A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF GRADUATES, POST GRADUATES, AND THOSE QUALIFIED TO TEACH BY TAKING CERTAIN CLASSES IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION AT VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE SINCE 1918

BY

MASON H. PULLEY

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Committee For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Agricultural Education

Approved:

Head of Department

Dean of Agriculture

Chairman, Graduate Committee

Virginia Polytechnic Institute

1940
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter I | ... | 1 |
| Introduciton | ... | 2 |
| Chapter II | ... | 4 |
| Smith-Hughes Teachers | ... | 5 |
| Chapter III | ... | 22 |
| Men in Allied and Non-Allied Occupations | ... | 23 |
| Chapter IV | ... | 37 |
| Conclusions | ... | 38 |
| Bibliography | ... | 48 |
| **Appendix A** | ... | 49 |
| A Register of Graduates in Agricultural Education at Virginia Polytechnic Institute Since 1918 |
| **Appendix B** | ... | 74 |
| A Register of Post Graduates in Agricultural Education at Virginia Polytechnic Institute Since 1918 who have not at present received their M. S. Degree |
| **Appendix C** | ... | 84 |
| A Register of men who qualified to teach in the Agricultural Education field since 1918 by taking certain classes in Agricultural Education, but did not register in the Agricultural Education Department |
LIST OF CHARTS

Chart A ................................................................. 13
  Relationship Between Tenure and Income of 242 men
  qualified at Virginia Polytechnic Institute,
  teaching Vocational Agriculture in Virginia at
different times during the ten-year period

Chart B ................................................................. 16
  Relationship Between Degree and Salary of 242 men
  Qualified at Virginia Polytechnic Institute to
  teach Vocational Agriculture in Virginia Over the
10 Year Period

Chart C ................................................................. 27
  Present Occupational and Income Distribution of 4
400 Men and Women Qualified at Virginia Polytechnic
Institute Since 1918 To Teach Vocational
Agriculture

Chart D ................................................................. 31
  A Distribution of Men and Women Holding Each of
  The Two Degrees Respectively in Agricultural Ed-
ucation from Virginia Polytechnic Institute Since
1918

Chart E ................................................................. 33
  A Chart Showing The Number of Post Graduates
  From Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Agricul-
tural Education Since 1918
Honors Received by Men Qualified at Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Agricultural Education Since 1918
In this thesis the author has conscientiously attempted to portray in clear fashion the status of all V.P.I. graduates, post graduates, and those qualified to teach in vocational agriculture since 1918.

The material collected, it is hoped, will serve as a source of information for professors at V.P.I. who have to do with guidance and placement. Furthermore, it is expected that the information contained herein, will show certain pertinent facts concerning the department of vocational education in question.

Is the department efficient? Do its graduates secure jobs? Are salaries commensurate with time spent in securing degrees? Does the higher degree have any significance so far as increase in salary or steps in advancement are concerned? Have the V.P.I. graduates obtained positions of unusual responsibility and honor? Has service rendered by these graduates been hit or miss, or has it been constructive and definite over a long period of time? What has been the percentage of V.P.I. agricultural men who have entered occupations allied to farming? Are there any facts which indicate success in these allied occupations?

Such questions as the above, and others, are answered in this thesis.
In attempting to collect the information mentioned above the author has made use of the Alumni Office files; the records in offices of the various supervisors of Agricultural Education - Dr. W. S. Newman, State Board of Education, Richmond, Va.; Mr. D. J. Howard, Assistant State Supervisor, Winchester, Va.; Mr. T. V. Downing, District Supervisor, Ivor, Va.; Mr. J. O. Hoge, District Supervisor, Blacksburg, Va.; Mr. F. B. Cale, District Supervisor, Appomattox, Va.; department files; Alumni files; Registrar's office; Cormier's thesis; and questionnaires.

Grateful acknowledgment is made to these men as well as to Professors E. C. Magill, H. C. Groseclose, H. W. Sanders, and other school officials who have rendered valuable assistance in the arduous task of preparing this thesis.
CHAPTER II
Since the inception of the department of Vocational Agriculture at Virginia Polytechnic Institute in 1918 there have been approximately 432 graduates, post graduates, and qualifiers. Of this number, approximately 262 or 60 percent are, at present, Smith-Hughes teachers.

In 1920 there were 7 graduates. At the present time, however, only one of these graduates is a Smith-Hughes teacher.

In 1921 there were 2 graduates but, at the present time, neither graduate is a Smith-Hughes teacher.

In 1922, of 9 graduates, 3 have remained Smith-Hughes teachers.

If one will examine the register of graduates at the end of this thesis, it will be noted that, as the number of graduates increases, the number of Smith-Hughes teachers correspondingly increases.

With regard to salaries, it is to be said that they were considerably larger at the inception of the department than at the present time. If one will examine the range of salaries in the early days of the department's work, he will notice such salaries as $2500, $2800, $3175, $2700, $2600, $3000, $3400, and the like. However, if one will examine the present
range of salaries of Smith-Hughes teachers he will notice such salaries as $1100, $1200, $1020, $1145, $1300, $1440, $1350, $1284, $1500, as being conspicuous.

In the school year 1926-1927, the range of salaries for Smith-Hughes teachers was $1100-$3400. In 1936-1937, the range of salaries was $990-$2600. It will be noted that, as new men have been added to the roster of teachers, salaries have been consistently lower than in previous days.

Such facts cause one to immediately consider reasons for the trends as noted. What are the justifications or reasons for these salary decreases?

One reason, perhaps, is the fact that there are more teachers now than there were formerly. In 1926-1927 there were 55 Smith-Hughes teachers in the state of Virginia. In 1936-1937, there were 147 such teachers. This represents an increase of 92 or more than 160 percent over a period of 10 years. No doubt, as school officials and people in general have seen demonstrated the practicability of teaching boys and girls Agriculture, they have demanded, in increasing numbers, the creation of new departments in their respective schools. The author himself in his own experience as teacher has noted time after time the erection of an adequate shop and classroom for instruction in agriculture, and this has been in response to a direct demand on the part of people that their children receive the same worthwhile instruction
that some other county's children are receiving.

No doubt, the Federal Government has not been able to increase its appropriation for instruction in Vocational Agriculture to such an extent as to keep salaries on a par with what they were when teachers and departments were few.

There have been additional Federal and State appropriations for expansion of the vocational education program but these appropriations have been for the establishing and maintenance of new departments, primarily, and not for the boosting of salaries to their old high-time level. The two funds are given below to give an example of increased appropriation.
### A Comparison of Appropriations

#### Smith-Hughes Fund

**1930-1931**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total amount Federal appropriation</td>
<td>$95,433.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount Federal appropriation</td>
<td>$190,866.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### George-Reed Fund

**1930-1931**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations Federal</td>
<td>$16,829.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation State</td>
<td>$33,658.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Smith-Hughes Fund

**1939-1940**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations Federal</td>
<td>$91,209.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$182,419.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Training Federal</td>
<td>$6,601.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$13,202.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
George-Deen Fund
1939-1940

**Appropriations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$117,718.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$58,859.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>$176,577.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher-Training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$6,051.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$6,051.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,103.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Virginia's Appropriations by Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>State Appropriations for Vocational Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1918-1919</td>
<td>$20,177.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-1920</td>
<td>46,312.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1921</td>
<td>56,472.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-1922</td>
<td>59,904.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-1923</td>
<td>61,524.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923-1924</td>
<td>70,865.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924-1925</td>
<td>55,712.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925-1926</td>
<td>66,867.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-1927</td>
<td>77,620.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927-1928</td>
<td>91,714.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928-1929</td>
<td>107,551.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929-1930</td>
<td>119,455.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1931</td>
<td>125,376.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-1932</td>
<td>136,792.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932-1933</td>
<td>117,088.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933-1934</td>
<td>105,813.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-1935</td>
<td>109,585.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935-1936</td>
<td>129,885.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-1937</td>
<td>138,718.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-1938</td>
<td>110,959.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938-1939</td>
<td>127,625.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939-1940</td>
<td>182,722.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,098,345.52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As men saw the range of salaries paid to teachers of Vocational Agriculture, more and more entered the field until, perhaps, the "saturation point" was reached, causing a decrease in salaries all along the line. Men without jobs were willing to accept salaries lower than their consciences would ordinarily justify them in accepting.

The fact that so many new departments in Vocational Agriculture have been organized in recent years is a testimonial to the success of Virginia Polytechnic Institute men and to the department which trained them.

With regard to tenure the author collected data concerning 242 men in Virginia who were Smith-Hughes teachers at different times during the ten-year period 1928-1938. Of this number, 176 or 73 percent remained in their positions continuously; giving evidence to the fact that service in the Vocational Agriculture field in Virginia is not temporary or haphazard, but is definite and constructive and over a fairly long period of time.

Fifty-seven or 23 percent of the 242 men studied made two changes in positions. Eight or 3 percent made three changes in positions. One man, or approximately 0.4 percent of the total, made four changes in positions.

There were none who made more than four changes in positions.

It seems that the mere fact of change is no criterion for either condemnation or commendation. Many different
factors might enter into the situation. There might be a clash of personalities. A principal or a superintendent might not have the desire to cooperate with or to encourage a particular type of agricultural teacher and vice versa. Incompetence on the part of either teacher or school official might play a part. Politics often enters into the situation. Living conditions or salary are sometimes considered. A chance for promotion or an attempt to run away from present or impending trouble might be factors. The existence of a large group of people opposed to educating farmers might serve to keep agricultural teachers "on the jump".

At any rate, the percentage of Smith-Hughes teachers who change from one teaching job to another is small as is evidenced by the foregoing figures.
CHART A

Relationship Between Tenure and Income of 242 men qualified at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, teaching Vocational Agriculture in Virginia at different times during the ten year period 1928-1938

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. making no changes</th>
<th>Per Cent making no changes</th>
<th>No. making 1 change</th>
<th>Per Cent making 1 change</th>
<th>No. making 2 changes</th>
<th>Per Cent making 2 changes</th>
<th>No. making 3 changes</th>
<th>Per Cent making 3 changes</th>
<th>No. making 4 changes</th>
<th>Per Cent making 4 changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial median annual salary of those making no changes</td>
<td>Initial median annual salary of those making 1 change</td>
<td>Initial median annual salary of those making 2 changes</td>
<td>Initial median annual salary of those making 3 changes</td>
<td>Initial median annual salary of those making 4 changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final median annual salary of those making no changes</td>
<td>Final median annual salary of those making 1 change</td>
<td>Final median annual salary of those making 2 changes</td>
<td>Final median annual salary of those making 3 changes</td>
<td>Final median annual salary of those making 4 changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If the reader will consider Chart A, he will notice that the initial median annual salary of the 176 men making no change in position is $2000 per annum. The final median annual salary of those making no changes in position is $1800.

The initial median annual salary of the 57 men making 2 changes in position is $1500, while the final median annual salary of those making 2 changes is $1600.

The initial median annual salary of the 8 men making 3 changes in position is $1700, while the final median annual salary of those making 3 changes is $1850.

The one man making 4 changes in position had an initial salary of $1900 while he had a final salary of $1800.

These figures cannot be held to be conclusive evidence of any one trend with regard to salary and tenure. There are many factors which enter into the consideration of groups of figures which prevent them from having a high reliability coefficient. For instance, we could not hold up one man's example of changing positions four times and say that the decrease in salary of $100 is due to shiftlessness. We would be compelled to have many examples of such turnover in order to reach a conclusion which would approach validity.

For the same reason we could not say that 57 people making a change in positions twice was any reason for an increase in salary of $100. There would have to exist many more cases for consideration.
Furthermore, many more factors than the above enter into the consideration of the salary changes. At the time when the changes were made there might have been more teachers than formerly. Also, it must be remembered that it is the low salary which can be most effectively increased.

A decrease in the median annual salary of those making no changes in position from $2000 to $1800 is probably due to the fact that an ever increasing number of teachers become engaged in agricultural instruction. Then, too, there were two 10 percent cuts, but one of these cuts was later restored.
CHART B

Relationship Between Degree and Salary of 242 Men

Qualified at Virginia Polytechnic Institute to Teach

Vocational Agriculture in Virginia Over the 10 Year Period

1928-1938

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smith-Hughes Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. having</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. having</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. S. Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>M. S. Degree</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It will be noted from Chart B "Relationship Between Degree and Salary" that during the ten-year period 1928-1938 the median annual salary of 234 Smith-Hughes teachers having the B. S. Degree is $1750. The median annual salary of the eight men having the M. S. Degree is $2200.

Judging by these figures, it is apparently desirable to acquire the M. S. Degree, unless too many decide to work for this degree, in which case the increased supply of teachers tends to lower the salary which can be demanded.

It will also be noted from observing the above mentioned chart that very few men with the M. S. Degree teach agriculture; further preparation seems to encourage one to enter a larger field of service than is usually associated with the job of teaching in a small community.

With regard to the success of Smith-Hughes teachers, it might be said that the author has taught in several schools where there have been Smith-Hughes teachers, and he has noticed that, in every case, the teacher in question has been a leader in activities which pertain to both the farmer and the school.

The author has also read statements from farmers and school officials concerning the value of the teacher of agriculture.

Below are three quotations from a farmer, a superintendent, and a principal respectively. The names of the authors of these quotations are not given, by request, but the statements
are included here in order that the reader might get at least a semblance of opinion from some common-sense men.

A dirt farmer whose name is not divulged has the following to say concerning the success of the teacher of Vocational Agricultural:

"The farmer of today is faced with innumerable problems that he did not have to cope with in years past. We find modern farming gradually developing into what might be called a specialized profession all its own, and like all of the other professions, if the farmer does not carry on his work on a professional basis he will either be forced out of the profession or else carry on a business with a low degree of success.

"To be a successful farmer in these days a man must have an open mind as far as new developments are concerned. He must be able to look ahead and make predictions which will, as accurately as is possible foretell the outcome of matters affecting his business. He must be a shrewd business man. He must have a personality suitable for his dealings with other people, and last but not least, he must be a hard worker.

"It is the good fortune of the farmer today that he has many agencies which are willing to give him aid with his problems. He has the county agent, the experiment stations, railroads, farm papers, the teachers of agriculture, and many others who are willing to help him carry on his work in the
most business-like way.

"It is my business here to point out how the teachers of agriculture in several high schools can be of service to the farmers.

"The teacher of agriculture has a special advantage in that he is located in the center of one community. Thus, he has a chance to come in personal contact with the farmers' classes in that community, and to help them with their problems individually. The ways in which the teacher can be of help to the farmers may be summed up as follows:

1. To bring him information on new developments in agriculture.
2. To assist in cooperative organization.
3. To locate suitable seed and livestock and pool orders for them.
4. To help the farmer with his individual problems.

"The teacher goes into his work with a specialized training and it is his job to keep in contact with the most modern developments in agriculture. He is able to pass on to the farmer this information concerning the latest trends in livestock production and new varieties of crops that might be grown to advantage.

"The trend today is toward more cooperation. Many communities are setting up consumer and cooperative marketing associations that are working successfully. The teacher of
agriculture is the man who can lay the foundation and help build these cooperatives.

"Pooling orders for seed and livestock can be done in many communities. As a result much cash expense and time can be saved if the local teacher can locate the best possible materials and can supervise the delivery of them.

"Every farmer has his own problems for which he can use information from a man with special training in agriculture. Such problems as crop rotation, drainage, erosion, insects, and disease control could be mentioned as examples.

"In conclusion, it might be said that not all farmers are open-minded enough to take advantage of the help that they can receive from teachers of agriculture. But, on the other hand, there are many who need it and are glad to get it. That is why the teacher of agriculture has a challenging task to perform."

A superintendent says:

"If all high school teachers could be hired for the entire year and if they would work as energetically and purposefully as my teacher of agriculture does, I feel certain that their efficiency as teachers would be developed and the total effectiveness of our high school would be proportionately increased.

A principal says:

"My teacher of agriculture has been of untold value to my faculty in working with them as individuals and in promoting
activities that have had far-reaching influence in the entire school and in return he says he finds the other members an unusual source of assistance to him and his work."
CHAPTER III
CHAPTER III

Men in Allied and Non-Allied Occupations

Approximately 40 percent of the 432 graduates, post graduates, and qualifiers in Vocational Agriculture at V.P.I. since the establishment of the department have entered occupations other than Smith-Hughes teaching.

The occupations entered represent a very wide range of jobs. The following is a list of the various types of work and the number of V.P.I. Agricultural Education men engaged in each:

1. Athletic coach 2
2. High school principal 8
3. High school teacher 9
4. County superintendent of schools 5
5. Superintendent of Indian Education 1
6. College teacher of Chemistry 1
7. College professor of Agricultural Education 3
8. Associate Professor of Agricultural Education 1
9. Assistant Professor of Agricultural Education 1
10. Instructor in Agricultural Education 1
11. Assistant Business Manager of Lumber Supply Co. 1
12. Assistant Professor of Farm Finance 1
13. Teacher of Industrial Arts in Vocational School 2
14. College Instructor in Agriculture 1
15. University Instructor in Animal Husbandry 1
16. State Supervisor of Agricultural Education 4
17. District Supervisor of Agricultural Education 5
18. Assistant State Supervisor Vocational Agriculture 2
19. Poultry Inspector and Insurance Farm Bureau Service 1
20. Assistant Poultry Husbandman-Agricultural Experiment Station 1
21. Assistant Agronomist Dept. Interior 2
22. Acting Supervisor Vocational Agriculture - Island Possession 1
23. Regional Director of Farm Debt. Adj. 1
24. Manager Farm Security Adms. Office 4
25. Farm Security Administration Work 2
26. College Experiment Station 1
27. County Agent 11
28. Federal Housing Administrator 1
29. Assistant County Agent 3
30. State Farm Specialist 1
31. Farm Manager 2
32. Farming 10
33. Field Agronomist Fertilizer Company 1
34. Agronomist-United States Department of Agriculture 4
35. United States Department of Agriculture-Washington, D. C. 1
36. Fertilizer Salesman 4
37. Manager Fertilizer Company 2
38. Assistant Business Manager-Farm Supply Company 1
39. Soil Conservation Work 11
40. Assistant Community Organization Specialist 1
41. Virginia Farm Bureau Federation 1
42. Field Agent Pet Milk Company 1
43. Secretary-Treasurer Production Credit Association 1
44. Field worker in Rural Rehabilitation 3
45. State N Y A Administrator 1
46. N Y A work 2
47. Southern States Cooperative-Farmers Supply Company 3
48. Field Manager, Southern States Cooperative Farmers Supply Company 5
49. Carnation Milk Company 1
50. Bacteriologist and Chemist 1
51. Milling Company 2
52. Tobacco Company 3
53. Dairy Business 2
54. Agency Manager Investors Syndicate 1
55. Manager Production Credit Loan Company 1
56. Salesman-Seed and Feed Service 2
57. Associate Entomologist, State Department of Agriculture and Immigration 1
58. Federal Fruit Inspector 1
59. Field Representative Production Credit
60. Loan Corporation
61. Shipping Clerk-Farm Equipment Company
62. Federal Housing Administration
63. Superintendent of Experiment Station-United States Department of Agriculture
64. Practicing Veterinarian
65. Physician
66. Dentist
67. Book Salesman
68. Jewelry Salesman
69. Automobile Salesman
70. Filling Station Operator
71. Oil Distributor
72. Du Pont Company
73. CCC Work
74. Agent Electric Fixture Company
75. United States Army
76. Life Insurance Salesman

It will be seen from the foregoing list that V.P.I. graduates in Vocational Agriculture secure positions in many different fields of endeavor. There are 76 occupations, all except the latter 12 being allied to Vocational Agriculture.
# Chart C

**Present Occupational and Income Distribution of 400 Men and Women Qualified**

At Virginia Polytechnic Institute Since 1918 To Teach Vocational Agriculture

## Occupations:

1. **Teaching Vocational Agriculture (1936-1937) Virginia**
   - 35 under 1400
   - 55 1400 to 1600
   - 29 1600 to 1800
   - 23 1800 to 2000
   - 20 2000 to 2200
   - 15 2200 to 2400
   - 5 2400 to 2600
   - 1 2600 to 2800
   - 1 2800 to 3000
   - 0 3000 and Over
   - Total 179
   - Median Income 1616

2. **Teaching Vocational Agriculture (1939-1940) Five States**
   - 5 under 1400
   - 43 1400 to 1600
   - 77 1600 to 1800
   - 59 1800 to 2000
   - 41 2000 to 2200
   - 17 2200 to 2400
   - 14 2400 to 2600
   - 6 2600 to 2800
   - 0 2800 to 3000
   - 0 3000 and Over
   - Total 262
   - Median Income 1835

3. **Education Other Than Vocational Agriculture**
   - 89

   - **A. Agricultural**
     - 1. County Agent
     - 2
     - 2. Soil Conservation
     - 2
     - 3. Farm Security
     - 1
     - 4. Administrator and Supervisor
     - 2
     - 5. College Teacher
     - 1
     - 6. Other
     - 5
     - Total 89
     - Median Income 1675

   - **B. Non-Agricultural**
     - 1. Principals and Teachers
     - 5
     - 2. County Superintendent
     - 4
     - 3. Other
     - 1
     - Total 10
     - Median Income 1600

   - **C. Non-Educational**
     - 49

     - **A. Agricultural**
       - 1. Farming
       - 10
     
     - **B. Non-Agricultural**
       - 1. Salesman
       - 1
     

## Notes:

- The salary scale at the beginning of the chart shows a comparison between those earned in 1936-1937 and 1939-1940.
Consideration of Chart C will show that the various types of jobs might be classified under three headings:

1. Teaching Vocational Agriculture
2. Educational other than Vocational Agriculture
3. Non-Educational

Under the head of Educational, there are such Agricultural jobs as County Agent, Soil Conservation Service, Farm Security Administration, College teaching and others; under the same head there are such non-agricultural jobs as Elementary and Secondary School Teaching, Administration, and Supervision, and College Teaching.

Under the head of non-educational, there are agricultural jobs which include Farming, Research and Statistics, Farm Management, Seed and Feed, and others.

There are also non-educational jobs which are also non-agricultural, such as Salesman, Physician, and others. Men who have had some teaching experience seem to be wanted in related fields. The persons who do not teach become successful, and receive good salaries in similar types of work. However, those who do not teach, as a rule, begin with lower salaries than do those who teach Vocational Agriculture. The United States Office of Education* states that 46,000 graduates

of 31 colleges from 1927-1935 had received an average income of $1341 for the first year after graduation.

Former teachers of Vocational Agriculture who have entered other occupations, have, for the most part, increased their incomes a little when making the change. This, perhaps, holds good for men leaving any occupation to enter another, because people usually change jobs to obtain a promotion of some kind, most often financial. There has been a moderately uniform spread of persons leaving each income group. The incomes of men leaving Vocational Agriculture might not have increased in the same way had they remained in teaching.

Differences in income status, however, must be qualified by the fact that the cost of living in various locations and occupations varies. An income of $100 in a small Virginia town might be worth as much or more to a person than a much larger income in a larger city.

Approximately 40 percent of the men qualified to teach Vocational Agriculture during the department's existence at V.P.I., who are no longer teaching, are now in jobs where their training and experience in Vocational Agriculture are perhaps of great value. Their salaries in these jobs are higher than the salaries of teachers of Vocational Agriculture with the same amount of experience. This difference cannot in any way be interpreted as a measure of relative ability or occupational success, nor can it be taken as a sufficient
measure of financial success because, as has been indicated, differences in cost of living and other factors may offset the differences in income.

Only 2.8 percent of the men qualifying at V.P.I. to teach Vocational Agriculture are now engaged in occupations other than educational or agricultural. Of this number, there is one physician, one dentist, two oil distributors, one book salesman, and several other types of salesmen.
Chart D

A Distribution of Men and Women Holding Each of
The Two Degrees Respectively in Agricultural
Education from Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Since 1918

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number holding M. S. Degree</th>
<th>Number holding both B. S. and M. S. Degrees</th>
<th>Number holding only M. S. Degrees</th>
<th>Number holding only B. S. Degree</th>
<th>Number holding under graduate Degrees from other Colleges</th>
<th>Total number holding degrees from Virginia Polytechnic Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>287 men and 2 ladies</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consideration of Chart D shows that there is a total of 310 graduates from Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Agri-cultural Education since 1918 and 46 or 15 percent of these graduates are M. S. Degree graduates.

Of the 46 M. S. Degree graduates, 25 or 54 percent received their undergraduate degree from Virginia Polytechnic Institute, while 21 or 45.6 percent received their undergraduate degree from other colleges.

There are 289 or 93 percent of the total graduates holding only B. S. degrees, 287 men and 2 women.
A Chart Showing The Number of Post Graduates From Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Agricultural Education Since 1918

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Post Graduates who received their undergraduate degree in Agricultural Education at Virginia Polytechnic Institute.</th>
<th>Number of Post Graduates who received their undergraduate degree in related fields at Virginia colleges</th>
<th>Number of Post Graduates who received their undergraduate degree from other colleges</th>
<th>Total number of Post Graduates in Agricultural Education rather than Agricultural Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>14 men</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consideration of Chart E shows that there is a total of 122 post graduates from Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Agricultural Education since 1918, and 24 or 19.7 percent of these post graduates received their undergraduate degree in Agricultural Education from Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

A smaller number, 15 or 12.3 percent received their undergraduate degree in related fields from Virginia Polytechnic Institute rather than Agricultural Education.

The largest number, 83 or 68 percent received their undergraduate degree from other colleges and the remaining 39 or 32 percent of the 122 have attended Virginia Polytechnic Institute at other intervals, pursuing courses leading to either B. S. or M. S. degrees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honor</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Honor</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>School Superintendent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>District Supervisor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>College Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Polytechnic Institute in Agricultural Education since 1918*
With regard to honors received in the group of 432 graduates, post graduates, and qualifiers of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, it will be noted from Chart F that 12 or 2.8 percent are master teachers, three or 0.7 percent are district supervisors, four or 0.9 percent are state supervisors, five or 1.2 percent are school superintendents, one or 0.2 percent is a department head, seven or 1.5 percent are college professors, three or 0.7 percent are specialists, four or 0.9 percent have received honor in the way of positions in other capacities.

A total of 39 or .9 percent have been awarded positions of responsibility and trust.
CHAPTER IV
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

1. Agricultural Education, as sponsored by the Smith-Hughes Act and given support by other Congressional Acts, has progressively increased in scope and influence.

2. Of the 432 men qualified at Virginia Polytechnic Institute to teach Vocational Agriculture since the establishment of the department in 1918, approximately 60 percent are engaged in teaching agriculture.

3. Of the 212 teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Virginia, all have studied at V.P.I.

4. Only 2.8 percent of the men qualifying at V.P.I. to teach Vocational Agriculture are now engaged in occupations other than educational or agricultural. Of this number, there is one physician, one dentist, two oil distributors, one book salesman, and several other types of salesmen.

5. Generally speaking, it is apparent that teaching Vocational Agriculture has not been in any way a poor job for men qualified at Virginia Polytechnic Institute to teach this subject. The men who have had some teaching experience seem to be wanted in related fields. The persons who do not teach
become successful and receive good salaries in similar types of work. However, those who do not teach, as a rule, begin with lower salaries than do those who teach Vocational Agriculture. The United States Office of Education states that 46,000 graduates of 31 colleges from 1927-1935 had received an average income of $1341 for the first year after graduation. This information is taken from the Government bulletin, United States Office of Education, Economic Status of College Alumni, United States Government Printing Office, 1939.

6. Former teachers of Vocational Agriculture who have entered other occupations have, for the most part, increased their incomes a little when making the change. This, perhaps, holds good for men leaving any occupation to enter another, because people usually change jobs to obtain a promotion of some kind, most often financial. There has been a moderately uniform spread of persons leaving each income group. The incomes of men leaving Vocational Agriculture might not have increased in the same way, had they remained in teaching.

Differences in income status, however, must be qualified by the fact that the cost of living in various locations and occupations varies. An income of $1900 in a small Virginia town might be worth as much or more to a person than a much larger income in a large city.

7. Approximately 40 percent of the men qualified to
teach Vocational Agriculture during the department's existence at V.P.I., who are no longer teaching, are now in jobs where their training and experience in Vocational Agriculture are perhaps of great value. Their salaries in these jobs are higher than the salaries of teachers of Vocational Agriculture with the same amount of experience. This difference cannot in any way be interpreted as a measure of relative ability or occupational success, nor can it be taken as a sufficient measure of financial success because, as has been indicated, differences in cost of living and other factors may offset the differences in income.

8. There have been two women graduates and one post graduate of the Department of Agricultural Education at V.P.I. since its inception. One graduate is successfully employed as assistant Smith-Hughes teacher in one of the counties of Virginia, the only lady graduate who has ever taught agriculture. The other lady graduate is teaching in general education in the West Virginia school system. The young lady post graduate, however, studied for a year on a practical problem under the head of the department for the purpose of determining the trends of progress made by groups of children. She had to give it up, as it would have been necessary for her to have followed the same pupils as their teacher from one grade to another. This practice, however, is not customary. The young lady changed her course and completed all
work leading to her master's degree in Home Economics and is gainfully employed in teaching academic subjects in the Virginia school system.

9. Figures issued by the United States Office of Education indicate that among the 46,000 alumni of the 31 schools studied, college men entering the field of teaching earn an average of approximately $2000 per annum eight years after graduation. The incomes of teachers of Vocational Agriculture have, generally speaking, increased with experience. The increase averages in the neighborhood of $125 for each four-year period.

This information is from United States Office of Education Bulletin, Economic Status of College Alumni, 1939.

10. Agricultural teachers were the first teachers in Virginia to use, as a group, the socialized recitation, the project, and other useful and practicable methods of teaching as recommended by Virginia's Revised Curriculum (a piece of work which is recognized universally as forward-looking).

11. The salaries of men sent out by Virginia Polytechnic Institute to teach agriculture in Virginia were much larger 15 years ago than they are now. It appears that this condition might be due to an ever increasing number of departments in the state's schools, a lack of sufficient
appropriation for maintenance of these departments, and an increasing supply of men available for teaching jobs.

12. Men in the high ranks in Agricultural Education Administration in Virginia are V.P.I. men - the state supervisor of Agricultural Education, three of the four district supervisors in Virginia, and all of the professors of Agricultural Education.

Two supervisors in West Virginia, one head teacher trainer in Arizona, and one supervisor in Puerto Rico are V.P.I. men.

13. Generally speaking, the M. S. Degree has meant an increase in salary and a promotion for V.P.I. men receiving this degree.

14. The New Deal Administration has created numerous jobs which are filled acceptably by V.P.I. men.

15. Seventy-three percent of the V.P.I. men teaching agriculture in Virginia have remained on the job continuously for a ten-year period, giving evidence to the fact, that service is forward-looking and not haphazard.

16. There are 181 or 58 percent of the 510 graduates in Agricultural Education from Virginia Polytechnic Institute since 1918, who are at present Smith-Hughes teachers in Virginia and other states.
17. There are 59 or 48 percent of the 122 post graduates in Agricultural Education from Virginia Polytechnic Institute since 1918, who are at present Smith-Hughes teachers in Virginia and other states.

18. There are 22 or 91.6 percent of the 24 who have qualified to teach in the Agricultural Education field since 1918 by taking certain classes in the Agricultural Education Department, although were not registered in this department, who are Smith-Hughes teachers in Virginia and other states.

19. The Register of graduates, post graduates, and qualifiers shows that 262 or 60.7 percent of the 432 who prepared themselves as Smith-Hughes teachers are engaged in that work for which they were prepared. The remaining 170 or 39.3 percent of the 432 are engaged in allied and non-allied occupations. There are 158 or 92.9 percent of the 170 engaged in allied occupations, and 12 or 7.1 percent of the 170 engaged in non-allied or non-educational occupations such as practicing medicine and salesmanship.

20. The Register of graduates, post graduates, and qualifiers also shows that 374 or 86.6 percent of the 432 men and women qualified at Virginia Polytechnic Institute are found to have been engaged in teaching agriculture at one time or another, which is the exact vocation for which they
were trained in our Agricultural Education Department.

Only 58 or 13.4 percent of the 452 men and women went immediately into Non-Agricultural Educational work, and, consequently, have never entered the exact profession for which they were trained.

21. There are 19 or 4.3 percent of the 452 men and women who were engaged in teaching subjects in general education in Virginia and other states.

Eleven or 58 percent of the 19 went directly into teaching in the general educational field, while 8 or 42 percent of the 19 were first engaged in teaching agriculture, and later went into teaching in the field of general education.

22. There are 11 or 2.5 percent of the 432 trained in our Agricultural Education Department who are county agricultural agents, nine in Virginia, one in West Virginia, and one in North Carolina, whose median income is $2633. It is evident that the men engaged in this line of work will be able to support their wives and children, and give them the benefit of at least a few necessities of modern life.

23. There are 12 or 2.8 percent of the 432 trained in our department, who are engaged in government work such as Soil Conservation Service, nine in Virginia, and three in North Carolina, whose median income is $2600, who will, along with their families, be able to enjoy a few of the modern
conveniences of life.

24. There are 8 or 1.9 percent of the 432 trained in our department who are engaged in government work such as Rehabilitation, six in Virginia and two in North Carolina, whose median income is $2300.

25. There are 7 or 1.6 percent of the 432 who are administrators and supervisors of Agricultural Education, four in Virginia, two in West Virginia, and one in Puerto Rico. The median income of these men is $3350.

26. Among the 432 trained in our department, five or 1.2 percent are college teachers of agriculture and Agricultural Education, four in Virginia and one in Arizona, with a median income of $3474.

27. Five or 1.2 percent of the 432 trained are city and county superintendents of schools, four in Virginia and one in Arizona. The median income of this group of men is $3000.

28. We have 10 farmers among our trained group, which represents 2.4 percent and whose incomes are not known except two which are $1500 and $5000 respectively. There are 2 or 0.4 percent farm managers, whose incomes range around $1500 per year.

29. Eight or 1.8 percent of our men are affiliated
with the Southern States Cooperative, Farmers Supply Company, four in Virginia, one in North Carolina, and two in Maryland. These men are earning salaries from $1800 to $4700, giving a median of $3000 per year.

30. Twelve or 2.8 percent are engaged in salesmanship with incomes ranging from $1800 to $4920 with a median of $2750 per year.

31. We have one practicing physician, one dead, and one practicing dentist, with a median of $5500 income per year. There are 3 or 0.7 percent engaged in the National Youth Administration work whose incomes range from $2300 to $2900 with a median of $2600 per year.

32. Four or 0.9 percent of our trained group are deceased, one physician, one college head of department, one aviator, and one student senior dropped dead during the 1939 Finals. Only one or 0.2 percent is unemployed at present, and 13 or 34 percent of the June 1940 graduating class, consisting of 38 in all, have not been gainfully employed. Only one or 0.2 percent of the group of 432 is lost, or whose whereabouts are unknown, even to the members of his immediate family. There are 6 or 1.4 percent in the United States Army, who are included in chemical laboratory research and infantry.
33. The occupational distribution grows wider with time as only 41 percent of those graduated in the classes from 1924-1928 are now teaching Vocational Agriculture, while 72 percent of those graduated in the classes from 1934-1938 group are still teaching. The study which has been made shows that of the 432 trained over the period of 21 years to teach agriculture, that the greater percentage have followed at one time or another the vocation for which they were prepared. Only a small percentage of the entire group trained went into allied and non-allied occupations.

34. Of the 432 trained at Virginia Polytechnic Institute to teach Vocational Agriculture, only partially complete data were secured for 430 and complete data were obtained for 400 men and women.
1. Melvin C. Knox - *Occupational Status of Men Qualified at Iowa State College Since 1923 to Teach Vocational Agriculture*, The Agricultural Education Magazine, March 1940, pp 174


5. Files and records of the Department of Vocational Education, V.P.I.

6. Records of the V.P.I. Registrar

7. Records of the V.P.I. Alumni Office

8. Correspondence with Supervisors and Teachers

9. Data from thesis of Ulysses Cormier - 1940
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