July 5, 1958

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Bruce Mc Hinton entitled "Significant Factors Influencing the Quality and Success of Supervised Farming Programs of Vocational Agriculture Students in Seven Schools of East Tennessee." I recommend that it be accepted for nine quarter hours of credit in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Agriculture Education.

A J Paulus
Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

J E W Wiegen, Jr.

Galen M. Drewry

Accepted for the Council:

Dale Bentley
Dean of the Graduate School

2 n
33

SIGNIFICANT FACTORS INFLUENCING THE QUALITY AND SUCCESS OF SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAMS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE STUDENTS IN SEVEN SCHOOLS OF EAST TENNESSEE

A THESIS

Submitted to
The Graduate Council
of
The University of Tennessee
in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the degree of
Master of Science

---

by

Bruce Mc Hinton

August 1958

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This study was made possible by the professional interest and cooperation of many persons. The writer wishes to express his thanks to all of those who assisted in the progress of the study.

Appreciation is expressed to the seven East Tennessee teachers of vocational agriculture and their students who provided data for this study; to Dr. A. J. Paulus and Dr. George W. Wiegers, Jr. for their assistance.

The author also wishes to extend grateful appreciation to his wife, Betty, for her help and encouragement; and daughters, Brucine and Michaela, for their patience and understanding during this study.

399964

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM AND ITS DEFINITION	1
	Purpose	1
	Limitations of the study	1
	Definitions of terms	1
	Need for the study	2
	Review of related studies	4
	Procedure	10
II.	FACTORS INFLUENCING THE QUALITY AND SUCCESS OF SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAMS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE STUDENTS	12
	Presentation of findings	12
III.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	44
	Summary	44
	Conclusions	47
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	51
	APPENDIX	54

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Year in School Related to Number Years Supervised Farming Program was Planned Ahead	13
II.	School Where Student is Enrolled Related to Length of Period for which Program was Planned	15
III.	Length of Period for which Planned Related to Completion of Supervised Farming Program	17
IV.	Grade in School Related to Size of Productive Enterprises carried	20
V.	School Where Students Enrolled Related to Size of Productive Enterprises carried	22
VI.	Grade in School Related to Completion of Planned Farming Program	24
VII.	Grade in School Related to Method of Financing Enterprises	26
VIII.	Grade in School Related to Student Ownership of Enterprises	28
IX.	Farm Facilities Available Related to Size of Productive Enterprises Carried	30
X.	Size of Home Farm Related to Size of Productive Enterprises Carried	33
XI.	Farming Status of Parents Related to Size of Productive Enterprises Carried	35

TABLE PAGE

XII. Number in Family Related to Size of Productive Enterprises Carried..... 37

XIII. Age of Brothers at Home Related to Size of Productive Enterprises Carried..... 38

XIV. School Where Student is Enrolled Related to Type of Farming for Which He is Planning..... 40

XV. Farming Plans of the Student Related to Size of Productive Enterprises Carried..... 43

XVI. Completed Supplementary Questions..... 57

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS DEFINITION

Purpose

This is a study of significant factors influencing the quality and success of supervised farming programs of vocational agriculture students in seven schools of East Tennessee.

This study embodies the elements of the home, farm and school planning.

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to seven departments of vocational agriculture in Tennessee. It is further limited to 244 students of the sophomore, junior, and senior agriculture classes of these schools. It is not within the province of this study to determine the extent of the influence of the agriculture curriculum which might affect the quality or success of the supervised farming program.

Definition of Terms

A "supervised farming program" as employed in this study is used to mean productive enterprises, improvement projects, and supplementary farm practice jobs conducted by students enrolled in vocational agriculture and for which systematic instruction and supervision on the farm are provided by the agriculture instructor.

A "productive enterprise" is a crop or animal which the agriculture student has a degree of ownership, managerial responsibilities, and expects to make a profit.

An "improvement project" as used in this study is interpreted to mean an undertaking involving a series of related jobs designed to improve the appearance and real estate value of the farm or make the home a better place in which to live.

A "supplementary farm practice job" refers to a small farm job carried out by the student for additional experience, skills and efficiency outside of the jobs involved in productive enterprises or improvement projects.

As used in this study, "grade in school" refers to grade level such as sophomore, junior, or senior.

As used in this study, "farm facilities" refers to those items necessary to carry out a farming program, such as equipment, land or finances.

"Productive man work units" refers to the number of hours of man labor necessary to produce a unit of a particular enterprise. The productive man work units used in this study were determined by the University of Tennessee Agriculture Economics Department.

Need for the Study

The primary aim of vocational agriculture is to train prospective farmers for proficiency in farming. It is commonly agreed that the supervised farming program is the best means for reaching this

objective. Broad and successful programs of supervised farming and related activities provide many experiences vital to instruction in the vocation of farming. Studies have shown that students of vocational agriculture most likely to farm are those who develop better-than-average programs of supervised farming. Capital goods, such as money, equipment, seed, feed, and livestock are needed by persons who strive to climb above the bottom rung of the so-called agriculture ladder. Supervised farming programs can assist in obtaining these assets.

This study attempts to bring together pertinent facts and information which influence the quality and success of supervised farming programs. By presenting these facts, this study will serve teachers of vocational agriculture to better direct the planning and carrying out of the supervised farming program.

There is need for information which will help to clarify the effect of such questions as:

1. How does the number of brothers at home affect farming programs?
2. How does the size of the family affect the farming program?
3. How does the ownership status of parents affect farming programs?
4. To what extent does farm facilities affect the farming program?
5. How does the size of the farm affect the farming program?
6. What affect does planning have on the success of a farming program?
7. To what extent do students carry out their plans for

the farming programs?

8. How are farming programs financed?

9. How much do students increase their farming programs as they progress in school?

Review of Related Studies

Many careful research workers have made contributions toward a better understanding of supervised farming programs and factors which influence their success.

Bjoraker[1] made a study of the purpose of the supervised farming programs in which he pointed out the opportunities which the farming program offers to develop managerial and business experience necessary for successful farming. He further pointed out that unless farming programs are carefully selected, well planned and carried out, the purposes of the supervised farming program would have little opportunity for realization.

Brown[2] found in his study one of the predominant factors in the success of farming programs was adequate facilities for carrying out the enterprise. He pointed out that there are many specific problems present on the farms which indicate a need for long-time planning.

---

[1]Walter T. Bjoraker, "Purposes of the Supervised Farming Program as Expressed by the Teacher Trainers of the Central Region and the Experienced Wisconsin Teachers of Agriculture," (Unpublished nonthesis study, Department of Agriculture Education, University of Wisconsin, 1951).

[2]Ray Bernard Brown, Sr., "Developing a Long-Time Program for Cameron Vocational Agriculture Department Based on a Survey of Farms in Cameron High School Area," (Unpublished Problem M. S., West Virginia University, 1951), 122 pp.

In a study of productive enterprises in a section of Louisiana, Love[3] pointed out that a majority of the students were carrying insufficient enterprises of good type and scope to prepare them for a future in the business of farming. His study indicated that most students have the necessary facilities for supervised farming programs.

Hearing[4] conducted a study of the home situation of boys in a school area. His study showed that full-time farms provided adequate opportunity for a boy to learn farming, whereas part-time farms did not provide adequate opportunity.

Warren's[5] study related to problems in the supervised farming program found that planning supervised practices, or experiences in lieu of it, for students with poor facilities was rated the most difficult problem. It was rated very difficult by experienced and inexperienced teachers.

In a Master's study, Shelby[6] pointed out that general information about the boys' interests, and facilities for conducting super-

---

[3]Eugene Franklin Love, "Study of the Productive Enterprises in the Supervised Farming Programs of Vocational Agriculture Students in Winn Parish, Louisiana," (Unpublished Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1951), 89 pp.

[4]Frank H. Hearing, "A Study of the Home Situation of Boys in the Lansing Central School Area to Determine the Kinds of Agriculture Instruction Needed," (Unpublished Master's thesis, Cornell University, 1952), 75 pp.

[5]Clarence Lee Warren, "Problems Related to the Supervised Farming Programs of In-School Students of Vocational Agriculture in North Carolina," (Unpublished Master's thesis, North Carolina State College, 1952), 59 pp.

[6]Joseph Herbert Shelby, "A Home Farm Survey to Aid Boys in Selecting Supervised Farming Programs," (Unpublished Master's thesis, Pennsylvania State College, 1949), 62 pp.

vised farming programs were of great value.

Snyder's[7] study of the development and validation of criteria of farming programs pointed out the following criteria to be important: (1) the goal of the student at the time he plans his long-time farming program, (2) the productive enterprises of the program are associated with the type of farming in which the individual desires establishment, and (3) a large number of supplementary farm practices are included in the farming program.

In Dobkin's[8] study of the size and scope of farming programs of agriculture, he found that the majority of students showed an increase in size and scope of enterprises from the tenth grade to the twelfth grade.

In a study directed by Horne[9] concerning the success of supervised farming programs, the study pointed out two major factors considered by teachers when assisting boys in selecting farming programs were: (1) the farming opportunities on the farm including land, buildings, equipment, and other facilities; (2) the type of farming followed

---

[7]Fred Calvin Snyder, "The Development and Validation of Criteria of Farming Programs of In-School Students in Vocational Agriculture in Pennsylvania Which Contribute to Establishment in Farming," (Unpublished Doctor's thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1955), 180 pp.

[8]James Dale Dobkins, "A Study of the Size and Scope of the Farming Projects of Kansas Vocational Agriculture Students," (Unpublished Master's thesis, Kansas State College, 1953), 35 pp.

[9]T. J. Horne, Jr., and Staff, "Factors Contributing to Success of Supervised Farming Programs," (Unpublished Staff Study, Agriculture Education Section, Vocational Education Department, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1952).

and the needs of the student, the farm, the family, and the community. He further pointed out the factors most affecting the boys' scope of farming programs were: (1) future plans of the boy, and (2) size of farm and facilities available.

In a doctor's thesis conducted by Abrams[10] of the development of supervised farming programs in vocational agriculture, the findings showed students should have facilities for supervised farming programs before enrolling in agriculture. He found the first semester was the most desirable time for planning the farming program, and it should be developed for a four-year period. The program should consist of productive enterprises, improvement projects, and supplementary farm jobs which would lead to a beginning in farming.

Watson[11] points out in a study of high school supervised farming programs as related to success in higher education and occupation in which they were engaged, that students with the highest number of total productive enterprises and improvement projects in high schools entered higher education and farming. Former students who are now farm owners had an average of 3.29 productive enterprises and improvement projects as compared to 2.73 per student for the average of the

---

[10] Morris Newton Abrams, "A Study of the Development of Supervised Farming Programs in Vocational Agriculture," (Unpublished Doctor's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1950), 155 pp.

[11] Melvern Watson, "A study of the High School Supervised Farming Programs of Former Students Relative to Their Success in Higher Education and Occupation in Which They are now Engaged," (Unpublished nonthesis study, Department of Agriculture Education, Oklahoma A & M College, 1950), 51 pp.

entire group now farming.

Burford's[12] study of supervised farming programs showed a gradual increase in productive enterprises, improvement projects, and supplementary farm jobs from the first to fourth year programs of students. He found no significant difference between the number of productive projects of students whose parents were renters or owners. The first-year students exercised less management over their projects than any other group.

Shanty's[13] study of how to improve farming programs based on the opinions of former students who are farming, found the following points to be important: (1) Programs broad enough in scope to provide a working knowledge of the business of farming. (2) The programs included projects of genuine interest to the pupil. (3) The farming programs aided over 80 per cent of the pupils to become established in farming. One of the weak features of the programs was the failure of the students to make long-time plans the first year of study.

Starrak[14] found in his study of supervised farming programs that slightly over 50 per cent of the projects were financed by the

---

[12] Lester F. Burford, "A Study of the Supervised Farming Programs in Vocational Agriculture Departments in Lubbock County," (Unpublished Master's thesis, Texas Technological College, 1947), 113 pp.

[13] David Frank Shanty, "Improvement of the Supervised Farming Program in Vocational Agriculture Based on the Opinions of Former Students Who are now Established in Farming," (Unpublished Master's thesis, Pennsylvania State College, 1945), 78 pp.

[14] James Abel Starrak, "Supervised Practice in Vocational Agriculture in Iowa," (Unpublished northesis study, Iowa State College, 1941), 32 pp.

parents, mainly by direct loans and in 30 per cent of the cases the boys owned sufficient capital to finance their programs. Only 51 per cent of the students involved in the study exercised complete control over the management of their respective productive enterprises.

In a study of the relationship between supervised farming programs and size of home farms made by Martin[15], he pointed toward a definite positive relationship existing between the size of pupils' home farms and the type of farming programs developed. As a whole, the students with higher ratings for farming programs came from large farms.

In Kilts's[16] study of the relation between supervised farming programs and farm resources, he points out a deficiency in building long-time programs and in the breadth of the practice program. He says,

> The Study indicates a need for greater effort in determining what are the boys' training needs, in selecting the proper practice media to meet these needs and more careful and consistent effort in relating the whole program of instruction to these needs. The selection, distribution and continuity of enterprises are weak.

---

[15] Hartley V. Martin, "A Study of the Relationship Between Supervised Farming Programs and Size of Home Farms and the Occupational Status and Establishment in Farming of Certain Young Men in the Central Square Central School Area." (Unpublished Master's thesis, Cornell University, 1954), 121 pp.

[16] Kenneth William Kilts, "The Relation Between the Supervised Farm Practice Program and the Farm Resources of the Boys of Twelve Vocational Agriculture Departments in Western Indiana," (Unpublished Master's thesis, Cornell University, 1930), 144 pp.

McReynolds[17] points out in a study of effective teaching that some of the main problems are in having boys complete a higher per cent of enterprises started and increasing the number of enterprises carried by each boy.

Procedure

The procedure followed was to review literature devoted to the problems of planning and carrying out supervised farming programs for students in vocational agriculture. From these readings and discussions with teachers of Agricultural Education at the University of Tennessee, a survey form was compiled to get data concerning students' supervised farming programs.

Collection of data was accomplished by interviewing teachers and students explaining the survey. The students completed the survey. Seven schools were selected in East Tennessee. The senior, junior and sophomore vocational agriculture classes of the school were surveyed.

In only one case was the student required to use his personal judgement in completing the survey. This was the case when he was asked to evaluate his farm facilities as to good, fair or poor.

After the study was begun, the writer felt a need for further information which the first survey did not cover. A supplementary

---

[17] Joseph Leland McReynolds, "The Relation of Certain Significant Project Problems to the Effectiveness of the Teaching of Agriculture in Mississippi." (Unpublished Master's thesis, Cornell University, 1926), 145 pp.

survey was conducted among the teachers in the seven schools. This data was collected by the interview method.

A copy of the major survey and the completed supplementary questions may be found in the appendix.

CHAPTER II

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE QUALITY AND SUCCESS OF SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAMS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE STUDENTS

Presentation of Findings

It is interesting to note that in Table I there is no definite pattern followed by the students of the seven schools in the length of time they planned their supervised farming programs when they enrolled as freshmen in agriculture.

The per cent planning for four years ranged from 40 per cent of the seniors, 28 per cent of the juniors, to 37 per cent of the sophomores. The sophomore group ranked highest of all those planning four years with 49 per cent. The senior group was the lowest with 24 per cent.

Only seventeen students of the 244 surveyed indicated they planned for three years. A total of eighty-four students planned for two years. Twenty per cent of the seniors, 16 per cent of the juniors and 28 per cent of the sophomores planned for two years.

To illustrate the further irregularity with which the students planned their programs, Table I shows a large per cent planning for only one year. The percentage ranged from 36 per cent of the seniors, 40 per cent of the juniors, to 29 per cent of the sophomores. Table I further illustrates a large group of the students planning on the two extremes, either for one year or four.

In a supplementary survey taken in the seven schools, all of

TABLE I

YEAR IN SCHOOL RELATED TO NUMBER YEARS SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM WAS PLANNED AHEAD

Year in School	Number Students	Years Planned Ahead							
		4		3		2		1	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Senior	50	20	40	2	4	10	20	18	36
Junior	85	23	28	9	10	14	16	39	46
Sophomore	109	41	37	6	6	30	28	32	29
		Percentage Distribution							
Senior	20	24		12		18		20	
Junior	35	27		53		26		44	
Sophomore	45	49		35		56		36	

the teachers indicated they allowed the students time for revising their farming programs after the freshman year. The time allowed for revision ranged from two days to ten days. This survey also showed the time allowed for planning the farming programs, in the freshman year, ranged from fifteen days to seventy days. Four teachers indicated they made no special effort to determine if a student enrolled in agriculture "one" planned to continue after the freshman year. All seven teachers indicated that if a student did not plan to continue in agriculture after the freshman year, he did not plan his supervised farming program any different than students who planned to continue in agriculture.

Table II shows the per cent students who planned their farming programs for four years varied from none in school "one" to 70 per cent in school "four". In three schools, 31 to 37 per cent of the students planned for four years. It is noted that the largest number of the students are planning for only one year. Eighty-nine students or 36 per cent indicated they planned for one year. The second highest number of students indicated they planned for two years. In school "one", 87 per cent of the students reported in this group.

Questions may come to ones mind as to why students within the same school plan their programs for different lengths of time and how planning affects the quality and success of the farming programs. This study does not try to determine the reasons for the different lengths of planning, however the effect of the planning on the farming programs is considered.

In the supplementary survey, six teachers indicated they stri-

TABLE II

SCHOOL[a] WHERE STUDENT IS ENROLLED RELATED TO LENGTH OF PERIOD FOR WHICH PROGRAM WAS PLANNED

School Number	Number of Students	Number of Years Planned							
		4		3		2		1	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	31	0	0	3	10	27	87	1	3
2	27	9	33	4	15	2	8	12	44
3	51	21	41	7	14	11	22	12	23
4	40	28	70	2	5	4	10	6	15
5	39	12	31	0	0	2	5	25	64
6	30	11	37	0	0	7	23	12	37
7	26	3	11	1	4	1	4	21	81

[a]Schools identified by number rather than name.

ved to get their students to plan their farming programs for four years. One teacher indicated he strived for two-year planning. Although the majority of the teachers indicated that they strive for four-year planning, Table II shows a large per cent of the teachers are not accomplishing this objective. It is noted in only one case, school number "four", more than 50 per cent of the students are formulating long-time supervised farming programs. The largest per cent of the students are planning one and two-year programs.

This study is in agreement with Shanty[1] and Kilts[2] in which they pointed out that a weakness of farming programs is the failure of students to make long-time plans the first year of study.

It is interesting to note in Table III the correlation between the students who planned for different lengths of time and the number of productive enterprises they started and completed. It is noted that the groups reporting the lowest per cent of the enterprises completed came from those planning their farming programs for one or four years. The group planning for three years reported the largest per cent of enterprises completed with 96 per cent followed very closely by the two-year group with 94 per cent.

It is also interesting to note that the eighty-four students who planned for four years reported the smallest number of enterprises started per student. This group started 2.9 enterprises per student

---

[1]David Frank Shanty, "Improvement of the Supervised Farming Program in Vocational Agriculture Based on the Opinions of Former Students Who Are Now Established in Farming," (Unpublished Master's thesis, Pennsylvania State College, 1945), 78 pp.

[2]Kenneth William Kilts, "The Relation Between the Supervised Farm Practice Programs and the Farm Resources of the Boys of Twelve Vocational Agriculture Departments in Western Indiana," (Unpublished Master's thesis, Cornell University, 1930), 144 pp.

TABLE III

LENGTH OF PERIOD FOR WHICH PLANNED RELATED TO COMPLETION OF SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Kind of Project	Number Years Planned Ahead	Number Students	Number Started	Completed	
				Number	Per Cent
Productive Enterprises	4	84	245	210	86
	3	17	51	49	96
	2	54	214	201	94
	1	89	300	251	84
Improvement Projects	4	84	295	260	88
	3	17	62	52	84
	2	54	202	188	93
	1	89	417	369	88
Supplementary Farm Practice Jobs	4	84	353	312	88
	3	17	59	47	80
	2	54	244	199	81
	1	89	499	427	86

as compared to four enterprises per student started by the group planning for two years. The group planning for one year started an average of 3.3 enterprises per student as compared to three for the group planning for three years, but as noted, the two-year group completed the smaller per cent of their enterprises.

There are teachers of vocational agriculture who contend that one-year planning is not enough to give the student a good guide to work by and that four-year planning is too far in advance for the student to clearly realize. Table III will substantiate this thinking.

Table III further shows in the case of improvement projects and supplementary farm practice jobs the range between per cent started and completed is much closer than in the case of productive enterprises. The largest per cent of improvement projects completed is found in the two-year-planning group with 93 per cent, followed by one and four-year-planning with 88 per cent. The three-year group shows 84 per cent completion, which is the smallest for all the groups.

The largest per cent of the supplementary farm practice jobs completed are found in the group planning for four years with 80 per cent, followed very closely with one-year planning, 86 per cent; two-year, 81 per cent; and three-year, 80 per cent completed.

Table III would lead one to think that the length of planning for the supervised farm program affects the productive enterprises phase of the program more than the improvement projects or supplementary farm practice jobs.

Since this table is not in agreement with other studies reviewed by the writer, it would be very interesting for further study to be

made in this area to see to what extent these conditions exist in other schools.

Table IV reveals that the students increased the size of productive enterprises as they progressed in school. The average number of enterprises carried varied from 3.4 per students in the senior group, 3.3 in the junior group, to 3.2 in the sophomore group.

The writer feels the number of productive man work units gives a better prespective of the size of the enterprises than does the average number of enterprises. It will be noted in the definition of terms that the productive man work units represents the number of hours of man labor necessary to produce a unit of a particular enterprise. In tabulating the surveys, the writer found several boys who had a larger number of enterprises than did other boys, but they were small in scope or did not require very much man labor to produce them. The productive man work unit will aid in correcting this misconception.

As can be noted in Table IV, the average number of enterprises increased one tenth as the student progressed in school, but the average number of productive man work units shows a larger increase. The average for the senior group was 329; junior group, 321; and the sophomore group, 314. This shows the senior group had an average increase of fourteen productive man work units over the sophomore group. It is further noted the lowest range in the senior group was thirty productive man work units where the junior and sophomore group shows a low of five. The writer feels that two very high cases in the sophomore group of 2278 and 2207 productive man work units increased the average somewhat above the normal condition. If these two high cases were

TABLE IV

GRADE IN SCHOOL RELATED TO SIZE OF PRODUCTIVE ENTERPRISES CARRIED

Grade	Number of Students	Size of Productive Enterprises			
		Number of Enterprises		Number Productive Man Work Units	
		Average	Range	Average	Range
Senior	50	3.4	1-9	329	30-1133
Junior	85	3.3	1-7	322	5-1363
Sophomore	109	3.2	1-9	314	5-2278

removed, the sophomore group would show an average number productive man work units of 277 per student.

Table IV is in agreement with studies made by Dobkins[3] and Kirkland[4] which showed the student increased his farming program as he progressed in school.

To study more closely the size of the productive enterprises carried by students, Table V shows a wide variation of the farming program by schools. School number "one" showed an average of 4.8 productive enterprises per student, whereas school "three" showed an average of 2.6 enterprises per student. Two schools showed an average of 3.0 to 3.4; two schools showed an average of 2.7 to 2.8.

It is interesting to note that although school "seven" showed an average of 4.0 enterprises per student and school "five" showed an average of 3.4, that school "five" showed an average number productive man work units per student of 421 as compared to 370 for school "seven", or an average increase of fifty one per student. Schools "four" and "six" show the same conditions. This would cause one to think a better means of evaluation of the size of farming programs can be made by adjusting the enterprises to productive man work units rather than using just the number of enterprises carried by the student.

Table V shows also that the school having the largest enroll-

---

[3]James Dale Dobkins, "A Study of the Size and Scope of the Farming Projects of Kansas Vocational Agriculture Students," (Unpublished Master's thesis, Kansas State College, 1953), 35 pp.

[4]James Bryant Kirkland, "A Study of Supervised Farming Practice Programs in Certain Schools of Tennessee," (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, 1936).

TABLE V

SCHOOL[a] WHERE STUDENTS ENROLLED RELATED TO SIZE OF PRODUCTIVE ENTERPRISES CARRIED

School Number	Number of Students	Size of Productive Enterprises			
		Number of Enterprises		Number Productive Man Work Units	
		Average	Range	Average	Range
1	31	4.8	2-9	576	38-2278
2	27	3.0	1-8	313	5-873
3	51	2.6	1-5	152	5-766
4	40	2.8	1-7	209	5-1363
5	39	3.4	2-6	421	29-1120
6	30	2.7	1-5	289	16-1068
7	29	4.0	2-7	370	51-861
Total	244	3.2	1-9	315	5-2278

[a]School identified by number rather than name.

ment in the three grades surveyed had the lowest average of productive enterprises per student.

The writer feels it would be very interesting to have further study to determine the causes for such a wide variation in farming programs in the schools.

Table VI reveals that the senior group completed a higher per cent of the productive enterprises than the juniors or sophomores but completed fewer improvement projects and supplementary farm practice jobs than the juniors or sophomores. The seniors completed 92 per cent of their productive enterprises started as compared to 85 per cent for the juniors, and 88 per cent for the sophomores. It will be noted in Table I (page 13) that 46 per cent of the junior classes planned their programs for one year when enrolled as freshmen, which the writer feels might help to explain the low per cent of completion.

Table III (page 17) reveals very little correlation between length of time the farming program was planned in relation to completion of improvement projects and supplementary farm practice jobs. Table VI also reveals very little correlation between grade in school as related to completion of improvement projects and supplementary farm practice jobs. Although the seniors completed the highest per cent of the productive enterprises started, Table VI shows they completed the lowest per cent of both improvement projects and supplementary farm practice jobs started, although the difference is not great.

It is commonly agreed that the productive enterprises are the most important phase of the supervised farming program for advancing a boy into the business of farming. It has been the experience of the

TABLE VI

GRADE IN SCHOOL RELATED TO COMPLETION OF PLANNED FARMING PROGRAM

Present Grade in School	Number of Students	Productive Enterprises		Improvement Projects		Supplementary Farm Practice Jobs	
		Started	Completed	Started	Completed	Started	Completed
		In Number of Cases					
Senior	50	171	157	167	140	209	177
Junior	85	285	243	313	282	330	288
Sophomore	109	354	312	496	447	606	520
Totals	244	810	712	976	869	1145	985
		In Percentage Completed					
Seniors			92		84		85
Junior			85		90		87
Sophomore			88		90		86

writer that students also realize the importance that productive enterprises offer for becoming established in farming and put more emphasis on them than they do on improvement projects and supplementary farm practice jobs as they progress in school. Table VI further illustrates the tendency of the senior student to put less emphasis on improvement projects and supplementary farm practice jobs. It is noted that they started fewer improvement projects and supplementary farm practice jobs per student than did the sophomore group.

This study is in agreement with McReynolds[5] in which he points out a major problem in vocational agriculture is getting boys to complete a higher per cent of the enterprises started.

Table VII reveals as the student progresses in school, he finances a larger per cent of his enterprises himself. The senior group financed 44 per cent of the enterprises themselves compared to 40 per cent for the juniors, and 36 per cent for the sophomores. The senior group reported 33 per cent of the enterprises were financed in cooperation with their parents, the junior group reported 39 per cent, and the sophomore group reported 42 per cent. It is interesting to note that the senior group reported the highest per cent of the enterprises being financed entirely by parents, with 22 per cent. The junior group reported 19 per cent and the sophomores, 18 per cent of the enterprises being financed by parents. As was pointed out in Table IV

---

[5]Joseph Leland McReynolds, "The Relation of Certain Significant projects Problems to the Effectiveness of the Teaching of Agriculture in Mississippi," (Unpublished Master's thesis, Cornell University, 1926).

TABLE VII

GRADE IN SCHOOL RELATED TO METHOD OF FINANCING ENTERPRISES

Grade in School	Number of Enterprises	Method of Financing				
		Self	Self and Parents	Parents	Bank	Other
		Distribution of Enterprises				
Senior	171	76	57	37	0	1
Junior	285	113	111	53	0	8
Sophomore	354	125	150	64	3	12
		Percentage Distribution				
Senior	100	44	33	22	0	1
Junior	100	40	39	19	0	2
Sophomore	100	36	42	18	1	3

(page 20) the enterprises carried by the seniors required more productive man work units to produce which possibly could help to account for the need for more parent financing.

It is interesting to note that of the 244 boys included in the survey, only three boys reported they had used the bank as a means of financing their enterprises. Twelve boys reported that they had used other means for financing their enterprises. In tabulating the surveys, the writer found these to be relatives of the student such as aunt, uncle, or brothers.

A very important phase of a successful farming program is that the student have full or partial ownership of his productive enterprises. Table VIII shows that 55 per cent of all grade levels--seniors, juniors, and sophomores--had 100 per cent ownership of their productive enterprises.

It is worthy of noting that sixty-seven students or 27 per cent reported no ownership at all of their productive enterprises. The writer wonders if these enterprises could technically be called a part of a boy's supervised farming program as it is commonly agreed that a student should have at least partial ownership. It is significant however, that the per cent having no ownership of their productive enterprises decreased as the student progressed in school.

A small number of the students reported ownership of 1 to 25 per cent. Only twenty-nine boys in the survey indicated they belonged in this group. The second highest per cent of the students indicated they had 26 to 50 per cent ownership of the enterprises. Twenty-three per cent of the seniors reported in this group, 31 per cent of the

TABLE VIII

GRADE IN SCHOOL RELATED TO STUDENT OWNERSHIP OF ENTERPRISES

Per Cent of Ownership	Grade in School					
	Senior		Junior		Sophomore	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	12	7	21	8	34	10
1-25	0	0	10	4	19	5
26-50	40	23	90	31	94	27
51-75	4	2	14	5	23	6
76-100[a]	115	68	150	52	184	52

[a]All cases except one 100 per cent.

juniors, and 27 per cent of the sophomores. A very small per cent of the students reported in the 51 to 75 per cent ownership group.

It is interesting to note in the 76 to 100 per cent ownership group only one case reported less than 100 per cent. This was a sophomore reporting 90 per cent ownership.

The writer was very pleasantly surprised at the high per cent of complete ownership. The senior group reported 68 per cent complete ownership, and the junior and sophomore group 52 per cent.

It is noted in Table VIII that the largest per cent of the students belong in two groups--the 26 to 50 per cent ownership or 100 per cent ownership.

Many agriculture teachers feel a very important determining factor in the quality and success of a supervised farming program is the farm facilities which the student has to carry out the program. The students surveyed were asked to evaluate the farm facilities they had where the farming program was being carried out.

Table IX reveals that eighty students or 33 per cent classified their farm facilities "good". Forty six of the students carried out their programs entirely on the home farm with an average number of enterprises of 4.3 and an average number productive man work units of 416. It is interesting to note that the twenty-six students who carried out their programs at home and some other farm had an average of 4.0 enterprises, but an average number productive man work units of 463 or fifty seven more work units than those carrying out the program entirely at home.

Eight students carried out their farming programs entirely off

TABLE IX

FARM FACILITIES AVAILABLE RELATED TO SIZE OF PRODUCTIVE ENTERPRISES CARRIED

Facilities[a]	Where Program was Carried	Number of Cases	Size of Productive Enterprises: Number of Enterprises Average	Number of Enterprises Range	No. Productive Man Work Units Average	No. Productive Man Work Units Range
Good	Home Farm	46	4.3	2-9	416	25-2207
	Home or Other Farm	26	4.0	2-7	463	64-580
	Other Farm	8	3.9	2-6	389	75-570
Fair	Home Farm	81	3.0	1-6	264	5-2278
	Home or Other Farm	20	3.2	2-6	364	38-1120
	Other Farm	13	2.6	2-4	297	16-861
Poor	Home Farm	46	1.8	1-4	196	5-700
	Home or Other Farm	2	3.0	3	265	125-405
	Other Farm	2	2.0	1-3	255	160-350

[a]Rating as determined by students at time of survey.

the home farm. This group reported an average number productive enterprises of 3.9 and an average of 389 productive man work units. It is worthy of noting that although this group reported an average of only one tenth less enterprises than the "home and other farm" group, they reported seventy four less productive man work units per student.

The largest group of the students classified their farm facilities as "fair". One-hundred-fourteen students in this group reported they carried out their program entirely at home. They reported an average number of 3.0 enterprises and average number productive man work units of 264 per student. The "home and other farm" group reported 3.2 enterprises and 364 productive man work units. It is worthy of noting that this group reported a substantial increase of one hundred more productive man work units per student than the "home farm" group. The "other farm" group reported 2.6 enterprises per student and 296 productive man work units. It is also noted that this group showed an increase of thirty-three productive man work units per student over the "home farm" group.

Fifty students or 20 per cent classified their farm facilities "poor". Forty six of this group carried out their program entirely at home with 1.8 enterprises and 196 productive man work units per student. Only two students reported in the "home and other farm" group and two in the "other farm" group. Since there were only two students in each group, the writer does not feel this is enough cases to get a true trend; but it is noted that they show an increase in both number of enterprises and productive work units over the "home farm" group. It is further noted under the range of productive man work units of

those carrying a part or all of the farming program off the home farm reported a much higher minimum range than those carrying the program on the home farm.

Table IX reveals in all cases where the student carried out part of the program on the home farm and another farm, the average number productive man work units was larger than for the other two groups. It is also noted that in the cases of "fair" farm facilities, the students carrying their programs on the home farm showed the smallest average number productive man work units. This may lead one to believe that when a student goes off the home farm to carry out his farming program it makes it necessary for him to carry larger enterprises to make it a paying activity.

Table X shows a trend that the student increased the number of productive man work units of his enterprises as the size of the home farm increased. Forty-four students or 18 per cent reported their home farm was from one to ten acres. This group had the smallest number of enterprises and productive man work units per student of any group, with 2.4 enterprises and 188 productive man work units.

One-hundred-seventeen students or 73 per cent reported their home farms were from one to one hundred acres. The largest number of students, fifty, reported in the twenty-six to fifty acre group.

There is a definite increase in productive man work units by the students up to the group whose home farm is 201 to 250 acres. The writer feels this decrease can be partly explained by the fact that of the six students in this group, only one of the parents is owner-operator. Four of the students reported their parents are share renters

TABLE X

SIZE OF HOME FARM RELATED TO SIZE OF PRODUCTIVE ENTERPRISES CARRIED

Acres in Home Farm	Number of Students	Size of Productive Enterprises			
		Number of Enterprises		Number Productive Man Work Units	
		Average	Range	Average	Range
1-10	44	2.4	1-4	188	5-861
11-25	36	2.8	1-6	236	16-628
26-50	50	3.0	1-9	254	5-842
51-75	39	3.7	1-8	357	35-885
76-100	19	3.8	2-7	396	38-816
101-125	13	3.5	2-5	349	41-1120
126-150	10	4.0	2-7	431	38-1122
151-175	10	4.5	2-7	543	70-2278
176-200	8	4.0	2-9	675	30-2207
201-250	6	4.4	2-6	446	31-750
251-300	2	3.3	3-4	726	385-1068
301-350	1	4.0	4	48	48
351-over	6	4.0	2-7	526	64-1363

and one is a farm manager.

The six students reporting their home farms over 350 acres showed a decrease in productive man work units as compared to some of the smaller size farms. In this group, three students reported their parents were share renters.

The lone student in the 301 to 350 group reported a very low number of productive man work units. He indicated he did not plan to farm.

Table XI showed 104 students or 43 per cent of the students' parents are owner-operator. This group reported an average number productive enterprises of 4.6 and an average of 462 productive man work units per student. It is noted under the heading of "totals", the weighted average for the entire group is 3.2 enterprises and 315 productive man work units per student.

Thirty-six students or 15 per cent reported their parents were share renters. This group showed an increase over the weighted average for the group reporting 3.4 enterprises and 359 productive man work units.

Nine students reported their parents were laborers. It is worthy of noting that this group reported equal to the weighted average of the group in number of enterprises, but 155 less productive man work units.

The second highest number of students reported their parents were not farming. Eighty-five students or 35 per cent reported in this group. They reported an average of 2.6 enterprises and 146 productive man work units or 169 less work units than the weighted average for the group.

TABLE XI

FARMING STATUS OF PARENTS RELATED TO SIZE OF PRODUCTIVE ENTERPRISES CARRIED

Status	Number Cases	Size of Productive Enterprises: No. Enterprises Average	No. Enterprises Range	Prod. Man Work Units Average	Prod. Man Work Units Range
Landlord	2	5.5	5-6	389	330-448
Owner-operator	104	4.6	1-9	462	29-2278
Share renter	36	3.4	1-5	359	25-842
Cash renter	6	3.3	2-5	193	41-444
Manager	2	2.0	2	34	31-38
Laborer	9	3.2	2-5	160	16-330
Not farming	85	2.6	1-9	146	5-575
Totals	244	3.2	1-9	315	5-2278

Table XI reveals that those students whose parents are owner-operator have the best possibilities for good farming programs. Those students whose parents are not farming do not have very good possibilities to grow into the business of farming.

Table XII reveals that usually as the number in the family increases, the size of the student's productive enterprises decreases. It is interesting to note in the cases where there were only two in the family, the students reported next to the smallest number of productive man work units per students of all the groups. The writer did not try to determine which of the parents was deceased. It would be very interesting to make further study to determine the influence of the parents on the success of the student's farming program.

Seventy-four per cent of the students reported there were from four to seven in the family. The largest number of students reported that there were five in the family.

It is noted that the twenty-eight students reporting ten to eleven in the family have a larger average number productive man work units than some of the smaller families. The writer feels it should be pointed out that of this group, twenty-one students reported their parents owner of the farms and thirteen reported that their parents actually operated the farm.

The writer has felt that students who had brothers at home old enough to share in the farming operation had less opportunity to carry a good supervised farming program. Table XIII shows that the age of the brothers at home had little if any effect on the size of the productive enterprises carried by the student.

TABLE XII

NUMBER IN FAMILY RELATED TO SIZE OF PRODUCTIVE ENTERPRISES CARRIED

Number in Family	Number of Students	Size of Productive Enterprises			
		Number of Enterprises		Number Productive Man Work Units	
		Average	Range	Average	Range
2	5	2.6	1-4	200	5-494
3	15	3.7	1-9	495	5-2207
4	38	3.5	2-7	385	27-2278
5	49	3.0	1-6	319	5-1068
6	45	3.0	1-7	360	30-1363
7	35	3.2	1-6	257	5-1120
8	18	2.6	1-6	223	35-750
9	11	2.5	1-4	163	16-535
10	8	3.0	2-5	262	15-550
11+	20	3.1	2-6	237	38-658

TABLE XIII

AGE OF BROTHERS AT HOME RELATED TO SIZE OF PRODUCTIVE ENTERPRISES CARRIED

Age of Brothers	Number of Students	Size of Productive Enterprises			
		Number of Enterprises		Number of Productive Man Work Units	
		Average	Range	Average	Range
0	76	3.3	1-9	290	5-2207
1-4	19	3.0	2-6	207	30-560
5-8	25	2.8	1-4	251	38-658
9-12	63	3.3	1-6	329	16-861
13-16	82	3.3	1-6	295	16-1133
17-20	48	3.4	1-6	319	6-1363
21-24	18	3.7	1-7	418	30-1363
25-over	9	3.1	2-6	356	51-2278

The group reporting brothers ranging from nine to twenty years of age showed an increase in productive man work units over the group having no brothers or brothers from one to eight.

The writer feels if any age group would affect the program it should be affected by the age group, nine to twenty, since this group could be engaged in 4-H programs or enrolled in agricultural classes. The group reporting brothers above high school age, twenty one and over, reported the highest average of productive man work units of any group. The study did not try to determine if the age group above high school were engaged in farming on the home farm or just living at home. It would be interesting to have further study to determine what effect such conditions would have on the size of productive enterprises.

As was stated in the introduction, the primary purpose of vocational agriculture is to prepare students for useful employment in the business of farming. The writer feels Table XIV shows to what extent the vocational agriculture departments in the survey are accomplishing this purpose.

From the study of the data in Table XIV, it is noted that students who were enrolled in vocational agriculture were preparing for five types of farming. It is further noted that 122 students or 50 per cent are preparing for general farming. The number of students in each department who were preparing for general farming varied from eight in school "six" to thirty-one in school "three". The number preparing for general farming exceeds that of all other types of farming.

Students in seven departments reported that they were preparing for dairy farming.

TABLE XIV

SCHOOL[a] WHERE STUDENT IS ENROLLED RELATED TO TYPE OF FARMING FOR WHICH HE IS PLANNING

Type of Farming Planned	School Number							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Totals
General	14	16	31	24	15	8	14	122
Dairy	6	1	1	4	4	1	2	19
Livestock	8	4	4	0	4	2	3	25
Poultry	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3
Truck	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	9
Part-time	0	1	3	0	0	12	1	17
No Farming	1	1	7	8	10	5	4	36
Not Indicating	0	0	2	3	6	0	2	13
Totals	31	27	51	40	39	30	26	244

[a]Schools identified by number rather than name.

Students in six departments reported preparing for livestock farming. Twelve students reported they were preparing for poultry or truck farming.

Four departments reported a total of seventeen boys who planned to do part-time farming. The number in each department indicated part-time farming was rather small except in one department. In school "six", twelve out of the thirty students enrolled indicated they planned to be part-time farmers.

It is noted that thirty-six students or 15 per cent of the students enrolled in vocational agriculture did not plan to farm. The number varied from one in schools "one" and "two" to ten in school "five". In school "five", 25 per cent of the enrollment indicated they did not plan to farm.

There were four schools in which students did not indicate the type of farming for which they were preparing. The number in each school that failed to indicate the type of farming they were preparing for was rather small except in one department. In school "five", six out of the thirty-nine students enrolled in vocational agriculture did not indicate the type of farming for which they were planning.

It is worthy of noting in Table XIV that sixty-six students or 25 per cent of the students enrolled in vocational agriculture are not preparing for full-time farming or have not decided the type of farming for which they want to prepare. It is further noted that students in these groups varied from 3 per cent of the students in school "one" to 56 per cent of the students in school "six".

Table XV showed that students who planned to farm full time carry larger productive enterprises than the group who has not planned for full-time farming. There were 178 students or 73 per cent who planned for full-time farming. This group reported 3.4 enterprises and 330 productive man work units per student.

There were seventeen students or 7 per cent who indicated part-time farming. This group reported 3.1 enterprises and 287 productive man work units per student.

The second highest per cent of the students indicated they did not plan to farm. There were thirty-six students or 15 per cent of the students in this group. They reported 2.8 enterprises and 255 productive man work units.

The smallest average number productive man work units was carried by the group not indicating for what type of farming they were preparing.

It is interesting to note that the group not indicating any type of farming and the group reporting they did not plan to farm had the highest minimum range of productive man work units.

TABLE XV

FARMING PLANS OF THE STUDENT RELATED TO SIZE OF PRODUCTIVE ENTERPRISES CARRIED

Plans of Student	Number of Students	Size of Productive Enterprises			
		Number of Enterprises		Number Prod. Man Work Units	
		Average	Range	Average	Range
Farming	178	3.4	1-9	330	5-2207
Part-time	17	3.1	1-4	287	5-1068
Not to Farm	36	2.8	1-6	255	29-871
Not Indicating	13	3.0	1-6	232	35-535

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

In this thesis a study was made to determine the effect of significant factors on the quality and success of supervised farming programs in certain departments of vocational agriculture in East Tennessee.

A total of 244 students of the senior, junior and sophomore classes of seven schools were selected for the study.

The study showed there was no definite pattern as to the length of time the students planned their supervised farming programs. The largest number of the students either planned their programs for one or four years. In only one school did more than 50 per cent of the students plan for four years. Although the majority of the teachers indicated they strived to get their students to plan for four years, it was found that they are not accomplishing their objective.

It was determined that the length for which the student planned his supervised farming program affected the per cent of completed productive enterprises more than improvement projects or supplementary farming practice jobs. The groups which planned for one or four years showed the lowest per cent completed of the productive enterprise phase of the farming programs. The group which planned for three years completed the highest per cent of the productive enterprises started, followed very closely by the two-year group.

It was found there was very little correlation between the length

of time the supervised farming programs were planned and the per cent completed of the improvement projects and supplementary farm practice jobs.

It was determined that students do increase their supervised farming programs as they progress in school. Although the increase as to the number of enterprises per student was not too great, it was found that the number of productive man work units necessary to carrying out the enterprises increased substantially as the students progressed in school.

It was found that there is wide variation as to the size of productive enterprises carried by the students in the different schools. Although the schools are located in similar areas, the average number of enterprises per student ranged from 4.8 to 2.6.

It was determined that seniors put more emphasis in completing productive enterprises than they do improvement projects and supplementary farm practice jobs. The seniors completed the highest per cent of the productive enterprises with 92 per cent; but, they completed the lowest per cent of the improvement projects and supplementary farm practice jobs.

In regard to method of financing enterprises, it was found that students finance more of their enterprises themselves as they progress in school. It was also found that students are making very little use of banks as a means of financing their enterprises.

It was found that 55 per cent of the enterprises were owned entirely by the students. It was also determined that students showed no ownership of 8 per cent of the enterprises.

One of the most important factors affecting supervised farming programs found in the study were the farm facilities available for the student to carry out his program. Boys who evaluated their farm facilities as being "good" reported larger enterprises than did those who reported their farm facilities "fair" or "poor". It was also found that students who go off the home farm to carry all or a part of their farming program carry larger enterprises than those who carry all the program on the home farm.

The study revealed that students do not necessarily increase the number of enterprises they carry as the size of the home farm increases. It was found however, that students showed a trend of increasing the number productive man work units needed to carry out the enterprises as the size of the home farm increased.

It was determined that students whose parents were owner-operator of the farm offered the most favorable conditions for carrying a good supervised farming program. Those students whose parents were not farming did not offer very favorable conditions to carry large farming programs.

The study showed a trend that as the number in the family increased, the size of productive enterprises decreased. One of the most outstanding effects of the family on the size of the productive enterprises was found when one of the parents of the student was deceased. Students who reported one of their parents deceased carried substantially smaller programs than other students.

It was determined that the age of the brothers at home had little if any effect on the size of the enterprise carried by the student.

It was found that 50 per cent of the students were preparing for general farming. A large number of the students indicated that they were planning for part-time farming or that they did not plan to farm at all. The number of students who were not planning for full-time farming was substantially higher in some schools than others.

The study showed that students who are planning for full-time farming carry much larger enterprises than do students who have not decided their farming future or those who plan not to farm or to do part-time farming.

Conclusions

Basing conclusions on the foregoing summary, it seems there are certain factors which the teacher of vocational agriculture can well afford to consider in supervising students in their supervised farming programs.

With all schools reporting a very irregular period for the length of time which students planned their supervised farming program, the teachers of vocational agriculture should attempt to give attention to a more systematic method for the students to plan their programs. The length of time for which the student should plan should be enough in advance to give a workable guide, but not beyond the student's comprehension.

With the students' completing approximately 87 per cent of the productive enterprises started, it seems that students should be urged and "sold" on the need for completing a larger per cent of the enter-

prises in that they acquire the knowledge and skills needed for the advancement in farming. We may also conclude that students need to be taught the importance of completing more of their improvement projects and supplementary farm practice jobs.

Comparing this study with others reviewed by the writer, we may conclude that the majority of the students in this study are carrying average or above average in the number of productive enterprises. It seems to the writer that a better means of evaluation of the farming program other than the use of the number of enterprises the student is carrying, should be considered by the teacher of vocational agriculture. The writer suggests that teachers consider the idea of transferring the enterprises into productive man work units as a means of showing the student the size of his farming operation.

The majority of the students are getting opportunities for financial participation in the productive enterprises of the supervised farming program. There seems to be a need on the part of the teachers to discuss with the students and parents the possibilities of using banks as a means of financing enterprises. The writer feels that this could be used as a wonderful opportunity for the student to acquire the training and experience of borrowing money while his capital needs are not too large and he has parental guidance.

The majority of the students are getting opportunities for ownership responsibilities. The majority of the students are entire owners or part owners. The writer feels that teachers should further emphasize to students and especially to parents the importance of ownership. If students are to have a desire to improve their farming programs, they

must have the satisfaction of owning a crop or animal and knowing that they will receive at least a part of the profit. It seems a very important time which parents should be contacted about this matter is when the student first enrolls in agriculture.

The teacher of vocational agriculture must have an understanding of the student's home farm situation if he is to give him the best guidance in planning his farming program. The writer feels that this should be done very soon after the student enrolls in agriculture. It was determined from the study that the kind of farm facilities the student has at home greatly affects the quality of the supervised farming program. If the farming program is not to be disappointing to both the student and the teacher, the student who does not have adequate facilities should understand this problem before enrolling in agriculture. The teacher should accept the responsibility of aiding interested students in finding facilities for carrying a good program.

With 50 per cent of the students preparing for general type farming, the writer feels that the teacher should give the students an opportunity to make a study as to the trend of farming today. It seems that the trend of farmers today is to specialize in a crop or animal rather than general farming.

The writer believes that further study should be conducted to determine other factors which might influence the quality and success of supervised farming programs. It would also be very interesting to compare the results of a similar study which could be conducted in other schools of Tennessee.

After the study was completed, there were still questions in

the mind of the writer that he wished he had included in this study.

Some of these questions are:

1. Why do the sizes of the supervised farming programs in the different schools vary so much since they are located in the same general area?

2. What effect does the teacher of vocational agriculture have on the success of the farming program?

3. What effect does the attitude of the parent about farming have on the student's farming program?

4. What effect does teacher-pupil load have on the farming program?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, Morris Newton. "A Study of the Development of Supervised Farming Programs in Vocational Agriculture." Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, Louisiana State University, 1950. 155 pp.

Bjoraker, Walter T. "Purposes of the Supervised Farming Program as Expressed by the Teacher Trainers of the Central Region and the Experienced Wisconsin Teachers of Agriculture." Unpublished nonthesis study, Department of Agriculture Education, University of Wisconsin, 1951.

Brown, Ray Bernard, Sr. "Developing a Long-Time Program for Cameron Vocational Agriculture Department Based on a Survey of Farms In Cameron High School Area." Unpublished Problem M. S., West Virginia University, 1951. 122 pp.

Burford, Lester F. "A Study of the Supervised Farming Programs in Vocational Agriculture Departments in Lubbock County." Unpublished Master's thesis, Texas Technological College, 1947. 113 pp.

Dobkins, James Dale. "A Study of the Size and Scope of the Farming Projects of Kansas Vocational Agriculture Students." Unpublished Master's thesis, Kansas State College, 1953. 35 pp.

Horne, T. J., Jr. and staff. "Factors Contributing to Success of Supervised Farming Programs." Unpublished staff study, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1952.

Kilts, Kenneth William. "The Relation Between the Supervised Farm Practice Programs and the Farm Resources of the Boys of Twelve Vocational Agriculture Departments in Western Indiana." Unpublished Master's thesis, Cornell University, 1930. 144 pp.

Kirkland, James Bryant. "A Study of Supervised Farming Practice Programs in Certain Schools of Tennessee." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, 1936.

Love, Eugene Franklin. "Study of the Productive Enterprises in the Supervised Farming Programs of Vocational Agriculture Students in Winn Parish, Louisiana." Unpublished Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1951. 89 pp.

Martin, Hartley V. "A Study of the Relationship Between Supervised Farming Programs and Size of Home Farms and the Occupational Status and Establishment in Farming of Certain Young Men in the Central Square Central School Area." Unpublished Master's thesis, Cornell University, 1954. 121 pp.

McReynolds, Joseph Leland. "The Relation of Certain Significant Projects Problems to the Effectiveness of the Teaching of Agriculture in Mississippi." Unpublished Master's thesis, Cornell University, 1926. 80 pp.

Mearing, Frank H. "A Study of the Home Situation of Boys in the Lansing Central School Area to Determine the Kinds of Agriculture Instruction Needed." Unpublished Master's thesis, Cornell University, 1952. 75 pp.

Shanty, David Frank. "Improvement of the Supervised Farming Program in Vocational Agriculture Based on the Opinions of Former Students Who are Now Established in Farming." Unpublished Master's thesis, Pennsylvania State College, 1945. 78 pp.

Shelby, Joseph Herbert. "A Home Farm Survey to Aid Boys in Selecting Supervised Farming Programs." Unpublished Master's thesis, Pennsylvania State College, 1949. 62 pp.

Snyder, Fred Calvin. "The Development and Validation of Criteria of Farming Programs of In-School Students in Vocational Agriculture in Pennsylvania Which Contribute to Establishment in Farming." Unpublished Doctor's thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1955. 180 pp.

Starrak, James Abel. "Supervised Practice in Vocational Agriculture in Iowa." Unpublished nonthesis study, Iowa State College, 1941. 32 pp.

Warren, Clarence Lee. "Problems Related to the Supervised Farming Programs of In-School Students of Vocational Agriculture in North Carolina." Unpublished Master's thesis, North Carolina State College, 1952. 59 pp.

Watson, Malvern. "A Study of the High School Supervised Farming Programs of Former Students Relative to Their Success in Higher Education and Occupation in Which They are Now Engaged." Unpublished nonthesis study, Department of Agriculture Education, Oklahoma A & M College, 1950. 51 pp.

APPENDIX

MY SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Check or fill in:

1. School number _____.
2. Grade in school _____.
3. Size of home farm _____.
4. Number in family _____.
5. Age of brothers at home now _____.
6. Number of enterprises you started during 1955-56 but did not complete _____.
7. Number of supplementary farm practice jobs you started during 1955-56 _____.
8. Number of supplementary farm practice jobs you started during 1955-56 but did not complete _____.
9. Number of improvement projects you started during 1955-56 _____.
10. Number of improvement projects you started during 1955-56 but did not complete _____.
11. Do you carry out your supervised farming program on the home farm? yes ___ No ___.
12. What kind of facilities do you have for carrying out your supervised farming program? Good ___ Fair ___ Poor ___.
13. Are your parents or guardians owner-operator of farm ___ landlord ___ share renter ___ cash renter ___ manager ___ laborer ___ not farming ___?
14. For how long did you plan your supervised farm program at the beginning of your agriculture course? 1 year___ 2 Years ___ 3 years ___ 4 years ___.
15. For what type of farming are you preparing? General _____ Dairy_____ Livestock _____ Poultry _____ Truck _____ Other _____ Not planning to farm _____.

List Enterprise and Scope Carried During 1955-56	Per Cent of Enterprise you own	How the enterprises were financed (Check as many as apply to the Enter.)				
		Self	Self & Parents	Parents	Bank	Others (write in)

TABLE XVI

COMPLETED SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS[a]

School Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Years strived for in planning SFP	2	4	4	4	4	4	4
Effort made to determine if student plans to continue in agriculture	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	no
Students not planning to continue in agriculture plan SFP different	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
Minimum requirements for SFP	no	no	no	no	yes	no	yes
—Productive enterprises					2		3
Improvement projects					4		5
Supplementary farm jobs					4		5
Number days allowed for planning SFP in freshman year	70	20	25	30	40	15	25
Number days allowed for revising SFP after freshman year	10	7	2	10	5	4	10

[a]Completed by the instructors of the seven schools in the study.