The student must be alert and eager, expecting the teacher to present lectures and give assignments that lead to the acquisition of skills that will be useful to him in the society in which he will later find himself — not necessarily in all cases the society as known and revered by the professor. The student must realize that his time in history places on his shoulders the responsibility of finding and making new applications of principles learned and taught by older, more experienced men — his teachers. His mind must remain optimistic, unfettered by the debilitating recollections of past failures. How information can be used to enhance the on-goingness of mankind must be his standard of judgement. While he must prepare to carry his own weight and support himself in the world, yet selfish evaluation of data and concepts in terms of "what's in it for me" cannot color the reaction of the student to information presented by the professor.

It may be impossible to separate the second "I" of the teacher-student complex, inspiration, from the first because certainly without proper motivation, teacher-learning cannot obtain. In the reciprocal nature of their relationship the student has the capability to challenge and call out the best in the teacher.

How well a teacher inspires depends largely on the student's responsiveness and dedication to scholarship and progress. The teacher is more or less limited in the amount of inspiration, guidance and motivation he can give by the capacity and fundamental attitudes the student has derived from his heredity and previous experiences.

If, as we frequently expect and hope, the student is to be better than his teacher was at the same level of development, many things yet are expected of him. He must be willing to accept sound advice and council given by more experienced teachers, for as Foxtail Johnson said, "If your foresight ain't so good, then try fertilizing it with wiser men's hindsight." The student must realize that while the current economic and social structure may not be perfect, it cannot be changed or destroyed without first having a workable alternative; and he must be willing to devote the same amount of time, talent and sacrifice to prove his alternate proposals as was expended in proving the old. He must prepare himself to serve better the society of tomorrow than did those now serving prepare.

The student must be capable of receiving and acting on constructive criticism. He must always be willing to hear and weigh the merit of counterproposals, realizing with some humility that he is not omniscient.

Finally, the student must ever be ready to express gratitude for efforts made by good teachers in going "above and beyond the call of duty" in individual advisement, sponsoring of extra-curricular activities and *in other ways* providing worthwhile learning experiences for the student.

Thus if information and inspiration are to be transmitted and generated, there must be a mutual appreciation and respect between the student and his teacher. From such a relationship can arise motivation, learning and self-fulfillment, the worthy objectives so much desired by both.

Attrition at my Institution

WILLIAM C. GEORGE

William C. George is an Associate Professor at Northwest Missouri State College, Maryville, Missouri. He received his B.S. Degree from Central Missouri State College, B.S. Degree in Agricultural Engineering, M.S. Degree in Agricultural Engineering, and Ed. D. in Agricultural Education from the University of Missouri. He has served as a high school principal and teacher in Missouri and as a college teacher in Arkansas, Illinois, and Missouri. He is a veteran of World War II. He is a member of Phi Delta Kappa, American Society of Agricultural Engineers, NACTA, NEA, Missouri State Teachers Association, and AVA.

Northwest Missouri State College is a state supported college established as a State Normal School in 1905. After 1949, it joined the trend in serving as a general college. Most of the students come from a predominantly rural area which is a rich livestock producing area at the edge of the corn belt. Its position in the northwest corner of Missouri places it within the reach of students from the states of Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas, as well as Missouri.

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS

Using the 1965-66 fall semester as an example, it was found that 52.1% of the students came from Missouri. Forty-five percent of that 52.1% came from the northwest district of Missouri which the college was set up to serve. Another 39.6% of the enrollment came from the state of Iowa with the remaining percentage from other states and other countries.

ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS

Northwest Missouri State College, being a state supported institution, bars no student from its doors. However, to enter the college, only the students in the upper two-thirds of their high school class are accepted on a non-probationary basis. All students are required to take an entrance examination. Those entering on a probationary basis must make a "C" or 2.0 average to remain in school. Transfer students are accepted if they are eligible to enter the college which they last attended.

ENROLLMENT AT NORTHWEST MISSOURI STATE COLLEGE

The enrollment has followed a general pattern of increasing substantially each year. Enrollment statistics are:

Enrollment Trends—NWMSC[1]

Full-Time Undergraduate Students*	1961-1962	1962 1963	1963-1964	1964 1965	1965-1966
Freshmen	1066	1282	1409	1758	1842
Sophomores	619	721	798	841	983
Juniors	475	559	572	620	559
Seniors	625	652	673	713	717
Special**	335	340	352	187	97
Total	3120	3554	3804	4119	4198

*Summer school enrollment not included

**Non-degree and post graduate students

STUDENT ATTRITION

A student may be suspended for academic deficiency or disciplinary reasons. Serious disciplinary action or continuous academic probation are grounds for dismissal. Withdrawal and dismissal data are presented in the following table for the years indicated.

NWMSC STUDENT ATTRITION AND WITHDRAWALS

School Year	Withdrawals	Dropped for Deficiency	Percent of Net Enrollment
1961-62			
1st Semester	86	165	8.0%
2nd Semester	47	197	10.4%
1963-64			
1st Semester	92	237	8.9%
2nd Semester	69	204	8.3%
1964-65			
1st Semester	121	307	9.7%
2nd Semester	88	280	9.7%
1965-66			
1st Semester	157	395	9.6%
2nd Semester	76	280	8.7%

SOME OBSERVATIONS AND REFLECTIONS

For a number of years the writer has noted enrollments in several of our mid-west colleges. It seems to be true that agriculture students tend to make up from 8 to 10 percent of the entering freshman classes in these schools. This is taking into account both majors and minors in the field of agriculture.

Perhaps we should reflect upon the fact that the agriculture departments in our smaller colleges have been losing a substantial number of students at the end of their second year. Where the departments have not had funds to develop special areas such as those in agricultural education, veterinary medicine, forestry, and others, the student must transfer to complete his curriculum. With the present trends in growth of junior colleges and enrichment of the graduate and research programs in the larger institutions, it is possible that some changes will come for all.

It would seem feasible that the junior colleges will take up the task as now performed by the small college agriculture departments and these departments should grow into full undergraduate status. With larger enrollments should come money to improve facilities and increase teaching staffs. All should encourage these students with aptitudes and abilities to continue into a graduate and/or research program. It seems reasonable that such shifts would help solve our present problems of small enrollments and small upper level classes. Improved agriculture departments and increased offerings should also improve our position enrollment-wise.

[1]Data adapted from the Northwest Missouri State College "Self Study" report presented to the North Central Association, July 1966.

"The Role of Non-Land Grant Colleges And Universities In Training Vocational Teachers"

RALPH A. BENTON
Southern Illinois University

* * *

Dr. Ralph A. Benton is an associate professor of Agricultural Industries at Southern Illinois University, where his duties include teaching courses in Agricultural Education and Extension, supervising adult education in agriculture, and serving one-half time as an academic adviser. He has served on the staff of Illinois State University and the University of Nebraska. He was for many years a teacher of vocational agriculture in Nebraska. Dr. Benton has a Bachelor of Science and a Master of Arts degree from the University of Nebraska, and a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Agricultural Economics from the University of Illinois.

In most states the training of vocational agriculture teachers is done in the land-grant college. However, a recent study revealed that in 1964 fourteen colleges and universities, non-land grant, in seven states, were authorized to train teachers eligible for certification as teachers of vocational agriculture.

The following is a report on the findings from the study relative to the fourteen colleges and universities. The objectives of the study were five in number:

1. To identify the professional staff.
2. To identify the physical facilities used.

3. To examine the pre-service and in-service training programs.
4. To determine the reasons for seeking approval.
5. To determine the role of these colleges in training vocational agriculture teachers.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES INVOLVED

Table I gives the name of the schools, their total enrollment, enrollment in agriculture (both undergraduate and graduate) and the percent of the total student body in agriculture. The average enrollment was 6075.5 students. The average number of undergraduate students in agriculture per school was 456.6 and the average number of graduate students for the ten schools giving graduate work was 27.7. For all fourteen schools an average of 7.8 percent of the total student body was enrolled in agriculture.

TABLE I. STUDENT ENROLLMENT, FALL 1964

College or University	Total Students Fall 1964	Enrollment in Agriculture			Percent of Total Student Body
		Undergraduate	Graduate	Total	
Arkansas St. College	4000	300	10	310	7.7
California State Polytechnic College	6962	1600	42	1642	23.6
East Texas State College	5330	173	26	199	3.7
Illinois State University	7376	205	—	205	2.8
Sam Houston State Teachers College	5714	481	45	526	9.2
Southern Ill. Univ.	13847	603	47	650	4.7
Southwest Texas St. College	4467	220	5	225	5.0
Stephen F. Austin State College	4268	187	11	198	4.6
Texas College of Arts and Industries	4231	253	13	266	6.3
Texas Technological Col.	13748	1072	66	1138	8.3
Tuskegee Institute	2638	119	—	119	4.5
University of Southwest Louisiana	6912	457	—	457	6.6
Wisconsin State University, Platteville	3020	306	12	318	10.5
Wisconsin State University, River Falls	2600	416	*	416	16.0

*none in fall quarter but 45-50 enrolled in summer and other quarter programs.

TEACHING STAFF

A total of 33 men were involved in teaching and directing the vocational agriculture teacher education programs. Of these, 20 were giving full-time and 13 part-time of their services. Of the 33 staff members, twelve possessed the Doctor of Philosophy degree, seven the Doctor of Education degree, seven a Master of Science degree, five a Master of Education degree, one a Master of Arts degree, and one a Bachelor of Science degree. Thus, 57.6 percent of the teacher trainers held a doctorate degree.

The major field of training for most was Agricultural Education at 85.0 percent. Twenty-nine of the 33 had experience as vocational agriculture teachers in public schools.

The total agricultural teaching staff including both teachers of technical agriculture and agricultural education courses per school ranged from a low of five to a high of 73 with an average of 20 teachers. The number of agriculture majors per instructor per school averaged 23.8.

PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Agriculture Building

Twelve of the 14 schools reported having a separate building housing the division or school agriculture. Ten had one or more classrooms for departmental use only. One reported that they had only offices and storerooms used exclusively by the agriculture faculty. Another reported they had a separate building for the school of agriculture but that classroom space was scheduled by the university for non-ag classes at times when the rooms were not used by agricultural classes.

Only one school reported not having laboratories exclusively for agriculture. Another commented that their laboratories were not for agricultural education majors alone. This situation very likely prevailed in most of the schools but was not asked for in the questionaire.

Agricultural Mechanics Shop

Only five schools had a separate agricultural mechanics shop building used just for training vocational agriculture teachers. Seven reported that their shop building was also used for teaching all agricultural engineering courses. In these cases the agricultural education majors and other majors were all in the same classes. One school reported that it used the Industrial Education shops for teaching agricultural mechanics. Still another had a separate shop but some students in general agriculture were also trained along with the agricultural education classes.

Library

In regard to library facilities, 50 percent of the schools did not have a departmental library of any kind. All books, periodicals, magazines, etc. were located in the central library. One school reported having a separate area in the University library for agriculture. Four have separate agricultural libraries but also have books in the central library. One school is developing a separate agricultural library and still another reports having a reading room in the agricultural building in which are deposited government periodicals, farm magazines, etc. All reference books and other materials are in the central library.

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FARM LAND

Each of the schools owned and operated farm, range, or timber land. These ranged in size from 200 to 3000 acres. The average was 1115 acres. One school was in the process of buying additional land. In all cases the schools used their farm land for applied research and or demonstration. Likewise, all had one or more resident farm operators.

Student labor was used by twelve of the schools in doing the farm work. At nine schools the students worked with the resident farm operators and in three cases the students worked along with other hired labor. In no cases did the students perform the farm work with only faculty supervision.

PRE-SERVICE TRAINING

Eleven of the colleges and universities operated on the semester basis and the other three used the quarter system. All schools under both systems of operation required more hours to complete the vocational agriculture teacher training curriculum than was the minimum for graduation. The average was 137 semester hours and 221 quarter hours.

Total semester hours required in professional education and psychology averaged 16.0 and schools on the quarter system averaged 17.0 hours. Vocational education hours required averaged 17.0 semester and 16.0 quarter hours.

Hours of methods in teaching vocational agriculture averaged 6.75 semester hours, and 10.0 quarter hours. From the report apparently only four states have a minimum requirement for hours in methods.

Those schools on the semester basis required an average of 7.0 hours of student teaching over an average period of 9.2 weeks. Those on the quarter system required an average of 10.0 hours for an average period of 8.66 weeks.

To be admitted to do student teaching in vocational agriculture, exactly one-half of the schools required their students to have a minimum overall grade point average of a "C". The other half required the equivalent of a "C+."

The technical agriculture required by the semester schools averaged 55 hours and for the quarter system schools it was 86.

All the schools sponsor a club for the agricultural education majors. Ten have a collegiate FFA Chapter, one has an Alpha Tau Alpha Chapter, and three schools have chapters in both organizations on campus.

IN-SERVICE ACTIVITIES

In-service training activities included field courses in agricultural education for teachers actively teaching, and workshops on campus for area vo-ag. teachers. All but four of the schools offered on-campus graduate courses in agricultural education, while eight give a Master's degree in agricultural education and six do not.

GENERAL INFORMATION

At the time of this study Sam Houston State Teachers College had been training vocational agriculture teachers for 47 years and Illinois State University only two years. Approximately 7609 have qualified to teach of which 57.4 percent entered teaching, and approximately 38.6 percent of those who entered are still teaching. Over the years three of the schools have shown a decrease in number of vo-ag. graduates; while the others have shown an increase. The overall increase in recent years is 17.6 percent.

The Agricultural Education Students

In all cases, the students enrolled in the vocational agriculture teacher training curriculum came largely from that portion of the state in which the college is located.

Upon graduation, the graduates from all the schools were acceptable in any part of their own state. This was not true in all cases regarding getting a vocational agriculture teaching job in another state. Four schools reported that their graduates in vocational agriculture are discriminated against in some states while accepted in others. Two reported that their graduates were acceptable in certain other states if they would take some additional course work within the state at the land grant institution. Some had not had any of their graduates try for a vo-ag. teaching position outside the home state and so didn't know if they would be accepted or rejected.

Nine of the schools reported that the majority of their graduates tend to accept teaching positions relatively near the college or probably in about the same areas from which the students originally came.

Joint-Staff Meetings

In all instances the teacher training personnel reported cordial working relations with the state supervisory staff and other teacher training personnel within the state. The chief state supervisor in each state also reported the same cordial relations. Likewise, in all states involved but one, there was effort to coordinate all the vocational agriculture teacher training activities within the state.

Six schools reported that the State Director of Vocational Education was the coordinator, and four named the chief supervisor of agricultural education as coordinator.

Professional Meetings

The vocational agriculture teacher trainers from all these schools attended one or more professional meetings each year. The following meetings were named and the order of listing does not indicate the most frequently attended:

1. American Vocational Association Convention
2. National Association of Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture Conference.
3. National F.F.A. Convention
4. National Center for Advanced Study and Research in Agricultural Education Special Conferences
5. Regional Conference for Vocational Agriculture Teacher Trainers and Supervisors
6. Regional Research Conference in Agricultural Education
7. State Vocational Agriculture Teachers Annual Conference
8. State Teachers Association District and Annual Meetings
9. State Vocational Association Meetings

Instructional Materials

Twelve schools prepare and two schools do not prepare instructional materials that are made available to agricultural teachers. Methods of distributing these materials included (1) by mail; (2) in workshops and area meetings; (3) through area supervisors; (4) at summer conferences; and (5) through the State Department of Education.

The agricultural education staff members in all schools but one give consultation services to school administrators and other educators.

Research Activities

In seven schools the agricultural education staff is expected to do research and in six schools they are not expected to do so. One reported that they do whatever research is necessary to conducting their program. In regard to time allocated for research, four schools stated that no time in the normal work day is given; two said that although they were encouraged to do research, no time was allowed for it; one stated that time equivalent to one-fourth of one position was allocated; another reported that five percent of the staff's work load was for research; another recorded 25.0 percent was stipulated but that the press of other duties cut the time nearly one-half; and two other schools stated that any research done had to be in addition to the regularly assigned work load. Finally, in only three of the schools is research counted as a part of the agricultural education teacher's work load.

REASONS FOR SEEKING APPROVAL

The reasons these colleges and universities gave for seeking approval to train vocational agriculture teachers that the state would certify, do not vary greatly. Nearly all gave more than one reason and several gave the same or similar reasons. These are grouped as follows:

1. Demand from students attending the institution.
2. Teacher training the main purpose of the college.
3. Without certification, a serious handicap was imposed upon the agriculture department and the graduates.
4. There was a shortage of vo-ag. teachers in the state.
5. To serve better the students of the region wanting to become vocational agriculture teachers.
6. To make it possible for the university to serve better all its students.
7. To offer a better service to the state.
8. People in the trade area demanded it.
9. To fit the needs of the agricultural situation in our part of the state.
10. This institution was charged by state vocational education leaders to train teachers of vocational agriculture.
11. Approval for training teachers of vocational agriculture was an outgrowth of early pioneering in teaching agriculture.
12. Approval to train teachers of vocational agriculture makes possible for more people to obtain an agricultural education and develop leadership.

The chief state supervisor of agricultural education in each of the states involved was also asked to state the reason submitted by the college or university for approval to train vocational agriculture teachers. Their answers were more brief and may be grouped as follows:

1. Need for more teachers.
2. Geographic location.
3. Only institution available for this kind of training at that time.
4. The land grant college was not interested in providing the type of training needed by agriculture teachers.
5. Need for a teacher-training department in a state controlled college under the State Board of Education.

ROLE OF THE NON-LAND GRANT COLLEGE

As a final point of information, both the teacher trainers and the chief state supervisors were asked to state their views as to what they considered to be the unique role, if any, of non-land grant colleges and universities in training vocational agriculture teachers.

First, the statements of the teacher-trainers are summarized. Some of the statements appear to be characterizations or advantages rather than indicative of a particular kind of role. They follow:

1. The non-land grant colleges are doing as good a job as the land grant colleges.
2. An important role in training workers in agricultural education for foreign service.
3. Better able to provide a real concern for the individual student resulting in a better teaching situation.
4. Curriculum and courses may be more easily adjusted or pointed toward the student in agricultural education.
5. Teaching facilities, such as college farms, are more likely to be used for instruction rather than for the furthering of research.
6. The role of training vo-ag. teachers is not unique in itself, but the high degree of success of our graduates indicates that our training program is sound and effective.
7. It gives stimulating competition to land grant colleges and makes both do a better job than had been done before.
8. Our mission is to serve the public and the schools of our region and state in the best way possible.
9. The role is to emphasize good teaching (instruction) and the development of abilities in students which make good teachers and leaders.
10. The role is to make it possible for more young men to become teachers of vocational agriculture.
11. The role is to provide college work and training primarily in a total atmosphere of teacher training without being hampered by majors in other areas of agriculture.
12. There is a closer student-teacher relationship in the smaller non-land grant college making for more effective teaching.
13. Schools in which teacher education has long been the emphasis are in advantageous position to give the most effective training.
14. The role is no different than that of the land grant college in training vocational agriculture teachers.

The comments of the chief state agricultural education supervisors concerning the role of non-land grant colleges in training vocational agriculture teachers were as follows:

1. The school in my state attracts more farm boys and it is less expensive than the State University.
2. They have no unique role.
3. It is questionable if they have a unique role.
4. The same concept as the land grant college.
5. Cost of operation excessive. Tend to train for the college trade area.
6. Non-land grant colleges can and do frequently find undergraduates who can be interested in becoming vocational agriculture teachers who would never be enrolled in a land grant college. We have to look to every possible source in the recruitment of potential agriculture teachers.
7. In my state their function is the same as the land grant college insofar as teacher education is concerned.

While each of the preceding statements by teacher trainers is an honest opinion of the function his school performs in preparing vocational agriculture teachers, a synthesis of all the statements, in the judgment of the writer, would be the following:

"The unique role of non-land grant colleges and universities in training vocational agriculture teachers is of a multiple nature. It includes making it possible for more young men to become vocational agriculture teachers in institutions whose responsibility has long been teacher education where the emphasis is on superior teaching with a close student-teacher relationship; they more effectively use the farm facilities for teaching and experience; and they better serve the people of a region as well as the state."