AN EVALUATION OF THE INSTITUTIONAL-ON-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM IN MICHIGAN

By

FORREST OLIVER STRAND

A THESIS

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Agricultural Education

1953

The author wishes to acknowledge the very friendly help of Dr. H. P. Sweany, Dr. Raymond Clark and Dr. H. M. Byram for assistance and suggestions in the preparation of this study.

The author wishes to give special acknowledgement to the Central Regional Committee and Mr. R. A. Hayward, the Committee's Chairman, and the Institutional-On-Farm Training Program in Michigan which was the basis for this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

Since the institutional-on-farm training program was instituted at the close of World War II, there have been these questions, "Has this type of an adult educational program been worthwhile in Michigan?" "Should additional programs of this type be initiated in the future?" How should future programs be administrated and financed?"

The Need. The institutional-on-farm training program was started in Michigan to aid returning veterans of World War II to become established on Michigan farms.

The need for an evaluation seemed great because of the amount of money so far invested in the program. To illustrate: On April 1, 1951, there were 6,066 trainees[1] in institutional-on-farm training in Michigan. It was estimated that each trainee would receive a monthly subsistence of approximately $80 or more. This would bring the total monthly subsistence to approximately $485,250, plus additional expenses for instruction, instructional materials and administration.

The time for an evaluation seemed appropriate. The program has been in operation for about six years and will not continue to be in operation indefinitely. It is not known whether to continue or have similar programs in the future.

---

1 Annual Report of the State Board of Control for Vocational Education, 1951. (Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State College Press, 1951), p. 5.

School administrators, officials in the veterans administration and some lay citizens have often wondered how much benefit the trainee received from this program. They have also wondered if the trainee continued his training because of the subsistence paid or because of the knowledge he was acquiring or both? And what suggestions would the veteran trainee offer for improvement of the training program.

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The problem was to evaluate the present institutional-on-farm training program in terms of opinions of the veterans enrolled. The subproblems were to (1) determine the method of instruction preferred, (2) to determine the amount of instruction that had been provided in the different areas and which areas are preferred, (3) to determine the progress that had been made, (4) to determine if the community had benefited from the program, (5) to determine if the program aided the establishment of the veteran, (6) to determine what educational experiences were most beneficial and (7) to determine whether or not the program should be continued.

Scope of the study. The study was to include a sampling of trainees which were in training at the time of the study. The number of veterans in training in the various years were 5,627 in 1948-49, 6,772 in 1949-50 and 6,066 as of April 1, 1951. Fifty classes in each state were randomly sampled.

From the fifty classes a sample was drawn randomly and used in this study.

DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

Institutional-On-Farm Training. A training program providing an opportunity for veterans of World War II to receive training in the occupational field of their choice. Under provisions of the Act (The Serviceman's Readjustment Act Public Law 346, 78th Congress), veterans who desire vocational and on-farm training in that occupation.[2] Training classes, on-farm training and training programs are used synonymously. It will be referred to in this study as the training program.

Veteran. A former serviceman of World War II who would be eligible for benefits as provided under Public Law 346, 78th Congress. The veterans were placed on the training program either as self-employed or as employed trainees. Each trainee was eligible for one year of training plus the number of months in service up to four years. Each trainee was given free instruction in addition to a subsistence wage to the trainee by the Treasurer of the United States.

The trainee, in order to receive subsistence, had to

---

[2] "Instructions Pertaining to the Negotiations of Contracts Between Veteran's Institutes, Boards of Education, and Veteran's Administration for Institutional-On-Farm Training and Development of Courses of Related Training for Farm Veterans", Bulletin No. 1017, Published by Eugene B. Elliott, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Lansing, Michigan, 1947 p. 9.

attend two hundred hours of classroom instruction per year and be visited on his farm by an instructor one hundred hours per year. This trainee during his instructional period must have shown growth to be eligible to continue on the training program. In future discussions the trainee will be referred to as the veteran.

Self-Proprietorship. A term which is applicable to a veteran who operates his own farm through ownership, lease, management or other tenure arrangement.[3]

Employer-Trainer. A term which is applicable to a veteran who takes the on-the-job portion of his training with a farmer employer who serves as the veteran's immediate supervisor.[4]

Hired-Hand. A person working for hire on a farm.

Veterans Instructor. A person approved by the Michigan State Department of Public Instruction to teach veterans in the on-the-farm training program. He is usually a graduate of an approved agricultural college with a B. S. Degree in agriculture.

Renter. A veteran operating a farm for profit either for cash paid to the land-owner for use of the land or on a share basis.

Owner-Renter. A veteran operating a farm whereby he owns

---

[3] Ibid., p. 10.

[4] Ibid., p. 10.

a part of the total acreage he tills and rents the remaining portion of the total acreage.

Owner-Operator. A veteran operating a farm as sole owner and operator.

Manager. A veteran who works for another under a managerial arrangement.

Classroom. A room designated as a meeting place for instruction given in a more formal manner than would be given on a farm. Usually an agricultural room in a local high school is used.

Individual-On-Farm Instruction. Training presented on the veteran's farm by the veteran's instructor. Fifty hours of this type of instruction was required.

Small Group on Farm. A meeting of several veterans with the veteran's instructor on a veteran's farm for the purpose of instruction.

Farm Records. Data kept by the veteran of the farming operations which usually consisted of cash expenses and receipts, farm inventory and production records.

Farm Plan. A plan developed by the veteran usually in cooperation with the veteran's instructor detailing his future farming methods and requirements.

Textbooks. Reference books on agriculture which were provided the veteran by the Veteran's Administration through the public school.

Bulletins. Published technical information usually com-

piled by the state agriculture college based on experimentation and other research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Since the inception of the training program there have been many articles written about the training program. However, few studies have been conducted to determine the outcome of participation of veterans in institutional-on-farm training.

Literature on Institutional-On-Farm Training. Wiegers[1] made a status study of 1,944 trainees, or approximately fourteen percent of the total number enrolled in Missouri. Wiegers' "reported that 93% of the trainees who responded were of the opinion that they had made more progress in becoming established or reestablished than they would have made had they received the equivalent of subsistance payments without benefits of instruction."

Wiegers made the following conclusions:[2]

1. Insofar as trainees did not as a general rule specialize in any certain type of farming, broad training covering many aspects of farming is needed.
2. Institutional-on-farm training had been effective in helping veterans with farm planning and management.

---

[1]George W. Wiegers, Jr., "Some Outcomes of Participation of Veterans in Institutional-On-Farm Training in Missouri," (unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, 1949), p. 5.

[2]Ibid., p. 12.

3. To some extent training had been effective in improving living conditions and in enriching socially the lives of veterans and their families.
4. Training had been of little use in providing for recestional activities or in the promotion of cooperative activities among veterans.
5. Apparently the extent of formal schooling had not been a major factor in veteran's ability to make farm plans and to apply certain improvement practices.
6. For the most part, training was meeting the needs of veterans enrolled in the program.

Wiegers continued by saying that the veterans indicated soil conservation and livestock production should be stressed more than they were in the present program. Quoting Wiegers,[3] "An explanation of this may be due to the widespread publicity given by the Soil Conservation Service to the need for soil conservation."

Wiegers stated that recreational and family relationships were rated very low in subjects to be stressed. Veterans who had taken Vocational Agriculture tended to rate the units of study as needing the same emphasis as did veterans who had no vocational agricultural training.

According to Agan,[4] veterans enrolled in institutional-on

---

[3]Ibid., p. 113

[4]R.J. Agan, "Swine Management Practices Used By Participants in the Institutional-On-Farm Training Program for Veterans." p.5 (unpublished Master's thesis, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, 1950)

farm training classes were using more improved practices in swine management than were veterans who were not enrolled in such classes.

In the Minnesota study by Kitts,[5] it is reported "that education pays off in farm ownership. All college graduates were sole or joint-owners except one who had a favorable agreement as a wage hand at home." Mr. Kitts further stated that those with least education were lowest on the ladder of ownership.

Slocum of Washington,[6] stated that 85% of the veterans were married with 83% married with children. Slightly more than half had completed 12 or more years of formal schooling. Of those, "48% of the veterans who had attended high school, had taken some vocational agricultural courses."

Slocum in another study showed that "seven out of each ten indicated that they felt that the program had been very much worthwhile."[7]

Slocum continued by saying, "A significant indication of the educational value of the training is the attitude of the participants with respect to additional agricultural instruction.

---

[5]Harry W. Kitts, "Educational Readjustments of Rural Veterans," College of Education, University of Minnesota, St. Paul Minesota, 1949, p. 39.

[6]W.L. Slocum, "Adjustment of Veteran Trainees To Farming and Rural Life," Washington Agricultural Experiment Stations, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, Bulletin 541, 1953, p. 3.

[7]Walter L. Slocum, Agricultural Training for Veterans; A report on Reactions of Participants, "Washington Agricultural Experiment Stations, Institute of Agricultural Science, State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, Bulletin Circular 206, October 1952, p. 3.

More than six out of each ten indicated that they would like to continue in an agricultural instruction program."[8]

Hoskins of New York,[9] in his study found that in Tompkins County "nearly 30% were enrolled in vocational agriculture before entering service; 17% had obtained an interest in a single farm enterprise; 49% had worked as wage hands at either home or away from home and that 30% were classified as "unpaid family workers" or had been on an allowance status at home."

In the Regional Study,[10] "over 60% of the veterans enrolled in the institutional-on-farm training in each state were from 26 to 35 years of age." The report further states that 50-60% had more than 36 months of eligibility. It was noted in this study that "there was a decrease in hired hand status from the time of enrollment to the time the schedules were completed."[11]

The Regional Report goes on to say that "with the exception of 3 states more than 60% of the trainees in the participating states had no training in agriculture in high school."[12]

---

[8]Ibid. p. 4.

[9]"Report of the Cooperative study of Institutional-On-Farm Training in the Central Region," Central Regional Conference On Research in Agricultural Education, The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., Dansville, Illinois, 1952, p. 12.

[10]Ibid., p. 12.

[11]Ibid., p. 18.

[12]Ibid., p. 21.

In comparing methods of instruction, the Report of the Central region stated that the trainees indicated that classroom instruction was of more value than either small group or individual on farm instruction.

In the course content, Livestock Production and Soil Conservation received the greater emphasis. From the study it was shown that "9 out of 10 in each state indicated that they were better established in farming because of their training."[13]

In the National Study,[14] the size of the veterans farms increased from an average acreage of 201.14 acres in 1949 to 207.14 in 1950. It stated further that "It has been shown that there is an important relationship between education of farm veterans and their advancement in tenure." "Those with the least education are also lowest in tenure status."[15]

From the National Study, it was shown that "class discussion of individual problems was preferred as an educational media."[16] "The majority of the veterans preferred 150 to 200 hours of class instruction per year."[17]

It was also stated that "almost three-fourths of the veter-

---

[13]"Education of Veterans, "American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Ave., N.W., Washington 5, D.C., Research Bulletin No. 5.

[14]Ibid., p. 18.

[15]Ibid., p. 54.

[16]Ibid., p. 55.

[17]Ibid., p. 60.

ans would be willing to pay from $10 to $50 for tuition per year for an educational program after the expiration of the program for veterans."[18]

Lintner of Ohio stated [19] in his study that out of 125 veterans, 84.6% indicated that subsistence payments were of great importance in enabling a veteran to become established in farming. However, Lintner stated that 80% of the veterans indicated that training was more important than subsistance in making progress. Lintner also stated that 50% of the veterans indicated that they would continue to take part in an educational farm program similar to the present one without subsistence.

As can be seen from the studies just reviewed, veterans found the training program valuable and educational. This study will try to determine if Michigan veterans feel that the training program in Michigan is valuable and if it or a similar adult agricultural training program should be continued.

---

[18] Ibid., p. 56.

[19] J. H. Lintner, "Effectiveness of Institutional-On-Farm Training in Ohio, The Agricultural Education Magazine, 25:103, November, 1952.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES USED IN DEVELOPING THE STUDY

The procedures used in developing the study are similar to others that are being used in educational research.

The questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed with the aid of various educational agencies in Michigan, along with various agencies of the Central States. After the questionnaire was developed and before it was used it was submitted to a group of veteran instructors and to a committee composed of representatives from the various Land-Grant Colleges of The Central Region for criticisms.[1]

After revision, it was again checked, revised and printed. The printed form was thought to yield more nearly complete and accurate responses. The committee also suggested calling the questionnaire "Veterans Schedule A" instead of a questionnaire.[2]

Sampling. The sampling was confined to veterans currently enrolled in the training program under full-time instructors. Classes included in the study must have been in operation for at least six months.

The major source of data for this study was obtained from a sampling of fifty institutional-on-farm classes in

---

[1]See Appendix for a list of the Land-Grant Colleges of the Central Region.

[2]See Appendix for a copy of the questionnaire (Veterans Schedule A) used.

Michigan. The state was divided into four sections and a list of the full-time veteran instructors in each section was made. The number of full-time instructors in the state was 122.

The sampling was done randomly within the sections of the state and the number drawn from each section was based on its percentage of the total number of instructors in the state. The veterans and instructors did not review the completed questionnaire. The questionnaires, when completed, were placed in envelopes provided and sealed in the presence of the class and mailed to the writer.

Technique Used. In tabulating the IBM cards of each veteran (300), certain key questions were selected and used as variables in tabulating the data. The questions selected are starred in the appendix.[3]

The tables depict raw scores, percentages and mean scores. Mean scores were computed in two ways. The mean score to the questions containing three possible answers was determined by assigning numerical values to the responses: Much= 2, Some=1, and None=0. Questions containing four possible answers were assigned numerical values to the responses: Good=3, Fair= 2, Poor= 1, and Uncertain= 0.

Raw scores show the actual number of veterans responding to the question. Percentages are based on the total veterans

---

[3]See Appendix for a copy of the questionnaire (Veterans Schedule A) that is starred.

who answered each specific question.

The data were taken from each Schedule A and placed on IBM cards. This transfer required three IBM cards for the veteran's responses to the questions. (The IBM cards were taken to a local manufacturing plant to be tabulated. The manufacturing plant, Gerity-Michigan Corporation of Adrian, had an IBM sorting and tabulating machine. Through the generosity of the Gerity-Michigan Corporation the IBM cards were summarized and tabulated.)

CHAPTER VI

THE FINDINGS

The veterans-their characteristics. The majority (66.3%) of the veterans were between 26 and 35 years of age. Over half of the veterans (61.4%) were married and had children. At the time of the survey 118 veterans had received between 13 to 24 months of training. Their status at the time of the survey was approximately 37% owner-operators, while only 10.4% were hired hands. Eighty-six veterans had graduated from elementary school, 113 from high school while just 2 had graduated from college. The remaining veterans had only completed part of their elementary, high school or college education. 177 had no vocational agriculture in high school, while 234 had had no young farmer or adult farmer training prior to enrolling in the institutional-on-farm training.

TABLE I

THE PERCENTAGE OF VETERANS IN MICHIGAN BY GRADE ATTAINED

Amount of education		Total numbers		Percent of total
Elementary	(86)	99		33.20
High school	(113)	130		60.60
College	(2)	18		6.19
No answer		3		0.01
		300	Total	100.00

From Table I it can be seen that over 50% of the veterans had attended high school, while a third had attended elementary school only. College graduates composed less than 10% of the veterans.

The instruction. The veterans reported that classroom instruction was of more value to them than individual-on-farm or small-group on-farm instruction. Much stress has been placed on individual on-farm instruction by teacher training centers and state departments of public instruction.

TABLE II

AN EVALUATION IN MEAN SCORES OF TYPES OF INSTRUCTION USED IN MICHIGAN BY VETERANS IN THE TRAINING PROGRAM.

Type of instruction	Mean score
Classroom (off farm)	1.78
Individual on farm	1.71
Small group on farm	1.25

In Table II, the veterans rated classroom instruction as the most valuable. Individual-on-farm instruction was ranked second with the small-group on farm as third. It should be noted that the difference between classroom and individual on-farm may not be of any significance.

Many educators feel that farm plans and records are more valuable than textbooks as an educational method. Veterans

felt that textbooks were more valuable than farm records and farm plans which had scores of 1.69 and 1.05 respectively.

TABLE III

AN EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL METHODS USED IN MICHIGAN FOR THE TRAINING OF VETERANS IN INSTITUTIONAL-ON-FARM TRAINING COMPUTED IN MEAN SCORES.

Methods	Mean Scores			
	Educational Attainment			
	Elementary	High School	College	Average
Textbooks	1.49	1.97	1.73	1.72
Farm records	1.69	1.78	1.61	1.69
Farm plan	1.13	1.18	0.83	1.05

From Table III it can be seen that high school graduates placed a higher value on each of the methods than did the elementary and college graduates. However, when we look at the average, the veterans rated textbooks over farm records or a farm plan as an educational method.

Units of instruction. In determining what units should be taught a comparison was made between what had been taught and what veterans thought should be taught. It was found that veterans wanted to stress all units that were taught even more than what had been stressed. The greatest need for improvement was reported for farm mechanics. The mean difference between

what had been taught and what should be taught was a plus .74. There was very little difference between the two in the case of farm and home accounts. The mean difference was a plus .01. This would indicate that approximately the correct amount of stress was placed on farm and home accounts in the present training program. No additional emphasis is indicated as being needed for farm and home records in a future program.

One reason for the indicated increase in emphasis is that some subjects or units were not fully covered during the training period. To account for this lack of training, it must be remembered that many veterans had not completed a full four-year course of instruction. Many veterans entered the training program in the middle of the year or were unable to study units of their choice. Another reason for an increased emphasis on certain subjects seemed to have been publicity given to their needs through newspapers, radio and organizations. Subjects given such emphasis are soil conservation, livestock and crop production.

From Table IV it can be seen that the greatest difference may have been the fact that very little farm mechanics is taught in Michigan. With the large investment in machinery the veterans evidently felt that more farm mechanics should be taught. Every unit should be stressed according to the veterans. Farm and home improvements received the second highest difference. This may indicate that the veterans felt a need for instruction in home improvements. Recreational activities showed a diff-

TABLE IV

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE IMPORTANCE OF UNITS OF INSTRUCTION IN FUTURE PROGRAMS OF ADULT EDUCATION AND THAT GIVEN THE UNITS IN THE PRESENT PROGRAM IN MICHIGAN

Units taught	Amount of stress		
	Present Program	Future Program	Mean Difference
Farm Mechanics	0.98	1.72	.74
Farm and Home Improvement	0.92	1.58	.66
Farm skills, such as castration, dehorning, laying out terraces	1.06	1.57	.51
Farm health and safety	1.22	1.63	.41
Fruit and Vegetable production	0.84	1.22	.38
Family relationships	0.80	1.18	.38
Marketing farm products	1.25	1.62	.37
Recreational activities	0.65	1.01	.36
Soil conservation	1.50	1.85	.35
Leadership	0.81	1.19	.31
Farm planning and management	1.50	1.78	.28
Livestock production practice	1.59	1.83	.24
Crop production practices	1.60	1.83	.21
Community and cooperatives activities	0.96	1.17	.21
Farming programs	1.31	1.48	.17
Farm and home accounts	1.58	1.59	.01
*Food preservation and storage		1.35	

*Due to error in printing scores were incomplete.

erence of .36. It should be noted that recreational activities were given the least stress in both the present and future program. Family relationships were shown to need much greater stress in future programs, which rated low in the present program.

Methods of instruction. In rating mediums of instruction, field trips were rated very high. Veterans with a high school education felt that field trips were more important than did those who had had college or elementary training. An important reason for this difference may be that those with high school training are more observing than those with less education. It would seem that more field trips should be included in the instruction.

Many educators have questioned the use of field trips as an educational medium, with high school classes. One reason, being that it causes an interruption of classes, loss of time from other classes and by school employees used to drive the bus. The use of field trips and their value is presented in Table V.

TABLE V

AN EVALUATION OF FIELD TRIPS PREFERRED BY VETERANS OF DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL LEVELS.

Amount of education	Answers in percent of total			
	Much	Some	None	Total
Elementary	46.4%	46.4%	6.2%	100.0%
High School	50.5	44.8	4.7	100.0
College	50.0	44.4	5.6	100.0

To summarize briefly Table V, it can be seen that field trips are important to former high school and college students an an educational medium. In both cases the response was in the "much value" column over 50% of the time. However, the elementary group are even in their evaluation of the field trip by giving both columns; Much and Some, 46.4%. Approximately 1/16 of all veterans felt that field trips were of no value.

Classroom instruction. In rating methods of classroom instruction,"discussion by class members" was indicated as first choice of veterans. The mean score was 2.04; "demonstration" was rated second with a mean score of 1.82. "Questions and answers" was third with "laboratory-actual preference" a fourth choice. "Lectures" were fifth in preference with "reports" sixth and "debates" last with a mean score of 1.09. This rating of classroom instruction by veterans should aid in selecting methods of instruction to use in future program.

TABLE VI

THE RATING GIVEN METHODS OF CLASSROOM TEACHING BY MICHIGAN VETERANS

Methods of teaching	Mean scores
Discussion by class members	2.04
Demonstration	1.82
Question and answer	1.44
Laboratory-actual performance by members	1.44
Lecture	1.35
Group or individual reports	1.10
Debates	1.09

In Table VI it is assumed that the veteran's opinion is based on his training program and is summarized in terms of mean scores. It should be noted that veterans preferred methods of teaching which required no preparation on their part. Class discussion which requires no preparation is popular as is a demonstration or even a lecture. Group or individual reports as well as debates require preparation on the part of veterans. These methods were rated low by the veterans.

ESTABLISHMENT IN FARMING

Degree of establishment. Ninety-six percent of the Michigan veterans indicated that they are better established in farming as a result of the training program. 3.36% were uncertain, while only 0.67% indicated that they were not as well established as a result of their training. This percentage is very high in favor of the training program. If the responses are correct than it would seem that the veterans thought the training program valuable in terms of assisting and establishing the veteran in farming.

Establishment without the training program. In response to the question,"Could you have made just as much progress in getting started in farming if you had received your subsistence allowance without the training program?". Only 17 veterans said yes; 257 said no; and 25 were uncertain. From their responses we can conclude that subsistence was not an important contribution to their success in establishment in farming.

Establishment by farming status. The above question was broken down by farming status. From table VII we see that some hired hands, partners and managers felt that they could have made some progress with subsistence without training. Reasons for this may be that hired hands, partners, and managers were unable to exercise full control of their farms due to employers, partners and owners. Or they may have felt that they received some instruction or help from their employers, partners or owners. However, it should be noted that the response for those in every status was high in their feeling that they could not have made the same progress with subsistence alone.

TABLE VII

THE FARMING STATUS THAT COULD HAVE BEEN MADE WITH SUBSISTENCE BUT WITHOUT TRAINING

Farming status at time of enrollment.	Could veterans make the same progress without training but with subsistence?		
	Answers in percent of total		
	Yes	No	Uncertain
Hired hand	2.3%	93.0%	4.7%
Partner	7.5	78.5	14.0
Renter	2.7	89.1	8.2
Owner-renter	0.0	86.6	13.4
Owner-operator	6.9	88.1	5.0
Manager	20.0	80.0	0.0

There were no owner-renters who felt that they could have

made progress with subsistence alone. However, over 13% were uncertain. Could a few of the owner-operators (6.9%) have been so well established that additional training was unnecessary? Or were they in need of financial help more than the techinical assistance the program could give them? These are questions that suggest additional investigation.

Establishment according to education. Again the above question was broken down according to the amount of education. Over 90% of the veterans felt that with their education they could not have made the same progress with subsistence but without training. We should remember that this is an opinion. It is a conjecture that some of the college-trained veterans may have had their pride hurt if they had answered in any other manner. Then again, it may be the correct opinion. This is reasonable as some veterans had had as much training as the instructor.

TABLE VIII

THE EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AS IT AFFECTS THE PROGRESS THAT COULD HAVE BEEN MADE WITH SUBSISTENCE BUT WITHOUT TRAINING.

Amount of education	Could the same progress have been made with subsistence but without training.				
	Yes	Percent	No	Percent	Total
Elementary	6	6.4%	88	93.6%	94
High School	7	4.3	156	95.7	163
College	4	26.6	11	73.4	15
Total	17		255		272

To evaluate the training program from an educational standpoint, we see that veterans with high school education indicated that more progress was made because of the training program than with subsistence without training then either elementary or college trained veterans. The veterans, regardless of educational status seemed to have felt that the training was more important than subsistence in making progress toward establishment in farming.

THE INSTRUCTOR

Use of instructor. Many thoughts have been raised as to whether or not the veterans would use the instructor after completion of institutional-on-farm training program. It has been shown in Table IX that over 50% of the veterans indicated that they would want to use the services of the instructor, "much".

TABLE IX

THE USE OF THE INSTRUCTOR BY VETERANS AFTER COMPLETION OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM

Farming status at time of enrollment	Answers in percent of total			
	Much	Some	None	No response
Hired hand (45)	60.4%	37.2%	0.0%	2.4%
Partner (79)	57.0	38.2	4.8	0.0
Renter (37)	43.2	56.8	0.0	0.0
Owner-renter (15)	60.0	40.0	0.0	0.0
Owner-operator (116)	55.1	44.9	0.0	0.0
Manager (5)	40.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
Total (300)	52.6	40.2	4.8	2.4

The hired hands, owner-operators and partners indicated the greatest desire to use the instructor. The renters and managers felt a lesser degree of help would be obtained from the instructor. This would seem logical as they obtain help from their landlord or employer. There is an unanswered question here relating to the hired hands and partners. Why haven't they indicated that they would use the instructor as much? Are they restricted more now than they hope to be or are expecting to become owner-operators? It would seem that the hired hand and partner would become owner-operators sooner than the renter and manager. Therefore, they would desire greater use of the instructor after the institutional-on-farm training program than the renter and manager. It might be that those who would use the instructor would use him on a part-time or same basis.

THE COMMUNITY

Community improvement. In evaluating whether or not the training program had been beneficial to the community a mean score was computed for each area. According to the veterans the training program aided the soil conservation program in their communities. The majority (over 90%) agreed that the program helped improve the farming practices as well as increasing the use of all educational programs. It is noted in Table X that leadership and recreation were improved some according to the veterans. This would be an area to work on as good leaders will make a good community.

TABLE X

THE MEAN SCORE VALUE VETERANS OF MICHIGAN GAVE THE INSTITUTIONAL-ON-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM AS IT HELPED THE NON-VETERANS IN THEIR LOCAL COMMUNITY.

Areas in which help was given.	Mean score
Soil conservation	1.49
Improved farming practices	1.27
Increased use of all educational agencies	1.16
Improved social and cooperative activities	0.93
Better rural leadership	0.89
Better rural recreation	0.63

FUTURE PROGRAMS

Need for more training. "Should there be another training program or similar programs?" Over 60% said that they would continue to take part in another institutional-on-farm training program even without subsistence. This speaks well of the present program. The majority felt that a similar program should be provided for veterans of the Korean Police Action. If such a program should become a reality, the veterans felt that some subsistence should be paid.

There is an indication that there is still a need for more training of veterans in agriculture. Over 50% of the veterans reported that they would need additional training after completion of the training program. This may be due to veterans

not receiving a complete four-year course, continual development of new agricultural ideas and practices, the magnitude of the subject, agriculture, or incompetent instruction.

It should be noted that over 80% of the veterans thought that former students of vocational agriculture should have additional training. Why should veterans, some of whom had completed a vocational agriculture course in high school, and had the training program still desire more training? Could it be that a vocational agriculture course in high school is of little value to do practical farming? Or do these veterans have the realization that with all their training they feel that they are not masters of the subject? Or does agriculture require continous training? These are questions which will require additional research.

Financing programs. It seemed surprising with such high taxes on all of us, that the veterans should state or urge that taxes be levied to help provide for an adult education program in local schools. This might suggest that the present training program is successful and that additional programs of a similar nature should be provided with tax money. The veterans felt that all farmers should have the opportunity to participate in adult education as provided by the local school.

To summarize Table XI we should take each question of the table and discuss its significance. Only 8% of the veterans felt that they would not continue to take part in a similar program without subsistence. While 60% were for the program,

TABLE XI

RESPONSES OF MICHIGAN VETERANS CONCERNING THE CONTINUATION OF THE PRESENT OR A SIMILAR INSTITUTIONAL-ON-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM.

Questions	Responses in percentages		
	Yes	No	Uncertain
Would you continue to take part in an educational program similar to the present one without subsistence?	62.0%	8.0%	30.0%
Should there be another Institutional-On-Farm Training program for those in the armed forces at present?	91.2	1.3	7.5
Should qualified trainees in a future program receive subsistence pay as in the present plan?	88.5	2.0	9.5
Would farmers who have completed institutional-on-farm training need further farm training?	58.7	11.1	30.2
Would farmers who have attended a college of agriculture need further training?	57.6	12.0	30.4
Would farmers who have completed vocational agriculture in high school need further training?	81.5	2.6	15.9
Would you be willing to pay taxes for an adult education program in local schools?	51.3	16.0	32.7
Should government officials be urged to provide tax money for adult education programs in the public schools?	57.5	16.5	26.0
Should all farmers have an opportunity to enroll in courses in farming offered by the public schools?	82.5	4.3	13.2

30% were uncertain as to whether or not they would participate. This would indicate a favorable attitude toward the present program. Over 90% said that another training program should be provided for those who are in the armed forces at the present time. As to whether or not subsistence should be paid to qualified trainees of a future program, 85% of the veterans felt that some subsistence should be paid.

In spite of the training received in the present program, the veterans felt that they would need further training. The veterans also thought that farmers who have attended a college of agriculture would need further training. Over 50% of the veterans were willing to pay taxes for an adult educational program in the local schools, while 57.5% of the veterans said that government officials should be urged to provide monies for adult education programs in public schools.

From Table XI it is shown that over 80% of the veterans thought that all farmers should have an opportunity to enroll in courses in farming offered by the public schools.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A need was felt for an institutional-on-farm training program. A program was provided that satisfied that need. The objective of establishment in farming was obtained and has provided a basis for developing future programs in adult education in agriculture.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. That the veterans received very little vocational agricultural training in high school and still less instruction from young farmer and adult farmer training programs prior to enrolling in the training program.

2. That the veterans felt that four years of vocational agriculture in high school did not give him a feeling that he was well trained to farm.

3. That classroom instruction was more valuable to the veteran than individual on-farm and small group on-farm training.

4. That more than the present amount of instruction or emphasis be given each area of instruction in future programs with farm mechanics receiving the greatest increase in emphasis in future programs in Michigan.

5. That high school and college-educated veterans felt that field trips were more valuable as an educational method than elementary-educated veterans.

6. That farm plans receive the same emphasis as an

educational medium and that more emphasis be placed on the use of good textbooks and bulletins.

7. That the training program was successful in the minds of the veterans was shown because they believed that they were better established now because of the training program and not because of the subsistence received. That the veteran's progress toward.establishment could not have been as great with subsistence, but without training.

8. That the instructor would be used as a farm advisor by the veteran after his training ends by over 50% of the veterans. This would indicate that the instructor should be retained in the community in an agricultural program to serve the veteran.

9. That the community where the veteran lived benefited by the instruction given.

10. That future training programs for future veterans should be provided. The majority of the veterans favored a similar training program and that subsistence be paid.

11. That in spite of the instruction already given additional training by the veteran would be needed.

12. That taxes be levied to help provide for an adult educational program in the local community.

13. That all farmers should have the opportunity to participate in courses in farming offered by the public schools.

THE CONCLUSIONS

There are many theories of how vocational agriculture should be taught. Just as there are many theories, there are many methods being used. Which method is preferred? Which method is the most efficient? Which method is the most effective?

As with teaching day school students, veterans have preferences. 1. The veterans seem to feel that the preferred method of teaching is one in which they do not have to study. They enjoy talking about themselves, their experiences, hearsays and experiences of their friends. Most people talk in generalities. In discussion groups, it is easy to make a statement without facts. The discussion period method of instruction enables the individual to release emotions, ideas and attitude by presenting them to the group. This method is excellent and should be used as it may open the mind of the student to become more receptive to the ideas of others.

However, as was hinted, there is some danger of being misused. Many times the discussion period becomes a debate or some other argumentative type of discussion. No one can be receptive if he is trying to defend his ideas or statements.

Demonstrations are popular because of the visual as well as the auditory experience. Many can visualize better then they can understand an idea by a verbal description. It is questioned whether demonstrations are used as well as given credit.

Many criticize the lecture method of instruction. However, the veterans indicated they would prefer a lecture to a debate or an individual report. The reason may be due to shyness on the part of the veteran. Many would rather listen then participate for fear of making a mistake. Another reason may be that they like to have some one give them a direct answer. A short condensed answer to a specific question may save time and energy for the veteran.

The lecture type of meeting may be preferred over a discussion method where a direct answer is not given. some individuals are afraid or unable to make decisions. Others like to receive direct answers, whereby if they fail they may be able to place the blame on others.

2. There should be a continuous evaluation of what should be taught. In Michigan, farm mechanics should be given increased emphasis. In developing a farm mechanics program, a revision should be made of what is taught. With the increase use of mechanical power, greater instruction should be given in selection, care, repair and use of labor saving devices. By this is meant the practical instead of why some machine or part operates as it does.

Farm skills which would be practical should be increased as well as farm marketing. Many farm skills such as laying out a terrace or using a surveyors level may not be as important or practical as trimming hooves, dehorning, castration or adjusting the draft of a plow.

3. Progress has been made by veterans in this program. This is evident from the data presented. Some have stated that the veterans' answers may be colored by their receiving subsistence. The reasoning is, "Why would anyone who is receiving money for some thing he should do, give an answer that will cut off his subsistence?" The writer feels that the data from the various cross-checked questions indicate that the answers were not colored. That the answers were sincere and honest. That the veteran felt subsistence important but not as important as the training received. The question might be raised, "Why would anyone be willing to pay taxes for something that was of little value?" The veterans indicated that they would be willing to support publicly financed programs. This should indicate satisfaction on the veterans part of the present program.

4. There have been some social influences in the veterans training program. Many will want to continue social visits and contacts made. Many will want to maintain that feeling that he is part of a group. Many will want to continue their training to improve their educational and financial standing just as they have done while they were on the training program. This strengthening of the social ties has benefited the community.

5. The program has aided the establishment of the veteran. Ninety-seven percent of the Michigan veterans indicated that they are better established. With such a high percentage the only conclusion that can be drawn is that they are better

established.

6. The future of an adult education program for farm families is good. There seems to be a felt need for the latest farm information. For new ideas, methods, techniques and results. Many veterans who are no longer on the training program will feel unsure of their source of information and their decisions. This would compel veterans to find someone or some program where they might find some answers to their problems. The someone may well be the veteran instructor conducting an adult farmer program.

In spite of all the reasons why there should be an adult education program, the success and future of such a program will be dependent upon one thing. That one point is "How much value or the degree of importance the veteran or individual places upon it in his mind." And that degree of importance or value will be dependent upon the attitude the individual has toward the program and those associated with it.

7. It is the conclusion of the writer that training in agriculture is never complete. This is borne out by the responses of veterans on whether further training for graduates of vocational agricultural students, college graduates and themselves will be needed. Agriculture is continually changing. A farm profitably managed today requires the latest scientific findings and "know how." This requires a man willing to change and accept new ideas. Many of these ideas have to be presented

or brought to the farmer of today for tomorrow. Training to meet the needs of students of vocational agriculture of necessity limits the scope of the training and does not provide, all specific instruction for future needs.

It is reported that Will James once said,"Human beings can alter their lives by altering their attitudes." Here it could be concluded then that what is accomplished is done by how the attitudes of the students were changed. No one is receptive to new ideas or methods if their attitude is one of distrust or skepticism.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES

1. A study to determine why veterans feel that four years of vocational agriculture in high school does not give him the feeling that he is well trained.

2. How on-farm instruction and small group on-farm instruction can be improved.

3. What phase of farm mechanics should be stressed?

4. Why is discussion by class members preferred and how can other methods of instruction be improved?

5. On what basis should a future program be financed? Should it be from tax monies, grants, gifts, tuition or a combination?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Cook, Glen C., Handbook on Teaching Vocational Agriculture. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Publishing Company, 1947. 651 pp.

Deyoe, George P., Supervised Farming in Vocational Agriculture. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Publishing Company, 1947. 453 pp.

Hamlin, H. M., A Community Program of Agricultural Education. Illini Union Bookstore, Champaign, Illinois, 1943, 137 pp.

Morgan, Arthur E., The Small Community. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943, 312 pp.

B. PERIODICALS

Besemer, Ellsworth I., "Use of Progress Reports Records," Agricultural Education Magazine, 23:10, April, 1951.

Chunn, Chris C., "Effectiveness of Institutional-On-Farm Training in Meeting Needs of Negro Veterans," Agricultural Education Magazine, 23;221, March, 1951.

Fetterolf, H. C., "After Entitlement, What?" Agricultural Education Magazine, 23;200, March, 1951.

Franken, U. R., "Establishing Veterans in Farming," Agricultural Education Magazine, 23;211, March, 1951.

Fidler, L. B., "Ohio Evaluation of Institutional-On-Farm Training", Agricultural Education Magazine, 23:224, April, 1951.

Fowle, Watson, "Outcomes of the Veterans Program." Agricultural Education Magazine, 23:231, April, 1951.

Thomas, Robert, "Measuring Results of Teaching Farm Veterans," Agricultural Education Magazine, 23:222, April, 1951.

Lintner, J. H., "Effectiveness of Institutional-On-Farm Training in Ohio", The Agricultural Education Magazine, 25:103,

PERIODICALS CONTINUED

Harris, R. O., "Local Progress Report on Sixty-One Veterans Who Have Completed Institutional-On-Farm Training", Agricultural Education Magazine, 23:227, April, 1951.

Hart, John C., "Build Course On Needs of Veterans," Agricultural Education Magazine, 22:163, January, 1949.

Mills, B. R., "Development of Our Veterans Training Program", Agricultural Education Magazine, 21:156, January, 1949.

Schipper, Homer, "Farm Veterans and Wives Work, Play and Learn Together", Agricultural Education Magazine, 22:148, January, 1950.

Smith, Hunter E., "Accomplishments in Veterans Program", Agricultural Education Magazine, 22:153, January, 1950.

Storms, D. A., "Did We Do What We Set Out To Do?" Agricultural Education Magazine, 23:232, April, 1951.

Swanson, George, "Developing Criteria To Evaluate Progress Made by Veterans", Agricultural Education Magazine, 21:156, January, 1949.

Swecker, John B., "West Virginia Veterans Making Progress Toward Establishment in Farming", Agricultural Education Magazine, 23:226, April, 1951.

Thompson, Charles, "Emphasis On Individual Instruction In Oklahoma Program For Veterans", Agricultural Education Magazine, 22:162, January, 1950.

Whitemarsh, Fred M., "Agencies Cooperate in Instruction Of Veterans", Agricultural Education Magazine, 21:157, January, 1949.

Woods, Stewart A., "Effective Methods in Farm Veteran Training", Agricultural Education Magazine, 22:161, January, 1950.

Zinn, L. Glenn, "Veterans Like to Learn Why", Agricultural Education Magazine, 22:15, July, 1949.

PUBLICATIONS OF LEARNED ORGANIZATIONS

Annual Report of the State Board of Control For Vocational Education. 1951, (Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State College Press, 1951).

"Instructions Pertaining to the Negotiations of Contracts Between Veterans" Institutes, Boards of Education, and Veteran's Administration for Institutional-On-Farm Training and Development of Courses of Related Training for Farm Veterans", Bulletin No. 1017, Published by Eugene B. Elliott, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Lansing, Michigan, 1947.

"Report of the Cooperative Study of Institutional-On-Farm Training in the Central Region", Central Regional Conference On Research in Agricultural Education, The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., Dansville, Illinios, 1952.

"Education of Veterans", American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Ave., N.W. Washington 5, D.C., Research Bulletin No., 5, 1953, 95 pp.

"History and Development of Institutional-On-Farm Training in Arkansas", State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, Institutional-On-Farm Training Program, Little Rock,Arkansas and University of Arkansas College of Education, Department of Vocational Teacher Education, Fayetteville, Arkansas, 1950, 62 pp.

"Developing Instruction in Vocational Agriculture for Veterans On Farms in Indiana", Department of Public Instruction, State of Indiana, Bulletin No. 196, 1947, 37 pp.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Agan, R. J., "Swine Management Practices Used By Participants in the Institutional-On-Farm Training Program For Veterans", Unpublished Master's Thesis, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, 1950.

Donahoo, A. W., "Soil Management Practices by Participants in The Institutional On-Farm Training Program for Veterans", Unpublished Master's Thesis, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, 1950.

Elliott, Dean A., "Implications for Adult Education in Agriculture From Responses of Participants in the Veteran Farm Training Program in the Central Region,III Course Content", Unpublished Master's Thesis, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, 1951.

Wiegers, Jr., George W., "Some Outcomes of Participation of Veterans in Institutional On-Farm Training in Missouri," Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, 1950.

APPENDIX

A LIST OF THE LAND GRANT COLLEGES OF THE CENTRAL REGION

Illinios

Iowa

Indiana

Kentucky

Kansas

Michigan

Minnesota

Missouri

Nebraska

North Dakota

Ohio

South Dakota

Wisconsin

INSTITUTIONAL-ON-FARM TRAINING IN THE CENTRAL REGION

Completed forms to be sealed in presence of class and mailed first class or expressed prepaid to:
Department of Vocational Education
Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa

Part I

DIRECTIONS: Please read each question carefully. Pick out the correct answer, or answers, and place an X in the answer space following it. Do not skip any questions.

X 1. What is your present marital status?

Single ( ); Married, no children ( ); Married, with children ( ); Divorced or Separated ( ).

X 2. What is your present age?

25 years or under ( ); 26 to 30 years ( ); 31 to 35 years ( ); 36 years or older ( ).

X 3. How many months of eligibility and entitlement for training or education did you have when you enrolled in Institutional On-Farm Training?

15 months or less ( ); 16 to 24 months ( ); 25 to 36 months ( ); More than 36 months ( ).

4. How long have you been attending classes in Institutional On-Farm Training?

6 months or less ( ), 7 to 12 months ( );13 to 24 months ( ); 25 to 36 months ( ); More than 36 months ( ).

X 5. How many years did you spend on a farm after the age of 10, while in or out of school, and prior to the time you enrolled in Institutional On-Farm Training?

None ( ); 1 to 3 years ( ); 4 to 6 years ( ); 7 to 9 years ( ); 10 or more years ( ).

6. How many years did you spend as a full-time partner, sharecropper, renter, owner-operator, or manager, prior to the time you enrolled in Institutional On-Farm Training?

None ( ); 1 to 3 years ( ); 4 to 6 years ( ); 7 to 9 years ( ); 10 years or more ( ).

X 7. What is your present farming status? (Check One)

(a) Hired hand ( ) (c) Renter ( ) (e) Owner-Operator ( )

(b) Partner or sharecropper ( ) (d) Owner and Renter ( ) (f) Manager ( )

X 8. What was your farming status at time of enrollment in Institutional On-Farm Training?

(a) Hired hand ( ) (c) Renter ( ) (e) Owner-Operator ( )

(b) Partner or sharecropper ( ) (d) Owner and Renter ( ) (f) Manager ( )

X 9. What is the highest school grade you have completed? (Circle one)

Elementary	High School	College
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	1 2 3 4

10. How many years of Vocational Agriculture did you have in high school?

(a) None ( ); (b) 1 year ( ); (c) 2 years ( ); (d) 3 years ( ); (e) 4 years ( ).

11. Prior to enrolling in Institutional On-Farm Training how many years of Young Farmer and/or Adult Farmer training did you have? (At least 10 meetings per year)

None ( ); 1 to 3 years ( ); 4 to 6 years ( ); 7 to 9 years ( ); 10 or more years ( ).

Part II

This part of the information blank deals with the Institutional On-Farm Training program for farm veterans of World War II as provided by Public Law 377.

12. Of what value has the following type of instruction been to you?

	Much	Some	None
(a) Individual on farm	( )	( )	( )
(b) Small groups on farm	( )	( )	( )
(c) Classroom (off farm)	( )	( )	( )

13. Have you used new farm practices as a result of your training?

Much ( ) Some ( ) None ( )

14. Have the following been of value in your Institutional On-Farm Training?

	Much	Some	None
(a) Farm and home records	( )	( )	( )
(b) Notebooks	( )	( )	( )
(c) Annual farm and home plan	( )	( )	( )
(d) Textbooks, reference books, and bulletins	( )	( )	( )
(e) Field trips to experiment station and state colleges of agriculture and to county field days	( )	( )	( )
(f) Field trips to fairs, shows, and sales	( )	( )	( )
(g) Field trips to farms in the community	( )	( )	( )
(h) Field trips to commercial firms such as stockyards, fertilizer plants, demonstration farms, machinery companies	( )	( )	( )

15. Have you received training in the following?

	Much	Some	None
(a) Farm mechanics	( )	( )	( )
(b) Farm skills, such as castration, dehorning, laying out terraces	( )	( )	( )
(c) Soil conservation	( )	( )	( )
(d) Farm and home accounts	( )	( )	( )
(e) Farm planning and management	( )	( )	( )
(f) Livestock production practices	( )	( )	( )
(g) Crop production practices	( )	( )	( )
(h) Fruit and vegetable production practices	( )	( )	( )
(i) Family relationships	( )	( )	( )
(j) Marketing farm products	( )	( )	( )
(k) Farming programs	( )	( )	( )
(l) Leadership	( )	( )	( )
(m) Recreational activities	( )	( )	( )
(n) Community and cooperative activities	( )	( )	( )
(o) Farm health and safety	( )	( )	( )
(p) Farm preservation and storage	( )	( )	( )
(q) Food preservation and storage	( )	( )	( )

16. Have persons from the following agencies assisted in your training program?

	Much	Some	None
(a) Rural Electrification Administration	( )	( )	( )
(b) Farm Credit Administration (Production Credit Association and Federal Land Bank)	( )	( )	( )
(c) Extension Service	( )	( )	( )
(d) Farm and Home Administration	( )	( )	( )
(e) Soil Conservation Service	( )	( )	( )
(f) Forestry Service	( )	( )	( )
(g) Production and Marketing Administration	( )	( )	( )
(h) State College of Agriculture	( )	( )	( )
(i) State Board for Vocational Education, Vocational Agriculture Section	( )	( )	( )

17. Should the progress of the student be measured by the number of new and improved farm practices carried out on the farm? Yes ( ) No ( ) Uncertain ( )

18. Should Institutional On-Farm Training be limited to: (Check one)

(a) Those who live on the farm and are employed full time on the farm ( )
(b) Those who live on the farm and are employed part time on the farm ( )
(c) Those who live in town and are employed full time on the farm ( )
(d) Those who live in town and are employed part time on the farm ( )
(e) Those who live in town or country and spend no time on the farm ( )

19. Are you better established in farming as a result of the Institutional On-Farm Training Program? Yes ( ) No ( ) Uncertain ( )

20. Does the Institutional On-Farm Training program help the people in your community who are not enrolled in the program?

	Much	Some	None
(a) Improved farming practices	( )	( )	( )
(b) Better rural leadership	( )	( )	( )
(c) Improved social and cooperative activities	( )	( )	( )
(d) Better rural recreation	( )	( )	( )
(e) Increased use of all educational agencies	( )	( )	( )
(f) Soil conservation	( )	( )	( )

21. Could you have made just as much progress in getting started in farming if you had received your subsistence allowance without Institutional On-Farm Training? Yes ( ) No ( ) Uncertain ( )

22. To what extent would you like to continue to use the advice and counsel of your Institutional On-Farm Training instructor after completion of training? Much ( ) Some ( ) None ( )

23. Would you continue to take part in an educational farm program similar to the present one without subsistence pay? Yes ( ) No ( ) Uncertain ( )

24. Should there be another Institutional On-Farm Training program for those in the armed forces at present? Yes ( ) No ( ) Uncertain ( )

25. What should be the maximum length of a future program for veterans?
1 year ( ); 2 years ( ); 3 years ( ); 4 years ( ); More than 4 years ( )

26. Should qualified trainees in a future program receive subsistence pay as in the present plan?
Yes ( ) No ( ) Uncertain ( )

27. In case of another Institutional On-Farm Training program, who should be responsible for giving the instruction? (Check one)

(a) State college of agriculture. . . . . ( )
(b) The Veterans Administration. . . . . ( )
(c) Public schools with or without vocational agriculture. . . . . ( )
(d) The public schools through the Vocational Agriculture Department. ( )
(e) The Extension Service. . . . . ( )
(f) The Soil Conservation Service. . . . . ( )
(g) Other agencies, public or private. . . . . ( )

Part III

This part of the information blank is to get your opinion as to the nature of a future educational program for farmers after the Institutional On-Farm Training program ends. This future program would be planned for all farmers with fewer requirements and no subsistence pay. Your experience in Institutional On-Farm Training will be of value in planning a more permanent program.

28. Where should instruction be given? (Check one) On the farm ( ); In the classroom ( ); Both ( )

29. How much instruction should be offered per year on the farm? (Check one)

(a) None ( ) (d) 10 to 20 hours ( ) (g) 50 to 75 hours ( )
(b) Less than 5 hours ( ) (e) 20 to 35 hours ( ) (h) 75 to 100 hours ( )
(c) 5 to 10 hours ( ) (f) 35 to 50 hours ( ) (i) More than 100 hours ( )

30. How often would farmers want on-farm instruction? (A farm visit by the instructor.) (Check one)

(a) Weekly ( ) (c) Monthly ( ) (e) Once every 3 months ( )
(b) Once every two weeks ( ) (d) Once every other month ( ) (f) None at all ( )

31. How often should instruction be given at the school or central meeting place? (Check one)

(a) Weekly ( )
(b) Every two weeks ( )
(c) Monthly ( )
(d) Every two weeks in slack season of farm work and monthly in other months. . . . . ( )
(e) Every week in slack season of farm work and monthly in other months. . . . . ( )
(f) None at all ( )

32. What length should nonshop class sessions be? (Check one)

(a) One hour ( ) (c) Two hours ( ) (e) Four hours ( )
(b) One and one-half hours ( ) (d) Three hours ( )

33. For what length of time and when should farm mechanic classes be held? (Check one)

(a) Two hours during the day ( ) (d) Three hours at night ( )
(b) Two hours at night ( ) (e) Three hours during the day plus three hours at night ( )
(c) Three hours during the day ( ) (f) A full day ( )

34. Who should give the instruction? (Check one)

(a) The regular vocational agriculture instructor who devotes part of his time to high school teaching. . . . . ( )
(b) An additional vocational agriculture instructor who would give full time to adult farm education. . . . . ( )
(c) An additional vocational agriculture instructor so that more time is available for adult work by both instructors. . . . . ( )
(d) Special instructors - local farmers, machinery dealers, mechanics, etc. . . . . ( )

35. Should farmers in the class form their own organization to assume some responsibility in planning and conducting their educational program? Yes ( ) No ( ) Uncertain ( )

36. How should farmers be grouped into classes in schools having more than one class? (Check one)

Grouped according to:
- (a) age ( )
- (b) farming status ( )
- (c) farming interests ( )
- (d) previous training ( )
- (e) location of farm ( )
- (f) a combination of the above factors ( )

37. To what extent would the following groups profit from instruction in farming?

	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
(a) Young farmers (ages 16-25)	( )	( )	( )	( )
(b) Adult farmers (ages 26-35)	( )	( )	( )	( )
(c) Adult farmers (ages 36 or older)	( )	( )	( )	( )
(d) Rural non-farmers	( )	( )	( )	( )
(e) Farm women	( )	( )	( )	( )
(f) Part-time farmers	( )	( )	( )	( )

38. To what extent should the following persons or groups take part in planning the farm problems to be studied?

	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
(a) Instructors of the class	( )	( )	( )	( )
(b) Students of the class	( )	( )	( )	( )
(c) Local advisory committee	( )	( )	( )	( )
(d) School superintendent	( )	( )	( )	( )

39. To what extent should the following factors be considered in choosing farm problems and farm jobs to be taught?

	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
(a) Leading farm enterprises of the community	( )	( )	( )	( )
(b) Experiences, interests, and opinions of the majority of the farmers in the class	( )	( )	( )	( )
(c) Ability of the instructor	( )	( )	( )	( )
(d) Subject matter information available	( )	( )	( )	( )
(e) Information obtained from local surveys	( )	( )	( )	( )
(f) Suggestions of advisory committees	( )	( )	( )	( )
(g) Anticipated changes in farming	( )	( )	( )	( )

X 40. How much should the following units be stressed in the course of study?

	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
(a) Farm mechanics	( )	( )	( )	( )
(b) Farm skills, such as castration, dehorning, laying out terraces, etc	( )	( )	( )	( )
(c) Soil conservation	( )	( )	( )	( )
(d) Farm and home accounts	( )	( )	( )	( )
(e) Farm planning and management	( )	( )	( )	( )
(f) Livestock production practices	( )	( )	( )	( )
(g) Crop production practices	( )	( )	( )	( )
(h) Fruit and vegetable production practices	( )	( )	( )	( )
(i) Family relationships	( )	( )	( )	( )
(j) Marketing farm products	( )	( )	( )	( )
(k) Farming programs	( )	( )	( )	( )
(l) Leadership	( )	( )	( )	( )
(m) Recreational activities	( )	( )	( )	( )
(n) Community and cooperative activities	( )	( )	( )	( )
(o) Farm health and safety	( )	( )	( )	( )
(p) Farm and home improvement	( )	( )	( )	( )
(q) Food preservation and storage	( )	( )	( )	( )

41. How would you rate the following methods of classroom teaching?

	Good	Fair	Poor	Uncertain
(a) Lecture	( )	( )	( )	( )
(b) Question and answer	( )	( )	( )	( )
(c) Discussion by class members	( )	( )	( )	( )
(d) Demonstration	( )	( )	( )	( )
(e) Laboratory - actual performance by students	( )	( )	( )	( )
(f) Group or individual reports	( )	( )	( )	( )
(g) Debates	( )	( )	( )	( )

42. How much of the instructors' time should be devoted to individual, including small group, on-farm instruction? (Check one)

(a) None ( ) (c) 25% ( ) (e) 75% ( )
(b) 10% ( ) (d) 50% ( ) (f) 100% ( )

43. How much time should be set aside in each class session for discussion of emergency farm problems as they arise? (Check one)

(a) None ( ) (c) Not more than 20 minutes ( ) (e) No time limit ( )
(b) Not more than 10 minutes ( ) (d) Not more than 30 minutes ( )

44. From your experiences with the Institutional On-Farm Training program, of what importance are these items in improving classroom instruction?

	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
(a) Supervised study in the classroom	( )	( )	( )	( )
(b) Home study	( )	( )	( )	( )
(c) Secure qualified instructors	( )	( )	( )	( )
(d) Secure recent books, bulletins and farm magazines	( )	( )	( )	( )
(e) Give time to individual farm problems of students	( )	( )	( )	( )
(f) Use movies, slides and other visual aids	( )	( )	( )	( )
(g) Bring in specialists	( )	( )	( )	( )
(h) Connect problems to actual farming situations of students	( )	( )	( )	( )
(i) Use local information	( )	( )	( )	( )
(j) Farm visits by the instructor	( )	( )	( )	( )
(k) Use notebooks	( )	( )	( )	( )
(l) Set up goals for each practice	( )	( )	( )	( )
(m) Change teaching methods from time to time	( )	( )	( )	( )
(n) Have active participation by all students	( )	( )	( )	( )

45. Should the trainees know in advance if the instructor is coming to the trainees' farm for on-farm instruction? (Check one)

Always ( ) Usually ( ) Occasionally ( ) Never ( ) Uncertain ( )

46. What emphasis should be given the following in on-farm instruction?

	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
(a) Supervising record keeping and analysis	( )	( )	( )	( )
(b) Follow-up of class instruction	( )	( )	( )	( )
(c) Social visit	( )	( )	( )	( )
(d) Getting acquainted with farm situation	( )	( )	( )	( )
(e) Demonstrating practices	( )	( )	( )	( )
(f) Supervising home study	( )	( )	( )	( )

47. Of what value is the following reference material for adult classes?

	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
(a) Bulletins and circulars from your home state colleges	( )	( )	( )	( )
(b) Bulletins and circulars from other state colleges	( )	( )	( )	( )
(c) Bulletins and circulars from the U.S. Department of Agriculture	( )	( )	( )	( )
(d) Farm magazines and papers	( )	( )	( )	( )
(e) Farm texts or reference books	( )	( )	( )	( )

48. To what extent should the following be used in an effective instructional program?

	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
(a) Motion pictures	( )	( )	( )	( )
(b) Filmstrips and slides	( )	( )	( )	( )
(c) Photographs, pictures, charts, tables, and graphs	( )	( )	( )	( )
(d) Specimens (grains, insects) and models (livestock, buildings)	( )	( )	( )	( )
(e) Maps	( )	( )	( )	( )
(f) Blackboard	( )	( )	( )	( )
(g) Bulletin board	( )	( )	( )	( )
(h) Field trips	( )	( )	( )	( )
(i) Wire or tape recordings	( )	( )	( )	( )
(j) Demonstrations	( )	( )	( )	( )

49. Of what value are the following recreational activities in a complete yearly program?

	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
(a) Variety of games	( )	( )	( )	( )
(b) Dances	( )	( )	( )	( )
(c) Refreshments	( )	( )	( )	( )
(d) Occasional programs for families	( )	( )	( )	( )
(e) Basketball, baseball, and softball teams	( )	( )	( )	( )
(f) Trips and tours	( )	( )	( )	( )
(g) Fishing and camping trips	( )	( )	( )	( )
(h) Annual banquet	( )	( )	( )	( )

50. To what extent could the following agricultural agencies be of assistance to the educational program?

	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
(a) Rural Electrification Administration	( )	( )	( )	( )
(b) Farm Credit Administration (Production Credit Association and Federal Land Bank)	( )	( )	( )	( )
(c) Extension Service	( )	( )	( )	( )
(d) Farm and Home Administration	( )	( )	( )	( )
(e) Soil Conservation Service	( )	( )	( )	( )
(f) Forestry Service	( )	( )	( )	( )
(g) Production and Marketing Administration	( )	( )	( )	( )
(h) State College of Agriculture	( )	( )	( )	( )
(i) State Board for Vocational Education, Vocational Agriculture Section	( )	( )	( )	( )

51. To what extent would the following associations and organizations be helpful to the educational program?

	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
(a) Dairy herd improvement associations	( )	( )	( )	( )
(b) Other livestock and poultry improvement associations	( )	( )	( )	( )
(c) Artificial insemination associations	( )	( )	( )	( )
(d) Crop improvement associations	( )	( )	( )	( )
(e) Local and community cooperatives	( )	( )	( )	( )
(f) State farm cooperatives	( )	( )	( )	( )
(g) Farm management associations	( )	( )	( )	( )

52. Would farmers who have completed Institutional On-Farm Training need further farm training?
Yes ( ) No ( ) Uncertain ( )

53. Would farmers who have completed Vocational Agriculture in high school need further farm training?
Yes ( ) No ( ) Uncertain ( )

54. Would farmers who have attended a college of agriculture need further farm training?
Yes ( ) No ( ) Uncertain ( )

55. Which of the following methods do you consider the best for financing adult farmer programs? (Check one)
    (a) Federal funds. . . . . ( )
    (b) State funds. . . . . ( )
    (c) Federal and state funds. . . . . ( )
    (d) Local school funds. . . . . ( )
    (e) Federal and local funds. . . . . ( )
    (f) State and local funds. . . . . ( )
    (g) Federal, state, and local funds. . . . . ( )
    (h) Tuition charge for students taking the training. . . . . ( )
    (i) Tuition plus financial aid from federal, state, and local funds. . . . . ( )

56. Would you be willing to pay taxes for an adult education program in local schools?
    Yes ( ) No ( ) (Uncertain ( )

57. What annual fee would you be willing to pay for a course including on-farm instruction after the present course is completed?

(a) None	( )	(d) $10.00	( )	(g) $35.00	( )
(b) $1.00	( )	(e) $15.00	( )	(h) $50.00	( )
(c) $5.00	( )	(f) $25.00	( )	(i) More than $50.00	( )

58. Should government officials be urged to provide tax money for adult education programs in the public schools? Yes ( ) No ( ) Uncertain ( )

59. Should all farmers have an apportunity to enroll in courses in farming offered by the public schools?
    Yes ( ) No ( ) Uncertain ( )