

THE ROLE OF THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURAL
INSTRUCTOR IN COORDINATING YOUNG FARMER PROGRAMS
IN THE UNITED STATES

by 6408

BRUCE R. FLIPSE

B.S., Kansas State University, 1967

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1971

Approved by:

G. J. Albrecht
Major Professor

LD
2668
R4
1971
F5
C.2

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere appreciation is given to Dr. James Albracht, Coordinator, Agricultural Education, Department of Adult and Occupational Education, College of Education, Kansas State University, for his counsel, encouragement, and supervision of the research and writing of this report. Thanks also must go to Professor Howard Bradley, Agricultural Education, Department of Adult and Occupational Education, College of Education, Kansas State University, for his suggestions and assistance in the preparation of this thesis. Appreciation is expressed also to Dr. Milton Manuel, Department of Agricultural Economics, College of Agriculture, Kansas State University.

BRF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Statement of Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	4
Limitations.	5
Definitions.	6
II. REVIEW OF THE SELECTED LITERATURE	10
Bothwell Report.	10
Course Planning.	12
Instructional Presentation	14
Farm Visitations	16
Class Attendance	17
Payment of Fees.	19
Summary.	20
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES.	23
Population	23
Development of the Instrument.	24
Measurement.	25
IV. THE FINDINGS.	26
Characteristics of Respondents	26
Presentations and Analysis of Findings	28
Course Content	29

CHAPTER	PAGE
Instructional Presentation	30
Farm Visitation.	32
Class Attendance	33
Payment of Fees.	35
Summary.	36
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	39
Summary of Findings.	40
Conclusions and Recommendations.	42
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	44
APPENDIX.	48

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Distribution of Respondents by States	27
II. Responses of Young Farmers and Instructional Leaders to the Statement, "The Following Should Decide on Young Farmer Course Content"	30
III. Responses of Young Farmers and Instructional Leaders to the Statement, "The Vocational Agriculture Instructor Should Teach".	32
IV. Responses of Young Farmers and Instructional Leaders to the Statement, "The Vocational Agriculture Instructor Should Visit Each Young Farmer"	33
V. Responses of Young Farmers and Instructional Leaders to the Statement, "A Young Farmer Should Attend".	34
VI. Responses of Young Farmers and Instructional Leaders to the Statement, "A Young Farmer Should Pay an Enrollment Fee of".	35

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the past two decades the need for efficient farming increased greatly. There was expanded population growth and increased food and fiber demands upon the farmer. During this period the cost of production increased and more efficient production was required. Slightly more than three million farms were reported in 1968 and this figure was expected to drop to approximately two and three-fourths million by 1980.

The average age of the farmer has been determined in excess of 50, with some figures as high as 56. It was estimated that one million new farmers would be needed by 1980. The colleges and universities provided some advanced education for farmers, however only two percent of the college graduates returned to the farm. With the low number of college graduates returning to the farm there was a great need for agricultural education for young farmers sponsored by the secondary schools in this country. In 1967 there were 350,000 enrolled in young and adult farmer programs in this country. About 68,000 were estimated to be young or beginning farmers.

The young farmer organization had a history dating back to 1927 in Ohio. Local chapters have organized into state

associations which in turn have cooperated in sponsoring a national institute for young farmers. It had grown to the extent that the National Young Farmer Institute had become an annual event. At this institute young farmers from each state meet to exchange views and become better informed in the business of farming.

A local young farmer organization is a method of accomplishing the broader objectives of a young farmer program. It provides a vehicle for developing leadership and intelligent followership. It prepares a young man for effective and intelligent participation in adult farmer organizations. A young farmer demonstrates to himself through an organization the importance of belonging to and participating in adult organizations. Most persons agree that young men need help in developing the desire and ability for participation in adult organizations.
(3)*

In 1970 Kansas had 48 young farmer chapters with a total membership of approximately 850. (2) These chapters had organized into a state association in May, 1962.

At the local level the vocational agriculture instructor acted as the advisor. He was the one who organized, taught, and advised the young farmers from the beginning. The young farmers organization helped the vocational agriculture instructor to be more effective in his teaching.

*The number in the parentheses denotes the number of the reference in the footnotes at the end of each chapter.

A local young farmer organization makes a teacher's work with young farmers more effective and relieves him of many responsibilities. Teacher-student relationship is improved. An organization of this type is an effective teaching procedure and not an added responsibility for a teacher. (3)

In recent years it had been speculated that the role of the vocational agriculture instructor had changed from that of a teacher to that of a part-time teacher and coordinator of the young farmer program, and that resource specialists made many of the class presentations.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The vocational agriculture instructors were not in complete agreement as to how they could best help the young farmers. A study by Bothwell (1) was conducted to help determine the desirable characteristics of young farmer classes in the State of Kansas. Bothwell's findings left some questions unanswered or indicated a lack of agreement by respondents. Specifically this study was designed to gain additional information on the national level to help answer the following questions:

- (1) Who can best decide on class course content?
- (2) How much of the teaching should be done by the vocational agriculture instructor?
- (3) How many farm visits should the instructor make to young farmers?

- (4) How many classes should the young farmer be required to attend?
- (5) How much enrollment fees should the young farmer pay to help meet the expenses of the class?

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The role of the vocational agriculture instructor had changed over the years. In the earlier years of the young farmer program the instructor taught most of the classes and made many farm visits to each young farmer. The instructor's advice was considered very valuable when the young farmer had many enterprises and had little communication with the specialists for the different areas of his farming program. Today the young farmer is more specialized and more educated in his business of farming. This has come about due to the advancement in communications and other training programs by people such as county extension agents, agricultural businessmen, and highly specialized farmers.

The amount of technical knowledge needed to farm has increased tremendously in the last few years. As a result, the vocational agriculture instructor has found it difficult to stay abreast of the increasing knowledge needed for specialization in the many areas. The value of farm visits

and class presentations by the instructor had always been important. Although this method was found to still be in use by vocational agriculture instructors, the number of farm visits and the amount of class presentations varied considerably.

In the past, course content has been determined by various methods. Some of the individuals and groups who had influenced the course content were the instructors, young farmers, state vocational departments, advisory councils, and others connected with the young farmer classes.

The number of class meetings a young farmer was required to attend varied between states. The amount of reimbursement for the requirement of class attendance also varied from state to state.

The amount of class dues which young farmers paid varied in local organizations. Current practice indicated that the dues were spent for such things as expenses for resource specialists, postage, telephone calls, and refreshments.

The major purposes of this study were to clarify the role of the vocational agriculture instructor and the member participation for the total young farmer program.

LIMITATIONS

The population in this study was limited to those young farmers, vocational agriculture teachers, agriculture businessmen, and state supervisory staff who attended the National Young

Farmers Institute at Wichita, Kansas, on December 6-9, 1970. This population did not necessarily represent a cross section of national young farmer education.

As a result of the survey methods used, the amount of information gathered was limited to the instructor's role and the young farmer's participation. There are additional factors which affect the young farmer program.

DEFINITIONS

The definitions used in this study had the following meanings. References by Phipps (3), (4), Roberts (5), and Roscoe (6), were useful in defining the terms.

Advisor. The person who coordinated and advised the young farmer chapter. This was normally the vocational agriculture instructor.

Advisory Council. The Kansas State Department for Vocational Education required an advisory council to be formed in each vocational agriculture department as part of the requirements for reimbursement. This group has the function of analyzing and making recommendations for improvement.

Farm Visits. A visit by the vocational agriculture instructor to the home or farming operation of the young farmer. The objective was educational or communicative in nature.

Instructional Leaders. Vocational agriculture instructors, agricultural businessmen, and state supervisory staff members who attended the National Young Farmers Institute at Wichita, Kansas, on December 6-9, 1970.

Population. The group of individuals studied. In this study the population was the young farmers who attended the National Institute for Young Farmers at Wichita, Kansas, held December 6-9, 1970.

Resource Specialist. An individual considered to be very well informed in a particular area of agriculture and available to present this information to the public.

Vocational Agriculture. The systematic instruction to agriculture in the public schools for those 14 years of age, or older, who have entered or were preparing to enter upon the work of the farm or an agriculture-related occupation.

Vocational Agriculture Instructor. The person employed by a high school to head the vocational agriculture department.

Young Farmer. An active member of the young farmer program. These men usually received the majority of their income from farming.

Young Farmer Program. An educational program under the direction of the vocational agriculture instructor for individuals who received part of their income from farming or other agriculture areas.

Young Farmer Classes. Educational classes held for members of the young farmer chapter. They were taught by the vocational agriculture instructor or a resource specialist. To meet the requirements for reimbursement by the Kansas State Board for Vocational Education, 15 classes were held each year. The class period was two hours and needed an average attendance of 75 percent with a minimum of ten members.

FOOTNOTES

1. David Bothwell, "A Way to Evaluate Young Farmer Classes" (unpublished Masters report, Kansas State University, 1970).
2. "Kansas Young Farmer Directory 1971," (Topeka, Kansas: Agricultural Education, Division of Vocational Education, State Department of Education, 1971) p. 5. (mimeographed).
3. Lloyd J. Phipps, Handbook on Agricultural Education. (Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1965), pp. 464 and 465.
4. Lloyd J. Phipps, Successful Practices in Adult Farmer Education. (Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1954).
5. Roy W. Roberts, Vocational and Practical Arts Education. (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1971).
6. John T. Roscoe, Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE SELECTED LITERATURE

A search of related literature for this study was made by surveying the literature at the Kansas State University Library and the Agricultural Education Library, Department of Adult and Occupational Education, College of Education, Kansas State University. No identical studies were found, but literature was found that helped in conducting this study.

BOTHWELL REPORT

The literature nearest related to this study was a masters report by Bothwell. (1) Bothwell's report covered some of the same characteristics of this study except that his was limited to the Kansas young farmer program.

Bothwell sent questionnaires to all who conducted young farmer programs in Kansas. Respondents were vocational agriculture instructors, school administrators, and young farmers. He computed the percentages of positive and negative answers to statements for each group of respondents. In addition to the percentages, a scale of weighted importance was arbitrarily established for all criteria. The scale was given the following value for each possible response (1):

- +2 very significant
- +1 significant
- 0 undecided or no response
- 1 limited significance
- 2 no significance

Bothwell's study (1) showed a strong positive response to the statement "Instructor and young farmer committee should plan and schedule classes." The weighted importance was +1.45, with 100 percent of the teachers, 93 percent of the administrators, and 95 percent of the young farmers giving a positive answer.

The weighted importance was +.03 in connection with "Should the advisory council assist in setting up classes." Sixty-four percent of the teachers, 83 percent of the administrators, and 74 percent of the young farmers responded by answering yes. (1).

The study (1) revealed that 99 percent of all respondents believed the members should recommend course content. The weighted importance was +1.48.

Bothwell's study (1) showed that 34 percent of the teachers, 61 percent of the administrators, and only 21 percent of the young farmers thought a minimum of four classes should be presented by the instructor. The weighted importance of this response was -.92.

In another closely related question, 87 percent of the teachers, 61 percent of the administrators, and 85 percent of the young farmers believed eleven or more classes should be taught by resource specialists. The weighted importance of this question was +.52. (1).

A very important phase of Bothwell's study (1) indicated that 81 percent of the teachers, 68 percent of the administrators, and 49 percent of the young farmers thought the instructor should visit each member's farm at least twice a year. This statement had a weighted importance of only +.10.

The study (1) showed a strong positive response to the statement "Young farmers should attend 75% or more of the classes." The weighted importance was +1.29, when 100 percent of the teachers, 90 percent of the administrators, and 97 percent of the young farmers answered yes.

COURSE PLANNING

Roller (6) reported that in his young farmer classes the instruction was planned by the instructor and the young farmers, with the instructor accepting major responsibility and providing leadership. The overall objectives were to discover and help solve major problems of each young farmer enrolled; instruction was to be systematic and conducted throughout the year, on-farm instruction was to be provided, and the instruction was to be practical and interesting.

The young farmer classes conducted by Miller (13) had no rigid policies established for the content of the program. The farmers felt that the program was theirs and that they had freedom to operate within the broad framework of policies of the State Department of Education and the local school board. They believed the program was being operated for their benefit and for the welfare of the county.

According to Carter (9) another important function of the instructor was the selection of class topics. Topics for classroom study needed to be at least of general interest to most members of the group. No two young farmers had exactly the same farming programs but there were areas where common interests and knowledges were shared. Therefore, an instructor needed to help his young farmers select topics to be studied. Problems which pertained to one individual were discussed during a visit to his farm. However, this did not infer that the topics selected were of the same importance to each member of the class. Sometimes there were common problems which a dairy farmer and a beef cattle producer needed to consider. It was further evident that topics of a seasonal nature should be studied in the appropriate season.

Young farmers have gathered the information needed to improve their farming operation in some way or another. As recorded by Wilbur Rawson (14), one young farmer living in an

irrigated area reported that a group of young farmers met at a cafe early each morning and discussed problems connected with irrigation. Records were jotted down concerning the different practices followed, and a type of research resulted. The competition of crop yield added to the interest. The common problems of these men and their desire to learn from one another created a type of education wanted and needed by farmers. According to Rawson this desire to learn should have been channeled into the young farmer organization.

Schools in rural communities are in a favorable position to include an educational program for young farmers of the community. It is doubtful that a community not offering young farmer education can justify a vocational agriculture program in its high school. A properly planned and organized young farmer program will be an asset to the school and a benefit to the community. Yet, the key to the success of a young farmer program remains with the vocational agriculture teacher. (14).

INSTRUCTIONAL PRESENTATION

There was no agreement in the matter of the number of class presentations to be made by either the vocational agriculture teacher or a resource specialist. Bothwell's study (1) indicated 86 percent of the respondents believed that eleven or more of the classes should be taught by resource specialists.

Carter (9) has suggested that resource specialists should serve as consultants.

I may be prejudiced, but for the best results I think the vocational agriculture teacher should teach most of the classes for young farmers. Resource personnel are fine as consultants, but may do a poor job of teaching young farmers.

Carter justified this statement with the belief that too often resource specialists were not familiar with the individual farm situations of the young farmers and did not provide the help wanted and needed.

If an outside person is used, I strongly advise that the teacher of vocational agriculture explain to him the kinds of information he wants presented to the class and give him as much background as possible on the members of the class. During fifteen years of experience, I have not found outside people very useful in teaching young farmer classes. (9).

Roderick (15) indicated that the use of a specialist had the best results when his job was limited to that of acting as a resource person. The teacher of vocational agriculture assumed the leadership of the class and called upon the specialist only when the problems could not be solved within the group or when additional or new information was needed which could be supplied best by the specialist. Class meetings handled by a specialist were ordinarily an informing or telling process. The specialist often did not know the particular problems of the group, and therefore, teaching was quite ineffective even though he presented information that was informative.

Resource persons from a university or commercial concern were most useful when they knew of the work of the class and came to the class session to discuss only one phase of agriculture production. Witts (18) used resource persons in his classes but found their own studying and testing to be most beneficial. During class sessions, the instructor or the class president served as moderator and the resource specialist sat with the class and entered into the discussion.

The field of agriculture was broad and complex, as pointed out by Tiner (17), and changes were so rapid that it was not possible or feasible for the vocational agriculture teacher to provide all the training young and adult farmers needed to keep abreast of technological advancements. The participation of competent resource personnel in educational activities was essential to the continued growth and upgrading of the young and adult farmer education program.

FARM VISITATIONS

Bothwell's study (1) indicated that 81 percent of the instructors, but only 49 percent of the young farmers, believed the instructor should make at least two farm visits per year. This was one phase of the instructor's role in which agreement was found.

A questionnaire developed by Forrest (1) was presented to 100 individuals representing seven areas of vocational education. The study revealed that 66 percent of those surveyed believed the instructor should visit adults on their jobs and provide requested instruction or suggestions for improving their situation.

One method used to improve the value of farm visits, according to Bjergo (8), was to see that young farmers and school administrators were more aware of the value and purposes of their visits. Farmers were not normally aware that participation in adult and young farmer classes entitled them to individual on-farm instruction. School administrators were in some cases aware that accompanying the instructor of vocational agriculture on farm visits was an administrative duty, but in one study (8) only ten percent of the administrators participated in at least three farm visits annually.

A study conducted by Michigan State University (12) revealed that class discussions, teacher instruction, and individual help by the instructor were designated as very valuable by the majority of class members. Nearly one-half of the members designated individual help through on-farm visits and presentation of guest speakers as very valuable.

CLASS ATTENDANCE

One of the requirements for a successful young farmer program was a steady attendance at all meetings. Well planned

educational programs were necessary to keep the attendance high.

In a report by Albracht (7) methods were discussed to improve present programs of adult education. One of these methods was to hire another teacher to conduct the program of adult education. If this was not possible, the teacher often wanted to multiply his present services by other people and resources which were available. These included class members and class officers, other young farmer associations, resource persons, neighboring vocational agriculture teachers, field trips, panels, and representatives from farm organizations.

Regardless of the amount of resources which are available to the teacher, he must continue to plan, make his farm visitations, analyze his program, and decide which of the resources are the most valuable to him. (7).

Phipps (4) suggested the advisory council analyze carefully all attendance data and determine whether the program served all who wanted, needed and could have profited from the instruction. The average attendance, the percentage of attendance for those who were enrolled, the average number of meetings attended by the top and lowest quartile, and the percentage of farmers enrolled in the class in each farming classification and in each geographical area in the community should be evaluated.

Some type of recognition for adult classes was recommended by Roderick (15). This may have been a factor in maintaining regular attendance. Most frequently, certificates were awarded on the basis of attendance, however, the exact criteria on which the awards were made were not determined by the class members themselves.

PAYMENT OF FEES

A study by Michigan State University (12) showed that of the 66 young farmers willing to pay for instruction, nearly three-fourths of them would not pay over ten dollars. R. L. Hummel (11) reported that the State of Ohio recommended that the local school boards should match the state reimbursement, but that some teachers charged a registration fee of ten to thirty dollars which was paid by the young farmers.

Phipps (3) found that many school administrators recognized that courses for young farmers were an integral part of the program of agricultural education and that the public schools were responsible for young farmer education. These administrators often did not hesitate to finance young farmer programs from general school funds. Nearly all schools supplied classrooms, heat, light, janitor services, and teaching supplies for courses. Most state boards for vocational education reimbursed the schools from state and federal monies for the salaries of instructors.

The portion of a teacher's salary for a young farmer course which was not reimbursed by the state was obtained from local school funds or from tuition fees charged the adults enrolled. Phipps considered it undesirable to charge a tuition fee to pay the non-reimbursable cost of the course.

SUMMARY

Findings from the review of literature indicated that young farmers, vocational agriculture instructors, and other authorities involved in young farmer education were not in total agreement as to the role of the vocational agriculture instructor in coordinating young farmer programs. It seemed obvious that further research was needed to help clarify this role in order to be most effective in working with the young farmer program. This study was designed with this as the main objective.

FOOTNOTES

1. David Bothwell, "A Way to Evaluate Young Farmer Classes" (unpublished Masters report, Kansas State University, 1970), pp. 20-21, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 33.
3. Lloyd J. Phipps, Handbook on Agricultural Education. (Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1965), pp. 435-436.
4. Lloyd J. Phipps, Successful Practices in Adult Farmer Education. (Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1954), pp. 251.
7. James Albracht, "Multiplying the Teachers Efforts in Adult Education" The Agricultural Education Magazine. 44: 44-45, August 1968.
8. Allen Bjergo, New Perspective in Young and Adult Farmer and Rancher Education, (Eric File 013 874) 1963.
9. R. B. Carter, "Providing Instruction for Young Farmers - A Pleasure", The Agricultural Education Magazine. 40: 142-143, December 1967.
10. Lewis L. Forrest, "The Role of the Vocational Agriculture Teacher," The Agricultural Education Magazine. 43: 128-129, November 1970.
11. R. L. Hummel, "Financing Young Farmer Programs in Ohio", Final Report of the Training Institute for Administrative Personnel and Teacher Educators Responsible for Young Farmer Education, (Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1968), p. 78.
12. "Michigan Phase of the National Study of Young Farmer Instruction in Vocational Agriculture", Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan; May 1962.
13. Charles E. Miller, "A County-Wide Vocational Agriculture Program for Adults," The Agricultural Education Magazine. 41: 186, February 1969.
14. Wilbur Rawson, "Education for Young Farmers," The Agricultural Education Magazine. 42: 248-249, April 1970.

15. C. V. Roderick, Teaching Adult Farmers (Columbia, Missouri: Department of Agriculture Education, University of Missouri), p. 9, 10.
16. O. B. Roller, "Successful Young Farmer Programs" The Agricultural Education Magazine. 41: 49, August 1968.
17. E. L. Tiner, "Use of Specialist or Resource Personnel in Young Farmer Education," Final Report of the Training Institute for Administrative Personnel and Teacher Educators Responsible for Young Farmer Education, (Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1968), p. 96.
18. Eldon E. Witt, "A Key to Effective Adult Education" The Agricultural Education Magazine, 41: 33, August 1968.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Included in this chapter is a description of the general plan of the study including the population, how the questionnaire was developed and how it was evaluated. This study was designed to help improve young farmer education. It was anticipated that this study would provide information relative to vital questions for vocational agriculture instructors in the area of young farmer education.

POPULATION

The population was divided into two groups who attended the Young Farmers Institute at Wichita, Kansas, on December 6-9, 1970. One group consisted of 162 young farmers whose ages were generally between 18 and 35. However, some of the young farmers may have been slightly older.

The other group of respondents was composed of instructional leaders, which consisted of vocational agriculture instructors, agriculture businessmen, and state supervisory staff members. This group of instructional leaders numbered thirty-one, and the ages of the instructional leaders varied widely. This group consisted of men with considerable experience in working with young farmers across the United States.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENT

After considerable investigation and a certain amount of interviewing, a study of this type appeared to be needed in the area of young farmer organizations. It was a relatively new field with little research having been completed. The type of instrument, questions, method of gathering data, and general design of the study was decided upon with the help and approval of Dr. James Albracht, Department of Adult and Occupational Education, Kansas State University. The next step was to get the cooperation of those responsible for the Young Farmers Institute to allow the study to be conducted as a part of the registration procedure.

The instrument used in this study was a questionnaire which was incorporated with the registration procedure. It was developed in cooperation with Mr. Dean Prohaska, Supervisor of Agricultural Education, State Department of Education of Kansas and was designed to be the official enrollment form for the National Young Farmers Institute. All respondents completed the form during the registration period. Because the questionnaire was included with the registration form, only five questions were asked. The respondents used the checking method for answering. The form included the name, occupation, and address of the individuals who registered for the institute.

The questionnaire covered five areas of interest in connection with the vocational agriculture instructor's role in young farmer education. The areas of interest were:

1. Who can best decide on class course content?
2. How much of the teaching should be done by the instructor?
3. How many farm visits should the instructor make to young farmers?
4. How many classes should the young farmer be required to attend?
5. How much enrollment fee should the young farmer pay to help meet the expenses of the class?

MEASUREMENT

Each of the five questions had four possible answers. The respondent selected the answer which most nearly indicated his perception of the correct answer. Each of the five questions was evaluated separately. The number of responses for each of the four answers were tabulated and percentages were calculated.

CHAPTER IV

THE FINDINGS

The responses to the five questions concerning course content, instructional procedures and young farmer's responsibilities are included in this chapter. Each of the five questions involved in this study were analyzed individually. The number and percentage of respondents to each answer are summarized in the tables of this chapter.

CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

Respondents to the questionnaire in this study were divided into two groups, 162 young farmers and 31 instructional leaders. The two groups included individuals from 18 states who were enrolled at the National Young Farmers Institute in Wichita, Kansas, December 6-9, 1970 and responded to the questionnaire. The 193 respondents whose answers were used in this study did not include the total enrollment of the institute as some individuals chose not to complete the questionnaire or made procedural errors in answering.

TABLE I
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY STATES

STATE	YOUNG FARMER	INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS	TOTAL
Kansas	68	7	75
Ohio	16	1	17
Nebraska	12	1	13
Pennsylvania	12	3	15
Texas	11	1	12
Indiana	9	1	10
South Carolina	8	3	11
Oklahoma	5	1	6
Minnesota	4	1	5
Kentucky	3	1	4
Missouri	3	4	7
Colorado	2	2	4
Georgia	2	1	3
Utah	2	0	2
Virginia	2	1	3
California	1	1	2
New York	1	0	1
West Virginia	1	2	3
	162	31	193

Since the institute was held in Wichita, Kansas, there was a concentration of Kansans included in the total of the respondents. Of the 162 young farmers responding, as tabulated in Table I, 68 were from Kansas. Seven of the 31 instructional leaders were residents of the host state. Most of the young farmers involved in the questionnaire ranged in ages from 18 to 35, while ages of the instructional leaders had a greater variance. The instructional leaders had considerable experience in young farmer education.

Respondents were divided into two groups to ascertain different attitudes, if any, concerning the young farmer program. The same questionnaire was used for both groups. The findings are found in the tables and the results are explained in this chapter.

PRESENTATIONS AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The responses of the young farmers and instructional leaders to each of the questions were tabulated and percentages were calculated. The percentages were calculated to the nearest one-tenth of a percent. This procedure was followed for the responses to each of the questions. A summary or "total" column was then included in each table for each response.

In some instances, more than one response was marked by an individual for a given question, and therefore, the total number of responses may have exceeded the total number of

respondents. Other questions had fewer responses when individuals chose not to indicate any preference for a certain question.

Each of the five questions of this study was evaluated separately. Comparison of the results of this study and the Bothwell study (1) were discussed when related questions were encountered.

COURSE CONTENT

The evaluation of the first statement concerned the question of who should be involved in the determination of the young farmer course content. A significant number of respondents considered that the young farmers should be involved in determining course content as indicated by the replies listed in Table II. A final analysis of combined responses of the two groups indicated that 69 percent favored the statement that young farmers should be involved in determining course content. Thirteen or 6.4 percent of the respondents indicated that the vocational agriculture instructors should determine course content. Four or 2.0 percent replied that local and/or state committees or councils should determine course content. However, 22.6 percent of all respondents indicated that they would favor a combination of all of the alternatives in determining course content.

The first question was related to a similar question in the Bothwell study (1), which asked for a response to the statement, "Instructor and young farmer committees should plan and schedule classes." The consensus of opinion from results of both studies indicated that those responding to the similar question favored having young farmers determine course content.

TABLE II

RESPONSES OF YOUNG FARMERS AND INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS
TO THE STATEMENT,
"THE FOLLOWING SHOULD DECIDE ON YOUNG FARMER COURSE CONTENT"

RESPONSE	YOUNG FARMERS		INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS		TOTAL	
	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.
YOUNG FARMERS	121	70.8	19	59.4	140	69.0
VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE INSTRUCTORS	11	6.4	2	6.3	13	6.4
LOCAL AND/OR STATE COMMITTEES OR COUNCILS	3	1.8	1	3.1	4	2.0
ALL OF THE ABOVE	36	21.0	10	31.2	46	22.6
TOTAL	175	100.0	32	100.0	203	100.0

INSTRUCTIONAL PRESENTATION

The second question was designed to give an indication as to how many of the classes should be taught by the vocational

agriculture instructor. The responses of the young farmers in Table III indicated that 40.6 percent replied that one-fourth of the classes should be taught by vocational agriculture instructors. Instructional leader responses indicated that 48.2 percent favored one-fourth of the classes being taught by the vocational agriculture instructor. Twenty and seven-tenths percent of the instructional leaders believed the instructor should teach one-half of the classes while 14.8 percent showed a preference that the instructor teach no classes.

These responses were in general agreement with the Bothwell study (1). The responses of this study indicated that one-fourth or less of the classes should be taught by vocational agriculture instructors. In the Bothwell study 85 percent of the young farmers and 87 percent of the teachers indicated that eleven or more classes should be taught by resource specialists. Thus, the parallel studies gave similar responses.

TABLE III
 RESPONSES OF YOUNG FARMERS AND INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS
 TO THE STATEMENT,
 "THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE INSTRUCTOR SHOULD TEACH"

RESPONSE	YOUNG FARMERS		INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS		TOTAL	
	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.
THREE-FOURTHS OR MORE OF THE CLASSES	13	8.4	4	14.8	17	9.3
ONE-HALF OF THE CLASSES	32	20.7	6	22.2	38	20.9
ONE-FOURTH OF THE CLASSES	63	40.6	13	48.2	76	41.8
NONE OF THE CLASSES	47	30.3	4	14.8	51	28.0
TOTAL	155	100.0	27	100.0	182	100.0

FARM VISITATIONS

A wide variation of opinion was indicated in Table IV by the two groups concerning visits to young farmers by the vocational agriculture instructors. Twenty-one or 72.4 percent of the instructional leaders indicated that three or more farm visits were necessary each year, while over one-half of the young farmer group favored one or no visits per year. When considering the total responses of the two groups 64 or 34.8 percent of the two groups indicated that they desired three or more farm visits per year. Thirty-four or 18.5 percent of the combined groups preferred two visits per year, and 76 or 42.9 percent preferred one visit during a year.

The findings of this study and those of Bothwell's (1) indicated some differences in opinion on this question. Results of this study showed that 46.7 percent of those who responded indicated a preference for one or less visits each year. Of those responding in Bothwell's study, 66.9 percent indicated that two or more visits were necessary each year, while in this study 53.3 percent desired two or more visits per year.

TABLE IV
RESPONSES OF YOUNG FARMERS AND INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS
TO THE STATEMENT,
"THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE INSTRUCTOR SHOULD VISIT EACH
YOUNG FARMER"

RESPONSE	YOUNG FARMERS		INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS		TOTAL	
	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.
THREE OR MORE TIMES	43	27.8	21	72.4	64	34.8
TWICE	29	18.7	5	17.3	34	18.5
ONCE	76	49.0	3	10.3	76	42.9
NONE	7	4.5	0	0.0	0	3.8
TOTAL	155	100.0	29	100.0	184	100.0

CLASS ATTENDANCE

The two groups of respondents were in close agreement on standards of class attendance for young farmers. Eighty-seven and

three-tenths percent of the young farmers and 90.3 percent of the instructional leaders indicated that young farmers should attend at least three-fourths or more of all classes conducted. Seven and four-tenths percent of the respondents indicated that young farmers should attend one-half of the classes, and 1.0 percent preferred attendance at less than one-fourth of the classes.

Findings of this study were similar to those of the Bothwell study (1) in the area of class attendance. Combined group totals of this study indicated that 87.9 percent of the respondents favored class attendance at three-fourths or more of all classes held. Response in the Bothwell study indicated that 96.1 percent also favored this measure.

TABLE V
RESPONSES OF YOUNG FARMERS AND INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS
TO THE STATEMENT,
"A YOUNG FARMER SHOULD ATTEND"

RESPONSE	YOUNG FARMERS		INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS		TOTAL	
	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.
THREE-FOURTHS OR MORE OF THE CLASSES	138	87.3	28	90.3	166	87.9
ONE-HALF OF THE CLASSES	11	7.0	3	9.7	14	7.4
ONE-FOURTH OF THE CLASSES	7	4.4	0	0.0	7	3.7
LESS THAN ONE-FOURTH	2	1.3	0	0.0	2	1.0
TOTAL	158	100.0	31	100.0	189	100.0

PAYMENT OF FEES

Respondents were asked to indicate their opinions on enrollment fees for young farmer classes. Possible enrollment fees listed in Table VI ranged from a \$15 fee to none. The greatest number of both groups indicated that a five-dollar enrollment fee would be compatible with their situations. Fees of more than five dollars were favored by 11.3 percent of the respondents while one-fourth of those questioned felt that no enrollment fee was necessary.

Results of this study were similar to those found by a Michigan State University survey (2). Three-fourths of those polled in the Michigan State University study indicated they would not pay more than a \$10 enrollment fee for young farmer classes. This study revealed that 63.7 percent of those responding were in favor of a five-dollar fee.

TABLE VI
RESPONSES OF YOUNG FARMERS AND INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS
TO THE STATEMENT,
"A YOUNG FARMER SHOULD PAY AN ENROLLMENT FEE OF"

RESPONSE	YOUNG FARMERS		INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS		TOTAL	
	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.
FIFTEEN DOLLARS OR MORE	4	2.7	1	4.0	5	2.8
TEN DOLLARS	10	6.6	5	20.0	15	8.5
FIVE DOLLARS	100	66.2	12	48.0	112	63.7
NONE	37	24.5	7	28.0	44	25.0
TOTAL	151	100.0	25	100.0	176	100.0

SUMMARY

The findings of this study revealed that the population, of 193 people from 18 various states, was in agreement with findings of previous studies. It was found, in similar reports, that the two groups agreed that course content should be decided by young farmer class members. Agreement with Bothwell's (1) findings were also noted in decisions concerning responsibility of instruction. There were some discrepancies, however, in the degree of agreement on this matter when compared with some of the sources in the review of literature.

Findings of this study concurred with those of Bothwell (1) on the statement of class attendance. Data in the two studies indicated that young farmers should attend three-fourths or more of the class meetings. There was also agreement between this study and the sources used in the review of literature concerning the amount of class fees. The information in this study and the information in most of the other studies indicated that young farmers desired class fees of five dollars.

There was some disagreement in the number of farm visits. The Bothwell study (1) indicated 66.9 percent preferred more than two visits per year, and this study reported a 53.3 percent preference for two or more visits per year. Forty-two and nine-tenths percent indicated a preference for one visit and

3.8 percent a preference for no visits per year. It appeared from this study that a requirement of one visit per year might be sufficient but that more visits be made if time is available and the young farmer desires it.

FOOTNOTES

1. David Bothwell, "A Way to Evaluate Young Farmer Classes" (unpublished Masters report, Kansas State University, 1970).
12. "Michigan Phase of the National Study of Young Farmer Instruction in Vocational Agriculture", Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, May 1962.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The major purposes of this study were to clarify the role of the vocational agriculture instructor and the member participation for the total young farmer program. This study was designed to gain additional information to be used in improving young farmer education.

Evaluation of the review of literature showed that the role of the vocational agriculture instructor was still not well defined. Certain areas of inquiry showed agreement on the instructor's functions, but many other areas were still undecided.

Bothwell (1) made a study and attempted to determine basic criteria for the instructor's role. This study was designed to supplement the findings of the study by Bothwell. This study was also designed to survey the opinions of young farmers on a national scale.

The instrument used in this study was a questionnaire developed for use at the 1970 National Young Farmers Institute held in Wichita, Kansas, December 6-9. The questionnaire was designed to be brief in content to allow it to be used as part of the registration procedure. The questionnaire was designed to cover five areas of interest as follows:

- (1) Who can best decide on class course content?
- (2) How much of the teaching should be done by the vocational agriculture instructor?
- (3) How many farm visits should the instructor make to young farmers?
- (4) How many classes should the young farmer be required to attend?
- (5) How much enrollment fee should the young farmer pay to help meet the expenses of the class?

The completed questionnaires were tabulated and percentages were determined. Through the use of totals and percentages, the study could be objectively compared with findings of similar studies.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The findings included the responses of 162 young farmers and 31 instructional leaders who participated in the National Young Farmers Institute at Wichita, Kansas, December 6-9, 1970. The responses of the combined groups, concerning the planning of course content, revealed that 69 percent indicated a preference for young farmers to decide the course content. There was an additional 22 percent who indicated that the young farmer, the

vocational agriculture instructors, and local and/or state committees or councils should be used in deciding course content.

The vocational agriculture instructor's role as the primary class instructor was a question viewed with mixed reactions. The largest response or 41.8 percent indicated that the vocational agriculture instructor should teach one-fourth of the classes. Twenty-eight percent of the respondents answered none while 20.9 percent preferred that the vocational agriculture instructor teach one-half of the classes.

Instructor visits to member farms also revealed some variation of opinion. One visit was preferred by 42.9 percent of the respondents which was the largest response for the four choices. Eighteen and one-half percent preferred two visits and 34.8 percent preferred three or more visits per year.

Both groups indicated that the young farmer should attend three-fourths or more of the class meetings. Agreeing on this choice was a combined percentage of 87.9 of the respondents in both groups.

Fee assessment, for class enrollment, was favored at the rate of five dollars per year by a majority of the respondents. Sixty-three and seven-tenths percent were in agreement of the five-dollar fee, 25.0 percent indicated that no fee should be charged, and 8.5 percent preferred a ten-dollar fee.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A study of the findings of this report revealed some relevant information concerning the role of the vocational agriculture instructor. As the two respondent groups were evaluated, the following conclusions were made:

- (a) Young farmers should always be given the opportunity to participate in determining class course content.
- (b) Vocational agriculture instructors should teach approximately one-fourth of the young farmer classes.
- (c) Vocational agriculture instructors should visit each young farmer at least once each year.
- (d) Young farmers should be encouraged to attend at least three-fourths of the young farmer classes conducted.
- (e) Enrollment fees should not exceed five dollars per member.

It is recommended that more detailed studies should be conducted on a national level to further evaluate and clarify the vocational agriculture instructor's role in young farmer education.

FOOTNOTES

1. David Bothwell, "A Way to Evaluate Young Farmer Classes"
(unpublished Masters report, Kansas State University, 1970).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Borg, Walter R. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1963.
- Nichols, Mark. Young Farmers Their Problems, Activities, and Educational Program. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1952.
- Phipps, Lloyd J. Handbook on Agricultural Education. Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1965.
- Phipps, Lloyd J. Successful Practices in Adult Farmer Education. Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1954.
- Roberts, Roy W. Vocational and Practical Arts Education. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1971.
- Roscoe, John T. Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

B. PERIODICALS

- Albracht, James. "Multiplying the Teachers Efforts in Adult Education," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 41: 44-45, August 1968.
- Carter, R. B. "Providing Instruction for Young Farmers, A Pleasure," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 40: 142-143, December 1967.
- Forrest, Lewis L. "The Role of the Vocational Agriculture Teacher," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 43: 128-129, November 1970.
- Horton, J. C. "Organization of Multiple-Teacher Programs," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 39: 30-35, August 1966.

- Miller, Charles E. "A County-Wide Vocational Agriculture Program for Adults," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 41: 186, February 1969.
- Rawson, Wilbur. "Education for Young Farmers," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 42: 248-249, April 1970.
- Rodgers, John H. "Continuing Education for Young Farmers," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 40: 160-161, January, 1968.
- Roller, O. B. "Successful Young Farmer Programs," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 41: 49, August 1968.
- Witt, Eldon E. "A Key to Effective Adult Education," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 41: 33, August 1968.

C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

- Bjergo, Allen. "New Perspective in Young and Adult Farmer and Rancher Education." Eric File 013 874, 1963.
- Bothwell, David. "A Way to Evaluate Young Farmer Classes," Unpublished Masters report, Kansas State University, 1970.
- Elson, Donald. "Operational Procedures for Multiple-Teacher Departments of Vocational Agriculture," Thesis, M.S. 1968. Library, Kansas State University, Manhattan.
- Hummel, R. L. "Financing Young Farmer Programs in Ohio," Final Report of the Training Institute for Administrative Personnel and Teacher Educators Responsible for Young Farmer Education, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1968.
- Hunsicker, H. N. "Why We Are Here," Final Report of the Training Institute for Administrative Personnel and Teacher Educators Responsible for Young Farmer Education, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1968.
- Kansas Young Farmer Directory 1971, Topeka, Kansas: Agricultural Education, Division of Vocational Education, State Department of Education, 1971, mimeographed.

"Michigan Phase of the National Study of Young Farmer Instruction in Vocational Agriculture," Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, May 1962. .

Roderick, C. V. Teaching Adult Farmers. Columbia, Missouri: Department of Agriculture Education, University of Missouri.

Tiner, E. L. "Use of Specialist or Resource Personnel in Young Farmer Education," Final Report of the Training Institute for Administrative Personnel and Teacher Educators Responsible for Young Farmer Education, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1968.

APPENDIX

THE ROLE OF THE VOCATIONAL, AGRICULTURAL
INSTRUCTOR IN COORDINATING YOUNG FARMER PROGRAMS
IN THE UNITED STATES .

by

BRUCE R. FLIPSE

B.S., Kansas State University, 1967

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1971

The major purposes of this study were to clarify the role of the vocational agriculture instructor and the member participation for the total young farmer program. This study was designed to gain additional information to be used in improving young farmer education.

Evaluation of the review of literature showed that the role of the vocational agriculture instructor was still not well defined. Certain areas of inquiry showed agreement on the instructor's functions, but many other areas were still undecided.

Bothwell made a study and attempted to determine basic criteria for the instructor's role. This study was designed to supplement the findings of the study by Bothwell and to survey the opinions of 162 young farmers and 31 instructional leaders who attended the 1970 National Young Farmers Institute held in Wichita, Kansas, December 6-9. The questionnaire was developed with the help and approval of Dr. James Albracht, Department of Adult and Occupational Education, Kansas State University and Mr. Dean Prochaska, Supervisor of Agricultural Education, State Department of Education of Kansas. It was designed to be the official enrollment form for the Institute. The questionnaire was designed to cover five areas of interest as follows:

- 1) Who can best decide on course content?
- 2) How much of the teaching should be done by the vocational agriculture instructor?
- 3) How many farm visits should the instructor make to young farmers?
- 4) How many classes should the young farmer be required to attend?
- 5) How much enrollment fee should the young farmer pay to help meet the expenses of the class?

The responses of the combined groups, revealed that 69 percent indicated a preference for young farmers to decide the course content. There was an additional 22 percent who indicated that young farmers, vocational agriculture instructors, and local and/or state committees or councils should be used in deciding course content.

The vocational agriculture instructor's role as the primary class instructor was a question viewed with mixed reactions. The largest response or 41.8 percent indicated that the vocational agriculture instructor should teach one-fourth of the classes. Twenty-eight percent of the respondents answered none while 20.9 percent preferred that the vocational agriculture instructor teach one-half of the classes.

Instructor visits to member farms also revealed some variation of opinion. One visit was preferred by 42.9 percent of the respondents which was the largest response for the four choices. Eighteen and one-half percent preferred two visits and 34.8 percent preferred three or more visits per year.

Both groups indicated that the young farmers should attend three-fourths or more of the class meetings. Agreeing on this choice were 87.9 percent of the respondents.

Fee assessment, for class enrollment, was favored at the rate of five dollars per year by a majority of the respondents. Sixty-three and seven-tenths percent were in agreement on the five dollar fee and 25.0 percent indicated that no fee should be charged.

A study of the findings of this report revealed some relevant information concerning the role of the vocational agriculture instructor. As the two respondent groups were evaluated, the following conclusions were made:

- (a) Young farmers should always be given the opportunity to participate in determining course content.
- (b) Vocational agriculture instructors should teach approximately one-fourth of the young farmer classes.
- (c) Vocational agriculture instructors should visit each young farmer at least once each year.
- (d) Young farmers should be encouraged to attend at least three-fourths of the young farmer classes conducted.
- (e) Enrollment fees should not exceed five dollars per member.

It is recommended that more detailed studies should be conducted on a national level to further evaluate and clarify the vocational agriculture instructor's role in young farmer education.