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INTRODUCTION

Supervised practice in the form of individual home projects is the basis of vocational education in agriculture. The home project is and has been the basic method of teaching vocational agriculture in the public schools since the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in Congress in 1917. For several years following the passage of the act much emphasis was placed upon class room procedure in the teaching of vo-
cational agriculture. The home project was supplementary and of minor importance. Experience has taught that good class room technique does not vocationalize agriculture. General supervised farm practice does. Today more emphasis is placed upon the home project and project program.

The project is a device by which the student can obtain actual farm experience along with class room instruction and supervision. It may be defined as a crop or livestock enterprise conducted through a complete period of production, with at least the major portion of the management and labor performed by the student, and having complete financial, labor and production records. Financial participation should be expected except in unusual cases.

The federal act provides for the carrying on of supervised farm practice. The chief form of supervised practice commonly used is the individual home project. The project is an aid in teaching and vocationalizing farming. The duration of the average project is too commonly the normal production period which in most farm enterprises is about six months. This short time project program does not teach farming properly. There are five types of projects in use in the field of vocational agriculture, as follows: major, minor, continuation, group and class projects.

This thesis is a study of the continuation project in the field of vocational agriculture. The continuation
project may be defined as a major or minor project, continued without interruption, two or more years. It is commonly confined to one farm enterprise and passes through the complete cycle of production.

From several years experience in teaching vocational agriculture in Kansas the writer has observed the following problems in connection with the short time home project, commonly called major and minor projects. They are:

1. The student has the problem of choosing and finding a project every year.

2. By closing the home project at the end of one phase of production, there is a loss of interest in project work.

3. When the project is sold and the proceeds are not reinvested in productive enterprises they soon disappear.

4. The short time project is often too small in scope and not economically worth while.

5. Short time projects are too often considered experimental and may not be adapted to the farm.

The writer has further observed that the long time supervised practice program with the continuation projects eliminates most of the foregoing problems. In addition, students with good continuation projects have a start in farming and usually enter that business. Should the student wish to enter college he can secure a livestock loan or convert his projects into cash and proceed.
Because this project has proved so valuable from the standpoint of the student, parent, and teacher, a study of the results obtained in other schools in this state and in other states was undertaken.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is confined to four major points relative to the continuation project, as follows:

1. To determine the scope of the continuation project in selected states.

2. To learn what results have been obtained with this project.

3. To learn the relation, if any, and the effect upon the teaching of vocational agriculture.

4. To what extent does the continuation project lead into the business of farming?

PROCEDURE

The plan of procedure is threefold: First, to interview teacher trainers and supervisors in states where emphasis is placed upon the continuation project. Questionnaires were sent to teacher trainers in New York, Minnesota, Nebraska and Oklahoma; to supervisors in Kansas, Michigan, Missouri and Wisconsin.

The second step in the procedure was to go into the
field and interview teachers who supervise this type of project. Questionnaires were sent thirty teachers in Ohio, Kansas and Oklahoma. Ten of these were sent to each state.

Finally the plan of studying the annual state project reports made by teachers of vocational agriculture to the state office was used. A comparison was then made of the records of the continuation and related projects. This comparison was made for Ohio and Kansas.

In making the survey with questionnaires special care was taken to get them in the hands of individuals who because of training and experience were well qualified to report. State supervisors were asked to pick ten teachers in their state to interview. Dr. C. V. Williams of Kansas and Prof. H. E. Bradford of the University of Nebraska recommended teacher trainers to interview.

Teacher trainers and supervisors were asked to answer the following four point questionnaire.

1. What has been done in your state toward the promotion and advancement of the continuation project?

2. To what extent does the continuation project lead into the business of farming?

3. What causes some continuation projects to fail?

4. Please write your opinion as to the importance of this project in the teaching of vocational agriculture.
Teachers of agriculture were asked the following questions:

1. How many years have you supervised continuation projects?
2. Number of completed continuation projects during this time.
3. Do continuation projects lead the boys into the business of farming?
4. Give the percentage of boys from your department, who carried continuation projects while in school, that are now farming.
5. What per cent of your continuation projects are owned by the students ______%? Are jointly owned ______%?
6. List the advantages of the continuation project.
7. List causes of failure of some continuation projects.
8. As a teaching device how does the continuation project compare with other types of projects?
9. Does the continuation project increase the standard and quality of your general practice program?_____ How?
10. Check the following ways your continuation
projects are financed. Rank in order of use.

Bank loan 
Loan from parents 
Student earnings 
Others 

11. Rating your present and former continuation project students in scholastic achievement. Give the approximate per cent that would rate high, medium and low. For example: High - 30%. Medium - 40%. Low - 30%.

12. Teachers were asked to report a successful continuation project in livestock production. In reporting the project the following form was used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student's name</th>
<th>Dates of project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST YEAR:</th>
<th>SECOND YEAR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of project</td>
<td>Name of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Inventory (Head)</td>
<td>Opening Inventory (Head)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Value)</td>
<td>(Value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Inventory (Head)</td>
<td>Closing Inventory (Head)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Value)</td>
<td>(Value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student's Share</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THIRD YEAR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOURTH YEAR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Head)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Teachers were also asked to report a successful continuation project in crops production. The following form was used:

**FIRST YEAR:**
- **Student's Name:** __________
- **Dates of project:** ________
- **Name of project:** ________
- **Opening Inventory (Acres):** ________
  - (Value) ________
- **Closing Inventory (Acres):** ________
  - (Value) ________
- **Expenses:** ________
  - Total ________
- **Student's Share:** ________

**SECOND YEAR:**
- **Name of project:** ________
- **Opening Inventory (Acres):** ________
  - (Value) ________
- **Closing Inventory (Acres):** ________
  - (Value) ________
- **Expenses:** ________
  - Total ________
- **Student's Share:** ________

**THIRD YEAR:**
- **Name of project:** ________
- **Opening Inventory (Acres):** ________

**FOURTH YEAR:**
- **Name of project:** ________
- **Opening Inventory (Acres):** ________
The Ohio State Department of Education furnished data from the annual project reports, 1931-32, for the comparison of continuation and related projects. These projects are compared in the following enterprises: swine, poultry, dairy, sheep, corn, potatoes, tobacco and truck.

Continuation projects are defined in the introduction. Related projects in this thesis refer to short time major and minor projects.

The following comparisons were made between continuation and related projects:

a. Number of projects in each classification.
b. Average scope.
c. Average production per unit of commodity.
d. Average labor income per unit of commodity.

The average scope was determined by taking the total number of projects in that particular enterprise and classification into the total number of animals for the same.

The average production per unit of commodity was found by dividing the total production by the total units of
commodity for the enterprise and classification.

The average labor income per unit of commodity was determined by dividing the total labor income by the total units of production for that particular enterprise and classification.

The Kansas State Board for Vocational Education furnished data for the comparison of the continuation and related projects in Kansas for the year 1932-33. These data were compiled from the annual project reports of all departments in the state.

Enterprises for Kansas included: swine, poultry, dairy, sheep, beef, wheat, potatoes, corn and legumes. The same points of comparison were used for Kansas as for Ohio.

FINDINGS

Teacher Trainer and Supervisor

In response to questionnaires sent to teacher trainers and supervisors of agriculture, five out of eight replied. Replies were received from New York, Minnesota, Nebraska, Wisconsin and Kansas. Missouri, Oklahoma and Michigan did not cooperate.

Below are the tabulations. Four questions were asked.

I. What has been done in your state toward the
promotion and advancement of the continuation project?

Replies:

a. Two reports that the continuation project is emphasized in teacher training work and at state conferences.

b. One teacher trainer reports, "We have put more emphasis on the long time program of farm practice which involves the entire farm. In a way it is a collection of continuation projects. We do have many single continuation projects."

c. Another teacher trainer says, "We have the long time supervised practice program in which the continuation of enterprises from year to year is an essential phase of the total program."

d. The Wisconsin state program provides that "every boy shall have a long time program of supervised practice emphasizing training in farm skills and ownership of part of the farming enterprise."

e. In Wisconsin, for the school year 1933-34, 1493 out of 4515 students of vocational agriculture had long time programs of supervised practice.

II. To what extent does the continuation project lead into the business of farming?

a. One teacher trainer reports "difficult to determine."
b. Another says, "Have made no study."

c. A third says, "In many cases it serves to start the boys out in farming."

d. A fourth writes, "The program of long time supervised practice is supposed to issue into placement."

e. "This long time program, of course, leads directly into the business of farming."

III. The third question asked was, "What causes some continuation projects to fail?"

Response:

a. Lack of objectives.

b. Lack of proper workable plans.

c. Student not interested.

d. Parents fail to cooperate.

e. Teacher fails to follow up work.

f. Wrong selection of project.

g. Lack of facilities at home.

h. Rented farms.

i. Too narrowly interpreted.

j. Not economically worth while.

k. Too little in scope.

l. Disregard of parents' place in the process.

m. Lack of definite purpose.

n. Changing interests of boy.

o. Unsettled financial conditions.
p. Department changes.

IV. The fourth question asked of the teacher trainers and supervisors was: Write your opinion as to the importance of this project in the teaching of vocational agriculture.

Response:

a. "I consider it very important, especially if it is progressive."

b. "We believe it should be emphasized at all times."

c. Long time supervised practice program is basal to instruction and the only basis of making agriculture vocational.

d. "Certainly if the agricultural teacher's program is to be really vocational there must be a long time training program."

From Teachers of Vocational Agriculture

The response to questionnaires sent to teachers of vocational agriculture was of about average expectancy. Thirty questionnaires were sent out and fourteen were returned.

The response according to states is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number questionnaires sent</th>
<th>Number questionnaires returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings on the questionnaires sent to teachers are tabulated below:

1. In reply to the question, how many years have you supervised continuation projects?
   a. Range in years of supervision from 1 to 13.
   b. Average in years of supervision  5.
   c. First year of continuation project supervision  1921.

2. Number of completed continuation projects during this time.
   a. Total completed continuation projects  1075.
   b. Average number of completed continuation projects per teacher  82.

3. Does the continuation project commonly lead the boys into the business of farming?
   Yes  11
   No  1
   Often  1

Comment:
   a. Very seldom
   b. Yes, without doubt

4. Percentage of boys from your department who carried continuation projects while in school that are now farming.
   a. Range in percentage 50 to 95 per cent.
b. Average percentage 74.3 per cent.

5. What per cent of your continuation projects are student owned ___%? Jointly owned ___%?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student owned</th>
<th>Jointly owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 63.95 36.04

6. As a teaching device for the teaching of farm skills and improved practices, how does the continuation project compare with other types of projects.

Rated in order of the best, favorably, and no difference, the following results were found:

Best--10
Favorably--2
No difference--1
Added comment to question 6 by teachers reporting:

a. I believe the continuation is twice as valuable as the short time project as a teaching device.

b. The boys who are able to carry this type of project feel that they are building more securely for the future.

c. The boys learn less but what is learned is of an advanced nature and specialized in type.

d. Much better because the boys have so many more problems and the return of problems taught when freshmen.

e. More accurate and workable information.

f. Permits complete cycle. Can exercise skill in improvement breeding and selection.

  g. Very little difference.

h. The continuation project gives the teacher the entire cycle of production over which to teach.

  i. Basis of all teaching.

j. I use continuation projects as basic projects and add other projects largely for educational value.

7. (A) Does the continuation project increase the standard and quality of your general supervised practice program?

   Yes--14

   No--0
7. (B) How does the continuation project increase the standard and quality of your general supervised practice program?

Response:

a. Boys see their errors in conducting the project and try to eliminate these the second year.

b. Last the year around; can plan more permanently.

c. Thorough interest and quality of project.

d. Not necessarily.

e. Gives standards for first year boys to meet.

f. We try to improve breeding production and set higher standards.

g. Larger units and better quality of products raised.

h. Stabilizes the boys' programs.

i. Boys work harder the second year.

j. Increases the number of projects carried.

k. Develops interest and success.

l. Better practices used and higher labor income.

m. Beneficial effect on student, parents, and other students.

8. To learn the ways most commonly used in financing the continuation project, teachers were asked to rank the methods listed below on frequency of use.
Results:

Parent loan - first
Student earnings - second
Bank loan - third
Others - fourth

9. To determine the scholastic ability and achievement of present and former continuation project students, teachers were asked to classify them into three general groups: High, medium, low. To assist the cooperator, no attempt was made to set numerical boundaries for these general groups.

The scholarship rating was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average
40.9% 44.09% 15%
10. To obtain the special advantages of this particular type of project, teachers were asked to list the advantages of the continuation project.

They are listed in order of frequency as follows:

a. Keeps up interest of the boy.
b. Furnishes the boy a start in farming.
c. More chance for financial success.
d. Student acquires improved practices and skills.
e. Insures experience over all seasons and good and bad years.
f. Projects increase in size.
g. They are a challenge to the energetic boy.
h. Boys get better equipment for project.
i. Better home relations.
j. Affords better teaching opportunity.
k. Increases knowledge.
l. Boy sees value of superior breeding stock.
m. Boy gets better equipment for continuation projects.

11. Teachers of vocational agriculture were asked to list cause why some projects fail.

They are listed in order of frequency as follows:

a. Poor home cooperation.
b. Lack of finances to continue.
c. Poor teacher supervision.
d. Drought, hail, disease.
e. Lack of student interest.
f. Poor quality of stock.
g. Projects not adapted to farm.
h. Projects grow to interfere with father's enterprises.
i. Failure of teacher to motivate.
j. Continuation project not progressive.
k. Poor markets.
l. Tenancy.
m. Continuation started too late in course.
n. No continuation crops projects.
o. Lack of student financial participation.
p. Scope of project too small.

State Office Reports

The third study made of the continuation project is that of comparing it with related projects of the same enterprise. The related project refers to short time projects as major and minor. The first report is a comparison of these two projects in Ohio, for the school year 1931-32. The enterprises compared are: sow and litter, poultry flock, chicks, dairy herd, sheep, corn, potatoes, tobacco and truck.
The continuation and related projects are compared as to number, average scope, average production per unit of commodity, and average labor income per unit of production.

The Ohio report follows in Table I.

A comparison of these two projects in Table I shows the following facts:

1. That for 1931-32, the average scope of the continuation project is larger than that of the related projects in five out of eight farm enterprises. These five enterprises are: sow and litter, poultry flock, baby chicks, corn and potatoes. The related projects have a larger scope in three enterprises. They are dairy, tobacco and truck.

2. The average production per unit of commodity is higher for continuation projects in six out of eight farm enterprises. These six enterprises are: sow and litter, poultry flock, baby chicks, dairy herd, potatoes and tobacco. The two enterprises in which the production of related projects exceeds that of the continuation projects are sheep and corn.

3. The average labor income per unit of production is more for the continuation project in seven out of nine enterprises. The enterprises are: sow and litter, poultry flock, baby chicks, dairy, sheep, tobacco and truck. The two enterprises where the labor income was less are: corn and potatoes.
SOME COMPARISONS OF RELATED AND CONTINUATION PROJECTS COMPLETED IN 1931-32.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enterprise</th>
<th>Classification of Projects</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Average Scope</th>
<th>Average Production</th>
<th>Average Labor Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sow and litter</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>1.3 sows</td>
<td>957 pounds of pork per sow</td>
<td>$16.16 per sow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1.9 sows</td>
<td>1040 pounds of pork per sow</td>
<td>$20.34 per sow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry flock</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>110 hens</td>
<td>97 eggs per hen</td>
<td>$.57 per hen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>135 hens</td>
<td>101 eggs per hen</td>
<td>$.66 per hen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicks</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>299 chicks</td>
<td>177 chicks raised</td>
<td>$14.21 per 100 chicks started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>359 chicks</td>
<td>244 chicks raised</td>
<td>$14.53 per 100 chicks started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy herd</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4.7 cows</td>
<td>198 pounds butterfat 4965 pounds milk</td>
<td>$27.22 per cow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.6 cows</td>
<td>224 pounds butterfat 5788 pounds milk</td>
<td>$36.09 per cow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>14.7 ewes</td>
<td>6.3 pounds wool 79 lambs per 100 ewes</td>
<td>$1.77 per ewe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14.7 ewes</td>
<td>6.4 pounds wool 74 lambs per 100 ewes</td>
<td>$1.83 per ewe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>7.7 acres</td>
<td>49 bushels per acre</td>
<td>$2.63 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>9.4 acres</td>
<td>47 bushels per acre</td>
<td>$2.60 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>.9 acre</td>
<td>118 bushels per acre</td>
<td>$22.27 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1.0 acre</td>
<td>122 bushels per acre</td>
<td>$20.27 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.4 acres</td>
<td>957 pounds per acre</td>
<td>$37.25 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.2 acres</td>
<td>1184 pounds per acre</td>
<td>$48.82 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.9 acre</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>$37.78 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.6 acre</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>$47.96 per acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The continuation and related project records as set up in Table II for Kansas were compared for the year 1932-33. The enterprises were swine, poultry, dairy, sheep, beef, wheat, potatoes, corn and legumes.

These two projects were compared as to average scope, average production per unit of commodity and average labor income per unit of commodity.

The comparison in Table II shows the following facts:

1. The average scope of the continuation project in Kansas for 1932-33 was larger than that of the related projects in 5 out of 9 enterprises. The five are: swine, dairy, sheep, potatoes and corn. The scope of the related project is larger with poultry, beef, wheat and legumes.

2. The average production was more for the continuation project in five out of nine major farm enterprises. These enterprises were: swine, poultry, dairy, sheep and wheat.

The production for the related projects was greater in the enterprises of beef, potatoes, corn and legumes.

3. In the comparison of the labor income the continuation project showed a greater return in seven out of nine enterprises. These enterprises are: swine, poultry, sheep, beef, wheat, potatoes, and corn. The related projects gave a larger income in the dairy and legume enterprises.
Table II
KANSAS
A COMPARISON OF RELATED AND CONTINUATION PROJECTS, 1932-33.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enterprise</th>
<th>Classification of Projects</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Average Scope</th>
<th>Average Production</th>
<th>Average Labor Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swine</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>6.4 head</td>
<td>156.8 pounds of pork per head</td>
<td>$1.60 per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8.3 head</td>
<td>204.0 pounds of pork per head</td>
<td>$2.37 per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>96.0 hens</td>
<td>70.0 eggs per hen</td>
<td>$.22 per hen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.1 hens</td>
<td>90.0 eggs per hen</td>
<td>$.47 per hen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.4 cows</td>
<td>236.4 gallons of milk</td>
<td>$31.29 per cow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.2 cows</td>
<td>368.4 gallons of milk</td>
<td>$19.55 per cow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9.3 ewes</td>
<td>22.3 pounds of mutton per head</td>
<td>$.61 per ewe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.6 ewes</td>
<td>29.2 pounds of mutton per head</td>
<td>$1.95 per ewe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1.6 head</td>
<td>969.9 pounds of beef per head</td>
<td>$6.74 per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5 head</td>
<td>806.6 pounds of beef per head</td>
<td>$19.79 per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>36.3 acres</td>
<td>10.3 bushels per acre</td>
<td>$.88 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.4 acres</td>
<td>19.3 bushels per acre</td>
<td>$1.61 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>.74 acres</td>
<td>109.0 bushels per acre</td>
<td>$11.30 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.0 acres</td>
<td>106.2 bushels per acre</td>
<td>$14.01 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>9.6 acres</td>
<td>24.4 bushels per acre</td>
<td>$1.42 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.9 acres</td>
<td>21.4 bushels per acre</td>
<td>$2.22 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.8 acres</td>
<td>1.01 tons per acre</td>
<td>$3.38 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0 acres</td>
<td>1.75 tons per acre</td>
<td>$1.86 per acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaires to teachers of vocational agriculture asked for project records of successful continuation projects in livestock and crop production. Following are some actual continuation project programs as reported.

Case Records

Case One

Berlyn Dillow, Arkansas City, Kansas, High School

Present occupation--Farming. 1930-34

Pictures of projects

First year

Name of project--Beef Management

Opening inventory--one head . . . Value . . . $115.00
Closing inventory--two head . . . . . . . . . . . 175.00
Increase in inventory . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 60.00
Receipts . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 00.00
Expenses . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 25.00
Receipts plus increase . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 60.00
Project income . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 35.00
Student's share . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . All

Second year

Name of project--Beef Management

Opening inventory--two head . . . Value . . . $175.00
Closing inventory--three head . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 295.00
Increase in inventory . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 120.00
Receipts ........................................... $ 00.00
Expenses ........................................... 48.00
Receipts plus increase ............................ 120.00
Project incomes ................................... 72.00
Student's share ................................... All

Third year (purchases four purebred cows with calves)

Name of project--Beef Management
Opening inventory--11 head ........................ $311.00
Closing inventory--14 head ........................ 420.00
Increase in inventory ............................... 109.00
Receipts ........................................... 130.00
Expenses ........................................... 98.40
Receipts plus increase ............................ 239.00
Project income .................................... 140.60
Student's share ................................... All

Fourth year

Name of project--Beef Management
Opening inventory--14 head ........................ $420.00
Closing inventory

Project not completed.

Project Photographs--1930-31-32-33-34
Berlyn Dillow--Continuation Projects with Beef
Management. (See following page.)
1930
Purebred Shorthorn
Heifer

1931
Shorthorn Cow
and Calf
Case One (cont.)

Photographs of Berlyn Dillow

Continuation Projects with Beef

1932

Continuing the Beef Herd

1933

Three Generations with the
Continuation Project
Case One (cont.)
Photographs of Berlyn Dillow
Continuation Projects with Beef

1934
The Young Beef Herd--the Result of
the Continuation Project

Case Two
Dale Walker, Atwood, Kansas, High School, 1932-33
Present occupation--Farming

First year
Name of project--Wheat
Opening inventory--50 acres . . . Value . $ 15.00
Closing inventory--50 acres . . . . . . . . . . . 151.95
Increase in inventory . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 136.95
Student's share 3/5 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 82.17

Second year
Name of project--Wheat
Opening inventory--80 acres . . . Value . . $20.00
Closing inventory--80 acres . . . . . . . . . 105.00
Increase in inventory . . . . . . . . . . . . . 85.00
Student's share 3/5 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 51.00

Case Three
Waldo Poovey, Oxford, Kansas, High School, 1929-34
Present occupation--Farming

First year
Name of project--Sheep--ewes and lambs
Opening inventory--8 head ewes . . Value . $64.00
Closing inventory--11 head ewes . . . . 50.00
Loss in inventory . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 14.00
Receipts . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 29.00
Expenses . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 11.00
Receipts plus increase . . . . . . . . . . . . . 15.00
Project income . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 15.00
Student's share . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 15.00

Second year
Name of project--Sheep--ewes and lambs
Opening inventory--11 head . . . Value . 40.00
Closing inventory--14 head . . . . . . . . . 56.00
Increase in inventory . . . . . . . . . . . . 16.00
Receipts . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 36.40
Expenses . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 13.00
Case Three (cont.)

Receipts and increase total ........... $ 52.40
Project income ......................... 39.40
Student's share ......................... 39.40

Third year

Name of project--Sheep--ewes and lambs
Opening inventory--19 head . . . . . . . Value . . . . . . . $ 95.00
Closing inventory--17 head ................. 68.80
Decrease in inventory ..................... 26.20
Receipts .................................. 129.40
Expenses ................................ 21.30
Receipts plus increase ..................... 103.20
Project income .......................... 81.70
Student's share ......................... 81.70

Fourth year

Name of project--Sheep--ewes and lambs
Opening inventory--24 head . . . . . . . Value . . . . . . . $ 97.00
Closing inventory--27 head ................. 116.00
Increase in inventory ..................... 37.00
Receipts .................................. 189.00
Expenses ................................ 27.50
Receipts plus increase ..................... 226.00
Project income .......................... 198.50
Student's share ......................... 198.50
Case Four
Vincent Fuller, Miltonvale, Kansas,
High School, 1929-32
Present occupation--Farming

First year

Name of project--Swine--sow and litter
Opening inventory--1 gilt ... Value ... $ 15.00
Closing inventory--1 sow ................. 20.00
Increase in inventory ................. 5.00
Receipts ........................................ 61.00
Expenses ....................................... 46.09
Receipts plus increase ................. 66.00
Project income ............................... 19.91
Student's share .............................. 19.91

Second year

Name of project--Swine--sow and litter
Opening inventory--3 sows .... Value .... $ 48.00
Closing inventory--3 sows ................. 42.00
Decrease in inventory ................. 6.00
Receipts ........................................ 156.65
Expenses ....................................... 135.74
Receipts plus increase and decrease .......... 129.74
Project income ............................... 14.91
Student's share .............................. 14.91
Case Four (cont.)

Third year

Name of project--Swine--sow and litter
Opening inventory--5 sows . . . . Value . $ 60.00
Closing inventory--5 sows . . . . . . . . . 60.00
Increase in inventory . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 00.00
Receipts . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 288.00
Expenses . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 218.00
Receipts plus increase . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 288.00
Project income . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 70.00
Student's share . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 70.00

Case Five

Harold Johnson, Anna, Ohio, High School, 1931-34

First year

Name of project--Dairy Management
Opening inventory--2 head
Closing inventory--2 head
Increase in inventory--0
Labor income . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $ 61.63
Student's share . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . All

Second year

Name of project--Dairy Management
Opening inventory--2 head
Closing inventory--3 head
Case Five (cont.)

Increase in inventory--1 head
Labor income ........................................ $ 91.55
Student's share ........................................ All

Third year
Name of project--Dairy Management
Opening inventory--5 head
Closing inventory--7 head
Increase in inventory--2 head
Labor income ........................................ $252.83
Student's share ........................................ All

Fourth year
Name of project--Dairy Management
Opening inventory--8 head (1934)
Closing inventory (not completed for 1934)

Case Six
Robert Hall, Wellington, Nevada,
High School, 1928-32

First year
Raised 125 turkeys

Second year
Raised 225 turkeys

Third year
Raised 545 turkeys
CONCLUSIONS

1. The continuation project has been widely used in a few leading agricultural states. Some remarkable project programs are found where it has been used.

2. More continuation projects are reported with livestock than with crops. Continuation projects fit in well with livestock production.

3. The continuation project is usually larger in scope.

4. Increased production can be expected with this type of project.

5. The continuation project returns a larger labor income.

6. Continuation projects in the long time supervised practice program naturally lead into the business of farming.

7. The long time supervised practice program is basal to all instruction in vocational agriculture.

8. Students medium to high in scholastic achievement should be encouraged to adopt long time supervised practice programs.
9. Teacher trainers and teachers of agriculture agree that the long time project program is fundamental in the teaching of vocational agriculture.

10. Where long time supervised practice programs are used good cooperation exists between parent, pupil and teacher.

11. The recent tendency in the field of vocational agriculture is to make the supervised practice program the basis of all instruction.

12. Where facilities and conditions permit, the long time supervised practice program composed of a number of continuation projects is preferable to a single continuation project.

13. Unsettled financial conditions are responsible for many continuation project failures.

14. The continuation project program should be progressive rather than repetitive.

15. The continuation project program proves most successful in schools where three and four years of agricultural training is offered.
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