# OPINIONS EXPRESSED BY AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION GRADUATES REGARDING THE ADEQUACY OF THE AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM AT THE OKLAHOMA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE

By

Billy Lee Whitt

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College

1956

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
the Oklahoma State University of Agriculture and
Applied Sciences in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
August, 1957

OPINIONS EXPRESSED BY AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION GRADUATES REGARDING THE ADEQUACY OF THE AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM AT THE OKLAHOMA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE

Thesis Approved:

Robert R. Price
Thesis Adviser

Roy N. Dugger

Lowell Mardis
Dean of the Graduate School

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to express my gratitude to Drs. Robert R. Price and Roy W. Dugger of the Department of Agricultural Education, and to Professor Fred LeCrone, Acting Dean of Resident Instruction, School of Agriculture, Oklahoma State University, who outlined the problem and assisted throughout the entire study. Thanks are due Dr. Randall J. Jones, Dean of Resident Instruction, School of Agriculture, for permission to use the questionnaire formulated by committee members of the School of Agriculture. My thanks go to Dr. M. R. Chauncey of the School of Education for his valuable assistance in helping determine the manner in which the data were analyized.

I also wish to express my appreciation to Miriam Oesch, Margaret Clawson, Carolyn Loose, Phyliss Wilson, Ruth Howard, and Carol Huggins, and to all others who assisted in some way with this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

In reviewing the records of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, it was determined that 1001 students have been graduated with a major in agricultural education between the years of 1925 and 1955, inclusive.[1] In addition to these graduates, 153 other students, since 1935, have completed all work required for a major in agricultural education while also completing required work as a major in another department of the School of Agriculture.[2] It might seem that this large number of graduates would have resulted in an over supply of teachers. Generally speaking, this is not true. Since 1951, Oklahoma has had an average annual turnover of eight percent among its vocational agriculture teachers.[3] At present this results in approximately 27 to 28 teaching positions being available each year.

The instructors in the Department of Agricultural Education at this college are vitally concerned about the matter of curriculum developments for its graduates. This is not only true in agricultural

---

[1] Annual and Summer Session Commencement Programs, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College Library, (Stillwater, 1925 - 1955).

[2] Annual Report of Agricultural Teacher Training Activities, as submitted to Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education; Department of Agricultural Education, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, (Stillwater, 1936 - 1955).

[3] Out-of-Service Personnel Files, Department of Vocational Education, Division of Vocational Agriculture, (Stillwater, 1951 - 1957).

education, but in all phases of teacher education programs. It is an accepted challenge to all those engaged in the preparation of teachers.

Instructors in subject matter areas have also become increasingly aware of this importance. Professor Fred LeCrone states,

> the teaching of subject matter material in technical agriculture or science courses in such a manner that presentations are relevant to the training of teachers is important in any teacher training program. Students who are training for teaching careers will benefit greatly from this type of approach since it involves the sharing of teaching techniques and procedures related to subject matter under consideration of instructors in teaching their courses.[4]

Attention is focused, therefore, upon the importance of continual evaluation as to the adequacy of the curriculum for preparation of teachers. With regard to this matter, it is reassuring to review curricula revisions accomplished during the past 32 years.[5] A particularily noticeable change has been made in the courses in technical agriculture. These changes will be discussed more thoroughly in a later chapter.

Whenever the curriculum is revised there should be some method of evaluating the adequacy of the revised product. It is a well-known fact that follow-up studies are necessary in proper evaluation of any educational program. Guber, in his article Placement and Follow-up of Business Graduates, states that a follow-up is necessary to "prove that a satisfactory percentage of our business graduates are working in the

---

[4]Fred LeCrone, Acting Dean of Resident Instruction, School of Agriculture and Associate Professor of Horticulture, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater, Oklahoma, personal interview.

[5]Oklahoma State Board for Vocational Education, State Plans for Vocational Education, (Stillwater, 1925 - 1932 and 1942 - 1956).

jobs for which they trained. . . to verify the results of our present and future students."[6]

Holman presents the thought, "that follow-up studies have a tremendous effect upon education for it serves as an opening wedge for continuous faculty study and improvement in education."[7]

The administrators and staff in the Department of Agricultural Education at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College recognize the importance of obtaining evaluation through a determination of the attainments of alumni. These officials are also interested in collecting information related to curriculum evaluation, job opportunities for those trained in the field, and other factors considered of importance in the training of students studying agricultural education at the institution. Such information can best be obtained through a thorough follow-up program.

Dr. Roy W. Dugger states, "Follow-up studies are one of the most important means available in evaluation of any educational program."[8] He indicated that the Oklahoma State University may follow the same pattern as Iowa State College, Michigan State College, The Pennsylvania State University, University of Minnesota, and Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, who have completed, or are in the process of completing follow-up studies of their graduates in the school of agriculture.

---

[6]Joseph Guber, "Placement and Follow-up of Business Graduates," American Business Education, (October, 1951), p. 52.

[7]W. Holman and R. J. Young, "Follow-up: New Variety," Clearing House, (January, 1954), p. 296.

[8]Roy W. Dugger, Assistant Professor of Agricultural Education, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater, Oklahoma, personal interview.

Many people, including college students, agricultural instructors, business men, and others often pose questions regarding possible fields of employment, and the adequacy of preparation for such employment. What percentage of graduates may normally be expected to teach vocational agriculture? Bryan, in 1956, surveyed 144 graduates at the University of Idaho.[9] Their first employment was grouped in eight occupational categories: 72 percent was initially employed teaching vocational agriculture; 10.4 percent entered miscellaneous occupations related to agriculture; 4.8 percent went into teaching fields other than vocational agriculture; 4.2 percent entered agricultural extension service; 1.4 percent began farming; 3.5 percent entered occupations not related to agriculture; and 2.1 percent went into military service or were unemployed. Other studies have also shown a wide variety of occupations entered by graduates of agricultural education.

Why are a large number of vocational agriculture teachers leaving the field of service? This is another question being asked by many people. Canada[10] and Stringfield[11] reported a preference to other work, limited chance of advancement, low salaries, lack of security, and failing health were reasons given by vocational agriculture teachers

---

[9]James E. Bryan, "A Survey of the Bachelor of Science Graduates in Agricultural Education at the University of Idaho from 1934-1954, Inclusive," (unpub. Master's Thesis, University of Idaho, 1956), p. 10.

[10]Ralph W. Canada, "Why Nebraska Teachers of Vocational Agriculture Left the Service," (unpub. Master's Thesis, Nebraska University, 1945) as reported in Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education, Vocational Division Bul. No. 246 (Washington, 1949), p. 40.

[11]Roy C. Stringfield, "Why Louisiana Teachers of Vocational Agriculture Left the Service," (unpub. Master's Thesis, Louisiana State University, 1949) as reported in Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education, Vocational Division Bul. 246 (Washington, 1949), p. 40.

for leaving the field of service. Bartlett in a similar study, found teachers in the state of Washington to be in agreement, but listed in addition such reasons as (1) overload of work, (2) restricted personal life, and (3) discipline problems as causative factors for discontinuing teaching as a career.[12]

Does the agricultural education curriculum properly prepare teachers to teach vocational agriculture? In the Fifth Annual Southern Regional Conference in Agricultural Education held at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, the problem of revision of the agricultural education cirriculum was voted first priority.[13]

The author felt if some facts or information relating to questions of the previous paragraphs could be answered, the School of Agriculture, particularily the Department of Agricultural Education, at this institution would be greatly benefited.

## Statement of the Problem

As far as could be determined, only one major investigation has been completed regarding curriculum evaluation in the School of Agriculture at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College. This study made by Paul G. Adams in 1956.[14] In evaluating courses in animal

---

[12]Lester C. Bartlett, "Tenure of Vocational Agriculture Teachers in the State of Washington," (unpub. Master's Thesis, Washington State University, 1948) as reported in Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education, Vocational Division Bul. 242, (Washington, 1948), p. 3.

[13]Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Southern Regional Research Conference in Agricultural Education, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, (Stillwater, 1956), p. 21.

[14]Paul G. Adams, "The Performance of Specified Extension Tasks by County Agricultural Agents in Oklahoma in Relation to Their Professional Training and Experience," (unpub. Ph. D. Dissertation, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1956), p. 99.

science, plant science, agricultural and extension education, oral and written communication, health, recreation, music, and art, he found,

> A positive association was established between the amount of formal training the county agents had received and the facility with which they reported having performed extension tasks in the field. Agents who had little or no formal training in specific subject matter areas reported that they had greater difficulty in performing extension tasks pertaining to specified subject matter areas.

Is it possible that an agricultural education curriculum may be inadequate because there is a limitation of subject material for some areas of study and an over emphasis of material in others? Is it possible that this condition in subject matter areas in the curriculum contribute to teachers leaving the field of service? These, along with certain other questions, constitute a problem of paramount importance for all engaged in training agriculture teachers. By obtaining the opinions of agricultural education graduates an attempt was made to ascertain those revisions in the agricultural education curriculum which would seem desirable at the Oklahoma State University.

## Purpose of the Study

In this research report the writer has attempted to complete an initial effort in follow-up studies of agricultural graduates at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College.

The primary purpose of this study was to gather opinions of agricultural education graduates regarding the adequacy of their major course of study, and to ascertain what revisions they suggest as desirable in the curriculum at the Oklahoma State University leading to a Bachelor of Science degree in agriculture with a major in agricultural education.

Secondary purposes of this research was to ascertain:

(1) The first and the present fields of employment of the graduates,

(2) Number of graduates changing fields of work and the factors considered responsible for these changes, and

(3) The number of vocational agriculture teachers presently interested in leaving field of service and the reasons for such interest.

Certain additional related findings were also determined.

## Definition of Terms

Graduates. Includes those individuals who have been graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in agriculture with a major in Agricultural Education at Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College between the years 1925 and 1955, inclusive.

Teachers or Teaching. Includes those individuals who have been graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in agriculture with a major in agricultural education between the years 1925 and 1955, inclusive, who are at the present time teaching vocational agriculture in high schools.

Non-teachers or Non-teaching. Includes those individuals who have been graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in agriculture with a major in agricultural education between the years of 1925 and 1955, inclusive, who are not teaching high school vocational agriculture at the present time.

## Procedure

First phase of the study. The personnel in the School of Agriculture at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College felt a need

for follow-up studies of its graduates. A committee, consisting of instructors from the several departments in the School of Agriculture, was selected to discuss these follow-up studies. After several months of consideration, the first step of the plan was initiated.

A questionnaire was developed by the committee for the purpose of securing desired information from all former agriculture graduates. Dr. Robert R. Price[15] and Professor Fred LeCrone[16] knew the author was planning to begin work on a problem for his master's degree in the near future. Since they were also serving as members of the committee they suggested that certain parts of this questionnaire would be quite applicable for this study. After having received the approval of the Dean of Agriculture and the Department of Agricultural Education, the author was given the priviledge of using the questionnaire as an aid in helping to complete his problem.

The material sent to the group of agricultural education graduates, who had been selected at random, included an introductory letter, an eight page questionnaire, and a stamped return envelope.[17] A sample introductory letter and questionnaire are included in the appendix. Several of the questions in the questionnaire were not pertinent to this study, but were included to gather information for the School of Agriculture.

---

[15]Robert R. Price, Associate Professor of Agricultural Education, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

[16]Fred LeCrone, Acting Dean of Resident Instruction, School of Agriculture and Associate Professor of Horticulture, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

[17]J. E. Wert, C. O. Nerdt, and J. S. Ahman, Statistical Methods in Education and Psychological Research, (New York, 1954), p. 109.

Second phase of the study. This phase consisted of securing the names of all the agricultural education graduates during the years of 1925 through 1955. One thousand and one names were obtained from Commencement Programs found in the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College Library.[18] After having secured the names, the author selected 450 graduates at random. From this group of 450, only 200 names were used in this research report. The reasons for selecting 450 graduates were that the author knew that some of the graduates selected at random were deceased; it was recognized that some of the mailing addresses would be incorrect, and that some of the addresses would not be available. The names used were the first 200 whose addresses could be found.

Addresses of all the names were obtained from the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College Alumni office. Although the addresses of 200 graduates were secured, 11 additional addresses had to be obtained because of faulty listing in the alumni office.

Five weeks prior to the date set for the return of all these questionnaires a reminder postcard was sent to those persons who had not returned their questionnaire: Reminder postcards were sent to 64 graduates.

A total of 155 questionnaires were returned. Of the 155 returned, 124 graduates had previously taught or were teaching at the present time. Only two questionnaires were not used because of incomplete answers.

Third phase of the study. This phase of study consisted of classifying, compiling, and analyzing the information obtained from the questionnaires returned.

Additional information that was not directly related to this study, but might prove to be of some value in formulating curriculum revisions in the future, is also included.

## CHAPTER II

## CHANGES IN THE CURRICULA

At the present time a person wishing to be graduated from the Oklahoma State University receiving a Bachelor of Science degree in agriculture with a major in agricultural education must meet the requirements in semester credit hours in the following fields:[1]

He must have completed the study of 57 hours of technical agriculture in subjects such as animal husbandry, agronomy, dairying, horticulture, and poultry; 21 hours of science related to agriculture, such as chemistry, botany, entomology, bacteriology, and zoology; eight hours of agricultural engineering, four hours of this being farm shop; 14 hours of agricultural education; three hours of education such as child and adolescent psychology or educational psychology; and additional requirements of English, five hours; American history and government, six hours; agricultural journalism or speech, two hours; and military science, a minimum of 10 hours.

A grade point average of 2.5 must be maintained in agricultural education and technical agriculture courses.[2]

---

[1] State Plans for Vocational Education, (Stillwater, 1925-1932 1942-1956).

[2] General Catalog, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, (Stillwater, 1932-1942).

It is interesting to note the changes that have been made in the curricula these past 32 years. In 1925 the requirement for technical agriculture courses was 40 hours. This requirement was increased to 43 hours in 1928, 55 hours in 1936, and 57 hours in 1947. The requirement of 57 hours still holds true at the present time. A grade point average of 2.5 must still be maintained.

There were no requirements for science relating to agriculture in 1925, but in 1928, 20 hours of required science was added to the curriculum. The requirement of science advanced to 24 hours in 1933, and decreased to 21 in 1950. There has been no increase since 1950.

Ten hours of agricultural education was required in 1925. This figure increased to 12 hours in 1933, and 14 hours in 1947. The present requirement is 14 hours. In 1945 a grade point average of 2.0 had to be maintained by students wishing to teach. This grade point average was raised to 2.5 in 1947. The grade point average is still the same as in 1947.

There was an additional requirement of five hours of educational courses in 1925; six hours in 1928; four hours in 1933; six hours in 1935; five hours in 1936; four hours in 1937; and three hours in 1947. Three hours are required at the present time.

Between the years of 1925 and 1927 there were no requirements in agricultural engineering or farm shop. In 1928 four hours of farm shop plus four hours of manual training were needed. Manual training was omitted in 1934, and eight hours of agricultural engineering and farm shop were required. Four hours of this agricultural engineering had to be farm shop. This requirement has not been changed since 1934.

# CHAPTER III

## PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

From an analysis of the information contained in the preceding chapter, it is shown there has been no major curriculum revision at this college since 1947. There is a possibility that the curriculum may need to be revised in some areas of study for agricultural education majors. Since the primary purpose of this research report is to gather opinions of agricultural education graduates regarding the adequacy of their major course of study, the author hopes that some information presented in this chapter may prove to be of some value in future years for planning curriculum revisions in this department.

Data presented in this chapter were obtained from questionnaires sent to 200, selected at random, agricultural education graduates between the years of 1925 and 1955, inclusive. Tables I through V show the number of questionnaires returned and opinions of the present teachers regarding the adequacy of the curriculum. Table VI shows the graduate's first fields of employment, present fields of employment, and the number lost or gained from first to present fields of employment. Tables VII through XII show the number and for what reasons the graduates changed their fields of work. Tables XIII through XIV show the number and for what reasons present teachers are interested in leaving the field of service. Tables XV through XXI are not directly related to this study, but might prove to be of some value in formulating curriculum revisions in the future.

Although there may seem to be a discrepancy in Tables III, IX, XI, XII, XIV, XVII, XVIII, XIX, and XX between the number of graduates and the number of indications, there is really none, because some of the graduates gave more than one answer. An example of this is shown in Table III where 87 teachers gave 130 answers. Each percentage is a separate unit, for it represents the number of times each indication was given by the group.

In Table III, included more technical subjects closely related to major field refers to technical agriculture courses such as animal husbandry, field crops, and other courses of this nature; included more work in major field refers to agricultural education courses; included more work dealing with group action refers to psychological motivation, group dynamics, social psychology, and courses of this nature.

## Questionnaire and Curriculum

Percentage and number of questionnaires returned. Table I shows that of the 200 questionnaires sent, 155 were returned. This was a

TABLE I

RETURNS RECEIVED FROM TWO HUNDRED RANDOMLY SELECTED GRADUATES

| Total Graduates 1925 - 1955 | No. Questionnaires Sent | No. Questionnaires Returned | Percent Return of Questionnaire |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1,001 | 200 | 155 | 77.5 |

77.5 percent return. Two of the questionnaires returned were not used because of incomplete answers.

Opinions as expressed by present teachers regarding adequacy of their major course of study as preparation for teaching. In analyzing Table II, 73.5 percent of the teachers indicated their major course of

TABLE II

OPINIONS EXPRESSED BY EIGHTY-SEVEN TEACHERS REGARDING THE ADEQUACY OF THEIR MAJOR COURSE OF STUDY AS PREPARATION FOR TEACHING

| Response | Teachers Indicating | |
|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent |
| Yes | 64 | 73.5 |
| No | 2 | 2.3 |
| To a degree | 21 | 24.2 |
| Totals | 87 | 100.0 |

study was adequate. It is also shown that 24.2 percent expressed the opinion that it was adequate to a degree and only 2.3 percent indicated that it was inadequate. An analysis of Tables III, IV, and V may give some indication why 2.3 percent of the teachers expressed the opinion that the curriculum was inadequate and why 24.2 percent expressed the opinion that it was adequate to a degree.

Teacher indication of fields of study which might have been helpful as preparation for teaching. Although, as shown by Table II, 73.5 percent of the teachers expressed the opinion that the curriculum was adequate, reference to Table III shows that 93 percent of the teachers indicated that additional studies might have been helpful as preparation for teaching.

Data presented in Table III indicate that the most commonly mentioned field of study which might have been helpful as preparation for teaching was more technical subjects closely related to major field of study. This was indicated by 57.5 percent of the teachers. The inclu-

TABLE III

INDICATIONS GIVEN BY EIGHTY-SEVEN TEACHERS AS TO THE FIELDS OF STUDY WHICH THEY FEEL MIGHT HAVE BEEN HELPFUL AS PREPARATION FOR TEACHING

| Fields of study | Teachers Indicating | |
|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent |
| Include more technical subjects closely related to major field of study | 50 | 57.5* |
| Include more work in major field | 28 | 32.2* |
| Include more work in subjects dealing with group action | 24 | 27.6* |
| Include more work in biological and physical science | 12 | 13.8* |
| Include more work in social science | 10 | 11.5* |
| None | 6 | 7.0* |
| Totals | 130 | 100.0 |

*Range of choices by teachers were one to four. This is the percentage of the 87 teachers who replied to each indication.

sion of more work in the major field was indicated as desirable by 32.2 percent, while 27.6 percent of the teachers were favorably inclined

toward additional work in subjects dealing with group action. Other fields or areas of study indicated by the teachers as being of possible value were more work in biological and physical sciences and in the social sciences. Six or 4.6 percent of the teachers indicated that no other field of study would have been helpful as preparation for teaching.

Opinions by teachers regarding the emphasis they would place on certain agricultural courses and related subjects. In this table one may assume the teachers are thinking in particular of their own locality. Table IV shows that 80.5 percent expressed the opinion that more emphasis

TABLE IV

EXPRESSION OF OPINIONS BY EIGHTY-SEVEN TEACHERS REGARDING EMPHASIS WHICH SHOULD BE PLACED ON CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL COURSES AND RELATED SUBJECTS

| Courses and related subjects | More | | Same | | Less | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Soils | 70 | 80.5 | 17 | 19.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Agricultural Engineering | 70 | 80.5 | 15 | 17.2 | 2 | 2.3 |
| Animal Husbandry | 50 | 57.5 | 37 | 42.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Field Crops | 46 | 52.9 | 41 | 47.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Agricultural Economics | 34 | 39.1 | 49 | 56.3 | 4 | 4.6 |
| Entomology | 25 | 28.7 | 61 | 70.2 | 1 | 1.1 |
| Dairy | 24 | 27.6 | 62 | 71.3 | 1 | 1.1 |
| Horticulture | 19 | 21.8 | 56 | 64.4 | 12 | 13.8 |
| Poultry | 15 | 17.2 | 66 | 75.9 | 6 | 6.9 |

should be placed on courses in soils, while only 19.5 percent considered present emphasis adequate. Further reference to Table IV shows that 80.5

percent indicated that more emphasis should be placed on agricultural engineering, while 17.2 percent stated that the same emphasis should be placed on it. Only 2.3 percent indicated that less emphasis should be placed on courses in the area of farm mechanics and agricultural engineering. Four teachers indicated on the margin of their questionnaire that there definitely should be more emphasis placed on farm shop. Table IV also shows that 52.9 percent of the teachers placed more emphasis on courses in field crops; whereas 47.1 percent indicated that the same emphasis should be placed on courses in this area of study. Opinions expressed also indicated that 28.7 percent of the teachers felt more emphasis should be given to entomology. A majority or 70.2 percent indicated that the same emphasis should be placed on courses in this field and only 1.1 percent felt that less emphasis should be placed on entomology.

In this table 39.1 percent of the teachers indicated that more emphasis should be placed on agricultural ecomomics, while 56.3 percent placed the same emphasis on courses of this nature. Only 4.6 percent expressed the opinion that less emphasis should be placed on these courses. Only 27.6 percent of the teachers placed more emphasis on dairy courses; whereas 71.3 percent expressed the opinion that the same emphasis should be placed on it. A small percentage, or 1.1 percent, indicated that less emphasis should be placed on dairy courses. Table IV shows that 21.8 percent placed more emphasis on horticulture courses. It also indicated that 64.4 percent of the teachers expressed the opinion that the same emphasis should be placed on horticulture, while 13.8 percent indicated that less emphasis should be placed on courses in this field. Only 17.2 percent of the teachers indicated that more emphasis should be

placed on courses in poultry. A majority, or 75.9 percent, placed the same emphasis on courses of this nature. Only 6.9 percent indicated that less emphasis should be placed on poultry courses.

Since a clear majority of the teachers placed more emphasis on courses in soils and agricultural engineering, one may come to the conclusion that, based on these expressed opinions, future teachers need more course work, or more thorough training, in these fields.

There was not any majority shown in Table IV, based on the opinions of the group, indicating that less emphasis should be placed on any agricultural course or related subject.

Opinions expressed by teachers regarding emphasis which should be placed on certain courses in which some degree of proficiency is required. As shown in Table V, 70.1 percent of the teachers indicated that

TABLE V

EXPRESSION OF OPINION BY EIGHTY-SEVEN TEACHERS REGARDING EMPHASIS WHICH SHOULD BE PLACED ON CERTAIN COURSES IN WHICH SOME DEGREE OF PROFICIENCY IS REQUIRED

| Courses | More | | Less | | Same | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Mathematics | 61 | 70.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 26 | 29.9 |
| English, Speech, and Journalism | 60 | 69.0 | 2 | 2.3 | 25 | 28.7 |

more emphasis should be placed on mathematics, while 29.9 percent expressed the opinion that the same emphasis should be placed on courses of this nature. There were no indications that less emphasis should be placed on mathematics.

Data presented in Table V also indicate that somewhat over two-thirds of the teachers were of the opinion that more emphasis should be given work in English, speech, and journalism; whereas only slightly over one-fourth indicated that the same emphasis should be placed on such courses, with only 2.3 percent expressing the opinion that less emphasis should be placed on courses in the area of communication. Seven teachers indicated that it would have been of greater value to them if they had been required to take more hours of speech.

## Employment

First employment of the graduates. The first employment of the graduates was grouped into eight different categories as shown in Table VI: Sixty-six and six-tenths percent taught vocational agriculture; 10.4 percent became agricultural teachers of veterans; 6.5 percent entered occupations related to agriculture such as feed and seed store operators, farm home administration officers, soil conservation, civil service, chamber of commerce, farm insurance, producing agricultural products, and the rural ministry. Another 5.9 percent were discovered to be teaching courses other than vocational agriculture; 3.3 percent went into farming or ranching; while 3.3 percent were employed by the agricultural extension service. Only 3.3 percent were found to have entered occupations which could not be considered as related to agriculture such as salesman, policeman, sanitarian, paper maker, building constructor, oil field employee, medical student, sawmill foreman, and highway department employee; .7 of one percent was unclassified either as unemployed or in the military service. This graduate was in the military service. An analysis of this table shows a variety and a wide range

of occupations that agricultural education majors may enter upon graduation.

TABLE VI

FIELDS OF EMPLOYMENT AS REPORTED BY THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-THREE GRADUATES

| Fields of Employment | First Position | | Present Position | | Loss or Gain - First - Present | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Vocational agriculture instructor | 102 | 66.6 | 87 | 56.9 | -15 | - 9.7 |
| Occupations related to agriculture | 10 | 6.5 | 30 | 19.6 | 20 | 13.1 |
| Veterans agriculture instructor | 16 | 10.4 | 4 | 2.6 | -12 | - 7.8 |
| Teaching other than vocational agriculture | 9 | 5.9 | 6 | 3.9 | - 3 | - 2.0 |
| Farming or ranching | 5 | 3.3 | 4 | 2.6 | - 1 | - .7 |
| Agricultural extension service | 5 | 3.3 | 6 | 3.9 | 1 | .6 |
| Occupations not related to agriculture | 5 | 3.3 | 11 | 7.2 | 6 | 3.9 |
| Unclassified | 1 | .7 | 5 | 3.3 | 4 | 2.6 |
| Totals | 153 | 100.0 | 153 | 100.0 | | |

Present employment of the graduates. To facilitate study of present fields of employment categories were developed listing eight different fields or areas. It was determined that 56.9 percent of the 153 graduates included in the study were currently employed as teachers of vocational agriculture; while 19.6 percent were in occupations related to agricul-

ture. Only 7.2 percent were found to be presently employed in occupations not related to agriculture; while 3.9 percent are currently serving in the agricultural extension service. A similar number totaling 3.9 percent are at present teaching courses other than vocational agriculture. It was necessary to list 3.3 percent of the remainder as unclassified; 2.6 percent were teachers of veterans agriculture, and 2.6 percent were farming or ranching. Of the 3.3 percent that were grouped as unclassified, only one person, or .7 of one percent, was unemployed, and this was due to poor health.

Loss or gain from first to present employment. Analysis of data regarding employment revealed that a loss of 15 men, or 9.7 percent occurred among those employed as vocational agriculture teachers. Since 32 of the 102 graduates whose first employment was teaching left the field of service, this would have been a loss of 20 percent; however, 17 graduates whose first employment was non-teaching changed to teaching; therefore, the net loss was reduced to 9.7 percent.

Occupations related to agriculture showed a gain of 13.1 percent. This was the highest gain among the respective fields of employment considered. Table VI shows that occupations not related to agriculture increased 3.9 percent. Graduates designated as unclassified showed a gain of 2.6 percent, while the number teaching courses other than vocational agriculture a loss of 2.0 percent was noted. Farming and ranching showed a loss of only .7 of one percent. As shown in this table the agricultural teachers of veterans decreased 7.8 percent, whereas a gain of .6 of one percent occurred in the agricultural extension service.

Analysis of data presented in this table indicates that the heaviest losses occurred in various phases of teaching, especially among teachers of vocational agriculture and of veterans. The categories farming and ranching also showed slight losses, but these losses were not as apparent as were those for the various phases of teaching.

## Employment Changes

Changes in fields of work since graduation. Table VII shows that

TABLE VII

CHANGES IN FIELDS OF WORK AS REPORTED BY ONE-HUNDRED AND FIFTY-THREE GRADUATES SINCE GRADUATION

| Response | Indicating Change | |
|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent |
| Yes | 70 | 45.8 |
| No | 83 | 54.2 |
| Totals | 153 | 100.0 |

45.8 percent of the graduates changed their field of work; whereas 54.2 percent remained in the same field. Surprisingly, the average number of changes indicated by those who had changed were only 1.7 times.

Changes in fields of work by graduates whose first employment was teaching. As shown in Table VIII, 68.6 percent of those individuals whose first field of employment was teaching have remained in the teaching field, while 31.4 percent left the field for other types of employment. A portion of those leaving the teaching field evidently

failed to gain stability in that the group averaged 1.6 times in changing fields of work. Twenty of these graduates changed their fields of work once, nine changed twice, one changed three times, and two changed four times. Reasons for leaving their fields of work can be noted in Table IX.

TABLE VIII

CHANGES IN FIELDS OF WORK SINCE GRADUATION AS REPORTED BY ONE-HUNDRED AND TWO GRADUATES WHOSE FIRST EMPLOYMENT WAS TEACHING

| Response | Graduates Indicating Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| No change - remained in teaching field | 70 | 68.6 |
| Changed from teaching to non-teaching | 32 | 31.4 |
| Totals | 102 | 100.0 |

Reasons for leaving fields of work as expressed by graduates whose first employment was teaching. While responses received in reply to questions relative to reasons for leaving the field of work were somewhat unsatisfactory, data are presented in the hope that at least some indication may be provided as to certain associated factors.

Table IX indicates that of the thirty-two teachers changing fields of work an average of 1.6 times 'better opportunities for advancement' was the most commonly mentioned factor, being indicated by 46.9 percent of the teachers. 'An increase in salary' was indicated an associated factor by 31.3 percent of the graduates; whereas 21.9 percent of the

group indicated 'better working conditions' as a factor influencing their decision to make a change. Twenty-one and nine-tenths percent of this group also indicated as a causative factor 'work more to my liking.'

TABLE IX

REASONS FOR LEAVING FIELDS OF WORK AS EXPRESSED BY THIRTY-TWO GRADUATES WHOSE FIRST EMPLOYMENT WAS TEACHING

| Reasons | Graduates Indicating Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Better opportunities for advancement | 15 | 46.9* |
| Increase in salary | 10 | 31.3* |
| Better working conditions | 7 | 21.9* |
| Work more to my liking | 7 | 21.9* |
| Personal or family health | 3 | 9.4* |
| Military | 3 | 9.4* |
| Improve living conditions | 1 | 3.1* |
| Improve retirement benefits | 1 | 3.1* |
| Professional improvement | 1 | 3.1* |
| No reason given | 9 | 28.1* |
| Totals | 57 | |

*Range of choices were one to four. This is the percentage of 32 graduates who replied to each suggested factor.

Other reasons given by the teachers were: 5.3 percent indicated 'personal or family health;' 5.3 percent indicated 'military service;' 1.8 percent 'improved living condition;' 1.8 percent indicated 'improved

retirement benefits;' 1.8 percent indicated 'professional improvement.' No reason was indicated by 21.9 percent of this group.

Changes in fields of work by graduates whose first employment was work other than teaching. Table X shows that 25.5 percent of the graduates remained in the same non-teaching field, while 33.3 percent changed from other fields to teaching vocational agriculture. Individuals changing to teaching averaged 1.2 changes in fields of employment.

TABLE X

CHANGES IN FIELDS OF WORK SINCE GRADUATION AS REPORTED BY FIFTY-ONE GRADUATES WHOSE FIRST EMPLOYMENT WAS OTHER THAN TEACHING

| Response | Graduates Indicating Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Changed from other fields to teaching | 17 | 33.3 |
| No change - remained in same non-teaching field | 13 | 25.5 |
| Changed from one non-teaching field to another non-teaching field | 16 | 31.4 |
| Changed non-teaching to teaching back to non-teaching | 5 | 9.8 |
| Totals | 51 | 100.0 |

This was the lowest average of any of the graduates who had changed their field of work. Thirteen of these graduates changed their employment once and four changed twice. Reasons for changing to teaching as expressed by these 17 graduates can be found in more detail by reference

to Table XI. Table X also shows that 41.2 percent of the graduates whose first employment was other than teaching, including the five graduates who had changed from non-teaching to teaching back to non-teaching, had changed their fields of work. This group averaged 1.9 times in changing fields of employment. These graduates averaged the highest in changing fields of work. Twenty of these changed once, nine changed twice, one changed three times, and two changed four times. Reasons as expressed by these graduates for changing fields of work are given in Table XII.

Reasons for changing to teaching as expressed by graduates whose first employment was other than teaching. As can be seen by reference to Table XI, 41.9 percent of the graduates whose initial employment was in a non-teaching field indicated as a reason for subsequently changing fields, 'an increase in salary,' while 17.6 percent gave as a reason, 'better opportunities for advancement.' Seventeen and six-tenths percent of this group indicated as a causative factor 'work more to my liking;' whereas 'better working conditions' was listed by 11.8 percent of the graduates. Other factors listed by the graduates were: Eleven and eight-tenths percent indicated 'improved living conditions;' 11.8 percent indicated 'improved retirement benefits;' 5.9 percent indicated 'only job available.' No reason for changing was indicated by 42.2 percent of this group.

Reasons for changing to other non-teaching fields as expressed by graduates whose first employment was non-teaching. The largest number and variety of reasons for leaving fields of work were given by this particular group. As can be determined by reference to Table XII, the

most commonly mentioned reason for changing fields of employment was 'an increase in salary,' and was given by slightly over one-half of the respondents in this group. 'Work more to my liking' was indicated by 38.1 percent of this group, while 28.6 percent of them indicated 'better opportunities for advancement.' Twenty-three and eight-tenths percent of the group of graduates replying to this question indicated 'better working conditions' as an important contributing factor.

TABLE XI

REASONS FOR CHANGING TO TEACHING AS EXPRESSED BY SEVENTEEN GRADUATES WHOSE FIRST EMPLOYMENT WAS OTHER THAN TEACHING

| Reasons | Graduates Indicating | |
|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent |
| Increase in salary | 7 | 41.2* |
| Better opportunities for advancement | 3 | 17.6* |
| Work more to my liking | 3 | 17.6* |
| Better working conditions | 2 | 11.8* |
| Improve living conditions | 2 | 11.8* |
| Improve retirement benefits | 2 | 11.8* |
| Only job available | 1 | 5.9* |
| No reason given | 7 | 42.2* |
| Total | 27 | |

*Choices indicated ranged from one to three. The percentage given is that of 17 graduates who replied to suggested factors.

TABLE XII

REASONS FOR CHANGING TO OTHER NON-TEACHING FIELDS AS EXPRESSED BY TWENTY-ONE GRADUATES WHOSE FIRST EMPLOYMENT WAS NON-TEACHING*

| Reasons | Graduates Indicating Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Increase in salary | 11 | 52.5** |
| Work more to my liking | 8 | 38.1** |
| Better opportunities for advancement | 6 | 28.6** |
| Better working conditions | 5 | 23.8** |
| Improve living conditions | 2 | 9.5** |
| Personal or family health | 2 | 9.5** |
| Improve retirement benefits | 1 | 4.8** |
| Other states would not accept agricultural education degree | 1 | 4.8** |
| Be own boss | 1 | 4.8** |
| Military | 1 | 4.8** |
| No reason given | 3 | 14.3** |
| Total | 41 | |

*This table includes the five graduates who changed from non-teaching to teaching back to non-teaching as well as those graduates who never taught.
**Choices indicated ranged from one to three. The percentage given is that of 21 graduates who replied to suggested factors.

Percentage of graduates indicating various other reasons as shown in Table XII were: Nine and five-tenths percent indicated 'improved living conditions;' 9.5 percent indicated 'personal or family health;' 4.8 percent indicated 'improve retirement benefits;' 4.8 percent indi-

dicated 'other states would not accept agricultural education degree;' 4.8 percent indicated "to be my own boss;" 4.8 percent indicated 'military service.' No reason was given by 14.3 percent of this group.

The one person, or 4.8 percent, did not indicate why other states would not accept his agricultural education degree.

## Teachers Presently Desiring to Change Field of Work

Response by teachers toward interest in changing field of work. Table XIII shows that 34 or 39.1 percent of the 87 teachers are interested in changing their field of work, while 53 or 60.9 percent of the teachers indicated they were satisfied with their present employment.

TABLE XIII

RESPONSE BY EIGHTY-SEVEN TEACHERS TOWARD INTEREST IN CHANGING FIELD OF WORK

| Response | Graduates Indicating Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 34 | 39.1 |
| No | 53 | 60.9 |
| Totals | 87 | 100.0 |

Analysis of data presented in Table XIV provides insight into the reasons why 39.1 percent of the teachers do desire a change in their field of service.

Indications by teachers of reasons for desiring a change in their field of work. The most commonly mentioned reason for desiring a change

from the teaching field was 'improved advancement opportunities.' This was indicated by 70.6 percent of the teacher as shown in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV

INDICATIONS BY THIRTY-FOUR TEACHERS OF REASONS FOR DESIRING A CHANGE FROM FIELD OF WORK

| Reasons | Teachers Indicating | |
|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent |
| Improved advancement opportunities | 24 | 70.6* |
| Salary increase | 13 | 38.2* |
| Better working conditions | 9 | 26.5* |
| Improved retirement benefits | 8 | 23.5* |
| Work more to my liking | 5 | 14.7* |
| Better living conditions | 2 | 5.9* |
| Older teachers not encouraged to stay in field by state department | 1 | 2.9* |
| Total | 62 | |

*Choice indicated ranged from one to three. The percentage given is that of 34 graduates who replied to suggested factors.

Thirty-eight and two-tenths percent indicated 'salary increase' as a desirable attainment. 'Better working conditions' was indicated by 26.5 percent of this group, while 'improved retirement benefits' was given by 23.5 percent. 'Work more to my liking' was indicated by 14.7 percent of the teachers; whereas 5.9 percent indicated 'better living conditions.' Only one teacher constituting 2.9 percent of the group

gave the reason that "older teachers were not encouraged to stay in the field by the state department."

In comparing certain data presented in Tables XI and XIV the two most commonly mentioned reasons, 'improved advancement opportunities' and 'salary increase,' were indicated both by the graduates who had changed to teaching and the ones desiring a change from teaching. The only difference was that 'salary increase' was indicated by a higher percentage frequency of those changing to teaching; whereas 'improved advancement opportunities' was indicated by a higher percentage frequency of those desiring a change from the teaching field.

## Additional Findings

Since data indicating a large number of opinions are presented in each of the tables XV through XXI, only the top three or four indications will be discussed in detail. This limited discussion is presented because it was felt that these data were not directly related to this study.

Teachers, whose first employment was teaching, indicating approximate time they decided to enter their present employment. Table XV shows that 41.5 percent of this group decided to teach 'previous to college entrance,' while 20.0 percent decided 'after military service.' Only 11.4 percent indicated their decision 'during second year of college;' whereas 11.4 percent decided 'during third year of college.' One teacher or 1.4 percent indicated 'in high school vocational agriculture.'

Teachers, whose first employment was non-teaching, indicating approximate time they decided to enter their present employment. As

shown in Table XV, 35.3 percent of this group decided to teach 'previous

TABLE XV

EIGHTY-SEVEN TEACHERS INDICATING APPROXIMATE TIME THEY DECIDED TO ENTER THEIR PRESENT FIELD OF WORK

| Approximate Time | 70 - 1st Employment Teaching | | 17 - 1st Employment Non-teaching | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Previous to college entrance | 29 | 41.6 | 6 | 35.3 |
| After military service | 14 | 20.0 | 4 | 23.5 |
| During second year of college | 8 | 11.4 | 1 | 5.9 |
| During third year of college | 8 | 11.4 | 1 | 5.9 |
| During first year of college | 6 | 8.6 | | |
| During fourth year of college | 3 | 4.3 | | |
| In high school vocational agriculture | 1 | 1.4 | 2 | 11.7 |
| Depression | 1 | 1.4 | 1 | 5.9 |
| Contacts with vocational agriculture teacher | | | 1 | 5.9 |
| Immediately after graduation | | | 1 | 5.9 |
| Totals | 70 | 100.0 | 17 | 100.0 |

to college entrance.' Although this was the most commonly mentioned time of decision, not any of this group taught high school vocational agriculture as their first field of work. These six graduates were unable to indicate why they did not teach as their first employment due to the limitation of the questionnaire. This table shows that 23.5

percent made their decision 'after military service.' Two teachers or 11.7 percent indicated decision while a student 'in high school vocational agriculture.'

An analysis of Table XV will show that the two reasons occurring with the highest percentage, 'previous to college entrance' and 'after military service,' were indicated by both the first employment teachers and first employment non-teachers.

Non-teachers, whose first employment was teaching, indicating approximate time they decided to enter their present field of work. In this table 28.1 percent indicated 'after teaching experience,' while 21.9 percent decided 'previous to college entrance.' Table XVI also shows that 15.7 percent indicated 'after military service;' whereas 12.5 percent decided 'during second year of college.' Limitation in construction of the questionnaire prevented showing why 28.1 percent of this group decided to enter their present field of work 'after teaching experience,' but some indications may be provided by a consideration of data presented in Table IX.

Although 21.9 percent of these non-teachers indicated they decided to enter their field of work 'previous to college entrance,' they taught high school vocational agriculture as their first field of work. No indications were given why this group taught as their first employment.

Non-teachers whose first employment was non-teaching indicating approximate time they decided to enter their present field of work. Table XVI shows that 23.5 percent decided to enter their present field of work 'previous to college entrance,' while 14.7 percent indicated

TABLE XVI

SIXTY-SIX NON-TEACHERS INDICATING APPROXIMATE TIME THEY DECIDED TO ENTER THEIR PRESENT FIELD OF WORK

| Approximate Time | 32 - 1st Employment Teaching | | 34 - 1st Employment Non-teaching | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| After teaching experience | 9 | 28.1 | 5 | 14.7 |
| Previous to college entrance | 7 | 21.9 | 8 | 23.5 |
| After military service | 5 | 15.7 | 5 | 14.7 |
| During second year of college | 4 | 12.5 | | |
| During third year of college | 2 | 6.3 | | |
| When opportunity presents itself | 1 | 3.1 | 5 | 14.7 |
| Immediately after graduation | | | 4 | 11.8 |
| During fourth year of college | 1 | 3.1 | 1 | 2.9 |
| After receiving advanced degree | 1 | 3.1 | | |
| Depression | 1 | 3.1 | | |
| During fifth year of college | | | 2 | 5.9 |
| When found satisfaction in work | | | 1 | 2.9 |
| No time given | 1 | 3.1 | 3 | 8.9 |
| Totals | 32 | 100.0 | 34 | 100.0 |

this 'after military service.' 'When opportunity presents itself' was listed as a factor by 14.7 percent; whereas 14.7 percent reported making such a decision 'subsequent to teaching experience.'

Although 23.8 percent or eight graduates decided to enter their present field of work 'previous to college entrance,' they changed to various fields of work, including teaching, before becoming more or less stabilized in their present occupations.

Teachers, whose first employment was teaching, indicating items that had the greater influence on their career selection. The most commonly mentioned indication that had the greater influence on these 70 teachers' career selection was 'natural aptitude and liking for type of work' as shown in Table XVII. This factor was indicated by 78.6 percent of the respondents. 'Experience while in high school' was indicated by 45.7 percent of this group, while 'counsel and influence of elementary school teacher, county agricultural agent, and high school teacher' was indicated by 41.5 percent of the teachers. Thirty-one and four-tenths percent indicated 'availability of positions in field.' It is interesting to note that 'salary' was indicated only one time, constituting only 1.4 percent of the respondents.

Teachers, whose first employment was non-teaching, indicating items that had greater influence on their career selection. Table XVII shows that 'natural aptitude and liking for type of work' was the most commonly mentioned item by this group too. This was indicated by 70.6 percent of the teachers. 'Counsel and influence of elementary school teacher, county agricultural agent, and high school teacher' was indicated by 35.3 percent of this group, while 'availability of positions in field' was indicated by 35.3 percent. Twenty-nine and four-tenths percent of the teachers indicated 'experience while in high school,' while 'experience in field' was also indicated by 29.4 percent. 'Salary' was not indicated by any of these 17 teachers.

TABLE XVII

EIGHTY-SEVEN PRESENT TEACHERS INDICATING ITEMS THAT HAD THE GREATEST INFLUENCE ON THEIR CAREER SELECTION

| Items of Influence | 70 - 1st Employment Teaching | | 17 - 1st Employment Non-teaching | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Natural aptitude and liking for type of work | 55 | 78.6* | 12 | 70.6* |
| Experience while in high school | 32 | 45.7* | 5 | 29.4* |
| Counsel and influence of elementary teacher, county agricultural agent, and high school teacher | 29 | 41.5* | 6 | 35.3* |
| Experience in field | 22 | 31.4* | 5 | 29.4* |
| Availability of positions in field | 21 | 30.0* | 6 | 35.3* |
| Parents' desires, approval and/or encouragement | 10 | 14.3* | 2 | 11.8* |
| Counsel and influence of close relatives | 9 | 12.9* | 3 | 17.6* |
| Experience while attending college | 7 | 10.0* | 2 | 11.8* |
| Counsel and influence college advisor or counselor | 7 | 10.0* | 1 | 5.9* |
| Counsel and influence of college teacher | 3 | 4.3* | 3 | 17.6* |
| Salary | 1 | 1.4* | - | -.-* |
| | 196 | | 45 | |

*Choices indicated ranged from one to four. The percentage given is that of 87 graduates who replied to suggested factors.

Non-teachers, whose first employment was teaching, indicating items that had the greater influence on their career selection. In Table XVIII 'natural aptitude and liking for type of work' was indicated by 90.6 percent of the non-teachers, while 56.3 percent of this group indicated 'availability of positions in the field.' Fifty-six and three-tenths percent of this group indicated 'experience in field;' whereas 28.1 percent of them indicated the item of 'counsel and influence of elementary school teacher, county agricultural agent, and high school teacher.'

Non-teachers, whose first employment was non-teaching, indicating items that had the greater influence on their career selection. As shown in Table XVIII 'natural aptitude and liking for type of work' was indicated by 64.7 percent of the graduates, while 47.1 percent, indicated 'availability of positions in field.' 'Experience in field' was only indicated by 29.4 percent of this group.

In reviewing certain information contained in this table, it is shown that the two groups tend to be in rather close agreement as to items having had the greater influence on their career selection.

Teachers, whose first employment was teaching, indicating items or persons assisting in their career selection. Findings of the investigations in Table XIX should prove to be of considerable interest to college instructors, advisors, and counselors.

In this table 'college instructor or instructors' were indicated by 55.7 percent of the teachers as a prominent factor in career selection. 'Personal advisor or counselor' was indicated by 52.9 percent of this group, while 32.9 percent indicated 'student associations or student contancts' were of assistance to them in making career selection.

TABLE XVIII

SIXTY-SIX TEACHERS INDICATING ITEMS THAT HAD THE GREATER INFLUENCE ON THEIR CAREER SELECTION

| Items of Influence | 32 - 1st Employment Teaching | | 34 - 1st Employment Non-teaching | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Natural aptitude and liking for type of work | 29 | 90.6* | 22 | 64.7* |
| Availability of positions in field | 18 | 56.3* | 16 | 47.1* |
| Experience in the field | 18 | 56.3* | 10 | 29.4* |
| Counsel and influence of elementary school teacher, county agricultural agent, and high school teacher | 9 | 28.1* | 8 | 23.9* |
| Parents' desires, approval, and/or encouragement | 4 | 12.5* | 7 | 20.6* |
| Experience while attending high school | 4 | 12.5* | 5 | 14.7* |
| Counsel and influence of close relatives | 2 | 6.3* | 8 | 23.5* |
| Counsel and influence of college advisor or counselor | 2 | 6.3* | 4 | 11.8* |
| Experience while attending college | 1 | 3.1* | 4 | 11.8* |
| Better retirement benefits | 1 | 3.1* | 0 | 0.0 |
| Counsel and influence of college teacher | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 5.9* |
| Family | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.9* |
| Totals | 88 | | 89 | |

*Choices indicated ranged from one to four. The percentage given is that of 66 graduates who replied to suggested factors.

TABLE XIX

EIGHTY-SEVEN PRESENT TEACHERS INDICATING ITEMS OR PERSONS ASSISTING IN THEIR CAREER SELECTION

| Items or Persons | 70 - 1st Employment Teaching | | 17 - 1st Employment Non-teaching | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| College instructor or instructors | 39 | 55.7* | 12 | 70.6* |
| Personal advisor or counselor | 37 | 52.9* | 9 | 53.0* |
| Student associations or student contacts | 23 | 32.9* | 10 | 58.8* |
| A particular course | 23 | 32.9* | 3 | 17.6* |
| Part-time employment experience | 13 | 18.6* | 1 | 5.9* |
| Aptitude tests | 11 | 15.7* | 2 | 11.8* |
| Experience or student organizations | 10 | 14.3* | 1 | 5.9* |
| Orientation course | 3 | 4.3* | 1 | 5.9* |
| None of these | 7 | 10.0* | 2 | 11.8* |
| Totals | 166 | | 41 | |

*Choices indicated ranged from one to four. The percentage given is that of 87 graduates who replied to suggested factors.

'A particular course' was indicated by the same number of teachers. It is interesting to note that 'part-time employment experience' was given by 18.6 percent of this group.

Teachers, whose first employment was non-teaching, indicating items or persons assisting in their career selection. Table XIX shows that

'college instructor or instructors' were also the most prominently mentioned items or persons by this group, being indicated by 70.6 percent of teachers. 'Personal advisor or counselor' was indicated by 58.8 percent of this group; whereas 'student associations and students contacts' were indicated by 58.8 percent of the respondents. Only one individual constituting 5.9 percent of the teachers indicated 'part-time employment experience.'

Non-teachers, whose first employment was teaching, indicating items or persons assisting in their career selection. Findings presented in Table XX provide evidence that 'college instructor or instructors' also played a prominent role in career selection by members of this group, being indicated by 53.1 percent of respondents, while 'personal advisor or counselor' was indicated by 50.0 percent of the graduates. As shown in this table 'student associations and student contacts' were given by 34.4 percent of the non-teachers; whereas 'a particular course' was indicated by 31.3 percent. 'Part-time employment experience' was indicated by 25.0 percent of the graduates.

Non-teachers, whose first employment was non-teaching, indicating items or persons assisting in their career selection. In this table 50.0 percent of the non-teachers indicated 'college instructor or instructors,' while 47.1 percent of the 34 graduates indicated 'personal advisor or counselor.' 'Student associations and student contacts' were indicated by 29.4 percent of this group; whereas 'a particular course' was given by 29.4 percent of them. Also indicated by 29.4 percent of the non-teachers was 'part-time employment experience.'

TABLE XX

SIXTY-SIX NON-TEACHERS INDICATING ITEMS OR PERSONS ASSISTING IN THEIR CAREER SELECTION

| Items of Importance | 32 - 1st Employment Teaching | | 34 - 1st Employment Non-teaching | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| College instructor or instructors | 17 | 53.1* | 17 | 50.0* |
| Personal advisor or counselor | 16 | 50.0* | 16 | 47.1* |
| Student associations and student contacts | 11 | 34.1* | 10 | 29.4* |
| A particular course | 10 | 31.3* | 10 | 29.4* |
| Part-time employment experience | 8 | 25.0* | 10 | 29.4* |
| Aptitude tests | 3 | 9.4* | 8 | 23.5* |
| Orientation course | 2 | 6.3* | 1 | 2.9* |
| Experience in student organizations | 2 | 6.3* | 0 | 0.0 |
| None of these | 5 | 15.6* | 6 | 17.6* |
| Totals | 74 | | 78 | |

*Choices indicated ranged from one to four. The percentage given is that of 66 graduates who replied to suggested factors.

In comparing the study findings as presented in Tables XIX and XX, surprisingly few differences are to be noted. A majority of members of all four groups are in agreement that college instructors, advisors, and counselors contribute more than any other reason or item in assisting them in their career selection.

Opinions by graduates regarding the adequacy of their major course of study as preparation for present occupations. Table XXI shows that

TABLE XXI

OPINIONS EXPRESSED BY SIXTY-SIX GRADUATES REGARDING THE ADEQUACY OF THEIR MAJOR COURSE OF STUDY AS PREPARATION FOR PRESENT OCCUPATIONS

| Present Occupation | Yes | | No | | To a Degree | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Agricultural extension service | 5 | 83.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 16.7 |
| Occupations related to agriculture | 19 | 63.3 | 3 | 10.0 | 8 | 26.7 |
| Farming and ranching | 3 | 75.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 25.0 |
| Veterans' agricultural teachers | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Teaching other than vocational agriculture | 3 | 50.0 | 2 | 33.3 | 1 | 16.7 |
| Occupations not related to agriculture | 1 | 9.1 | 6 | 54.5 | 4 | 36.4 |
| Unclassified | 1 | 20.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 1 | 20.0 |

83.3 percent of the agricultural extension employees indicated that their major course of study was adequate for their field of work. Only one or 16.7 percent indicated that it was adequate to a degree. This table also shows that 63.3 percent of the graduates engaged in occupations related to agriculture indicated their major course of study was adequate for their profession, while 26.7 percent felt it was adequate to a degree. Only 10.0 percent indicated their major course of study was inadequate. Seventy-five percent of those farming or ranching expressed the opinion their major course of study was adequate, while

25.0 percent indicated that it was adequate to a degree. Table XXI also shows that 75.0 percent of the veterans' agricultural teachers felt that their major course of study was adequate for their field of work, and only 25.0 percent of them indicated that it was inadequate.

As shown in this table 50.0 percent of those engaged in teaching other than vocational agriculture expressed the opinion their major course of study properly prepared them for their profession. Only one, or 16.7 percent indicated that it was adequate to a degree, while 33.3 percent felt their major course of study was inadequate as preparation for their field of work. Table XXI shows that only one or 9.1 percent of those working in occupations not related to agriculture expressed the opinion their major course of study was adequate, while 36.4 percent indicated it was adequate to a degree. Fifty-four and five-tenths percent of this group felt their major course of study was inadequate as preparation for their occupation.

Twenty percent of those grouped 'unclassified' expressed the opinion their major course of study was adequate as preparation for their present occupation. Twenty percent of this group indicated that it was adequate to a degree, while 60.0 percent felt that it was inadequate.

Since the majority of the graduates, as shown in Table XXI, expressed the opinion their major course of study was adequate as preparation for their present occupation, one may conclude with a fair degree of confidence that, according to the expressed opinions, agricultural education majors are capable of entering other fields of work, except those that are not related to agriculture and unclassified.

# CHAPTER IV

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Summary

The primary purpose of the study was to secure opinions of agricultural education graduates regarding the adequacy of the major course of study. A further purpose was to ascertain what revisions in the curriculum would seem desirable. Secondary purposes were to ascertain: (1) The first and the present fields of employment of the graduates; (2) How many and for what reasons graduates have made changes in their fields of work; and (3) How many and for what reasons present teachers are interested in leaving the vocational agriculture teaching profession.

A questionnaire was sent to 200 randomly selected agricultural education majors who were graduated between the years 1925 and 1955, inclusive. Of the 200 schedules submitted, 153 usuable schedules were returned.

Data, including expressed opinions from these questionnaires were classified, compiled, and an analysis was attempted with the following results being obtained.

Almost three fourths of the 87 present teachers expressed the opinion their major course of study was adequate; whereas about one-fourth indicated it was adequate to a degree. Only a very small percentage expressed the opinion that it was inadequate.

Present teachers indicated certain emphasis on fields of study which might have been helpful in preparation for teaching. Ranked as to considered order, they were given as follows:

1. Include more technical subjects closely related to major field of study
2. Include more work in major field
3. Include more work in subjects dealing with group action
4. Include more work in biological and physical sciences, and
5. Include more work in social sciences.

A small percentage of the respondents indicated that they felt no other field of study would have been helpful as preparation for teaching.

Teachers also expressed certain opinions regarding desirable emphasis to be placed on specific agricultural courses and related subjects. Ranked by a considered judgment as to order the respondents felt that more emphasis should be placed on the following:

1. Soils
2. Agricultural engineering
3. Animal husbandry
4. Field crops
5. Agricultural economics
6. Entomology
7. Dairy
8. Horticulture
9. Poultry

Ranked as to considered order, the same emphasis was placed on the following:

1. Poultry
2. Dairy
3. Entomology
4. Horticulture
5. Agricultural economics
6. Field crops
7. Animal husbandry
8. Soils
9. Agricultural engineering

Only a very small percentage of the teachers indicated that less emphasis should be placed on these courses and related subjects. Ranked by a considered judgment as to order, the respondents felt that less emphasis should be placed on the following:

1. Horticulture
2. Poultry
3. Agricultural economics
4. Agricultural engineering
5. Entomology
6. Dairy

Teachers expressed certain opinions regarding desirable emphasis to be placed on certain courses in which some degree of proficiency is required. Two-thirds of the teachers indicated that more emphasis should be placed on mathematics, English, speech, and journalism, while almost one-third of them indicated that the same emphasis should be placed on these courses. Only a very small minority expressed the opinion that less emphasis should be placed on English, speech, and journalism.

The first employment of the graduates was grouped into eight categories listed as follows: Sixty-six percent taught vocational agriculture; 10.4 percent became agricultural teachers of veterans; 6.5 percent entered occupations related to agriculture; 5.9 percent were teaching other than vocational agriculture; 3.3 percent were farming or ranching; 3.3 percent were employed by agricultural extension service; 3.3 percent entered occupations not related to agriculture; .7 of one percent were unclassified.

The present fields of employment of the graduates were also grouped into eight categories listed as follows: Fifty-six and nine-tenths percent were teaching vocational agriculture; 19.6 percent entered occupations related to agriculture; 7.2 percent were in occu-

pations not related to agriculture; 3.9 percent were employed by the agricultural extension service; 3.9 percent entered teaching other than vocational agriculture; 3.3 percent were unclassified; 2.6 percent were veterans' agriculture teachers; 2.6 percent were farming or ranching.

All fields of employment showed a gain in the number of men employed from the first to the present fields of work, except those in the various phases of teaching and those engaged in farming and ranching. Teachers of vocational agriculture and veterans showed the heaviest losses.

Almost half of the graduates had changed their fields of work since graduation. Thirty-two of the 102 graduates, whose first employment was teaching, had changed their fields of work. Ranked as to considered order, the reasons for leaving fields of work as expressed by these graduates were:

1. Better opportunities for advancement
2. Increase in salary
3. Better working conditions
4. Work more to my liking
5. Personal or family health
6. Military
7. Improved living conditions
8. Improved retirement benefits, and
9. Professional improvement.

No reason was given by nine graduates.

Of the 51 graduates, whose first employment was in a field other than teaching, 17 had changed to teaching, 16 had changed to another non-teaching field, 13 remained in same field, and 5 had changed to teaching back to a non-teaching field. Ranked as to considered order, the reasons for changing to teaching as expressed by the 17 graduates mentioned above were:

1. Increase in salary
2. Better opportunities for advancement
3. Work more to my liking
4. Better working conditions

5. Improve living conditions
6. Improve retirement benefits
7. Only job available.

No reason was given by seven graduates.

Ranked by a considered judgment as to order, the reasons for changing to other fields as expressed by the 21 graduates, including the five graduates who had taught at one time, were

1. Increase in salary
2. Work more to my liking
3. Better opportunities for advancement
4. Better working conditions
5. Improve living conditions
6. Personal or family health
7. Improve retirement benefits
8. Other states would not accept agricultural education degree
9. Be own boss, and
10. Military.

No reason was given by three graduates.

Thirty-four of the 87 present teachers indicated interest toward changing their field of work. Ranked as to considered order, the reasons for desiring a change were:

1. Improve advancement opportunities
2. Salary increase
3. Better working conditions
4. Improve retirement benefits
5. Work more to my liking
6. Better living conditions, and
7. Older teachers not encouraged to stay in field by State Department.

Eighty-seven present teachers indicated approximate time they decided to enter their field of work. Ranked by a considered judgment as to order, the approximate time given by the 70 first employment teaching were listed as follows:

1. Previous to college entrance
2. After military service
3. During second year of college
4. During third year of college
5. During first year of college

6. During fourth year of college
7. In high school vocational agriculture, and
8. Depression.

Ranked by a considered judgment as to order, the approximate time given by the 17 first employment non-teaching was:

1. Previous to college entrance
2. After military service
3. In high school vocational agriculture
4. During second year of college
5. During third year of college
6. Depression
7. Contacts with vocational agriculture teacher, and
8. Immediately after graduation.

Sixty-six non-teachers indicated approximate time they decided to enter their fields of work. Ranked as to considered order, the approximate time given by 32 first employment teaching were listed as follows:

1. After teaching experience
2. Previous to college entrance
3. After military service
4. During second year of college
5. During third year of college
6. When opportunity presented itself
7. During fourth year of college
8. After receiving advanced degree, and
9. Depression.

One graduate did not give any approximate time.

Ranked as to considered order the approximate time given by 34 first employment non-teaching, including five graduates who had taught at one time, was:

1. Previous to college entrance
2. After military service
3. After teaching experience
4. When opportunity presented itself
5. Immediately after graduation
6. During first year of college
7. During fourth year of college, and
8. When found satisfaction in work.

Three graduates did not give any approximate time.

Eighty-seven present teachers indicated items that had the greater influence on their career selection. Ranked by a considered judgment as to order, the items indicated by 70 first employment teaching were:

1. Natural aptitude and liking for type of work
2. Experience while in high school
3. Counsel and influence of elementary school teacher, county agricultural agent, or high school teacher
4. Experience in field
5. Availability of positions in field
6. Parents' desire, approval, and/or encouragement
7. Counsel and influence of close relatives
8. Experience while attending college
9. Counsel and influence of college advisor or counselor
10. Counsel and influence of college instructor, and
11. Salary.

Ranked as to considered order, the items indicated by 17 first employment non-teaching were:

1. Natural aptitude and liking for type of work
2. Counsel and influence of elementary school teacher, county agricultural agent, or high school teacher
3. Availability of positions in field
4. Experience while attending high school
5. Experience in field
6. Counsel and influence of college teacher
7. Counsel and influence of close relatives
8. Parents' desires, approval and/or encouragement
9. Experience while attending college, and
10. Counsel and influence of college advisor or counselor.

Sixty-six non-teachers indicated items that had the greater influence on their career selection. Ranked as to considered order, the items indicated by 32 first employment teaching were:

1. Natural aptitude and liking for type of work
2. Availability of positions in field
3. Experience in field
4. Counsel and influence of elementary school teacher, county agricultural agent, or high school teacher
5. Parents' desires, approval, and/or encouragement
6. Experience while attending high school
7. Counsel and influence of close relatives
8. Counsel and influence of college advisors or counselors
9. Better retirement benefits, and
10. Experience while attending college.

Ranked by a considered judgment as to order, the items indicated by 34 first employment non-teaching, including five graduates who had taught at one time, were:

1. Natural aptitude and liking for type of work
2. Availability of positions in field
3. Experience in field
4. Counsel and influence of elementary school teacher, county agricultural agent, or high school teacher
5. Counsel and influence of close relatives
6. Parents' desires, approval, and/or encouragement
7. Experience while attending high school
8. Counsel and influence of college advisors or counselors
9. Experience while attending college
10. Salary
11. Counsel and influence of college teacher, and
12. Family.

Eighty-seven present teachers indicated items or persons assisting in their career selection. Ranked by a considered judgment as to order, the items or persons indicated by 70 first employed teaching were:

1. College instructor or instructors
2. Personal advisor or counselor
3. Student association or student contacts
4. A particular course
5. Part-time employment experience
6. Aptitude tests
7. Experience in student organizations, and
8. Orientation course.

Ranked as to considered order the items or persons indicated by 17 first employment non-teaching were:

1. College instructor or instructors
2. Student associations and student contacts
3. Personal advisor or counselor
4. A particular course
5. Aptitude tests
6. Orientation course
7. Experience in student organizations, and
8. Part-time employment experience.

Two graduates indicated none of these.

Sixty-six non-teachers indicated items or persons assisting in their career selection. Ranked as to considered order, the items or

persons indicated by 32 first employment teaching were:

1. College instructor or instructors
2. Personal advisor or counselor
3. Student associations and student contacts
4. A particular course
5. Part-time employment experience
6. Aptitude tests
7. Orientation course, and
8. Experience in student organizations.

Five graduates indicated none of these.

Ranked by a considered judgment as to order, the items or persons indicated by the 34 first employment non-teaching, including five graduates who had taught at one time, were:

1. College instructor or instructors
2. Personal advisor or counselor
3. Student associations and student contacts
4. A particular course
5. Part-time employment experience
6. Aptitude tests, and
7. Orientation course.

Six graduates indicated none of these.

Sixty-six graduates expressed opinions regarding the adequacy of their major course of study as preparation for present occupation. A majority of the graduates in the various fields, except the one in occupations not related to agriculture and unclassified, indicated that their major course of study was adequate. A high percentage of the graduates in occupations not related to agriculture and unclassified indicated that it was inadequate. Only a relatively small percentage of the entire group indicated their major course of study was adequate to a degree.

## Conclusions

On the basis of findings evidenced in this research study, according to the expressed opinions of the group, the following conclusions seem apparent:

1. Although 73.5 percent of the present teachers indicated their major course of study was adequate, 93 percent indicated that additional fields of study would have been helpful as preparation for teaching. Since 57.5 percent of the teachers indicated that more technical subjects closely related to the major field of study should be included, one may conclude, with a fair degree of confidence, that courses in this area should be given more emphasis.

2. Since a clear majority or 80.5 percent of the teachers felt that more emphasis should be placed on courses in soils, agricultural engineering, and approximately 70 percent of them felt that more emphasis should be placed on mathematics, English, speech, and journalism, one may conclude that additional requirement or more thorough training should be provided in the areas of soils, agricultural engineering, and courses dealing with communication skills.

One way which these additional requirements could be met is by reducing the required hours of course work in various other areas which were designated by the respondents as being of less importance.

3. The study indicated that agricultural education majors do not experience a great deal of difficulty when entering various other occupations after graduation. An exception to this statement seems necessary for those entering fields not related to agriculture and unclassified fields.

4. This study also indicates that 45.8 percent of the graduates changed their field of work one or more times. The four most commonly mentioned reasons for changing were the same with only a minor difference in the order of importance, no matter if the graduates had changed from teaching to non-teaching, fron non-teaching to other non-teaching,

from non-teaching to teaching, and from non-teaching to teaching back to non-teaching. The reasons indicated for changing were: (1) Better opportunities for advancement; (2) Increase in salary; (3) Better working conditions; and (4) Work more to my liking.

5. Thirty-four or 39.1 percent of the present teachers of vocational agriculture indicated interest toward changing their fields of work. The four most commonly mentioned reasons by this group were: (1) Improve advancement opportunities; (2) Salary increases; (3) Better working conditions; and (4) Improve retirement benefits.

## Recommendations

On the basis of the findings of this study, the following recommendations are presented: (1) That additional research should be made of all present teachers of vocational agriculture, who have had at least three years of experience, to ascertain what revisions they feel should be made in the agricultural education curriculum at this university. A teacher with three years of experience should know his deficiencies of course work at this time.

If further study is made the author would recommend a questionnaire similar to the one used in this study, but a few revisions need to be made to make it more desirable. There are certain parts that are too general and not specific enough, for this questionnaire was designed for all School of Agriculture graduates. It would certainly be wise to be more specific in areas such as first field of employment, additional studies that might have been helpful as preparation for teaching, emphasis to be placed on certain agricultural courses and related subjects, reason for changing fields of employment, and other things of this nature.

(2) As a tentative recommendation it would seem desirable for staff members of the Department of Agricultural Education at Oklahoma State University along with the staff of the State Department of Vocational Education, Division of Vocational Agriculture to give serious consideration to the advisability of increasing the experiences provided college students in the areas of soils, agricultural engineering, as well as courses dealing with the acquisition of communication skills. (3) Since 39.1 percent of the present teachers indicated that they desired a change from their field of work for the reason of

1. Improve advancement opportunities
2. Salary increase
3. Better working conditions, and
4. Improve retirement benefits,

it is recommended that additional research studies be made to ascertain how these conditions can be improved.

# A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Paul G. "The Performance of Specified Extension Tasks by County Agricultural Agents in Oklahoma in Relation to Their Professional Training and Experience," (unpub. Ph. D. dissertation, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1956).

Bartlett, Lester C. "The Tenure of Vocational Agriculture Teachers in the State of Washington," (unpub. Master's thesis, Washington State College, 1948), as reported in Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education, Vocational Division Bul. No. 242 (Washington, 1950).

Beamer, R. W. "A Follow-up Study of Virginia Polytechnic Institute Graduates - Agricultural Education," (unpub. Master's thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1948), as reported in Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education, Vocational Division Bul. No. 242 (Washington, 1950).

Bell, E. L. "Factors Influencing Occupational Choices," Agricultural Education Magazine, XXII (1950).

Bryan, James E. "A Survey of Bachelor of Science Graduates in Agricultural Education at the University of Idaho from 1934 to 1954, Inclusive," (unpub. Master's thesis, University of Idaho, 1956).

Canada, Ralph W. "Why Nebraska Teachers of Vocational Agriculture Left the Service," (unpub. Master's thesis, Nebraska University, 1945), as reported in Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education, Vocational Division Bul. No. 237, (Washington, 1948)

Chapman, John C. "Occupational Status of Men Who Qualified at Louisana State University Since 1919 to Teach Vocational Agriculture," (unpub. Master's thesis, Louisana State University, 1949), as reported in Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education, Vocational Division Bul. No. 246 (Washington, 1951).

Commencement Programs, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College Library, (Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1925-1955).

Edwards, Robert L. "Why Graduates in Agricultural Education Do Not Teach Vocational Agriculture," (unpub. Master's thesis, North Carolina State College, 1953), as reported in Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education, Vocational Division Bul. No. 256 (Washington, 1955)

General Catalog. Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, (Stillwater, 1932-1942).

Gurber, Joseph, "Placement and Follow-up of Business Graduates," American Business Education, October, 1955.

Holman, W. and R. J. Young, "Follow-up: New Variety," Clearing House, January, 1954.

Out-of-Service Files. Department of Vocational Education, Division of Vocational Agriculture, (Stillwater, 1951-1957).

Phipps, Loyd J. "Tenure of Vocational Agriculture Teachers in Illinois," (unpub. Non-thesis study, University of Illinois, 1947), as reported in Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education, Vocational Division Bul. No. 237 (Washington, 1948).

Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Southern Regional Research Conference in Agricultural Education. Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, (Stillwater, 1956).

Reports for Agricultural Teachers Training, as submitted to Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Agricultural Education 1936-1955, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, (Stillwater).

Roderick, Cecil V. "Why Former Teachers of Vocational Agriculture Left the Profession," (unpub. Non-thesis study, University of Missouri, 1953), as reported in Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education, Vocational Division Bul. No. 256 (Washington, 1955).

Salem, Olive A. "What Became of Graduates in Agricultural Education?" Agricultural Education Magazine, XIV (1942).

State Plans for Vocational Education, (Stillwater, 1925-1932 and 1942-1956).

Stringfeld, Roy C. "Why Louisana Teachers of Vocational Agriculture Left the Service," (unpub. Master's these, Louisana State University, 1949), as reported in Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education, Vocational Division Bul. No. 246 (Washington, 1951).

Wert, J. E., C. O. Neidt, and J. S. Ahman. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychological Research, New York: Appleton Century and Crofts Book Company, Inc., 1954.

APPENDIX

1. Letter of transmittal
2. Schedule
3. Follow-up postal card

Oklahoma
Agricultural and Mechanical College

SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION
STILLWATER



Dear Aggie Alum:

The current situation in agriculture, and the need for additional graduates in many fields, has prompted us to make a survey of those who have graduated from the School of Agriculture at Oklahoma A. and M. College. Therefore, we are enclosing a questionnaire which we feel will give us important information to more accurately advise students who are interested in careers in agriculture.

Although the questionnaire may seem to be rather lengthy it will require only a few minutes of your time to complete. You will be doing a great service to the School of Agriculture if you will furnish the information requested, and return the questionnaire at your earilest convenience.

This material will be kept confidential and reported only as a summary of the data.

We send you greetings from the campus, and invite you to come back for a visit at every opportunity.

Sincerely yours,

Randall J. Jones, Dean
Resident Instruction

RJJ:cl

## WHAT DO YOU THINK?

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information from alumni relative to the job opportunities for those trained in agriculture and to seek advice as to career selection, curricula development, and other factors important in the training of college students studying agriculture at Oklahoma A. and M. College.

### I. PERSONAL DATA

A. Name: _____
(first (middle) (last)

B. Address: _____

C. Years at Oklahoma A. and M.: _____

D. Year of graduation (BS): _____ Age at graduation: _____

E. Your undergraduate major: _____

F. Advanced study: Yes _____ No _____

| | Institution | Major Field | Degree | Date |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | | | | |
| 2. | | | | |

G. Marital status as undergraduate student at A. and M.:

_____ Single _____ Married before entering school

_____ Married as undergraduate in school

H. Military Service: Yes _____ No _____

### II. YOUR OCCUPATIONAL RECORD AND EXPERIENCES

Students are continually asking the question, "What kind of jobs are available to agriculture graduates?". Information concerning your experiences will help answer their questions more accurately. Salary and income information will be handled confidentially and never used in a manner that it can be identified with any one person.

A. What is your present occupation? Please be specific. For example, indicate dairy farmer, feed salesman, soil conservation engineer, agriculture journal reporter, etc. Never just farmer, journalist, salesman, or engineer.

_____

B. Occupations are grouped into three major classes. Check the class that applies in your situation.

_____ 1. Public employment (federal, state, local, etc.)

_____ 2. Private employment (working for individual or corporation)

_____ 3. Self employment (in own business i.e., farming, contracting, etc.)

C. Your occupational record. Students always ask about starting salaries, advancement, rate of advancement, and maximum income from different occupations. Your record will serve to help answer these questions. Read instructional note before checking items and filling out record.

List full time jobs beginning with your present job and going back to include all full time jobs you have had since graduation.

| Kind of Job Held* | Period Employed | | Salary | | Number of salary increases in each job | Did the change in jobs or professional advancement require a move? | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | From | To | Beginning | Ending or Present | | Yes | No |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

*Use the number preceeding the general classifications of occupations as outlined below to indicate the kind of jobs held.

Classification of occupations:

1. Farming, i.e., dairying, ranching
2. Business related to agriculture
3. Industry related to agriculture
4. Profession related to agriculture
5. Business not related to agriculture
6. Industry not related to agriculture
7. Profession not related to agriculture

D. Your Income Record

What was your annual income at the end of the following specific periods?

| First year | Second year | Fifth year | Tenth year |
|---|---|---|---|
| $_____ | $_____ | $_____ | $_____ |

III. CAREER SUMMARY TO DATE

A. What contacts led to your first employment? (Check no more than 2)

_____ 1. College Placement Bureau

_____ 2. Major advisor

_____ 3. Major department

_____ 4. Other college staff member

_____ 5. Students and friends

_____ 6. Parents or close relatives

_____ 7. Contacts made on own initiative

_____ 8. Interviews with personnel men

_____ 9. Other (specify) _____

B. How important was success in your first job to your career?

_____ 1. Very important _____ 3. Not important

_____ 2. Important _____ 4. No relationship

C. Have you made definite changes in your field of work since graduation?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes" indicate a. Number of changes made (_____), and
b. Reasons for changes. (check no more than two items below)

_____ 1. Increase in salary

_____ 2. Better working conditions

_____ 3. Personal or family health

_____ 4. Improved living conditions

_____ 5. Improved retirement benefits

_____ 6. Better opportunity for advancement

_____ 7. Work more to my liking

_____ 8. Other (specify) _____

D. Are you interested in changing your field of work?

Yes _____ No _____

If "yes" check reason below. (check no more than two)

_____ 1. Salary increase

_____ 2. Better working conditions

_____ 3. Personal or family health

_____ 4. Better living conditions

_____ 5. Improved retirement benefits

_____ 6. Improved advancement opportunities

_____ 7. Work more to my liking

_____ 8. Other (specify) _____

E. If you had an 18-year-old son entering college, what career would you recommend that he consider?

_____

IV. YOUR EXPERIENCES IN SELECTING YOUR CAREER

A. Check below the approximate time of your decision to enter the occupation in which you are now engaged.

_____ 1. Previous to college entrance

_____ 2. During first year of college

_____ 3. During second year of college

_____ 4. During third year of college

_____ 5. During fourth year of college

_____ 6. Immediately after graduation

_____ 7. After military service

_____ 8. Other (specify) _____

B. Select three of the following items and rank them in the order of their greatest influence to you in making your career selection.

_____ 1. Parents' desires, approval and/or encouragement

_____ 2. Counsel and influence of close relatives

_____ 3. Counsel and influence of elementary school teacher, county extension agent, or high school teacher

_____ 4. Experiences while attending high school

_____ 5. Experiences while attending college

_____ 6. Counsel and influence of college teacher

_____ 7. Counsel and influence of college advisor or counselor

_____ 8. Availability of positions in field

_____ 9. Experience in the field

_____ 10. Natural aptitude and liking for type of work

_____ 11. Other (specify) _____

C. Rank three of the following items or persons that, in your college experience, were of assistance to you in the decisions made regarding your career. (Check no more than three)

_____ 1. Orientation course

_____ 2. Aptitude tests

_____ 3. Personal advisor or counselor

_____ 4. College instructor or instructors

_____ 5. A particular course

_____ 6. Student associations or student contacts

_____ 7. Experiences in student organizations

_____ 8. Part-time employment experiences

## V. YOUR TRAINING AS RELATED TO YOUR CAREER.

### A. Your Course of Study and Your Career

1. Is your present occupation in the same field as your major course of study in college?

   a. Yes _____ b. No _____ c. Closely related _____

2. Do you feel that your major course of study prepared you for your present occupation?

   a. Yes _____ b. No _____ c. To a degree _____

3. Do you feel some other course of study would have been equally as satisfactory in preparing you for your present occupation?

   a. Yes _____ b. No _____ c. Partially so _____

4. What additional courses or fields of study do you feel might have been helpful to you in your present occupation? (check only 1 or 2 items)

_____ a. None

_____ b. Include more technical work in major field

_____ c. Include more technical subjects in areas closely related to major field of study

_____ d. Include more work in biological and physical sciences

_____ e. Include more work in social sciences

_____ f. Include more work in subjects dealing with group action

5. In regard to English, speech and journalism, would you recommend:

_____ a. More emphasis

_____ b. Less emphasis

_____ c. Same emphasis

6. In regard to mathematics, would you recommend:

_____ a. More emphasis

_____ b. Less emphasis

_____ c. Same emphasis

7. How effective do you feel the courses taken in your major field of study were in preparing you for your present occupation?

a. Technical training:

_____ (1) Very effective

_____ (2) Effective

_____ (3) Ineffective

b. Training in dealing with others:

_____ (1) Very effective

_____ (2) Effective

_____ (3) Ineffective

8. Was the type of training you received helpful in securing your first job after graduation?

a. Yes _____ b. No _____ c. To a degree _____

If "yes", which of the following was most helpful:

_____ (1) The college degree

_____ (2) Broad training in agriculture

_____ (3) Specialized training in major field

_____ (4) Both broad and specialized training

_____ (5) Other (specify) _____

B. Aptitudes and abilities you feel most important in securing employment and in advancing in your occupation.

_____ 1. Getting along with other people

_____ 2. Technical knowledge and skill

_____ 3. Getting things accomplished

_____ 4. Moral and professional integrity

_____ 5. Ability to speak and write

_____ 6. Hard work

_____ 7. Scholastic record

_____ 8. Participation in community affairs

_____ 9. Other (specify) _____

C. What emphasis (more, less, same) would you place on these courses in preparing you for teaching vocational agriculture?

| | More | Less | Same |
|---|---|---|---|
| Agricultural Economics | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Agricultural Engineering | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Animal Husbandry | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Dairying | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Entomology | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Field Crops | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Horticulture | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Poultry | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Soils | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Dear Aggie Alum:

Some weeks ago we mailed to you a questionnaire concerning graduates of the School of Agriculture at Oklahoma A & M College. As yet, we have not received your copy of the questionnaire. We would appreciate very much your filling it out and returning it at your earliest convenience in order that the survey may be completed.

Thanks very much for your help.

Sincerly yours,

s/ Randall J. Jones

Randall J. Jones, Dean
Resident Instruction

# VITA

Billy Lee Whitt

Candidate for the degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: OPINIONS EXPRESSED BY AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION GRADUATES REGARDING THE ADEQUACY OF THE AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM AT THE OKLAHOMA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE

Major Field: Agricultural Education

Biographical:

Personal data: Born near Purdy, Oklahoma, December 26, 1933, the son of Willie Lee and Sylvia Mazie Whitt.

Education: Attended grade school at Purdy and Lindsay, Oklahoma; graduated from Lindsay High School in 1952; received the Bachelor of Science degree from Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, with a major in Agricultural Education, in August, 1956; entered graduate school in September, 1956.

Experiences: Completed apprentice teaching at Marlow, Oklahoma, in March, 1956; graduate assistant in the Horticulture Department at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1956-1957.

Honors: Phi Kappa Phi, Phi Delta Kappa, Alpha Zeta, and "O" Club.

Date of Final Examination: July, 1957.