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THE TREND TOWARD CONSOLIDATION OF SMALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS INTO LARGER ECONOMIC UNITS HAS DONE MUCH TO BROADEN THE SCOPE OF EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS AVAILABLE TO PRESENT-DAY AMERICAN YOUTH. A SIMILAR TREND HAS BEEN DEVELOPING IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE. IN ORDER TO REMAIN FINANCIAL SOLVENT, AGRICULTURE ALSO HAS HAD TO ENLARGE ITS SCOPE INTO LARGER AND MORE ECONOMICAL UNITS. AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM HAD EXPERIENCED A FEW GROWING PAINS IN THE STRUGGLE TO MEET THE CHALLENGES BROUGHT ABOUT BY THESE CHANGES.

Consolidation of small school districts resulted in larger areas and more students to serve. Single-teacher departments are incapable of effectively meeting the needs of their respective students according to Dr. Milo Peterson. In an effort to provide meaningful educational opportunities where the need existed, many schools employed an additional vocational agricultural teacher. This arrangement was designed to provide additional time and talent for the execution of more complete programs. Most of these multiple-teacher departments were
established with a recognition of the needs of the com-
munity for a total program of vocational agriculture.
Instruction for both adult and young farmers is often in-
cluded in addition to the regular vocational agricultural
program for high school boys in this type of department.

The success of educational programs is largely de-
pendant upon constant evaluation. It is with this thought
in mind that a number of conditions have been investigated
relative to multiple-teacher departments of vocational
agriculture. The nature and extent of the problem will
be more clearly defined in the following section.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The various federal acts which encouraged the estab-
lishment and promotion of vocational agricultural educa-
tion have allowed a considerable amount of state and local
autonomy. Local school authorities have been able to
benefit from this in organizing programs of agricultural
education.

Overcrowded conditions together with many other
factors have placed demands upon schools for their best
effort in the utilization of limited funds for the maxi-
mum possible returns in terms of educational accomplish-
ment.

In the effort to provide as many course offerings
as possible, teachers are often required to teach in subjects for which they have not been adequately prepared. In the case of the vocational agricultural teacher, he is often required to devote considerable time to the preparation of lessons for the teaching of non-agricultural subjects. Yet he is expected to maintain a challenging program of vocational agriculture. Little or no provision is made for the development of high quality education. In many cases he is expected to teach a full complement of classes without a preparation period and yet carry out his after-school-hours responsibilities.

Multiple-teacher departments frequently include such features as adult evening classes. This service together with project supervision and FFA activities demands a sizeable amount of an agricultural teacher's time in the evenings without having to prepare for classes outside of his major area of interest. Being required to teach non-vocational agricultural subjects appears to occur with greater frequency for the younger of the two or more teachers constituting multiple-teacher departments. Beginning teachers, in their effort to secure employment often have accepted so-called "temporary" arrangements requiring them to teach one or more non-agricultural subjects. However, this "temporary" arrangement has approached permanency in some cases.

Vocational agricultural teachers are concerned about
good quality education rather than superficial presentation in subject matter areas beyond their scope of intensive interest. Teaching in non-agricultural subjects detracts from the time available to maintain and develop high standards in their area of major concern.

The above problem with its many implications forms the basis for this study of multiple-teacher departments in Washington and Oregon with recognition that the same condition exists in varying degree in many single-teacher departments.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purposes of this study are to show the extent to which vocational agricultural teachers have served in the teaching of non-agricultural high school subjects, the amount of time spent in actual instruction of these subjects, and the divisions of subject matter. It is hoped that these findings will be used for consideration in the establishment of new multiple-teacher departments or for the improvement of existing departments whether multiple or single teacher in scope.

LIMITATIONS

The study is limited to the extent that:

1. The results obtained are partially based on data
collected through the use of a highly structured questionnaire. However, the remarks and comments of individual respondents were given special consideration.

2. There was a scarcity of information available in research studies, books and magazine articles which directly applied to this specific problem.

3. Results and information summarized in this study are based on the one hundred eighteen teachers who served in the ten multiple-teacher departments in Oregon and thirty-four in Washington. These data are not necessarily applicable to areas outside of the sampling region, however, it is quite possible that they could have some relationship to similar conditions existing elsewhere.

4. Only men who have served or are now serving in multiple-teacher departments in Oregon and Washington were consulted.

ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

Basic assumptions relative to the study are:

1. Efficiently operated multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture allow for specialization on the part of individual teachers, thus,
providing greater depth and value to educational offerings.

2. Teachers who devote their full time to their chosen area of teaching will be more likely to produce superior educational results and achieve greater personal satisfaction.

3. The increasing trend toward consolidation of school districts will result in the establishment of more multiple-teacher departments.

METHODS

One hundred eighteen teachers have been selected to comprise the sample for purposes of this study. These teachers represent the total number who served in the forty-four multiple-teacher departments in Oregon and Washington during the seven year period ending with the 1960-1961 school year. Ten of these were in existence for one or more years in Oregon while the remaining thirty-four represent those existing in Washington for part or all of the same period.

Two sources were consulted for collecting data relative to the kind and amount of non-agricultural subjects taught by teachers in this sample. Records were made available by the State Departments of Vocational Agricultural Education in both Oregon and Washington. These
documents provided basic information as well as the whereabouts of the men comprising the sample.

The second source involved replies from teachers who served in multiple-teacher departments in the two states. Respondents were asked to supply additional information relative to the problem not available from the state office records.

A total of ninety-four useable returns were received out of one hundred eighteen teachers polled. This amounts to a seventy-nine and sixty-six hundredths per cent total return. Oregon had a seventy-eight per cent return while eighty and five tenths per cent of the Washington teachers submitted useable questionnaires. A copy of the questionnaire is included in the appendix.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Multiple-Teacher Department

Any department of vocational agriculture in the public secondary schools which employs more than one teacher to carry out the functions of the department.

Junior Man or Junior Teacher

The teacher employed in a multiple-man department having the least teaching experience or the least seniority.
Senior Man or Senior Teacher

The teacher having the most teaching experience or having the longest period of employment in the department, often designated as department head and having major responsibility for the operation of the total program of vocational agricultural education in the school.

All Day Pupils

Students enrolled in the regular high school phase of the vocational agricultural program. They remain in school all day as opposed to students who attend only part time such as young farmers and/or adult evening class members.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER ONE

The need for the provision of additional time and talent has been recognized for the execution of more complete programs of vocational agriculture. This has led to the establishment of multiple-teacher departments.

Most teachers required to teach non-agricultural subjects have been able to adapt to the situation with little difficulty unless no time is allowed for preparation. When no time is given, teachers must choose between making preparation for their non-agricultural classes at the expense of the agricultural program or operate on a level of quality somewhat less than optimum.
for either or both areas of instruction.

This study endeavors to show the extent to which teachers in multiple-teacher departments in Oregon and Washington have served in teaching non-agricultural subjects. Other factors contributing to successful operation will also be reported.

Data have been gathered from state department records in both states. Additional information was obtained through the use of a questionnaire mailed to each member of the sample.

The results of this study are not necessarily applicable to areas beyond the sampling region. Only men who have served or are now serving in multiple-teacher departments in Oregon and Washington were consulted.
CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND

Multiple-teacher vocational agricultural departments have been of interest to the author for a number of years because of having had experience with them as a high school student, a student teacher and as a vocational agricultural teacher.

As a high school student the author received four years of vocational agricultural instruction in a department having three teachers. A fourth teacher was added during the last year. This arrangement allowed each instructor to specialize in his particular area of the total program. Students were rotated from one area to the next so that they participated in each of the areas every school year. All students were able to benefit from the specific experience and knowledge of each teacher and yet retain a clear understanding of the objectives of the total program. After having had experience with several other multiple-teacher departments the author considers the above described department to be highly desirable and effective.

Following a term of student teaching in a two teacher department, the author accepted employment as a junior teacher in a department that had always been single in scope prior to this time. This was a case of increasing
the staff without a corresponding expansion of facilities. Over crowded conditions, teaching of non-vocational agricultural subjects, lack of non-teaching period and endeavoring to adjust to this new situation on the part of both teachers all exercised their effect upon the degree of progress obtained. These two years of experience have prompted the further investigation of conditions existing in multiple-teacher departments which may have some relationship to the teaching of non-vocational agricultural subjects.

There has been a sixty per cent net increase of multiple-teacher departments in Oregon during the seven year period ending with the 1960-1961 school year. Washington has experienced a reduction during this period, however, the trend is upward again as shown by the graph in figure 1.

RELATED INFORMATION

A search of publications revealed no information directly related to teaching schedules of vocational agricultural teachers. However, a number of authors have reported findings which have contributed to the successful operation of multiple-teacher departments. The term successful operation appears to carry a manifold meaning. Treating students as individuals, producing quality
TABLE 1

Rate of change by years in the number of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in Washington and Oregon during the seven year period ending in 1960-1961.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Washington No</th>
<th>%change</th>
<th>Oregon No</th>
<th>%change</th>
<th>Total No</th>
<th>%change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954 - 1955</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955 - 1956</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>07.40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957 - 1958</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-09.09</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-06.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958 - 1959</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-25.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-14.28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959 - 1960</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 - 1961</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-11.11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>04.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Net</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-37.03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-21.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gain or Lose
Fig. 1 Rate of change in the number of multiple-teacher departments in Washington and Oregon during the seven year period ending in 1960-1961.
educational results, working a reasonable number of hours and being able to experience a fair degree of personal satisfaction are included in the meaning of this term. The following section deals with a presentation of these findings as they apply to a number of major areas.

**Teaching Load**

The success of a multiple-teacher department is largely dependent upon the number of students per teacher according to David C. Barrett. He maintains that each teacher should have no more than one unit consisting of thirty students.

A group of teachers attending a summer workshop in Pennsylvania concluded that thirty-five all day pupils constituted a full teaching load. H. S. Brunner, in reporting on this conference, stated several other conclusions. A second teacher should be demanded when the enrollment reaches fifty all day pupils. He further reported that seventy all day students in the agricultural program constituted a full load for two teachers. A third teacher should be added when the enrollment reaches seventy-five. Where out-of-school students are served in such programs as adult evening classes or young farmer classes, a full teacher load is considered to be forty students.

Results of a Pacific Regional study reported by
Henry A. TenPas\textsuperscript{10} indicated that an enrollment of sixty all day students is considered the critical point at which staff additions should be made.

An editorial in the \textit{Agricultural Education Magazine} presented several factors relative to teaching load and quality teaching. They are as follows:\textsuperscript{9}

\textbf{Responsibility of the profession:}

Teachers know what quality teaching is. They want to do quality work. To treat students as individuals teachers need:

1. Small classes and limited enrollments
2. Recognition of time requirements for on-farm instruction
3. A schedule which does not involve more than fifty per cent of the teacher's work week with classes and other routine assignments.

These conditions are essential if teachers are to have a fair chance to function properly and work a reasonable number of hours. Favorable conditions are necessary if we are to practice what we preach.

\textbf{On-Farm Instruction}

One of the important factors contributing to quality teaching is emphasized in the above quotation.\textsuperscript{9} It requires time to successfully execute this fundamental segment of the vocational agricultural program. Fifty
per cent of the multiple-teacher department schools in Pennsylvania provided the teachers some school time to visit student farming programs, according to Martin B. Yarnell.\textsuperscript{14}

An investigation of the time allowed for on-the-farm instruction during school time in Oregon was conducted by Thomas A. Williams.\textsuperscript{13} His findings show that twenty-one per cent of the schools allowed no school time for this purpose. Sixty-five per cent granted from one to five hours per week. Six to ten hours per week were provided by eleven per cent, while only two of the eighty schools granted more than ten hours for home project supervision each week. A number of school administrators felt that this did not merit release time from school and, therefore, should be done on Saturdays and evenings.

\textbf{Cooperation Between Teachers}

The most important consideration in addition to or improvement of multiple-teacher departments is one of personal relationships among the staff members, as shown by Henry A. TenPas in his study of multiple-teacher departments of the Pacific Region. Sixty-seven per cent of more than four hundred teachers emphasized the necessity of regular staff meetings for planning and coordination of the program at least once per week,
A clear definition of the responsibilities of each teacher together with daily staff conferences are considered to be important factors contributing to the success of multiple-teacher departments by David C. Barrett.

A suggested approach for the operation of two-teacher departments of vocational agriculture has been advanced in conclusion of an investigation conducted by Gerald B. James:

1. A democratic sharing of responsibilities between the two teachers.
2. Joint decision making in purposes, operation and functioning.
3. The two should operate as co-teachers, as a team, with neither maintaining power over the other.
4. An effort should be made to divide duties and responsibilities so that neither teacher would specialize in any one phase of the over-all job.
5. Time should be set aside at the end of each year to study and evaluate the year's work and reallocate duties and responsibilities. It is neither necessary or desirable that one man continue with one area alone over a period of years.
6. Plans and policies should be in writing.
A study conducted in Texas by Herman H. Stoner presents another approach for the operation of multiple-teacher departments. A number of responsibilities which have a relationship to the cooperation between teachers were reported as follows:

1. There should be a written agreement between the teachers outlining the duties of each.
2. One teacher should be head teacher.
3. All teachers should not teach class at the same time. One teacher should be free to meet visitors and other callers.
4. Teachers should not teach the same class each year.
5. Teachers should not teach the same boy through the entire program.
6. A uniform grading system should be established between teachers.
7. Teachers should take turns attending livestock shows during class time.

**Physical Facilities**

The addition of staff members without a corresponding expansion of facilities can seriously restrict the potential effectiveness of the instructional program. This was revealed by Cleo A. Collins in a study involving multiple-teacher departments in thirty-two states.
One classroom and one farm mechanics shop supplied with suitable equipment is considered to be adequate for two teachers. However, an additional classroom should be provided for each supplementary teacher according to H. S. Brunner.\textsuperscript{3} The necessity of a properly equipped conference room was also accentuated by this study. A telephone, typewriter and secretary are absolute necessities. Access to a duplicator at any time was also considered to be indispensable.

**Administrative Factors**

After investigating a number of problems related to multiple-teacher departments, Cleo A. Collins recommended several proposals designed to improve their effectiveness.\textsuperscript{4} He proposed that each state develop a state plan setting forth minimum requirements for the approval of multiple-teacher departments. Within this framework of policy, each local department could then develop a yearly plan of operation suited to its particular needs and objectives. This plan would produce a certain amount of standardization and yet allow a considerable degree of local autonomy. He further proposed that a special program of in-service education be implemented by supervisory and teacher training staffs for teachers serving in multiple-teacher departments.
The Future of Multiple-Teacher Departments

The increasing trend in the establishment of multiple-teacher departments has been indicated by Martin B. Yarnall. He reported that seventy-eight per cent of the multiple-teacher departments had been established within the eight years immediately prior to his study carried out in Pennsylvania during 1955. Multiple-teacher departments as a whole resulted in increased effectiveness of the program according to Yarnall.

Dr. Milo Peterson recently published a collection of thought-provoking statements relative to the future of multiple-teacher departments which are quoted as follows:

"For four decades we have ambled along in false security and foolish pride thinking that one-teacher departments represented an adequate arrangement. From now on this must change.

One-teacher departments cannot do the job. Two, three, five-man departments must be developed. Our only alternative is to re-allocate our resources to provide sixty per cent for young and adult farmer work and forty per cent for the high school Future Farmers of America work.

So let us start a few trends of our own:
Multiple-teacher departments, vastly increased adult work based on the farm management approach, and a young farmer program that gets to the heart of the problem of establishment in farming.

No other unit of our society is structured to meet the educational needs of farm people as well as our public schools. This is our task if we are to be true to our professional ideals."

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER II

A review of literature revealed no information directly applicable to the thesis problem. However, a number of basic concepts considered to be requisite to the successful operation of the multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture were found. The desirability of limiting class size and students per teacher was reported by Barrett, Brunner and TenPas. Another author emphasized the importance of providing time for on-farm supervision. TenPas attested to the necessity of regular staff meetings to coordinate departmental activities. The value of a written agreement relative to the division of responsibilities was reported by Barrett and Stoner.

A degree of standardization has been proposed by
Collins through the development of a state plan setting forth minimum requirements for the approval of multiple-teacher departments. He also proposed the implementation of special in-service training programs for teachers serving in multiple-teacher departments.

Multiple-teacher departments as a whole resulted in increased effectiveness of the program according to Martin B. Yarnell who reported a marked increase in their existence. However, Dr. Milo Peterson has shown the pressing need for an even greater expansion of multiple-teacher departments consisting of up to five teachers.
CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

These findings are largely based on results obtained from a questionnaire mailed to each member of the sample. The remaining data has been obtained from state office records.

The two-part questionnaire was designed as a means of discovering the operating procedures of multiple-teacher departments as seen by both junior and senior teachers. This information has been evaluated on the basis of its relationship to the teaching of non-vocational agricultural subjects. The design of the questionnaire is based on the assumption that the teaching of other subjects detracts from the efficiency of the operation of the vocational agricultural program and, thus, results in a net reduction in the quality of instruction.

The proper evaluation of the main problem will be facilitated by a consideration of the various components. Therefore, a number of general findings will be presented to lend perspective to the main question.

Age of Respondents

Age and experience are two factors which appear to have some relationship to the way respondents reply to
particular questions. Respondents completing junior-teacher questionnaires were an average of thirty-eight years of age. Those who replied as senior-teachers averaged slightly more than forty-two years. It is interesting to note that teachers from Oregon averaged about six years younger in each of the two categories than their Washington counterparts. Refer to table 2 for present average ages of respondents.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Junior Teachers</th>
<th>Total of Years</th>
<th>Size of Sample</th>
<th>Average age in Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2254</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Teachers</th>
<th>Total of Years</th>
<th>Size of Sample</th>
<th>Average age in Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1417</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the number of respondents falling within the various age groups based on their present age.

Present Occupations

More than forty-five percent of those who replied as junior teachers are now engaged in other occupations.
Only twenty-five per cent of those who served as senior teachers during the period of time covered by the study are now working in jobs other than teaching vocational agriculture. Factors such as age and experience together with several advantages not usually given to junior teachers were apparently responsible for a greater percentage of senior teachers remaining in the profession. A much greater loss to other occupations was found among the Oregon senior teachers as shown by table 4. More than forty-one per cent transferred to other work as compared to only eighteen per cent for Washington senior teachers.
Table 4
Present Occupations of Respondents
(Per cents are rounded to the nearest whole number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>JUNIOR TEACHERS</th>
<th>SENIOR TEACHERS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher, Voc. Agriculture</td>
<td>22  54</td>
<td>10  56</td>
<td>26  81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student in Ag. Ed.</td>
<td>1  6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher, other Voc. Subjects</td>
<td>4  10</td>
<td>1   3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher, other subjects</td>
<td>6  15</td>
<td>3   17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher, College</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>1   3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administration</td>
<td>2  5</td>
<td>1   6</td>
<td>2   6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt. Ag. Agencies</td>
<td>4  10</td>
<td>1   6</td>
<td>2   17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Ag. Companies</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>2   11</td>
<td>1   3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Bureau Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td>1   8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>1  3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Voc. Ag. Teachers</td>
<td>19  46</td>
<td>8   44</td>
<td>6   19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>41  103</td>
<td>32  103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Tenure

Junior teachers who later became senior teachers served an average of one and one-half years prior to accepting major responsibility. These data are shown in table 5.

Table 5
The Average Number of Years of Service as a Junior Teacher Prior to Advancement to Senior Teacher Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total Of Years</th>
<th>Size Of Sample</th>
<th>Average Time in Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only a limited number of junior teachers have advanced to senior teacher rank in Oregon. Most of them started in a single-teacher dept. and expanded their program to allow for the addition of a second man.

Senior teachers as a group served an average of seven and seven tenths years in this capacity as shown by table 6.

Table 6
Average Length of Service in Multiple-Teacher Departments for Senior Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total Of Years</th>
<th>Size Of Sample</th>
<th>Average Service in Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average tenure in the school where they were first employed in a multiple-teacher department was more than nine years for those who answered as senior teachers. This is about two times longer than for the average junior teacher according to data shown by Table 7.

### Table 7

**Length of Tenure in the School Where Teachers Were First Employed in a Multiple-Teacher Department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total Of Years</th>
<th>Size Of Sample</th>
<th>Average Tenure in Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Senior Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total Of Years</th>
<th>Size Of Sample</th>
<th>Average Tenure in Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agricultural Staff Meetings**

One plausible reason for the high rate of turn over among junior teachers is their lack of communication with other staff members. Less than twenty-nine per cent reported having a regular established time at which to meet during their first year for the purpose of coordinating plans for departmental operation. Only seventeen per cent indicated this practice during their last year as a
A greater number of senior teachers recognized the importance of regular staff conferences as indicated by their reply to the same question. Senior teachers and junior teachers evidently have differing concepts of the term "staff meeting". This may be one plausible reason for the extremes in their responses. Fifty per cent engaged in this method of communication during their first year as a senior teacher. This amount increased to sixty per cent by the last year. The frequency of these staff conferences was about evenly divided between weekly and daily meetings as shown by Table 8.

**Division of Responsibilities**

The existence of a written understanding as to the division of responsibilities between the staff members of a department is considered to have a relationship to successful operation. Approximately thirty per cent of the respondents indicated the adoption of such a policy. One exception exists relative to senior teachers during their first year of service in that capacity when less than sixteen per cent had written statements of agreement. Departments with written policies of agreement between staff members tend to be more faithful in holding regular staff conferences. More than eighty-three per cent of the Washington junior teachers possessing written
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Interval</th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Oregon</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Last Year</td>
<td>First Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
policies of agreement also participated in regular staff
meetings to aid in coordinating departmental activities.
A similar relationship existed for the balance of the
sample.

Physical Facilities

Physical facilities, such as, the number and arrange-
ment of class rooms obviously have a direct bearing on
teaching schedules as well as operational procedures of
multiple-teacher departments.

During their first year in a multiple-teacher de-
partment, less than fifty-five per cent of the junior
teachers had their own individual class rooms. The sit-
uation grew worse during the last year where only forty
per cent possessed their own class rooms. This condition
was reversed with the senior teachers reporting more than
fifty-three per cent having their own rooms during their
last year as compared to forty-five per cent the first
year.

Division of Students Among Teachers

The way in which students are assigned to the two
or more teachers for class room and on-farm instruction
has some relationship to departmental organization.
Several arrangements for dividing students among teachers
for the purpose of home project supervision have been
reported. Three-fourths of the respondents adhered to a
plan whereby each teacher provided on-farm instruction for those students assigned to him for classroom work. Several schools divided their students among teachers according to geographical area with the thought of saving travel time and expense. Table 9 summarizes this information.

Table 9

Methods used to Divide Students Among Teachers For Supervision of Home Projects

(Per cents rounded to nearest whole number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Division</th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Oregon</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Junior Teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Area</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as in Class</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Methods</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number in Sample</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>*21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Senior Teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as in Class</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others Methods</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number in Sample</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>*15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some used more than one method

Non-Teaching Periods

The majority of teachers were given a non-teaching period for the purpose of lesson planning and/or project supervision. However, a considerable number of teachers were denied this time so fundamental to better quality
agricultural education. More than thirty-seven per cent of the junior teachers were required to teach a full schedule of classes in addition to their after school responsibilities of the agricultural program. The relationships between the teaching of non-vocational agricultural subjects and non-teaching periods will be presented later in this chapter.

A considerable number of respondents called attention to the pressing need for time during the regular school day in which to plan and prepare. Several have proposed that two non-teaching periods be granted for vocational agricultural teachers. Because of the added responsibility of project supervision, agricultural teachers without non-teaching periods either make preparation at home or else neglect this important aspect of professional teaching. Therefore, it has been suggested that two periods be given to allow time for planning and to partially compensate for the time required for on-farm instruction. If home project supervision is necessary, it then seems imperative to allow sufficient time to do a satisfactory job.

Area Teaching

One of the advantages often given for multiple-teacher departments is their allowance for specialization on the part of individual teachers. Permitting each
teacher to function in his area of major interest aids in the provision of superior educational opportunities. Some degree of area teaching was reported by slightly more than half of all respondents.

**Adult Education**

More than three-fourths of the Oregon multiple-teacher departments reported the existence of adult education programs. Less than half of these departments in Washington offered this educational service. This may be due to the promotional program encouraging the development of adult work in Oregon.

**Advising the FFA Chapter**

What arrangements should be made for acting as advisor to the FFA? A number of variations are in existence. Many teachers share equally in acting as advisor during meeting ceremonies. Approximately half of the junior teachers reported this arrangement. Senior teachers indicated that up to eighty-three per cent of their group shared in this responsibility.

Failure to allow each teacher to serve in this capacity can have a serious effect upon intra-teacher relationships in addition to loss of respect on the part of students for the teacher not given this opportunity.
Educational Advancement

Pressure to continue the pursuit of education is becoming increasingly evident in certification requirements as well as salary schedules. However, no provision is made for more than half of the teachers in this study to continue their education. About one-third of the schools allowed time off without pay during the summer for one teacher. Less than ten per cent reported any educational leave or substitute arrangement whereby teachers could be excused from their teaching duties without complete loss of salary.

Personal Relationships

Numerous factors are responsible for maintenance of satisfactory personal relationships between teachers. Since good working relationships between teachers are a requisite to successful operation of multiple-teacher departments, it seems imperative that teachers be consulted prior to making additions to the departmental staff. More than twenty per cent of the Washington Senior teachers and eight per cent of those in Oregon were assigned junior teachers without the senior teachers having the opportunity to give prior approval.

Teaching in a multiple-teacher department requires tolerance, patience and willingness to work hard for the development of the best in each student. The job should
Table 10

Relationships Existing Between Junior and Senior Teachers in Multiple-Teacher Departments

(Per cents rounded to nearest whole number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Junior Teachers</th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Oregon</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) A definite subordination on the part</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the junior-man with most decisions made by senior-man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) A fairly equal relationship where both or all</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parties shared in arriving at decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Each teacher made decisions in his own area of</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility independent of the other teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample of Junior Teachers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) A definite subordination on the part</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the junior-man with most decisions made by senior-man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) A fairly equal relationship where both or all</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parties shared in arriving at decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Each teacher made decisions in his own area of</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility independent of the other teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample of Senior Teachers</td>
<td>*33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>*13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some checked more than one item
be equal relative to the sharing of work, supervision of students and reception of public recognition for results produced.

**Advantages and Disadvantages of Multiple-Teacher Departments**

A number of advantages and disadvantages have been reported relative to the merits of multiple-teacher departments. They are included in the following list.

**Advantages of Multiple-teacher departments:**

1. Division of work load
2. Allows for specialization
3. Provides for enlargement and expansion of the program
4. Allows for more time for FFA and supervision of home projects
5. Smaller classes possible
6. Superior curriculum can be taught
7. More individual help for students
8. One teacher's abilities supplement the other
9. Encourages better organization
10. Allows for a better summer program
11. Allows for adult program
12. Companionship and cooperation
13. Easier to have representative at functions away from school.
Disadvantages: of Multiple-teacher departments

1. Most departments are not designed to properly accommodate two teachers
2. Duplication of effort
3. Less efficient use of total time
4. Possibility of personality conflict
5. Requires considerable coordination
6. Creates disturbance to class while other group is in the shop
7. Divided loyalty of students
8. Difficulty in getting acquainted with all of the students
9. Possibility of students working one teacher against the other
10. Possibility of conflicting philosophies
11. Too much attention to details and not enough concern for over-all objectives
12. Difficult to divide responsibilities equally
13. Different requirements for standards of workmanship
14. Unequal enthusiasm for FFA activities.

The material presented to this point has been a consideration of various conditions existing in multiple-teacher departments. Their relationship to teaching schedules is only secondary, however. Data more pertinent to the teaching of non-vocational agricultural subjects will be presented in the remainder of the chapter.
The Teaching of Non-Vocational Agricultural Subjects

Table 1 reveals that sixty-one per cent of the junior teachers taught non-vocational agricultural subjects during their first year. The average for the last year was only three per cent lower for the same group. Senior teachers as a group taught non-agricultural subjects in only thirty per cent of the cases during their first year. Both junior and senior teachers from Washington experienced an increase in the number of non-vocational agricultural subjects that they were required to teach. This may be a result of the trend toward greater stress on mathematical and scientific areas of education.

Table II shows the various opinions about the teaching of non-vocational agricultural subjects. One-fifth of the junior teachers taught them only as a temporary arrangement during their first year. Others welcomed the opportunity to try teaching in another field. It is perplexing to note the number of respondents who made no reply to this question. However, the senior teachers who did reply most frequently indicated intentions for their teaching of other subjects to be only temporary in nature.

Twenty-two per cent of the junior teachers during their first year indicated that their responsibility of teaching non-vocational agricultural subjects interfered
Table 11

Opinions of Respondents About Teaching Non-Vocational Agricultural Subjects

(Per cents rounded off to the nearest whole number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Junior Teachers</th>
<th>Senior Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Yr.</td>
<td>Last Yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I taught them only because it was required and as a temporary arrangement.</td>
<td>11 19</td>
<td>8 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I welcomed the opportunity to try teaching in another field.</td>
<td>14 24</td>
<td>14 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It made no difference</td>
<td>10 17</td>
<td>10 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3 5</td>
<td>3 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>21 36</td>
<td>24 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>59 -</td>
<td>59 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with the operation of the agricultural program. The summary in table 12 shows that this condition improved only slightly during the last year of teaching for junior-men. An inverse relationship for senior teachers existed in comparing their first and last years. Approximately twice as many reported conflict the last year as compared to the first.

A large portion of the senior teachers were opposed to their junior teachers being required to teach non-agricultural subjects. Thirty per cent resigned themselves to the situation as inevitable if they were to
have a second teacher. Several indicated that teaching in other subject matter areas results in neglect of the agricultural program and is neither fair to the teacher nor the program. Less than ten per cent advocated the encouragement of this arrangement as a means of improving public relations as shown in table 13.

Table 12

Number of Respondents Replying to the Question of Whether or Not the Teaching of Non-Voc. Ag. Subjects Interfered with the Operation of the Agricultural Program

(Per cents rounded to the nearest whole number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Reply</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data-gathering instrument was designed to obtain information relative to conditions existing during each of two different years. Respondents were asked to reply in regard to their first year of experience in a multiple-teacher department whether or not they had prior teaching experience in a single-teacher program. They were then requested to answer the same question based on conditions
### Table 13

**Attitudes Expressed by Senior Teachers in Regard to Junior Teachers in Their Departments Being Required to Teach Non-Vocational Agricultural Subjects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Oregon</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Too much neglect to the Agricultural program</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not fair to Ag. program or the teacher</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enthusiasm for the Ag. program is greatly reduced on the part of the junior man</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opposed</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May be necessary to keep the junior man</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A healthy situation if time permits</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A good experience, however, it should be limited to retain major interest in ag.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good for improving public relations in the school</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Reply</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in sample</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
existing during the last year in which they served in a multiple-teacher department. If a respondent was a junior teacher during his first year in a multiple-teacher department, he answered questions as a junior teacher for both the first year and the last year of service as a junior teacher. In the case where a junior teacher was promoted to a senior teacher the respondent filled out two questionnaires; one for his experience as a junior teacher and another describing conditions while he was a senior teacher. Beginning teachers or those with only one year of experience in a multiple-teacher department answered the section for first year only. These arrangements are to show any changes which may have occurred for either junior or senior teachers as a group. It seems reasonable to assume that junior teachers who experienced a condition which they may have felt to be undesirable would exert their influence to create an improvement, move to another department, or leave the profession. Some have learned to live with the condition.

Including both junior and senior teachers, there were forty-nine responses to the teaching of non-vocational agricultural subjects during their first year of experience in multiple-teacher departments. Table 14 shows that the same group included fifty-two occurrences of teaching other subjects during their last year of
Table 14
Respondents Who Taught Non-Vocational Agricultural Subjects While Serving in Multiple-Teacher Departments
(Per cents rounded to nearest whole number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th></th>
<th>Oregon</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Yr.</td>
<td>Last Yr.</td>
<td>First Yr.</td>
<td>Last Yr.</td>
<td>First Yr.</td>
<td>Last Yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total junior teachers in sample</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Teachers who taught non-ag. subjects</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total senior teachers in sample</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior teachers who taught non-ag. subjects</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total who taught non-voc. ag. subjects</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
experience. Therefore, the total number of cases where non-vocational agricultural subjects were taught amounts to one hundred one.

The twenty-four non-vocational agricultural subjects in table 15 are listed in the order of decreasing frequency with which they were taught. These twenty-four subjects were taught in a total of one hundred forty-one instances by one hundred one teachers. This shows that each of the teachers who taught non-vocational agricultural subjects taught an average of one and four tenths subjects in addition to their agricultural classes.

These subjects were taught by approximately fifty per cent of the total teachers constituting the sample.

All respondents indicating that they taught non-vocational agricultural subjects were asked whether or not they felt adequately prepared to teach in these subjects. The term "adequate" was defined as not having to learn a lot of new material before being able to teach the subject.

About half of the junior teachers reported that they felt adequately prepared during their first year. Fifty-eight per cent indicated their feeling of adequacy during their last year. Only forty-one per cent of the senior teachers felt that they were adequately prepared to teach non-agricultural subjects for both first and last years.
Table 15

Frequency of Response to the 24 Non-Voc. Ag. Subjects Taught by Teachers in Multiple-Teacher Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Shop</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra or Math</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Hall</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Drawing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Mechanics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade Core Curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Defense</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College Ag.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran's Ag.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade Ag.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above statements require further scrutiny prior to drawing hasty conclusions. It seems reasonable to assume that whether or not a teacher felt that he was adequately prepared for the teaching of subjects outside of his field may have some relationship to the possession of non-teaching periods and the difficulty of the subject. For example, several teachers who felt adequately prepared possessed non-teaching periods in connection with "teaching" study hall. In spite of this absurd example, there is obviously a difference in the amount of preparation required for teaching driver training as compared to chemistry or physics. The following section deals with the occurrence of non-teaching periods for the various subjects taught and the relationships to adequacy of preparation. The relationships between these three factors are shown by a series of graphs starting with figure 2.

There were eleven junior teachers who felt they were not adequately prepared for teaching non-agricultural subjects during their first year. These eleven teachers taught a total of eight different subjects with sixteen occurrences the teacher-subject ratio amounts to approximately one and one-half subjects. Figure 2 expresses the percentage of those who taught the various subjects and the per cent having a non-teaching period. All percentages are based on the number of times which the several
Figure 2

The Occurrence of a Non-Teaching Period
For the Various Subjects Taught

Junior Teachers Not Adequately Prepared For Teaching Non-Vocational Agricultural Subjects

Number of Teachers = 11
Frequency of Occurrence = 16
Ratio = 1.45

(All percentages are based on this figure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>First Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem.</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biol.</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alg.</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserv.</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech.</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Sc.</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vation</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw.</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Bar chart showing the distribution of non-teaching periods across various subjects]
subjects were taught.

Thirty-one per cent of this group taught general science, however, only slightly more than half of these had a non-teaching period. Only half of the thirteen percent who taught physics were given time for preparation. A similar relationship existed for general shop.

During their last year, five junior teachers inadequately prepared for other subjects, taught eight different subjects. A non-teaching period was provided for only half of those teaching algebra or math. The remaining subjects were instructed without the provision of preparation time. The reason for these teachers feeling inadequately prepared is evident from these data taken from figure 3.

Junior teachers who were adequately prepared during their first year were provided with non-teaching periods in nearly all of the cases as shown by data in figure 4. The same general concept can be drawn from figure 5 which refers to adequately prepared junior teachers during their last year. All senior teachers were given non-teaching periods in conjunction with the teaching of non-vocational agricultural subjects with the exception of a very small percentage of those who were adequately prepared during their last year. Figures 6 through 9 portray these findings. The senior teachers who expressed their feeling of adequacy during both their first and
Figure 3

Junior Teachers Not Adequately Prepared For Teaching Non-Vocational Agricultural Subjects During Their Last Year as a Junior-Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chem.</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biol.</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alg.</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. Col.</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Arts</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Teachers = 5
Frequency of Occurrence = 9
Ratio = 1.80
Figure 4

Junior Teachers Who Were Adequately Prepared For Teaching
Non-Vocational Agricultural Subjects During Their First Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Alg.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Ed.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellor</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Study</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ave. No. of Teachers = 26
Non-Voc. Ag. Subjects Taught = 1.58
Number of Teachers = 26
Freq. of Occurrence = 40
Figure 5

Junior Teachers Who Were Adequately Prepared For Teaching Non-Vocational Agricultural Subjects During Their Last Year

Ave. No. of Non-Voc. Ag. subjects taught per teacher = 1.31

Number of Teachers = 32
Frequency of Occurrence = 42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Teaching</td>
<td>% With Non-Teach. Per.</td>
<td>% Teaching</td>
<td>% With Non-Teach. Per.</td>
<td>% Teaching</td>
<td>% With Non-Teach. Per.</td>
<td>% Teaching</td>
<td>% With Non-Teach. Per.</td>
<td>% Teaching</td>
<td>% With Non-Teach. Per.</td>
<td>% Teaching</td>
<td>% With Non-Teach. Per.</td>
<td>% Teaching</td>
<td>% With Non-Teach. Per.</td>
<td>% Teaching</td>
<td>% With Non-Teach. Per.</td>
<td>% Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6

Senior Teachers Not Adequately Prepared For Teaching Non-Vocational Agricultural Subjects First Year

Number of Teachers = 1
Frequency of Occurrence = 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto Mechanics</th>
<th>Driver Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Teaching the Subject</td>
<td>% Teaching the Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Non-Teach. Per.</td>
<td>% With Non-Teach. Per.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratio = 2.0

50% 50%
Figure 7
Senior Teachers Not Adequately Prepared For Teaching Non-Vocational Agricultural Subjects Last Year

Number of Teachers = 2
Frequency of Occurrence = 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Defense</th>
<th>Auto Mechanics</th>
<th>Welding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Teaching the Subject</td>
<td>% With Non-Tech. Per.</td>
<td>% Teaching the Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 1/3%</td>
<td>33 1/3%</td>
<td>33 1/3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8

Senior Teachers Who Were Adequately Prepared For Teaching Non-Vocational Agricultural Subjects First Year

Av. No. of Non-Voc. Ag. subjects taught = 1.00

No. of Teachers = 11
Frequency = 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>% Teaching the Subject</th>
<th>% With Non-Teach. Per.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biol.</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alg. Math</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech.</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>% Teaching the Subject</td>
<td>% Teaching the Subject With Non-Teach. Per.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biol.</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem. Mech.</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Study</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last year, teaching non-vocational agricultural subjects for teachers who were adequately prepared for teaching non-vocational agricultural subjects was 1.09. The ratio of teacher to non-teacher was 1.09. The frequency of teachers who taught non-vocational agricultural subjects was 12. The average number of non-vocational subjects taught last year was 36.
last years were given non-teaching periods in each case. Their reason for not feeling adequately prepared for other subjects is apparently due to some reason other than preparation time. However, the above information lends support to the direct relationship between adequacy of preparation and provision of non-teaching periods.

**Future of Multiple-Teacher Departments**

The senior teachers from both states were asked whether they expected the number of multiple-teacher departments to increase in their state. Oregon's senior teachers exhibited greater optimism by their fifty-eight per cent reply in the affirmative. Only twenty-two per cent of the Washington senior teachers anticipated any growth in the numbers of multiple-teacher departments.

**Summary of Chapter III**

**Findings**

A number of general findings of secondary importance have been presented in the first part of this chapter to lend perspective to the main problem area of the research project.

It has been shown that a relationship exists between those who have written policies for division of
responsibilities among teachers and the frequency of staff meetings for the purpose of coordinating the departmental activities.

The time allowed for the satisfactory execution of on-the-farm instruction has not been commensurate with the significance of this fundamental segment of agricultural education.

Some form of area teaching whereby a degree of specialization in teaching is practiced has been reported by approximately half of the sample.

The paramount nature of satisfactory personal relationships between teachers has been shown to parallel the findings of other authors.

Teaching of non-vocational agricultural subjects and its effect upon a variety of factors ultimately influencing the successful operation of the agricultural program have been considered. The incidence of teaching other subjects was generally greater for junior teachers. Respondents who taught other subjects revealed a relationship between the possession of non-teaching periods and adequacy of preparation.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

Many teachers required to teach non-vocational agricultural subjects have been able to adapt to the situation with little difficulty when given time for preparation. When no time is given, teachers must choose between making preparation at the expense of the agricultural program or operate on a level of quality somewhat less than optimum for either or both areas of instruction.

This study endeavors to show the extent to which teachers in multiple-teacher departments in Oregon and Washington have served in teaching non-agricultural subjects. Other factors contributing to successful operation have also been reported.

Data have been gathered from state department records in both states. Additional information was obtained through the use of a questionnaire mailed to those teachers who have served in multiple-teacher departments.

The results of this study are not necessarily applicable to areas beyond the sampling region. Only men who have served or are now serving in multiple-teacher departments in Oregon and Washington were consulted.

A review of literature revealed no information directly applicable to the thesis problem. However, a number of basic concepts considered to be requisite to
the successful operation of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture were found. The desirability of limiting class size and students per teacher was reported by Barrett, Brunner and TenPas. Another author emphasized the importance of providing time for on-farm supervision. TenPas attested to the necessity of regular staff meetings to coordinate departmental activities. The value of a written agreement relative to the division of responsibilities was reported by Barrett and Stoner.

A degree of standardization has been proposed by Collins through the development of a state plan setting forth minimum requirements for the approval of multiple-teacher departments. He also proposed the implementation of special in-service training programs for teachers serving in multiple-teacher departments.

Multiple-teacher departments as a whole resulted in increased effectiveness of the program according to Yarnell who also reported a marked increase in their existence. However, Peterson has shown the pressing need for an even greater expansion of multiple-teacher departments consisting of up to five teachers.

The tabulation of data gathered for this study has produced a number of general findings having only an indirect relationship to the main problem area of the research project. However, they do aid in lending perspective to the more specific considerations.
It has been shown that a relationship exists between those who have written policies for division of responsibilities among teachers and the frequency of staff meetings for the purpose of coordinating the departmental activities.

The time allowed for the satisfactory execution of on-the-farm instruction has not been commensurate with the significance of this fundamental segment of agricultural education.

Some form of area teaching whereby a degree of specialization in teaching is practiced has been reported by approximately half of the sample.

The paramount nature of satisfactory personal relationships between teachers has been shown to parallel the findings of other authors.

Teaching of non-vocational agricultural subjects and its effect upon a variety of factors ultimately influencing the successful operation of the agricultural program have been considered. The incidence of teaching other subjects was generally greater for junior teachers. Respondents who taught other subjects revealed a relationship between the possession of non-teaching periods and adequacy of preparation.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions have been drawn from the
findings obtained through this investigation of teaching schedules of vocational agricultural teachers in multiple-teacher departments.

(1) Many teachers required to teach non-vocational agricultural subjects have been able to adapt to the situation with little difficulty when given time for preparation.

(2) A relationship exists between adequacy of preparation and the possession of non-teaching periods. This has been shown relative to teaching non-vocational agricultural subjects.

(3) Requiring vocational agricultural instructors to teach subjects outside of their field with no provision of preparation time is neither fair to the teacher, the students or the subject.

(4) The incidence of teaching non-vocational agricultural subjects was generally greater for junior teachers.

(5) The majority of teachers in multiple-teacher departments lack sufficient time to properly execute the fundamental role of on-the-farm supervision.

(6) Satisfactory personal relationships between staff members in multiple-teacher departments is considered to be imperative for successful operation.
(7) A relationship exists between those who have written policies for division of responsibility among teachers and the frequency of staff meetings for the purpose of coordinating the departmental activities.

(8) Some form of area teaching allowing for a degree of specialization in teaching is practiced in only about half of the cases studied.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Further investigation is needed in the area relative to the teaching of non-vocational agricultural subjects by teachers in multiple-teacher departments of Washington and Oregon.

The development of a standard plan of operation for multiple-teacher departments should be included as part of the state plan for vocational education in each of the two states. This plan should be used as a guide to insure the inclusion of equipment, facilities and policies which would allow for effectively meeting the needs of the community without hardships placed on the vocational agricultural instructors constituting the particular department. This plan should be specific in its stipulations and yet make allowance for a reasonable amount of local autonomy. A number of areas that should be included are discussed in the following paragraphs.

The maximum number of students per teacher should
be definitely stated and adhered to. This should be approximately forty to forty-five students. When expansion occurs to a point beyond the load for one teacher and not enough for two full time teachers an additional man should be added. In the case where non-vocational agricultural subjects must be taught, provision should be made to provide time for preparation.

To successfully execute the fundamental role of on-the-farm supervision, each teacher should be given at least one hour per school day. An additional hour for lesson planning should also be allowed. This minimum allowance of time will help to reduce the number of hours required of vocational agricultural teachers in the evenings.

Instruction relative to the standard procedures and policies of multiple-teacher departments should be included as a part of the teacher training program. Inservice training classes should be held from time to time for upgrading conditions as the need appears evident.

Satisfactory personal relationships between staff members can be given a greater chance of occurring where a regular schedule of staff meetings is adhered to.

A written agreement among agricultural department staff members should be required so that each teacher clearly understands his responsibilities in relationship
to the total program.

The standard plan should include a policy for the establishment of area teaching. This will allow each teacher a certain degree of specialization.

This is not considered to be all inclusive. However, the adoption of the above recommendations can go to great lengths in providing opportunity for vocational agricultural teachers in multiple-teacher departments to offer a superior program of agricultural education which would truly meet the basic needs of American farm youth.
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Mr. Bert Brown  
Chief Supervisor  
Division of Voc. Agriculture  
Department Of Education  
Olympia, Washington  

Dear Mr. Brown;

Nine years have passed since the completion of my high school vocational agriculture under the supervision of Mr. Ralph Olmstead at Battle Ground. Since that time I have served in the Army, completed college at Oregon State University and have taught vocational agriculture for two years at Estacada, Oregon. At the present time I am working toward the completion of my masters program under the direction of Dr. Henry TenPas and Dr. Philip B. Davis here at OSU.

Multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture have interested me for a number of years because of having had experience with them, first of all, as a student, then as a student-teacher and finally as a vocational agriculture teacher. I have selected this area for my thesis study and would like to include the states of Washington and Oregon.

There has been some concern relative to the utilization of staff members in multiple-teacher departments here in Oregon for teaching non-vocational ag. subjects. Due to inadequate educational preparation, many ag. teachers have found it necessary to devote considerable amounts of time in preparation for teaching these classes which often results in neglect to the vocational agriculture program. This has been especially true of beginning teachers in multiple-man departments.

With respect to the above problem, it is my purpose to study various conditions existing in multiple-teacher departments. Following are a few of the questions which I would like to find answers to:

1. What subjects are being taught by voc. ag. teachers other than voc. ag.?
2. What part of their teaching load is devoted to non-voc. ag. subjects?
3. What effect does the above have on tenure and satisfaction?
4. To what extent are beginning teachers in multiple-teacher departments required to teach out of their field as compared to senior men in multiple-teacher departments?

Information will be gathered through questionnaires mailed to the teachers concerned. I would like to interview approximately ten multiple-teacher departments including some from each of the two states. These interviews will be in addition to the questionnaire which will be sent to all multiple-teacher departments in Washington and Oregon.

If you consider this to be a worthwhile study and within the limits of your policy of administration, I would appreciate your permission to contact the departments concerned in your state. Any suggestions or information that you could offer will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Robert M. Farring
Mr. Robert M. Farring  
618 S. 19th Street  
Corvallis, Oregon

Dear Mr. Farring:

We are very much interested in your study concerning various aspects of multiple-man departments in Vocational Agriculture.

Please feel at liberty to contact any or all of our multiple-man departments. We have 17 of them and they are indicated on the enclosed directory of Vocational Agriculture Instructors in this state.

Sincerely yours,

Bert L. Brown  
Director  
Vocational Agriculture Education
Mr. Robert M. Farring  
618 S. 19th Street  
Corvallis, Oregon

Dear Bob:

I wish to thank you for returning to us the Vocational Form 1's. We understand that we are going to have a program review by the U. S. Office of Education in the near future and so I am glad to have these forms returned to this office.

I have filled out your two forms -- "Record of Information Not Shown on Vocational Form 1" and the present addresses of certain vocational agriculture teachers who have taught in the past in some of our schools. Since the information was not shown on the Vocational Form 1's, it has been quite a job to dig this material out. In several cases I am still not exactly sure of the schedule in these schools back as far as 1954 and 1955. However, this is the best that we can do.

We were able to give you present addresses except for Mervin Hall, who is reported to have taught vocational agriculture at South Kitsap High School in Port Orchard. Actually we can find no record of ever certifying this man to teach vocational agriculture in the State of Washington. His present address is entirely unknown to us; in fact, the man as a man is unknown to us.

In answer to your questions in the letter -- Chester Lybecker did teach at Walla Walla in 1954 and 1955. During this year he taught one class in vocational agriculture for at least one semester -- possibly two. The other five periods of the day were devoted to the direction of the vocational education program since he was the Local Director.
Eisenhower High School in Yakima came into being in 1956-1957, and the former Yakima High School was named Davis High School in honor of a former superintendent of schools in Yakima. It was in this year of 1956-57 that a differentiation was made between the two high schools. Previous to that time they only had Yakima High School.

In answer to your question regarding Pasco, it was only a two-man department during the year 1957-1958. All other years it has been a single-man department.

Sincerely yours,

BERT L. BROWN
Director
Vocational Agriculture Education
Mr. Robert Farring
618 S. 19th street
Corvallis, Oregon

Dear Bob:

We have noted your letter of October 2, requesting the addresses of Lawrence Grover, Carl Rose, and Earl Jones.

Lawrence Grover is working as Public Relations Representative for the Federal Shopping Way, Inc., Federal Way, Washington. His mailing address is 2216 Grand Boulevard, Vancouver, Washington; and he can be reached by telephone at OXford 4-3379. Larry said he would be willing to help you with your project in any way possible.

At this time we do not know the whereabouts of Earl Jones who taught vocational agriculture for us in Ontario. The last I heard, Earl was somewhere in California.

The address for Carl Rose is 11,100 14th Street, Group Box A129, Dawson Creek, British Columbia. I am sure that, if you would send one of your questionnaires to Carl, he would be glad to complete it and send it back to you.

You topic of "Multiple Teacher Departments of Vocational Agriculture" for a thesis is a good one. If our office can be of any further help, please feel free to call on us.

Very truly yours,

Leonard E. Kunzman
Acting Director
Agricultural Education
Dear Fellow Ag. Teachers: (Past and Present)

I have chosen the area of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in Washington and Oregon as the basis of a thesis study. Your co-operation in the completion and return of this questionnaire will provide information needed to aid in the further improvement of vocational agricultural education.

A few minutes of your valuable time will be appreciated in reply to a few questions. If you desire to receive a summary of these findings, please check the blank indicated for this purpose on page one of the questionnaire.

The data being collected is a means of discovering the operating procedures of multiple-teacher departments. No information from any individual department will be made public.

Please answer even if you are not now teaching in a M-T. department.

Sincerely yours,

Robert M. Farring
**Definition of Terms**

**Multiple-Teacher Department**

Any department of vocational agriculture in the public secondary schools which employs more than one vocational agricultural teacher to carry out the functions of the department.

**Junior-Man or Junior-Teacher**

The teacher or teachers employed in a multiple-teacher department having less teaching experience or authority than the teacher in charge of the department.

**Senior-Man or Senior-Teacher**

The teacher having the most teaching experience or having the longest period of employment in the department. Often designated as department head and having major responsibility for the operation of the total program of vocational agricultural education in the school.

---

**A Study of Multiple-Teacher Departments of Vocational Agriculture in Washington and Oregon**

**SECTION ONE**

**JUNIOR-TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE**

Name_________________________ School_________________________

Present Mailing Address_____________________________________

Present Occupation_________________ Present Age___________

(if other than voc. ag. teacher)

There are two parts to this questionnaire; section one for teachers who served as the junior-man in a multiple-teacher department; and section two for those who have served as the senior-man of a multiple-teacher department. If you have served in both capacities, please fill out both sections.

If you are not now teaching vocational agriculture please answer on the basis of the conditions existing while you were teaching in a multiple-teacher department, as indicated in the questionnaire.
Check here if you wish to receive a summary of this study.

Indicate the school where you were employed in a multiple-teacher department for each of the school years listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School year</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>School year</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951-52</td>
<td></td>
<td>1956-57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53</td>
<td></td>
<td>1957-58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-54</td>
<td></td>
<td>1958-59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-55</td>
<td></td>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-56</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ANSWER BY CHECKING THE PROPER ITEM

1. How long did you teach voc. ag. in the school where you were first employed as an ag. teacher in a multiple-man department?
   ____ (a) Years. (Please indicate the number of years)

2. Were you the junior-man throughout your stay in this department?
   ____ (a) yes
   ____ (b) No

3. If the answer to No. 2 above is "no", explain the change which took place.

4. Did you do your student teaching at the school where you were first employed as an ag. teacher in a multiple-man department?
   ____ (a) Yes
   ____ (b) No

5. How long had this been a multiple-teacher ag. department prior to the year you started teaching there?
   ____ (a) Yes    ____ (b) No
Many of the following questions are divided into two parts. If one part does not apply to you, please leave it blank. The headings at the beginning of these questions will apply wherever there are two columns for you to respond to. The left-hand column refers to conditions which existed during your first year of teaching as a junior-man in a multiple-teacher department. The right-hand column is to indicate the situation which existed during the school year of 1960-61 or the last year that you served as a junior-man in a multiple-teacher department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This column is for answers that apply to your first year of teaching as a junior-man.</th>
<th>This column is for the school year 1960-61 or the last year that you served as a junior-man.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. Did you have a non-teaching period in which you could do lesson planning or make on-the-farm visits, etc.?

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

7. Did you teach any other high school subjects in addition to voc. ag.?

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

8. If the answer to No. 7 above is "yes", please answer the following question: In what area or areas did you teach in addition to voc. ag.?

- (a) General Science
- (b) Biology
- (c) Chemistry
- (d) Math or Algebra
- (e) General Shop
- (f) Other - Specify
- (g) General Science
- (h) Biology
- (i) Chemistry
- (j) Math or Algebra
- (k) General Shop
- (l) Other - Specify
This column is for the 79 answers that apply to your first year of teaching as a junior-man.

9. Do you feel that you were *adequately prepared to teach in the above indicated subjects?  
   *Adequate here meaning that you did not have to learn a lot of new material yourself before being able to teach the subject.
   ____ (a) Yes  ____ (c) Yes
   ____ (b) No  ____ (d) No

10. Which statement best represents your feelings about teaching subjects other than voc. ag.?
   ____ (a) I taught them only because it was required and as a temporary arrangement.
   ____ (e) I taught them only because it was required and as a temporary arrangement.
   ____ (b) I welcomed the opportunity to try teaching in another field.
   ____ (f) I welcomed the opportunity to try teaching in another field.
   ____ (c) It made no difference.
   ____ (g) It made no difference.
   ____ (d) Other - please explain.
   ____ (h) Other - please explain.

11. Did your responsibility of teaching non-voc. ag. subjects interfere with the operation of the voc. ag. program?
   ____ (a) Yes - explain if you wish.  ____ (c) Yes - explain if you wish.
   ____ (b) No  ____ (d) No
This column is for the answers that apply to your first year of teaching as a junior-man. This column is for the last year that you served as a junior-man.

12. Was there a written understanding as to the division of responsibilities between the two or more ag. teachers in the department?
   ____ (a) Yes  ____ (c) Yes
   ____ (b) No  ____ (d) No

13. Did each ag. teacher have his own individual classroom?
   ____ (a) Yes  ____ (c) Yes
   ____ (b) No  ____ (d) No

14. Did you have a regular established time at which to meet with the other ag. teacher for the purpose of co-ordinating plans for the operation of the department?
   ____ (a) Yes  ____ (c) Yes
   ____ (b) No  ____ (d) No

15. If you answered "yes" to No. 14, how often did you meet?
   ____ (a) Daily  ____ (d) Daily
   ____ (b) Weekly  ____ (e) Weekly
   ____ (c) Other - Specify  ____ (f) Other - Specify

16. Did you usually visit with the senior ag. teacher during lunch period?
   ____ (a) Yes  ____ (c) Yes
   ____ (b) No  ____ (d) No
This column is for answers that apply to your first year of teaching as a junior-man.

This column is for the school year 1960-61 or the last year that you served as a junior-man.

17. Check the item which best describes the relationship existing between yourself as a junior-teacher and the senior-teacher in the department. (remember to answer both columns)

_____ (a) A definite subordination on the part of the junior-man with most decisions made by the senior-man.

_____ (b) A fairly equal relationship where both parties shared in arriving at decisions.

_____ (c) Each teacher made decisions in his own area of responsibility independent of the other teachers.

_____ (d) Other - please explain.

18. Did you take turns in acting as FFA advisor during the opening ceremonies of meetings?

_____ (a) Yes

_____ (b) No

_____ (c) Yes

_____ (d) No

19. What arrangements are provided to allow for additional education toward a masters degree?

_____ (a) Sabbatical leave

_____ (b) Time off during summer for one teacher

_____ (c) Internship arrangement with teacher training institution.

_____ (d) Other - please explain
20. Do you feel that a voc. ag. teacher should be given time off from the regular school day for on-the-farm supervision?

_____ (a) Yes

_____ (b) No

21. Do you have an adult program?

_____ (a) Yes

_____ (b) No

22. Do you practice "area teaching" or some arrangement whereby each teacher functions as a specialist in only a few of the many areas comprising the total program?

_____ (a) Yes

_____ (b) No

23. How are the students divided among ag. teachers for the purpose of supervision of their farming programs?

_____ (a) By geographical area

_____ (b) By those assigned to each teacher for classroom instruction.

_____ (c) Other - please explain
A Study of Multiple-Teacher Departments of Vocational Agriculture in Washington and Oregon

SECTION TWO

SENIOR-TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Name_____________________________________ School________________

Present Mailing Address____________________________________________________

Present Occupation________________________ Present Age__________
(if other than voc. ag. teaching)

There are two parts to this questionnaire; section one for teachers who served as the junior-man in a multiple-teacher department; and section two for those who have served as the senior-man of a multiple-teacher department. If you have served in both capacities, please fill out both sections.

If you are not now teaching vocational agriculture please answer on the basis of the conditions existing while you were teaching in a multiple-teacher department, as indicated in the questionnaire.

Check here if you wish to receive a summary of this study.

Indicate the school where you were employed in a multiple-teacher department for each of the school years listed below:

School year | School | School year | School
1951-52 | | 1956-57 | |
1952-53 | | 1957-58 | |
1953-54 | | 1958-59 | |
1954-55 | | 1959-60 | |
1955-56 | | 1960-61 | |

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ANSWER BY CHECKING THE PROPER ITEM

1. How long did you teach voc. ag. in the school where you were first employed as an ag. teacher in a multiple-teacher dept?
   ___(a) Years (Please indicate the number of years)
2. How many years have you served as a junior-man prior to accepting major responsibility as a senior-man in a multiple-teacher department?

_____(a) Years (Please indicate the number of years)

3. How many years have you served as the senior-man in a multiple-teacher department?

_____(a) Years (Please indicate the number of years)

4. Did you do your student teaching at the school where you were first employed as an ag. teacher in a multiple-man department?

_____(a) Yes

_____(b) No

Many of the following questions are divided into two parts. If one part does not apply to you, please leave it blank. The headings at the beginning of these questions will apply wherever there are two columns for you to respond to. The left-hand column refers to conditions which existed during your first year of teaching in a multiple-teacher department as a senior-man. The right-hand column is to indicate the situation which existed during the school year 1960-61 or the last year that you served as a senior-man.

This column is for answers that apply to your first year of teaching as a senior-man

This column is for the school year 1960-61 or the last year that you served as a senior-man.

5. Have you ever been called upon to teach any non-vocational ag. courses in high school during the time that you were serving as the senior-man in a multiple-teacher department?

_____(a) Yes

_____(c) Yes

_____(b) No

_____(d) No
6. If the answer to No. 5 above was "yes", please answer the following question: In what area or areas did you teach in addition to voc. ag.?

- (a) General Science
- (b) Biology
- (c) Chemistry
- (d) Math or Algebra
- (e) General Shop
- (f) Other - specify
- (g) General Science
- (h) Biology
- (i) Chemistry
- (j) Math or Algebra
- (k) General Shop
- (l) Other - specify

7. Do you feel that you were adequately prepared to teach in the above indicated subjects? Adequate here meaning that you did not have to learn a lot of new material yourself before being able to teach the subject.

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

8. What is your preference when contemplating the hiring of a teacher to fill a vacancy in the department headed by you?

- (a) Prefer an experienced teacher
- (b) Prefer a beginning teacher
- (c) No preference

9. Were you consulted in the selection of new teachers to fill existing vacancies in your department?

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

10. What is your attitude toward the junior teacher in your department being required to teach non-vocational ag. subjects?
11. What are some of the advantages or disadvantages of a multiple-teacher department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Do you feel that there will be an increase in the number of multiple-teacher departments in your state?

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

13. Did you have a non-teaching period in which you could do lesson planning or make on-the-farm visits, etc.? (Be sure to answer both columns)

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

14. Did your responsibilities of teaching non-voc. ag. subjects interfere with the operation of the voc. ag. program?

- (a) Yes (explain if you wish)
- (b) No

15. Which statement best represents your feelings about teaching subjects other than voc. ag.?

- (a) I taught them only because it was required and as a temporary arrangement.
- (b) I welcomed the opportunity to try teaching in another field.
- (c) It made no difference
- (d) Other - please explain

- (e) I taught them only because it was required and as a temporary arrangement.
- (f) I welcomed the opportunity to try teaching in another field.
- (g) It made no difference
- (h) Other - please explain
16. Was there a written understanding as to the division of responsibilities between the two or more teachers in the department?

   (a) Yes  
   (b) No 

17. Did each ag. teacher have his own individual classroom?

   (a) Yes  
   (b) No 

18. Did you have a regular established time at which to meet with the other ag. teacher or teachers for the purpose of co-ordinating plans for the operation of the department?

   (a) Yes  
   (b) No 

19. If you answered "yes" to No. 18, how often did you meet?

   (a) Daily  
   (b) Weekly  
   (c) Other - specify  

20. Did you usually visit with the junior-ag. teacher during lunch period?

   (a) Yes  
   (b) No
This column is for answers that apply to your first year of teaching as a senior-man. This column is for the school year 1960-61 or the last year that you served as a senior-man.

21. Check the item which best describes the relationship existing between yourself as a senior-teacher and the junior-man or men in the department. (Please remember to answer for both columns as explained on page 2 of this questionnaire)

_____ (a) A definite subordination of the part of the junior-man with most of the decisions made by the senior-man.

_____ (b) A fairly equal relationship where both or all parties shared in arriving at decisions.

_____ (c) Each teacher made decisions in his own area of responsibility independent of the other teachers.

_____ (d) Other - please explain

_____ (e) (f) (g) (h)

22. Did you take turns in acting as FFA advisor during the opening ceremonies of meetings?

_____ (a) Yes

_____ (b) No

_____ (c) Yes

_____ (d) No

23. What arrangements are provided to allow for additional education toward a masters degree?

_____ (a) Sabbatical leave

_____ (b) Time off during summer for one teacher

_____ (c) Internship arrangement with teacher training institution

_____ (d) Other - please explain

24. Do you feel that a voc. ag. teacher should be given time off from regular school day for on-the-farm supervision?

_____ (a) Yes

_____ (b) No
25. Do you have an adult program?

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

26. Do you practice "area teaching" or some arrangement whereby each teacher functions as a specialist in only a few of the many areas comprising the total program?

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

27. How are the students divided among the ag. teachers for the purpose of supervision of their farming programs?

- (a) By geographical area
- (b) By those assigned to each teacher for classroom instruction
- (c) Other - explain.