

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF MAJORS IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

by

LARRY CHARLES ASHER

B. S., Kansas State University, 1963

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1968

Approved by:


Major Professor

LD
2668
74
1968
A834
C.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem	1
Scope and Purpose	4
Limitations of Research	7
Definition of Terms	7
Organization of Thesis	9
II. RELATED RESEARCH	10
Per cent of Graduates Teaching	10
Farm, 4-H and Vocational Agricultural Background	12
Factors Affecting Decision To Enroll in Agricultural Education	12
Influences To Teach or Not To Teach	13
III. PROCEDURE OF RESEARCH	16
Source of Data	16
Population and Sample	16
Analysis of Data	17
IV. ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA	19
Occupational Plans	19
Background of Students	21
High School Grades	23
College Grades	25
Motivation To Enroll in Agricultural Education	28
Influences To Teach	33

CHAPTER	PAGE
Influences To Not Teach	35
Role of the Teacher	38
V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTED FURTHER STUDY	40
Conclusions	40
Suggested Areas of Further Study	42
BIBLIOGRAPHY	43
APPENDIX	45

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Division of Sample by Class into the Group That Planned To Teach as First Choice and Those Who Planned Not To Teach as First Choice	20
II. 4-H, Farming and Vocational Agricultural Experience by Class Between Those Who Planned To Teach and Those Who Planned Not To Teach	22
III. High School English, Science and Vocational Agricultural Grades by Class Between Those Who Planned To Teach and Those Who Planned Not To Teach	24
IV. College English, Science and Over-all College Grades by Class Between Those Who Planned To Teach and Those Who Planned Not To Teach	26
V. Comparison of Those Who Planned To Teach With Those Who Planned Not To Teach Concerning the Three Major Influences Causing Them To Enroll in Agricultural Education	29
VI. The Three Most Important Influences Causing the Student To Want To Teach Vocational Agriculture After Graduation .	34
VII. The Three Most Important Influences Causing the Student To Not Want To Teach Vocational Agriculture After Graduation	36
VIII. Comparison of Ideas That a Teacher Should Be an "Agriculturalist" or an "Educator" by Class Between Those Planning To Teach and Those Planning Not To Teach.	39

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Problem

The Kansas State Board for Vocational Education released a mimeographed sheet indicating that for 1966 there were 10,325 positions in teaching vocational agriculture in the United States and that 1,077 replacements were needed; 162 departments could not be opened because of a shortage of teachers; all but 9 states reported a shortage of teachers; and about 61 per cent of those qualified to teach ever entered the profession.¹

At a meeting of teacher educators, state supervisors and teachers of vocational agriculture in March 1967, at Chicago, Illinois, a survey was made of the teacher supply situation in the twelve states represented at the meeting. The twelve states were Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. The leaders of the field of vocational agriculture from the twelve states reported that of the 3,185 estimated positions in their states as of July 1967, there would be 381 positions to be filled and 309 persons available to fill them. This represented a shortage of 72 graduates available for teaching in the twelve states.

¹Kansas State Board for Vocational Education, "Facts on Supply and Demand for Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in the United States" (Topeka: Kansas State Board for Vocational Education, 1967). (Mimeographed.)

One of the twelve states, Kansas, showed a total of 185 positions with 28 positions to be filled, but only 7 or 8 graduates available for teaching.²

From the above data it was assumed for the purpose of this thesis that schools had been faced with a shortage of vocational agricultural teachers which was considered large. It was observed from the above reports that if every enrolled student of agricultural education across the country during the school year 1966-1967 had decided to teach, there still would not have been enough persons to fill all of the available positions that were open in the field of agricultural education. Previous information had indicated that about sixty per cent of those students enrolled in agricultural education accepted teaching positions upon graduation, the others usually entered other fields of agriculture.

It was observed by the writer that these facts had caused several problems within the field of agricultural education. The writer was an experienced teacher of vocational agriculture of four years, teaching in two high schools during that time. At the time of the study he was the teacher of vocational agriculture at Seaman High School, Unified School District Number 345, Topeka, Kansas. While at Seaman High School the writer developed and taught a cooperative work program in agriculturally related occupations. He was also made more acutely aware of the problems in the field of vocational agriculture

²C. W. Dalbey, "Report of the Central States Seminar in Agricultural Education" (Des Moines: State Board for Vocational Education, February 1967), p. 25. (Mimeographed.)

through his participation in the 1966 American Vocational Association's Annual Convention held in Denver, Colorado. Some of these observed problems were as follows:

(1) A shortage of teachers had caused many departments of vocational agriculture to be closed. This had deprived many students of this needed education before seeking futures in the field of agriculture at a time when job opportunities and the need for technical information had been increasing rapidly.

(2) A shortage of teachers had caused many schools to hire inferior or limited ability teachers simply because everyone, who was even remotely qualified, was encouraged to teach because of the shortage. This not only "short changed" the students under the instruction of those teachers by giving them a deficient education, but in many cases it harmed the image of vocational agriculture in the community and could have caused the program to be dropped.

(3) This problem had not only affected the students and community, it had also affected the teacher and his profession. Because of the presence of inferior teachers, the image of the vocational agricultural teaching profession had not been as high as it might have been. In the opinion of the writer, the image of the agricultural teacher in the community had not been as good as should have been expected; salaries had been held down more than could be otherwise counted upon; and changes and new ideas in agricultural education had been brought about more slowly than normal.

It was an assumption of this study that if the agricultural education profession was to overcome these problems, it would need to

find an adequate number of well qualified persons to fill the available positions in the field. It was further assumed that this could only be done through motivating more high school graduates to enroll in agricultural education curriculums across the country and then stimulating more of the well qualified graduates of the programs to enter the teaching profession, at the same time, discouraging those who were not well qualified. Those who were not well qualified might be motivated to seek employment at some other point in agriculture for which they were better suited.

This research was not designed to provide the total answer to all the problems, but to provide information concerning the areas of: (1) high school student motivation towards enrolling in the agricultural education curriculums; (2) the influence of certain high school and college grades and experiences upon the choice of teaching or not teaching; and (3) other factors that had motivated enrollees in agricultural education to plan to teach or to plan not to teach.

Scope and Purpose

The sample was divided into two groups with one group being those that indicated they planned to teach after graduation as a first response, and the other being those that indicated they planned not to teach after graduation as a first response. This study dealt with the following specific questions concerning these two groups:

(1) Was there a difference between the two groups concerning farm background, 4-H experience and vocational agricultural experience?

(2) Was there any significant difference between the two groups concerning: (a) average high school English grades; (b) average high

school science grades; and (c) average high school vocational agricultural grades?

(3) Was there any significant difference between the two groups concerning: (a) average college English grades; (b) average college science grades; and (c) over-all accumulated college grades?

(4) What were the most important factors in causing the students from both groups to enroll in agricultural education?

(5) What factors motivated those enrolled in agricultural education to plan to teach as a first choice?

(6) What factors motivated those in agricultural education to plan not to teach as a first choice?

(7) Was there a difference between the two groups concerning the idea of whether a teacher should first be an "agriculturalist" or an "educator"?

These questions were felt to be important and in need of answering in order to partially answer the main problem of the need of more well qualified vocational agricultural teachers. By studying the background and the motivational factors behind the students that were enrolled in agricultural education, it was hoped to determine how the group that planned to teach differed from the one that did not plan to teach. It was also expected that this information might provide clues as to how best to interest more students in agricultural education and teaching in the future.

By comparing high school and college grades it was hoped to determine if there was a significant difference between the group that planned to teach and the one that planned not to teach. If there was

a significant difference between the groups, it was reasoned that this information might be used to indicate which persons were most likely to succeed if encouraged towards teaching. Also, a significant difference in grades might have been indicative of a reason why some students planned not to teach. This was due to the minimum grade requirements necessary for obtaining a degree in agricultural education at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas. The minimum requirements were as follows: (1) written communications--a 1.5 grade based on a 4 point system, with a minimum grade of a D in one course; (2) oral communications--a 2.0 grade or higher; (3) a 2.5 grade or higher in twenty-four semester hours in the teaching field; and (4) a 2.2 grade or higher in all courses taken while at Kansas State University.³

Through identifying factors that motivated agricultural education majors to plan to teach, it was assumed that one would be able to determine why students had been drawn to teaching. It was planned that this information would be made available to local vocational agricultural teachers, administrators and boards, state staff, and teacher training personnel, as well as their respective professional organizations, to work towards maintaining and improving the factors that motivated students to want to teach. Also, by knowing what factors caused students not to want to teach, these same people would know what factors needed attention in order to improve the image of teaching vocational agriculture and increase motivation towards the profession.

³Statement by Howard Bradley, assistant teacher educator, agricultural education, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, personal interview.

Limitations of Research

This study was concerned with the above mentioned problems in the State of Kansas. Kansas State University is the only teacher educator institution for vocational agriculture in Kansas. The population of this study was therefore limited to the enrollees in the agricultural education curriculum at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas. It was further limited to those enrolled during the spring semester of 1967. This information was obtained from the University Office of Agricultural Education.

The sample group included all students in attendance on March 23, 1967, at the agricultural education seminar, a required course for all agricultural education majors. In addition to this group the seniors who were doing student teaching at the time were included in the study. Data were obtained on eighty-nine of the students enrolled by this process, but the information was not complete on nineteen of the students; therefore, information from the remaining seventy students was used. This was 70.7 per cent of the total population which was ninety-nine students. A portion of the information was obtained by examination of student in the Admissions and Registrar's Office of Kansas State University and additional information was obtained by use of a questionnaire.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were set aside for special definition as they applied to the study and had definitions for this study that could have varied somewhat from those in ordinary usage:

Significant Difference--a difference indicated at the five

per cent level of significance as determined by using the Chi Square Formula of statistical measurement.

High school English grade--the average grade for all English classes taken by the students in grades nine through twelve, excluding classes specifically designated as "yearbook" or "journalism."

High school science grade--the average grade for all science classes taken by the student in grades nine through twelve, including general science, biology or specific branches thereof, chemistry and physics.

High school vocational agricultural grade--the average grade for all classes in vocational agriculture during grades nine through twelve.

College English grades--the average grade for the two required classes of written communications at Kansas State University or transfer grades from other institutions that fulfill these requirements.

College science grade--the average grade for the basic science courses including botany, zoology, chemistry 1 and 2 or transfer grades from other institutions that fulfill these requirements.

Agriculturalist--one who is a specialist in agriculture and teaches.

Educator--one who is a teacher and has agriculture as his special field.

Planned to teach--those students in the sample who responded that they planned to teach vocational agriculture as their first occupational choice upon graduation.

Planned not to teach--those students in the sample who responded

that they did not plan to teach vocational agriculture as their first occupational choice upon graduation.

4-H experience--those students who had had one or more years of 4-H work prior to filling out the questionnaire.

Farm experience--those students who had had one or more years of living and working on a farm prior to filling out the questionnaire.

Organization of Thesis

The remainder of this thesis was organized in the following manner: (1) Chapter II is a resume' of past research that is related to the subject; (2) Chapter III explains the research procedure, measurement devices and reasons for their use; (3) Chapter IV is the report of this study and will be broken down into the following sections: (a) background of students, including 4-H experience, farm experience and vocational agricultural experience; (b) high school grades; (c) college grades; (d) motivation to enroll in agricultural education; (e) motivation to teach or not to teach; and (f) view of a teacher as an "agriculturalist" or an "educator"; and (4) Chapter V is the summary and conclusions of this study along with suggested areas to study further.

CHAPTER II

RELATED RESEARCH

In preparation for the research presented in this thesis, other research was surveyed which was related to the general area by using the library and Office of Agricultural Education at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, and by obtaining seven theses and reports from other states through inter-library loan.

There had been a number of studies made concerning factors related to why graduates in agricultural education do or do not teach, but it was not possible to find any of these studies that were made while the enrollees were still in school. Since this was the case, the researcher cited information from studies that had been made after the students had graduated. This information was assembled to be compared with the findings of this study, and it was noted whether decisions and factors changed as well as whether they were similar between the two groups. The two groups were those that indicated they planned to teach and those that indicated they did not plan to teach.

Per cent of Graduates Teaching

It was observed from the related research that a number of the graduates of agricultural education curriculum do not go on to teach vocational agriculture. In a study made by Hoerner of graduates from Iowa State University, "of the 1,022 total graduates, 654 (64.0 per cent) had actually taught vocational agriculture sometime since graduation."¹

¹Thomas A. Hoerner and Clarence E. Bundy, "Occupational Choice and Tenure of Ag. Ed. Grads," The Agricultural Education Magazine, December, 1966, p. 128.

In a study made at West Virginia University of graduates from 1951 to 1961 it was indicated that 45.5 per cent of the graduates entered teaching upon graduation and 54.5 per cent of the graduates entered other occupations.²

Shoup, in a study made in the state of New York, indicated that 59 per cent of the graduates between the years 1955 and 1960 went into teaching vocational agriculture.³

Ogelsby, in a study in Utah, reported that 68.5 per cent of the graduates had accepted an agricultural teaching position as their first regular employment after graduation.⁴

During a five year period, 1963 to 1967, eighty-five students graduated from Kansas State University with majors in agricultural education, and sixty of them had taught or were teaching at the time of this study. This was 70.6 per cent entering the teaching profession.⁵

²Donald Eugene Cook, "Occupational Status of West Virginia University Agricultural Education Graduates 1951-1961" (unpublished Master's thesis, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia, 1962), p. 23.

³Charles Aldrich Shoup, "Factors Affecting the Occupational Choice of Agricultural Education Graduates" (unpublished Master's thesis, Cornell University, Ithica, New York, 1965), p. 2.

⁴John M. Ogelsby, "Factors Affecting Length of Tenure of Vocational Agriculture Teachers Who Are Recent Graduates of Utah State Agricultural College" (unpublished Master's thesis, Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, 1954), Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education, Supplement No. 9, 1956, p. 56.

⁵Information obtained from Howard Bradley, assistant teacher educator, agricultural education, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, personal interview.

Farm, 4-H and Vocational Agricultural Background

It was an observation from the review of related research that background in farming, 4-H work and vocational agriculture were often considered to be influential factors in a person's choice to teach or not to teach. In Cook's study at West Virginia University it was indicated that graduates of agricultural education with vocational agricultural experience are more likely to teach than those who have not had any vocational agricultural experience. The same was true concerning FFA experience while in high school, but it was indicated that 4-H had little effect in the decision of graduates to remain in the field.⁶

In the study by Shoup, "Those who had taken a substantial amount of agriculture in high school taught in significantly more cases than those who had not."⁷

Factors Affecting Decision To Enroll in Agricultural Education

Cook's study indicated that, "Next to the persons own decision, vocational agriculture teachers are an important factor in guiding men into agricultural education."⁸

Froehlich, in his study of graduates of Iowa State University who were not teaching at the time of the study, found the following items the four most important towards influencing students to enroll in agricultural education: (1) own idea; (2) vocational agricultural

⁶Cook, op. cit., p. 49.

⁷Shoup, op. cit., p. 58.

⁸Cook, loc. cit.

instructor; (3) friend was enrolled; and (4) college counselor.⁹

Material gathered by Dr. Willard Wolf at Ohio State University indicated that 50.0 per cent of the students had given their vocational agricultural teacher as the main reason behind their enrolling in agricultural education.¹⁰

In a study by Severance, of graduates from Kansas State University in agricultural education from 1955 to 1963 that did not teach, it was found that 34.8 per cent of the persons listed their vocational agricultural instructor as the most influential. "Friends" was listed in 21.2 per cent of the cases, and both "parents" and "self" were listed in 13.7 per cent of the cases.¹¹

Influences To Teach or Not To Teach

In Froehlich's study at Iowa State it was found that those who had taught as their first occupation, but were not teaching now, indicated training, working closely with people and salary as the reasons why they had chosen to teach.¹²

Cook, in comparing those who were teaching at the time of his

⁹Loren Hugo Froehlich, "Factors Related to the Tendency of Iowa State University Agricultural Education Graduates to Not Enter or to Leave the Vocational Agricultural Teaching Profession" (unpublished Master's thesis, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1966), p. 41.

¹⁰Clyde F. Archer, "Making Up Your Mind to Teach," The Agricultural Education Magazine, December 1963, p. 158.

¹¹Harold G. Severance, "The Occupations of Graduates in Agricultural Education Who Did Not Teach Vocational Agriculture" (unpublished Master's report, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, 1966), p. 23.

¹²Froehlich, op. cit., p. 97.

study with those who were not teaching, found that for those who were teaching, personal interest was listed as the most important factor for the choice with opportunity for service second and salary third. Those who were not teaching ranked the same three items with personal interest first, salary second and opportunity for service third.¹³

In Shoup's study the following four items were ranked as the most important for not teaching vocational agriculture: (1) more chance for personal achievement elsewhere; (2) trend of fewer teachers and departments discouraging; (3) many vocational agricultural students are not interested; and (4) greater possibilities in the job taken.¹⁴

Ogelsby's study indicated that "inability to find a satisfactory position in the geographical area of interest"; "drafted into service"; "enjoy other work"; "better financial prospects in other fields"; and "always planned to enter a field other than teaching" as the five main factors for graduates in agricultural education choosing occupations other than teaching.¹⁵

A study of New York State by Tuthill indicated the following five reasons as the most important for leaving the teaching profession: (1) inadequate salary; (2) too confining; (3) enter field of administration; (4) limited chance for advancement; and (5) too much expected of the agricultural teacher.¹⁶

¹³Cook, op. cit., p. 31.

¹⁴Shoup, op. cit., p. 34.

¹⁵Ogelsby, op. cit., p. 42.

¹⁶Fred A. Tuthill, Jr., "Tenure of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in the High Schools of New York State." (unpublished Master's thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 1953), p. 79.

In a study by Holmberg, of job satisfaction of vocational agricultural teachers the following was noted:

Dissatisfaction was expressed by the majority of the respondents relative to the following factors:

1. Shop storage space
2. Salary schedules and annual increments
3. Tenure and retirement policies
4. Advisory councils
5. Security and opportunity for advancement offered by the vocational agricultural teaching profession.¹⁷

In a study by Ruth, graduates from Ohio State University indicated the following:

The five most disliked features were: working hours demanded, time for family life, opportunity for advancement, yearly salary, and facilities available for teaching. The five factors most liked by former teachers were: relations with farm people, relations with town people, relations with students (discipline), and retirement plans available.¹⁸

Severance, in a study of graduates of Kansas State University that did not teach, found that salary was indicated most often as the first reason for not teaching and that lack of advancement possibility was indicated most often as the second reason for not teaching.¹⁹

¹⁷ Donald R. Holmberg, "Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction of Vocational Agricultural Teachers" (unpublished Master's report, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, 1962), p. 60.

¹⁸ William Edward Ruth. "Some Influences Affecting Teachers of Vocational Agriculture to Leave the Profession" (unpublished Master's thesis, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1965), p. 123.

¹⁹ Severance, op. cit., p. 46.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE OF RESEARCH

Source of Data

Information for this research was obtained by two methods. First, a questionnaire was prepared to provide background information, information concerning motivation to enroll in agricultural education and the decision whether to teach or not to teach. This information was not readily available by any other means. After a preliminary copy of the questionnaire was prepared, it was discussed with personnel in agricultural education at Kansas State University. After revisions were made, the final copy was prepared to be administered to the sample group.

The second source of information came from student records in the Admissions and Registrar's Office at Kansas State University. From these records the investigator obtained the following information on each student in the sample: (1) average high school English grade; (2) average high school science grade; (3) average high school vocational agricultural grade; (4) college classification; (5) average college English grade; (6) average college science grade; and (7) over-all accumulated college grade through the fall semester of 1966.

Population and Sample

The population of the study was all of the enrollees in the agricultural education curriculum at Kansas State University during the spring semester of the 1967 school year. There were ninety-nine

students enrolled in the curriculum at the time of this survey.

The sample for this study was all of the students attending agricultural education seminar, a required course of all agricultural education majors, on the date of March 23, 1967, and the senior students who were doing their student teaching at the time. In all, eighty-nine questionnaires were completed, or 89.9 per cent of the total population. For the sample obtained by this method, information for the study was also obtained from the college records. When all material was gathered, it was found that adequate information for the study was attainable from only seventy of the eighty-nine students. The information from these seventy students, which composed 70.7 per cent of the total population, was used in the preparation of this thesis. This group was divided according to their response to question five on the questionnaire. Those who indicated they planned to teach as their first choice were placed in one group, and those who indicated they planned not to teach were placed in another. There were fifty respondents that indicated they planned to teach as their first choice and twenty respondents that indicated they planned to do something other than teaching as their first occupational choice. The data were then analyzed from the standpoint of these two groups.

Analysis of Data

Chi Square was used as the measure of statistical significance for the following areas of data: (1) high school English, science, and vocational agricultural grades; (2) college English and science grades; (3) over-all college grades; (4) 4-H and farm background experience; and (5) the choice as to whether a teacher should be more of an

"agriculturalist" or an "educator." This was done to determine if there was a significant difference between the group that indicated they planned to teach and the group that indicated they did not plan to teach. Chi Square was used because the sample was too large to use the Fisher Exact Probability Test based on information from Sigall's Non Parametric Statistics and other measures of statistical comparison did not lend themselves as well to the form of the data.

The remainder of the data were treated by ranking and a comparison of these rankings, as well as the percentage of the sample making the various choices. Because of the size of the sample and the large array of choices, there was no other statistical measure that could be applied to this information to the knowledge of the researcher and the persons he consulted about the matter.

Although some of the data presented in the tables were broken down by classes, it was necessary to treat it as one unit statistically in order to have a sample large enough to provide reliable results. Originally the writer had planned to break the study down into the following four divisions: (1) those who planned to teach as first choice; (2) those who planned to farm as first choice; (3) those who planned to enter an agriculturally related business; and (4) those who planned to enter some other field; but upon tabulating the available information, it was found the groups were too small for statistical comparison at a reliable level. The researcher then decided to break the data down into two groups of--to teach and not to teach.

At specific points in the study it was necessary to make other groupings in order to apply valid statistical analysis. These points are noted in the sections where they occur.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine how enrollees in agricultural education that planned to teach differed in background, grades and motivational factors from those that planned not to teach in background, grades and motivational factors. These data were based upon seventy of the ninety-nine students enrolled in the agricultural education curriculum at Kansas State University during the spring semester of 1967, except where otherwise noted. These data were divided and treated under the following headings in this chapter: (a) occupational plans; (b) background of students; (c) high school grades; (d) college grades; (e) motivation to enroll in agricultural education; (f) motivation to teach or not to teach; and (g) view of a teacher as an "agriculturalist" or an "educator."

Occupational Plans

Table I indicates the number of students in the sample for each class and whether they indicated on the questionnaire the choice of planning to teach or planning not to teach. The freshman and sophomore classes had a lower percentage of students planning to teach, 65 and 64 per cent respectively, than did the junior and senior classes, 80 and 75 respectively. This indicated to the researcher a dropping out of those that did not plan to teach or a changing of the mind, however this difference in this sample was not enough to be significant at the .05 level.

The total per cent planning to teach was 71. This was almost identical to the per cent that actually did teach after graduating from Kansas State University in agricultural education from 1963 to 1967. During those five years eighty-five students graduated and sixty of them had taught or were teaching at the time of this study. This was 70.6 per cent entering the teaching profession.¹

TABLE I

DIVISION OF SAMPLE BY CLASS INTO THE GROUP THAT PLANNED TO TEACH
AS FIRST CHOICE AND THOSE WHO PLANNED NOT TO TEACH
AS FIRST CHOICE

Class	To Teach		Not To Teach	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Freshman	13	65%	7	35%
Sophomore	9	64	5	36
Junior	16	80	4	20
Senior	12	75	4	25
TOTAL	50	71%	20	29%

The per cent that indicated they planned to teach in this study and the per cent actually entering the teaching profession after graduating from Kansas State University from 1963 to 1967 were both larger than those cited in the related research from other states. In the related research there was a range from 45.5 per cent to 68.5 per cent of graduates entering the teaching professions from states other than Kansas.²

¹Information obtained from Howard Bradley, assistant teacher educator, agricultural education, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, personal interview.

²See pages 10 and 11.

Background of Students

In Table II are shown data relative to the 4-H, farming and vocational agricultural background of the seventy students in the sample. Section A of the table concerns 4-H experience. This was defined as having participated in one or more years of 4-H work. The table indicates that of those that planned to teach, an average of 70 per cent had 4-H experience, and 30 per cent had no 4-H experience. In contrast to this, 85 per cent of those that planned not to teach had 4-H experience, and 15 per cent had no 4-H experience. In three of the four classes all respondents had 4-H experience. The sophomore class contained all of the respondents that did not have any 4-H experience for the group that did not plan to teach. This seemed to indicate to the writer that some difference existed between these two groups concerning experience in 4-H, but the Chi Square measure of significant difference indicated that it was not significant at the .05 level for this sample. This corresponded with the findings of Cook that 4-H had little effect in the decision of the graduates to remain in the field.³

In section B of Table II farm experience was considered. Farm experience was defined as one or more years of having lived and worked on a farm. In both of the groups all of the students in the sample had some farm experience. This indicated that farm experience had no bearing upon the plans to teach or not to teach in this sample.

³See page 12.

TABLE II

4-H, FARMING AND VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURAL EXPERIENCE
BY CLASS BETWEEN THOSE WHO PLANNED TO TEACH
AND THOSE WHO PLANNED NOT TO TEACH

Factor and Class	To Teach				Not To Teach			
	Experience No.	%	No Experience No.	%	Experience No.	%	No Experience No.	%
A. 4-H Experience								
Freshman	10	77%	3	23%	7	100%	0	0%
Sophomore	5	55	4	45	2	40	3	60
Junior	12	75	4	25	4	100	0	0
Senior	8	67	4	33	4	100	0	0
TOTAL	35	70%	15	30%	17	85%	3	15%
B. Farm Experience								
Freshman	13	100%	0	0%	7	100%	0	0%
Sophomore	9	100	0	0	5	100	0	0
Junior	16	100	0	0	4	100	0	0
Senior	12	100	0	0	4	100	0	0
TOTAL	50	100%	0	0%	20	100%	0	0%
C. Voc. Ag. Experience								
Freshman	11	85%	2	15%	6	86%	1	14%
Sophomore	8	89	1	11	3	60	2	40
Junior	13	81	3	19	4	100	0	0
Senior	8	67	4	33	2	50	2	50
TOTAL	40	80%	10	20%	15	75%	5	25%

Section C of Table II indicates experience in vocational agriculture during high school. Of those students in the sample who planned to teach, forty students or 80 per cent had taken vocational agriculture in high school and ten or 20 per cent had not taken vocational agriculture. In the group that planned not to teach, fifteen students or 75 per cent had taken vocational agriculture and five students or 25 per cent had not. Statistical analysis of this data indicated that there was no significant difference at the .05 level between these two groups in this sample; therefore, it was assumed that experience in vocational agriculture had no influence upon the choice to teach or not to teach. This was contrary to the findings of Cook and Shoup.⁴

High School Grades

Table III deals with the average grades students in the sample received in the following high school subjects: (1) English; (2) science; and (3) vocational agriculture. The average English grade for those who planned to teach was 2.52 while the average for those who planned not to teach was 2.50. The average science grade for the two groups was the same, 2.70. The average vocational agricultural grade for the group that planned to teach was 3.58 while the average grade for the group that did not plan to teach was 3.60. All of these grades were based upon a 4.0 grading system. The maximum deviation in grades between the groups in any of the subjects was no more than .02 of a grade point.

The writer divided the total figures for each of the subject

⁴See page 12.

TABLE III

HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH, SCIENCE AND VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURAL
GRADES BY CLASS BETWEEN THOSE WHO PLANNED TO TEACH
AND THOSE WHO PLANNED NOT TO TEACH

Factor and Class	To Teach					Not To Teach				
	Number Receiving Grade*					Number Receiving Grade*				
	A	B	C	D	Avg.	A	B	C	D	Avg.
A. English Grade										
Freshman	1	6	5	1	2.52	0	3	4	0	2.43
Sophomore	1	5	3	0	2.78	0	3	2	0	2.60
Junior	0	9	5	2	2.44	0	1	3	0	2.25
Senior	1	3	8	0	2.42	1	1	2	0	2.75
TOTAL	3	23	21	3	2.52	1	8	11	0	2.50
B. Science Grade										
Freshman	2	7	4	0	2.85	0	5	2	0	2.71
Sophomore	2	3	4	0	2.78	1	2	1	1	2.60
Junior	1	9	5	1	2.63	0	2	2	0	2.50
Senior	1	6	4	1	2.58	1	2	1	0	3.00
TOTAL	6	25	17	2	2.70	2	11	6	1	2.70
C. Voc. Ag. Grade										
Freshman	5	6	0	0	3.45	4	2	0	0	3.67
Sophomore	6	2	0	0	3.75	2	1	0	0	3.67
Junior	8	4	1	0	3.55	2	2	0	0	3.50
Senior	5	3	0	0	3.63	1	1	0	0	3.50
TOTAL	24	15	1	0	3.58	9	6	0	0	3.60

* This average is based upon a four point system--4=A; 3=B; 2=C; 1=D; and 0=F.

areas into two groups for more accurate statistical analysis than obtainable by using average grades. The two divisions were: above average grades, A and B; and average and below grades, C and D for English and science courses; A grade, and B grade and below for the vocational agricultural grades. Further division was not possible for accurate statistical analysis.

Analysis of the data indicated, as did the average grades, that there was no significant difference at the .05 level between those who planned to teach and those who planned not to teach. This was true of all three of the subject areas. This would indicate that high school grades were not an indicative factor of whether an enrollee planned to teach or not to teach.

College Grades

Table IV considers the average grades in college English, college science and over-all accumulated college grades between the group that planned to teach and the group that planned not to teach. Section A of the table deals with average college English grades for the two groups. In the group that planned not to teach there were nineteen respondents because one student in the sample had not taken any college English courses. The group that planned to teach had an average grade of 2.02 while those that planned not to teach had an average grade of 1.84. There was a contrast between the two groups in the freshman class. While the other classes varied .20 of a grade point or less between the two groups, the freshman class showed a variance of .65 of a grade point with those planning to teach having a higher average than those planning not to teach.

TABLE IV

COLLEGE ENGLISH, SCIENCE AND OVER-ALL COLLEGE GRADES BY
CLASS BETWEEN THOSE WHO PLANNED TO TEACH AND
THOSE WHO PLANNED NOT TO TEACH

Factor and Class	To Teach						Not To Teach					
	Number Receiving Grade *						Number Receiving Grade *					
	A	B	C	D	F	Avg.	A	B	C	D	F	Avg.
A. English Grade												
Freshman	1	2	8	2	0	2.15	0	2	0	3	1	1.50
Sophomore	0	0	9	0	0	2.00	0	1	2	2	0	1.80
Junior	0	3	9	4	0	1.94	0	0	4	0	0	2.00
Senior	0	1	10	1	0	2.00	1	0	2	1	0	1.80
TOTAL	1	6	36	7	0	2.02	1	3	8	6	1	1.84
B. Science Grade												
Freshman	0	3	6	2	2	1.77	0	0	1	4	2	.86
Sophomore	1	3	1	4	0	2.11	1	0	3	1	0	2.20
Junior	0	7	7	2	0	2.31	0	0	2	2	0	1.50
Senior	0	1	8	3	0	1.83	0	2	1	1	0	2.25
TOTAL	1	14	22	11	2	2.02	1	2	7	8	2	1.60
C. Over-all College Grade												
Freshman	0	4	6	3	0	2.08	0	2	1	4	0	1.71
Sophomore	0	4	5	0	0	2.44	0	1	4	0	0	2.20
Junior	0	7	9	0	0	2.44	0	0	3	1	0	1.75
Senior	0	5	7	0	0	2.42	1	2	1	0	0	3.00
TOTAL	0	20	27	3	0	2.34	1	5	9	5	0	2.10

* This average is based upon a four point system--4=A; 3=B; 2=C; 1=D; and 0=F.

For statistical analysis the total grades for college English were divided into three groups---above average grades, A and B; average grades, C; and below average grades, D and F. There was no significant difference at the .05 level between the college English grades of the two groups in this sample though the average English grades and statistical analysis indicated enough difference to merit further study of this factor with a larger sample.

Section B of Table IV deals with average college science grades. The group that planned to teach had an average grade that was .42 of a grade point larger than those that planned not to teach, 2.02 and 1.60 respectively. The freshman and junior classes deviated from each other most markedly. The freshman that planned to teach had an average grade of 1.77 while those that planned not to teach had an average of .86 or .91 of a grade point difference. In the junior class there was a difference of .81 of a grade point between the two groups, being 2.31 for those that planned to teach and 1.50 for those that planned not to teach. For statistical analysis the sample was divided into the same three groups as were used for the analysis of college English grades. The Chi Square test indicated there was not a reliable significant difference at the .05 level between the two groups in this sample, but enough difference was indicated that the writer felt further study into the area would be beneficial.

Section C of Table IV shows the over-all college grades of the students in the sample. The total average for the group planning to teach was .24 of a grade point higher than that for the group planning not to teach. The average grades were 2.34 and 2.10 respectively. The junior and senior classes varied most markedly between the two groups.

For the juniors, the group planning to teach had an over-all grade average of 2.44 while the group planning not to teach had an average of 1.75 or a difference of .69 of a grade point. The senior class presented the opposite picture. The group planning to teach had an average of 2.42 while those planning not to teach had an average of 3.00 or a difference of .58 of a grade point with those planning not to teach having the higher average.

The two groups were divided into above average grades, A and B; and average and below average grades, C, D and F, for statistical analysis. The writer found no reliable significant difference at the .05 level in the grades between the two groups, but a definite difference did seem to be indicated. The minimum over-all grade requirement for graduation in agricultural education at Kansas State University was 2.20. This average fell between the two groups with those planning to teach being above it and those planning not to teach being below it. This led the writer to conclude that though statistically there was not a significant difference at the .05 level, there was a distinct difference between the two groups concerning over-all college grades with those not planning to teach having an average grade below that required to graduate in agricultural education.

Motivation To Enroll in Agricultural Education

Table V indicates the three most important motivational factors causing students in the two groups to enroll in the agricultural education curriculum. The "vocational agricultural teacher," "farm work," "vocational agricultural work" and "FFA work" were the four factors of major importance in both groups. In the group that planned to teach

TABLE V

COMPARISON OF THOSE WHO PLANNED TO TEACH WITH THOSE WHO PLANNED NOT TO TEACH CONCERNING
THE THREE MAJOR INFLUENCES CAUSING THEM TO ENROLL IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Influential Factor	To Teach					Not To Teach										
	1st Choice No.	%	2nd Choice No.	%	3rd Choice No.	%	Wtd. Total	Rank	1st Choice No.	%	2nd Choice No.	%	3rd Choice No.	%	Wtd. Total	Rank
Voc. Ag. Teacher	16	32%	16	32%	7	14%	87	1st	3	15%	4	20%	3	15%	20	2nd
Farm Work	11	22	5	10	11	22	54	2nd	3	15	2	10	3	15	16	3rd
Voc. Ag. Work	9	18	10	20	6	12	53	3rd	5	25	3	15	4	20	25	1st
FFA Work	6	12	9	18	4	8	40	4th	1	5	4	20	3	15	14	4th
University Personnel	3	6	1	2	5	10	16	5th	1	5	0	0	0	0	3	10th
Others**	2	4	3	6	2	4	14	6th	3	15	0	0	0	0	9	6th
4-H Work	2	4	1	2	2	4	10	7th	1	5	1	5	2	10	7	7th
Interest or Aptitude Tests	1	2	2	4	3	6	10	7th	1	5	0	0	2	10	5	8th
Father	0	0	1	2	2	4	4	9th	1	5	4	20	1	5	12	5th
Brothers or Sisters	0	0	1	2	2	4	4	9th	0	0	2	10	0	0	4	9th
College Catalog	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	11th	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14th
County Agent	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	12th	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	12th
Reading Books and Magazines	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	12th	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14th

TABLE V (continued)

Influential Factor	To Teach					Not To Teach					Wted. Total	Rank				
	1st Choice No.	%	2nd Choice No.	%	3rd Choice No.	%	Wted. Total	Rank	1st Choice No.	%			2nd Choice No.	%	3rd Choice No.	%
Friends	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	1	14th	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	14th
School Counselor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15th	1	5	0	0	0	0	3	10th
Other Relatives	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15th	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	12th
Principal or Superintendent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15th	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14th
Other Teachers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15th	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14th
Mother	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15th	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14th
TOTAL	50	100%	50	100%	50	100%	---	---	20	100%	20	100%	20	100%	---	---

* A weighted total was used to obtain the relative value of each of the factors so that a useful ranking could be made. A factor chosen as first choice was given the weight of 3; second choice 2; and third choice 1, thus the largest weighted total was the most influential factor and the smallest was the least influential.

** Following is a list of the responses received in the category "Others":

TO TEACH		NOT TO TEACH	
1st Choice	2nd Choice	1st Choice	
Wife	General Curriculum	Background in all areas	
Want to teach	Diverse Curriculum	of agriculture	
	Veteran's Admin.	Scholarship	
	Counselor	Veterinary School	
		possibilities	

they were in the above mentioned order with weighted values of eighty-seven, fifty-four, fifty-three and forty respectively. The "vocational agricultural teacher" was the most influential factor with a weighted value of thirty-three points above the second response, "farm work." In the group indicating they did not plan to teach, the "vocational agricultural teacher" was the second most influential factor with a weighted value of twenty, while "vocational agricultural work" was rated first with a value of twenty-five, "farm work" was ranked third with a value of sixteen and "FFA work" ranked fourth with a value of fourteen. These four factors were the most important for both groups because they received 148 of the possible 210 responses. This was 70.5 per cent of the total responses.

"University personnel" was fifth in the group that planned to teach with a weighted value of sixteen, but was ranked tenth in the group that did not plan to teach with a weighted value of three. Even though this factor was ranked fifth in the group that planned to teach, it seems that it had little influence in relation to the first four factors.

The response "other" ranked sixth in both groups. The idea of a broad general curriculum appeared twice in the group that planned to teach and once in the group that planned not to teach. Other factors appearing only once were, "wife," "want to teach," "Veteran's Administration Counselor" and "working with young students" for those that planned to teach; and "scholarship" and "veterinary school possibilities" in the group that planned not to teach.

"4-H work" and interest and aptitude tests" ranked seventh in the

group that planned to teach with values of ten, and seventh and eighth among those that planned not to teach with values of seven and five respectively. "Brothers or Sisters" was ranked ninth in both groups. "Father" was also ranked ninth in the group that planned to teach, but was ranked fifth with a value of twelve in the group that did not plan to teach. The remaining factors--"college catalog," "county agent," "reading books and magazines," "friends," "school counselor," "other relatives," "principal or superintendent," "other teachers" and "mother"--seemed to have little or no major influence on the students enrolled in agricultural education from either group.

The table indicated that major motivation for the agricultural education curriculum originated around the vocational agricultural teacher, his program and farm experience. This would agree with the cited related research as all pointed out that the vocational agricultural instructor was a very important influential factor. The fact that friends was mentioned as a fairly important factor in Froehlich's and Severance's studies is somewhat in opposition to the findings of this study. The influence of friends was of minor importance in this study.⁵

With the major motivation to enroll in agricultural education centering around the vocational agricultural instructor, it seemed to the writer that this was the area from which motivation must come for further increases in the enrollment in agricultural education. A definite weakness in motivation was noted in the other aspects of the

⁵See pages 12 and 13.

school program--"school counselor," "other teachers" and "principal or superintendent." This indicated a need for education and public relations towards the program of agricultural education directed to these people, particularly school counselors, as they were in the best position to guide students in educational and occupational choices. There was also an indication that increased emphasis upon university personnel might render that factor more effective in the future.

Influences To Teach

Table VI presents data obtained in response to question six asking the students in the sample to indicate the three most important factors causing them to want to teach as a first choice. "Like to stay close to production agriculture," "teaching is a challenge" and "want to farm on the side" were the factors receiving the most responses. Of 150 possible responses, these three factors received 77 or 51 per cent of the responses. The response, "like to stay close to production agriculture," received 22 per cent of the total responses and had a weighted value of eighty-two which was thirty-three points above the second ranked response, "teaching is a challenge," receiving a value of forty-nine. "Want to farm on the side" received a weighted value of thirty-seven and was ranked third.

"Doing good for others," "stepping stone to a better job," "others" and "secure future" were ranked fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh and received weighted values of twenty-two, twenty-one, nineteen and eighteen respectively. These four factors received 26.5 per cent of the total responses. Responses under the category of "others" were, "like to work with young people," which received four first choice

TABLE VI

THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT INFLUENCES CAUSING
THE STUDENT TO WANT TO TEACH VOCATIONAL
AGRICULTURE AFTER GRADUATION

Influential Factor	1st Choice		2nd Choice		3rd Choice		Wted.* Total	Rank
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Like to stay close to production agriculture	17	34%	14	28%	3	6%	82	1st
Teaching is a challenge	9	18	8	16	6	12	49	2nd
Want to farm on side	5	10	7	14	8	16	37	3rd
Doing good for others	3	6	4	8	5	10	22	4th
Stepping stone to a better job	6	12	0	0	3	6	21	5th
Others**	5	10	0	0	4	8	19	6th
Secure future	3	6	2	4	5	10	18	7th
Enjoy working with adult farmers	0	0	3	6	4	8	10	8th
Can meet public better	0	0	4	8	1	2	9	9th
Little routine to job	1	2	2	4	2	4	9	9th
Salary	1	2	2	4	1	2	8	11th
Advancement possibilities	0	0	2	4	3	6	7	12th
Longer vacation	0	0	1	2	1	2	3	13th
Social advantage	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	14th
No Response	0	0	0	0	4	8		
TOTAL	50	100%	50	100%	50	100%	--	----

* A weighted total was used to obtain the relative value of each factor so that a useful ranking could be made. First choice factors were given a value of 3; second choice 2; and third choice 1, thus the largest weighted total was the most influential and the smallest the least influential.

** Following is a list of the responses received in the category, "Others":

First Choice

Like to work with young
people (4 responses)
Want to do for some boy what
my ag. teacher did for me

Second Choice

Enjoy working with youth
(3 responses)
Develop leadership through
FFA

responses and three third choice responses; "want to do for some boy what my agricultural teacher did for me" as a first choice response; and "develop leadership through FFA" as a third choice response.

Factors of lesser significance were, "enjoy working with adult farmers," "can meet the public better," "little routine to job," "salary," "advancement possibilities," "longer vacations" and "social advantages." These factors were ranked in the order listed and received weighted values between ten and two. They were classified by the researcher as having had little major influence in causing the students to plan to teach.

Influence Not To Teach

Table VII deals with influences causing students to not want to teach. The four responses ranked highest were, "college grades," "not interested in teaching," "took agricultural education only to receive the training" and "salary." They were ranked in that order and received weighted values of twenty-five, twenty-one, seventeen and sixteen respectively. These four factors received thirty-six responses or 60 per cent of the possible sixty responses.

"College grades" was indicated as the most important reason for not planning to teach. Although there was not a significant difference at the .05 level between the college grades received by those students that planned to teach and those that did not plan to teach, the group that planned to teach did have an average that was above that required for a degree in agricultural education at Kansas State University, and the group that did not plan to teach had an average that was below that required for a degree in agricultural education. This was not found to

TABLE VII

THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT INFLUENCES CAUSING THE STUDENT
TO NOT WANT TO TEACH VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE
AFTER GRADUATION

Influential Factor	1st Choice		2nd Choice		3rd Choice		Wted.* Total	Rank
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
College grades	6	30%	3	15%	1	5%	25	1st
Not interested in teaching	5	25	2	10	2	10	21	2nd
Took ag. ed. only for training	3	15	3	15	2	10	17	3rd
Salary	2	10	3	15	4	20	16	4th
Others**	2	10	2	10	1	5	11	5th
Personal problems	1	5	2	10	0	0	7	6th
Lack of advancement	1	5	1	5	1	5	6	7th
Insecure future	0	0	1	5	0	0	2	8th
May have to teach other class	0	0	1	5	0	0	2	8th
Could meet public better in another occupation	0	0	1	5	0	0	2	8th
Long irregular hours	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	11th
Discipline problems	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	11th
Non-adjustment with co-workers	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	11th
Lack of adequate finances and facilities in which to teach	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	11th
Possible public criticism	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15th
Possible community problems	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15th
No Response	0	0	1	5	5	25		
TOTAL	20	100%	20	100%	20	100%	--	----

* A weighted total was used to obtain the relative value of each factor so that a useful ranking could be made. A factor chosen as first choice was given a weight of 3; second choice 2; and third choice 1, thus the largest weighted total was most influential.

** These responses were listed under the category, "Others":

<u>First Choice</u>	<u>Second Choice</u>	<u>Third Choice</u>
Interest	Love to work with cows	Want to teach one
Interested in flying	Want to farm	area of ag. only

be a factor in any of the related research studied by the writer in relation to this thesis.

"Not interested in teaching" and "took agricultural education only to receive training" seemed to be factors closely related by those not planning to teach. They were ranked second and third.

Whereas the first three factors listed were first responses the majority of the time, "salary," which was ranked fourth, was a second and third choice more often than a first choice. This indicated that though salary is an important factor in deciding not to teach, it is not commonly thought of as being the most important factor for not teaching.

The following were received as responses under the category, "others," which was ranked fifth with a weighted value of eleven: first choice--"interest" and "interest in flying"; second choice--"love to work with cows" and "want to farm"; third choice--"would be interested if I could teach only one area of agriculture."

"Personal problems" and "lack of advancement" were ranked sixth and seventh with weighted values of seven and six respectively. The remaining factors were ranked in the following order, but were classified by the researcher as having little major influence in causing the student to plan not to teach: "insecure future," "may have to teach other classes," "could meet the public better in another occupation," "long irregular hours," "discipline problems," "non-adjustment with co-workers," "lack of adequate finances and facilities in which to teach," "possible public criticism" and "possible community problems." All of these factors received weighted totals of two through zero which indicated they were always selected as a second or

third choice.

In the related research, "salary," "lack of advancement" and "insecure future" were the most commonly mentioned reasons for teachers leaving the field or not teaching at all. The findings of this study tended to agree although salary did not seem to be as important a factor in this study as it did in the related studies, and lack of advancement and insecure future were considered of somewhat lesser importance in this study than in the related research.⁶

Role of the Teacher

Table VIII indicates the response of students in the sample to question eight of the questionnaire. Those who planned to teach indicated they felt the role of the teacher was first that of an "educator" in 74 per cent of the cases and an "agriculturalist" in 26 per cent of the cases, while those planning not to teach were split equally with 50 per cent indicating that a teacher should first be an "agriculturalist" and 50 per cent indicating that a teacher should first be an "educator."

In statistical analysis of this factor it was found that there was a significant difference at the .05 level between the two groups in response to the question. Students planning to teach felt that a teacher should be an "educator" first more often than those planning not to teach.

⁶See pages 13,14 and 15.

TABLE VIII

COMPARISON OF IDEAS THAT A TEACHER SHOULD BE AN "AGRICULTURALIST"
OR AN "EDUCATOR" BY CLASS BETWEEN THOSE PLANNING TO TEACH
AND THOSE PLANNING NOT TO TEACH

Factor and Class	To Teach		Not To Teach	
	No.	%	No.	%
A. "Agriculturalist"				
Freshman	4	31%	3	57%
Sophomore	3	33	3	60
Junior	4	25	0	0
Senior	2	17	4	100
TOTAL	13	26%	10	50%
B. "Educator"				
Freshman	9	69%	4	43%
Sophomore	6	67	2	40
Junior	12	75	4	100
Senior	10	83	0	0
TOTAL	37	74%	10	50%

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTED FURTHER STUDY

Conclusions

From this research the writer made the following conclusions:

1. The per cent of students planning to teach (71.0%), as indicated by this study, did not differ significantly from the actual per cent that did teach (70.6%), as determined by a comparison with the graduates from Kansas State University in agricultural education from 1963 to 1967, but was larger than the per cent teaching from other states as determined by the related research.

2. Participation in 4-H work, farm experience or vocational agricultural work did not have a significant difference at the .05 level on whether a student planned to teach or not.

3. There was no significant difference at the .05 level between those planning to teach and those planning not to teach concerning high school English, science and vocational agricultural grades.

4. There was no significant difference at the .05 level between those planning to teach and those planning not to teach concerning college English, science and over-all accumulated college grades, but the writer found that the average grade required for graduation in agricultural education fell between the two groups. Those planning to teach had an average grade higher than that required and those planning not to teach had an average lower than that required; therefore, the writer concluded that over-all college grades were significant factors in planning to teach or not to teach.

5. Concerning motivation to enroll in agricultural education, the "vocational agricultural teacher," "farm work," "vocational agricultural work" and "FFA work" were the most important factors, in that order, for the group planning to teach. For the group planning not to teach, the same four factors were most important, but were in the following order: "vocational agricultural work," "vocational agricultural teacher," "farm work" and "FFA work." School personnel other than the vocational agricultural teacher were not mentioned except once as a third choice response in the group planning not to teach. These above factors indicated to the writer a need for vocational agricultural teachers to attempt to do more towards motivating students to enroll in agricultural education, as they and their programs are the main influential factors towards enrolling in agricultural education. Also, there was indicated a need for education and public relations concerning the program of agricultural education directed to other high school personnel, but primarily to the guidance counselors as this is their main responsibility.

6. "Like to stay close to production agriculture," "teaching is a challenge" and "want to farm on the side" were the three most important influential factors causing students to plan to teach. "Advancement possibilities," "longer vacations" and "social advantages" were least influential towards the desire to teach.

7. The four most important influences in causing the students not to plan to teach were, "college grades," "not interested in teaching," "took agricultural education only for the training" and "salary." "Possible public criticism" and "possible community problems" were listed as least influential.

8. There was a significant difference at the .05 level between the group planning to teach and the group planning not to teach concerning the idea of whether a teacher should first be an "agriculturalist" or an "educator." The group planning to teach indicated more frequently that a teacher should first be an "educator" and the group not planning to teach was equally divided between the two ideas.

Suggested Areas of Further Study

This study suggested to the writer a need for further study between such groups of majors in agricultural education in certain areas. They were as follows: (1) college English grades; (2) college science grades; and (3) over-all college grades. Though there was not a significant difference at the .05 level concerning these factors, there was an indication of some difference between the two groups. It was felt that a study of these factors in more detail with larger samples might indicate a significant difference.

In addition to the above areas, the writer felt that study as to why the high school guidance counselor was not an important influential factor in causing students to enroll in agricultural education was needed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Archer, Clyde F. "Making Up Your Mind to Teach," The Agricultural Education Magazine, December 1963, p. 158.
- Cook, Donald Eugene. "Occupational Status of West Virginia University Agricultural Education Graduates 1951-1961." Unpublished Master's thesis, West Virginia University, Morgantown, 1962.
- Dalbey, C. W. "Report of the Central States Seminar in Agricultural Education." Iowa: State Department of Vocational Agriculture, Des Moines, February 1967. (Mimeographed.)
- Froehlich, Loren Hugo. "Factors Related to the Tendency of Iowa State University Agricultural Education Graduates to not Enter or to Leave the Vocational Agricultural Teaching Profession." Unpublished Master's thesis, Iowa State University, Ames, 1966.
- Hoerner, Thomas A. and Clarence E. Bundy. "Occupational Choice and Tenure of Ag. Ed. Grads." The Agricultural Education Magazine, December 1966, pp. 128-30.
- Holmberg, Donald R. "Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction of Vocational Agricultural Teachers." Unpublished Master's report, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, 1962.
- Kansas State Board for Vocational Education. "Facts on Supply and Demand for Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in the United States." Topeka, 1967. (Mimeographed.)
- Ogelsby, John M. "Factors Affecting Length of Tenure of Vocational Agriculture Teachers Who Are Recent Graduates of Utah State Agricultural College." Unpublished Master's thesis, Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, 1954.
- Ruth, William Edward. "Some Influences Affecting Teachers of Vocational Agriculture to Leave the Profession." Unpublished Master's thesis, Ohio State University, Columbus, 1965.
- Severance, Harold G. "The Occupations of Graduates in Agricultural Education Who Did Not Teach Vocational Agriculture." Unpublished Master's report, Kansas State University, Manhattan, 1966.
- Shoup, Charles Aldrich. "Factors Affecting the Occupational Choice of Agricultural Education Graduates." Unpublished Master's thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca, 1965.
- Tuthill, Fred A., Jr. "Tenure of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in the High Schools of New York State." Unpublished Master's thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca, 1953.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to discover why students in Agricultural Education at Kansas State University chose the Agricultural Education Curriculum; what future plans they have after graduation and the major reasons for that decision.

Your carefully considered responses to the items in this questionnaire will obtain valuable data which will be helpful in guiding and counseling future students.

1. Name _____
2. Have you ever belonged to 4-H? ____Yes ____No Number of years _____ :
3. Have you ever lived on a farm? ____Yes ____No Number of years _____
4. What are the five major influences causing your enrollment in Agricultural Education at Kansas State University? (Number them in the order of their importance with (1) being the most important.)

____Principal or Superintendent
 ____University Personnel
 ____Vocational Agricultural Work
 ____Reading Books and Magazines
 ____Friends
 ____4-H Work
 ____County Agent
 ____Other Teachers
 ____College Catalogues
 ____Father

____School Counselor
 ____Interest or Aptitude Tests
 ____FFA Work
 ____Vocational Agricultural Teacher
 ____Brother or Sister
 ____Farm Work
 ____Other Relative
 ____Mother
 ____Others (Specify)

5. What are your plans upon terminating your University education assuming you have no military obligation? (List a first and second choice by numbering them 1 and 2.)

____Teaching ____Farming ____Agriculturally Related Business or Industry

____Other (Specify) _____

6. If you marked teaching as your first or second choice in question five, what are the three factors that have been most influential in your desiring to teach? (Number them in the order of importance with (1) being the most important.)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Stepping stone to a better job | <input type="checkbox"/> Want to farm on the side |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Secure future | <input type="checkbox"/> Little routine to the job |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Salary | <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching is a challenge |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Longer vacation | <input type="checkbox"/> Doing good for others |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Can meet public better | <input type="checkbox"/> Advancement possibilities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Like to stay close to production agriculture | <input type="checkbox"/> Others (Specify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Social advantages | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Enjoy working with adult farmers | _____ |

7. If your first choice in question five was something other than teaching what are the three major factors that have been the most influential in your choosing not to teach as a career? (Number them in the order of importance with (1) being the most important.)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Insecure future | <input type="checkbox"/> Salary |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Long irregular hours | <input type="checkbox"/> Discipline problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> College grades | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-adjustment with co-workers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Possible public criticism | <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of advancement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not interested in teaching | <input type="checkbox"/> Could meet public better in another occupation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personal problems | <input type="checkbox"/> Possible community problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Took Agricultural Education only for the training | <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of adequate finances and facilities in which to teach |
| <input type="checkbox"/> May have to teach other classes | <input type="checkbox"/> Others (Specify) |
| | _____ |
| | _____ |

8. Which do you consider as the more important aspect of a vocational agricultural teacher, "Agriculturalist" or "Educator"? (Read the following definition and then check one.)

☐ "Agriculturalist" - One who is a specialist in agriculture and teaches.

☐ "Educator" - One who is a teacher and has agriculture as his special field.

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF MAJORS IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

by

LARRY CHARLES ASHER

B. S., Kansas State University, 1963

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1968

The purpose of this study was to determine the significance of certain factors in causing students to enroll in agricultural education at Kansas State University and to plan to teach or not to teach.

This study was based on the following sources: (1) Master's theses and reports; (2) articles from the Agricultural Education Magazine; (3) a questionnaire administered to enrollees in agricultural education at Kansas State University; and (4) information from the school records concerning these students.

The population for this study was all students enrolled in agricultural education at Kansas State University during the spring semester of 1967. A questionnaire was administered to students in a required course of all enrollees. In addition the students doing student teaching at the time were included in the sample. Completed questionnaires were obtained from eighty-nine of the ninety-nine enrollees in agricultural education. After administering the questionnaire additional data were obtained from school records for each of the students included in the sample. Complete data were obtainable for seventy students of the sample. This was 70.6 per cent of the total population.

Fifty (71.0%) of the students in the sample indicated they planned to teach and twenty (29.0%) indicated they did not plan to teach. The remaining data were analyzed in relation to the above two groups.

Thirty-five (70.0%) of those planning to teach and seventeen (85.0%) of those planning not to teach had had 4-H experience. All students in the sample had had farming experience. Forty (80.0%) of

those planning to teach and fifteen (75.0%) of those planning not to teach had had vocational agriculture. All of these factors were found to be not significant at the .05 level.

The average high school English, science and vocational agricultural grades for those planning to teach were 2.52, 2.70 and 3.58 respectively, based upon a four point system. For those planning not to teach the grades were 2.50, 2.70 and 3.60 respectively. There was no significant difference between the two groups at the .05 level.

College English and science grades for those planning to teach were both 2.02 based on a four point system. For those planning not to teach they were 1.84 and 1.60 respectively. These differences were not found to be significant at the .05 level.

The over-all college grade for those planning to teach was 2.34 while it was 2.10 for those planning not to teach. This difference was not statistically significant at the .05 level, but was significant in this study due to a minimum grade requirement for graduation which fell between the grades of these two groups.

"Vocational agriculture teacher," "farm work," "vocational agricultural work" and "FFA work" were listed as the four most important influences for enrolling in agricultural education by both groups. The order differed from the above only in that those planning not to teach ranked the "vocational agricultural teacher" second, "farm work" third and "vocational agricultural work" first. These four factors received 70.5 per cent of the total possible responses.

Concerning the group that planned to teach, the three most influential factors towards that decision were "like to stay close

to production agriculture"; "teaching is a challenge"; and "want to farm on the side."

"College grades," "not interested in teaching," "took agricultural education only for the training" and "salary" were the four factors most influential in the students planning not to teach.

At the .05 level, significantly more of the students planning to teach indicated that a teacher should first be an "educator" rather than an "agriculturalist" than did those planning not to teach, 74.0 and 50.0 per cent respectively.