

A COMPARISON STUDY OF TEACHERS OF
VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE WHO HAD PERSEVERED
AND THOSE WHO HAD LEFT THE FIELD OF
TEACHING IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KANSAS
DURING 1971-1975

by

Larry Dee Hoobler

B. S., Kansas State University, 1970

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Agricultural Education
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1976

Approved by:


Major Professor

LD
2668
R4
1976
H66
C.2
Document

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researcher wishes to extend his gratitude to the Agricultural Education graduates of Kansas State University who contributed their time and suggestions to this study.

A very special note of appreciation is expressed to Dr. James J. Albracht, the researcher's major advisor, for his valuable guidance and assistance. Grateful acknowledgment is given to Professor Howard R. Bradley and Professor Paul N. Stevenson who served on the researcher's supervisory committee.

A special thank you is given to the researcher's wife, Diane, for her assistance and encouragement. Appreciation is also extended to the researcher's two and a half year old daughter, Tammy, for her patience and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	2
	Objectives	2
	Operational Definitions of Terms	3
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
III.	DESIGN AND PROCEDURE	8
	The Research Design	8
	Selection of Subjects and Assignment to Groups	8
	Procedures	9
	Data Analysis and Presentation	9
	Significance of the Study	10
IV.	THE FINDINGS	11
V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	38
	Summary	38
	Conclusions	44
	Recommendations	45
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	46
	APPENDIX	49

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Returns of Those Who Remained and Those Who Left Teaching	12
II.	General Information About Those Who Remained and Those Who Left Teaching	13
III.	Present Annual Salary Comparison	15
IV.	Contributions of an Active FFA Organization to a Successful Vocational Agriculture Program	16
V.	The Importance of Areas of Study in Teaching Vocational Agriculture	18
VI.	Factors Considered in Choosing Another Profession	20
VII.	Usefulness of Agricultural Education Preparation	21
VIII.	Sources of Information for Those Teaching and Those Who Left	23
IX.	The Role of the Vocational Agriculture Teacher ..	25
X.	Administrators Attitudes Toward Vocational Agriculture Programs	26
XI.	Likes and Dislikes of Teaching and Non-Teaching Graduates	28
XII.	Interests in Areas When Teaching	29
XIII.	Working Hours After Leaving Teaching	31
XIV.	Obtaining First Job After Teaching	31
XV.	Consider Teaching Vocational Agriculture Again ..	31
XVI.	Occupations After Teaching	33

XVII. Salary of First Job After Teaching	35
XVIII. Reasons for Leaving Teaching	36

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As a teacher of vocational agriculture for four years, the author became interested in the problem of teaching tenure during his relatively brief teaching experience. Vocational agriculture was one of the few remaining fields which report a shortage of teachers. The annual survey of "Supply and Demand of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture" revealed that 120 teachers were still needed nationwide in 1971, but efforts were unsuccessful in filling these positions. (Woodin, 1971, Table 1) By 1972 there were 134 unfilled positions, but the big jump came in 1973 when 273 positions went unfilled. In 1974 the figure rose again with 292 unfilled positions. (Sollenberger, 1975, p. 16.)

In 1971 a record-breaking 1,743 new persons were qualified for teaching vocational agriculture, the largest number in any of the past seven years. At the same time, however, the percentage of those qualified who entered teaching decreased. Only 49.6 percent of newly qualified persons entered vocational agriculture teaching. A nation-wide normal for the profession. (Woodin, 1972, p. 251.) In 1974 the annual turnover rate had increased to about 12 percent among active vocational agriculture teachers, somewhat higher than among teachers in general. (Sollenberger, 1975, p. 16.)

Because of the increasing demand for vocational agriculture

instructors by schools going to multi-teacher departments, competition for teachers from technical institutes, community colleges and similar institutions, it became apparent that steps should be taken to reduce the rapid turnover of vocational agriculture teachers and encourage more qualified personnel to enter the profession.

Statement Of The Problem

All areas of Kansas had been losing vocational agriculture teachers at an alarming rate and hopefully this study would answer the question, "What have been the major causes of vocational agriculture teachers leaving the profession?" and to determine what fields they entered after teaching.

The purpose of this study was to study the reasons for the rapid turnover of vocational agriculture instructors in Kansas and why these persons changed to another field of employment. A control group of an equal number of teachers who remained in the teaching field during the years from 1971 through 1975 was used to compare their characteristics and attitudes with those who had left teaching.

Because of the rapid turnover rate of teachers considerable study was needed of the methods for correcting problems with the vocational agriculture teaching structure indicated from responses of former teachers. Then, recommended changes could be suggested.

Objectives

After researching several studies of a related nature and professional publications, it was expected that vocational agri-

culture teachers left the field of teaching and pursued other occupations for financial security, personal job advancement, and fewer extra-curricular activities.

The objectives of this study were to identify the reasons why teachers left or remained in the field of vocational agriculture teaching, and to determine biographical and attitudinal differences of the two groups.

Operational Definition Of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were most appropriate:

Agricultural education. This term refers to either the curriculum or division of the College of Agriculture with the responsibility for developing teachers of vocational agriculture at the secondary level.

Agricultural education graduates. Those students that pursued a study of agricultural education at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, and received their Bachelor of Science Degree shall be termed "agricultural education graduates."

Control Group. Through this report the term "control group" shall refer to teacher(s) who are teaching in a reimbursed department of vocational agriculture in Kansas during this period.

Field. Kansas State University has trained students to become vocational agriculture instructors since 1918. Being a vocational agriculture instructor was the "field" for which they were trained.

Former teacher(s). Agricultural education graduates that once taught vocational agriculture that did not continue teaching

shall be referred to as "former teacher(s)."

Instructor(s). "Instructor(s)" were those individuals providing instruction to a student in a desired course of study.

Occupational status. In this report the term "occupational status" referred to the vocation, job, or earning-power area pursued during the limits of this study by former teachers at the time of this study.

Present teacher(s). This term is synonymous with "Control Group."

Reimbursed departments. Departments of vocational agriculture having a teacher listed on the list of Vocational Agriculture Teachers of Kansas, 1970-71 through 1974-75, published by the State Department of Vocational Education Office, Topeka, Kansas shall be referred to as "reimbursed department."

Sample individuals. This term shall indicate those persons involved in furnishing responses for the questionnaire which was developed for this study.

Subjects. This term is synonymous with "sample individuals."

Teacher(s). This term is synonymous with "instructor(s)."

Tenure. The term "tenure" shall be used to describe the situation when an individual has stayed at one occupational location or area for a certain length of time.

Vocational agriculture. Vocational agriculture in Kansas has been compounded into five parts: classroom teaching, agricultural mechanics, supervised farming, experiencing agricultural occupations, and the Future Farmers of America organization.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

To date very few recent studies have been conducted related to attitudes, interests, and tenure of present and former vocational agriculture teachers. More studies in this area have been performed concerning students entering the agricultural education curriculum in college and the follow-up of these students as to their teaching intentions and performances, but the majority of those who entered teaching and later left the field have never been studied.

A study of the list of vocational agriculture teachers of Kansas for the years 1959-60 through 1965-66 revealed that 118 teachers had left the profession. (Vocational Agriculture Teachers of Kansas, 1966) This indicated that an average 12.6 percent of the teachers were leaving the field each year. A study by (Wallace, 1967) during this five-year period revealed that Kansas lost 24.8 teachers per year.

Another reason for shortage of vocational agriculture instructors revealed by a study by (Roderick, 1953) that 23.8 percent of qualified vocational agriculture teachers were teaching in fields other than vocational agriculture. It was also found that 22.4 percent were engaged in farming, and an equal number in agricultural commercial work.

A study of Kansas State University agricultural education graduates who did not elect to teach vocational agriculture

indicated that salary was most often ranked first as the reason they did not teach vocational agriculture. Lack of advancement possibilities was indicated most often as the second-ranked reason. (Severance, 1966)

A University of Tennessee study compiled by the Department of Agricultural Education revealed that salary was the main factor influencing teachers to leave the profession. Ranking second to salary was "limited chance for promotion in vocational agriculture." (University of Tennessee, 1958)

Another Master's Report, by Schrag concerning the employment history of vocational agricultural teachers in Kansas for the years 1918 through 1947 showed that "A more promising future" was the major reason (54.8 percent) for leaving the field. This was followed closely by salary (43 percent). (Schrag, 1955)

Why is there need for concern in this area of keeping vocational agriculture teachers in their respective field? A comparison of the number of positions in teaching vocational agriculture over the past 7 years (1965-71) shows that the number has stabilized at around 10,500 positions nationwide. "Supervisors, however, predict that 11,977 positions will be available by 1975." These figures do not include approximately 900 positions in technical institutes and community colleges. (Woodin, 1972)

"More than 2,000 new teachers are employed each year in departments of vocational agriculture in high schools, agricultural colleges and agricultural extension services." (Hoover, 1962)

This indicates a "need for competent, trained individuals as vocational

agriculture instructors in the public secondary and some state junior colleges in this country. However, Kansas State University could supply only 15 of 25 needed vocational agriculture teachers for public secondary school job openings in Kansas during the fall of 1964" (Wallace, 1967)

It seems apparent that teaching of agriculture still has an increasing importance in today's advanced technical society. "Today 3 out of every 10 jobs in private employment are related to agriculture." In 1970 3.2 million persons were employed in farming and projections indicate that by 1980 average farm employment will reach 3.6 million workers. (Dept. HEW, 1964) "Farm operators and workers will need higher levels of training." (Hunsicker, 1970)

The methods of teaching of vocational agriculture will need updating to meet public demands in education. "Career Education will be the greatest single factor affecting education during the next ten years." (Moore, 1972) "The publicity about 'too many unemployed teachers' has tended to discourage teaching as a career. For a young man or woman with an ag major the opportunity was never greater." (Harvey, 1975)

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

Research Design

For this study the design used was a type of Criterion-Group design with the intention of determining what caused the condition of teachers who left and who remained in the teaching field.

Selection Of Subjects And Assignment To Groups

Subjects were all teachers of vocational agriculture in secondary schools in Kansas who left the profession between July 1, 1971 and June 30, 1975. This was determined by studying lists of "Vocational Agriculture teachers of Kansas," 1970-71 and 1974-75, available from State Department of Vocational Education, Topeka, Kansas. An equal number of teachers who remained in teaching during the period from 1971 to 1975 was used as the control group to identify why they remained in teaching and to see where differences in attitudes and interests occurred.

The two groups of subjects in this study were the individuals mentioned above who left the vocational agriculture teaching field and those who remained in teaching. The population used in this study was limited to graduates in agricultural education from Kansas State University for the years 1954-1974. The population included those who continued to teach vocational agriculture and those who left the field during the 1971-75 time period regardless

of their graduation date. Since all teachers who left the field during this five-year period were sampled, this study was representative of the total population. The control group was randomly selected from the population of present teachers of vocational agriculture in Kansas who were in the corresponding graduating class at Kansas State University as those who left the field.

Procedures

The sample of vocational agriculture instructors mentioned in the selection of subjects area was involved in answering a questionnaire that was mailed to all former teachers who quit teaching during this five-year period. The follow-up of non-respondents was planned with two mailings of the original questionnaire in all follow-ups with a different cover letter used each time.

A waiting period of 30 days was used between each follow-up. The period of time this survey was performed had little significance on the results of the study, but plans were to complete the questionnaire and follow-up before May 15, 1976. A variety of questions were used in the questionnaire ranging from check lists to opinion questions. The questionnaire was pilot tested before initial mailing.

Data Analysis And Presentation

After the return of the questionnaires, the analysis of the data was compiled. Each question was analyzed individually so it could be rated on its importance to the study and determine which questions answered most directly the major reasons vocational agriculture instructors leave the field.

The data was presented by listing responses, check-list data, graphs, and tables. After analyzing the findings, conclusions and recommendations were made.

Significance Of The Study

The importance of this study was to compile an informative and factual report on the findings to determine the reasons for the turnover of vocational agriculture teachers in Kansas. The writer considered a consistant rate of over 10 percent and the fact that one-half the qualified graduates of agricultural education entered the vocational agricultural teaching profession, as factors which indicated the importance of a study of this kind.

CHAPTER IV

THE FINDINGS

There were 86 graduates of Agricultural Education at Kansas State University as indicated in Table I. For the 43 still teaching there were 40 (93%) who returned usable questionnaires. For the graduates who taught but left teaching there were 34 (79%) of the 43 graduates who returned usable questionnaires. Of the 86 graduates in the study 74 (86%) usable returns were tabulated in the findings of the study.

Information in Table II gives the general information on age, teaching, salary, and education characteristics of those who were teaching and those who had left. Very little difference was found in the ages between those teaching (29.9), those who left (29.1), and in the number of locations for those teaching (1.7), and those who left (1.5).

Little difference was found in beginning salaries for those teaching (\$7,212), and those who left (\$7,029). Also little difference was found in time of receiving the Bachelor of Science degree (1968 for those teaching, and (1967) for those who left.

Some difference was found in the years of teaching for those who remained (6.75), and those who left (4.06). Also some difference was found in hours taken beyond the Bachelor or Master of Science degrees with those teaching (16), and those who left (12.7) credit hours beyond the previous degree.

TABLE I
RETURNS OF THOSE WHO REMAINED AND THOSE WHO
LEFT TEACHING

	NO. OF GRADUATES	NO. OF RETURNS	PERCENT OF RETURNS
TEACHING	43	40	93
NON-TEACHING	43	34	79
TOTALS	86	74	86

TABLE II

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THOSE WHO REMAINED AND
THOSE WHO LEFT TEACHING

	TEACHING		NON-TEACHING	
	RANGE	AVERAGE	RANGE	AVERAGE
AGE	23-45	29.9	24-39	29.12
YEARS TAUGHT	2-19	6.75	1-13	4.06
NO. TEACHING LOCATIONS	1-5	1.7	1-3	1.53
BEGINNING SALARY	4,600-9,500	7,212	5,000-9,900	7,029
HIGHEST TEACHING SALARY	9,000-15,644	11,284	7,100-14,167	8,935
B. S. DEGREE	1954-1974	1968	1960-1974	1967
M. S. DEGREE (Total No.)	-----	22(55%)	-----	6(17.6%)
HRS. BEYOND B. S. OR M. S.	0-35	16	0-31	12.74

Much difference was found in the salaries of those who remained in teaching (\$11,284), and those who left (\$8,935). Twenty-two of those who remained in teaching had their Master of Science Degrees while six of those who left teaching had received their Master of Science Degree.

The information in the Present Salary Comparisons in Table III indicated that the graduates who were teaching had a narrower income range than the non-teaching graduates. There were more high and low wage incomes among the non-teaching graduates. Nine (26.5%) of the non-teaching graduates made in excess of \$13,999 while seven (20.6%) earned less than \$8,000 a year. Thirty-four (86%) of the 40 graduates teaching vocational agriculture made between \$9,000 and \$13,000 annually, while 13 (38%) of 34 non-teaching graduates earned between \$9,000 and \$13,000 annually. None of the 40 graduates teaching vocational agriculture made less than \$9,000 whereas nine (26.5%) of the 34 graduates not teaching made less than \$9,000 annually.

Information in Table IV indicated little difference between the teaching and non-teaching groups concerning contributions of an active FFA organization to a successful vocational agriculture program. A weighted average was determined for each area by giving a value of 5 for first choice, 4 for second, 3 for third, 2 for fourth, and 1 for fifth choice. No differences were indicated for the factor of student interest with both the teaching group and those who had left reflecting an identical 4.18 weighted average, and the factor of parental contact with identical weighted averages of 2.9 for both groups.

TABLE III
PRESENT ANNUAL SALARY COMPARISON

SALARY	TEACHING		NON-TEACHING	
	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.
BELOW \$8,000	0	0	7	20.6
8,000-8,999	0	0	2	5.9
9,000-9,999	9	22.5	5	14.7
10,000-10,999	10	25.0	2	5.9
11,000-11,999	4	10.0	7	20.6
12,000-12,999	11	27.5	1	3.0
13,000-13,999	3	7.5	1	3.0
OVER \$13,999	3	7.5	9	26.5
TOTALS	40	100.5*	34	100.2

* Rounded to the nearest 1/10 percent

TABLE IV

CONTRIBUTIONS OF AN ACTIVE FFA ORGANIZATION TO A
SUCCESSFUL VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAM

	TEACHING						NON-TEACHING					
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	Wt. Ave.*	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	Wt. Ave.*
STUDENT INTEREST	19	13	5	2	1	4.18	15	12	4	1	1	4.18
YOUTH INVOLVEMENT	14	12	9	4	1	3.85	16	13	4	1	0	4.29
PARENTAL CONTACT	5	5	15	11	4	2.90	0	9	16	6	3	2.90
COMMUNITY SERVICE	0	6	7	8	14	2.14	2	3	2	13	13	2.03
SUPERVISED PROGRAM	1	5	3	14	17	1.98	0	1	6	11	16	1.76
OTHER (Reinforce Learning, Public Relations, Motivation)	3	1	0	0	1	.50	2					.29

* Weighted Average: 1st Choice 5 pts., 2nd Choice 4 pts., 3rd Choice 3 pts.,
4th Choice 2 pts., 5th Choice 1 pt.

Little differences were noted for two factors of lower importance with community service 2.14 for those teaching, and 2.03 for those who left, and in the contribution of a supervised program for those teaching 1.98, and 1.76 for those who had left. Some differences were indicated for the Youth Involvement factor with 4.29 for teachers of vocational agriculture, and 3.85 for those who had left the profession.

Other contributing factors were public relations, motivation and reinforce learning. Both groups held in high esteem the contributions of an active FFA organization.

The information on The Importance of Areas of Study in Teaching Agriculture in Table V indicated little differences were found between the two most valuable fields of study. Animal Science was found to be the most valuable area of study for those teaching with a weighted average of 3.825, and also for those who left teaching with a weighted average of 3.76. Little difference was noted in Agricultural Mechanics, another high-interest area, with those teaching responding with a weighted average of 3.725, and those who left having a weighted average of 3.62. Little difference was found in the area of agricultural education with those teaching indicating a weighted average of 2.725, and with those who left a weighted average of 2.81.

Some difference was found in the importance of Plant and Soil Science with those who were teaching responding with a weighted average of 3.126, and for those who left a weighted average of 2.910. Much difference was found in the area of Agricultural

TABLE V

THE IMPORTANCE OF AREAS OF STUDY IN
TEACHING VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

AREA	TEACHING (Wt. Ave.)*	NON-TEACHING (Wt. Ave.)*
ANIMAL SCIENCE	3.825	3.76
AGRICULTURAL MECHANICS	3.725	3.62
PLANT AND SOIL SCIENCE	3.125	2.91
AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION	2.725	2.81
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS	1.75	3.06
OTHER (Horticulture, Entomology, and Biology)	.125	.15

* Weighted Average: 1st Choice 5 pts., 2nd Choice 4 pts., 3rd Choice 3 pts., 4th Choice 2 pts., 5th Choice 1 pt.

Economics for those teaching with a weighted average of 1.75, and for those who left a weighted average of 3.06.

Other areas of study important for teaching vocational agriculture included Horticulture, Entomology, and Biology with those who remained in teaching giving a weighted average of .125, and for those leaving a weighted average of .15.

Both groups, the teaching and those who left, indicated that family interests would be the chief concern in choosing another occupation. Data in Table VI illustrated that this choice had a weighted average importance rating of 2.98 for those teaching, and 2.75 for those who left teaching. Location and money had identical importance ratings (2.53), with climate ranking last (2.05) for those who were teaching. Climate was second (2.55) followed by money (2.47), and location (2.18) was last in importance for those who had left teaching.

Little differences between the groups were expressed for family interests and money. Some difference was noted for the location factor, and the largest difference between the groups was evident for the climate factor.

Other considerations concerning choosing another profession included the type of work, happiness, interest, own boss, employer attitude, housing, and night activities.

Both groups, the teaching and those who left indicated little difference in the helpfulness of agricultural education preparation. Data in Table VII illustrated that this choice had a weighted average rating of 2.8 for those teaching, and 3.0 for those who left teaching.

TABLE VI

FACTORS CONSIDERED IN CHOOSING ANOTHER PROFESSION

FACTORS	TEACHING					NON-TEACHING				
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	Wt. Av.*	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	Wt. Ave.*
FAMILY INTERESTS	18	9	7	6	2.98	11	8	7	6	2.75
MONEY	6	15	13	6	2.53	8	5	16	5	2.47
LOCATION	9	11	9	9	2.53	2	13	7	11	2.18
CLIMATE	7	4	12	16	2.05	4	9	5	15	2.55
OTHER (Type of Work, Happiness, Interest, Own Boss, Employer Attitude, Housing, Night Activities)	1	2	0		.25	8				.94

* 1st Choice 4 pts., 2nd Choice 3 pts., 3rd Choice 2 pts., 4th Choice 1 pt.
(May not total 34 responses.)

TABLE VII
USEFULNESS OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION PREPARATION

	TEACHING		NON-TEACHING	
	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.
VERY HELPFUL	7	17.5	14	41.2
HELPFUL	20	50	12	35.3
SOME HELP	11	27.5	4	11.8
LITTLE HELP	2	5.0	2	5.8
NO HELP	0	0	2	5.8
WEIGHTED AVERAGE*	2.8		3.0	

* Very Helpful 4 pts., Helpful 3 pts., Some Help 2 pts., Little Help 1 pt., No Help 0 pts.

Of those teaching 27 (67.5%), and 26 (76.5%) of those who left indicated that agricultural education preparation was either very helpful or helpful. Eleven (27.5%) of those teaching, and 4 (11.8%) of those who left the profession suggested some help was obtained in agricultural education preparation. Two respondents in each group indicated little help was realized in agricultural education preparation while 2 (5.8%) non-teachers expressed no help was gained in this preparation.

The data in Table VIII suggested minor differences in the major sources of information for those who were teaching and those who left. Textbooks were the major sources of information for both groups being listed by thirty-three (41.3%) of those teaching, and by 24 (35.3%) of those who left teaching. Extension periodicals were listed second in major use as indicated by twenty-two (27.5%) of those teaching, and by eighteen (26.5%) of those who left.

For those who left teaching seventeen (25%) responded that college notes were the third most important source of the majority of the information they used. For those who were still teaching the college notes were the least in importance being selected by six (7.5%) of the respondents. Magazines were ranked fourth in importance by both groups being selected by eight (10%) of those teaching, and five (7.4%) of those who left teaching.

Other sources of the majority of information was selected by eleven (13.7% of those teaching, and four (5.8%) of those who left teaching. Other selections included core materials, experiments, laboratory manuals, and experience. A new development in

TABLE VIII

SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THOSE
TEACHING AND THOSE WHO LEFT

SOURCE	TEACHING		NON-TEACHING	
	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.
TEXTBOOKS	33	41.3	24	35.3
EXTENSION PERIODICALS	22	27.5	18	26.5
MAGAZINES AND NEWSPAPERS	8	10.0	5	7.4
COLLEGE NOTES	6	7.5	17	25.0
OTHER (Core, Experiments, Lab Manuals, Experience)	11	13.7	4	5.8

Kansas during the later part of the research period involved the introduction of the Oklahoma and Kansas core materials to the vocational agriculture teachers. This might explain why three times as many teachers selected this response as those who had left teaching. The major sources of information for those teaching involved textbooks, Extension periodicals and other, while those who left teaching relied most heavily on textbooks, Extension periodicals and college notes.

Both the teaching and the non-teaching groups responded to the breadth of the vocational agriculture teachers' role. In Table IX the results displayed that twenty-one (52.5%) of those teaching, and twenty (58.8%) of those who left perceived the role of the vocational agriculture teacher as too general. Seventeen (42.5%) of those teaching, and fourteen (41.2%) who left considered the role of the vocational agriculture teacher as being about right.

Two (2.0%) of those teaching responded that the vocational agriculture teacher's role was too specialized, while none of those who left teaching selected that choice. Apparently similar views were held as to the breadth of the role of the vocational agriculture teacher by both those who were teaching and those who left.

Much difference was found in the strength of support of the administrators in Table X toward the vocational agriculture program. For those teaching an average of 5.13 was attained and for those who left the field an average of 4.0 was achieved. A score of 7 was high and 1 low as to the support given the vocational agriculture program by the administrator.

TABLE IX

THE ROLE OF THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHER

	TEACHING		NON-TEACHING	
	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.
TOO GENERAL	21	52.5	20	58.8
ABOUT RIGHT	17	42.5	14	41.2
TOO SPECIALIZED	2	5.0	0	0
TOTALS	40	100.0	34	100.0

TABLE X

ADMINISTRATORS ATTITUDES TOWARD VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS

	SCALE - (7 STRONG, 1 WEAK)							
	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Wt. Ave.*
TEACHING - NO.	8	10	12	3	4	2	1	5.13
NON-TEACHING - NO.	3	7	5	3	6	8	2	4.0
	SCALE - (7 PLEASANT, 1 UNPLEASANT)							
	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Wt. Ave.*
TEACHING - NO.	8	10	9	8	3	1	1	5.13
NON-TEACHING - NO.	4	10	3	9	4	4	0	4.68

Results of the findings indicates some difference in the pleasant or unpleasant attitudes of administrators toward vocational agriculture programs. For those teaching an average of 5.13 was achieved, and for those leaving an average of 4.68 was obtained with 7 high and 1 low for the degree of pleasantness of the administrator's attitude.

Results of the findings in Table XI indicated very little difference in the likes and dislikes of teaching and non-teaching graduates toward selected occupational characteristics. The occupational characteristics included those which are usually referred to as being significant to the occupational choice of teaching as a career. The responses of the teaching and non-teaching graduates were nearly identical for each of the characteristics.

In both the teacher and non-teaching groups location, job responsibility, working with youth, life style, job opportunities, and professional status were liked rather than disliked. Both groups disliked earnings, length of working hours, discipline, and job advancement.

Animal Science was the highest interest area for 31 teachers of vocational agriculture, and 26 or those who left as indicated in Table XII. Little difference was noted in the degree of interest in the subject of Animal Science for teachers of vocational agriculture with a weighted average of 4.55, and for those who left 4.53. The area of Crops and Soils was rated 3.85 for those teaching, and 3.88 for teachers who left. Interest in Young and Adult Farmers was rated 2.9 for those teaching, and 3.0 for those who left the profession.

TABLE XI

LIKES AND DISLIKES OF TEACHING AND NON-TEACHING GRADUATES
TOWARD SELECTED OCCUPATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHING

	TEACHING		NON-TEACHING	
	LIKES	DISLIKES	LIKES	DISLIKES
LOCATION	32	0	22	21
JOB RESPONSIBILITIES	21	3	25	2
LIFE STYLE	19	3	17	6
JOB OPPORTUNITIES	15	5	14	7
PROFESSIONAL STATUS	12	9	7	8
DISCIPLINE	7	22	4	19
EARNINGS	7	29	6	21
JOB ADVANCEMENT	6	19	6	18
LENGTH OF WORKING HRS.	3	25	5	20
*WORKING WITH YOUTH	33	0	3	0

* Working with youth was omitted from the Non-Teaching questionnaire.

(Some subjects responded with more or less than 3 responses with a few write-in responses.)

TABLE XII

AREAS OF INTEREST WHEN TEACHING

	TEACHING				NON-TEACHING			
	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	WT. AVE.* DEGREE OF INTEREST	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	WT. AVE.* DEGREE OF INTEREST
ANIMAL SCIENCE	31	9	0	4.55	26	8	0	4.53
AGRICULTURAL MECHANICS	30	9	1	4.45	22	10	2	4.18
FFA	24	16	0	4.20	25	8	1	4.41
CROPS AND SOILS	17	23	0	3.85	18	13	3	3.88
FIELD TRIPS	18	18	4	3.70	19	13	2	4.00
JUDGING CONTESTS	18	17	5	3.65	21	10	3	3.71
FARM VISITS	12	20	8	3.20	15	16	3	3.71
AGRIBUSINESS	9	15	16	2.65	11	18	5	3.35
YOUNG & ADULT FARMERS	10	18	12	2.90	12	10	12	3.00
HORTICULTURE	7	14	19	2.40	2	12	20	1.94
SHOWING LIVESTOCK	6	6	28	1.90	4	11	19	2.12

* High Interest 5 pts., Medium Interest 3 pts., Low Interest 1 pt.

Some difference was evident in the area of FFA with present teachers showing a weighted average of 4.2, and 4.41 for those who left. Teachers of vocational agriculture rated field trips 3.7, and non-teachers indicated a 4.0 weighted average. Also some difference was noted in the area of showing livestock, 1.9 for those teaching, and 2.12 for those who left. In the area of Agricultural Mechanics a rating of 4.45 was noted for those teaching, and 4.18 for those who left.

Much difference was found in the area of judging contests with weighted averages of 3.65 for those teaching, and 4.06 for those who left. The interest area of farm visits for teachers of vocational agriculture was rated 3.2 for those teaching, and 3.71 for those who left. Also the subject of horticulture (2.40) was a stronger concern for those in teaching as compared to 1.94 for the non-teaching group. The largest difference in interest occurred in the area of agribusiness with a weighted average of 2.65 for those teaching, and 3.35 for those who left.

Results of Table XIII indicated the number of working hours after leaving the teaching field remained about the same for 15 (44.1%) of the teachers who left. Ten (29.4%) of the teachers who left indicated working hours increased after teaching, and nine (26.6%) expressed working less hours after leaving the field.

Information from Table XIV indicated 19 (55.9%) of teachers who left the teaching field preferred to seek the job, while 7 (20.6%) were contacted by the employer, and eight (23.5%) were self-employed.

TABLE XIII
WORKING HOURS AFTER LEAVING TEACHING

	NO.	PCT.
MORE	10	29.4
ABOUT THE SAME	15	44.1
LESS	9	26.5
TOTALS	34	100.0

TABLE XIV
OBTAINING FIRST JOB AFTER TEACHING

	NO.	PCT.
SEEK THE JOB	19	55.9
EMPLOYER CONTACT YOU	7	20.6
OTHER (Self-employed)	8	23.5
TOTALS	34	100.0

TABLE XV
CONSIDER TEACHING VOC. AG. AGAIN

	NO	PCT.
YES	20	59
NO	14	41
TOTALS	34	100

The results of Table XV indicated that 20 (59%) of the teachers who left the teaching field would consider teaching vocational agriculture in Kansas again. Fourteen (41%) were not interested in teaching vocational agriculture in the state again at the present time.

Data in Table XVI gave the occupations after leaving teaching. During the first year after teaching 16 (47%) of the 34 who left teaching were farming full time. Eight (33.5%) of the 34 were in agribusiness employment. Four (12%) of the 34 who left teaching were in agricultural finance positions, while three (9%) were in agricultural machinery positions. Three (9%) were in other positions, namely one each in graduate school, military, and county agent work.

In addition to the 34 full-time positions for the first year after teaching 4 of the 34 also held part-time positions. Two (6%) were also part-time farmers, one (3%) was a part-time agribusinessman, and the other (3%) had a part-time agricultural machinery position.

During the second year after teaching 11 (38%) of the 25 who had left teaching for two years or more were full-time farmers. Seven (24%) of the 25 were in full-time agribusiness, four (14%) were in agricultural finance, two (7%) were in agricultural machinery, and 1 was in "other" occupations. In addition to the 25 full-time positions for those who had left teaching, four also had held part-time positions during the second year after leaving teaching with two (7%) part-time farmers, one (3.5%) part-time agribusinessman and one (3.5%) part-time agricultural machinery.

TABLE XVI

OCCUPATIONS AFTER TEACHING

	1ST YEAR		2ND YEAR		3RD YEAR		4TH YEAR		5TH YEAR	
	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.	NO.	PCT.
FARMING FULL PART	16 2	47 6	11 2	38 7	10 2	53 10.5	4	57	1	50
AGRIBUSINESS FULL PART	8 1	23.5 3	7 1	24 3.5	3 1	16 5.8				
AG FINANCE	4	12	4	14	2	10.5	2	28.5		
AG MACHINERY FULL PART	3 1	9 3	2 1	7 3.5						
OTHER (Graduate Students, Military Co. Agents, etc.)	3	9	1	3.5	1	5.8	1	14.3	1	50
TOTALS	38	100*	29	100*	19	100**	7	100	2	100

* Four indicated a part-time and a full-time job.

** Three indicated a part-time and a full-time job.

The third year after graduation indicated ten (53%) of the 16 who were farming full time the third year after leaving teaching. Three (16%) were in full-time agribusiness, two (10.5%) were in agricultural finance, and one (5.8%) was in "other." Two (10.5%) who were working full time were also farming part time, and one (5.8%) was in agribusiness part time. One (1.5%) indicated "other" as his occupational employment.

Four (57%) of the seven who had left teaching were farming the fourth year after leaving teaching. Two (28.5%) of the seven were in agricultural finance, and one (14.3%) indicated "other." There were two respondents who had left teaching for 5 years with one farming and one replied "other" as his occupational placement.

The results indicated that the majority of those who left teaching went into farming, followed by agribusiness, agricultural finance, agricultural machinery, and "other" in that order.

The data in Table XVII suggested salary in the first job after teaching was not a major factor for leaving the field of teaching. Nine (26.5%) indicated an average income of \$1,555 less than when teaching with a range of \$500 to \$3,000 less. Five (14.7%) respondents received the same salary while six (17.6%) reported less than \$1,000 more in salary. Seven (20.6%) expressed a salary increase of \$1,001-\$2,000 with seven (20.6%) reporting an increase of over \$2,000 in the first job after teaching.

Data in Table XVIII gave the responses of teachers who left the field of teaching vocational agriculture as to their reasons for changing occupations. Of the seventeen concerns listed on the

TABLE XVII

SALARY OF FIRST JOB AFTER TEACHING

SALARY	NO.	PCT.
LOWER SALARY*	9	26.5
SAME SALARY	5	14.7
0-\$500 MORE	3	8.8
\$501-\$1,000 MORE	3	8.8
\$1,001-\$1,500 MORE	4	11.8
\$1,501-\$2,000 MORE	3	8.8
OVER \$2,000 MORE	7	20.6
TOTALS	34	100.0

TABLE XVIII

REASONS FOR LEAVING TEACHING

REASON	VERY IMPT.	IMPT.	SOME IMPT.	LITTLE IMPT.	NOT IMPT.	WT. AVE.* IMPORTANCE
FARMING	16	1	1	11	14	2.35
BE YOUR OWN BOSS	16	2	3	3	10	2.32
MAKE MORE MONEY	6	10	8	7	8	2.26
WORKING CONDITIONS	8	7	5	3	11	1.94
DISLIKE OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES	5	8	7	5	9	1.85
PAPER WORK	8	3	7	5	11	1.76
TOO LONG HOURS	5	3	11	4	11	1.62
DISLIKED DISCIPLINE	6	3	7	7	11	1.59
LIFE STYLE	4	8	3	5	14	1.50
DIFFICULT TO SEE PROGRESS	5	5	6	4	14	1.50
GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION	4	2	3	3	22	.91
HEALTH	0	1	4	2	27	.38
OBTAIN ADVANCED DEGREE	2	0	0	0	32	.24
WERE NOT REHIRED	0	0	1	0	33	.06
OVERSEAS ASSIGNMENT	0	0	0	0	34	0.00
ACCEPT TEACHING AT HIGHER LEVEL	0	0	0	0	34	0.00
RETIREMENT	0	0	0	0	34	0.00

* Very Impt. 4 pts., Impt. 3 pts., Some Impt. 2 pts., Little Impt. 1 pt., Not Impt. 0 pt.

questionnaire farming (2.35), and being your own boss (2.32) had the highest weighted averages and were the two major reasons for leaving teaching with 16 subjects indicating both of these areas as very important reasons for changing professions. Other important concerns of teachers who left the field and respective weighted averages were to make more money (2.26), working conditions (1.94), and dislike of teaching activities (1.85). Factors with some importance in influencing change in jobs and weighted averages were too much paper work (1.76), too long of hours (1.62), disliked discipline (1.59), difficult to see progress (1.5), and life style (1.5).

Low weighted average importance ratings were recorded for geographic location (.91), health (.38), and to obtain an advanced degree (.24). These factors were of little concern as reasons for leaving the teaching field. Overseas assignment, accept teaching at a higher level, and retirement were rated as not important by all 34 respondents as to reasons for leaving vocational agricultural teaching.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

A major problem in Kansas has been the rapid turnover of vocational agriculture teachers. As a result, a great shortage of teachers existed in meeting the needs as the demand continued to outdistance the supply. In order to obtain more information to solve the problem the writer decided to survey those who remained in teaching and those who left during a five-year period from 1971 through 1975. Although it is probably equally important to increase the number of persons qualified to teach, this study concentrated its emphasis on those who left teaching and the reasons they gave for doing so.

In addition to normal turnover there was an increasing demand for vocational agriculture teachers because schools went to multi-teacher departments, and a great competition existed for teachers with technical institutes, community colleges, and similar institutions. It became apparent that steps should be taken to reduce the turnover rate of vocational agriculture instructors and encourage more qualified personnel to enter the profession.

The major purpose of the study was to survey the opinions of those who had left teaching, and why these persons changed to another field of employment. Another purpose was to determine if there was a difference in personal characteristics of those who remained in teaching and those who left.

This study was conducted by surveying all teachers of vocational agriculture in secondary schools in Kansas who left the profession between July 1, 1971 and June 30, 1975. An equal number of teachers who remained in teaching during the period 1971-1975 was used as the control group to help identify why they remained in teaching and to see where the differences in attitudes and interests varied between the two groups.

The control group was randomly selected from the population of present teachers of vocational agriculture in Kansas who were in the corresponding graduation class at Kansas State University as those who left. This study was limited to graduates in agricultural education from Kansas State University of the years 1954 through 1974 and who taught for a minimum of one year.

Data were collected through the use of two mail questionnaires (one for teaching and one for those who left) which were developed with the aid of the writer's graduate advisor. The questions selected for both questionnaires were almost identical with the exception of several questions on the non-teaching questionnaire which concerned reasons for leaving the field.

Responses were received from ninety-three percent of the present teachers, and seventy-nine percent of those who left on the initial mailing of the survey instrument. Each respondent was asked information concerning his age, number of years taught, beginning and present salary, educational advancement, program information, and interests and attitudes. Additional information was asked those who left teaching concerning reasons for leaving and facts relating to present employment.

The respondents indicated a degree of importance on several questions by means of a rating scale which ranged from 1 (highest) to 5 (lowest). Weighted averages, percentages, and frequency of responses were used to determine the importance of different subject matter.

It was found that age, years taught, number of teaching locations, and beginning salary had similar results for both groups. Much difference was found in the area of highest teaching salary and the number with a masters degree with the teaching group superior in both categories.

An area of major concern for most employees regardless of occupation tends to be in the area of annual salary. The majority of those who stayed in teaching tended to concentrate in the middle income range with present salaries between \$9,000 and \$13,000. The teachers who left had a wider range of annual salaries with a larger concentration at the lower end (below \$9,000) of the salary schedule and more persons with a salary in excess of \$13,000.

Youth involvement and student interest are the two factors both teachers and non-teachers considered to be the major contributors to an active FFA organization which in turn made a successful vocational agriculture program. The supervised occupational experience program was found by both groups to be the least important factor to a successful FFA organization.

Through the educational process of teacher preparation many different fields of learning were introduced and pursued. Both

those teaching and the non-teaching groups agreed the areas of study in animal science and agricultural mechanics were the most important in teaching vocational agriculture. The study in agricultural education, plant and soil science showed some importance while agricultural economics was rated almost twice as important for the non-teaching group than those who remained in teaching.

Many times employees were faced with the opportunity of choosing another profession and certain factors were involved in this decision. Both the teaching and non-teaching groups indicated family interests was the most important factor in choosing another profession. The factors of money, climate and location showed very little difference between the two groups.

Agricultural education preparation was considered to be of more value for those who have left the teaching field than it is for those presently teaching vocational agriculture. This indicated the area of agriculture education preparation had some longevity value helpful for those in agricultural related occupations.

In the study of sources of information for teaching vocational agriculture it was found that teachers were using textbooks, magazines and newspapers, and the core curriculum more frequently in teaching than those who had left the field. College notes were used less frequently by teachers who remained while both groups used extension periodicals about the same amount. Textbooks were used the most by both the teaching and non-teaching groups for sources of teaching information.

Similar views were expressed by teachers and non-teachers as the majority in both groups indicated the role of the vocational agriculture teacher as being too general followed closely by the "about right" role. Several teachers considered the vocational agriculture teachers' position too specialized.

A major difference was found in the attitude of administrators toward vocational agriculture programs with those remaining in teaching experiencing more pleasant support by administrators for the program than those experienced who left the field. Very little difference was found in the likes and dislikes of those teaching and those who left toward selected occupational characteristics of teaching. Location, job responsibility, life style, job opportunities, and working with youth were strong employment factors which were liked. Earnings, length of working hours, discipline, and job advancement were heavily regarded as dislikes by both groups.

Little difference in the interest between the teachers and non-teachers was found for the following teaching areas which received high-interest ratings: animal science, agricultural mechanics, FFA, and crops and soils. Field trips, judging contests, farm visits, and agribusiness instruction had average degrees of interest. Showing livestock, young and adult farmers, and horticulture ranked the lowest in teaching interest for both groups.

The remaining findings concerned the results for those who left the teaching field. Although the majority of those who left

indicated a major dislike for "length of working hours" while the findings indicated that twenty-five were working about the same or more hours after leaving teaching.

The majority of teachers who changed professions went out to seek the job or became self employed with only a few actually contacted by an employer. Another promising finding indicated that twenty teachers who left the field would consider teaching vocational agriculture in Kansas again.

An area of major concern for this study was to determine the professions that lure teachers out of teaching. Findings indicated that about one half of those who left the teaching field went into full or part-time farming with another one fourth going into full or part-time agribusiness. Ag finance and ag machinery dealerships took another twelve percent with one each going into county extension, graduate school, and military service.

Although earnings was a major dislike while teaching, over forty percent had the same or a lower net income or salary in the first job after teaching. On the other hand, almost thirty percent received a raise of at least \$1,500.

The reasons for leaving teaching is possibly the most important finding of this survey. Farming, being your own boss, and to make more money were the most important reasons for leaving. Other major concerns were working conditions, paper work, dislike of teaching activities, discipline, and working hours. Life style, difficulty in seeing progress and location were of some concern. Overseas assignment, were not rehired, retirement, to obtain an

advanced degree, or teaching on a higher level were of little or no concern for those who left teaching.

Conclusions

During the 5-year period of the study farming was the major single factor contributing to teachers leaving the field. Since net farm income has increased for the past several years and those who left teaching indicated a desire to make more money, it was concluded that the bright outlook of farming was the deciding factor in the decision to change employment.

Since agricultural education majors had always expressed a high degree of interest in the areas of animal science and agricultural mechanics it was concluded that those who did not go into farming would pursue a career in agribusiness or agricultural mechanics.

It was concluded that administrator relationships toward vocational agriculture programs had an influence on teacher tenure. Where support was strong and pleasant teachers tended to stay and when it was not, teachers tended to leave.

Although little average difference was noted between teachers who remained and those who left, a large difference was expressed in the highest teaching salaries, and it was concluded that those with higher teaching salaries tended to stay in teaching and those with lower teaching salaries changed professions.

A major difference was noted between the two groups in relation to the number of individuals who had obtained a M. S. degree. Fifty-five percent of those teaching and eighteen percent of those

who left had a masters degree. The writer concluded that those who left the field of teaching probably had limited plans of staying in teaching.

Recommendations

In analyzing the findings of the study, the author recommended the following:

1. A study should be made to determine the present involvement of teachers in farming. The study should determine the degree of satisfaction the teacher receives by involvement in farming.
2. Each teacher in cooperation with the Teacher Education Staff at Kansas State University should develop a plan to achieve the Master of Science Degree Program.
3. Cooperative conferences should be held between school administrators and teachers of vocational agriculture to improve the administrators' support of vocational agriculture programs.
4. The salary of vocational agriculture teachers should be based on 12 months of employment, and that the salary be calculated as 12/9ths on the standard teacher salary schedule.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.
(Census of Agriculture, 1964).
- Harvey, Paul, "Wanted: Ag Teachers," Los Angeles Times, 1975.
- Hoover, Norman K., Handbook of Agricultural Occupations, 1962, 219.
- Hunsicker, H. N. Chairman, "Guidelines for Developing Programs in Agricultural Education for the 70's," Division of Vocational and Technical Education, 1970.
- Moore, Carlos H., "Agricultural Education in Transition." State Supervisor in Agriculture Education, Arizone, Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 45, November, 1972.
- Roderick, C. V., "Why Former Teachers of Vocational Agriculture Left the Profession," Department of Agricultural Education, College of Education, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., 1953.
- Schrag, Elmer Phillip, "Employment History of Vocational Agriculture Teachers in Kansas," Masters Report, College of Education, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 1955, Table 9.
- Severance, Harold D., "The Occupations of Graduates in Agriculture Education Who Did Not Teach Vocational Agriculture," Masters Report, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS, 1966.
- Sollenberger, George, "Ag Teacher, A Growing Shortage," The Furrow, May-June, 1975, 16.
- University of Tennessee, Research Report, "Why Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Tennessee Leave the Profession," Issued by Department of Agricultural Education. May, 1958, 1.
- "Vocational Agriculture Teachers of Kansas, 1959-60 through 1965-66," Supplied by the State Department of Vocational Education, Topeka, Kansas.
- Wallace, James Howard, "Why Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Kansas Leave the Field," Masters Report, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 1967.

Woodin, Dr. Ralph J., "Supply and Demand for Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in the United States for the 1970-71 School Year." Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, Dec. 1971.

Woodin, Dr. Ralph J., "Teacher Shortage Continues in Agricultural Education," Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 44, April 1972, 251.

APPENDIX

TO: Present and former Vocational Agriculture Teachers in Kansas

FROM: Larry D. Hoobler, Vocational Agriculture Instructor
Council Grove High School

SUBJECT: A Survey to Determine Why Vocational Agriculture Teachers
Stay In or Leave the Teaching Field

One of the major problems of vocational agriculture is the turn-over of vocational agriculture teachers in Kansas. Would you please take five minutes from your busy schedule to respond to the enclosed questions? From this survey I hope to determine why teachers stay in or leave the field. This information will be of assistance in planning programs in agricultural education at Kansas State University.

The information will be used for compiling data for my masters report and all material will be confidential.

If you would like a copy of the summary of this report, check the last item on the questionnaire.

Enclosed you will find a stamped, self-addressed envelope. The return of your opinions by March 1 will be deeply appreciated.

TEACHING QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Age _____ Number of years taught _____ Number of teaching locations _____ Beginning teaching salary \$ _____ Highest teaching salary \$ _____ B. S. Degree _____ (yr.) M. S. Degree _____ (yr.) Hours beyond B. S. or M. S. _____ Present salary (circle one) Below \$8,000; \$8,000-8,999; \$9,000-9,999; \$10,000-10,999; \$11,000-11,999; \$12,000-12,999; \$13,000-13,999; over \$13,999.

List teaching jobs you have held since 1971:

<u>JOB</u>	<u>DATE</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Why do you think an active FFA organization contributes to a successful vocational agriculture program? Rank (1-highest, 5-lowest)
- | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| a. _____ Student Interest | d. _____ Parental Contact |
| b. _____ Community Service | e. _____ Supervised Program |
| c. _____ Youth Involvement | f. _____ Other (specify) _____ |
3. Rank the following areas of study at Kansas State University as to their value in teaching vocational agriculture in high school. (1-highest, 5-lowest)
- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| a. _____ Animal & Dairy Science | d. _____ Agricultural Economics |
| b. _____ Agricultural Mechanics | e. _____ Agricultural Education |
| c. _____ Plant & Soil Science | f. _____ Other (specify) _____ |
4. Rank the factors which you consider most important when choosing another profession. (1-highest, 4-lowest)
- | |
|--------------------------------|
| a. _____ Money |
| b. _____ Climate & Environment |
| c. _____ Location |
| d. _____ Family Interests |
| e. _____ Other (specify) _____ |
5. The amount of working hours in teaching vocational agriculture is:
- | |
|-------------------|
| _____ too many |
| _____ about right |
| _____ not enough |
6. How helpful is the Agricultural Education Preparation for teaching vocational agriculture?
- | |
|--------------------|
| _____ very helpful |
| _____ helpful |
| _____ some help |
| _____ little help |
| _____ no help |
7. From which two sources do you obtain the majority of your teaching information?
- | |
|---------------------------------------|
| _____ textbooks |
| _____ college notes |
| _____ magazine and newspaper articles |
| _____ extension periodicals |
| _____ other (specify) _____ |

8. In my opinion, the role of the vocational agriculture teacher is:
- ☐ too general
 - ☐ too specialized
 - ☐ about right
9. Administration's attitude toward Vocational Agriculture.
Place a check (✓) over the number which corresponds the closest to your perception of the administration's attitudes.

strong	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	weak
	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	

pleasant	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	unpleasant
	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	

10. What do you like or dislike about teaching (check the top 3)

<u>Likes</u>	<u>Dislikes</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Earnings	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Location	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Job responsibility	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Length of working hours	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Working with youth	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Discipline	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Life style	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Job opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Job advancement	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Professional status	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. Please indicate your degree of interest when teaching--

	<u>HIGH</u>	<u>MEDIUM</u>	<u>LOW</u>
Animal Science	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Horticulture	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Crops & Soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Agricultural Mechanics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Agribusiness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FFA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Young & Adult Farmers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Judging Contests	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Farm Visits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Showing Livestock	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Field Trips	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I would like a copy of the summary of this report.

yes ☐ no ☐

Name: _____

Address: _____

NON-TEACHING QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Age ____ Number of years taught ____ Number of teaching locations ____ Beginning teaching salary \$ ____ Highest teaching salary \$ ____ B. S. Degree ____ (yr.) M. S. Degree ____ (yr.) Hours beyond B. S. or M. S. ____ Present salary or net income: (circle one) Below \$8,000; \$8,000-8,999; \$9,000-9,999; \$10,000-\$10,999; \$11,000-11,999; \$12,000-12,999; \$13,000-13,999; over \$13,999.

List occupations held since 1971:

OCCUPATION

1971 _____
1972 _____
1973 _____
1974 _____
1975 _____

2. Why do you think an active FFA organization contributes to a successful vocational agriculture program? Rank (1-highest, 5 lowest)
a. _____ Student Interest d. _____ Parental Contact
b. _____ Community Service e. _____ Supervised Program
c. _____ Youth Involvement f. _____ Others (specify) _____
3. Would you consider teaching vocational agriculture in Kansas again?
_____ yes _____ no
4. Rank the following areas of study at Kansas State University as to their value in teaching vocational agriculture in high school. (1-highest, 5 lowest)
a. _____ Animal & Dairy Science d. _____ Agricultural Economics
b. _____ Agricultural Mechanics e. _____ Agriculture Education
c. _____ Plant & Soil Science f. _____ Other (specify) _____
5. Rank the factors which you consider most important when choosing another profession. (1-highest, 4-lowest)
a. _____ Money
b. _____ Climate and Environment
c. _____ Location
d. _____ Family Interests
e. _____ Other (specify) _____
6. Was the annual salary in your first job after teaching-- (check one)
_____ lower by \$ _____ in salary
_____ same salary
_____ 0-500 dollars more in salary
_____ 501-1,000 dollars more in salary
_____ 1,001-1,500 dollars more in salary
_____ 1,501-2,000 dollars more in salary
_____ over 2,000 dollars more in salary

7. The amount of working hours after teaching was:
☐ More
☐ About the same
☐ Less
8. In obtaining your first job after teaching did you
☐ seek the job
☐ or did the employer contact you.
☐ other (specify) _____
9. How helpful was the Agricultural Education preparation for your present position?
☐ very helpful
☐ helpful
☐ some help
☐ little help
☐ no help
10. From which two sources did you obtain the majority of your teaching information?
☐ textbooks
☐ college notes
☐ magazines and newspapers
☐ extension periodicals
☐ other (specify) _____
11. How many credit hours of graduate work did you complete while teaching vocational agriculture?
☐ 0-5 hrs. ☐ 21-20 hrs.
☐ 6-10 hrs. ☐ Had Masters degree
☐ 11-15 hrs. ☐ Masters plus
☐ 16-20 hrs.
12. In my opinion, the role of the vocational agriculture teacher is:
☐ too general
☐ too specialized
☐ about right
13. Administrations attitude toward Vocational Agriculture.
 Place a check (✓) over the number which corresponds the closest to your perception of the administrations attitudes.

strong 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 weak

pleasant 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 unpleasant

14. What did you like or dislike about teaching? (check the top 3)

<u>Like</u>	<u>Dislike</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Earnings	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Location	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Job responsibility	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Length of working hours	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Discipline	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Life Style	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Job opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Job advancement	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Professional status	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. Please indicate your degree of interest when teaching.

	<u>HIGH</u>	<u>MEDIUM</u>	<u>LOW</u>
Animal Science	_____	_____	_____
Horticulture	_____	_____	_____
Crops & Soils	_____	_____	_____
Agricultural Mechanics	_____	_____	_____
Agribusiness	_____	_____	_____
FFA	_____	_____	_____
Young & Adult Farmers	_____	_____	_____
Judging Contests	_____	_____	_____
Farm Visits	_____	_____	_____
Showing Livestock	_____	_____	_____
Field Trips	_____	_____	_____

16. Reasons for leaving teaching: Very impt Impt Some Little impt Not impt

To make more money	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Overseas assignment	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Farming	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Geographic location	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Dislike of teaching activities	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Too long hours	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Health	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Working conditions	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Weren't rehired	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Disliked discipline	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Retirement	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Difficult to see progress	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
To obtain advanced degree	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
To accept teaching degree at a higher level	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Life style	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Be your own boss	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Paper work	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

I would like a copy of the summary of this report.

_____ yes

_____ no

Name: _____

Address: _____

A COMPARISON STUDY OF TEACHERS OF
VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE WHO HAD PERSEVERED
AND THOSE WHO HAD LEFT THE FIELD OF
TEACHING IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KANSAS
DURING 1971-1975

by

Larry Dee Hoobler

B. S., Kansas State University, 1970

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Agricultural Education
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1976

A major problem in vocational agriculture was the rapid turnover of teachers. In Kansas the demand was greater than the supply of vocational agriculture teachers. It was considered important by the writer to gather information on why teachers left the field.

The specific purpose of the study was to survey the opinions of teachers of vocational agriculture in Kansas and to compare the attitudes and interests of those who left and those who remained in teaching vocational agriculture between 1971-1975.

Data were collected through the use of a mail questionnaire. The respondents of one group were the forty-three vocational agriculture teachers who were selected by a random sample of numbers. The respondents in the other group included the total population of forty-three teachers who left teaching vocational agriculture during the same period. The study was limited to graduates of Kansas State University who received B. S. degrees between 1954-1974. Responses were received from ninety-three percent of those teaching and seventy-nine percent of those who left.

The respondents' personal and occupational-related data and interests and attitudes were analyzed. Reasons for leaving teaching, and factual information relating to present employment were also included in the questionnaire to those who left teaching. Weighted averages, percentages, and frequency responses were used to determine the importance of the responses.

Responses were received from 93 percent of those teaching and 73 percent of those who left on the initial mailing of the questionnaire. Each respondent replied concerning his age, number of years

taught, beginning and present salary, educational attainment, vocational agriculture program information, and his interests and attitudes. The respondents indicated the degree of importance for interests and attitudes by checking on a rating scale with 1 highest and 5 lowest. Weighted averages, percentages, and frequency of responses were used to determine the importance of items on the questionnaire.

It was found that ages, years taught, number of teaching locations, and beginning salary had little effect on those who left teaching. Much difference was found between those remaining in teaching and those who left for highest teaching salary, and the number who attained the Master of Science Degree. In both cases those who were teaching had higher salaries and attained more Master of Science Degrees.

Both the teaching group and those who left preferred teaching animal science and agricultural mechanics. Agricultural education instruction and plant and soil science were rated as important, with agricultural economics rated more important by those who left than those who remained in teaching.

A more favorable attitude by administrators toward vocational agriculture programs was indicated by teachers who remained than those who left. There was little difference in the attitudes toward teaching by the two groups involved in the study. More than 50% of those who left teaching went into farming as their occupations, followed by agribusiness, agricultural finance, and agricultural mechanics occupations, in that order.

In analyzing the findings of the study the author recommended the following:

1. A study should be made to determine the present involvement of teachers in farming. The study should determine the degree of satisfaction the teacher receives by involvement in farming.
2. Each teacher in cooperation with the Teacher Education staff at Kansas State University should develop a plan to achieve the Master of Science Degree Program.
3. Cooperative conferences should be held between school administrators and teachers of vocational agriculture to improve the administrators support of vocational agriculture programs.
4. The salary of vocational agriculture teachers should be based on 12 months of employment, and the salary should be calculated as 12/9ths on the standard teacher salary schedule.