DIFFERENCES IN SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN AREA I OF TEXAS THAT EXHIBIT LIVESTOCK ON THE STATE LEVEL AND THOSE THAT DO NOT EXHIBIT ABOVE THE DISTRICT LEVEL

By

LARRY DEAN SCHICKEDANZ

Bachelor of Science

Panhandle A & M College

Goodwell, Oklahoma

1959

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of
the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Science
August, 1964

DIFFERENCES IN SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN AREA I OF TEXAS THAT EXHIBIT LIVESTOCK ON THE STATE LEVEL AND THOSE THAT DO NOT EXHIBIT ABOVE THE DISTRICT LEVEL

Thesis Approved:

Robert R. Price
Thesis Adviser

Everett D. Edington

J. H. Boggs
Dean of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is expressed to the many individuals who helped to make this study possible.

To Dr. Robert Price, who served as major thesis adviser; Dr. Everett Edington, minor thesis adviser; and Mr. Herman Brown, graduate assistant, my sincere appreciation is expressed for their patient guidance and encouragement throughout the course of this study.

The writer is especially indebted to the sixty-eight teachers of vocational agriculture in Area I of Texas and Mr. Walter Labay, Area I supervisor, for their valuable contribution to this study. Without their assistance this study would not have been possible.

Appreciation is also expressed to Mrs. Quin Baker who served as typist.

To my wife, Charleen, for her devoted assistance and encouragement, I express my sincere gratitude.

L.D.S.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

As has been stated by authors of other studies of this type, the world we live in today has become a complex and scientific society to live in. The environment around which we live has and is steadily revolving at a pace that is fast and furious to keep up with. This has been brought about by several factors; mainly automation, mechanization and faster and better transportation and communications all over the world today.

We have found great emphasis being placed on mathematics, science, engineering and academic excellence the past several years. This has brought about great changes in the cirriculums of our modern day educational systems. Due to these emphases on the above, in some instances we have tended to disregard some of the primary objectives (which in the past have been to prepare the individual to go out into a democratic society) and to focus more directly upon the science and mathematical fields. This is good, however, we still need not overlook the greater-than-ever need for the students who do not go into some scientific or mathematic field. One of the main needs for this segment of our education to be enriched has been brought about by the large increases and the more-than-ever overcrowding of certain sections of our large urban areas.

More than ever before, vocational agriculture needs to continue to strengthen its program to meet the growing needs of this complex situation. In the past the vocational agriculture and Future Farmers of America programs in the state of Texas have made amazing progress along the lines of developing a student to be better prepared to provide food, fiber and clothing for himself and his family. This holds true no matter what vocation or occupation he chooses to pursue. This great and dynamic educational structure has been built partly around the vocational agriculture instructor and his opportunity to utilize all of the educational facets he has available in his community.

Just this past year students of vocational agriculture in Area I of Texas, for the first time, lacked only a few dollars having a total labor income of one million dollars from their supervised farm training programs in vocational agriculture.

Leadership has proved to be one of the essential and most dynamic assets that an individual can take with him into the kind of scientific society in which we live. The local agriculture instructor has brought about training in leadership in many different ways. Many use shows and fairs as a means of teaching responsibility, building character, motivation and interest as well as the pride and accomplishments that go with the type of training found in exhibiting livestock.

Each year, however, we have more and more pressure applied to us to cut down on livestock shows and fairs because of the time away from classroom instruction in other subjects, costs, etc. One reason for this thinking might be the increasing number of schools now beginning to require eighteen to twenty credit hours for graduation from high school. This requirement has increased the subject load of the student

throughout his high school career. Some programs are rated entirely on the amount of showring winnings each year and not on the total all-around program being provided for the student. Maybe the theory that enough motivation and interest can be generated by showing only on the local and district level is of sound thinking. Certainly it has its merits, both good and bad.

Due to some of the feelings expressed by educators and agriculture personnel about the value of participation in shows and fairs on the state level has created a vital need for this study.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The central problem in this study was to determine the effect that participating in fairs and livestock shows has had on the vocational agriculture program by comparing selected characteristics of departments that are rated high in exhibiting livestock to those that exhibited very little beyond the county level.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

High Participation Group and Low Participation Group. In order to compare the two groups of departments, data was presented under the headings of High Participation Group and Low Participation Group. The High Group represents those departments that exhibited livestock most frequently above the county and district level. The Low Participation Group represents those departments that most frequently exhibited livestock on the county or district level. A further basis for dividing the departments into the High or Low Participation Group was the number of livestock that each department exhibited at these shows and fairs.

Exhibiting livestock beyond the county, district and state level was the only criteria considered in determining the group to which a department would be classified.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect that exhibiting livestock had on:

(a) labor income from their supervised farming program

(b) participation in Future Farmer activities

(c) participation in leadership contests

(d) farm mechanics program

(e) Young Farmer organization

(f) number of dropouts

(g) student scholarship

(h) number of boys retained for three years in vocational agriculture

(i) teacher tenure

(j) salaries above state scale

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study involved the ninety-five departments of vocational agriculture in Area I of Texas. The study was limited to the sixty-eight departments which returned the surveys mailed to them. The study involved the dividing of the departments of vocational agriculture into a group rated high in participation in livestock exhibition and into a group rated low in participation of livestock. The High Participation Group represents those departments that most frequently exhibited livestock above the county and district level. The Low Participation

Group represents those departments that most frequently exhibited livestock on the county or district level. A further basis for dividing the departments into the High or Low Participation Group was the number of livestock that each department exhibited at these shows and fairs.

Exhibiting livestock beyond the county, district and state level was the only criteria considered in determining the group to which a department would be classified.

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

In making this study, the first step was to secure a list of all the departments of vocational agriculture in Area I of Texas. A questionnaire was formulated and mailed to each of the departments in the Area. In addition to data secured by this method, other information was secured from the files of the State Department of Vocational Agriculture.

The data secured was divided into several categories: (1) that pertaining to level of participation in livestock shows and fairs, (2) participation in Future Farmer activities, (3) scholarship, (4) the supervised farming program, (5) that pertaining to the instructor, (6) participation in leadership contests.

In order to make a comparison of the two groups of departments, they were designated the High Group and the Low Group. Tables and charts were constructed accordingly and the data was tabulated and analyzed using the t-Test and chi-Square to determine significant differences in the two groups, and then conclusions were drawn.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The vocational agriculture programs of America have been based on the agriculture phase of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. This Act encouraged states to provide programs of vocational agriculture, which otherwise may never have been adequately provided in the public school systems. The Smith-Hughes Act states that vocational agriculture programs were: to be of less than college grade, to fit for useful employment and be designed to meet the needs of persons over 14 years of age who have entered upon or who are preparing to enter upon the work of the farm or farm home.

One of the basic foundations of the total vocational agriculture program, which is carried out by the local teacher, has been based upon the supervised farm training program. This situation is also endorsed by the Smith-Hughes Act.

The Future Farmers of America organization, which was founded in 1928, in Kansas City, Missouri, is an integral part of vocational agriculture. The primary aim of the Future Farmers of America is the development of agricultural leadership, cooperation and citizenship. Its motto is:

Learning to Do
Doing to Learn
Earning to Live
Living to Serve

As can be seen, two of the main functions of the Future Farmers of America correlate very closely with the main objectives of the Smith-Hughes Act. Participation in livestock shows and fairs has been used many years as a means of development of the objectives of both the Smith-Hughes Act and the Future Farmers of America. However, over the years some people have tended to be very critical of this type of participation above the local or district level.

> "Administrators and others interested in programs of vocational agriculture may question the practicability of participation in livestock and crop shows. Some teachers may neglect other important phases of the program of vocational agriculture in order to spend excessive time at shows. Since the writer's basic assumption in this investigation was to accept the factors which refute the null hypothesis, show winnings should be accepted as one of the criterion in measuring the effectiveness of programs of vocational agriculture. One may observe that the above-average group averaged $254 per department from show winnings in contrast to an average of $46 for the below-average group. Thirty of the 50 below-average departments reveal no cash winnings at the three major shows; ten of the above-average group show no cash winnings. It was evident when the investigator made his comparison that district supervisors rated departments above average which were most active in show programs.
>
> The writer would recommend that those interested in local programs of vocational agriculture seriously consider the possibilities of a local community crop and livestock show. It is believed that local shows do much more for local programs of vocational education in agriculture than participation in major shows. The writer believes that participation in shows strengthens the supervised farm training programs of students. On the basis of the findings of this study, it is recommended that winnings at the major shows be regarded as one of the measures when one is evaluating programs of vocational agriculture." ([6], pp. 149-150)

Knebel has indicated that showing livestock only on a local basis might actually tend to strengthen the local program more than participation in major shows. He has recommended that winnings at the major shows be regarded as one of the measures in evaluating the vocational agriculture program.

In a study conducted by Benton Thomason he has this to say about the supervised farm training and the labor income from it:

> "The most active students in shows and fairs were far above the average vocational agriculture student in many respects.
>
> All but 24 of the 221 students studied had projects in enterprises other than those exhibited. One-hundred-eighty-four of these students had breeding projects, 144 of which were of the same type as the livestock exhibited. Ninety-three of the students had crop projects in addition to their animal projects.
>
> These 221 students owned 815 different projects for an average of 3.69 projects per student. A breakdown of the students, according to the number of enterprises owned, showed that 99 had four or more projects, 55 owned three types, 42 owned two types of projects and 24 owned only one.
>
> Income from enterprises from which projects were exhibited made up 31.5% of the total labor income for these students while income from other projects amounted to 68.5% of the total labor income. This proves that boys do use their income from show animals to develop their total farm training program, and that the student who shows an animal usually has a large farming program back home of projects that he is not showing.
>
> The students who most actively participated in shows and fairs had an average investment of $1,869.07 and an average labor income of $948.61, as compared with the state average investment of $452.09 and an average labor income of $235.15 during the same period." ([8], pp.3)

Thomason's study shows that the larger total labor income and the larger investment in farming came from the students who most actively participated in shows and fairs.

Hoar concluded in "A Study of the Influence That Participation in Shows and Fairs Has Had on the Establishment of Purebred Herds of Livestock and Dairy Cattle Among Former Members of the FFA" that:

> "The evidence presented in this study leads the writer to believe and conclude that there are two of several factors which have the most influence on the FFA member in establishing and maintaining a purebred herd or flock of livestock or dairy cattle. First, that extensive participation in shows

and fairs in connection with FFA work has had a definite influence on the FFA member, his interest and leadership in agriculture and his establishment in farming." ([5], pp. 91)

Baker, in a similar study in Oklahoma, states that:

"Supervised farming with its emphasis on "learning to do by doing" has had a dynamic effect on vocational education in agriculture. If we accept the aim of vocational agriculture as the training of present and prospective farmers for proficiency in farming, then we must place considerable emphasis on the supervised farm training program. Table V indicates a significant difference in investment in farming and labor income per student in favor of the High Group. The mean difference in investment in farming per student between the two groups is $396. The High Group was also superior to the Low Group in labor income per student.

Based on data secured in this table it seems apparent that the departments that exhibit livestock beyond the county level do have superior programs of supervised farming when compared to the Low Participation Group." ([1], pp. 22)

Baker concludes that departments that exhibit livestock beyond the county level have superior supervised farm training programs when compared to the Low Participation Group.

In a study conducted by Jack Stone concerning teacher trainer centers he states that:

"There seems to be a great deal of association, based upon data secured in this study, between the number of fairs and shows participated in and the number of State Farmer degrees awarded in the various departments. Schools which reported the stronger show programs generally were also notably higher in number of students attaining the degree of State Farmer." ([7], pp. 51-52)

Diggens and Bundy state that:

"Large numbers of boys and girls fit and show dairy cattle each year. Dairy heifer and cow projects are very popular with members of both 4-H clubs and Future Farmers of America chapters. Perhaps one of the reasons for the popularity of projects of this type is that they provide the youngsters with an opportunity to gain valuable experience in selection, fitting and showing of dairy animals. The element of competition and the desire to win may also be motivating factors." ([3], pp. 304)

"There are many benefits that may come from the exhibiting of hogs. Just how many of them will be attained by the individual showman will depend upon the interest and effort he puts into the project. The following are some of the things that can be gained by showing hogs:

1. Fairs, sales and shows provide excellent opportunities to study types of hogs, factors to be considered in the selection of breeding stock and opportunity to develop swine judging ability.

2. These events give the showman an opportunity to gain new ideas concerning efficient hog production.

3. Exhibiting is looked upon by most breeders of purebred hogs as a means of advertising whereby they may sell breeding stock.

4. Fairs and sales bring the buyer and seller together. They provide excellent opportunities to make comparisons in the purchase of new breeding stock.

5. A producer of good hogs gains much in the way of personal satisfaction in seeing his hogs compared with the hogs of other breeders.

6. There may be a financial gain resulting from higher selling prices and from prize winnings." ([4], pp. 308-309)

Mr. W. R. Watt, Manager of the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show asks the question: "Why are livestock shows held?".

"Why are livestock shows held? They are show windows of the beef industry. The finest beef cattle of various breeds are exhibited for comparison, to be judged by men who study and put into practice the latest trends in what is expected of the best beef cattle.

To the show are brought the offspring of well-known and proven sires and dams, often champions themselves. Because they have been chosen as champions, or placed high in their class, they have gone through the rigorous inspection of a judge who has looked at their general conformation first, then to the finer points.

It is at livestock shows where the breeder may observe the type of animal he strives to breed. In addition, the consumer sees on foot the type of beast which eventually reaches his table and learns that the people in the livestock industry are working hard to produce the kind of beef the public demands.

A livestock show is of value as an educational medium for youngsters through their fitting and showing of animals. Many boys and girls pay for their college education with prize money they win in the show ring of a livestock show and through the sale of their prize animals; and many of them put their knowledge back into the field by becoming breeders." ([10], pp. 52-53)

Dr. A. E. Darlow of Oklahoma State University very aptly describes the value of shows when he states in effect:

"Possibly shows have not accomplished all (livestock improvement) they set out to do just as our preachers and ministers have not accomplished all they would like to do, but they have accomplished some good and we should continue to make use of anything that contributes to progress. Patterns resulting from showring procedures have not always been correct - but when they were wrong, breeders have been quick to recognize it - then immediately have set about to correct the errors.

Stock shows have proven to be the outstanding classrooms, or laboratories, for the assimilation, coordination and dissemination of information in the art and science of animal husbandry. Some of our outstanding judges have, in my opinion, proved to be master teachers and have had an influence beyond our ability to evaluate - not only on the type of animal that is now being produced but upon the general business of livestock production." ([2], pp. 8-9)

Hoar sums up the vocational agriculture program in this way:

"In all probability, the educational value and improvement in livestock, dairy cattle and other agricultural products work hand in hand together. The general public is becoming more interested in the farm and its occupants. At the present time, the farm population is gradually decreasing; however, life on the farm is becoming more pleasant. Fairs and shows have had some influence on this because of the production of better seed stock by selection resulting in improvement of the farm and its prosperity.

The showing of animals and agricultural products for their monetary value is not the only benefit derived from shows and fairs. The opportunity to gain recognition is of much importance to the individual, more especially the youth of our great nation. All individuals, if normal, like to have a certain degree of recognition. This recognition may be accomplished in many ways for various individuals. A part of this may be accomplished for farm youth through the means of vocational agriculture and Future Farmers of America activities." ([5], pp. 4-5)

Wall's remarks concerning the FFA program are:

"A good Future Farmer chapter is a part of any sound program of vocational education in agriculture. There is usually a close relation between the kind of an FFA chapter and the kind of program in vocational education in agriculture in the school. This is because the FFA is a definite part of the program in vocational agriculture. It is designed to supplement, round out, vitalize and motivate the learning experiences that are provided the farm boys in high school vocational agriculture. The FFA is a part of the instructional program - not something aside and outside the course in agriculture.

Students of vocational agriculture should find in the FFA ways and means of learning which the teacher could not very well, in any other way, make a part of the learning experiences. The FFA offers opportunities to vitalize the teaching and may motivate boys to have a greater interest in their school work in agriculture, in farming, in farm life, in the entire school and in the general welfare of the people. A good FFA program enriches the instructional program." ([9], pp. 31)

Thomason's conclusions on the boys' need for recognition are:

"A boy between the ages of 14-20 has many things on his mind. The normal boy wants to be active, he likes glamour, he wants praise. He likes to be cheered for carrying the ball, hitting a home run, or making a goal. If not kept busy, you may find him at the teenage hang-outs, pool halls, or honkey-tonks. If a community program of vocational agriculture is to be successful, it must be as interesting to the student as the activities mentioned above. Here is where a very active FFA chapter comes in. I doubt that any program of vocational agriculture will be very successful without a good active FFA chapter. In our state we have found that fairs, stock shows and contests perform a major part in creating interest among our FFA members. Boys like competition, they like recognition and they like the praise and publicity." ([8], pp. 5)

In the study conducted by Baker he has concluded that:

"The evidence presented in this study clearly indicates that there is desirable relationship between certain characteristics of an adequate program of vocational agriculture and the amount of participation of a department in shows and fairs. As a definite part of the conclusions, it should again be pointed out that the only basis for dividing the departments into High and Low Groups was the extent of their participation in fairs and livestock shows. Based on these premises, it seemed evident that exhibiting livestock does not have a detrimental effect upon any of the outcomes measured.

> Exhibiting livestock is one way, and certainly not the only way, to motivate, stimulate and involve boys in the business of agriculture. The prime requisite to any successful program of vocational agriculture is the compatible combination of active interested students and a well-qualified, energetic, enthusiastic teacher capable of disseminating his enthusiasm to those around him.
>
> From this study this author concludes, that teachers of vocational agriculture and their students are justified in participating in fairs and livestock shows if they use these experiences as the means to an end and not the end itself." ([1], pp. 30-31)

As we can see by the comments and conclusions drawn by other writers in this review of literature, there are those who think that exhibiting livestock is one of the basic fundamentals of a well-rounded program of vocational agriculture. However, during the past several years the size of the average farm has steadily increased while the number of farmers has decreased at a very rapid rate. In the past it took 75 to 80 percent of the population to produce the world's food supply; it is now being produced by about eight to nine percent of today's population. This has greatly decreased the job opportunities for the person interested in farming, yet about forty percent of the population is connected with agriculture occupations. So this in itself provides still a great opportunity for agricultural minded students.

Even though the decrease in farm job opportunities is greatly lessened we still need to provide opportunity and experience which will enable the individual student to feel adequate and acceptable. Every boy must be made to feel that he is worthy and can do a job well. Many teachers have used livestock shows and fairs as a means of recognition, pride and accomplishment. In this study we will attempt to find out if any of these and other characteristics have any effect on the total vocational agriculture program.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The following tables, analyses and comments constitute a presentation of data secured in the course of this investigation. Ninety-five departments of vocational agriculture in Area I of Texas divided into two groups were studied. The High Group contained thirty-three departments and the Low Group had thirty-five departments. The t-Test and the chi-Square test were used to determine significant differences that existed between the two groups. The t-Value at the one percent level for 66 degrees freedom is 2.65; at the five percent level is 2.00. The chi-Square value at the one percent level for 66 degrees freedom is 11.345; at the one percent level for 46 degrees freedom is 13.277; at the five percent level for 46 degrees freedom is 9.488.

FUTURE FARMER ACTIVITIES

Table I indicates a very significant difference at the one percent level in participation in livestock shows and fairs in favor of the High Group. This data reenforces the validity of the division of the two groups. The number of animals entered per year per school is also significantly higher for the High Participation Group. Table I also indicates that the High Group enters a significantly higher number of steers per year; however, the mean number of steers entered per show is not significantly different between the two groups. The number of hogs entered per school year for the High Group is significantly higher at

the one percent level for the High Group, but the mean number of animals entered per show between the two groups is significant only at the five percent level. The High Group also shows a significant difference at the one percent level in the mean number of lambs exhibited per year. This significant difference also shows in favor of the High Participation Group in exhibiting breeding stock at livestock shows and fairs.

TABLE I

MEAN NUMBER OF SHOWS AND FAIRS PARTICIPATED IN FOR THE SCHOOL YEAR 1962-63

	High	Low	Total	t-Value
Fairs and shows	4.36	1.83	3.10	34.29**
Animals entered	141.27	30.83	86.05	5.28**
Animals entered per school per year	32.48	16.57	24.53	
Steers entered per school per year	15.39	5.52	10.26	9.50**
Steers entered per school per show	3.53	3.02	3.28	.526
Hogs entered per school per year	86.94	18.37	52.66	27.29**
Hogs entered per school per show	19.44	10.04	14.74	2.04*
Lambs entered per school per year	23.82	4.89	14.36	12.62**
Lambs entered per school per show	5.46	2.67	4.07	1.48
Breeding stock entered per school per year	5.18	1.34	3.26	4.09**

TABLE I (continued)

	High	Low	Total	t-Value
Breeding stock entered per school per show	1.19	.73	1.47	.97
Dairy animals entered per school per year	.27	.0	1.35	
Dairy animals entered per school per show	.062	.0	.031	

*Significant at five percent level
**Significant at one percent level

From this data we can conclude that the difference in mean number of animals exhibited per year per school comes from exhibiting all types of livestock. However, with the exception of hogs, there is not a significant difference in the mean number of animals showed per school per show.

JUDGING CONTESTS

Table II shows that 20.00 percent of the Low Group did not participate in livestock judging contests at all, and that 5.71 percent of them participated only on the local level. In the High Group 3.03 percent participated on the district level as compared to only 2.86 in the Low Group. In area participation 78.79 percent of the High Group participated as compared to 62.86 percent of the Low Group. On the state level 18.18 percent of the High Group qualified for state participation as compared to only 8.57 percent of the Low Group. Neither group qualified for national participation. In Texas to qualify for state competion in all judging contests, the team must be in the upper 10 percent at the area level.

TABLE II

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN LIVESTOCK JUDGING CONTESTS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	0.0	20.00	10.0
Local participation	0.0	5.71	2.86
District participation	3.03	2.86	2.95
Area participation	78.79	62.86	70.83
State participation	18.18	8.57	13.38
National participation	0.0	0.0	0.0

Data in Table III shows that 3.03 percent of the High Group did not participate in any contests as compared to 34.28 percent of the Low Group who did not participate. On the local level of participation 3.03 of the High Group participated on the local basis as compared to 2.86 percent of the Low Group. In the High Group none stopped on the district level while 2.86 of the Low Group dropped out of participation. In area participation 69.70 percent of the High Group participated as compared to only 2.86 percent of the Low Group. Neither group qualified for national participation.

TABLE III

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN DAIRY CATTLE JUDGING CONTESTS

	High	Low	Total

TABLE III (continued)

	High	Low	Total
No participation	3.03	34.28	18.66
Local participation	3.03	2.86	2.95
District participation	0.0	2.86	1.43
Area participation	69.70	57.14	63.42
State participation	24.24	2.86	13.55
National participation	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table IV shows that 72.73 percent of the High Group did not parti-

TABLE IV

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN DAIRY PRODUCTS JUDGING CONTEST

	High	Low	Total
No participation	72.73	88.57	80.65
Local participation	0.0	2.86	1.43
District participation	0.0	0.0	0.0
Area participation	12.12	2.86	7.49
State participation	12.12	5.71	8.92
National participation	3.03	0.00	1.52

pate in any contests as compared to 88.57 percent of the Low Group who did not participate. On the local level of participation none of the

High Group participated on the local basis as compared to 2.86 percent for the Low Group. Neither group stopped on the district level of participation. In area participation 12.12 percent of the High Group participated as compared to only 2.86 percent for the Low Group. On the state level 12.12 qualified for state participation as compared to only 5.71 percent of the Low Group. The High Group qualified one team for national competition as compared to none for the Low Group.

TABLE V

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN GRASS JUDGING CONTESTS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	75.76	68.57	72.17
Local participation	0.0	2.86	1.43
District participation	0.0	2.86	1.43
Area participation	24.24	25.71	24.98

In Table V we see that 75.76 percent of the High Group did not participate in any contests as compared to only 68.57 percent of the Low Group who did not participate. On the local level of participation none of the High Group participated only on a local basis as compared to 2.86 percent for the Low Group. In the High Group none stopped on the district level while 2.86 of the Low Group dropped out of participation. In area competition 24.24 percent of the High Group participated as compared to 25.71 percent of the Low Group. In Texas a state grass judging contest is not held.

TABLE VI

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION
IN CROPS JUDGING CONTESTS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	63.64	60.00	61.82
Local participation	3.03	2.86	2.95
District participation	0.00	5.71	2.86
Area participation	33.33	31.43	32.38

Data in Table VI shows that 63.64 percent of the High Group did not participate in any contests as compared to only 60.00 percent of the Low Group who did not participate. On the local level of participation 3.03 percent of the High Group participated only on a local basis as compared to 2.86 percent for the Low Group. In the High Group none stopped on the district level while 5.71 percent of the Low Group dropped out of participation. In area competion 33.33 percent of the High Group participated as compared to 31.43 percent for the Low Group. In Texas a state crop judging contest is not held.

Indications from Table VII are that 57.58 percent of the High Group did not participate in any contests as compared to 72.14 percent of the Low Group who did not participate. On the local level of participation 3.03 of the High Group participated on the local basis as compared to 2.86 of the Low Group. Neither group stopped on the district level. In area competition 30.30 percent of the High Group participated as compared to 17.14 percent of the Low Group. On the state level 9.09 percent of

the High Group qualified for state participation as compared to only 2.86 percent of the Low Group. Neither group qualified for national participation.

TABLE VII

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN MEAT JUDGING CONTESTS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	57.58	72.14	64.86
Local participation	3.03	2.86	2.95
District participation	0.0	0.0	0.0
Area participation	30.30	17.14	23.72
State participation	9.09	2.86	5.98
National participation	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table VIII shows that 45.46 percent of the High Group did not participate in any contests as compared to 60.01 percent of the Low Group who did not participate. On the local level of participation none of the High Group participated only on a local basis as compared to 2.86 percent for the Low Group. In the High Group 6.06 percent stopped on the district level while 5.71 percent of the Low Group dropped out of participation. In area competition 33.33 percent of the High Group participated as compared to 25.71 percent of the Low Group. On the state level 15.15 percent of the High Group qualified for state participation as compared to only 5.71 percent of the Low Group. Neither group qualified for national participation.

TABLE VIII

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION
OF POULTRY JUDGING CONTESTS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	45.46	60.01	52.74
Local participation	0.00	2.86	1.43
District participation	6.06	5.71	5.89
Area participation	33.33	25.71	29.52
State participation	15.15	5.71	10.43
National participation	0.00	0.00	0.00

Data from Table IX shows that 39.39 percent of the High Group did not participate in any contests as compared to 48.57 percent of the Low Group who did not participate. On the local level of participation 6.06 percent of the High Group participated only on a local basis as compared to 11.43 percent for the Low Group. In the High Group none stopped at the district level while 5.71 percent of the Low Group dropped out of participation. In area competition 42.43 percent of the High Group participated as compared to 31.43 percent of the Low Group. On the state level 12.12 percent of the High Group qualified for state participation as compared to only 2.86 percent of the Low Group. Neither group qualified for national participation.

From data presented here it can probably be assumed that departments high in participation of livestock shows also are as strong or slightly higher in participation in judging contests. The High Group definitely

has qualified more judging teams for the state judging contests.

TABLE IX

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION
OF LAND JUDGING CONTESTS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	39.39	48.57	43.98
Local participation	6.06	11.43	8.75
District participation	0.00	5.71	2.86
Area participation	42.43	31.43	36.93
State participation	12.12	2.86	7.49
National participation	0.00	0.00	0.00

LEADERSHIP CONTESTS

Table X shows that 9.09 percent of the High Group did not participate in any contests as compared to 25.71 percent of the Low Group who did not participate. On the local level of participation none of the High Group participated as compared to 5.71 percent for the Low Group. In the High Group 72.73 percent participated in the district contest as compared to 60.01 of the Low Group who participated. In area competition 18.18 percent of the High Group qualified for the area contest while only 5.71 percent of the Low Group qualified. The Low Group qualified 2.86 percent for the state contest while the High Group failed to qualify. In Texas in all leadership contests the team must win the district contest to be eligible for the area contest and must win the area contest

to be eligible for the state leadership contest. Each of the 10 areas is allowed to have one participant in the state contest.

TABLE X

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN JUNIOR CHAPTER CONDUCTING CONTESTS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	9.09	25.71	17.40
Local participation	0.00	5.71	2.86
District participation	72.73	60.01	66.37
Area participation	18.18	5.71	11.95
State participation	0.00	2.86	1.43

Data collected in Table XI shows that 18.18 percent of the High Group did not participate in any contests as compared to 17.14 percent of the Low Group who did not participate. On the local level of participation 6.06 percent of the High Group participated only on a local basis as compared to 5.71 percent for the Low Group. In the High Group 63.64 percent participated in the district contest as compared to 74.29 percent of the Low Group who participated. In area competition 9.09 percent of the High Group qualified for the area contest while only 2.86 percent of the Low Group qualified. The High Group qualified 3.03 percent for the state contest while the Low Group failed to qualify.

Table XII shows that 51.52 percent of the High Group did not participate in any contests as compared to 42.86 percent of the Low Group who

did not participate. On the local level of participation 9.09 percent of the High Group participated as compared to 2.86 percent for the Low Group. In the High Group 30.30 percent participated in the district contests as compared to 40.01 percent of the Low Group who participated. In area competition 60.06 percent of the High Group qualified for the area contest while 8.57 percent of the Low Group qualified. The High Group 3.03 percent qualified for the state leadership contest while the Low Group failed to qualify.

TABLE XI

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN SENIOR CHAPTER CONDUCTING CONTESTS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	18.18	17.14	17.66
Local participation	6.06	5.71	5.86
District participation	63.64	74.29	68.97
Area participation	9.09	2.86	5.98
State participation	3.03	0.00	1.52

Indications from Table XII might lead one to believe that the Low Group spends more time than the High Group in training radio teams than they do in training other leadership teams.

Table XIII shows that 39.39 percent of the High Group did not participate in any contests as compared to 60.00 percent of the Low Group who did not participate. On the local level of participation 6.06 percent

TABLE XII

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN RADIO CONTESTS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	51.52	42.86	47.19
Local participation	9.09	2.86	5.98
District participation	30.30	40.01	35.16
Area participation	6.06	8.57	7.32
State participation	3.03	0.00	1.52

of the High Group participated only on a local basis as compared to 2.86 percent of the Low Group. In the High Group 42.43 percent participated

TABLE XIII

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN JUNIOR FARM SKILLS CONTESTS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	39.39	60.00	49.70
Local participation	6.06	2.86	4.46
District participation	42.43	28.57	35.50
Area participation	9.09	8.57	8.83
State participation	3.03	0.00	1.52

in the district contest as compared to only 28.57 percent of the Low

Group who participated. In area competition 9.09 percent of the High Group qualified for the area contest while 8.83 percent of the Low Group qualified. The High Group qualified 3.03 percent for the state contest while the Low Group failed to qualify.

TABLE XIV

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN SENIOR FARM SKILLS CONTESTS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	42.43	42.86	42.65
Local participation	6.06	2.86	4.46
District participation	39.39	45.71	42.55
Area participation	9.09	8.57	8.83
State participation	3.03	0.00	1.52

Data from this Table XIV indicates that 42.43 percent of the High Group did not participate in any contests as compared to 42.86 percent of the Low Group who did not participate. On the local level of participation 6.06 percent of the High Group participated only on a local basis as compared to 2.86 percent of the Low Group. In the High Group 39.39 percent participated in the district contest as compared to 45.71 percent of the Low Group who participated. In area competition 9.09 percent of the High Group qualified. The High Group qualified 3.03 percent for the state contest while the Low Group failed to qualify.

TABLE XV

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN GREENHAND QUIZ CONTESTS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	39.39	40.00	39.70
Local participation	3.03	2.86	2.95
District participation	48.49	45.71	47.10
Area participation	9.09	8.57	8.83
State participation	0.00	2.86	1.43

In Table XV we find that 39.39 percent of the High Group did not participate in any contests as compared to 40.00 percent of the Low Group who did not participate. On the local level of participation 3.03 percent of the High Group participated only on a local basis as compared to 2.86 percent of the Low Group. In the High Group 48.49 percent participated in the district contest as compared to 45.71 percent of the Low Group who participated. In area competition 9.09 percent of the Low Group qualified. The Low Group qualified 3.03 percent for the state contest while the High Group failed to qualify.

From this information it might be concluded that the High and Low Groups participated about equally on all levels of participation, except that the High Group did qualify two more teams for state participation. The only exception to all levels of participation was the radio contest where the Low Group had more participation.

FUTURE FARMER FOUNDATION AWARDS

TABLE XVI

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN LIVESTOCK FARMING AWARDS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	15.15	25.71	20.43
Local participation	60.61	60.01	60.31
District participation	21.21	8.57	15.89
Area participation	3.03	5.71	4.37
State participation	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table XVI shows that 15.15 percent of the High Group did not participate in the awarding of the Livestock Farming Award as compared to 25.71 percent of the Low Group who did not participate. On the local level 60.61 percent of the High Group awarded the Livestock Farming Award as compared to 60.01 percent of the Low Group. In the High Group 21.21 percent participated in the district contest as compared to 8.67 percent of the Low Group who participated. In area competition 3.03 percent of the High Group qualified its entry while 5.71 percent of the Low Group qualified. Neither of the groups qualified its entry in the state contest. In Texas in all Future Farmer Foundation Awards, an individual must win the district contest to be eligible for the area contest, and must win the area contest to be eligible for the state contest.

TABLE XVII

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN FARM MECHANICS AWARDS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	27.27	25.71	26.45
Local participation	57.58	60.01	58.80
District participation	12.12	5.71	8.92
Area participation	3.03	5.71	4.37
State participation	0.00	2.86	1.43

Data from Table XVII shows that 27.27 percent of the High Group did not participate in the awarding of the Farm Mechanics Award as compared to 25.71 percent of the Low Group who did not participate. On the local level of 57.58 percent of the High Group awarded the Farm Mechanics Award as compared to 60.01 percent of the Low Group. In the High Group 12.12 percent participated in the district contest as compared to 8.67 percent of the Low Group who participated. In area competition 5.71 percent of the Low Group qualified its entry while only 3.03 percent of the High Group qualified. In the state contest 2.86 percent of the Low Group qualified while the High Group failed to qualify.

Indications from Table XVIII show that 54.55 percent of the High Group did not participate in the awarding of the Farm Electrification Award as compared to only 34.29 percent of the Low Group who did not make the award. On the local basis 39.39 percent of the High Group awarded the Farm Electrification Award as compared to 45.71 percent of the Low

Group. In the High Group only 3.03 percent participated in the district contest as compared to 5.71 percent of the Low Group who participated. In area competition 3.03 percent of the High Group qualified its entry in comparison with 14.29 percent of the Low Group qualifying. Neither of the groups qualified an entry in the state contest.

TABLE XVIII

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN FARM ELECTRIFICATION AWARDS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	54.55	34.29	44.42
Local participation	39.39	45.71	42.55
District participation	3.03	5.71	4.37
Area participation	3.03	14.29	8.66
State participation	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table XIX shows that 39.39 percent of the High Group did not participate in the awarding of the Crop Production Award as compared to only 25.71 percent of the Low Group who did not make the award. On the local level only 42.43 percent of the High Group awarded the Crop Production Award as compared to 62.86 percent of the Low Group. In the High Group 18.18 percent participated in the district contest as compared to only 8.57 percent of the Low Group who participated. In area competition none of the High Group qualified its entry while 2.86 percent qualified in the Low Group. Neither of the groups qualified its entry in the state contest.

TABLE XIX

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN CROP PRODUCTION AWARDS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	39.39	25.71	32.55
Local participation	42.43	62.86	52.65
District participation	18.18	8.57	13.38
Area participation	0.00	2.86	1.43
State participation	0.00	0.00	0.00

Indications of Table XX show that 57.58 percent of the High Group did not participate in the awarding of the Public Speaking Award as compared to only 37.14 percent of the Low Group who did not make the award. On the local level only 21.2 percent of the High Group awarded the Public Speaking Award as compared to 34.14 percent of the Low Group. In the High Group only 12.12 percent participated in the district contest as compared to 17.14 percent of the Low Group who qualified. In area competition 9.09 percent of the High Group qualified its entry while 11.43 percent qualified in the Low Group. Neither of the groups qualified its entry in the state contest.

Data presented here shows that the Low Group probably puts more emphasis on public speaking than does the High Group as the Low Group has more participation on all levels.

TABLE XX

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC SPEAKING AWARDS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	57.58	37.14	47.36
Local participation	21.21	34.29	27.75
District participation	12.12	17.14	14.63
Area participation	9.09	11.43	10.26
State participation	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table XXI shows that 27.58 percent of the High Group did not participate in the awarding of the Soil and Water Management Award as compared to only 42.86 percent of the Low Group who did not make the award. On the local level only 36.36 percent of the High Group awarded the Soil and Water Management Award as compared to 51.42 percent of the Low Group. In the High Group 6.06 percent participated in the district contest as compared to 2.86 percent of the Low Group who participated. In the area competition none of the High Group qualified any entry while 2.86 percent of the Low Group qualified. The Low Group qualified 2.86 percent of its entries in the state contest while none of the High Group entries qualified.

Information presented in Table XXI indicates more participation on all levels in favor of the Low Group.

Data from Table XXII shows that only 9.09 percent of the High Group did not participate in the awarding of the Star Greenhand Award as com-

TABLE XXI

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN SOIL AND WATER MANAGEMENT AWARDS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	57.58	42.86	50.22
Local participation	36.36	51.42	43.89
District participation	6.06	2.86	4.46
Area participation	0.00	2.86	1.43
State participation	0.00	2.86	1.43

pared to 22.86 percent of the Low Group who did not make the award. On the local level 54.55 percent of the High Group awarded the Star Greenhand Award as compared to 57.14 percent of the Low Group. In the High Group 24.24 percent participated in the district contest as compared to

TABLE XXII

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN STAR GREENHAND AWARDS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	9.09	22.86	15.98
Local participation	54.55	57.14	55.85
District participation	24.24	14.29	19.27
Area participation	6.06	5.71	5.89
State participation	6.06	0.00	3.03

only 14.29 percent of the Low Group who participated. In area competition 6.06 percent of the High Group qualified its entry while 5.71 percent of the Low Group qualified. In the state contest 6.06 percent of the High Group qualified an entry as compared to none for the Low Group.

TABLE XXIII

LEVEL OF TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION IN CHAPTER STAR FARMER AWARDS

	High	Low	Total
No participation	12.12	20.00	16.06
Local participation	54.55	54.28	54.32
District participation	15.15	22.86	19.00
Area participation	12.12	2.86	7.49
State participation	6.06	0.00	3.03

Data collected in Table XXIII shows that 12.12 percent of the High Group did not participate in the awarding of the Chapter Star Farmer Award as compared to 20.00 percent of the Low Group who did not make the award. On the local level 54.55 percent of the High Group awarded the Chapter Star Farmer Award as compared to 54.28 percent of the Low Group. In the High Group only 15.15 percent participated in the district contest as compared to 22.86 percent of the Low Group who participated. But in area competition 12.12 percent of the High Group qualified its entry while only 2.86 percent of the Low Group qualified. The High Group qualified 6.06 percent of its entries for the state contest while none of the Low Group qualified.

TABLE XXIV

FUTURE FARMER ACTIVITIES PARTICIPATED IN FOR THE PAST FOUR YEARS

	High	Low	Total	t-Value
Mean number State Farmers	5.45	3.89	4.67	4.38**
Number of Area Star Farmers	4.00	0.00	4.00	
Number of State Star Farmers	1.00	0.00	1.00	
Number of American Farmers	6.00	10.00	16.00	
Number of Area Star American Farmers	2.00	1.00	3.00	
Percent Receiving Standard Chapter Rating	78.79	65.72	-----	
Percent Receiving Superior Chapter Rating	66.67	54.29	-----	
Number receiving National Chapter Rating	4.00	9.00	13.00	
Number District Officers	70.00	76.00	146.00	
Number Area Officers	14.00	11.00	25.00	
Number State Officers	2.00	2.00	4.00	

**Significant at the one percent level

Table XXIV indicates the High Group is superior to the Low Group in the mean number of State Farmer Degrees received during the past four years. This fact might indicate that participation in livestock shows helps to formulate a well-rounded program in qualifying for the State Farmer Degree. Of the approximately 46,000 Future Farmer members in the state of Texas, about 920 receive the Lone Star Farmer Award

each year. The data does show the number of students receiving the Area Star Farmer Award is higher for the High Group than the number receiving the State Star Farmer Award. The total number of American Farmers is in favor of the Low Group, however. The number of chapters receiving the Standard and Superior Chapter Rating is fairly equally divided, although, the Low Group has received five more awards on the national level. This circumstance might indicate the Low Group also has a well-rounded program of vocational agriculture. The Low Group has had six more district officers than the High Group, but the High Group has produced three more area officers than the Low Group. Both groups have produced an equal number of state officers.

FARM MECHANICS PROGRAM

Table XXV shows that only three schools taught no farm mechanics during the three or four years of vocational agriculture offered. The data presented on percentage of schools spending various amounts of time in farm mechanics also indicates that both groups have a fairly well-rounded program of farm mechanics in their total program of vocational agriculture.

TABLE XXV

PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS SPENDING VARIOUS AMOUNTS OF TIME IN FARM MECHANICS FOR THE SCHOOL YEAR 1962-63

	HIGH AGRICULTURE				LOW AGRICULTURE			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Less than six weeks	42.43	18.18	12.12	6.06	28.57	8.57	11.43	2.86
Six weeks	36.36	27.27	21.21	0.00	34.29	40.00	8.57	2.86
More than six weeks	18.18	51.52	63.64	33.33	37.15	48.57	74.29	28.57

Three schools taught no shop

Thirteen schools offered Ag. IV

SCHOLARSHIP

Table XXVI indicates that the mean grade point for students in vocational agriculture is significantly in favor of the Low Group. So this might bear out the theory that some critics have concerning the fact that livestock shows on the state level take the student out of too much class-time.

TABLE XXVI

SCHOLASTIC STANDING OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE STUDENTS FOR THE YEAR 1962-63

	A	B	C	D	F	Total	Mean Grade Point	Chi-Square Value
High	199	512	364	81	35	1191	2.64	
Low	196	378	323	50	19	966	2.71	11.708**
Total	395	890	687	131	54	2157	2.68	

10 unreported in High Group

8 unreported in Low Group

**Significant at the five percent level

Data presented in Table XXVII definitely indicates a significant difference in all subjects in favor of the Low Group again. This information further validates the theory that too much exhibiting causing time away from the classroom may have a detrimental affect on students' grades.

TABLE XXVII

SCHOLASTIC STANDING OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE STUDENTS IN ALL SUBJECTS FOR THE YEAR 1962-63

	A	B	C	D	F	Total	Mean Grade Point	Chi-Square Value
High	118	364	503	146	60	1191	2.28	
Low	116	310	428	76	36	966	2.41	
Total	234	674	931	222	96	2157	2.35	15.062**

10 unreported in High Group

8 unreported in Low Group

**Significant at the one percent level

Information was secured from the questionnaires concerning the number of dropouts from vocational agriculture for a four-year period. Data was collected beginning with a sophomore class of boys for the school year 1960-61 and following them through their senior year, 1962-63. Table XXVIII shows a significant difference in favor of the Low Group concerning the mean number of dropouts reported. This would lead one to believe that livestock shows and fairs have no holding power as has so strongly been the contention of advocates of stock shows. There is the possibility that the difference is that the Low Participation Group is composed mostly of schools with small enrollments of boys in high school, while the High Participation Group is composed of departments with up to 100 students in them. This factor may bring about the tendency for

TABLE XXVIII

DIFFERENCE IN MEAN NUMBER OF DROPOUTS FOR STUDENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE FOR THE SCHOOL YEARS 1960-61 to 1962-63

	High	Low	Total	t-Value
Dropouts from vocational agriculture	9.00	4.9	6.95	4.96**
Total number of students	1191	966	1079	

Nine unreported schools in each group

**Significant at the one percent level

the larger schools to screen or limit their total number of students by a screening process therefore causing a higher rate of dropouts. It was found that the High Group had an average dropout of 18.14 per one hundred students and the Low Group 13.14 per one hundred students.

SUPERVISED FARM TRAINING

In Table XXIX we see that the mean labor income for the High Group is $255.89 as compared to $219.86 for the Low Group. As near as the two groups are equal in mean labor income it might be assumed that both groups have a well-rounded program of vocational agriculture. This might be due to supervised farming and its emphasis on "learning to do by doing". Definitely it has had a dynamic effect on vocational education in agriculture.

TABLE XXIX

LABOR INCOME OF STUDENTS FOR THE SCHOOL YEAR 1962-63

	High	Low	Total
Mean labor income	$255.89	$219.86	$237.88

THE TEACHER

TABLE XXX

COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS WITH YOUNG FARMER ORGANIZATIONS

	High	Low
Number of Young Farmer Organizations	15.	17.
Number of Area Officers	8	9
Number of State Officers	3	1
Mean number of meetings	8	12

It is interesting to note from Table XXX that each group participated about equally in the number of Young Farmer Organizations which each teacher helped to sponsor in the community. This might be another indication of the merits of each group in that each teacher has his own method of basing a sound and dynamic type of program of agriculture in his community. Both groups have produced about the same number of area

and state officers. The Low Group does average four more meetings per year than does the High Group.

TABLE XXXI

FRINGE BENEFITS SCHOOLS PROVIDE TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

	High	Low	Total
Salary above state scale	27	18	45
Expenses at fairs and shows	3	7	10
Vocational agriculture pickup furnished	18	15	33
Gas for pickup	2	2	4
Oil for pickup	2	2	4
Tires for pickup	9	9	18
Insurance for pickup	13	12	25
Repairs for pickup	13	13	26
Other benefits	4	4	8
Unreported on survey	4	2	6

In Table XXXI a comparison of the two groups indicates that teachers in the High Group receive compensations for their services above and beyond the state salary scale more often than teachers in the Low Group. Expenses at livestock shows and fairs were provided for more teachers in the Low Group which might be an indication that this is compensation for not being paid by the school above the state salary scale. The other benefits received by teachers of both groups run comparitively the same.

Both groups of teachers are probably doing a satisfactory job for the community.

TABLE XXXII

DIFFERENCES IN CERTAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

	High	Low	Total	t-Value
Mean years experience teaching vocational agriculture	12.31	10.05	11.18	1.19
Mean years experience teaching vocational agriculture in present school	6.00	6.61	6.30	
Unreported schools	4	1		

There is no significant difference in mean years experience teaching vocational agriculture as indicated by Table XXXII. The table also indicates there is no difference in the mean years experience teaching vocational agriculture in the present school system. The mean number of years teaching in the present department is 6.30 for all departments studied. It could be assumed then that both types of programs have a desirable tenure for the teacher in his department.

From Table XXXIII we see that 76.63 percent of the two groups studied feel that there is justifiable educational value in exhibiting livestock beyond the county and district level. Some of the educational value that teachers felt students received from exhibiting livestock are:

TABLE XXXIII

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS TO THE VALUE OF SHOWS AND FAIRS

Response	H I G H		L O W	
	Yes	Percent Schools	Yes	Percent Schools
Justifiable educational value in exhibiting livestock beyond the county and district level	27	81.82	25	71.43
Unreported schools	4		1	

1. Encourages boys to learn to excell.
2. Gives a feeling of achievement.
3. Teaches boys responsibility with fair play.
4. Better livestock for comparison
5. Contact with other boys and breeders valuable.
6. Encourages students to breed and feed better animals.
7. Provides more competition thereby creating a desire to do a better job.
8. Good public relations.
9. Sound training for boys.
10. Signs of well-rounded program with vocational agriculture teacher who appreciates competitive activities.
11. Working with other people develops leadership.
12. Boys learn from other boys.
13. Serves as excellent motivation and interest vehicle.
14. Builds and teaches character (Boys learning to lose as well as win).

15. Teaches and increases knowledge in selection and management of modern livestock industry and trends.

16. Gives some students responsibility who would not have any otherwise.

17. Pride of achievement.

18. Pride of ownership.

19. Financial benefits.

20. Gives non-athletic boys chance to represent school in activities.

21. Helps build project programs.

22. More experience in showing as well as being away from home.

23. Develops responsibility.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect that exhibiting livestock on the state level has on participation in Future Farmer activities, leadership training, labor income from supervised farm training programs, scholarship, number of dropouts, Young Farmer Organization, community attitude toward these programs by higher salary, fringe benefits and teacher tenure.

The study was limited to ninety-five departments of vocational agriculture in Area I of Texas. The sixty-eight departments reporting were divided into thirty-three departments which exhibited livestock on the state level and into a second group of thirty-five departments which did not exhibit above the county and district level.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. It was very definitely found that the group rated high in exhibiting livestock showed a significantly larger amount of animals per school per year than groups of low exhibition. The significant difference came in the number of hogs exhibited by the High Group. Hogs were the only type of livestock that showed any significant difference in favor of the High Group in the mean number of animals showed per school per show.

2. In judging contests the High Group's participation was slightly higher than the Low Group. The High Group has qualified several more judging teams for the state judging contests.
3. Again the High Group was equal to the Low Group in level of participation in leadership contests, with the exception of the radio contest, where the Low Group dominated at all levels. The High Group did qualify two more teams for state participation though.
4. In Future Farmer Foundation Awards both groups participated almost equally on all levels of participation. However, the Low Group did place more emphasis on public speaking and soil and water management.
5. Data collected showed the High Group produced significantly more State Farmers than the Low Group. The investigation indicated that this group also produced more Area Star Farmers, State Star Farmers and Area Star American Farmers. The Low Group excelled in the total number of American Farmers, number of chapters receiving national chapter ratings and number of district officers.
6. Indications show that both groups had a well-rounded program of farm mechanics.
7. There was a significant difference in grades in vocational agriculture and all subjects favoring the group which was low in exhibiting livestock.
8. The number of dropouts also significantly favored the Low Participation Group.

9. There was not much noticeable difference in labor income between the two groups.
10. Both groups sponsored about the same number of Young Farmer Organizations. Thus we can conclude both groups are doing a variety of types of education in the community.
11. The High Group receives compensation above and beyond the state salary scale more often than does the Low Group.
12. There was no significant difference found in the total years of teaching vocational agriculture or the total years teaching in the present department between the teachers of the two groups.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon an analysis of data presented in this study, certain conclusions can be suggested as to the differences which could be expected in the characteristics of departments of vocational agriculture that are rated high in exhibiting livestock as compared to those departments that are low in participation in exhibiting livestock.

The evidence obtained from this study clearly indicated that there is a desirable relationship between certain characteristics of an adequate program of vocational agriculture and the amount of participation of a department in livestock shows and fairs. Again we should realize that the only basis for dividing the departments into High and Low Groups was the state level of participation as compared to the county and district level of participation in exhibiting livestock. So from this we must conclude that the Low Participating Group also used some livestock exhibition as a valuable teaching tool. Although it was not

used as extensively in the Low Group as the High Group, it can be assumed that exhibition is of some educational value on all levels.

The only characteristics tested which significantly favored the Low Group was the mean grade point and dropouts from vocational agriculture.

We can assume that exhibiting livestock has been very useful in creating a desirable learning situation and that it may continue to be used as such. However, some teachers place more emphasis on other facets of the total program of vocational agriculture to help strengthen the learning processes of the student. We can assume that the teacher who exhibits only on a county and district level is probably placing more emphasis on leadership training, judging contests or some other phase of the total program. This seems to be good because no two people have the same situation or react to a certain situation in a similar way. It can be concluded that if a teacher needs to exhibit livestock to carry out a successful program of vocational agriculture, then he certainly is justified in doing so. If this is the facet he chooses to follow in creating interest, motivation, responsibility and achievement that makes up an energetic and enthusiastic student, then who are we to advocate a change in his program or methods? However, this study indicated by no means is it necessary to exhibit livestock on a state level to have a well-rounded program of vocational agriculture.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Baker, James Kenneth, "Differences in Selected Characteristics Between Departments of Vocational Agriculture in Oklahoma That Exhibit Livestock on the State Level and Those That Do Not," (unpub. Master of Science Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1962), pp. 22, 30, 31

2. Darlow, A. E., "The Case of Pedigreed Livestock," National Livestock Record Associations, Allan C. Atlason, 3964 Grand Avenue, Gurnee, Illinois, (No date or place of publication indicated), pp. 8-9

3. Diggins and Bundy, Dairy Production, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., June, 1959, pp. 304

4. Diggins and Bundy, Swine Production, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., June, 1959, pp. 308-309.

5. Hoar, Keith, "A Study of the Influence That Participation in Shows and Fairs Has Had on the Establishment of Purebred Herds of Livestock and Dairy Cattle Among Former Members of the FFA," (unpub. Master of Science Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1951), pp. 4, 5, 91

6. Knebel, Earl, "An Analysis of Factors Contributing to Effective Programs of Vocational Agriculture," (unpub. Ph.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1955), pp. 149-150

7. Stone, Jack Edward, "Observed Differences in Selected Characteristics Between Departments Serving as Apprentice Teaching Centers and Other Departments of Vocational Agriculture," (unpub. Master of Science Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1960), pp. 51-52

8. Thomason, Benton F., "Determining the Relationship of Shows and Fairs to the Supervised Farm Training Program of Vocational Agriculture Students," (Non-thesis study, Oklahoma State University, 1950), pp. 3,5

9. Wall, Stanley, "A More Effective FFA," Interstate, (Danville, Illinois, 1960), pp. 51

10. Watt, W. R., Manager Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show, "Life and Its Best," American Angus Association, (No date or place of publication indicated), pp. 52-53

APPENDIX

Borger, Texas
Box 551

Dear Fellow Teacher,

Since vocational agriculture and the Future Farmer of America activity program has been thoroughly discussed, it is most important that we have a true picture and a factual report in Texas on vocational agriculture departments and their activities. I am making a study of all the departments in Area I to determine the effect of exhibiting livestock on grades, interest in FFA and size and scope of the supervised farm training program.

I have attempted to prepare this questionnaire so that it will require a minimum of time and effort on your part. I will certainly appreciate your taking the time to accurately provide the information requested and return it to me by Oct. 15, 1963. Please rest assured that this information shall be kept confidential to the extent that names of teachers and/or departments of vocational agriculture shall not be identified.

This study has the approval of the State Department of Vocational Agriculture and is under the direction of the Department of Agriculture Education, Oklahoma State University.

Respectfully,

Larry Schickedanz
Voc. Agri. Instr.

1. Level of Participation in Livestock Shows and Fairs:
   Please check one:
   None_____
   County_____
   District_____

2. List the number of head of livestock and dairy cattle that your chapter exhibited at the following fairs and shows during the school year 1962-63.

	Steers	Barrows	Lambs	Breeding Stock	Dairy
County					
District					
Amarillo					
Ft. Worth					
El Paso					
San Antonio					
Houston					
Tri-State Fair					
South Plains Fair					
Texas State Fair					
Others					

3. Level of Participation in Leadership Activities:
   Circle the level of participation your chapter has participated in during the school year 1962-63. (O-None, L-Local, D-District, A-Area, S-State, N-National)

   Judging Contests:

Livestock	O	L	D	A	S	N
Dairy	O	L	D	A	S	N
Dairy Products	O	L	D	A	S	N
Meats	O	L	D	A	S	N
Grass	O	L	D	A	S	N
Crops	O	L	D	A	S	N
Poultry	O	L	D	A	S	N
Land	O	L	D	A	S	N

   Leadership Contests:

Jr. Chapter Conducting	O	L	D	A	S	N
Sr. Chapter Conducting	O	L	D	A	S	N
Radio	O	L	D	A	S	N
Jr. Farm Skills	O	L	D	A	S	N
Sr. Farm Skills	O	L	D	A	S	N
Greenhand Quiz	O	L	D	A	S	N

FFA Foundation Awards:

Livestock Farming	O	L	D	A	S	N
Farm Mechanics	O	L	D	A	S	N
Public Speaking	O	L	D	A	S	N
Crop Production	O	L	D	A	S	N
Farm Electrification	O	L	D	A	S	N
Soil and Water Management	O	L	D	A	S	N
Star Greenhand	O	L	D	A	S	N
Chapter Star Farmer	O	L	D	A	S	N

4. How many boys from your chapter have received the State Farmer Degree during the past four years?_____

5. How many area Star Farmers has your chapter had during the last four years?_____State Star Farmers?_____

6. How many boys from your chapter have received the American Farmer Degree during the last four years?_____Area Star Farmer?_____State Star American Farmer?_____ Other?_____

7. What is the highest chapter award your chapter has received in the past four years?
   1. State Level
      Superior_____ Standard_____
   2. National Level
      Gold_____ Silver_____ Bronze_____

8. What FFA offices have members of your chapter held in the past four years?
   Circle one:

	Number of officers					
District	0	1	2	3	4	5
Area	0	1	2	3	4	5
State	0	1	2	3	4	5
National	0	1	2	3	4	5

9. How much time do you spend in farm mechanics each year?

	Ag. I	Ag. II	Ag. III	Ag. IV
Less than 6 weeks	_____	_____	_____	_____
Six weeks	_____	_____	_____	_____
More than 6 weeks	_____	_____	_____	_____

10. What is the total sq. feet of shop area in your dept.?_____

11. Do you have a Young Farmer organization? Yes_____No_____

12. Approximately how many meetings do you have per year?_____

13. What is the number of Young Farmer officers your organization has had during the last four years? Area_____State_____

14. What was the grade average for students in Vocational Agriculture I, II, III, IV for the school year 1962-63?
    1. Total number of students in Voc. Agri._____
    2. Grade average in Voc. Agri.:
       Number of boys receiving A_____B_____C_____D_____F_____
    3. Average grades in all subjects:
       Number of boys receiving A_____B_____C_____D_____F_____
       (May I suggest that a girl in the principal's office copy the grades from the permanent records for you.)

15. How many dropouts did you have in your department from the school year 1960-61 to 1962-63? (Begin with sophomore class 1960-61 and follow them through their senior year 1962-63.)

	61-62	61-62	62-63
1. Dropouts from Vocational Agriculture	_____	_____	_____
2. Dropouts from school	_____	_____	_____

16. Are you paid above state scale for your services as vocational agriculture instructor? Yes_____ No_____

17. Are any of your expenses paid by the local board while you are attending shows and fairs? Yes_____ No_____

18. Does your school provide a pickup for you or your department? Yes_____ No_____

19. Does the school provide gas_____, oil_____, tires_____, insurance_____ and repairs_____ for the pickup?

20. Are you provided by the local board any other benefits for your services? Yes_____ No_____

21. How many years have you taught vocational agriculture?_____

22. How many years have you taught vocational agriculture in this department? _____

23. How many teachers have served this department as vocational agriculture instructor in the past 10 years? _____

24. Do you think there is justifiable educational value in exhibiting livestock beyond the county level? Yes_____ No_____

25. List two or three reasons that support your answer to question number 24.
    1._____
    2._____
    3._____

_____ Department

_____ Instructor

VITA

Larry Dean Schickedanz

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: DIFFERENCES IN SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN AREA I OF TEXAS THAT EXHIBIT LIVESTOCK ON THE STATE LEVEL AND THOSE THAT DO NOT EXHIBIT ABOVE THE DISTRICT LEVEL

Major Field: Agriculture Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born at Shattuck, Oklahoma, January 29, 1938, the son of Guy Howard and Teola Faye Schickedanz.

Education: Attended grade school at Fargo, Oklahoma; graduated from Fargo High School in 1955; received the Bachelor of Science Degree from Panhandle A & M College with a major in Animal Husbandry in May 1959; qualified for a teaching certificate in Agriculture Education from Oklahoma State University in May 1960; completed requirements for the Master of Science Degree in August, 1964.

Military Experience: None

Professional Experience: Vocational Agriculture instructor in Borger, Texas, since 1960.

Other: Member of the First Baptist Church, Borger, Texas, Texas State Teachers Association, Hutchinson County Teachers Association, Borger Classroom Teachers Association, Texas Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association, National Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association, American Vocational Association and the Borger Kiwanis Club.