May 28, 1959

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Walter Gene Calton entitled "The Setting of Vocational Agriculture in 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 Agricultural Education.

Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Dean of the Graduate School

THE SETTING OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN 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

Walter Gene Calton

June 1959

28
33

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer desires to express his appreciation to all who cooperated in conducting the study.

Appreciation is expressed to the Tennessee Vocational Agriculture Teachers who contributed information for this study. Special appreciation is extended to Dr. George W. Wiegers, Jr., Dr. R. G. Spitze and Dr. O. B. Graff, who served as the examining committee.

The writer wishes to acknowledge help provided by Dr. A. J. Paulus, Dr. R. W. Beamer, and Dr. C. L. Cleland.

The writer expresses appreciation to his wife, children and other relatives for their help and encouragement during this study.

451551

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM AND ITS DEFINITION.	1
	Statement of the problem.	1
	Importance of the study.	1
	Scope and limitations of the study	2
	Organization of the study.	2
	Definition of terms.	2
	Methods of research.	3
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.	5
III.	THE SITUATION OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TENNESSEE.	20
	Presentation of findings	20
IV.	SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS.	42
	Summary.	42
	Implications	45
BIBLIOGRAPHY.		48
APPENDIX.		51

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I. Controlling Purpose of Vocational Agriculture as Indicated by Tennessee Teachers 21

II. Extent to Which Vocational Agriculture Instruction in Tennessee Contributes to Students Entering Various Areas 23

III. Size of Vocational Agriculture Departments in Tennessee with Respect to Enrollment. 25

IV. Number of Students Enrolled in Largest and Smallest Classes of Vocational Agriculture 26

V. Number of 1958 Vocational Agriculture Graduates Farming in 1959. 28

VI. Situation Concerning Size of Vocational Agriculture Departments in Tennessee with Respect to Number of Students Enrolled 29

VII. Number of Boys Enrolled in Vocational Agriculture Who Should Not Be There for Various Reasons 31

VIII. Reasons for Requiring Students to Enroll in Vocational Agriculture 33

IX. Effect of the Guidance Program Upon the Type of Student to Enroll in Vocational Agriculture 35

X. Effect of the Guidance Program Upon the Number of Students Enrolling in Vocational Agriculture. 37

TABLE PAGE

XI. The Extent to which Various Subjects Contribute to Students Entering Non-farm Agricultural Occupations 38

XII. A Comparison of Selected Factors of the Vocational Agriculture Profession with Those in Other Agricultural Service Professions 40

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS DEFINITION

Statement of the Problem

It is widely believed by many people identified with vocational agriculture that the conditions in and surrounding the program are not what they ought to be. The purpose of this study was to find out what evidence there is supporting this belief and to determine what changes, if any, should be made to improve the present program.

The following questions served as a guide for the study:

1. Are the controlling purposes of vocational agriculture realistic?
2. How vocational is vocational agriculture?
3. How much does vocational agriculture contribute to its graduates?
4. How do people associated with vocational agriculture feel about the present program?
5. What is the need for farmer replacements?

Importance of the Study

The study provides directors, supervisors, teacher trainers, and other educational leaders with information concerning the situation of vocational agriculture. This information will serve as a basis for making changes in policies which should improve the present program.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The study included an examination of information concerning the situation of vocational agriculture. The information examined was primarily that of studies conducted in the Southern Region States, especially Tennessee since such information was more readily available here. It is believed, however, that the conclusions of the study are applicable to the general program. Other information examined was secured from 130 white teachers of vocational agriculture in Tennessee.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I introduces the problem and the procedure followed in making the study, Chapter II presents the review of related literature, Chapter III includes the data and discussion of the finding concerning the present program of vocational agriculture as viewed by the teachers of vocational agriculture in Tennessee, and Chapter IV includes a summary of the findings and the implications of the study.

Definition of Terms

The "present program" as used in this study refers to the over-all program of vocational agriculture applicable to all states and territories where vocational agriculture exists. It includes purposes, objectives, supervised farming, etc.

The term "vocational agriculture" refers to agriculture taught in the public high schools under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917.

"I. Q." (intelligence quotient) refers to the mental capacity of the student.

"Departments" refers to the vocational agriculture departments in the secondary schools in Tennessee.

"Teacher" as used in this study applies to all white persons employed as vocational agriculture teachers in Tennessee during the school year 1958-9.

"Non-farm agricultural occupations" refers to the work of all organizations and individuals producing for and servicing farmers, and distributing farm products.

The term "related occupations" is used synonymously with "non-farm agricultural occupations" unless otherwise indicated.

"Farmer replacements" as used in this study refers to the people who will take the place of farmers leaving the occupation.

The term "occupation" as used in this study is interpreted to mean any vocation or type of work.

"Information blank" refers to the form used in this study to acquire information concerning facts and opinions of vocational agriculture teachers in Tennessee.

Methods of Research

A review was made of selected literature devoted to the problem as stated. Much of the literature used was of Tennessee sources, but some was from other states and pertained to various areas. From these readings and discussions with teachers, teacher trainers, and administrators, the investigator developed a list of the kinds of data to be collected concerning the problem.

A list of Tennessee's vocational agriculture teachers, their present teaching position, and their address were obtained from the office of the Agricultural Education Department of the University of Tennessee in Knoxville. Information blanks (see Appendix) were developed and mailed to all white vocational agriculture departments in the state, numbering 272. Of the information blanks mailed, 130 or 47.8 per cent were completed and returned to the writer.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

At the beginning of vocational agriculture the term "agriculture" was used almost synonymously to the word "farming". If John Doe was said to be in agriculture it was commonly taken to mean that he was a farmer. Since then, however, farming has gradually evolved into a modest segment of the total agricultural field. The writer felt that a brief review of the major changes that have taken, and are taking place in agriculture would be useful at this point. An account of the changes follow:

Several factors are responsible for the many changes in agriculture in the United States. Very important among these factors are the great population up-swing, the industrial boom, and the enormous improvement in technology.

According to a Special Report on Agriculture[1], the farmer now grows food enough for himself and twenty others. In 1890, he grew only enough for himself and three others. The number will soon be twenty-five. The report also states that since the early 1940's the combined per acre yield of 18 leading field crops have increased 40 per cent.

The most important single implement introduced into agriculture in this generation has been the gasoline tractor. It has been improved over

---

[1]"What City People Should Know About Farmers", Special Report on Agriculture, Capper's Farmer, Topeka, Kansas, 1958, pp. 1-7.

the years, reduced in cost, and adapted in size to farms of various sorts. In 1957, there were 4,600,000 tractors on farms of the United States, compared with 920,021 in 1930[2].

The United States was predominantly rural until about 1920, when the number of urban people exceeded the rural for the first time. Since then the farm population has gradually decreased.

The population living on farms in the United States numbered about 20,396,000 in April 1957 compared with 31,974,000 in 1920[3]. The farm population today is about 11.5 per cent of the total population and is estimated to be only 5 per cent by 1975. Farm operators, owners, and managers make up only 4 per cent of the nation's labor force.

According to a comprehensive study made by Shoemaker[4], the total number of farms in the United States is decreasing at a rate of 89,000 a year. However, larger farms are increasing in number. There were 60,000 more class I, II, and III farms (Those producing 5,000 dollars gross sales, or more, per year) in 1954 than in 1949. Shoemaker also reported that 44 per cent of the farms produce 91 per cent of the market sales. Only 27 per cent of all farms have an annual gross income of 5,000 dollars or more.

---

[2]U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Statistics 1957 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1958), p.531.

[3]Ibid, p.535

[4]Karl Shoemaker, Opportunities and Limitations for Employment of Farm People Within and Outside of Farming". United States Department of Agriculture (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1958), pp.2-6.

Givens[5], in a speech to vocational agriculture teachers, made the following remarks:

> Thirty years ago agriculture produced 70 to 80 per cent of its own production supplied, buying only 20 to 30 per cent from business. Today agriculture buys from business almost 50 per cent of its production input, in such items as machinery, fertilizer, and mixed feeds. Currently these purchases are running in excess of sixteen billion dollars a year. In addition, it is estimated that 38 to 40 per cent of the purchasing power of the nation is directly geared to agriculture, and that agriculture provides employment directly or indirectly for 37 per cent of our nation's workers.

Today there are six million persons producing for and servicing farmers and ten million persons distributing farm products[6]. There are millions of professional and other workers in agricultural occupations closely related to farming.

The many changes in agriculture have indirectly resulted in a good deal of confusion and dissatisfaction among the educational leaders of our country and especially among those concerned with educating farm people. The people associated with vocational agriculture are no exception.

In reference to the changes in agriculture, the California State Bureau of Agriculture Education made this statement:

> The Bureau must. . . recognize that the work of the farm as it existed in 1917 is now largely carried out away from the farm, yet. . . requires a thorough knowledge of agriculture.

---

[5]J. E. Givens, "Meeting The Educational Needs of Farm Boys Through Vocational Agriculture", The Agreview, p. 2-8. (Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1958)

[6]"What City People Should Know About Farmers", op. cit.

[7]Byron J. McMahon, et. al., "Program of Work" (California State Department of Education, Sacramento, California, 1958-1959) p. Foward.

In the judgement of the writer, the following reviews show the intensity of unrest and frustration among our ranks:

Several studies have been made recently to determine the reasons why vocational agriculture instructors leave the profession. A study by Lamberth[8] revealed that "no future in the profession" was the most frequently mentioned minor reason for the vocational agriculture teachers of Tennessee leaving the profession.

Springfield,[9] found in a similar study that the two major reasons for teachers leaving the profession were, "lack of security", and "no future in vocational agriculture".

Givens,[10] speaking to vocational agriculture teachers, said:

> "Nothing concentrates a man's mind like the knowledge that he is to be hanged within a fortnight." That statement was made by Samuel Johnson. Somehow or other I felt it was appropriate at this point because I get the impression that the condition which you face in the field of vocational agriculture is sufficient to concentrate a man's mind.

One vocational agriculture teacher said,[11]

> Program-wise I am all shook up--and confused. One day I read where vocational agriculture should train for occupations related to agriculture, but they never tell me how to do it or what to teach. The next day I hear the "hold-the-line" philosophy that

---

[8]E. E. Lambreth, "Why Former Tennessee Teachers of Vocational Agriculture left the Profession," (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Agricultural Education, The University of Tennessee, March 1958), p.27.

[9]Roy C. Springfield, "Why Louisiana Teachers of Vocational Agriculture Left the Service," Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education, Supplement 4:40, 1951.

[10]J. E. Givens, op. cit., p.3.

[11]H. N. Hunsicker, "The Foward Look in Vocational Agriculture," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 31:197, March 1959.

> vocational agriculture instruction has always been, is, and always will be only for those who plan to farm or who are now engaged in farming. . . . . Many of my day school students, especially Freshmen, Sophomore, and Junior boys really don't know yet what they are going to do.

Another teacher[12] writes, "We need a unity of purpose in our program." He also said that teachers of vocational agriculture have heard so much about related occupations, agricultural integration, etc. that they don't know just what should be taught nor accomplished.

Many of the directors, supervisors, and teacher trainers of vocational agriculture are also greatly concerned about the present position of the program. This concern was reflected in an article written by J. Bryant Kirkland[13] of North Carolina State College. Speaking of alternatives for the improvement of future programs, he stated that we must either limit vocational agriculture to two or three years at the all-day level and put more emphasis upon adult farmer work, or we must give two types of instruction to all-day students; namely for those planning to farm and for those who are likely to enter related occupations.

A letter[14] written to Doctor W. T. Spanton in Washington concerning a conference held in Chicago (Letter preceeded conference) contained the following:

---

[12] H. N. Hunsicker, Ibid., p. 197.

[13] J. B. Kirkland, "Future Programs and Their Development", The Agricultural Education Magazine, 23:3, July 1950.

[14] Letter from George W. Wiegers, Jr., Professor and Department Head, Agricultural Education Department, University of Tennessee, to W. T. Spanton, dated December 31, 1958.

One of the outstanding teacher trainers in the Southern Region brought up a concern for the conference that perhaps is of more importance than the problems listed. He made the concern quite clear so I will quote from his letter:

"I hope that the committee can plan a conference that will result in some changes in our programs. If we are going to Chicago to tell each other how good we are, and have been since 1918, and anyone is disloyal who suggests that we ought to consider some major changes, then we had better use the time and travel visiting our first-year teachers back home. I still think that there is a future in vocational agriculture (I know several teachers who do not). However, I believe that we are in serious trouble and a careful diagnosis and some prescription writing--maybe even an operation--is in order. I do not mean the usual trouble with Congress on appropriations, but the more subtle and dangerous feeling that there is really no longer a need for vocational agriculture in public schools. . . ."

In recent years the controlling purpose of vocational agriculture, as set forth in writing, speeches, and discussions, has been "to train present and prospective farmers for useful employment and proficiency in farming." This statement was derived from the following selected provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act:[15]

1. . . .the controlling purpose of such education shall be to fit for useful employment;

2. . . .that such education shall be. . .designed to meet the needs of persons. . ., who have entered upon or who are preparing to enter upon, the work of the farm. . . .

The controlling purpose of vocational agriculture has not changed (in writing) since 1917 in spite of the drastic changes that have taken place in agriculture since that time. However, there is evidence that the written purpose does not conform to the practices in vocational

---

[15]Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, Report of the Commission, Vol. I (Washington: Government Printing Office, June 1914), p. 80.

agriculture. In discussing this with the writer, one person made a statement to the effect that it matters very little what is written; what we do is what counts. Others have expressed the belief that it is important that the two do conform.

Vocational Agriculture, as viewed by the writer, has developed in such a manner that the programs and standards may be consistantly changed to conform with the development of the work and the conditions in the states and communities.

The Research Committee[16] of the Southern Region reported from interviewing 1,244 school superintendents, principals, vocational agriculture teachers, and students enrolled (high school, young out of school and mature farmers) in vocational agriculture classes that only 15.4 per cent believed that the controlling purpose of vocational agriculture should be limited to training persons for useful employment and proficiency in farming. Almost one-half (46.3 per cent) responded that it was more important to provide training for useful employment in agricultural occupations including farm and non-farm agricultural work.

A study by Sanders[17] reported recently in the south shows that, in general, not more than one student out of every five who completed one or more courses in vocational agriculture entered a farming occupation, and approximately six out of every 100 entered an occupation related to farming.

---

[16]Research Committee of The Southern Region, "What Constitutes an Effective Program of Vocational Agriculture in A Community," (Report of A Southern Region Study in Vocational Agriculture, 1956), p. 12-13.

[17]H. W. Sanders, "Follow-up Study of Students of Vocational Agriculture in Virginia, 1954-55," (Department of Agricultural Education Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1959), p. 1 (Mimeographed)

A study[18] of 12,800 graduates in a corn belt state showed that approximately 26 per cent of those who graduated from 1941 to 1950 were farming in 1955 and that 9 per cent were in occupations related to farming.

Busbice and Ahalt[19] conducted a study of 1131 vocational agricultural graduates in Maryland and found that 31.9 per cent were farming (included full-time and part-time farmers) and 7.1 per cent were in agricultural pursuits related to farming.

A survey[20] of vocational agriculture students made recently in Missouri showed that only about 20 per cent of those questioned said that they planned to go into farming. About 36 per cent said that they planned to enter fields closely related to the farming occupation.

In 1947 a study[21] was made in North Carolina to determine the occupational status of American farmers who received the award from 1928 to 1947. The study revealed that 45 per cent were farming and 11 per cent were in occupations related to farming.

---

[18]G. F. Ekstrom, "Occupational Survey of Former Students of Agriculture Who Graduated from Missouri High Schools 1941-50 Inclusive," Agricultural Education Magazine, 30:44, August, 1957.

[19]Wayne E. Busbice and A. M. Ahalt, "The Occupational Status of Recent High School Graduates of Vocational Agriculture in Maryland" (College of Agriculture, Department of Agricultural Education, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, 1958) pp. 3-4.

[20]"Careers for Farm Youth", Nation's Agriculture, The American Farm Bureau Federation, Mt. Morris, Illinois, 34:15-16, February 1959.

[21]J. B. Kirkland, op. cit., p.18.

Bender[22] in a non thesis study at Ohio State University concerning the "Vocational Status of Students of Vocational Agriculture Graduating in 1953 and 1954" found that 37 per cent were engaged in full-time farming, 7 per cent were in agricultural related jobs, and 7 per cent were enrolled in agricultural colleges.

A study conducted by Sutherland and Thompson[23] concluded that forty-two per cent of the 11,361 students enrolled in vocational agriculture in California in 1955 had no forseeable opportunity whereby they might enter farming.

Brumm[24] reports that in a summary of thirty-two studies, 28.3 per cent of the 117,115 vocational agriculture graduates were farming and 9 per cent were in related occupations.

The average enrollment in vocational agriculture according to Brumm is sixty, yet:

> For a considerable portion of the students enrolled, "Vocational Agriculture" is actually "general agriculture" since they have not made vocational choices or have made unreasonable choices.
>
> More should be done to familiarize secondary school students with the opportunities and requirements in. . ."Non-farm agricultural occupations."

---

[22]R. E. Bender, "Vocational Status of Students of Vocational Agriculture Graduating in 1953 and 1954, Summaries of Studies in Agriculture Education, Supplement 10:10, 1957.

[23]S. S. Sutherland and O. E. Thompson, "A Profile of All-Day Vocational Agriculture Students in California" (Department of Agricultural Education, University of California, no date given), (Mimeographed).

[24]Kenneth G. Brumm, et. al., "Replanning Agriculture Education in Illinois Schools" (Report of Study Group X, Allerton House Conference on Education, Urban, Illinois, 1958) pp. 21-24.

Today of the 62 million employed Americans, 24 million or nearly 40 per cent work somewhere in agriculture. One-third of the 24 million work on the farm. Two-thirds provide services for farmers, process and distribute farm products and other related work. This means that twice as many people are employed in the agricultural non-farm occupations as in all the farming occupations combined. This being an established fact, the writer felt it appropriate to review the thinking of others regarding the place of instruction in vocational agriculture concerning non-farm agricultural occupations.

Hunsicker[25] had this to say as to how instruction in vocational agriculture should be geared:

1. . . .lead to farming, college in agriculture, professional and semi-professional agricultural positions, and to many other agricultural occupations which require a background in agricultural training.

2. Instruction in vocational agriculture 'post' high school level be limited to farming and farm problems.

Burkett[26] gave this account:

> There is an ever increasing occupational classification of semi-professional non-farm agricultural occupations in the general fields of agriculture communications, agriculture manufacturing, agriculture research and agriculture business. These occupations require a knowledge of the farm and farm practices which can be gained through the. . .vocational agriculture program. If the young man goes into a professional agriculture field or any other field related to agriculture, the only period in his lifetime that he will receive any experience in farm training is at the high school age level.

---

[25] H. N. Hunsicker, op. cit., p. 197.

[26] Lowell A. Burkett, "Trends in Vocational Agriculture Training," Agricultural Leaders Digest, 40:13, February 1959.

There have been several studies made recently to determine the value of training in vocational agriculture to students entering occupations other than farming.

Bittner[27] concluded from a study of 320 men in occupations related to farming that no important differences existed in the occupational status of farm-reared high school graduates who had studied vocational agriculture and those who had not studied vocational agriculture. It was further concluded that the value of vocational agriculture to students who enter non-agricultural occupations is equal to the value that can be obtained from the other high school courses they may elect.

Bender[28] concluded from his study that boys who have high school training in vocational agriculture do as well or better in the college of agriculture than those who do not have such preparation. The college students who had previous training in vocational agriculture accumulated a 2.78 point hour ratio compared to 2.61 for those with no previous vocational agriculture training.

Bender also said, "Evidence indicates that high school guidance councilors are advising many of the college capable students away from agriculture." Many other competent people in the educational field also adhere to this belief.

---

[27]Ralph H. Bittner, "Are Vocational Agriculture Graduates Successful in Non-farm Occupations?" Agricultural Education Magazine, 31:228, April 1959.

[28]Ralph E. Bender, "Students of Vocational Agriculture Succeed in College," Agricultural Education Magazine, 31:220-222, April 1959.

Georgia vocational agriculture leaders[29] are directing their instructional program in the following manner.

> The vocational agriculture instructional program is designed to educate primarily for proficiency in farming by accomplishing this aim; it also educates for proficiency in other agricultural pursuits closely related to farming; and is suitable education in the preparation of students for college. Students desiring to enter farming receive maximum benefits from vocational agriculture. Related occupations require many of the same knowledges, aptitudes, and skills. Vocational agriculture is highly desirable if not a needed adjunct of the more specific technical competencies developed in the college curricula.

Shoemaker's study[30] revealed that there were 1,291,000 farm operators (according to 1954 census) of class I, II, and III farms producing annually a gross sales of 5,000 dollars or more. The farm replacements needed per year for these farms were 22,747. There are approximately 220,000 boys available each year; thus 9.7 per cent of the available replacements have a place in farming of these classes.

Research conducted by members of the Agricultural Economics Staff[31] at the University of Tennessee concluded the following:

There were 231,631 farms in Tennessee (according to 1950 Bureau of Census). Of this number only 83,289 (36 per cent) were economic farms class I-V (Farms producing over 2,500 dollars gross sales annually). The replacements needed for these farms were 1,874 of which there were 10,506 farm boys age twenty available to fill the need. Thus only 5.6

---

[29] "A Guide For Developing an Instructional Program in Vocational Agriculture for High School Students of Georgia," February 1959, pp. 1-96. (Publisher and Source Unknown)

[30] Karl Shoemaker, op. cit., p.3.

[31] "Farmer Replacement Needs," Agricultural Economics Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 3 pp. (Mimeographed)

per cent of these young men have a place in a farming occupation that is anywhere near desirable.

The number of replacements needed for economic farms class I-V ranged from 78 for Gibson County to only one for Scott County.

Many conscientious leaders in agricultural education believe that more should be done to bring about a realization by young men and women of the opportunities in agriculture.

The need for agricultural college graduates is far greater than the supply. ". . .approximately 15,000 jobs a year are available to college of agriculture and home economics graduates while only 8,500 are being supplied to fill the needs."[32]

Givens[33] gives the following views concerning this:

> The key to motivation for careers in our agricultural economy must be built on the concept that what is involved in this respect is not just the 11 per cent of our population which is directly concerned with farm production but rather than the task is to train young men for the job of filling the responsibilities and opportunities which exists in what is commonly being referred to today as the agri-business segment of our economy which constitutes not 11 but 37 per cent of the working force in this nation.

In a discussion concerning farm replacements, Hamlin[34] declares that in a community of three hundred farms, no more than ten new farm

---

[32]Nation's Agriculture, op. cit., p. 17.

[33]Givens, op. cit., p. 2.

[34]Herbert M. Hamlin, "Agricultural Education in Community Schools" (Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Danville, 1950), pp. 188-192.

operators are likely to be needed each year. However, boys who do not have the opportunity to farm may well consider the opportunities in non-farm agricultural occupations. He also feels that it should be made clear to high school boys that nothing but frustration awaits them if they train for occupational opportunities which do not exist. Hamlin suggests "teaching" about agricultural occupations.

Concerning the type of student needed in agriculture, Hamlin[35] says:

> Sometimes the vocational agricultural department has been used as a "dumping ground" for a school on the assumption that a boy who cannot succeed in other studies may do better in agriculture.
>
> Management of a modern farm. . .calls for a high level of ability. It is unfair to lead a boy to believe that he can succeed in an agricultural occupation when far better outlets for his limited abilities are available in other occupations.

Some of the conclusions of a most comprehensive study conducted by Butler[36] were as follows:

Of 2,243 Tennessee vocational agriculture graduates reported, 1,709 or 76.2 per cent were engaged in occupations other than full-time farming. This means that less than one-fourth of the vocational agriculture graduates reported were actually full-time farmers.

Bulter also concluded that Tennessee vocational agriculture teachers accepted the majority of the boys who desired to enroll in

---

[35] Ibid., pp. 186-187.

[36] J. J. Butler, "Some Guidance Concerns in Vocational Agriculture", (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Agriculture Education, The University of Tennessee, June 1959), pp. 90-100.

vocational agriculture irrespective of their objectives. He says that many vocational agriculture teachers would be unable to accept or reject prospective students if they desired to do so because of school policies and a lack of facilities in other departments.

The study further showed that 90 per cent of the Tennessee vocational agriculture teachers render some assistance to the development of specific skills and abilities that will be helpful to those graduates entering occupations other than farming.

CHAPTER III

THE SITUATION OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TENNESSEE

Presentation of Findings

The purpose of this chapter is to present the data compiled from the information contributed by the vocational agriculture teachers of Tennessee concerning the situation of vocational agriculture.

Table I shows the controlling purposes of vocational agriculture as reported by the vocational agricultural teachers of Tennessee. "To train for useful employment and proficiency in farming" only was ranked highest by 68.3 per cent of the respondents. It was ranked second by 20.8 per cent, and third by 10.9 per cent. No teacher ranked it fourth. It accumulated a mean rank of 1.43.

"To train for useful employment and proficiency in an agricultural occupation" (farming and non-farm agricultural work) was ranked first by 30.6 per cent of the respondents. It was ranked second, third and fourth by 48.6, 17.1 and 3.6 per cent, respectively. The mean rank accumulated was 1.85.

Only 16.2 per cent of the teachers ranked "To train good citizens, intelligent consumers, and efficient producers" first. However, it was ranked second by 26.6 per cent and third by 51.4 per cent. A mean rank of 2.47 was accumulated.

"To provide enlightenment in agriculture" received first place ranks by only 5.2 per cent of the respondents. It was ranked fourth by about

TABLE I

THE CONTROLLING PURPOSE OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE AS INDICATED BY TENNESSEE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS

Controlling Purpose	Number Reporting	Rank								
		Mean	1		2		3		4	
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
To train for useful employment and proficiency in farming	101	1.43	69	68.3	21	20.8	11	10.9	0	0
To train for useful employment and proficiency in an agricultural occupation (Farming and non-farm agricultural work)	111	1.85	34	30.6	54	48.6	19	17.1	4	3.6
To train good citizens, intelligent consumers and efficient producers	105	2.47	17	16.18	28	26.66	54	51.41	6	5.71
To provide enlightenment in agriculture	77	3.53	4	5.19	4	5.19	16	20.77	53	68.86

two-thirds (68.9 per cent) of the teachers answering. The mean rank was 3.53

Table II shows in general that vocational agriculture instruction contributes much to students who enter agricultural pursuits; both farming and non-farming.

"Farming" received the highest rating, "Advanced training" second highest and "Related occupations" lowest. Of 129 teachers responding, 82 or 63.5 per cent gave "Farming" a rating of four, 30 or 23.3 per cent gave a rating of three and 16 or 12.4 per cent gave it a rating of two. Every teacher believed that vocational agriculture contributed at least some to students entering the farming occupation, since none gave it a rating of zero, and only one teacher gave it a rating of one.

The fact that 121 or 93.8 per cent of the 129 respondents gave "Advanced training" a rating of two or better reflects their belief that vocational agriculture instruction is of great value to students who enter agricultural colleges. Only 2 teachers believed that instruction in vocational agriculture would be of no value to those going on for "Advanced training" in agriculture.

Almost 90 per cent (116) of the respondents rated "related occupations" two or better. Only one teacher believed that instruction in vocational agriculture would contribute nothing. This fact also reflects the Tennessee teachers' belief that students of vocational agriculture who enter non-farm agricultural occupations (producing for and servicing farmers and distributing farm products) find their previous training in vocational agriculture a very valuable asset.

TABLE II

THE EXTENT TO WHICH VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE INSTRUCTION IN TENNESSEE CONTRIBUTES TO STUDENTS ENTERING VARIOUS AREAS

Extent of Contribution		Area					
		Farming		Related Occupations		Advanced Training	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
(very much)	4	82	63.5	23	17.8	46	35.7
	3	30	23.3	51	39.5	39	30.2
	2	16	12.4	42	32.6	36	27.9
	1	1	.8	12	9.3	6	4.7
(none)	0	0	.0	1	.8	2	1.5
Total Responses		129	100.0	129	100.0	129	100.0
Mean Rate		3.49		2.64		2.70	

The mean rates accumulated for "farming", "related occupations", and "advanced training" were 3.49, 2.64, and 2.70, respectively.

It is interesting to note in Table III that the average number of students enrolled in the vocational agriculture departments of Tennessee is 59.6

Of 127 teachers responding, almost three-fourths (74 per cent) were teaching in departments ranging in size from 26 to 75. There were 21 departments or 16.5 per cent which had 76-100 students enrolled. Six and three-tenths per cent of the departments had enrollment of more than a hundred students while 3.2 per cent had fewer than 25.

Table III also shows the average number of students enrolled in the various size departments. The average size of the departments with fewer than 25 enrolled was 21.3 students per department. Departments of the 26-50 size average 41.3 students and of those departments of 51-75 in size the average is 62.3. The average enrollment per department ranging in size from 76 to 100 was 86 and for those departments of the 101-125 size, 109.6 students was the average.

The average given in Table III for departments larger than 125 should not be accepted as valid because only one response was received from departments of that size.

The size of vocational agriculture classes in Tennessee is shown in Table IV.

Classes ranged in size from 3 to 40 in departments from which 130 responses were received.

An interesting finding is the fact that the average size of the

TABLE III

SIZE OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS IN TENNESSEE WITH RESPECT TO ENROLLMENT

Size	Departments		Number of Students	
	Number	Per Cent	Total	Average Per Department
0 - 25	4	3.2	85	21.3
26 - 50	48	37.8	1977	41.2
51 - 75	46	36.2	2867	62.3
76 - 100	21	16.5	1807	86.04
101 - 125	7	5.5	767	109.57
126 - 150	1	.8	150	150
Total	127	100.0	7,568	59.6

TABLE IV

NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN LARGEST AND SMALLEST CLASSES OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE AS REPORTED BY TENNESSEE TEACHERS

Class Size	Number Classes Reported	Range in Size	Number of Students	
			Total Number	Average Per Class
Largest	130	7-40	2,824	21.7
Smallest	130	3-21	1,463	11.3

smallest classes in the Tennessee vocational agriculture departments was 11.3 students. The writer expected a much lower average. In his judgement, a class with ten or twelve students make possible a very desirable teaching situation.

The average size of the largest classes was 21.7 students with a range from 7 to 40. Although the extremities of the range are certainly undesirable, the average is not too disadvantageous.

The writer believes that the figures shown in Table V probably conclude the most important findings of the study.

Forty-four east Tennessee departments reported a total of 445 graduates of vocational agriculture for the school year 1957-58. Of this number 167 or 37.5 per cent were farming (included full-time and part-time farmers).

Forty-six departments responding from middle Tennessee reported a total of 356 boys graduating from vocational agriculture in 1958, of which 114 or 32 per cent were farming. Compared to this, thirty-five west Tennessee departments reported a total of 290 vocational agriculture graduates in 1958. Here 121 or 41.7 per cent were farming.

The total number of vocational agriculture departments reporting were 125 from which there were 1091 graduates in 1958. Of this number a total of 382 or 35 per cent were farming.

Information concerning enrollment is shown in Table VI.

It is interesting to note that, according to the Tennessee vocational agriculture teachers, the problem of enrollment is not so great concerning the departments being "too small" as it is with them being "too large".

TABLE V

NUMBER OF 1958 TENNESSEE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE GRADUATES FARMING IN 1959

Area in State	Departments Reported		1958 Graduates		
			Total	Farming	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Number	Per Cent
East	44	35.2	445	167	37.5
Middle	46	36.8	356	114	32.0
West	35	28.0	290	121	41.7
Total	125	100.0	1091	382[a]	35.0

[a] Includes full and part-time farmers

TABLE VI

SITUATION CONCERNING SIZE OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS IN TENNESSEE WITH RESPECT TO NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED

Enrollment	Departments by Time					
	Past		Present		Future	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Too small	15	11.5	10	7.7	10	7.7
Too large	43	33.1	38	29.2	29	22.3
About right	72	55.4	82	63.1	91	70.0
Total	130	100.0	130	100.0	130	100.0

Less than 8 per cent of the 130 departments responding reported an enrollment problem at present, or expected one in the future from the "too small" standpoint. Only fifteen or 11.5 per cent of the respondents indicated that there had been, in the past, a problem of "too small" an enrollment in their departments.

However, almost one-third of the teachers reported "too large" an enrollment problem in the past. Thirty-eight or 29.2 per cent of the responses indicate a similar problem at present, and twenty-nine or 22.3 per cent anticipated the problem of "too large" an enrollment in the future.

Further analysis of Table VI shows that the situation at present is improving and that continuous improvement is anticipated. For instance only about one-half of the teachers responding indicated that the enrollment had been "about right" in the past. The number of departments reporting "about right" at present was 82 or 63.1 per cent and those expecting to be "about right" in the future were ninety-one or 70 per cent.

Table VII presents in summary the number of boys enrolled in vocational agriculture who should not be there, and the reasons.

It was pointed out by some of the respondents that usually there are several reasons why a boy should not be in vocational agriculture; not just one. Therefore, some of the students were reported for more than one of the reasons listed in Table VII.

Eighty teachers reported a total number of 669 students enrolled in their vocational agriculture classes whom they believed should not be

TABLE VII

NUMBER OF BOYS ENROLLED IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TENNESSEE WHO SHOULD NOT BE THERE FOR VARIOUS REASONS

Reasons	Number Teachers Reporting	Students Reported	
		Total Number	Average Per Teacher
No interest in agriculture	80	669	8.46
Inadequate home facilities	119	981	8.24
No reasonable chance to become engaged in agriculture	83	827	9.96
Insufficient mechanical ability	43	155	3.60
Other	5	20	4.00
Total	330[a]	2652[b]	8.04

[a] Most teachers responded to more than one reason

[b] Some students were reported for more than one reason

there, because the students were not interested in agriculture. This is an average of 8.46 students per department.

One hundred and nine-teen teachers indicated there were a total of 981 students in their vocational agriculture classes who should not be there because they did not have adequate facilities to carry out a supervised farming program.

There were 827 students (almost ten students per department) who, according to 83 respondents, should not be in vocational agriculture because they have no reasonable chance to become engaged in an agricultural occupation.

Forty-three teachers gave "insufficient mechanical ability" as the reason why 155 of their students should not be in vocational agriculture. This was an average of 3.6 per department.

Some of the other reasons why students should not be in vocational agriculture stated by teachers were "no interest in anything", and "mental ability too low".

According to the responses secured, there was an average of about eight students per vocational agriculture department who should not have been there.

A study of Table VIII shows who is required to enroll in vocational agriculture and the reasons.

It may be somewhat surprising to notice that nearly one-half of all departments were required to enroll some student(s). Of the 130 responses secured, thirty-one or 23.8 per cent of the departments were required to enroll the ninth grade boys. "Unable to schedule other

TABLE VIII

REASONS FOR REQUIRING STUDENTS TO ENROLL IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TENNESSEE

Students Required	Departments		Number Students by Reason		
	Number	Per Cent	School Policy	Scheduling Difficulty	Other
9th Grade	31	23.8	10	20	1
10th Grade	13	10.0	5	8	0
11th Grade	6	4.6	3	3	0
12th Grade	5	3.9	1	4	0
Certain Individuals	8	6.2	3	4	0
No One	67	51.5	--	--	-
Total	130	100.0	22	39	1

courses" was the most frequent reason given (20 times) although "School policy" was a reason given quite often (10 times). One teacher stated, "no other choice", as a reason.

The tenth, eleventh and twelth grades were required to enroll in vocational agriculture in thirteen, six, and five cases, respectively. Again, the reason "unable to schedule other courses" was most frequently given (15 times) and "school policy" was given 9 times.

There were eight cases where departments of vocational agriculture were required to enroll "certain individuals". Four teachers gave "unable to schedule other courses" and three gave "school policy" as the reasons. One teacher failed to indicate why certain individuals were required to enroll in vocational agriculture in his school.

Sixty-seven or 51.5 per cent of the respondents indicated that no one was required to enroll in vocational agriculture in their school.

An attempt was made by the author to determine what effect, if any, the guidance programs of Tennessee schools have on vocational agriculture enrollment. Two aspects of this phase of the study were explored, namely, the type of student in terms of intelligence and the number of students.

Of 130 teachers responding, 65 or one-half reported that the guidance program had no effect whatsoever upon any aspect of the enrollment of boys in vocational agriculture. Several teachers stated, in effect, that there was no guidance program in the school.

However, Table IX shows that several departments reported that their guidance programs did have some effect upon the type of student enrolling in vocational agriculture. Ten departments reported that the

TABLE IX

THE EFFECT OF THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM UPON THE TYPE OF STUDENT TO ENROLL IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TENNESSEE

Student I. Q.	Departments Reporting Guidance Direction	
	Into	Out of
High	10	28
Low	36	2
Total	46	30

guidance director(s) of their school tended to guide high I. Q. students into vocational agriculture while twenty-eight indicated that the director(s) tended to guide high I. Q. students out of vocational agriculture. Thirty-six respondents reported that low I. Q. students were guided into vocational agriculture while only two teachers indicated that low I. Q. students were guided out.

Fifty-five teachers responded to the "number of students" aspect of the guidance question. (Table X) Twenty-six or 47.3 per cent revealed that the guidance program in their schools tended to increase enrollment while eleven or 20 per cent indicated that the guidance program tended to decrease enrollment. One-third (18) of the respondents reported that their guidance program did not affect the number of boys enrolling in vocational agriculture.

Table XI shows the extent to which the various subjects taught in the secondary schools contribute to students who enter non-farm agricultural occupations.

By looking at the mean rating figures in Table X one can see a comparison of the value of the subjects to students entering fields of work related to farming. The mean rating given to "vocational agriculture" was 2.99 within a rating scale of zero to four. This high rating was due to the fact that eighty-four or 66.2 per cent of the 127 respondents rated vocational agriculture either three or four. Thirty-seven teachers rated vocational agriculture two and only six rated it as low as one. No one gave it a rating of zero. The subject receiving second highest rating was Science which accumulated a mean rating of 2.32. Of 125

TABLE X

THE EFFECT OF THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM UPON THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLING IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TENNESSEE

Student Number	Departments Reporting	
	Number	Per Cent
Increased	26	47.3
Decreased	11	20.0
Not Affected	18	32.7
Total	55	100.0

TABLE XI

THE EXTENT TO WHICH VARIOUS SUBJECTS CONTRIBUTE TO STUDENTS ENTERING NON-FARM AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATIONS[a] AS REPORTED BY TENNESSEE TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

Extent of Contribution		Subjects											
		Vocational Agriculture		Other Vocational Subjects		Mathematics		Science		Social Science		English	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
(Very Much)	4	48	37.8	4	4.2	15	11.9	16	12.8	3	2.5	22	17.9
	3	36	28.4	18	19.0	26	20.6	35	28	12	9.9	30	24.4
	2	37	29.1	44	46.3	50	39.7	52	41.6	46	38.0	38	30.9
	1	6	4.7	16	16.8	25	19.8	17	13.6	43	35.5	18	14.6
(None)	0	0	0	13	13.7	10	7.9	5	4.0	17	14.1	15	12.2
Total	-	127	100.0	95	100.0	126	100.0	125	100.0	121	100.0	123	100.0
Mean	-	2.99		1.83		2.00		2.32		1.59		2.21	

[a] Occupations related to farming (producing for and servicing farmers and distributing farm products)

respondents, sixteen or 12.8 per cent rated the subject four, thirty-five or 28 per cent rated it three, fifty-two rated it two and seventeen rated it one. Five teachers gave it a rating of zero.

The subject receiving third highest total rating was English with a 2.21 mean rating accumulated. Twenty-two or 17.9 per cent of the respondents rated the subject four, thirty or 24.4 per cent rated it three, thirty-eight or 30.9 per cent rated it two and eighteen or 14.6 per cent gave it a rating of one. Fifteen teachers rated English a zero.

The mean rating accumulated by the subject mathematics was 2.0. One hundred and one or 80.2 per cent of the teachers rated mathematics either one, two or three. Fifteen gave it a rating of four while ten rated it zero.

Other vocational subjects which included training and industry, industrial arts, etc., established a mean rating of 1.83 while the social sciences accumulated a mean rate of 1.59.

Table XII shows how Tennessee vocational agriculture teachers compared certain factors of their profession with those same factors in other agricultural service professions such as the extension service, soil conservation service, etc.

Twenty-five or 19.4 per cent of the teachers responding rated the factor "job security" inferior in comparison to job security in other agricultural service professions. However, eighty-three or 64.3 per cent rated it equal and twenty-one or 16.3 per cent rated it superior.

Only nine or 7.1 of the respondents rated "controlling purpose" of vocational agriculture inferior while seventy-six or 60.3 per cent

TABLE XII

A COMPARISON OF SELECTED FACTORS OF THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROFESSION WITH THOSE OF OTHER AGRICULTURAL SERVICE PROFESSIONS[a] AS REPORTED BY TENNESSEE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS

Rating	Occupational Factor									
	Job Security		Controlling Purpose		Patrons Attitude		Outlook		Salary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Inferior	25	19.4	9	7.1	9	7.0	40	31.3	105	81.4
Equal	83	64.3	76	60.3	79	61.2	70	54.7	24	18.6
Superior	21	16.3	41	32.6	41	31.8	18	14.0	0	0
Total	129	100.0	126	100.0	129	100.0	128	100.0	129	100.0

[a] Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, etc.

rated it equal. Forty-one or 32.6 per cent of the teachers gave it a superior rating.

Under "patrons attitude" nine or 7 per cent of the teachers rated it inferior, seventy-nine or 61.2 per cent rated it equal and forty-one or 31.8 per cent gave it a superior rating.

Almost one-third of the respondents rated "Outlook" for the profession inferior while seventy or 54.7 per cent rated it equal and eighteen or 14 per cent gave it a superior rating.

The number of teachers rating the factor "salary" inferior was 105 or 81.4 per cent. Twenty-four or 18.6 per cent rated it equal and not a single teacher rated it superior.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

An attempt has been made in this study to assemble evidence concerning the situation of vocational agriculture which might indicate that changes are needed in the vocational agriculture program.

The information for this study was secured through the review of many studies and from the reports of 130 vocational agriculture teachers in Tennessee.

The study showed that the controlling purpose of vocational agriculture as written does not conform to the practices being carried out in many of the departments. The mean rank given the purpose "to train for useful employment and proficiency in farming" only was fairly close to the one given "to train for useful employment and proficiency in an agricultural occupation" (includes farm and non-farm agricultural work); 1.43 and 1.85 respectively. Many teachers of vocational agriculture indicated that they were preparing boys for both farming and related occupations.

Chapter II shows much evidence of frustration and discontentment among the people associated with vocational agriculture. Much of the confusion concerns the controlling purpose of vocational agriculture and the number of boys going into farming.

It was found that many competent leaders of vocational education in agriculture have taken the step forward to broaden the scope of the

vocational agriculture program to include a place for persons who enter non-farm agricultural occupations.

It was determined that the number of farmer replacements needed each year is far less than the number of persons available to fill the positions. For example, only 5.6 per cent of the Tennessee farm boys age twenty were needed as replacements for economic farms class I-V (Farms producing an annual gross income of $2500 or more) according to 1950 census information. As shown in Chapter II, Shoemaker calculated that about 10 per cent of the available farm boys have a place in the farming occupation that is anywhere near desirable.

It was found that vocational agriculture as taught in Tennessee contributes much to its graduates who enter occupations related to farming as well as those who enter agricultural colleges for advanced training. However, it was determined that more needs to be done to acquaint students with the opportunities in non-farm agricultural occupations. For example, about 15,000 agricultural college graduates are needed each year while there are only 8,000 or so available. There are about one-third as many jobs in farming as there are in related occupations.

The percentage of vocational agricultural graduates entering the farming occupation has decreased considerably since 1920. Only 35 per cent of the 1958 vocational agriculture graduates as reported by Tennessee vocational agriculture teachers were farming at the time of this study. This included full-time and part-time farmers. Other studies revealed similar findings (Chapter II).

It was found that almost one-half of the 130 schools from which vocational agriculture teachers reported, required certain students to

enroll in vocational agriculture. It was mandatory in 31 of the schools that all freshmen boys enroll in vocational agriculture. Five schools even required senior boys to enroll. "Scheduling difficulties" and "school policy" were the major reasons given for requiring students to enroll in vocational agriculture.

Another finding of the study was that about one-half of the schools from which teachers reported had guidance programs which affected the enrollment of boys in vocational agriculture. As a general statement low I. Q. students were guided into vocational agriculture while high I. Q. students were guided out. In most cases this tended to increase total enrollment.

It is a result of the above stated situation, the writer believes, that the following is true:

It was found from the reaction of teachers in this study that a large number of the boys enrolled in vocational agriculture should not be there. Some teachers, for example, reported as many as thirty boys in vocational agriculture classes who, in their opinion, should not be there. Eighty teachers reported 669 boys who were not interested in agriculture. There were 981 boys reported who did not have adequate facilities for carrying out a suitable supervised farming program.

It was also reported by teachers that many students in vocational agriculture should not be there because of "low mechanical ability".

The average number of students enrolled in vocational agriculture departments in Tennessee, according to this study, was about sixty. The size of classes ranged from three to forty. The average number of students

for the largest classes was 21.7, and the smallest classes averaged 11.3.

In the past, almost one-half of the vocational agriculture departments in the study have been concerned with the problem of either "too large" or "too small" an enrollment. According to the teachers who reported 36.9 per cent of the departments are at present either "too large" or "too small" with respect to the number of students enrolled.

It was found that Tennessee vocational agriculture teachers believe the "outlook" for vocational agriculture is slightly inferior as compared to that for other agricultural service professions. "Job security" was rated about equal to that in other agricultural service professions, and "controlling purpose" and "patrons attitude" were rated slightly superior in the vocational agriculture profession. The Tennessee teachers rated "salary" far inferior to that in other agricultural service professions.

Implications

Based on the finding of this study the writer believes that many vocational agriculture teachers have become frustrated and discontented because of conflicts growing out of the disparity between believing on the one hand that vocational agriculture instruction should be limited to training persons for successful farming and believing on the other that the instruction should be based on the actual agricultural education needs of those enrolled.

Vocational agriculture taught according to the controlling purpose as written, contributes some to students entering non-farm agricultural occupations, however, instruction and counciling especially for these

students should be provided in the curriculum.

Vocational agriculture as taught in Tennessee is not as "vocational" as it ought to be. One vocational agriculture leader made a statement to this effect.

> We have a few departments in Tennessee that are truly vocational; there are many, however, that are not vocational. We must not say that they are not justifiable; we say they need improving.

Indeed there are many vocational agriculture departments in Tennessee which are not vocational to the desired degree because:

1. Only a low percentage of the vocational agriculture graduates enter farming. Since much of the instruction is applicable only to the work of the farm, the knowledge gained has very limited application outside of farming. Many vocational agriculture graduates enter non-agricultural occupations.
2. The teacher of vocational agriculture in too many cases does not have authority to select or reject his students. Several teachers made statements on the information blanks returned to the effect that they got the students who couldn't pass other subjects.

Several teachers indicated that even though no one was required to enroll in vocational agriculture the choice of subjects were such that the effect was the same. One teacher stated that boys in his school had the choice between Latin and vocational agriculture.

The above implies that vocational agriculture is not always an elective which students take voluntarily. This supports Hamlin's belief that vocational agriculture departments are sometimes used as "dumping grounds".

Based upon the findings of this study the writer suggests careful consideration for changes in the following phases of the vocational agriculture program:

1. The controlling purpose of vocational agriculture.
2. The scope of vocational agriculture.
3. The degree to which vocational agriculture is elective.
4. The selection of vocational agriculture enrollees.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bender, R. E. "Students of Vocational Agriculture Succeed in College," Agricultural Education Magazine, 31 (April 1959), pp. 220-222.

_____, "Vocational Status of Students of Vocational Agriculture Graduating in 1953 and 1954," Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education, Supplement 10, 1957, p. 10.

Bittner, R. H. "Are Vocational Agriculture Graduates Successful in Nonfarm Occupations," Agricultural Education Magazine, 31 (April 1959), p. 228.

Brumm, Kenneth G., et. al. "Replanning Agricultural Education in Illinois Schools," Report of Study Group X, Allerton House Conference on Education, Urban, Illinois. 1958. pp. 21-24.

Burkett, L. A. "Trends in Vocational Agriculture Training," Agricultural Leaders Digest, 40 (February 1959) p. 13.

Butler, J. J. "Some Guidance Concerns in Vocational Agriculture," Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Agricultural Education, The University of Tennessee, June 1959.

"Careers for Farm Youth," Nation's Agriculture, The American Farm Bureau Federation, Mt. Morris, Illinois, 34 (February 1959), pp. 15-16.

Commission on National Aid To Vocational Education, Report of The Commission, Vol. I (Washington: Government Printing Office, June 1914), p. 80.

Ekstrom, G. F. "Occupational Survey of Former Students of Vocational Agriculture Who Graduated from Missouri High Schools 1941-50 Inclusive," Agricultural Education Magazine, 30 (August 1957), p. 44.

Givens, J. E. "Meeting The Educational Needs of Farm Boys Through Vocational Agriculture," The Agreview, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, (July 1958), pp. 2-8.

Hamlin, H. M. Agricultural Education In Community Schools, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Danville, 1950.

Hunsicker, H. N. "The Forward Look in Vocational Agriculture," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 31 (March 1959), p. 197.

Kirkland, J. B. "Future Programs and Their Development," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 23 (July 1950), p. 3.

Lambreth, E. E. "Why Former Tennessee Teachers of Vocational Agriculture Left The Profession," Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Agricultural Education, The University of Tennessee, March 1958, p. 27.

McMahon, et. al. "Program of Work," (California State Department of Education, Sacramento, 1958-59), p. forward.

Research Committee of The Southern Region, "What Constitutes an Effective Program of Vocational Agriculture in a Community," Report of A Southern Region Study in Vocational Agriculture, 1956, p. 12-13.

Sanders, H. W. "Follow-up Study of Students of Vocational Agriculture in Virginia," Department of Agricultural Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1959. (Mimeographed)

Shoemaker, Karl "Opportunities and Limitations for Employment of Farm People Within and Outside of Farming," United States Department of Agriculture (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1958), pp. 2-6.

Springfield, Roy C. "Why Louisiana Teachers of Vocational Agriculture Left The Service," Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education, Supplement 4, 1951. p. 40.

Sutherland, S. S. and O. E. Thompson, "A Profile of All-Day Vocational Agriculture Students in California," Department of Agricultural Education, University of California, 11 pp. (Mimeographed)

"Tennessee Farm Replacement Needs," Department of Agricultural Economics, The University of Tennessee, 3 pp. (Mimeographed)

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Statistics 1957, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1958), pp. 531-535.

"What City People Should Know about Farmers," Special Report on Agriculture, Capper's Farmer, Topeka, Kansas, 1958, pp. 1-7.

APPENDIX

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE

Date: April 4, 1959

To: Vocational Agricultural Teachers of Tennessee

Have you heard these statements? "Vocational agriculture is on the way out." "Most vocational agricultural graduates do not enter the farming occupation." "Agriculture as taught in Tennessee is not vocational." "Vocational agriculture is going to be turned back to the states." "The teachers of vocational agriculture are on thin ice."

These are typical statements that we who are associated with vocational agriculture are hearing more and more. Do they indicate that our present program is not completely justifiable?

Enclosed you will find an information blank from which we hope to get the true situation of the vocational agriculture departments of Tennessee, and the views of the vocational agricultural teachers concerning our present program. This will be a part of the research going into a study being conducted at the University of Tennessee to determine the present setting of vocational agriculture in Tennessee.

Please complete the form and return it to us by April 15 if possible. It is important that we get a return from every department in the State.

The individual information given will be confidential and the forms will be destroyed as soon as collective data is compiled.

Very truly yours,

W. G. Calton
Vocational Agriculture Teacher
Boonshill

WGC/el

INFORMATION BLANK

INFORMATION BLANK

I. How much does vocational agriculture instruction contribute to the needs of students entering the following?

	Entent of Contribution (Circle appropriate number)				
	None		Some		Very Much
1. Farming (General, Livestock, Broiler growing, etc.)----------	0	1	2	3	4
2. Non-farm agricultural occupations (Producing for and Servicing Farmers and Distributing Farm Products)----------	0	1	2	3	4
3. Advanced training in agriculture (Agricultural College work, etc.)-----	0	1	2	3	4

II. What is (are) the controlling purpose (s) of vocational agriculture as practiced in your department? (Mark "X" before inappropriate purposes; rank the remaining purpose (s) in order of importance.)

____1. To train for useful employment and proficiency in the farming occupation.
____2. To train for useful employment and proficiency in an agricultural pursuit. (Farming and non-farm agricultural work)
____3. To train good citizens, intelligent consumers, and efficient producers.
____4. To provide enlightment of agriculture.
____5. Others (State)

III. How many boys are there in the following situations?

____1. Number in your high school.
____2. Number enrolled in vocational agriculture.
____3. Number in your largest vocational agriculture class.
____4. Number in your smallest vocational agriculture class.
____5. Number of graduates of vo-ag last year (1957-58).
____6. Number of graduates of vo-ag last year who are not farming.

IV. What is your situation concerning enrollment problems?

The total enrollment of all-day boys in vocational agriculture--

	Too Small	Too Large	About Right
1. In the past has been----------			
2. At present is----------			
3. In the future is expected to be---			

V. How many boys are enrolled in vocational agriculture who should not be there for each of the following reasons?

(No.) ____1. No interest in agriculture.

(No.) ____2. Inadequate facilities for carrying out a satisfactory supervised farming program.

(No.) ____3. Do not have reasonable chance of becoming engaged in an agricultural pursuit.

(No.) ____4. Insufficient mechanical ability.

(No.) ____5. Other (State why)

VI. Who is required to enroll in vocational agriculture in your school and why?

Check Here	Who is required to enroll in vocational agriculture	Reasons Why Required		
		School Policy	Unable to schedule other courses	Other (State)
	9th Grade			
	10th Grade			
	11th Grade			
	12th Grade			
	Certain Individuals			
	No One			

VII. How does your school guidance program affect the enrollment of boys in vocational agriculture? (Check) The efforts of the guidance director(s):

1. Have no effect upon vocational agriculture enrollment ____.

2. Tend to guide high I.Q. students, into ____) vocational agriculture.
   Out of ____)

3. Tend to guide low I. Q. students, into ____) vocational agriculture.
   Out of ____)

4. Tend to, increase ____) total number enrolled in vocational agriculture.
   decrease ____)
   have no effect on ____)

VIII. How much do the following subjects contribute to students entering non-farm agricultural occupations (Producing for and servicing farmers and distributing farm products)? (Please answer for each subject)

	Extent of Contribution (Circle appropriate number)				
	None		Some		Very Much
1. Vocational Agriculture	0	1	2	3	4
2. Other Vocational Courses (T.&I. Distributive education, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4
3. Mathematics (Geometry, Algebra, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4
4. Science (Chemistry, Physics, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4
5. Social Science (Civics, History, etc.)	0	1	2	3	4
6. English	0	1	2	3	4

IX. How do you compare the following factors of your work as an agricultural instructor to the same factors as found in other agricultural service occupations (Agricultural Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, etc.)?

Factors of Your Work	Degrees of Comparison		
	Inferior	Equal	Superior
Job Security			
Controlling Purpose of Your Work			
Patrons Attitude			
Long-Range Outlook			
Salary			