

A STUDY OF THE PATTERN OF COOPERATION BETWEEN THE VETERANS-
ON-THE-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM AND THE VOCATIONAL
AGRICULTURE PROGRAM IN KANSAS HIGH SCHOOLS

by

MARVIN LEE RIGGS

B. S., Kansas State College
of Agriculture and Applied Science, 1948

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Education

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE
1952

INTRODUCTION

The topic of this report "A Study of The Pattern of Cooperation Between The Veterans-On-The-Farm Training Program and The Vocational Agriculture Program in Kansas High Schools" was chosen because the writer had worked with two classes of the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program as a Vocational Agriculture Instructor at Coffeyville, Kansas, for four years and had become closely acquainted with the program. Working with the program caused an interest in how the program first began, how rapidly it was accepted, and whether or not a similar program would be advisable after the Veterans Program is terminated.

The Veterans Administration asked the Kansas State Department for Vocational Education for aid in setting up and establishing the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program in Kansas because it was evident that the Vocational Agriculture program had helped high school boys become established in farming in Kansas. This statement was made by Director C. M. Miller, State Director of Vocational Education in Kansas. The Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program is subsidized 100 per cent by the Federal Government.

The Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program began in Kansas in 1946 and saw its most rapid expansion in 1947. The peak enrollment in the program was reached in the summer of 1951 with approximately 325 schools participating and 7500 to 8000 veterans enrolled.

The State Board for Vocational Education has a contract with the Veterans Administration governing the planning and execution of the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program. The Veterans Administration finances the program. The State Board administers the program according to laws which authorize them to set up a course of study with the Approval Agency of the office of Veterans Affairs. The State Approval Agency has to approve all institutions offering training for veterans. A school must have facilities that would be approved for a regular Vocational Agriculture program in order to be approved for the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program.

Mr. C. M. Miller is the Director of Vocational Education in Kansas. Mr. L. B. Pollom is the Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture in Kansas. Mr. C. C. Eustace is the Supervisor and Mr. R. H. Berkley the Assistant Supervisor of the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program in Kansas. Mr. Eustace and Mr. Berkley handle all of the administration of this program. The local school board is responsible to the State Board for Vocational Education and the State Board is responsible to the Veterans Administration.

A school participating in the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program usually has an advisory council. These local councils have regulations set up for them in the official Institutional On-Farm Training For Kansas Veterans of World War II manual which they follow in assisting with the conduct of the program.

The local Veterans-On-The-Farm Training Instructor must submit reports to the State Board for Vocational Education once each month. The State Board approves and certifies to the Veterans Administration that the training complies with the law. Mr. Eustace makes a Progress Report once a year to the State Board for Vocational Education.

The State of Kansas is divided into four areas with an Area Supervisor for each area. Each area usually has twelve districts. There are approximately seven sub-districts in each district. The State Board for Vocational Education has a professional improvement program for the Veterans Instructors. Short skill courses are offered each summer and the instructors are required to attend. Mr. Eustace and Mr. Berkley hold District meetings for instructors twice a year. The Area Supervisors hold Sub-District meetings for instructors four times a year.

PROCEDURE

After selecting the topic of this Report the writer consulted several leaders in the Vocational Agriculture field in Kansas concerning the problem. Consultants in phrasing the questionnaire included Prof. A. P. Davidson, major instructor, Prof. Howard Bradley, and Prof. L. F. Hall, all of the Department of Education, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kansas. Director C. M. Miller, Supervisor L. B. Pollom, and Mr. R. H. Berkley of the State Board for Vocational Education, Topeka, Kansas, were interviewed. The following Vocational Agriculture Instructors in Kansas offered valuable suggestions in framing questions to be used in the questionnaire: Mr. J. W. Taylor, Manhattan, Mr. Robert E. Stephens, Randolph, Mr. Charles O. Carter, Chanute, and Mr. Clem Young, Cherryvale.

A copy of the questionnaire, a cover letter, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were sent to 141 Vocational Agriculture Instructors in Kansas. Each of these departments had one or more Veterans-On-The-Farm Training classes. The questionnaires were mailed to the instructors on February 25, 1952. Approximately 57 per cent of the instructors had returned their questionnaires by April 1. At this time a reminder card was sent to the schools that had not responded. Results were tabulated May 1 on the basis of 106 questionnaires returned. This number constituted 75.2 per cent of the questionnaires mailed. The answers given on the questionnaires returned constitute the basis of this report.

DATA

Table 1. The date of the first enrollment of veterans.

Date		:	Per cent
January 1946 to October 1946	---	:	7.5
November 1946 to January 1947	---	:	25.5
February 1947 to December 1947	---	:	17.9
January 1948 to September 1948	---	:	14.2
January 1949 to November 1949	---	:	14.2
January 1950 to September 1950	---	:	8.5
February 1951 to September 1951	---	:	9.4
No Response -----			2.8

The Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program was begun in Kansas early in 1946 and grew very rapidly in the three months between November 1946 and January 1947. World War II ended in the summer of 1945 and many of the veterans were discharged and home by the end of the year. It required a few months for the program to be set up and become operative. There was a shortage of qualified instructors for the program. The local schools had to make some preparations for handling the program. These facts contributed to the delay in starting the program, and it did not get into full swing until late 1946 and early 1947.

The number of classes started each year tapered off gradually through 1949. Classes could not be started in a given locality until there were sufficient veterans to fill a minimum size class. Some veterans were not interested in going to school. Others did not think that they could sacrifice the time required for the training classes. Still others did not have suitable farming operations to be approved for the program.

The returns on this question showed that the program moved from the eastern Kansas counties to the western counties. When the program was first established it was thought that a farming operation of wheat alone was not suitable for approval, since deversified farming was being promoted. The western counties are not as thickly populated as eastern counties, therefore it took a larger area to furnish the number of veterans required to fill a class. When the program first began an instructor was paid a flat rate per veteran for milage and if he had to drive too far to make his supervisory visits he would lose money on travel. These factors account for the fact that the development of the program moved from east to west.

The smallest number of classes established in any one year was in 1950. At this time the program had leveled off. There was a slight upsurge of new classes and enrollment in 1951. This was due to the ruling stating that veterans could not enroll for training after July 25, 1951, except as quoted,

"The law provides that a course of education or training shall be initiated before the termination of four years after the date of discharge or by July 25, 1951, whichever is the later, and that such education or training cannot be offered beyond July 25, 1956, except for the veterans who enlisted under the Voluntary Recruitment Act of October 6, 1945." ¹

Table 2. Number of veterans enrolled when school started this program.

Number of veterans	Per cent
4-----	20.8
26-----	17.0
24-----	14.2
5-----	13.2
12-----	3.8
27-----	2.8
18-----	2.8
16-----	2.8
3-----	2.8
30-----	1.9
25-----	1.9
23-----	1.9
21-----	1.9
16-----	1.9
14-----	1.9
10-----	1.9
No Response-----	1.9

Table 2 (concl.)

Number of veterans	: Per cent
48-----	.9
28-----	.9
15-----	.9
8-----	.9
6-----	.9

The largest percentage of the schools returning questionnaires had 4 veterans enrolled when they first started the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program. This is explained by the fact that when the program first started a Vocational Agriculture Instructor was allowed to enroll four veterans in addition to his day school program. Thus 20.8 per cent of those schools reporting started with only 4 veterans enrolled.

The second largest percentage of schools reported 26 veterans in their first enrollment. This is accounted for by the fact that the program made a change over to the effect that one instructor could enroll 26 veterans in one class providing the Vocational Agriculture Instructor supervised the farm shop program.

The third largest percentage of schools reported 24 veterans in their first enrollment. This was due to the fact that the maximum enrollment for one instructor without the aid of a Vocational Agriculture Instructor was 24. In the fourth group,

13.2 per cent of the schools reported a beginning enrollment of 5 veterans. The other variations in size of beginning enrollment are not significant enough to merit further discussion.

Table 3. Number of veterans enrolled at the peak of this program.

Number of veterans	: Per cent
26 -----	24.5
30 -----	7.5
28 -----	6.6
50 -----	5.7
27 -----	5.7
54 -----	4.7
29 -----	4.7
24 -----	3.6
52 -----	2.8
48 -----	2.8
100 -----	1.9
77 -----	1.9
74 -----	1.9
72 -----	1.9
57 -----	1.9
32 -----	1.9
25 -----	1.9
106 -----	.9
91 -----	.9

Table 3 (concl.)

Number of veterans	: Per cent
80 -----	.9
78 -----	.9
75 -----	.9
70 -----	.9
60 -----	.9
58 -----	.9
56 -----	.9
51 -----	.9
40 -----	.9
33 -----	.9
31 -----	.9
23 -----	.9
20 -----	.9
19 -----	.9
16 -----	.9
14 -----	.9
No Response -----	.9

The peak enrollment of veterans for 24.5 per cent of the schools returning questionnaires was 26. This number is due to the previously stated fact that 26 was the number of veterans one instructor could enroll when the Vocational Agriculture Instructor was in charge of the shop program. The next most

frequently listed number was 30 veterans by 7.5 per cent of the schools. They followed with 6.6 per cent having 28, 5.7 per cent with 50, 5.7 per cent with 27, 4.7 per cent with 54, and 4.7 per cent with 29. Other answers appeared less frequently as listed in the table.

The largest peak enrollment was 106 veterans. The smallest peak enrollment was 14. The latter was probably a part-time class.

Table 4. Number of veterans enrolled now.

Number of veterans	: Per cent
26 -----	9.4
23 -----	9.4
24 -----	6.6
18 -----	5.6
25 -----	4.7
22 -----	4.7
20 -----	4.7
16 -----	4.7
None -----	3.6
52 -----	2.8
27 -----	2.8
19 -----	2.8
48 -----	1.9
47 -----	1.9
46 -----	1.9

Table 4 (cont.)

Number of veterans	: Per cent
44 -----	1.9
42 -----	1.9
40 -----	1.9
30 -----	1.9
21 -----	1.9
15 -----	1.9
14 -----	1.9
77 -----	.9
72 -----	.9
64 -----	.9
62 -----	.9
57 -----	.9
56 -----	.9
55 -----	.9
54 -----	.9
51 -----	.9
50 -----	.9
45 -----	.9
43 -----	.9
39 -----	.9
38 -----	.9
37 -----	.9

Table 4 (concl.)

Number of veterans	: Per cent
36 -----	.9
17 -----	.9
13 -----	.9
12 -----	.9
11 -----	.9

This questionnaire was sent out February 25, 1952. Therefore, the present enrollment to which this question refers is for the period of time ranging from February 25 to May 1, 1952. The returns showed 9.4 per cent of the schools enrolling 26 veterans, and the same percentage of schools had an enrollment of 23 veterans. The highest present enrollment was 77. The lowest enrollment of a school still operating a Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program was 11. There were 3.6 per cent of the schools reporting no veterans at the present time.

Table 5. The Vocational Agriculture Instructor supervises the veterans program.

Reply	: Per cent
Yes -----	84.9
No -----	13.2
No Response -----	1.9

Table 5 (concl.)

(a) If so, how many hours does this supervision require per week?

Reply	Per cent
2 hours -----	36.7
1 hour -----	24.4
4 hours -----	24.4
6 hours -----	12.2
Over 8 hours -----	1.1
None -----	1.1

The veterans program is supervised by the Vocational Agriculture Instructor in 84.9 per cent of the schools. Of those Vocational Agriculture Instructors who do supervise the program, 36.7 per cent reported the supervision required 2 hours per week, 24.4 per cent reported 1 hour per week, 24.4 per cent reported 4 hours per week, and 12.2 per cent reported 6 hours per week. In other words, more than one-third of the instructors returning questionnaires estimated that they spent 2 hours per week supervising the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program.

Table 6. The Vocational Agriculture Instructor gives shop instruction for the veterans program.

Reply	Per cent
Yes -----	90.6
No -----	9.4

(a) If so, how many hours does this supervision require per week?

4 hours -----	55.2
2 hours -----	19.8
6 hours -----	10.4
8 hours -----	7.3
3 hours -----	3.1
1 hour -----	2.1
Over 8 hours -----	2.1

Shop instruction for the veterans was given by 90.6 per cent of the Vocational Agriculture Instructors. More than half of the instructors, 55.2 per cent, stated that shop supervision and instruction required four hours per week. This can be explained by the fact that a large number of schools have their veterans shop on Saturday morning. Others provide shop for veterans one-half day a week. In some cases even though there are several classes of veterans, the Vocational Agriculture Instructor is

responsible for the shop instruction in only one class. Perhaps some schools have two classes and each class has shop every other week. In other schools only half of the class may have shop at one time and each veteran enrolled has shop every other week.

There were 19.8 per cent of the instructors who stated it required only 2 hours of supervision per week to supervise the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training shop program. Some of these may have had a four hour shop class every other week. Some may have had the shop scheduled on a school day and arrangements made for the Veteran's Instructor to teach shop until the high school students were dismissed and the Vocational Agriculture Instructor could then take over. In Coffeyville, there are two veterans classes, each having shop one afternoon a week. After school is out, the Vocational Agriculture Instructor helps in the shop and is responsible for tool checking, ordering supplies, and maintaining the shop. There may be other instructors who follow a similar plan.

The instructors who are required to work six hours or more per week supervising the veterans shop in addition to their Vocational Agriculture duties are in my opinion, carrying an excessive teaching load. This study shows 10.4 per cent reporting 6 hours, 7.3 per cent reporting 8 hours, and 2.1 per cent more than 8 hours required for shop instruction.

Table 7. The Vocational Agriculture Instructor is responsible for ordering shop supplies such as oxygen, acetylene, welding rod, and solder for veterans.

Reply	Per cent
Yes -----	97.2
No -----	2.9
Part of time -----	.9

The practice of having the Vocational Agriculture Instructors order shop supplies for the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program was followed by 97.2 per cent of the instructors reporting. This plan undoubtedly was more convenient for all concerned. Such a plan allows the instructor to keep an accurate account of supplies on hand, supplies on order, and supplies to be ordered. It also avoids duplicate orders for the same material. In most cases the Vocational Agriculture Instructor is more familiar with the sources of supply.

Table 8. The veterans pay for shop materials used, such as oxygen, acetylene, welding rod, and solder.

Reply	Per cent
No -----	56.6
Yes -----	43.4

More than half of the schools reporting, 56.6 per cent, did not charge the veterans for shop supplies. It is assumed that in schools where veterans did not pay for shop materials used the administrators thought they could finance the program easier than they could go to the trouble of collecting for supplies used. In some cases the local school administrators may have felt that the money was available to furnish the supplies and that the veterans were deserving of them.

There were a few inconsistent answers, due perhaps to misinterpretation of the question. The question was stated with the idea of covering all supplies of any description. A few instructors, however, interpreted the question to mean only the supplies mentioned. In such cases they might answer "no" to the question and then comment that they did charge for various supplies, such as sheet metal, steel stock, and small hardware. Others answering "yes" stated they charged for only a part of the supplies mentioned in the question.

Table 9. Collection of shop charges.

Reply	: Per cent
Vocational agriculture instructor --	66.0
Veterans instructor -----	29.6
Others -----	4.4

In 66 per cent of the schools reporting the Vocational Agriculture Instructor collected the shop charges. This is a duty assumed by the instructor as a part of his veterans shop supervision.

The 29.6 per cent of the schools that follow the practice of having the Veterans Instructor collect the shop charges from veterans have the advantage of the Veterans Instructor being in closer contact with the individual veteran. Probably some of these schools are in the group where the Vocational Agriculture Instructor does not teach shop. In this case the Veterans Instructor would likely be teaching shop and would naturally collect the charges.

The 4.4 per cent answering "others" probably have the administrators or purchasing agents collect the shop charges.

Table 10. The Vocational Agriculture Instructor opens and closes the school building for all veterans classes.

Reply	: Per cent
No -----	92.4
Yes -----	6.6
Shop class only -----	.9

It was gratifying to find that 92.4 per cent of the Vocational Agriculture Instructors were not required to open and close the school building for all veterans classes. There would seem to be no valid reason why the Veterans Instructor should not be capable and trustworthy enough for this job. If the administrators can not hold the Veterans Instructor responsible for locking and unlocking doors and carrying school keys, then he is not worthy of public school employment by the school board. Of course if the Vocational Agriculture Instructor is required to meet with all veterans classes as a part of his supervisory duties, then it might be considered reasonable to expect him to lock and unlock the building. Some one has to take the responsibility of being at the school on time to open it for the class and being the last one to leave and lock all doors and windows.

Table 11. The Vocational Agriculture Instructor is responsible for tool checking for all veterans classes.

Reply	: Per cent
Yes -----	67.0
No -----	31.1
Part of time -----	1.9

Since 67 per cent of the Vocational Agriculture Instructors, or approximately two-thirds, are responsible for tool checking, it is safe to say that this is a valid practice, and is as it should be if the Vocational Agriculture Instructor is to cooperate in the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program. The percentage of instructors answering "No" to this question may be somewhat skewed by the fact that some of them may not participate in the program.

It would seem that in most cases if the Vocational Agriculture Instructor is supervising the shop program, is responsible for ordering equipment and supplies, and is trying to hold tool replacement to a minimum, that he would want to check the tools at the end of each shop period.

Table 12. The Vocational Agriculture Instructor is required to make the vocational agriculture shop available to the veterans at times other than the regularly scheduled classes for veterans.

Reply	: Per cent
Occasionally -----	76.4
Never -----	12.3
Often -----	11.3

More than three-fourths, 76.4 per cent of the Vocational Agriculture Instructors said that they "occasionally" made the shop available to the veterans at other than regular class time. Several of those answering "occasionally" stated that they were not required to, but did make the shop available at times other than for regularly scheduled classes.

There is a definite need for providing this type of shop time to the veteran who has had breakdown of equipment and needs to make the necessary repairs. There are also times when the veteran is working on a large project that will be put into service as soon as completed and has to meet a seasonal deadline. Examples would include swine farrowing houses when farrowing time is near, self-feeders for fattening hogs, and repairing of farm machinery before the season starts. There are times when the veteran cannot work in the field because of weather conditions, but he can profitably spend the hours in shop. The school shop provides space inside and tools and equipment that the veteran in most instances does not have on his farm.

In 12.3 per cent of the replies the Vocational Agriculture Instructor stated that he "never" made the shop available other than for the regularly scheduled class periods for veterans.

The remaining 11.3 per cent answered "often" to this question. Since there is not a definite measure to use in answering this question it is possible that one mans opinion

of "often" might be "occasionally" in the opinion of another. Having Veterans working in your shop while high school students are working can easily lead to disciplinary problems.

Table 13. The Vocational Agriculture Instructor is acquainted with a majority of the farm problems of each veteran.

Reply	: Per cent
Yes -----	62.3
No -----	34.9
No Response -----	1.9
Yes and no -----	.9

There were 62.3 per cent of the Vocational Agriculture Instructors who reported that they were acquainted with a majority of the farm problems of each veteran. These instructors probably are acquainted with the general problems that confront the veterans collectively. There were 34.9 per cent of the instructors answering "no" to the question, 1.9 per cent did not answer at all, and .9 per cent checked both "yes" and "no". It is assumed that the latter was acquainted with the problems of some of the veterans and not of others.

Table 14. Schools having an advisory board.

Reply	Per cent
Yes -----	86.8
No -----	12.3
Yes and no -----	.9
Appointed by the school board -----	Yes--26.3
Appointments staggered -----	Yes--12.6
Use U. S. D. A. Council -----	Yes--45.3
Otherwise --	
In most cases appointed by the Veterans Instructor and the Vocational Agriculture Instructor -----	15.8

An advisory board is used by 86.8 per cent of the schools that returned questionnaires. This per cent is not surprising in as much as the Veterans Administration Manual recommends the use of an advisory board and sets up the duties of such a board.

In 26.3 per cent of the schools having advisory boards, the school board appoints the members. This plan has the advantage of the advisory boards feeling directly responsible to the school board and the school administrators in making decisions concerning the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program.

Appointments are staggered in 12.6 per cent of the schools having advisory boards. This is particularly advantageous in that there will always be some experienced members on the board who are acquainted with the individual veterans and the policies set up by the former council.

Almost half, 45.3 per cent, of the schools use the United States Department of Agriculture Council as an advisory board. This is convenient since the council is established and functioning in the county for other purposes also. The U. S. D. A. Councils are composed of prominent farmers and well-trained men from government agencies.

The Veterans Instructor and Vocational Agriculture Instructor appoint the advisory board in 15.8 per cent of the schools. This would have the advantage of these instructors knowing the men in the community who would give their time and effort to the program. Members of advisory boards must be willing to make some sacrifices in order to meet when needed and to make the necessary decisions and recommendations.

Table 15. The occupation of each advisory board member.

Occupation	: Per cent
Farmer -----	29.9
County Agent -----	10.8
S. C. S. -----	9.3

Table 15 (cont.)

Occupation	: Per cent
Banker -----	8.7
P. M. A. -----	7.9
Vocational Agriculture Instructor --	6.2
F. H. A. -----	3.5
R. E. A. -----	2.3
Veterans Instructor -----	1.9
Implement dealer -----	1.7
P. C. A. -----	1.7
Weed Supervisor -----	1.5
Merchant -----	1.5
H. D. A. -----	1.5
N. F. L. A. -----	1.3
School Board Member -----	1.3
School Superintendent -----	1.3
Hardware Merchant -----	.8
Federal Land Bank -----	.8
Lumber dealer -----	.6
4-H Club Agent -----	.6
Postman -----	.6
Produce Buyer -----	.4
Insurance Agent -----	.4

Table 15 (concl.)

Occupation	; Per cent
Mayor -----	.2
Lawyer -----	.2
F. S. C. -----	.2
High School Principal -----	.2
State Senator -----	.2
Farm Security -----	.2
Contractor -----	.2
Druggist -----	.2
Oil Agency -----	.2
Auto Agency -----	.2
Restaurant Owner -----	.2
Elevator Manager -----	.2
High School Custodian -----	.2
Real Estate Agent -----	.2
Feed Dealer -----	.2
County Engineer -----	.2
County Commissioner -----	.2
Garage Man -----	.2

It is necessary to explain how the answers to this question were obtained. Each school was asked to list the occupation of each member of the advisory board. Some would answer "all farmers" and not list them. This made it necessary to estimate how many farmers were on their board. Others would list a few occupations and say the rest were farmers without stating the number. Some schools would simply write "U. S. D. A. Council" and it was necessary to make an assumption as to the personnel of their U. S. D. A. Council.

Some of the schools had small advisory boards and others had large boards. The number of times each individual occupation occurred was listed and this number was divided by the total number of members given in order to arrive at the percentage shown in the table. Schools not having an advisory board did not answer this question.

The occupation "Farmer" occurred 29.9 per cent of the time. Not included in this per cent are the members of other occupation titles that were also part-time farmers. Most every advisory board had at least one farmer as a member. Some boards were made up entirely of farmers and others were composed of half-time farmers and half-time business men and others. Farmers are desirable members of advisory boards since they have had the experience of getting started in farming and know the problems confronting the veteran in his effort to become established in farming.

Other occupations represented on the advisory boards in more than 5 per cent of the replies were: County Agent 10.8 per cent; the S. C. S. 9.3 per cent; the Banker 8.7 per cent; and the P. M. A. 7.9 per cent. The County Agent, S. C. S., and P. M. A. were most always members of the U. S. D. A. Council. The Banker is a desirable member particularly in rural areas, since he is familiar with the farming of the community and handles the farm financing.

Table 16. Frequency of advisory board meetings.

Reply	Per cent
Whenever needed -----	88.3
Once a month -----	8.5
Four times a year -----	2.1
Once a year -----	1.1

The advisory board in 88.3 per cent of the schools meets "whenever needed". When there is business to be transacted by the advisory board a meeting is called. Meetings are called to handle such problems as taking in new veterans in a class, making an annual examination of the veterans in the class, examining veterans applying for fourth year training, etc. This procedure is sound, since there is little reason for having

an advisory board meeting unless there is a need. Members will make more of an effort to attend the meeting if they know there is work to be done and the meeting is important to the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program.

"Once a month" was the answer given in 8.5 per cent of the replies for frequency of advisory board meetings. When there is considerable business to be transacted, and particularly where there is more than one class of veterans, it would seem to be necessary to meet once a month.

Advisory Boards meeting "four times a year" constituted 2.1 per cent of the replies. This would perhaps be as often as needed provided the Veterans Instructor and the Vocational Agriculture Instructor were authorized to take care of minor points of business without consulting the board. In 1.1 per cent of the schools the advisory boards hold an annual business meeting.

Table 17. The advisory board functions in establishing policies that are of definite value to the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program.

Reply	: Per cent
Yes -----	66.7
No -----	33.3

The advisory board does function in establishing policies that are of a definite value to the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program in the opinion of 66.7 per cent or two-thirds of the Vocational Agriculture Instructors contacted. The other one-third apparently had advisory boards that, in the opinion of the person replying to the questionnaire, do not function properly.

The advisory board should be of benefit to the Veterans instructor, Vocational Agriculture Instructor, and to the school. The board can rule on policies and make decisions as a board and be less subject to individual criticism. In instances where the board refuses to accept a veteran for entrance into the class or for additional training he usually will not object to the group decision. However, if such decisions are made by the school acting alone, there might be unfavorable criticism.

Table 18. The veterans program has enabled the increase of the Vocational Agriculture library.

Reply	: Per cent
Yes -----	78.3
No -----	20.8
Yes and no -----	.9

About four-fifths, 78.3 per cent, of the Vocational Agriculture Instructors said that they had increased their Vocational Agriculture library through the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program. One Instructor was undecided, and 20.8 per cent said "no".

Table 19. The veterans program has enabled the increase of the visual aids library.

Reply	: Per cent
Yes -----	84.9
No -----	15.1

The visual aids library has been increased by 84.9 per cent of the Vocational Agriculture Instructors due to the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program. The visual aids purchased were not specified. Some schools may have purchased visual aid equipment that they would not have purchased if the Veterans program had not given them an additional need for the equipment.

Table 20. The Vocational Agriculture Instructor is responsible for approving teaching aids to be purchased for veterans instruction.

Reply	Per cent
Yes -----	73.6
No -----	24.5
Sometimes -----	1.9

It is the responsibility of the Vocational Agriculture Instructor to approve teaching aids purchased for veterans instruction in 73.6 per cent of the schools. Approximately one-fourth, 24.5 per cent, of the Instructors do not have this responsibility, 1.9 per cent do in some instances.

Advantages of the Vocational Agriculture instructor approving the purchasing of teaching aids for veteran instruction are many. Such a plan will avoid duplication, keep supply in line with need, assure a check on teaching value, and safeguard price.

Table 21. The estimated cost per veteran per year to the school over and above reimbursement in this program.

Cost	Per cent
\$ 5.00 -----	31.1
\$10.00 -----	18.9
None -----	16.0
No Response -----	14.2
\$25.00 -----	13.2
\$15.00 -----	3.8
Less than \$5.00 -----	1.9
\$50.00 -----	.9

This proved to be one of the most difficult and controversial questions on the questionnaire. For this reason 14.2 per cent did not answer the question.

The highest percentage was 31.1 per cent of the Instructors who checked \$5.00 as the estimated cost per veteran per year to the school over and above reimbursement. The next estimate was \$10.00 by 18.9 per cent of the Instructors and 16 per cent said "none". The highest estimate was \$50.00.

The majority of the Instructors believed that there was an additional cost to the school over and above reimbursement. This extra cost would include the depreciation and replacement of equipment, the repair and maintenance of equipment, and the replacement of tools.

Table 22. The veterans shop program has served as an incentive to all-day vocational agriculture students in improving their shop program.

Reply	Per cent
Yes -----	51.9
No -----	47.2
Yes and no -----	.9

Instructors replying to this question were almost evenly divided in their answers. One Instructor offered the comment that his students were inspired to do more shop work, but could not do so because of limited space for their projects.

Table 23. The veterans farming programs do inspire vocational agriculture students to develop better farming programs.

Reply	Per cent
No -----	58.5
Yes -----	38.7
No Response -----	2.8

The Vocational Agriculture Instructors in 58.5 per cent of the schools did not believe that the veterans farming programs inspired vocational agriculture students to develop better farming programs. Only 38.7 per cent of the instructors thought that the veterans farming programs were inspirational to their vocational agriculture students.

Table 24. The estimated number of hours the Vocational Agriculture Instructor spends per month in filling out veterans forms.

Hours	Per cent
None -----	30.2
$\frac{1}{2}$ hour -----	20.8
1 hour -----	19.8
2 hours -----	18.9
3 hours -----	4.7
5 hours -----	2.8
Over 5 hours -----	1.9
10 hours -----	.9

It is interesting to find that 30.2 per cent of the Vocational Agriculture Instructors reported that they do not spend any time filling out veterans forms. Several of this group commented that they had a secretary to do this work or

that the Veterans Instructor filled out all forms. There were 20.8 per cent of the Instructors that spent one-half hour per month at this task. One hour was required by 19.8 per cent and two hours were required by 18.9 per cent of the Vocational Agriculture Instructors.

Table 25. Approximate per cent of the veterans increase in net worth per year attributed to the training program.

Reply	: Per cent
50 per cent -----	39.6
25 per cent -----	30.2
75 per cent -----	12.3
10 per cent -----	8.5
No Response -----	7.5
100 per cent -----	1.9

One-half of the veterans increase in net worth per year was attributed to the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program by 39.6 per cent of the Instructors. One-fourth of the gain was checked by 30.2 per cent of the Instructors. To say that one-half of the increase is due to the program means that the veteran is now increasing his net worth per year twice as much as he would if he were not in the program.

Table 26. The vocational agriculture day school program has been handicapped because of the veterans program.

Reply	: Per cent
No -----	74.5
Yes -----	22.6
Yes and no -----	2.8

Approximately three-fourths, 74.5 per cent, of the Vocational Agriculture Instructors reported that their program had not been hindered by the Veterans-On-The-Farm training program. This question was set up with a space for comments to be written in concerning the reasoning behind the answer. An appreciable number of the instructors offered comment.

Among the reasons most commonly offered stating the program had been beneficial were: increased amount of equipment, provided adult leadership, and developed interest in community activities.

That the vocational agricultural program had been handicapped by the veterans program was reported by 22.6 per cent of the instructors queried.

Some of the reasons offered were: conflicting shop periods, noise from veterans shop work interfering with instruction of all day students, lack of school space to facilitate both

programs, tool breakage and losses, and curtailing time for farm visits on the part of the vocational agricultural instructor. Both the "yes" and "no" groups were agreed that there were advantages to the veterans program as well as disadvantages.

Table 27. Influence of the veterans program on future programs in adult education in vocational agriculture.

Reply	: Per cent
Favorable -----	85.8
Unfavorable -----	5.7
No effect -----	4.7
No Response -----	3.8

The most favorable effect of the veterans program on adult education listed was that this program has shown the public the need for adult education. The veterans program has shown that we need to follow up our high school vocational agriculture boys with young farmer and adult classes. Some vocational agriculture graduates who are not veterans have expressed a desire to enroll in adult classes.

The veterans program has brought good farming practices and soil improvement practices into public eye. The public is aware of the fact that the veterans are gaining knowledge and putting it into practice.

Veterans from communities not having vocational agriculture in their local high schools have taken an active part in instigating vocational agriculture in their districts. Others are sending their sons to neighboring high schools where vocational agriculture is offered.

Comments on the "unfavorable" answers, 5.7 per cent, were few. Three stated that they doubted if the veterans would attend class without being paid subsistence. One pointed out that the veterans who had finished training did not attend educational meetings for farmers.

Table 28. Veterans who did not take vocational agriculture in high school are favorably impressed by the veterans program.

Reply	Per cent
Yes -----	89.6
No -----	5.7
No effect -----	1.9
No Response -----	1.9
Yes and no -----	.9

Some instructors stated that many of these veterans now wish that they had taken vocational agriculture or that they had had an opportunity to take vocational agriculture in high school. Some reported that this group of veterans made their

best students and that they definitely were more interested than those who had vocational agriculture in high school. Others, however, stated that this group of veterans were not as favorably impressed with the program as those who had vocational agriculture in high school.

Table 29. If a program of young farmer education is developed under the supervision of the State Department for Vocational Education, in the opinion of the Vocational Agriculture Instructor the student should be paid subsistence.

Reply	: Per cent
No -----	93.4
Yes -----	4.7
No Response -----	1.9

Comments were not ask for on this question but we had two clever ones volunteered. One instructor said "definitely no, I'm a taxpayer", another "why more Santa Claus?"

Table 30. Method of financing teacher cost if a program of young farmer education is developed.

Reply	: Per cent
By a combination of both individual and public funds -----	55.7
By public funds -----	39.6
By the individual -----	3.8
No Response -----	.9

The teacher cost of a program of young farmer education should be financed by both the individual student and public funds according to 55.7 per cent of the Vocational Agriculture Instructors. This could be done by charging the individual a fee that would go toward payment of the teacher's salary. Teacher cost should be financed entirely by public funds was indicated by 39.6 per cent of the Instructors.

Table 31. Method of financing cost of equipment if a program of young farmer education is developed.

Reply	: Per cent
By public funds -----	46.2
By a combination of both the individual and public funds -----	45.3

Table 31 (concl.)

Reply	Per cent
By the individual -----	7.6
No Response -----	.9

The cost of equipment should be financed by public funds in the opinion of 46.2 per cent of the instructors. Running a close second, 45.3 per cent thought equipment cost should be financed by a combination of both public funds and the individual.

Table 32. Method of financing cost of housing if a program of young farmer education is developed.

Reply	Per cent
By public funds -----	69.8
By a combination of both the individual and public funds -----	21.7
By the individual -----	8.5

The cost of housing includes heat, light, and janitor cost. Over two-thirds, 69.8 per cent, of the Instructors believe that this expense should be covered by public funds if a young

farmer class is developed. Partial payment by the individual student in addition to public funds was favored by 21.7 per cent of the Instructors.

In summarizing the last three questions it can be stated that a majority of the Vocational Agriculture Instructors favor a combination of individual and public funds for teacher cost of a young farmer class, and favor the use of public funds to cover equipment and housing costs.

Table 33. The number of hours of class time that should be devoted per month if a program of young farmer education is developed.

Hours	Per cent
4 hours -----	53.7
8 hours -----	35.0
2 hours -----	7.6
No Response -----	1.9
4 to 8 hours -----	.9
As much as possible -----	.9

More than half, 53.7 per cent, of the Instructors would devote four hours per month to class instruction if they had a young farmer program.

Eight hours per month class time was the choice of 35 per cent of the Instructors. A small number of Instructors, 7.6 per cent, favored only two hours of class instruction per month.

Table 34. The number of hours of on the farm instruction that should be devoted per month per student if a program of young farmer education is developed.

Hours	Per cent
1 hour -----	39.6
2 hours -----	38.7
4 hours -----	12.2
$\frac{1}{2}$ hour -----	3.8
Whatever needed -----	2.8
4 hours or more -----	.9
1 or 2 hours -----	.9
No Response -----	.9

If a program of young farmer education is developed, one hour of on the farm instruction should be devoted per month per student according to 39.6 per cent of the Vocational Agriculture Instructors. Two hours were recommended by 38.7 per cent of the Instructors.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study show that the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program began in Kansas early in 1946 and had its most rapid growth between November 1946 and January 1947. A class having the characteristics of a composite of the answers most often checked would have begun with four veterans, hit its peak in enrollment at 26, and have a present enrollment of either 26 or 23. The Vocational Agriculture Instructor spends two hours per week supervising the veterans program and four hours per week giving veterans shop instruction. The Vocational Agriculture Instructor is responsible for ordering shop supplies and the veterans do not pay for the shop materials they use. When charges are made the Vocational Agriculture Instructor makes the collections.

The Vocational Agriculture Instructor is not required to open and close the school building for all veterans classes, but he is responsible for tool checking of all veterans classes. He occasionally makes the shop available to veterans other than for regularly scheduled periods. The Vocational Agriculture Instructor is acquainted with a majority of the farm problems of each veteran.

An advisory board is used by 86.8 per cent of the schools, and in approximately half of the cases the U.S.D.A. Council is used in this capacity. The most often listed occupation of an advisory board member was "farmer". The advisory board meets

whenever needed for purposes of business. The board functions in establishing policies that are of a definite value to the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program.

The veterans program has enabled the instructor to increase his vocational agriculture library and his visual aids library. The agriculture instructor is responsible for approving teaching aids to be purchased for veterans instruction. Five dollars is the estimated cost per veteran per year to the school over and above reimbursement from the Veterans Administration.

The Vocational Agriculture Instructors of 51.9 per cent of the schools believed the veterans shop program served as an incentive to their high school vocational agriculture students, while 58.5 per cent did not believe the veterans farming programs were an incentive to the high school vocational agriculture student.

Approximately three out of ten Vocational Agriculture Instructors do not spend any time filling out veterans forms. Fifty per cent of the veterans increase in net worth per year was attributed to the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program. C. E. Bundy, Iowa, found in his study that 95.6 per cent of the veterans in Kansas thought they were better established in farming as a result of the veterans training program.²

The high school vocational agriculture program was not handicapped by the veterans program. The veterans program will have a favorable influence on future programs in adult education in vocational agriculture.

Veterans who did not take vocational agriculture in high school were favorably impressed by the veterans program. Bundy found that 70.5 per cent of the veterans in the Kansas program had not had vocational agriculture in high school.²

If a program of young farmer education is developed under the supervision of the State Department for Vocational Education, the student should not be paid subsistence, teacher cost should be financed by a combination of both individual and public funds, and cost of equipment and housing should be financed with public funds alone. Bundy showed 87.3 per cent of the veterans could not have made as much progress in getting started in farming if they had received subsistence allowance without training. He also found 57 per cent of the veterans would continue to take part in a similar program without subsistence pay. He found 31.2 per cent of the veterans believed that federal funds should be used in financing adult farmer programs and 52 per cent of them were willing to pay taxes for an adult education program in local schools.² Hoskins found that 75 per cent of the farm veterans would be willing to pay from ten to fifty dollars tuition for a suitable instructional program and that the majority would be willing to have from one to five per cent of the taxes used for adult education.³

If a program of young farmer education is developed, four hours of class time should be devoted per month and one hour of on the farm instruction should be devoted per month per student.

Bundy found 49.5 per cent of the veterans wanted on-the-farm instruction once a month. He found 32.1 per cent of the veterans wanted classroom instruction every week in slack season of farm work and monthly in other months.² Hoskins found that 60 per cent of the veterans would prefer to meet weekly or twice weekly.³

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author hereby expresses his sincere appreciation to Prof. A. P. Davidson, Department of Education, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kansas. Professor Davidson read the entire Report, made corrections and suggestions in preparing the questionnaire, and offered advice and encouragement.

Acknowledgment of assistance is made to Mr. C. M. Miller, Director of Vocational Education in Kansas; Mr. L. B. Pollom, Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture in Kansas; Mr. C. C. Eustace, Supervisor of the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program in Kansas; and Mr. R. H. Berkley, Assistant Supervisor of the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program in Kansas.

Thanks are expressed to the following people who acted as consultants, advisors, reviewers, and provided encouragement for the author: Prof. L. F. Hall, Prof. Howard Bradley, Prof. Loren Whipps, of Kansas State College; Mr. J. W. Taylor, Mr. Robert E. Stephens, Mr. Charles O. Carter, Mr. Clem Young, Mr. Frank Carpenter, Vocational Agriculture Instructors in Kansas; and Mr. W. F. Currier, Mr. Henry Hedley, of Coffeyville, Kansas; and other consultants.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Reprint of paragraph 10035, Veterans Administration Regulations, Dated April 1, 1950. Veterans Administration Regional Office, Wichita, Kansas
2. Bundy, C. E. Statistical Research Number 505 "Results of Survey Made In Kansas In Connection With the Regional Study of Institutional On-Farm Training Being Conducted at Iowa State College." State Board for Vocational Education, Topeka, Kansas.
3. Hoskins, E. R. Progress Report of the National Committee on Research in the Education of Farm Veterans. Department of Rural Education, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

APPENDIX

Coffeyville, Kansas
February 25, 1952

TO: Kansas Vocational Agriculture Instructors
FROM: Marvin L. Riggs, Voc. Ag. Instr., Coffeyville, Kansas
SUBJECT: Questionnaire for Master's Report

Dear fellow Instructor:

I am enclosing a two-page questionnaire on the problem of "A Study Of The Pattern Of Cooperation Between The Veterans-On-The-Farm Training Program And The Vocational Agriculture Program In Kansas High Schools" and a self-addressed stamped envelope. This questionnaire is to be the basis of my Master's Report.

It is my intention to obtain the view point of the Vocational Agriculture Instructor and not necessarily the view point of the school administrator or veterans instructor. I feel that you teachers are better qualified to give the information that I need. I will deeply appreciate your assistance in returning this questionnaire.

In order that I may have sufficient time to prepare my Report, I am requesting that you return this questionnaire not later than March 15. I shall attempt to have a summary report to present to each of you at conference this summer. I hope you will find this summary helpful to you as a teacher.

Sincerely yours,

Marvin L. Riggs
Marvin L. Riggs

REMINDER CARD

Dear Fellow Instructor:

This card is to remind you to please complete and return my questionnaire on the problem of "A Study of the Pattern of Cooperation between the Veteran On Farm Training Program and the Vocational Agriculture Program in Kansas High Schools", that was mailed to you on February 25.

I realize you are all very busy but 15 minutes of your time will certainly mean a lot to me at this time.

Your cooperation will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
Marvin L. Riggs
Marvin L. Riggs

Questionnaire

A Study Of The Pattern Of Cooperation Between
The Veterans-On-The-Farm Training Program And The
Vocational Agriculture Program In Kansas High Schools

1. What was the date of your first enrollment of veterans?
Month _____ Year _____
2. How many veterans were enrolled when your school started this program? _____
3. How many veterans were enrolled at the peak of this program? _____
4. How many veterans are enrolled now? _____
5. Do you supervise the veterans program? * Yes _____ No _____
If so, how many hours does this supervision require per week?
1 hr. _____ 2 hrs. _____ 4 hrs. _____ 6 hrs. _____ 8 hrs. _____
6. Do you give shop instruction for the veterans program? * Yes _____ No _____
If so, how many hours does this supervision require per week?
1 hr. _____ 2 hrs. _____ 4 hrs. _____ 6 hrs. _____ 8 hrs. _____
7. Are you responsible for ordering shop supplies such as oxygen, acetylene,
welding rod, and solder for veterans? * Yes _____ No _____
8. Do the veterans pay for shop materials used, such as oxygen, acetylene, welding
rod, and solder? Yes _____ No _____
9. Who collects the shop charges? Voc. Ag. Instr. _____ Veterans Instr. _____ Others _____
10. Are you required to open and close the school building for all veterans classes?
Yes _____ No _____
11. Are you responsible for tool checking for all veterans classes? Yes _____ No _____
12. Are you required to make Vocational Agriculture shop available to the
veterans at times other than the regularly scheduled classes for veterans?
Never _____ Occasionally _____ Often _____
13. Are you acquainted with a majority of the farm problems of each veteran? Yes _____ No _____
14. Do you have an advisory board? Yes _____ No _____
A. Manner in which board is created:
a. Appointed by school board? Yes _____ No _____
 Appointments staggered? Yes _____ No _____
b. Use U.S.D.A. Council? Yes _____ No _____
c. Otherwise _____
15. What is the occupation of each member of your advisory board?
1. _____ 5. _____
2. _____ 6. _____
3. _____ 7. _____
4. _____ 8. _____
16. How often does the advisory board meet? Twice a month _____ Once a month _____
Four times a year _____ Whenever needed _____

*--Where Veterans-On-The-Farm Training has been discontinued, answer questions as they related to the program while in operation.

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE PATTERN OF COOPERATION BETWEEN THE VETERANS-
ON-THE-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM AND THE VOCATIONAL
AGRICULTURE PROGRAM IN KANSAS HIGH SCHOOLS

by

Marvin Lee Riggs

The purpose of this Report was to learn when the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program first began in Kansas, how rapidly it was accepted, how the program affected the Vocational Agriculture program and if similar classes for young farmers would be desirable after the veterans program has been terminated.

A questionnaire consisting of thirty-four questions was sent to 141 Vocational Agriculture Instructors in Kansas who had one or more Veterans-On-The-Farm Training classes. The questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope. It was mailed February 25, 1952 and approximately 57 per cent of the questionnaires was returned by April 1. At this time a reminder card was sent to the remaining schools. The results were tabulated after May 1 on the basis of a 75.2 per cent return.

The Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program was begun in Kansas early in 1946 and had its most rapid growth between November 1946 and January 1947. A class having the characteristics

of a composite of the answers most often checked would have began with 4 veterans, hit its peak enrollment at 26, and have a present enrollment of either 26 or 23. The Vocational Agriculture Instructor spends two hours per week supervising the veterans program and four hours per week giving veterans shop instruction; he is responsible for ordering shop supplies and the veterans do not pay for the shop materials they use. When charges are made, the Vocational Agriculture Instructor makes the collections.

The Vocational Agriculture Instructor is not required to open and close the school building for all veterans classes, but he is responsible for tool checking of all veterans classes. He occasionally makes the shop available to veterans other than for regularly scheduled periods. The Vocational Agriculture Instructor is acquainted with a majority of the farm problems of each veteran.

An advisory board is used by 86.8 per cent of the schools, and in approximately half of the cases, the U. S. D. A. Council is used as an advisory board. The most often listed occupation of an advisory board member was "farmer". The board meets whenever needed for purposes of business, and functions in establishing policies that are of definite value to the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program.

The veterans program has enabled the instructor to increase his vocational agriculture library and his visual aids library.

The agriculture instructor is responsible for approving teaching aids to be purchased for veterans instruction. Five dollars is the estimated cost per veteran per year to the school over and above reimbursement from the Veterans Administration.

The Vocational Agriculture Instructors of 51.9 per cent of the schools believed the veterans shop program served as an incentive to their high school vocational agriculture students, while 58.5 per cent did not believe the veterans farming programs were an incentive to the high school vocational agriculture student.

Approximately three out of ten Vocational Agriculture Instructors do not spend any time filling out veterans forms. Fifty per cent of the veterans increase in net worth per year was attributed to the Veterans-On-The-Farm Training program. The high school vocational agriculture program was not handicapped by the veterans program. The veterans program will have a favorable influence on the future programs in adult education in vocational agriculture. Veterans who did not take vocational agriculture in high school were favorably impressed by the veterans program.

If a program of young farmer education is developed under the supervision of the State Department for Vocational Education, the student should not be paid subsistence, teacher cost should be financed by a combination of both individual and

public funds, and cost of equipment and housing should be financed with public funds. If a program of young farmer education is developed, four hours of class time should be devoted per month and one hour of on the farm instruction should be devoted per month per student.