

MULTIPLE-TEACHER DEPARTMENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

---

A study of thirty multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture throughout the United States to be used as a basis for organizing similar departments in Virginia and especially in Charlotte County.

A THESIS

submitted to

THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION,

THE DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,

AND TO THE GRADUATE COMMITTEE

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for

THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF SCIENCE

IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

BY

GILBERT RAY KINZIE, B.A.

BLACKSBURG, VIRGINIA

1941

Approved:

---

Head of Department

---

Dean of Agriculture

---

Chairman, Graduate Committee

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was planned and carried to completion under the direction of the late Professor Edmund C. Magill. For his assistance, as well as that of others, the author wishes to express his appreciation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
THE SITUATION-----	1
THE PLACE OF THIS STUDY-----	3
THE PLAN OF PROCEDURE-----	5
THE STUDY AND FINDINGS-----	8
SUMMARY-----	49
CONCLUSIONS-----	52
RECOMMENDATIONS-----	57
BIBLIOGRAPHY-----	66
APPENDIX I----QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN THIS STUDY-----	67
APPENDIX II---LIST OF MULTIPLE-TEACHER DE- PARTMENTS INCLUDED IN THIS STUDY-----	70

LIST OF TABLES

		<u>Page</u>
Table I	The Number of Years the Present Status of Consolidation Had Existed and the Number of Years the Present Number of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture Had Been Employed-----	9
Table II	The Enrollment in Classes of Vocational Agriculture as a Percentage of the Total Enrollment in High Schools-----	11
Table III	The Percentage of High School Teachers Teaching Vocational Agriculture-----	13
Table IV	The Average Number of Boys Enrolled in Vocational Agriculture per Teacher of Agriculture-----	15
Table V	The number of Years of Vocational Agriculture Offered and the Length of Periods-----	18
Table VI	Ratio of the Number of Classrooms and Shoprooms to the Number of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture-----	20
Table VII	Data on Part-Time Classes-----	23
Table VIIIA	Data on Evening Classes-----	25
Table VIIIB	Data on Evening Classes-continued	26
Table IX	Teacher Load in Terms of Enrollment in All-Day, Part-Time, Evening, and Day-Unit Classes-----	28
Table X	Size of Program as Shown by Average Number of Individuals in Organized Instruction Per Teacher of Vocational Agriculture-----	30

LIST OF TABLES-CONTINUED

		<u>Page</u>
Table XI	The Relation of the Number of Periods Spent in Shop by Classes of Agriculture to the Number of Days in the School Session and the Number of Boys Enrolled in Vocational Agriculture-----	31
Table XII	The Number of Years of Experience of Head Teachers and Assistant Teachers in the Multiple-Teacher Departments-----	33
Table XIII	Degrees Held by Head Teachers and Assistant Teachers of Vocational Agriculture-----	36
Table XIV	Salaries of Head Teachers and Assistant Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in the Thirty Multiple-Teacher Departments---	38
Table XV	The Relation of Travel Allowance, Area Served, and the Number of Boys Enrolled-----	41

## The Situation

In 1937, Dr. Sidney B. Hall, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, at the request of Mr. R. W. Bobbitt, Division Superintendent of Charlotte County, Virginia, appointed a committee to study the school plant needs in Charlotte County in terms of a long range planning program. The county school board and the people of the county had previously agreed to abide by whatever recommendations this committee should make. The committee in its report recommended, among other things, that the county consolidate its seven high schools into one central high school to be located at Charlotte Court House.

The decision to consolidate the high schools of the county created many new problems never before faced by any county in Virginia. In order to set up a program of Vocational Agriculture which would be most efficient in such a consolidated school, Mr. Bobbitt consulted Mr. Edmund C. Magill, Professor of Vocational Agriculture at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, with reference to the most desirable building plan, facilities, and organization for instruction. Since there were in the high schools of the county over two hundred boys enrolled in Vocational Agriculture, an enrollment approximately three times as large as that found in any single department in the state, it became

evident that the information needed was not available on the basis of previous experience in Virginia. It was furthermore evident that a considerable amount of research would be required in reaching the most satisfactory solution to these problems since they resulted from an unprecedented consolidation in Virginia and all of the information would have to be secured from without the state.

Therefore, this study of certain Multiple-Teacher Departments of Vocational Agriculture throughout the United States was undertaken with the idea that the results might be used as a basis for organizing similar departments in Virginia and especially in Charlotte County.

### The Place of This Study

When plans were being made to consolidate the high schools of Charlotte County, it was found that there were no large departments of Vocational Agriculture in Virginia, whose plans could be used as a basis for planning the work in this county. Furthermore, no references could be located of any studies of large departments of agriculture and of the problems confronted by departments in county-wide consolidated schools. So many problems were raised by the consolidation that it seemed desirable that more than one study be undertaken. The present study is one of two related studies which were decided upon. As the studies progressed it was found that no departments existed which were identical to the one which was to result from the consolidation in Charlotte County. There were three types of rather large departments found which approached the Charlotte County situation; these were as follows: first, multiple-teacher departments, but with a smaller enrollment in agriculture and serving a smaller area than in Charlotte County; second, large departments in large city high schools serving small densely populated areas; third, County Agricultural Schools which serve the entire county but which conduct large farms and offer a more specialized type of instruction to

the students most of whom board at the school.

Among the problems raised by this consolidation in Charlotte County the following seemed to require special study; first, the number of teachers of Agriculture required; second, the placing of responsibilities of the department; third, the organization for instruction; fourth, the division of boys between teachers for all-day instruction; fifth, the organization for supervision of boys' home farm practice; sixth, the responsibility for instruction in part-time and evening classes; seventh, type of building; eight, size of classrooms and shops; ninth, number of classrooms and shops; tenth, necessary facilities and the number of each; eleventh, the desirable facilities and the optimum number of each; twelfth, the most practical arrangement of the facilities. The first six of these are discussed in the findings of this study, while the last six are discussed in the findings of the study made by Mr. John C. Layman, entitled "A Study to Determine A Practical Plan and Arrangement of Facilities for the Vocational Agriculture Building at the Proposed Consolidated High School in Charlotte County."

## The Plan of Procedure

In the solution of the problems presented by the county-wide consolidation of schools in Charlotte County, the first step was a visit to Charlotte County for the purpose of securing information as a background for the study.

The author and Mr. John C. Layman made this trip in November, 1938 at which time a conference was held with Mr. R. W. Bobbitt, Division Superintendent of Schools, and the three teachers of vocational agriculture.

At this conference, information on the local situation was secured, problems presented by consolidation were more clearly defined, and possible sources of necessary information for the solution of the problems were suggested.

After this trip, the decision was made to visit the United States Office of Education in Washington, D. C. for the purpose of locating all of the multiple-teacher departments of Vocational Agriculture in the United States.

The trip to Washington was made in January, 1939 at which time Dr. F. W. Lathrop, Research Specialist, assisted the author and Mr. Layman in finding the locations of the multiple-teacher departments. Conferences were arranged with the Regional Agents and information was secured as to which departments were most typical of the Charlotte County Consolidation.

Since the majority of multiple-teacher departments were found in the south and since these were more comparable to the department planned for Charlotte County, it was decided that a trip to visit a number of schools could be most profitably made in the south.

After permission was secured from the state supervisors of vocational agriculture to visit certain schools, a trip was planned which included visits to two multiple-teacher departments in each of the states of Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina. This trip was taken in March, 1939 by Mr. C. E. Richard of the Department of Agricultural Education, V.P.I., Mr. John C. Layman, and the author of the present study.

At each school the teachers of vocational agriculture were interviewed and answers secured on previously prepared questionnaires.

After the ten multiple-teacher departments were visited, the list of questions on information desired was revised, mimeographed and mailed to the other schools selected for use in this study. Professor Edmund C. Magill had previously obtained permission from the various state supervisors to solicit information to use in research from certain schools in their states. Twenty questionnaires were returned although some were incomplete. Follow-up letters were used to secure information to complete the questionnaires.

The ten multiple-teacher departments of agriculture visited along with the twenty multiple-teacher departments contacted by questionnaire compose the thirty departments covered by this study.

## The Study and Findings

The thirty multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture included in this study are widely scattered throughout the United States, and some are found in each of the four Regions. Half of the departments, however, are located in the Southern Region and these fifteen departments are perhaps more comparable to the department resulting from consolidation in Charlotte County, Virginia, than those found in other regions. Therefore, the multiple-teacher departments are grouped by regions in the tables which follow. This grouping also readily permits comparisons between regions. The departments are listed by town and state rather than by the name of the school and the data given in these tables are for the year 1938-'39 unless otherwise indicated. In a few tables, comparisons are drawn between the averages for the multiple-teacher departments studied and the averages for all departments of agriculture in the Regions and in the United States. Totals and averages are shown on the tables where considered significant.

Table I The Number of Years the Present Status of Consolidation Had Existed and the Number of Years the Present Number of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture Had Been Employed

Regions, Towns and States	No. of years present consolidation had existed	No. of years present no. of Agriculture teachers had been employed
<u>N. Atlantic</u>		
Williamantic, Conn.	18	6
Caribu, Maine	1	1
New Brunswick, N. J.	18	3
Wayne, W. Va.	1	1
<u>Southern</u>		
Elba, Alabama	14	4
Enterprise, Ala.	10	4
Moultrie, Georgia	11	1
Gueydan, La.	16	2
Ville Platte, La.	32	1
Ellisville, Miss.	12	1
Eupora, Miss.	6	6
Purvis, Miss.	7	1
Sumrall, Miss.	11	1
Conway, S. C.	10	4
Easley, S. C.	18	6
Pickens, S. C.	8	4
Covington, Tenn.	13	4
Lexington, Tenn.	3	3
Van, Texas	7	6
<u>N. Central</u>		
Winfield, Kan.	15	16
Paducah, Ky.	1	1
Austin, Minn.	15	2
Eldorado Springs, Mo.	2	2
Park River, N. D.	25	10
<u>Pacific</u>		
Bakersfield, Cal.	20	4
Hayward, Cal.	50	1
Lodi, Cal.	27	1
Modesto, Cal.	20	10
Salinas, Cal.	3	2
Santa Rosa, Cal.	17	12
Totals	411	120
Averages	15.7	4

Table I. OBSERVATIONS

Of the 30 schools included in this study 20 or 2/3 of them had maintained the present consolidation for 10 years or more; while only 4 out of 30 had operated with the present number of teachers of agriculture for longer than 10 years. Teachers of vocational agriculture had been added in 26 of the schools during the past 10 years and in 22 of the schools in the past 5 years.

Of the 30 schools, 10 had added a teacher of agriculture for the current session and in 3 of these the consolidations had been effected at the beginning of the current session.

The average number of boys enrolled in vocational agriculture in the 15 schools having the oldest consolidations (13 years or more) was found to be 113 while the average number of boys enrolled in vocational agriculture for the 15 schools having the youngest consolidations (12 years or less) was found to be 95.

In only one case, Winfield, Kansas, had the number of teachers of vocational agriculture remained constant for a longer period than the present consolidation had existed, while the present status of consolidation in the majority (20 of 30) of the multiple-teacher departments studied had been maintained for longer than 10 years. Additional teachers of agriculture had been employed during the past 10 years in nearly all (26 of 30) schools.

Table II The Enrollment in Classes of Vocational  
Agriculture as a Percentage of the Total  
Enrollment in High Schools

Regions, Towns, and States	Total High School Enrollment	Enrollment in Vocational Agriculture	Per Cent Enrolled in Vocational Agriculture
<u>Atlantic</u>			
Williamantic, Conn.	1100	63	5.7
Caribu, Maine	550	72	13.1
New Brunswick, N. J.	1475	164	11.1
Wayne, W. Va.	550	156	28.4
Totals	<u>3675</u>	<u>455</u>	<u>12.4</u>
<u>Southern</u>			
Elba, Ala.	282	30	10.9
Enterprise, Ala.	460	42	9.1
Moultrie, Georgia	937	98	10.5
Gueydan, La.	210	102	48.6
Ville Platte, La.	470	34	7.2
Ellisville, Miss.	600	128	21.3
Eupora, Miss.	320	77	24.1
Purvis, Miss.	200	49	24.5
Sumrall, Miss.	400	75	18.8
Conway, S. C.	650	130	20.0
Easley, S. C.	500	84	16.8
Pickens, S. C.	354	87	24.6
Covington, Tenn.	390	107	27.4
Lexington, Tenn.	412	130	31.5
Van, Texas	540	100	18.5
Totals	<u>6725</u>	<u>1273</u>	<u>18.9</u>
<u>N. Central</u>			
Winfield, Kan.	1200	86	7.2
Paducah, Ky.	599	78	13.0
Austin, Minn.	1600	89	5.6
Eldorado Springs, Mo.	450	95	21.1
Park River, N. D.	308	109	35.4
Totals	<u>4157</u>	<u>457</u>	<u>11.0</u>
<u>Pacific</u>			
Bakersfield, Cal.	4000	240	6.0
Hayward, Cal.	1620	113	6.9
Lodi, Cal.	1300	158	12.1
Modesto, Cal.	2000	163	8.1
Salinas, Cal.	1400	106	7.5
Santa Rosa, Cal.	1400	154	11.0
Totals	<u>11,720</u>	<u>934</u>	<u>7.9</u>
Grand Totals	26,277	3119	Average 11.73

Table II OBSERVATIONS

The number of boys enrolled in vocational agriculture in the 30 high schools was found to be approximately 11% of the total high school enrollment.

The range in the percentages of high school students enrolled in vocational agriculture in the different schools was found to be from 5.8% to 48.6%.

The 15 schools with the lowest percentages (5.7% to 13.0%) enrolled in vocational agriculture had an average high school enrollment of 1258 each and a total enrollment in vocational agriculture of 1619 while the 15 schools with the highest percentages (13.1% to 48.6%) enrolled in vocational agriculture had an average high school enrollment of 429 and a total enrollment in vocational agriculture of 1501.

As a rule the larger the total high school enrollment the smaller the percentage enrolled in vocational agriculture. This would naturally be expected since the larger schools generally offer a broader choice of elective subjects.

It is also noted that the total high school enrollments in the Pacific Region were consistently high while in the Southern Region they were consistently low.

The 6 schools in the Pacific Region were all among the 15 schools with the lowest percentage enrolled in vocational agriculture while only 4 of the 15 schools in the Southern Region were among the group.

Table III The Percentage of High School Teachers  
Teaching Vocational Agriculture

Regions, Towns, and States	Total no. of teachers in H. S.	Number of teachers of Vocational Agriculture	Per Cent of H. S. Teachers Teaching Voc. Agri.
<u>N. Atlantic</u>			
Williamantic, Conn.	34	2	5.6
Caribu, Maine	23	2	8.7
New Brunswick, N. J.	66	2	3.0
Wayne, W. Va.	20	2	10.0
Totals	<u>143</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>5.6</u>
<u>Southern</u>			
Elba, Ala.	11	2	18.2
Enterprise, Ala.	16	2	12.5
Moultrie, Georgia	34	2	6.3
Gueydan, La.	10	2	20.0
Ville Platte, La.	6	2	33.3
Ellisville, Miss.	48	2	4.2
Eupora, Miss.	14	2	14.3
Purvis, Miss.	13	2	15.4
Sumrall, Miss.	13	2	15.4
Conway, S. C.	26	2	7.7
Easley, S. C.	22	2	9.1
Pickens, S. C.	13	2	15.4
Covington, Tenn.	16	2	12.5
Lexington, Tenn.	13	2	15.4
Van, Texas	17	2	11.8
Totals	<u>272</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>11.0</u>
<u>N. Central</u>			
Winfield, Kan.	42	2	8.8
Paducah, Ky.	15	2	13.3
Austin, Minn.	67	2	3.0
Eldorado Springs, Mo.	17	2	11.8
Park River, N. D.	13	3	23.1
Totals	<u>154</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7.1</u>
<u>Pacific</u>			
Bakersfield, Cal.	171	8	4.7
Hayward, Cal.	65	3	4.6
Lodi, Cal.	50	4	8.0
Modesto, Cal.	60	4	6.6
Salinas, Cal.	51	3	5.9
Santa Rosa, Cal.	54	4	7.4
Totals	<u>451</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>5.8</u>
Grand Total	1020	75	7.4

Table III OBSERVATIONS

In the 50 departments studied it was found that 7.4% of the high school teachers taught vocational agriculture as compared with 11.7% of the total high school enrollment enrolled in agriculture.

In the 15 schools with the lowest percentages enrolled in agriculture there were only 4 cases in which the teachers of agriculture composed more than 10% of the teaching staff while in the 15 schools with the highest percentage of students enrolled in agriculture there were only 4 cases in which the teachers of agriculture composed less than 10% of the teaching staff.

The ratio of the number of teachers of agriculture to the total number of teachers in each school ranged from 1 out of 3 to 1 out of 33.

The Southern Region, with 11% of the high school teachers teaching agriculture, ranked highest while the North Atlantic Region with 5.6% of the high school teachers teaching agriculture ranked lowest. The percentage of high school teachers teaching agriculture in the North Central and Pacific Regions was found to be 7.1% and 5.8% respectively.

It is noted that in the Pacific Region all of the multiple teacher departments included in the study had more than two teachers of agriculture.

Table IV The Average Number of Boys Enrolled in Vocational  
Agriculture per Teacher of Agriculture

Regions, Towns and States	Number of teachers of Vocational Agriculture	Total Enrollment in Vocational Agriculture	Average number Enrolled per Teacher of Agriculture
<u>N. Atlantic</u>			
Williamantic, Conn.	2	63	31.5
Caribu, Maine	2	72	36.0
New Brunswick, N. J.	2	164	82.0
Wayne, W. Va.	2	156	78.0
Totals	<u>8</u>	<u>455</u>	<u>56.9</u>
<u>Southern</u>			
Elba, Ala.	2	30	15.0
Enterprise, Ala.	2	42	21.0
Moultrie, Georgia	2	98	49.0
Gueydan, La.	2	102	51.0
Ville Platte, La.	2	34	17.0
Ellisville, Miss.	2	128	64.0
Eupora, Miss.	2	77	38.5
Purvis, Miss.	2	49	24.5
Sumrall, Miss.	2	75	37.5
Conway, S. C.	2	130	65.0
Easley, S. C.	2	84	42.0
Pickens, S. C.	2	87	43.5
Covington, Tenn.	2	107	53.5
Lexington, Tenn.	2	130	65.0
Van, Texas	2	100	50.0
Totals	<u>30</u>	<u>1273</u>	<u>42.4</u>
<u>N. Central</u>			
Winfield, Kan.	2	86	43.0
Paducah, Ky.	2	78	39.0
Austin, Minn.	2	89	44.5
Eldorado Springs, Mo.	2	95	47.5
Park River, N. D.	3	109	36.33
Totals	<u>11</u>	<u>457</u>	<u>45.2</u>
<u>Pacific</u>			
Bakersfield, Cal.	8	240	30.0
Hayward, Cal.	3	113	37.66
Lodi, Cal.	4	158	39.5
Modesto, Cal.	4	163	40.75
Salinas, Cal.	3	106	35.33
Santa Rosa, Cal.	4	154	38.5
Totals	<u>26</u>	<u>934</u>	<u>35.9</u>
<u>Grand Totals</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>3119</u>	<u>41.59</u>

Table IV OBSERVATIONS

Of the 30 multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture studied:

- 23 were two-teacher departments,
- 3 were three-teacher departments,
- 3 were four-teacher departments, and
- 1 was an eight-teacher department.

The average number of boys enrolled in all-day classes of vocational agriculture per school in the 30 multiple-teacher departments was 104 with a range of from 30 to 240.

The average number of boys enrolled per teacher in all-day classes of vocational agriculture was found to be 41.59, with a range from 15 to 82.

When the 30 schools were grouped according to the number of teachers of agriculture, the average number of boys enrolled in agriculture per teacher and the range was as follows:

No. of teachers	No. of Departments	Average No. enrolled per teacher	Range of enrollment per teacher
2	23	45	15 to 82
3	3	36	35 to 38
4	3	40	39 to 41
8	1	30	_____

The average number of boys enrolled per teacher was considerable larger and the range was much greater in the two-teacher departments than in the departments having more than two teachers.

The schools of the North Atlantic Region showed the highest teacher load with an average of 56.9 boys enrolled in all-day classes of vocational agriculture per teacher, while the Pacific Region showed the lowest with an average of 35.9 boys per teacher.

Table V The Number of Years of Vocational Agriculture Offered and the Length of Class Periods.

Regions, towns and States	No. of years of Agriculture Offered in High School	Length of periods in minutes
<u>N. Atlantic</u>		
Williamantic, Conn.	4	120
Caribu, Maine	4	90
New Brunswick, N. J.	3	90
Wayne, West Va.	4	90*
<u>Southern</u>		
Elba, Ala.	3	90
Enterprise, Ala.	3	90
Moultrie, Georgia	4	120
Gueydan, La.	4	60
Ville Platte, La.	4	90
Ellisville, Miss.	4	90
Eupora, Miss.	2**	90
Purvis, Miss.	3	90
Sumrall, Miss.	3**	90
Conway, S. C.	3	90 & 60
Easley, S. C.	4	120
Pickens, S. C.	4	90 & 120
Covington, Tenn.	4	60
Lexington, Tenn.	4	60
Van, Texas	3	90
<u>N. Central</u>		
Winfield, Kan.	4	60 & 180
Paducah, Ky.	4**	90
Austin, Minn.	4	80
Eldorado Springs, Mo.	4	100 & 120
Park River, N. D.	4	90
<u>Pacific</u>		
Bakersfield, Cal.	4	120
Hayward, Cal.	4	60
Lodi, Cal.	4	60
Modesto, Cal.	4	90
Salinas, Cal.	4	55
Santa Rosa, Cal.	4	60

\*90 minutes average(60 minute periods alternate with 120 minute periods)

\*\*Instruction in Agriculture is also offered in one or more Elementary grades.

Table V OBSERVATIONS

Of the 30 multiple-teacher departments there were 22 departments in which 4 years of vocational agriculture were offered, 7 departments in which 3 years of vocational agriculture were offered, and 1 department in which only 2 years of vocational agriculture were offered.

In 3 of the schools, instruction in vocational agriculture was offered in the elementary grades. At Eupora, Mississippi this instruction was offered in grades 7 and 8; at Sumrall, Mississippi it was offered in grade 6; and at Paducah, Kentucky in grade 8.

Of the 30 multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture, 13 departments used 90 minute periods.

The average length of periods used for vocational agriculture in the 30 departments studied was 87.17 minutes.

The 90 minute class period was the most frequently used as shown by the following summary:

Number of departments:	Length of Class Period Used
13	90 minutes
6	60 minutes
5	60 0 180 minutes*
4	120 minutes
1	80 minutes
1	55 minutes

\*In these 5 schools a combination of 2 different length periods, ranging from 60 to 180 minutes, was used.

Table VI Ratio of the Number of Classrooms and Shoprooms to the Number of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture

Regions, Towns And States	Number of teachers	Number of classrooms	Number of shoprooms
<u>N. Atlantic</u>			
Williamantic, Conn.	2	2	1
Caribu, Maine	2	2	1
New Brunswick, N. J.	2	2	1
Wayne, W. Va.	2	2	1
<u>Southern</u>			
Elba, Ala.	2	1	1
Enterprise, Ala.	2	1	1
Moultrie, Georgia	2	2	1
Gueydan, La.	2	2	1**
Ville Platte, La.	2	1	1
Ellisville, Miss.	2	2	2
Eupora, Miss.	2	2	1
Purvis, Miss.	2	1	1
Sumrall, Miss.	2	2	1
Conway, S. C.	2	2	1
Easley, S. C.	2	2	1
Pickens, S. C.	2	2	1
Covington, Tenn.	2	2	1
Lexington, Tenn.	2	2	1
Van, Texas	2	2	1***
<u>N. Central</u>			
Winfield, Kan.	2	2	1
Paducah, Ky.	2	2	1
Austin, Minn.	2	1	2
Eldorado Springs, Mo.	2	2	1
Park River, N. D.	3*	2	3***
<u>Pacific</u>			
Bakersfield, Cal.	8	7	2***
Hayward, Cal.	3	2	1***
Lodi, Cal.	4	3	1***
Modesto, Cal.	4	3	1***
Salinas, Cal.	3	3	1
Santa Rosa, Cal.	4	3	1
<b>Grand Totals</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>36</b>

\* A 4 month shop course conducted by 3 short-term teachers

\*\* Shop used only by students in grades 10 and 11.

\*\*\* Farm Mechanics offered as a separate course.

## Table VI OBSERVATIONS

A classroom for instruction in vocational agriculture was provided for each teacher of vocational agriculture in nineteen of the 30 schools. This seems the most ideal arrangement.

In 5 schools there was only a single classroom for vocational agriculture. However, in 2 of these schools, Elba, Alabama and Enterprise, Alabama, there was no conflict in the use of the single classroom since one teacher, known as the inside teacher, conducted the all-day classes, while the other teacher, known as the outside teacher, devoted his time entirely to those not in school and used the classroom only during out of school hours for part-time and evening classes.

In the 3 other schools in which there was only one classroom for vocational agriculture, either the shoproom was used as a classroom or a temporary arrangement had been made to use a classroom in another building or department.

A shoproom was provided for each teacher in 3 of the 30 schools. The advantages claimed for this arrangement are that each teacher may conduct shop classes at the same time without conflict, each teacher is solely responsible for the tools in his shop, and that each teacher may have a part of his group doing classroom work while

the others work in the shop. The apparent disadvantage in having a shoproom for each teacher is the extra cost of supplying the facilities.

In 26 of the 30 schools there was only one shoproom. This arrangement in the average shop seems most desirable from an economical viewpoint, as it makes possible more efficient and constant use of the shoproom. The outstanding difficulty encountered was scheduling the use of the shop to avoid conflict during the winter months when greater emphasis is placed on this phase of instruction due to seasonal advantages. The schedule in some cases provided for classes alternating in the use of the shop every week of two weeks.

When a full-time course in shop or farm mechanics was offered, generally, no shop work was scheduled for classes in vocational agriculture. In some cases the full-time course in shop or farm mechanics was open only to boys in vocational agriculture III and IV while in other cases it was an elective course open to all.

Table VII Data on Part-Time Classes

Regions, Towns and States	No. of Teachers	No. of Teachers Conduct- ing Part- Time Classes	No. of Classes	No. Meetings Held	En- rollment in Part- Time Classes
<b>N. Atlantic</b>					
Williamantic, Conn.	2	0	0	0	0
Caribu, Maine	2	2	2	7	38
New Brunswick, N. J.	2	0	0	0	0
Wayne, W. Va.	2	1	1	24	15
Totals	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>53</u>
<b>Southern</b>					
Elba, Alabama	2	1	1	18	30
Enterprise, Ala.	2	1	1	16	9
Moultrie, Georgia	2	0*	0	0	0
Gueydan, La.	2	2	2	16	5
Ville Platte, La.	2	2**	1	16	20
Ellisville, Miss.	2	2	2	9	25
Eupora, Miss.	2	0	0	0	0
Purvis, Miss.	2	2**	4	24	47
Sumrall, Miss.	2	2	2	50	27
Conway, S. C.	2	2	2	15	33
Easley, S. C.	2	2	2	24	60
Pickens, S. C.	2	2	2	18	40
Covington, Tenn.	2	0	0	0	0
Lexington, Tenn.	2	0	0	0	0
Van, Texas	2	1	2	15	41
Totals	<u>30</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>221</u>	<u>337</u>
<b>N. Central</b>					
Winfield, Kan.	2	2	2	20	34
Paducah, Ky.	2	1	1	15	34
Austin, Minn.	2	1	2	16	39
Eldorado Springs, Mo.	2	0	0	0	0
Park River, N. D.	3	2**	1	20	45
Totals	<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>152</u>
<b>Pacific</b>					
Bakersfield, Cal.	8	0	0	0	0
Hayward, Cal.	3	0	0	0	0
Lodi, Cal.	4	0	0	0	0
Modesto, Cal.	4	0	0	0	0
Salinas, Cal.	3	0	0	0	0
Santa Rosa, Cal.	4	0	0	0	0
Totals	<u>26</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<b>Grand Totals</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>542</b>

\* Part-time classes were conducted by a special county teacher of agriculture

\*\* These teachers alternated or worked together in conducting part-time classes.

Table VII OBSERVATIONS

Out of the 30 multiple-teacher departments, there were 17 of 57% of the departments conducting part-time classes.

It was noted that there were no part-time classes conducted in the 6 multiple-teacher departments in the Pacific Region.

Out of the total of 75 teachers there were 28 who conducted at least one part-time class.

The average enrollment in part-time classes per department conducting classes was approximately 32.

Out of 30 multiple-teacher departments there were 11 in which all teachers conducted part-time classes. In 3 of the departments 2 teachers alternated or worked together in conducting part-time classes.

The average number of meetings conducted per year in the part-time classes was 19.

Table VIIIA Data on Evening Classes

Regions, Towns and States	No. of Teachers	No. of Teachers Conducting Evening Classes	Enrollment in Evening Classes
<u>N. Atlantic</u>			
Williamantic, Conn.	2	0	0
Caribu, Maine	2	1	25
New Brunswick, N. J.	2	1	18
Wayne, West Va.	2	2	70
<u>Southern</u>			
Elba, Ala.	2	2	241
Enterprise, Ala.	2	2	170
Moultrie, Georgia	2	2	300
Gueydan, La.	2	0	0
Ville Platte, La.	2	2*	22
Ellisville, Miss.	2	2	50
Eupora, Miss.	2	2	222
Purvis, Miss.	2	2	85
Sumrall, Miss.	2	2	85
Conway, S. C.	2	2	125
Easley, S. C.	2	2	220
Pickens, S. C.	2	2	435
Covington, Tenn.	2	2	210
Lexington, Tenn.	2	2	1050
Van, Texas	2	2	168
<u>N. Central</u>			
Winfield, Kan.	2	2	30
Paducah, Ky.	2	1	38
Austin, Minn.	2	2	142
Eldorado Springs, Mo.	2	2	90
Park River, N. D.	3	2	50
<u>Pacific</u>			
Bakersfield, Cal.	8	0	0
Hayward, Cal.	3	0	0
Lodi, Cal.	4	0	0
Modesto, Cal.	4	4	80
Salinas, Cal.	3	0**	0
Santa Rosa, Cal.	4	1	26
Grand Totals	75	46	3952

\* The two teachers alternate in conducting one evening class.

\*\* By ruling of the local school board the teachers in this county were not permitted to conduct evening classes.

Table VIII B Data on Evening Classes-Continued

Regions, Towns and States	No. of Classes per Teacher	No. of Meetings per year	Total No. of Classes
<u>N. Atlantic</u>			
Williamantic, Conn.	0	0	0
Caribu, Maine	4	20	4
New Brunswick, N. J.	1	15	1
Wayne, W. Va.	2-3	12	5
<u>Southern</u>			
Elba, Ala.	2-7	18	9
Enterprise, Ala.	2-5	20	7
Moultrie, Georgia	3-1	10	4
Gueydan, La.	0	0	0
Ville Platte, La.	$\frac{1}{2}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$	10	1
Ellisville, Miss.	1-1	10	2
Eupora, Miss.	3-2	10	5
Purvis, Miss.	2-2	12	4
Sumrall, Miss.	3-2	12	5
Conway, S. C.	2-2	20	4
Easley, S. C.	5-4	24	9
Pickens, S. C.	4-4	27	8
Covington, Tenn.	3-3	12	6
Lexington, Tenn.	1-7	15	8
Van, Texas	2-1	28	3
<u>N. Central</u>			
Winfield, Kan.	1-1	10	2
Paducah, Ky.	1	10	1
Austin, Minn.	1-4	14	5
Eldorado Springs, Mo.	2-1	10	3
Park River, N. D.	1-1	12	2
<u>Pacific</u>			
Bakersfield, Cal.	0	0	0
Hayward, Cal.	0	0	0
Lodi, Cal.	0	0	0
Modesto, Cal.	1-1-1-1	10	4
Salinas, Cal.	0	0	0
Santa Rosa, Cal.	1	10	1
Grand Totals		351	103
Average		14.6	3.3

Tables VIIIA. and VIIIB. --- OBSERVATIONS

Out of the total 75 teachers in the 30 departments studied, 46 teachers, or approximately 61% conducted evening classes.

Evening classes were conducted in 24 of the 30 departments or in 80% of them. Of the six departments not conducting evening classes four were in the Pacific Region.

In 60% of the departments (18 out of 30), both teachers conducted evening classes. The number of classes conducted by each teacher ranged from one to seven.

Each class met on an average of 15 evenings per year. The average enrollment per class was approximately 38.

There was an average enrollment of approximately 86 per teacher conducting evening classes.

It is noted that only 5 of the 26 teachers in the Pacific Region conducted evening classes. In one multiple-teacher department in the Pacific Region, teachers were not permitted by the school board to conduct evening classes.

Table IX Teacher Load in Terms of Enrollment in  
All-Day, Part-Time, Evening, and Day-Unit Classes

Regions, Towns and States	Number Enrolled In				Total No. in Organized Instruc- tion
	All- Day Class es	Part- Time Class- es	Evening Classes	Day- Unit Class- es	
<u>N. Atlantic</u>					
Williamantic, Conn.	63	0	0	0	63
Caribu, Maine	72	38	0	0	110
New Brunswick, N. J.	164	0	18	0	182
Wayne, W. Va.	156	15	70	0	241
Totals	<u>455</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>598</u>
<u>Southern</u>					
Elba, Alabama	30	30	241	70	371
Enterprise, Ala.	42	9	170	62	283
Moultrie, Georgia	98	0	300	0	398
Gueydan, La.	102	5	25	0	132
Ville Platte, La.	34	20	22	0	76
Ellisville, Miss.	128	25	50	0	203
Eupora, Miss.	77	0	222	0	299
Purvis, Miss.	49	47	85	0	181
Sumrall, Miss.	75	27	85	0	187
Conway, S. C.	130	33	125	0	288
Easley, S. C.	84	60	220	0	364
Pickens, S. C.	87	40	435	0	562
Covington, Tenn.	107	0	210	0	321
Lexington, Tenn.	130	0	1050	0	1180
Van, Texas	100	41	168	0	309
Totals	<u>1273</u>	<u>337</u>	<u>3408</u>	<u>132</u>	<u>5150</u>
<u>N. Central</u>					
Winfield, Kan.	86	34	30	0	150
Paducah, Ky.	78	34	38	0	150
Austin, Minn.	89	39	142	0	270
Eldorado Springs, Mo.	95	0	90	75	280
Park River, N. D.	109	45	50	0	204
Totals	<u>457</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>350</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>1054</u>
<u>Pacific</u>					
Bakersfield, Cal.	240	0	0	0	240
Hayward, Cal.	113	0	0	0	113
Lodi, Cal.	158	0	0	0	158
Modesto, Cal.	163	0	80	0	243
Salinas, Cal.	106	0	0	0	106
Santa Rosa, Cal.	154	0	26	0	180
Totals	<u>934</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>106</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1040</u>
Grand Totals	3119	542	3952	207	7860
Average per Department	108.96	18.06	131.73	6.56	262.
Average per Teacher	41.59	7.09	52.70	2.76	104.8

## Table IX OBSERVATIONS

The average number of pupils enrolled in all-day classes of vocational agriculture per teacher was 41.59. The range in the enrollment in vocational agriculture per department was 30 to 240.

The average number enrolled in part-time classes per department conducting classes was approximately 32, with a range of from 9 to 60.

The average number enrolled in evening classes per department conducting classes was approximately 165 with a range of 18 to 1050.

It is noted that day-unit classes were found in only 3 of the 30 multiple-teacher departments.

An average of 104.8 individuals were reached per teacher through all organized instruction including all-day, part-time, evening, and day-unit classes.

Table X Size of Program as Shown by Average Number of Individuals in Organized Instruction per Teacher of Vocational Agriculture

United States and Regions	Average number of individuals in organized instruction per teacher		Difference in Averages
	in the U.S.*	in 30 multiple-teacher departments**	
Total	69.3	104.8	35.5
North Atlantic	49.6	74.8	25.2
Southern	86.3	171.7	85.4
North Central	58.4	95.8	37.4
Pacific	53.3	40.0***	-13.3

\*1939 - 1940

\*\*1938 - 1939

\*\*\*No Part-time or Day-unit classes in the 6 multiple-teacher departments and no evening classes in 4 out of 6 departments in the Pacific Region.

#### Observations

An average of 35.5 more individuals were reached in organized instruction per teacher in the thirty multiple-teacher departments studied than the average number reached per teacher in the United States.

In the Pacific Region only did the teachers in the multiple-teacher departments studied reach fewer individuals than the average for all teachers in the region.

In the Southern Region the teachers in the multiple-teacher departments reached an average of 85.4 more individuals than the average for all teachers.

Table XI The Relation of the Number of Periods Spent in Shop by Classes of Agriculture to the Number of Days in the School Session and the Number of Boys Enrolled in Vocational Agriculture

Regions, Towns and States	Number of Periods in Shop	No. of days in the School Session	Enrollment in Vocational Agriculture
<u>N. Atlantic</u>			
Williamantic, Conn.	15	180	63
Caribu, Maine	45	180	72
New Brunswick, N. J.	70	190	164
Wayne, West Va.	60	180	156
Totals	<u>190</u>	<u>730</u>	<u>455</u>
<u>Southern</u>			
Elba, Alabama	40	180	30
Enterprise, Ala.	30	180	42
Moultrie, Georgia	36	180	98
Gueydan, La.	40	180	102
Ville Platte, La.	15	180	34
Ellisville, Miss.	36	180	128
Eupora, Miss.	20	160	77
Purvis, Miss.	45	160	49
Sumrall, Miss.	60	160	75
Conway, S. C.	20	180	130
Easley, S. C.	25	180	84
Pickens, S. C.	20	180	87
Covington, Tenn.	30	180	107
Lexington, Tenn.	40	180	130
Van, Texas	180*	180	100
Totals	<u>637</u>	<u>2640</u>	<u>1273</u>
<u>N. Central</u>			
Winfield, Kan.	72	180	86
Paducah, Ky.	40	160	78
Austin, Minn.	20	180	89
Eldorado Springs, Mo.	30	180	95
Park River, N. D.	180*	180	109
Totals	<u>342</u>	<u>880</u>	<u>457</u>
<u>Pacific</u>			
Bakersfield, Cal.	198*	200	240
Hayward, Cal.	182*	183	113
Lodi, Cal.	160*	200	158
Modesto, Cal.	180*	200	163
Salinas, Cal.	72	200	106
Santa Rosa, Cal.	5	200	154
Totals	<u>797</u>	<u>1183</u>	<u>934</u>
Grand Totals	1966	5433	3119
Averages	36.9	178.7	103.96
*These six schools had a special farm mechanics course which ran the full year and carried one unit credit.			

## Table XI OBSERVATIONS

In 15 schools where the enrollment in vocational agriculture was less than 100 the average number of periods spent in shop work was found to be 34.2 per school year. The average school year in these cases was 175 days. Thus shop work was done on approximately one-fifth (19.5%) of the days in the school session.

In schools where the enrollment in vocational agriculture was over 100 the average number of periods spent in shop work was found to be 41.4 per school year. This does not include 6 schools having special shop courses. The average school year in these cases was 186 school days. In these schools, shop work was done on 22.3% of the days in the school year.

The average number of periods spent in shop work by 24 schools was 36.9 and the average number of days in the school year was 178.7.

In 6 schools, shop work or farm mechanics was offered as a full-time course. All six of these schools had an enrollment of 100 or over. The average number of days spent in the shop per school session in these six schools was 180.

Table XII The Number Years' Experience of Head Teachers And Assistant Teachers in Multiple-Teacher Departments

Regions, Towns and States	No. of years as teacher of Agri.		No. of years in present position	
	Head Teacher	Assistant Teacher	Head Teacher	Assistant Teacher
<u>N. Atlantic</u>				
Williamantic, Conn.	8	4	8	3
Caribu, Maine	9	1	9	1
New Brunswick, N. J.	20	3	13	3
Wayne, West Va.	4	1	4	1
Totals	<u>41</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>Southern</u>				
Elba, Alabama	12	3	3	3
Enterprise, Ala.	10	2	1	2
Moultrie, Ga.	3	1	3	1
Gueydan, La.	16	3	10	2
Ville Platte, La.	8	1	4	1
Ellisville, Miss.	31	6	20	4
Eupora, Miss.	12	1	5	1
Purvis, Miss.	9	1	6	1
Sumrall, Miss.	6	1	6	1
Conway, S. C.	8	1	8	1
Easley, S. C.	30	1	30	1
Pickens, S. C.	6	4	6	4
Covington, Tenn.	17	4	12	4
Lexington, Tenn.	12	7	12	2
Van, Texas	12	7	3	3
Totals	<u>192</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>129</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>N. Central</u>				
Winfield, Kan.	22	17	20	15
Paducah, Ky.	13	2	1	2
Austin, Minn.	17	9	16	2
Eldorado Springs, Mo.	6	8	6	2
Park River, N. D.	10	4	10	3
Totals	<u>68</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>24</u>
<u>Pacific</u>				
Bakersfield, Cal.	20	18	20	18
Hayward, Cal.	19	12	4	1
Lodi, Cal.	19	17	17	13
Modesto, Cal.	11	11	11	8
Salinas, Cal.	19	14	1	6
Santa Rosa, Cal.	8	13	8	4
Totals	<u>96</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>50</u>
Grand Totals	<u>397</u>	<u>177</u>	<u>277</u>	<u>113</u>
Averages	13.43	5.9	9.23	3.76

Table XII OBSERVATIONS

The average number years of experience of the head teacher as a teacher of vocational agriculture was found to be 13.43, while the average number years of experience of the assistant teacher as a teacher of vocational agriculture was found to be 5.9.

The head teacher in the 30 multiple-teacher schools studied had on the average more than twice the number of years of experience as the second or assistant teacher.

The range in years of experience of the head teacher was 3 to 31 while the range in years of experience of the assistant teacher was 1 to 18.

There were 9 out of 30 assistant teachers who were teaching their first year.

The median in years of experience for the head teachers was 12 years while the median in years of experience for the assistant teachers was 4 years.

Only in 2 cases did the assistant teacher have more years of experience than the head teacher and in both cases the assistant teacher was transferred from another school while the head teacher had received total experience in the present position.

It was found that the head teachers had held their present positions for an average of 9.23 years while

the assistant teachers had held their present positions for an average of 4.43 years.

Only 3 out of 30 head teachers were holding their present positions for the first year, while 10 out of 30 assistant teachers were holding their present positions for the first year.

In 14 cases out of 30 the head teachers had had all experience as a teacher of vocational agriculture in the present position.

In 16 cases out of 30 the assistant teacher had had his total experience as a teacher of agriculture in his present position and 9 of these were teaching their first year.

Table XIII Degrees Held by Head Teachers and Assistant Teachers of Vocational Agriculture

Regions, Towns and States	Degrees held by:			
	Head Teacher	First Ass't	Second Ass't	Third Ass't
<u>N. Atlantic</u>				
Williamantic, Conn.	M.S.	B.S.		
Caribu, Maine	B.S.	B.S.		
New Brunswick, N. J.	M.S.	B.S.		
Wayne, West Va.	B.S.	B.S.		
<u>Southern</u>				
Elba, Alabama	B.S.	B.S.		
Enterprise, Ala.	M.S.	B.S.		
Moultrie, Ga.	B.S.	B.S.		
Gueydan, La.	B.S.	B.S.		
Ville Platte, La.	B.S.	B.S.		
Ellisville, Miss.	M.S.	M.S.		
Eupora, Miss.	B.S.	B.S.		
Purvis, Miss.	B.S.	B.S.		
Sumrall, Miss.	B.S.	B.S.		
Conway, S. C.	B.S.	B.S.		
Easley, S. C.	M.A.	B.S.		
Pickens, S. C.	B.S.	B.S.		
Covington, Tenn.	B.S.	B.S.		
Lexington, Tenn.	M.S.	B.S.		
Van, Texas	M.S.	B.S.		
<u>N. Central</u>				
Winfield, Kan.	M.S.	M.S.		
Paducah, Ky.	B.S.	B.S.		
Austin, Minn.	M.S.	B.S.		
Eldorado Springs, Mo.	B.S.	B.S.		
Park River, N. D.	B.S.	B.S.	B.S.	
<u>Pacific</u>				
Bakersfield, Cal.	B.S.	B.S.	B.S.	
Hayward, Cal.	B.S.	B.S.	B.A.	
Lodi, Cal.	B.S.	B.S.	None	B.S.
Modesto, Cal.	B.S.	B.S.	B.S.	B.S.
Salinas, Cal.	B.S.	B.S.	B.S.	
Santa Rosa, Cal.	B.S.	B.S.	B.S.	M.S.

Table XIII OBSERVATIONS

Of 30 head teachers, 9 held master's degrees while only 2 of the 30 assistant teachers held master's degrees. Both of these 2 were under 2 of the 9 head teachers who held master's degrees.

Of the 70 teachers in multiple-teacher departments, 12 teachers held master's (11 M.S., 1 M.A.) degrees. 57 teachers held bachelor's degrees, (56 B.S., 1 B.A.).

One teacher held no degree.

Approximately 1 out of every 6 teachers held master's degrees.

The average years of experience of the 12 teachers with master's degrees was found to be 16.83 years while the average number years of experience of 57 teachers with bachelor's degrees was found to be 8.49 years.

Table XIV Salaries of Head Teachers and Ass't Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in the 30 Multiple Teacher Departments

Regions, Towns and States	Salary of:			
	Head Teacher	First Ass't	Second Ass't	Third Ass't
<b>N. Atlantic</b>				
Williamantic, Conn.	\$2400.	\$1800.	\$	\$
Caribu, Maine	2333.	1500.		
New Brunswick, N. J.	3700.	1675.		
Wayne, West Va.	1975.	1885.		
Totals	<u>10,408.</u>	<u>\$6860.</u>		
<b>Southern</b>				
Elba, Alabama	2000.	1800.		
Enterprise, Ala.	2000.	1800.		
Moultrie, Ga.	2200.	1800.		
Gueydan, La.	2170.	1620.		
Ville Platte, La.	2154.	1600.		
Ellisville, Miss.	1800.	1800.		
Eupora, Miss.	2000.	1800.		
Purvis, Miss.	2400.	1800.		
Sumrall, Miss.	2800.	1800.		
Conway, S. C.	1860.	1467.		
Easley, S. C.	2400.	1500.		
Pickens, S. C.	1800.	1740.		
Covington, Tenn.	2600.	1950.		
Lexington, Tenn.	2150.	2400.		
Van, Texas	2700.	1900.		
Totals	<u>33,034.</u>	<u>26,777.</u>		
<b>N. Central</b>				
Winfield, Kan.	2728.	2400.*		
Paducah, Ky.	2412.	1680.		
Austin, Minn.	3100.	2700.		
Eldorado Springs, Mo.	2100.	2100.		
Park River, N. D.	2400.	2200.		
Totals	<u>12,740</u>	<u>11,080</u>		
<b>Pacific</b>				
Bakersfield, Cal.	4200.	3360.	3360.	
Hayward, Cal.	2640.	2340.	2340.	
Lodi, Cal.	2800.	2650.	2800.	2350.
Modesto, Cal.	2792.	2492.	2492.	2492.
Salinas, Cal.	2800.	2700.	2500.	
Santa Rosa, Cal.	2900.	2700.	2600.	2600.
Totals	<u>18,132.</u>	<u>16,242.</u>	<u>16,092.</u>	<u>7442.</u>
Grand Totals by group	<u>74,314.</u>	<u>60,959.</u>	<u>16,092.</u>	<u>7442.</u>
Grand Total, all teachers-----				\$158,807.

\* Half-time teacher of vocational agriculture, \$1200., figured as full-time.

Table XIV OBSERVATIONS

The salaries of the 69 teachers in the 30 departments ranged from \$1467 to \$4200 and averaged \$2301.55.

The salary received by the head teachers in the 30 departments averaged \$2477.13. The salaries of these teachers ranged from \$1800 to \$4200.

The salary received by the assistant teachers in the 30 departments averaged \$2031.97.

The range of salary for this group was from \$1467 to \$3360.

The average difference in salaries received by head teachers and assistant teachers was \$445.16. (These salaries do not include travel allowance in cases where a separate allowance is made.)

The following comparison is made between average salaries in the departments studied and the average salaries for white teachers in the United States and Regions:

	Average salaries per teacher of vocational agriculture:	
	In the U.S.	In the 30 departments
Totals	\$1,989.08	\$2,301.55
N. Atlantic	2,104.43	2,158.50
Southern	1,980.03	1,993.70
N. Central	1,922.25	2,382.00
Pacific	2,026.59	2,757.52

Tables XIII & XIV. OBSERVATIONS

RELATIONS OF SALARIES AND DEGREES

The salaries of the 12 teachers with master's degrees ranged from \$1800 to \$3700 and averaged \$2481.50.

One teacher of these 12 held the M.A. degree and received a salary of \$2400 which was slightly below the average for all teachers with the master's degree.

The salaries of the 56 teachers with bachelor's degrees ranged from \$1467 to \$4200 and averaged \$2254.09.

One teacher of these 56 held the B.A. degree and received a salary of \$2340, which was considerably above the average for the teachers with bachelor's degrees.

The difference in average salaries of teachers with master's and bachelor's degrees was found to be \$227.41.

One teacher held no degree and received a salary of \$2800.

Average annual salary of white teachers of vocational agriculture:

1935 - 1936	\$1838.57
1936 - 1937	1879.19
1937 - 1938	1967.41
1938 - 1939	1989.08

Table XV The Relation of Travel Allowance,  
Area Served, and Number of Boys Enrolled

Regions, Towns and States	Number of boys	Area served in square miles	Total Travel Allowance
<u>N. Atlantic</u>			
Williamantic, Conn.	63	707	\$3555
Caribu, Maine	72	201	400
New Brunswick, N. J.	164	453	600
Wayne, West Va.	156	908	800
Totals	<u>455</u>	<u>2269</u>	
<u>Southern</u>			
Elba, Alabama	30	255	\$850 plus \$200 M.F.*
Enterprise, Ala.	42	453	950 plus \$200 M.F.*
Moultrie, Ga.	98	616	0
Gueydan, La.	102	707	0
Ville Platte, La.	34	1257	600
Ellisville, Miss.	128	1257	0
Eupora, Miss.	77	314	5¢ per mi. S.T.**
Purvis, Miss.	49	453	5¢ per mi. S.T.**
Sumrall, Miss.	75	531	0
Conway, S. C.	130	314	440
Easley, S. C.	84	314	540
Pickens, S. C.	87	707	440
Covington, Tenn.	107	707	500
Lexington, Tenn.	130	453	600
Van, Texas	100	707	0
Totals	<u>1273</u>	<u>9045</u>	
<u>N. Central</u>			
Winfield, Kan.	86	133	Pick-up furnished
Paducah, Ky.	78	314	0
Austin, Mimm.	89	1018	750
Eldorado Springs, Mo.	95	707	400
Park River, N. D.	109	9507	5¢ per mile
Totals	<u>457</u>	<u>11,679</u>	
<u>Pacific</u>			
Bakersfield, Cal.	240	1964	Car upkeep by school
Hayward, Cal.	113	314	0
Lodi, Cal.	158	255	5¢ per mile
Modesto, Cal.	163	453	565
Salinas, Cal.	106	453	900
Santa Rosa, Cal.	154	314	100
Totals	<u>934</u>	<u>3753</u>	
Grand Totals	3119	26,746	
Averages	103.96	891.53	

\*Maintenance Fee

\*\*State Trips

Table XV OBSERVATIONS

In 18 multiple-teacher departments where an exact amount was allowed for travel, the average allowance amounted to \$5.96 per boy enrolled in all-day classes of agriculture. In these 18 departments the average area was 554.89 square miles.

In the 9 departments with over 100 boys enrolled in all-day classes of agriculture, the travel allowance averaged \$4.58 per boy and the average area per school was 485.44 square miles.

In the 9 departments with less than 100 boys enrolled in all-day classes of agriculture the travel allowance averaged \$8.82 per boy or nearly twice as much as in the 9 largest departments and the average area was 624.33 square miles. A positive correlation was found between size of area and amount of travel allowance per boy when grouping is on the basis of enrollment.

In 9 of the 16 departments where travel allowance was less than \$500 the average area served by the school was 507 square miles with an average enrollment of 103.3.

In 10 of the 18 departments where travel allowance was \$600 and over the average area served by the school was 602.8 square miles with an average enrollment of 98.7. Little correlation is seen here between travel allowance and area or between travel allowance and enrollment when grouping is

on the basis of travel allowance. There seems to be a negative correlation between area served and travel allowance.

In the 7 largest school areas the average area was 589 square miles with an average travel allowance of \$523.57.

In the 11 smallest school areas the average area was 362 square miles and the average travel allowance \$654.09.

In the 7 largest areas the travel allowance per boy enrolled in all-day classes averaged \$5.81 while in the 11 smallest areas the travel allowance per boy enrolled in all-day classes averaged \$6.06.

These figures result from grouping on the basis of areas.

The 7 largest areas

Average area	Average no. all-day boys	Average travel	Travel per boy
859 sq. mi.	90	\$523.57	\$5.81

The 11 smallest areas

362 sq. mi.	108	\$654.09	\$6.06
-------------	-----	----------	--------

It seems that in larger areas less travel allowance is made per boy than in the smaller areas. This may be due to the fact that education is not so advanced in sparsely settled areas as in the more densely populated areas.

In a large area the average cost per visit to homes of boys is greater than in the smaller area. This may result in less visiting. Different results appear when division of schools into groups is on the basis of enrollment, travel allowance and area.

## Teachers' Responses to Special Questions

Included in the questionnaire were eight special questions called for opinions and experiences of teachers. All Teachers, however, did not respond to all of the questions. The following are the questions, with the number and division of responses:

1. "Do you think the area served by your school too large for the most efficient instruction in agriculture?" There were 21 responses; 15 negative; 6 positive. The 6 teachers who gave a positive response had a school area of from 314 square miles to 9507 square miles.

2. "Do you consider the present number of teachers sufficient to provide adequate instruction for all groups?" There were 21 responses; 9 negative, 12 positive.

3. "What changes, if any, might be made to provide more efficient instruction for any group?" There were 17 responses. There were 5 teachers who gave response number (1). The other responses listed were each made by only one teacher.

The needed changes suggested were:

- (1) Add more teachers.
- (2) Complete shop and separate agriculture building.
- (3) Better equipped library and filing space for teaching information.

- (4) Adequate laboratory equipment.
  - (5) Housing of farm mechanics in the same building as other agricultural work.
  - (6) Reduce size of all-day classes.
  - (7) Increase number of part-time classes.
  - (8) Increase number of evening classes.
  - (9) Provide transportation for part-time students.
  - (10) Start branch high school for first and second year for vocational agriculture work where the radius would be about 15 miles.
  - (11) Release of agriculture teachers from other school duties to supervise farm practice.
  - (12) Decrease the amount of individual services rendered.
  - (13) Establish continuation for part-time students.
4. "Which age group do you think profits most by additional instruction in agriculture?" There were 18 responses; 5 thought ages 14-17; 9 thought ages 18-25; and 4 thought ages 26-65.
5. "What are some difficulties (solved or unsolved) that you have encountered with your present organization for instruction in agriculture?"

There were 21 different difficulties listed as follows:

- (1) Getting boys established in farming after graduation.
- (2) Coordinating work of the department.
- (3) Lack of facilities.
- (4) Lack of adequate project supervision.
- (5) Part-time academic load carried by some of the teachers.
- (6) Difficulty in providing adequate projects near the school.
- (7) Lack of time for counselling and guidance.
- (8) Much time lost in visiting projects a great distance away from the center.
- (9) Supervision of projects a great distance away from the center is very expensive.
- (10) Difficulty in administering adequate follow-up program of graduates.
- (11) Other high school activities of senior vocational agriculture students interfere with work in vocational agriculture

- (12) Close cooperation between teachers of vocational agriculture is sometimes difficult to secure.
- (13) Less unity in the F.F.A. organizations.
- (14) Difficulty in transportation of pupils on field trips.
- (15) Inability to secure proper demonstration materials in proximity of school.
- (16) Scheduling and division of territory for visitation.
- (17) Lack of sufficient maintenance funds for buying materials for classroom and shop.
- (18) Problem of transportation to center for adult evening classes and part-time classes.
- (19) Problem of adjusting organization to rapidly increasing enrollment.
- (20) Keeping up interest in part-time and evening class instruction.
- (21) Vocational agriculture is not an elective. Disinterested students are required to take it.

6. "Is a high degree of cooperation between teachers of vocational agriculture necessary under your present

organization of instruction?" There were 21 responses and all 21 were affirmative. Seven of these 21 responses were emphasized by the addition of such phrases as: "absolutely essential", "imperative", "100% necessary", "very much so", and "absolutely".

### Summary

1. The consolidations in the 30 multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture studied had existed for an average of 15.7 years. (I)\*
  2. The present number of teachers of vocational agriculture had been employed for an average of 4 years. (I)
  3. The number enrolled in all-day classes of vocational agriculture averaged 11.73% of the total high school enrollment. (II)
  4. The number of teachers teaching vocational agriculture averaged 7.4% of the total number of high school teachers. (III)
  5. The enrollment in all-day classes of vocational agriculture averaged 41.59 boys per teacher of vocational agriculture. (IV)
  6. Of the 30 departments studied, 23 were found to be two-teacher departments. (IV)
  7. Four years of vocational agriculture were offered in 22 of the 30 departments. (V)
  8. The 90 minute period was used in 13 of the 30 departments. (V)
  9. One shop room was used in 19 of the 30 departments. (VI)
  10. Part-time classes were conducted in 17 of the 30.
- \* Roman numerals in parenthesis refer to tables.

- departments with an average enrollment of approximately 32 per department. (VII)
11. Evening classes were conducted in 24 of the 30 departments with an average enrollment of approximately 38 per class. (VIII A)
12. An average of 104.8 individuals were reached per teacher through all organized instruction including all-day, part-time, evening, and day-unit classes. (IX)
13. The average number of individuals in organized instruction per teacher in the 30 multiple-teacher departments was greater than the average for white teachers in the U. S. (X)
14. An average of 36.9 days per school year were spent in shop work in the 24 schools not offering a separate shop course. (XI)
15. Head teachers had an average of approximately 13 years teaching experience while assistant teachers had an average of approximately 6 years. (XII)
16. Approximately one out of every six teachers held master's degrees. (XIII)
17. The average salary of teachers in the 30 multiple-teacher departments was \$2301.55 as compared with an average of \$1989.08 for all white teachers of vocational agriculture in the United States. (XIV)
18. The difference in average salaries of teachers with master's and bachelor's degrees was found to be \$227.41 per year. (XIV)
19. An exact amount was allowed for travel in 18 of the 30 departments studied. The average

travel allowance in these 18 departments amounted  
to \$5.96 per boy. (XV)

20. The average size of area served by the 30 schools  
was approximately 892 square miles. (XV)

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture resulting from consolidations are fairly stable as indicated by the number of years the older departments included in this study had existed.
2. Multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture are increasing in number. This conclusion is substantiated by the fact that 10 of the 30 departments studied had become multiple-teacher departments by adding the second teacher at the beginning of the current year.
3. The number enrolled in vocational agriculture was generally found to be in inverse proportion to the total number enrolled in high school. The number enrolled in vocational agriculture would likely have been in direct proportion to the number of farm boys enrolled in high school but these figures were not available for this study.
4. The number of teachers of agriculture corresponds fairly closely with the number of boys enrolled in vocational agriculture, although the range of from 15 to 82 per teacher is rather broad.

5. The majority of multiple-teacher departments are the two-teacher type in which the second teacher is added when the enrollment or program becomes too large for one teacher.
6. As a rule, four years of vocational agriculture are offered in the multiple-teacher departments and one advantage noted is that two classes are seldom taught in one group as is frequently the case in the single-teacher departments.
7. There is a marked tendency toward the use of the 90 minute class period.
8. There is indication of a slight tendency toward providing instruction in agriculture for the upper elementary grades.
9. The use of one classroom for each teacher seems to be the standard practice.
10. As a rule, only one shop was provided for the two-teacher departments. Apparently, the shop is put to more efficient use in a multiple-teacher department than in a single teacher department, since the shop is used by two teachers instead of one.
11. In the departments with very large enrollments in vocational agriculture, found particularly in the Pacific Region, there is a marked tendency toward offering a separate course in shop or farm mechanics.

12. The number of class periods spent in the shop per school year ranged from 15 to 72 with an average of 36.9 for the 24 schools without separate shop courses. It is quite apparent that the shop is idle more days than it is used even in a multiple-teacher department. This fact might be considered as a justification for a separate course in shop or farm mechanics.
13. It is apparent that day-unit classes are becoming a less important part of the instructional program from the standpoint of the number of such classes conducted.
14. More emphasis has been placed on evening classes than on part-time classes as indicated by the total enrollments in each. Perhaps more emphasis should be placed on part-time classes since the larger number of teachers think this group, aged 18-25, profits more by additional instruction.
15. While shops are used more efficiently in the multiple-teacher departments than in the single-teacher departments, it is evident that their efficiency of use is greatly increased when a separate shop course is offered since this provides for daily use of the shop.

16. As a rule, the head teachers have more years teaching experience than the assistant teachers. Head teachers in the schools included in this study had an average of 13.43 years teaching experience as compared with an average of 5.9 years for assistant teachers.
17. Master's degrees were held by nearly one-third of the head teachers and by approximately one-sixth of all teachers. This seems to indicate that a higher degree of training is required of head teachers. The difference between the average salary received by men with master's degrees and that received by those with bachelor's degrees would indicate that the ones with master's degrees are more in demand and command a higher salary.
18. The average salary of 69 teachers in the 30 departments was \$2301.55 as compared with the average salary for all teachers of vocational agriculture in the United States of \$1,989.08 for the same year. This would seem to indicate that teachers in multiple-teacher departments are more highly paid and therefore should be better qualified than the average teacher.
19. The average difference of \$445.16 in salary received by head teachers and that of assistants is apparently explained by the fact that as a rule head teachers had more years teaching experience and held higher

degrees than assistant teachers.

20. While this study shows that the travel allowance averaged less per boy in the large sparsely populated areas, it seem reasonable to believe that a greater cost would be incurred if these boys are to receive the same amount of supervision.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has not shown definitely that one type of organization for instruction in a multiple-teacher department of vocational agriculture is superior to another or that one is better adapted to a particular situation than another. There are no measures of results under the various types of organization found in the different departments studied. It seems difficult, therefore, to make definite recommendations as to the type of organization.

However, since there seems to be a trend toward consolidation in Virginia, we need to recognize the problems faced by multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture. Rather than attempt to make definite recommendations the author has chosen what seems to be a more desirable procedure—that of discussing types of organization, pointing out the advantages and disadvantages of each type brought out by the study, and of calling attention to points to observe in the organization of a multiple-teacher department.

Various types of organization have been set up in the multiple-teacher departments of different states to provide instruction in agriculture for the different groups. Each type of organization has its advantages and disadvantages, of course, and these must be

Considered in establishing an organization for a multiple-teacher department.

One type of organization which is being used in a number of states is that in which the work is divided as nearly equally as possible between the teachers, each having the same number of all-day classes, part-time classes and evening classes. For convenience, we shall refer to this type as Type I.

Another type of organization, which we shall refer to as Type II, is an organization in which there is an "inside" and an "outside" teacher. The "inside" teacher is so called because he works in the school and is responsible for all-day classes. The "outside" teacher works outside the school with the part-time and evening school members.

There are other types of organization but these two types are the ones most frequently found and are the only ones which we shall consider at present. Let us now turn our attention to some of the problems or difficulties encountered under these two types of organization with respect to the supervision of the boys' farm practice.

Some difficulties result directly from the consolidation and from the fact that the school is serving a very large area. There are many boys who live a great distance from school, some of them as far as thirty miles, and who are transported by buses to and from school each day. This means that they must leave home rather early each morning

and return rather late in the evening. Those who have a distance to walk to the bus line must leave home still earlier and return later. This is a disadvantage from a number of standpoints. First of all, this allows the boy little time at home to devote to his supervised practice program, and he may not be able to carry in his program some of the enterprises that he needs and would like very much to have. Then, too, it is often difficult for boys living so far from school to bring into the school shop various kinds of equipment which needs repair. From the standpoint of the teacher, there is the disadvantage of having to travel such a great distance to visit these boys. The expense of travel in supervising these boys is so great that the result is an increase in the total cost of supervision per pupil. Then the proportion of the teachers' time spent in going and coming is greater causing the amount of time required per pupil for supervision to be increased. These two factors of increased time and expense involved in the supervision of the boys a great distance from school may result in these boys being neglected to some extent. The problems or difficulties are common to either type of organization.

One difficulty which is encountered in the Type I organization is that each teacher has a greater proportion of new boys to become acquainted with each year than is the case in a one teacher department. Under the simplest division of classes between the teachers in a

multiple-teacher department one teacher takes charge of the first and second year classes while the other takes charge of the third and fourth year classes. Each teacher will have one class of boys, which will be approximately one-half of his boys, each year who will be new boys for him. In a one-teacher department the incoming first year group is the only new group with which the teacher must become acquainted. The average class in the multiple-teacher department is always larger than this first year group in the one-teacher department so the teacher in the multiple-teacher department spends a larger proportion of his time becoming acquainted with new boys and their home situations. This acquaintance is necessary in order that he may be of service to each boy; first, in helping him to plan a farm practice program adapted to his needs; and second, in supervising that program. This time required to become acquainted with a larger group of boys tends to increase the load of the teacher and while the load is increased the efficiency of supervision may decrease. At least we are safe in assuming that the teacher cannot be of greatest service to the boy until he has become well acquainted with him and his home situation.

Another difficulty which may be encountered is that of securing close cooperation and working harmony between the teachers. The extent of this difficulty will depend largely on the personalities of the teachers but even when a cooperative spirit exists there may be a lack of time.

Some multiple-teacher departments have attempted to overcome this disadvantage by very close cooperation in the work of supervising the farm practice of the boys. In one multiple-teacher department the teachers got together at the beginning of each week and planned their visits for the week. It was arranged that the teachers would visit in different areas each day, or perhaps for that entire week each teacher would visit in one particular area. If one teacher had a boy who should be visited in the other teachers area it was arranged that the teacher who was in charge of that area would call on the boy and check on his work or give him the assistance needed. Such close cooperation between two teachers of Agriculture planning visitation trips would not only remove some of the difficulties previously mentioned but would also tend to reduce mileage traveled in supervision and thus reduce the cost. It was claimed that this system of cooperation worked satisfactorily in that particular situation but of course the main prerequisite for this system was that each teacher must be acquainted with the boys of the other teacher and must be familiar with their supervised farm practice programs.

One variation of the Type I organization which may be used to simplify supervision of farm practice in a multiple-teacher department is that of having each teacher teach all of the boys from a given area. While this plan simplifies the supervision of farm practice it, at the

same time, raises the problem of each teacher having to teach boys in all four grade groups which generally necessitates combining two grade groups into one class. This plan would remove the advantage existing in the other plan of having each grade group in a separate class.

One advantage existing under the Type I organization is that of having each grade group in a separate class. In a one-teacher department some grade groups are small and the teacher generally finds it necessary to combine these smaller grade groups into one class in order that he may teach all of the boys and at the same time have class periods of the desired length. This combination of different grade groups is not, by any means, the most ideal arrangement and is not necessary in a multiple-teacher department under the Type I organization. The enrollment in each grade is generally sufficiently large to justify having each grade in a separate class. This makes it possible for a student to follow through a four year course in agriculture without any unnecessary repetition and it is easier for the teacher to outline the work in such a way that the course increases in difficulty and breadth as the pupils' ability and knowledge increases. The needs of the boys in a given grade are more nearly alike and the problem of adapting the course to the needs of the group is simplified when each grade is in a separate class. In the large departments each grade may even be large

enough to justify division into two or three or more classes. When this is the case the group may be divided on the basis of ability or the type of farming being followed and a more homogenous grouping obtained. As a result of such grouping a class interested in a certain type of farming may be able to have a teacher who is more of a specialist in that field. Field trips may be planned more advantageously for the entire group when the group is of a homogeneous nature with respect to interest in a particular type of farming. Larger classes may be handled with the same degree of satisfaction when the boys are in the same grade.

Another advantage claimed for the Type I organization is that the boys have a contact with more than one teacher of Agriculture and may profit from this variety of contacts. This may be of considerable advantage to the boys especially if the different teachers have specialized to some extent in different fields.

An advantage of the Type II organization is that the teacher may be more of a specialist in the instruction of the group he is responsible for. The "inside" teacher may be especially well able to guide the high school boy in making a choice of a vocation, a type of farming, or of enterprises under a type of farming. He may have studied some of the problems of the high school boy and may be better prepared to aid him in planning a long-time supervised practice program which will make it easier for

the boy to finally become established in farming.

Another advantage is that the "inside" teacher devotes his full time to only one group, the all-day boys, and has a better opportunity to become well acquainted with that group and their home situations. The energy of the teacher is not divided among the different age groups and he may be able to do better work with the one group.

Then, again, the "inside" teacher is able to follow each boy through the entire course of Agriculture offered by the high school. There is no break in the boy's program and its supervision as is the case when the boy has a different teacher every year or so. It requires considerable time for another teacher to become well enough acquainted with a boy and his supervised farm practice program to supervise his work as efficiently as can the teacher who has worked with the boy for a year or two. So when the same teacher is responsible for instruction in all the classes of Agriculture in the high school and can follow each boy, more efficient instruction and supervision may result.

A disadvantage of the Type II organization is that the "inside" teacher, since he is not in charge of evening classes has less opportunity to become acquainted with the boys' parents. A close acquaintance with the parents is essential if the teacher is to direct most successfully the program of the boy.

Another disadvantage is that the "inside" teacher is not able to follow a boy as closely after the boy leaves high school. Under this organization, the "outside" teacher becomes responsible for the boys' training and supervision after he completes high school work. Although the "outside" teacher may be a specialist in the part-time work he is not so well acquainted with the boy and his program as the "inside" teacher who has followed his work through the high school years.

The extent of any advantage or disadvantage which has been mentioned may vary with the situation and circumstances. Quite often a teacher may be able to remove or lessen the extent of a disadvantage or may be able to strengthen an advantage. These advantages and disadvantages mentioned may not be all which exist under the two types of organization but should at least be considered in setting up the organization for instruction in a multiple-teacher department. If certain disadvantages exist under one type of organization and can be removed or lessened to some extent while the advantages are maintained that type of organization may be more readily adapted to a particular situation.

There is no evidence to justify us in saying that one type of organization in a multiple-teacher department of vocational agriculture is better than another since it has already been pointed out that the advantages and disadvantages of a type of organization will vary with the situation. It will always be the responsibility of the local teacher of vocational agriculture and the school administrators to recognize the merits of each type of organization and to make such adaptation and adjustments as will tend to insure the maximum efficiency of the program.

## Bibliography

- Agricultural Education - Vol. VII. No. 1 - P.8  
The Supervised Farming Program - T.V.Downing
- Agricultural Education - Vol. VI. No. 7 - P. 104  
A Philosophy of Supervised Practice - H.M.Hamlin
- Agricultural Education - Vol. VIII. No. 7 - P. 101  
Teaching Objectives for Agriculture in the Elementary  
School - W. H. Shively
- Federal Board Bulletin 163, Series 41  
Supervised Farm Practice Planning
- Federal Board Bulletin 112, Series 29  
Supervised Practice in Agriculture Including Home  
Projects.
- Statistical Release No. 4, 1937-838. Miscellaneous Number  
2213, June 12, 1939.  
United States Department of the Interior, Office of  
Education, Washington, D. C.  
Salaries of Teachers of Agriculture, 1937-'38.
- Statistical Release No. 1. 1937-'38, June 12, 1939.  
United States Department of the Interior, Office of  
Education, Washington, D. C.  
"Teaching Load of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture  
1937-'38"
- Statistical Release, No. 5, Miscellaneous 2542, March 10, 1941  
Federal Security Agency, United States Office of  
Education, Washington, D. C.  
"Size of Vocational Agricultural Program, 1934-'35  
and 1939-'40.

APPENDIX I

INFORMATION SHEET

A Study of Multiple-Teacher Departments of Agriculture

Name of School \_\_\_\_\_ Post Office \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

Names of teachers of Agriculture (Give address if not same as school.)

Teachers No. 1 \_\_\_\_\_

Teacher No. 2 \_\_\_\_\_

Teacher No. 3 \_\_\_\_\_

(Place an X before the name of head teacher if one is so designated)

	Teacher No. 1	Teacher No. 2	Teacher No. 3
1. Years experience as a teacher of agriculture			
2. Years taught in Present position			
3. Degree or degrees held			
4. Salary received per year			
5. Allowance for travel expenses per year			

6. \_\_\_\_\_ Number of year present consolidation has existed.
7. \_\_\_\_\_ Number of years the present number of teachers of Agriculture have been employed.
8. \_\_\_\_\_ Number of teachers in high school other than teachers of Agriculture.
9. \_\_\_\_\_ Number of months school is in session each year.
10. \_\_\_\_\_ Number of years of Agriculture students in high school can take.
11. \_\_\_\_\_ Elementary grades in which per-high school Agriculture taught in a separate class.
12. \_\_\_\_\_ Total enrollment in high school.
13. \_\_\_\_\_ Total enrollment in all-day classes of Agriculture.
14. \_\_\_\_\_ Total enrollment in day-unti classes (if any are conducted).
15. \_\_\_\_\_ Number of classrooms used for classes of Agriculture.
16. \_\_\_\_\_ Number of shop rooms used for instruction in farm shop.
17. \_\_\_\_\_ Approximate number od days spent by each all-day class in shop work annually.
18. \_\_\_\_\_ Schedule of all-day classes for each teacher of Agriculture:  
(Indicate grade in high school by Roman numerals. Example: Agri. I, etc. Indicate divisions of a grade by letters. Example: Agri. IA, etc.)

Periods	Length minutes	in Classes of Teacher No. 1	Classes of Teacher No. 2	Classes of Teacher No. 3
1st				
2nd				
3rd				

4th

5th

6th

- |  | Teacher No.1 | Teacher No.2 | Teacher No.3 |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 19. Number of part-time classes each teacher is responsible for. |              |              |              |
| 20. Average number of meetings held per year by each class.      |              |              |              |
| 21. Total number enrolled in part-time classes.                  |              |              |              |
| 22. Number of evening classes teacher is responsible for.        |              |              |              |
| 23. Average number of meetings held per year by each class.      |              |              |              |
| 24. Total number enrolled in evening classes.                    |              |              |              |

Instructions in answering the following four questions:-

If figures are available for the following, they would be preferred in terms of enrollment for each of the five years.

If figures are not readily available, indicate the trend by underlining the word which best expresses it.

- What has been the general trend in high school enrollment during the last five years? (increased, decreased, no change)
- What has been the general trend in enrollment in Agriculture during the past five years? (increased, decreased, no change)
- What has been the general trend in enrollment in part-time classes during the past five years? (increased, decreased, no change)
- What has been the general trend in enrollment in evening classes during the past five years? (increased, decreased, no change)
- List courses offered in high school. (If a copy of the course of study can be sent, this information need not be filled in. This means all courses)

	First year	Second Year	Third Year	Fourth Year
Required courses	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
Elective Courses	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____

### Opinions and Experience

1. Do you think the area served by your school too large for the most efficient instruction in Agriculture?
2. Do you consider the present number of teachers of Agriculture sufficient to provide adequate instruction in Agriculture for all groups (all-day, part-time, and adults) in the area served by the school?
3. What changes, if any, might be made to provide more efficient instruction for any group?
4. Which age group (of those you have had) do you think profit most by additional instruction in Agriculture? 14-17, 18-25, 26-65?
5. What are some difficulties (solved or unsolved) that you have encountered with your present organization for instruction in Agriculture?
6. Is a high degree of cooperation between teachers of Agriculture necessary under your present organization for instruction?
7. Is it difficult under your present system of organization to get cooperation desired between all teachers?
8. Is supervision of farm practice as adequate and as closely followed as might be done in a one teacher department? Why?

NOTE: Use reverse side if more space needed.

We are particularly anxious to invite your experience and impressions "pro and con" concerning the multiple-teacher agricultural school. Also to secure anything which will help us to secure a maximum of the good features and a minimum of the faults involved in such a move.

## APPENDIX II

### Location of the Thirty Departments of Vocational Agriculture Included In The Study

#### Departments visited by the author:

Elba, Alabama  
Enterprise, Alabama  
Moultrie, Georgia  
Ellisville, Mississippi  
Purvis, Mississippi  
Easley, South Carolina  
Pickens, South Carolina  
Covington, Tennessee  
Lexington, Tennessee

#### Departments Responding to the Questionnaire:

Williamantic, Connecticut	Winfield, Kansas
Caribu, Maine	Austin, Minnesota
New Brunswick, New Jersey	Eldorado Springs, Missouri
Wayne, West Virginia	Park River, North Dakota
Gueydan, Louisiana	Bakersfield, California
Ville Platte, Louisiana	Hayward, California
Eupora, Mississippi	Lodi, California
Sumrall, Mississippi	Modesto, California
Conway, South Carolina	Salinas, California
Van, Texas	Santa Rosa, California
Paducah, Kentucky	