

SWORDS INTO PLOUGHSHARES: A HISTORICAL
ACCOUNT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM
TRAINING PROGRAM IN OKLAHOMA
UNDER THE SERVICEMEN'S
READJUSTMENT ACT
OF 1944, 1945-1966

By

BRUCE EDWARD NIEMI

Bachelor of Arts
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
1974

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
Stillwater, Oklahoma
2001

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
July, 2005

SWORDS INTO PLOUGHSHARES: A HISTORICAL
ACCOUNT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM
TRAINING PROGRAM IN OKLAHOMA
UNDER THE SERVICEMEN'S
READJUSTMENT ACT
OF 1944, 1945-1966

Dissertation Approved:

Reynaldo L. Martinez

Dissertation Adviser

Lynna Ausburn

Ronald A. Petrin

William G. Weeks

A. Gordon Emslie

Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

The Veterans' Agricultural Training Program (VATP) was organized in Oklahoma nearly 60 years ago in an interesting time and space. The United States had, in concert with its major allies, Great Britain and the Soviet Union, recently won World War II and emerged unscathed as the most powerful nation in the World. The American people were elated by the defeat of Germany and the sudden victory over Japan. This victory along with the return of prosperity after the Great Depression provided faith to the American People in what government could accomplish in a positive way for society. The accomplishments of the progressive education movement and the connection of education with society and community would sustain a positive image of public education in the minds of Americans for the generation.

This is the story of the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program in Oklahoma. This study discusses how the program was administered, how it contributed to the growth of the Oklahoma's community college and occupational education system, and how, as a community education movement, the VATP developed a cadre of leadership for Oklahoma and communities where the participants lived.

As historical research, this study was influenced by the historiography of progressive education. This historiography has developed through three stages: First, was the celebratory stage, house or Whig history written by education "missionaries" and progressive historians for the most part before 1960. It portrayed education as a part of

the march of progress, and the victory of the forces of enlightenment and democracy over those of elitism and tradition (Kleibard, 1995).

After 1960, a second stage, social and intellectual history emerged. It included such as Bailyn (1960), Cremin (1961), and Krug (1964), believed the professional biases of education walled schools off from the rest of society. Armed with new progressive tools such as testing and guidance derived from the field of psychology, educators tailored instruction to create what Krug said had “implications of caste education” (p. 230).

From Krug’s work on the American high school, the third group of radical revisionist historians received their inspiration. This group presented a new interpretation of progressive education that the progressive education movement had the effect of restricting educational opportunity, inhibiting social mobility, and maintaining an unequal and unfair distribution of political power. Following the lead of Krug, the radical revisionists dismissed the claims of celebratory history of education that progressives were democratic, “idealistic and humanitarian intellectuals” saving the working class from the “selfish, wealthy elite and from the bigoted proponents of orthodox religion” (Katz, 1968, p. 1). The radical revisionist, instead, saw progressive educators instead as repressive, promoted by status-hungry middle class parents and a new class of professional administrators serving the interests of the dominant elites (Kleibard, 1995).

Qualitative and cultural studies researchers will be pleased to know that the theoretical lens for this study refocused over the course of the research. Framing the study as critical theory and postmodernism was proposed to be what would become the initial theoretical perspective for this study. Many doctoral students at the College of

Education of Oklahoma State University in the first years of the 21st century found critical theory to be an appealing lens to view education. However, given the nature of political action critical action mandates, this theory seemed impractical for interpretation and action of a historical study.

The next stop on this journey to find a theoretical hook was Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee where the Southern Agrarians, the political and literary criticism movement were centered. This group of the interwar period advocated the back-to-the-land movement and subsistence farming to counter the dehumanizing forces of science, industrialism, and the secularism of the modern age. The Southern Agrarians were “Southern positive reactionaries” who were anti-communist and revered the Old South (Conkin, 1959). Under contemporary historiography, Southern Agrarians would be classified as “anarchists,” a historical school that believes “everything was better in the Middle Ages” (Petrin, personal communication, April 24, 2003).

While Southern Agrarians were ultra-conservatives, the philosophy appealed to Eleanor Roosevelt and certain members of Roosevelt’s Brain Trust (particularly M. E. Wilson, the founder of Agricultural Extension at Montana State University, a land-grant college) as the basis for the New Deal’s Subsistence Homesteads program for the unemployed. Ultimately, the U.S. Resettlement Administration (R.A.), who built and managed the Subsistence Homesteads, rejected the return to the land concept. Led by Rexford Guy Tugwell, the R.A. embraced the modern approach of building suburban garden cities to house the urban working class (Conkin, 1959).

Conkin’s (1959) history of New Deal communities, *Tomorrow a New World: The New Deal Community Program* became an organizational model for this study. Conkin’s

study demonstrated that Southern Agrarians had little to do with the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program other than the "Forty acres and a Jeep" (Titus, 1944, p. 25) proposal. The program was beyond a return to the land movement, but it was in fact a program of vocational agricultural education for adult students who were veterans, a special student classification.

A technical agricultural education course of study for adult students implemented by the U.S. Veterans' Administration and the Oklahoma education agencies is a socially constructed technological regime. Since the 1980s science and technology studies (SES) has analyzed the use of a technology system, such as aircraft or automobiles or grain elevators, as a technological regime. The VATP fits nicely into the concept of a technology regime. It is the system that delivers technical knowledge necessary for efficient agricultural production in a capitalist economy (Bijker & Pinch, 1987). The study finally devolved into an Oklahoma history of the public administration for adult vocational agricultural education. This discovery convinced me that, in the final analysis, all history is atheoretical (Petrin, personal communication, July 11, 2005).

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the people who made this study possible. First, I want to acknowledge my adviser and the chair of my dissertation committee, Dr. Reynaldo L. Martinez, Jr., whose encouragement in researching a topic on the history of vocational education thus making it possible to develop this study and have it accepted by the committee and the Graduate College at Oklahoma State University. I appreciate the work of the members of the committee in reviewing this study and making comments on improving its form and content. These members include: Dr. Lynna Ausburn, a specialist in occupational education research; Dr. William G.

Weeks of the Department of Agricultural Education whose course on the history of agricultural and extension education helped inspire this work; and Dr. Ron Petrin of the OSU History Department whose course in historiography developed my interest in this field. Two former members of the committee also bear mentioning: Professor Emeritus Deke Johnson of the Oklahoma Center for Community Education where I worked as a graduate assistant in 2003-2004 and who introduced to the community education movement; and Dr. Joan Warren who encouraged me to pursue the doctoral program in occupational education.

Special thanks to the veterans of World War II and the administrators, trainers, instructors, and students of the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program who provided their oral history of the VATP. I am particularly grateful to my former colleague in the House of Representatives, state Representative Larry O. Hansen, a former VATP administrator, whose story inspired this study. In memoriam, this study is dedicated to Dale Dupy (1915-2003) and Enoch Watterson (1926-2005) who contributed much to this history.

I would also like to thank family and friends for their support and encouragement. My daughters, Meredith and Julie, and my friend, Theresa Dreiling, who accommodated long absences and the financial sacrifices made while pursuing this degree. I appreciate the encouragement of my friends, especially Van Eden, for listening to my weekly discourses on veterans' farm training and seeing occupational education as the "Way of the Future."

Special thanks also go to friends in the graduate program in the College of Education at OSU, including Upton Shimp, Mark Malaby, Betsy Showalter, Dee Brown,

Jackie Bach, Sharon Brown, John Wood, and Jeanine Huss, with whom I attended class with all during this process. Also, I want to extend thanks and special acknowledgements to my fraternity Brothers and Sisters of the Phi Chapter of Omicron Tau Theta, the honorary society for career and technical education.

I appreciate the help of Carol Hanneman, and her staff, of the Carl Albert Congressional Studies Center at the University of Oklahoma, my alma mater, for their assistance. Thanks go to the staff of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries for their help in the use of the Governors' Archives. And, I extend my appreciation to Professor Jennifer Paustenbaugh of the Special Collections and Archives at the Edmon Low Library at Oklahoma State University. My special thanks go to Margaret Butler of the Court of Civil Appeals for Oklahoma for transcribing all of the interviews of participants in the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program. This work was so valuable to the study's research and will continue to be made available to future historical researchers of Oklahoma occupational education.

Finally, I appreciate Todd, Aarand, Jana, and the student helpers at the Technology Center at the College of Education for putting up with me all day during the summer of 2005 while I typed this dissertation on the lab's computers. And, my thanks to Sonia Brumfield for assistance in formatting this dissertation in line with the Graduate College's Thesis Manual for electronic filing of a Ph.D. dissertation.

Stillwater, Oklahoma
July 20, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement	8
Purpose.....	9
Research Questions.....	11
Definitions.....	12
Limitations and Delimitations of the Study	19
Significance of the Study	21
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	23
Introduction.....	23
History of Vocational Education	24
Vocational Education in the Pre-Industrial Era	24
Early American Agricultural Education	25
Decline of the Apprenticeship System.....	25
Growth of Lyceums and Mechanics’ Institutes	26
Reconstruction and Freedmen’s Vocational Education.....	26
Establishment of the Land-Grant Institutions	28
The “Ivy Silo”: Land-Grant Colleges and Agricultural Research	32
“1890 Institutions”: Historically Black Land-Grant Colleges	34
State-established District Agricultural Schools	36
Demonstration Work and the Extension Service	36
Vocational Education in the Industrial Age.....	39
Manual Arts Training Comes to America.....	39
The Great Debate over Vocational Education in Public Schools	41
Efforts to Enact Federal Vocational Education Legislation	43
The “Smith-Hughes-Man” and Vocational Agricultural Education.....	44
Social Efficiency	47
Federal Legislative History of Vocational Education, 1917-1963	53
Post-Industrial Vocational Education	71
Sputnik and the Great Society.....	72
The New Vocationalism	75
New Missions for Agricultural Education	78
Vocational Education and the GI Bill.....	80
Vocational Education Initiatives of the New Deal	80

Chapter	Page
National Defense Vocational Training Programs	81
Origins of the GI Bill	82
III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	85
Theoretical Foundations for the Study.....	88
Research Methodology	91
Problem Definition.....	91
Review of Existing Research on the GI Bill.....	91
Document Analysis.....	92
Oral History	93
Data Analysis and Reporting	97
IV. FINDINGS.....	100
Introduction.....	100
“Forty Acres and a Jeep”: Veterans Return to Oklahoma	103
Vocational Education to the Rescue	108
Administration of Vocational Programs in Oklahoma	109
James Barney Perky: Agricultural Educator and Entrepreneur	114
Henry Garland Bennett: Education Entrepreneur	116
War-Time National Defense classes in Vocational Agriculture.....	121
State Administration of War Production Training Programs	124
Lessons Learned from War-Training Programs	127
Creating the Institutional On-Farm Training Program	132
Korean War Veterans.....	138
The Oklahoma G.I. Bill Institutional On-Farm Training Program.....	139
State Veterans’ Agricultural Training Program Staff	141
State Accrediting Agency	148
Local Veterans’ Agricultural Training Program Administration.....	151
Veterans’ Agricultural Training as Community Education	158
Veterans’ Agriculture Instructors	161
The Veteran-Trainees.....	165
Veterans’ Agricultural Training and the Making of Modern Oklahoma.....	169
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	176
Introduction.....	176
Research Questions Findings	177
Research Question Conclusions.....	178
Summary of Conclusions about the Research Questions	182
Recommendations of the Study	184
Summary of Recommendations of the Study	185

Chapter	Page
REFERENCES	186
APPENDIXES	206
APPENDIX A – INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL.....	206
APPENDIX B – INTERVIEWS.....	207
APPENDIX C – INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENTS.....	208
APPENDIX D – INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR VETERANS INSTRUCTORS	211
APPENDIX E – INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR VETERAN TRAINEES	214

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. List of 1862 Morrill Act Land-Grant University	30
2. List of 1890 Morrill Act Land-Grant Universities.....	35
3. List of Federal Occupational Education Legislation	54
4. Courses Offered, Participating Community Schools, Veterans' Enrollment for the VATP, by Biennial Year, 1946-1960.....	147
5. Oklahoma VATP Participating Community Schools and Enrollment, 1949.....	154

Swords into Ploughshares: A Historical Account of the Institutional On-farm Training
Program under the Servicemen's Readjustment
Act of 1944, 1945-1966.

CHAPTER I

Introduction

*They shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning
hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, nor shall they learn war
anymore.*

- Isaiah 2:4

Within a fortnight of the D-Day invasion of Western Europe by allied military and naval forces, the Congress of the United States, in a fit of patriotism and appreciation of the sacrifices of America's soldiers and sailors, passed and President Roosevelt signed into law, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, popularly known as the "GI Bill of Rights"). The GI Bill provided a cafeteria of offerings of benefits to the veterans who would be returning from service in World War II. The GI Bill contained benefits for unemployment insurance, homeownership, rehabilitation, and education and training (Ross, 1969).

World War II continued for another year for United States forces across Europe and the Pacific Theaters of Operations. The Liberation of Paris and The Philippines, Aachen, the Hurtgren Forest, The Bulge, Iwo Jima, the Ruhr Valley, and Okinawa lay ahead, where tens of thousands of American casualties were inflicted by Axis Powers forces. The War ended unexpectedly following the advent of the nuclear age in the summer of 1945. Shortly after V-J Day, a *Time* (1945) correspondent wrote poetically of the atmosphere of peace Americans sensed:

... September's hot days and moonless nights held the first, smoky promise of fall. Across the continent the people of the United States looked at a land at peace after the years of war.

Soldiers who had cheered Manhattan's towers when their ships docked now strained their eyes for the half-forgotten tree or turn of the road which would mean the real end of their long journey home. War workers bound back to farms and small towns, millions who had been city-bound by gasoline rationing looked out again at the U.S. scene they best remembered – a two-lane highway seen through the windshield of a four-door sedan. . .

For six long years the news had come from overseas. In war-jammed cities the important things of existence had been steel shavings coiling from a machine tool, the glare of a welding torch, the sound of riveting gun and typewriter, the brain fag and weariness of overwork. But now the U.S. experienced the quiet clarity of eye and mind which comes after a long fever. . .

Across the land last week it was hot, and once more the U.S. people could listen with contentment to that most peaceful of all evening music – the tinkling of the lawn sprinklers, turning drowsily in the darkness. (p. 5)

Millions of men and women recently discharged from the military and naval forces and looking for the next step in their lives took advantage of the benefits contained in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. The GI Bill was credited by politicians from both political parties as having created the American middle class of the late 20th Century. The GI Bill was fabled for the way that this legislation affected postwar American culture. Social and intellectual historians commented on how this law changed higher education by bringing in new students and democratizing colleges and universities (Olson, 1974). The GI Bill and American universities molded the "Man in the Gray Flannel Suit," the Organization Man of William H. Whyte Jr.'s landmark qualitative study (Whyte, 1956; Wilson, 1955).

Another less heralded education and training program under the GI Bill that benefited returning soldiers was institutional on-farm training or the veterans' farm training program. Institutional on-farm training was the statutory name cited in the GI Bill legislation, and the subsequent Wheeler Act, for a vocational education program providing agriculture education to returning World War II veterans, and later to veterans of the Korean War, through community public high school buildings. In 1947, the Wheeler Act (Public Law 377) was passed by Congress and signed by President Truman amending the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. The Wheeler Act provided specifically for institutional on-farm training setting forth definite standards for the training. Institutional on-farm training was reauthorized for veterans of the Korean Conflict by

section 252 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (H.R. 7656, 1952).

The veterans farm training program combined classroom instruction in farming practices with regular on-site visits by the instructor to assess the application of classroom instruction to farms. According to regulations promulgated by the U.S. Veterans' Administration, the federal agency that administered the program, the trainee had to have complete control of the farming operation, attend classes at least 200 hours per year, receive supervised on-farm visits from the instructor for 100 hours per year, and have a "farm and home plan" (H.R. 2181, 1947, p. 8) in place as a guide for the trainee's individual instruction. The policies for the local program were to be established by a local advisory committee consisting of members who were local farmers, vocational agriculture teachers, and representatives of the U.S. Department of Agriculture local offices and other qualified institutions operating in the area (H.R. 2181, Senate, 1947).

Institutional on-farm training was a large and important undertaking in occupational and agricultural education in Oklahoma. In 1949, Oklahoma had the seventh largest veterans' farm training program in the United States. The institutional on-farm training was paid for by federal funds authorized under the GI Bill.

The Oklahoma State Board of Vocational Education was one of the state agencies designated as a member of the state approving board for Oklahoma (Goble, 2003). The institutional on-farm training program affected the vocational education system in Oklahoma. The budget for the State Board for Vocational Education more than quadrupled in the first three years after V-J Day because of the federal payments to the state by the U.S. Veterans' Administration for the operation of the on-farm program.

A separate division, the Division of Veterans' Agricultural Training, was created by the Oklahoma State Board for Vocational Education to administer the program. The State Board's director selected an auditor to monitor and evaluate the Veterans' Agricultural Training Division's operations (Tyson, 1974). The institutional on-farm training program was so popular that it lasted until the early 1960s in order to accommodate returning Korean War veterans. At its peak, the veteran's agricultural training program employed 700 teachers teaching 750 classes in 342 communities (Stewart, 1982).

Classes were modeled after vocational agricultural education courses with 100 hours of on-farm site visits by a veterans' agriculture instructor and 200 hours of classroom instruction by agriculture teachers at local schools. By 1951, the institutional on-farm training program in Oklahoma enrolled over 15,000 adult pupils, making the state's program the seventh largest in the nation in 1949 (Investigation of veterans' educational program, 1951). The program's curriculum varied according to local conditions and the needs of its student, with an emphasis on subjects related to planning, production, marketing, conservation, financing, management, mechanics, and record keeping (Stewart, 1982).

One rural community that provided veterans' farm training under the GI Bill was Pryor Creek, Oklahoma. Pryor Creek was the county seat of Mayes County. The city of Pryor Creek rested in a valley in northeastern Oklahoma between the Ozark Mountains to the east and the Cross Timbers further west. The rich farm land was bisected by the Grand (Neosho) River. During the Great Depression the waters of Grand River were impounded by Pensacola Dam built by the Grand River Dam Authority, an agency of the

state government of Oklahoma. The state envisioned the lake region as "conservation and reclamation district for the waters of the Grand River" (S.B. 395, 1935). The Grand River project spurred industrial development in the region and DuPont Chemicals opened an ammunition plant south of Pryor Creek at the beginning of World War II (Holway, 1969).

In Pryor Creek, Oklahoma, on November 21, 1945, two months after World War II was won and eighteen months after passage of the GI Bill, eight men gathered at the invitation of the local superintendent of schools, Garland Gofrey, to serve on a local advisory committee and to hear a presentation by George Summers, an official of the Oklahoma Soldiers' Relief Commission (*Pryor Jeffersonian*, 1945). The advisory committee members were all distinguished businessmen, teachers, and heads of local government agency offices in Pryor Creek. Summers had traveled the 41 miles north from Muskogee on U.S. 69, the old military post road, to brief the Pryor Creek advisory committee on the provisions of on-the-job training under the GI Bill. Pryor Creek leaders discussed institutional on-farm training and other types of on-the-job training under the GI Bill that day in 1945 (*Pryor Jeffersonian*, 1945).

Historians of occupational education have commented on how the GI Bill affected the field of career and technical education. Gordon (2003) stated that, in addition to the direct participants in vocational education through on-the-job training experiences and in proprietary trade schools, "a large number of veterans in college majored in vocational teacher education and taught in vocational programs" (p. 51). There were no narratives of programs of the GI Bill, however, documenting the vocational programs authorized by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. Frydl (2000) stated there were no studies of

the Servicemen's Readjustment Act that examined the situation of the more than seven million World War II veterans who did not go to college.

The absence of historical scholarship about vocational education's role in the GI Bill, as well as all other areas of occupational education, presents a unique research opportunity. A study of institutional on-farm training necessitates the use of historical research methodology, infrequently used in the field of occupational education. In order to address research questions designed to delve into the nature, composition, form, and consistency of acts or events, the method of research is historical research (Barlow, 1981).

The nature of occupational education studies is immediacy: solving a community's economic development problems, helping youth and adults find and train for new careers, devising curriculum and pedagogies, or increasing industrial education teacher efficacy. The field's focus on the present and future concerns creates a lens where past achievements in the field are overlooked and forgotten. An Oklahoma historian recently observed that vocational educators "view history as something that happened five years ago" (Goble, 2004). Barlow (1981) commented:

Historical research is neglected in the field of educational research, particularly in the occupational education studies field. A scholar of vocational education stated by the mid 1960s vocational education discovered research, but practically none of the research dealt with the historical area. While few persons in vocational education were qualified to do any kind of research, ever fewer were qualified to do historical research. Those who were usually were also responsible for other

tasks, and ventures into the history of vocational education became of necessity a low priority. (p. 30)

The value of historical research for vocational education is not only in understanding the meaning and context of the field's accomplishments but content for telling the story of vocational education to policymakers whose funding has created the American system of career and technical education.

Chapter I of this research study contains an introduction describing the problem and purpose of the research, the research questions to be pursued by the study, the limitations and significance of the study, and the definitions of terms used in the study. Chapter II is a review of pertinent literature related to the development of vocational education and agricultural education in the United States. Chapter III outlines the research methods employed to study adult vocational agricultural education in the context of the institutional on-farm training under the GI Bill in the state of Oklahoma from the end of World War II to the termination of institutional on-farm training program in 1961. In Chapter IV, the findings are presented using the research methodology outlined in the third chapter. Finally, in Chapter V, the conclusions of the study based upon the data reported in the previous chapter are presented and recommendations for further research opportunities in the area of postwar adult vocational agricultural education are offered.

Problem Statement

The veterans' institutional on-farm training program affected states in the farm belt in the aftermath of World War II. In Oklahoma, veterans' agricultural training

quadrupled the size of the state's vocational education agency. The problem of this study was that there were no published accounts regarding the effects and outcomes of the on-farm training program in Oklahoma to guide historians and policy makers concerning the outcome of this program and its contribution to the development of vocational education in the state. The lack of historical information concerning the veterans' farm training program resulted in a gap in the knowledge regarding an influential program linked to the development of the Oklahoma Career and Technical Education system after 1960. Additionally, the lack of a historical accounting of the results of institutional on-farm training under the GI Bill leaves as an unknown how the participants of this program and the state of Oklahoma were affected by its implementation, or how the practices of administration of this educational program contributed to the growth and development of vocational education.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to produce a historical account of the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program (VATP) in Oklahoma by an investigation of institutional on-farm training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (the so-called GI Bill of Rights) education and training benefits for World War II and Korean War veterans. The investigation examined the way veterans' farm training was carried out by an agency of the state of Oklahoma in 351 public schools across the state. The study sought answers to questions on how VATP affected the veterans, their communities, and the development of the Oklahoma Career

and Technical Education system. The study focused on the purposes and the individual and collective social and economic value of institutional on-farm education and training portion of the GI Bill.

Until 1963, Oklahoma's vocational education system was dominated by the field of agricultural education. The institutional on-farm agricultural training program under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (GI Bill of Rights) was selected for study because of both the large number of Oklahoma veterans who participated in the program and the program's suspected influence on the growth of Oklahoma's Career and Technical Education system under the program after World War II. Information regarding the participants in institutional on-farm training was largely unknown.

This study of the GI Bill's institutional on-farm training program was informed by using science and technology studies (STS). The use of STS followed the suggestions of Lewis (1999) and Petrina (1998) regarding the need for research on the direction, curriculum and instruction, and culture of vocational education. Petrina (1999) saw the genealogy, history, and historiography of technology education as a research area of engagement that was appropriate for answering such central framing questions in technology education as:

- Toward what end are we committing technology education? Whose end and why? What means have we chosen to move us in that direction? Should we be heading in that direction?
- How was technology education practiced in the past? Who said so, and how does that link up to current power structures and values?

- How is or was technology education practiced in subcultures and in other cultures? Who said so, and how does that link up to current power structures and values? (pp. 48-51)

At the inception of this research project, a gap exists in knowledge concerning the effects of the GI Bill's vocational programs (Frydl, 2000). By examining the veterans' agricultural program in Oklahoma researchers could learn lessons concerning to what end our society was committing vocational education at mid-20th century and how agriculture education and training was practiced in Oklahoma.

Research Questions

The three research questions that guided this study were:

1. How was institutional on-farm training administered in Oklahoma?
2. How did institutional on-farm training influence the perception of vocational education and the development of the Oklahoma system of area vocational-technical schools?
3. How were the social and economic lives of the veterans and their instructors and the communities in which they lived affected by their participation in on-farm training?

Definitions

Occupational education is a field of education that is a diverse, large, and complex area of curriculum of education and training designed to prepare people for employment. Lynch (2000), described it on a secondary school level as “a collective term in high schools to identify curriculum programs designed to prepare students to acquire an education and job skills, enabling them to enter employment immediately upon high school graduation” (p. 156). The area includes agricultural education, business education, family and consumer science education, health occupations education, industrial education, marketing and distributive education, technical education, technology education, and trade and industrial education. Occupational education courses were delivered through many different venues. The use of facilities, delivery by institutions and venues, and the types of students that were enrolled in occupational education programs varied from elementary and middle school students to adult learners. Career and technical courses were often used in conjunction with in-service training, human resources development, and adult education programs. Career and technical education courses were conducted through a variety of delivery systems that included public institutions, proprietary schools, apprenticeships, and on-the-job training (Gordon, 1999).

Occupational education courses also are delivered through the shared use of public education facilities as part of community education. In order to better describe and update the image of the discipline, the premier association of occupational educators, the American Vocational Association (AVA), abandoned the term “vocational education” and changed its name to the Association for Career and Technical Education (ACTE) in

December 1998. This organization has encouraged other associations and public vocational education agencies to replace this nomenclature with the career and technical education name (Lynch 2000).

Gordon (2003) and Scott and Sarkeos-Wircenski, (1996) provided the following definitions for the sub-disciplines of occupational education:

1. Agricultural Education includes agronomy, animal science horticulture, agricultural mechanics, agribusiness, and bioengineering and technology. Agricultural education is the oldest branch of the occupational education. It has consistently changed its instructional programs to meet the needs of a dynamic and rapidly changing industry and society.
2. Business Education started with instruction in bookkeeping and secretarial office procedures taught by commercial schools. Following the advent of automation, the field changed its focus from clerical skills to management systems, computer applications and information systems, and entrepreneurship. Its emphasis has been redirected from the local economic community to the global market.
3. Family and Consumer Sciences Education, formerly known as Home Economics education, seeks to promote nutrition and wellness and to meet the needs of individuals and families in diverse family, community and work environments. This program trains individuals in occupations such as food service, child development, hotel management, and interior design.
4. Health Occupation Education was designed to train individuals for careers in health care. In the 1950s the field was established to provide training of

licensed practical nurses. It developed into a popular career education area intended to provide skills and attitudes necessary to succeed a variety of health occupations, including such positions as nursing, physicians' and dental assistants, emergency medical technicians, massage therapists, home health aides, and pharmacy and radiological technicians.

5. Marketing Education is the instructional program designed to prepare individuals for major occupational areas within sales, distribution and marketing vocations. It was first devised in the during the Great Depression as distributive education to train for workers in the retail trade. The field evolved into educating and training workers who aspire to management positions in business, including general merchandising, apparel and accessories marketing, financial, insurance and real estate marketing, logistics, and business and personal services marketing.
6. Technical Education was developed in response to the World War II national defense effort. National vocational education programs, such as Engineering, Science, Management War Training (ESMWT), were established by Congress to train technicians who would work on jobs in the defense industry that required more limited competencies in mathematics and science than those of professional engineers but more than those needed by skilled mechanics. (Rulan, 1979). Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act after the Soviet Union's launch of the Sputnik I satellite to train needed technicians for the Cold War military-industrial complex. Courses included electronics, engineering drawing, and refrigeration and air conditioning mechanics. These

technical occupation programs contributed to the expansion of the community college movement in the 1960s (Chandler, 1990). Contemporary technical education subjects includes the subgroups of protective services, such as criminal justice and fire protection; engineering and science technology; communication technology; and computer programming and data processing.

7. Technology Education was defined as an applied discipline designed to promote technological literacy that provides an understanding of the impacts of technology. It is the descendent of late-19th century manual arts movement and industrial arts education. This includes technological business organization, industrial techniques, tools and skills to solve practical problems and extend human capabilities. This education is applicable to occupations in industries such as construction, manufacturing, communication, transportation, power, and energy.
8. Trade and Industrial Education seeks to develop in students sufficient knowledge and skills to secure initial employment and advancement in a wide variety of trades, including aircraft and auto mechanics, carpentry, metalworking, graphic arts, and cosmetology.

The following other terms are also used in this study:

- Adult farmer programs: Adult education programs in agriculture conducted for farmers established in farming and ages 25 and over (Ekstrom & McClelland, 1952).
- Antifoundationalism: Modernist researchers believe in the Enlightenment, scientific method, and positivist traditions that say objects exist independently

of the knower's subjective experiences. Constructivists are antifoundational because they refuse to adopt "foundational" standards by which truth can be universally known (Lincoln & Guba, 2000).

- Community Education: This field of education is both an educational philosophy and process that transform tradition K-12 education into community learning centers and involves collaboration with the school, home, family, private and public agencies, and business and industry. The processes, programs, and practices play a part in the development of career and technical education curricula since these workforce programs were tied to the needs of community and business and industry needs for manpower and employment. Components of community education include life-long learning, community involvement, and the efficient use of school resources. Career and technical education accomplished this process through its use of local advisory committees that set the course for community school curriculum and course offerings (Minzey & LeTarte, 1994).
- Establishment in farming: To develop effective ability to make a beginning and advance in farming (Deyoe, 1953).
- Ethnomethodology: Rooted in phenomenology, ethnomethodology, according to Watson and Goulet (1998), is a study of methods:

It asks not why, but how. It asks how people get things done – how they transform situations or how they persevere, situation “unchanged,” step by step, and moment to moment...it is interested in ordinary methods rather than their theorists. (p. 97)

- Fallibilism: After the French Revolution, positivist philosophy developed that rejected theology and metaphysics because of their fallibility based on subjective reality. Constructivists, critical theorists, postmodernists, and others believe that truth is located in specific historical, political, economic, and social infrastructures of society which may create a “false” or “divided consciousness” (Lincoln & Guba, 2000).
- GI Bill of Rights: In June, 1944, Congress passed and President Roosevelt signed the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, popularly known as the GI Bill of Rights. The legislation provided funds for a variety of benefits, including housing and education programs for honorably-discharged soldiers and sailors after the war. The GI Bill was subsequently extended for veterans of the Korean Conflict and Vietnam War.
- Institutional On-Farm Training: Also known as the veterans’ programs, the veterans’ farm program, and the Veterans’ Agricultural Training Program (VATP). This training was a program of adult agricultural education for veterans of World War II and the Korean War organized under the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 (P.L. 78-346) and the Veterans’ Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (P.L. 82-550) which was operated from 1945 to 1961. The program involved both on-the-job and classroom training. Students were required to complete 200 classroom hours and 100 hours of on-farm site visits per year. The program was paid for by funds from the U.S. Veterans’ Administration.

- Linguistics: A study of the theories of language, “which views relationships between words and what those words signify as the functions of an internal relationship within a linguistic system.” (Lincoln & Guba, 2000, p. 177)
- Phenomenology: this term can refer to a philosophy, an interpretive theory, a social science analytical perspective, or a research methods framework used for the purpose of achieving a greater understanding or meaning of everyday experience. As a qualitative method, phenomenology is the study of how people describe things and experience them sensually and focuses on descriptions of these experiences (Patton, 2002).
- Post-empiricist philosophy: Pioneered by Thomas Kuhn in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (1962)*, this philosophy of science rejects the assertion of positivism that only empirically based positive knowledge could be considered genuine knowledge (Patton, 2002).
- Southern Agrarianism: A radical conservative American political movement of the interwar period that idealized the Old South and advocated a return to the land and an ideal of subsistence farming as a response to the northern industrial capitalist economy. The movement had its origin after World War I within the “Fugitives,” a group of young English professors and graduate students at Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee, which included Allan Tate, John Crow Ransome, and Robert Penn Warren among others. Disillusioned with the failure of the political agenda, the Southern Agrarians had a major impact as a school of literary criticism (Conkin, P. K., 1988).

- V-J Day: Victory over Japan Day, the day on which the fighting with Japan ended on September 2, 1945 by their acceptance of the terms of the Potsdam Conference.
- V-E Day: Victory over Europe Day, the day on which the surrender of Germany was announced (May 7th, 1945), officially ending the European phase of World War II.
- Veteran: A former service member honorably discharged from the United States armed forces for service in World War II between September 16, 1940, and December 31, 1946, and/or in the Korean Conflict between June 27, 1950, and February 1, 1955.
- Veterans' benefit: Pre- or post-service benefit, either monetary or non-monetary, that rewards men and women for their service during World War II and the Korean Conflict.
- Young farmers' programs: Agricultural education programs conducted for boys, aged 14 to 24 years old, who were not attending high school "but who come back for part-time or short-course instruction"(Ekstrom & McClelland, 1952, p. 8).

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

A delimitation of this study was that it produced a historical account of only the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program (VATP) in Oklahoma. The study did not examine all of the vocational and on-the-job training programs of the 1944 and 1952 GI

Bills. The study set boundaries around the programs of the GI Bill of Rights and concentrated its investigation only on institutional on-farm training and further limits the examination of this component of the GI Bill education and training to the program's operation in the state of Oklahoma. Other education and training benefits for attending institutions of higher education, proprietary vocational schools, or for industrial on-the-job training were not studied.

The oral history element of the study yielded personal stories and experiences of participants about the program. Although oral histories were good sources of material, the program ended in Oklahoma 42 years ago. Many of the participants in the program are deceased or otherwise incapacitated. Interviewees who came forward are now at least 80 years old. They participated in the program over fifty years ago. Relying on their recollections may have produced details of the training program that were vague and suspect of accuracy.

A final limitation of the study concerns "peer checking" of the categories and themes developed through the data analysis of the study. Peer checking is used in qualitative research to verify decisions about the use of data. During the data collection and analysis of research for this study there was no formal attempt to do peer checking. Since there was no peer checking of the data analysis, the analysis was dependent solely on the personal and unverified views of the researcher. However, the dissertation adviser and committee were presented with the information on the study and their critiques and comments were always incorporated in the final study form.

Significance of the Study

The study of the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program was significant for several reasons. First, there were no studies of the vocational education and training aspects of the GI Bill. Second, as large as the Oklahoma institutional on-farm training program was under the GI Bill, there was little information on why this training developed, when it did, how it was carried out, and what its outcomes were for the participants and the social and economic life of local communities and Oklahoma. Such knowledge provided insight into the effectiveness, effect, and influence of on-farm training for its participants, their communities, and the Career and Technology Education system in Oklahoma. It also provided a basis for informing future decisions regarding veterans' education and training programs.

After over 85 years of federal aid to vocational education, the efficacy of such education and training programs has been brought into question by both federal and state policymakers. Further, as a nation we are once again involved in the Global War on Terrorism that is likely to have long-term consequences for veterans' affairs and education. The creators of the GI Bill worried about how to deal with veterans of two wars fought over 50 years ago and developed solutions that utilized vocational education programs.

The purposes of historical research are to study past events, draw conclusions about those events, and apply the generalizations and conclusions to present and anticipated events. Questions examined in this study were how the Oklahoma State Board of Vocational Education organized itself to deal with the influx of military personal after

World War II; how the experience of the GI Bill on-farm training program in Oklahoma influenced program participants and contributed to the growth of the state vocational education program after 1965; and how the GI Bill institutional on-farm training affected community life in Oklahoma. An anticipated outcome was that the information, conclusions, and recommendations developed from this study will inform decisions about occupational education and training needs for future civilian and veteran populations, particularly soldiers returning from the Global War on Terrorism.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

*You can meet them in school, or
In lanes, or at sea,
In church, or in trains, or in shops, or at tea,
For the saints of God are just folk like me,
And I mean to be one too.*

- Lesbia Scott (Grand Isle, 1929))

Introduction

The review of literature for a historical research study of the GI Bill had several initial topics. These topics included: the history of vocational education and agricultural education; New Deal vocational education programs through 1943; and the history of the GI Bill. Because the methodology of this study was qualitative research, the oral history interviews with participants enrolled and personnel who worked in the institutional on-farm training yielded rich and thick descriptions about the program related to the research questions of this study. These data were analyzed to develop themes for the study. As the

themes developed, the literature review was revised to yield thematic sources for this study.

History of Vocational Education

Vocational education had a long and distinguished history dating back to ancient Egypt. Every culture has developed systems for teaching trades and occupations to the next generation for the purposes of either workforce reproduction or to enhance the teaching of academic subjects through “hands-on” experiences. In this section, the chronological development of vocational education, with particular emphasis on agricultural education, is discussed through three periods of historical technological advancement: the pre-industrial, industrial, and post-industrial ages.

Vocational Education in the Pre-Industrial Era

Vocational education originated with apprenticeships in the pre-industrial era. Apprenticeship was the oldest known type of vocational education and was a basic method for obtaining occupational competence (Watkinson, 1996). Ancient Egyptians used the apprenticeship system to educate and train aspirants to the Sacredotal class of priests, teachers, and managers, and to the industrial class. The Talmud, the ancient Hebrew law, demanded the teaching of trades and Plato developed the idea that each man or woman should do the work for which they are best fitted. Guild schools were

organized in the Middle Ages by craft guilds to educate their members children (Gordon, 2003).

Early American Agricultural Education

Agricultural and extension education was a component of the field of occupational education with a long history in the United States beginning in the early colonial period. Indians at Plymouth Rock taught the Pilgrims how to plant corn and fertilize the rocky New England soil. James Oglethorpe developed an agricultural education system for Georgia colonist that involved using the agricultural practices of local Indians, establishing an experimental farm, and providing instructors. Georgia was the first colony to teach agricultural classes in an orphan school near Savannah (Moore, 1987). Benjamin Franklin advocated the teaching of agriculture in every town as early as 1749 (Drache, 1996).

Decline of the Apprenticeship System

The apprenticeship system declined in the early 19th century in the United States with the advent of the Industrial Revolution, the factory system specialization of labor, and the development of free public elementary schools. Also, the emerging trade union movement attempted to develop and regulate a new apprenticeship system to serve only a small number of people and thereby maintained a high level of wages (Kantor, 1982).

Growth of Lyceums and Mechanics' Institutes

In the early 19th century, private societies of mechanics established schools to provide a full-scale educational program for apprentices (Watkinson, 1996). Lyceums and mechanics' institutes emerged such as the Gardiner Lyceum in Maine, 1823; the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia, 1824; the Petersburg Benevolent Mechanics' Association in Virginia, 1825; the Maryland Institute for the Promotion of Mechanic Arts, Baltimore, 1826; the Ohio Mechanics' Institute, Cincinnati, 1828; and the San Francisco Mechanics' Institute, 1854 (Barlow, 1990).

Reconstruction and Freedmen's Vocational Education

African American slaves were emancipated during the Civil War. Freedom created a need for the education of former slaves and their productive integration into the capitalist economy. During Reconstruction colleges and schools for former slaves were established in the South through the efforts of the U.S. Army, philanthropic groups such as the American Missionary Society, and the Freedmen's Bureau. Hampton Normal and Industrial Institute of Virginia opened in 1867 that proved successful for the education of Black Americans in pedagogy and vocational subjects. Booker T. Washington was a former slave and a graduate of Hampton Institute, where he was mentored by Samuel Chapman Armstrong, the Institute's headmaster.

In 1881, Washington opened the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute in Alabama with two small, converted buildings, no equipment, and very little money.

Manual training was one of the education activities in the Tuskegee curriculum that included construction skills practiced on developing the college's campus. At the time of Washington's death in 1915, Tuskegee had more than 100 well-equipped buildings, 1,500 students, over 200 faculty teaching 38 trades and professions, and a two million dollar endowment. Washington had pioneered national programs in agriculture, industry, health, education, housing, and politics. Washington's movement had extended education to many rural adults (Denton, 1993). Tuskegee Institute, through the efforts of Thomas Monroe Campbell, sponsored a movable school to bring agricultural training to Black adults in rural areas and pioneered the use of demonstrations as an effective teaching tool (Wall & Noland, 1990).

Besides building the Tuskegee Institute, Washington was an educational philosopher. Washington believed the best interests of African Americans would be served through industrial education, intelligent farm management and land ownership, cultivation of habits of thrift and patience, and application of good manners and high morals. He adopted his mentor's philosophy of "head, heart, hands" to Tuskegee (Denton, 1990). These middle-class skills and character attributes won approval from white Southern society and built a base for advancement of Black Southerners.

Washington announced this philosophy in his famous "separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand" speech at the 1895 Atlanta Exposition (Gordon, 1999).

Establishment of the Land-Grant Institutions

At the dawn of the nineteenth century, the United States was predominately an agricultural economy with most working Americans engaged in agricultural activities. Educational institutions responded by offering courses designed to improve the scientific knowledge of the country's farmers. The 1800 U.S. Census reported a farm population of 4.3 million and agriculture employed 85 percent of the workforce. The Gardiner Lyceum in Maine which offered agricultural courses opened in 1823, and other agricultural education programs followed in Maine and Massachusetts. When the Rensselaer School was opened in New York in 1824 it offered agricultural courses (Moore, 1987).

By mid-century it became apparent to agriculturalists that a new model for higher education needed to be devised for to improve the scientific knowledge and skills of farmers and mechanics. In 1851, Jonathan Baldwin Turner proposed a new model for higher education. He believed there were two classes of people that required two approaches to education, the well-to-do who required a classical education in the universities, and the industrial classes who had no universities. Turner proposed the establishment of an industrial college designed for the industrial classes. The industrial college would contain an experimental farm with all types of livestock and crops. It would have dormitories and buildings where lectures would be held during cold weather. Commencement would be similar to a fair. Turner advocated federal land grants from the federal government to support this college model (Herren & Hillison, 1996).

State governments, acting in their role as "laboratories of the states," soon responded to Turner's call for establishment agricultural and industrial universities. In

1855, the legislature for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania established the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania (now Pennsylvania State University) for the purposes of training farmers and their wives and educating research specialists and teachers. Agricultural colleges were founded the same year in Michigan and Maryland in 1856. These institutions, while being the pioneers in the national agricultural education movement, lacked good professors and quality curriculum materials (Moore, 1987).

Based on the initial success of the state agricultural institutions, Turner and others called on Congress to provide a uniform mechanism of federal funding for agricultural and industrial universities in every state. In 1856, Turner convinced U.S. Representative Justin Morrill (R-Vermont) to introduce the Morrill Act of 1862, establishing a federal land grant for the

... endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactics to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts...in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life.
(Sec. 4)

Under the Morrill legislation, states received 30,000 acres of land per senator and each representative in Congress for that state. These lands were the states' to be sold or leased for the establishment of a land grant college. If no public lands were located in a state, then land in western states was granted to the state in the form of land scripts. Table 1 presents a list of the land-grant universities organized under the Morrill Act of 1862, including the name of the university, the date the institution was established (and/or, if

founded prior to the enactment, its acceptance as a land-grant college under provisions of the Morrill Act of 1862), and its location.

Table 1

List of Land-Grant Universities Established under the Morrill Act of 1862.

Institution	Date Established (accepted under the Morrill Act of 1862)	Location
Auburn University	1872	Auburn, AL
University of Alaska	1922 (1929)	Fairbanks
University of Arizona	1891 (1910)	Tucson
University of Arkansas	1872	Fayetteville
University of California	1869	Davis
Clemson University	1893	Clemson, SC
Colorado State University	1879	Fort Collins
University of Connecticut	1881	Storrs
Cornell University	1868	Ithaca, NY
University of Delaware	1869	Newark
University of Florida	1884	Gainesville
University of Georgia	1801(1886)	Athens
University of Idaho	1868	Moscow
University of Illinois	1868	Urbana
Iowa State University	1859 (1862)	Ames
Kansas State University	1863	Manhattan
University of Kentucky	1880	Lexington
University of Massachusetts	1867	Amherst
Michigan State University	1857 (1863)	East Lansing
University of Minnesota	1851 (1863)	St. Paul
Mississippi State University	1880	Mississippi State
University of Missouri	1841 (1863)	Columbia
Montana State University	1893	Bozeman
University of Nebraska	1871	Lincoln
University of Nevada	1874	Reno
University of New Hampshire	1868	Durham
New Mexico State University	1890	Las Cruces
North Carolina State University	1889	Raleigh
North Dakota State University	1891	Fargo
Ohio State University	1873	Columbus
Oklahoma State University	1891	Stillwater
Oregon State University	1865	Corvallis
Pennsylvania State University	1869 (1863)	University Park

Table 1 (continued)

Purdue University	1874	West Lafayette
South Dakota State University	1884	Brookings
University of Tennessee	1794 (1868)	Knoxville
Texas A&M University	1876	College Station
Utah State University	1890	Logan, UT
University of Vermont	1801 (1862)	Burlington
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University	1872	Blacksburg
Washington State University	1892	Pullman
West Virginia University	1868	Morgantown
University of Wisconsin	1849 (1863)	Madison
University of Wyoming	1887	Laramie

Note. From *The history and growth of vocational education in America*, 2nd ed., (p. 40) by H. R. D.Gordon, 2003, Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press. Copyright 2003 by Waveland Press. Reprinted with permission.

By the late 19th Century, tension developed between the farmers and academics at the state land-grant agricultural colleges. Farmers believed that the land-grant colleges should not only develop new agricultural scientific and technological processes but also teach these processes to farmers and their sons. The land-grant colleges were seen by farmers as agricultural business schools teaching farm accounting, management techniques, agricultural plans and layouts, and acquaintance with farm equipment. Farmers opposed course offerings in languages, humanities, and philosophy, even going so far as to demand state legislatures separate agricultural colleges from universities that offered classical studies. Most of all, the curriculum was to include manual labor that would not only introduce the students to modern farming techniques but also, keep them working the soil and keep the children on the farm (Marcus 1986).

The “Ivory Silo”: Land-Grant Colleges and Agricultural Research

Agricultural scientists at the land-grant colleges were intent on building a profession. This was a part of an overall movement in the 19th century that developed professions and the middle class in a capitalist society. Marcus (1986) said that the scientists at the agricultural colleges believed that they should be the leaders in agriculture because of several important assumptions, including:

... agricultural processes followed and could be expressed as scientific principles; these principles could be revealed and verified through the pursuance of the methods of science; the understanding and uncovering of these principles necessitated specialized training, competence, and knowledge as well as adherence to science’s methods; and this specialized training, competence, and knowledge was held by no other group. (p. 3)

The college faculties criticized established farm practices. They compared factories and farms, and believed farms required the same complex principles of organization. The professors considered traditional farming methods as guess work and that scientific practices would modernize farming on a modern industrial production factory model. To the scientists “farms were defined as a group of discrete yet interdependent and hierarchically organized parts and farming or an aspect of farming as a group of activities structured in the same manner” (Marcus, 1986, p. 2).

The agriculturalists’ curriculum favored social, physical, and natural sciences. They opposed as irrelevant the staples of classical education. The professors advocated abolishing the manual labor requirement because, they believed, it impeded the

absorption of scientific knowledge and was beneath the dignity of scientists. Finally, the faculty members saw the mission of the agriculture college as not the education of farmers but the creation of the next generation of scientific investigators (Marcus 1986).

The agricultural professors circumvented mandates for manual labor by defining manual labor as those activities, such as laboratories and horticultural gardens, which served to demonstrate the scientific principles set forth in lectures (Marcus, 1986).

Another area of conflict was over farmers' institutes and the courses offered. Farmers created competing institutes through farm organizations and state agricultural agencies.

The colleges and competing agencies had different visions of agricultural education.

Ultimately, the colleges developed winter short courses that taught the scientific foundations of agriculture that the faculty advocated (Marcus 1986).

The conflict over the "ivory silo" was institutionalized by the Morrill Act of 1890. The National Grange and Farmers' Alliance lobbied for federal oversight of agricultural colleges that resulted in a requirement that college presidents submit annual reports to the secretaries of the Interior and Treasury. The reports included discussion of faculties, facilities, course offerings, and enrollments, required that federal funds be spent only on instruction in agriculture, and specified penalties for noncompliance. The agricultural scientists scored a victory by defining agricultural instruction as physical, natural, and economic science thus providing a wider range of courses than simply farm training (Marcus, 1986).

Agriculture developed as an industry and Congress took action providing for scientific research for better practices and productivity. The Hatch Act of 1887 further contributed to the scientific revolution in agriculture. This act contained the research

component of the land-grant colleges (Graham, 1994). The Hatch Act was passed to help farmers with research on fertilizer and “artificial manure” (Hillison, 1996, p. 9). The Hatch Act developed a system of experiment stations at every land-grant college to conduct research supporting agricultural instruction. The Hatch Act also established a system of cooperative funding between the USDA and land-grant institutions. The experiment stations were mandated to publish reports of research findings and to disseminate them to the farmers (Graham 1994). The Hatch Act further provided funds “for the type of scientific research that brought about an agricultural revolution which still provides the world’s greatest supply of food that is also the most inexpensive and of the very best quality” (Hillison, 1996, p. 8).

“1890 Institutions”: Historically Black Land-Grant Colleges

The Morrill Act of 1890 also expanded the land-grant system. It provided federal funds for the establishment of agricultural and mechanical colleges serving African Americans, known as “1890 colleges and universities”. The 1890 Morrill Act recognized the need for agricultural and industrial education for Blacks in the post-Reconstruction segregated South. Through this bill, black land-grant colleges were opened in the former Confederacy and in the border states of Maryland, Kentucky, Missouri, Delaware, and Oklahoma. The Second Morrill Act required that all land-grant funds be equitably divided in states that maintained separate schools for races. The schools were founded primarily to provide training for black teachers; these institutions evolved into land-grant colleges providing opportunities to students across the nation and world; these Southern

institutions have developed research capabilities and a large extension service (Neyland, 1989).

Table 2 lists the land-grant universities established under the Morrill Act of 1890 including the name of the university, the date the institution was established (and accepted as a land-grant college under the Morrill Act of 1890), and its location.

Table 2

Land-Grant Universities Established Under the Morrill Act of 1890

Institution	Date Established (accepted under the Morrill Act of 1890)	Location
Alabama A&M University	1875 (1891)	Huntsville
Alcorn State University	1872 (1892)	Lorman, MS
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff	1882 (1891)	Pine Bluff
Delaware State University	1892	Dover
Florida A&M University	1887 (1891)	Tallahassee
Fort Valley State University	1891 (1890)	Fort Valley, GA
Kentucky State University	1887 (1893)	Frankfort
Langston University	1898	Langston, OK
Lincoln University	1866 (1891)	Jefferson City, MO
University of Maryland-Eastern Shore	1886 (1890)	Princess Ann
North Carolina A&T University	1891	Greensboro
Prairie View A&M University	1876	Prairie View, TX
South Carolina State University	1896	Orangeburg
Southern University	1881 (1891)	Baton Rouge, LA
Tennessee State University	1912	Nashville
Virginia State University	1868 (1890)	Petersburg
West Virginia State College	1891	Institute

Note. From *The history and growth of vocational education in America*, 2nd ed., (p. 48) by H. R. D. Gordon, 2003, Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press. Copyright 2003 by Waveland Press. Reprinted with permission.

State-established District Agricultural Schools

States again paved the way for increased opportunities in agricultural education for their youth. At the turn of the 20th Century, several states, in an effort to provide more opportunities for a secondary and agricultural education for their rural youth, established agricultural schools along the line of various district schemes: Alabama, Georgia, and Virginia established the special agricultural schools in each congressional district; Oklahoma set up schools in its state supreme court districts; while Arkansas, Michigan, Mississippi, North Dakota, and Wisconsin used various county or district schemes (Hillison, 1989; Moore, 1987).

The schools had dormitories and operated school farms. The schools were tied to agricultural experiment stations in Alabama (Hillison, 1996). In Virginia, the district agricultural schools performed extension work such as agricultural demonstrations, youth activities, and home economics programs that were precursors of the extension model of the Smith-Lever Act, adopted by Congress in 1914 (Hillison & Sutphin, 1999). These district schools were the precursor of federal aid to secondary vocational agricultural education established by the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. The district schools emphasized science in their curricula (Hillison, 1989, 1996).

Demonstration Work and the Extension Service

As new farming methods emerged from the scientific laboratories of land grant universities, the Bureau of Plant Industry of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the

Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations saw a new role for the agricultural colleges in bringing this information to the farmers and industry. They pressed Congress for new initiatives for the dissemination of these innovations and their implementation on the nation's farms (Fiske, 1989). In 1914, the U.S. Congress established the third pillar in the land-grant system triad when it passed the Smith-Lever Act that created the cooperative extension system (Graham, 1994).

Seaman A. Knapp, known as the "father of the extension movement," started cooperative demonstration work. Booker T. Washington, the founder of the Tuskegee Institute, was also influential in cooperative work. His work as educator, in conjunction with Seaman A. Knapp, served a vital purpose to rural Black farmers and homemakers in the late 1800s through Tuskegee's efforts in providing agricultural training to rural black southerners using the movable school and demonstration teaching methods (Goldenstein, 1989).

Demonstration work drew on the farmers' institute, the Chautauqua correspondence course, and the university extension movement that provided outreach to rural people. Demonstration work greatly influenced the Smith-Lever Act and acted as a model for extension work. Knapp believed that "what a man hears, he may doubt. What he sees, he may possibly doubt. But what a man does himself, he cannot doubt" (Graham, 1994, p. 417).

Seaman Knapp had a long career in agricultural education and application. In 1896, Knapp left the presidency of Iowa Agricultural College (now Iowa State University) to lead a large corporate farming operation in Louisiana. A renowned agriculturalist, he was appointed as an agent for the U.S. Department of Agriculture's

Bureau of Plant Industry. In this capacity, he convinced farmers in Louisiana and Texas to demonstrate modern farming practices on their “demonstration” farms. In this effort he saw that local involvement and support, rather than government sponsorship, was critical to the adoption of new methods. A break came in 1904 when an outbreak of boll weevil was combated through the use of the demonstration method (Graham 1994).

In 1906, the Division of Agricultural Education was established in the Office of Experiment Stations by the Department of Agriculture with Knapp appointed as its director. In 1915, the Department was reorganized to include the States Relations Service that included the Division of Agricultural Education. The division cooperated with universities, farm agencies, and railroads promoting economic development in promoting new seed and other extension-type activities (Hillison, 1996).

The demonstration method quickly spread throughout the United States and was utilized by youth and homemakers, as well as farmers, in growing corn, gardening techniques, and canning practices. The success of this method of teaching in rural areas gained support for a national extension system. The County Life Commission appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt recommended the national extension system to educate rural Americans. The Commission’s recommendation led to the introduction of several legislative initiatives that ultimately resulted in the passage of the Smith-Lever Act (Hillison, 1996).

Vocational Education in the Industrial Age

Vocational education in the schools corresponded to the development of curriculum as a field of study that occurred with the publication of Franklin Bobbitt's *The Curriculum* in 1918 (Kliebard, 1995, 1999). Pinar, et al. (2000, p. 71), cited the British historian David Hamilton as locating the contemporary field of curriculum in the movement from absolutism to the Enlightenment:

Overall, the transition from the age of absolutism to the age of Enlightenment was marked, in curriculum terms, by four processes. First, continuous attention was given to the search for new knowledge. Secondly, repeated attempts were made to develop taxonomies of knowledge (e.g., the taxonomic initiatives of Carl Linnaeus, 1707-1778) that might accommodate such new knowledge. Thirdly, such taxonomic attention lead to the fragmentation (or specialization) of knowledge, as in the individual separate subjects. Finally, growing attention to the concept of academic freedom - particularly after the founding of Berlin University in the early years of the nineteenth century – fostered repeated revision in the curricula of schools and universities. (Hamilton, 1990, p.36)

Manual Arts Training comes to America

The Philadelphia Centennial Exposition of 1876 featured what was the greatest stimulus to the manual training movement. At the Exposition, Victor Della Vos, the Director of the Imperial Technical School of Moscow, demonstrated a system of tool

instruction based on students building models from plans designed by the students.

President of Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), John Runkle, was so impressed with Della Vos' Russian system that he established Russian-style engineering laboratories in 1877 and the School of Mechanic Arts in 1878 at MIT (Kliebard, 1999).

The Russian system and Sloyd system in Sweden stimulated a great debate in the United States on the acceptability of manual training in American high schools. To fully understand how this debate and the subsequent passage of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 resulted in federal funding and the sanctioning of vocational education in the public schools, it was important first to understand the political, social and economic climate of the Progressive Age.

The Progressive Age occurred at the turn of the 20th century and is too diverse to be considered a single movement but was an era in which a number of underlying assumptions about the nature of society changed and a debate ensued over reforms to address social issues that resulted from the societal changes (Wiebe, 1967). The era's greatest societal change emerged from a triumvirate of factors that included the industrial revolution and the awareness of people that economic institutions were too large and the individual becoming less significant in the scheme of things, the urbanization of society, and immigration of people from southern and eastern Europe (Noble, 1984). Also, the progressives were the first generation of Americans that did not live through nor have their reform impulses dissipated by the trauma of the Civil War and Reconstruction (Church & Sedlak, 1976). In the 1830s, faced with the first wave of this social change the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts created a common school program. By the beginning of 20th century public school education was struggling with

the issue of how to address problems of the industrial age (Angus & Mirel, 1999; Cremin, 1961; Krug, 1964).

The Great Debate over Vocational Education in Public Schools

In the early-20th Century a debate of the Progressive Age raged over how to integrate vocational education into the new public high school curriculum. This debated between “conservative” and “liberal” interpretations of progressive education. The ultimate goal of conservatives was social order while the goal of liberal was social justice. To accomplish their goals, conservatives equated large institutions with efficiency and economy and a society operated on the principles of “Taylorism” or scientific management and social efficiency. Meanwhile, liberals sought reforms that helped immigrants adjust to their adopted country, which supported labor causes, that advanced participatory democracy, and that attempted to recreate the democratic ideals of the previous century (Church & Sedlak, 1976). According to Sedran (2005) the conservatives were not “traditionalists” because the conservatives emphasized “efficiency and its orientation toward the present and future rather than the past ... [and]they were far more concerned with the inculcation of virtues and trait actions necessary to ensure social stability in the modern world” (p. 209).

On the conservative side of the vocational education debate were the proponents of “social efficiency”, David Snedden and Charles A. Prosser. On the other side of this debate was John Dewey and his disciples at Teachers College, Columbia University, such as George S. Counts, William Heard Kirkpatrick and Harold Rugg, who advocated the

integration of vocational subjects into the traditional academic high schools (Ryan, 1995).

David Snedden and Charles A. Prosser were schoolmen and progressives grounded in the pragmatist philosophy emerging at the turn of the 20th Century. They were part of a generation of social and political leaders who would implement the ideas of pragmatism and progressivism in American education (Bergan, 1982; Luetkemeyer, 1987). The social efficiency theory that Snedden and Prosser advocated was:

... the position in education that calls for the direct teaching of knowledge, attitudes, and skills, intended to shape the individual to predetermined social characteristics. It presumes to improve society by making its members more vocationally useful and socially responsible. Those who “view with alarm” and blame the schools for not remedying the ills of society frequently look to it as a means to reform. It is a deceptively simple panacea because of its direct approach, and not infrequently its most vocal advocates are found in the ranks of the concerned lay public. . . Applied to curriculum, social efficiency usually leads to demands for reorganization of the studies, sometime for a whole new synthesis of new and more “practical” studies. (Drost, 1967, p. 3)

John Dewey was a “liberal” advocate for a humanist approach to vocational education. As Lewis (2004) observed, the disciples of social efficiency saw vocational “knowledge to be used to reproduce the blue-collar classes that invented it, by teaching it to their children exclusively” (pp. 21-22). In contrast, Dewey believed that manual training was a “legitimate education that would be valid for all children” (p. 22) and should be incorporated in the curriculum in conjunction with instruction in social studies,

mathematics, and science beginning in elementary school not only for the children of the working class, but for children of all social classes, as well.

Efforts to Enact Federal Vocational Education Legislation

Snedden's social efficiency ideas were incorporated in the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 (Public Law or P.L. 347) that created the first federal subsidy of secondary school education. The Panic of 1893 demonstrated to industrialists how American products were not competitive in the domestic and international market and the inadequacy of the apprenticeship system for training workers. Leading manufacturers founded the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) in 1895 to work for education reform. In Massachusetts key business leaders lobbied the General Court to create the Douglas Commission which recommended the creation of a state vocational education system and Snedden was appointed state Commissioner of Education to implement the recommendations. In 1906, the NAM, educators, social reformers, and the American Federation of Labor founded a national vocational education reform lobby, the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education (NSPIE), to promote vocationalism as a solution for labor force reproduction and to curb the worst excesses of industrialism. Snedden's protégé, Charles Prosser, was appointed staff director of NSPIE and was the chief architect of the movement for a new federal law for industrial education (Smith, 1999). Commenting on the NSPIE efforts to secure the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act, Cuban (1982) stated

... writers are unanimous in crediting the NSPIE and an interlocking network of educators, businessmen, legislators, public officials, ad hoc committees, blue-chip business coalitions for brokering the bill, first through the national Commission on Vocational Education, appointed by President Wilson in 1914, and then through Congress. (p. 48)

The act created a Federal Board for Vocational Education which consisted of the cabinet secretaries of agriculture, commerce, and labor, the commissioner of education, and three lay members, to administer the provisions of the act. In turn, it required states to establish state vocational education boards, separate from their boards of education, as the statewide agencies operating the federally funded programs (Gordon, 2003). The board was the first federal school board that allocated funds for vocational programs to the states, promulgated regulations, and implemented the act (Cuban, 1982).

The separate administrative structure mandated by the Smith-Hughes Act on both the federal and state which reinforced the idea of a dual system of education. By creating programs in agricultural education, home economics, and trade and industrial education segregated from the academic curriculum the dual system was further solidified. This administrative progressivism removed education from the reach of city politics and its widespread corruption.

The “Smith-Hughes Man” and Vocational Agricultural Education

The passage of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 was also accomplished with the support of the agricultural education community (Gordon 1999). The act established

funding for agricultural education as well as home economics and trade and industrial education in American public schools. A highly formal and structured system of state supervision of local high school vocational agriculture teachers, known as the “Smith-Hughes man,” soon developed (Hillison, 1999). The Smith-Hughes Man was the most influential educator after the local superintendent in rural communities. He received a higher salary than other classroom teachers because of the federal funding for the vocational agriculture program. The “vo-ag” teacher was able to develop his own constituency in his community through his leadership role of the Future Farmers of America (FFA) and for his contact with and technical assistance to local farmers. In the interwar period, the FFA grew to have over 80,000 members across the nation. It sponsored a series of 157 radio broadcasts between 1931 and 1944 to acquaint the public with FFA’s activities and the organization’s wartime contributions (Hillison & Williams, 2001).

Separate black vocational agricultural programs with black agriculture teachers were found in many regions of the nation. Excluded from participation in the FFA, black agriculture students joined New Farmers of American (NFA), founded in 1927, which helped the students develop leadership and human relations skills. NFA and FFA merged in 1965. Many NFA alumni believe the skills they learned help them achieve middle class status, but believe the merger led to the decline of black leadership in agriculture and loss of identity among black students (Wakefield and Talbert, 2003).

By 1950, state and district supervisors of agricultural education in state vocational departments were institutionalized and elevated to a professional status. Agricultural teacher educators often felt their role was usurped by the state supervisor. State

supervisors had the power to hire and fire local agriculture teachers regardless of the local administration. The supervisors held separate professional conferences and demanded the teachers' attendance. After 1960, the role of the Smith-Hughes man shifted from an "ironfisted" supervisor to a consultant and facilitator, even though the new role appeared to diminish the stature of the position. Today, supervision has devolved to local administrators and directors (Hillison, 1999).

Prior to 1917, supervision was disorganized and conducted by local school principals and teacher trainers. The land-grant college experience and the secondary district agricultural schools demonstrated the demand for agricultural education in the public high schools. The introduction of technology on the farm and other changes in production agriculture changed the face of agricultural education (Lee and Turner, 1994).

Herren and Edwards (1996) described how land-grant colleges became the source of training for agricultural teachers despite a push by normal schools in 1908 and again in 1910 to be the locus of this training for all vocational educators. The political influence of land-grant institutions insured their leadership in agricultural education and separate departments were established in colleges of agriculture. The role of the normal schools in agricultural education was on the preparation of elementary teachers. Many normal schools established rural education programs which emphasized instruction in agricultural subjects (Hillison, 1998). The fact that agriculture teachers were products of these institutions rather than the teachers' colleges established a closer connection between agricultural education and the agriculture industry than with pedagogy. It set agriculture teachers apart from classroom teachers in other disciplines and, as we shall

see, would contribute to a gap that widened after the implementation of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 (Herren & Edwards, 1996).

Social Efficiency

Vocational education reform contributed to the transfer of the factory model to education. The concepts of scientific management practices were also attractive and professional rather than lay control was established (Cuban, 1982; Kliebard, 1999). Finally, six fundamental theories of social efficiency were applied by Snedden and Prosser to the teaching and curriculum in the new vocational education institutions. These six fundamental theories were:

1. Socioeconomic stratification. Sociologists held that in all societies, the development of social classes was a natural, indeed an essential phenomenon. Movement between social classes was possible, but a stable social system rightfully made vertical social mobility difficult.
2. Probable destiny. The theory of probable destiny was an intrinsic corollary of socioeconomic stratification. According to the theory of probable destiny, social classes are inherently stable, so that a person born into a working-class family will probably live and die as a member of the working class. A young person's "probable destiny" could be determined by a combination of factors, including socioeconomic class at birth, aptitudes, and interests.
3. Psychometrics. Psychological measurement, an emerging science at the time, was seen as capable of determining each student's probable destiny as a

simple matter of testing. Classification into the academic or vocational tracks would then be both reliable and scientifically based.

4. Social control. The theory of social control posited that for any society to exist, its members must adhere to both the implicit and explicit norms of that society. For society to endure over time, such adherence must be voluntary and near automatic on the part of the citizenry.
5. Pedagogy. Although never formulated as a single, coherent theory, pedagogy involved the systematic study of teaching and learning that was rapidly developing at that time. According to Wirth (1972), Albert Shaw's study of the administration and teaching methods used at Hampton Institute, combined with Snedden's own dissertation, *Administration and Educational Work of American Juvenile Reform Schools*, led Prosser and Snedden to conclude that the pedagogy for career and technical education must be based on an organized, rigidly sequenced, hands-on approach to teaching.
6. Behaviorism. As the emerging learning theory of the early 1900s, behaviorism provided the final foundation for social efficiency. In particular, the research of E. L. Thorndike (Thorndike, 1932) contended that learning consists of the formation of links between specific stimuli and responses through the application of rewards (Wirth, 1972). This emphasis on SOR pairing reflected behaviorism's positivistic philosophical base. That is, an analysis of the human condition that relies on only verifiable observations of behavior and not on untenable mentalistic constructs. Further, behaviorists believed that most human behavior could be understood as basic reflexive learning

mechanisms or "laws" that operate on one's experience within the environment. (Doolittle and Camp, 1999, p. 24)

Of these six fundamental theories, the most controversial was social control and the question over how social control was embedded in social efficiency theory. There has been confusion over the meaning of social efficiency theory. Social efficiency was described by one scholar as a movement “which held that children should get the education appropriate to their future roles as workers or homemakers” (Ravitch, 2000, 89). Kliebard (1995) wrote that the social efficiency movement emphasized rugged individualism, social control, and Fredrick Taylor’s principles of scientific management. Krug (1964) believed that social efficiency emerged from the quest of educators for a social mission for schools. Krug acknowledged that social efficiency had dual conceptions of social service and social control merged into this social mission (Null, 2002a).

The term social efficiency was first defined and applied to educational thought by William C. Bagley in his 1905 study, *The Educative Process*. Bagley’s definition of the term had “nothing to do with rugged individualism, training of individuals for occupations, the sorting of students into their inevitable places in society, or the elimination of monetary waste in school administration” (Null, 2002a, p. 81). To Bagley the meaning of social efficiency was social service and a moral position about the relationship of the individual to society (Null, 2002a). The goal of public education, according to Bagley, was to demonstrate how individual efforts could contribute to the overall improvement and progress of society (Null, 2002b).

In usage, the term social efficiency came to mean social control or A 'conservative' vision of education, meaning that most people who define this concept, describe it as the belief that schools should train students for specific future occupations. These occupations, moreover, often are viewed as unchanging, or conservative, and quite specific. (Null, 2002b, p. 165)

David Snedden is considered to be the primary scholar responsible for developing after World War I the social efficiency-social control ideology (Null, 2002b; Snedden, 1918). In a debate with Bagley over the role of vocational education at the 1914 annual meeting of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, Snedden argued for "occupational efficiency" or "vocational efficiency" that differed markedly from Bagley's understanding of social efficiency (Null, 2002b). In contrast to Bagley's vision of general or liberal education, Snedden believed that vocational schools would have a curriculum designed by specially trained experts that would meet the needs of all students based on task analysis of all vocations and then developing specific knowledge, skills, and abilities for each vocational choice (Null, 2002b). The version of social efficiency advocated by Snedden and Prosser dominated the debate over academic and vocational education in the years before World War I. This argument became the basis for vocational education envisioned in the Smith-Hughes Act passed by Congress in 1917. This philosophy would dominate vocational education until the early-1960s.

Beginning in the 1920s in an effort to counter the social efficiency-social control theory interpretation, social reconstructionism was promoted by such disciples of John Dewey as George S. Counts, William Heard Kilpatrick, William C. Bagley, and Harold Rugg. This movement evolved as the progressive education movement's most radical

component. Social reconstructionism faded into obscurity after World War II, and had begun to resurrect itself in the late 20th century as a neo-social reconstructionism by critical theorists, postmodernists, and neo-Marxists. Many of today's most outspoken proponents of the new social reconstructionism were career and technical educators (Zuga, 1994).

Social reconstructionists believed individualism would only enable the student to become more effective in achieving his or her own interests in contrast to the previous themes of the progressive education movement. Rather than creating a more harmonious and cooperative social order, the schools were contributing to making society more competitive. The objective of social reconstruction was educating and training the individual to work harmoniously in a collective society (Bowers, 1967). To the reconstructionists, the most distinguishing feature of the movement was its "advocacy of a central role for programs and policies of educational institutions in achieving the deepening and extension of democratic values into the economic and social (ethnic, racial, and social class) relationships through participative planning" (Benne, 1995, p. xxiii).

Spring (1968) took issue with the founding of social reconstruction in the late-1920s and its rejection of the social efficiency model. Instead, he traced its origins to educators who at the turn of the century advocated education for social efficiency and in the political ideology of Theodore Roosevelt's New Nationalism. Spring found evidence in Krug's (1964) thesis, *The Shaping of the American High School*, that social efficiency was a combination of social service and social control. This social service aspect was the same attack on rugged individualism that the reconstructionists would use a generation

later. Spring (1968) offered a quote by Michael O'Shea that "intense individual feelings and actions must be brought under control and cooperation must largely take the place of original tendencies to opposition and aggression" (p. 112).

Spring (1968) viewed the "New Nationalism" of Theodore Roosevelt and the 1912 "Bull Moose" Progressive Party as "the social efficiency ideology in political garb" (p. 113). Roosevelt was an advocate for industrial training – "a utilitarian education should undoubtedly be the foundation of all education, providing such means of education as will enable each man to become a self-respecting unit in the community" (p. 113). Spring maintained that social efficiency education and the New Nationalism did not die out with Roosevelt's defeat in 1912, and they became the basis for liberal demands for national economic planning during the Great Depression. Eric Goldman (1952) pointed out that Franklin D. Roosevelt's brain-trust debated "should planning hew closer to the Associational Activities pattern, with its emphasis on noncompulsory relations between government and economic life, or should it follow more the New Nationalism pattern of powerful federal controls?" (p. 114).

The Depression and World War II demanded a completely planned society with social specialization and collective harmony, an agenda called for by the reconstructionists. This degree of central planning was achieved not only by the totalitarian regimes in Europe but by the western democracies. Spring (1968) concluded by asking "were the social reconstructionists a new breed of progressive educator or were they in the tradition of social efficiency education?" (p. 114).

The social control concept of social efficiency was linked by Walter Drost (1967) to Stanford sociologist Edward A. Ross who predicted the end of communities bound by

close personal relations and advocated a new means for social control. Teachers, Ross believed, would become the new “economical system of police” who would fit the student into a slot in the social organization. Social efficiency education was predicated on producing an individual who would fit into social specialization and collective harmony for the common good. This would be achieved by a differentiated curriculum or track system, where courses were selected on the basis of the social destination of the pupil. Collectivism was taught by divesting the student of all selfish interests that would be achieved through group play and work (Spring, 1968).

The debate over social efficiency either as social reconstructionism or social control defined vocational education for the 20th century. According to Null (2002b), reconstructionists such as Bagley, believed social control “trapped a generation of Americans into a specific vocational position” and suffered “from a ‘production-consumption theory’ that attempted to solve all of life’s problems with economic terms, business analogies, and purely factory-model thinking” (p. 167).

Federal Legislative History of Vocational Education, 1917-1963

Vocational education in the 20th century was driven by federal assistance to states and local schools contained in federal education legislation. The Table 3 is a summary of federal legislative activity expanding the scope of federal aid for occupational education. The table provides the popular name of the legislation, its enactment date, a citation of the statute, and summary of what effect legislation had for occupational education,

beginning with the 1862 Morrill Act and continuing through the “No Child Left Behind” Act of 2001.

Table 3

History of Federal Legislation Related to Occupational Education

Legislation	Enactment Date	Citation	Summary of Act
Morrill (Land Grant) Act (first)	July 2, 1862	none	Provided for land grants to the states that could be sold or leased to raise money for establishing A & M colleges.
Hatch (Experimental Stations) Act of 1887	March 5, 1887	none	Provided funds to states to establish agricultural experiment stations for conducting agricultural research and disseminating results.
Morrill Act (second)	August 30, 1890	none	Expanded 1 st Morrill Act to provide land grants for Black A&M colleges in 16 southern & border states.
Adams Act	March 16, 1906	PL 47	Increased appropriations to states for operation of experiment stations under the Hatch Act.
Nelson Amendments	March 4, 1907	PL 242	Increased support for A&M colleges and designated money for A&M instructor preparation.
Smith-Lever Act (Agriculture Extension Act)	May 8, 1914	PL 95	Created cooperative extension work for instruction and practical demonstration in agriculture and home economics education at less than college level.

Table 3 (continued)

Smith-Hughes (Vocational Education) Act of 1917	February 23, 1917	PL 347	Created federal aid to states and local educational agencies for establishing and operating vocational education programs in public institutions at less than baccalaureate level.
Smith-Sears Act	June 27, 1918	PL 178	Authorized funds for vocational rehabilitation for disabled veterans of World War I.
Smith-Fess (Industrial Rehabilitation) Act	June 2, 1920	PL 236	Provided federal aid for the vocational rehabilitation of industry-disabled persons.
Smith-Bankhead (Federal Rehabilitation) Act	June 2, 1920	PL 236	Provided programs fro the rehabilitation of non-military disabled persons into civilian employment. Created federal assistant director of vocational rehabilitation and state rehabilitation boards
Clark-McNary Act	1924		Provided matching funds to states for cooperative farm- forestry work.
Hawaii Act	1928		Extended the benefits of the Hatch Act and Smith-Lever Act to the Territory of Hawaii
Capper-Ketchum Act	1928		Funds for the further development of extension work at 1 st Morrill Act land grant colleges in addition to Smith-Lever Act funds.
Alaska Act	1929		Extended Hatch Act and Smith-Lever Act benefits to the Territory of Alaska.

Table 3 (continued)

George-Reed Act	February 5, 1929	PL 702	Supplemental authorization for vocational agriculture and home economics.
Puerto Rico Act	1931		Coordinated Agricultural Experiment Station work in and extended the benefits of the Hatch Act and Smith-Lever Act to the Territory of Puerto Rico.
George-Ellzey Act	May 22, 1934	PL 245	Increased appropriations for vocational agriculture and home economics, and reinstated funds for trade & industrial education.
Bankhead-Jones Act	1935		Extended scope of research work under the Hatch Act, provided for future development of agricultural extension, and for the endowment and support of 1862 and 1890 Morrill Act land grant colleges.
George-Dean Act	June 8, 1936	PL 673	Broadened the scope of vocational education by adding provisions for programs in distributive education and authorizing funding for industrial teacher education. Increased funding for home economics, agriculture, trade and industrial education.
Puerto Rico Act	1937		Extended the benefits of extension provisions of Bankhead-Jones act to the Territory of Puerto Rico.
Bankhead-Jones Act	1939		Provided additional funding and further development of agricultural extension work conducted under the Smith-Lever Act.

Table 3 (continued)

Vocational Education for National Defense	1940-1945		Series of ten acts to fund vocational education for national defense for training workers in war industry and food production.
Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI Bill of Rights)	June 22, 1944	PL 78-346	Readjustment of veterans to civilian life by providing tuition and subsistence payments while participating in higher education, postsecondary vocational education, on-the-job training, and institutional on-farm training.
Bankhead-Flanagan Act	1946		Provided additional funding and further development of cooperative agricultural extension work conducted under the Smith-Lever Act and the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935.
George-Barden (Vocational Education) Act of 1946	August 1, 1946	PL 79-586	Increased annual appropriations for all forms of vocational education. The law added allocations for the U.S. Office of Vocational Education and funds for fisheries training. The act also began the devolution of program spending controls from the federal government to state and local education agencies.
Agricultural Marketing Act	1946		Authorized matching funds to states for extension programs in marketing, transportation, and distribution of agricultural products outside of the Smith-Lever formula.

Table 3 (continued)

Wheeler Act	1947	PL 80-377	Amended GI Bill of Rights to provide for full-time subsistence and tuition payments for institutional on-farm trainees. Provided national standards for institutional on-farm training programs.
Clark-McNary Amendment	1949		Authorized USDA cooperation with land grant colleges in aiding farmers through advice, education, demonstration, etc., in establishing, renewing, protecting and managing wood lots, and in harvesting, utilizing, and marketing the products thereof.
Smith-Lever Act Amendments	1953		Simplified and consolidated ten separate laws related to extension; established new funding procedures based on rural/urban formulae and amounts; repealed the Capper-Ketchum Act and two Bankhead-Jones Acts.
Smith-Lever Act Amendments	1955		Authorized extension work with disadvantaged farm families and funds for extension outside of traditional funding formulae.
Health Amendments Act of 1956	August 7, 1956	PL 84-911	Authorized funds for practical nursing vocational education programs.
Fishery Amendment, George-Barden Act of 1956	August 8, 1956	PL 84-911	Promoted fisheries industry by adding fisheries distribution to vocational programs paid for by federal vocational education funds.

Table 3 (continued)

National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958	September 2, 1958	PL 85-864	Comprehensive education act following the Sputnik crisis that stressed importance of science, mathematics, foreign language, and technical education. Title VIII created postsecondary area vocational & technical school concept in residents of areas inadequately served. Encouraged development of technical education programs which combined manipulative skills with math, science, and applied technology.
Captioned Films for the Deaf Act	September 2, 1958	PL 85-905	Authorized a loan service for captioned films.
Education of Mentally Retarded Children's Act of 1958	September 6, 1958	PL 85-926	Authorized federal assistance for training teachers of the handicapped.
Area Redevelopment Act of 1961	May 1, 1961	PL 87-27	Subsistence and tuition payments for unemployed individuals from economically disadvantaged areas enrolled in retraining.
Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) of 1962	March 15, 1962	PL 87-415	Provided training opportunities for under- and unemployed individuals based on training needs as determined by the Department of Labor and local employment service agencies.
Health Professionals Educational Assistance Act of 1963	September 24, 1963		Federal funds to expand teaching facilities for health programs and loans for students in health professions.

Table 3 (continued)

Higher Education Facilities Act (HEFA) of 1963	December 16, 1963	PL 88-204	Federal matching loans & grants to colleges & universities for expansion of physical facilities and student housing, including junior college, undergraduate, & graduate programs for training technicians.
Vocational Education (Perkins-Morse) Act of 1963	December 18, 1963	PL 88-210	Authorized funds to states for vocational education to high school students, postsecondary students to prepare for employment, employed persons needed training to achieve employment stability or advancement, persons with academic or socio-economic or other disabilities, research and development, area vocational school construction, and ancillary services including teacher training, vocational guidance.
Civil Rights Act of 1964	July 2, 1964	PL 88-352	Provided grants to colleges to conduct special institutes for training teachers to deal effectively with desegregation issues.
Economic Opportunity Act of 1964	August 20, 1964	PL 88-452	Established the Job Corps, Work Training Programs for aged 16-21 people, Work Study Programs low-income youth, and Work Experience Programs to individuals in need.

Table 3 (continued)

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965	April 11, 1965	PL 89-10	Strengthened local school agencies and provided additional assistance to areas serving low-income and educationally deprived students; provided school libraries, textbooks, and other instructional materials; assistance to agencies developing exemplary programs that served as models.
National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act of 1965	June 8, 1965	PL 89-36	Provided for the establishment and operation of residential schools for postsecondary education and training of the deaf.
Higher Education Act of 1965	November 8, 1965	PL 89-329	Assistance to colleges and universities for establishment of community service & continuing education programs; educational opportunity grants and low-interest student loans; and established the National Teacher Corps.
Adult Education Act of 1966	November 3, 1966	PL 89-750	Grants to states to encourage the expansion of adult education programs; adult teacher training; adult education demonstrations.
Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments (ESEA) of 1966	November 3, 1966	PL 89-750	Provided grants to states for education programs for handicapped students.

Table 3 (continued)

<p>Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) OF 1967</p>	<p>June 29, 1967</p>	<p>PL 90-35</p>	<p>Combined teacher education legislation in one act that included: National Teacher Corps, teachers in areas of critical shortage, fellowships for teachers, improved opportunities for training, training programs for higher education personnel.</p>
<p>National Sea Grant College and Program Act</p>	<p>1966</p>		<p>Established a Commerce Department program providing for applied research, formal education, and advisory (extension) services for development of marine and Great Lakes resources. The program was integrated into Cooperative Extension in 30 coastal and Great Lakes states.</p>
<p>Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments (ESEA) of 1967</p>	<p>January 2, 1968</p>	<p>PI 90-247</p>	<p>Regional centers for education of handicapped; model centers and services for deaf-blind children; personnel recruitment and information dissemination on education of the handicapped; technical assistance for education in rural areas; support for dropout prevention and bilingual education programs.</p>

Table 3 (continued)

Vocational Education Amendments of 1968	October 16, 1968	PL 90-576	Rewrite of the 1963 Vocational Education Act that: created National Advisory Council, created state and local advisory councils, required detailed state plans, funded exemplary programs to bridge the school and work gap, funded state-based research, funded projects to broaden vocational education curricula, provided funds for vocational education leadership and professional development, furnished funding for a teacher/industry exchange program, earmarked funds for support of cooperative vocational education programs, funded consumer & homemaking education, and authorized funds to work study programs for needy vocational students.
District of Columbia Public Education Act	1968		Established Federal City College and authorized extension work funding through that institution.
Nurse Training Act of 1971	November 18, 1971	PL 92-158	Amended Public Health Services Act to fund nurse training facilities.
Education Amendments of 1972	June 23, 1972	PL 92-318	Established the National Institute of Education to conduct research; expanded community colleges and occupational education at the postsecondary level; created the Bureau of Occupational & Adult Education within the US Office of Education.

Table 3 (continued)

Rural Development Act of 1972	1972		Title V authorized rural development and small-farm extension programs, required administration in association with Smith-Lever Act programs, and established State Rural Development Advisory Council.
Smith-Lever Act Amendment	1972		Guam and Virgin Islands were designated as States under Section 10.
Rehabilitation Act of 1973	September 26, 1973	PL 93-112	Affirmative action for and prohibited discrimination against handicapped workers.
Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973	December 28, 1973	PL 93-203	Consolidated manpower legislation; eliminated manpower categorical grant programs and instituted block grants to operate training programs to meet local labor market needs.
Education Amendments of 1974	August 21, 1974	PL 93-380	Encouraged the development of individualized education plans (IEP) for children with special needs; Women's Educational Equality Act of 1974; support for career education; established National Center for Educational Statistics; bilingual education research.
Women's Educational Equality Act of 1974	August 21, 1974	PL 93-380	Provided financial incentives for states to develop programs specified in the Act to bring about educational equality for women.

Table 3 (continued)

Education of All Handicapped Children Act	November 29, 1975	PL 94-142	Protection of privacy and due process rights for handicapped children; definition of terms; grants to states and local school systems to improve vocational education and related services for the handicapped.
Education Amendments of 1976	October 12, 1976	PL 94-482	Eliminated sex discrimination & sex stereotyping; required the development of a national vocational education data reporting and accounting system; established NOICC and SOICC Occupational Information Coordinating Committees; assistance to remodel vocational education facilities for handicapped accessibility.
Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act	August 5, 1977	PL 95-93	Established youth employment programs to promote school-to-work transition.
Food and Agriculture Act	1977		
Career Education Incentive Act of 1978	December 13, 1977	PL 95-207	Authorized establishment of career education programs in elementary and secondary schools.

Table 3 (continued)

Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1978	October 27, 1978	PL 95-524	Provided funds for comprehensive employment and training services, youth programs, the National Commission on Employment Policy, counter-cyclical public service employment program, private sector opportunities for the economically disadvantaged, and the young adult conservation corps.
Educational Amendments of 1978	November 1, 1978	PL 95-561	Established the community schools concept to use existing educational facilities for adult instruction comprehensive basic skills program for reading, mathematics, and communication.
Department of Education Organization Act of 1979	October 17, 1979	PL 96-88	Established Department of Education to administer programs of the education division of the Department of Health, Education & Welfare.
Job Training Partnership Act (JPTA) of 1982	October 13, 1982	PL 97-300	Provided funds to regional service delivery areas (SDA) that used private industry councils (PIC) to determine needed training programs; established Special Summer youth employment programs; reauthorized Job Corps.
Education Handicapped Act Amendments of 1983	December 2, 1983	PL 98-199	Coordinate education programs assisting transition of handicapped youth from school to postsecondary education, work, and adult services. Support for expanding preschool special education and early intervention programs.

Table 3 (continued)

Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1984	February 22, 1984	PL 98-221	Authorized demonstration projects addressing problems of youth with disabilities transition from school to work.
Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984	October 19, 1984	PL 98-524	Improve vocational education programs to meet needs of workforce; assured access for special populations to quality vocational education programs; promote public-private cooperation; improve academic foundation of vocational students; use of new technologies; vocational education services for unemployed; assist economically depressed areas; assist states with supportive services, special programs, and guidance and placement; improve consumer and homemaking education; and strengthen vocational education research.
Handicapped Children's Protection Act	August 5, 1986	PL 99-372	Support to parents in litigation over a rights of handicapped children to secure a free, appropriate education.
Education Handicapped Act Amendments	October 6, 1986	PL 99-457	Established infant & toddler programs for handicapped; expanded discretionary and transition programs.
Rehabilitation Act Amendments	October 21, 1986	PL 99-506	Funding for supported employment services for persons with disabilities.

Table 3 (continued)

Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act of 1988	August 19, 1988	PL 100-407	Assistance to states in developing technology-related assistance to handicapped & their families.
Children with Disabilities Temporary Care Reauthorization Act	October 25, 1989	PL 101-127	Authorized funds to provide temporary care for children with disabilities and for crisis nurseries for child in risk of abuse.
Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)	July 26, 1990	PL 101-336	Banned discrimination & guaranteed equal
Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990	September 25, 1990	PL 101-392	Provided funds for academic and vocational education integration and Tech Prep programs; eliminated set-asides for support services for special populations; assisted states & local schools in teaching skills & competencies necessary to work in a technologically advanced society.
Education of the Handicapped Amendments (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act – IDEA) Act of 1990	October 30, 1990	PL 101-476	Expanded the list of persons who are eligible for special education. IDEA was the most important piece of legislation ever passed by Congress for educating disabled children and youth.
Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 1990	October 31, 1990	PL 101-496	Authorized grants to support planning, coordination, and delivery of special services for persons with developmental disabilities.

Table 3 (continued)

Job Training Reform Amendments of 1992	September 7, 1992	PL 101-367	Revised JPTA of 1982; required on-the-job training contracts and development of individual service strategies (ISS) – an individualized employability development plan for each JPTA participant.
Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act Amendments of 1994	March 9, 1994	PL 103-218	Expanded efforts to assist states in developing and implementing a comprehensive, consumer-responsive, state-wide program of technology assistance to individuals with disabilities.
Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994	March 31, 1994	PL 103-227	Established 8 national goals and development of voluntary academic and skill standards to assist state and local agencies in helping every child to meet criteria.
School-to-Work Opportunities Act (STWOA) of 1994	May 4, 1994	PL 103-239	The act emphasized preparing students with the knowledge and skills about jobs and the labor market to transition from school to employment through school-based, work-based and connecting activities. Provides funds to states and local agencies for collaborative partnerships, integrated curriculum, technological advances, adaptable workers, comprehensive career guidance, work-based learning, and step-by-step approach.

Table 3 (continued)

Improving America's Schools Act of 1994	October 20, 1994	PL 103-382	Reauthorization of ESEA to improve teaching and learning of children in high poverty schools to enable them to meet Goals 2000 standards. Increased opportunities for vocational and applied technology education to provide input in state plans.
Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act	1996	PL 104-193	The welfare reform bill signed by President Clinton, authorized vocational training programs for welfare mothers.
Workforce Investment Act	1998	PL 105-220	Repealed and replaced the JPTA, established state and local workforce investment boards and local service delivery areas for administering occupational skill training, authorizes individual training account vouchers, required one-stop delivery systems in each local area, established accountability performance indicators, mandated state unified plans to ensure coordination of workforce development activities.
Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act	1998	PL 105-332	Reauthorized vocational programs for five years, instituted new accountability measures, and a new funding mechanism for special populations.
No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act	2001	PL 107-110	Closes the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind.

After passage of the Smith-Hughes Act, Congress passed a series of laws, many of which were authored by Senator Walter George (D-GA), that expanded the scope of occupational education programs from the three original fields – agricultural, home economics, and trade and industry – to include new emerging occupational fields. These new fields included distributive (later marketing) education through the George-Dean Act (P.L. 673) in 1936; the area of technical education through the Vocational Education for National Defense programs during World War II; business education programs were added by the George-Braden Act of 1946 (P.L. 79-586); and health occupations programs were added in 1956 with passage of the Health Amendments Act (P.L. 84-911), authorizing the provision of licensed practical nursing courses.

Post-Industrial Vocational Education

After 1945, a new paradigm, the post-industrial era, emerged in developed nations (Bell, 1973). Contributing to this shift were globalization, automation and information technology, meritocracy, scarcity of natural resources, the service economy, the role of women, decentralized authority structures, and occupational changes. The large industrial working class was being replaced by scientific, technical and professional workers who were needed to design and operate automated and cybernated machinery. Today this post-industrial trend manifested itself in the change of focus of industrial giants like General Electric and Boeing from concentrating on manufacturing to selling long-term services contracts (Robinson, 2001). This post-industrial revolution was further joined by

both a decentralized sub-urbanization of settlement and another wave of newcomers to our shore (Bell, 1973).

The post-industrial age required a new type of career and technical education. The global economy, information technology, and the growth of the service sector called for flexible and transferable job skills rather than the job specific training of the social efficiency model. Lynch (2000) described new trends for secondary school career and technical education in the early 21st century. Types of secondary-level vocational education included introductory courses taught for general labor market preparation such as introduction to computers, technology education, typing or word processing, and family and consumer sciences courses that were designed to provide learners with life skills. Additionally, specialized labor market preparation courses such as agricultural education, trade and industrial education, or tourism and hospitality were predicted to be needed.

Sputnik and the Great Society

Vocational education changed rapidly beginning in the late-1950s. Two trends - the international Cold War and a national emphasis on eradicating systemic unemployment and economic development for rural and urban depressed areas - relied on vocational education to train needed highly-skilled technicians and retrain displaced workers, youth, and persons with special needs.

On October 4, 1957, the Soviet Union launched the first man-made satellite Sputnik I from the Baikonur Cosmodrome at Tyuratam, Kazakhstan. It is hard to

remember the effect this event had on the American public nearly fifty years ago. The launch caught the United States completely off guard and had a similar affect on policymakers as the September 11, 2001 attack. The nuclear physicist Edward Teller said the U.S. had lost a battle more important than Pearl Harbor,” and Senator Scoop Jackson called Sputnik “a devastating blow to the prestige of the United States as the leader in the scientific and technical world.” Congress passed the “Space Act” establishing the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in 1958.

Also, in response to concerns about the loss of America’s “brain power” in the Space Race, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (NDEA, P.L. 85-864) (Divine, 1993). The NDEA provided appropriations for training highly skilled technicians needed for national defense; strengthened instruction in science, mathematics, foreign language and other critical subjects; and for the provision of guidance counseling and testing services. The NDEA also improved state statistical services, and established loans, grants and graduate fellowships for higher education students. Demonstration and information dissemination grants were also made to state agencies for education television and other technology at a time when such efforts were beginning to get off the ground. Finally, technical education efforts were expanded in such areas as data processing (Gordon, 2003). Oklahoma State University’s Oklahoma City campus was opened in 1961 because of funds that were available for technician training through the NDEA (Chandler, 1991)

In order to win the Democratic presidential nomination in 1960, Senator John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, a Catholic, and his advisers believed it necessary for him to run and win a presidential primary in a Southern Protestant state to dispel the myth that a

Catholic can not win. To accomplish this mission, Kennedy entered the West Virginia primary and ran against a Protestant Senator from Minnesota, Hubert H. Humphrey. Kennedy won the primary. During the campaign, Kennedy, a wealthy New Englander and Harvard University graduate observed, first hand, the problems of unemployment caused by industrial decline and isolation. This experience so shocked Kennedy that area redevelopment became an important part of his campaign against Vice President Richard M. Nixon in the general election. He pledged that, if elected, he would work for and sign the Area Redevelopment Act which had been repeatedly vetoed by President Eisenhower (Kennedy, 1960). Kennedy signed the Area Redevelopment Act (P.L. 87-27), providing vocational training and retraining in areas of chronic unemployment and labor surplus, in 1961 (Gordon. 2003).

The following year, Congress passed and the President signed the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (MDTA, P.L. 87-415). MDTA was intended to deal with unemployment problems resulting from automation and technological problems and other types of systemic employment. It funded training and retraining for youth and for the unemployed and underemployed. Trainees received a stipend during the training and the federal government funded state vocational education agencies to develop and conduct courses under the act (Gordon, 2003).

President Kennedy selected a Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education in 1961 to evaluate programs and recommend improvements to the U.S. occupational education system. The Panel's membership included the incumbent director of the Oklahoma Department of Vocational Education James Barney Perkey (1909-1967). The Panel's report, submitted to Kennedy in November 1962, criticized vocational

education's accomplishments and called for its expansion to serve the unemployed and disadvantaged. The panel's recommendations was incorporated in the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (VEA, P.L. 88-210) enacted by Congress. This law had such sweeping changes that it was called the "second Magna Carta of Vocational Education." This legislation was recognition of the shift in United States from an industrial, manufacturing-based economy to a postmodern, global, service-oriented economy. It took into account the needs of students rather than strictly the labor force reproduction aspects of vocational education. Provisions of bill included increased federal subsidies to the states, abolished rigid funding formulae, support of residential vocational schools, work-study programs for vocational students, research/demonstration/training programs, expanded occupational education for high school youth, federal support for adult and post-secondary education, training and retraining programs for the poor, handicapped, and out-of-work, and for unemployed workers, and the authorized the establishment and construction of area vocational and technical schools (Cuban, 1982).

The New Vocationalism

In succeeding decades, as the United States Congress passed additional laws reauthorizing vocational education programs, the theoretical foundations of this legislation shifted from the social efficiency model advocated by Snedden and Prosser to the more progressive ideal called for by John Dewey.

At the turn of the 21st Century, the field of career and technical education was in upheaval. This decline seemed to be plaguing the discipline even after a decade of

reform. There was a general acknowledgement that secondary vocational education received negative reviews from general academic educators and upwardly mobile parents. As controversial as the vocational education reforms were, the reforms of high school majors, schools-within-schools, authentic assessment, contextual learning, and tech prep had been tried and improved. The future of 21st century career and technical education depends on innovations. Federal career and technical education legislation of the last two decades included the Carl Perkins Act and the School-to-Work Act structured new vocational education programs around these innovations (Gordon, 2003; Lynch, 2000).

Congress passed the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act in 1984 (P.L. 98-524) which modernized vocational education programs, provided greater access for marginalized and special needs populations, promoted coordination of vocational education programs with other agencies in order to address labor force training needs, improved integration of academic and vocational education subjects, provided retaining opportunities for workers, assisted states in funding guidance counseling and other special programs, and strengthened vocational education research. Congress amended the Carl D. Perkins Act in 1990 (P.L. 101-392) to provide occupational education programs for the purpose of making America more competitive in the world market through program improvement, occupational skill competencies, academic skill competencies, and Tech Prep.

The School-to-Work Opportunities Act (STWOA, P.L. 103-239) which Congress enacted in 1994 was designed to address the serious skills shortage through partnerships between the schools and industry. It included work-based learning through on-the-job

training experiences, and more integration of occupation and academic education components (Gordon, 2003)

The Carl D. Perkins Act of 1998 (P.L. 105-332) reauthorized vocational programs for five years. It involved new accountability measures and a new funding mechanism for special populations. Each state was required to report to the Secretary of Education on academic and vocational proficiency attainments, graduation or certification attainment, placement and completion of postsecondary education, and placement in military service or employment, and participation in non-traditional training and employment (Gordon, 2003; Lynch, 2000).

The Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (PL 105-220) replaced the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) by providing a unified approach to training. The act also introduced vouchers for job training and required that local workforce investment boards establish a one-stop delivery system to provide core services, access to intensive services, and to authorize training (Gordon, 2003).

Between 1982 and 1994, a steep decline occurred in enrollment in secondary vocational education because these programs were not seen as meeting the needs of students, employers, or the community. Vocational education programs competed against college preparatory curriculum for a shrinking student population. Programs were targeted for the educationally disadvantaged students and confusion with school-to-work programs received the wrath of education critics as elitists viewed workforce education as inappropriate for college bound students. The general perception of the public was vocational education inhibited students' career and educational choices. The four forces stimulating high school vocational reform were: the new economy, new public

expectations for schools, new research on student learning and motivation, and high school reform. The following six components developed by vocational educators were integral to reform: 1) high school majors; 2) contextual teaching and learning; 3) work-based learning; 4) authentic assessment; 5) career academies; and 6) tech prep (Lynch, 2000).

Lynch (2000) also believed that career and technical educators gave increased attention to multiple, authentic assessments. Standardized tests of academic achievement were not enough. Working examples of multiple assessments in vocational education, included portfolios, demonstrations, reports, work-based activities, student productions, term papers and projects, essays, student criticisms of literary and technical work, paper and pencil tests, case study analyses, and employer and teacher formal and informal observations. Professional assessment should incorporate any of these methods however, the standards movement considered high stakes testing as the only reliable measure even when standardized testing defied progressive knowledge about learning. Tests did not measure critical thinking, and they were perceived by minorities as unfair (Lynch, 2000).

New Missions for Agricultural Education

At the beginning of the 21st Century, only about two percent of the population was directly engaged in farming. Agriculture was conducted by corporate farms, and processed and marketed through multinational food integrators. Agricultural education became a combination technology, agriscience, consumer, and environmental education, teaching urban youth the role of agriculture in a complex economic system (Hillison

1996). Issues concerning biotechnology, food safety, sustainable agriculture, and conservation were subjects that urban and suburban students could understand (Trexler & Meischen, 2002).

Efforts were made through Agriculture in the Classroom and other programs to promote agricultural literacy and to use agriculture as a teaching medium for science and other related subjects in elementary and middle schools. This was actually revitalizing a concept that was used in over 21 states in the early 20th century that followed the teachings of Prestalozzi and used hand-on activities such as gardening (Hillison, 1998).

Finally, land-grants institutions were envisioned nearly 150 years ago as the education for the industrial and agricultural class. Over the next 50 years, research and extension activities were added to enhance this role. what the role was for the higher education and agricultural education in the 21st century?

Herren and Edwards (2003) identified three issues that evolved at the turn of the 21st century concerning the role of land-grant colleges. First, would the universities shift from their historic tripartite mission of teaching, research, and extension, to an elitist mission similar to traditional universities and thus subordinate their commitment to teaching and extension? Second, would community colleges usurp land-grant universities in the role of providing education and upward mobility for the “industrial class?” And third, what would be the future practice of agricultural education (including leadership and communication programs) and extension departments as in the development of a social science component at the land-grant institutions of higher education?

Vocational Education and the GI Bill

Vocational Education Initiatives of the New Deal

Before the enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI Bill of Rights) by Congress, the New Deal administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt created several community development and education programs aimed at dealing with unemployment. In 1930, there were a total of about 3.2 million unemployed Americans, of which 878,562 were between the ages of 15 and 24, or 28 percent of this age group. Of African American youth, 38 percent were without jobs. About 36 percent of all youth had been unemployed between two and six-months (Rawick, 1957).

The Civilian Conservation Corps (C.C.C.) was the first effort directed at the youth unemployment problem. Founded by Congress in 1933, the CCC employed young men between the ages of 17 and 28 in reforestation and other environmental projects under the leadership of U.S. Army officers and enlisted men, leading to the CCC's designation as "Roosevelt's Tree Army" (Kliebard, 1999). Because on an average the enlistees in the program had only a ninth grade education, the program was authorized to conduct vocational training courses for ten hours per week (Kliebard, 1999; Gower, 1967; Ralston, 2000).

In 1935, the National Youth Administration (N.Y.A.) was formed by executive order within the Federal Emergency Relief Agency (F.E.R.A.) to combat the youth unemployment problem. This program combined job training with work experience under the general control of public schools. The N.Y.A., a New Deal education program,

like the C.C.C., was opposed by the vocational education establishment because the New Deal vocational programs loosened the grip of the American Vocational Association on the profession by competing for vocational education funds outside the Smith-Hughes funding mechanism, creating a direct federal program as alternative to secondary schools and providing adult programs in vocational education (Kliebard, 1999).

National Defense Vocational Training Programs

During World War II, the N.Y.A. was converted into the massive program called Vocational Education for National Defense. Training programs were developed for aircraft work, shipyard work, machine shops, sheet metal work, electrical work, telephone installation, and automotive and truck repair.

The defense buildup served to create new job opportunities for African Americans, for which the NYA had paved the way by providing industrial job training that had previously been available to black people on a very limited basis. The opening of industrial jobs for African Americans contributed to the migration of southern blacks to northern and western cities where factory jobs could be found. Between 1940 and 1944, one million African-American workers were employed in civilian jobs. By 1944, the workforce included more than double the number of black skilled workers than had existed ten years before. These jobs contributed to creating an educated and mobilized black working-class leadership that would be the cadre of the civil rights movement over the next ten years (Kliebard, 1999).

In Oklahoma, Food Production War Training (FPWT) evening classes in canning and machinery upkeep and repair were conducted in local high schools. The courses were administered by the State Board of Vocational Education through high school vocational agricultural teachers. High schools employed an advisory committee composed of alumni of the local Future Farmers of America (FFA) chapter (Price, personal communication, October 7, 2003).

Origins of the GI Bill

As the industrial workforce was burgeoning with national defense orders, Roosevelt administration planners were concerned about what faced America at the conclusion of hostilities (Reagan, 2000). The National Resources Planning Board (NRPB) created the Conference on Post-war Readjustment of Civilian and Military Personnel (known as the Osborn Committee after the committee's chairman Brigadier General Frederick Osborn, U.S. Army) in 1942. The Osborn Committee produced a study that called for a vocational rehabilitation and retraining program that would also provide college opportunities for returning veterans. The committee had serious concerns about the postwar reconstruction in the United States.

The Osborn Committee expressed these concerns in a document popularly referred to as the "American Beveridge Report" (Frydl, 2000, p. 22). This report was so named because it coincided with a 1942 survey, written by Lord William Beveridge, criticizing the haphazard system of British social welfare programs and national mobilization (Bennett, 1996; Mosch, 1970; Olson, 1974; Ross, 1969). The report by the

Osborn Committee expressed concerns about the social and political system in postwar America. The researchers speculated the United States could recede into another depression with demobilization. The prospect of twelve million veterans proficient in handling firearms might become a revolutionary fascist or communist army if economic conditions were bad enough. The committee's recommendation was to create a system of social and educational benefits for the veterans that would both assist in the citizen soldiers' readjustment to civilian life and stimulate the postwar economy. These recommendations were incorporated into the legislative bill that was introduced in Congress as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Ross, 1969).

Congress passed by unanimous votes of both the Senate and House of Representatives the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (or G.I. Bill of Rights) and was signed by the President on June 22, 1944. The bill consisted of sections that provided for:

- Education and training;
- Loan guaranty for a home, farm, or business;
- Readjustment benefits of \$20 a week for up to 52 weeks (known as the so-called 52/20 Club);
- Job search assistance;
- Top priority for building materials for VA hospitals;
- Priority hiring for civil service jobs; and
- Military review of dishonorable discharges.

The overwhelming support the G.I. Bill enjoyed was a reflection that the legislation had emerged as a veterans' measure showing appreciation for the troops, from the original

intent of the administration to link veterans' benefits with the general needs of the population (Ross, 1969)

The education and training sections of the GI Bill of Rights included courses for completion of high school, higher education, vocational and trade schools, on-the-job training, and institutional on-farm training, the last program was the subject of this dissertation. All qualified students received a stipend directly from the Veterans' Administration. Books and supplies expenses were paid directly or reimbursed, and tuition and other expenses were paid by the V.A. to the institution (Frydl, 2000).

CHAPTER III

Research Methodology

It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness.

– Karl Marx (Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, 1859)

Rationale for Methodology

Patton (2002) divided scientific research into five purposes: basic research, applied research, summative evaluation, formative evaluation, and action research. Basic research sought to extend knowledge and discover truth. Applied research attempted to understand human and societal problems. Summative evaluation made determinations on the effectiveness of human interventions and actions, while formative evaluation sought to improve those interventions. Finally, action research solved problems in a program, organization, or community.

Occupational educators questioned the type of research accomplished in the field. The new critical occupational educators branded conventional research as conservative with an uncritical conceptualization that reinforced the conservatism of the field. Patrick

N. Foster (2003), Marie Hoepfl (1997), Theodore Lewis (1999) and Stephen Petrina (1998) commented on the lack of a critical approach to research in the field and studies and suggested research areas of engagement to inform “critical framing questions” (Petrina, 1998, p. 48). Lewis (1998) observed that

We in technology education must employ the paradigm that can best answer questions we wish to have answered. If we stick to tried and true paradigms the consequence is that certain key kinds of questions will not be asked or answered. (p. 52)

Qualitative research methods were the methods that answered Lewis’ “questions we wish to have answered.” These methods yield data that could not be manipulated mathematically, separating them from quantitative methods (Foster, 2003). Qualitative methods were derived from anthropology and sociology that since the late-20th century increasingly found their way into educational research (Cole, 1991). Sociology and anthropology are disciplines designed to understand the “other,” and qualitative methods permit the sociologist to affect an attitude of detachment toward society so that he or she can “observe the conduct of self and others, to understand the mechanisms of social processes, and to comprehend and explain why both actors and processes are as they are” (Vidich & Lyman, 2000, p. 38). The emergence of qualitative methods met with resistance from the popularity of complex quantitative methods, funding agencies, and that the interpretations of such data by researchers were largely subjective and not scientific (Peshkin, 2000).

Critical researchers suggested that one research area of engagement that should be pursued was the history, historiography, and genealogy of vocational education (Lewis,

1999). The genealogy, history and historiography of occupational education could answer such central framing questions in the field as: To what direction were we committing occupational education? What was and what ought to be the nature of knowledge in occupational education? How should this knowledge be organized, selected, and taught? How was occupational education practiced in other cultures and how does that link up to current power structures and values? (Petrina, 1999).

According to Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, and Taubman (2000), A field of study does not just “happen.” A field evolves over time and involves the labor of many participants. To begin to understand curriculum comprehensively it is essential to portray its development historically. The ahistorical posture of the traditional field has meant that “curriculum [has been] practiced with urgency in a crisis atmosphere that excludes contemplation of its evolution.” (Hazlett, 1979, p. 131) (p. 69)

Historical research is a category of basic research that aids in the clarification of issues and the basis for decision making (Travers, 1984). Historical research involves “investigating, recording, analyzing, and interpreting the events of the past for the purpose of discovering generalizations that are helpful in understanding the past, present, and, to a limited extent, in anticipation of the future” (Best & Kahn, 1998, p. 26). These studies have often included an application of the descriptive analytical approach. It is a process that critically examines an issue through the use of records, reports, earlier writings, logs, and other recorded data that were made contemporary to the time of the event or at a later date. Such research is an examination of the past for facts, a relating of

those facts to current data, and the making of conclusions (Best & Kahn, 1998; Borg & Gall, 1983).

Historical research in the field of education has had the following three important purposes: 1) to acquire knowledge from past events and activities; 2) to isolate and pinpoint areas requiring educational reform; and 3) to build a foundation so that future trends might be predicted from past events (Borg & Gall, 1983). Such an examination of the past, using the historical method, “provides information that aids in making educational decisions” (Wiersma, 1986, p. 290). Historical research leads to valid generalizations and these generalizations are important research (Travers, 1984).

Theoretical Foundations for the Study

Philosophy is divided into three branches – metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology. Of these three branches, epistemology has the greatest application to education because it was the branch that dealt with the essence of knowledge and questions of how and what we knew. Epistemology attempted to answer questions such as: How do people learn? What knowledge is of utmost value? What are the different types of knowledge? Epistemological questions are constantly being asked in school reform issues and in education classes (Moore, 1988).

The epistemology of this study of the Veterans’ Agricultural Training Program in Oklahoma is social constructionism. Constructionism emerged as a part of a broad movement away from positivism, or “an empiricist, logical atomistic, designative, representational account of meaning and knowledge” (Schwandt, 2000, p. 196). This

movement involved a variety of developments in pragmatism, theory of science, philosophy of language, philosophy of social science, sociology of knowledge, phenomenology, ethnomethodology, and linguistics. The themes that characterized the post-empiricist philosophies included: antifoundationalism, thoroughgoing fallibilism, primary emphasis on the social character of the self, the need to cultivate a community of inquirers, awareness and sensitivity to radical contingency, and recognition that there was no escape from the plurality of traditions (Bernstein, 1991; Schwandt, 2000).

Constructivism was further framed as the social construction of technology (SCOT), a perspective that emerged in the early-1980s among Dutch, English, and American sociologists and historians of science and technology (Bijker & Pinch, 1987). SCOT attempted to define a technological regime in terms of the way that users of a technology constructed that technology in its everyday use. Technology in this respect was not only a particular technological artifact such as an automobile or bicycle or grain elevator, but the social organizational system that developed to support that technological regime (Hughes, 1989).

For this study, the technological regime was the emergence of agriculture as an industry and as a part of a larger market economy in the United States. Agricultural innovations such as the horse harness, heavy plow, and three field rotation began as early as the medieval period. Along with mechanical and administrative advances, these innovations sparked technological changes that were so profound that a revolution in social and economic conditions took place in the second half of the Middle Ages (Lucas, 2005). Kulikoff (1992) argued that by the 1850s the desire by migrants to the West “for land and the independence it brought” (p.208) had become the “new western rural

proletariat” (p. 215). These immigrants and their quest for freedom and cheap land were eclipsed by bourgeois culture and agricultural specialization for the capitalist market economy (Wilentz, 1997).

The theoretical perspective taken in this study was critical theory. According to Kincheloe and McLaren (2002),

A critical social theory is concerned in particular with issues of power and justice and the ways that the economy, matters of race, class, and gender, ideologies, discourses, education, religion, and other social institutions and cultural dynamics interact to construct a social system. (p. 281)

Critical theory does not just study and understand society but critiqued and changed society (Patton, 2002). Critical theory was influenced by Marxist class conflict in understanding community and societal structures and by the 1960s radical struggles, and provided a theoretical framework which was to be judged by the “extent to which it provides a stimulus to action” (Guba & Lincoln, 1998, pp. 213-214). Since the goals of occupational education involved taking a larger role for the study of career and technical subjects in U.S. public education, and a goal of this study was analyzing the way in which the GI Bill on-farm training contributed to the development of current power structures and values, then “critical theory research may be very appropriate for” (Foster, 2002, p. 35) a theoretical perspective of this study.

The research method employed in this study was historical research. This approach enabled the researcher to answer the research questions regarding the development of vocational education under the GI Bill, its impact on the current approach to Career and Technical Education in Oklahoma, the experiences of veterans enrolled in

the on-farm agricultural education program under the GI Bill, and the application of generalizations, if any, from the program to development of new concepts and programs in occupational education and programs for veterans.

Research Methodology

Problem Definition

The first step in the process of creating a historical account of the veterans' agricultural training program was the definition of the problem. The problem statement, purpose, and research question sections of this study found in Chapter I established the problem definition. This problem definition was used as a guide for the research.

Review of Existing Research on the GI Bill

Second, a review of the literature concerning veterans' farm training was conducted. The literature reviewed was identified through references found in books, journal articles, unpublished dissertations and theses, transcripts of congressional hearings, and/or government reports. Other sources of data for the research on the Oklahoma veterans' agricultural training program included census records concerning wages, literacy, education, and other social indicators to provide a general context for the immediate postwar era in northeastern Oklahoma from 1945 to 1957. Qualitative data from such sources as diaries, letters, reminiscences, school reports, newspapers, and other

contemporary journal articles were examined (Mertens, 1998). Additional primary and secondary sources were identified through the use of preliminary sources and bibliographic indexes and reviewed. Primary references were those sources that were written during the time of the study. Secondary sources were those that were produced later and provide an interpretation of the original data (Borg & Gall, 1983; Mertens, 1998; Travers, 1986; Wiersma, 1983).

Document Analysis

Third, sources of historical facts were identified and researched. This involved the interpretation of mute evidence such as written texts and artifacts. The main disciplines that have tried “to develop theory and methods on the use of artifacts and documents are history, art history, archaeology, anthropology, sociology, cognitive psychology, technology, cognitive psychology, and cultural studies” (Hodder, 2000, p. 703). These sources were documents, artifacts, and biographies found in archives, such as the Library of Congress or the archives of the Oklahoma State Department of Education, include documents on the administration of the GI Bill education and training program.

Freedom of Information requests for the records of the Division of the Veterans’ Agricultural Training Program from the Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education (ODCTE) revealed that the state agency kept files for a period of only five years. The ODCTE had disposed of all records of the VATP some years ago. The only documents that were left were an occasional text book or report kept privately by individuals who worked in the veterans’ program. It was hoped that during the oral

history phase, described below, such records would surface and be available for examination. It turned out that participants in the program maintained no records either which were understandable after over 50 years.

In order to reconstruct the activities of the program, it was necessary to find records that were maintained by the federal government, other state and local agencies, and individuals who had the foresight to archive this information. It was also necessary to research published accounts of the program published in theses, handbooks, and vocational and agricultural education journals and magazines at the time of the program's operation. These published articles described aspects of the accomplishments of the VATP in both Oklahoma and other states.

Oral History

Fourth, oral or life history was used to give a first hand account of the program from those who participated in the VATP. Oral history is a type of unstructured interview. Its modern formal organization began with the Oral History Project founded by Allan Nevins at Columbia University in 1948 (Fontana & Frey, 2000).

During World War II, prior to Nevins' project at Columbia University, Lieutenant Colonel, later Brigadier General, S. L. A. Marshall pioneered the use of oral history interviews of U.S. troops in both the European and Pacific Theaters of Operation to complete his research on the history of U.S. Army operations in both the Battle of The Bulge and the amphibious invasion of Kwajalein Island. Marshall's methodology was widely adopted by U.S. Army units for military history (Everett, 1992).

An interdisciplinary development, oral history involved the fields of education, anthropology, history, folklore, biography, psychology, sociology, and ethnography (Mertens, 1998). It captured a variety of classes from working people to Presidents and gave voice to the marginalized in communities (Fontana & Frey, 2000). A life history might represent a process whereby the researcher and reader came to understand the semiotic means by which someone else made sense of the world (Tierney, 1998).

Good oral history interviews provide background information, personal insights, or anecdotes rarely found in official documents or histories. Like all historical sources, oral history interviews contain personal biases that may have contributed important data for the analysis of events. The interviewees may have also been reluctant to honestly reveal or discuss mistakes or errors that occurred years earlier. A greater problem, particularly with the population of participants in the Oklahoma Veterans' Agricultural Training Program (VATP), was the inability of interviewees to provide accurate accounts of events because of the length of time since the interviewees' involvement in the VATP and limitations of human memory. This is particularly a concern when recalling traumatic events or actions that took place years before. Due to the length of time which transpired between experiences and its recollection, interviewees may condense the sequence of events and tend to omit critical judgments and actions (Everett, 1992).

Historians in the past have viewed oral history as an inexpensive or instantaneous method for producing history. An effort was made in this study to prepare for oral history interviews of VATP participants by the review of documents and histories of institutional on-farm training and by the attempt to be aware of personal biases (Everett, 1992). The oral history was conducted in accordance with approval by the Institutional Review

Board (IRB) of Oklahoma State University that examined the sampling methods, interview questions used, treatment of the interviewees, interviewee informed consent forms, and other procedures prior to conducting the oral history interviews. The IRB approval letter is found in Appendix A of this dissertation.

The population sample of this study's oral history component consisted of individuals who participated in the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program in Oklahoma. These individuals were those people who served as supervisors, administrators, teachers, and students who participated in the on-farm training program in different communities in Oklahoma. The interviews included: four administrators of the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program (VATP), a teacher-trainer in agricultural education who worked with VATP administrators and instructors, eight instructors, and three trainees. A list of the interviewees, the category of their participation in the study, the date or dates in which these individuals were interviewed is found in Appendix B. The population sample for the oral history interview was obtained by using the so-called "snowball" or "chain" sampling method explained in detail in the section below.

The oral histories were conducted in an interview method and responses recorded. Each participant who was interviewed was given an informed consent form (see Appendix C) explaining the study, the interviewee's rights under the research protocol, and the disposition of tape recordings and interview transcripts. Each participant who was interviewed signed the form indicating the participant's consent and that the interviewee, each of whom was male, understood his rights. This signed form was co-signed by the interviewer and the interviewee was given a copy for his records. A copy signed by the interviewee was maintained by the researcher.

The interviews that were conducted with VATP participants were semi-structured and open-ended interviews. They were intended to explore how experiences in the VATP affected the participant's lives and were intended to solicit his perceptions regarding the program's impact on the development of the Oklahoma Career and Technology Education system. Oral history research on the Oklahoma veterans' institutional on-farm training program included taped memoirs, typewritten manuscripts, and a research method that involved in-depth interviewing. During the interview, the interviewer stimulated the interviewees to begin the act of remembering, jog their memories, and recorded and presented the interviewee's words through recorded in-depth interviews. The purpose of the interviews was to determine how things got to be the way they are in contemporary times. The researcher listened to the participants talk about how the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program affected their lives and the development of the Oklahoma Career and Technology Education system (Cutler, 1971; Tierney, 1998).

The type of sampling technique that was utilized for the oral history interviews of this study was called the "snowball" or "chain" sampling. Under this strategy, the researcher interviewed anyone who was involved in the program by seeking referrals from program participants of their friends and other people they believe met the interviewee criteria. To begin the "snowball," this researcher attended annual dinner meetings of agricultural education teachers with over twenty years of experience in the field held at the Payne County Fairgrounds in both July 2003 and July 2004. At the agricultural education dinner, the researcher presented a proposal of this study to the group and solicited the participation in the study of teachers who had worked in the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program. Finally, at the end of each interview, the

interviewer asked the interviewees if they could identify several others who may have been involved in the VATP and who could contribute rich information for the study (Patton, 2002).

Two categories of interview questions were used to conduct interviews of participants in the VATP. One category of questions was used to interview administrators and instructors in the program. A second category of questions were directed at those who were enrolled in the on-farm training program. Efforts were made to prepare interview questions that addressed thoroughly each of the study's research questions listed in Chapter I. The Review of Literature found in Chapter II was used to reveal themes about the history of vocational agricultural education. These themes provided a basis for analyzing veterans' farm training. Questions were then devised to ask program participants about the aspects of the veterans' program that they experienced that addressed those themes. The interview questions for both the categories of student and instructor participants are listed in Appendix D and Appendix E.

Data Analysis and Reporting

Finally, in the document analysis phase, the historical materials, including documents, congressional committee reports, materials from the Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education, letters and other materials from gubernatorial and congressional archives, theses, books, maps, diaries, and other such materials, secured were reviewed for their level of relevance and application. The materials were examined to determine whether they were primary or secondary sources. They were also judged on

the basis of their validity and reliability. Validity of documents that were examined was defined and determined by if the document in question dealt with the subject of the study, that is the VATP, or an associated subject, such as veterans' affairs or vocational education. Reliability was determined the document's presence in a library, archive, governors' records or collection of government documents.

The historical data found in the oral histories were evaluated and synthesized to draw new conclusions. Biographies and oral histories were evaluated to determine if there was disagreement over major themes and facts. Bits of data from the oral interviews were transferred to three-inch by five-inch cards. These completed data cards were sorted by the researcher into piles of card to review themes that emerged from the data. The themes were then classified and thematic statements were developed and elaborated upon to describe aspects of veteran farm training from the viewpoint of the participants in the program (Merten, 1998). In most qualitative studies, themes and categories are the subject of "peer-checking." Peer-checking was not accomplished in this study, as is the case in many historical research studies, and the lack of peer-checking appears as a limitation of the study listed in Chapter I (Petrin, personal communication, July 11, 2005). In this study data were drawn from multiple sources: historical materials and oral histories. The structured and overlapping employment of multiple data sources is referred to as triangulation.

The data collected were continually reviewed throughout the data collection process. The schedule of analysis and interpretation included these general steps: The data were analyzed; the analysis was examined and reorganized; the reorganized data were synthesized and the synthesis was interpreted.

The information and analysis was presented in a final documentation report contained in Chapter IV of this dissertation. As a stylistic note, references in the final report contained in Chapter IV were cited in accordance with the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, 5th edition (2001). Interviews of participants in the oral history of the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program appear cited as a personal communication. Personal communications were cited with the name of the interviewee, "personal communication", and the date of the interview. This was the only citation of the interview and the interview was not cited in the Reference section of this report. The only deviation from the APA Publication Manual was the citation of archival data. In this case, the data were cited in accordance with the bibliographic style of the archive from which the data were derived. The citation appeared in the text next to the data in the following form: name of item cited, date of data, archive collection name, box name, folio number, name of archive, location, in the manner requested by the archive. Similar to the personal communication in the APA Publication Manual, the citation is not listed in the References. The archive or collection where the data was retrieved, however, was listed in the References.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Don't let anyone tell you that you were a sucker for fighting the War against Fascism.

- The Chaplain, (*Battleground*, 1949).

It was even sillier. I dreamed I was going to have my own home - just a nice little house with my wife and me out in the country, in the suburbs anyway. That's the cockeyed kind of dream you have when you're overseas.

-Fred Derry, (*The Best Years of Our Lives*, 1946).

Introduction

The purpose of this section of the study on the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program (VATP) in Oklahoma is to report the findings of the study. For the purpose of this study, the data collected on the VATP addressed the research questions developed to guide the study. These research questions are:

1. How was institutional on-farm training administered in Oklahoma?

2. How did institutional on-farm training influence the perception of vocational education and the development of the Oklahoma system of area vocational-technical schools?
3. How were the social and economic lives of the veterans and their instructors and the communities in which they lived affected by their participation in on-farm training?

Data for this study were collected and analyzed from multiple sources of historical and qualitative data. These data sources included: federal and state legislation, editions of the Congressional Record, papers and correspondence from the archives of the governors of Oklahoma who held office from 1943 to 1967, correspondence from senators and representatives, master's and doctoral degree theses and dissertations, journal articles, articles from other periodicals, newspaper articles, proceedings and reports from educational interest groups, and reports of federal and state agencies including the U.S. Veterans' Administration, Oklahoma Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education.

Oral history interviews were conducted with administrators, instructors, and trainees who participated in veterans' farm training in Oklahoma during the duration of the program to fill holes in the archival data and to confirm the available documents and artifacts researched in this study. The proceedings of the interviews were either taped or field notes were compiled after they were conducted. The data from these interviews were then transcribed and compiled and analyzed using qualitative data management techniques described in Chapter III of this study. All of the data form the basis for the drafting of this written report of the study's findings.

The organization of this chapter includes sections on the following findings from the data: First, the report deals with issues faced by postwar state policymakers concerning veterans' affairs upon the return to Oklahoma of discharged soldiers, sailors, and airmen, and the response of vocational education to the issues of veterans' affairs. Next, the chapter contains a brief description of how the State Division of Vocational Education was organized and operated at the end of World War II. This section includes information about the war-time adult Vocational Education for National Defense (VEND) programs, the administration of Vocational Education for National Defense programs, and lessons learned from Vocational Education for National Defense programs that informed the VATP. The chapter then includes a legislative history of efforts in creating the institutional on-farm training program under the GI Bill of Rights. Veterans' assistance legislation for veterans of the Korean War is discussed. The next section of this chapter presents the reporting of specific data on the GI Bill institutional on-farm training program in Oklahoma, the staffing of the state Veterans' Agricultural Training Program, and the role of the State Accrediting Agency in the state Veterans' Agricultural Training Program. The local Veterans' Agricultural Training Program administration in community schools is then discussed, along with data reported on the state Veterans' Agricultural Training Program as community education. Then the chapter reports on data collected from study interviewees concerning the experiences and perceptions of veterans' agricultural instructors, and the experiences and perceptions of trainees in Veterans' Agricultural Training Program. Finally, historical events and perceptions on the effect that the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program had on the expansion of the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education and the effect that

the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program had on social life in Oklahoma are reported and discussed.

"Forty acres and a Jeep": Veterans Return to Oklahoma

Robert S. Kerr was elected governor of Oklahoma in 1942 at the age of 46. An Oklahoma City oil executive and national Democratic Party official, he was closely connected to the state's social and business establishment. As the "war governor," Kerr presided over many of the state's defense activities and agencies that planned and implemented postwar reconstruction programs. He became the point man for receiving complaints of many Oklahomans on the handling of veterans' affairs in the immediate months following the end of hostilities in Europe and the Pacific (Corbett, 1983).

Immediate cries to bring the troops home followed the abrupt end of the war in the summer of 1945. To deal with their impending return, Kerr contacted the new V.A. chief, General Omar Bradley, affectionately known as the "GI General" by the men who served under him (Frank, 1955b). The Governor requested the General's attendance at a "state-wide meeting of civic, veteran, educational, and business leaders" to be convened in March to "more fully inform our community leaders on establishment of veterans' centers and other activities in connection with serving more effectively the community's returning veterans" (Kerr to Omar Bradley, Washington, DC, February 20, 1946. Robert S. Kerr Collection, Gubernatorial Series, box 15, folder 1, Carl Albert Congressional Research Center, University of Oklahoma).

The Governor wrote to U.S. Marine Corps General Graves B. Erskine at the Veterans' Administration, saying community leaders at the meeting would "be eager to know the procedures of operation which you are finding successful in those communities and those states which are operating under the general plan outlined in your Order No. 3" (RSK to Graves B. Erskine, Washington DC, February 20, 1946. Robert S. Kerr Collection, Gubernatorial Series, box 15, folder 1, Carl Albert Research & Studies Center, University of Oklahoma).

Throughout the late-1940s and well into the mid-1950s, state leaders pondered a state World War II veterans' bonus and other legislative aid to veterans. Early in 1946, the Oklahoma V.F.W Commander, Elmer Vail, wrote Governor Kerr requesting a special session of the Oklahoma Legislature to enact laws for the benefit of World War II veterans, arguing:

[An] emergency is at hand...exhausted funds of the "on-the-job training program,; school lands being grabbed by speculators, housing problems, hospital shortage, unemployment, labor disputes (Elmer W. Vail to Robert S. Kerr, February 8, 1946. Robert S. Kerr Collection, Gubernatorial Series, box 15, folder 1, Carl Albert Congressional Research Center, University of Oklahoma).

Throughout the immediate postwar years, state policy makers debated veterans' issues. Frequent concerns were voiced about a World War II veterans' bonus and other assistance. For example, in 1953, state Senator Harold R. Shoemake of Muskogee introduced and secured passage of Senate Bill 193 establishing the Oklahoma Veterans' Farm and Home Loan Authority. In July, Governor Johnston Murray appointed V.F.W. member John McGinnis of Tulsa, and two American Legionnaires, Jack Newman of

Ponca City and Fred Frey of Chickasha, to serve on the Authority's Board of Directors. The board designated John Sparkman the Authority's executive director, who established a presence in the Oklahoma State Department of Veterans' Affairs on August 3, 1953. Senator Shoemake wrote Sparkman to congratulate and tell him "D-Day and H-Hour has arrived as far as taking positive action for the veteran is concerned. The anxious eyes of Oklahoma veterans are upon your office and the leaders of this program" (Harold R. Shoemake to John Sparkman, September 19, 1953. Johnston Murray Collection, Box 23, folder 7, Oklahoma Western History, University of Oklahoma)

Shoemake urged the Authority to work for bonds with a campaign under the "initiative petition and referendum law" (Harold R. Shoemake to John Sparkman, September 19, 1953). This method, Shoemake believed, would pledge the full faith and credit of the state to finance the farm and home loan program so that every veteran would have the "opportunity to enter the farming or cattle business, or buy a home" (Harold R. Shoemake to John Sparkman, September 19, 1953). The Senator thought "adoption of the act by initiative petition will forever stamp out any criticism thereof by certain big business pressure groups" (Harold R. Shoemake to John Sparkman, September 19, 1953). By the spring of 1954, James K. Smith, the state Budget Director, notified Governor Murray that "the Authority has found it impossible to sell the bonds as provided in said act." (J. K. Smith to Johnston Murray, April 9, 1954. Johnston Murray Collection, M452, Box 23, Folder 7. Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma).

The 1955 legislative session placed two legislative referenda, State Questions number 369 and 370, on the July 3rd, 1956 Primary Election ballot for to approve the creation of the Veterans' Home and Farm Authority. The referendum also asked the

voters to authorize the issuance of \$50 million in general obligation bonds for loans to resident veterans for the purchase or improvement of farms and homes and to invest common school funds to secure the mortgages. Both questions were defeated by the voters by a nearly two-to-one margin (Oklahoma State Election Board, 1994).

Supporters of the Farm and Home Loan Authority, such as Senator Shoemaker, were part of a populist, “back-to-the-land” movement which many agriculturalists involved in veterans’ institutional on-farm training found to be impractical given the realities of agriculture at mid-century. In 1944, a Saturday Evening Post referred to such programs as “crackpot schemes” and the “back to the land movement of the World War I is updated by ‘forty acres and a Jeep’ for G.I.s” (Titus, 1944, 24). Titus recommended that local communities establish screening committees based on that established by a North Dakota county agent near Foreman, ND, to qualify veterans before they entered. A University of Wisconsin land use specialist was quoted by the Post who warned:

There are of course good farming chances in the these northern forest areas but for a certain type of man only...age combined with work in forest industries and servicing vacationists will offer good opportunity for the man who likes the life and who is decently financed at the start. (p. 25)

Titus also referred to a statement by Dean E. L. Anthony of Michigan State College of Agricultural and Applied Science, who warned:

Unless properly advised in selection and trained in management, many [veterans’ farm programs] may be headed for trouble. A man with a job and a few acres is one thing; a man with only the few acres as a source of livelihood is something else entirely. (p. 25)

Based on the verdict of the state's electorate in the 1956 primary election, the people of Oklahoma apparently heeded warnings concerning a "back-to-the-land" movement for "40 acres and a Jeep." The return of many citizen-soldiers and sailors to the civilian life at the conclusion of World War II had created a strain on every facet of the social and economic fabric of the United States and the individual States. The demobilization of these men and women from military and naval service, as well as the conversion of national defense industry to peacetime production and the displacement of industrial workers created stress for elected executive officials and legislators and other policy makers. Veterans' affairs in the area of employment, housing, and education were controversial issues faced by these officials. The primary reason for the enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 was its usefulness as a tool for the efficacy of the postwar economy. Vocational education was a useful tool for America to deal with this crisis (Spalding, 2000).

The GI Bill of Rights worked in its intended purpose of assisting in readjusting World War II veterans in their return to civilian life. Ten years after the end of World War II the *Saturday Evening Post* reported that "we licked the veteran problem" (Frank, 1955a, p. 30). Frank (1955b) observed:

Men still wear bronze-star discharge buttons from World War I, but when did you last see a "ruptured duck?" the GI made a more abrupt break with everything smacking of military service because he was more fed up with it, more impatient to make up for lost time (p. 74)

Oklahoma voters seemed to agree when they rejected referenda Veterans' Home and Farm Authority in the next year's primary election. In 1960, a young Naval veteran of the

Battle of the Solomons was elected President of the United States The World War II GIs who returned to civilian life in 1945 and 1946 were now assuming society's most responsible positions that they would dominate until well into the 1990s.

Vocational Education to the Rescue

In the immediate postwar period, vocational education was respected for its behaviorist notions on guidance testing and channeling students into the "right" career. *School Life*, a publication of the Federal Security Administration (1948), examined the connection between guidance and vocational education:

Vocational education also contributes to democracy in helping to choose and develop leaders. By tests and tools, guidance services identify and measure the traits and abilities that are important for developing democratic leadership. Such devices offer means for identifying boys and girls who have these traits. They also help individuals identify and use opportunities, such as committee work, for cooperation and leadership. (p. 5)

Vocational agricultural education for veterans was similar to other agricultural education programs in terms of preparing the veteran-trainees to begin and make progress as farmers, to produce agricultural products efficiently, to market farm products, to manage the business end of the farm, to practice soil and water conservation, to operate proficiently farm machinery, to maintain a suitable farm and home life, and to cooperate in the development of local, state, national and international agricultural policies and programs (Lawson, et al., 1947).

Administration of Vocational Programs in Oklahoma

During the first 24 years of federal aid to vocational education, vocational education programs in Oklahoma were administered by decentralized management administrative bureaucracy. This organizational arrangement evolved as a result of the rise of the administrative state occurring between 1933 and 1945. These changes in public administration were brought on by a) new constituencies seeking the expansion of the responsibilities of government into social and economic affairs, b) the growth of professionalism that emerged within bureaucratic ranks, c) the emergence of an emphasis on strong executive leadership, and d) the nature of federalism that shifted the delivery of policy decisions in economic and social affairs from state and local governments to the national government (Gordon & Milakovich, 1998).

The rise of the American administrative state during the Depression and War years was the latest change, for the time, in the constant growth of government and federal power since the adoption of the Constitution of the United States. These changes and “the existence of the administrative state and reliance on large-scale public administration lie in the policy choice of governments to undertake organizational action themselves to achieve their ultimate political goals” (Rosenbloom & Goldman, 1998, p. 49).

James Q. Wilson’s 1974 study, “The Rise of the Bureaucratic State,” (as cited in Rosenbloom & Goldman, 1998) identifies several primary roots for the evolution of governmental bureaucracies. These primary roots located by Wilson include: a) the development of a reliable postal system; b) the promotion of economic development and

social well-being through governmental action in economic sectors, which led to the creation of “clientele departments” such as the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Education, and Veterans’ Affairs; c) the creation of a large defense establishment to address national emergencies during World War II and the Cold War; and d) the political demands for regulatory activity of such areas as transportation, economic monopolies, consumer products, labor relations and fair employment, and the environment and occupational health.

Changes occurred in the managerial and professional natures of public administration. In 1883, President Chester A. Arthur, a product of the Conkling political patronage machine in New York, signed the Pendleton Act that reformed the Civil Service System and ushered in the era of “merit” public administration (Reeves, 1975). Civil service shifted from political loyalty to professional competency. A political scientist and future president, Woodrow Wilson, in his classic essay, *The Study of Administration*, conceived of the metaphor of a political-administration dichotomy. The dichotomy and the application of the principles of administration based on scientific management during the progressive age and advocated by early public administration scholars like Frank Goodnow, Leonard D. White, William Mosher, Luther Glick and others, became the first phase in the history of public administration in America. The emerging field was complete with the renowned “1313” Public Administration Clearing House (PACH) at the University of Chicago, graduate programs and professional associations, and a debate over a growing discipline separate from political science (Uveges & Keller, 1989).

The political dimension of new constituencies and the demand for government intervention in economic and social affairs intersected with the new professionalism of the public servants changed the intergovernmental relations between the federal government and the states. National economic and social policies were implemented through categorical grants-in-aid from the national government to the states or local government entities. Categorical grants-in-aid were grants of money for narrowly defined projects in a specific policy area such as vocational education, highways or public housing. The dialog between vocationalists or civil engineers or housing officials with similar backgrounds, interests, and professional competencies working in the federal or state or local bureaucracies that administer these policies has altered the nature of federalism to the metaphor “picket-fence federalism” (Gordon & Milakovich, 1998). Former North Carolina Governor Terry Sanford defined the term “picket-fence federalism.” in his 1967 study *Storm over the States*:

The lines of authority, the concerns and interests, the flow of money, and the direction of programs run straight down like a number of pickets stuck into the ground. There is, as in a picket fence, a connecting cross slat, buth that does little to support anything. In this metaphor it stands for the governments. It holds the pickets in line; it does not bring them together. The picket-line programs are not connected at the bottom. (as cited in Gordon & Milakovich, 1998, p. 95)

The Depression and War years were not only an impetus for strengthening the role of executive branch of the national and state governments, and the presidency in particular, but this era also spawned a corps of public entrepreneurs. Bureaucratic leaders, such as Hyman Rickover, J. Edgar Hoover, and Robert Moses, the men who christened

the nuclear navy, built the F.B.I., and created the New York transportation and park systems. These public servants share key leadership characteristics of using the agency to achieve their vision, dominate the media and become associated in the public's mind as the personification of the agency, and constantly devise ways to expand their program (Rosenbloom & Goldman, 1998).

Each of these elements contributing to a shift in public administration during the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt found its way into the development of the Oklahoma Board for Vocational Education. Following enactment of the Smith-Hughes Act by Congress on February 23, 1917, the Oklahoma Legislature passed the Act of Acceptance (Session Laws 1917). The Act of Acceptance created the State Board for Vocational Education. The Board was chaired by the President of the State Board of Education, who also served as the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The other members of the Board included the president of the State Board of Agriculture, and the presidents of the State University (OU) and the president of the Agricultural and Mechanical College (OAMC). A fifth member of the Board was appointed by the Governor who served as the State Board's Executive Secretary (Session Laws 1917).

Four fundamental ideas of state-federal relations provided the basis for a plan of cooperation for the promotion of vocational education between the Federal government and the Oklahoma State Board for Vocational Education. These ideas included:

1. that vocational education being essential to the national welfare, it is a function of the National Government to stimulate the states to develop and maintain this service;

2. that Federal funds are required to adjust equitably among the states the burden to provide this service;
3. that since the Federal Government is vitally interested in the success of vocational education, it should, so to speak, secure a degree of participation in this work; and
4. that only by creating such a relationship between the Federal Government and the several states can better and more uniform standards of education efficiency be set up. (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1956, p. 74)

In 1929, the Oklahoma State Legislature transferred the functions of the State Board for Vocational Education to the State Board of Education and designated the State Superintendent for Public Instruction as the Director of Vocational Education (Session Laws 1929). By 1931, the State Department of Education contained three “vocational education divisions” - agricultural, home economics, and trade and industry education - each with a state supervisor who reported to the State Superintendent (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1931). This transfer of oversight for a complex educational program from a part-time boards to a professionally-staffed administrative agency was consistent with the centralization of the administrative state that occurred during the progressive age (Krug, 1964).

In 1941, the Oklahoma Legislature enacted a comprehensive reorganization of the State Board of Education. H.B. 168 divided the State Department into eleven divisions, including a “Division of Vocational Education.” The Act amended the Act of Acceptance authorizing the State Board for Vocational Education to appoint a Director of Vocational Education. The three federally-funded vocational education programs in Oklahoma

authorized under Smith-Hughes Act, along with a new division for distributive education, were consolidated within the State Department of Education (Session Laws 1941). The Legislature placed the Vocational Rehabilitation Division which administered programs for the disabled within the Vocational Education Division (Session Laws 1949).

James Barney Perky: Agricultural Educator and Entrepreneur

Also in 1941, the State Board of Education, under the authority of H.B. 168, appointed James Barney Perky, the state's supervisor of agricultural education, to fill the position of Director of Vocational Education (Tyson, 1974). Perky was an example of the "bureaucratic entrepreneurs" of his generation who built massive government agencies, centralization that resulted from the impulses of scientific management and the new functions of government imposed by progressive reforms (Lewis, 1980). He was an imposing man of six feet, eight inches, who would dominate and build a state institution over the next quarter century. A native of Cleburne, Texas, Perky moved as a child with his family to Oklahoma City. He was graduated from Central High School in Oklahoma City in 1921. That fall he matriculated at the University of Wisconsin and was graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in Agriculture. Perky subsequently enrolled in the University of Wisconsin's Graduate College and was awarded the Master of Science degree in Agriculture (Goble, 2003).

Political savvy was one of Perky's strongest assets. He cultivated strong ties with members of the Oklahoma Legislature, and he was close friends with the state's Governors. Perky had especially close ties with Governor Roy J. Turner personally

through personal ranching business transactions, and professionally because of the Governor's sponsorship of the Annual Turner Field Day and Judging Contest for 4-H, Future Farmers of America (FFA), and Young Farmers' Association (YSA) at Turner's Hereford Heaven Ranch near Sulphur, Oklahoma (Hansen, personal communication, March 16, 2005).

In other political activities, Perky maintained an agency "flower fund" whose proceeds were used to help pay the campaign expenses of politicians who were friends of vocational education (Bellmon, personal communication, February 8, 2005). Perky encouraged the political ambitions of vocational agricultural teachers across the state to serve in the state legislature or local elected offices (Hansen, personal communication, March 30, 2005).

First and foremost, Perky was a professional agricultural educator. Throughout his career at the State Division of Vocational Education, Perky showed strong favoritism toward the vocational education agency's agricultural education division. He continued to serve in the dual capacity of both director and as supervisor of the organization's Division of Agricultural Education. He had the reputation in the agency as favoring agricultural education while "tolerating the rest." He was derisive of the mission of other divisions within the agency and frequently referred to the Distributive Education Division at the State Board's as the "division of collar buttons and bows" (Hansen, personal communication, April 15, 2002).

Perky practiced a traditional top-down, hierarchical management style at the Oklahoma State Division of Vocational Education. His management style included

obtaining all available information on issues, listening to the advice of his subordinates, and making clear-cut decisions (Stewart, 1982).

Henry Garland Bennett: Education Entrepreneur

When Perky first arrived at the State Agricultural Education Division in 1931 he quickly befriended another bureaucratic entrepreneur, the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College President Henry Garland Bennett (OAMC). Bennett was a dominant political figure during the first half of the 20th century and many Oklahoma schoolmen sought his support and counsel “which ensured [their] success in state school politics” (Corbett, 1982, p. 135). Perky and Bennett had a mutual interest in consolidating agricultural education efforts in a state where “agriculture is our basic industry” (State Board of Education for Oklahoma, 1952).

Bennett became President of OAMC in 1928, thanks in no small part to having been the college-roommate with the Lieutenant Governor of Oklahoma, William Judson Holloway, who helped Bennett overcome the concerns of the State Board of Agriculture over Bennett’s ability to govern a the land-grant college (Hanson, 1983). A native of Arkansas, Bennett was graduated from Ouachita College and earned the Doctor of Education degree from the Teachers’ College at Columbia University. He served as a school superintendent before becoming President at Southeastern State Teachers College in Durant. A prominent Baptist layman, Henry Bennett, like Perky, was an entrepreneurial administrator who was adept at navigating the labyrinth of bureaucracy

and Oklahoma politics. By the time of Perky's appointment as Director of Vocational Education, Bennett had survived three Oklahoma governors (Boggs, 1992).

When the State Division of Vocational Education was moved to Stillwater, Bennett saw an opportunity to extend his influence into vocational education. Since the 1900s a debate had raged between normal schools (later called teachers colleges) and the land-grant institutions over the appropriate venue for teacher training (Herren & Edwards, 1996).

Like Perky, Henry Bennett made use of political allies and contact in the case of locating Division of Vocational Education on the OAMC, an unlikely political in the person of the state's Governor William H. (Alfalfa Bill) Murray. Governor Murray took office in the dark days of the Great Depression. Alfalfa Bill Murray used the full executive power of the governor's office to face the crisis of the Depression confronting the state, including convening interstate conferences, issuing executive orders, and calling up the Oklahoma National Guard. Alfalfa Bill incurred the wrath of well-educated progressive Oklahomans for because of his reactionary attitude toward appropriations for the state's system of higher education (Bilger, 1983).

Murray was not ignorant and "in spite of own very limited contact with public education, he felt competent to give advice on the fields of study to be taught at colleges and universities and unabashedly denounced the teaching of sociology, for instance, as superfluous" (Bilger, 1983, p 58). He was the first farmer (and constitutional scholar) to run for governor. During a sabbatical from politics in the 1920s he founded a agricultural colony in Bolivia. As the Speaker of the House of Representatives during the First

Oklahoma legislative general assembly, Murray worked for passage of an agricultural education bill

... requiring the teaching of the elements of agriculture, horticulture, stock feeding, and domestic science in the public schools; to create a harmonious system of agriculture and industrial education for Oklahoma; to provide for the establishment of departments of agricultural instruction in the state normal school and for the chair of agriculture for schools in the Agricultural and Mechanical College; and to provide for the establishment and maintenance of agricultural schools of secondary grade in each Supreme Court Judicial District with branch agricultural experimental stations and short courses for farmers. (Session Laws, 1907-1908)

The following year, the state legislature appropriated funds for opening and named the district school of agriculture in Tishomingo in Murray's honor (Session Laws, 1909).

Bennett's Land-Grant college in Stillwater for the industrial class and farmers must have appealed to the Governor. During his administration Murray signed an executive order entitled the "Memorandum of Agreement by and between the State Department of Vocational Education and the Oklahoma A. & M. College Relative to State Supervision and Teacher Training in the Several Fields of Vocational Education." The memorandum authorized OAMC to provide office space for the State Division of Vocational Education, pay one-half of the salaries plus the support services for a "resident and itinerant teacher training service." Murray's agreement offered courses for the training of

... city superintendents and high school principals, supervisors of agricultural education and trade and industrial education vocational agricultural teachers, trade and industrial teachers, commercial teachers, and related subject teachers , including: teachers of science...drawing...mathematics...social science. (Oklahoma Dept. of Vocational Education & O.A.M.C.--Memorandum of Agreement, n.d., Presidents' Papers Collection No. 70-005, Box 15, Folder 26, Special Collections and University Archives, Oklahoma State University Libraries).

Bennett had scored a double victory. First, he claimed leadership for the land-grant college in the expanding field of vocational education. Second, in the depths of the Great Depression, Bennett found a source of state and federal funds from the State Department of Vocational Education. And finally, Bennett seemed to be the only college president who found favor with Governor "Alfalfa Bill" Murray (Bilger, 1983).

Later in the 1930s, Bennett attempted to secure \$450,000 in funding from the U.S. Interior Department's Federal Emergency Administration for Public Works (P.W.A.) in 1938 to build "a classroom and laboratory building for vocational and rural education" at OAMC. The building was

...designed to house the departments of Vocational Agriculture, Vocational Home Economics Education, Rural Education, and Trades and Industrial Arts Education. These departments are charged with training teachers for lines of work indicated in the department names given above and for specific services to agriculture and engineering in the way of training teachers and specialists for carrying on work of the type indicated throughout the state. (PWA grant application O-135, September

8, 1938, Presidents' Papers Collection 70-005, Box 17, Folder 5, Special Collections and University Archives, Oklahoma State University Libraries)

The following year the acting U.S. Commissioner for Public Works returned the application to Bennett. An accompanying letter explained "Congress has now adjourned without taking any action which would authorize the [P.W.A.] to make further allotments" (E.W. Clark to Henry G. Bennett, September 9, 1939) for the project. A building dedicated to serving the purposes of "vocational and rural education" at OAMC was never built.

Locating the Division of Vocational Education on the OAMC campus in Stillwater proved to be both beneficial to the agency and the college. As Hansen (personal communication, February 16, 2005) observed:

Well, there was a wooden building just west of Life Science One – and they had built that building back in–in the thirties when Doctor Bennett slated Mr. Perky and the state board – at that time, the state board was vocational education – and moved this operation to Stillwater, and the university was benefiting at that time from teacher training, staff, and agriculture and home economics, T&I [trade and industrial] and BE [business education]. So Mr. Perky didn't mind at all getting away from Oklahoma City. And so, they built – Dr. Bennett had a building built. It set this way adjacent [parallel] to Monroe. So when this other program started and it grew like top seed, well, the University built an "L" to the ag–vocational ag building. That was done in '46.

The State Division of Vocational Education developed out of a lay board originally organized to implement the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 on the state-level. By

the late 1920s, as the responsibilities of administering a federal program became more complex, it evolved into a professionally-managed agency and staffed by trained personnel using the principles of public administration. Oklahoma vocational education in the interwar period was dominated by vocational agricultural education because the state was dominated by the agricultural industry. As a result, the agency developed close ties to Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College whose governance had close ties to the industry leaders and organizations, and who wished to further the mission of the state land-grant college.

War-time National Defense Classes in Vocational Agriculture

World War II began on September 1, 1939, with the invasion of Poland by Nazi Germany. While the United States observed a foreign policy of isolationism prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, President Roosevelt and Congress pursued a strategy of national defense in preparation for the possibility of war.

One strategy was preparing workers through vocational training programs for occupations essential to the national defense industry. Federal grants were made to the states to cover the costs of this training through a series of laws passed by Congress called Vocational Education for National Defense (VEND). Congress approved the first such act (P.L. 76-668) on June 27, 1940, to provide appropriations for Supplemental Courses for employed workers during off work hours, and Pre-Employment-Refresher Courses for unemployed adults. On October 9, 1940, Congress passed a \$10,000,000 appropriations measure (P.L. 76-812, H.R. 10539) to provide equipment and supplies for

Out-of School Rural and Non-rural Youth through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941. A total of 245,511 persons participated in this program. Finally, additional appropriations (P.L. 77-146, H.R. 4926) totaling \$15 million were enacted by Congress to provide vocational courses for Rural and Non-Rural Youth (Bowen, Bruening, & Hall, 2003)

The supplemental and pre-employment classes were intended as trade and industrial education courses for occupations in war industrial plants, such as lathe operators, machinists, and welders. Dr. John W. Studebaker, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, in testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives subcommittee of Committee on Appropriations, defined these courses as:

Supplementary...taken by people already at work who came back to the schools for 15 to 20 hours a week to get some training supplementary to their employment. A pre-employment course is a full-time course of about 40 hours a week, taken by those persons who would go into the plants to work...refresher courses, we now call pre-employment...because large numbers of people are persons who have not previously learned the skill. (H.J.Res. 316 House Hearings, 1942, p. 8)

By 1942 war industrial training was not the only training needed for the national emergency. Industrial employment and The Draft depleted the nation's population of farm boys. Initiatives were needed in rural America to increase agricultural production. Continuing his testimony that day, Commissioner Studebaker told the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee of the need for agricultural training for the national defense effort:

In certain communities up to this time there has been a surplus of youth for farm needs and those youth were very eager to have training to get them into industry, the picture has now changed to such a point that it is probable that with the increased demands for food there is no surplus of farm labor. Therefore we need now to put into that community a different kind of training program that will keep the youth on the farms. (H.J. Res. 316, House Hearing, 1942, p. 33)

Several days later, Studebaker explained to a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee of the U.S. Senate the need for the agricultural training appropriation of:

...\$15,000,000 in which to open up a large number of farm shops in rural regions, to make some kind of training in mechanics available to relatively isolated young people out in the farm regions. (H.J. Res. 316 Senate Hearing, 1942, p. 10)

The Pre-employment National Defense Training Program for Rural and Non-rural Youth (OSY Program, Public Law [P.L.] 77-647, H.R. 7181) was made available to adults on July 1, 1942. The revised program (OSYA) included both commodity and farm mechanics courses. In 1943, the Congress appropriated \$12.5 million (P.L. 78-135, H.R. 2935) for the further expansion of the program which was then called Rural War Production Training (RWPT). A final appropriation (P.L. 78-373) of \$10.5 million for Food Production War Training was authorized by Congress in 1944 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945 (Blaine, Bruening, & Hall, 2003).

The Federal Security Agency (F.S.A.) (1946) reported that from the beginning of the rural war-training programs on December 1, 1940, until their close-out on May 31, 1945, there were a national total of 4,188,552 enrollments in 195,217 courses. Of the

total enrollments, food processing courses accounted for over 1.5 million enrollments, or 36.1 percent; farm machinery classes had more than 1.2 million students or 29 percent; shop, including auto mechanics, metal work, woodworking, and electricity courses, had 785,201 enrollees, or 19.6 percent; food production or commodity courses, were 12.8 percent; and 104,324 students were enrolled in farm worker training, or 2.5 percent. In Oklahoma, 4,470 students were enrolled in pre-employment courses and 822 workers were students in supplementary courses at 50 schools in 30 cities under the provisions of Public Law 668 during fiscal year 1942 (H.J. Res. 316 House Hearings, 1942).

State Administration of War Production Training Programs

The federal government, through the U.S. Office of Education within the F.S.A., provided grants to the states to finance the war training programs. Established on April 25, 1939, by the President's Reorganization Plan I, under the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 561; 5 U.S.C. 133), the F.S.A. encompassed all federal health, education, and welfare organizations, including the New Deal "alphabet soup" emergency relief agencies – the Civilian Conservation Corps (C.C.C.), the Works Progress Administration (W.P.A.), and the National Youth Administration (N.Y.A.). These federal work relief agencies conducted vocational training programs during the Depression emergency years of the Roosevelt Administration. Across the nation and in Oklahoma, the W.P.A. conducted a variety of early childhood and adult education programs (Otey, 1984) As the national defense emergency intensified, and war production training got underway, the relief agencies, as Senate Appropriations Chairman

Kenneth Douglas McKellar (D-TN) observed, “were doing the same thing, except that they [were] not doing it in connection with the state, but on their own account” (H.J. Res. 316, Senate, 1942, p. 2) until the agencies were phased out in late 1943.

The Office of Education within the F.S.A. implemented the war production legislation and was responsible for dispersing the grant money to state agencies and monitoring their activities. State Boards for Vocational Education were given responsibility for administration of war-time training programs (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1942).

In Oklahoma, the State Board for Vocational Education assigned oversight of war-time training programs to existing subdivisions within the agency. Responsibility for administration of vocational training of war production workers was given to the Trade and Industrial Education (T & I) Division.

The largest war production training school in Oklahoma was the Engineering, Science, Management, War Training (E.S.M.W.T.) Program that President Henry G. Bennett conducted at Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College (Rulan, 1979). Approximately 6,000 persons were trained in vocational and first-year college-level courses in engineering drawing, industrial drafting, physics, chemistry, inspection, and production control. Graduates of the E.S.M.W.T. Program at OAMC found jobs through the Midwest Procurement District of the U.S. Army Air Forces Materiel Command at the Douglas Aircraft Company and the Oklahoma City Air Depot (now Tinker Air Force Base) and at aircraft plants in Fort Worth, Wichita, Tulsa, Dallas, Kansas City, New Orleans, and Omaha (ESMWT War Production Training Report, 1943, Presidential

Papers Collection 70-005, Box 42, Folder 10 Special Collections and University Archives, Oklahoma State University Libraries).

The agricultural RWTP/FPWT programs were supervised by the staff of the Vocational Agriculture program. The T & I staff consisted of one state supervisor and two assistant supervisors, plus a clerical staff of one bookkeeper and three secretaries. The Vocational Agriculture Division had a much larger staff that included the state supervisor, the assistant supervisor, four district supervisors, the executive secretary of the Future Farmers of America (FFA), a field auditor, two secretaries, five stenographers, and a clerk (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1944).

Food Production War Training courses were conducted through local public school districts. The funding was paid to the school boards as disbursements for allowable expenses from the State Board for Vocational Education. The individual public schools recruited students, hired instructors, provided classroom space, furnished equipment and supplies, and filed reports and financial statements to the State Board (Ekstrom & McClelland, 1952).

The Oklahoma State Division of Vocational Education was involved in war-time defense training programs. As the state's vocational education agency, the Vocational Education Division was mandated by the federal legislation to administer federal grant programs for both agriculture and industry war-time vocational training. The war production training programs were merged into existing function divisions of the State agency which had expertise in the subject areas of War Production Training programs. Finally, the War Production Training programs provided experience to the Oklahoma

State Division of Vocational Education in managing large-scale adult education programs.

Lessons Learned from War-Training Programs

Ekstrom and McClelland (1952) concluded that postwar adult vocational education programs were able to draw several lessons from the OSY/RWTP/FPWT programs. These lessons included justification of adult work, making possible multi-class programs, leadership capitalization, the use of special teachers, the enlargement of vocational agriculture departments, the immediate application of instruction, the popularity of farm mechanics, school-community service, the addition of instructional facilities, and inter-agency cooperation. The lessons are discussed briefly below:

- War-training programs justified adult vocational education. Before World War II, vocational agricultural teachers concentrated on all-day classes and considered adult farmer education an extracurricular activity. Wartime training caused educators to shift their emphasis toward adult vocational topics. As Dr. Robert Price, the current chairman emeritus of the Oklahoma State University Department of Agricultural Education, stated on the evolution of adult farm education:

... but the thing that, as I reflect on the development of the program, when the program started in Oklahoma we had part-time, there was mostly adults, but we had very little interest in it among

the [state] supervisors. (Price, personal communication, October 7, 2003

- The experience with war-time programs demonstrated that multi-class programs were possible. Less than 10,000 adult and young farmer classes were taught in federally-funded secondary vocational agriculture departments the year before Pearl Harbor. Two years later, in 1943, nearly 67,000 RWPT courses were offered (U.S. Office of Education, 1946). These were taught or supervised by vocational agriculture teachers who found it possible to conduct more than one adult class per period.
- War-time programs developed a cadre of adult farm education leaders. The sheer numbers of course offerings forced agriculture teachers “to serve largely as supervisors and direct the work of others in the organization and teaching of the courses deemed necessary by the government” (Ekstrom & McClelland, 1952, 32).
- Use of special teachers. Before World War II, teachers of vocational agriculture were educated in college teacher training programs and certified. The extent and immediacy of war-time training made it necessary to look outside this traditional structure. Dr. Price (personal communication, October 7, 2003), who served as the vocational agriculture teacher in a rural community in western Oklahoma during World War II, commented:

For instance, ah, we had a cooking school...that canned a tremendous amount of stuff. And we hired a woman that was

pretty good in canning...and a blacksmith or a person that was pretty good [for the farm mechanics course].

Mechanics and other tradesmen were utilized in teaching farm mechanics classes. Successful farmers were drafted into teaching commodity classes. The lack of teacher training did manifest itself in class discussions that tended to wander and what were typified by one informant as “bull sessions” (Bellmon, personal communication, January 25, 2005).

- War programs created a demand for the enlargement of agricultural education departments. The use of the agricultural teachers as supervisors demonstrated to school administrators the need for assigning teachers to adult education duties. Specialized areas such as farm mechanics necessitated the need for an instructor in that specialization who would then devote the remainder of his time to adult programs.
- Application of instruction. The war situation encouraged the immediate use of principles and practices learned in the classroom. Instructors and their students engaged these lessons in supervised farm experiences. Food was processed and canned, terraces were built, tractors and other machinery were built.
- The popularity of farm mechanics. Farms rapidly mechanized during the interwar period. World War II imposed production limits on all vehicle manufacturing except for those essential to the war effort. Machinery classes were very popular and suggested that farmers were interested in maintenance and repair of their equipment. Farmers would enroll in agricultural

engineering courses for the opportunity to repair machinery or do construction jobs on their farms.

- School-community service. War training programs emphasized school-community projects such as canning and machinery repair, and used such projects as opportunities for cooperative education. Dr. Price served as an agriculture teacher in Hitchcock during World War II. The Hitchcock High School sponsored a FPWT program that included a school cannery and farm machinery repair operation. The school-community education program had as many as 19 combines awaiting repair. The cannery was in continuous operation. One of the problems of the program was competition with existing farm implement dealers and the attitude of community members that the FPWT program was a repair service rather than an educational activity (Price, personal communication, October 7, 2003).
- The addition of instructional facilities. Because of the nature of war training courses and war-time travel restrictions, courses were offered in facilities away from the main school, such as rural schools, community halls, and farm houses. The success of adult classes indicated to school leaders the need for expanded classrooms and lab facilities.
- Cooperation with other agencies. War-time adult farm education courses brought vocational agriculture teachers into contact with a variety of external organizations and encouraged interagency coordination. The programs encouraged further cooperation with the Agricultural Extension Service. Before the War, vocational agriculture-extension cooperation was often the

subject of considerable misunderstanding and jealousy due to each organization's operation under separate pieces of federal legislation and because the former was an arm of the community school, while the latter was a county-based agency (Hamlin, 1949). Disputes were often taken to the highest level and generally involved participation of secondary vocational agricultural students in 4-H extension activities, the relationship of county agents to adult farm education courses at community schools, and competition between 4-H and FFA boys at county fairs (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1964). The defense programs created a climate for cooperation with community agricultural organizations such as general farmers' organizations, farm cooperatives, groups operating rural telephone lines and artificial insemination projects, mutual insurance associations, soil conservation districts, rural electrification cooperatives, and the like. The war-time program also brought the agriculture departments into contact with federal and state agencies outside of agriculture, including war production boards and federal employment offices (Ekstrom & McClelland, 1952).

The VEND training programs made significant contributions to the growth of the State Division of Vocational Education. Thousands of Oklahomans trained for essential national defense production jobs through trade and industry and engineering courses held at OAMC. As important to a farm state like Oklahoma were the agricultural education courses held at local high schools under the FPWT Program. Early in World War II, Congress recognized the importance of keeping farmers "down on the farm" and keeping a steady production of agricultural commodities. War Production Board food rationing

and restrictions on automotive and implement manufacturing made it imperative that Americans conserve all products. The FPWT program accomplished this community service by helping farmers in their local communities can home grown horticultural commodities and maintain their farm machinery. Finally, on a programmatic level, the State Division of Vocational Education and community school agricultural education departments learned valuable lessons on managing large-scale adult education programs.

Creating the Institutional On-Farm Training Program

Training for veteran farmers was informed by experiences gained from agricultural education courses provided under a series legislation called Vocational Education for the National Defense (VEND) passed for the emergency to deal with vocational training needs of defense industries. Veterans' farm training programs were established through the disabled veterans' rehabilitation legislation (Public Law 78-16) and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the so-called G.I. Bill of Rights (P.L. 78-346). Based upon a study of the World War I on-the-farm training rehabilitation program, a policy was developed in 1943 for training disabled veterans under P.L. 78-16. The policy provided that the training course had to contain elements so clearly appropriate to the employment objective that "successful completion of the course would indicate satisfactory employability in the chosen occupation" (H.R. 2181, 1947, 8). The institutional on-the-farm training program had the following elements:

1. the veteran taking the training had to have control of the operation of the farm and an ownership or tenure arrangement;

2. the farm had to be of sufficient size and suitable for farm management for that type of farming;
3. a veterans' agricultural training committee consisting of representatives of vocational agricultural and U.S. Department of Agriculture agency personnel in the area, leading farmers and representatives of other qualified institutions were to be impaneled for the purpose of providing guidance to the veteran in technical matters;
4. the institution would provide instruction in school for 200 hours per year, and at least eight hours per month;
5. instructors would engage the trainee in supervised agricultural experiences on the trainee's farm for 100 hours per year and visit the farm twice a month;
6. between visits by the instructor, the veteran trainee would complete assignments related to the operation of the farm;
7. the course of study would be individual and follow a farm and home plan particular to the trainees farm; and
8. the farm and home plan would cover a complete livestock cycle of 12 months and include a financial statement, budget of income and expenses, schedule of production and disposal of farm products, inventory of livestock, equipment, and supplies, and statement of family living for a period of up to four years (U.S. Congress. House, 1947).

The G.I. Bill (P.L. 78-346) extended the same on-farm training benefit to all veterans in the same training institution. However, in Veterans' Administration Instruction No. 8, dated August 27, 1946, Veterans' Administrator, General Omar N.

Bradley, classified institutional on-farm training as part-time instruction. This reclassification of instruction of veterans' on-farm training was needed, in Bradley's opinion, because the veteran trainee while working on the farm was not under the direct instruction or direct supervision of the instructor. The farmer only worked with the instructor for two hours per week in the classroom and for an hour per week in supervised agricultural experience (SAE) meetings at the farmer's operation. An industrial worker in an on-the-job training program, by contrast, was being instructed or supervised by the factory employer on a full-time, 40 hour per week, basis. The full monthly subsistence allowance for farmer-trainees of \$65 for trainees with no dependents or \$100 for trainees with dependents was reduced to \$10.25 per month and \$22.50 per month, respectively (H.R. 2181, 1947).

The V.A. Instruction of August 27, 1946, reclassifying veterans' on-the-farm training to part-time instruction and reducing veteran-trainees' subsistence allowance, created a political firestorm in farm states only two months before the 1946 congressional by-elections. According to Grant (2002):

The post-World War II era represented a kind of watershed in American society. Following a decade of hard times in the Great Depression and the uncertain years of war, Americans in the late 1940s and early 1950s looked forward to rebuilding their lives. The struggle to abandon old ways of handling domestic problems was played out in the political arena as voters began to turn out the Old Guard conservatives and to elect increasing numbers of younger, progressive men. (p. 132)

In Oklahoma, Governor Robert S. Kerr, a partisan Democrat, was concerned about the volatile veterans' vote. The previous winter as soldiers and their families clamored to "bring the boys home," Kerr had received a letter from a Shady Point couple who wrote the governor "as one Democrat to another." The couple's son was serving as a Marine in China. The Marine's wife and children had been living with the couple in Shady Point since he had gone off to war. He was now requesting the couple "to stamp a Republican ticket straight through if they cared anything about him", because "he was fed up with the way things are going and so were the rest of the boys, especially the dads." The couple urged the governor to "send the fathers home" (Mr. and Mrs. J. T. Nixon to R. S. Kerr, February 18, 1946. Carl Albert Congressional Research Center, University of Oklahoma, Robert S. Kerr Collection, Gubernatorial Series, Box 15, Folder 1).

Now, Kerr's closest advisers fretted about the effect that the V.A. Instruction might have on the veterans voting Republican in the fall. Milt Phillips, the new State Director of Veterans' Affairs Commission and an influential Seminole publisher who knew his way around Oklahoma politics, wrote to Kerr:

Perky is set to chop it [Veterans Agricultural Training Program] if General Bradley orders the cut back effective at once...for gosh sake, if the President can't have Bradley change this thing permanently, have him hold off making the agriculture cut back effective until Jan. 1. (Milt Phillips to R. S. Kerr, September 23, 1946. Carl Albert Center. University of Oklahoma. Robert S. Kerr Collection, Gubernatorial Series, box 15, folder 2)

Phillips assured the Governor, “I have typed this myself – only Harvey [Black], Jim [Perky], and Mel [all members of the State Accrediting Agency]...have copies” (Milt Phillips to R. S. Kerr, September 23, 1946.).

Having recently returned from serving as the commander of American ground troops in European Theater of Operations, General Bradley, had not met such resistance since the landing at Omaha Beach. Later, General Bradley admitted in a letter to Senator Robert A. Taft (R-OH), the Chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee:

Immediately following the issuance of the directive referred to above, opposition was voiced by persons interested in the program. In line with these objections and the suggestions from Members of Congress, the directive was rescinded, in this regard, on September 25, 1946, until such time as the particular question might be considered by Congress. (H.R. 2181, 1947, p.8)

Such action anticipated by Bradley was taken the following year by the incoming 80th Congress. During the interim, students in institutional on-farm training continued to receive the full allowance and schools were paid the full tuition charges. The V.A. continued to believe the rescinded directive was “a sound administrative measure” (9). The agency estimated that it would reduce the cost of training per 100,000 trainees from \$117.2 million to \$48,345,000 per year (H.R. 2181, Senate, 1947).

The 80th Congress did not waste time in responding to General Bradley’s directive. Representative William McDonald (Don) Wheeler (D-GA), a 31 year old Air Force veteran and farmer, introduced H.R. 2181, an act relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans. Similar bills were introduced and Congressman Wheeler called the

veterans' farm training program "a much needed back-to-the-farm movement in that it allows veterans to get technical agricultural training...without the necessity of going to a regular agricultural school" (H.R. 2181, Congr. Rec. 93, 1947, p. 5057). The bill amended Veterans Regulation [no.] 1 by adding the term "institutional on-farm training" and specified standards for the operation of the program by states and communities (H.R. 2181, Senate 1947, p. 10).

On May 12, 1947, the House of Representatives considered and passed H.R. 2181 by a voice vote. The bill moved to the Senate where Senator Taft opposed it based on General Bradley's position that it was an abuse of the education allowance provisions of the G.I. Bill of Rights and its administrative regulations.

The bill then went to the U.S. Senate where it was opposed by Senator Robert Taft, nicknamed "Mr. Republican" because of his opposition to New Deal programs. H.R. 2181 was heard by the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, chaired by Senator Wayne Morse (R-OR) of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on June 9-12, 1947. On July 25, 1947, the Senate rejected by a vote of 31-45 a motion by Senator Taft to recommit the bill. The legislation was then passed by the U.S. Senate by voice vote. H.R. 2181 went back to the chamber of origin for final passage, where the House of Representatives then passed the bill. On August 6, 1947, President Harry Truman signed the legislation into law. The stage was now set for the full implementation of the veterans' farm training program (Congressional Quarterly Service, 1965).

Korean War Veterans

The Korean War began on June 25, 1950, with an invasion of the Republic of Korea (ROK - South Korea) by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK – North Korea). Korean War veterans were not covered by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. Soldiers from the Oklahoma National Guard's 45th Infantry Division were activated on September 1, 1950, and sent into combat in Korea on December 28, 1951, to replace the 1st Cavalry Division. As the Korean Conflict dragged on into its second year, families of soldiers began asking Congress if "something is being passed that will help them finish school, start farming, or get started in business" (Robert G. Wilson to Robert S. Kerr, March 5, 1952, Walters, Oklahoma. Carl Albert Center. University of Oklahoma. Robert S. Kerr Collection, Legislative Series, Box 30, Folder 29).

The Teague Committee, a congressional investigating body, was impaneled in 1951 to examine the operations of the Veterans' Administration educational and home loan program. The committee's concern was over "training of poor quality or 'blind alley' training [which] should be guarded against by appropriate provisions" (Investigation of Veterans' Educational Program, 1951, p. 1278). The committee gave the VA's handling of on-farm training a pass in its report *Investigation of Veterans' Educational Program* (1951).

The veterans' agricultural training program was extended in 1952 to accommodate veterans of the Korean War who served in the armed services between June 27, 1950 and January 31, 1955 (Phipps, 1956). The training program's extension

was a result of the passage by Congress of Public Law 550, Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (Veterans' institutional on-farm training, 1955).

One other subsequent congressional hearing was held in July 1955 by the Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee. This hearing was on legislation authored by Senator Lister Hill (D-AL) concerning the education and training allowances paid to Korean War veterans pursuing institution on-farm training (Veterans' Institutional On-Farm Training, 1955).

The Oklahoma G.I. Bill Institutional On-Farm Training Program

The Veterans Agricultural Training Program (VATP) was created to meet the requirements for veterans' institutional on-farm training under the provisions of the G.I. Bill of Rights. VATP replaced the loosely organized on-the-job training program which functioned under a farmer-trainer. In many cases the farmer trainer was the trainee's father or other relative (Stewart, 1982).

In May 1946, the Oklahoma State Department of Education assumed responsibility for administration of the Veterans Agricultural Training Program in Oklahoma. The State Department of Education operated under the direction of the State Board of Education, a six member board appointed by the Governor of Oklahoma for six year terms. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction was a constitutional officer of the state elected by people of Oklahoma for a four year term. The State Superintendent served as chairman of the Board of Education and was the chief executive officer of the

State Department of Education, the Board's administrative arm (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1948).

In 1946, the year the Veterans' Administration recognized the Division of Vocational Education as the state agency to cooperate with the VA in administering veterans' farm training, A. L. Crable was the State Superintendent for Public Instruction. Crable was a close associate of OAMC President Bennett and both men had been implicated the previous year in a textbook scandal that resulted in their indictment. Crable would be impeached but not removed from office by the Oklahoma State Legislature, although the fall out from the scandal contributed to his resounding defeat by Oliver S. Hodge in the 1946 Democratic Run-off Primary Election. (Oklahoma State Election Board, 1994).

The State Department of Education in 1946 contained the Office of the State Superintendent for Public Instruction and had agency divisions for Adult Education, Certification, Curriculum, Examination and Inspection, Finance, Health Education, Research, School House Planning, Transportation, Vocational Education, and Vocational Rehabilitation. Since segregation of public schools, and every other aspect of social life in Oklahoma, was still enforced in the years immediately after World War II, the State Department of Education employed an Agent for "Negro Schools" (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1946). The Vocational Education Divisions were centralized under Director Perky's office on the OAMC campus in Stillwater. However, each of the agency's functional divisions were scattered about throughout central Oklahoma. The Agricultural Education, Distributive Education, and the VATP Divisions were located in the State Division's building at OAMC, the Home Economics Education Division

quartered in the State Capitol, while the T & I Division was housed in the old N.R.A. Building on West Sixth Street in Stillwater (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1954).

The program became a division within the State Division of Vocational Education. The Board of Vocational Education consisted of the State Superintendent and six members who were also appointed for a term of six years by the governor of the state. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction served as president of the Board. The State Board for Vocational Education had policy oversight for activities of the Division of Vocational Education (Oklahoma State Division of Vocational Education, 1949).

The VATP joined the agency's subdivisions for agricultural education, home economics, distributive education, trade and industrial education, and vocational rehabilitation. Mr. Perky appointed Bonnie Nicholson, the Assistant State Vocational Agriculture Supervisor, as Director of the VATP division. Nicholson appointed Earl C. May as Assistant State Supervisor of the VATP. The VATP Division grew so rapidly that by 1947 it warranted an additional assistant supervisor, and Cecil D. Maynard was employed to fill that position. G. J. Dippold was appointed the teacher trainer in 1946 (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1946, 1948).

State Veterans' Agricultural Training Program Staff

The Veterans Agricultural Training Program (VATP) was a boost to the state agency. In 1945, the annual expenditures of the agency were \$250,000. By 1948 the agency's budget had increased to \$3.5 million dollars. The program became so complex

by 1947 that an auditing division was created, and S. D. Center and Larry O. Hansen were hired as field auditors (Tyson, 1974). There were six district supervisors – Marvin Anderson, Dale Dupy, William R. Hare, Carl Smith, Velden Swigart, and Oris Taylor - and a clerical staff consisting of a chief clerk, a chief clerk for finance and auditing, an enrollment chief clerk, eight secretaries, and a file clerk and mimeograph operator in 1946 (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1946).

The veterans' farm training program was a popular program. The following year, 1947, new hires at the VATP included a subject matter specialist, eleven more secretaries, a supply clerk, a Vari-Typer operator, a mail clerk, a PBX operator, and six additional district supervisors – Clifford Burton, Foreman Carlile, John A. Hightower, Jack R. Houser, Von H. Long, Howard Richardson, Murl R. Rogers, Sewell G. Skelton, and Carl L. Smith - and the supervisor for Negroes, Samuel E. Fuhr. The addition of new district supervisors was an indicator of the growth of the program, since it was the function of this position to interface with the community schools in providing equipment and supplies, assisting the local vocational agriculture teacher in hiring local staff, and supervising instruction (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1947).

With a total complement of 47 employees, the VATP was the largest subdivision within the Oklahoma State Division of Vocational Education. The VATP was essentially the tail that wagged the dog of the State Division. The Vocational Rehabilitation Division was the next largest of the Board's subdivision with 36 full-time staff and one part-time interviewer. Although Vocational Rehabilitation was a part of the State Division of Vocational Education, it was headquartered separately in Oklahoma City, and had a separate mission and federal legislative mandate from the other administrative elements

of the State Division. The Division of Vocational Agriculture, always the perennial premier agency of the State Division in that period, had only thirteen personnel, less than one-third of the 1947 strength of the VATP (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1947). The agency had grown so fast that it had outgrown the Board's headquarters building on the OAMC campus in Stillwater. Soon, it was necessary for the agency to request the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College to build an addition to the building to accommodate new staff. According to one administrator: "So when this other program [VATP] started and it grew like top seed, well, the University built an L to the ag-vocational ag building. That was done in '46." (Hansen, personal communication, February 16, 2005)

In 1948 the staff size dropped to 41 total employees. The number of district supervisors, however, increased to fourteen men, although the supervisor for Negro programs was not listed on the staff roster for that year. The 1949 State Division staff directory indicated that the total administrative component of the VATP Division was back up to 47 persons but now the number of district supervisors had stabilized at 13 district supervisors and the supervisor for Negroes (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1948).

The nadir of the VATP Division was in the period of 1947 to 1949 when the national number of enrollments in institutional on-farm training was approximately 270,000 veteran-trainee in each month according to the U.S. Veteran's Administration's Rehabilitation and Education Division (Erkstrom & McClelland, 1952). An administrator in State Division's headquarters at the time interviewed for this study described the magnitude and feeling of the program's operation:

Well, when I came aboard, VATP was bringing in, uh, close to three million dollars, uh, three million dollars a year, and all the other programs together – well, it's just like under the, uh, vocational education act of '63 – they—the state and federal funds were, well, in the VATP, the other divisions weren't getting total—weren't totaling a million dollars even. So VATP, on one time, had close to 60 employees. At the height, they had about 35 girls and about 20 men – let's see, 15, 18, yeah, yeah, it could have been anywhere from 50 to 60 counting janitors and everybody, and then of course, gradually, as the enrollment was down, they'd come down on the number of supervisors and the number of office people. It was a big day for program. We just, you know – IBM was just coming out with, uh, computers, or what did they call them? Were they computers then? Let's see— Yeah, yeah, tabulating machines — and all that. We made punch cards and, uh, at school, each veteran had a card and they came—and it gave his enrollment date and his, uh, entitlement date. So, as long as he was in training satisfactorily, we got a report on him every month, and the girls had—some of them, of course, would terminate and take a job, or leave for some reason or other. So they'd take this deck of cards from this school and go through these monthly reports, and then if there was everything in the right, they'd shoot it in the tabulator and make the invoice to go— to Veterans Administration.

We got a lot of good help from, uh, the university on that. They did our tabulating for us. We—we took our punch cards over [to Whitehurst] and had them—to be tabulated, and they had the equipment to do that. We—we just kept the punch cards up to date. Raymond Girard was, uh, I think the man in the county in

charge, but he had a couple of helpers. I don't remember their names. Uh, they did—that knew how to run the equipment, and we got a lot of big—lot of good help. I don't think they charged us anything. They might have. I don't remember. I-I don't remember just where it was 'cause I didn't follow it over there very much. We had two girls who were good on the key punching machine, and one of them was real familiar with the tabulating – both of them – and they did a lot more of the rest of us, so we let them handle it...I know one of them had been a teacher, but the other girl, she must have had experience in Tulsa or someplace in a bigger town. She was a little bit more—very, very good. They— We trained people to help key punch so we'd have somebody key punching nearly all the time. I think maybe we had two key punches at one time. They had a little office by themselves where they could make them—they make a-a lot of noise, so we tried to cut the sound down a little bit....But-but it wasn't—wasn't too bad. I was in my little office right next to it—right next door to them and-and we got along all right.

(Hansen, personal communication, March 30, 2005)

The VATP Division declined after 1949. In 1950, the first year of the Korean War, the total staff had dropped to 41 members, with the 12 district supervisors and the supervisor for Negroes. In 1951, the staff complement fell again down to 29 personnel, with only ten district supervisors and the elimination of the position of supervisor for Negro programs. In 1952, the program employed 21 staff with six district supervisors. By that year, one of the Assistant State Supervisor positions and the position of Director of Teacher Training had both been abolished. The state VATP staff roster in 1953 had only 14 members with three district supervisors. In 1954, the year after the July 27, 1953,

Korean War armistice at Panmunjom, eight VATP staff remained and supervision duties were in the hands of the Division's State Supervisor and Assistant Supervisor.

Throughout the remainder of the 1950s the size of the VATP Division continued to dwindle. This may have been a function of the loss of eligibility of World War II veterans for veterans' education and training benefits, the lack of popularity of the farm training program among a younger generation of Korean War veterans, the declining fortunes of Oklahoma agriculture, and the industrialization of the state in the postwar period. The State Department of Education personnel directory showed the following numbers: 1955 – seven staff members; 1956 – six staff; 1957 – four personnel; 1958 – three people; and two people are listed for each year for 1959, 1960, and the program's closeout in June 1961 (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960).

Table 4, below, provides biennial data on the number of veterans' classes offered, number of participating community schools, and the number of veterans enrolled on June 30th of each reporting biennial year, and the cumulative enrollment in the VATP since the beginning of VATP's operation in 1946.

Table 4

Number of Courses Offered, Number of Participating Community Schools, Veterans' Enrollment on June 30th of Reporting Year, and Cumulative Enrollment for the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program, by Biennial Year, 1946-1960.

Year	No. of Classes	No. of Participating Community Schools	Enrollment	Cumulative Enrollment Reported
1946	n/r	n/r	1,700	4,000
1947	n/r	n/r	10,614	15,000
1948	700	342	15,549	21,000
1950	724	355	15,000	28,000
1952	352	257	5,553	28,000
1954	140	129	1,269	25,000
1956	84	83	752	40,000
1958	63	62	400	42,000
1960	31	31	130	42,000

The data collected in this study led to the finding that the Oklahoma Division of Vocational Education grew dramatically in the first five years after V-J Day as a result of the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program. Discharged soldiers anxious for readjustment to civilian life and establishment in farming took advantage of the subsistence allowance and the tuition free training. The subsistence allowance enabled the veteran-trainees to get started in farming and to purchase new dwellings, farm buildings, and furnishings for their farms and homes (Oklahoma State Division of Vocational Education, 1949).

The program was a "cash cow" for the agency, bringing in new money and new responsibilities. The administration of the VATP added nearly 50 employees within the second program year. The new employees and heavy workload managing such a large, far-reaching program necessitated the expansion of the Division's headquarters building on the OAMC campus in Stillwater. Just as rapidly as the state VATP grew in its first five years, it began to decline. Veteran's GI Bill benefits began to run out and the trainees

found new pursuits related to non-agricultural employment and the raising of their “Baby Boom” families. Although a new group of veterans from the Korean Police Action began to return in the early-1950s, these veterans were not joining VATP in the record numbers of the World War II cohort. Staggered discharges of Korean War soldiers, disillusionment over less than victory in that War, the resistance of voters in a conservative era, and new employment opportunities in industrial employment lessened the attraction of farm training (Dreesen, personal communication, April 7, 2005).

State Accrediting Agency

The U.S. Veterans’ Administration required the governor of each state to designate an agency to execute contracts for education and training programs with the Veterans’ Administration. The purpose of the agency, according to its chairman, was:

... approval and supervision of establishments to train veterans under Public Law 346, as amended, and Public Law 550... for the supervision of approved establishments that afford training to our ex-servicemen. All schools of high education and learning are approved for training veterans. (C. B. Bolan to Johnson Murray, October 1, 1952, Record Group 8-N-1-1, Box 25, Folder 10, Governor's Office Records, Oklahoma State Archives, Oklahoma Department of Libraries, Oklahoma City, OK.)

In 1947, Governor Roy Turner notified General Bradley that he had designated as members of the State Accrediting Agency: M.A. Nash, chancellor of the Oklahoma State Board of Regents for Higher Education, who was appointed chairman of the State

Accrediting Agency; H. Milt Phillips, the War Veterans' Commission director (who was appointed the Agency's administrative secretary); Oliver Hodge, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction; Harvey Black; and J.D. Perky. (Turner to Bradley, June 9, 1947, Box 32, Folder 9, Record Group 8-M-1, Governor's Office Records, Oklahoma State Archives, Oklahoma Department of Libraries, Oklahoma City, OK.)

Larry O. Hansen was hired by J. B. Perky, in 1947 to work as an administrative assistant in charge of managing the VATP office staff. Hansen would stay to make a career with the state agency, retiring in 1984 as the Deputy Director for Administration of the State Department of Vocational and Technical Education under Dr. Francis Tuttle. Hansen began his career as bookkeeper for a wealthy Oklahoma City oilman who owned a cattle ranch near Governor Turner's Hereford Heaven spread near Sulphur in Murray County. Hansen accompanied the oilman to Hereford Heaven. On a visit to the ranch, Hansen met Perky and Governor Turner. The visit took place shortly after Hansen was discharged from the U.S. Navy where he served as secretary (Yeoman) for troop ship captain at Okinawa and manned the ship's forward antiaircraft turret during the fleet's frequent raids by kamikaze bombers. Hansen related:

So we toured his [Turner's] ranch one day, he and I did, and Mr. Perky was there with his son, Jim. He had one son, Jim [who] went to the Naval Academy, and I've been with Turner at the ranch before but that was the first time I met Mr. Perky and Jim. And I think Mr. Perky's son helped to Turner's daughter's horse, and she was hollering, she couldn't quite handle it someway or another, and the horse came close to us and she was hollering "help," and young Perky jumped to the cause. You know, he grabbed the horse's bridle and stopped him, so he saved

what might have been, you know, a little accident or it could have been a big accident. But anyway, later on, Perky and Likins got into the cattle business together. Likins kind of financed it, I think. It was Perky's ranch way out west of town a ways. And they turned out some – I don't think neither one of them wanted a partner, and Likins was willing to sell out and Perky was willing to buy, so Likins just asked me to work with Mr. Perky, "Gave me some figures." He didn't want to work with him for some reason. But anyway, so Mr. and Mrs. Perky came to the city, and he worked one afternoon. They were happy and my boss was happy. So Mr. Perky hired me. (Hansen, personal communication, February 16, 2005).

Later in Hansen's off-duty time from the Vocation Education Division he was a civic leader, serving as Stillwater's mayor, a city commissioner, chair of the hospital board, and for a term in the State House of Representatives.

As office manager and later in the capacity of field auditor, finance director, and the last state supervisor of veterans' programs, Hansen had an opportunity to observe the inner-workings of the State Accrediting Agency:

In most states, uh, the G.I. Bill called for the establishment of a state accrediting agency for all training programs – universities, colleges, junior colleges, high schools, private schools, business schools, trade schools and all that had to be approved by the state accrediting agency. So we had to execute a contract every year. It wasn't–there wasn't any really money involved. It was just approval...that the agency was a school [that] was capable of offering training. (Hansen, personal communication, March 30, 2005)

The administrative staff and the activities

... had an office in the-- For a long time, the state accrediting office was in the historical building on Lincoln Boulevard... They were there for many years, and I think... I don't remember. But most of the time, there would be national meetings with state accrediting agencies, and since Oklahoma was a little bit different in the agriculture program in that the state board of vocational – uh, then it was the state board for vocational education – that ran the program here in Oklahoma, and some states wondered how we managed to do that. Uh, but by and large, it didn't make that much difference who did it. You had to get agriculture people and teachers involved...

Typical problems that involved the state VATP administration meeting with the State Accrediting Agency, included, according to Hansen (personal communication, March 30, 2005): Education and ability of the veterans' agriculture instructors, length of eligibility of veterans under the P.L. 16 program for disabled veterans, eligibility and length of service for veterans under the P.L. 346 legislation, and allowable expenditures by local schools.

Local Veterans' Agricultural Training Program Administration

The State Board for Vocational Education contracted with local public school boards of education to conduct the actual Veterans' Agricultural Training Program courses. Since the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, the State Board had established relationships with vocational agriculture departments in the state's high

schools. The VATP leadership came from the state agency's Vocational Agriculture Division, so it was an easy transition to set up the veterans' program in local schools. The VATP program was rolled out at a summer conference of vocational agriculture teachers in the summer of 1946. Mr. Perky said, "There's a lot of you here that oughta have that program going, and we want it going within the next six months." (Price, personal communication, October 7, 2005).

In 1948, the Veterans Agricultural Training Program employed 700 teachers teaching 750 classes in 342 communities. Classes were modeled after vocational education with 100 hours of on-farm visits and 200 hours at schools, accommodating over 15,000 adult pupils. Stewart (1982) observed that there was

... quite a bit of latitude in curriculum and choice of subject matter, according to local conditions, experience, and the need of the clientele. Planning, production, marketing, conservation, financing, management, mechanics, and record keeping making some of the other needed elements work were stressed. (pp. 39-40)

Local school superintendents were responsible for the operation of VATP in their public school district or high school. The local district then invoiced the State VATP Division for reimbursement of tuition, supplies, and other expenses (Hansen, personal communication, March 30, 2005).

The use of advisory committees had been a staple in vocational agricultural education since 1911, and the necessity for advisement of this large program provided an additional opportunity for their use. State regulations for the operation of veterans' farm training programs specified their use (Erkstrom & McClelland, 1952). The personnel of the committees usually included representatives of the Cooperative Extension Service,

vocational agriculture, soil conservation district, business and proprietary interests, the U.S. Employment Service, and agencies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture such as the Farmers Home Administration, Production and Marketing Administration, and Farm Credit Administration (Dreesen, personal communication, April 7, 2005). While serving as the agriculture teacher at Hitchcock, Dr. Price had this experience with an advisory committee composed of former F.F.A. members:

See we had, it was peculiar largely to my group, our group in Hitchcock, they had tried to start it one year before I went there to Hitchcock, what they called the alumni FFA. And, they met monthly and sometime with another if something came up, and, and those young men were farming or getting started farming. And, that was one of the most wonderful things that happened to me because it helped me to get a perspective on what was happening. In fact, I guess I really came over to, was invited to come over to the staff [at OAMC] because of the fact we had this group that met every month, maybe didn't meet at harvest time but they met there and we had someone come that was knowledgeable enough if it's a disease or something that happened, that we called a "resource person." Often times from the college...from the university I should say (laughter)...but you see there was a chance for people to say that you're duplicating, you've got two teachers there, you don't need but one. But the truth of the matter is, it was a cooperative effort and the experience that the administrator had already had and years that he taught with his (unintelligible) that really contributed to the success of the program. This was an alumni, we had people in that community that didn't always pronounce words so we called it an "all-um-ni." But you know that was a guy getting started

in farming as some of them had been farming, as some of them had been farming for a while and trying to expand. And it was a cracker jack of a place for a person to teach, you know, and advance. (Price, personal communication, November 4, 2003)

The local community school's agriculture teacher or the chairman of the vocational agriculture department in large high schools became in effect, the local supervisor of the program. This teacher would work with the superintendent, principal, local advisory board and veterans instructors in recommending standards for the program, reviewing and approving trainees' farming facilities, approving interruptions in training of trainees and other absences, advising instructors in formulating course outlines, suggesting improvements to training, and evaluating the program's progress (Dreesen, personal communication, April 7, 2005).

School districts participating in the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program and their enrollment are listed in Table V below:

Table 5

Oklahoma Veterans' Agricultural Training Programs, by community and their enrollment, January 1, 1949.

Community School	Enrollment	Community School	Enrollment
Achille	45	Kinta	66
Ada	24	Kiowa	42
Adair	43	Konawa	35
Addington	21	Lacy (Hennessey)	22
Afton	43	Lahoma	42
Agra	22	Lamont	24
Alex	24	Laverne	45
Aline	20	Lawton	37
Allen	55	Leedey	47
Altus	83	LeFlore	47
Alva	48	Lexington	44
Ames	23	Liberty (Morris)	67
Anadarko	86	Liberty (Mounds)	36

Table 5 (continued)

Antlers	48	Lindsay	48
Apache	21	Locust Grove	47
Arapaho	21	Lone Grove	19
Ardmore	98	Lone Wolf	47
Arnett	25	Lookeba	24
Atoka	131	Loyal	18
Barnsdall	24	Luther	22
Battiest	25	Macomb	32
Beaver	49	Madill	36
Beggs	43	Magnum	232
Bennington	24	Manitou	21
Berlin (Sayre Route 1)	20	Mannford	13
Bethel (Shawnee)	21	Marietta	171
Billings	24	Marlow	65
Binger	41	Marshall	56
Bixby	71	Mason	20
Blackwell	71	Maud	22
Blair	40	Maysville	42
Blanchard	38	McCurtain	24
Boise City	49	McLish (Fittstown)	47
Bokchito	23	McLoud	66
Boley	39	Medford	24
Boswell	72	Meeker	20
Boynton	42	Miami	45
Bradley	21	Milburn	44
Braggs	17	Miller Washington (Redbird)	12
Bristow	105	Minco	69
Broken Arrow	58	Mooreland	48
Broken Bow	61	Moton (Taft)	44
Buffalo	73	Moyers	21
Buffalo Valley (Talihina)	35	Mt. Park	23
Burbank	46	Mountain View	47
Burns Flat	25	Muldrow	63
Butler	23	Muskogee	89
Byars	21	Napier (Ada)	14
Cache	23	Newkirk	36
Caddo	60	Norman	55
Calvin	52	Nowata	77
Camargo	20	Nuyaka	22
Cameron	58	Oaks Mission (Oaks)	70
Canadian	18	Oakwood	24
Canton	20	Okarche	24
Carmen	27	Okeene	64
Carnegie	37	Okemah	63

Table 5 (continued)

Carter	48	Olustee	21
Chandler	64	Omega	19
Chattanooga	39	Onapa (Checotah)	21
Checotah	49	Owasso	21
Chelsea	73	Paden	19
Cherokee	97	Panama	42
Cheyenne	43	Pauls Valley	61
Cheyenne Valley (Orienta)	24	Pawhuska	19
Chickasha	69	Pawnee	154
Chouteau	23	Perkins	45
Claremore	68	Perry	95
Clarita	37	Piedmont	44
Clayton	21	Pierce	20
Clearview	20	Pocasset	46
Cleveland	61	Ponca City	57
Clinton	21	Port (Sentinel)	23
Cloud Chief	22	Porter	20
Colgate	59	Porum	22
Cobb (Durant Route 2)	18	Poteau	93
Colcord	72	Prague	42
Collinsville	54	Pryor	64
Colony	24	Purcell	42
Comanche	37	Putnam	22
Cordell	20	Quinton	71
Corn	21	Ramona	42
Covington	41	Rattan	41
Coweta	46	Red Oak	46
Crawford	23	Rentiesville	38
Crescent	42	Reydon	24
Cushing	35	Ringling	87
Custer City	24	Ringwood	24
Dale	43	Rocky	23
Davenport	15	Roosevelt	19
Davis	22	Rush spring	50
Deer Creek	23	Ryan	39
Dewey	39	Salina	25
Dibble (Blanchard Rt. 2)	67	Sallisaw	111
Dill City	45	Sand Springs	18
Dover	30	Sapulpa	44
Drummond	25	Sasakwa	43
DuBois (Muskogee Rt. 4)	35	Savanna	21
Duke	19	Sayhre	49
Dunbar (Okmulgee)	52	Sedan (Mountainview)	19
Duncan	45	Seiling	46
Durant	58	Seminole	41

Table 5 (continued)

Durham	23	Sentinel	23
Eakly	42	Shattuck	49
Earlsboro	38	Shawnee	83
Edmond	33	Sickles (Lookeba)	24
Eldorado	24	Smithville	24
Elk City	41	Snyder	44
Elmore City	21	Sperry	39
El Reno	91	Spiro	108
Erick	42	Stafford	24
Eufaula	97	Sterling	18
Fairland	24	Stigler	91
Fairview	75	Stillwater	84
Fargo	24	Stillwell	95
Fay	22	Stratford	23
Fitzhugh	23	Stroud	19
Fletcher	48	Stuart	52
Fort Cobb	93	Sulphur	70
Fort Towson	43	Sweetwater	21
Foss	22	Tahlequah	131
Fpx	17	Talihina	56
Frederick	92	Taloga	21
Freedom	23	Tatums	22
Gage	25	Temple	38
Garber	47	Terral	23
Geary	77	Thomas	23
Goltry	25	Tipton	53
Gore (Jefferson)	24	Tishamingo	63
Gotebo	46	Tonkawa	48
Gould	46	Tryon	31
Grainola	21	Tuskahoma	40
Grandfield	65	Tuttle	47
Greenfield	37	Union Grade (Stillwell)	45
Grove	79	Union Valley (Randlett)	22
Gutherie	174	Utica	33
Guymon	22	Valliant	20
Hammon	39	Vanoss	43
Hardesty	21	Verden	24
Hartshorne	42	Vian	80
Haskell	59	Vici	40
Hastings	21	Vinita	116
Haywood	36	Vinson	23
Headrick	22	Wagoner	85
Heavener	46	Wainwright	22
Helena	25	Wakita	24
Hennessey	42	Walters	44

Table 5 (continued)

Hillsdale	45	Wanette	41
Hinton	25	Wapanucka	38
Hitchita	24	Warren (Blair)	26
Hitchcock	44	Washington	24
Hobart	43	Watonga	42
Holdenville	114	Waukomis	51
Hollis	68	Waurika	23
Hominy	46	Waynoka	49
Hooker	18	Weatherford	43
Hugo	129	Webbers Falls	41
Hulbert	75	Welch	70
Hunter	45	Weleetka	46
Hydro	20	Wellston	20
Idabell	132	Westville	68
Independence (Custer City)	24	Wetumka	64
Indiahoma	19	Wewoka	106
Indianola	40	Whitesboro	44
Irving (Ryan)	9	Wilburton	42
Jay	95	Wilson	19
Jefferson	21	Wilson (Henryetta)	24
Jet	48	Wister	23
Jones	19	Woodson (Tallahassee)	30
Kansas	43	Woodward	48
Kaw City	26	Wright City	22
Kellyville	21	Wyandotte	47
Keota	58	Wynnewood	22
Kingfisher	42	Yale	61
Kingfisher Sep.	18	Yukon	62
Kingston	20	351 schools	15,103

Veterans' Agricultural Training as Community Education

Local high school vocational agriculture programs had excellent relations with their communities (Price, personal communication, November 4, 2003). This relation was based on vocational agriculture's philosophy of community education, a prevalent concept in the immediate postwar period, which held that the "basic method and purpose of education must become that of improving the quality of daily living in communities"

(Lund, 1948, p. 11). According to Hamlin (1949), the characteristics of a community school included:

1. The school district provides most of the education at public expense of most of the people of the community. It is a primary unit in our system of public education.
2. The major purpose of the school is to cause the people of the community, its students, increasingly to identify their personal welfare with the welfare of the community and the welfare of the community with that of the state, the nation, and the world.
3. The school district or the attendance unit within the district is an area which is already, in some respects, a community and which offers the possibility of developing more of the characteristics of a true community.
4. There is the closest possible approach to local autonomy in the management of the school. The people of the community do for themselves everything they are capable of doing. Only those functions which cannot be performed well by the community are delegated to the county, the state, and the nation.
5. The whole community is served impartially by the school without discriminations because of age, sex, color, race, economic or social conditions, political or organizational affiliations, or any other considerations.
6. The school operates democratically, that is all who are affected by school policies share in making them, directly or through their representatives.

7. The school program is based upon the needs of the community with recognition that a major need in every community is to become well adjusted to its total environment.
8. Education in the school and education in the community are closely interwoven.
9. The school is concerned only with education. It is a “community educational center,” not a “community center” or a “community service station.”
10. The resources of the community are fully used by the school in the educational process.
11. There is continuous study by the school in cooperation with the community of the community situation and the relation of the school to it.
12. The school educates for democratic community planning and cooperates in educational programs related to the resulting plans.
13. The school cooperates impartially with the action agencies of its community but maintains its independence from them. (pp. 11-13)

Another authority from the postwar years developed additional criteria on good community education. Lund (1948) believed the characteristics of community education and community schools must be: agencies that improve community living; identify community needs and develop action plans; better living begins in the immediate school environment; a comprehensive and flexible curriculum; a dynamic program; full use of resources; use distinctive teaching materials; have learning experiences for all community members; improve social and community relations; continuous evaluation; cooperatively developed pupil personnel services; proper personnel policies and staff development;

democratic pupil-teacher-administrator relations; a high expectancy for improving community living; buildings and equipment available to all children, youth, and adults; and a budget that is a financial plan for what is desirable for the community.

The veterans' on-farm training utilized the principles and characteristics of community education and community schools. This was accomplished through the use of advisory committee's community surveys, life-long learning, and the concept of education for the betterment of the community (Price, personal communication November 4, 2005).

Veterans' Agriculture Instructors

Veterans' agriculture instructors were employed by each of the public school boards of education participating in the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program. Initially, the qualifications for being a veterans' instructor was a Bachelor of Science degree in an area of agriculture. The veterans' instructors interviewed for this study held degrees in animal science and soil science. All of the instructors interviewed were recently separated from military service at the time of their employment as veteran instructors. The instructors interviewed intended to pursue an occupation as a full-time farmer after their discharge and their employment as instructors were their first civilian jobs. Many of the instructors did not intend to make a career in agricultural education.

The large number of teachers required for the institutional on-farm training program created a problem in finding instructors who had a practical background and experience in agriculture and adequate training in technical agriculture and in methods of

teaching (Phipps, 1956). This need to find competent veterans' instructors resulted in qualified candidates being "Shanghaied" into service with the program. An OAMC graduate interviewed for this study traveled through Stillwater shortly after his discharge. One morning he was downtown still wearing the uniform of an U.S. Army Air Forces major. By coincidence, the major saw his old college friend who was the Guthrie vocational agricultural teacher. The next day, the Air Force major was on his way to Guthrie and the beginning of a career that lasted nearly ten years and advancement to VATP District Supervisor before finally leaving the VATP to begin farming in Perry (D. Dupy, personal communication, April 7, 2005).

A U.S. Army poultry specialist and OAMC animal science graduate who was a wrestler on the 1936 Canadian Olympic team in Berlin had a similar experience. He met the Guthrie agriculture teacher at a Stillwater soda fountain – leading one to believe the Guthrie teacher must have haunted the soda fountain to lay in wait for potential instructor candidates. The former Canadian wrestler remained with the Guthrie VATP program until 1953. During his employment he attended law school at Oklahoma City University and after leaving the program he pioneered the breeding of Red Angus cattle and founded the agricultural commodity association that represents Red Angus stockmen (Ciga, personal communication, December 28, 2003).

A U.S. Marine Corps platoon lieutenant and OAMC soil science graduate who would later have a long, distinguished career as governor and U.S. Senator, was pressed into service as a veterans' instructor in his home town of Billings. His students were the younger brothers of classmates at Billings High School before World War II, and were living on their parents' farms while attending classes. Many of these trainees did not stay

in farming and used the VATP program as a way station before finding jobs in industry, usually with one of the nearby defense installations, such as Tinker Field or Vance Air Force Base. This instructor left the Billings program after a short time to start a soil conservation business with surplus military bulldozers and then campaigning for and serving in the Oklahoma Legislature (Bellmon, personal communication, February 8, 2005).

The popularity of the VATP in Oklahoma and the lack of degreed candidates forced the State Board to permit the hiring of instructors who were graduates of an agriculture program at one of the two-year agricultural schools, such as Panhandle Agricultural and Mechanical College, Connors State Agriculture College, or Murray State Agricultural College. The use of instructors who uncertified or did not hold a baccalaureate degree followed the recommendation of Charles Prosser of hiring industry professionals as instructors under provisional certification pending completion of teacher training requirements (Hansen, personal communication, February 16, 2005).

Perky held annual summer conferences and other agriculture teacher meetings for staff development purposes to explain new curriculum and teaching methods and innovations. These meetings were the roots of the annual summer conference held by Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education for vocational teachers. Hansen observed:

See, we— In vocational agriculture, here in the state department for years, they have what they call monthly professional improvement group meetings. Well, it's a group of counties [who] will go together and the schools in that county will meet once a month after school, and it's kind of – well, I don't want to say show

and tell, but it's an exchange of information and what works and, you know, what might not work, and what new trends might be coming out and that—that sort of thing, and Mr. Perky established that way back when at the judgment. (Hansen, personal communication, March 30, 2005).

Dr. Price (personal communication, October 7, 2003) attended the meetings first as an agriculture teacher and later as a teacher-trainer for adult farm education on the faculty at OAMC:

We had a conference every year in June or July, ah, ah, what we called a, the vocational agriculture teachers of this state, in which all the supervisors were there and attendance at that conference was mandatory. If you didn't show up you got a telephone call from Perky.

Local school administrators, agriculture teachers, and the veterans' instructors were responsible for developing curriculum and course outlines based on local agriculture operations and market conditions. The State Division of Vocational Education developed and published books and materials used by local instructors for their courses. Curriculum development by the staff of the State Board for Vocational Education was the origins of the Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center (CIMC) at the Department of Career and Technology Education which is now one of the nation's leaders in the development of competency-based instructional materials. According to a state administrator of the program:

So three or four books, oh like, Feeds and Feeding [by Frank Barron Morrison, 1948] and Farm Business Management... and that – was that McGraw-Hill? I

can't think. I can't remember for sure... and some others that were pretty popular with every student, and we set up an allowance of – and I don't remember what the figure was – for each veteran to have a book... and there was another one or two I don't remember, but-but there would be some others specialized veteran–in a specialized area. If you asked for a book and we'd–the school could buy it for them. (Hansen, personal communication, March 30, 2005)

The instructors tended to dismiss the consequences and the results of the VATP. Most of the instructors viewed the program as a type of compensation for soldiers which was consistent with the findings of Frydl (2000). The instructors viewed the training and stipend as an allotment from the government until the veterans readjusted to their civilian lives and secured employment or remuneration from farming (C. Dupy, personal communication, April 15, 2005).

The Veteran-Trainees

Trainees in the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program were one of three trainee status groups. According to Smith (1952) the groups in Oklahoma included:

1. Self-employed farm veterans having control of a unit of such size and character that it would support him and his family at the end of training.
2. Employer-trainees, specialized, those working as herdsmen or managers on large ranches or dairies where pure-breed herds were kept.

3. Employer trainee-Farmer General, where the veteran did not have managerial control but worked for wages under a superior farmer who agreed to teach him the business. (p. 3)

A national survey commissioned by the U.S. Office of Education (1948) and conducted by the American Vocational Association in 1947 indicated that the average age of trainees was 28.3 years old; 73 percent of the trainees were married; approximately 43 percent had less than an eighth grade education; and a majority of the trainees wanted in addition to technical agriculture training desired subject matter in cooperative activities, farm family living, and group recreational and social activities. The study also found that 77 percent of the trainees wanted to participate in local organizations somewhat analogous to the F.F.A. or Young Farmers' Association.

The veteran-trainees interviewed for this study expressed mixed opinions on the Veteran's Agricultural Training Program. Their opinions ranged from the experience in the program as being the "best years of our lives" (Watterson, personal communication, May 1, 2005) to the program being a failure.

A Marine Corps veteran of the Battle of Iwo Jima who enrolled at the program's enrollment peak in 1949 said:

What he'd do, we'd go out on these classes and on these field trials – what we'd call field trials – and we'd study the grass program and we may brand, we may de-horn. We'd do something every day with the cows, horse, or land – maybe straight grass one day. And, uh, in other words, it was one of the finest programs that the federal government ever come up with. (Watterson, personal communication, May 1, 2005)

In contrast, after being contacted for the study, an Army veteran in Pryor, Oklahoma, refused to continue the interview for the study. He believed that the VATP was the “worst scam the federal government ever played on the American people because no one got anything out being in the program and it’s clear that someone made a lot of money from it” (anonymous, personal communication). This veteran refused to elaborate on the opinion expressed in his response so it was impossible to ascertain if his opinion was based either on political beliefs about the role of the federal government, his suspicions about the interviewer and the interviewer’s motives, if he was tired or ill and did not want to be bothered, or if the veteran had bad experiences with the VATP.

The passage of time since the veteran-trainees’ involvement in the VATP has clearly affected their responses to interview questions. The involvement of the trainees in farming and their participation in the VATP was over 50 years ago and a small part of their lives. A U.S. Navy veteran who returned to the poultry farm near Chickasha had difficulty remembering any details about the classes other than the fact he was enrolled for about a year (anonymous, personal communication, October 10, 2003).

An Oklahoma Department of Vocational Education (1949) publication portrayed a contemporary picture of the success of the program. It showed photographs of veteran-trainees attending class, successfully established in farming, achieving a happy home, and participating in cooperative community activities. Farm publications of the postwar period also showed veteran-trainees making a living from farming and working in cooperation with neighbors to build a better community (Schipper, 1949; Stafford, 1949).

On-farm training improved the degree of participation in community life. Contemporary academic studies of the program showed that trainees were better

established in the community than in farming and were taking an active part in community life and accepting their responsibilities as citizens (Smith, 1954). All of the participants in this study became involved in the civic and political affairs of Oklahoma. The participants served as governor, sheriff of Carter County, assistant superintendent of an area technical school, mayor of Stillwater, on hospital boards, church trustees, and founded agriculture commodity organizations.

This environment of cooperation and community spirit did come across in at least one interview with the trainees. A trainee in Lone Grove, Oklahoma, stated that his veterans' class took an active interest in local politics. In the 1952 election campaign, the class encouraged him to run for county sheriff and actively worked for his election (Watterson, personal communication, May 1, 2005).

Veterans' instructors and trainees, alike, expressed enthusiasm for the work they accomplished in the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program. Some interviewees believed that it was an outstanding program in adult agricultural education, while others believed that the program's impact was in the area of sustaining the veterans until they found a role for themselves in civilian life on or off the farm. Program participants at the time of their involvement in VATP were interested in cooperative, community activities, but after the passage of over fifty years they appear to be less sure of the community service fostered by the program. The social life and community participation of VATP instructors and trainees in the 1940s and 1950s was in contrast to what the studies by Robert Putnam (1998) reveal about the sharp decline in public participation of all varieties: voting, political party membership, labor unions, and even newspaper readership waning in the late-20th century.

Veterans' Agricultural Training and the Making of Modern Oklahoma

Evidence from this study reveals that the institutional on-farm training program was a success. Most participants responded that VATP established a positive role for vocational education in the state and provided a positive political environment for establishment of a system of area technical schools in Oklahoma after 1964.

They believe that the VATP was the best adult education ever conducted (Watterson, personal communication, May 1, 2005). An indication of the success in this regard were the number of studies conducted in the postwar period showing the number of veteran farm trainees “continuing or demanding further training in young farmer and adult agricultural training classes” (Naugher, 1948, p. 60). Studies also showed that veteran trainees were willing to levy taxes in their communities to provide for adult vocational education programs (Gingery, B. E., 1953).

Development of the area vocational schools in Oklahoma after 1964, as documented below, is an example of the impetus of the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program in encouraging adult vocational education. The concept of the area vocational schools and community college first emerged in the 1940s as an outgrowth of both the junior college and community education movements (Hamlin, 1949).

Oklahoma had been a farm state since statehood. The State prospered during World War I, but in the early-1920s Oklahoma lapsed into an agricultural depression that preceded the Great Depression. The situation was ameliorated by the Osage and Seminole oil field booms, but the sharp fall in crude oil prices and the 1930s Dust Bowl

drought wreaked havoc on the state. Oklahoma lost more population than any other individual state for that decade and earned a national reputation for *The Grapes of Wrath*.

Since the beginning of World War II an industrial base centered on the aviation industry had been growing in Oklahoma. The Vocational Education for National Defense programs helped to establish a skilled aerospace workforce for Tinker Air Force Base and Douglas Aircraft Company manufacturing and maintenance plants. Workers at Tinker Field in the late-1940s were responsible for the overhaul of first-generation turbojet engines for the U.S. Army Air Forces (Air Logistics Command, 1983).

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College took up the task of providing technical education for returning veterans to learn postsecondary vocation skills under the GI Bill of Rights. In 1946 President Bennett took advantage of the government disposal as surplus property of Glennden Army Hospital in Okmulgee as a site to open the OAMC Technical Branch that provided associate's degree-level courses in a variety of trade and industry education subjects (Dean, 1991).

This was not OAMC's final venture in adult technical education. In 1958, Oklahoma State University (nee OAMC) led by Bennett's successor, Oliver S. Willham, opened a two-year technical branch in Oklahoma City in anticipation of federal technical education funds under the recently enacted National Defense Education Act (Chandler, 1991).

Postwar government and education leaders welcomed industrial growth for the state and set to work to plan for economic development. Governor Johnston Murray campaigned on a pledge to work for industrial development when he ran for a term of what he later called "four hectic, often frustrating years" in the "toughest governorship in

the land...fuming about the staggering maze of unsolved problems which shame my state and hold it in the category of the retarded” (Murray & Dewlen, April 30, 1955, p. 20).

Murray was the son of the Great Depression-era Governor William H. (Alfalfa Bill) Murray. As a young man, the future governor helped Alfalfa Bill with the organization an agricultural colony in South America. During World War II, Murray worked in the VEND war production program as the Personnel Manager of Douglas Aircraft Company in Oklahoma City.

As Governor, Johnston Murray is best known for signing loyalty oath legislation that was ultimately declared unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court but which brought him notoriety among far right partisans during the McCarthy Era. During the Korean War, Murray took a leading role in the Southern Regional Education Board, along with University Presidents George Cross at OU and Oliver Willham at OAMC and state planning director Morton Harrison, “to assist all southern colleges and universities in their efforts to respond effectively to the national defense needs in the emergency period” (L. W. Weatherby to Oliver Willham, December 19, 1952, Box 7, Folder 8, RG 8-N-1-1, Governor's Office Records, Oklahoma State Archives, Oklahoma Department of Libraries, Oklahoma City). Governor Murray also traveled extensively on trade missions and efforts to recruit industrial plans for the state (Myers, 1983).

Other political leaders in the 1950s also encouraged industrial development. In 1955, shortly after Murray left the governor’s office, Midwest City School Superintendent Oscar V. Rose, whose jurisdiction encompassed Tinker Field, shared with the new governor, Raymond D. Gary, his “interest in the development of industry in our state” and “in anything which might make the operation of such industrial establishments

satisfactory.” Rose went on to explain his work to “develop and maintain a school program adequate and satisfactory to the migrant citizens coming into our community as a result of the great federal installation located within its boundaries” (Rose to Gary, personal communication, April 6, 1955, Box 3, Folder 8, Record Group 8-O-3, Governor's Office Records, Oklahoma State Archives, Oklahoma Department of Libraries, Oklahoma City, OK.)

John F. Kennedy, the first president elected from the “Greatest Generation,” appointed the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education after taking office in 1961. The Panel included two Oklahomans, Perky and Dr. Lela O’Toole, Dean of the College of Home Economics at the Oklahoma State University. The Panel’s report was incorporated in the Vocational Education Act of 1963. It included a recommendation for the funding of area schools to help solve chronic unemployment problems in depressed rural areas.

Oklahoma moved rapidly and decisively to take advantage of the area school concept due to the participation of Perky and O’Toole. According to Larry Hansen the federal grant program for developing area schools came on line in 1964 (Hansen, personal communication, March 30, 2005). Five local public school districts – Ardmore, Duncan, Enid, Oklahoma City, and Tulsa – had moved to open vocational schools by 1965. Still, if area schools were going to serve depressed rural areas, the Oklahoma Constitution would have to be amended to provide “permission of a combination of districts to act for the general permission of all” because “district funds may not be spent for uses outside district boundaries” (An educational must, 1966, p. A7).

In a letter thanking Governor Henry Bellmon, a former veterans' instructor in Billings, Oklahoma, for his participation in an event in Wilburton, Oklahoma in spring 1965, Eastern Agricultural and Mechanical College President J. N. Baker said:

There is a gap in coordination...that becomes most obvious when one starts dealing with the area school concept. Several of us are dabbling in vocational training, with no specific plan for getting the job done... our state badly needs some bold, forward educational planning...I feel that some variation of the community college...concept, which a number of states are developing needs to be employed in order that educational opportunity, both academic and vocational, will be readily available in our state...many states are making the local area area partially responsible for the support and governing, of its area school, this idea seems to have some merit. (J. N. Baker to Henry Bellmon, April 22, 1965, Henry Bellmon Papers, Gubernatorial Collection, MC 2-1-2, Box 105, Folder 9, Special Collections and University Archives, Oklahoma State University Libraries).

Bellmon replied thanking Baker for his suggestion and asked his advice on membership and "an agenda for getting the activities underway and...goals we are attempting to reach" (Bellmon to Baker, personal communication, May 22, 1965, Henry Bellmon Papers, Gubernatorial Series MC 2-1-2, Box 105, Folder 9, Special Collections and University Archives, Oklahoma State University Libraries). In a note to Bob Breeden, the Governor's chief of staff, concerning Baker's advice Bellmon suggested a state vocational technical conference and that they "probably would have a hard time keeping [Chancellor of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education E. T.] Dunlap out of the act." Bellmon pondered "we ought to get George Romney [the Governor of Michigan and

1968 Republican presidential hopeful] down here for this, or something like it. He'd be a good draw.”

The 1965 Oklahoma Legislature passed a resolution introduced by state Senators Bob Murphy (D-Stillwater) and Dewey Bartlett (R-Tulsa) to put the issue of area schools as State Question No. 434 on the 1966 Run-off Primary ballot. Wanting to build support for the measure with business and industry, Bellmon appointed a Governor's Advisory Committee on Vocational and Technical Education composed of school superintendents and board members, businessmen, farm organization and labor leaders, military personnel commanders, and vocational educators. Appointing J. B. Fox, Superintendent of the Ardmore Schools, as the chairman of the advisory committee, Bellmon requested “specific suggestions and action in support of State Question 434 in the very near future.” Bellmon said it was “critically important in our efforts to provide a full range of educational opportunities to the youth of Oklahoma” and that the committee offer a detailed plan, including school location and coordination in a curriculum” for the area schools (Bellmon to Fox, March 29, 1966. Henry Bellmon Papers, Gubernatorial Series, MC 2-1-2, Box 105, Folder 9, Special Collections and University Archives, Oklahoma State University Libraries).

State Question No. 434 was ratified by the people of Oklahoma in the May 24, 1966 Run-off Primary Election by a 214,598 yes to 206,458 no vote, not a large margin of victory among the populist electorate of Oklahoma who always were always reluctant to permit a property tax increase. The constitutional amendment allowed citizens to vote for an area vocational education district, elect boards of education to govern the district school system, and to levy a five-percent (5%) ad valorem property tax to pay for the

capital expenditures for and operations of district school system (Oklahoma State Election Board, 1994). Since the 1966 Run-off Primary Election 54 area school campuses have been established across the state. VATP participants interviewed for this study agree that VATP contributed to the growth of the area school program.

CHAPTER V

Conclusions and Recommendations

Cadets of the graduating class--Boys, I've been where you are now and I know just how you feel. It's entirely natural that there should beat in the breast of every one of you a hope and desire that some day you can use the skill you have acquired here. Suppress it! You don't know the horrible aspects of war. I've been through two wars and I know. I've seen cities and homes in ashes. I've seen thousands of men lying on the ground, their dead faces looking up at the skies. I tell you, war is hell!

- General William Tecumseh Sherman
(1880)

Introduction

World War II was total war. Every veteran interviewed for this study who was close to the front lines of battle in the Second World War painted a description similar to the scenes described by Sherman in his famous 1880 speech to the graduating cadets of an Ohio military academy. Many of these veterans saw combat and witnessed the hell of war – whether they commanded a marine tank platoon in Pacific Island invasions, or clerked in a field hospital on the Anzio beachhead, or manned an anti-aircraft gun aboard a destroyer repelling kamikazes off the coast of Okinawa, or carried a flamethrower to

ferret out the enemy in pillboxes and caves on Iwo Jima. All of these veterans were grateful when they heard the news of Japan's surrender and each one privately resolved to return home to create a better world.

Unlike many veterans of earlier conflicts, and the wars that came later in American history, these citizens returned from military service to a grateful nation. The nation provided all honorably discharged soldiers and sailors of World War II a generous package of benefits that included tuition and subsistence allowances for education and training. The World War II GI Bill of Rights education benefits has been heralded for creating the modern American middle class, for democratizing education, for serving as a catalyst "to dispense literature and the other arts in order to cultivate leisure in a manner previously unrealized" (Payne, 1997, p. 4).

This chapter of the study on the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program (VATP) in Oklahoma is a summary of the major findings and how they address the three research questions posed by the study, and the implications, conclusions, and recommendations for further research and scholarship on the vocational agricultural education provided under the GI Bill of Rights.

Research Questions Findings

This study of the GI Bill's Veterans' Agricultural Training Program was framed by three separate research questions. These research questions were: First, how was institutional on-farm training administered in Oklahoma?; second, how did institutional on-farm training influence the perception of vocational education and the development of

the Oklahoma system of area vocational-technical schools?; and finally, how were the social and economic lives of the veterans and their instructors and the communities in which they lived affected by their participation in on-farm training?

The research questions are related to several issues or themes in the development of vocational education in American society. The themes include: the creation of an administrative state, the establishment of institutions and procedures for educational institutions, state and federal relations, and the development of community colleges and technical institutes as a tertiary level – after the classical university and land-grant institution – of post-secondary and adult education.

In order to shake out themes from the data and to arrive at this level of analysis involved a methodological journey through several different theoretical perspectives. The perspectives that were picked up and examined included: critical theory, postmodernism, Southern Agrarianism, social construction of science and technology studies, and finally, the history of vocational education administration. This follows since most history is written as atheoretical (Petrin, personal communication, July 11, 2005).

Research Question Conclusions

The first research question addressed the daily nuts-and-bolts of how legislation is implemented by an administrative agency in terms of that agency's organization, personnel, budgeting, and planning and program evaluation activities. These functions were routine of public administration, and they informed the role public administration played in the formulation and implementation of public policy. The VATP during its

nearly 15 years of operation mobilized hundreds of schools, administrators, and teachers to conduct thousands of courses enrolling tens of thousands of adult learners.

Secondly, the VATP, and to a lesser extent its predecessor war-time Vocational Education for National Defense (VEND) programs, was the first big, adult vocational education program effort ever conducted in Oklahoma. The programs helped to propel vocational education from vocational agriculture, all-day programs for secondary high school boys into the field of adult education that had implications for economic development, community education, workforce training, and lifelong learning. The experience of VATP affected the opinions of policy makers and voters in creating what the Oklahoma CareerTech System proudly calls the “Crown Jewel of Education” in Oklahoma. The VATP experience demonstrated the usefulness of evening classes on vocational subjects. It established a record for the Oklahoma State Division of Vocational Education of administering large-scale, expensive adult vocational education courses serving thousands of students in hundreds of communities.

Lastly, the veterans themselves who trained under the VATP were citizens of the state of Oklahoma taking their places in their communities after the interruption of World War II. These veterans had aspirations for their lives, homes, and communities.

Specifically, in relationship to research question 1, the findings of this study were the GI Bill institutional on-farm training program for veterans was administered by the Oklahoma State Board for Vocational Education in accordance with veterans’ policy established by federal law and administrative regulations. The Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI Bill of Rights) was viewed by policy makers during World War II primarily as a tool for the efficacy of the postwar U.S. economy and only

secondarily as a reward to veterans for their years of service and sacrifice (Spradling, 2000). The State Board was an existing state agency that was established in accordance with federal and state legislation to furnish vocational education programs to day and adult students in the state through locally-controlled public secondary school boards of education. Unlike the case of the VEND programs during the national emergency which merged these programs into existing organizational line functions, the state agency created a new division to accomplish the mission of the GI Bill's institutional on-farm training program. The VATP Division quickly became the largest subdivision of the State Division of Vocational Education. The administrator for the State Board Vocational Education, James B. Perky, was typical of "public entrepreneurs" in federal and state agencies who built bureaucratic power for themselves and their agencies in cooperation with elected officials (Lewis, 1980).

With regard to research question number 2, the growth of the Oklahoma vocational education system after 1965 was affected by the success of the adult vocational education of the VATP in Oklahoma. A number of graduate theses and dissertations in agricultural education across the nation researching attitudes of the veteran-trainees enrolled in veterans' farm training courses concluded that program participants were satisfied with the training they received; that trainees were inclined to enroll in further adult vocational education courses; that VATP led to the further development of the Young Farmers movement; that more adult vocation education opportunities, similar to the VATP, should be made available to the community at-large; and veteran-trainees would vote for tax levies to provide vocational education programs. The Veterans' Agricultural Training Program in Oklahoma, and the subsequent

development of the area school concept, was a part of a period of democratization of education and support for public education which began with the passage of the GI Bill of Rights in 1944 and extended through to the Proposition 13 initiative election in 1978.

In the VATP we see the antecedents of the characteristics of practices and operation of present day Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education. These practices and operating procedures include: the independent political power of the state agency, the use of instruction personnel with provisional certificates at technology centers, the convening of the annual summer conference for vocational teachers, and the development of custom curriculum by the Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center (CIMC) within the state CareerTech agency.

Finally, with regard to research question number 3, the veterans who participated in the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program had a high degree of involvement in the affairs of their community and took responsible leadership roles in the politics, educational, and civic activities. The VATP held in-class instruction in technical agriculture subjects and supervised agricultural experiences (SAE) at the veteran-trainees' farming operations. Agricultural education at mid-20th century also had a community service aspect typified by community surveys, use of advisory committees, operation of school-community canning plants and other agricultural outreach projects, and leadership training in student vocational agriculture clubs. The VATP required veteran-trainees to develop farm-home plans to be carried out during training and use to evaluate trainee progress. Instruction and SAE activities emphasized cooperation with local, state, national, and international agencies and their policies, particularly those policies concerning water and soil conservation. Veteran-trainees studied during the

course of the program rated the community and social aspects of the program as being important to them. In addition, many veterans returned to their communities from military service with a heightened sense of mission for building a better world. The World War II generation of GIs had a strong group identity fostered by their experience in the Great Depression and World War II and in the War's aftermath. All of the participants interviewed for this study expressed this sense of purpose and group identity. All of the interviewees in this study took active leadership roles in community affairs.

Summary of Conclusions about the Research Questions

1. The purpose of the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program was to provide an educational program. The veteran-trainees subsistence allowance was considered to be by those at the Veterans' Administration and the State Division of Vocational Education as a feature that was incidental to the training and not a cash bonus to veterans.
2. The implementation of institutional on-farm training was based on the principles of "picket-fence federalism" with state agencies receiving services disbursements from federal vocational education agencies, and then contracting with local school agencies to carry out the instruction of the veteran-trainees.
3. The organization of the Division of the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program and the parent agency, the Oklahoma Division of Vocational Education was organized as a traditional managerial public administration

scheme. The professionalized management of the agency was an outgrowth of the rise of the administrative state during the progressive age.

4. The Veterans' Agricultural Training Program was a manifestation of the community education movement.
5. The Veterans' Agricultural Training Program was a part of the period of democratization of and support for public education that began with the passage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 through the Proposition 13 Initiative in 1978, and that contributed to the creation of community colleges and area technical schools.
6. Instructors and veterans-trainees who participated in the Oklahoma Veterans' Agricultural Training Program were favorably impressed with the quality of adult vocational agricultural education, and this positive attitude assisted in the development of the area school concept for vocational education after 1964.
7. Instructors and veteran-trainees interviewed for this study appreciated the community education and leadership aspects of the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program. An unintended consequence of the programs was the responsible leadership roles in community affairs interviewees assumed after their involvement in the program.
8. The Veterans' Agricultural Training Program contained the roots of characteristics of the contemporary Department of Career and Technology Education, including:

- a. The state agency is a politically powerful and independent branch of the state education establishment.
- b. The practice of recruiting as instructors for area technology centers industry professionals without teacher training or certification and providing the teachers with provisional certificates while they undergoing training during employment.
- c. The presence of an annual summer conference for state supervisors, staff, and vocational teachers.
- d. The development of the Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center (CIMC) to develop custom curriculum materials.

Recommendations of the Study

A critical historical analysis of vocational education in Oklahoma is incomplete. Vocational education, or career and technical education, is a large field of public policy that has implications for secondary and postsecondary education, public administration, and federalism.

Three studies of the vocational education system have been completed. All three of the studies have been so-called “house,” celebratory or Whig histories. They were written by historians with close ties to and commissioned by the Oklahoma State Division of Vocational Education and its successor incarnations.

A critical study of the program cannot be accomplished until all of the data is available. The study of the Veterans’ Agricultural Training Program in Oklahoma was

incomplete because there is not enough data from state agency records to create a complete historical account of the program and its activities. The state agency has thousands of cartons of records on its operations stored in a warehouse in Stillwater, Oklahoma. The administration of the state agency does not know what are contained in the records and lacks the staff to archive these papers.

Finally, there is general agreement that the GI Bill of Rights for World War II and Korean War veterans helped to produce the most prosperous and well informed society in history. Education Benefits for veterans of the Global War on Terrorism should be funded for this cohort in order to accomplish a greater social and economic purpose for American society.

Summary of Recommendations of the Study

1. There is a need for further study of the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program in Oklahoma.
2. There is a need for a critical analysis of vocational education and training in Oklahoma to study which groups benefited from public expenditures in this policy area.
3. The Oklahoma State Department of Career and Technology Education must institute a records management and archival program to enable more historical research on the accomplishments of this state institution.
4. Veterans' benefits should accomplish social and economic goals of society rather than as a recruiting tool or bonus for military service.

REFERENCES

- American Psychological Association. (2001). *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, 5th ed. (2001). Washington, D. C.: The Author.
- Anderson, G.L. (1976). *Land-grant universities and their continuing challenge*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Angus, D. L. and Mirel, J. E. (1999). *The failed promise of the American high school, 1890-1995*. New York: Teachers' College Press.
- Association of Land-grant Colleges and Universities. (1964). *Proceedings: Committee on Extension Organization and Policy, Association of Land-grant Colleges and Universities 1939-1949*. Washington, D.C.: Federal Extension Service.
- Bailyn, B. (1960). *Education in the forming of American society: needs and opportunities for study*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Barlow, M. L. (1990). Historical background of vocational education. In Albert J. Pautler (Ed.), *Vocational education in the 1990s: major issues*. (pp. 5-24). Ann Arbor, MI: Prakken Publications.
- Barlow, M. L. (1981). Our important past. In Gordon I. Swanson (Ed.), *The future of vocational education*. (21-32). Arlington, VA: American Vocational Association, Inc.
- Bell, D. (1973). *The coming of post-industrial society*. New York: Basic Books.

- Benne, K. (1995). Recollections on the social reconstructionist movement. In M. E. James (ed.). *Social reconstruction through education: The philosophy, history and curriculum of a radical ideal*. (pp. xiii-xx). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.
- Bennett, M. J. (1996). *When dreams came true: The GI Bill and the making of modern America*, Washington: Brassey's Inc.,
- Bernstein, R. J. (1991). *The new constellation: The ethical-political horizons of modernity/postmodernity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bernstein, R. J. (1983). *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism: Science, Hermeneutics, and Praxis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Bergan, T.J. (1982). David Samuel Snedden: The ideology of social efficiency, *Journal of Thought* 16(2), 91-102.
- Best, J. W. and Kahn, J. V. (1986). *Research in Education* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Bijker, W. E. and Pinch, T. J. (1987). The social construction of facts and artifacts: or how the sociology of science and the sociology of technology might benefit each other. In W. E., Bijker, T. P. Hughes, & T. J. Pinch (Eds.), *The social construction of technological systems: New directions in the sociology and history of technology*. (pp. 17-50). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bilger, E. (1983). William H. Murray: Governor of Oklahoma, 1931-1935. In LeRoy H. Fischer (ed.). *Oklahoma governors, 1929-1955: Depression to prosperity* (pp. 54-78). Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Historical Society.

- Boggs, J. H. (1992). A History of governance at Oklahoma State University James H. Boggs. Centennial histories series. Stillwater, OK: Oklahoma State University.
- Boone, H. N. et al. (1987, winter). Supervised occupational experience programs: History, philosophy, current status, and future implications. *Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture* 28(4), 57-64.
- Borg, W. R. and Gall, M. D. (1983). *Educational Research: An Introduction* (4th ed.) New York: Longman.
- Bowen, B., Bruening, T., & Hall, D. (n.d.). Agriculture education and World War II. Unpublished manuscript. North Carolina State University.
- Bowers, C. A. (1967, winter). The ideologies of progressive education. *History of Education Quarterly* 7(4), 452-473.
- Chandler, P. P. (1991). A history of Oklahoma State University at Oklahoma City. Centennial histories series. Stillwater, OK: Oklahoma State University.
- Church, R. and Sedlak, M. (1976). *Education in the United States: An interpretive history*. New York: Free Press.
- Cole, A. L. (1991). Interviewing for life history: A process of ongoing negotiation. In I. F. Goodson & J. M. Mangan (Eds.), *Qualitative educational research studies: Methodologies in transition*. RUCCUS Occasional Papers, (Vol. 1. pp.185-208) London, ON: University of Western Ontario, Division of Curriculum Studies.
- Congressional Archives. Carl Albert Research & Studies Center, University of Oklahoma. Norman, Oklahoma.

- Congressional Quarterly Service. (1965). *Congress and the nation: A review of government and politics in the postwar years, 1945-1964*, v. 1. Washington, D.C.: The Author.
- Corbett, W. P. (1983). Robert Samuel Kerr, 1943-1947. In LeRoy H. Fischer (ed.). *Oklahoma governors, 1929-1955: Depression to prosperity*. (pp. 124-149). Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Historical Society.
- Cremin, L. A. (1961). *The transformation of the school: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Conkin, P. K. (1959). *Tomorrow a new world: The New Deal community program*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Conkin, P. K. (1988). *The Southern Agrarians*. Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press.
- Cuban, L. (1982). Enduring resiliency: Enacting and implementing federal vocational education, H. Kantor and D. B. Tyack, (eds.) *Work, youth, and schooling: Historical perspectives on vocationalism in American education*. (pp. 45-78). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Cutler, W. W. (1971 summer). Oral History – Its Nature and Uses for Educational History. *History of Education Quarterly* 11(2), 124-194.
- Dean, L. D. (1991). *The history of Oklahoma State University Technical Branch, Okmulgee*. Centennial history series. Stillwater, OK: Oklahoma State University.
- Denton, V. L. (1993). *Booker T. Washington and the adult education movement*. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press.

- Deyoe, G. P. (1953). *Farming programs in vocational agriculture*. Danville, IL: The Interstate Publishers.
- Divine, R. A. (1993). *The Sputnik challenge*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Doolittle, P. E. and Camp, W. G. (1999, fall). "Constructivism: The career and technical perspective." *Journal of Vocational and Technical Education* 16(1), 23-31.
- Drache, H. M. (1996). *History of U. S. Agriculture and its Relevance to Today*. Danville, IL: Interstate Publishers.
- Drost, W. H. (1967). *David Snedden and education for social efficiency*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Ekstrom, G. F. and McClelland, J. B. (1952). *Adult education in vocational agriculture*. Danville, IL: Interstate.
- Ellis, G. W. (1949). A Farm Training Program for Veterans in the Pryor Community. Unpublished master's thesis. Oklahoma A&M College.
- Everett, S. E. (1992). *Oral history: Techniques and procedures*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army Center of Military History.
- Federal Security Agency. Office of Education. (1948, December). Vocational education – Democracy in action. *School Life* 31(3) 4-5.
- Federal Security Agency. Office of Education. (1946). *Final report Rural War Production Training Program*, Bul. 1946, No. 11. Washington, D.C.: The Author.
- Fiske, E. P. (1989, fall). From rolling stones to cornerstones: Anchoring land-grant education in the counties through the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. *Rural Sociologist* 9(4), 7-14.

- Foster, P. N. (2002, fall). Using case study analysis in technology education research. *Journal of Career and Technical Education* 19(1), 32-46.
- Frank, S. (1955a). We licked the veteran problem: Part Two. *Saturday Evening Post* CCXXXVIII 30.
- Frank, S. (1955b). We licked the veteran problem: Part One. *Saturday Evening Post* CCXXXVII 20.
- Frydl, K. J. (2000). *The GI Bill*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Chicago.
- Ginergy, B. E. (1953). An analysis of the responses of Nebraska veterans enrolled in institutional on-farm training regarding financing future adult courses in agriculture. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Nebraska.
- Goble, D. (2003). *Learning to earn: A history of career and technology education in Oklahoma*. Stillwater, OK: Department of Career and Technology Education.
- Goldman, E. F. (1952). *Rendezvous with destiny; a history of modern American reform*. New York: Knopf.
- Goldenstein, E. H. (1989, April). Booker T. Washington and cooperative extension. *Negro Educational Review* 40(2), 4-14.
- Gordon, G. J. and Milakovich, M. E. (1998). *Public administration in America* (6th ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Gordon, H. R. D. (2003). *The history and growth of vocational education in America*, 2nd ed. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Governor's Office Records, Oklahoma State Archives, Oklahoma Department of Libraries, Oklahoma City, OK.

Gower, C. W. (1967 spring). The Civilian Conservation Corps and American education: Threat to local control, *History of Education Quarterly* 7(1) 58-70.

Graham, D. L. (1994). Cooperative extension system. In C. J. Arntzen and Ellen M. Ritter (eds.). *Encyclopedia of Agricultural Science*. (Vol. 1, pp. 415-430). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Grant, Jr., P. A. (2002). Oklahoma's rising star: The election of Mike Monroney to the United States Senate. *Chronicles of Oklahoma* LXXX (2) 132-141.

Guba, E. G. and Lincoln. Y. S. (1998). Competing paradigms in social research. N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research*. (pp. 195-220). London: Sage.

H. J. Res. 316: a joint resolution making additional appropriations of 1942 for education and the training of defense workers, pre-employment and supplementary course of less than college grade: Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives. 77th Congress, 2 (1942) (testimony of John W. Studebaker).

H. J. Res. 316, a joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1942 to the Office of Education. Federal Security Agency for education and the training of defense workers, preemployment and supplementary course of less than college grade.,. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate. 77th Cong., 2 (1942) (testimony of John W. Studebaker).

H.R. 2181, 80th Cong., 93 Cong. Record, 5056-5057 (1947).

- H.R. 2181. An act relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. (Morse Subcommittee). 80th Cong., 1 (1947).*
- H.R. 7656, 82nd Cong., 96 Cong. Record, 6854-6856 (1952) (enacted).
- Hamilton, D. (1990). *Curriculum history*. Geelong, Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Hamlin, H. M. (1949). *Agricultural education in community schools*. Danville, IL: The Interstate.
- Hanson, V. D. (1998, winter). The origins of agrarianism and the development of self. *NAMTA Journal* 23(1), 236-255.
- Hanson, M. L. (1983). Henry Judson Holloway: Governor of Oklahoma, 1929-1931. In LeRoy H. Fischer (ed.). *Oklahoma governors, 1929-1955: Depression to prosperity* (pp. 31-53). Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Historical Society.
- Hanson, V. D. (1998, winter). Emerging psychological characteristics of farm life. *NAMTA Journal* 23(1), 256-283.
- Herren, R. V. and Edwards, M. C. (2002). Whence we came: The land grant tradition – Origin, evolution, and implications for the 21st century. *Journal of Agricultural Education* 43(4), 88-100.
- Herren, R. V. and Hillison, J. (1996). Agricultural education and the 1862 land-grant institutions: The rest of the story. *Journal of Agricultural Education* 37(3), 26-32.
- Hillison, J. (1999). Whatever happened to the Supervisor of the Smith-Hughes Man? *Journal of Agricultural Education* 40(2), 55-63.

- Hillison, J. (1998). Agriculture in the classroom: Early 1900s style. *Journal of Agricultural Education* 39(2), 11-18.
- Hillison, J. (1996). The origins of agriscience: Or where did all that scientific agriculture come from? *Journal of Agricultural Education* 37(4), 8-13.
- Hillison, J. (1989). Congressional district schools: Forerunner of federally supported vocational agriculture. *Journal of Agricultural Education* 30(4), 7-12.
- Hillison, J. and Sutphin, C. M. (1999, December). History of extension work in Virginia prior to Smith-Lever. *Journal of Extension* [on-line] 37(6). Available at: <http://www.joe.org/joe/1999december/comm2.html>
- Hillison, J. and Williams, S. (2001). When FFA was king of radio airwaves. *Journal of Agricultural Education* 42(2), 11-17.
- Hodder, I. (2000). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N.K. Denizen and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd Ed., pp. 703-716). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hoepfl, M. C. (1997). Choosing Qualitative Research: A Primer for Technology Education Researchers. *Journal of Technology Education* IX (1), 47-63.
- Holway, W.R. (1969). *A history of the Grand River Dam Authority, State of Oklahoma, 1935-1968*. Tulsa, OK: The Author.
- Hughes, T. P. (1987). The evolution of large technological systems. In W. E., Bijker, T. P. Hughes, & T. J. Pinch (Eds.), *The social construction of technological systems: New directions in the sociology and history of technology*. (pp. 50-82). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Investigation of veterans' educational program. Hearings before the House Select Committee to Investigate Educational, Training and Loan Guaranty Programs Under GI Bill (Teague Committee), created pursuant to H. Res. 93. House of Representatives. 82nd Cong., 1 (1951).*
- Kantor, H. (1982). Vocationalism in American education: The economic and political context, 1880-1930. In H. Kantor and D.B. Tyack (eds.), *Work, youth, and schooling: Historical perspectives on vocationalism in American education.* (pp. 14-44). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Katz, M. D. (1968). *The irony of early school reform: Educational innovation in mid-nineteenth century Massachusetts.* Boston, MA: Beacon.
- Kennedy, J. F. (1960, September 12). Kennedy on West Virginia. *Huntington Advertiser*, 1, 6.
- Kincheloe, J. and McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative theory*, (2nd ed., pp. 279-313). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.,.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1999). *Schooled to Work: Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876-1946.* New York: Teachers' College Press.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1995). *Struggle for the American curriculum, 1893-1958* (2nd ed.) New York: Routledge.
- Krug, E. A. (1964). *The shaping of the American high school.* New York: Harper & Row.
- Kulikoff, A. (1992). *The agrarian origins of American capitalism.* Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.

- Lawson, B. C., et al. (1947). *Developing instruction in vocational agriculture for veterans on farms in Indiana*. Indianapolis: Indiana Department of Public Instruction.
- Lee, J. S. and Turner, D. L. (1994). *Introduction to world agriscience and technology*. Danville, IL: Interstate Publishers.
- Lewis, E. (1980). *Public entrepreneurs: Toward a theory of bureaucratic political power: The organizational lives of Hyman Rickover, J. Edgar Hoover, and Robert Moses*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Lewis, T. (2004). A turn to engineering: The continuing struggle of technology education for legitimization as a school subject. *Journal of Technology Education*, 16(1) 21-39.
- Lewis, T. (1999). Research in technology education--Some areas of need. *Journal of Technology Education*, 10(2), 42-57.
- Lincoln, Y. S. and Guba, E. G. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative theory* (2nd ed., pp. 163-188) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lucas, A. R. (2005). Industrial milling in the ancient and medieval worlds: A survey of the evidence for an industrial revolution in Medieval Europe. *Technology and Culture*, 46(1), 1-30.
- Luetkemeyer, J.F. (1987) The Snedden/Prosser Social Efficiency Paradigm of Vocational Education, *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 25, 31-43.
- Lund, J. (1948, November). Education can change community life. *School Life*, 31(2) 11-12.

- Lynch, R.L. (2000). High school career and technical education for the first decade of the 21st century. *Journal of Vocational Education Research* 25(2), 155-198.
- Marcus, A. I. (1986, spring). The ivory silo: Farmer-agricultural college tensions in the 1870s and 1880s. *Agricultural History*, 60(2), 245-298.
- Mertens, D. M. (1998). *Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative & qualitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Minzey, J. T. and Letarte, C. E. (1994). *Reforming Public Schools Through Community Education*. Midland, MI: Pendel Publishing.
- Moore, G. E. (1988, December). A philosophy primer for agricultural educators. *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, 61(6).
- Moore, G. E. (1987, February). The status of agricultural education prior to the Smith-Hughes Act. *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, 59(8).
- Morrill Land-Grant Act. (1862). *U.S. Statutes at Large*. 12, 503.
- Mosch, T. R. (1970) The GI Bill: A Precedent in Educational and Social Policy in the United States, Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Oklahoma.
- Murray, J. and Dewlen, A. (1955, April 30). Oklahoma is in a mess! *Saturday Evening Post*, CCXXVII (44), 20.
- Myers, J. L. (1982). Johnston Murray: Governor of Oklahoma, 1951-1955. In LeRoy H. Fischer (ed.). *Oklahoma governors, 1929-1955: Depression to prosperity* (pp. 174-197). Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Historical Society.
- Naugher, R. E. (1948). Summary of veterans' farm training study. *Agricultural Education Magazine*, 21(3), 57, 60.

- Neyland, L. W. (1990). *Historically black land-grant institutions and the development of agriculture and home economics, 1890-1990*. Tallahassee, FL: Florida A and M University Foundation, Inc.
- Noble, D. F. (1984). *Forces of production: A social history of industrial automation*. New York: Knopf.
- Null, J. W. (2002a). Who meant what with social efficiency: Several different conceptions of a narrowly understood term. *American Educational History Journal*, 29, 80-88.
- Null, J. W. (2002b). An investigation into the meaning of social efficiency: The term within its historical context. *Journal of the Philosophy and History of Education*, 52. Retrieved February 24, 2002, from <http://members.aol.com/sopheswpes/2all2.htm>
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. (1956). *Twenty-sixth Biennial Report, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1954-1956*. Oklahoma City: The Author.
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. (1954). *Twenty-fifth Biennial Report, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1952-1954*. Oklahoma City: The Author.
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. (1923-1962). *Oklahoma Educational Directory*. Oklahoma City: The Author.
- Oklahoma State Department for Vocational Education. (1949). *The Veterans' Agricultural Training Program in Oklahoma: Developing the ability to farm successfully*. Oklahoma City: The Author.
- Oklahoma State Election Board (1994). *Oklahoma elections: Statehood to present, volume 1*. Oklahoma City: The Author.

- Olson, K. W. (1974). *The G.I. Bill, the veterans, and the colleges*. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press.
- Otey, G. N. (1984). New Deal for Oklahoma's Children: Federal Day Care Centers, 1933-1946. *Chronicles of Oklahoma*, 62(3), 296-311.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluations methods*. (3rd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Payne, M. (1997). Introduction: Some versions of cultural and critical theory. In Michael Payne (ed.), *A dictionary of cultural and critical theory* (pp.1-12). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Peshkin, A. (2000). The nature of interpretation in qualitative research. *Educational Researcher*, 29(9), 5-10.
- Petrina, S. (fall 1998). The Politics of Research in Technology Education: A Critical Content and Discourse Analysis of the Journal of Technology Education, Volumes 1-8." *Journal of Technology Education*, 10(1), 27-57.
- Phipps, L. J. (1956). *Handbook on teaching vocational agriculture*. Danville, IL: The Interstate.
- Pinar, W., Reynolds, W, Slattery, P., and Taubman, P. M. (2000). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourse*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Pryor Jeffersonian (1945, November 29). On-job training offered veterans by city schools. *The Pryor Jeffersonian*, 38(51) 1.
- Ralston, C. F. (2000). Adult education as a Welfare Measure during the Great Depression: A Historical Case Study of the Educational Program of the Civilian

- Conservation Corps, 1933-1942. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Pennsylvania State University, University Park.
- Ravich, D. (2000). *Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reform*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Rawick, G. P. (1957). *The New Deal and Youth: The Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Youth Administration, and the American Youth Congress*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Reagan, P. T. (2000). *Designing a new America: The origins of New Deal planning, 1890-1943*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Reeves, T. C. (1975). *Gentleman boss: The life of Chester Alan. Arthur*. New York: Knopf.
- Robinson, P. (2001, 2 April) Boeing Co. CEO changes company's flight pattern. *Tulsa World*, 95(217), E-1.
- Ross, D.R.B. (1969). *Preparing for Ulysses: Politics and Veterans during World War II*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rosenbloom, D. H. and Goldman, D. D. (1998). *Public administration: Understanding management, politics, and law in the public sector* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rulan, P. R. (1979). The campus cadets: A history of collegiate military training, 1891-1951. *Chronicles of Oklahoma*, LVII(1), 67-90.
- Ryan, A. (1995). *John Dewey and the high tide of American liberalism*. New York: Norton.

Schipper, H. (1948, February). Farm veterans and wives work, play and learn together.

Agricultural Education Magazine 22, 148.

Schwandt, T.A. (2000). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry:

Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social construction. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S.

Lincoln, (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd Ed. pp. 189-214).

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Scott J. and Sarkeos-Wircenski, M. (1996). *Overview of vocational and applied*

technology education. Homewood, Ill.: American Technical Publishers.

September 1945. (1945, September 17). *Time* XLVI(12), 5.

Session Laws of 1949, Chapter IA, Article 14, H. B. 120, 22nd Oklahoma Legislature.

Approved June 7, 1949.

Session Laws of 1941, Chapter 26, H .B. 168, 18th Oklahoma Legislature. Approved

April 16, 1941.

Session Laws of 1935, S. B. 395 (the Grand River Dam Authority Enabling Act)., 15th

Oklahoma Legislature. Approved April 1935.

Session Laws of 1929, Chapter 267, S. B. 30, 12th Oklahoma Legislature. Approved June

19. 1929.

Session Laws of 1917, Chapter 155, H. B. 213, 6th Oklahoma Legislature. Approved

March 24, 1917.

Session Laws of 1909, Chapter 3, Article XXXI, H. B. 348, 2nd Oklahoma Legislature.

Approved March 3, 1909.

Session Laws of 1907-1908, Chapter 3, Article III, S. B. 109, 1st Oklahoma Legislature.

Approved May 20, 1908.

- Setran, D. P. (2005). "From moral aristocracy to Christian social democracy": The transformation of character education in the Hi-Y, 1910-1940. *History of Education Quarterly* 45(2), 207-246.
- Snedden, D. (1918 December). Vocational education after the war. *School and Society* 8, 751-758.
- Smith, L. A. (1954). A study of the present status of farmers in Bolivar and Sunflower Counties, Mississippi, who have been enrolled in the institutional on-farm training program at the Cleveland Consolidated School. Unpublished master's thesis, Michigan State University.
- Smith, Jr., C. L. (1952). A study of the accomplishments by trainees while enrolled in the "Veterans Agricultural Training Program" in Oklahoma. Unpublished master's thesis. Oklahoma State University.
- Smith, N. B. (1999). A tribute to the visionaries, prime movers and pioneers of vocational education, 1892 to 1917. *Journal of Vocational and Technical Education* 16(1), 67-76.
- Spauding, D. J. (2000). The four major GI bills: A historical study of shifting national purposes and the accompanying changes in economic value to veterans. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas.
- Special Collections & University Archives, Edmon Low Library, Oklahoma State University. Stillwater, Oklahoma.
- Spring, J. H. (1968). Social efficiency and the New Nationalism. *History of Education Quarterly*, 8(1), 111-114.

- Stafford, L. O. (1949, February). Program for wives of veterans in Allen County, Indiana. *Agricultural Education Magazine* 22, 178.
- Stewart, R. P. (1982). *Programs for people: Oklahoma vocational education*. Stillwater, OK: State Department of Vocational and Technical Education.
- State Board of Education for Oklahoma. (1945-1962). *Biennial Report of the State Board of Education for Oklahoma*. Oklahoma City: The Author.
- Tierney, W. G. (2000). Undaunted courage: Life history and the postmodern challenge. Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd Ed., pp. 537-554) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Titus, H. (1944, November 18). Please! No more crackpot land schemes. *Saturday Evening Post* CCXVII, 24-25.
- Trexler, C. J. and Meischen, D. (2002). A qualitative study of prospective elementary teachers' grasp of agricultural and science educational benchmarks for agricultural technology. *Journal of Agricultural Education* 43(2), 68-81.
- Travers, R. M. W. (1978). *An Introduction to Educational Research* (4th ed.) New York: Macmillan.
- Tyson, C. (1974). *The history of vocational and technical education in Oklahoma*. Stillwater, OK: State Department of Vocational and Technical Education.
- U.S. Office of Education (1948). *Summary of veterans' farm training study*. Vocational Division Miscellaneous 3301. Washington, D.C.: The Author.
- U.S. Office of War Information. (1945). *U. S. Government Manual*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

- Uveges, Jr., J. A. and Keller, L. F. (1989). The first 100 years of American public administration: The study and practice of public management in American life. In Jack Rabin, W. Bartley Hildreth, and Gerald J. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of public administration* (pp. 1-42). New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.
- Vaughn-Roberson, C. A. (1983). Roy Joseph Turner: Governor of Oklahoma, 1947-1951. In LeRoy H. Fischer (ed.). *Oklahoma governors, 1929-1955: Depression to prosperity* (pp. 150-173). Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Historical Society.
- Veterans' institutional on-farm training. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. U.S. Senate. 84th Cong., 1 (1955).*
- Wakefield, D. B., Talbert, B. A. (2003). A historical narrative on the impact of the New Farmers of America (NFA) on selected past members. *Journal of Agricultural Education* 44(1), 95-104.
- Wall, P. L. and Noland, J. (1990). Thomas Monroe Campbell and the "movable school". *Teaching Education* 3(1), 56-64.
- Watkinson, J. D. (1996, winter). Reluctant scholars: Apprentices and the Petersburg Benevolent Mechanics' Association School," *History of Education Quarterly* 36(4), 429-448.
- Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma. Norman, Oklahoma.
- Whyte, W. H. (1956). *The organization man*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Wiebe, R. H. (1967). *The search for order, 1877-1920*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Wiersma, W. (1991). *Research Methods in Education: An Introduction*, (5th ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Wilentz, S. (1997). Society, politics, and the market revolution. In Eric Foner (ed.). *The new American history* (rev. and expanded ed., (pp. 61-84). Philadelphia: Temple University Press,

Wilson, S. (1955). *Man in the gray flannel suit*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Zuga, K. F. (1994). Implementing technology education: A review and synthesis of the research literature. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 372 305.

Zuga, K. F. (1992, spring). Social reconstruction curriculum and technology education. *Journal of Technology Education* 3(2), 1-11.

Appendix A

Institutional Review Board Approval

Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board

Date: Wednesday, January 19, 2005
IRB Application No ED0557
Proposal Title: Swords into Ploughshares: The History of the Veterans Agricultural Training Program in Oklahoma, 1945-1961
Reviewed and Processed as: Expedited

Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved Protocol Expires: 1/18/2006

Principal Investigator(s)

Bruce Niermi	Reynaldo Martinez
360 Ag Hall	209 Willard
Stillwater, OK 74078	Stillwater, OK 74078

The IRB application referenced above has been approved. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45 CFR 46.


The final versions of any printed recruitment, consent and assent documents bearing the IRB approval stamp are attached to this letter. These are the versions that must be used during the study.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period of one calendar year. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of this research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved protocols are subject to monitoring by the IRB and that the IRB office has the authority to inspect research records associated with this protocol at any time. If you have questions about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact me in 415 Whitehurst (phone: 405-744-1676, colson@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,


Sue C. Jacobs, Chair
Institutional Review Board

Appendix B

Interviews

1. Dreesen, R., Hansen, L., Maynard, C. and Dupy, D. (2003, 16 July). Interview by author, tape recording, Stillwater, OK.
2. Dupy, D. (2000, 16 July). Interview by author, tape recording, Stillwater, OK.
3. Hansen, L. (2002, 15 April). Interview by the author, not recorded, Stillwater, OK.
Larry Hansen Interviews: 2-16-05, March 30, 2004
4. Interview with Gov. Henry Bellmon, 2-8-05
5. Ralph Dreesen, April 7, 2005
6. Cleo Dupy, December 29, 2004, April 15, 2005
7. George Chiga, December 28, 2003
8. Dr. Robert R. Price, October 7, 2003, November 4, 2003,
9. Price, R. R. (2003, 27 July). Interview by author, unrecorded, Stillwater, OK.
10. Enoch Watterson Interview, Ardmore, Oklahoma, May 1, 2005

Appendix C

Informed Consent Document

I, _____, hereby authorize Bruce Niemi to perform the following procedure: interviewing me for the purpose of compiling an oral history of the veterans' agricultural training program in Oklahoma after World War II.

Project Title:

Swords into Ploughshares: The History of the Veterans' Agricultural Training Program in Oklahoma, 1945-1961.

Investigators:

Principal Investigator: Bruce Niemi, M.S.

Co-Principal Investigator: Reynaldo L. Martinez, Ph.D.

Purpose:

The subject of this research is a documentation of the history of the veterans' agricultural training program in Oklahoma after World War II. Scholars as well as the general public are unaware of the successes and failures of this veterans' program of adult farm education. Persons who participated in this program as teachers, administrators, and students are asked to recount their experiences in the program as part of general historical record. Respondents will be asked how they became involved in the program, what they did as participants, how they ended their involvement, and what their perceptions were of the success or shortcomings of the program in Oklahoma and in their communities with particular emphasis on other vocational education initiatives.

Procedures:

As an interviewee, I will be subjected to an interview consisting of 35 questions prepared before the interview and follow-up questions to clarify my responses. The interviews will take place in my home or a place of my choosing. The questions will concern my participation in the veterans' agricultural training program, my perceptions of the program, and my recollections about how the program influenced my life and my later participation in other vocational education initiatives. The interview will be taped for subsequent transcription and content analysis. In the final report on the project I will be credited for any comments or information I divulge that is used in the report. I will not be subjected to any physical or psychological discomfort or stress.

Risks of Participation:

I am aware that there are no known risks associated with this project which are greater than those ordinarily encountered in daily life.

Benefits:

The story of the veterans' agricultural training program is a neglected topic. The benefit to society of this study is greater knowledge of the history of vocational education in Oklahoma and an understanding of how education and technology affected society and the agricultural economy of this state. My participation in this oral history project is intended to broaden the historical knowledge of the program and inform future occupational education programs for veterans and civilians.

Confidentiality:

Data gathered from this interview will be recorded on audiotape. These tapes will be stored in the office of the Principal Investigator. The tapes will be transcribed by a stenographer and the transcripts will be used to provide data for a historical record of the veterans' agricultural training program in Oklahoma. The recorded and transcribed data will be kept indefinitely and may be donated to a historical society or university library collection. I understand that I will be identified by name and credited as the source of the information I gave in the published report and as the person interviewed in the oral history. I understand that the OSU Institutional Review Board has the authority to inspect consent records and data files to assure compliance with approved procedures.

Compensation:

No compensation will be made to me as a participant in this interview.

Contacts:

If I have any questions about this procedure or the results of the study I can contact:

Bruce Niemi, 360 Agricultural Hall, Stillwater, OK 74078, 405-744-5414

Dr. Reynaldo Martinez, 209 Willard Hall, Stillwater, OK 74078,
405-744-7741

Dr. Sue Jacobs, IRB Chair, 415 Whitehurst Hall, Stillwater, OK 74078,
405-744-5700

Participant Rights:

My participation in this interview is voluntary and I may request discontinuing my participation prior to the publication of the final report on the veterans' agricultural training program without reprisal or penalty.

Signatures:

I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy of this form has been given to me.

Signature of Participant

Date

I certify that I have personally explained this document before requesting that the participant sign it.

Signature of Researcher

Date

Appendix D

Interview Questions for Veterans Instructors

Questions directed at the instructor category participants will include:

1. How did you become a veteran's instructor in the GI Bill on-farm training program?
2. What community did you serve as an on-farm veterans' instructor?
3. Was this your home-town, as in did you grow up in the community and attend school there?
4. How old were you when you were hired as a veterans' instructor?
5. What was your job immediately before you were hired on as a veterans' instructor?
6. How was the job as a veterans' instructor like or unlike your previous work?
7. Was being an agricultural teacher one of your career goals before you were hired for the position of veterans' instructor?
8. Why did you decide to take the job as veterans' instructor?
9. Were you a member of the armed forces during World War II or the Korean War?
10. What was your experience like in the armed services?
11. Did your experience in the military or naval service help you to relate to the returning veterans who were your students?
12. What was your attitude toward the veterans who were your students?
13. Did you know any of the students from the time before the war?
14. What were the students like?
15. Did any black or minority veterans participate in any on-farm training classes in your community?
16. Did WAC or WAVES or Women Marines veterans enroll in any on-farm training classes in your community?

17. If women or minority veterans attended your classes, what were the veteran students like?
18. What were the people in community like?
19. How did the non-veteran community members feel about the veterans receiving a free education in agriculture and a stipend at the taxpayers' expense?
20. What was the attitude of the local school superintendent concerning the veteran's agricultural training at the school you taught in?
21. How about the attitude of the school principal toward the veteran's program?
22. Did the regular faculty at the school you taught at participate in the program or did you hear them express any opinions about the veterans and their agricultural program?
23. Did the clerical or custodial staff at the school where you were the veteran's on-farm instructor concern themselves with the program or express any resentment about the extra work that the veterans' classes cause for them?
24. What were some of the things that the regular school staff liked about the agricultural training?
25. Were there any things about the program that they didn't like?
26. What was it like to serve as an instructor in the veterans' agricultural education program?
27. What teaching style or methods did you employ when you were teaching classes as a part of the on-farm training?
28. What curriculum and instructional materials did you use?
29. How did you obtain curriculum and instructional materials issued to you by the administrators of the program?
30. Did you ever have to provide your own materials?
31. What supervision of teaching did you receive?
32. How did you assess their training?
33. Did the students become "better farmers"?

34. What types of activities were organized by the trainees in veterans' farm training?
35. What kinds of the student initiated activities involved the trainees' wives or family members?
36. What kinds of comments or suggestions were made by the trainees to include activities or field trips for the wives and other family members?
37. Did students realize that they had a career on the farm or did it help them find a future outside of farming?
38. What are some antidotes or stories that you recall from your time teaching in the veterans' program?
39. How did your participation in the on-farm training affect your attitude about vocational education in Oklahoma?
40. How did attitudes change about how effective vocational training could be after veterans' farm training?
41. How do you believe the veterans' farm training program affected the further development of Oklahoma's vocational education system?

Appendix E

Interview Questions for Veteran-Trainees

Questions for students participating in the program include:

1. How did you enroll in the GI Bill on-farm training program?
2. In what community did you attend your classes?
3. Was this your home-town, as in did you grow up in the community and attend school there?
4. How old were you when you enrolled in the veterans' on-farm training courses?
5. What motivated you to take evening classes in agriculture?
6. What classes did you take?
7. Why did you take these particular classes?
8. What types of activities, instruction, diplomas, and awards did you participate in or achieve while in the on-farm training program?
9. Did you complete all of the courses for the veterans' on-farm training?
10. What factors prevented you taking classes?
11. What were the attitudes like of the regular school personnel toward the veterans taking courses in the community's school building?
12. What were the attitudes of the veteran's instructors toward the veterans enrolled in the on-farm training in your community?
13. What did people in the community think about the veterans enrolled in the on-farm training program?
14. What was the attitude of the people in the community toward the veterans receiving a free education in agriculture and stipend while enrolled in on-farm training?
15. Did any black or minority veterans participate in on-farm training in your community?

16. Did WAC or WAVES or Women Marines veterans enroll in on-farm training in your community?
17. If women or minority veterans attended your classes, what were these veterans' students like?
18. Did you and the other students in the class work and socialize together?
19. How did you feel about your participation in the on-farm training?
20. Were you looked upon as an adult in the classroom?
21. How useful was the on-farm training program you?
22. Did the program help you to become a better farmer?
23. Did your experience as a student in the program convince you that perhaps farming wasn't the way to go and that you should get a job outside of agriculture?
24. What are some antidotes or stories that you recall from your experience as a student in veterans' on-training?
25. How did your participation in on-farm training influence your attitude about vocational education in Oklahoma?
26. How many of the wives commented that they would like to attend activities with wives of the other trainees?
27. How do you believe the veterans' farm training program affected the further development of Oklahoma's vocational education system?

VITA

Bruce Edward Niemi

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: **SWORDS INTO PLOUGHSHARES: A HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM UNDER THE SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, 1945-1966.**

Major Field: Education Option: Occupational Education Studies

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born April 24, 1949. Tulsa Oklahoma.

Education: Graduated with the degree of Bachelor of Arts, University of Oklahoma, 1974, and the degree of Master of Science, Oklahoma State University, 2001. Completed the requirements for Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in July 2005.

Experience: City Planner – Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission, Upper Marlboro, MD, 1975-1979; and Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, 1979-1981. Circuit Rider City Manager, Northeast Area Municipal Council, 1982-1985. City Manager, Grove, Oklahoma, 1985-1987. Planning Consultant, 1987-2000. Member of the House of Representatives, Oklahoma Legislature, 1990-1992. Executive Director, Tulsa Community Action Agency, 1992-1994. Adjunct Instructor of Political Science – Tulsa Community College 1984-2002; and Northeastern State University, 2002-2003. Visiting Instructor of Landscape Architecture – Oklahoma State University, 2004-2005.

Professional Memberships: Omicron Tau Theta; International Technology Education Association; Association of Career and Technical Education. History of Education Society; Society for the History of Technology; North American Victorian Studies Association.

Name: Bruce Edward Niemi

Date of Degree: July, 2005

Institution: Oklahoma State University

Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: SWORDS INTO PLOUGHSHARES: A HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM IN OKLAHOMA UNDER THE SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, 1945-1966

Pages in Study: 215

Candidate for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major Field: Education

Option: Occupational Education Studies

Scope and Method of Study: This research project was a study of the implementation of institutional on-farm training in Oklahoma under the GI Bill of Rights for World War II and Korean War veterans. The research questions addressed a) how the program was administered in Oklahoma; b) how the Oklahoma veterans' Agricultural Training Program contributed to the growth of vocational education leading to the development of a system of area technical schools, and c) the program's effect on the social and economic lives of the participants and their communities. The research methodology was historical research utilizing document analysis and the qualitative research method of oral history.

Findings and Conclusions: This study found that administration of the program stemmed from the major developments in the field of public administration during the Great Depression and World War II. Program leaders created alliances with external political and higher education leaders. The program created a culture for an independent, politically-powerful state vocational education agency, resolved the problem of a teacher shortage through the use of uncertified and/or provisionally certified teachers, established a tradition for summer conferences for vocational teachers, and created a curriculum development component within the agency. The study found that the program was an example of "picket-fence" federalism. The program was established as technical agricultural instruction but it also was community education that had a positive effect on veterans' reintegration and developed a cadre of community leaders. The program contributed directly to a positive perception of adult vocational education among its participants that was instrumental in the passage of a provision in the state constitution establishing the area technical schools system.

ADVISER'S APPROVAL: Reynaldo L. Martinez, Jr.
