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ABSTRACT

This study was concerned with the development of supervised farming programs in vocational agriculture.

The normative-survey method with the questionnaire technique was used in securing the data for this study.

A questionnaire was mailed to the state supervisor of vocational agriculture in each of the twelve Southern States. There were eleven of the supervisors who cooperated in the study by returning the completed questionnaires. From a mailing list of the teachers of vocational agriculture in the eleven Southern States, a sampling of 1036 teachers was selected and a questionnaire was mailed to them. There were 596 teachers who cooperated in the study by returning completed questionnaires. The data from the supervisors' and teachers' completed questionnaires form the basis for this study.

Surveys of the local farming conditions where there are departments of vocational agriculture are considered an essential activity by the teacher of vocational agriculture. The data in this study indicate that a large majority of the teachers of vocational agriculture make some type of farm survey in the community where they are teaching.

The study further indicated that students should have facilities for supervised farming programs before enrolling in vocational agriculture. A majority of the supervisors and teachers represented in this study indicated that they required this practice.
The data from this study indicated that a majority of the states did not require the use of the launching or orientation program for beginning students. However, data from the study reveal that a majority of the teachers represented use the launching or orientation program. A reasonable conclusion would be that there is a need for the launching or orientation program in vocational agriculture.

The first semester of school was indicated by data in this study to be the most desirable time for the development of the supervised farming programs. Data also indicated that the programs should be developed for a period of four years.

The study indicated that the supervised farming programs should consist of productive enterprises, improvement projects, and supplementary farm jobs. The data indicate that the supervised farming programs should be developed to such an extent that they will give the students a beginning in farming.

The data from this study indicate that the parents should be consulted in the development of the student's supervised farming program. The parents should be consulted during the student's first year in vocational agriculture and the program should be approved by the parents.

The study did not indicate a very strong recommendation for the use of an advisory council. However, a majority of the teachers represented in this study did have an advisory council.

The data from this study indicated that the practice of familiarizing the local school administrators with the purpose of supervised farming was an important activity. Conference of the teacher
of vocational agriculture and the local administrators was the practice used by a majority of the teachers represented in this study for familiarizing the local administrators with the purpose of supervised farming.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There has been vocational education of an informal nature since the earliest civilization. The sons of the tribes were taught by their fathers the methods they used in providing a livelihood for the family. Mothers instructed daughters in the ways of making a home for the family. The elders of the tribe trained eager youth long before agriculture became established and before towns and villages were built.¹

When the American Colonies were first established, vocational education was brought into them in form of apprenticeship. Young apprentices were assigned to the craftsmen who taught these apprentices the skills and knowledge necessary for them to carry on the trade. The apprentice usually lived in the home of the master and was subject to the master for all of his training.

This type of vocational education continued until the industrial revolution. When industry began using machinery, the type of training had to be changed. The hand worker had been acquainted with the entire process of the production of a product. Now he was acquainted with only a small portion of the process in the production of the product. The employer was no longer interested in the particular employee as in the apprentice type of training, but was interested only in the amount of produce the machinery and labor could turn out. This revolution also

called for better trained people. The use of the machinery required more skilled and trained men to operate it. The production had shifted from the home to the factory, and in like manner, the training had to be shifted from the home. This made it necessary to begin to look to the schools for training in this type of education.

Vocational education schools at their beginning were of the private and philanthropic type. They were established to give young people training in the type of vocation that they desired to enter. These schools were not all successful, but they were of the type that gave a trend toward vocational work and the value of this training in preparing young people for a way of life.

The first public aid for vocational education was the passage of what is commonly known as the Morrill Act in 1862. The private venture schools such as the manual labor, mechanics institute and the lyceums had caused many of the forward thinking people to recognize the importance of and the need for this type of education. This was followed by the Morrill Act and its amendments which made grants of land to each state for the endowment of agricultural and mechanical colleges.

Vocational agriculture was very important in the early schools of a vocational nature. The early lyceums and manual labor schools were mostly of the agricultural type.

There were many early attempts for vocational education but it was in the twentieth century before it made any progress in the public school system. There was a much greater need for vocational education than was provided before this time, but the American people followed the old country's tradition so closely that vocational education had a very
difficult time in breaking into the curriculum of the public schools. In fact, it is still today not accepted by many school people. They still wish to keep the old traditional subjects in the schools. Vocational agriculture had its first Federal aid in the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act by Congress in 1917. There have been several Acts following this one which have increased the amount of appropriations and have provided for further development of the vocational agriculture program.

The purpose of the vocational agriculture program is to offer training in the vocation of farming so that present and prospective farmers may become proficient in farming. This training is to be offered in an organized manner with group instruction and the actual doing of the job on the farm. This instruction is usually set up to meet the needs of three groups of students—the all-day students, who are boys regularly enrolled in the school, young farmers who are becoming established in farming and are not regularly enrolled in school, and adult farmers who are established in farming.

The vocational training leading to the progressive establishment of the students, as ordinarily sponsored by secondary schools under the provisions of the National Vocational Education Acts, is commonly referred to as supervised farming programs. It is believed that for the student to reach the aim of vocational agriculture he must have a functional supervised farming program.

The supervised farming program is considered by most if not all leaders in vocational agriculture to be the most important phase of the entire vocational agriculture program. The young man who is enrolled in
vocational agriculture has a wonderful opportunity to get ahead in life in his supervised farming program in vocational agriculture. He can study and learn of the better farm practices as they are carried out in experimental tests and then put them to actual use on his home farm. Also, all of this is done under the direct supervision of his teacher of agriculture, who is a man who has been trained both by experience and collegiate study. Where else may one find such a combination for the successful beginning into a vocation and a way of life?

It is the responsibility of the teacher of vocational agriculture to assist each student in the development of a supervised farming program. This program should be of such quality and quantity that it will become a means of establishing this student in farming. The teacher should visit and assist the student in the work of the supervised farming program and should assume the responsibility of following the progress of each supervised farming program so closely that it will operate at its maximum efficiency and will be successful in attaining the goals set up.

Communities vary in agricultural enterprises and practices, and individual farms in a community may differ in enterprises grown and farm practices followed. This makes it nearly impossible for two supervised farming programs to be identical. Likewise, vocational agriculture trainees differ in their choice of farming occupations for which training is desired. In the same manner, facilities for training that are available to the student will vary according to the farming occupations of the different communities and according to the several farms within the community. This makes it necessary for the teacher of vocational
agriculture to know the individual situations of each student and farm. He should know from a close study of the local farming situations what would be best to recommend to the student in assisting him in becoming an established farmer.

The importance of the supervised farming programs in the overall training of farm boys cannot be over emphasized. The teachers of vocational agriculture must realize the importance of supervised farming in their work and devote wholeheartedly the time necessary to place this part of the program on a successfully functioning basis.

In vocational agriculture the phrase, "learning by doing", is stressed very much. Since the supervised farming part of the vocational agriculture program is the doing part, great importance and stress should be placed upon it. The ability of the teacher to visualize the importance of supervised farming and to begin to develop outstanding and successful programs of supervised farming, means the ability of the teacher to have a successful program of vocational agriculture. In other words, the more successful the programs of supervised farming, the better the classroom instruction, the more successes the students will have, and greater benefits will be derived from the program by the students and community.

There has been a nation wide trend of young people moving from the farms to the city. Probably the census for 1950 will show a larger per cent of the people who have moved to the urban area. What effect this will have on the economic conditions of the country is not known, but if we are to remain in a balanced state, we will have to have farms and farmers to grow food and other materials for the people in the
urban areas. The supervised farming programs have a wonderful opportunity to help with this problem. If a boy has a well developed supervised farming program, and if at the end of his four years he has a beginning in farming, it appears he would be much more likely to remain on the farm than otherwise. The success the teacher has in helping establish a young man on the farm and helping him get a successful beginning in farming will depend largely on the type of supervised farming program that is developed and carried on by the student throughout his training period.

Supervised farming is a means by which the students of vocational agriculture may learn the methods of farming and in so doing prepare themselves for life. There must be interest in the thing taught and a desire to learn on the part of the pupil for efficient learning to take place. Supervised farming can furnish such interest and desire for study and learning by giving the student something that is real and concrete with which to work. It gives him something that he can see grow and produce, and he can see some benefits from the work and study that he has done. Supervised farming also facilitates learning by furnishing a definite objective, which the student understands and appreciates. The student has his enterprises in his supervised farming program, and he knows that through them he has an opportunity to learn farming, to make money, and to prepare himself for life. There is a definite objective, a goal toward which he can work and if successful will eventually reach.

Supervised farming facilitates learning by supplying problems that are real to the student. They are not hypothetical cases from a
textbook, but they are live problems that are real and observable, and
the student must make some kind of decision in order to solve them.
These problems are changing problems which call for continuous thought
and action on the part of the student. The growth of the enterprises
in the supervised farming program have varied conditions and problems
that have to be met. They may not necessarily be solved in the same
manner everytime they occur. This is putting together in learning what
goes together in doing. It is a very good method of learning. The
better the supervised farming programs, the more learning can be ex­
pected to take place on the part of the students enrolled in vocational
agriculture.

The supervised farming program may be so developed to include
all the elements of practice necessary for the student to become competent
in farming. It may include enterprises and practices to such an extent
that at the end of the student's school career he will have had
sufficient training that he can successfully assume the responsibility
of operating a farm of his own. The student will have had training in
the operative and managerial phases of farming, will have made decisions
about the farming operations, and will have had experience in the farming
occupation to such an extent that he may go into the profession of
farming as a well-trained individual.

It is possible for the supervised farming program to make
sufficient money to give the student a beginning in farming. If the
student has a well rounded and large enough program it is very likely
this will be true. The supervised farming program plays an important
part in the life of the student of vocational agriculture. The teacher
of vocational agriculture should realize this and work toward the
development of such programs that will be a challenge to the student
and will assist the student in becoming successfully established in the
occupation of farming.

Statement of the Problem. A study of the development of supervised
farming programs in vocational agriculture is the title of this problem.

The purpose of this study is to determine: (1) the practices and
procedures used by teachers of vocational agriculture in the development
of the supervised farming programs of all-day students of vocational
agriculture. (2) the better practices with recommendations for the
particular practices to follow in the development of supervised farming
programs.

For the agriculture program to be vocational in nature, there
must be some type of participation on the part of the student in the
carrying out what is studied by him in the classroom. This is one of the
important functions of the supervised farming program. Also, for a
student of vocational agriculture to make a beginning in the occupation
of farming, there must be some type of program developed to reach this
aim. Therefore, the supervised farming programs may be considered one
of the most important phases of the total vocational agriculture program.
A successful beginning of an undertaking has much to do with the entire
success of the job being done. The proper development of the supervised
farming programs of the students of vocational agriculture will have much
to do with the success of the vocational program and the success of the
individual student toward meeting the final aim of the program. With
the above facts in mind, the development of supervised farming programs was considered an important and timely topic for which there is a need for further study and research.

**Delimitations.** This study is limited to the development phase of the supervised farming programs of all-day students of vocational agriculture. It is further limited to a sampling of schools offering vocational agriculture for white children in eleven southern states.

**Definitions.** Supervised farming is a phase of the program of vocational agriculture in which the student uses what he has been taught in the classroom on his home farm or some other farm for a period of at least six months a year under the supervision of the teacher of vocational agriculture.

All-day classes are classes in vocational agriculture designed to meet the needs of students over fourteen years of age who have entered or who are preparing to enter upon the work of the farm and are regularly enrolled in high school.

Long-time supervised farming program is that farming program developed by the all-day student under the guidance of the teacher of vocational agriculture that will offer experiences and develop proficiency in his chosen farming occupation.

Production project is a business venture for profit involving a series of farm jobs usually including a production cycle in a farm enterprise.

Farm job is a natural unit of farm work distinct from other units with respect to nature, purpose, procedure, knowledge, and abilities required.
**Improvement project** is an undertaking involving a series of jobs designed to improve the appearance and real estate value of the farm and the efficiency of the farm business as a whole and which contributes to the comfort or convenience of the farm family.

**Contributory project** is a production project in a student's supervised farming program, the products of which are consumed or utilized in the conduct of the major or minor projects.

**Major project** is a production project which normally yields the major income in a student's supervised farming program.

**Minor project** is a production project which ordinarily yields less income than a major project in a student's farming program, but which may be fitted into the program so as to utilize and balance labor more effectively and yield a quick cash return on a small investment.

**Managerial job** is a farm job within an enterprise that results in intelligent decisions on the part of an individual to do something a certain way.

**Operative job** is a farm job that requires physical work with tools or implements, but which also involves sound judgment and thinking.

**Supplementary farm practice** is a farm job, other than the jobs of the enterprises of the supervised farming program, for additional experience, skill, and efficiency lying outside of the jobs included in the student's production or improvement projects.

**Source and treatment of data.** The normative-survey with the questionnaire technique was the method used in securing the data for this study.² A questionnaire was formulated and mailed to the state

²Questionnaires may be found in Appendix.
supervisors of vocational agriculture in the twelve southern states. This questionnaire pertained to the practices required and recommended by the state supervisors for the development of the supervised farming programs of the all-day students of vocational agriculture in their state.

There were eleven supervisors who cooperated in the study.

A second questionnaire was formulated and mailed to a selected sample of teachers of vocational agriculture in the eleven southern states. This sample was selected from a mailing list of the white teachers of vocational agriculture in these states. The lists were taken and every third teacher was selected and mailed a questionnaire.

The questionnaire to the teachers was formulated to find out the actual practices used by the teachers in the development of the supervised farming programs. Also, some general information such as degree held by the teacher was included in the questionnaire.

There were 1036 questionnaires mailed to the teachers of vocational agriculture in the eleven southern states. There were 596 replies and this is 57.5 per cent of the total number sent out. The data from these questionnaires are tabulated in Chapter III. The summary and conclusions are presented in Chapter IV. The recommendations are presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Supervised farming was begun in the schools of Massachusetts in 1908, under the guidance of the first supervisor of agricultural education, Rufus W. Stimson. It was there that Mr. Stimson originated and established the school and farm cooperation plan. He developed the "project" method of teaching agriculture in the rural communities. The students would study agriculture in the classroom, and on their home farm they would carry out in actual practice what they had studied in the classroom.

The project method of teaching vocational agriculture spread in a limited manner to all parts of the country. When the Smith-Hughes Act was passed this was considered an important part of the vocational agriculture program. Included in the Act in section 10 is the following statement: "that such schools shall provide for directed or supervised practice in agriculture, either on a farm provided for by the school or other farm, for at least six months per year." Therefore, when vocational agriculture began in the public schools with Federal aid it was necessary for supervised farming to be included in the course of vocational agriculture.

---


At first the project work in vocational agriculture was carried on as projects in farm crops the first year, animal production the second year, horticulture the third year, and farm engineering, farm management and farm economics the fourth year. However, in about 1930 the leaders in vocational agriculture decided that since farming is a continuous business and not by projects of one kind one year and another the next year, that the supervised farming programs should be developed in the same manner that the farming business is carried on. This changed the method of teaching vocational agriculture from the project basis to a unit basis known as the farm job. The supervised farming programs were developed as a continuing program with the aim of establishing the student in farming.

The supervised farming program is important for the student to complete the learning process by actually doing what he has been taught in the classroom. "After the classroom discussion, the teaching process should be continued in the laboratory and at the home farm of each boy, where an opportunity usually exists for the application of the acquired knowledge in the practice of real farm jobs, of jobs occurring in a boy's project, and of those jobs he does or can do on the home farm."^3

Deyoe states that supervised farming bridges the gap between agriculture as a subject and farming as a vocation. Only as doing is provided as an integral part of instruction can students develop the abilities needed for success in farming and farm living. The learner must see himself in action and note the results of these actions in

---

terms of progress toward acceptable goals before he will be able to appraise his own growth. The teacher must observe the learner in practical situations in farming and appraise the learner's achievement in this in order to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. Well rounded programs of supervised farming provide many situations for learning by doing and evaluating outcomes.4

Deyoe lists the practices which are associated with selecting and developing good programs of supervised farming as follows:

1. Guidance is provided for prospective students so that enrollments in vocational agriculture consists of persons who are interested in farming and have facilities available for developing satisfactory programs of supervised farming.

2. Conference of student, parents, and teacher is held before or at the beginning of the school year to explain the purpose of supervised farming and the relation of these programs to the improvement and management of the home farm and to the development of the boy.

3. Students are guided to make surveys of enterprises and secure other information on their home farms for use in selecting programs of supervised farming.

4. Early in the school year, class instruction is provided which leads to the selection of programs of supervised farming by each student.

5. Agreements between parents, student, and teacher are developed for each program of supervised farming, in many cases in writing and signed by all parties concerned.

6. Students are guided to set challenging goals for themselves in developing their programs and to use appropriate measures of efficiency for measuring progress toward these goals.

7. During the first year, students are guided to select long-time programs of supervised farming.

8. Throughout each year, class instruction is organized to aid students to develop abilities for approved practices and to make plans for applying them to their programs of supervised farming.

9. Students are guided to adopt some approved practices in addition to those already used on the home farm.

10. Visits by the teacher are made to home farms throughout the year, with most of these visits planned to provide instruction to the students in carrying out and evaluating their farming.

11. At least some of the home visits are scheduled in advance with the students, with a growing tendency toward this practice for all or most visits.

12. Instruction is provided on values of records and on methods of keeping and summarizing them and using the results.

A study was sponsored by the United States Office of Education pertaining to the evaluation of local programs of vocational agriculture. This study was made in most of the states during the years of 1940 and 1941. It was based on evaluative criteria established by a National Committee on Standards in Agricultural Education. A representative sample of schools was selected from each state and the evaluative criteria were applied to these schools. There are sections of this study which pertain to supervised farming programs and parts of these sections are included here.

Under the heading of Scale I in the evaluative study is listed the initiation, relationships, and supervision of supervised farming programs. The study gave the following characteristics for a "very superior" program in this phase of the vocational agriculture program:

---

5Ibid., pp. 223, 237.
In the typical "very superior" program, arrangements were made for a student's supervised farming program previous to or at the beginning of his first year of vocational agriculture, in three-way conferences of the parents, the boy, and the teacher. About the same time the student and the teacher made a survey of enterprises on the home farm and recorded the findings.

The teacher made a systematic and thorough attempt to explain the purposes of supervised farming programs to the parents at the beginning of the student's first year of vocational agriculture. The teacher and student discussed with each parent how the supervised farming program fitted into the development and management of the home farm. A written agreement concerning the first year's supervised farming program between the parent, teacher, and student was made, although not necessarily signed by the parent.

A teacher in the "very superior" program made an average of eight visits to each first-year student's supervised farming program during the year. Of all the visits made by teachers, 60 per cent were functional, 27 per cent were inspectional, and 13 per cent were for other purposes. Most of his students, during their first year of vocational agriculture, planned a long-time supervised farming program.

For the "very inferior" program in the initiation, relationships, and supervision of supervised farming programs, the evaluative study presented the following characteristics:

The typical "very inferior" program was weak in every respect. No arrangements were made with parents for supervised farming programs at or near the beginning of the year. No survey of farming enterprises was made.

No attempt was made to explain the character and purposes of supervised farming programs to parents. No attention was given to supervised farming home-farm relationships. Agreements with parents were vague or nonexistent. The teacher made 1.6 visits a year to first-year students. Of these visits 15 per cent were functional, 28 per cent were inspectional, and 57 per cent were for other purposes. Only rarely did students make long-time plans for their supervised farming programs.

---


7Ibid., p. 7.
The characteristics of good initiation, relationships, and supervision of supervised farming programs was described from a study of sixty-four "very superior" and "superior" programs. These characteristics are:

1. Conferences of students, teachers, and parents are held near or at the beginning of the school year to arrange for supervised farming programs.

2. Surveys of enterprises on each farm are made by teacher and students.

3. Teacher explains the characteristics and purposes of supervised farming programs to parents of first-year students.

4. Parent, teacher, and student agreements on supervised farming programs are made.

5. At least half of the visits of the teacher are functional, i.e., have learning value for the student.8

Scale II of the evaluative study pertained to the supervised farming programs of the all-day students of vocational agriculture. Evaluation committees studied and supervised farming programs of 1,162 all-day students, a little less than three for each local program. The students interviewed were usually third or fourth year high school students. The study listed the characteristics of a "very superior" program as follows:

The typical "very superior" supervised farming program offered specific training, inasmuch as the farm enterprises included were those in which the trainee expected to engage as a farmer and were those common to the community. Usually this program made a real contribution to the permanent improvement of the home farm. It offered a high quality of managerial experience, usually involving the management of all or part of a farm. This typical program provided for

---
8Ibid., p. 7.
several approved practices beyond those found on the home farm, and it showed advancement each year in the farming methods and the continuation of projects. This "very superior" program had particular merit in that it provided the nucleus of a farm business either at home or elsewhere. In cases where the young man was to farm with his parents, the program provided for the development of a partnership plan.9

In comparison to the "very superior" program the evaluative study listed the following characteristics for the "very inferior" program:

The typical "very inferior" program offered little to meet the specific needs of trainees in preparation for a farming career in the community. There was no recognition with respect to the desirability of permanent improvement on the home farm. Only limited opportunity for managerial experience was offered; control of productive enterprise projects was often lacking. No approved practices beyond those already in use on the home farm were found. Either there were no continuation projects, or there was no development from year to year. This typical program offered no assistance in establishing the young man in farming, and there was no evidence of a partnership arrangement with parents.10

The characteristics of a strong supervised farming program were described from a study of 331 "very superior" and "superior" programs as follows:

1. The enterprises included are appropriate to the needs of students and the farming of the community.

2. Some provision for the student's managerial experience is made.

3. Approved farm practices in addition to those ordinarily found on the home farm are evident.

4. There is evidence of accumulation of assets leading to establishment in farming.11

9Ibid., p. 10.

10Ibid., p. 11.

11Ibid., p. 12.
The common weaknesses in supervised farming programs found by the evaluative study are:

1. There is little or no improvement on the home farm through improvement projects. Supervised farming programs and the work of the teacher on such programs are weakest at this point.

2. Continuation projects do not exist or show progression.

3. There is little or no evidence of partnerships between father and son.12

The organization of the course of study for the all-day students was the topic for Scale III of the evaluative study. This phase of the study is important in a study of supervised farming programs because the course of study is built around the enterprises in the supervised farming programs. The "very superior" course of study was characterized by the following:

The typical "very superior" course was built around the enterprises represented in the supervised farming programs. The fact that many of the students carried a given enterprise in their programs resulted in an increased time emphasis in the study of that enterprise. The course units were taught just before they were needed for planning the various phases of the enterprise. Usually the corresponding activity of the supervised farming was planned when the unit was taught. The course was organized on a cross-sectional or horizontal basis so that the instruction on major enterprises extended 2 or more years. Students often visited, with teacher, the supervised farming programs of other students to secure a basis for study of local problems. The unit of organization of this course of study was in terms of farming activities, the job or problem, for example, as compared with the topic. These units were arranged seasonally; for example, the job "potato planting" was taught at potato-planting time or just previously. Within each unit the approach to the learner was through his interest, experience, or need. The activities of the Future Farmer chapter were utilized as opportunities for teaching.13

---

12 Ibid., p. 12.
The "very inferior" course in comparison to the "very superior"

had the following characteristics:

The typical "very inferior" course was well below the
"inferior" course in every respect. There was little or no
relationship between supervised farming and the course of
study. This relationship applied to content, content
emphasis, assistance in conduct of projects, coincidence
between planning and teaching, teaching continuity in major
enterprises, and project visiting. The topic was the unit
of the course of study. Units were taught without regard to
season; the approach was logical; and Future Farmer activities
were disregarded as teaching opportunities.14

The characteristics of a good course of study organization were
described from a study of 239 "very superior" and "superior" courses as
follows:

1. Farm enterprises and problems represented in individual
supervised farming programs are included in the course of
study.

2. Farm enterprises and problems represented in indi-
vidual supervised farming programs affect the emphasis on
enterprises in the course of study.

3. Each unit of the course is taught at such time as to
give the greatest assistance to the student in carrying out
his supervised farming.

4. The unit of organization is in terms of farming
activities.

5. Units are arranged seasonally.

6. The approach to the unit is through the interest,
experience, or need of the learner.15

The characteristics of the common weaknesses found in the organ-
ization of courses of study were found by the evaluative study to be:

14Ibid., p. 15.
15Ibid., p. 16.
1. Planning of a supervised farming activity is not done at the time that activity is taught.

2. Major enterprises, when launched as a part of the supervised farming program, are continued through one year only.

3. Activities of the FFA chapters are disregarded as a means of reaching some of the objectives of vocational agriculture.

The importance of the supervised farming in developing the boy into partnership and management of the farm business is emphasized by an article written by Parsons:

The boy's home farming program is the keystone in his learning to be a farmer. Without a well balanced developing, and continuous long-time farming program which gives a full cross section of his type of farming, little progress will be made toward his actually learning to be a farmer and to his establishment in farming.

Unless the boy uses the superior practices he works out in class in his own home farming, you will not change his attitudes toward improvement in farming methods. Classroom information does not become knowledge until actually carried out in use in his own farming. Likewise attitudes toward better farming methods are the results of the successful use of these practices in farming.

A good supervised farming program in which the boy has management and a financial interest is essential to complete and motivate his instruction in the vocational agriculture class. Many studies of the efficiency of instruction in vocational agriculture show that boys who during their school career build up real ownership of livestock and who have a foundation herd or flock and who have accumulated capital and equipment, are the ones who become farmers. Also, those boys whom their parents have given management of their program and who have been progressively taken into a farm partnership are more than likely to become established as farmers.

16Ibid., p. 16.
It is not too difficult for the teacher of vocational agriculture and the boy to persuade his parents to let him own his enterprises and to follow the recommended practices in carrying them out. However, for the boy to have an actual part in the management of the farming and a definite partnership in the farm business is an entirely different matter. It takes both time and much personal work on the part of the teacher with the boy's parents to get them to let him participate in the management of the farm and to have actual partnership, even though he may be the only boy and wanting to farm.

Let me illustrate by the case of the boy who was made Star State Farmer this past year. Albert comes from a 1,074-acre beef cattle and sheep farm. While in high school he built up a nice flock of sheep and herd of beef cows which he owned and took care of himself. When he finished high school his dad gave him a one-fourth share in the whole farming operations but no management. When you talked to Albert it was, "Dad says, do this, do that." It took much personal work and follow-up by his teacher for two years more before the boy's dad really took him in as an actual partner in the operation of the farm. Now when you talk to them it is, "We are doing so and so. We plan to do this." Albert is now definitely established in farming and well satisfied with staying on the farm with dad. Previously he felt that he was being well paid for his work on the farm but that he really did not have any share or responsibility in its operation. He tackles his work now with real enthusiasm. The two are working together as partners and Albert has an entirely different attitude.

The teacher of vocational agriculture will find each boy and his parents present a different problem. The teacher must gain the confidence and good will of all concerned and then work tactfully and long to bring about the desired results. Unless you get both the partnership and management the boy usually leaves the home farm and goes elsewhere.

Another illustration will show how the boy's farming program enabled him to accumulate some dairy cows and get the necessary training so that he could become his dad's partner. In this case the boy was the only child and his parents were anxious for him to stay on the farm. His farming program while in school is shown herewith:

When Dan finished high school he continued farming with dad on a one-third partnership with a definite part in the
management and at the end of the second year became an equal partner with dad in the operation of the thirty cow dairy farm. In addition, Dan got married and set up housekeeping in an apartment which they made in one part of the large farm house.

In this situation the teacher had little difficulty in getting the parents to take Dan into full partnership in the farming business. Many instances might be given where dad let the boy own and carry out a good farming program while in high school but was unwilling to take the boy into any partnership after the boy finished school. These boys are now no longer farming with dad.17

One of the studies made on supervised farming was made in Iowa by Sweeney and Starrak and published in February, 1941. Following are the findings of this study that has to do with the development and supervision of supervised farming:

Instruction in vocational agriculture in the secondary schools of the state is carried on under the provisions of federal legislation, embodied in national vocational education acts. The first of these acts, popularly known as the Smith-Hughes Act, was passed in 1917, and is still in force. The latest, the George Dean Act, which increases substantially the amount of the federal subsidy provided in the Act of 1917 and extends its provisions to include additional vocations, became operative in 1933.

Because of its comparative newness, the program in vocational agriculture is not generally well understood or appreciated except in communities where the work has been carried on successfully for a number of years. Attempts to acquaint the general public with the program have been scattered and sporadic, with the result that the current ideas concerning it have been acquired by hearsay or long-range observation and consequently are not always accurate or adequate.

Perhaps as little understood and appreciated as any phase of the current program of vocational agriculture is that known as supervised farm practice. The Smith-Hughes

---

17D. W. Parsons, "Developing the Boy into Partnership and Management Through His Farming Program," Agricultural Education Magazine, XX (June, 1948), p. 224.
Act makes definite mandatory provisions for this part of the program. Section 10 of the Act reads, "...that such schools shall provide for directed or supervised practice in agriculture, either on a farm provided for the school or other farm, for at least six months per year..." Two requirements, therefore, must be met if the school is to be reimbursed for its supervised practice program: (1) Supervised practice must be carried on upon a farm; and (2) it must cover a period of at least six months each year.

The earlier forms of supervised farm practice may have satisfied the letter of the law, but there is little doubt that they fell far short of the spirit of it, as expressed in the ideals and objectives of those educators who assisted in the writing of the Act. In these beginning years the typical farm-practice program of the individual boy was quite narrow, usually limited to one production project, often a very small one, per year with no continuity of enterprises from year to year as he progressed through his high school course.

In more recent years the trend has been in the direction of individualized farming programs, diversified in character and comprising various integrated enterprises carried over a period of several years. In the effective management of this preferred form of supervised farm practice, there is a deliberate and carefully planned effort to improve the quality of the products, to increase the scope of the various enterprises, to integrate the different enterprises into a comprehensive program and finally, to lead to the establishment of the boy as an independent farm operator.

In vocational agriculture, the school comes to the farm home for the purpose of obtaining its cooperation in teaching the boy through participation in real life problems encountered in his supervised farming program or in the farm business as a whole or in both.

For many reasons it is highly desirable that the active interest and intelligent cooperation of the parents be obtained in order to insure the development of a satisfactory supervised practice program for the boy. In the first place the instructor cannot give the boy's project work as close supervision as can the parents. Care must be taken, however, to insure that the parents work with the teacher to see that the boy carries out his own plans rather than work with the boy to carry out the recommendations that may be made by the teacher. In other words, the parent should become co-supervisor.
In the second place it is desirable that the parents approve the long-time program and production plans before they are finally adopted, since they may call for considerable adjustment of the whole farm program as they develop. Usually the boy is held responsible for obtaining this approval, but the instructor verifies it.

A third reason why the obtaining of parental cooperation is desirable is that parents assist in financing the boy's project in the majority of cases. This assistance is often essential because of the difficulties encountered by minors in obtaining credit. Parents, however, must understand as thoroughly as possible the educational principles involved in the supervised practice program, if their assistance in this direction is to do more good than harm. Uninitiated parents often think that helping their boys financially means giving them outright money, feed and equipment, and are inclined to be much too lenient in money matters, thus depriving the boys of the full benefit of the business experiences involved in the management of their projects. In fact, some are likely to think that they will be regarded as non-cooperative and uninterested if they do not give outright to their boys and money and equipment needed. The wise instructor will take steps to insure that parents are disillusioned in this regard as early as possible and are made to realize that the real purpose of the supervised farming program is to educate the boy, not to make money for him.

A fourth reason for obtaining the interest and cooperation of the parents has been emphasized by certain instructors. In order that the productive projects undertaken by the boy may grow into a long-time life farming program, these instructors encourage a partnership between father and son in the particular enterprise which the boy has chosen for his project. Under the partnership agreement, the boy owns a percentage of the enterprise and gradually takes over the active management of the whole enterprise on the farm. Such an arrangement, of course, enlarges greatly the experience of the boy and increases his opportunity to improve his productive methods and in addition may help to make his particular enterprise of the home farm more profitable.

Comprehensive, supervised farming programs are those which involve a variety of home projects, planned for and carried on over a number of years. The end objective of such a program is the establishment of the boy as an independent farmer as a result of the expansion and integration of the separate projects or enterprises into a broad farming program. The ideal of becoming a successful farmer is thus kept alive in the mind of the boy and
serves to motivate the learning of knowledge and abilities, the value of which would not be made so obvious if the program were limited to small, independent, short-lived projects. In addition a long-time program is more apt to lead to partnership in the home farm business than are small, independent, seasonal projects.

It is worthy to note that in all the 24 departments it was found necessary, or at least advisable, to revise the plans for the long-time programs each year. Since in actual-life situations this same need is experienced, it might be regarded as indicative of the real and vital character of the project programs.

The advisability of selecting the animals and seed for the productive projects, with a view of their becoming the foundation stock for the long-time projects, is also quite obvious. Breed lines, rather than individual quality, should receive more emphasis.

It is interesting to note that although the majority of the instructors encourage the development of the productive projects into partnership enterprises with the parents of the boy, more of them are in favor of the complete ownership by the boy of the productive projects which form the initial stages in his long-time program.

Since 25 per cent of the instructors do not initiate the long-time program in the first year of the boy's enrollment in the vocational agriculture course, it can hardly be considered essential to do so, although 64 per cent of the instructors reported the plans for the long-time program for the beginning vocational agriculture student cover a period of four or more years, while the remainder plan for lesser periods. In the case of students who are on the point of graduating from the vocational agriculture course, only 45 per cent of the instructors have the boys plan for as much as four years ahead. The remainder seem satisfied with plans covering two and three years.

The type of supervision which produces superior farm-practice programs involves much more than the mere over-seeing of the work on the home farm through visitation by the instructor. Much direction was given by the instructors investigated to the shaping of the program in the classroom during the planning period and later in the solution of problems which arise as the project progresses. The total supervision given to the farm-practice program may, therefore, be thought of as occurring in two places, i.e., in the classroom and on the home farm of the boy.
It is, perhaps, to be expected that the instructors in schools with superior supervised farming programs connect closely the work of the classroom with the home projects, to the mutual benefit of both phases. This was found to be so in the case of the 24 instructors investigated. In doing so they make use of more than one device or activity.

The class periods in vocational agriculture in the typical school are devoted almost exclusively to teaching production techniques. The managerial phases are introduced quite realistically in the actual planning of the supervised farming programs. Budget estimates are made of possible productive projects to determine the advisability of undertaking them. Record of projects of some years' standing are analyzed in the search for factors which result in gain and loss. The value of accurate records is thus made apparent to the boy, and his ability to keep and interpret records is developed.

Since the boys make their initial plans for their projects before many of the essential principles and techniques have been taken up systematically in class work, the instructors find it necessary to have the boys check upon their project plans periodically, as new ideas are developed, and to make any changes indicated by their newly acquired knowledge. This type of supervision of the home projects reduces the number of farm visitations, and thus results in a more economical use of the instructor's time.

In most of the programs investigated, the instructors use the conference method in implementing the various classroom supervision practices discussed above. These conferences are with the individual boys, or with a small group of boys who happen at the time to be grappling with identical or quite similar problems. On rare occasions a few instructors utilize classroom periods to take the whole class to a farm where a demonstration of a correct practice, which each boy will need to use in his own project, is given.

The amount of home supervision found necessary to insure superior supervised farming programs seems to vary considerably with the different instructors. When the projects are carefully planned during regular class periods, and when the active interest and intelligent cooperation of the parents are secured by the various means which have been described perviously in this report, the amount of home supervision may be materially reduced, and the time spent on the farm by the instructor may be devoted to the closer supervision
of the actual work of the project.

There are very few of the instructors who notify the boys of impending visits in order to insure that they will be at home. Most of them prefer to run the risk of not seeing the boys, due to their possible absence from home, rather than have the boys make special preparations for their coming and thus deceive them as to the normal conditions of the projects. There are also few who leave with the boy a check sheet of recommendations. It would appear that such a sheet would have considerable value, especially if compiled with the cooperation of the boy.18

In discussing the importance of supervised farm practice, Cook writes the following:

It is often said that the kind of supervised farm practice work done in the school is a symbol of the kind of an agricultural teacher in the department. This no doubt is very true for if the instructor is satisfied with weak, poorly developed supervised practice work his program will be very weak. There have been cases where school boards have discontinued the agricultural work simply because of the poor supervised farm practice work of the students. If a boy be allowed to have a dozen hens for his supervised farm practice he cannot expect to make much of a success. His undertaking would be too small to stimulate and encourage him to do a very satisfactory piece of work. Such projects do not develop a boy's responsibility and enthusiasm neither do they receive the respect of the community.19

Rutland makes the following suggestions to teachers on supervised practice work in agriculture:

A. Aims of supervised practice work.

The aims of supervised practice work may be stated as follows:

(1) To insure contact of the learner with the farming vocation in which he is preparing to engage.


19Cook, op. cit., p. 215.
To furnish a means of securing first hand knowledge and experience in doing the jobs the pupil will be called upon to do in his chosen farming vocation.

To aid the Agricultural instructor in making intimate contact with farm homes.

To enable the pupil to earn while he learns.

To give the pupil an opportunity to make definite improvement in practices on the home farm in succeeding years.

To help raise the standard of farming and rural living in the region.

To facilitate learning by having a definite objective in view which the pupil understands and appreciates.

To help develop a growing consciousness of individuality on the part of the pupil through ownership and full control of a farm enterprise.

To put together in learning what goes together in doing.

To develop self activity on the part of the pupil.

To develop a feeling of confidence in the pupil by having him to do the things successfully that his vocation will demand of him before he goes out to tackle the job by himself on a farm of his own.

To develop the boy in executive ability as well as in manual skill.

B. Selecting supervised practice work.

A survey of the pupil's home farm made by the pupil under the direction and supervision of the agriculture instructor will be helpful in getting the pupil to recognize the agriculture resources and possibilities of his home farm, by indicating the type of farming practices; the character of soil; the location of farm in its relation to school, market and neighbors; arrangement of fields and buildings; and the amount and kind of equipment used on the farm. It will also be helpful to the pupil in determining available facilities for carrying out supervised home farm work.
After a study of the pupil's home farm has been made by him as suggested above the following may be helpful to the teacher in guiding the pupil in selecting supervised home farm work.

Select supervised practice work of such a nature that:

1. The pupil can procure satisfactory equipment and finances.

2. The pupil would enjoy, get satisfaction out of and develop pride in working out the details which lead toward the success of the work in the end.

3. The possible financial returns will be large enough so that the pupil will undertake it with zeal, interest and determination. At the same time the pupil must not overlook the fact that the outstanding aim in his doing supervised practice work is to learn the jobs that will help him in following his chosen vocation. In no case should the pupil increase the size of his project beyond the limits to which they can advantageously be expanded under the given educational objectives.

4. It will represent vital problems on the farm if it is to be coupled up closely with the work in the school and the pupils desire to secure as much training as possible in farming.

5. It will offer the pupil the greatest opportunity for securing experience in better practices in the vocation of farming for which he is being prepared to engage and should be of such a character that it can advantageously be continued for a number of years.

6. It will not conflict with the pupil's other farm duties, or the supervised practice enterprise must become a part of a similar enterprise normally occurring on the farm and which the pupil's time would be spent in any case.

7. It will involve problems new to the student or involve new and more extensive handling of problems already being worked on.

8. It will involve the principles taught in the classroom and correlate such study with the best farm practice in the region.
(9) It will involve the relation of the enterprise or enterprises to the whole farm business plan.

(10) It will be a means of developing a spirit of cooperation and community interest among the members of the class, and, so far as possible, a feeling of pride in their accomplishment among the parents.

C. Pupils responsibility for supervised practice.

The pupil is the one person who must be held directly responsible for supervised practice work. This responsibility for the conduct of supervised practice lies in the fact that he is the learner and must do the practice work necessary in preparing himself to meet the demands of the vocation for which he is training.

Therefore, in carrying out his supervised practice work he should agree to do as much of the actual work as possible, that which he does not do he should be directly responsible for its being done satisfactorily. Those jobs which are turned over to someone else in case he cannot get to do them should be the jobs in which he has already acquired skill in doing. He should do those jobs in which he has not already acquired skill. The possibility of his trying to avoid the responsibility of the success or failure of his supervised practice work should be eliminated by being sole owner, manager, operator and day laborer in order that he may develop both managerial ability as well as manipulative skill in the operations necessary to the success of his practical farm work.

D. Time for beginning supervised practice.

An early start in the supervised practice work is essential.

a. For the new pupil every attempt should be made to have him arrange for his supervised practice work before school opens, so that the study of his work in the classroom and the planning for his farm practice work will be on an actual basis of carrying out some distinct kind of supervised practice work.

b. For the pupil who has already had a year's experience in agriculture consideration should be given to the previous year's work as well as to the new work he is undertaking. He should plan to carry on again, the second year, some phase or phases of his previous supervised practice work for the purpose of improvement over previous
practices. Along with this improvement work the old pupil should plan early on what he intends to carry out the next year in the new line of work.

Supervised practice work is a vital part of the Vocational Agriculture Course. Therefore, ample time should be provided in the instructor's annual teaching plans for study, preparation of outlines and plans, checking records, etc., of the supervised practice work. It is suggested that not less than 2 - 90 minute periods per month be set aside by the instructor for this work.

J. Supervising the home practice work.

Importance of supervision. The supervision of the home farm work is the most vital factor in the whole program of vocational education in the farming occupations. Supervision is much more than inspection, the checking and verification of accomplishment in required work. It is more than inspection plus the giving of directions for specific tasks in accomplishment. It is farm teaching of the boy as an individual working at a vocation in order that by his own self-directed activity he may be modified toward increased proficiency in that vocation. The teacher works with the boy as advisor and friend, to enable the boy to make his own plans, to formulate the steps of his own procedure, to specify the jobs which must be done, to discover the needs for and the means to the skill, knowledges and social abilities requisite to success in the vocation which he is now pursuing. No part of the teacher's work is more exigent in its demands for tact and resourcefulness, none more fully necessitates the teaching attitude - a looking at the problem with eyes of the boy.

Number and length of visits. No standard can be set up as to the proper number of visits per boy or the proper length of visits in each case. Both will vary with the boy, with the home conditions, with the nature of the enterprise and with season, as well as with the distance to be covered in going and coming. Go as often as the boys need you and stay as long as they need you. 20

Federal Board for Vocational Education Bulletin No. 163 states the importance of supervised farming as follows:

20J. B. Rutland, Pupil's Record Book for Supervised Practice Work in Agriculture (Austin, Texas: University of Texas), pp. 3-6; 8-9.
The best measure of value of instruction is what the student does with what he has learned. If he uses it, he has usually profited by it. If he does not use it there may be some cold storage values but these will be questionable. In the first place, if the boy does not use what he is taught and is not planning to do so while he is being taught, his interest is usually at a low ebb. In general we do not learn what we are not interested in learning. In the second place, it is difficult for a teacher to secure adequate participation on the part of the student in any other way than through a supervised farm practice program. When no such program is set up the tendency is to deal with merely informational teaching content. The cold storage values created are largely a type of informational values which are not worth much to start with and will be constantly deteriorating through lack of use.

On the other hand, if we accept as our major aim the establishment in farming of such boys as want to be farmers, then the instruction should obviously deal with the activities of an actual farming training program in which the boy can participate in immediately.

The content of a course of study should be derived largely from the type or types of farming prevailing in the locality, and be built upon a selective basis to represent a fair composite of the farming programs of the members of the class. The idea which should be kept constantly in mind is that the instruction of each boy in the class should be based on the activities in which he can engage in the type of farming for which he is receiving; conversely, if such participation is not provided for a majority of the class, the course of study will be relatively ineffective regardless of its content. It is a waste of time to try to teach what the students are not ready to use.

The course of study each year should be flexible enough to meet the instruction demands growing out of the students supervised farm practice. Since a boy's farming program represents a cross section of farming, the course of study should be organized on the same basis, instead of by segregating portions of the course, such as crop studies in one year and animal studies in another year, and an abstract subject matter basis. Secondly, the course of study should be organized on a farm job unit basis, instead of on a farm enterprise basis or worse yet, on an informational subject matter basis. Jobs in the different enterprises may be distributed over more than one year as best fits the student as their farming program develops. In any case it will be necessary to supplement group instruction with individual instruction. A flexible course of study should facilitate
For a farm business to be a successful business, it must have a well-rounded and balanced program of enterprises. The same is true of the supervised farming programs of all-day students of vocational agriculture. Jones makes the following recommendations for the development of balanced farming programs for students of vocational agriculture:

With more and more attention focused in the direction of "balanced farming," the challenge presented teachers of vocational agriculture in developing well-rounded farming programs on the part of individual students is correspondingly made more acute.

This is especially true in areas where the tendency has always been and still is toward the one crop system, as for example in certain areas of the South where practically all effort is devoted to cotton production. The situation is further aggravated by the tenancy system and a lack of adequate facilities and of financing.

As is true in all phases of the work in vocational agriculture, there is no magic wand which may be waved to secure the desired results. One fact stands out—the teacher must set his own goals before he approaches the boys on the subject. He must be wide awake to the conditions in the community and be thoroughly familiar with such. Not only should this familiarity be incident to conditions as they exist at present, but should go much further and consider in the entirety the possibilities which the area offers for improvement both in fostering improved practice with reference to those enterprises already being used and for additional enterprises.

After the teacher has thoroughly saturated his thinking with honest convictions as to the needs in his community, nothing will further strengthen his confidence more than persistent contacts with influential people in the community. Leading farmers, wide awake business men, key bankers, other agricultural leaders and the parents of the boys to be taught should be consulted and their friendship cultivated. They can do much to verify the feasibility of the boy's plans and give him increased confidence so necessary to proceed into something different.

---

In the orientation process, both before and after school starts, freshmen should be thoroughly familiarized with the department and what it proposes to offer. Let it be thoroughly understood that a well-rounded student will participate to the full extent of his facilities in at least three phases of closely correlated work; namely (1) classroom work similar in nature to other school subjects, (2) the supervised farming program, and (3) the Future Farmers of America.

It has been known for a long time that if boys are permitted to do the things which they like to do, it is much easier to get them to adopt practices conceded to be best for them.

This is where the F.F.A. comes in. A strong Future Farmer organization can do more than any one thing to aid the teacher in developing strong individual farming programs. Boys in general like to excel. If they are thoroughly familiarized with the F.F.A. and understand that to so excel they must meet certain minimum standards they will soon assume the initiative in setting their own standards.

As the general interest in F.F.A. increases the boys themselves will set up in the annual program of work their own standards under the division headed Supervised Farming Program. Careful supervision by the teacher will result in reasonable standards for each degree of membership. Beginning with the Green Hand degree each successive degree should demand more extensive programs. If the F.F.A. is sufficiently active and as a few members progress to the higher degrees and otherwise meet the success in various enterprises, they can and should be encouraged to assume some of the initiative in helping younger boys in developing plans for the kind of program necessary to win them similar acclaim.

The chapter may even go much further in helping its members and through cooperative effort start aiding them by establishing breeding stock "chains" as in furnishing a gilt with the understanding that the boy return two gilts from the first or second litters for redistribution to other worthy members. It is also possible to aid members in constructing equipment, securing feed, seed, fertilizer and the like. If the chapter does not have the capital, it may usually be secured as a chapter loan from the local bank, from an individual or on an open account to be repaid as the participating members repay their loans to the chapter. Breeding service may be offered with chapter owned sires placed with dependable and accessible members.
Back in the classroom much time must be spent in teaching freshmen classes in the economic possibilities with new enterprises. A determination of probable profit, labor and income distribution and the extent to which they fit into the soil improvement program must be made. By and large, the planning of farming programs should center around the principles upon which the better farmers farm and provide for (1) cash income, (2) food for the family, (3) feed for the livestock, (4) soil improvement and conservation, and (5) home and farm improvement with sufficient time for civic, social and religious activity. Some of these principles will naturally be applied under improvement projects or farm practice jobs. The student should be induced to set up a program such as a successful farmer would practice except on a smaller scale.

Such studies should make extensive use of statistical data, estimates based upon local practice, reference material, success stories of farmers and data from record summaries of advanced students.

In all cases the boy, his parent or guardian and the teacher should be in complete understanding as to the intent of the program and the plans to be executed.

As a further boom to developing balanced programs by introducing new enterprises all boys should be informed well in advance of livestock and product shows and encouraged to plan to participate in such. The teacher may well commit himself to stand by in such events to the extent that he crawls in the straw with the boys at such shows, and "roughs it" with them. He may come out the following morning looking like a real hay seed, but he will be duly compensated in his own satisfaction in the fact that such events are invaluable promotional and educational events. If they are successful, they will return to the local community with a good story to inspire not only themselves to more fervent activity but other boys as well. If they lose, they will with proper guidance accept the challenge to do better next time.

Much material aid may be expected from the host of friends which the teacher and the boys should, as previously stated, have already cultivated. As the program proceeds it should reflect itself as a definite feature in the overall improvement program in the community. Special effort should be made to instigate a program which will demand public attention. The public must be kept informed. Regular well-prepared news articles in which general, as well as individual, summaries
are presented are effective in attracting public attention and at the same time encourages the students. If such publicity is given and responsible people realize that the once so-called "project" is no longer just a routine minimum requirement for a passing agriculture grade, but that it actually means "business" in trying to make long lasting improvements and establish boys as successful farmers such people will soon be coming to the teacher volunteering physical and financial aid.

Building strong, balanced programs justifies much thought, effort, and time, for only by developing such programs can farm boys in vocational agriculture "grow" into successful farming which is the number one objective of vocational agriculture.  

In developing supervised farming programs, the following suggestions to teachers of vocational agriculture were made by Sanders in his study of Supervised Farming Planning:

Planning supervised farm practice has been talked of since supervised farm practice was evolved. It was intended as insurance of successful farming for the agricultural student. As such, planning has been a miserable failure at least as judged from written plans found in record books in Virginia.

Many reasons might be given but there is one reason that seems to underlie all others. Vocational instruction commonly has been devoted to teaching agriculture - not to teaching farm boys to be proficient in their farming, their own farming. Planning has come after instruction. Often it has been an afterthought. Planning needs to have first place, making instruction necessary in order to meet the demands of the plan or program of the student. It is amazing to think that a Virginia State Farmer has had a plan no better than that of other vocational students. Either planning is not essential to farming or we are doing a very inefficient job.

All farmers do some planning. Good farmers do so very carefully. They are critical of old practices as well as the new. Poor farmers depend on "hunches" rather than critical thinking. It is true that good farmers do not write out their plans. There is careful figuring and critical thinking leading to mental decisions concerning the business for the next year and those to follow. It is often a clear cut mental

---

22 A. C. Jones, "Developing Balanced Farming Programs with Students of Vocational Agriculture", *Agricultural Education Magazine*, XX (June, 1948), pp. 225, 237.
plan. Planning continues daily with modifications and enlargements—an over developing, never fully completed or fixed plan.

The vocational student has had a limited farming experience especially of a managerial nature. The teacher in turn has little knowledge of the exact nature of the farm experience and farming habits of the individual student. This necessitates more complete plans for the student than the farmer. Planning should be justified by objectives which insure more proficient farming.

Objectives in developing or planning supervised farming programs:

(1) To insure a program which will bring a maximum of satisfaction to the agricultural student, a more complete farm experience and more valuable vocational experience.

(2) To develop skill in management through having to contend with problems of estimating costs, making financial agreements, organizing and applying facts, and using records.

(3) As a guide to the instructor in providing the agricultural instruction demanded by the program of the individual student. (Training farmers—not teaching agriculture.)

As a matter of fact real faith in planning as an educational tool is now needed. It is our greatest opportunity to reach two essential objectives in producing a proficient farmer; first, to develop abilities necessary in managing a "farm business effectively"; second, to produce a young farmer who will "grow vocationally" after he is out of our class. He should be better able to reason, to be alert for the new in agriculture, to set up new standards for his farming and to meet new situations. These should be the fruits of more intelligent and more careful planning. Let us take planning seriously. It is as important as culling chickens and judging livestock.

---

23H. W. Sanders, Supervised Farming Planning (Blacksburg, Va., Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1940), p. 1.
Hammonds gives the advantages of using farm practice as a method of teaching vocational agriculture as follows:

1) Farm practice teaches the teacher.
   a) The teacher who would successfully use the farm practice method learns that he cannot teach just about agriculture, he must teach agriculture and about it too.
   b) The teacher selects a different content when he selects something that he knows the pupils are going to use now and in the future. The teacher learns that the content must fit the pupils and the community.
   c) The economic return from farm practice, though sometimes overstressed, helps the teacher to see importance of a money return in a vocation. It helps him to evaluate what he teaches in terms of its use in producing an income.
   d) The teacher becomes less bookish. He comes to know that the problem is not in the book, but on the farm. More correctly the boy has or must be caused to have a farm problem. The problems are real.
   e) The teacher is brought into intimate contact with the farming of the community. The teacher uses the community for educative purposes, for himself and pupils.
   f) The teacher is forced to think of the pupils individuality. The teacher learns to know his pupils. Often a boy who cannot grasp abstract ideas quickly will do excellent farm practice. Such boys are respected more by the teacher and he understands them.

2) Farm practices conforms to the standards of good teaching methods.
   a) It results in self activity on the part of the learner. Farm practice is self activity, individual participation. As farm practice is done by individuals, individual differences are taken care of. Farm practice is almost a guarantee that the teacher will pay attention to the individual differences.
   b) The learner gets satisfaction from his work. Nothing succeeds like success and nothing satisfies like success. The pupil feels that the thing done is worthwhile. Farm practice of the proper kind and scope challenges the pupil. The pupil has the satisfaction of production, the satisfaction of removing the obstacles between him and his goal, the satisfaction of working in real vocations, the satisfaction of realizing that he is growing, developing.
   c) Organization is involved. The organization is natural and genuine. Each project becomes an organized
center. Information must be interpreted, evaluated, classified, and used on each large unit of activity.

(d) Thinking on the part of the learner is secured. Literally hundreds of demands for thinking are involved in a farm practice program. 1. Determining the projects to make the program; 2. determining the scope of each project; 3. determining the best fertilizer or feed; 4. determining the best breed, strain, or variety; 5. determining how to control the insects and diseases; 6. keeping the records and so on. The ability to think thus developed is more likely to function in later farming because farming now and farming later will have identical elements.

(e) Farm practice helps develop initiative on the part of the learner. To the extent the pupils are required to initiate their own programs and carry them out, initiative has a chance to be developed.\(^\text{\textsuperscript{24}}\)

One of the studies in the state of Louisiana pertaining to the building of supervised practice programs was made by Gar. From eighteen general farm surveys of their home farms made by boys in the Redhimer High School, Chestnut, Louisiana, Natchitoches Parish. He concluded the following:

Vocational education as provided in the National Vocational Act of Congress is treated in this study so as to develop the students in vocational agricultural schools to the maximum degree of efficiency.

The supervised farm practice program for each boy is based on intelligent decisions made from careful analysis of the home farm survey. The farmer training is based on the student's interests, his ideals, his attitude, his ability, and the kind of farmer he hopes to become.

The supervised farm practice program is organized according to the student's interests and possibilities including those enterprises found in the type of farming for which he is preparing. The enterprises are broken up into farm jobs. These jobs are then distributed over...

\(^{24}\)Carse Hammonds, "Farm Practice as a Method of Teaching," Agricultural Education Magazine, II (June, 1936), pp. 83, 96.
students training periods according to range of difficulty. The farm jobs in each year are arranged in order of seasonal sequence so far as possible.

In this study the farm jobs in order of difficulty are taught to each student according to its importance to the student. Individualized instruction is used in most cases because no two students have to perform the same farm job in the same manner or degree.

Our previous method of building the supervised farm practice program and course of study was called the box system because it brought together all enterprises of similar classification and were studied until completed, then other enterprises were taken up in the same manner. Livestock enterprises were studied one year and crop the next year. The only logical point about the box system is the economy of study, but repetitive training to form habits is the psychology to vocational education. The outstanding weakness of the box system is that farmers do not go by the box system. They do not plant crops one year and grow livestock the next year but they operate all enterprises at the same time. In the past the supervised farm practice program grew out of the course of study but the new plan, as shown in this study, states that the course of study must grow out of the supervised farm practice program.

Careful business analysis has been made of the two farms in this study and re-organization of the farms to improve farm efficiency has been attempted supporting a supervised farm practice program that will be a cross section of the type of farmer the student is to become.

Five double periods has been set aside for the teaching of farm jobs. This plan gives time for making a survey of community practices, summarizing practices, discussion of practices, and making plans to be entered in record books. Thorough instruction is necessary for desired results.25

---

Cook lists the following practices that a vocational agriculture teacher should follow in the procedure of conducting supervised practice program of the student:

1. Visit prospective boys and their parents in summer.
2. Visit the homes of the boys enrolled in the present classes in advance of the time necessary for the selection of their enterprises. The work should be well explained to the parents and an early selection of supervised practice work encouraged.
3. Aid the students in choosing the enterprises of worthwhile scope. Insist upon student ownership.
4. Help students analyze enterprises to discover jobs and problems to be studied.
5. Require students to study these jobs.
6. Assist the student in writing the plan in detail.
7. Plan project agreement between the teacher, the boy, and the parent.
8. Have students copy plans in their record book.
9. Aid in the selection of seed and animals.
10. Have students keep accurate and complete records as well as diary of their work.
11. Encourage modern and scientific farm practices.
12. Conduct tours to permit students to observe supervised practice done by others.
13. Encourage the showing of worthy products and livestock at local fairs.
14. Help students to find a market for the products that they wish to sell.
15. Require a final story and a financial summary of the boys' work.26

One of the studies found on supervised farm practice was made by Bressler. He made a survey of the practices used by the teachers of Pennsylvania in their project work. He makes the following statements:

From the writer's experience and from many reports heard in the field, it is evident that supervised practice and classroom instruction need to be more closely integrated to develop a functional program of

26Cook, op. cit., pp. 177-178.
vocational agriculture in our rural communities. Project plans lack definiteness and completeness, and need to be written more systematically. Project supervision need to be improved by making our visits more purposeful.

Probably the main reason for the lack of an integrated course of study is that teachers follow, and rightly so, the course of study set up by the State Department in which subjects are taught on a four year basis. They fail to realize, however, that this plan also implies that time be given to project instruction. They stick too close to textbook instruction and allow no time for the pupil to fix in his mind that his project is a part of the agriculture course. They fail to give ample time to the selection and planning of projects. Projects in too many cases are a side line to subject matter instruction. It is common practice for the pupil to select a project without the guidance of previous instruction concerning the possibilities he has for success with the particular project selected. Too often the pupil is assigned the task of writing a plan for which in many cases he has had no previous instruction. On some occasions be given a brief outline to serve as a guide. Such a procedure is inefficient and tiresome, and the interest of the pupil for project work is lost from the very beginning.

The pupil starts his project and is visited at various intervals throughout the year by the teacher. In too many cases these so called project visits are merely "friendly calls" or "telescopic visits" in which the teacher may sign his name in the project record book and look across to the next hill and see the pupil's corn project.

Following is an article prepared and written on supervised practice for the Agricultural Education magazine by Schmidt:

In every efficient preparatory vocational-training course, theory and practice go hand in hand. Theory that is, facts and principles, must be known to guide practice, and practice is necessary to fix right habits of doing and thinking.

---

In vocational agriculture we have what I regard as an ideal situation for providing adequate practice or for giving adequate farmer-training experience. This is due to the fact that our vocational agriculture course is in reality a part-time cooperative course. In it, the school cooperates with the home farms of the boys taking the vocational course. Instruction in agriculture is given at the school, and supervised farm-training experiences are provided for on the home farms of the boys. These training experiences involve the management and operation of a series of home projects in agriculture, together with the performance of numerous supplementary farm-training jobs.

Because of this cooperative nature of the preparatory vocational agricultural courses, schools do not need a farm or land, or livestock and farm equipment, to give effective instruction and training in vocational agriculture. All of these things are generally provided for on the home farms of the boys. Superintendents and principals of schools where vocational agriculture is taught should be familiar with this cooperative nature of the vocational agriculture program and understand that it is absolutely imperative that boys in vocational agriculture classes have facilities for engaging in adequate supervised farm-training work. It is usually a waste of time, energy, and money to put into vocational agriculture classes boys who have no facilities for such work.

With our particularly fine set-up, namely a department of vocational agriculture in the high school and the home farms of the boys, any teacher of vocational agriculture can easily give real vocational education for farming, provided that he has the sympathetic support of his high school principal, his superintendent of schools, and the parents.

In most states points of view regarding project work have recently changed. Projects are now regarded as the most important part of a real farmer training program. In the past, too often projects were regarded as something to be done to meet a requirement. Often they had little or nothing to do with the actual school work. They were a side issue, largely unrelated, to what went on in the vocational agriculture classes. The new point of view regards projects as important training devices by means of which the pupils acquire experience in the
management of farm enterprises, and skill in the execution of the jobs involved in such enterprises.

Consequently, in many of our best departments, practically all the instruction in agriculture now centers around the project work, or the farm-training programs of the boys in agriculture classes, and project activities predominate and become the most important part of what goes on in the classroom.

In my opinion, a farm-training program consists of a series of projects extending through the entire training period (and often continued thereafter), together with the performance of numerous other farm jobs not arising in the projects. In such a program a boy would list the projects he proposes to conduct each year, together with the supplementary farm-training jobs that do not arise in the project work.

In many good departments of vocational agriculture, the formation of just such farm-training programs is the beginning of the work in the vocational agriculture class. The boys are asked first of all to visualize and to make a thorough study as to just what is the type of farming they would like to be prepared to enter when they are through school or shortly thereafter. This choice is entirely an individual matter, in which each boy considers the types of farming in the community, the type on his home farm, and his own individual interests, desires, and abilities. As a result of considerable study of this problem he formulates his long-time supervised farm-training program. His training program may have to be altered as time goes on, but as a rule no radical changes will be necessary.

The building and the complete carrying out of such a farm-training program is, in my estimation, the one most important factor in getting a boy in the all-day vocational agriculture class really established in farming. He is never going to get anywhere if he does not first make a well-aimed start and then gradually grow and develop toward the desired goal. Our problem in vocational agriculture is not the placement of a boy in some occupation at the completion of his training, as it is in a vocational trade or industrial school. Our problem is rather one of helping the boy to grow into a business of farming, and to make each year's school and home work in vocational agriculture an important step toward the ultimate goal.

I firmly believe that all teachers of vocational agriculture would like to see as many as possible of their
agriculture students established in some way in farming. I think nothing would give them more pride and satisfaction in life than to see a large scattering of progressive and successful young farmers in the communities where they have taught and be able to say, "This young man and that young man made his start in farming in my vocational agriculture class."

I think that fitting boys to become established in farming, and to make better starts in farming than they otherwise could have made is our big job as teachers of vocational agriculture. It is not only the job we want to do; it is the job we must do if federal funds for vocational agriculture are to be continued. Unless we do accomplish our aim of training and of establishing in farming the boys in our vocational agriculture course, we will not long hold, our jobs as teachers of vocational agriculture. Our task is not one of imparting facts and explaining theories pertaining to agriculture; it is one of training future farmers. The results of our work must be seen on the farms in the communities. And it will be so seen if the work we are doing is effective and really taking hold. "By their fruits ye shall know them" is the final test of the success or failure of every vocational agriculture teacher.

In the last analysis, I do not believe that it is a difficult problem to get boys in the all-day vocational agriculture course started on a good long-time supervised farm-training program. Usually a small inexpensive beginning in two or three of the right kinds of farm enterprises is advisable, always, however, with a looking forward to a steady and gradual increase in size of the enterprises. Together with this increase in size should go also each year, if possible, the taking up of a new enterprise. Thus the value of the projects would increase steadily to an astonishing degree. If constantly improved practices go hand in hand with the increase in size and extent of enterprises, resulting in greater efficiency of production and marketing, the boy will make wonderful progress. Such a plan is much better than starting on a larger and more expensive scale and not growing and developing. 28

Since the business of farming is a continuous business and for the supervised farming programs to be functional, they should be developed on

a long-time basis. Shoptaw presents the following discussion about long-
time farming programs:

Supervised farming was provided for in the original vocational education act, in the assertion that the program in vocational agriculture "shall provide for directed or supervised practice." Without a doubt the expression "supervised or directed practice" represents a feeling of need for a laboratory type of teaching in which such abilities as are suggested in the classroom can be "tried out" on the farm under the supervision of the agriculture teacher. It probably represents too, a conviction that in order for the work in vocational agriculture to be "vocational," it must of necessity be "acted out," under something approaching natural conditions. Rousseau once said, "Do as much as possible of your teaching by doing, and fall back on words only when doing is out of the question." Upon this foundation, vocational agriculture was built.

The term "project," while not original with workers in the field of vocational agriculture, has certainly been as widely used by them as by any other group. Someone has defined a project as "a wholehearted, purposeful activity, carried to completion in its natural setting." The term is used in many instances however when its use would be prohibitive, were this definition adhered to. The term has been used by workers in the field of vocational agriculture themselves as synonymous with "supervised practice" or "supervised farming," which use has the effect of confining the entire program of home farm activities rather than a "program."

We should like to think of supervised farming as "a wholehearted, purposeful program of farm activities, carried to completion in its natural setting." What, then are the requirements of a supervised farming program if we use this as a definition?

In the first place the term "wholehearted" describes an "attitude" toward the activities of the farm and farm home. It suggests pleasure and satisfaction in doing whatever comprises the supervised farming program. It suggests that the participant is sincere in his belief that the effort has merit—that it is not being indulged in for the sake of a scholastic record or because it is a requirement of all students enrolled in vocational agriculture. Accordingly, it is hardly probable that one who does not have sympathy
for farm life, for the work of the farm, and for problems which farm people have to face, will be able to develop a supervised farming program, in the light of the above definition.

In the second place we included the additional descriptive adjective "purposeful" in our definition. For any activity to be "purposeful" it would of necessity be indulged in with a purpose—an objective or a goal—which must be constantly in the view of the participant. Goals and objectives suggest a planning ahead—a picture, in the beginning, of what is hoped a program may become. Goals and objectives then, presuppose planning, in the beginning, for continuous operation, over a period of years. Ideally, a supervised farming program in vocational agriculture would include plans for operation over many years. Many supervised farming programs, so called, do not measure up to our definition because they are not, in this sense, "purposeful" activities.

In the third place, we have spoken of the supervised farming programs as "farm activities". An activity may be either mental or physical or both. However, in general, a farm activity is in part at least, physical. Thus a supervised farming program does include physical activity on the part of the boy whose program it is. While such an interpretation does not preclude the use of hired labor in connection with the development of the farming program, it does imply the actual participation of the boy in carrying it out. While such personal participation is generally considered a necessary characteristic of supervised farming, unfortunately there are some so-called supervised programs in which the owners do not actually participate. Such a program cannot fulfill the purpose which was in the minds of the founders of vocational agriculture.

For the fourth point in our definition we wish to call attention to the expression "carried to completion." This expression suggests necessity for the personal participation of the boy during the various stages or steps leading toward the completion of the program. In other words it would not be possible for a boy to carry his program to completion unless he was with it during its entire cycle. He could not, for example, work in a drug store or service station after school hours and throughout the summer vacation while his father planted and cultivated his crops or cared for his animals. It is difficult to see how such farm activities would be either purposeful or wholehearted, and certainly the "carrying to completion" would be accomplished by the dad and not by the boy.
Finally, the significance of the phrase "in its natural setting"—the final portion of our definition—should be weighed, in arriving at an evaluation of a supervised farming program. The implication is that the activities are to be carried out on the boy's home farm. Despite all the suggested values to come from school farms, school demonstration plots, class projects, and other activities, the fact remains that such enterprises could never grow into a mature farm operation through which a farm family might earn a living. They could never form the nucleus around which a boy could build his ultimate farming activities because, obviously such projects could not belong to individuals. It is true that group projects such as chapter-owned brood sows, bulls, seed cleaners, etc., may contribute toward the building of farming programs for the several boys making up the group. Indeed the foundation stock which eventually starts a boy into a farming program that will become his life work may well come from a class or group enterprise. But it is not conducted in its "natural setting" until it becomes the personal property of the boy, and is located on the farm on which he lives. Therefore, while such group projects as feeding out hogs on the school grounds upon the garbage from the lunchroom oftentimes proves a profitable venture from the standpoint of the F.F.A. chapter, it cannot constitute, in the true sense of the term, a "supervised farming program."

What then does constitute a supervised farming program which will meet our requirements, as set forth in the above definition? While it is true that many types of programs may fulfill the "letter" of the law, the only program which meets the "spirit" of the law as well as the letter, is one that is continuous in nature. Under this type, plans are made early in the high school career, and a beginning made toward the development of a program which is to run throughout high school, through the transition years, and into establishment in farming. If we insist that in order for a course in agriculture to be "vocational," it must function directly in producing a livelihood, then the continuous or long-time program is the one which complies with the requirement.

What then are the characteristics of a long-time supervised farming program? We should like to suggest first that such a program must grow in (1) the number of production enterprises, and (2) in the scope of the enterprises used to make it up. That is to say, that while fifty baby chicks, a gilt, or a dairy heifer would perhaps make a satisfactory enterprise during the first year, for the second year, a hundred chicks, two gilts, or a sow and litter, would be necessary. This represents growth in scope of enterprises.
Again, a gilt, plus an acre of feed might be satisfactory for a first year program, while for the second year there should be added a pork production enterprise, a second feed crop, and perhaps another cash crop, such as small grain or cotton. This represents growth in the number of enterprises making up the program.

If it is agreed that the long-time or continuous program is the one that meets the spirit and the letter of the law, then serious thought should be given to the proper procedure in developing such a program with farm boys. We should like here to suggest some factors which must be considered if such a program is to be formulated. It should be stated first however, that such a program for any boy would have to be started early in his training in vocational agriculture. To be sure, each boy must have a "project" or a semblance of a supervised farming program each year he is enrolled in vocational agriculture. But what we are saying is that his "long-time" program must be started early. Here we are faced with the fact that the ninth grade boy seldom knows what profession he will prepare for, to say nothing of the type of farming he will follow, if any.

If the ninth grade boy does not know what type of farming he is to follow, it is the responsibility of the agriculture teacher to help him come to a decision. This must begin with an orientation of the boy as to possibilities in various farm enterprises, and then guidance into a selection. Some orientation and guidance are possible throughout the school year of classes, but they should begin out on the farm before school opens. One of the most vital and perhaps most slighted summer activities of an agriculture teacher is that associated with guiding incoming ninth grade boys into the organization of farming programs which it is hoped they are to follow through and beyond high school.

Such guidance in the selection of enterprises, by the boy, must be done in an atmosphere of interest and cooperation on the part of his parents. Vocational agriculture is a type of family education, in which the facts and skills taught, and the decisions made are of necessity shared by the parents. A supervised farming program would of course be carried out on the home farm, and although long-time plans might envision actual farm ownership by the boy, the early stages of the development of the program would have to be carried out on the home farm, upon land belonging to, or rented by, the boy's father. It is obvious therefore, that the parents must be in sympathy with the whole undertaking if there is to be a program which will carry through.
Productive enterprises on the farm may be roughly divided into two groups, (1) those in which the cycle (time from launching to marketing) is one year or less, and (2) those in which the cycle is a matter of two or more years. Pork production, broiler production, and most cash crops are examples of the first group, while such enterprises as dairy and beef heifers, registered gilts, fruit production and pasture improvement, represent the long-cycle type of enterprise. A farming program built around long-cycle enterprises offers several advantages, two of which should be mentioned in connection with the present discussion.

In the first place, long-cycle enterprises differ less from the program of an established farmer than do those of short cycle. To be sure, the program of the efficient farmer is made up of both short and long cycle enterprises, but the "backbone" or stabilizing influence of the program is always the long cycle projects. A farmer may buy and feed out steers or hogs, as a short time enterprise, but with such projects he may be in business one year and out the next. His breeding herds and soil improvement projects are less flexible as to time of beginning and marketing, and are thus conducive to unstabilization. A supervised farming program, built upon long-cycle enterprises has a better chance of carrying over into the establishment of its owner as a mature farmer.

The second advantage held by a program which is built around long-cycle projects is the absence of "stopping places" at the end of each year. A boy may select a crop of cotton or corn for a project, take the best of care in planting, cultivating, harvesting and marketing it, and then decide, at the end of the year that such work is harder than "jerkling soda" or selling gasoline. If he so concludes, then liquidating his "farm assets" is as simple as shedding his work clothes. On the other hand, if he has instead, a breeding animal which has not yet yielded any marketable product, liquidation is less simple. Then too, the power of attachment to something "owned" may prevent a desire to "desert" the program, and thus result in a continuation into full-time farming.

It would be unfair to terminate this discussion of the long-time program in supervised farming without some further mention of the holding power of such a program. There is none of us so strong willed as never to experience times when we would yield to temptation which might pull us away from our ideals and well planned activities, and boys enrolled in vocational agriculture are no exception. There are periods of discouragement when a boy will wonder why he ever started in the business of farming. When in such a state of mind, a visit to the barn where his registered animal munches contentedly, the
hay which its owner has placed there, may be the "tonic" necessary for complete recovery. We should strive to see to it that no student of vocational agriculture, in a mood of discouragement, ever has to ask himself, "what have I to show that I have a farming program?"

The development of the long-time farming programs is considered a very important part in the final establishment of the student of vocational agriculture in farming. Wall stresses the importance of developing supervised farming programs and the characteristics of a good program in the following article:

The primary aim of vocational agriculture is: "To train present and prospective farmers for proficiency in farming." Such training, especially on the boy and young-farmer level, should lead toward establishment in farming.

A boy in vocational agriculture cannot become established in farming by tending the family cow or by growing an acre of corn. Neither can he become established in farming by having poultry as a livestock enterprise one year, hogs the next year, beef cattle another year, and dairy still another. Farming is a long-time business, and the in-and-outer seldom succeeds at it.

The supervised farming program of a student who is to become established in farming should be put into operation as early as feasible and should be expanded and improved throughout the training period. Well-chosen enterprises started in the freshman and sophomore years should ordinarily be continued. Adding other enterprises as opportunity permits is nearly always wiser than having one set of projects this year and a different set next year. Continuation livestock projects, together with feed-crop projects, help give direction to a program.

Some characteristics of a good supervised farming program are noted herewith:

1. Leads toward establishment in farming (implies long-time planning)

2. Adapted to the home-farm
3. Provides opportunity for self-direction
4. Provides opportunity for carrying out significant improved practices
5. Provides opportunity to make a satisfactory labor return
6. It is a program the boy will like to carry
7. Makes the boy less of a burden to his family
8. Can be carried out
9. Includes enterprises significant to success in the locality
10. Includes supplementary practice

The teacher must believe in long-time farming programs and must be enthusiastic about each student's plans and procedures, if this phase of his program is to be a success. The student must realize that to develop his long-time farming program into a practical and sound farming business will require much time, thought, and work. To this end the teacher should have his course of study, including individual and class instruction, based largely on those things that the students will be facing in developing their programs. Supervised farming is essential in learning to farm. The boy's farming program provides his primary motive in wanting to learn better farming practices.

Before a teacher can give intelligent guidance to a boy in setting up his supervised farming program, the teacher must first have thought through the situation to determine what program he thinks the boy probably should have. In order that the teacher may have a thorough knowledge of the situation, he needs to visit the student's home and make a study of the farm. Teachers of agriculture in Kentucky use an information sheet, "Home Farm Facts," in gathering data on the home-farm business. In addition to information on the survey, the teacher needs to be familiar with other facts such as:

1. Size of family
2. Other brothers at home
3. Other persons farming on this farm
4. Financial status of father, also of the student
5. Attitudes of parents toward vocational agriculture

After the teacher has become familiar with the student's home farm situation, and not until then, is he in a position to help the student plan his farming program.

Cooperation of the parents in the operation of a boy's supervised farming program is necessary for the successful establishment of the boy in farming. Teachers should not
fail to include the parents in the planning, being sure they understand why the boy should have a good farming program and where the teacher hopes to take the boy in establishment in farming. Doing this enables the teacher, the boy, and the parent to have a better concept of the program the boy should have. It also eliminates much of the "giving to the program" on the part of the father. "Giving to the program" does not make for good teaching.

Boys need to learn what a good trade agreement is, and how to make a good trade agreement. Many young men need to farm as tenant operators before they are financially able to be owner-operators. The making of fair and equitable trade agreements is as important to a tenant farmer as is the use of many critical improved farming practices. A boy who makes a poor trade agreement with his dad is learning to make poor trade agreements.

Under ordinary conditions in general farming, the farming program of a boy in vocational agriculture should be developed as follows:

**Productive enterprise projects**
- A cash crop (adapted to the farm and for which there is a good market)
- Livestock (one or two major projects, adapted to the farm)
- Feed crops (to produce home-grown feed for the livestock)

**Improvement projects**
Consisting of making improvement in some enterprise or enterprises not carried as a productive enterprise, such as: pasture improvement, record keeping on home-farm business, farm and home improvement, and care and repair of home farm machinery.

**Supplementary practice** - to gain knowledge of a skill in those practices that are not a part of the projects. To be counted as supplementary practice, the student should have received instruction in how the practice should be carried out - either as class instruction, individual problems at school, or individual on-farm instruction. Students should not count as supplementary practice the chore jobs they may do around the farm.

In guiding the students in the selection of productive enterprise and improvement projects, the teacher should see to it that those chosen are of a nature that can be continued and expanded from year to year. The enterprises selected should be adapted to the farm and should be of the scope and character to challenge the boy. For a boy to have an old hen
and a few chicks, or three ewes, or one-tenth of an acre of tobacco is not enough to challenge him. Not only are enterprises of such scope unchallenging, they do not provide opportunity for carrying out significant improved practices. If we fail in this respect we have failed in vocational agriculture.30

From a summary of previous studies presented in this study pertaining to the development of supervised farming programs of all-day students of vocational agriculture, it may be interesting to note some of the special points emphasized by these studies. (1) There should be selection of students who have facilities to carry on supervised farming programs. (2) Conferences should be held by the students, parents, and teacher to determine the nature of the supervised farming program. (3) The supervised farming program should be developed on a long time basis with special emphasis on the student becoming established in farming. (4) Surveys or other data gathering studies should be made of the farming activities in the community and on the home farm of the student. (5) The supervised farming programs should consist of enterprises that will aid in the establishment of the student in a balanced business of farming. (6) There should be a close relationship between classroom instruction and the supervised farming programs.
Supervised farming is the vocational part of agriculture. This part of the agriculture program gives the student a chance to carry out on the farm what he has learned in the classroom. The teacher of vocational agriculture is expected to assume the responsibility of directing each student into the development of a supervised farming program that will give the student the necessary training and experience for him to become successful in the occupation of farming.

The foundation of vocational agriculture instruction is the maintenance of sound supervised farming programs.¹ The instruction in the classroom should be based on the types of supervised farming programs that have been developed by the students in the classes of vocational agriculture. In order for instruction to be of the most effective type, the supervised farming programs must be developed in such a manner that they will be well-rounded and will be good business ventures for the students who are going to carry them out.

For the teacher of vocational agriculture the ultimate aim of the program in vocational agriculture is the establishment of the student in farming. To succeed in this endeavor, the supervised farming programs

must be developed so as to give the student an opportunity to make a
start and advance in the occupation of farming. They should include
production enterprises that will be of monetary value to the student
so he may continue in and enlarge his business. There should be im-
provement projects to help improve the farm and living conditions, and
supplementary farm jobs to give further training and assist in the farm
operation as a whole. The development of supervised farming programs of
this type will give the student the learning opportunities necessary for
him to become an established farmer within the community in which he
lives.

Since supervised farming is considered an integral part of the
total program of vocational agriculture, it is imperative for these
programs to be developed in such a way that they will give the maximum
aid in carrying out the aim of vocational agriculture. The teacher
should work with the students assisting them in developing their super-
vised farming programs with this point of view. The development of the
supervised farming program is the initial step in the establishment of
students in farming and should be given a great amount of time and
thought emphasis by the teacher, student, and parents.

The importance which the development of supervised farming has
to a complete program of vocational agriculture was an important factor
in making this study. In order to try to secure a broad view of the
developmental phase of supervised farming, it was decided that the study
would be made over eleven Southern States.

The normative-survey with the questionnaire method was used in
securing data for this study. The danger that the replies to questionn-
aires may represent a selected group is always present. "Objective appraisals of this factor suggest that the danger of a selected response has been over estimated. Until evidence to the contrary is forthcoming, it seems reasonable to conclude that this factor is probably not decisive in affecting the results of the typical questionnaire, particularly if a reply of more than 50 per cent is received." The writer believes that the 596 teachers whose questionnaires were used as a basis for this study are a fair random selection of teachers of vocational agriculture in the eleven Southern States represented.

The fact that the data which were tabulated and recorded from the first 300 questionnaires that were received gave the same median for several items as the data from all 596 questionnaires is some evidence that the above statement is true. In tabulating the data the writer found no evidence that only the best teachers had filled out and returned the questionnaire.

Questionnaires were mailed to the state supervisors in the twelve Southern States. There were eleven returned and data from them are used in this study. The following states cooperated in the study: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

In the questionnaire mailed to the supervisors of vocational agriculture in the states included in this study, information was sought regarding the number of white high school departments of vocational agric-
culture in the state, number of white teachers of vocational agriculture in the state, policy used in the state on securing farm information about each community, state policy on requirement for the supervised farming programs of students enrolling in vocational agriculture, state policy on providing special plans for facilities for supervised farming programs, state policy on use of launching or orientation program for beginning students, state policy on when the supervised farming programs are developed, state policy on the development of long-time supervised farming programs, state policy on the number of years the supervised farming programs are developed, state policy on the content of the supervised farming programs, state policy on use of class time in discussing the supervised farming programs, state policy on the recording of the supervised farming programs, state policy on the characteristics of the supervised farming programs, state policy on the teacher working with the parents in developing supervised farming programs, state policy as to an advisory council, and state policy on familiarizing the administrators of the local schools about the purpose of the supervised farming programs.

In addition to the questionnaire each supervisor was asked to return a list of the white teachers of vocational agriculture in his state with their addresses. A random sampling was made from this list and a questionnaire was mailed to the teachers selected by this sampling. This sampling was made by taking each state's list of teachers and every third teacher was selected to be included in the study.
In the questionnaire sent the teachers of vocational agriculture represented in this study, information was sought regarding type of degree held by the teacher, number of years the teacher had taught vocational agriculture, number of years the teacher had taught at the school where he is now teaching, number of years there has been a department of vocational agriculture in the school, number of students enrolled in vocational agriculture, policy on making surveys or other data gathering studies, type of surveys or studies made, requirements for the supervised farming programs of students enrolling in vocational agriculture, policy on providing facilities for supervised farming programs, type of facilities provided for supervised farming programs, the use of a launching or orientation program for beginning students, policy on developing long time supervised farming programs, length of programs developed, content of supervised farming programs, the use of classroom time in discussing the supervised farming programs, the recording of the supervised farming programs, the practice of working with the parents in the development of the supervised farming programs, the use of an advisory council in the development of the supervised farming programs, and the familiarization of the local administrators with the purpose of the supervised farming programs. Data pertaining to these factors are presented in this chapter.

In making the random sample from the mailing list of teachers of each state there were 1036 teachers selected. A questionnaire was mailed to each of these teachers with a letter explaining the purpose of the questionnaire and requesting their cooperation in the study. Table I
gives the number of questionnaires mailed to each state, number of
questionnaires that was returned from each state, and the per cent of
questionnaires returned by the teachers from each state.

TABLE I

Number Of Questionnaires Mailed To And Returned From Each State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number Mailed</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Per Cent Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1036</strong></td>
<td><strong>596</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table I indicate that of the 1036 questionnaires mailed
there were 596 or 57.5 per cent of them returned. There were seventy-
seven questionnaires mailed to teachers in Alabama with sixty-three or
62 per cent returned. Teachers in Arkansas returned the next highest
per cent by returning sixty-three out of ninety-one questionnaires
mailed to them for a 69 per cent return. Teachers in Louisiana returned
forty-six or 62 per cent of the seventy-four questionnaires mailed to
them. Twenty-five or 60 per cent of the forty-two questionnaires
mailed to the teachers of Florida were returned. There were forty-two or 58 per cent of the seventy-two questionnaires mailed to the teachers of Virginia returned. There were eighty-nine questionnaires mailed to the teachers in Mississippi, of which fifty or 56 per cent were returned. Oklahoma teachers returned fifty-five or 56 per cent of the ninety-eight questionnaires mailed to them. Teachers in Tennessee returned a total of forty-eight or 56 per cent of the eighty-five questionnaires mailed to them. There were 220 questionnaires mailed to the teachers in Texas and there were 119 or 54 per cent of them returned. Teachers in North Carolina returned fifty-four or 49 per cent of the 109 questionnaires mailed to them. The teachers of South Carolina returned thirty-one or 40 per cent of the seventy-nine questionnaires mailed to them.

The teachers of vocational agriculture represented were requested to state the type of degree which they held. The purpose of this was to determine the type of degrees held and how many teachers had acquired degrees beyond that of a bachelor's degree. Table II presents the type of degrees held by the teachers of vocational agriculture who cooperated in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Degree</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Master of Science</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table II reveal that there were 456 or 76.5 per cent of the teachers of vocational agriculture who cooperated in this study have a Bachelor of Science degree. There were 122 or 20.5 per cent of the teachers that have a Master of Science degree. There were eighteen or 3.0 per cent of the teachers who have some other type of degree.

It might be of interest to note that of the eighteen other kinds of degrees, there were thirteen Master of Arts, two Master of Education, two Bachelor of Arts, and one Doctor of Philosophy.

The teachers of vocational agriculture were asked to list the number of years that they had taught vocational agriculture. The purpose of this question was to determine how many years the teachers who cooperated in this study had been teaching vocational agriculture. Table III indicates the number of years the teachers of vocational agriculture who are represented in this study have taught vocational agriculture.

TABLE III

Number of Years Teachers Have Taught Vocational Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median 6.3 Years
Data in Table III disclose that there were 258 or 43.3 per cent of the teachers who have had less than four years of teaching experience. Next in order was five to nine years of teaching experience with 113 or 18.9 per cent of the teachers in this group. There were 106 or 17.8 per cent of the teachers who have from ten to fourteen years of teaching experience. There were fifty-one or 8.6 per cent of the teachers who have from fifteen to nineteen years of teaching experience. The next largest group was the teachers with twenty to twenty-four years of teaching experience. There were forty-one or 6.9 per cent of the teachers in this group. There were twenty or 3.3 per cent of the teachers with twenty-five to twenty-nine years of teaching experience. The smallest number and per cent was in the thirty to thirty-four years group. There were only seven or 1.2 per cent of the teachers represented in this study in this group.

The number of years of teaching experience which the teachers of vocational agriculture who cooperated in this study have ranged from less than one year to thirty-three years. The median number of years of teaching experience held by these teachers was 6.3 years.

To determine the tenure of the teachers of vocational agriculture in their present teaching position, each teacher represented was requested to state the number of years that he had taught in the school where he was teaching. The purpose of this was to determine if the teachers remained at one school for a very long period of time. Table IV reveals the number of years the teachers have taught in the school where they were teaching at the time they filled out the questionnaire.
### TABLE IV

**Number Of Years Teachers Have Taught In School Where Now Teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>596</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median 3.5 Years

Data in Table IV indicate that the largest number of teachers are in the group having a tenure of less than four years. There were 365 or 61.2 per cent of the teachers in this group. Next in order as to the number of teachers in the group was from five to nine years of tenure. There were 111 or 18.6 per cent of the teachers who have this amount of tenure in their present position. There were sixty-four or 10.7 per cent of the teachers who have from ten to fourteen years of tenure. There were thirty-two or 5.4 per cent of the teachers who have from fifteen to nineteen years of tenure. The next group have from twenty to twenty-four years of tenure. There were seventeen or 2.8 per cent of the teachers in this group. There were five or .9 per cent of the teachers with twenty-five to twenty-nine years of tenure. There were only two or .4 per cent of the teachers with thirty to thirty-four years of tenure.
years of tenure.

The number of years of tenure which the teachers of vocational agriculture who are included in this study have ranged from less than one year to thirty-two years. The median number of years of tenure held by the teachers was 3.5 years.

To determine the number of years each department has been established, each teacher represented was requested to give the number of years there had been a department of vocational agriculture in the school where he was teaching. Table V presents data dealing with the number of years there has been a department of vocational agriculture in each school.

**TABLE V**

Number Of Years There Has Been A Department Of Vocational Agriculture In The School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 596 100.0

Median 12.7 Years
Data in Table V disclose that 163 or 27.4 per cent of the departments have been established from ten to fourteen years. There were 146 or 24.5 per cent of the departments that have been established from zero to four years. Next in order were departments which have been established from fifteen to nineteen years with ninety-eight or 16.4 per cent of this group. There were eighty or 13.4 per cent of the departments that have been established from twenty to twenty-four years. From five to nine years there were forty-eight or 8.0 per cent of the departments that have been established for this period of time. There were forty-one or 6.9 per cent of the departments that have been established from twenty-five to twenty-nine years. There were twenty or 3.4 per cent of the departments that had been established between thirty and thirty-four years.

The number of years that departments of vocational agriculture have been established ranged from less than one year to thirty-three years. The median number of years that the departments have been established was 12.7.

To determine the size of the classes of vocational agriculture, each teacher represented was requested to list the number of all-day students there were enrolled in his department. Table VI indicates the size of classes in each department of vocational agriculture.
### TABLE VI

**Size Of Classes Of Vocational Agriculture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130 - 139</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 - 129</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 - 119</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 109</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 - 99</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 89</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>596</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median 40.6

Data in Table VI reveal that largest number of classes with 154 or 25.9 per cent within the group between thirty to thirty-nine students. Closely following this group is the group with between forty to forty-nine students. There were 151 or 25.3 per cent of the classes with this number of students. There were ninety-three or 15.6 per cent of the classes with from twenty to twenty-nine pupils in them. There were sixty-nine or 11.6 per cent of the classes with fifty to fifty-nine students in them. Next in order with nineteen or 3.2 per cent of the classes was the group with from eighty to ninety students in them. Close-
ly following this group were the classes with from ten to nineteen students in them. There were eighteen or 3.0 per cent of the classes in this group. There were seventeen or 2.9 per cent of the classes with seventy to seventy-nine students in them. There were eight or 1.3 per cent of the classes with ninety to ninety-nine students in them. There were six or 1.0 per cent of the classes with one hundred to one hundred and nine class members in them. There were four or .7 per cent of the classes with 110 to 119 students in them. The groups with 120 to 129 and 130 to 139 students had two or .3 per cent of the classes in each group. There was not any class with less than ten members in it.

The size of the classes of vocational agriculture in the schools in this study ranged from ten to one hundred and thirty-five students. The median size of the classes of vocational agriculture was 40.6 students.

It is thought that the teacher of vocational agriculture should know the local farm conditions in order that he may give the most effective type of instruction possible to the students of vocational agriculture. One of the best ways to secure this information is by the use of different farm surveys. In order to determine the policy of the states about the use of surveys in securing farm information, each supervisor was requested to give his state's policy about this matter. Table VII denotes the policy about the use of surveys of the state's included in this study.
TABLE VII

State Policy On Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Required by state policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommended state policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table VII indicate that ten or 90.9 per cent of the states recommend the use of the surveys for obtaining farm information about the community. There was one or 9.1 per cent of the states that require the use of the surveys. There were none of the states that did not recommend the use of surveys.

To determine the types of surveys recommended for use in the states included in this study, each supervisor represented in this study was requested to check the type of survey that was recommended by him for use in his state. Table VIII presents the data pertaining to the types of surveys recommended by the state supervisors with several supervisors recommending more than one type of survey to be used in his state.
### TABLE VIII

Types Of Surveys Recommended By State Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Survey</th>
<th>Number Recommended</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. General farm survey</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Facility survey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Enterprise survey</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other type survey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table VIII denote that the general farm survey was recommended by ten or 50.0 per cent of the cases. The enterprise survey was recommended six or 30.0 per cent of the cases. Next in order of recommendation by the state supervisors was other type survey with three or 15 per cent of the cases. The facility survey was recommended by one supervisor or 5 per cent of the cases.

To determine the number of teachers of vocational agriculture that make farm surveys, each teacher included in this study was requested to state whether he made surveys or not. Data in Table IX reveal the number of teachers who make surveys and the number who do not make them.
TABLE IX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teachers who make surveys</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teachers who do not make surveys</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table IX indicate that a large majority of the teachers make some type of farm survey. There were 548 or 91.9 per cent of the teachers that make surveys. There were only forty-eight or 8.1 per cent of the teachers included in this study that do not make any kind of farm surveys.

To determine the types of surveys made by the teachers of vocational agriculture, each teacher represented was requested to check the type of survey he uses in obtaining farm information about the community in which he is teaching. Table X presents data pertaining to the types of surveys used by the teachers to gather farm information and the number of teachers that use each type. There were many teachers who checked more than one type of survey.
TABLE X

Types Of Surveys Made By Teacher Of Vocational Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Survey</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. General farm survey</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Facility survey</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Enterprise survey</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other type survey</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>700</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table X disclose that 288 or 41.1 per cent of the teachers' surveys made by the teachers were of the enterprise survey type. The general farm survey followed closely with 263 or 37.7 per cent of the surveys made were of this type. There were ninety-four or 13.4 per cent of the surveys used as the facility survey type. Other type surveys were used in fifty-five or 7.8 per cent of the cases.

For a student of vocational agriculture to reach the aim of the program in vocational agriculture, i.e., to become established in farming, he must have facilities for a supervised farming program. To determine the states policy on students having facilities for supervised farming before he is permitted to enroll in vocational agriculture, the state supervisors represented were requested to check their policy about this factor. Table XI presents the states policy on students having facilities for supervised farming programs.
### TABLE XI

State Policy On Student Facilities For Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Required by state policy or plan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommended state policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table XI indicate that the states are very positive about the students of vocational agriculture having facilities for supervised farming programs. There were ten or 90.9 per cent of the eleven states surveyed in this study that state that the facilities for supervised farming programs is a required state policy. There was one or 9.1 per cent of the eleven states which state that this factor is a recommended state policy. There were not any of the eleven states that did not recommend that the students have facilities for supervised farming programs.

To determine the practices followed by the teachers of vocational agriculture that are included in this study as to the requirement of each student having the facilities for a supervised farming program before he is admitted to study vocational agriculture, each teacher was requested to check the practice followed by him in his school regarding
this factor. Table XII indicates the practices followed by the teachers as to whether facilities are required for students enrolling in vocational agriculture.

**TABLE XII**

**Teacher Require Students To Have Facilities For Supervised Farming Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Always required</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Usually required</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sometimes required</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Not required</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table XII indicate that a majority of the teachers always require the student to have facilities for his supervised farming program. There were 401 or 67.3 per cent of the teachers always requiring this practice. There were 160 or 26.8 per cent of the teachers that usually require the students to have facilities for the supervised farming programs. There were only twenty-five or 4.2 per cent of the teachers that do not require this practice. Ten or 1.7 per cent of the teachers sometimes require the students to have facilities for the supervised farming programs.
There may be occasions when there are students who are very interested in vocational agriculture but who do have the facilities for carrying on a supervised farming program. In some schools there are special plans made for these students. To find out what the state policy was as to this factor, each state supervisor represented was requested to state if such special plans for facilities for supervised farming programs were made in his state. Table XIII reveals the state policy on special plans for facilities for supervised farming programs.

**TABLE XIII**

State Policy On Special Plans To Provide Special Facilities For Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Special plans are made in the state</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Special plans are not made in the state</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from Table XIII indicate that a majority of the states included in this study do have a policy for providing special plans for facilities for supervised farming programs. There were seven or 63.6 per cent of the states in this group. There were four or 36.4 per cent of the states that do not make special plans for facilities for supervised farming programs.
To determine the type of special facilities provided for supervised farming programs in the states, each supervisor represented was asked to check the type of special plan recommended in his state. There were several supervisors who checked more than one type of plan for his state. Table XIV indicates the types of special plans for facilities for supervised farming programs in the states and number of times that each type of plan is recommended.

### TABLE XIV

Types Of Special Plans Made In The States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Plan</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Rent land</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Group or school projects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Farm placement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table XIV denote that the plan of renting land is recommended more than any other plan by the state supervisors. This practice was recommended six or 40.0 per cent of the cases. The plan for group or school projects was next in order of importance with five or 33.3 per cent of the times recommended. Farm placement was next with three or 20.0 per cent of the types of plans used. There was only one
or 6.7 per cent of the plans listed as other type plan.

To determine if the teachers made special plans for facilities for supervised farming programs for students who did not have the facilities, each teacher was requested to state whether there were special plans made for supervised farming programs in his school.

Table IV presents the number of teachers that are represented in this study who provide special facilities and the number that do not provide these facilities.

TABLE IV

Teachers Policy On Special Plans For Facilities For Supervised Farming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teachers do provide special facilities for supervised farming</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teachers do not provide special facilities for supervised farming</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table IV disclose that 338 or 56.7 per cent of the teachers provide special facilities for supervised farming programs. There were 258 or 43.3 per cent of the teachers included in this study who do not provide special facilities for students who do not have facilities for supervised farming programs.
To determine the types of special plans made by the teachers for supervised farming programs, each teacher represented was requested to check the type of special plan that was used in his school. There were several teachers who checked more than one type of plan. Table XVI reveals the types of special plans made by the teachers for facilities for supervised farming programs.

**TABLE XVI**

Types of Special Plans Made by Teachers for Facilities for Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Plan</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Rent land</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Group or school projects</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Farm placement</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>426</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table XVI denote that the group or school projects plan appears the greatest number of times with 188 or 44.1 per cent of the cases. There were 113 or 26.4 per cent of the types of special plans made as a practice of renting land. Next in order of importance was the plan of farm placement with seventy-seven or 18.1 per cent of the cases in this category. There were forty-eight or 11.3 per cent of the plans listed as other type of plans.
The beginning of the student of vocational agriculture by a means of what is commonly known as a launching or orientation program is considered by many vocational educators as an important step toward the successful establishment of the students in farming. To determine the state policy on the use of the launching or orientation program for beginning students, each state supervisor represented was requested to state whether this type of plan was used in his state. Table XVII gives the number of states that have a launching or orientation program and the number that do not use this practice.

**TABLE XVII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. States have a launching or orienting program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. States do not have a launching or orienting program</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table XVII reveal that six or 54.5 per cent of the eleven states represented in this study do not have a launching or orientation program. There were five or 45.5 per cent of the states that have a launching or orientation program.
To determine the state policy of the states that use the launching or orientation program, each supervisor represented was requested to check as to the extent that the launching or orientation program was used by the teachers in his state. Data in Table XVIII present the state policy on the use of the launching or orientation program for beginning students in vocational agriculture.

**TABLE XVIII**

State Policy On The Use Of The Launching Or Orientation Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Required by state policy or plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommended state policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table XVIII reveal that three or 60.0 per cent of the five states that use a launching or orientation program have this practice as a recommended state policy. There were two or 40.0 per cent of the five states who have this practice required by state policy or plan.

To determine the number of teachers that use the launching or orientation program, each teacher represented was requested to check the extent that he used this practice. Data in Table XIX indicate the number of teachers that use the launching or orientation program for beginning students in vocational agriculture and the extent that each teacher uses it.
TABLE XIX

Teachers who Use The Launching Or Orientation Program For Beginning Students Of Vocational Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Always use it</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Usually use it</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sometimes use it</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Do not use it</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table XIX reveal that a majority of the teachers included in this study use the launching or orientation program. There were 342 or 57.4 per cent of the teachers that always use this practice. There were 136 or 22.8 per cent of the teachers that usually use this practice. There were thirty-eight or 6.4 per cent of the teachers that sometimes use this practice. There were eighty or 13.4 per cent of the teachers included in this study that do not use the launching or orientation program.

To determine the recommendations by the states on the length of the launching or orientation program, each state supervisor represented was asked to check the length of time recommended by him for the launching or orientation program in his state. Data in Table XX indicate the states recommendation on the length of the launching or orientation program.
TABLE XX

States Recommendation on Length of Launching or Orientation Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Two weeks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Four weeks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Six weeks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table XX disclose that two or 40.0 per cent of the states recommend times other than what was listed for the launching or orientation program. The periods of time of two, four, and six weeks were each recommended by one or 20.0 per cent of the cases.

To determine the time spent by the teachers of vocational agriculture in the use of the launching or orientation program, each teacher represented was requested to check the time that he used in carrying out this practice. Data in Table XXI present the time used for the launching or orientation program for beginning students of vocational agriculture and the number of teachers that use each.
TABLE XXI

Time Spent By Teachers Of Vocational Agriculture Launching Or Orienting Beginning Students In Vocational Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Two weeks</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Four weeks</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Six weeks</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table XXI indicate that there were 268 or 51.9 per cent of the teachers that use two weeks for the launching or orientation program. There were 130 or 25.2 per cent of the teachers that use four weeks for this practice. There were eighty-six or 16.7 per cent of the teachers that use six weeks for this practice. There were thirty-two or 6.2 per cent of the teachers that use some other time than listed for the launching or orientation program for beginning students in vocational agriculture.

To determine when the states recommended that the supervised farming programs be developed, each state supervisor represented was requested to check the time that was recommended in his state for the development of the supervised farming programs. Data in Table XXII present the time recommended by the state supervisors for the development
of the supervised farming programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. First six weeks of school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. First semester of school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. First year of school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table XXII indicate that a majority of the state supervisors recommend the first semester of school for the development of the supervised farming programs. There were six or 54.5 per cent of the supervisors who recommended this practice. There were three or 27.3 per cent of the supervisors who recommended the first six weeks of school. The time of first year in school and other times were each recommended one or 9.1 per cent of the cases.

To determine when the teachers of vocational agriculture that are included in this study develop the students supervised farming programs, each teacher was requested to check the time that he carried this practice out. Data in Table XXII indicate the time when the
teachers develop the students supervised farming programs.

TABLE XXIII

When The Teachers Develop The Students Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. First six weeks of school</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. First semester of school</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. First year of school</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table XXIII disclose that 322 or 54.0 per cent of the teachers develop the students supervised farming programs the first semester of school. Next in order of importance is the first six weeks of school with 179 or 30.0 per cent of the teachers using this time. There were seventy-nine or 13.3 per cent of the teachers that use the first year of school, and sixteen or 2.7 per cent of the teachers use other time for the development of the students supervised farming programs.

To determine the states policy on students developing individual long-time programs of supervised farming, each state supervisor represented was requested to check the policy within his state as to this
practice. Data in Table XXIV present the state policy on students developing individual long-time supervised farming programs.

**TABLE XXIV**

*State Policy On Students Developing Individual Long-Time Supervised Farming Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Required by state policy or plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommended state policy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table XXIV reveal that the policy of recommending the practice of students developing individual long-time supervised farming programs was carried out in eight or 72.7 per cent of the states. There were three or 27.3 per cent of the states that have this practice required by state policy. There were not any of the states that did not recommend this practice.

In order to ascertain whether the teachers represented in this study used the practice of requiring each student to develop an individual long-time supervised farming program, each teacher was requested to state to the extent that this practice was followed in his school.
Data in Table XXV indicate the extent to which this practice was carried out by the students enrolled in vocational agriculture in schools represented in this study.

**TABLE XXV**

**Teachers Require Students Develop Individual Long-Time Supervised Farming Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Always require it</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Usually require it</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sometimes require it</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Do not require it</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table XXV denote that 277 or 46.5 per cent of the teachers always require the students to develop an individual long-time supervised farming program. There were 214 or 35.9 per cent of the teachers that usually require this practice. There were twenty-nine or 4.9 per cent of the teachers that sometimes require this practice. Of the 596 teachers represented in this study, there were only seventy-six or 12.7 per cent of them that do not require the students to develop individual long-time supervised farming programs.

To determine the states recommendation on length of time the supervised farming programs are developed, each supervisor was requested
to check the length of time that is recommended for the supervised farming programs in his state. Data in Table XXVI indicate the length of time that is recommended for the supervised farming programs in the states represented in this study.

**TABLE XXVI**

State Recommendations On Length Of Time Supervised Farming Programs Are Developed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. One year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Two years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Three years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Four years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table XXVI disclose that eight or 72.7 per cent of the states recommended that the supervised farming programs be for a four year period. There were two or 18.2 per cent of the states that recommended the supervised farming programs to be of greater length than four years. There was one or 9.1 per cent of the states that recommended a period of three years for the supervised farming programs. There was not any state that recommended the periods of one or two years for
the supervised farming programs.

To ascertain what length of time the teachers represented in this study require the students supervised farming programs to be developed, each teacher was requested to check the length of time students in his department develop their supervised farming programs. Data in Table XXVII give the length of time students supervised farming programs are developed in the schools represented in this study.

**TABLE XXVII**

Length Of Time Students Supervised Farming Programs Are Developed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. One year</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Two years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Three years</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Four years</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>596</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table XXVII indicate that 301 or 50.5 per cent of the teachers require the students supervised farming programs to be for a period of four years. There were 159 or 26.6 per cent of the teachers who required the supervised farming programs to be for a period of three
years. Next in order was the period of one year with seventy-four or 12.6 per cent of the teachers requiring this period of time. There were thirty-two or 5.3 per cent of the teachers that required the supervised farming programs to be for two years duration. There were thirty or 5.0 per cent of the teachers who required other lengths of time for the supervised farming programs.

It is thought for the supervised farming programs to be most effective in meeting the aim of vocational agriculture, they should consist of productive enterprises, improvement projects, and supplementary farm jobs. To ascertain the states policy on supervised farming programs consisting of productive enterprises, improvement projects, and supplementary farm jobs, each state supervisor represented was requested to check the extent this practice was done in his state. Data in Table XXVIII indicate the state policy on supervised farming programs consisting of productive enterprises, improvement projects, and supplementary jobs.

TABLE XXVIII

State Policy On Supervised Farming Programs Consisting Of Productive Enterprises, Improvement Projects, And Supplementary Farm Jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Required by state policy or plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommended state policy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XXVIII reveal that six or 54.5 per cent of the eleven states have a state policy of recommending that the supervised farming programs consist of productive enterprises, improvement projects, and supplementary farm jobs. There were five or 45.5 per cent of the states that required this practice by state policy or plan. There were not any of the states that did not recommend this practice.

To determine the extent to which the teachers required the supervised farming programs to consist of productive enterprises, improvement projects, and supplementary farm jobs, each teacher was requested to check the extent this practice was carried out in his school. Data in Table XXIX present the extent the teachers who are represented in this study carry out the practice of the supervised farming programs consisting of productive enterprises, improvement projects, and supplementary farm jobs.

### TABLE XXIX

**Supervised Farming Programs Consist Of Productive Enterprises, Improvement Projects, And Supplementary Farm Jobs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Always</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Usually</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sometimes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Does not apply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>596</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XXIX indicate that a majority of the supervised farming programs always consist of productive enterprises, improvement projects, and supplementary farm jobs. There were 154, or 76.2 per cent of the teachers who checked this category. There were 134, or 22.5 per cent of the teachers who usually followed this practice. There were only eight or 1.3 per cent of the teachers who sometimes follow this practice. There were not any of the teachers who checked that this practice does not apply in their school.

To determine the state policy regarding the use of classroom time in discussing individual supervised farming programs, each state supervisor represented was requested to check the extent that this practice was followed in his state. Data in Table XXX disclose the state policy on use of classroom time in discussing individual supervised farming programs of the students enrolled in vocational agriculture.

**TABLE XXX**

**State Policy On Use Of Classroom Time In Discussing Individual Supervised Farming Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Required by state policy or plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommended state policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XXXI denote that ten or 90.9 per cent of the states included in this study recommended the practice of use of classroom time in discussing individual supervised farming programs of the students enrolled in vocational agriculture. There was one or 9.1 per cent of the states that required this practice by state policy or plan. There were not any of the states that did not recommend this practice.

To determine the number of teachers represented in this study that use classroom time for discussing individual supervised farming programs of the students enrolled in vocational agriculture, each teacher was requested to state his policy on the use of this practice. Data in Table XXXI denote the number of teachers that use classroom time for discussing individual supervised farming programs of students enrolled in vocational agriculture and the number of teachers that do not follow this practice.

**TABLE XXXI**

Teachers Use Classroom Time For Discussing Individual Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teachers Use Classroom Time</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teachers Do Not Use Classroom Time</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XXXI reveal that 361 or 77.4 per cent of the teachers represented in this study use classroom time for discussing individual supervised farming programs of the students enrolled in vocational agriculture. There were 135 or 22.6 per cent of the teachers that do not follow this practice.

To determine the amount of classroom time recommended by the states to spend in discussing the individual supervised farming programs of the students enrolled in vocational agriculture, each supervisor represented was asked to check the time that was recommended for this practice in his state. Data in Table XXXII present the state recommendations for the amount of classroom time that should be spent in discussing individual supervised farming programs of students enrolled in vocational agriculture.

TABLE XXXII

State Recommendation On Amount Of Classroom Time To Spend In Discussing Individual Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. One hour a week</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Two hours a week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XXXII denote that seven or 63.6 per cent of the supervisors recommended other times than one or two hours per week for using classroom time in discussing individual supervised farming programs. Of these seven supervisors there were two that recommended two hours per month, two recommended three hours per month, two recommended six hours per month, and one recommended the amount of time thought necessary by the teacher. There were three or 27.3 per cent of the supervisors that recommended one hour a week for this practice. There was one or 9.1 per cent of the supervisors that recommended two hours per week.

To ascertain the amount of classroom time spent by the teachers represented in this study in discussing individual supervised farming programs of students enrolled in vocational agriculture, each teacher was requested to state the amount of time that he spent in carrying on this practice. Data in Table XXXIII give the length of classroom time spent by teachers for discussing individual supervised farming programs and the number of teachers that uses each amount of time listed.

**TABLE XXXIII**

**Classroom Time Spent By Teachers In Discussing Individual Supervised Farming Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. One hour a week</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Two hours a week</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Other</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XXXIII reveal that 244 or 52.9 per cent of the teachers represented in this study use one hour a week of classroom time in discussing individual supervised farming programs of students enrolled in vocational agriculture. There were 155 or 33.6 per cent of the teachers that use some other time than one or two hours a week for this practice. There were sixty-two or 13.5 per cent of the teachers that use two hours a week for this practice.

The recording of the students supervised farming programs is considered by many leaders in vocational agricultural education as an important phase of the training of the student in vocational agriculture. To determine the state policy on recording of the students supervised farming programs, each state supervisor was requested to check the extent that this practice was carried out in his state. Data in Table XXXIV give the extent that the practice of recording of the students supervised farming programs is carried out in the states represented in this study.

### TABLE XXXIV

State Policy On Recording Of Students Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Required by state policy or plan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommended by state policy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XXXIV disclose that eleven or 100.0 per cent of the states require the recording of the students supervised farming programs by state policy or plan. All the state supervisors evidently consider this as an essential and very important practice for the students supervised farming programs.

To determine the extent to which teachers represented in this study required the recording of the students supervised farming programs, each teacher was requested to check the extent that this practice was carried out in his school. Table XXXIV gives the policy of the teachers represented in this study as to the recording of the students supervised farming programs.

**TABLE XXXIV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Always recorded</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Usually recorded</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sometimes recorded</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Do not record them</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XXXV indicate that 523 or 87.8 per cent of the teachers represented in this study always have the students supervised farming programs recorded. There were fifty-nine or 9.9 per cent of the teachers that usually record the. There were nine or 1.5 per cent of the teachers that sometimes use this practice. There were only five or .8 per cent of the 596 teachers represented in this study that do not have the students supervised farming programs recorded.

To determine the states recommendations on where the supervised farming programs of the students of vocational agriculture are recorded, each supervisor represented was requested to state where he recommended the recording of the supervised farming programs of the students enrolled in vocational agriculture in his state. Table XXXVI presents state supervisors recommendations on where the supervised farming programs of the students of vocational agriculture should be recorded. There were several supervisors who recommended more than one place for recording of the supervised farming programs.

TABLE XXXVI

State Recommendation On Where Supervised Farming Programs Should Be Recorded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. In supervised farming record book</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Student notebooks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XXXVI indicate that the practice of recording the supervised farming programs in the supervised farming record book was recommended nine or 64.3 per cent of the cases. There were four or 23.6 per cent of the cases recommended for the use of student notebooks for this practice. There was one or 7.1 per cent of the cases recommended for some other type of record for recording of the students supervised farming programs.

To ascertain the practices used by the teachers represented in this study in recording of the students supervised farming programs, each teacher was requested to check the practice that he used in his school. Table XXXVII indicates the practices followed by the teachers in recording the students supervised farming programs and the number of teachers that used each practice. There were many teachers who used more than one type of practice in recording the supervised farming programs.

TABLE XXXVII

Where Students Supervised Farming Programs Are Recorded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. In supervised farming record books</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Student notebooks</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Other</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XXXVII denote that 504 or 70.8 per cent of the practices followed in recording of the students supervised farming programs by the teachers represented in this study was the practice of recording the programs in the supervised farming record books. There were 117 or 20.6 per cent of the cases reported that used student notebooks for this practice. There were sixty-one or 8.6 per cent of the cases reported that used some other means for this practice.

The training of students in vocational agriculture should be for a specific type of farming, a type of farming that will eventually be a way of life for the student. To determine the state policy on developing supervised farming programs for a specific type of farming, each supervisor represented was requested to state the policy followed in his state regarding this practice. Table XXXVIII presents the states, that are represented in this study, policy on developing the students supervised farming program for a specific type of farming.

### TABLE XXXVIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Required by state policy or plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommended state policy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XXXVIII indicate that eight or 72.7 per cent of the states recommend the development of the students supervised farming programs for a specific type of farming. There were three or 27.3 per cent of the states that require this practice by state policy or plan. There were not any of the states that did not recommend this practice.

To determine the extent that the teachers represented in this study required the development of the students supervised farming programs for a specific type of farming, each teacher was requested to state the procedure that he followed in his school. Table XXXIX gives the procedures used by the teachers in developing the students supervised farming programs for a specific type of farming and the number of teachers that follow each practice.

**TABLE XXXIX**

**Supervised Farming Programs Developed For A Specific Type Of Farming**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Always</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Usually</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sometimes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Does not apply</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>596</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XXXIX reveal that a majority of the teachers usually require the students supervised farming programs to be developed for a specific type of farming. There were 363 or 60.9 per cent of the teachers that usually require this practice. There were 159 or 26.7 per cent of the teachers that always require this practice. There were sixty-five or 10.9 per cent of the teachers that sometimes require this practice. Only nine or 1.5 per cent of the teachers reported that this practice does not apply in his school.

To determine the state policy on developing the students supervised farming programs so that they are flexible and may be changed to meet any changing conditions necessary, each supervisor was requested to state the policy in his state regarding this practice. Table XL indicates the policy of the states represented in this study regarding the development of the students supervised farming programs in such a manner that they are flexible.

TABLE XL

State Policy On Flexibility Of Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Required by state policy or plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommended by state policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XI disclose that ten or 90.9 per cent of the states recommend that the students supervised farming programs be developed in such a manner that they are flexible and can be changed to meet any necessary modifications. There was one or 9.1 per cent of the states that required this practice by state policy or plan. There were not any of the states that did not recommend this practice.

To determine the extent that the teachers included in this study carried out the practice of developing the students supervised farming programs in such a manner that they are flexible, each teacher was asked to state the extent that he followed this practice in his school. Table XLI presents the activities followed by the teachers in developing the students supervised farming programs in such a manner that they are flexible and may be changed to meet necessary modifications.

**TABLE XLI**

**Supervised Farming Programs Are Developed To Be Flexible**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Always</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Usually</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sometimes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Does not apply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XII denote that 360 or 60.4 per cent of the teachers represented in this study always require the students supervised farming programs to be developed so that they are flexible. There were 232 or 38.9 per cent of the teachers that usually followed this practice. There were four or .7 per cent of the teachers that sometimes followed this practice. There was not a teacher that reported this practice does not apply in his school.

The ultimate aim of the vocational agriculture program is to establish the student in farming. The supervised farming program should provide for the student the necessary training and assistance to reach this aim. To ascertain the state policy on developing the students supervised farming programs to the extent that they will give them a beginning in farming, each state supervisor was requested to give his state’s policy regarding this practice. Table XLII disclose the policy of the states represented in this study regarding the developing of the students supervised farming programs to the extent that they will give them a beginning in farming.

**TABLE XLII**

State Policy On Developing Supervised Farming Programs To The Extent That They Will Give Students A Beginning In Farming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Required by state policy or plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommended by state policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XLIII indicate that ten or 90.1 per cent of the states recommend that the students supervised farming programs be developed to the extent that they will give them a beginning in farming. There was one or 9.1 per cent of the states that required this practice by state policy or plan. There were not any of the states that did not recommend this practice.

To determine what the teachers included in this study did regarding the development of the students supervised farming programs to the extent that they would give them a beginning in farming, each teacher was requested to indicate the extent this practice was carried out in his school. Table XLIII presents the practices followed by the teachers in developing the students supervised farming programs to the extent that they give the students a beginning in farming and the number of teachers that followed each practice.

**TABLE XLIII**

**Supervised Farming Programs Developed To The Extent That They Will Give Students A Beginning In Farming**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Always</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Usually</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sometimes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Does not apply</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>596</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XLIII disclose that 368 or 61.7 per cent of the teachers usually require the development of the students supervised farming programs to the extent that they will give the students a beginning in farming. There were 125 or 21.0 per cent of the teachers that sometimes require this practice. There were ninety-eight or 16.4 per cent of the teachers that always follow this practice, while five or .9 per cent of the teachers reported that this practice does not apply in their schools.

To determine the states policy on the practice of working with the parents in developing the students supervised farming programs, each supervisor represented was requested to state the policy followed in his state regarding this practice. Table XLIV denotes the state policy on the practice of working with parents in developing the students supervised farming programs.

TABLE XLIV

State Policy On Working With Parents In Developing Student Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Required by state policy or plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommended state policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XLIV indicate that ten or 90.1 per cent of the states represented in this study recommended the practice of working with parents in developing the students supervised farming programs. There was one or 9.1 per cent of the states that required this practice by state policy or plan. There were not any of the states that did not recommend this practice.

To determine whether the teachers represented in this study consulted parents in developing the students supervised farming programs, each teacher was requested to record the extent that this practice was followed in his school. Table XLIV indicates the extent that the teachers consulted parents in developing students supervised farming programs and the number of teachers that followed each practice.

**TABLE XLIV**

Parents Consulted In Developing Student Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Always</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Usually</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sometimes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Do not</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XLV disclose that 305 or 51.2 per cent of the teachers represented in this study usually consulted parents in developing students supervised farming programs. There were 225 or 37.7 per cent of the teachers that always used this practice. There were fifty-seven or 9.6 per cent of the teachers that sometimes followed this practice, while only nine or 1.5 per cent of the teachers do not follow it.

To determine the state recommendation on how parents should be consulted in developing students supervised farming programs, each supervisor represented was asked to record the procedure recommended for this practice in his state. Table XLVI presents the state recommendation on how parents should be consulted in developing student supervised farming programs. There were two states that recommended more than one practice.

**TABLE XLVI**

State Recommendation On How Parents Should Be Consulted In Developing Student Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Individually</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. In groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XLVI indicate that eleven or 84.6 per cent of the cases recommended by the states represented in this study were that the parents should be consulted individually in developing student supervised farming programs. To work with the parents in groups was recommended by two or 15.4 per cent of the cases. There was not any other recommendation made for this practice.

To determine how the teachers represented in this study consulted parents in developing student supervised farming programs, each teacher was requested to state the procedure followed in carrying on this practice in his school. Table XLVII indicates the procedures followed by the teachers in consulting parents in developing student supervised farming programs and the number of teachers that used each procedure.

There were teachers that reported using more than one procedure for this practice.

**TABLE XLVII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Individually</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. In groups</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XLVII reveal that 579 or 90.2 per cent of the cases reported by the teachers included in this study consulted the parents individually in the developing of the student supervised farming programs. There were sixty-three or 9.8 per cent of the cases reported the practice of consulting the parents in groups. There was not any other practice used for consulting the parents.

To determine the states recommendation on when parents should be consulted in developing student supervised farming programs, each supervisor represented was requested to state the recommendation made in his state regarding this practice. Table XLVIII presents the states recommendation on when parents should be consulted in developing student supervised farming programs. There were several states that recommended more than one practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Recommendation On When Parents Should Be Consulted In Developing Student Supervised Farming Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Before the student enters vocational agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. During the student's first year in vocational agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. During the student's second year in vocational agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table XLVIII disclose that eleven or 52.4 per cent of the cases recommended by the states represented in this study on when parents should be consulted in developing student supervised farming programs were for during the student's first year in vocational agriculture. There were seven or 33.3 per cent of the cases that recommended this practice before the student enters vocational agriculture. There were three or 14.3 per cent of the cases that recommended this practice during the student's second year in vocational agriculture. There was not any other recommendation made for this practice.

To determine when the teachers represented in this study consult parents in developing student supervised farming programs, each teacher was requested to record when parents were consulted by him regarding this practice in his school. Table XLIX discloses when the teachers consulted parents in developing student supervised farming programs. There were teachers who reported they followed more than one procedure in this practice.
TABLE XLIX

When Teachers Consult Parents In Developing Student Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Before the student enters vocational agriculture</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. During the student's first year in vocational agriculture</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. During the student's second year in vocational agriculture</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other times</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table XLIX reveal that 507 or 69.5 per cent of the cases reported were that the parents were consulted during the student's first year in agriculture in developing student supervised farming programs. There were 184 or 25.2 per cent of the cases that reported the time used as before the student enters vocational agriculture for this practice. There were 19 or 2.6 per cent of the cases that reported the time used as during the student's second year in vocational agriculture, while twenty or 2.7 per cent of the cases reported some other time for this practice.

To determine the policy of the states represented in this study regarding the student supervised farming programs being approved by parents, each state supervisor was requested to state the policy in his
state regarding this practice. Table L presents the state policy on student supervised farming programs being approved by parents.

TABLE L

State Policy On Student Supervised Farming Programs Being Approved By Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Required by state policy or plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommended by state policy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table L indicate that nine or 81.8 per cent of the states included in this study recommended by state policy the parents approving the student supervised farming programs. There were two or 18.2 per cent of the states that required this practice by state policy or plan. There were not any states that did not recommend this practice.

To determine the practices followed by teachers represented in this study regarding the student supervised farming programs being approved by parents, each teacher was requested to record the extent this practice was carried on in his school. Table LI reveals the practices followed by teachers in having student supervised farming programs approved by parents.
TABLE LI

Teachers Have Student Supervised Farming Programs Approved By Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Always</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Usually</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sometimes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Do not</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table LI indicate that 270 or 45.3 per cent of the teachers represented in this study usually have student supervised farming programs approved by parents. There were 225 or 37.6 per cent of the teachers that always follow this practice. There were thirty-six or 6.0 per cent of the teachers that sometimes use this practice, while sixty-six or 11.1 per cent of the teachers do not use this practice.

To determine the policy of the states included in this study regarding the use of a written agreement between parents, students, and teacher on the responsibility for the supervised farming program, each supervisor was requested to check the policy followed in his state regarding this practice. Table LII presents the state policy on written agreement between parents, student, and teacher on responsibility for the supervised farming program.
TABLE LII

State Policy On Written Agreement Between Parents, Student, And Teacher On Responsibility For The Supervised Farming Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Required by state policy or plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommended by state policy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not recommended</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table LII indicate that eight or 72.7 per cent of the states represented in this study recommended the use of written agreement between parents, student, and teacher on responsibility for the supervised farming program. There were two or 18.2 per cent of the states that required this practice by state policy or plan. There was one or 9.1 per cent of the states that did not recommend this practice.

To determine the extent that the teachers included in this study used the practice of written agreement between parent, student, and teacher for the responsibility of the supervised farming program, each teacher was requested to record the extent that he followed this practice in his school. Table LIII presents the extent that the teachers used written agreement between parents, student, and teacher for the responsibility of the supervised farming program.
TABLE LIII

Written Agreement Between Parents, Student, And Teacher For The Responsibility Of The Supervised Farming Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Always</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Usually</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sometimes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Do not</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>596</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table LIII indicate that 279 or 46.8 per cent of the teachers do not use a written agreement between parents, student, and teacher for the responsibility of the supervised farming program. There were 138 or 23.1 per cent of the teachers that always use this practice. There were 125 or 21.0 per cent of the teachers that usually followed this practice. There were fifty-four or 9.1 per cent of the teachers that sometimes used the written agreement.

To determine the state policy on requiring the teachers to have an advisory council, each state supervisor included in this study was asked to state the policy in his state regarding this practice. Table LIV presents the state policy on requiring the teachers to have an advisory council for his department.
TABLE LIV

State Policy On Advisory Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Required by state policy or</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommended state policy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not recommended</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table LIV reveal that six or 54.5 per cent of the states recommended the use of an advisory council by state policy. There were two or 27.3 per cent of the states that required this practice by state policy or plan. There were two or 18.2 per cent of the states that did not recommend this practice.

To determine how many of the teachers represented in this study that had an advisory council for their departments, each teacher was requested to state whether he followed this practice. Table LV indicates the practice followed by the teachers regarding an advisory council.
### TABLE LV

**Teachers Have An Advisory Council**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teachers who have an advisory council</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teachers who do not have an advisory council</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table LV denote that 311 or 52.2 per cent of the 596 teachers represented in this study had an advisory council for their departments. There were 285 or 47.8 per cent of the teachers that did not have an advisory council.

To ascertain the state policy on advisory council participating in the development of student supervised farming programs, each supervisor represented was requested to state the policy followed in his state regarding this practice. Table LVI presents the state policy on advisory councils participating in the development of student supervised farming programs.
TABLE LVI

State Policy On Advisory Council Participating In Development Of Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Required by state policy or plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommended state policy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not recommended</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table LVI disclose that six or 54.5 per cent of the states recommended the advisory council participating in development of student supervised farming programs. There were four or 36.4 per cent of the states that did not recommend this practice. There was one or 9.1 per cent of the states that required this practice by state policy or plan.

To determine whether the teachers represented in this study had their advisory council participate in the development of student supervised farming programs, each teacher was requested to record whether this practice was followed in his school. Table LVIII reveals whether the teachers used their advisory council in the development of the student supervised farming programs.
TABLE LVII

Advisory Council Participate In Development Of Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Advisory council participates in development of supervised farming programs</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Advisory council does not participate in development of supervised farming program</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table LVII indicate that 206 or 66.2 per cent of the 311 teachers that had advisory councils had them participating in the development of student supervised farming programs. There were 105 or 33.8 per cent of the teachers that had advisory councils who did not follow this practice.

To ascertain the state policy on familiarization of local administrators with the purpose of supervised farming programs, each supervisor represented was requested to state the policy followed in his state regarding this practice. Table LVIII presents the state policy on familiarization of local administrators with the purpose of the supervised farming programs.
TABLE LVIII

State Policy On Familiarization Of Local Administrators With The Purpose Of Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Required by state policy or plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommended state policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not recommended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table LVIII disclose that ten or 90.9 per cent of the states recommended the familiarization of local administrators with the purpose of the supervised farming programs. There was one or 9.1 per cent of the states that required this practice by state policy or plan. There were not any of the states that did not recommend this practice.

To determine whether the teachers represented in this study familiarizes the local administrators with the purpose of the supervised farming programs, each teacher was requested to state whether he followed this practice in his school. Table LIX presents whether the teachers familiarize the local administrators with the purpose of the supervised farming programs.
TABLE LIX

Teacher Familiarizes Local Administrators With The Purpose Of Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teachers who familiarize local administrators with the purpose of supervised farming programs</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teachers who do not familiarize local administrators with the purpose of supervised farming programs</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table LIX indicate that 565 or 94.8 per cent of the teachers familiarize the local administrators with the purpose of the supervised farming programs. There were only thirty-one or 5.2 per cent of the teachers that did not follow this practice.

To determine the procedures used in the states for familiarizing local administrators with the purpose of supervised farming programs, each supervisor represented was requested to record the type of procedure used in his state for this practice. Table LX presents the procedures used in the states for familiarizing local administrators with the purpose of supervised farming programs. There were several supervisors who recorded more than one procedure for this practice.
### TABLE LX

Procedures Used In States For Familiarizing Local Administrators With Purpose Of Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conference of teacher and local administrators</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conference of teacher and district supervisor with local administrators</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Literature from state office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table LX indicate that nine or 42.9 per cent of the procedures used was by a conference of teacher and local administrators. There were nine or 42.9 per cent of the procedures used was by a conference of teacher and district supervisor with local administrators. There were three or 14.2 per cent of the procedures used by literature from the state office. There was not any other procedure recommended by the state supervisors.

To determine the procedures used by teachers included in this study for familiarizing local administrators with the purpose of the supervised farming programs, each teacher was requested to record the procedure used by him in his school. Table LXI presents the procedures used by teachers for familiarizing local administrators with the purpose
of the supervised farming programs. There were teachers who stated they used more than one procedure for this practice.

### TABLE LXI

Procedures Used By Teachers For Familiarizing Local Administrators With Purpose Of Supervised Farming Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conference of teacher with local administrators</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conference with district supervisor, teacher, and local administrators</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Literature from the state office</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>696</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table LXI indicate that 437 or 62.8 per cent of the procedures reported as used by the teachers for familiarizing the administrators with the purpose of supervised farming was the procedure of a conference of teacher and local administrators. There were 149 or 21.4 per cent of the procedures reported used for this practice as a conference with district supervisor, teacher, and local administrators. The procedure of literature from the state office was reported sixty-two or 8.9 per cent of the cases for this practice. There were forty-eight or 6.9 per cent of the cases reported as some other procedure for this practice.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY

This study concerns itself with the practices recommended by state supervisors of vocational agriculture and practices used by teachers of vocational agriculture in the development of supervised farming programs for students enrolled in vocational agriculture in eleven Southern States. There were eleven state supervisors and 596 teachers who cooperated in this study.

Data in this study reveal:

1. That there were 258 or 43.3 per cent of the 596 teachers represented in this study who have taught less than five years. The median number of years the teachers have taught was 6.3.

2. That there were 365 or 61.2 per cent of the teachers who have taught less than five years in the school where they were teaching. The median number of years that the teachers have taught where they were teaching was 3.5.

3. That there were 163 or 27.4 per cent of the departments of vocational agriculture that have been established between ten and fourteen years. The median number of years the departments have been established was 12.7.
4. That the median number of students enrolled in vocational agriculture classes was 40.6.

5. That there were ten or 90.9 per cent of the states that recommended the use of surveys in securing information about the farms in the communities where vocational agriculture is taught.

6. That there were ten or 50.0 per cent of the recommendations made by the state supervisors for the use of the general farm survey in securing farm information about the communities where agriculture is taught.

7. That 548 or 91.9 per cent of the teachers make some type of survey in the community where they teach.

8. That many teachers use more than one type of survey in securing farm information about the community in which they teach. The enterprise survey was recommended by the teachers 268 or 41.1 per cent of the cases, with the general farm survey being recommended 263 or 37.7 per cent of the cases.

9. That ten or 90.9 per cent of the states require by state policy or plan the student to have facilities for a supervised farming program.

10. That there were 401 or 67.3 per cent of the teachers who always require the students to have facilities for supervised farming programs.

11. That seven or 63.6 per cent of the states provide special plans for facilities for supervised farming programs. There were 388 or 56.7 per cent of the teachers who provided special plans for facilities
for supervised farming programs.

12. That the practice of renting land was recorded as being used by six or 40.0 per cent of the states in providing special plans for supervised farming programs.

The practice of group or school projects was recorded as being used by 188 or 44.1 per cent of the teachers in providing special plans for supervised farming programs.

13. That in using the launching or orientation program for beginning students, six or 31.5 per cent of the states do not follow this practice. However, there were 342 or 57.4 per cent of the teachers who always use the launching or orientation program for beginning students in vocational agriculture with only eighty or 13.4 per cent of the teachers that do not use it.

14. That of the five states recommending the use of a launching or orientation program there were two or 40.0 per cent of them that recommended a length of time other than two, four, or six weeks. There were 268 or 51.9 per cent of the teachers who use two weeks for the launching or orientation program.

15. That six or 54.5 per cent of the state supervisors recommended that the supervised farming programs be developed during the first semester that the student is enrolled in vocational agriculture. There were 322 or 54.0 per cent of the teachers who develop the students supervised farming programs during the first semester of school.
16. That there were eight or 72.7 per cent of the states that recommended by state policy the development of individual long time supervised farming programs. For the practice of developing individual long time supervised farming programs there were 277 or 46.5 per cent of the teachers who always require this practice.

17. That there were eight or 72.7 per cent of the states that recommended the supervised farming programs be developed for four years. There were 301 or 50.5 per cent of the teachers who developed the supervised farming programs for four years.

18. That there were six or 52.5 per cent of the states recommended by state policy that the supervised farming programs consist of productive enterprises, improvement projects, and supplementary farm jobs. There were 451, or 76.2 per cent of the teachers who always require the supervised farming programs to consist of productive enterprises, improvement projects, and supplementary farm jobs.

19. That there were ten or 90.9 per cent of the states that recommended by state policy the use of classroom time in discussing individual supervised farming programs. There were 461 or 77.4 per cent of the teachers who use classroom time in discussing individual supervised farming programs.

20. That for the amount of classroom time used in discussing individual supervised farming programs, seven or 63.6 per cent of the states recommended time other than one or two hours a week. There were 224 or 52.9 per cent of the teachers who recommended one hour a week for classroom time to use in discussing individual supervised farming programs.
21. That eleven or 100.0 per cent of the states require by state policy or plan the recording of the students supervised farming programs. There were 523 or 87.8 per cent of the teachers who always require the recording of the supervised farming programs.

22. That in determining where the supervised farming programs are recorded, there were nine or 61.3 per cent of the cases recommended by the states as in the supervised farming record book. The supervised farming record book was used in 504 or 70.8 per cent of the ways used by the teachers in recording the students supervised farming programs.

23. That eight or 72.7 per cent of the states recommended by state policy that the supervised farming programs be developed for a specific type of farming. There were 363 or 60.9 per cent of the teachers who usually developed the students supervised farming programs for a specific type of farming.

24. That ten or 90.9 per cent of the states recommended by state policy that the supervised farming programs should be developed in such a manner that they are flexible. There were 360 or 60.4 per cent of the teachers who always develop supervised farming programs that are flexible.

25. That ten or 90.1 per cent of the states recommended by state policy that the supervised farming programs be developed to the extent that they will give the students a beginning in farming. There were 368 or 61.7 per cent of the teachers who usually followed this practice.

26. That ten or 90.1 per cent of the states recommended by state policy the working with parents in developing student supervised
farming programs. There were 305 or 51.2 per cent of the teachers who usually consulted parents in developing student supervised farming programs.

27. That there were thirteen practices recommended by the states for consulting the parents with eleven or 84.6 per cent as the practice of consulting them individually. There were 579 or 90.2 per cent of the 642 practices used by the teachers as the practice of consulting the parents individually for the development of the student supervised farming programs.

28. That eleven or 52.4 per cent of times recommended by the states on when the parents should be consulted in developing the students supervised farming programs was during the student's first year in vocational agriculture. There were 507 or 69.5 per cent of times reported by the teachers for consulting parents in developing the students supervised farming programs as during the student's first year in vocational agriculture.

29. That nine or 81.8 per cent of the states recommended by state policy that the student supervised farming programs should be approved by the parents. There were 270 or 45.3 per cent of the teachers who usually have the student supervised farming programs approved by the parents.

30. That eight or 72.7 per cent of the states recommended by state policy the use of a written agreement between parents, student, and teacher on the responsibility for the supervised farming program.
There were 279 or 46.8 per cent of the teachers who do not have a
written agreement between parents, student, and teacher for the
responsibility of the supervised farming program.

31. That six or 54.5 per cent of the states recommended by
state policy that there should be an advisory council for the department
of vocational agriculture. There were 311 or 52.2 per cent of the
teachers who have an advisory council.

32. That six or 54.5 per cent of the states recommended by
state policy the participation of the advisory council in the development
of the supervised farming programs. Of the 311 teachers who had an
advisory council, there were 206 or 66.2 per cent of them whose advisory
council participated in the development of the student supervised
farming programs.

33. That ten or 90.9 per cent of the states recommended by
state policy the familiarization of the local administrators with the
purpose of supervised farming programs. There were 565 or 94.8 per cent
of the teachers who familiarize local administrators with the purpose
of the supervised farming programs.

34. That the practices of conference of teacher and local ad-
ministrators and conference of teacher and district supervisor with
local administrators were each recommended nine or 42.9 per cent of the
cases recommended by the states for the procedure used for familiarizing
the local administrators with the purpose of the supervised farming
programs. The teachers reported the procedure of conference of teacher
with local administrators 437 or 62.8 per cent of the procedures used
for familiarizing local administrators with the purpose of the supervised farming programs.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions are drawn from this study of the development of supervised farming programs in eleven Southern States with some assurance that they are valid and will be of some benefit to the teachers of vocational agriculture.

1. The teachers of vocational agriculture should know the farming conditions in the community where he is teaching. This is a necessary activity if he is going to present material in his teaching that will be of the most value for the students.

   There should be surveys made of the farms in the community where there is a department of vocational agriculture to determine the farming practices in that community. The teacher of vocational agriculture should select the survey schedule that will best serve his needs.

2. The practical training in vocational agriculture is received by the students on the farm where they have their supervised farming programs. The teaching of vocational agriculture and the learning by the students will be more successful and economical where there are facilities available for supervised farming programs.

   The student can not carry out the training in vocational agriculture unless he has the facilities for a supervised farming program. There should be facilities for the supervised farming programs. There may be occasions where it would be of value for the making of special plans for the supervised farming programs.

3. Data indicate that six or 54.5 per cent of the states represented in this study do not recommend the use of a launching or orientation
program. However, data from this study reveal that there were 342 or
57.4 per cent of the teachers included in this study who always use the
launching or orientation program.

The use of a launching or orientation program will give
the beginning student a successful start toward reaching
the aim of vocational agriculture. It should be used by
all teachers in order they may achieve the most success
from their teaching.

4. There is sufficient evidence from this study to indicate
that the supervised farming programs should be developed during the first
semester that the student is enrolled in vocational agriculture.

The supervised farming programs should be developed
early in the student's program of study in vocational
agriculture. This will give the student an early be­
ginning toward becoming established in farming.

5. The development of the supervised farming programs on a long
time basis is shown by the data from this study as an accepted practice.

The supervised farming programs should be developed
on a long time basis so they will be continuous in
nature and will closely represent the actual farming
conditions under which a farm is operated. The super­
vised farming programs should be developed for a period
of at least four years.

6. There is sufficient evidence from the data in this study
that the supervised farming programs should consist of productive enter­
prises, improvement projects, and supplementary farm jobs.

For the student to receive practical experience in all
phases of farming, he should develop a supervised farming
program that includes productive enterprises, improvement
projects, and supplementary farm jobs.

7. Data from this study reveal that the discussion of individual
supervised farming programs in the classroom is considered an important
activity in the success of the supervised farming programs.

The discussion of individual supervised farming programs in the classroom will help the student solve problems concerning his program, and it will also give the other students the benefit of the solutions to the problems raised by the student. It will present an indication to the class on how each student is conducting his supervised farming program.

8. There is evidence from this study that the practice of recording the supervised farming programs is generally followed by the teachers of vocational agriculture.

The students should record their supervised farming programs so they will have a basis on which to study what they have done with the program and will be able to determine the practices which have proven to be successful. Probably the best place to record the supervised farming programs is in the student's supervised farming record book.

9. Data from this study indicate that the supervised farming programs should be specific, flexible, and large enough to give the student a beginning in farming.

The supervised farming programs should be specific so they will train the student for a specific type of farming. They should be developed so they are flexible and if any changes are found necessary to make, they may be made without having a serious effect on the functioning of the program. The supervised farming programs should be large enough to give the student a beginning in farming.

10. There is sufficient evidence from this study to indicate that consulting the parents of the students in developing the supervised farming programs is an approved practice.

The cooperation of the parents is very essential for the development of the supervised farming programs. The parents can probably be consulted best individually; however, there may be occasions where a group meeting of the parents may prove to be more desirable. The parents should be consulted as soon as possible after the student
begins to study vocational agriculture. The parents should approve the supervised farming programs so they will be familiar with what is expected of the student in carrying out his study in vocational agriculture. If the parents approve the supervised farming programs, it should not be necessary for a written agreement between the parents, student, and teacher for the responsibility of the supervised farming program.

11. The data from this study did not indicate a very strong recommendation for the use of an advisory council. However, a majority of the teachers represented in this study did have an advisory council.

There is a definite place for an advisory council in the program of vocational agriculture. The members of the council can advise and assist the teacher of vocational agriculture in determining the type of agricultural program for the community. They should be familiar with the supervised farming programs and can greatly aid the teacher and students in helping them select enterprises for their supervised farming programs that have proven successful in the community.

12. The data from this study indicate that the practice of familiarizing the local administrators with the purpose of the supervised farming programs is recommended by a majority of the state supervisors and used by a large majority of the teachers represented in the study.

The local administrators should be familiarized with the purpose of the supervised farming programs. The teacher of vocational agriculture cannot expect to carry out the most effective program without the aid of the local administrators. For the local administrators to give the help to the teacher of vocational agriculture that is necessary for a successful program, he must be familiarized with and understand the program in vocational agriculture.
CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations for the development of supervised farming programs in vocational agriculture will have to be general in nature. It is realized that the problem of developing each program is a separate and distinct problem from any other program of supervised farming. With these facts in mind, the following recommendations are made to the teachers of vocational agriculture for the development of supervised farming programs.

The teacher should secure all the information possible about the farming conditions in the community where he is teaching. This may be done by making farm surveys of the farms in the community. These surveys may be ready prepared surveys or they may be survey schedules prepared by the teacher in such a way that he thinks will best meet his needs. The teacher should not try to make surveys of all the farms in one year but should make surveys of a sampling of the farms each year until he has an overall view of the farming conditions in the community. The data from these surveys should be tabulated in such a manner that they will be of value to the teacher.

To have effective supervised farming programs the students must have facilities for these programs. There may be occasions when the student does not have the facilities for a program. The teacher may assist this student in securing facilities by providing special plans.
for the program. Some of the special plans may be renting land, group or school projects, and farm placement. These special plans may not be as effective as facilities on the student's home farm, but they will help provide training.

The launching or orientation program provides a beginning for the new student. It is in this program that the student is familiarized with the program of vocational agriculture and develops his supervised farming program. Each teacher should orient the beginning student of vocational agriculture with such a program.

The supervised farming program should be developed early in the first year that the student is enrolled in vocational agriculture. It should be developed so that it will train the student for a specific type of farming, but still be flexible so that changes can be made in it when necessary. The supervised farming program should consist of productive enterprises, improvement projects, and supplementary farm jobs so that it will offer a monetary return, improve the home farm, and give the student training in all phases of the operation of a farm.

The programs of supervised farming cannot be most effective without the cooperation of the parents. The parents should fully understand the purposes of the supervised farming programs and should have an active part in the supervision of these programs. They should be consulted both individually and in groups for the development and carrying out of the supervised farming programs.

The advisory councils are made up of men of all professions within the community. They can be of great assistance in helping the teacher
determine the type of vocational agriculture program for the community. Each teacher should have an organized and functioning advisory council.

The local administrators direct the overall program of education for a community. The vocational agriculture program is a part of the overall educational program. These administrators should be very familiar with the purpose of the vocational agriculture program and the teacher of vocational agriculture should accept the responsibility of familiarizing the local administrators with the purpose of the program of vocational agriculture.

Further recommendations may be made in relation to other studies that should be made either as a companion study or studies relating to this one. From the writer's experience with this study and other studies in this field, the following recommendations are presented:

1. That a study be made over the Southern States concerning the supervision by the teachers of vocational agriculture of the supervised farming programs. This study of supervision could be developed similar to this study since it is closely related to the development of the supervised farming programs.

2. That a study be developed on similar basis as this study with the data being secured from a smaller selected sample and by personal visitation and interviews by the person making the study. This would involve a longer period of time and more expense but it should offer an opportunity for a very interesting and successful study.

3. That a study be made on the evaluation of supervised farming programs. This study might concern itself with the material gains made
over a period of years by students of vocational agriculture who carried out programs of supervised farming.

4. That a study be made by comparing the results of this study with data secured from boys who have been established in farming. This may be done by obtaining from the states a list of boys who are established in farming and secure information from them relating to the factors that aided them in becoming established in farming. The data then could be compared to the data in this study to determine what effect the procedures used in developing their supervised farming programs had in assisting them in becoming established in farming.
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THESSES


Questionnaire for State Supervisor

1. How many white high school departments of vocational agriculture are there in your state? ________.

2. How many white high school teachers of vocational agriculture are there in your state? ________.

3. Are surveys or other data gathering studies made in each community where there is a department of vocational agriculture to assist the teacher in determining course content for the course of study?
   a. Required by state policy or plan ________.
   b. Recommended state policy ________.
   c. Not recommended ________.

4. If surveys or studies are used, what type of survey do you recommend the teacher use?
   a. General farm survey ________.
   b. Facility survey ________.
   c. Enterprise survey ________.
   d. Other type survey ________.

5. Are students who enroll in vocational agriculture in your state required to have facilities for supervised farming?
   a. Required by state policy or plan ________.
   b. Recommended state policy ________.
   c. Not recommended ________.

6. If students do not have facilities for supervised farming, are there any special plans made to provide facilities for them in your state?
   Yes ________.
   No ________.

7. If the answer to the above question is yes, what type of special plans are there made in your state?
   a. Rent land ________.
   b. Group or school projects ________.
   c. Farm placement ________.
   d. Other (please specify) ________.

8. Do you have a program in your state, commonly known as the launching program, for orienting beginning students in vocational agriculture?
   Yes ________.
   No ________.

9. Do the teachers of vocational agriculture orient beginning students by the use of a launching program?
   a. Required by state policy or plan ________.
   b. Recommended state policy ________.
   c. Not recommended ________.
10. If the launching program is used, how long do you recommend that the teachers spend in launching the students?
   a. Two weeks
   b. Four weeks
   c. Six weeks
   d. Other (please specify)

11. When do you recommend that the supervised farming programs of the beginning students of vocational agriculture be developed?
   a. First six weeks of school
   b. First semester of school
   c. First year of school
   d. Other (please specify)

12. Do teachers require the students to develop individual long time supervised farming programs?
   a. Required by state policy or plan
   b. Recommended state policy
   c. Not recommended

13. For how many years do you recommend that the student's supervised farming programs be developed?
   a. One year
   b. Two years
   c. Three years
   d. Four years
   e. Other

14. Do the supervised farming programs of the students of vocational agriculture in your state consist of productive enterprises, improvement projects and supplementary farm jobs?
   a. Required by state policy or plan
   b. Recommended state policy
   c. Not recommended

15. Do the teachers of vocational agriculture use scheduled class time in discussing the individual supervised farming programs of the students?
   a. Required by state policy or plan
   b. Recommended state policy
   c. Not recommended

16. If the above is done, how much time on the average is spent discussing the supervised farming programs?
   a. One hour a week
   b. Two hours a week
   c. Other (please specify)
17. Are the student supervised farming programs recorded?
   a. Required by state policy or plan
   b. Recommended state policy
   c. Not recommended

18. If the above is done, where are these supervised farming programs recorded?
   a. In supervised farming record books
   b. Student's notebook
   c. Other (please specify)

19. Are the supervised farming programs developed to meet the needs of the student in becoming established in a specific type of farming?
   a. Required by state policy or plan
   b. Recommended state policy
   c. Not recommended

20. Are the supervised farming programs developed so that they are flexible and may be modified to meet any changes necessary?
   a. Required by state policy or plan
   b. Recommended state policy
   c. Not recommended

21. Are the supervised farming programs developed to the extent that when a student has completed his training in vocational agriculture he will have made a beginning in farming?
   a. Required by state policy or plan
   b. Recommended state policy
   c. Not recommended

22. Do the teachers of vocational agriculture in your state work with the students' parents in developing supervised farming programs?
   a. Required by state policy or plan
   b. Recommended state policy
   c. Not recommended

23. If the teachers work with the parents in developing the students supervised farming programs, what procedure do you recommend?
   a. Individually
   b. In groups
   c. Other

24. If the teachers work with the parents in developing students supervised farming programs, when do you recommend that this practice be carried out?
   a. Before the student enters vocational agriculture
   b. During the student's first year in vocational agriculture
   c. During the student's second year in vocational agriculture
   d. Other times (please specify)
25. After the supervised farming programs have been developed, are they approved by the parents?
   a. Required by state policy or plan __________.
   b. Recommended state policy __________.
   c. Not recommended __________.

26. Does the teacher, the student and the parent have a definite written agreement as to each one's responsibility to the student's supervised farming program?
   a. Required by state policy or plan __________.
   b. Recommended state policy __________.
   c. Not recommended __________.

27. Does each teacher of vocational agriculture have an advisory council?
   a. Required by state policy or plan __________.
   b. Recommended state plan __________.
   c. Not recommended __________.

28. If there is an advisory council for the schools in your state, are the council members familiar with and do they participate in the development of the supervised farming programs?
   a. Required by state policy or plan __________.
   b. Recommended state policy __________.
   c. Not recommended __________.

29. Are the local administrators of the schools familiarized with the purpose of the supervised farming programs?
   a. Required by state policy or plan __________.
   b. Recommended state policy __________.
   c. Not recommended __________.

30. If the above is done, what procedure is used in your state?
   a. Conference of teacher with local administrators __________.
   b. Conference of teacher and district supervisor with local administrators __________.
   c. Literature from the state office __________.
   d. Other (please specify) __________.
Questionnaire for Teacher of Vocational Agriculture

1. How many years have you taught vocational agriculture? ________.

2. What type of degree do you hold?
   B.S. ________.
   M.S. ________.
   Other ________.

3. How many years have you taught in the school in which you are now teaching? ________.

4. How many years have there been a department of vocational agriculture in your school? ________.

5. How many students are there enrolled in your vocational agriculture classes? ________.

6. Have you made surveys or other data gathering studies in your community to assist you in determining the course content for the course of study?
   Yes ________.
   No ________.

7. If the answer to the above is yes, what type of surveys or studies have you made?
   a. General farm survey ________.
   b. Facility survey ________.
   c. Enterprise survey ________.
   d. Other type survey ________.

8. Are students who enroll in vocational agriculture in your school required to have facilities for supervised farming programs?
   a. Always required ________.
   b. Usually required ________.
   c. Sometimes required ________.
   d. Not required ________.

9. If the students do not have facilities for supervised farming, are there any special plans made for them?
   Yes ________.
   No ________.

10. If the answer to the above question is yes, what type of plans are made in your school?
   a. Rent land ________.
   b. Group or school projects ________.
   c. Farm placement ________.
   d. Other (please specify) ________.
11. Do you start new students by means of an orientation program commonly known as launching program?
   a. Always use it ________.
   b. Usually use it ________.
   c. Sometimes use it ________.
   d. Do not use it ________.

12. If you use the launching program, how much time do you spend in launching the students?
   a. Two weeks ________.
   b. Four weeks ________.
   c. Six weeks ________.
   d. Other (please specify) ________.

13. When is the student's supervised farming program developed?
   a. First six weeks of school ________.
   b. First semester of school ________.
   c. First year of school ________.
   d. Other (please specify) ________.

14. Do you require each student to develop a long time supervised farming program?
   a. Always require it ________.
   b. Usually require it ________.
   c. Sometimes require it ________.
   d. Do not require it ________.

15. For what length of time is the student's supervised farming program developed?
   a. One year ________.
   b. Two years ________.
   c. Three years ________.
   d. Four years ________.
   e. Other ________.

16. Do the supervised farming programs of the students of vocational agriculture in your school consist of productive enterprises, improvement projects, supplementary farm jobs?
   a. Always ________.
   b. Usually ________.
   c. Sometimes ________.
   d. Does not apply ________.

17. Do you use scheduled class time in discussing the individual supervised farming programs of the students?
   a. Yes ________.
   b. No ________.

18. If you do the above, how much time on the average do you spend in discussing the supervised farming programs?
   a. One hour a week ________.
   b. Two hours a week ________.
   c. Other (please specify) ________.
19. Are the students supervised farming programs recorded?
   a. Always ________.
   b. Usually ________.
   c. Sometimes ________.
   d. Do not record them ________.

20. If the above is done, where are the supervised farming programs recorded?
   a. In the supervised farm record books ________.
   b. Student notebooks ________.
   c. Other (please specify) ________.

21. Are the supervised farming programs developed to meet the needs of the students in becoming established in a specific type of farming?
   a. Always ________.
   b. Usually ________.
   c. Sometimes ________.
   d. Does not apply ________.

22. Are the supervised farming programs developed so that they are flexible and may be modified to meet any changes necessary?
   a. Always ________.
   b. Usually ________.
   c. Sometimes ________.
   d. Does not apply ________.

23. Are the supervised farming programs developed to the extent that when a student has completed his training in vocational agriculture he will have made a beginning in farming?
   a. Always ________.
   b. Usually ________.
   c. Sometimes ________.
   d. Does not apply ________.

24. Do you work with the students’ parents in developing supervised farming programs?
   a. Always ________.
   b. Usually ________.
   c. Sometimes ________.
   d. Do not ________.

25. If you work with the parents in developing the student’s supervised farming program, what procedure do you use?
   a. Individually ________.
   b. In groups ________.
   c. Other ________.

26. If you work with the parents in developing the students supervised farming programs, when do you carry this out?
   a. Before the student enters vocational agriculture ________.
   b. During the student’s first year in vocational agriculture ________.
c. During the student's second year in vocational agriculture _____
d. Other times (please specify) _________.

27. After the student's supervised farming program is developed, do you have it approved by the parents?
   a. Always _________.
   b. Usually _________.
   c. Sometimes _________.
   d. Do not _________.

28. Do you have a written agreement between the parents, the students, and yourself as to each one's responsibility to the student's supervised farming program?
   a. Always _________.
   b. Usually _________.
   c. Sometimes _________.
   d. Do not _________.

29. Do you have an advisory council?
   Yes _________.
   No _________.

30. If you do have an advisory council, are the council members familiar with and do they participate in the development of the supervised farming programs?
   Yes _________.
   No _________.

31. Have the local administrators of the schools been familiarized with the purpose of the supervised farming programs?
   Yes _________.
   No _________.

32. If the answer to the above question is yes, what procedure has been used in your school?
   a. A conference between the local administrators and you _________.
   b. A conference between the local administrators, district supervisor, and you _________.
   c. Literature from the state office _________.
   d. Other (please specify) _________.

Name of School _________.
City _________.
State _________.
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