor	10		8		2	1	2	4		1		2					3	4	3	
High school teacher other than Vo-Ag	3		3			2	1								1	2				
Farming	2		2			2											2			
Farm manager	1		1				1										1			
TOTALS	16		14		2	5	4	4		1		2			1	5	7	3		
CURRENT																				
Vo-Ag instructor	11		9		2	3	4	3				1					3	5	3	
Government or non-profit agency	1		1					1							1					
Other	1		1			1									1					
Administrator	1		1			1									1					
Farming	1		1			1											1			
Farm manager	1		1				1										1			
TOTALS	16		14		2	6	5	4				1			3	3	7	3		

in-state. The distance from graduates' home county varied from three living in their home counties up to 51-100 miles for another graduate. As revealed in Table XXVI, the graduates who were employed in government or non-profit agency, other, and administrator had only been employed for one year in their present position. The two graduates who were employed in farming and as a farm manager had been employed for three years in their current employment area.

Analyzing the data in Table XXVII revealed that the initial and current employment patterns of the 1971 graduates were as follow: Vocational agriculture teaching was selected by eight graduates; five were from Kentucky and three were from out-of-state. Upon comparing place of employment, three taught in Kentucky, three in this home state, and two chose out-of-state for their initial employment. The range in distance from home county varied from 1-50 miles for two graduates up to 401-1,000 for another graduate. The above graduates had been employed as vocational agriculture instructors from one to three years. Three graduates from Kentucky chose to accept the position of vocational center teacher in the state of Kentucky. Two graduates lived in their home counties, while another lived 1-50 miles away. It was found that the graduates had been employed for three years. Further inspection of data revealed that high school teaching other than vocational agriculture, insurance, lab technician, and other teaching was the initial employment for four Kentucky residents who were employed in-state. The range in distance from their home counties varied, with two graduates living in their home counties and two other graduates living 1-50 miles away. They have all been employed for one year, except for the other teacher, and he has been employed for two years.

TABLE XXVII

DISTRIBUTION OF 1971 GRADUATES AS TO INITIAL AND CURRENT EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS (N = 15)

Type of Employment by Period	Residence		Place of Employment			Miles From Home County									Years in Occupation					
	Kentucky	Out-of-State	Kentucky	Home State	Out-of-State	0	1-50	51-100	101-150	151-200	201-250	251-300	301-400	401-1,000	1	2	3	4	5	6
INITIAL																				
Vo-Ag instructor	5	3	3	3	2		2	1	1		1	1	1	1	2	4	2			
Vocational center teacher	3		3			2	1										3			
High school other than Vo-Ag	1		1			1									1					
Insurance	1		1			1									1					
Lab technician	1		1				1								1					
Other teacher	1		1				1										1			
TOTALS	12	3	10	3	2	4	5	1	1		1	1	1	1	5	8	2			
CURRENT																				
Vo-Ag instructor	4	3	4	3		4		1			1		1		2	3	2			
Insurance	1		1			1									1					
Farming	2		2			2									1	1				
Salesman, Ag products	1		1						1							1				
Vocational center teacher	2		2			1	1								1	1				
Other teacher	1		1				1									1				
Governmental or non-profit agency	1		1			1									1					
TOTALS	12	3	12	3	0	9	2	1	1		1		1		6	7	2			

Regarding 1973 employment, four Kentucky residents and three out-of-state residents are still employed as vocational agriculture instructors. Four Kentucky graduates are teaching in-state, while three out-of-state students are teaching in their home states. In 1971 there were no graduates teaching in their home counties, but in 1973 four were teaching in their home counties, while another was more than 301 miles away. This group of graduates varied in the years in current occupation from one to three years. Farming and vocational center teaching was reported as the current employment for two graduates each. The four graduates were Kentucky residents and working in Kentucky. Three were employed in their home counties, while another was 1-50 miles away. One graduate had been farming for one year and another for two years. The graduates who were vocational center teachers had been employed for a similar time. Insurance, salesman, agricultural products, other teacher, and governmental or non-profit agency were the current employment for four graduates. They were all in-state residents and employed in-state. All of these were employed in their home counties, except the agricultural products salesman, who was within 150 miles of his home. The graduate in insurance and governmental or non-profit agency had been employed for one year; the graduate in agriculture products sales and other teacher had been employed for two years.

Inspection of the contents of Table XXVIII reveals that five 1972 graduates were Kentucky residents, while one was from out-of-state. The data on initial employment revealed that two of the graduates became vocational agriculture teachers in Kentucky, while four taught out-of-state. The range of distance from home county was from 1-50 miles for

TABLE XXVIII

DISTRIBUTION OF 1972 GRADUATES AS TO INITIAL AND CURRENT EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS (N = 29)

Type of Employment by Period	Residence		Place of Employment			Miles From Home County									Years in Occupation					
	Kentucky	Out-of-State	Kentucky	Home State	Out-of-State	0	1-50	51-100	101-150	151-200	201-250	251-300	301-400	401-1,000	1	2	3	4	5	6
INITIAL																				
Vo-Ag instructor	5	1	2		4		1	1	1					3	3		3			
Tire company	3				3		3										3			
High school teacher other than Vo-Ag	2		2			2									2					
Farming	6	1	6	1		7									3	4				
Vocational center teacher	2		2			1	1								1	1				
Graduate school	3	1	3	1			3							1	4					
Railroad		1		1		1									1					
Governmental or non-profit agency	1		1						1							1				
Fertilizer business	1		1				1								1					
Other	1		1				1								1					
Farm manager	1		1				1								1					
TOTALS	25	4	19	3	7	11	11	1	2					4	20	9				
CURRENT																				
Vo-Ag instructor	5	1	2	1	3	2	1							3	4	2				
Farm manager	1		1				1								1					
Tire company	3		1		2	1	2								3					
Farming	8	2	8	2		10									5	4	1			
High school teacher other than Vo-Ag	2		2			2									1	1				
Vocational center teacher	1	1	1	1		1	1								1	1				
Banking or farm credit	1				1									1	1					
Graduate school	1				1									1	1					
Governmental or non-profit agency	1		1						1							1				
Elementary teacher	1		1				1								1					
Other	1		1					1							1					
TOTALS	25	4	19	3	7	11	11	1	2					4	20	9				

one graduate up to 401-1,000 miles for three graduates. Three of the six graduates had been employed for one year, while three were employed for two years. Three Kentucky residents chose employment at a tire company out-of-state for their initial employment. All three were living within 50 miles of their home counties and had been employed at this tire company for one year. Three of this group were Kentucky residents, while one was from out-of-state. Three entered graduate school in-state, while another chose to attend graduate school in his home state. Three of the graduates were living 50 miles from their home counties, while another graduate was 401-1,000 miles away. The above four graduates had been in graduate school for one year. Six of this group were Kentucky residents, while one was from out-of-state. Six chose to enter farming in Kentucky and one entered farming out-of-state. All seven graduates are farming in their home counties, and three of the graduates have been farming for one year and four for two years. High school teacher other than vocational agriculture and vocational center teacher were chosen by four graduates, two in each occupation. All four were Kentucky residents and accepted employment in-state. The two high school teachers other than vocational agriculture were living in their home county. One of the vocational center teachers was living in his home county, while the other graduate lived 1-50 miles away from his home county. The graduates who were farming had been doing so for one year, but one of the vocational center teachers had taught for one year and the other for two years. Railroad, governmental or non-profit agency, fertilizer business, other, and farm manager were the occupations of five graduates. Four of this group were Kentucky residents, while one was from out-of-state. All the Kentucky residents were employed in-

state, while the out-of-state graduate was employed in his home state. The range of distance from home county was from one living in his home county to 101-150 miles for another graduate who was employed by a governmental or non-profit agency. All had been employed for one year except the governmental or non-profit agency employee, who had been employed two years.

In describing selected aspects of the current employment of the 1972 graduates, it should be noted that eight of these were Kentucky residents, while two were from out-of-state. Relative to current employment it was found that eight graduates were farming in Kentucky, while two were farming in their home states. All the above graduates were farming in their home counties, and five had been farming for one year, four for two years, and one for three years. Six of the graduates chose vocational agriculture as their current employment. Five of this group were Kentucky residents, while one was from out-of-state. Relative to place of employment, two were in Kentucky, one was in his home state, and three were out-of-state. Two of the graduates lived in their home counties, while three graduates were up to 401-1,000 miles from home. Four of the above graduates had been employed for one year and two for two years. In 1973 there were three graduates employed at a tire company. All three were Kentucky residents. One was employed in Kentucky, and two were employed out-of-state. The range of distance from home county was from zero miles for one graduate up to 1-50 miles for two graduates. The three graduates had been employed at the tire company for one year. Vocational center teacher and high school teacher other than vocational agriculture were selected by three in-state residents and one out-of-state resident as current employment. Three were

employed in Kentucky and the other in his home state. The range in distance from their home counties varied from zero for three graduates up to 1-50 miles for another graduate. The vocational center teacher had been employed for one year and the other for one year. It was also found that the vocational center teachers had been comparably employed. Farm manager, banking or farm credit, graduate school, governmental or non-profit agency, elementary teacher, and other were the occupations chosen by six graduates. All six were Kentucky residents, but the graduates in banking or farm credit and graduate school were employed out-of-state. The range in distance from home county was from 1-50 miles for two graduates up to 401-1,000 for two graduates. All graduates had been employed for one year except the governmental or non-profit agency employee, and he had been employed two years. The data in Table XXVIII revealed that seven graduates' initial employment was farming, while six chose vocational agriculture instructor. It further revealed that ten graduates were currently farming and six had remained in teaching.

Table XXIX was developed to describe the initial and current employment patterns of the 1973 graduates. Four of this group were Kentucky residents, while two were from out-of-state. It was found that four of the graduates became vocational agriculture instructors in Kentucky, while two taught out-of-state. The range of distance from home county was from 1-50 miles for two graduates up to 401-1,000 miles for another graduate. All the above graduates have been employed since May 10, 1973. Farming was selected by two Kentucky residents, and they chose to farm in Kentucky in their home counties. The graduates have been farming one year. Farm manager, vocational center teacher,

TABLE XXIX

DISTRIBUTION OF 1973 GRADUATES AS TO INITIAL AND CURRENT EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS
(N = 13)

Type of Employment by Period	Residence		Place of Employment			Miles From Home County									Years in Occupation					
	Kentucky	Out-of-State	Kentucky	Home State	Out-of-State	0	1-50	51-100	101-150	151-200	201-250	251-300	301-400	401-1,000	1	2	3	4	5	6
INITIAL																				
Vo-Ag instructor	4	2	4		2		2	2					1	1						6
Farm manager	1				1									1						1
Farming	2		2			2														2
Vocational center teacher	1		1			1														1
Presently in graduate school	1		1				1													1
Lab technician	1		1			1														1
Feed and Seed business	1		1			1														1
Totals	11	2	10		3	5	3	2					1	2						13

*These graduates started to work after May 10, 1973, and their initial and current employment are the same.

presently in graduate school, lab technician, and feed and seed business were the initial and current employment of five graduates. It was found that all were employed in Kentucky except the farm manager, and he was employed out-of-state. The range of distance from home county was from zero miles for three graduates up to 401-1,000 miles for another graduate. All the above graduates were employed after May 10, 1973. Therefore, their initial and current employment were the same.

In Table XXX a Likert-type scale, which was a continuum from Excellent through Poor, was used to determine graduates' judgments regarding selected factors associated with the Agricultural Education Division. For statistical treatment of these data numerical values were assigned to the response categories in the following pattern:

Response Categories	Numerical Value	Range of Actual Limits for Categories
Excellent	5	4.50 and above
Good	4	3.50 - 4.49
Satisfactory	3	2.50 - 3.49
Fair	2	1.50 - 2.49
Poor	1	1.49 and below

By their mean response of 4.58 the graduates indicated that "the availability of the agricultural education staff for advisement and counseling" was excellent. The next highest mean response of 4.17, or good, was received for "the degree to which the agricultural education staff if oriented towards student needs."

Graduates felt the department was "good" in helping them secure jobs as disclosed by the 4.02 mean response assigned to this factor. Also rated good on the average by the graduates were the degree to which they were prepared to effectively work with school and state department

TABLE XXX

GRADUATES' JUDGMENTS REGARDING SELECTED FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH THE AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION DIVISION AT MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY

Judgment Factors	Distribution of Responses by Judgment Factors										Response*
	Excellent		Good		Satis.		Fair		Poor		
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	
The availability of the Ag. Ed. staff for advisement and counseling	73	61.3	42	35.3	4	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.58
The degree to which the Ag. Ed. staff is oriented towards students' needs	37	31.1	67	56.3	14	11.8	0	0.0	1	0.8	4.17
The degree to which you were prepared to adequately set up and work with an advisory committee	6	5.0	44	37.0	51	42.9	14	11.8	4	3.4	3.29
The degree to which you were prepared to effectively work with the school administration and State Department	23	19.3	53	44.5	34	28.6	9	8.4	0	0.0	3.76
The degree to which you were prepared to plan and maintain the physical facilities	16	13.5	60	50.4	35	29.4	6	5.0	2	1.7	3.69
The degree to which you were prepared to order and maintain equipment	18	15.1	47	39.5	36	30.3	12	10.1	6	5.0	3.50
Your preparation to effectively guide and counsel students in job placement	11	9.2	48	40.3	33	27.7	20	16.8	7	5.9	3.30
Help received from the Ag. Ed. Department in securing job placement	56	47.1	26	21.9	26	21.9	5	4.2	6	5.0	4.02

*Mean response based on following scale: Excellent = 5; Good = 4; Satisfactory = 3; Fair = 2; Poor = 1.

administrators, to plan and maintain physical facilities, and to order and maintain equipment with 3.79, 3.69, and 3.50 mean responses, respectively.

The Agricultural Education Department staff was rated "satisfactory" in their efforts to prepare graduates to effectively guide and counsel students in job placement and to adequately set up and work with an advisory committee. On these two factors graduates' mean responses were 3.30 and 3.29, respectively.

Table XXXI reflects the distribution of graduates regarding their assessment of competency related to teaching vocational agriculture. The competency areas that were rated "good" by graduates and their respective mean responses were professional education, 3.70, and FFA advisor, 3.52. Competency areas which were rated by graduates in the "satisfactory" category were cooperative education, with a 3.40 mean response, and young and/or adult farmer advisement, with a mean response of 2.97. Respondents were given an opportunity to add any competence they felt had been omitted from the list that was applicable to a vocational agriculture teacher's position.

Because responses to this were so varied, it was not possible to summarize and present them in tabular form. However, a list of the added competencies is offered for the reader's inspection in Appendix B.

To analyze responses regarding the factors which influenced graduates to leave the vocational agriculture teaching profession, a Likert-type scale which was a continuum from "very much" influence through "no" influence was used. To permit statistical treatment of data, numerical values were assigned to the response categories, as in Table IV previously.

TABLE XXXI

GRADUATES' ASSESSMENT OF COMPETENCY IN SELECTED AREAS RELATED TO TEACHING VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

Competency Areas	Distribution of Responses by Comptency Area										Mean Response*
	Excellent		Good		Satis.		Fair		Poor		
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION: Refers to Teaching Methods & Skills, Visual Aids, Motivational Methods, and Class Management	15	12.6	61	51.3	37	31.1	4	3.4	2	1.7	3.70
COOPERATIVE: Refers to conducting learning experiences in Career Selection, Selection of Training Centers, Student Placement, and Human Relations	5	4.2	53	44.5	47	39.5	12	10.1	2	1.7	3.40
FFA ADVISOR: Refers to preparing Students and Projects for Fairs, Shows & Contests, Planning & Conducting Occupational Experience Programs, Record Books, Program of Activities, and State & Local Reports	16	13.5	48	40.4	44	37.0	4	3.4	7	5.9	3.52
YOUNG AND/OR ADULT FARMER ADVISOR: Refers to setting up and conducting a Young and/or Adult Farmer Program	4	3.4	35	29.4	49	41.2	15	12.6	16	13.5	2.97

*Mean response based on following scale: Excellent = 5; Good = 4; Satisfactory = 3; Fair = 2; Poor = 1.

In Table XXXII are listed the factors influencing graduates to leave the vocational agriculture teaching profession. The factor with "some" influence on the graduates' decisions to leave the vocational agriculture teaching profession after teaching for from one to six years was salary, which received a 1.50 mean response. "Little" influencing factors on the graduates' decisions to leave the vocational agriculture teaching profession and respective mean responses were (2) lack of advancement opportunities, 1.44; (3) too many evening responsibilities, 1.28; (4) discipline problems, 1.22; (5) time required for FFA activities, 1.06; (6) long hours and state reports, 1.00; (8) little or no opportunity to specialize, 0.83; (9) personality conflicts with administration, 0.78; (10) too few teacher aides and materials available, 0.72; (11) dislike working with high school students and over-emphasis of athletics, 0.67; (13) dislike teaching certain areas of vocational agriculture, 0.61; and (14) failure to adjust to school schedule and community attitude toward vocational agriculture, 0.56. The factors which had "slight" influence on the graduates' decisions to leave the vocational agriculture teaching profession were dislike for adult or young farmer programs and size of community, 0.44; poor rapport with other teachers in system, 0.39; and dislike community standards for teachers, 0.33. The factors community responsibilities, expected to teach other subject matter areas, and ethnic and religious factors--0.22--and too short summer vacations and wife not happy with vocational agriculture profession--0.11--had almost no influence on the graduates' decisions to leave the teaching profession.

There were only 18 graduates who started teaching vocational agriculture from July 1, 1967, through June 30, 1973, who have since left the teaching profession.

TABLE XXXII

COMPARISON OF FACTORS INFLUENCING GRADUATES TO LEAVE THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHING PROFESSION

Influencing Factors	Very Much		Much		Some		Little		None		Mean Response*
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Salary			5	27.8	4	22.2	4	22.2	5	27.8	1.50
Long hours					5	27.8	8	44.4	5	27.8	1.00
Lack of advancement opportunities			7	38.9			5	27.8	6	33.3	1.44
Too many evening responsibilities	1	5.6	3	16.7	2	11.1	6	33.3	6	33.3	1.28
Discipline problems	1	5.6	3	16.7	3	16.7	3	16.7	8	44.4	1.22
Personality conflicts with administration			2	11.1	1	5.6	6	33.3	9	50.0	0.78
Failure to adjust to school schedule					2	11.1	6	33.3	10	55.6	0.56
Time required for FFA activities			3	16.7	3	16.7	4	22.2	8	44.4	1.06
Dislike for adult and young farmer programs			2	11.1			2	11.1	14	77.8	0.44
Dislike working with high school students			2	11.1	3	16.7			13	72.2	0.67
State reports	1	5.6	2	11.1	2	11.1	4	22.2	9	50.0	1.00
Community responsibilities					1	5.6	2	11.1	15	83.3	0.22
Community attitude toward vocational agriculture			1	5.6	3	16.7	1	5.6	13	72.2	0.56
Dislike community standards for teachers					2	11.1	2	11.1	14	77.8	0.33
Too short summer vacations							2	11.1	16	88.9	0.11
Size of community	1	5.6			1	5.6	2	11.1	14	77.8	0.44
Ethnic and religious factors					1	5.6	2	11.1	15	83.3	0.22
Dislike teaching certain areas of vocational agriculture					5	27.8	1	5.6	12	66.7	0.61
Too few teacher aids and materials available			2	11.1			7	38.9	9	50.0	0.72
Little or no opportunity to specialize					7	38.9	1	5.6	10	55.6	0.83
Poor rapport with other teachers in system	1	5.6					3	16.7	14	77.8	0.39
Expected to teach other subject matter areas					1	5.6	2	11.1	15	83.3	0.22
Over-emphasis of athletics	1	5.6	1	5.6	1	5.6	3	16.7	12	66.7	0.67
Wife not happy with vocational agriculture profession							2	11.1	16	88.9	0.11

*Mean response is based on the following scale: Very Much = 4; Much = 3; Some = 2; Little = 1; None = 0.

NOTE: No graduates left the vocational agriculture teaching profession in the years 1970 and 1973.

Listed as follows are some of the individual factors which had very much influence on graduates' leaving the teaching profession: (1) too many evening responsibilities, (2) discipline problems, (3) state reports, (4) size of community, (5) poor rapport with other teachers in system, and (6) over-emphasis of athletics. The poor rapport with other teachers was individual cases in multi-teacher departments. The factors influencing the graduates to leave the teaching profession were varied because of the size of the samples, the difference in the number of years taught, and no graduates from the 1970 and 1973 graduating classes leaving the profession. None of the factors included on the survey form received "very much" or "much" responses from any group members.

Table XXXIII revealed that of 119 graduates from July 1, 1967, through June 30, 1973, 24 (20.2 percent) have not participated in a collegiate graduate program since qualifying to teach vocational agriculture. Those not participating, by year of graduation, ranged from a low of one (5.3 percent) for the 1968 graduates to a high of five (38.5 percent) for the 1973 graduates. There were 37 (31.1 percent) of the graduates who reported having completed partial requirements for M.S. or M.A. degrees, with from 0-15 semester hours, while another 18 (15.1 percent) of the graduates had completed 16-36 semester hours of graduate study toward the M.S. or M.A. degree. Thirty-six (30.3 percent) of the graduates reported a M.S. degree or equivalent received as of June 30, 1973. Only one (0.8 percent) of the graduates reported a Rank I or equivalent received. Rank I is a planned program of 30 semester hours above the M.S. degree. Three (2.5 percent) of the graduates had a Ph.D. or equivalent in progress. Five of the seven 1967 graduates had completed a M.S. degree or equivalent. It should be mentioned that while

TABLE XXXIII

COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF GRADUATES BY YEAR OF GRADUATION

Educational Status	Distribution by Status Level														Total by Level of Attainment	
	1967		1968		1969		1970		1971		1972		1973			
	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent	No.	Per-cent
Have not participated in a collegiate graduate program			1	5.3	2	10.0	3	18.8	3	20.0	10	34.5	5	38.5	24	20.2
Partial requirement for M.S. or M.A. degree																
0 - 3									1	6.7	2	6.9			3	2.5
4 - 6			1	5.3	2	10.0			3	20.0	1	3.4			7	5.9
7 - 9			1	5.3			1	6.3	2	13.3	3	10.3	3	23.1	10	8.4
10 - 12	1	14.3	1	5.3					1	6.7	2	6.9	3	23.1	8	6.7
13 - 15			2	10.5	2	10.0	3	18.7			2	6.9			9	7.6
16 - 18			1	5.3	1	5.0			1	6.7					3	2.5
19 - 21							2	12.5			2	6.9			4	3.4
22 - 24	1	14.3	2	10.5	1	5.0			1	6.7					5	4.2
25 - 27			2	10.5			2	12.5					1	7.7	5	4.2
28 - 36											1	3.4			1	0.8
M.S. or equivalent received	4	57.1	6	31.6	11	55.0	5	31.3	3	20.0	6	20.7	1	7.7	36	30.3
Rank I or equivalent received			1	5.3											1	0.8
Ph.D. or equivalent in progress	1	14.3	1	5.3	1	5.0									3	2.5
Ph.D. or equivalent received--Specify area of study and university																
Totals	7		19		20		16		15		29		13		119	100.0

of the 1973 graduates had completed his M.S. degree, 11 (55 percent) of the 1969 group had completed requirements for the M.S. degree. As of June 30, 1973, 95 (79.8 percent) of the group had participated in a collegiate graduate program.

Table XXXIV was developed to allow comparison of graduates' membership in professional organizations related to employment areas by year of graduation. Surprisingly, it was found that 42 (35.3 percent) of the graduates were not members of any professional organizations. The distribution of graduates by the number of organizations attracting the greatest number of graduates in order was as follows: (1) three professional organizations, 25 (21 percent); two professional organizations, 15 (12.6 percent); one professional organization, 15 (12.6 percent); four professional organizations, 11 (9.2 percent); five professional organizations, 5 (4.2 percent); six professional organizations, 2 (1.7 percent); seven professional organizations, 1 (0.8 percent).

It should be observed, by the year of graduation, that the number of professional organizations in which graduates held membership varied greatly. There was one in the 1967 group and 15 in the 1972 group who did not hold membership in any professional organization. Seventy-seven of the 119 graduates held memberships in one or more professional organizations.

TABLE XXXIV

COMPARISON OF GRADUATES' MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS RELATED TO EMPLOYMENT AREAS BY YEAR OF GRADUATION

Number of Professional Organizations in Which Memberships Were Held	Distribution by Number of Organizations													
	1967 (N = 7)		1968 (N = 19)		1969 (N = 20)		1970 (N = 16)		1971 (N = 15)		1972 (N = 29)		1973 (N = 13)		Overall (N = 119)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
0	1	14.3	8	42.0	2	10.0	5	31.3	6	40.0	15	51.7	6	46.2	42	35.3
1			4	21.1	3	15.0	2	12.5			5	17.3	1	7.7	15	12.6
2	1	14.3	1	5.3	4	20.0	1	6.3	1	6.7	5	17.3	1	7.7	15	12.6
3	2	28.6	3	15.8	9	45.0	3	18.8	3	20.0	2	6.9	3	23.1	25	21.0
4			1	5.3	1	5.0	3	18.8	4	26.7			2	15.4	11	9.2
5	1	14.3			1	5.0	1	6.3	1	6.7	1	3.5			5	4.2
6	1	14.3	1	5.3			1	6.3							3	2.5
7											1	3.5			1	0.8
8	1	14.3	1	5.3											2	1.7
Totals	7		19		20		16		15		29		13		119	100.0

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary purpose of Chapter V is to present an abbreviated review of the study problem and its setting, the design and conduct of the study, and the major findings. Also presented are conclusions and recommendations which were based upon analysis and summarization of data collected and upon observations and impressions resulting from the design and conduct of the study.

Summary of the Study

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to compile information on graduates who have received their Bachelor of Science Degree in Agriculture from Murray State University and qualified to teach vocational agriculture during the period July 1, 1967, to June 30, 1973. This study determined the different occupations that graduates had selected, their tenure, and other selected aspects of their employment patterns.

This study also solicited a sincere opinion from each student concerning certain portions of the Agricultural Education program at Murray State University.

Specific Objectives of the Study

In order to accomplish the purposes of the study, the following specific objectives were formulated:

1. To provide a general description of graduates with regard to residence and college attendance.
2. To determine persons having the greatest influence on the students' enrollment in agriculture at Murray State University.
3. To determine initial and current employment, length of tenure, how graduates made contact with their employers, factors that influenced graduates to enter and remain in employment, and gross income from first and present employment. In effect, this will help determine a complete job history of agricultural education graduates.
4. To determine the opinions of former students toward selected functions of the Agricultural Education Division at Murray State University.
5. To determine the factors which influenced graduates who had taught vocational agriculture to leave the field.
6. To determine the advanced degrees that graduates have received or have in progress as of June 30, 1973, and the number of professional organizations relating to graduates' occupational areas in which they are a member.

Rationale for the Study

The basic rationale behind this study was the belief that graduates who have received their Bachelor of Science Degree in Agriculture from Murray State University and had qualified to teach vocational

agriculture could and would provide helpful information on the quality of the agricultural education training they had received. Many new ideas and approaches have been implemented in the agricultural education program at Murray State University. The Agriculture Department and Agricultural Education Division staffs wanted the follow-up and feedback data from the 119 graduates who were putting their training into practice. It was felt that this would enable personnel to make sound changes on what graduates say is needed to strengthen the program.

Design and Conduct of the Study

Following a review of research and literature related to the problem, the major tasks involved in the design and conduct of the study were (1) determining the population for the study, (2) developing an instrument for collecting data, (3) developing a procedure for collecting data, and (4) selecting the method for analyzing the data.

The study population consisted of 119 Agricultural Education graduates from Murray State University for the period July 1, 1967, to June 30, 1973, who had qualified to teach vocational agriculture. Usable responses were received by February 11, 1974, from 100 percent of the study population.

Findings of the Study

This study was concerned with compiling information on graduates who had received their Bachelor of Science Degree in Agriculture from Murray State University and qualified to teach vocational agriculture. Six specific objectives were developed to guide the conduct of the study. Objectives of the study were utilized as a basis for organizing the following summary of the study findings.

Transfer of Credits and Place of Residence of Graduates. There had been 119 graduates of the Murray State program, 98 (82.4 percent) of whom were Kentucky residents and 21 (17.6 percent) of whom were from out-of-state. It was found that 16 (13.5 percent) of the graduates transferred from junior colleges or other colleges in-state, while 17 (14.3 percent) transferred from junior colleges or other colleges out-of-state. Of those who did transfer, 17 (51.5 percent) transferred from 1 to 40 hours, while the remaining 16 (48.5 percent) graduates transferred from 41 to 80 semester hours. There was a total of 33 (27.7 percent) transfer students and 86 (72.3 percent) non-transfer students in the population studied.

Persons Having Greatest Influence on Students' Enrollment. Persons having the greatest influence on students' enrollment at Murray State University, in order as established by overall frequency of responses, were (1) vocational agriculture teachers, (2) it was their "own idea," (3) father or guardian, (4) a friend presently enrolled, (5) relative other than parents, (6) other influences such as "Murray is my home," "enjoy agriculture," "wife's idea," and "own idea farming," (7) college agriculture faculty members and other college representative, (8) mother or guardian, and (9) college counselor.

Job History of Graduates. Objective number three revealed that of the 119 graduates' initial and current employment, 55 selected teaching vocational agriculture as their initial employment at annual salary levels ranging from $7,067 for the 1967 group to $8,738 for the 1971 graduates. Fourteen graduates became high school teachers in areas other than vocational agriculture, for which they received salaries

ranging from $5,400 to $6,338 per year. Farming was selected by 13 graduates as their initial employment. Because of the variance in information received from this respondents, no mean salary levels could be determined.

Six graduates chose vocational center teaching as their initial employment at mean annual salaries ranging from $8,533 to $9,800. Six graduates were found to be presently in graduate school. For the graduate students it was not possible to determine mean salaries.

Government or non-profit agencies, elementary school teaching, laboratory technician work, farm management and tire companies each attracted three of the graduates for a total of 15 at respective mean salary ranges of $6,800 to $9,100; $6,100 to $7,100; $8,000 to $12,000; $6,500 to $11,000; and $8,367.

The Cooperative Extension Service and insurance each became the initial employment for two graduates. The salary range for the extension workers was $6,500 to $7,000, while that for the insurance employees was $7,200 to $7,800.

Three graduates who began their careers as teachers of high school subjects other than vocational agriculture had the lowest computed mean annual salary, $5,400. A laboratory technician who graduated in 1971 had the highest mean salary reported, $12,000.

It was found that the 1973 employment areas for the 119 graduates in order of the number of graduates by type of employment were vocational agriculture instructor, 48, with annual salaries ranging from $8,300 for the 1973 group to $10,738 for the 1968 graduates. Farming was chosen as the current employment for 17 graduates. Because of the variance in reported information from these respondents, no mean salary

levels could be determined. Seven graduates were high school teachers in areas other than vocational agriculture, for which they were receiving salaries ranging from $6,625 for the 1972 group up to $8,667 for the 1969 group. Six graduates chose governmental or non-profit agency for their present employment and were receiving salaries from $7,000 for the 1972 graduates up to $12,750 for two graduates. Vocational center teaching and insurance were the types of current employment for five graduates each. The salary range for the vocational center teachers was $9,200 to $10,200, while that for the insurance representatives was $7,800 to $14,100. Farm manager and administrator was the 1973 employment for four graduates each. The salaries reported for the farm managers varied from $6,500 to $11,000, while the salaries for the administrators varied from $7,600 to $13,500. Elementary teacher, feed and seed business, and tire company each attracted three of the graduates, for a total of nine, at the respective mean salary ranges of $7,000 to $8,500; $7,600 to $9,500; and $9,000. Vocational center coordinator, college teaching, others, and presently in graduate school was the current employment for two graduates each. The mean salary for the two vocational center coordinators was $10,756. College teaching or research work salaries varied from $9,300 to $14,000 and others mean salary ranged from $7,300 to $8,400, while it was not possible to compute mean salaries for the graduates presently in graduate school. Cooperative extension service, banking or farm credit, laboratory technician, other teacher, salesman, agriculture products, and department store manager were the types of present employment for seven former Murray State graduates. The salaries ranged from $7,800 for the category "other teacher" to $11,000 for the department store manager.

The lowest computed mean annual salary was $6,500 for a graduate who began his career as a farm manager. The highest mean salary reported was $14,100 for an insurance representative who graduates in 1969.

When a comparison was made between the initial and current employment patterns for all graduates by year of graduation, all groups, except the 1967 group, were quite varied in their employment.

The graduates of 1968, 1969, 1971, 1972, and 1973 were quite varied in the types of initial and current employment. However, for every year except 1972 more graduates chose the vocational agriculture teaching profession as their initial and current employment than any other type of position.

Length of Tenure. A summary of all groups' initial employment patterns revealed that 48 graduates had been employed for one year; 28 graduates, for two years; 18 graduates, for three years; 10 graduates, for four years; 11 graduates, for five years; and four graduates, for six years.

A comparison of all groups' current employment patterns revealed that 51 graduates had been employed for one year; 26, for two years; 14 graduates, for three years; 14 graduates, for four years; 10 graduates, for five years; and four graduates, for six years. Although the graduates have varied in their length of tenure, all reported they were employed currently and had been employed since qualifying to teach vocational agriculture.

Comparison of Ways Graduates Made Contact With Their Employers. The practices most often followed by graduates to contact their first

employer and the number using each method were made inquiry requesting employment, 49; college counselor, 42; farming, 14; teacher placement service, 5; friend or others informed you of the opportunity and presently in graduate school, 3; and college of agriculture placement service, contacted by employer, and other, specify job interview at Murray State University, 1 each.

The practices most often used by graduates to contact their 1973 employers and the number using each were friend or other person informed you of the opportunity, 18; made inquiry requesting employment, 14; contacted by employer, 12; private employment agency and other specify, 4 each; college of agriculture placement service, 2; and college counselor, 1. Sixty-four graduates were on the same job in 1973 in which they first began working, which meant they had utilized no additional methods to contact employers.

None of the 119 graduates used the following methods: answered an ad or listing, friend or others informed you of the opportunity, state employment agency, private employment agency, and presently in military service. In contacting 1973 employers, none of the graduates reported using teacher placement service, job and listing, and state employment agency as practices for contacting their 1973 employers. When compared by practices used to contact their first employers, there appeared to be a consistent pattern whereby most graduates made inquiry requesting employment and/or consulted college counselor for first employment. When compared by years, there appeared to be no consistent patterns of practices or procedures utilized by graduates in contacting their 1973 employers, nor were there any major differences indicated among groups.

Factors That Influenced Graduates to Enter and Remain in Employment. When a summary was developed of the mean responses of all graduates as to the influence of selected factors influencing them to enter their first employment, the factor which had much influence on the graduates' decisions was "felt best trained in this area." The influencing factors which graduates reported as having some influence on their decisions to enter their first employment were "freedom and independence," "security," "working closely with people," "salary," "good hours," "opportunity for advancement," "wife happy with line of employment," "farming opportunity available," "educational facilities," "prestige of position," "parental home," and "evenings free." Those areas, according to the data, which had little influence on the groups' decisions to enter their first employment were "good recreational facilities in area," "own my own house," and "health factors."

A summary of the mean responses of all graduates revealed the selected factors influencing graduates to remain in their present employment was formulated. The factors which had much influence on the graduates' decisions to remain in their present employment were "freedom and independence of the job," "felt best trained," and "security." The factors which had some influence were "working closely with people," "salary," "opportunity for advancement," "wife happy with line of employment," "good hours," "farming," "prestige of position," "educational facilities," "close to parental home," "own my own house," and "evenings free." "Good recreational facilities in area" and "health factors" were factors in the little influence categories. No mean responses in the very much and no influence categories were found among this group.

Judgments of Former Students Regarding Aspects of the Murray State University Agricultural Education Program. By the graduates' mean responses to eight selected judgment factors it was determined that "the availability of the agricultural education staff for advisement and counseling" was excellent; also rating excellent was "the degree to which the agricultural education staff is oriented towards student needs." Graduates rated the department good on "helping them secure jobs," "the degree to which they were prepared to effectively work with school and state department administrators," "to plan and maintain physical facilities," and "to order and maintain equipment."

The Agricultural Education Division staff was rated satisfactory in their efforts to prepare graduates "to effectively guide and counsel students in job placement" and "to adequately set up and work with an advisory committee."

Graduates were surveyed regarding their assessment of competency related to teaching vocational agriculture. Competencies rated good by graduates were "professional education" and "FFA advisor." Competency areas which were rated in the satisfactory category by graduates were "cooperative education" and "young and/or adult farmer advisement." Respondents were given an opportunity to add competencies they felt had been omitted from the list which were applicable to a vocational agriculture teacher's position. Because responses to this were so varied, it was not possible to summarize and present them in tabular form.

Factors Influencing Graduates to Leave the Vocational Agriculture Teaching Profession. Comparison of factors influencing 18 graduates to leave the vocational agriculture teaching profession was accomplished by getting the graduates to rate a list of 24 factors.

Factors having some influence on the 18 graduates' decisions to leave the vocational agriculture teaching profession were salary, lack of advancement, too many evening responsibilities, discipline problems, time required for FFA activities, long hours and state reports, little or no opportunity to specialize, personality conflicts with administrators, too few teacher aides and materials available, dislike working with high school students, over-emphasis of athletics, dislike teaching certain areas of vocational agricultural, and failure to adjust to school schedule and community attitude toward vocational agriculture. The factors which had slight influence on the graduates' decisions to leave the vocational agriculture teaching profession were dislike for adult or young farmer programs, size of community, poor rapport with other teachers in system, and dislike community standards for teachers. The factors community responsibilities, ethnic and religious factors, expected to teach other subject matter areas, too short summer vacations, and wife not happy with vocational agriculture profession had the least amount of influence on the graduates' decisions to leave the vocational agriculture teaching profession. None of the selected factors included on the survey form received very much or much response from any group.

Educational Attainment of Graduates and Professional Organization Participation. There were 37 of the graduates who reported having completed partial requirements (0-15 semester hours) for a M.S. or M.A. degree, while another 18 of the graduates had completed 16 to 36 semester hours of graduate study toward the M.S. or M.A. degree. Thirty-six of the graduates reported holding a M.S. degree or equivalent as of June 30, 1973. Only one of the graduates reported a Rank I or

equivalent as having been received. Rank I refers to a planned program of 30 semester hours above the M.S. degree. As of June 30, 1973, three of the graduates had a Ph.D. or equivalent in progress, while 95 of the graduates had participated in a collegiate graduate program.

Graduates' membership in professional organizations related to employment areas, by year of graduation, was determined. Those not participating in any type of professional organizations ranged from a low of one graduate from the 1968 group to a high of 5 from the 1973 group.

The data revealed that 42 of the graduates were not members of any professional organizations. The distribution of graduates by the number of organizations attracting the greatest number of graduates were as follow: three professional organizations, 25; two professional organizations, 15; one professional organization, 15; four professional organizations, 11; five professional organizations, 5; six professional organizations, 3; eight professional organizations, 2; and seven professional organizations, 1. Seventy-seven of the 119 graduates held membership in one or more professional organizations.

Conclusions

Inspection and interpretation of the study findings prompted the formulations of certain conclusions by the investigator as detailed below.

1. The Murray State University Agricultural Education program had proven to be equally beneficial for transfer students, both from in-state and out-of-state, and for "native" students. In all cases the program seems to have been flexible in meeting

student needs and providing a quality program for qualifying to teach vocational agriculture.

2. University personnel, including counselors, agricultural faculty, and others, have little influence on students' decisions to enroll in agriculture at Murray State University.
3. Placement services and/or personnel at Murray State University were effective in aiding agricultural education graduates in contacting their first employers. However, in contacting 1973 employers, graduates relied primarily on other sources.
4. Graduates entered their first employment and remained in their 1973 employment only after carefully analyzing their own abilities and the benefits the employment offered in relation to their abilities and personal desires.
5. The Murray State University Agriculture staff was helpful in aiding graduates to secure first employment but had only a minor role in aiding them in contacting subsequent employers.
6. Respondents for the most part received comparable salaries for their first employment and have remained at comparable levels throughout their careers. That is, they have advanced and progressed at about the same rates.
7. Agricultural Education graduates of Murray State University exhibit little mobility in terms of relationship between place of employment and distance from their home counties.
8. As indicated by the fact that 100 percent of the graduates were employed at the time of the study, the Agricultural Education program at Murray State University has been very successful in preparing individuals for gainful careers.

9. The Murray State University Agricultural Education program is flexible enough to prepare graduates for entry and advancement in a wide variety of careers, particularly in those related to agriculture.
10. The Murray State University Agricultural Education program has prepared a substantial number of highly qualified vocational agriculture teachers for entry and advancement in the profession.
11. Former students hold favorable opinions about the department, staff, and quality of education received through the program. The teaching graduates feel particularly well prepared for their professional responsibilities.
12. According to many respondents, vocational agriculture teaching is a very demanding occupation involving many evening responsibilities, long hours, and relatively few opportunities for advancement, and these contribute to the exodus of some good teachers from the profession.
13. The majority of graduates have continued to improve themselves professionally by participating in graduate programs.
14. Murray State University Agricultural Education graduates on the whole have demonstrated concern for their professions by their membership and participation in professional organizations.

Recommendations

General

1. The agricultural education curriculum at Murray State

University should continue to be as flexible enough to meet the needs of non-transfer and transfer students who are planning to qualify to teach vocational agriculture.

2. The Murray State University Agricultural Education Division must take a more active role in placement of graduates.
3. The agricultural staff should strive to inform those patrons who have influence on students about the advantages of majoring in agriculture and qualifying to teach vocational agriculture at Murray State University.
4. The Agricultural Education staff should continue a close relationship with high school agribusiness programs and should seek the opinions of the high school vocational agriculture teachers about potential students and use this in counseling and advisement with students.
5. The Agricultural Education staff should continue to encourage students to qualify to teach vocational agriculture only if they demonstrate the desirable qualities of a teacher.
6. It is recommended that the Agricultural Education staff broaden their counseling and guidance program for informing students about job opportunities that are available to them upon qualifying to teach vocational agriculture.
7. The Murray State University Agricultural Education staff needs to better utilize the vocational agriculture teachers who are presently teaching to help inform students of the duties and responsibilities of a vocational agriculture teacher.
8. The Agriculture Education Division should establish an advisory committee to aid in deciding curriculum for the Murray State

Agriculture Department and to keep the Agriculture Department and Agricultural Education Division as relevant in the future as they have been in the past.

9. The Agricultural Education Division should continue to strive to meet the needs of vocational agriculture teachers and continue the excellent rapport it presently has with the students who have received their degrees and certification in agriculture from Murray State University.

Recommendations for Additional Research

It is recommended by the investigator that it would certainly be valuable in meeting accountability demands if similar research could be conducted in the next four or five years involving former students who have qualified to teach vocational agriculture at Murray State University. A continuing study of former students is a must to help the Agricultural Education Division meet the needs of students and society in the future.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

(1) Archer, Clyde F. "Making Up Your Mind to Teach." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 36, No. 6 (December, 1963), 158 and 164.

(2) Best, John W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

(3) Brinkley, Harold R. "Basic Concepts for Educating Tomorrow's Teachers." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 37, No. 7 (January, 1971), 189 and 199.

(4) Brown, Junious Douglas, and Glen C. Shinn. "Factors Which Affect Retention of Vocational Agriculture Instructors in the Southeastern United States." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Florida A & M University, 1973.)

(5) Bryan, James E. "Why Don't They Teach." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 29, No. 6 (December, 1956), 137.

(6) Cragun, John J. "Are We True Professional Workers?" Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 33, No. 8 (February, 1961), 184.

(7) Cunningham, Clarence J. "Recruitment Requires Coordination." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 36, No. 6 (December, 1963), 155-156.

(8) Fenton, Wendell L. "A Study to Determine Why Oklahoma Vocational Agriculture Instructors Changed Their Professions During the 1968-1970 School Years and Their New Occupations." (Unpub. M. S. report, Oklahoma State University, 1970.)

(9) Froelich, Loren H. "Factors Related to the Tendency of Iowa State University Agricultural Education Graduates to Not Enter or to Leave the Vocational Agriculture Teaching Profession." (Unpub. M. S. thesis, Iowa State University, 1966.)

(10) Froehlich, Loren H., and Clarence E. Bundy. "Why Qualified Vocational Agriculture Teachers Don't Teach." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 39, No. 6 (December, 1966), 134-135.

(11) Granberry, Royce L. "A Comparison of Selected Characteristics of Students Enrolled in Terminal and Transfer Curricula in Agriculture in Four Texas Junior Colleges." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1971.)

(12) Harrison, William R. "An Identification of Factors Influencing Teachers of Vocational Agriculture to Terminate or Continue High School Teaching." (Unpub. M. S. report, Oklahoma State University, 1970.)

(13) Hodges, Stanley L. "Employee-Employer Assessment of the Effectiveness of Agricultural Mechanics Training Received at Modesto Junior College." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1973.)

(14) Hoerner, Thomas Allen. "Factors Related to Employment of Iowa State University in Agriculture Education." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Iowa State University, 1965.)

(15) Hoerner, Thomas A., and Clarence E. Bundy. "Occupational Choice and Tenure of Agricultural Education Graduates." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 39, No. 6 (December, 1966), 128-130.

(16) Houskin, C. A. "Estimating Sample Size." Journal of Research Services, Vol. 3 (1963), 3.

(17) Lamberth, Edwin E. "Why Teachers of Vocational Agriculture Continue to Teach." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 35, No. 8 (March, 1963), 194.

(18) Lamberth, Edwin E. "Why Teachers of Vocational Agriculture Leave the Profession." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 31, No. 8 (February, 1959), 174.

(19) Peters, Curtis, R. "The Occupational Decisions That Have Been Made by State Farmers in Alfalfa County from 1929 Through 1971 and Some of the Information Related to Those Decisions." (Unpub. M. S. thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1973.)

(20) Shirley, Del. "Follow Up of California Polytechnic Agriculture Education Graduates for the Years 1966-1968." (A staff study, Agricultural Education Department, California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo, June, 1969.) ED 049385.

(21) Tarone, Ernest, and E. M. Jurgensen. "Fifteen Kinds of Teacher Problems." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 37, No. 7 (February, 1965), 192-193.

(22) Thomas, Wendell Ray. "A Survey of Salary Schedules, Benefits and Working Conditions for Agriculture Teachers in the United States." (Unpub. M. S. thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1973.)

(23) Thompson, John F. "A Look at Some Who Quit Teaching." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 39, No. 7 (January, 1967), 156-158.

(24) Updyke, Gary W. "New Teachers' Perception of the Pre-Service Agricultural Education Program at Oklahoma State University." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1974.)

(25) Vossler, Leo. "Why Former Teachers of Vocational Agriculture Left the Profession." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 32, No. 8 (February, 1960), 180-181.

(26) Wiegers, George W. "A Focus on Agricultural Education Majors Who Graduated from the College of Agriculture, University of Tennessee." Knoxville, Tennessee: Department of Agricultural Education, University of Tennessee, 1965.

(27) Woodin, Ralph J. "Supply and Demand for Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in the United States for the 1967-68 School Year." ED 028272.

(28) Woodin, Ralph J. "Supply and Demand for Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in 1972." (A staff study, The Department of Vocational-Technical Education, The University of Tennessee, February, 1973.)

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

Dear

When you were in college, did you ever wonder what occupation you would select and what would be your tenure in that particular occupation? Have you ever given any thought to why some graduates qualifying to teach vocational agriculture began teaching and later left for another field of endeavor? Why have some graduates failed to enter the teaching field, while others have remained in teaching since graduation?

These questions are of interest to us in the Agricultural Education Division at Murray State University; so much so, in fact, that a study is being carried out to determine the factors related to occupational choice, tenure, selected aspects, and employment patterns of graduates in Agricultural Education. This study will include all graduates from July 1, 1967 through June 30, 1973.

Would you be willing to give 15 minutes to fill out the following questionnaire? If so, you can help determine the factors related to occupational choice, tenure, selected aspects, and employment patterns of over 125 graduates since July 1, 1967.

I would appreciate your response at your earliest convenience. As you will see, much of the information is personal; therefore, no signature is requested. A number has been assigned to your questionnaire; thus, I will have a record of those that have not been returned. Your assistance in this study will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Eldon E. Heathcott, Graduate Assistant
Agricultural Education Department
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

Study of Agricultural Graduates from Murray State University who qualified to teach Vocational Agriculture from July 1, 1967 through June 30, 1973.

Instructions:

Place a check (✓) or circle the best rating before the most appropriate answer to each question. When asked to specify or give specific answers, please be brief as possible. Answer all questions unless not applicable. All individual information will be held in strict confidence. You have not been asked to sign your name to this questionnaire. Your response is only a coded number.

Followup of Murray State University Agricultural
Education Graduates from July 1, 1967
through June 30, 1973.

Years you were enrolled at MSU ____ Year Received Teaching Certificate ____

Other Colleges Attended	Hours Transferred	Home County State
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

I. What one person made the largest contribution toward influencing your enrollment in Agriculture at M.S.U.?

1. ___Father or guardian
2. ___Mother or guardian
3. ___Vo-Ag Instructor
4. ___H. S. Supt. or principal
5. ___County Extension Agent
6. ___College counselor
7. ___Relative other than parents
8. ___Contact with College Agri. Faculty Member
9. ___Contact with other college representative
10. ___Friend was a graduate
11. ___Friend was presently enrolled
12. ___Own idea
13. ___Other, specify

_____

14. ___Answer not known

II. Employment after Graduation:

A. Considering your first employment, rate the following factors as having: (0) no influence, (1) little influence, (2) some influence, (3) much influence, or (4) very much influence on your decision to enter your first occupational area. (Circle best rating for each of the 16 factors.)

	Amount of Influence				
	None	Little	Some	Much	Very Much
1. Salary	0	1	2	3	4
2. Working closely with people	0	1	2	3	4
3. Freedom and independence of the job	0	1	2	3	4
4. Security	0	1	2	3	4
5. Felt best trained in this area	0	1	2	3	4
6. Farming opportunity available	0	1	2	3	4
7. Good hours	0	1	2	3	4
8. Opportunity for advancement	0	1	2	3	4
9. Evenings free	0	1	2	3	4
10. Close to parental home	0	1	2	3	4
11. Own my own house	0	1	2	3	4
12. Wife happy with line of employment	0	1	2	3	4
13. Good recreational facilities in area	0	1	2	3	4
14. Educational facilities	0	1	2	3	4
15. Prestige of position	0	1	2	3	4
16. Health factors	0	1	2	3	4

B. What was your yearly income before taxes (gross) from your first employment following college graduation? (Round to nearest one hundred dollars.)

1. $_____

III. Employment Record:

How many jobs (different occupations) have you held (6 months duration or longer) since your graduation from MSU? (Exclude military service and graduate school.) List occupations in chronological order, ending with present employment. Place an "X" under in-state or out-of-state.

Occupations	In-State	Out-of-State	Miles From Home County	Years in Occupation

IV. Agricultural Education Judgement:

Please circle the appropriate number on the right below which indicates your sincere judgement about the following statements concerning the quality of the program provided by the Agricultural Education Division at Murray State University:

Rate the Quality of Agricultural Education at MSU on the following 8 points:

	Poor	Fair	Satis-factory	Good	Excel-lent
1. The availability of the Ag. Ed. Staff for Advisement and Counseling	0	1	2	3	4
2. The degree to which the Ag. Ed. Staff is oriented towards student needs	0	1	2	3	4
3. The degree to which you were prepared to adequately set up and work with an advisory committee	0	1	2	3	4
4. The degree to which you were prepared to effectively work with the school administration and State Department	0	1	2	3	4
5. The degree to which you were prepared to plan and maintain the physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4
6. The degree to which you were prepared to order and maintain equipment	0	1	2	3	4
7. Your preparation to effectively guide and counsel students in job placement	0	1	2	3	4
8. Help received from the Ag. Ed. Department in securing job placement	0	1	2	3	4

Rate Your Competence In These Areas:

1. PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION--Refers to Teaching Methods & Skills, Visual Aids, Motivational Methods, and Class Management	0	1	2	3	4
2. COOPERATIVE--Refers to conducting learning experiences in Career Selection, Selection of Training Centers, Student Placement, and Human Relations	0	1	2	3	4
3. FFA ADVISOR--Refers to preparing Students and Projects for Fairs, Shows & Contests, Planning & Conducting Occupational Experience Programs, Record Books, Program of Activities and State & Local Reports	0	1	2	3	4
4. YOUNG AND/OR ADULT FARMER ADVISOR--Refers to setting up and conducting a Young and/or Adult Farmer Program	0	1	2	3	4
5. OTHER COMPETENCIES--Add any competence you feel has been omitted that is applicable to a Vocational Agriculture Teacher: _____	0	1	2	3	4

V. **Present Employment: Please answer the following questions even if present occupation is the same as occupation after graduation.**

A. **How did you make contact with your 1973 employer?**

1.____Present job is same as first
2.____College of Agriculture Placement Service
3.____Teacher Placement Service
4.____Answered job ad listing
5.____Made inquiry requesting employment
6.____College Counselor
7.____Employer contacted you
8.____Friend or other person informed you of the opportunity
9.____State employment agency
10.____Private employment agency
11.____Other, specify _____

B. Considering your 1973 employment, rate the following factors as having: (0) no influence, (1) little influence, (2) some influence, (3) much influence, or (4) very much influence on your decision to remain in your present occupational area. (Circle best rating for each of the 16 factors.)

	Amount of Influence				
	None	Little	Some	Much	Very Much
1. Salary	0	1	2	3	4
2. Working closely with people	0	1	2	3	4
3. Freedom and independence of the job	0	1	2	3	4
4. Security	0	1	2	3	4
5. Feel best trained for this job	0	1	2	3	4
6. Farming opportunity available	0	1	2	3	4
7. Good hours	0	1	2	3	4
8. Opportunity for advancement	0	1	2	3	4
9. Evenings free	0	1	2	3	4
10. Close to parental home	0	1	2	3	4
11. Own my own home	0	1	2	3	4
12. Wife is happy with present job	0	1	2	3	4
13. Good recreational facilities in area	0	1	2	3	4
14. Educational facilities	0	1	2	3	4
15. Prestige of position	0	1	2	3	4
16. Health factor	0	1	2	3	4

C. What was your yearly income before taxes (gross) from your 1973 employment? Do not include income from other sources such as interest earned, rentals, and similar income. Farmers please use your 1972 income. (Round to nearest one hundred dollars.)

1. $_____

D. If you have taught vocational agriculture and have since left for another occupational area, rate each of the following factors below according to influence on your decision to leave the vocational agriculture teaching profession. Rate on a (0) to (4) point scale, depending upon the degree of influence the factor had on your decision. A number (0) rating = no influence, (1) little influence, (2) some influence, (3) much influence, or (4) very much influence.

	Amount of Influence				
	None	Little	Some	Much	Very Much
1. Salary	0	1	2	3	4
2. Long hours	0	1	2	3	4
3. Lack of advancement opportunities	0	1	2	3	4
4. Too many evening responsibilities	0	1	2	3	4
5. Discipline problems	0	1	2	3	4
6. Personality conflicts with administration	0	1	2	3	4
7. Failure to adjust to school schedule	0	1	2	3	4
8. Time required for FFA activities	0	1	2	3	4
9. Dislike for adult and young farmer programs	0	1	2	3	4
10. Dislike working with high school students	0	1	2	3	4
11. State reports	0	1	2	3	4
12. Community responsibilities	0	1	2	3	4
13. Community attitude toward vocational agriculture	0	1	2	3	4
14. Dislike community standards for teachers	0	1	2	3	4
15. Too short summer vacations	0	1	2	3	4
16. Size of community	0	1	2	3	4
17. Ethnic and religious factors	0	1	2	3	4
18. Dislike teaching certain areas of vocational agriculture	0	1	2	3	4
19. Too few teacher aids and materials available	0	1	2	3	4
20. Little or no opportunity to specialize	0	1	2	3	4
21. Poor rapport with other teachers in system	0	1	2	3	4
22. Expected to teach other subject matter areas	0	1	2	3	4
23. Over emphasis of athletics	0	1	2	3	4
24. Wife not happy with vocational agriculture profession	0	1	2	3	4

VI. Educational Status:

A. What advanced degree or degrees have you received or had in progress as of June 30, 1973?

1.____Have not participated in a collegiate graduate program

2.____Partial requirement for M.S. or M.A. degree ____ sem. hrs.

3.____M.S. or equivalent received

4.____Rank I or equivalent received

5.____Ph.D. or equivalent in progress

6.____Ph.D. or equivalent received--Specify the area of study and university:

_____

_____

B. In how many professional organizations relating to your occupational area are you presently a member? (Do not include honorary or social organizations.)

_____

C. I would appreciate receiving a summary of the study upon its completion.

Yes _____ No _____

If your answer to part C is yes, please give an address:

Please return this questionnaire to:

Eldon E. Heathcott
Agricultural Education Department
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

Any other comments:

APPENDIX B

OTHER COMPETENCIES LISTED BY GRADUATES

Other competencies listed by respondents as being important in their employment were as follow:

1. Community service
2. Public relations
3. Cooperation with other agencies and school administration
4. Parent-teacher relationship
5. Understanding students' problems
6. Working with other teachers
7. Personal counseling students with problems
8. Supervision of experience programs
9. Teaching Agricultural Mechanics
10. Ability to teach slow learners
11. Leadership
12. Allocation of teacher's time in order of importance
13. Ability to discipline
14. Cooperation with community
15. Ability for hard work

VITA

Eldon Eugene Heathcott

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE, TENURE AND SELECTED ASPECTS OF THE EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS OF MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY GRADUATES QUALIFYING TO TEACH VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

Major Field: Agricultural Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born near Bogota, Tennessee, November 7, 1933, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Hobert V. Heathcott.

Education: Graduated from Newbern High School, Newbern, Tennessee, in May, 1952; attended Murray State University from September, 1952, to September, 1954, and from 1957-1959; received the Bachelor of Science in Agriculture from Murray State University in 1959; attended University of Kentucky January, 1959, through June, 1960, and June, 1962; attended Murray State University June, 1959, through May, 1960; received the Master of Arts in Education from Murray State University in 1960; attended Murray State University 1968 through 1973, achieving Rank I plus 15 hours; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1974.

Professional Experience: U. S. Army, November, 1954-1956; Murray Wholesale Grocery 1957-1960, laborer, Murray, Kentucky; United States Department of Agriculture, 1960-1961, Inspector of Frozen Foods, Humboldt, Tennessee; Ballard County Board of Education, July, 1961, through January, 1967, teacher of vocational agriculture, Barlow, Kentucky; State Department of Vocational Education, January, 1967, through January, 1968, State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture, Frankfort, Kentucky; January, 1968, through June, 1968, Coordinator of Reimbursed Programs, Paducah Region; Murray State University, July, 1968, through May, 1973; on leave from Murray State University for the 1973-1974 academic school year; graduate teaching assistant, Agricultural Education Department, Oklahoma State University, from June, 1973, through May, 1974.

Professional Organizations: Phi Delta Kappa, Murray State Agricultural Club, Calloway County Agricultural Council, Murray Chapter FFA Alumni, American Association Teacher Educators in Agriculture, Kentucky Vocational Agricultural Teachers' Association, National Vocational Agricultural Teachers' Association, Kentucky Education Association, First District Education Association, Murray State University Education Association, Kentucky Vocational Association National Vocational Association, Collegiate FFA, and Red Red Rose.

Leadership Activities: President of Ballard County Agricultural Council, Secretary for the First District Vocational Agriculture Teachers, Ballard County Fair Board, member of Roman Catholic Church.