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AN ASSESSMENT OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVE WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS IN OREGON HIGH SCHOOLS

I. INTRODUCTION

Cooperative work experience programs in vocational agriculture, thought of by many as being founded under a new concept in career education, in reality were formed on guidelines established and tested for years.

The basic principles forming the guidelines for the program are nearly identical to guidelines established by the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 for supervised farming programs in agricultural education. The "learning by doing" principle that has guided supervised farming programs for fifty-eight years still supports the belief that students in vocational agriculture should have the opportunity to apply classroom concepts, principles, and competencies in realistic work situations.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 (25) gave vocational agriculture the legal direction to expand agricultural supervised occupational experience programs to off-farm settings. This allowed vocational agricultural programs to meet the trend of an increasing off-farm labor force in agriculture with a decreasing number of persons actually farming. Thus came a real need for preparing students in vocational agriculture to fill the ever-increasing number...
of off-farm agricultural occupations using the guidelines set forth by the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 for agricultural supervised farming projects. To accomplish this preparation in Oregon, cooperative work experience programs were established and developed in high schools with vocational agricultural programs.

**Problem**

Cooperative work experience programs in Oregon high school vocational agricultural programs share the common goal of providing students in agriculture with off-farm supervised occupational experience. Other than this common goal, little specific information is known about program involvement, program structure, program planning, and use of available resources.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to determine the program structure, program involvement, program planning, and use of available resources of agricultural cooperative work experience programs in Oregon high schools by assessing the existing agricultural cooperative work experience programs in the area of, advisory committee involvement, cooperative work experience stations, selection of cooperative work experience students, training agreements,
cooperative work experience supervision, training plans, records and reports, and general information.

**Limitations**

1. This study was limited to the state of Oregon.

2. This study includes only those high schools with vocational agricultural programs in 1973. This study does not include those high schools without vocational agricultural programs but with cooperative work experience students in agriculture placed in Diversified Occupational Programs.

3. The instrument used to assess the cooperative work experience programs was a mailed questionnaire rather than a personal interview. A questionnaire is limited in that sentence structure and meaning may be misinterpreted by the respondent.

4. It was further limited in that some of the vocational agricultural departments surveyed did not respond by returning the questionnaire.

**Procedure**

**Phase I**

The first phase of this study consisted of reviewing related literature and similar studies to determine the assessment criteria
in the areas of; advisory committee involvement, cooperative work experience supervision, training plans, records and reports, and general information. The author also discussed with Gordon Galbraith, Consultant for Agricultural Education, the assessment criteria in each of the above areas.

Phase II

The second phase of this study consisted of selecting those high schools to be surveyed. Since there was no apparent means of identifying those schools with agricultural cooperative work experience programs, all of the high schools with vocational agricultural programs were sent questionnaires. The agricultural programs not utilizing a cooperative work experience program were asked to return the questionnaire indicating they did not have a cooperative work experience program.

Phase III

The third phase was to develop a questionnaire to send to the vocational agricultural departments. A questionnaire was developed and revised. Rod Juranek and Lynn Reagan, vocational agricultural instructors, and Gordon Galbraith, Consultant for Agricultural Education, tested the questionnaire. A brief letter of explanation, a
self-addressed return envelope, and a questionnaire were sent to each vocational agricultural department in the state of Oregon.

Phase IV

The final phase of this study consisted of analyzing and summarizing the data received from the returned questionnaires. From the data received, the author will identify program structure, program involvement, program planning, and use of available resources. Also, the author made recommendations for the improvement of agricultural cooperative work experience programs in Oregon.

Background Information

Through an agricultural cluster curriculum, an agricultural student can receive a broad preparation common to many agricultural occupations. Students in vocational agriculture develop competencies in agricultural production, agricultural supplies, agricultural mechanics, agricultural processing, ornamental horticulture, forestry, agricultural resources, and agricultural services. These areas are complemented by an integration with youth leadership provided through the youth organization, the Future Farmers of America (FFA), and strengthened and enhanced by a supervised occupational experience program.

Three basic types of supervised occupational experience have
proven most effective for vocational agricultural students: supervised farming projects; supervised laboratory work experience; and supervised cooperative work experience.

Supervised farming projects allow the agricultural student to assume personal responsibility and management of livestock or crops projects. Cooperative work experience provides the student with practical application of skills and knowledge in one of the many off-farm agricultural occupations. Students in agriculture who lack the opportunities for either a supervised farming project or a cooperative work experience can be placed in supervised laboratory work experience. Students are placed on farms, school land laboratories, forestry laboratories, or in greenhouses.

Unlike the student with a supervised farming project or supervised laboratory work experience, the cooperative work experience students are placed with employers in agribusiness service, processing, or in distribution for work experience consistent with their occupational goals.

Definitions of Terms

For reasons of clarity, the following terms are defined:

1. **Supervised Occupational Experience**: An essential part of occupational preparation in the agricultural cluster. Three types of supervised occupational experience have proved to be
most effective for agricultural students: supervised farming projects; supervised laboratory work experience; and supervised cooperative work experience.

2. **Agricultural Cluster:** An instructional program that includes agricultural science and mechanics integrated with youth leadership through the Future Farmers of America (FFA) and strengthened with supervised occupational experience. Instruction within the cluster centers around the following subject matter areas; animal science, plant science, agricultural mechanics, soil science, agricultural business management, and agricultural leadership.

3. **Supervised Cooperative Work Experience:** An occupational experience that provides the agricultural student with practical application of skills and knowledge in one of many agricultural occupations. Students placed in cooperative work experience are employed in agribusiness, service, processing, or in distribution to meet their occupational goals.

4. **Off-Farm Agricultural Occupation:** An occupation in which the worker needs competency in one or more of the primary areas of plant science, animal science, soil science, agricultural mechanics, agricultural business, and management.

5. **Agricultural Competencies:** The knowledge and skills of basic production agriculture (crop production, animal science, farm
mechanics, soil science and agricultural business and management) which are required by a person employed in an off-farm agricultural occupation.

6. **Advisory Committee**: A group of persons, usually outside the education profession, appointed by the school board for the purpose of offering counsel to the school regarding the career education program, with particular attention toward keeping the program practical and attuned to community needs. Members are representatives of the local community who are interested in the activities with which the program is concerned.

7. **Competencies**: Knowledge and skills which are required by a person in order to become employed in a particular occupation and advance in that occupation.

8. **Supervising Teacher**: The vocational agricultural instructor who has the responsibility for teaching the related instruction, for coordinating the cooperative work experience program, and for supervising cooperative work experience students.

9. **Training Agreement**: A document listing the terms of employment of a trainee in an approved Training Station. The agreement contains the responsibilities of the parent, school, student, and employer.

10. **Training Plan**: A listing of the activities in which the student will be engaged at the training station. In addition, there
appears a listing of the information that should be taught in the related instruction class.

11. **Training Station:** The agricultural business or firm in which the student will work while participating in the cooperative work experience program. Sometimes is referred to as the "training center."
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

There have been few research studied of agricultural cooperative work experience programs. This fact is directly attributed to the relatively short time cooperative work experience programs in agriculture and other career oriented high school programs have been used. The preponderance of literature dealing with cooperative work experience programs are professional opinions and established program guidelines developed by departments of education, universities and professional authorities.

Advisory Committee

It has been observed that "the ideal way to obtain job competence is by supplementing a classroom laboratory and instruction with the learning opportunities of an actual job" (5, p. 2). To accomplish this competence the community must serve as an extension of the classroom. Advisory committees serve as advisory links between the classroom and the community.

Moore (22) states that keeping an advisory committee informed is the key to capitalizing on the committee's resources. He also stressed that a well-informed and active advisory committee should
include as its regular activities: evaluation of cooperative work experience and project training; suggesting courses of study and curriculum guidelines for a cooperative work experience program; providing assistance in the recruitment and screening of students; providing assistance in setting qualifications for selecting cooperative work experience students; and advise on publicizing the proposed cooperative work experience program. Along the same lines, the University of Nebraska (15, p. 19) recommends that the agricultural advisory committee help locate training stations, publicize and promote the program, and set standards for student selection.

Dillon (12) observed that the local advisory committee, whether it serves the entire school or just a subject area, should make recommendations on courses to be offered, clientele to be served, and financial needs. Like Dillon, Meeks (21) states the advisory committee should be involved with the planning of program curricula and in validating material content. This will produce a curriculum that meets the students' social and economic needs as well as for necessary skills and related knowledge.

Forrest (14), in a study involving 100 randomly selected vocational teachers from North Carolina, found that 68 percent of those teachers surveyed felt that citizen groups, to include an advisory committee, should be directly involved in the planning of cooperative work experience programs. Anderson and Bender (2, p. 11), in a
similar study involving 317 vocational teachers throughout the United States, found that only 50.4 percent of those teachers surveyed were utilizing an advisory committee for their cooperative work experience program. The University of the State of New York, in their Cooperative Work Experience Manual for Business and Distributive Education (5, 23-38), recommends that work experience programs in the developmental phase seriously consider the use of an advisory committee. In a similar publication (31, pp 1-9) by the same university it was recommended that programs in development use an advisory committee.

**Selection of Cooperative Work Experience Students and Stations**

There have been many professional observations leading to recommended guidelines important in the selection of cooperative work experience students and training stations. This indicates the existing concern and identified importance both student and training station selection has on work experience programs today.

Pender (24) has observed that one of the most important elements of an effective cooperative training program is the systematic and careful selection of students to participate in the program. A study by Cushman, Hill, and Miller (8, p. 35) found that one of the high priority items is placing the student in out-of-school settings
provide real job experience closely related to the students' course of study. The University of Nebraska (15, p. 43-44) recognizing the importance of student selection, suggests the use of a criteria check sheet containing items such as age, personal characteristics, school attendance record, etc., for the systematic selection of students to enter agricultural cooperative work experience. The Oregon Department of Education (4, p. 10) suggests that student selection and hiring be completed through a systematically planned procedure. Research conducted by Anderson and Bender (2, p. 15) revealed that vocational agricultural instructors representing 44 states found having a definite plan for screening and selecting students for cooperative work experience of considerable to extreme importance. The same study revealed (2, p. 11) that 81.3 percent of the 317 teachers surveyed throughout the United States in Agriculture, Distributive Education, and Trades and Industry were utilizing student selection standards.

The student qualifications for placement in a cooperative training program have been discussed and studied in many ways. Craig (7), in a 1967 study of 31 vocational agricultural teachers and 62 agricultural business employers, recommended that students should be at least high school juniors or seniors enrolled in agriculture before being placed in a cooperative work experience station. He also found that students should be selected on their work experience needs, vocational plans, and work experience interests.
On the other hand, Pender (24) observed that students should possess a degree of maturity to begin in the adult world of occupational involvement. He also found that the student should have good school attendance, present a neat and clean appearance, and possess some of the elementary abilities and skills necessary for functioning in the job. Furthermore, Pender has observed that a student who is fair, courteous, and shows respect in the classroom will most likely transfer his behavior to his work experience and to his employer, fellow employees, and customers.

Peifer (23), in a study of eight distributive occupational programs, found that no minimum over-all grade average is required for students to be enrolled in any of the surveyed distributive occupational programs. He also found that 16 was the optimum placement age. In New York State one of the standards for an industrial educational program is that student be 16 years old or older and work a minimum of 15 hours per week.

Klaurens (17) has found that students in distributive education judge the wealth of the program by the degree of job satisfaction and occupational growth they derive from the work experience. From this finding she strongly believes that a student should be placed in a training station which provides the potentials for satisfaction.

In a 1964 study of 85 high schools, Mascari (19) found that 31 percent of the schools used grades most frequently in the placement
and selection of cooperative work experience students while 25 percent used teacher recommendations, 23 percent used student interest, 23 percent attendance, and 19 percent used interviews.

In the development of guidelines successful in Pennsylvania vocational agricultural programs, Hoover (16) found that students should be surveyed for work experience interest areas prior to student selection.

Several authorities strongly agree that cooperative work experience stations be systematically selected along with the cooperative work experience students. Dupy (6) in a study of 28 vocational agricultural instructors from ten states, found that securing qualified agricultural businesses to act as training stations ranked as their greatest problem with a cooperative work program. In a similar study, Clemons (6) also found the major weakness of the program was the difficulty of locating good job placement stations. Pender (24) recommends that cooperative work experience stations be systematically selected to meet the needs for, practical work experience, occupational preparation, direction in choosing an occupational field on which to concentrate in college, financial assistance to prolong school life, and increase self reliance and poise.

Like Dupy and Pender, Anderson and Bender (2, p. 16) in a study involving 317 vocational teachers from 44 states found that 76.0 percent of the teachers were utilizing a set of training station
selection standards. In the same study, the teachers felt that a systematic and well-planned method of selecting training stations was of considerable to extreme importance. The University of the State of New York (5, p. 29) stressed as a key point of operation the selection of appropriate work experience stations.

Recognizing the importance of training station selection to the total cooperative work experience program success, the University of Nebraska (15, p. 43-44) suggests using a standardized 12 criteria check sheet for selecting training stations.

Dillon (12) in a 1973 study, found that the local school has the obligation to help students find their first job. Keeping in trend with this observation, Ryan (27) reported that Georgia is initiating a program called "Employ-Ability-Days." The program is designed to computerize placement requirements for job stations and to update these requirements daily. This will hopefully give a uniform selection of training stations and students.

In the field of distributive education, Klaurens (17) found that consideration must be given to locate work experience stations that offer the potentials for student satisfaction and growth.

Training Plans and Agreements

Numerous professional articles have been published stressing
the importance of training plans in cooperative work experience programs.

In a study including 317 vocational teachers throughout the United States, Anderson and Bender (2, p. 11) found that 78.1 percent of the teachers were utilizing training plans in their program. In the same study, vocational agricultural representatives from 44 states indicated that a written training plan listing the activities the student will engage in at the work station is of considerable to extreme importance (2, p. 20).

The University of the State of New York (30, p. 29) and the Oregon Department of Education (4, p. 10) both established guidelines for a strong cooperative work experience program, the development and maintenance of training plans. The University of Nebraska, in their handbook for agricultural work experience (15, p. 82), recommended that the teacher-coordinator should assume responsibility for preparation of the final training plan after groundwork had been made by the student, teacher, and employer.

Statler (29) concluded that a successful training program in cooperative work experience is only as good as the individual training plan. He also found that much good comes from having students prepare their own training plan. Like Statler, Albracht (1) observed that the heart of the Kansas Agricultural Career Experience program (KACE) was training plans. He also observed that a work experience
program becomes relevant and interesting to the student when the training plan is jointly developed by the employer, student, and teacher-coordinator.

Binkley (3) found that cooperation depends heavily on employer understanding. This understanding can be strengthened by a training plan developed by the student, teacher, and employer. In a study to identify the responsibilities of the teacher and employer in cooperative work experience, Craig (7) found, as did Binkley and Statler, that the training plan should be developed jointly by the student, teacher and employer. Furthermore, he found that the training plan should remain flexible enough so that the student can progress from simple tasks to more complex tasks during the work experience.

To successfully develop a training plan, McMillion (12) suggested: a study of competencies be made well in advance of the development of the training plan with the employer, involve the student in preparing the preliminary training plan, classify how many hours are to be included in the experience, the level of performance selected by the student should reflect his occupational objective, and not make the training plan too narrow.

Even though not legally binding, training agreements serve as an excellent means of clearly stating student, employer, parent, and school responsibilities. Dillon (12) states that the partners involved in his training agreements are the teacher, student, employer, and
parent. The parent sanctions the arrangements, and the student, teacher, and employer initiate the training plan, listing the tasks and competencies the student will learn at school and implement on the job, and those he will both learn and perform on the job.

Anderson and Bender (2, p. 11) found that 70.5 percent of the 317 vocational teachers they surveyed in 1967 utilized training agreements. The same test group thought it was of considerable to extreme importance to have a written training plan between the parent, school, employer, and student listing responsibilities.

Loven (18) found that the overall content of a training agreement depends on each local situation and, if nothing else, the agreement should clearly define the responsibilities of the student, employer, and teacher-coordinator.

In the development of guidelines successful in Pennsylvania Vocational Agricultural Programs, Hoover (16) found that work experience agreements must be signed by the teacher, employer, parent, and student.

Cooperative Work Experience Supervision

Through the development of guidelines successful in Pennsylvania Vocational Agricultural Programs, Hoover (16) found that successful cooperative work experience programs are those in which the teacher of agriculture works closely with business and parents,
and supervises students while they are on the job. Like Hoover, Simmons (28) cited that cooperative work experience should be an extension of the instruction given by the instructor accomplished through close cooperation with the employer ensuring that the student receives proper occupational training and supervision.

Cushman, Hill, and Miller (8, p. 35) found that most teachers in their study place high priority emphasis on facilitating coordination of the program through frequent teacher visits to the work location. Along the same line, Dillon (12) observed that the teachers' responsibility in work experience is to visit the student at the work station and discuss his progress, solve problems, and find ways to ensure that the school and the on-the-job program are properly coordinated.

The University of the State of New York (30, p. 11-12) (5, p. 29) and the Oregon Department of Education (4, p. 11) strongly recommend planning on-the-job supervision as a cooperative work experience program guideline.

A study conducted by Davis and Jurgenson (10) showed that the parent, school, student, and employer expected and welcomed supervision by the teacher.

Using experience as a conclusion basis, Binkley (3) concluded that successful supervision stems from spending adequate time supervising, providing sound supervision from the start, and
observing the student at work but not interfering with him.

Klaurens (17) found that supervision in Distributive Education affords the supervising teacher the basis to offer education as the need arises. Along the same lines, McMillion (20) found that the training supervisor must know what the student is learning in class to properly supervise him.

Anderson and Bender (2, p. 17) found that the vocational agricultural teachers surveyed in their study agreed that the teacher-coordinator should have an organized and systematic plan for visiting students at training stations. They rated their agreement as of considerable to extreme importance.

**Records and Reports**

Several professional observations and guidelines have been established emphasizing the importance of cooperative work experience records and reports.

The University of the State of New York (31) and the Oregon Department of Education (4, p. 12) both suggest that records should be kept on each work experience student and progress be recorded after each work experience visit. Both suggestions are sound elements of program development and operation.

A study conducted by Anderson and Bender (2, p. 18) revealed that vocational agricultural instructors representing 44 states found
of considerable to extreme importance the maintenance of certain reports and records to insure a sound and operational cooperative work experience program.

The University of Nebraska (15, p. 103) has recommended that the student's cooperative work experience file contain, permanent records, employer's evaluation, supervision reports, training plans, training agreements, completed student records, and evaluation forms.

Loven (18) found that progress profiles allow the coordinator and student to have a continuous summary of each student's progress and effectively evaluate each training station by indicating to what extent each student has been trained.

In a 1970 study of 100 randomly selected vocational agricultural teachers from North Carolina, Forrest (14) found that 90 percent of the teachers surveyed agreed that it was the teacher-coordinator's responsibility to assist guidance counselors in maintaining up-to-date information and progress on work experience student's cumulative files.
III. PRESENTATION OF DATA

This study covers those Oregon High Schools identified in 1973 as having reimbursable vocational agricultural departments. All 90 of the identified departments were surveyed on their agricultural cooperative work experience program structure, program involvement, program planning, and use of available resources. The results can be best presented by a consideration of the components of the questionnaire.

**Questionnaires Sent and Returned**

Of the 90 questionnaires sent on the first mailing 52 or 57.7 percent were completed and returned. Those schools not returning the first questionnaire were mailed another two months later. Of the 38 questionnaires sent on the second mailing 13 were returned and answered. This gave a total of 65 or 72.2 percent questionnaires completed and returned. Table 1 shows the results of the questionnaires sent, returned completed, and not returned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number sent</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned answered</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreturned</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Information

Table 2 shows the number of surveyed schools that actually had an agricultural cooperative work experience program. The survey revealed that only 63.1 percent or 41 of the schools surveyed had a cooperative work experience program in agriculture.

Table 2. Agricultural cooperative work experience involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departments with cooperative work experience programs</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments without cooperative work experience programs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total agricultural departments surveyed</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those agricultural departments with cooperative work experience programs, as shown in Table 3, have an average of 11.2 more students in their agricultural program than do those departments with no cooperative work experience program. It was also revealed that an average of 13.4 agricultural students in those schools with a cooperative work experience program were on a cooperative work experience. This is over 25 percent of the total average number of agricultural students in those schools and dramatizes the importance of a cooperative work experience program in providing each student with supervised occupational experience.
### Table 3. Student involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average no. of students</th>
<th>Median no. of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departments with cooperative work experience programs</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments without cooperative work experience programs</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience involvement</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All questionnaire results that follow are based on the responses received from the 41 vocational agricultural departments with agricultural cooperative work experience programs.

Table 4 indicates the number of schools with agricultural cooperative work experience programs that give grades, credit, and summer credit for cooperative work experience and require a minimum number of hours of cooperative work experience completed to receive credit. Since cooperative work is designed to be a supervised occupational learning experience not available within the classroom, the study clearly shows that not all of the schools with an agricultural cooperative work program evaluate and reward their work experience students for successfully completed work experience. Furthermore, the study revealed that slightly over 50 percent of the schools gave credit for cooperative work experience completed during the
summer when the majority of agricultural production, processing, and service is rendered.

Table 4. Student credit and grades for cooperative work experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide grades and credit for</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide credit for summer</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require a minimum number of hours to</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receive credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those schools that required a minimum number of hours of cooperative work experience successfully completed to receive credit, required an average of 175.9 hours of work experience completed per credit as shown in Table 5. If a student in these schools worked the recommended 15 hours per week he would complete the 175.9 hour average revealed in the study in less than 12 weeks.

Table 5. Minimum hours of work experience completed to receive credit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of cooperative work experience</th>
<th>Average hours</th>
<th>Median hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>175.9</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agricultural Advisory Committee

As shown on Table 6, the agricultural advisory committee is being used to publicize, promote, and evaluate the agricultural cooperative work experience program in less than two-thirds of the schools with a work experience program in agriculture. This indicates that over one-third of the departments with cooperative work experience programs in agriculture are not utilizing a strong resource that can serve as a vital link between the community and the school.

Table 6. Agricultural advisory committee involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in publicizing and promoting the program</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in program evaluation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in developing and locating work experience stations</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in selection of cooperative work experience stations</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selection of Cooperative Work Experience Students

Table 7 shows that only 19 or 46.3 percent of the agricultural departments with cooperative work experience programs in agriculture have a planned method of systematically selecting their cooperative work experience students. This low percentage is expected when one considers that only 24 or 58.5 percent of the schools presently survey their students yearly on work experience interests and only 15 or 36.6 percent have a minimum set of personality standards guiding the selection of their agricultural cooperative work experience students.

Table 7. Cooperative work experience student selection criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department has an established selection plan</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students surveyed yearly on work experience interests</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students permitted to work a portion of the regular school day</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department has a minimum set of personality standards guiding student selection</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 clearly reveals that final selection of the agricultural cooperative work experience student is not being made by the employer in all schools. A closer look shows that 9.8 percent of the schools surveyed with a cooperative work experience program in agriculture had the vocational agricultural instructor make the final student selection while 24.4 percent had final selection made jointly by the vocational agricultural instructor and the employer.

Table 8. Employer interviews, minimum work age and final selection of cooperative work experience students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student-employer interview before employment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Conducted</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Not conducted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Minimum age student can enter cooperative work experience:** |        |         |
| 1) 14 years old                        | 17     | 41.5    |
| 2) 15 years old                         | 7      | 17.1    |
| 3) 16 years old                         | 17     | 41.5    |
| **Total**                                | 41     | 100.1   |

| **Final selection of the student made by:** |        |         |
| 1) The employer                           | 27     | 65.9    |
| 2) The Vo-Ag instructor                    | 4      | 9.8     |
| 3) Both the employer and Vo-Ag instructor  | 10     | 24.4    |
| **Total**                                 | 41     | 100.1   |
The study also revealed that the majority of those schools with an agricultural cooperative work experience program favored their students entering a work experience at either 14 or 16 years of age. The difference in age may be accounted for by the fact 14 year olds are required to have a work permit and do not have a driver's license. In some rural areas this may lead to employment and transportation problems.

**Training Agreements**

Table 9. Training agreements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training agreement for each student on cooperative work experience</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training agreement for each student on cooperative work experience</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training agreement contains:

1) Signatures and responsibilities of the teacher, parent, student and employer

   - Yes: 37 (90.2)
   - No: 4 (9.8)

2) Duration of the work period

   - Yes: 34 (82.9)
   - No: 7 (17.1)

3) The time schedule of work

   - Yes: 32 (78.0)
   - No: 9 (22.0)

As shown in Table 9, 36 or 87.8 percent of the agricultural departments with cooperative work experience programs had training agreements for each student in the program. Although training agreements are not legally binding, they do help ensure that the parent,
student, employer, and supervising teacher understand their respective responsibilities. The study revealed that 90.2 percent or 37 of the schools were including in their training agreements the signatures and responsibilities of the teacher, parent, student, and employer.

Selection of Cooperative Work Experience Stations

Questionnaire responses revealed that less than 50 percent of the time 23 or 56.1 percent of those schools with a cooperative work experience program in agriculture were using a planned method of selecting work experience stations.

Table 10. Selection of work experience stations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A planned method of selecting work experience stations is being used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25% of the time</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50% of the time</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-74% of the time</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-100% of the time</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the questionnaire impressively revealed that 39 or 95.1 percent of the departments stated that the employer understood the objectives of the program before a student is placed in the
cooperative work experience station. It was also found that an average of 37 percent of the students and a median of 30 percent of the students involved in cooperative work experience find their own work stations.

Cooperative Work Experience Supervision

Respondents were asked to estimate how often they actually observed the student at work. It was revealed that they observe their students working, during a scheduled visit, over 75 percent of the time.

Table 11. Student supervision (estimated).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervising teacher observes the student at work:</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) 0-25% of the time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 26-50% of the time</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 51-74% of the time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) 75-100% of the time</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 shows that the supervising teacher makes an average 2.8 cooperative work experience visits per week during the school year and spends an average of 3.0 hours per week making these visits.
It must be remembered that the time the supervising teacher spends making visits is on top of his regular school class load. During the summer, when the majority of agricultural harvesting, processing, and service is rendered and the supervising teacher has no regular in-school class load, an average of 6.6 supervised work experience visits are made per week with an average of 5.8 hours per week spent making these visits.

Table 12. Cooperative work experience supervision visits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision visits/week during:</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The school year</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The summer</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours spent on supervision/week during:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The school year</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The summer</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training Plans

Those schools with cooperative work experience programs in agriculture indicated that an average of 68.8 percent of their cooperative work experience students have written training plans listing the students' learning activities. It was also found that 36 or 87.8 percent of the departments had the employer contribute to the content of the
students' training plan and 34 or 82.9 percent revised and updated the students' training plan to cover individual work experience changes.

**Records and Reports**

Of the schools with an agricultural cooperative work experience program, the study revealed that 36 or 87.8 percent are maintaining a file on each cooperative work experience student. The contents of the work experience file are shown in Table 13.

**Table 13. Work experience file contents.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work permit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer's evaluation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training plan</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision reports</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training agreements</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of work completed</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment certificate date</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractor operator permit verification</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 clearly reveals that 35 or 85.4 percent of the agricultural departments with a cooperative work experience program have student progress recorded after each cooperative work experience visit. This indicates the schools' concern over student evaluation and program accountability. Despite this concern, only 21 or 51.2 percent of the schools made student progress available to the work experience student's counselor and permanent file.

Table 14. Student progress report maintenance and use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student progress recorded</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after each visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student progress made</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>available to student's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counselor and permanent file</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. COMPARISON WITH ACCEPTED CONCEPTS AND PRINCIPLES

Resnick and Ricciuti (26) observed that many educators have chosen to ignore the practical needs of students and continue to "traditionally educate" them for further formal education. They reported that such programs may satisfy the needs for 20-30 percent of our high school graduates who enter college but do not meet the needs of the majority who must find employment and satisfying life roles in a "post-industrial, service-oriented society." The study reveals that 36.9 percent of those schools in Oregon with an agricultural program are not providing their students, through a cooperative work experience program, the opportunity to experience off-farm employment in hopes of finding a satisfying life role.

Professional observations made by Forrest (14), Moore (22), Meeks (21), and Dillon (12) encouraged the use of the agricultural advisory committee in program publicizing, promotion, evaluation, planning, and work station selection. The University of the State of New York (5 and 3) strongly encouraged the use of an advisory committee in work experience program planning. The study showed that less than 70 percent of those Oregon High Schools with an agricultural cooperative work experience program were using their advisory
committee to promote, publicize and evaluate their program, and locate and select new work experience stations.

Of those 41 schools with a cooperative work experience program in agriculture, only 19 or 46.3 percent indicated they had an established plan for the selection of their cooperative work experience students. Observations made by Pender (24), Cushman, Hill, and Miller (8) revealed that one of the most important and high priority items of any cooperative work experience program should be the systematically planned, and careful selection of cooperative work experience students. These professional observations are further strengthened by similar recommendations made by the Oregon Department of Education (4) and the University of Nebraska (15).

Studies conducted by Dupy (13), Clemons (6), and Pender (24) found that securing qualified work experience stations is often the greatest problem with a cooperative work experience program and strongly recommended the work station by systematically selected from a master plan. In those Oregon high schools with a cooperative work experience program in agriculture a planned method of selecting work experience stations was being used less than 50 percent of the time by only 56.2 percent of the schools.

Although not legally binding, training agreements are maintained on cooperative work experience students in 36 or 87.8 percent of those schools with an agricultural cooperative work experience
program. This indicates that a majority of the schools are concerned about student, parent, school, and employer responsibilities in a cooperative work experience. Studies conducted by Anderson and Bender (2, p. 11) showed that vocational teachers consider the training agreement of considerable to extreme importance.

A study conducted by Hoover (16) in the development of guidelines successful in Pennsylvania Vocational Agricultural Programs revealed that a successful cooperative work experience program stems from close and adequate supervision of the student. The Oregon Department of Education (4) strongly recommends on-the-job supervision as a program guideline. In Oregon, the study revealed that the supervising teacher spends an average of 3.0 hours per week making an average of 2.8 work experience visits per week during the school year. During the summer it was found that the number increases to 6.6 visits per week with an average of 5.8 hours per week spent making the visits. Considering that the average number of agricultural cooperative students per school was 13.4, it appears that adequate supervision is being given.

Those schools with an agricultural cooperative work experience program indicated that an average of 68.8 percent of their work experience students have written training plans listing the student's learning activities. From a study conducted by Statler (29) on training plans, it was concluded that a successful training program
in cooperative work experience is only as good as the student's individual training plan. The University of the State of New York (5) and the Oregon Department of Education (4) both recommend the use of training plans as program guidelines.

A previous study conducted by Loven (18) indicated that accurate and timely progress records on each work experience student are necessary for training evaluation and student progress. In Oregon, it was found that 36 or 87.8 percent of the schools maintained a progress file on each cooperative work experience student.
V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Vocational agriculture was established by the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 and provided students in our public secondary schools with the opportunity to prepare for farming occupations. Supervised farming projects, an integral part of the original program, enabled the student to apply classroom competencies, principles, and concepts in a realistic work situation. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 (25) broadened vocational agriculture so that it would prepare students for off-farm as well as on-farm occupations. From this Act came cooperative work experience in agriculture and provided the student with the opportunity to apply the basic classroom competencies, principles, and concepts in real off-farm agricultural work situations.

The purpose of this study was to determine the program structure, program involvement, program planning, and use of available resources of agricultural cooperative work experience programs in Oregon high schools. This was accomplished by assessing the existing agricultural cooperative work experience programs in the areas of; advisory committee involvement, cooperative work experience stations, selection of cooperative work experience students,
training agreements, cooperative work experience supervision, training plans, records and reports, and general information.

Data collected for this survey were obtained by sending questionnaires to the 90 high schools identified as having vocational agricultural departments. Completed questionnaires were received from 65 or 72.2 percent of the school agricultural departments. Of those 72.2 percent responding to the questionnaire, 41 or 63.1 percent indicated having an agricultural cooperative work experience program.

It was found that 38 or 92.7 percent of those schools with cooperative work experience programs in agriculture were giving credit for an average of 175.9 hours of work experience completed successfully.

Fewer than 70 percent of the schools with agricultural cooperative work experience programs were using their agricultural advisory committee to publicize, promote (27 or 65.9 percent), and evaluate the program (26 or 63.4 percent), and develop and locate new cooperative work experience stations.

Of those 41 schools with cooperative work experience programs in agriculture, only 19 or 46.3 percent indicated they had an established plan for selecting cooperative work experience students and a planned method of selecting cooperative work experience stations was
being used less than 50 percent of the time by 23 or 56.2 percent of the schools.

The study revealed that 40 or 97.6 percent of the agriculture departments have the employer interview the student before being placed in the work experience station. It was also found that 27 or 65.9 percent of the schools left final selection of the work experience student up to the employer.

Thirty-six or 87.8 percent of those schools with cooperative work experience programs have training agreements for each student on cooperative work experience.

Over 50 percent of the time, 29 or 70.7 percent of the supervising teachers observe the student at work when a visit is made and 34 or 82.9 percent of the schools indicated that cooperative work experience visits are planned and scheduled in advance.

Those schools with agricultural cooperative work experience programs indicated that an average of 68.8 percent of their work experience students have written training plans listing the students' learning activities.

The study revealed that 35 or 85.4 percent of the schools have a progress report made after each cooperative work experience visit and only 21 or 51.2 percent of the schools made their progress reports available to the students' counselor and permanent file. It
was also found that 36 or 87.8 percent of the schools maintained a file on each cooperative work experience student.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations are based on the data received from those schools with an agricultural cooperative work experience program and the review of related literature.

1. All Oregon high schools with agricultural programs should adopt a supervised cooperative work experience program in agriculture.

2. Each school should establish a plan for selecting its agricultural cooperative work experience students, centering the plan around the minimum age a student can enter a work experience and the minimum personality development standards a student must have to enter the real work world.

3. The final selection of the agricultural cooperative work experience student should be made by the employer.

4. Each student participating in an agricultural cooperative work experience should have a signed training agreement listing the student, school, and parent responsibilities, the duration of the work period, and the schedule of work.

5. Each school should establish a plan or criteria check for
selecting its agricultural cooperative work experience stations.

6. Adequate student supervision and supervision time should be provided during the academic year and during the summer.

7. Each agricultural cooperative work experience student should have a training plan developed by the supervising teacher, student, and employer, and updated periodically to cover work experience changes.

8. Each school should develop a file on each agricultural cooperative work experience student. The file should contain the student's work permit verification if required, employer's evaluation, training plan, supervision reports, training agreements, hours of work completed, employment certificate date, and tractor operators permit.

9. In-service and pre-service instruction should be given on the development and maintenance of agricultural cooperative work experience programs.
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APPENDIX I

FIRST COVER LETTER FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

7 August 1973

Dear Vo-Ag Instructor:

I am attempting to assess the present agricultural cooperative work experience programs in Oregon. From this study I hope to identify the general involvement and use of the program in our field and make recommendations for the general improvement of the program.

I greatly appreciate your consideration in filling out the enclosed questionnaire and returning it in the self-addressed envelope. If your agricultural department does not have a cooperative work experience program you need not complete the questionnaire past Section I, item b. before returning it.

Sincerely,

Michael R. Eslinger
OSU Graduate Student
APPENDIX II

SECOND COVER LETTER FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

11 October 1973

Dear Vo-Ag Instructor:

Two months ago you should have received a form to fill out concerning Agricultural Cooperative Work Experience. The information you can supply is necessary to make this survey representative.

In case you have mislaid the first form I am sending another and greatly appreciate your filling it out and returning it in the self-addressed envelope.

Michael R. Eslinger

OSU Graduate Student
APPENDIX III

QUESTIONNAIRE

I. General Information:
   a. How many students do you have in your vocational agricultural program? ___ students
   b. Do you have a cooperative work experience program in agriculture? If you do, how many students are in the program? ___ yes ___ no ___ students
   c. Is the student given grades and credit for cooperative work experience? ___ yes ___ no
   d. Is the student given school credit for cooperative work experience completed during the summer? ___ yes ___ no
   e. Do you require a minimum number of hours of cooperative work experience completed to receive school credit? If so, how many hours must be completed per unit of credit? ___ hours/credit

II. Agricultural Advisory Committee:
   (The agricultural advisory committee:)
   a. is involved with publicizing and promoting the cooperative work experience program ___ yes ___ no
   b. is involved in the evaluation of the program ___ yes ___ no
   c. is involved in developing and locating cooperative work experience stations, ___ yes ___ no
   d. is involved in the selection of cooperative work experience stations. ___ yes ___ no

III. Selection of Cooperative Work Experience Students:
   a. The vocational agricultural department has an established plan for selecting cooperative work experience students. ___ yes ___ no
   b. Each year your students are surveyed on their cooperative work experience interest area. ___ yes ___ no
c. students on cooperative work experience are permitted to work a portion of the school day.
   _yes_ _no_

d. What is the minimum age you allow students to enter cooperative work experience?
   _14_ _15_ _16_

e. Does the school have a minimum set of personality development standards guiding the placement of cooperative work experience students?
   _yes_ _no_

f. Final selection of the students are made by the:
   _employer_ _Vo-Ag teacher_

g. Before being placed in the work experience station, the employer interviews the student.
   _yes_ _no_

IV. Training Agreements:

a. Each student on cooperative work experience has a training agreement.
   _yes_ _no_

(The training agreement contains:)

b. the signatures of the teacher, student, parent, and employer.
   _yes_ _no_

c. the responsibilities of the student, school, parent and employer,
   _yes_ _no_

d. the duration of the work period,
   _yes_ _no_

e. the time schedule of work.
   _yes_ _no_

V. Cooperative Work Experience Stations:

a. A planned method of selecting cooperative work experience stations is being used.
   _0-25_ _26-50_ _51-74_ _75-100_

b. Before a student is placed in cooperative work experience station, the employer understands the objectives of the program.
   _yes_ _no_

c. What percentage of your students find their own cooperative work experience stations?
   _percent_

VI. Cooperative Work Experience Supervision:

a. The supervising teacher observes the student at work when a visit is made.
   _0-25_ _26-50_ _51-74_ _75-100_

b. Cooperative work experience visits are planned and scheduled in advance.
   _yes_ _no_

c. How many cooperative work experience visits do you make per week during:
   1. the school year?
      _visits/week_
   2. the summer?
      _visits/week_
d. How many hours do you spend making cooperative work experience visits per week:
   1. during the school year? ___ hours/week
   2. during the summer? ___ hours/week

VII. Training Plans:
   a. What percent of your cooperative work experience students have written training plans listing his learning objectives? ___ percent
   b. The employer contributes to the content of the training plan. ___ yes ___ no
   c. The students training plan is revised and updated to cover work experience changes. ___ yes ___ no

VIII. Records and Reports:
   a. Student progress is recorded after each cooperative work experience visit. ___ yes ___ no
   b. A record of the students progress is made available to the student's counselor and permanent file. ___ yes ___ no
   c. A file is maintained on each cooperative work experience student. ___ yes ___ no
   d. The cooperative work experience file on the student contains:
      1. work permit, (if required) ___ yes ___ no
      2. employer evaluation. ___ yes ___ no
      3. training plan. ___ yes ___ no
      4. supervision reports. ___ yes ___ no
      5. training agreements. ___ yes ___ no
      6. hours of work completed, ___ yes ___ no
      7. employment certificate date. ___ yes ___ no
      8. tractor operator permit verification ___ yes ___ no