8-1951

A Study of the Supervision of Farming Programs of All-Day Students as Conducted by Selected Negro Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Texas

William Lowell Kissam
Prairie View A&M College

A STUDY OF THE SUPERVISION OF FARMING PROGRAMS OF ALL-DAY STUDENTS AS CONDUCTED BY SELECTED NEGRO TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TEXAS

KISSAM

1951

A STUDY OF THE SUPERVISION OF FARMING PROGRAMS OF ALL-DAY STUDENTS AS CONDUCTED BY SELECTED NEGRO TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TEXAS

by

William Lowell Kissam

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE
in the
GRADUATE SCHOOL
of
PRAIRIE VIEW AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE
PRAIRIE VIEW, TEXAS

AUGUST, 1951

DEDICATED

To my wife, Lillian Tyler Kissam, whose inestimable assistance will forever be cherished.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was made possible through cooperation of thirty-two teachers of vocational agriculture, who so generously gave of their time for personal interview. The services of these teachers are greatly appreciated. Their names and addresses are found in the Appendix. I am also grateful to those who have assisted in the formation and conduct of the study: (1) to Dr. E. M. Norris, of the Department of Agricultural Education of Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College, who as adviser, contributed valuable counsel, criticism and encouragement as the study progressed; and (2) to Messers E. E. Collins, S. E. Palmer, Gus Jones, W. D. Thompson and Paul Rutledge, area supervisors of vocational agriculture in Texas, who selected teachers from their respective areas for this study.

W. L. K.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES

BIOGRAPHY

Nativity.---The writer was born January 12, 1915 and is the first child and only son of two children born to William and Eula Kissam of McGregor, Texas, west of the Brazos River, eighteen miles from Waco in McLennan County, Texas.

Training.---He completed his elementary education in a three-teacher school in McGregor and his high school training in Phyllis Wheatley High School of Houston, Texas, graduating there in 1932. After completing two years in Paul Quinn College, the writer entered Prairie View Normal and Industrial College in 1934, taking a special course in vocational agriculture and graduated with honors in 1936, receiving a bachelor of science in agricultural education. The writer is recognized as the first student to enter Prairie View in his own trailer house, in which he slept, prepared his own meals, did his weekly laundry and prepared his lessons. He parked his house one mile from the campus paying fifty cents per month as rent because he was not permitted to park it on Prairie View's property.

Experience.---All of the writer experience has been that of teaching vocational agriculture in high schools on 100 per cent basis in the following schools:

1. August 1, 1936, Fairview High, Linden, Texas, one year.
2. July 1, 1937, Flint Hill High School, Palestine, four years.

It was during his tenure here in which he was married to Lillian Josephine Tyler, then teaching as vocational homemaking teacher in the same school. On July 1, 1941, the writer was employed in a two man department of vocational agriculture in the Jackson High School, Tyler, Texas, Smith County which job he now holds.

A STUDY OF THE SUPERVISION OF FARMING PROGRAMS OF ALL-DAY STUDENTS AS CONDUCTED BY SELECTED NEGRO TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TEXAS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

The core of the problem in this study is embodied in this question: What constitutes good supervision of farming programs of all-day boys on the home farm? The best teachers of vocational agriculture have long realized that for the satisfactory development of programs of supervised farming, instruction at school is not enough, regardless of how well it is done. To be successful in all his teaching activities the vocational agriculture instructor must be just as much concerned with the out-of-school agricultural activities of his boys as with those which he conducts in the classroom. If farming programs, are regarded as productive and as a step to becoming progressively established in farming, are of adequate scope, studied, planned, and carried through to completion by the boys, they need much real supervision in order to be kept going right and to be brought to a proper completion. In supervising farming programs on the home farm the instructor has numerous supervisory responsibilities. The degree to which he knows what these responsibilities are and the degree to which he is able to carry them out successfully

will indicate the effectiveness of his supervision. Therefore the writer is very much concerned with what constitutes good supervision of farming programs of all-day boys on the home farm.

Purpose of the Study

Since the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917, teachers of vocational agriculture have been using a variety of practices in supervising the farming programs of all-day students.

This study has been conducted in order to isolate the most effective practices. It deals with the practices used by thirty-two selected Texas Negro teachers of vocational agriculture in supervising the farming programs of all-day students on the home farm.

These selected teachers have been rated successful in their profession by their area supervisors.

The use of some of these practices which were rated high, in this study, should result in teachers of vocational agriculture doing a more effective job of supervising the farming programs of their all-day students.

Method of Investigation

Each of the five Negro area supervisors were asked to select six of their teachers of vocational agriculture, who were conducting successful programs, to assist in this study.

The five area supervisors were given questionnaires and were included in this study.

One supervisor listed eight men, two suggested seven, the other two gave six names to be used. This made a total of thirty-four plus the five district supervisors and the co-worker of the author. This made a grand total of forty individuals contacted. Thirty-two of the forty received were sufficiently complete for use in this study.

Each individual was given a questionnaire[1] to be used to collect the data. The questions covered the areas to be included in this study. The data from the questionnaire were compiled by the writer in developing this study on supervising farming programs of all-day students.

A large portion of the data was secured through personal interviews during the Texas State Convention of New Farmers of America and State Judging Contest, held at Prairie View A & M College, 1950 and 1951.

Definition of Terms

Certain terms used in this study seem to need defining in order that the reader may interpret the data correctly.

Effective practice is one of the small units of action on the part of a teacher of vocational agriculture which together form a procedure or method that gives the desired

---

[1]See Appendix for copy of Questionnaire.

results in supervising the farming program of all-day students.

Supervision of the farming program refers to the supervision given the student by the teacher on the boy's home farm or such places as may be used for the conduct of the boy's project program. The State Plan for vocational education states that each student is required to conduct supervised farm practice which usually takes the form of home projects.

Farming programs are activities to provide experience which contribute to development of abilities that are needed for proficiency in the type of farming in which the student is likely to engage.

Total program refers to the existence of all-day, part-time and evening school instruction in a particular school program in a community.

All-day students are pupils who are regularly enrolled in a daily high school class of vocational agriculture.

Need for the Study

Since the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917 and the establishment of the vocational agriculture departments in high schools, teachers have been using a variety of practices in supervising the farming program of all-day students. There has been a difference of opinion among the teachers as

to what constitutes proper supervision of the farming programs.

The need for this study lies in the fact that there is a difference of opinion as to what constitutes effective supervision of farming programs. The better teachers have long realized the importance of effective supervision of the farming program. No similiar study was found to have been made in Texas among Negro schools.

E. O. Bolender[1] points out that there is a need for frequent and careful supervision to secure proper development of the student's farming program. He says:

> Difference of opinion among workers in agricultural education has been expressed concerning the need for detailed supervision of boys' farming programs, provided a good job of class teaching has been done, plans of practices have been well formulated, and home situations are favorable. There is an abundance of evidence to indicate that boys, even in the most favorable situations, will not develop their programs to the degree which is possible without frequent and careful supervision. It is in no sense a reflection on the quality of class teaching to assume that it does not go all the way and that there must be a follow-up with individual teaching through supervision. Good class teaching furnishes the foundation on which plans of practices may be built and effective supervision carried out, but it does not take the place of individual work with boys.

The point of view, that there is a difference of opinion as to what constitutes proper supervision of the farming

---

[1] Bolender, E. O., Rhoad, C. E., and Kenestrick, H. G., Teaching Procedures in Developing Boys Through the Use of Their Farming Programs. Department of Agricultural Education, The Ohio State University. Columbus: 1940. Chap. IV. p. 73.

program is illustrated in a study made by C. H. Wiswall[1] of Idaho. He states:

> The number of visits per project made by various teachers ranged from 11.4 in the highest school to two in the lowest school.

George P. Deyoe[2] indicates the importance of proper supervision of the farming program by pointing out that classroom teaching alone, is not sufficient to bring about the best results.

Since there is a difference of opinion as to what constitutes effective supervision of the farming program and the better teachers have long realized the importance of effective supervision of the farming program; a study of the practices used by thirty-two selected Texas Negro teachers of vocational agriculture in the supervision of the farming programs of all-day students was made.

This study should provide a better basis for the selection of effective practices to be used in the supervision of the farming programs of all-day students.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The study deals only with thirty-two teachers who have a successful total program of vocational agriculture. They

---

[1] Wiswall, C. H., A Study of Project Supervision in Idaho for the Years 1932-33 and 1933-34. p. 146.

[2] Deyoe, George P., Supervised Farming in Vocational Agriculture. Interstate Publishing Company, Danville, Ill., 1943. p. 331.

were not selected on the basis of their ability in supervising the farming program of all-day students but on their ability to conduct a well-rounded program of vocational agriculture.

It does not attempt to measure the quality or quantity of the supervision given by the selected teachers to the supervision of the farming programs. It was only an attempt to isolate the most effective practices that were used by the teachers. No attempt was made to determine the causes for the conditions found.

The author wishes it to be understood that this study is an appraisal of the supervision of the farming program of all-day students as it is conducted. It is not a commendation or condemnation of the practices used by these teachers.

The number of teachers of vocational agriculture is limited to thirty-two as this is a personally conducted interview supplemented by a prepared questionnaire. These teachers were selected from all sections of Texas and represent what some of the best teachers are doing. As far as the author has been able to determine this should be considered as a representative sample and indicate what should be done in farming-program supervision.

Basic Assumptions

1. That effective supervision of the farming program of all-day students is important to a successful program of vocational agriculture.
2. The area supervisors of teachers of vocational agriculture can satisfactorily rate a teacher of vocational agriculture.
3. A selected group of teachers can indicate effective practices that should be used by most teachers of vocational agriculture.
4. The group of 32 selected teachers could indicate effective practices in supervising the farming program of all-day students.
5. That practical recommendations growing out of research can be made for securing better supervision of the farming programs of all-day students. Such recommendations would be of value to teachers of vocational agriculture.
6. That the selected group of teachers may provide valid, reliable information regarding the practices used in supervising the farming programs of all-day students.

Specific Objectives

The general purpose of this study is to isolate the effective practices used by thirty-two selected Texas Negro

teachers of vocational agriculture in supervising farming programs of all-day students. To accomplish this purpose certain specific objectives for the study are planned. They are as follows:

1. To raise the practices used in supervising the farming programs according to the value of effectiveness in the opinion of the selected teachers.
2. To determine the scheduling of project supervision.
3. To find the factors which determine the number of supervisory visits made per boy for the year.
4. To find the time of day which is considered best for the supervision of the farming programs.
5. To determine the amount of time that is involved in the supervision of the farming programs.
6. To find the preparation which is made by teachers before arriving at the home of the boy.
7. To find what records are kept by the instructor and the use that is made of these records.
8. To determine some of the major difficulties that are encountered in project supervision.
9. To show the changes that have been made in the past three years in project supervision.

Related Studies

Buckley[1] found that the distance between home and school affected the program of supervised practice. The number of visits by the teacher were greater for those nearer the school.

Rutledge[2] found that not enough supervisory visits were made to home farms. If the visits were made they were not reported as such. The desirable practice of contacting more than one person per home visit was followed, to some extent.

Wiswall[3] in his study attempted to determine distribution of visits. Whether or not teachers make visits which coincide with critical periods in projects. The study failed to show conclusively that project visits were determined by the needs of the boys.

---

[1]Buckley, Ralph Barnette, "Distance from Home to School as a Factor Influencing Certain Phases of Supervised Practice Program of Boys Taking Vocational Agriculture," M S Thesis, 1935, West Virginia University, p. 51, Library West Virginia University.

[2]Rutledge, Paul, "Analysis of Official Travel Done by Vocational Agriculture Teachers," M S Thesis, 1950, Prairie View A & M College, Texas, p. 39, Library Prairie View College.

[3]Wiswall, Clinton Henry, "A Study of Project Supervision in Idaho for the Years 1932-33 and 33-34," M S Thesis, 1936, University of Idaho, p. 146.

Ogle's[1] study was an inquiry into procedures in both carrying out and supervising home projects. The results indicated that securing the cooperation of parents is the most important factor in remedying project difficulties. Frequent and longer visits were minor factors. The need for special training in project supervision was indicated. The personality of the teacher was practically equivalent to the methods of the teacher as a factor in success in supervising and conducting projects. The weakness or failure of teachers in project supervision mentioned most frequently were, "too few visit," "too short visit," and the lack of motivation of project work.

Wallace[2] in his study of the summer teacher's load of twenty-seven teachers in Southwestern, Ohio found that the average number of visits per teacher per student during the summer was 2.2 visits per boy. This is below the recommended state minimum which is at least one visit each month per boy.

---

[1] Ogle, George Calvin, "The Home Project in Vocational Agriculture," M S Thesis, 1923, University of Missouri, Columbia, p. 135.

[2] Wallace, Marion W., "A Study of the Summer Teaching Load of Twenty-Seven Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Southwestern, Ohio," Master's Thesis, The Ohio State University, 1942.

CHAPTER II

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS DATA

Ranking of Farming Program Supervision Practices

The ranking of certain practices used in supervision of the farming programs of all-day students was made by thirty-two selected Texas Negro teachers of vocational agriculture. Two questions were asked to measure the ranking of these practices. First, was the practice used? Second, what value did the teachers place upon the practice? Comparing these rankings should give some measure of the effectiveness of the practice.

A list of the possible practices was made out in advance and personally presented to each teacher in the form of a questionnaire. These teachers were asked to check the practices they used and rate all of the practices according to effectiveness, using the following scale: High = 3; Average = 2; Low = 1; No value = 0.

The data were then tabulated. The number of teachers using the practice and the rating of effectiveness according to the opinion of the teachers were calculated. Using these two ratings and giving each equal value, a cumulative score was calculated.

It is important to notice that all of the rating of practices used in supervision of the farming program ranked

high in the final score. Due to this fact, they should all be considered important practices when supervising the farming programs of all-day students.

This may indicate that there were not a sufficient number of practices listed to secure a wide distribution in the score. There was a range from 69.3 for the lowest to 97.9 for the highest ranking practice.

The low rating of 69.3 for the practice of grading the progress of the student gives rise to the question - How much importance should be placed on the farming program in determing the grade of the student? Are all grades made in the classroom and none out on the farm in the proper conduct of a farming program? Does the low rating given to the teaching of new skills indicate that there is a tendency to forget that teaching can be done out on the farm?

A study of the rankings as shown in Table I, indicates that a working relationship between the boy, parent and teacher is a matter of prime consideration by the teachers while supervising the farming program of all-day students on the home farm. This finding compares very favorable with G. A. Schmidt's[1] contribution on Project Supervision.

This working relationship includes informing the parent of the purpose of the farming program. The progress of the

---

[1] Schmidt, G. A., Project and the Project Method in Agricultural Education, Ch. X.

TABLE I THE RANKING OF PRACTICES USED IN SUPERVISION OF THE FARMING PROGRAM OF ALL-DAY STUDENTS ON THE HOME FARM RANKED IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE

Items	Number Teachers Using	Number Teachers Rating	Percent Teachers Rating 3	Percent Teachers Rating 2	Percent Teachers Rating 1	Percent Teachers Rating 0	Percent Teachers Using	Evaluated Score	Evaluated Score in Percentage	Final Score
1 . Develop a Working Relationship between the boy, parent and teacher.	32	32	90.6	6.2	3.1		100	2.872	95.9	97.9
2 . Encourage the Use of Improved Practices Taught in Class	31	31	80.6	19.3			96.9	2.805	93.6	95.2
3 . Check Students Project Record Book	32	32	65.6	31.2	3.1		100	2.623	87.5	93.7
4 . Determine the Weaknesses and Suggest Improvement in the Farming Program	31	32	62.5	34.4	3.12		96.9	2.594	86.5	91.2
5 . Secure a Background for Class Problems	30	32	59.4	34.4	6.25		93.7	2.532	84.5	89.1
6 . Guide the Student into New Projects	30	32	43.8	50.	6.25		93.7	2.376	79.2	86.4
7 . Develop an Incentive to do Things the Correct Way	29	31	54.9	32.2	12.9		90.5	2.420	80.7	85.6
8 . Modify Previous Plans	31	32	21.8	65.6	12.9		96.9	2.191	73.1	85.0
9 . Give Timely Help	27	30	60	36.4	3.3		84.3	2.567	85.5	84.9
10. Teach New Skills	26	30	33.3	50	16.6		81.2	2.165	72.2	76.7
11. Grade Progress of the Students	23	30	36.7	30.3	30.3	3.31	71.8	2.001	66.8	69.3

boy and possible improvements in the farming program are pointed out to the parent. It also gives an opportunity to solicit the aid of the parent in seeing that the boy's farming program is carried to a successful completion.

Encouraging the use of improved practices taught in the classroom rated second in the opinion of the teachers. This gives an opportunity to point out the direct application to the student's farming program, of improved practices taught in class.

Checking a student's project book was considered valuable and rated third. It aided in determining the use the student was making of plans prepared in the classroom. It also gives an opportunity to check the completeness and accuracy of the project records.

Determining the weakness and suggestions for improvements is the farming program ranked fourth in the opinion of the teachers. It gives an opportunity for aiding the student in developing phases of his farming program in which weaknesses have developed.

Securing a background for classroom problems makes it possible for the teacher to use the problems of the boys as a basis for classroom study and discussion. This practice ranked fifth.

Guiding the students into new projects makes it possible for the teacher to add new units to the student's farming program when new opportunities are observed. The teachers rated this practice sixth.

Developing an incentive to do things the correct way ranked seventh. This practice gave an opportunity to achieve through private conference, objectives that were not accomplished in the classroom.

Modifying previous plans ranked eighth. This gave an opportunity for making necessary adjustments due to unforseen conditions.

The giving of timely help to the student by the teacher ranked ninth. Through this practice the student could be given assistance at the time when it is needed.

Tenth place was given to teaching of new skills. This practice makes it possible to take care of individual needs, when the skills were not effectively taught as a part of regular class work.

The lowest ranking was given to the grading of the progress of the student.

Summary.---The rankings of the practices used in the supervision of the farming programs of all-day students are as follows:

1. Develop a working relationship between the boy, parent, and teacher.
2. Encourage the use of improved practices taught in class.
3. Check student's project book.
4. Determine the weaknesses and suggest improvements in the farm program.
5. Secure a background for classroom problems.
6. Guide the student into new projects.
7. Develop an incentive to do things the correct way.
8. Modify previous plans.
9. Give timely help.
10. Teach new skills.
11. Grade progress of the student.

The practices were ranked on the basis of use and importance by the thirty-two selected teachers. All but one practice received a score of above 75 per cent out of a possible 100. The range in scoring was from 97.9 for the highest and 69.3 for the lowest score.

All the practices ranked high in the final score which indicates that they should be considered important.

The Scheduling of Farming Program Supervision Visits

A check as to the methods used by teachers in scheduling visits, should be of value in determining the best methods of conducting the supervision of the farming programs of all-day students.

The advantages and disadvantages listed by this group of teachers may indicate the reason that some of these methods of scheduling are used more frequently than others.

A list of the possible methods of scheduling visits were given to each teacher. They were asked to check the method or methods they normally used. The advantages and disadvantages of all the methods listed were to be given by the teachers.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Methods Used by Teachers in Scheduling Supervisory Visits.---

Method a. When Critical Points are Reached.---

Twenty-eight of the thirty-two teachers indicated that they scheduled supervisory visits to farming programs when critical points are reached in the student's projects.

The advantages to this method are that the teachers are able to give help when it is needed. The teachers are able to make a greater contribution to the student's farming program. Encouragement in the use of improved practice

is more effective at the time of need. This may prevent loss. The boy's interest is higher and teaching is more effective.

TABLE II ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF METHODS USED BY 32 TEACHERS IN SCHEDULING

Practice Used	Number of Teachers Checking	Per Cent of Teachers Checking
a) Dates when critical points are reached in a student's farming program	28	87.5
b) Written or verbal notice	25	78.1
c) Student invitation	24	75.0
d) Unannounced visit	24	75.0
e) Student statement of need	20	65.5
f) Regular schedule for the teacher unknown to the student	9	28.3
g) When teacher's time permits	9	28.3
h) Post a schedule in agricultural room for the student	4	12.5

This method requires more time on the part of the teacher especially when the boy has a large farming program. The student may learn to depend too much on the teacher. The teacher is required to keep a rigid schedule to prevent missing the critical points in any of the students' projects.

Method b. Written or Verbal Notice.---

A written or verbal notice was used by twenty-five of the teachers.

The advantages given were that the students were at home which saved time and driving on the part of the teacher. The project record books were in better condition. This made it possible for the teacher to spend more time on the project. The parents were prepared for the supervisory call.

The disadvantages were that it does not allow the student much leeway. It requires more effort on the part of the teacher in preparing the notice. The student tends to prepare for the visit and makes it difficult to grade interest.

Method c. Student Invitation.---

There were twenty-four teachers who reported the use of student invitation as a method of scheduling visits.

The advantages listed were that the student has a definite need and interest. He is ready for the help that the teacher can give. It aids in developing a feeling of cooperation between the student and teacher. Due to the fact that the student took the initiative, the teacher can be of greater service.

There were some definite disadvantages given to this method. The student invitation may not fit in with the teacher's schedule. Some boys do not recognize a need, and may hesitate to ask for help from the teacher. Sometimes unnecessary calls are made. Students tend to dress up their projects before inviting the teacher and thus create an abnormal situation.

Method d. Unannounced Visits.---

Twenty-four teachers used the unannounced visit as one method of scheduling project supervision calls.

There were eight advantages given for this method of scheduling visits. It gives a better cross-section of the farming program as it shows conditions as they normally exist. It tends to keep boys on their toes and checks workmanship of the "show off" type of student. Progress can be easily judged; presenting a better opportunity to grade the student and his project record book. The boy feels that the instructor is interested in his program.

Five disadvantages were given. The boy and parents may not be at home thus necessitating extra trips. Boys are likely to let things go. The teacher may overlook mistakes and lose the boys respect when you pass over them. The family is not prepared and ill at ease.

Method e. Student Statement of Need.---

There were twenty teachers who depended upon students statement of need as one method of scheduling project supervision visits.

The advantages of this method were that there is a definite problem to be solved. The student feels that the teacher's help will be of definite value in its solution.

The student may not recognize the need for help and the teacher may overlook the slow students. These were the disadvantages given for this method.

Method f. Regular Schedule for Teacher Unknown to Student.---

Nine teachers reported that they use a regular schedule for the supervision of the farming program which is unknown to the student.

This method has the advantage that it can be made flexible to meet the needs of both the student and the teacher. The teacher can see the project under normal conditions.

A disadvantages to this method, the teachers stated that the boy might not be at home. Problems do not arise according to a fixed schedult. The boy may be busy with farm work and not want to take the time required for project supervision. The majority of the teachers objected to a fixed schedule because it produced a routine procedure.

Method g. Inspection When Time Permits.---

Nine of the thirty-two teachers favored inspection of the farming program when their time permitted.

This method is convenient for the teacher and permits more visits when used properly.

The disadvantages were that teachers may not take time for the supervision of the farming program. There is a tendency to let project supervision ride. The teacher may not call at the boy's home at the time he needs help.

Method h. Post Schedule in Agricultural Room for the Students.---

Four teachers reported that they post a schedule in the agricultural room to notify the student as to the date of the supervisory visit.

Projects and project books were in better condition due to the fact that the student had an opportunity to prepare in advance for the visit.

Parents were prepared for the supervisory visit and ready to ask questions.

The disadvantages of posting a schedule were that it did not give the teacher an opportunity to see the project under normal conditions. The teacher found it difficult to keep a rigid schedule. Problems did not arise according to the posted schedule. It did not meet the needs of the individual students.

Summary.---The methods used by the thirty-two teachers in scheduling visits appeared to fall into two groups. Approximately two-thirds of the teachers used a group which included five methods for the scheduling of supervisory visits. They are:

1. Dates when critical points are reached in a student's farming program
2. Written or verbal notice
3. Student invitation
4. Unannounced visits
5. Student's statement of need

Approximately one-third of the teachers used the second group which included three methods. They are:

1. Regular schedule unknown to the student
2. When the teacher's time permitted
3. A schedule posted in the agricultural room for the students as a notification of the visitation dates.

Factors that Determine the Number of Visits

A ranking of possible factors which may bring about more farming program supervision visits and may be of value in determining the number of visits for a given student's farming program.

The possible reasons for farming program supervision calls were listed on a questionnaire. The teachers were to rate the reason according to the following scale: High = 3; Average = 2; Low = 1; No value = 0. They were also to indicate the ones they used in determining the number of visits an individual boy's farming program received. The data were tabulated with the percentage of teachers using the factor; the rating placed on the factor and the cumulative value calculated.

A study of the rankings as shown in Table III, gives rise to some questions. Why should beginning students be given prime consideration in the scheduling of visits? Have the teachers done such a good job with the older students that they have little need for help, or is it that their farming programs have not expanded properly?

The rankings by the thirty-two teachers indicate that the beginning students require more consideration for supervisory visits. The beginning student would be classified as boys taking their first year of vocational agriculture.

A student who needs encouragement ranked second. This factor could apply to all students of vocational agriculture, where conditions exist that are detrimental to the conduct of a good farming program.

A large farming program ranked third as a factor to be considered in determining the number of visits per boy, per

TABLE III FACTORS THAT DETERMINE THE NUMBER OF VISITS MADE PER BOY PER YEAR AND RANKING OF EACH ACCORDING TO IMPORTANCE

Factors Considered as Causes For More Supervisory Visits	Percent of Teachers Ranking 3	Percent of Teachers Ranking 2 Average	Percent of Teachers Ranking Low or 1	Percent of Teachers Ranking 0	Evaluated Score in Terms of 3 = 100%	Evaluated Score in Percent	Percent of Teachers That Use Factors to Make Visits	Final Score
a) Beginning Students	83.8	16.1			2.842	97.7	96.5	95.6
b) Students Need Encouragement	80.8	19.2			2.788	92.9	93.5	93.2
c) Large Farming Program	50.	46.8	3.12		2.467	82.2	93.5	87.8
d) Poor Parental Attitude	63.4	23.3	13.3		2.501	83.5	78.	80.7
e) Students With Low Ability	59.2	29.6	11.1		2.479	82.5	75	78.7
f) Poor Project Opportunity	40.7	44.5	14.8		1.259	42.	65.5	53.7
g) Good Project Opportunity	21.4	60.6	14.3	3.5	1.997	66.5	34.2	53.3
h) Good Student	24	48	2.0	8	1.880	62.6	15.6	39.1
i) Good Parental Attitude	8	64	1.6	1.2	1.680	56	15.6	35.8
j) Small Farming Program		52.8	42.7	4.8	1.531	51		25.5
k) Older Students	4	48	40	.8	1.120	33.7	3.5	18.6

year. This may be due to the fact that a large farming program involves more problems requiring supervision by the teacher.

Poor parental attitude was ranked fourth, as a factor in determining visits. This may indicate that more guidance and help is required on the part of the teacher. The parent in this case may not give the full value of his experience and promote conditions for a satisfactory farming program.

Students with low ability ranked fifth. This factor required consideration because the student may not have the ability to solve his problems without the guidance of the teacher.

The next six factors ranked in the lower half of the scoring.

Poor project opportunities ranked sixth as a factor in determining the number of visits made per boy, per year.

Good project opportunities ranked seventh. The lower ranking of this factor may be due to a smaller amount of the teacher's time being required to set up a satisfactory farming program.

Good students as a factor for consideration in scheduling visits, ranked eighth. The low ranking given this factor may be due to good students having the ability to solve many of their problems without requiring the aid of the teacher.

Good parental attitude ranked ninth. The low rating of this factor for consideration might be due to the teachers' feeling that less time was necessary in securing the aid of the parent in the promotion of a satisfactory farming program.

A small farming program ranked tenth as a factor. This rating may be caused by a student's small farming program presenting fewer problems needing the assistance of the teacher.

Older students ranked last as a factor which determines the number of visits per boy, per year. The lowest ranking being given to this factor may be due to the teachers feeling that the students have developed the ability to solve their own problems. It may be due in part to insufficient expansion of the farming programs.

Summary.---The factors considered as possible causes for more supervisory visits were ranked with a range in score of 95.6 for the highest to 18.6 for the lowest. The factors with a score of more than 75 are: First beginning students; second, students who need encouragement; third, students with a large farming program; fourth, students where poor parental attitude exists; and fifth, students with low ability.

The factor in the lower half of the scoring are: Sixth, poor project opportunities; seventh, good project opportunities; eighth, good students; ninth, good parental attitudes; tenth, a student with a small farming program and eleventh, older students.

Time of Day Considered Best for Farming Program Supervision

To find the time of day that the teacher preferred for project supervision would be of some value in helping determine the period of day to be alloted for farming program supervision. The choice of time during the school year may vary from that preferred in the summer months.

First and second choice were to be indicated on the period of the day which the teachers preferred for the supervision of farm projects. In the questionnaire, project supervision during the school year and summer months were listed separately.

There is criticism, that during the summer months the period from 2:00 to 4:00 P. M. is not included in this survey.

Sixteen of the thirty-two teachers gave first choice to the morning hours of from 7:00 to 10:00 for the supervision of the farming program of all-day students during

the summer. Fourteen of the teachers gave first choice to the afternoon period from 3:00 to 7:00. Six gave first choice to the noon period during the hours of 10:00 to 2:00. Four teachers checked more than one of the three periods as to first choice, which indicated that they gave them an equal rating.

TABLE IV TIME OF DAY PREFERRED DURING THE SUMMER FOR THE SUPERVISION OF FARMING PROGRAMS

Time of Day	First Choice		Second Choice	
	Number of Teachers Checking	Per Cent of Teachers Checking	Number of Teachers Checking	Per Cent of Teachers Checking
Morning: 7:00-10:00	16	44.4	7	24.2
Noon: 10:00-2:00	6	16.6	11	37.95
Afternoon: 3:00-7:00	14	39.0	11	37.95

As to second choice for the period of day preferred for the supervision of the farming program of all-day students, eleven teachers checked the noon period from 10:00 to 2:00. The afternoon period from 3:00 to 7:00 was also checked by eleven teachers. Seven teachers chose the morning period from 7:00 to 10:00 as a second choice. Four teachers did not give a second choice.

It should be noted that the period of the day from 2:00 to 3:00 P. M. was not included.

Some of the teachers commented that they preferred the morning period, particularly during the harvest season. The students were more likely to be at home waiting for the dew to dry. They, therefore, would have time to spend with the teacher.

TABLE V TIME-OF-DAY PREFERRED DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR FOR THE SUPERVISION OF FARMING PROGRAMS

Time of Day	First Choice		Second Choice	
	Number of Teachers Checking	Per Cent of Teachers Checking	Number of Teachers Checking	Per Cent of Teachers Checking
Morning before school			4	14.3
Noon Hour			1	3.6
Evening after school	28	82.4	2	7.1
Saturday morning	6	17.6	21	7.5

During the school year, twenty-eight of the thirty-two teachers gave first choice to the period in the evening after school for the supervision of the farming program of all-day students. Six teachers checked Saturday morning as their first choice. Two teachers checked both the period

in the evening after school and Saturday morning which indicated that they had no preference.

As a second choice during the school year, twenty-one teachers indicated that they preferred Saturday morning for their supervisory work. Four checked the period in the morning before school as a second choice. Two preferred the evening after school. One teacher gave the noon hour as second choice. Four teachers did not have a second choice.

Summary.---Sixteen of the thirty-two teachers gave first choice to the morning period from 7:00 to 10:00 for the supervision of the farming program of all-day students during the summer. Fourteen teachers checked the afternoon period from 3:00 to 7:00. Six teachers preferred the period from 10:00 to 2:00 for their supervision of the farming program.

Eleven teachers preferred as second choice the noon period from 10:00 to 2:00 for the supervision of the farming program during the summer. Eleven also checked the afternoon period from 3:00 to 7:00. Seven teachers preferred the morning period from 7:00 to 10:00 as second choice for supervision of the farming program.

During the school year, twenty-eight of the thirty-two teachers gave first choice to the period after school, as the time they preferred to supervise the farming programs.

As a second choice of time for the supervision of farming programs, twenty-one teachers preferred Saturday morning. Four teachers checked the period in the morning before school. Two indicated that they liked the period in the evening after school. One teacher checked the noon hour as the time of day he preferred as second choice for the supervision of the farming programs of all-day students.

Amount of Time Involved in Farming Program Supervision

Using the per cent of time spent by the teacher in farming program supervision and the total working hours in a year, will give the approximate number of hours spent in supervision. Then, using the approximate time spent per visit, per boy and the above estimate of time used in supervision, will give an estimate of the number of visits per year per teacher.

The teachers were asked to list the number of boys supervised in an evening after school, a full day in the summer and Saturday morning. They were to estimate the amount of time they spent at each call on a crop and livestock project and a boy's total farming program.

There seemed to be some variation in the opinion of the teachers as to the per cent of time that should be spent in supervisory visits. There was a range of from 10 to 40 per cent with the mean number being approximately 20 per cent. The average time spent was 21 per cent.

The largest group of teachers used approximately 60 minutes for each supervisory visit.

The greatest per cent of the teachers preferred to visit two boys in an evening after school.

Most of the teachers preferred to visit from five to six boys a day in the summer.

On Saturday morning the largest percentage of teachers preferred to visit from two to three boys.

The average number of visits for 31 of the teachers was 7.3. The mean number of visits for the 31 teachers was 7, this compares very favorable with George P. Deyoe.[1]

If we use these figures as guides, we would find that a teacher should spend 20 per cent of his total time on the job for supervision of the farming program. If we use 45 hours as a working week and 52 weeks per year, there would be 2,240 hours available. Of this time, 448 hours would be spent in supervising the farming program of all-day students. If we use 60 minutes as the length of time for the visit, there would be a possibility of 448 supervisory calls per year.

The number of individual supervisory visits per boy per year, would then depend on the number of boys in the department.

---

[1] Deyoe, op. cit., p. 341.

TABLE VI DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS ACCORDING TO PER CENT OF TIME SPENT IN SUPERVISION OF FARMING PROGRAMS

Per cent of teaching time spent in project supervision	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45 and Over
Percentage of teachers spending the given amount of time	13.8	20.7	20.7	24.1	13.8	3.4	3.4	
Number of teachers	4	6	6	7	4	1	1	

TABLE VII DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS IN PERCENTAGE ACCORDING TO MINUTES OF TIME SPENT FOR EACH SUPERVISORY VISIT

Minutes spent	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90-99	100 and over
Livestock project	6.6	13.3	46.6	16.6	16.6					
Crop project	36.6	13.3	43.4	3.4		3.4				
Boy's total farming program			9.3	9.3		37.4	6.2		21.9	15.6

TABLE IX NUMBER OF VISITS TEACHERS MADE PER BOY PER YEAR

Number of visits per boy per year	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Distribution of teachers according to number of visits per boy per year	6	3	3	6	5	4	3		1

TABLE VIII THE DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS IN PERCENTAGE ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS SUPERVISED

Number of boys	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Evening after school	9.3	62.5	28.1							
Full day in summer			6.2	9.3	21.9	31.1	12.5	9.3	3.1	
Saturday morning		3.0	36.7	23.3	3.4	6.6				

If we take the state average of approximately 30 boys per department this would allow time for a possible average of 13.6 visits per boy per year.

Using seven as the minimum number of visits listed by the selected teachers, this would indicate that the average number of visits should range between seven and 13.6 visits per boy. The number of visits trending toward seven when the number of boys in the department is above thirty and trending toward thirteen when there are less than thirty in the department.

Summary.---The range in time spent on farming program supervision was from 10 to 40 per cent. The average amount of time being 21 per cent and mean number being 20. The amount of time spent at each supervisory visit appeared to be approximately 60 minutes.

The largest per cent of the teachers visited five to six boys in a full day. Two to three boys were visited on Saturday morning and two boys in an evening after school. The average number of visits per boy per year was 7.3 and the mean number was seven.

Using the figures given by the teacher, there was a possibility of 448 hours per year being spent in supervision of the farming program of all-day students on the home farm.

Preparation Made and Reference Material Carried while Conducting Farming Supervision

The preparation made by the teachers before conducting the supervisory visit should give some indication as to the proper preparation for project supervision.

The data were organized in the questionnaire in the form of six questions. It included material reviewed before the trip, reference material and equipment carried while on the trip.

TABLE X TECHNICAL MATERIAL REVIEWED BEFORE CONDUCTING FARMING PROGRAM SUPERVISION

Technical Material Reviewed	Number of Teachers Making Preparation
Parasite and disease control for crops and livestock	9
Boy's farming program	5
Livestock feeding	4
Feed and labor cost	3
Current farm price	3
Fertilizer recommendation	2
Crop problems	2
Experiment Station data	1
Current machinery problems	1
Current farm problems	1

Twenty-four of the thirty-two teachers indicated that they made some preparation in regard to reviewing technical or other material before arriving at the home of the boy.

Eight teachers made no preparation before going to the boy's home.

The type of material reviewed varied but in general, covered anticipated problems in the projects to be supervised. The material listed by the teachers included current parasite and disease control problems for both livestock and crops. The boys' farming programs and previous supervision records of the programs were reviewed. Feed and labor cost, current prices, fertilization recommendations and recent crop and livestock bulletins were checked.

TABLE XL REFERENCE MATERIAL CARRIED DURING THE SUPERVISION OF THE FARMING PROGRAM

Reference Material	Number Teachers Reporting
Parasite and disease control for crops and livestock	19
Feeding	10
Machinery handbooks	4
Crop bulletins	4
General livestock bulletins	2
Feed and labor cost	1
Fertilizer recommendation	1
Current marketing information	1
Vegetable crop bulletins	1

Twenty-seven of the teachers reported that they carried reference material. Five of the teachers did not carry reference material.

The information covered in the reference material which they carried included parasite and disease control, bulletins for crop and livestock, livestock feeding bulletins, fertilization recommendation for crops, dairy and swine bulletins, current feed cost sheet, current market prices, machinery hand books, vegetable and orchard crop bulletins.

Summary.---The material reviewed before conducting the supervisory visit and the reference material carried were closely related. This may indicate that the teachers did not possess sufficient knowledge of the subjects mentioned without the aid of the reference material. Approximately 75 per cent of the teachers reviewed and carried reference material.

The most important subject matter reviewed and carried was: parasite and disease control for crops and livestock and livestock feeding.

Information Covered and use Made of Records Kept on Supervision of Farming Program

A list of the items included in the records kept by the teachers on farming program supervision and the use made

of this information could be an aid in setting up project supervision records.

The teachers were asked to list the items included in the records and the use made of them. They were to submit samples of these records. Seven teachers responded to this request, four used the form suggested by George P. Deyoe[1] in his book entitled "Supervised Farming in Vocational Agriculture."

TABLE XII ITEMS INCLUDED IN RECORDS OF FARM PROGRAM SUPERVISION

Item	Number Teachers Reporting
Name of boy	31
Date of visitation	20
Recommendations	17
Boy's farming program	12
Observations	7
Project book condition	7
Student grade	6
Size of home farm	6
Address	6
Telephone	5
Age	4
Parent or guardian's name	4
Year in school	4
Problems encountered	4
Major farm enterprises	4
Progress of student	3
Critical periods in project	3
Classroom problems	2
Rough notes on farming program	2
Shop jobs	1

[1]Deyoe, op. cit., p. 351.

Thirty-one teachers indicated they kept a record of supervision of the farming program of all-day students. The type of record kept and the content varied. There were four items that appeared common to most of the records. They were: the name of the boy, date of visitation, recommendations made by the teacher and the boy's farming programs. There were other items listed but they appeared in less than one-third of the records kept by the teachers.

TABLE XIII USES MADE OF RECORDS KEPT ON FARMING PROGRAMS

Item	Number Teachers Reporting
To determine next visit	17
For follow-up work	12
Classroom problems and illustrations	6
To make out travel report	3
To keep from missing boys	2
For project summary and teaching material	2
To determine the progress of the boy	2
Planning future farming programs	2
For shop jobs	1
To determine grade of student	1

The use made of the record appeared to help determine the next visit and for follow-up work.

Summary.---There were four items that appeared common in most of the records: The name of the boy, date of visitation, recommendations made by the teacher and the boy's farming program.

The use made of the record helped determine the next visit and for follow-up work.

The Equipment Carried by the Teacher while Conducting Supervisory Visits

A list of equipment normally carried by the selected teachers could be of value to other teachers of vocational agriculture in choosing the proper equipment to be carried while supervising the farming program of all-day students.

The teachers were asked to list the items they normally carried while supervising the farming program, particular emphasis being given the items they used most frequently.

TABLE XIV EQUIPMENT CARRIED BY THE TEACHER WHILE CONDUCTING SUPERVISORY VISITS

Item	Number Teachers Reporting
Vaccinating syringes	22
Worming tools and capsules	13
Castrating knife	11
Farm level	9
Clippers	7

TABLE XIV (CONTINUED)
EQUIPMENT CARRIED BY THE TEACHER WHILE CONDUCTING SUPERVISORY VISITS

Item	Number Teachers Reporting
Wrenches and tools	6
Pruning tools	5
Mastitis cards	4
Soil test equipment	3
Scales	3
Needle teeth clippers	3
Dehorning	2
Sprayer	2
Oil	2
Hoof trimmers	2
Milk test sample bottles	2
Pig ringing tools	2
Bee veil	2
Hive tools	1
Egg scales	1
Caponizing equipment	1
Livestock medicine	1
Spray and dust material	1
Measuring jack for land	1

The items carried by the teachers appeared to be those items of equipment not easily found on the home farm.

The equipment most frequently listed as being carried by the teacher was a vaccinating syringes. They could be used for the control of diseases of Swine, Cattle, and in some cases dogs.

Most of the remaining equipment carried included items which promoted the use of improved practices.

Summary.---There were three items of equipment carried by one-third or more of the teachers. Twenty-two teachers carried vaccinating syringes. Thirteen teachers carried castration equipment. All but two of the thirty-two teachers carried some piece of equipment which was not easily found on the home farm.

Related Problems that were Investigated

The three related problems investigated were some of the major difficulties encountered in supervision of the farming programs. The teachers gave suggestions and criticisms for supervisory visits. They also listed changes they have made in the last three years.

As a part of the interview in connection with this study, each teacher was asked to give his reaction and comment on three questions. They were as follows:

1. What are the major difficulties you encounter in project supervision?
2. What changes have you made in the last three years?
3. Do you have any suggestions or criticisms for supervisory visits?

A summary of the answers given can be found in Table XV, XVI, and XVII.

TABLE XV DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED IN FARMING PROGRAM SUPERVISION

Item	Number Teachers Reporting
Boys or parents not home	10
Boys busy with farm work	5
Lack of time on part of teacher	5
Lack of interest on part of parents	4
Parents object to change of practice	3
Keep record up-to-date	3
Getting boys to keep livestock separate	3
Parents taking too much time	2
Boys do not follow plans	2
Lack of parental financial support	1
Project books lost	1
Right kind of feed	1

Major Difficulties Encountered.---The major difficulties listed appeared to deal with organization, and the stimulation of interest and proper attitude on the part of the parent and boy.

The difficulty of finding the boy or parent at home was listed most frequently.

Changes Made in the Last Three Years in Supervising Farming Programs.---Most of the changes listed by the teachers, were made so as to bring about more effective farming programs. To accomplish this, they suggested that the supervisory visits be made more timely. Better supervisory records should be kept.

TABLE XVI CHANGES MADE IN THE LAST THREE YEARS IN SUPERVISING FARMING PROGRAMS

Item	Number Teachers Reporting
Make visits more timely	7
Better project supervision records	5
Spent less time on project supervision	4
More emphasis placed on project books	2
Set up schedule for visit	2
Spent more time in classroom grading books	1
Give boy written report of each visit	1
Greater emphasis on all practices	1
More recommendations on labor saving devices	1
Spent more time with parents	1
Spent more time on project supervision	1
Do more visiting during early morning	1
Spend more time with slow students	1
Spend less time with fast students	1
Drop definite schedule	1

Four teachers stated that they were spending less time on supervising the farming programs. Transportation difficulties and of the boy's and parent's time. The teacher should keep the parent informed on the farming program.

A teacher suggested that more use should be made of the project books than just a place to keep records.

It was also suggested that the instructor should have managerial experience and responsibility.

The boy should be given a definite grade after each visit to give him an understanding as to his progress. A challenge should be left at the close of each supervisory visit.

TABLE XVII SUGGESTIONS OR CRITICISMS FOR PROJECT SUPERVISION

Item	Number Teachers Reporting
Make supervisory visit with definite purpose in mind	5
Farming program supervision should be given more time	4
Teachers should have managerial experience and responsibility	2
More use should be made of project record books	1
Schedule visits so as to make worthwhile use of time	1
Boys should be given a definite grade at each visit	1
A challenge should be left with the boy at the close of each visit	1

Summary.---Some of the teachers suggested that the supervisory visits should be made with a definite purpose in mind. Farming programs supervision should be given more time. They stated that it reflects the interest of the teacher and helps to develop the interest of the boy. Supervisory visits should be scheduled to make worthwhile use of the boy's and parent's time. The teacher should keep the parent informed on the farming program.

The teacher suggested that more use should be made of the project books than just a place to keep records.

It was also suggested that the instructor should have managerial experience and responsibility.

The boy should be given a definite grade after each visit to give him an understanding as to his progress. A challenge should be left at the close of each supervisory visit.

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The ranking of the practices used were as follows:

1. The developing of a working relationship between the boy, parent and teacher.
2. To encourage the use of improved practices taught in class.
3. Check student's project book.
4. Determine weakness and suggest improvements in the farming program.
5. Secure a background for classroom problems
6. Guide the student into new projects.
7. Develop an incentive to do things the correct way.
8. Modify previous plans.
9. Give timely help.
10. Teach new skills.
11. Grade progress of the students.

The methods used by approximately two-thirds of the teachers in scheduling visits were:

1. Dates when critical points were reached in the farming program.
2. Give the student a written or verbal notice.
3. Student invitation

4. Unannounced visit.

5. Student statement of need.

Factors considered most important as possible causes for more supervisory visits were:

1. Beginning students

2. The student who needs encouragement

3. A large farming program

4. Poor parental attitude

5. A student with low ability

The material reviewed before conducting supervisory visits and the material carried were closely related. The most important subject matter reviewed and carried were bulletins on parasite and disease control for crops and livestock and livestock feeding

The approximate amount of time spent in farming program supervision was 20 per cent and 60 minutes spent per visit.

Four items common to most of the records kept by the teacher in supervision of the farming program were:

1. Name of boy

2. Date of visit

3. Recommendations made by the teacher

4. The boy's farming program

The use made of the records appeared to be mainly for determining the next visit and for follow-up work on the boy's farming program.

Equipment most frequently listed as being carried was vaccinating syringes. Most of the remaining equipment carried included items which promote the use of improved practices.

The time of day preferred for project supervision during the school year was in the evening immediately following school.

There appeared to be little difference in the choice of time for supervision between the early morning or late afternoon in the summer.

Conclusions

In the light of this study and information revealed from the thirty-two selected Negro teachers of vocational agriculture in Texas the following conclusions were reached:

1. It is very essential to develop a working relationship between the boy, parent and teacher.
2. That teachers of vocational agriculture should encourage the use of improved practices taught in class and that the project record book can serve to aid in determining the weaknesses in the farming program and suggest improvements.
3. In the best total programs of vocational agriculture in Texas in Negro schools the students farming program serve as background for classroom

problems, timely help is given by the teacher when necessary and that as near as possible visits are scheduled when critical points are reached in the students farming program.

4. The scheduling of visits may be announced or unannounced. The time of day best suited to all concerned for best results.
5. There is a need for extra supervisory visits to the beginning student, to the student who needs encouragement, one with low ability, large farming program, and to those with poor parential attitude.
6. Not enough time has been spent actually supervising the farming programs of all-day boys on the home farm. Not much attention given to the record of supervisory visits.
7. It is desirable that technical material covering problems to be encountered be reviewed before making supervisory visits.
8. It is necessary to carry pieces of equipment and material which promote improved practices when making supervisory visits.

Recommendations

The following specific recommendationa are offered for the consideration of the teachers of vocational agriculture

to improve the supervision of the farming program of all-day students on the home farm:

1. That the teacher very early in the game develop a working relationship between the boy, parent and teacher.
2. That the teacher encourage the use of improved practices taught in class. The student project book be checked to aid in determining the weaknesses in the farming program and suggest improvements. This may aid in guiding the student into new projects.
3. That the student's farming program serve as a background for classroom problems. This should help to develop an incentive in the student to properly conduct his farming program.
4. That previous plans be modified (by the teacher) and timely help given when necessary. New skills necessary to the boy's farming program that were not effectively taught in the classroom should be taught at this time.
5. That in scheduling visits the teachers should be familiar with the dates when critical points are reached in the farming program and visit at this time. These may be announced or unannounced visits. A written notice given during the summer months and

verbal or written notice given during the time when the boys are in school.

6. Unannounced visits be made to determine conditions as they exist under a normal situation.
7. That extra visits be concentrated on the beginning student to aid in developing proper parental attitude. He can also aid in setting up an adequate, properly managed farming program for the student.
8. That a student who needs encouragement and one with low ability receive extra supervisory visits.
9. That a large farming program receive sufficient visits to cover the critical periods in the projects.
10. That when poor parental attitude exists extra calls should be made to educate the parents as to the aims and purposes of the boy's farming program.
11. That the hours after school and Saturday mornings be used in the supervision of the farming program. During the summer the early morning hours and the late afternoon hours receive prime consideration as to the time of day to supervise the farming program.
12. That the teacher make a minimum of seven visits per boy per year. That he spend at least 20 per cent of his total teaching time in the supervision of the farming program with an average of a minimum of 60

minutes per visit.

13. That the technical material covering problems that may be encountered in the supervision of the farming program be placed upon parasite and disease control for crops and livestock and livestock feeding.

14. That records of the supervisory visits be kept and include such information as boy's name, date of visit, recommendations made by the teacher, and the boy's farming program. The records be used to determine the next visit and for follow-up work in the boy's farming program.

15. That the teacher carry vaccinating syringes and other small pieces of equipment which promote improved practices and not likely to be found on the home farm.

The supervision of farming programs appeared weak in organization to secure accomplishments of specific objectives. Farming program supervision should receive special attention in teacher training and in meetings conducted by the supervisors for in-service teachers to correct this situation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Bolender, E. O., Rhoad, C. E., and Kenestrick, H. G., Teaching Procedures in Developing Boys Through the Use of Their Farming Programs. Columbus: Department of Agricultural Education, Ohio State University, 1940.

Deyoe, George P., Supervised Farming in Vocational Agriculture, Danville, Illinois: Interstate Publishing Company, 1937.

Schmidt, C. A., Project and the Project Method in Agriculture Education. New York: The Century Company, 1937.

Bulletin

Ross, W. A., Clements, D. M. and Johnson, E. L., "Directing Vocational Agriculture Day School Students in Developing Their Farming Programs." Federal Security Agency, U. S. Office of Education, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C: (1944).

Theses

Lemon, Ralph D., "Farming Program Supervision of All-Day Students as Conducted by Selected Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Ohio." Ohio State University Library, Ohio State University, Columbus: (1943).

Ogle, George Calvin, "The Home Project in Vocational Agriculture." M. A. Thesis, University of Missouri, Columbia: (1932).

Rutledge, Paul, "Analysis of Official Travel Done by Vocational Agriculture Teachers." M. S. Thesis, Prairie View A & M. College, Prairie View, Texas: (1950).

Wallace, Marion W., "A Study of the Summer Teaching Load of 27 Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Southwestern, Ohio." Master's Thesis, The Ohio State University,(1942).

Wiswall, Clinton Henry, "A Study of Project Supervision in Idaho for the Years 1932-33 and 1933-34." (1934).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF TEACHERS WHO CONTRIBUTED IN THE MAKING OF THIS STUDY

Teacher	School	Post Office
Archie, N. L.	Booker Washington	Conroe, Texas
Arnold, R. V.	Sweet Home	Sequin, Texas
Baker, M. G.	Wharton High	Wharton, Texas
Coleman, Sherman	Jasper	Jasper, Texas
Coss, W. H.	Holland	Carthage, Texas
Criner, L.	Hooks High	Hooks, Texas
Cunningham, I. C.	Smith Graded	Gause, Texas
Davis, N. L.	Jackson High	Tyler, Texas
Dorsey, T.	Lott	Lott, Texas
Foreman, R.	Dogan	Fairfield, Texas
Harper, McNoble	Pruitt	Atlanta, Texas
Harris, James	Edna	Edna, Texas
Hayes, L. T.	Macedonia	Jefferson, Texas
Holloway, J. W.	Stanton	Tyler, Texas
Johnson, E. J.	Omaha	Omaha, Texas
Kline, H. V.	Gonzales	Gonzales, Texas
Lockett, W. F.	Central	Jefferson, Texas
Lyons, E. C.	Quitman	Quitman, Texas
McClellan, Van	Lindale	Lindale, Texas
Moody, R. A.	Emmett Scott	Tyler, Texas
Palmer, S. E.	Supervisor Area II	Tyler, Texas
Powell, J. R.	Huntsville	Huntsville, Texas

Names and Addresses of Teachers (Continued)

Teacher	School	Post Office
Rigsby, A. B.	Sam Schwartz	Hempstead, Texas
Robinson, M. R.	Timpson	Timpson, Texas
Sampson, S. H.	Duale	Cuero, Texas
Scott, Alton	Marlin	Marlin, Texas
Smith, A. L.	Carver	Frankston, Texas
Tamplin, D.	Concord	Mt Enterprise, Texas
Thomas, O. J.	State N.F.A.Adviser	Prairie View, Texas
Wallace, Lawrence	St. Paul-Shiloh	Oakwood, Texas
Washington, E. J.	Winona	Winona, Texas

APPENDIX B

Jackson High School
Rt. 3, Box 287
Tyler, Texas

Dear Fellow Worker:

I am in need of some very essential information in order to complete my thesis.

My subject is, "A Study of the Supervision of Farming Program of All-Day Students as Conducted by Selected Negro Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Texas."

Each area supervisor was asked for the names and addresses of six men in his area who were doing successful jobs of supervising farming programs of their all-day boys.

You were among the selected teachers in Texas doing a successful job of supervising all-day boys in their farming programs. I am asking you to kindly fill out the enclosed questionnaire and please mail to me on or before Tuesday (_____). A stamped addressed envelope is provided for your convenience.

If you would like to have a one page summary of this study kindly put your name and address in the space below and return with your questionnaire. Thanking you very kindly, I am,

Sincerely yours,

William L. Kissam

_____

Name_____

Address_____

Town_____

APPENDIX C

A STUDY OF THE SUPERVISION OF FARMING PROGRAMS OF ALL DAY STUDENTS AS CONDUCTED BY SELECTED NEGRO TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TEXAS

(Questionnaire)

Name_____School_____

Address_____

I. What procedure do you use in supervising the farming programs of all-day students on the home farm? List in sequence as you use them.

Example: 1. May make appointments with the boy in advance.

2. Before stopping will check project record from last visit.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

II. Check the list of practices you use in project supervision on the home farm. Rate the practices according to value of effectiveness in project supervision. Use the following scale:

1. High 2. Average 3. Low 4. No Value

Check	Rating	
_____	_____	a) Check students' project record book
_____	_____	b) Develop a working relationship between the boy, parent and teacher
_____	_____	c) Encourage the use of improved practices taught in class
_____	_____	d) Teach new skills
_____	_____	e) Modify previous plans
_____	_____	f) Develop an incentive to do things the correct way
_____	_____	g) Secure a background for problems to use as classroom problems
_____	_____	h) Determine the weaknesses and suggest improvements in the project program of the boy

Check Rating

_____ _____i) Guide the student into new projects
_____ _____j) Grade the progress of the student
_____ _____k) Give timely help
_____ _____l) others

III. How do you schedule visits? Check as many as you use. Give advantages and disadvantages of methods checked.

Check

_____a) Post a schedule in the agricultural room for the students - Advantage____Disadvantage_____

_____b) Regular schedule teacher follows unknown to student - Advantage_____Disadvantage_____

_____c) Written or verbal notice
Advantage_____Disadvantage_____

_____d) When critical points are reached in a boy's farming program - Advantage_____
Disadvantage_____

_____e) Student invitation
Advantage_____Disadvantage_____

_____f) Unannounced visit
Advantage_____Disadvantage_____

_____g) Inspection when your time permits
Advantage_____Disadvantage_____

_____h) Student statement of need
Advantage_____Disadvantage_____

IV. What determines the number of visits you make per boy per year? Check the ones that are important to you in scheduling the visits. Rate them according to importance, using the following scale.

1-High ;: 2-Average:; 3-Low :; 4-No Value :;

Check Rating

_____ _____a) Student with large farming program requires
_____ _____b) Students with small farming program requires more visits
_____ _____c) Older students require more visits
_____ _____d) Beginning students require more visits

Check Rating (Continued)

_____ _____e) Poor parential attitudes require more visits
_____ _____f) Good parential attitude require more visits
_____ _____g) Poor project opportunities require more visits
_____ _____h) Good project opportunities require more visits
_____ _____i) Good students require more visits
_____ _____j) Students of low ability require more visits
_____ _____k) More visits are required where students need encouragement
_____ _____l) Others

V. What time of day do you consider best for project supervision? List first and second choice:

During School Year	During the Summer
_____a) Morning	_____a) Morning
_____b) Noon	_____b) Noon
_____c) Evening	_____c) Evening
_____d) Saturday Morning	

VI. How many boys do you normally visit in:

_____a) An evening after school
_____b) A full day during the summer
_____c) A Saturday morning
_____d) Others

VII. How much time do you normally spend at each visit on:

_____a) A livestock project
_____b) A crop project
_____c) A boy's total farming program

VIII. 1. Do you review technical or other material in fields where you feel a lack of information before arriving at the home of the boy?_____

2. What type of technical or other material do you normally review before arriving at the home of the boy?

3. Do you carry reference material with you while out on project supervision?_____

4. If you carry reference material, what kind? Bulletins____Handbooks___Textbooks___Others_____

5. List type of information covered in technical or other information carried normally.

6. What tools and equipment do you normally carry while out on project supervision? Example, scale, hoof trimming tools, vaccinating needles, prunning tools, castrating knife, etc.

IX. 1. Do you keep a record of your project supervised?___

2. If you keep a record, what is included in the record? Furnish a sample, if possible.

3. How do you make use of the record?

X. 1. What are the major difficulties you encounter in project supervision? Please list them:

2. Do you have any suggestions or cirticism to make in regard to project supervision?

XI. 1. What changes have you made in the last three years in project supervision? Why were these changes made?

2. Approximately what per cent of your time is spent in project supervision?_____.

3. Do you take boys with you when visiting projects after school____how many_____.

4. Do you anticipate the problems of the student before arriving at his home_____.

5. How many supervisory visits do you normally make per boy per year_____.

XII. Use the back of this sheet to qualify any previous answers if you wish.