



TECHNIQUES AND PROCEDURES IN
INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING
PROGRAMS IN MICHIGAN WITH
IMPLICATIONS FOR ADULT EDUCATION

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE
Lawrence Clare Pancost
1952



3 1293 01783 6440

This is to certify that the
thesis entitled
Techniques and Procedures in Institutional On-Farm
Training Programs in Michigan with
Implications for Adult Education

presented by

Lawrence Clare Pancost

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

M. A. degree in Education

L. M. Byrany
Major professor

Date November 21, 1952

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.
MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE

TECHNIQUES AND PROCEDURES IN INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING
PROGRAMS IN MICHIGAN WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR ADULT EDUCATION

By

Lawrence Clare Pancost

A THESIS

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

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Vocational Education

1952

1/152
3

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. H. M. Byram, his advisor, to Dr. H. P. Sweany who directed this study, and to the other members of his examination committee for their helpful suggestions and criticisms.

Most deeply and most directly the author is indebted to the teachers of veterans, and the teachers of vocational agriculture in Michigan who responded to Schedule B of the North Central Regional Study of the Institutional On-Farm Training Program.

L. C. P.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED	1
THE PROBLEM	2
DEFINITION OF TERMS USED.	3
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	5
ORGANIZATION OF CLASSES	6
PLANNING COURSE CONTENT	7
NEEDS FOR ADDITIONAL FARM TRAINING.	9
METHODS OF INSTRUCTION.	9
ADMINISTRATION.	11
TRAINING FOR VETERANS OF FUTURE WARS.	12
SUMMARY	13
III. METHOD OF INVESTIGATION	14
IV. OPINIONS OF TEACHERS RELATIVE TO ADULT EDUCATION BASED ON THEIR EXPERIENCES IN INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM.	16
EVALUATION OF THE PRESENT PROGRAM	17
TEACHERS OPINIONS AS TO THE NATURE OF FUTURE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR FARMERS.	19
CLASS ORGANIZATION.	20
PLANNING COURSE CONTENT	26
NEEDS FOR ADDITIONAL FARM TRAINING.	31
TEACHING METHODS.	31
SOCIAL ACTIVITIES OF ADULT CLASSES.	39

CHAPTER	PAGE
USE OF RESOURCES AND AGENCIES	39
ADMINISTRATION.	41
TRAINING FOR VETERANS OF FUTURE WARS.	45
V. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	47
EVALUATION OF THE PRESENT PROGRAM	48
OPINIONS OF TEACHERS AS TO THE NATURE OF FUTURE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR FARMERS.	49
SOME EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS	54
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES	56
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	57
APPENDIX	59

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLE	PAGE
I. The Amount of Use of Agricultural and Educational Agencies in the Institutional On-Farm Training Program by Teachers	18
II. The Number of Opinions of Teachers Regarding Farmers' Desires for Frequency of Instruction in the Classroom and on the Farm.	22
III. Teachers Believed to be Qualified as Instructors in the Institutional On-Farm Training Program	24
IV. Teachers' Opinions of the Benefits Which Various Groups Would Receive from Instruction in Farming.	25
V. Teachers' Opinions Regarding Bases Which Should be used for Grouping Personnel in Adult Education Classes. . . .	27
VI. Teachers' Opinions of the Amount that Units be Stressed in the Course of Study	29
VII. Ratings of Teachers of Different Methods of Classroom Teaching	32
VIII. Opinions of Teachers of the Relative Importance of Teaching Practices for Improving Classroom Instruction. . . .	34
IX. The Opinions of Teachers Regarding the Amount of Emphasis to be Given Activities of Teachers for Improving On-Farm Instruction	35

TABLE	PAGE
X. Teachers Rating of the Value of Different Reference Materials for Adult Classes in Agriculture	36
XI. The Opinions of Teachers Regarding the Extent of Use of Various Audio-Visual Aids in an Effective Instructional Program.	38
XII. Teachers' Opinions of Methods Considered Best for Financing Adult Farmer Programs.	42
XIII. Teachers' Opinions Regarding the Amount of Course Fee to Charge for Adult Education Programs.	44
XIV. Michigan Teachers Responding to Schedule B, Institutional On-Farm Training in the Central Region Questionnaire. . .	61
XV. Factors to be Considered in Choosing Farm Problems and Farm Jobs to be Taught	62
XVI. The Use that could be made from Agricultural and Educational Agencies in the Institutional On-Farm Training Program.	63
XVII. The Extent to which Agricultural Associations and Organizations could be Helpful in Educational Programs	64

FIGURE

I. Map of the Location of Classes Drawn from the Veterans Institute in Those Centers	60
II. Schedule B, Study of Institutional On-Farm Training in the Central Region	65

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

In the United States more than 300,000 veterans have been enrolled in the institutional on-farm training program under the direction of approximately 15,000 instructors. The veterans' training program is, no doubt, the most intensive program in agricultural education that has ever been offered for large numbers of adult farmers. The program involves a minimum of 200 hours of class instruction and 100 hours of on-farm instruction for each student annually. Each full-time instructor has only 20 veteran students. Experience gained in this program may have important implications for the improvement of the regular and adult farmer classes in vocational agriculture.

Three years ago, the research committee of the Agricultural Education Section of the American Vocational Association appointed a national committee to encourage research in the training program for farm veterans on a regional and state basis. Proposed studies were discussed at meetings of the research conference of the North Central Region in 1949 and 1950.

Plans for a proposed study of the institutional on-farm training program in the North Central Region were developed by a committee of representatives from five states at the regional research conference which was held at Purdue University in August, 1950. Dr. H. H. Remmers of Purdue served as consultant with respect to sampling and statistical procedures. The first draft of the schedules to be used in this study

was prepared by Mr. Robert L. Hayward, chairman of the committee. The schedules were further developed by committee members at Purdue.

In October, 1950, four of the five committee members, including Mr. Clarence E. Bundy of the Department of Vocational Education, met at Ames, Iowa to make more detailed plans for this study of the institutional on-farm training program. The schedules were completed in the fall of 1950. They were given to a selected group of veterans and teachers in Michigan in the Winter of 1951. This thesis deals with the opinions of teachers of veterans and of vocational agriculture in Michigan obtained through the use of the schedules designed for teachers.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It is the purpose of this study to determine and compare the opinions and recommendations of instructors of veterans and instructors of vocational agriculture concerning techniques and procedures employed in the institutional on-farm training program for veterans which may be effectively used in training young and adult farmers in Michigan. Problem areas to be investigated in this study are: 1. What methods of organization and administration of this type of program are considered best? 2. What teaching practices are recommended for adult classes? 3. What kinds of program planning are considered best for future classes? 4. What outside agencies are considered helpful? 5. Who are considered qualified to teach? and 6. What students are considered in need of instruction?

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

Institutional On-Farm Training Program. This program is authorized under Public Law 346, 78th Congress, and its amendment, Public Law 377, 80th Congress. This legislation gives in detail the basis for providing education and training, paying subsistence allowance for veterans enrolled in approved institutions for such courses. The institutional on-farm training program was designed specifically to provide education and training in agriculture for veterans who had entered into farming, and who wished to receive further education and training in this occupation.

Objectives of institutional on-farm training are to develop abilities as follows: to make a beginning and advance in farming, to produce farm commodities efficiently, to market farm products advantageously, to maintain a favorable environment, to do effective farm mechanics operations, and to improve the living conditions of the farm family. These abilities are needed by individuals to be well trained for proficiency in farming and in farm living.

Veteran. A serviceman honorably discharged from World War II. In this study, it will refer to those who are enrolled in the institutional on-farm training program.

Instructor of Vocational Agriculture. A teacher meeting qualifications for teaching agriculture in high schools receiving reimbursement

from Smith-Hughes and subsequent Federal Acts.

Qualified Instructor of Veterans. A teacher qualified to teach vocational agriculture, but one who teaches veterans only.

Specially Certificated Instructor of Veterans. A teacher not meeting qualifications for teaching vocational agriculture, but one who is given a special certificate to teach veterans.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

At the present time, no studies have been reported in Michigan of the opinions of teachers of the institutional on-farm training program or the teachers of Vocational Agriculture of the institutional on-farm training program. This program has been running since 1946 and should present some implications to be used in future adult educational programs.

The need for studies of the institutional on-farm training program was ably stated by Professor H. M. Hamlin¹ in an address delivered before the American Vocational Association in Atlantic City, New Jersey, December 9, 1949, when he said:

Because the entire veteran retraining program as projected under the G. I. Bill differs so radically from our traditional concepts and philosophy of public education, it has occasionally been referred to as the "great experiment in socialized education."

Institutional On-Farm Training is significant because it has marked a striking departure from our conventional methods of agricultural education. At its best, it has possibly been the best agricultural education ever provided. In it, we have, for the first time:

1. Provided for young farmers, the age-group most neglected in our previous programs and the one probably most deserving of our time and attention.
2. Maintained a year-round program of instruction and a program extending over several years for a group of adult farmers.
3. Made available adequate time for working with class members in class and on their own farms a set of high standards for teaching loads.

¹ H. M. Hamlin, "The National Study of the Institutional On-Farm Program for Veterans," Agriculture Education Magazine, :23;6, July, 1950.

4. Cooperated with other agencies of agricultural education in providing a type of education impossible to provide unless resources are pooled.
5. Introduced many new procedures and devices, including the use of farm and home plans as bases for instructional planning.
6. Developed a large staff of special teachers of adults.

Other states have completed studies of the institutional on-farm training program. A review of their findings will be made in the same order of items as is found in Chapter IV of this thesis.

ORGANIZATION OF CLASSES

Mr. J. H. Lintner,² Supervisor, Ohio compared four different types of instruction, namely: off-farm instruction taught by the veterans' teacher, off-farm instruction taught by other educational agencies, on-farm instruction by small groups, and on-farm individual instruction. It was found that instruction provided by the veterans' instructor in off-farm and individual on-farm instruction is of greatest assistance in helping veterans to become established in farming. The present totals of 200 hours on-farm and 100 hours of off-farm instruction were not excessive.

A special study based upon 330 responses received from random sampling of veteran trainees in Arkansas showed that:³ Although the

² J. H. Lintner, "Values of Farm Veteran Training", Agricultural Education Magazine, 22:158, January, 1950.

³ History and Development of Institutional On-Farm Training in Arkansas, Arkansas State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, Institutional On-Farm Training Program, Little Rock, and University of Arkansas, College of Education, Department of Vocational Teacher Education, Fayetteville, December, 1950, p. 53.

veterans generally regarded both the organized classroom instruction and the individual on-farm training as highly valuable, a small majority thought that the off-farm classroom instruction was more helpful than the individual on-farm training. A small majority of the veteran trainees said that the individual visits of the instructors on their farms were more valuable than the field demonstrations and field practices conducted with small groups.

The Central Region Study of the institutional on-farm training program made by Mr. James D. Hamilton⁴ found that veterans rated classroom instruction of the most value and, with the exception of one state, individual on-farm instruction was rated higher than small group on-farm instruction. More emphasis might be given to the improvement of individual on-farm instruction. This suggestion is also applicable to small group on-farm instruction since more efficient use of instructor time may result from this type of instruction.

PLANNING COURSE CONTENT

Mr. D. W. Martens⁵ found that the opinion of most of the instructors sampled in the North Central Region was that they and the trainees

⁴ James D. Hamilton, "Implications for Adult Education from Responses of Participants in the Veteran Farm Training Program in the Central Region, III." Thesis, M. S. 1951, Iowa State College, Ames.

⁵ D. W. Martens, "A Summary of Procedures Used in Institutional On-Farm Training Programs from Responses of Instructors of Veterans Classes in the Central Region." (Original not seen) Thesis, M. S. 1952, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

were better able to select problems than advisory boards as then organized. Important items in the course of study were: farm planning and management, livestock practices, soil conservation, and farm and home accounts.

On the basis of mean scores obtained in typical states, Mr. D. A. Elliott⁶ reported the ranking of the 17 units of study by veteran students in decreasing order of emphasis were as follows: soil conservation, livestock production practices, crop production practices, farm planning and management, farm mechanics, farm skills, marketing farm products, farm and home accounts, farm and home improvement, farm health and safety, farming programs, food preservation and storage, community and cooperative activities, leadership, fruit and vegetable production practices, family relationships, and recreational activities.

Melvin W. Cooper⁷ found that important procedures followed by teachers of veterans in Wisconsin were: to encourage trainees to establish general farming goals and objectives, to employ democratic methods to determine the content of courses for the group instruction, to adapt the class schedule to the farming program of the trainees, to obtain the cooperation of other agencies in arranging for group instruction, and to

⁶ Dean Alexander Elliott, "Implications for Adult Education in Agriculture from Responses of Participants in the Veterans Farm Training Program in the Central Region, II." (Original not seen) Thesis, M. S. 1951, Iowa State College, Ames.

⁷ Melvin W. Cooper, "Techniques and Procedures Employed in the Training of Veterans Enrolled in the Institutional On-The-Farm Training Program," Agricultural Education Magazine, 24:103, November, 1951

check the progress of the trainees by making an annual analysis of the farm business and by keeping a record of approved farming practices followed by trainees.

NEEDS FOR ADDITIONAL FARM TRAINING

Mr. Clarence L. Rhodes⁸ reported that even though more than 70 per cent of the veterans sampled in each state were of adult-farmer age, they indicated that young farmers would benefit most from farming instruction. Younger adult farmers would benefit more than farmers 36 years old and older. Farm women would benefit more than part-time farmers, and rural non-farmers would benefit the least from instruction in farming. Farmers who have completed vocational agriculture in high school need further training the least. Some type of a farm training program should be provided to meet the needs of veterans after they have completed their present programs. The longer the veterans have been in the training program, the greater the need seen for further training of farm groups of various ages and training.

METHODS OF INSTRUCTION

James D. Hamilton⁹ found that the veterans in each of the 11 states of the North Central Region study preferred the demonstration and

⁸ Clarence L. Rhodes, "Implications for Adult Education from Responses of the Participants in the Veterans Training Program in the Central Region, IV," Thesis, M. S., 1952, Iowa State College, Ames.

⁹ Hamilton, op. cit.

discussion methods of classroom teaching. Laboratory work involving actual performance by students, and question-answer methods received almost equal ratings. The lecture method rated below these first four methods. Group or individual reports and debates were rated lowest.

Bulletins and circulars from the home state college were the preferred source of reference materials. Bulletins and circulars from the United States Department of Agriculture were rated second, followed by farm texts or reference books. Veterans in two states rated farm magazines and papers fairly high.

J. H. Lintner¹⁰ in his study found that discussion and demonstration methods of teaching were of greatest value in teaching veterans. The teacher's biggest problem was to make the instruction fit the needs of a rather divergent group in age, educational background, marital status, and farming opportunity.

Marshall G. Warren¹¹ reported on the audio-visual materials and methods and they are listed in rank according to the extent to which the veterans indicated that they should be used in an effective instructional program: (1) demonstrations; (2) field trips; (3) motion pictures; (4) specimens and models; (5) filmstrips and slides; (6) blackboards;

¹⁰ Lintner, op. cit.

¹¹ Marshall G. Warren, "Implications for Adult Education in Agriculture from Responses of Participants in the Veterans Farm Training Program in the Central Region, VII," (Original not seen) Thesis, M. S. 1952, Iowa State College, Ames.

(7) photographs, pictures, charts, tables, and graphs; (8) bulletin boards; (9) maps; (10) wire or tape recordings. The results of this study suggest that the audio-visual materials and methods employed in the institutional on-farm training program have been of considerable value to the veterans.

J. H. Lintner¹² in Ohio reported that the Agricultural Extension Service and the Soil Conservation Service, ranked highest in the veterans' opinions in their ability to provide educational opportunities to farmers. The agencies with only a secondary educational objective; i.e., federal lending agencies, rank lowest. Teachers of vocational agriculture were ranked in an intermediate position. These veterans believe existing educational opportunities may be improved by (a) providing for more "service" for farmers, (b) promoting greater coordination between agencies, (c) increasing the number of educational trips, and (d) devoting more time to the consideration of individual rather than group problems.

ADMINISTRATION

In the Central Region study of the institutional on-farm training program made by Willard Anderson,¹³ the responses of veterans showed

¹² J. H. Lintner, "A Study of the Effectiveness of the Institutional On-Farm Training Program in Ohio with Implications for Future Programs in Adult Education," (Original not seen) Thesis, Ph. D., 1952, Ohio State University, Columbus.

¹³ Willard Raymond Anderson, "Implications for Adult Education in Agriculture from Responses of Participants in the Veterans Farm Training Program in the Central Region, I," Thesis, M. S., 1952, Iowa State College, Ames.

that public schools, through the department of vocational agriculture, should be responsible for instruction in a future institutional on-farm training program. Other agencies that ranked high were the Veterans Administration and the state college of agriculture.

The findings showed that federal funds would be the best single source of financial aid for adult education for farmers. A majority of the veterans preferred a combination of federal funds with other funds; either state, local, or tuition. More than 50 per cent of the veterans in each state indicated they would be willing to pay taxes for adult education programs in local schools.

The findings of the study showed considerable variance of opinions among veterans in the 11 states in regard to the problems of administration, an indication, perhaps, that it is necessary to adapt the implications of the findings to conditions within each state.

TRAINING FOR VETERANS OF FUTURE WARS

W. R. Anderson¹⁴ also reported that more than 80 per cent of the veterans interviewed in each of the 11 states were of the opinion that the training they received contributed more than the subsistence payments toward their making progress in getting started in farming. More than 50 per cent of these veterans indicated that they would continue to take part in an educational farm program similar to the present one without subsistence pay if such a program were offered.

¹⁴ Anderson, op. cit.

The findings showed that the majority of veterans preferred fewer than 100 hours of on-farm training per year for future adult farmer classes. More than 50 per cent of the veterans in six states preferred more than 50 hours of on-farm instruction. Fewer than 50 per cent of the veterans recommended on-farm instruction at one week or two week intervals. A majority of veterans in all states, except Missouri, recommended weekly meetings, and monthly meetings during busy seasons for classroom instruction.

The majority of veterans recommended that vocational agriculture instructors should give the instruction. Special instructors were preferred by a large number of veterans.

SUMMARY

Many of the studies reported here used the schedules developed for the regional study of the institutional on-farm training program. However, only one study using the schedules of the regional study dealt with the opinions of teachers.

In addition, Lintner of Ohio and Cooper of Wisconsin reported opinions of teachers regarding certain practices used in the institutional on-farm training program. Lintner found teachers devoting full time to adult classes seemed best. Cooper reported that teacher-pupil planning of the course of instruction, and evaluation of the progress of veterans based on goals and objectives cooperatively established were useful practices.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

Michigan cooperated with ten other states in the North Central Region in a study of implications for adult education of the institutional on-farm training program for veterans. This investigation was confined to 11 of the 13 states within the central region--Iowa, Minnesota, Kentucky, Indiana, Missouri, Nebraska, Wisconsin, North Dakota, Michigan, Ohio, and Kansas.

Data were collected by means of Schedule A from veterans and Schedule B from instructors of veterans and instructors of vocational agriculture. Schedules were constructed in cooperation with supervisors and teacher trainers in the various states of the central region.

Each state chairman of this research project compiled and submitted a list of full-time instructors of veterans listed by supervisory or type of farming area. Classes must have been in operation at least six months to be included. This list was sent to Iowa State College, where, using a table of random numbers, 50 classes for veterans in Michigan were selected as shown on Figure I and Table XIV in the Appendix. This was a geographic sampling, including the following: southeastern Michigan, seven classes; southwestern Michigan, eight classes; northern Michigan and Upper Peninsula, twenty-three classes; and northwestern Michigan, twelve classes.

A letter was sent to the teachers of veterans selected asking their cooperation in this study, and urging them to attend a meeting

on February 13, 1951, at Michigan State College for the teachers drawn in the Michigan sample. This meeting was held during a week-long conference for teachers of veterans on the campus. At this meeting, 31 teachers of veterans filled out the form for teachers, Schedule B. They also received instructions for securing data on Schedule A from their farm-veteran students in a class session during the following week. Those teachers selected, but not attending the meeting, were contacted by teacher trainers or supervisors. In schools which had a teacher of vocational agriculture who had some active part in this educational program, such teachers were asked to fill out Schedule B.

The information was recorded on data sheets before sending them to Iowa State College. On March 15 when these schedules were completed, there were 6,246 veterans in training in Michigan. From teachers associated with the selected classes, 73 B schedules were returned. At Iowa State College, the data were recorded on sheets and later transferred to IBM cards for processing.

This thesis is a report of the responses on Schedule B of the random sample of Michigan instructors in the institutional on-farm training program, and instructors of vocational agriculture in those schools where there was a vocational agriculture department. Schedule A which was used in obtaining opinions from the veterans enrolled in the classes of the instructors of veterans mentioned above is being reported on in other studies.

CHAPTER IV

OPINIONS OF TEACHERS RELATIVE TO ADULT EDUCATION BASED ON THEIR EXPERIENCES IN INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM

It was felt that a study of the institutional on-farm training program should be made before the program is completed if any benefits are to be derived from the experiences. A better evaluation would be a long-time study of the success of veterans in farming. However, in order to evaluate the present program now, one must rely on limited evidence. As of now, how good has this program been? The opinions of teachers participating in the program are some of the best evidence of the program at this time. In this chapter, the opinions of the teachers will be presented and discussed.

The teachers were divided into three groups in this study to compare their opinions of the different phases of institutional on-farm training. The first group was the qualified instructors of vocational agriculture teaching only veterans; the second group was the specially certificated instructors for classes of veterans; and the third group was the instructors of vocational agriculture departments in the same school as the Veterans' Institute. There were 22 qualified instructors of vocational agriculture teaching veterans, 28 specially certificated instructors for classes of veterans, and 23 instructors of vocational agriculture in this Michigan study. If the three groups differed greatly in their opinions on a question, the differences were reported, but if the groups were in agreement, only the one opinion was reported.

I. EVALUATION OF THE PRESENT PROGRAM

In the survey blank certain questions were raised concerning the quality of the institutional on-farm training program. Procedures different from other adult farmer educational programs were used. Advisory committees were required by law. Should they be required in future years?

Many agricultural and educational agencies outside the school were used in the institutional on-farm training program. How valuable were these agencies in the present program?

Advisory committees. Under Public Law 346, before enrollment of veterans, the prospective veteran trainee needs approval for enrollment and continuance in the program by the local advisory committee.¹⁵ This committee has members selected from farmers in the community, members of the county agricultural council, and businessmen. These committee members are people who know the veteran, the farm, and the community and can help appraise the training program and assist in determining whether suitable progress is being made by the veterans.

In this study, 21 per cent of the teachers received no help from advisory committees. Advisory committees were of much help to 18 per cent of the teachers reporting. The remaining teachers received some help from these advisory committees.

¹⁵ Institutional On-Farm Training for Veterans, Office of Vocational Education, Department of Public Instruction, Bulletin No. 1019, Lansing, Michigan, 1949. p. 11.

If a committee was required for approving the veterans' training program, why were they not used more? The high percentage of teachers replying some use, brings up the question--are teachers using them to full advantage?

Agricultural and Educational Agencies. The various agencies were used in varying amounts by the different teachers. The composite ratings of the opinions of teachers relative to the amount of use of these various groups of agricultural and educational agencies are shown in Table I.

TABLE I

THE AMOUNT OF USE OF AGRICULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES IN
THE INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM BY TEACHERS

Agencies	No Oppor-			
	Much	Some	None	tunity
Extension Service	46	24	0	0
Michigan State College	43	23	2	1
Soil Conservation Service	35	28	2	4
State Board for Vocational Education-- Vocational Agriculture Section	13	54	9	2
Farm and Home Administration	10	47	10	1
Farm Credit Administration (Production Credit Association and Federal Land Bank)	5	51	7	3
Production and Marketing Administration	8	41	15	2
Forestry Service	8	41	15	6
Rural Electrification Administration	0	34	11	19

It can be observed that the Extension Service, Michigan State College, and the Soil Conservation Service were used very much. These agencies have extensive staffs and could help meet the educational needs of the veterans. The Farm and Home Administration, the State Board for Vocational Education--Vocational Agriculture Section, the Production and Marketing Administration, Forestry Service, the Farm Credit Administration, and the Rural Electrification Administration were used some by the teachers. In various parts of the state, some of these last agencies were not available and in some cases were not used although they were available.

Types of instruction. All groups of teachers felt that individual on-farm instruction was of much value to the trainees. Classroom, off-farm instruction was considered by the teachers to be almost as valuable as on-farm instruction. Instruction of small groups on the farm was of some value to the trainees.

II. TEACHERS OPINIONS AS TO THE NATURE OF FUTURE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR FARMERS

There has been considerable development in the adult education program in agriculture for farmers. However, only a small portion of the farmers are being reached and new programs of adult education for the farmers will need to be planned to meet the probable demand of farmers. Departments of vocational agriculture probably will be expected to provide adult education for more farmers. The experiences of teachers in the institutional on-farm training program will be of value in planning training programs for different types of farmers. The opinions of teachers

regarding practices in planning adult education programs will be more sound if obtained while this experience with the institutional on-farm training program is fresh in their minds. With this in mind, questions pertaining to class organization, educational needs of farmers, and teaching methods were raised.

CLASS ORGANIZATION

A number of implications concerning class organization for future programs in agricultural education for adults may be drawn from this study. The on-farm instruction in the institutional on-farm training program was allowed 100 hours. This is the most time ever allowed an adult farmer program; how successful was it?

In present adult farmer programs, the classes generally meet a few weeks in the winter. The institutional on-farm training program met throughout the year.

What should be the practices used in organization of classes? Where should classes meet, and for how long? How often should classes meet? Who should teach the classes? What students should receive the instruction?

Place to offer instruction. The opinion of 96 per cent of all teachers reporting in this study was that instruction for farmers should be given in both the classroom and on the farm. In the future, there should be more on-farm instruction as it is felt to be a basic place where learning can take place. Two of the teachers wanted all of the

instruction to take place on the farm. If more on-farm teaching is used in future programs, the instructional cost probably will be higher than present adult classes, because individual instruction reduces the number of students one teacher can handle.

Hours of on-farm instruction. Opinions regarding hours of on-farm instruction varied considerable between the three groups of teachers. Practically all teachers wanted fewer hours than the present program for veterans. The modal time for each group was 35 to 50 hours. A greater portion of the regular teachers favored less than 50 hours of on-farm instruction. The greater number of teachers of veterans wanted more hours, mostly between 50 and 100 hours. The present program of 100 hours of instruction on the farm is more than adequate according to these replies.

Frequency of on-farm instruction. The opinions of teachers regarding the frequency of on-farm instruction differed greatly as shown in Table II. The teachers split about evenly between visiting every two weeks or monthly. This would mean that at least 12 visits should be made to each student in adult programs per year. The average based on data would be approximately 22 visits per year on the farm. It can be seen that the amount of on-farm instruction wanted stresses the importance placed upon on-farm instruction by all groups of agricultural teachers.

Notice of on-farm visits. That an advance notice of an on-farm visit by the instructor should usually be given is the opinion of a large majority of the teachers. Some of the instructors wanted advance notices given before every visit.

TABLE II

THE NUMBER OF OPINIONS OF TEACHERS REGARDING FARMERS' DESIRES FOR FREQUENCY OF INSTRUCTION IN THE CLASSROOM AND ON THE FARM

Frequency	On-Farm Instruction	Classroom Instruction
Weekly	8	22
Biweekly	30	6
Monthly	29	4
Biweekly in slack season-- otherwise monthly	<u>a</u>	11
Weekly in slack season-- otherwise monthly	<u>a</u>	30
Bimonthly	4	<u>a</u>
Every three months	1	<u>a</u>

a Data not solicited

Frequency of class instruction. It was the opinion of nearly one-half of the teachers that class instruction at the school or central meeting place should be given every week in slack season, and monthly the rest of the time. Nearly one-third of the teachers thought that

instruction should be weekly throughout the year as shown in Table II. From this response of the teachers, there was a tendency to favor a reduction in the number of classes held during the busy season. More than one-half of the teachers favored monthly meetings when farmers are busy. It seems logical to provide instruction more often in slack season when the pressure of farm work is off.

Length of non-shop class sessions. The length of non-shop class sessions should be two hours. Some of the qualified instructors of veterans wanted classes three hours long. Classes four hours in length were considered too long. A well organized lesson plan put over quickly is the best policy.

Length of mechanics shop class sessions. The class sessions dealing with farm mechanics should be three hours in length in the opinion of most of the teachers. The most favorable time to have shop was thought to be at night. About 20 per cent of the teachers of veterans thought a full-day class session was best. It will be noted that shop classes should be longer than non-shop classes.

Instructors. Instruction given by additional vocational agriculture instructors who would give full time to adult education was thought to be the best arrangement for assignment of teachers as shown in Table III. Most of the remaining teachers favored vocational agriculture instructors who divided their time between the day-school program and the adult program. Special instructors such as local farmers, machin-

ery dealers, mechanics, etc. were recommended by only a very few teachers; possibly indicating that they are not as successful teachers as has been believed. Not any of the teachers of veterans wanted the regular vocational agriculture teacher to devote part of his time to high school teaching and part to teaching veterans.

TABLE III

TEACHERS BELIEVED TO BE QUALIFIED AS INSTRUCTORS IN THE
INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM

Suggested Instructors	Opinions of Regular Agri- cultural Teachers	Opinions of Qualified Veterans' Instructors	Opinions of Specially cert- ified Veterans' Instructors
The regular vocational agriculture teacher who devotes part of his time to high school teaching	4	0	0
An additional vocational agriculture instructor who would give full time to adult farm education	8	11	16
An additional instructor of vocational agriculture so that more time is available for adult work by both instructors	10	8	5
Special instructors--local farmers, machinery dealers, mechanics, etc.	1	3	7

Use of instructors' time. In their responses, the instructors felt that between 25 and 50 per cent of the instructors' time should be devoted to individual and small group instruction on the farm. However, the specially certified veterans' instructors favored at least 50 per cent of the time be devoted to the individual. It would seem that a suitable agricultural education program should allow approximately 50 per cent of the time for individual instruction on the farm.

Class membership. In the opinions of all three groups of teachers the greatest emphasis in the adult education program should be with the young farmers, and young adult farmers between the ages of 26 and 35, as shown in Table IV. Farm women and older adult farmers would profit from some instruction and part-time farmers to a lesser extent. Teachers believe that rural non-farmers would probably receive the least benefit from instruction in farming.

TABLE IV
TEACHERS' OPINIONS OF THE BENEFITS WHICH VARIOUS GROUPS
WOULD RECEIVE FROM INSTRUCTION IN FARMING

Groups	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
Young farmers (ages 16-26)	55	16	0	1
Adult farmers (ages 26-35)	54	18	0	0
Adult farmers (ages 36 or older)	24	45	1	3
Farm women	23	44	0	4
Part-time farmers	19	45	4	5
Rural non-farmers	7	32	15	18

This table definitely shows that the younger age groups of farmers will probably profit most from instruction in vocational agriculture as indicated by the opinions of the teachers. Future classes should be organized to meet the needs of these groups especially.

PLANNING COURSE CONTENT

In most class situations, a teacher of adults is a leader of the discussion and a help to finding sources of information. There are various ways of developing courses in adult agricultural education. The course may be developed around one enterprise or cut across several enterprises as in soil conservation. In planning courses, the procedures need to provide for individual participation and activity, have individual instruction, and be democratic in procedure.

In this section, consideration will be given to the teachers' responses on how much class participation should be used in planning or conducting the program. How should class groupings be made? What should be included in a course of study?

Program Planning. In program planning, 85 per cent of all teachers favored teacher-student organizing, planning, and conducting the educational program. The students should have an important part in planning the program. The teachers rated teachers in general of less importance than the students in planning the program. The advisory committee was used only some in planning the educational program. The school superintendent was used very little, and 20 per cent of the

teachers thought he should have no part at all. This was probably because he would have little specific help for planning the details for educational programs.

TABLE V
TEACHERS' OPINIONS REGARDING BASES WHICH SHOULD BE
USED FOR GROUPING PERSONNEL IN ADULT EDUCATION CLASSES

Bases	Regular Agricultural Teachers	Qualified Veterans' Instructors	Specially Certificated Veterans' Instructors
Age	0	1	1
Farming status	0	0	0
Farming interests	10	5	7
Previous training	0	0	2
Location of farm	0	0	0
A combination of the above factors	13	15	18

Grouping farmers in classes. The majority of all the teachers, as shown in Table V, felt that in schools having more than one class, the farmers should be grouped into classes by a combination of factors. The most important factor was farming interests. Other factors that should be considered are age and previous training.

Choosing farm problems and jobs. In choosing farm problems and farm jobs to be taught, the most important factor was what are the

leading farm enterprises of the community as shown in Table XV in the Appendix. Closely following this in importance was the experiences, interests, and opinions of the majority of the farmers in the class.

Other factors to be considered relatively unimportant in choosing content of the instructional program are: ability of the instructor, information obtained from local surveys, subject matter information available, suggestions of advisory committees, and anticipated changes in farming. These are listed in decreasing order of importance, but were grouped closely. In other words, these factors are of about the same importance.

Course of study. A systematic plan of instruction is needed. The several parts of the course of study may be planned as a development of a comprehensive plan for the whole farm. This suggests the developing of a series of units, each of which is designed to develop approved practices for the purpose of developing improvements of the farm and farm home. Each unit, which may be either a farm enterprise or a subject area, should be divided into those specific problems or jobs important to the needs of veterans.

In the opinion of teachers units that should be stressed much in the course of study were: farm planning and management, farm and home accounts, soil conservation, livestock production practices, crop production practices, farm mechanics, and farm skills--castration, dehorning, laying out terraces, etc. as shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI
TEACHERS' OPINIONS OF THE AMOUNT THAT
UNITS BE STRESSED IN THE COURSE OF
STUDY

Unit	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
Farm planning and management	61	12	0	0
Farm and home accounts	56	17	0	0
Soil conservation	55	18	0	0
Livestock production practices	53	20	0	0
Crop production practices	53	20	0	0
Farm Mechanics	48	25	0	0
Farm skills--castration, dehorning, laying out terraces, etc.	44	30	0	0
Marketing farm products	38	35	0	0
Farm and home improvement	35	38	0	0
Farm health and safety	34	39	0	0
Farming programs	32	38	1	3
Family relationships	28	42	0	1
Community and cooperative activities	26	45	0	2
Food preservation and storage	22	44	1	6
Leadership	19	51	1	3
Fruit and vegetable production practices	16	49	1	6
Recreational activities	5	60	4	4

These units, except farm mechanics and farm skills, might be elements of farm planning and management and thus could be closely tied together in a course of study. Farm mechanics and farm skills are doing types of instruction, and help give a variety of activities to the course of study.

Units to be stressed some in the course of study in the opinion of the teachers were: marketing farm products, farm and home improvements, farm health and safety, farming programs, family relationships, community and cooperative activities, food preservation and storage, leadership, fruit and vegetable production practices, and recreational activities.

These units do not deal with production, and probably do not challenge the interest of the students like the units to be stressed much. Some of the last units are somewhat personal in nature and are, perhaps, hard to handle on a class basis.

The course of study unit, recreational activities, had only five teachers indicate it as of much value. Four teachers indicated recreational activities of no value, and four teachers were uncertain. However, 60 responses checked it as having some value in the course of study and such activities should not be entirely omitted.

Class time for emergency farm problems. In the class session, no time limit for discussion of emergency farm problems was indicated by the instructors as the best practice. Those who would put a time limit on discussion of farm emergency problems mostly favored 30 minutes.

It is important to spend ample time on these emergency problems as they arise, and help the students develop satisfactory answers.

NEEDS FOR ADDITIONAL FARM TRAINING

Who needs adult education? To what extent does it vary with previous training? Do farmers who have completed institutional on-farm training, high school vocational agriculture, or college agricultural training need further farm training? These are important questions to have answered so that future agricultural training programs will be adequate.

Class membership. Of the teachers' responses, 80 per cent thought farmers who had completed institutional on-farm training needed further farm training. They also thought that 95 per cent of the vocational agriculture high school students needed further instruction. Of farmers who have attended a college of agriculture, 65 per cent of the teachers thought they needed more training.

From these responses, the teachers indicated that they firmly believe that education is a continuing process. There is a need for additional farm training programs for all farmers, regardless of previous training.

TEACHING METHODS

Many aids were used in the institutional on-farm training program. Of what importance were these aids in improving the instructional program?

Classroom teaching methods. Methods to use in classroom teaching rated good by the teachers were: demonstrations, discussion by class members, laboratory--actual performance by students, and question and answer as shown in Table VII. Group or individual reports, debates, and lectures were rated fair in value. This shows that teachers think that students want more activity in the instructional program, rather than dry lectures by the instructors or sessions where individuals do most of the talking.

TABLE VII
RATINGS OF TEACHERS OF DIFFERENT METHODS OF CLASSROOM TEACHING

Method	Good	Fair	Poor	Uncertain
Demonstration	72	11	0	0
Discussion by class members	62	9	2	0
Laboratory--actual performance by students	57	15	0	0
Question and answer	34	33	6	0
Group or individual reports	26	36	4	5
Debates	17	33	16	7
Lecture	7	44	21	1

Teaching practices used in classroom instruction. The opinions of all three groups of teachers concerning relative importance of teaching practices were nearly alike and reported as one opinion. In the opinion of teachers practices of much importance for improving the classroom instruction were: secure qualified instructors; the practice of connecting problems to actual farming situations of the students; farm visits by the instructor; active participation by all students; bring in specialists; securing recent books, bulletins, and farm magazines; giving time to individual farm problems of the students; using local information; use of movies, slides, and other visual aid material; and changing teaching methods from time to time.

Setting up goals for each practice, supervised study in the classroom, use of notebooks, and home study were of some importance as teaching practices as shown in Table VIII. Teachers probably do not think that these types of activities appeal to adults in classes.

Supervised study in the classroom and home study received many responses in the none column. Do they need more emphasis or are they of questionable use?

TABLE VIII

OPINIONS OF TEACHERS OF THE
RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING PRACTICES
FOR IMPROVING CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION

Practices	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
Secure qualified instructors	64	9	0	0
Connect problems to actual farming situations of students	61	11	0	1
Farm visits by the instructor	57	14	1	1
Have active participation by <u>all</u> students	56	15	1	1
Bring in specialists	48	22	0	3
Secure recent books, bulletins, and farm magazines	47	24	1	1
Give time to individual farm problems of students	46	24	3	0
Use local information	44	24	3	2
Use movies, slides, & other visual aids	38	34	1	0
Change teaching methods from time to time	36	35	1	0
Set up goals for each practice	25	34	7	6
Supervised study in the classroom	12	43	11	6
Use notebooks	11	41	8	6
Home study	6	42	17	9

Improvement of on-farm instruction. Activities to be given much emphasis for improving on-farm instruction in the opinion of the teachers, as shown in Table IX, were: getting acquainted with the farm situation, supervising record keeping and analysis, following up of class instruction, and demonstrating practices or skills.

TABLE IX

THE OPINIONS OF TEACHERS REGARDING THE AMOUNT OF EMPHASIS TO BE GIVEN ACTIVITIES OF TEACHERS FOR IMPROVING ON-FARM INSTRUCTION

Activities	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
Getting acquainted with farm situation	57	16	0	0
Supervising record keeping and analysis	51	22	0	0
Following up of class instruction	51	20	0	2
Demonstrating practices	41	31	0	1
Supervising home study--regular agriculture teachers	4	46	17	6
Making a social visit	1	45	15	12

From the opinions of teachers regarding the amount of emphasis to be given activities of teachers for improving on-farm instruction, it can be seen that: the individual can be better understood when his home farm is known by the teacher, the teacher should spend time on records and their analysis of the farm business, and the teacher should follow up class instruction and see that it is put into practice when possible.

It is easier to demonstrate practices than to talk about or describe them to a class. The student can learn more readily the skill through a demonstration. It is doubtful if very many students try out a new practice that is only described to them.

Of some value were activities such as supervising home study by the regular agriculture teachers, or making a social visit. The latter provides little on-farm instruction.

Reference materials for adult classes. Bulletins and circulars from Michigan State College were rated far superior to any other type of reference for adult classes as shown in Table X. These materials, developed in our state, give farmers information that is adapted to their needs. These bulletins and circulars cover particular subjects on Michigan conditions making them valuable class references.

TABLE X

TEACHERS' RATING OF THE VALUE OF DIFFERENT REFERENCE
MATERIALS FOR ADULT CLASSES IN AGRICULTURE

Reference Material	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
Bulletins and circulars from your home state college	60	13	0	0
Farm magazines and papers	39	29	1	2
Farm texts or reference books	37	34	1	1
Bulletins and circulars from the United States Department of Agriculture	22	45	3	3
Bulletins and circulars from other state colleges	9	53	8	3

Farm magazines and papers and farm texts or reference books have also much value as reference material. Their use is probably limited to the material presented fitting the farming situations of adult class members.

Bulletins and circulars from the United States Department of Agriculture and bulletins and circulars from other state colleges were of some value. They are too general and try to cover the whole United States in one bulletin.

Audio-visual aids for classroom instruction. According to the opinions of teachers audio-visual aids of much use in an effective instructional program were: blackboards, field trips, and specimens (grain, insects, and models--livestock, buildings, etc.). This is shown in Table XI. These aids help the teacher show, as well as tell, the students about abilities that can be used on his home farm. Student interest is higher where action in class work is provided.

Demonstrations; photographs, pictures, charts, tables, graphs, film strips, and slides; motion pictures; bulletin boards; maps; and wire or tape recordings were considered of some use in an effective instructional program.

TABLE XI

THE OPINIONS OF TEACHERS REGARDING THE EXTENT OF USE OF VARIOUS
AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS IN AN EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Teaching Aids	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
Blackboard	48	25	0	0
Field trips	40	32	0	1
Specimens (grain, insects) and models (livestock, buildings, etc.)	36	34	0	3
Demonstrations	35	37	0	1
Photographs, pictures, charts, tables, and graphs	24	49	0	0
Filmstrips and slides	17	56	0	0
Motion pictures	12	59	0	2
Bulletin board	13	57	1	2
Maps	8	62	0	3
Wire or tape recordings	3	51	2	15

SOCIAL ACTIVITIES OF ADULT CLASSES

Recreational activities for adult education classes. It has been generally felt that adults, like youth, enjoy playing. There are those who have felt that some adults were attracted by the games more than by the educational program. What types of recreational and social activities are best suited to adult agriculture classes? Will the class interest be greater because of social activities? In answering these questions, only about one-half of the instructors indicated that they used any of these activities very much. This would seem to indicate that these activities are not used to a very large degree in adult class programs.

Trips and tours, and occasional programs for families were rated the most valuable by all the instructors. These were closely followed in importance by an annual banquet and refreshments.

The next activities were rated low. They were basketball, baseball, and softball teams; dances; and a variety of games. There seems to be little need for these activities in an adult program.

Of no importance were fishing and camping trips. This type of activity can best be carried on in the individual family, rather than as a class activity.

USE OF RESOURCES AND AGENCIES

The use that could be made of agricultural and educational agencies. Earlier in this study, the teachers' use of agricultural and educational

agencies in the institutional on-farm training program was reported. This part is concerned with the question, "Could agricultural agencies be of assistance to the educational program?" In program planning, it is important to know where to turn for help and assistance of other agencies.

The Extension Service, Michigan State College of Agriculture, and the Soil Conservation Service were selected as those which could offer much assistance for an agricultural education program. These agencies have subject matter available on many aspects of agriculture, and they have specialists who can be used in many kinds of agricultural education classes. Their willingness to help also makes them a desirable aid.

The State Board for Vocational Education, Vocational Agriculture Section was thought to be able to offer some assistance for the educational program. Its assistance is primarily in helping schools meet legal requirements in order to qualify for financial aid, but their staffs can be used as consultants on teaching methods and practices.

Forestry Service, Production and Marketing Administration, Farm and Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, and the Farm Credit Administration, respectively, were thought valuable in offering some assistance. Their services are less extensive than those rated of much value. These data can be found in Table XVI in the Appendix.

The use that could be made of agricultural associations and organizations. Agricultural associations and organizations have been used in adult farmer educational programs and now in the institutional on-farm training program. Farmers are members of these various groups

and feel a close relationship to them. To what extent would agricultural associations and organizations be helpful to the educational program?

The Dairy Herd Improvement Association, and the Artificial Insemination Associations could offer much help to an educational program in Michigan. Local and community cooperatives, Crop Improvement Associations, and other livestock and poultry improvement associations could be of some help. These associations of farmers have programs affecting many farmers, and can provide both printed materials and resource persons.

Farm Management Associations and State Farm Cooperatives were also considered of some help. Table XVII in the Appendix shows the teachers' responses to this question.

ADMINISTRATION

Financing adult farmer programs. Two methods of financing adult farmer programs considered best by the teachers were use of funds from: (1) federal, state, and local sources and (2) tuition supplemented by federal, state, and local funds. By indications, as shown in Table XII, the teachers seem to feel it is the responsibility of all levels of government to support these adult education programs.

There were some teachers who felt that only federal and state funds should be used for financing adult farmer programs. Only a few chose federal and local funds or state and local funds for adult programs.

TABLE XII

TEACHERS' OPINIONS OF METHODS CONSIDERED BEST
FOR FINANCING ADULT FARMER PROGRAMS

Methods	Regular Agricultural Teachers	Qualified Veterans' Instructors	Specially Certificated Veterans' Instructors
Federal funds	2	2	4
State funds	0	0	1
Federal and state funds	3	4	1
Local school funds	0	1	0
Federal and local funds	1	1	1
State and local funds	1	1	1
Federal, state, and local funds	9	6	11
Tuition charge for students taking the training	0	0	0
Tuition, plus financial aid from federal, state, and local funds	8	7	9

Tuition charged to the students alone taking the training was not indicated as desirable by a single teacher. From this, it seems the teachers felt it is the government's responsibility to at least provide most of the money to finance adult farmer programs.

In response to the question, "Would you be willing to pay taxes for an adult education program in local schools?", 84 per cent of all

the teachers responded that they would. The other 16 per cent were uncertain. Thus, the teachers felt adult education is important enough for them, as citizens, to financially support it by taxes.

Should an annual fee be charged for agricultural classes? There was wide disagreement by the teachers in what should be charged students for a course including on-farm instruction after the present institutional on-farm training program is completed. The range of recommended charges was from none to \$50.00 as shown in Table XIII. None of the charges mentioned received a majority of responses; consequently, the amount to charge for course fees of future programs must be considered carefully at each school planning a course.

TABLE XIII

TEACHERS' OPINIONS REGARDING THE AMOUNT OF
COURSE FEE TO CHARGE FOR ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Course fee to charge	Regular Agricultural Teachers	Qualified Veterans' Instructors	Specially Certificated Veterans' Instructors
None	2	5	6
\$1.00	2	0	1
\$5.00	10	3	3
\$10.00	4	8	8
\$15.00	2	1	3
\$25.00	3	5	4
\$35.00	0	0	0
\$50.00	0	0	3
More than \$50.00	0	0	0

Who should be responsible for giving the instructions? Approximately two-thirds of the teachers indicated that the public schools, through the vocational agriculture department, should be responsible for giving the instruction. The instruction would be handled in the same manner as the present program. The remainder of the teachers' responses were divided into many small groups. The public schools, with or without vocational agriculture departments, was suggested by 16 per cent of the teachers; state colleges of agriculture by 11 per cent; the

Extension Service by 7 per cent; and the Veterans' Administration by 5 per cent. It is evident that the teachers felt that the veteran should get his vocational training through the local school. Schools not having a department of vocational agriculture would have this responsibility if the veterans lived in their patronage area in sufficient numbers to justify classes.

III. TRAINING FOR VETERANS OF FUTURE WARS

Training for those in the armed forces at present. Eighty-four per cent of the teachers felt that there should be another institutional on-farm training program for those in the armed forces at present. Another 12 per cent were uncertain, thus another program received the approval of almost all the teachers. One teacher stated that there should be no future program. Is this teacher doing an adequate job at present? We should plan for a future on-farm training program.

Length of training for future programs. The teachers' responses showed a wide difference of opinion on the length of future training programs for veterans. The majority, 62 per cent, wanted four years; the same as the present program.

The rest of the teachers split up with 15 per cent wanting two years, and another 15 per cent wanting three years. Eight per cent of the teachers wanted more than four years. Only one teacher felt that one year was long enough.

Subsistence pay for qualified trainees. Qualified trainees in a future program should receive subsistence pay as in the present program was indicated by 78 per cent of the instructors, 14 per cent were uncertain. This left only 8 per cent of the teachers wanting no subsistence pay for future programs. Subsistence pay should be planned for future programs.

.....

The findings reported in this study do not cover all the items found in Schedule B. Only items relative to the purpose of this study were used.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

During the progress of World War II, the Congress of the United States, recognizing the problems of servicemen in their readjustment to civilian occupations at the end of hostilities, legislated the most intensive subsidized educational program for all veterans ever sponsored by our government. Part of this educational program was the institutional on-farm training program for veterans who were farming.

The regulations of the institutional on-farm training program require that each trainee be given a minimum of 200 hours of classroom instruction, and 100 hours of on-farm instruction. Classes of veterans were limited to 25 students per instructor, with 20 student preferred.

Purpose of the study. The purpose of this investigation was to determine the opinions of the teachers of veterans of the institutional on-farm training program, and teachers of vocational agriculture concerning techniques and procedures of the institutional on-farm training program which may be applied to other programs of agricultural education for adults.

Method of investigation. A schedule was made to solicit the opinions of instructors in a regional study and was used in getting the opinions reported in this investigation. A sample of 50 teachers was drawn from a list of full-time instructors of classes of veterans of each state which had been in operation at least six months.

In Michigan, 31 of the teachers of veterans attending a teachers of veterans conference, at Michigan State College, in February, 1951, filled out schedule B. The other 19 teachers of veterans, and 23 teachers of vocational agriculture were contacted by state supervisors or teacher trainers in agricultural education from Michigan State College.

In this study no statistical determinations were made, because very little difference of opinion was found between the instructors of veterans and the teachers of vocational agriculture on the various items used in this study of schedule B.

I. EVALUATION OF THE PRESENT PROGRAM

Advisory committees. Advisory committees were of some help to 61 per cent of the teachers. These committees were of much help to 18 per cent of the teachers, but 21 per cent of the teachers reported no help at all. The high percentage of teachers reporting some help may indicate that studies are needed on how to use advisory committees.

Agricultural and Educational Agencies. The amount of use of agricultural and educational agencies in the institutional on-farm training program by teachers were as follows: Much--Extension Service, Michigan State College, and Soil Conservation Service. Some--State Board of Vocational Education-Vocational Agriculture Section, Farm and Home Administration, Production and Marketing Administration, Forestry Service, Farm Credit Administration--Production Credit Association and Federal Land Bank, and Rural Electrification Administration. These agencies are valuable to a teacher in presenting to his classes the

broad picture of farming as it is today.

II. OPINIONS OF TEACHERS AS TO THE NATURE OF FUTURE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR FARMERS

Organization of classes. The opinion of 96 per cent of all teachers was that instruction for farmers should be given both in the classroom, and on the farm. The modal time of the number of hours of on-farm instruction was 35 to 50 hours. The teachers split about evenly between visiting the farm every two weeks or monthly. This would mean at least 12 visits to each student in the adult program per year. An advance notice of an on-farm visit should usually be given by the instructor. It can be seen that the amount of on-farm instruction wanted stresses the importance placed in this instruction by all groups of agriculture teachers.

It was the opinion of about one-half of the teachers that classes at the school or central meeting place should be given every week in slack season, and monthly the rest of the time. Another one-third of the teachers favored meeting weekly throughout the year. Non-shop class sessions should be about two hours in length, and shop classes should be three hours in length most of the teachers felt.

Instruction given by an additional teacher of vocational agriculture, who would give full time to adult education was thought to be the best arrangement for assignment of teachers. Special instructors were recommended by only a very few teachers.

Farmers between the ages of 18 and 35 were thought to benefit much

from an adult education program. Farm women and older adult farmers would benefit from some instruction.

Planning course content. In program planning, 85 per cent of all the groups of teachers favored teacher-student organizing, planning, and conducting the educational program. Advisory committees were used only to a limited degree in program planning. Farmers should be grouped in classes by a combination of factors, namely: age, farming status, farming interests, previous training, and location of the farm.

In choosing farm problems and jobs to be taught, the most important factor to consider was the leading farm enterprises of the community. Of much importance were experiences, interests, and opinions of the majority of farmers in class. Of some importance were: the ability of the instructor, information from local surveys, subject matter information available, suggestions of the advisory committees, and anticipated changes in farming. Why were local surveys rated low when they are a means of finding leading community enterprises?

The units to be stressed in the course of study ranked much by the teachers were as follows: farm planning and management, farm and home accounts, soil conservation, livestock production practices, crop production practices, farm mechanics, and marketing farm products. Some stress should be made in units of: farm and home improvements, farm health and safety, family relationships, community and cooperative activities, food preservation and storage, leadership, fruit and vegetable production, and recreational activities.

In the class session, no time limit for discussion of emergency farm problems was indicated by the instructors as the best policy. It seems advisable to spend ample time on these problems to help the students work out the solutions.

Needs for additional farm training. Of the teachers' responses, 80 per cent thought farmers who had completed the institutional on-farm training program needed further instruction. Also, 95 per cent of the teachers thought vocational agriculture high school students needed further instruction.

Teaching methods. The teachers rated classroom teaching methods good as follows: demonstration, discussion by class members, laboratory--actual performance by students, and question and answer. Methods ranked fair were: group or individual reports, debates, and lectures. The teachers seem to feel that students want more activity in the instructional program.

Qualified instructors, the teachers felt, were most important for improving classroom instruction. Also rated of much importance by the teachers were the practices of connecting problems to actual farming situations of the students, active participation by all students in the class, using specialists, securing recent books, bulletins, and farm magazines, giving time to individual farm problems of the students, using local information, use of movies, slides, and other visual aids, and changing teaching methods. Setting up goals for each practice, supervised study in the classroom, use of notebooks, and home study were of some value.

The teachers felt the activities for improving on-farm instruction to be given much emphasis were: becoming acquainted with the farm situation, supervising the keeping and analyzing of records, following up of class instruction, and demonstrating practices or skills. Of some value were: supervising home study, and making a social visit.

Bulletins and circulars from Michigan State College were thought by the teachers to be far superior to any other type of reference material for adult classes. Farm magazines and papers, and farm texts or reference books are of much value. Bulletins and circulars from the United States Department of Agriculture and other state colleges have some value.

The teachers felt no one teaching aid for effective classroom instruction was outstanding. Blackboards, field trips, use of specimens, and demonstrations were of much use as teaching aids. Photographs, pictures, charts, tables, graphs, film strips, slides, maps, and wire or tape recordings were of some value as aids.

Social activities of adult classes. Trips and tours, and occasional programs for families were rated as the most valuable activities. These were closely followed by an annual banquet and refreshments at meetings.

Use of resources and agencies. The Extension Service, Michigan State College of Agriculture, the Soil Conservation Service, and the State Board of Vocational Education--Vocational Agriculture Section, could be of much use in the institutional on-farm training program was the opinion of the teachers. Of some use to the program were: Forestry Service, Production and Marketing Administration, Farm and Home Administration, and the Farm Credit Administration.

The teachers felt that much use in the institutional on-farm training program could be made of Dairy Herd Improvement Associations, and Artificial Insemination Associations. Crop Improvement Associations, Local and Community Cooperatives, other Livestock and Poultry Improvement Associations, Farm Management Associations, and State Farm Cooperatives were of some use to the program.

Administration. The two methods of financing adult farmer education programs considered best by the teachers were use of funds from: (1) federal, state, and local funds, and (2) tuition supplemented by federal, state, and local funds. Of all the teachers responding, 84 per cent would be willing to pay taxes to support an adult education program in local schools. There was little agreement among the teachers on what should be charged students for an adult farmers' course.

Approximately two-thirds of the teachers indicated that public schools, through the vocational agriculture department, should be responsible for giving the instruction.

Training for veterans of future wars. Eighty-four per cent of the teachers felt that there should be another institutional on-farm training program for those persons in the armed forces at the present time. The majority of the respondents, wanted the length of the future training program to be four years. The qualified trainee in a future program should receive subsistence pay was recommended by 78 per cent of the instructors.

III. SOME EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

From this study, the opinions of the teachers indicated that:

1. The younger farmers are the ones who should receive the most training. More classes are needed for farmers 16 to 35 years of age. These farmers are in a transitional period, and can be helped in adult farmer classes.
2. Future adult farmer classes probably should be organized on a year around basis with a continuous educational program. Frequency of class meetings could be planned around the farm work load. More meetings can be held in slack seasons, but some meetings might be held every month of the year.
3. The teacher probably should be employed to work full-time with adult farmers. This was considered better than a teacher splitting his time between adult and day school programs. Teachers probably feared that the adult program would be slighted if a combination was arranged. A teacher with a specific part of the agriculture program, as adult farmers, could concentrate all his efforts on it, and probably would achieve greater results for his undivided efforts.
4. More instruction time is probably needed in the classroom than the present minimum required in adult farmer classes. There is a feeling that more than 50 hours of classroom instruction might be provided each year. For the most part, classes should be about two hours in length, except if the class is conducted in the shop or laboratory.
5. On-farm instruction was rated very important by the teachers

and in the future more time probably should be allowed for this type of instruction. This is in contrast to the present in which only a few visits are made. For the most part, teachers wanted 12 visits to each student per year as a minimum, if each visit would be about two hours in length. A teacher having 25 adult students would have to spend a minimum of 600 hours of on-farm instruction per year. This is equivalent to one-fourth of his time being spent out on the farm. Teacher time and load will need to be scheduled to accomplish this.

6. In the opinion of the teachers in this study, it is the responsibility of all levels of government to support an adult education program. However, there was a tendency to feel that adults should help pay for the classes. In no case was it felt that the class members should support the program entirely.

7. There is still to be tried this kind of program with young farmers without subsistence pay. Whether the in-training payments have colored the veterans' viewpoint has yet to be discovered. It is hoped that they were interested in the training program for other things than the subsistence pay alone. Other devices may need to be used to increase interest in future adult education classes.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

1. A study to determine whether the teacher's background of training, teaching, and farming affects the success of his students in becoming established in farming.
2. What kinds of needs, both agricultural and non-agricultural, do farm veterans have?
3. What happens to veterans after they leave the institutional on-farm training program?
4. How do instructors spend their time when they visit students on their farms?
5. How can group instruction be used both on and off the farm?
6. How can advisory committees be developed and used in an adult farmer educational program?
7. How are objectives used in planning courses, determining learning procedures, and evaluating outcomes in the institutional on-farm training program?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Willard Raymond, "Implications for Adult Education in Agriculture from Responses of Participants in the Veterans Farm Training Program in the Central Region, I," Thesis, M. S., 1952, Iowa State College, Ames. pp. 93.
- Cooper, Melvin W., "Techniques and Procedures Employed in Training of Veterans Enrolled in the Institutional On-Farm Training Program," Agriculture Education Magazine, 24:103, November, 1951.
- Elliott, Dean Alexander, "Implications for Adult Education in Agriculture from Responses of Participants in the Veteran Farm Training Program in the Central Region, II," (Original not seen) Thesis, M. S., 1951, Iowa State College, Ames. pp. 164.
- Hamilton, James D., "Implications for Adult Education from Responses of Participants in the Veterans Farm Training Program in the Central Region, III," Thesis, M. S., 1951. Iowa State College, Ames. pp. 124.
- Hamlin, H. M., "The National Study of the Institutional On-Farm Program for Veterans," Agriculture Education Magazine, 23:6, July, 1950.
- History and Development of Institutional On-Farm Training in Arkansas, Arkansas State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, Institutional On-Farm Training Program, Little Rock, and University of Arkansas, College of Education, Department of Vocational Teacher Education, Bulletin, Fayetteville, December, 1950. pp. 62.
- Institutional On-Farm Training for Veterans, Office of Vocational Education, Department of Public Instruction, Bulletin No. 1019, Lansing, Michigan, 1949. pp. 60.
- Lintner, J. H., "Values of Farm Veteran Training," Agricultural Education Magazine, 22:158, January, 1950.
- Lintner, J. H., "A Study of the Effectiveness of the Institutional On-Farm Training Program in Ohio with Implications for Future Programs in Adult Education," (Original not seen) Thesis, Ph. D., 1952, Ohio State University, Columbus. pp. 394.
- Martens, D. W., "A Summary of Procedures Used in the Institutional On-Farm Training Program from Responses of Instructors of Veterans Classes in the Central Region," (Original not seen) Thesis, M. S., 1952, University of Nebraska, Lincoln. pp. 78.
- Rhodes, Clarence L., "Implications for Adult Education from Responses of the Participants in the Veterans Farm Training Program in the Central Region, IV," Thesis, M. S., 1952, Iowa State College, Ames. pp. 117.

APPENDIX

FIGURE I



X Indicates the location of classes drawn from the Veterans Institute in these centers

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

TABLE XIV
MICHIGAN TEACHERS RESPONDING TO SCHEDULE B
INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING IN THE CENTRAL REGION QUESTIONNAIRE
1951

School	Teacher of Veterans	Teacher of Agriculture
Baraga	1	0
Bay City	1	0
Beaverton	1	1
Big Rapids	2	1
Cadillac	3	0
Caledonia	1	1
Carson City	1	1
Cheboygan	1	0
Chesaning	1	1
Coldwater	1	1
Cooke	1	0
Dowagiac	1	1
Elkton	1	1
Fairview	1	1
Felch	2	1
Frank Ledge	1	1
Hart	1	1
Hickory Corners	1	1
Ironwood	1	0
Lake Odessa	1	1
Leslie	1	1
Marlette	1	1
Monroe	1	0
Mount Pleasant	2	1
North Branch	1	1
Olivet	1	1
Paw Paw	1	1
Peek	1	1
Perry	1	1
Petoskey	1	0
Pickford	1	1
Reading	1	1
St. Clair	1	1
Sand Creek	1	1
Scottville	1	1
Sheridan	1	1
Stephenson	4	1
Traverse City	4	1
Waldron	1	0

TABLE XV
FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CHOOSING FARM PROBLEMS
AND FARM JOBS TO BE TAUGHT

Factors	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
Leading farm enterprises of the community				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	17	6	0	0
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	16	2	0	0
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	28	4	0	0
Experiences, interests, and opinions of the majority of the farmers in the class				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	17	6	0	0
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	12	7	1	2
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	21	7	0	0
Ability of the instructor				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	5	15	3	0
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	9	12	1	0
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	13	13	0	2
Subject matter information available				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	3	17	2	1
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	5	12	5	0
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	14	11	1	2
Information obtained from local surveys				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	6	17	0	0
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	6	14	2	0
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	11	16	0	1
Suggestions of advisory committees				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	7	15	1	0
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	5	15	1	1
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	7	20	0	1
Anticipated changes in farming				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	4	16	3	0
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	4	16	0	1
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	11	14	1	2

TABLE XVI

THE USE THAT COULD BE MADE FROM AGRICULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL
AGENCIES IN THE INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM

Agency	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
Rural Electrification Administration				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	4	16	0	2
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	3	15	2	2
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	6	18	1	3
Farm Credit Administration (Production Credit Association and Federal Land Bank)				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	3	18	0	1
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	4	18	0	1
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	5	20	1	2
Extension Service				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	20	3	0	0
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	18	4	0	0
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	20	8	0	0
Farm and Home Administration				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	3	20	0	0
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	6	17	0	0
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	7	19	1	1
Soil Conservation Service				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	15	8	0	0
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	18	4	0	0
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	20	8	0	0
Forestry Service				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	4	19	0	0
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	10	12	0	0
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	8	18	0	2
Production and Marketing Administration				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	5	17	0	0
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	5	14	2	1
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	6	18	0	4
State College of Agriculture				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	20	3	0	1
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	14	8	0	0
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	21	7	0	0
State Board for Vocational Education--				
Vocational Agriculture Section				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	13	10	0	0
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	8	12	1	1
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	11	11	0	6

TABLE XVII

THE EXTENT TO WHICH AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATIONS AND
ORGANIZATIONS COULD BE HELPFUL IN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Association or Organization	Much	Some	None	Uncertain
Dairy herd improvement associations				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	15	8	0	0
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	13	9	0	0
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	20	8	0	0
Other livestock and poultry improvement assn.				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	8	15	0	0
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	8	14	0	0
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	11	17	0	0
Artificial insemination associations				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	14	9	0	0
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	13	9	0	0
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	15	13	0	0
Crop improvement associations				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	10	13	0	0
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	8	12	0	2
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	11	16	0	1
Local and community cooperatives				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	9	14	0	0
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	8	12	0	2
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	14	11	0	3
State Farm Cooperatives				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	4	18	0	1
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	4	17	0	2
Specially Certified Veterans' Instructors	11	14	1	2
Farm Management associations				
Regular Agricultural Teachers	5	17	0	2
Qualified Veterans' Instructors	4	18	0	3
Specially Cert. Veterans' Instructors	12	9	2	5

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

65

Part I

RECTIONS: 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.

. What is your present teaching status? (Check one)

Instructor of veterans (); Instructor of Vocational Agriculture (); Both ()

. What is your present age? (a) 25 years or under () (d) 46 to 55 years ()
(b) 26 to 35 years () (e) 56 years or older ()
(c) 36 to 45 years ()

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

<u>Elementary</u>	<u>High School</u>	<u>College</u>	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	1 2 3	Graduate (Agriculture) Graduate (Other curricula)

. Do you hold a Master's Degree? Yes () No ()

. Did you meet certification requirements for teaching - (Check one)

(a) General high school subjects only () (c) Both general high school and
(b) Vocational agriculture only () (d) vocational agriculture ()
(d) Neither general high school nor
vocational agriculture ()

. How many years of vocational agriculture did you have in high school?

None (); 1 year (); 2 years (); 3 years (); 4 years ()

. How many years did you spend on a farm after the age of 10, including time when you were either in or out of school?

(a) None () (c) 3 to 5 years () (e) 11 to 15 years ()
(b) 1 to 2 years () (d) 6 to 10 years () (f) 16 years or more ()

. How many years did you spend as a full-time partner, sharecropper, renter, owner-operator, or manager?

(a) None () (c) 3 to 5 years () (e) 11 to 15 years ()
(b) 1 to 2 years () (d) 6 to 10 years () (f) 16 years or more ()

9. In which of the following occupational areas have you had one or more years of experience?

- (a) Teaching vocational agriculture ☐
- (b) Agricultural Extension ☐
- (c) In occupations not related to agriculture ☐
- (d) In occupations involving activities ☐
related to agriculture or education
(S.C.S., R.E.A., Farm implement
dealer, etc.)

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.

10. Of what value have the following types of instruction been to the trainees?

- | | <u>Much</u> | <u>Some</u> | <u>None</u> |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (a) Individual on farm. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| (b) Small groups on farm. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| (c) Classroom (off farm). | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

11. Has the use of an advisory committee helped your Institutional On-Farm Training program?

Much ☐ Some ☐ None ☐

12. To what extent have you used the following agencies in your Institutional On-Farm Training program?

- | | <u>Much</u> | <u>Some</u> | <u>None</u> | <u>No Opportunity</u> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (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. . . . | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

13. Should the progress of the student be measured by the number of farm practices carried out on the farm?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Uncertain ☐

4. 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 ()

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

- | | <u>Much</u> | <u>Some</u> | <u>None</u> |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| (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. | () | () | () |

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

7. What should be the maximum length of a future program for veterans?

1 year (); 2 years (); 3 years (); 4 years (); more than 4 years ()

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

9. 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.

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

21. 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 | () |

22. 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 | () |

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

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

24. 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 | () | | |

25. 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 | () |
| (c) Three hours during the day | () | hours at night | |
| | | (f) A full day | () |

26. 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. | () |

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

28. 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 | () |

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

	<u>Much</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>
(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.	()	()	()	()

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

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

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

	<u>Much</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>
(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.	()	()	()	()

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

	<u>Much</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>
(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.	()	()	()	()

32. Continued

	<u>Much</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>
(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.	()	()	()	()

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

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>
(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.	()	()	()	()

34. 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% ()

35. 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 ()

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

	<u>Much</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>
(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.	()	()	()	()

36. Continued.

	<u>Much</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>
(k) Use notebooks.	()	()	()	()
(l) Set up goals for each practice.	()	()	()	()
(m) Change teaching methods from time to time	()	()	()	()
(n) Have active participation by <u>all</u> students. .	()	()	()	()

37. 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 ().

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

	<u>Much</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>
(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.	()	()	()	()

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

	<u>Much</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>
(a) Bulletins and circulars from your home state college.	()	()	()	()
(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.	()	()	()	()

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

	<u>Much</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>
(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.	()	()	()	()

41. Of what value are the following recreational activities in a complete yearly program?
- | | <u>Much</u> | <u>Some</u> | <u>None</u> | <u>Uncertain</u> |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| (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. | () | () | () | () |
42. To what extent could the following agricultural agencies be of assistance to the educational program?
- | | <u>Much</u> | <u>Some</u> | <u>None</u> | <u>Uncertain</u> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| (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. | () | () | () | () |
43. To what extent would the following associations and organizations be helpful to the educational program?
- | | <u>Much</u> | <u>Some</u> | <u>None</u> | <u>Uncertain</u> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| (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. | () | () | () | () |
44. Would farmers who have completed Institutional On-Farm Training need further farm training? Yes () No () Uncertain ()
45. Would farmers who have completed Vocational Agriculture in high school need further farm training? Yes () No () Uncertain ()
46. Would farmers who have attended a college of agriculture need further farm training? Yes () No () Uncertain ()

47. 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 ()
48. Would you be willing to pay taxes for an adult education program in local schools?
Yes () No () Uncertain ()
49. What annual fee do you think should be charged for a course including on-farm instruction after the present program 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 ()
50. Should government officials be urged to provide tax money for adult education programs in the public schools? Yes () No () Uncertain ().
51. Should all farmers have an opportunity to enroll in courses in farming offered by the public schools? Yes () No () Uncertain ().
52. How many years experience have you had teaching agriculture? (Check one)
- (a) Less than 1 year () (c) 3 to 5 years () (e) More than 9 years ()
 - (b) 1 to 2 years () (d) 6 to 9 years ()
53. Are regular vocational agriculture teaching facilities available in your school?
(Check one) Yes () No ()

ROOM USE ONLY

Mr 31 '53

Mr 18 '53

Fe 7 '54

ROOM USE ONLY

AP 16 '54

AP 30 '54

Mar 10 '54

Ac 4

Jul 24 '56

Jul 22 '57

Nov 15 '58