

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE HOME FARM AND THE SUPER-
VISED FARMING PROGRAMS OF STUDENTS ENROLLED
IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN THE CROSS
TIMBERED SECTION OF OKLAHOMA

By

WILLIAM GRANDY GIBSON

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1958

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of
the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
August, 1958

NOV 18 1959

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE HOME FARM AND THE SUPER-
VISED FARMING PROGRAMS OF STUDENTS ENROLLED
IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN THE CROSS
TIMBERED SECTION OF OKLAHOMA

Thesis Approved:

Ray W. Dugger

Thesis Adviser

Don M. Orr

Lawrence M. Vain

Dean of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation for the assistance rendered by the many persons aiding in this study. I am indebted particularly to Dr. Roy W. Dugger and Professor Don M. Orr whose guidance and help carried the entire work to its completion. I also am indebted to Mr. Olan Labor and Mr. Frank McAlla who helped in the formulation of an interview schedule.

Also, I would like to express great appreciation to Mrs. Ann Paris for her kind consideration in typing this thesis.

This acknowledgment would be incomplete without expressing deep appreciation to my wife, Ruth, who gave constructive criticism and encouragement in making this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Definition of Terms	5
Purpose of the Study	5
Purpose of the Study	5
Procedure	5
II. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	7
Plant Enterprise	7
Animal Enterprise	19
III. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	31
Summary	31
Conclusions	36
Recommendations	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY	39
APPENDIX	40

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. The Coefficient of Correlation Between Total Acres in the Home Farm and Total Acres in the Supervised Farm Training Program	8
II. The Coefficient of Correlation Between Acres Owned in the Home Farm and Total Number of Acres in the Supervised Farming Program	9
III. The Coefficient of Correlation Between Rented Acres in the Home Farm and Total Acres in the Supervised Farming Program	10
IV. The Coefficient of Correlation Between Acres of Cropland in the Home Farm and Total Acres in the Supervised Farming Program	11
V. The Coefficient of Correlation Between Acres of Wheat on the Home Farm and Acres of Wheat in the Supervised Farming Program	11
VI. The Coefficient of Correlation Between Yield Per Acre of Wheat Grown on the Home Farm and Yield Per Acre of Wheat in the Supervised Farming Program	12
VII. The Coefficient of Correlation Between Acres of Oats on the Home Farm and Acres of Oats in the Supervised Farming Program	13
VIII. The Coefficient of Correlation Between Yield Per Acre of Oats on the Home Farm and Yield Per Acre of Oats in the Supervised Farming Program	13
IX. The Coefficient of Correlation Between Acres of Other Small Grains on the Home Farm and Acres of Other Small Grains in the Supervised Farming Program	14
X. The Coefficient of Correlation Between Yield Per Acre of Other Small Grains on the Home Farm and Yield Per Acre of Other Small Grains in the Supervised Farming Program	15

Table	Page
XXIV. The Coefficient of Correlation Between Swine Purchased for Resale on the Home Farm and Swine Purchased for Resale in the Supervised Farming Program	25
XXV. The Coefficient of Correlation Between Female Sheep Usually Kept on the Home Farm and Female Sheep Usually Kept in the Supervised Farming Program	26
XXVI. The Coefficient of Correlation Between Sheep Produced and Sold on the Home Farm and Sheep Produced and Sold in the Supervised Farming Program	27
XXVII. The Coefficient of Correlation Between Sheep Purchased for Resale on the Home Farm and Sheep Purchased for Resale in the Supervised Farming Program	27
XXVIII. The Coefficient of Correlation Between Poultry Females Usually Kept on the Home Farm and Poultry Females Usually Kept in the Supervised Farming Program	28
XXIX. The Coefficient of Correlation Between Poultry Produced and Sold on the Home Farm and Poultry Produced and Sold in the Supervised Farming Program	29
XXX. Enterprises Conducted on the Home Farm and Not Included as a Part of the Supervised Farming Program	30

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Supervised farming has been construed by many people to mean a one-animal or one-crop enterprise with no definite plan for a well-rounded farming program. Professor Don M. Orr raised the question as to whether this practice is desirable and encouraged the writer to do a study concerning it. With this in mind, the writer has attempted to find the amount of students in vocational agriculture who take advantage of the opportunities offered on the home farm. The cross timbered region of Oklahoma was chosen for the study.

The cross timbered section of Oklahoma is a region bounded on the east by a line running from the Missouri line southward along the western borders of Washington and Tulsa counties, the center of Okmulgee county and the eastern borders of Okfuskee and Hughes counties. The line then runs southwest through the center of Hughes county and along the southern borders of Seminole and Pottawatomie counties. The line runs north through Cleveland, Oklahoma and Logan counties where it runs northwest then east through Payne county. From Payne county, the line runs through the center of Pawnee county north through the center of Osage county to the Missouri line.

The section is characterized by timber and prairies intermingled with a sandstone soil, supporting oaks and heavy soil grasses. The sandstone soil under cultivation is subject to serious erosion and soil improving crops are necessary.

The frost free period ranges from 205 days in the northwestern corner of Osage county to 223 days in the southern part of Seminole county. Rainfall varies from thirty-two to thirty-nine inches a year which increases from the west to the east.

Section 10 of the National Vocational Act,¹ passed by the Sixty-Fourth Congress in 1917, includes the following regulations concerning Agricultural Education: (1) that the controlling purpose of such education shall be to fit for useful employment; (2) that such education shall be of less than college grade; (3) it shall be designed to meet the needs of persons over fourteen years of age who have entered upon or who are preparing to enter upon the work of the farm or home farm; (4) the school shall provide for directed or supervised farm practice in agriculture, either on a farm provided for by the school or other farm for at least six months a year.

Earl Knebel made a study of the factors that contribute to effective programs of vocational agriculture, and stated in the summary of his thesis:

A strong supervised farm training program appears to be of utmost importance in the development of an effective program of vocational education in agriculture. A strong supervised farm training program should include production ² projects, improvement projects, and supplementary farm jobs.

¹Public Law No. 347, Sixty-Fourth Congress, Approved February 23, 1917.

²Earl H. Knebel, "An Analysis of Factors Contributing to Effective Programs of Vocational Agriculture," (Unpub. Ed. D. Dissertation, Oklahoma A. and M. College, 1955), p. 164.

In analyzing the values of farming programs Deyoe³ stated that "one of the most important values of farming programs is that these activities provide for learning through doing." It was also pointed out by Deyoe that supervised farm practice is a basis for evaluating the effectiveness of instruction in vocational agriculture. Effective education in vocational agriculture can be measured by the improvements revealed in the lives and work of farm people.

J. R. Hamilton⁴ made the following observations in reviewing the seven principles of vocational education in agriculture: General education is fundamental to the democratic way of life, but does not satisfy the need of special training required by the modern farmer. Vocational education in agriculture does meet this need and the boy with a good supervised farming program generally makes a good student in vocational agriculture.

Peterson⁵ observed that the one-calf or other one-animal project has been allowed to substitute for real directed experience. A very serious weakness in the one-calf project or its equivalent is unrealistic in that it inefficiently partitions a farm enterprise, limits the development of junior partnerships at the enterprise level, and tends to isolate the farming program from class room instruction.

³George P. Deyoe, Farming Programs in Vocational Agriculture, (Danville, Illinois, 1953), pp. 25-29.

⁴J. R. Hamilton, "Seven Principles of Vocational Education in Agriculture," Agricultural Education Magazine, February, 1958, p. 177.

⁵Miles J. Peterson, "Farming Programs - A Critique," Agricultural Education Magazine, March, 1957, p. 195.

Snyder⁶ raised the question as to whether the programs of vocational agriculture students led to establishment in farming and made the following statement.

The in-school farming program of the student is the core of instruction in high school classes in vocational agriculture. An objective of vocational agriculture, one many educators consider the most important, is to aid students to become established in farming.

The relation of the supervised farming and classroom instruction was emphasized by Snowden.⁷ He observed that if the vocational agriculture instructor follows the principle -- one learns what he practices -- there is but one way for a student to learn to be proficient in farming. Supervised practice is the core of this learning if learning is to be proficient.

In view of the federal administrative requirements and the findings from the studies made on supervised farm training programs, the need for further investigation of supervised farm training programs was evident. Therefore, a study of the opportunities offered by the home farm as compared to the actual farm training program of the student was proposed.

Statement of the Problem

The extent to which the student enrolled in vocational agriculture has been encouraged and directed in taking advantage of the

⁶Fred C. Snyder, "Do Student's Programs Lead to Establishment in Farming," Agricultural Education Magazine, May, 1956, p. 246.

⁷O. L. Snowden, "Supervised Practice is Essential for Complete Learning," Agricultural Education Magazine, September, 1953, p. 56.

opportunities offered on the home farm for supervised farm training is the problem of this thesis.

Definition of Terms

The term "supervised farming program" is used in this thesis to refer to productive enterprises conducted by the student of vocational agriculture on the home farm.

Purpose of the Study

The study was made to ascertain whether there is significant correlation between the major plant and animal enterprises on the home farm and the student's productive enterprise projects.

Procedure

In attempting to solve the problem of this thesis, a procedure was developed which included the following steps:

1. A review of selected literature pertaining to evaluation of supervised farm training programs was made.
2. Consultations with vocational agriculture teachers in the region studied and the staff of the Department of Agricultural Education at Oklahoma State University were arranged to help select factors on the home farm which contribute most effectively to the supervised farm training programs. These factors were used in preparing tentative interview schedules which were later revised to improve (a) clarity of communication, (b) completeness, and (c) conciseness.
3. Data for this study concerning the home farm were obtained

by prepared interview schedules shown in the Appendix.

4. Students enrolled in vocational agriculture were selected at random from the schools having vocational agriculture in the cross timbered section of Oklahoma. The location of these schools is shown in the Appendix.

5. The questionnaire concerning the home farm was filled out by the writer through the use of personal interviews with the students concerned.

6. Data concerning the student's supervised farm training program were obtained from the material on file in the Office of the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture.

7. Data were tabulated and analyzed.

8. Conclusions were made concerning the extent the student enrolled in vocational agriculture has been encouraged and directed in taking advantage of the opportunities on the home farm for supervised farm training.

CHAPTER II

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Data presented in this chapter concerning the home farm were obtained in individual interviews with one hundred boys enrolled in vocational agriculture in twenty schools in the cross timbered section of Oklahoma. Five boys from each school were selected at random and a visit was made by the writer to the home farm where the data were obtained. Data concerning the supervised farming programs of each of the boys were obtained from the records on file in the Office of the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture.

The coefficients of correlations were calculated by the statistical laboratory of Oklahoma State University.

Tables I through XXIX are arranged to indicate the plant and animal enterprises grown on the home farm and included in the supervised farming program.

Plant Enterprises.

Total Acres. Table I shows that there is a significant relationship between the total acres on the home farms and the total acres in the supervised farming program. It is also shown that eighty-seven per cent of the boys living on farms in the cross timbered area do not have any plant enterprises in their supervised farming program.

TABLE I

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN TOTAL ACRES IN THE
HOME FARM AND TOTAL ACRES IN THE SUPERVISED
FARM TRAINING PROGRAM

Total Acres on the Home Farm	Frequency	Total Acres In Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
		0	87
20 - 79	5	2 - 16	8
80 - 149	21	17 - 31	0
150 - 219	33	32 - 46	1
220 - 289	16	47 - 61	2
290 - 359	13	62 - 76	1
360 - 429	5	77 - 91	0
430 - 499	3	92 - 106	1
500 - 569	0		
570 - 639	1		
640 - 709	2		
710 - 779	0		
780 - 849	0		
850 - 919	0		
920 - 989	0		
990 - 1059	0		
1060 - 1129	1		

Coefficient of Correlation = .298

Owned Acres. Table II shows there was significant correlation between acres owned by the parents and total acres in the supervised farming program of boys enrolled in vocational agriculture.

The number of parents owning land was ninety-one and only twelve boys living on these farms had plant enterprises in their supervised farming programs.

TABLE II

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN ACRES OWNED IN THE
HOME FARM AND TOTAL ACRES IN THE SUPERVISED
FARMING PROGRAM

Number of Owned Acres On Home Farm	Frequency	Total Acres in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	9	0	88
1 - 49	8	2 - 16	7
50 - 99	18	17 - 31	0
100 - 149	5	32 - 46	1
150 - 199	29	47 - 61	2
200 - 249	8	62 - 76	1
250 - 299	5	77 - 91	0
300 - 349	13	92 - 106	1
350 - 399	1		
400 - 449	0		
450 - 499	3		
500 - 549	0		
550 - 599	0		
600 - 649	1		

Coefficient of Correlation = .228			

Rented Acres. Table III shows there was no significant correlation between number of rented acres and number of acres in the supervised farming program.

It was shown that forty-one of the home farms are rented or have rented land and only five of the boys living on these farms had plant enterprises in their supervised farming program.

TABLE III

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN RENTED ACRES IN THE HOME FARM AND TOTAL ACRES IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Number of Rented Acres on Home Farm	Frequency	Total Acres in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	59	0	95
1 - 49	7	2 - 16	1
50 - 99	10	17 - 31	1
100 - 149	3	32 - 46	0
150 - 199	10	47 - 61	1
200 - 249	4	62 - 76	1
250 - 299	4	77 - 91	0
300 - 349	2	92 - 106	1
350 - 399	0		
400 - 449	0		
450 - 499	0		
500 - 549	0		
550 - 599	0		
600 - 649	1		

Coefficient of Correlation = .142

Cropland. Table IV shows there was significant correlation between acres of cropland in the home farm and total acres in the supervised farming program. While there was significant correlation, it was indicated that eighty-seven of the boys do not have any cropland.

Wheat. Table V shows there was a highly significant correlation between acres of wheat grown on the home farm and acres of wheat in the supervised farming program.

It was indicated that while fifty-seven of the home farms grow wheat, only five of the boys have wheat in their supervised farming

TABLE IV

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN ACRES OF CROPLAND ON THE HOME FARM AND TOTAL ACRES IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Number of Acres Cropland on Home Farm	Frequency	Total Acres In Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	8	0	87
1 - 19	15	2 - 16	8
20 - 39	14	17 - 31	0
40 - 59	25	32 - 46	1
60 - 79	10	47 - 61	2
80 - 99	9	62 - 76	1
100 - 119	4	77 - 91	0
120 - 139	4	92 - 106	1
140 - 159	1		
160 - 179	0		
180 - 199	0		
200 - 219	5		
220 - 239	2		
240 - 259	1		
260 - 279	0		
280 - 299	2		

Coefficient of Correlation = .209

TABLE V

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN ACRES OF WHEAT ON THE HOME FARM AND ACRES OF WHEAT IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Number of Acres Wheat on Home Farm	Frequency	Acres of Wheat in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	57	0	59
1 - 19	21	1 - 9	1
20 - 39	12	10 - 19	2
40 - 59	4	20 - 29	1
60 - 79	2	30 - 39	0
80 - 99	2	40 - 49	0
100 - 119	1	50 - 59	1
120 - 139	0		
140 - 159	0		
160 - 179	1		

Coefficient of Correlation = .551

programs. The writer observed that this may be due to the restrictions placed on wheat by the government.

Yield of Wheat. By referring to Table VI, it was evident that there was significant correlation between yield per acre of wheat grown on the home farm and yield per acre of wheat in the supervised farming program. It was also shown that the yields of the students' farming program compared favorably with that of the home farm.

TABLE VI

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN YIELD PER ACRE
OF WHEAT GROWN ON THE HOME FARM AND YIELD PER ACRE
OF WHEAT IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Yield Per Acre* of Wheat on Home Farm	Frequency	Yield Per Acre of* Wheat in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	57	0	95
1 - 5	0	1 - 5	0
6 - 10	0	6 - 10	1
11 - 15	13	11 - 15	2
16 - 20	20	16 - 20	1
21 - 25	7	21 - 25	1
26 - 30	3	26 - 30	0

Coefficient of Correlation = .291

*Bushels per acre.

Table VII shows that there was no significant correlation between acres of oats on the home farm and acres of oats in the supervised farming program.

Fifty-one of the home farms grew oats while only two of the boys grew oats as a part of their supervised farming program.

TABLE VII

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN ACRES OF OATS ON THE HOME FARM AND ACRES OF OATS IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Number of Acres Oats on Home Farm	Frequency	Acres of Oats in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	49	0	98
1 - 9	3	5	1
10 - 19	17	50	1
20 - 29	14		
30 - 39	8		
40 - 49	4		
50 - 59	1		
60 - 69	3		
70 - 79	1		

Coefficient of Correlation - .142			

Yield of Oats. Table VIII shows there was no significant correlation between yield of oats on the home farm and yield in the supervised farming program. It is also shown that the two that grew oats

TABLE VIII

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN YIELD PER ACRE OF OATS ON THE HOME FARM AND YIELD PER ACRE OF OATS IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Yield Per Acre* of Oats on Home Farm	Frequency	Yield Per Acre of* Oats in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	49	0	98
15 - 19	4	35	1
20 - 24	9	40	1
25 - 29	11		
30 - 34	12		
35 - 39	9		
40 - 44	6		

Coefficient of Correlation - .171			

*Bushels per acre

had a yield per acre that was in the top yields of the area surveyed.

Other Small Grains. Table IX shows there was significant correlation between acres of other small grains on the home farm and acres of other small grains in the supervised farming program.

TABLE IX

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN ACRES OF OTHER SMALL GRAINS
ON THE HOME FARM AND ACRES OF OTHER SMALL GRAINS
IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Number of Acres of Small Grains on Home Farm	Frequency	Acres Small Grains in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	77	0	97
1 - 19	10	10	1
20 - 39	7	12	1
40 - 59	5	18	1
60 - 79	0		
80 - 99	0		
100 - 119	1		
----- Coefficient of Correlation - .306 -----			

It is also shown that twenty-three of the farms grew other small grains and only three of the boys grew other small grains.

Yields of Other Small Grains. Table X shows there was no significant correlation between yield per acre of other small grains on the home farm and yield per acre of other small grains in the supervised farming program, although the yields of the students were in the higher yields found on the home farms.

TABLE X

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN YIELD PER ACRE OF OTHER SMALL GRAINS ON HOME FARM AND YIELD PER ACRE OF OTHER SMALL GRAINS IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Yield Per Acre of* Other Small Grains on Home Farm	Frequency	Yield Per Acre of* Other Small Grains in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	78	0	97
10 - 14	4	22	1
15 - 19	12	23	1
20 - 24	5	24	1
25 - 30	1		

Coefficient of Correlation = .128			

*Bushels per acre

Grain Sorghum. Table XI shows there was no significant correlation between the acres of grain sorghums grown on the home farm and acres of grain sorghums in the supervised farming program.

The table also shows twenty-nine of the home farms grew grain sorghums while three of the boys included it in their supervised farming programs.

TABLE XI

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN ACRES OF GRAIN SORGHUMS ON THE HOME FARM AND ACRES OF GRAIN SORGHUMS IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Acres of Grain Sorghums on Home Farm	Frequency	Acres of Grain Sor- ghums in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	71	0	97
5 - 14	10	2	2
15 - 24	7	12	1
25 - 34	5		
35 - 44	5		
45 - 54	0		
55 - 64	2		

Coefficient of Correlation - .146			

Yields of Grain Sorghum. Table XII shows there was no significant correlation between the yield per acre of grain sorghum on the home farm and yield per acre of grain sorghum in the supervised farming program. It was observed that the yields of the students compared favorably with the yields of the home farm.

TABLE XII

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN YIELD PER ACRE OF
GRAIN SORGHUM ON THE HOME FARM AND YIELD PER ACRE OF
GRAIN SORGHUM IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Yield Per Acre of* Grain Sorghum on Home Farm	Frequency	Yield Per Acre of* Grain Sorghum in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	71	0	79
10 - 19	26	16	1
20 - 29	1	25	1
30 - 39	2	30	1

Coefficient of Correlation = .079			

Forage Sorghum. Table XIII shows there was a negative significant correlation between acres of forage sorghum on the home farm and acres of forage sorghum in the supervised farming program.

It was indicated that ninety-nine of the boys did not have forage sorghum as a part of their supervised farming program, while ninety-two of the home farms did not grow forage sorghum.

Yield of Forage Sorghum. Table XIV shows there was a negative correlation that was not significant between yield per acre of forage sorghum on the home farms and yield per acre of forage sorghums in the

TABLE XIII

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN ACRES OF FORAGE SORGHUM ON THE HOME FARM AND ACRES OF FORAGE SORGHUM IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Number of Acres of Forage Sorghum on Home Farm	Frequency	Acres of Forage Sorghum in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	92	0	99
10 - 29	5	17	1
30 - 49	0		
50 - 69	2		
70 - 89	1		

Coefficient of Correlation = $-.307$

supervised farm training programs. The student that did grow forage sorghum had a yield below that of any of the yields found on the home farms.

TABLE XIV

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN YIELD PER ACRE OF FORAGE SORGHUM ON THE HOME FARM AND YIELD PER ACRE OF FORAGE SORGHUM IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Yield Per Acre of* Forage Sorghum on Home Farm	Frequency	Yield Per Acre of* Forage Sorghum in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	92	0	99
4	1	3.5	1
5	3		
6	4		

Coefficient of Correlation = $-.029$

*Tons per acre.

Corn. Table XV shows a negative correlation that was not significant between acres of corn on the home farm and acres of corn in the supervised farming program.

The number of farms having corn was eleven, while one boy had corn as a part of his supervised farming program.

TABLE XV

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN ACRES OF CORN
ON THE HOME FARM AND ACRES OF CORN IN
THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Acres of Corn on Home Farm	Frequency	Acres of Corn in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	89	0	99
10 - 24	7	1	1
25 - 39	0		
40 - 54	2		
55 - 69	1		
70 - 84	1		

Coefficient of Correlation = $-.028$

Yield of Corn. Table XVI shows there was a negative correlation that was of no significant correlation between yield per acre on the home farm and yield per acre in the supervised farming program. The students' yield was in the lower yields found on the home farms.

TABLE XVI

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN YIELD PER ACRE
OF CORN ON THE HOME FARM AND YIELD PER ACRE
OF CORN IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Yield Per Acre* of Corn on Home Farm	Frequency	Yield Per Acre* of Corn in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	89	0	99
20 - 29	1	25	1
30 - 39	5		
40 - 49	1		
50 - 59	3		
60 - 69	1		

Coefficient of Correlation = $-.034$

*Bushels per Acre.

Animal Enterprises

Beef Females. Table XVII shows that there was no significant correlation between beef females usually kept on the home farm and beef females usually kept in the supervised farming program.

Seventy-four of the farmers kept beef females for breeding stock. Twenty-one of the boys enrolled in vocational agriculture kept beef females for breeding stock.

Beef Produced and Sold. Table XVIII indicates that there was no significant correlation between animals produced and sold on the home farm and animals produced and sold in the supervised farming program.

Thirty-four of the farms did not produce and sell any beef animals. Table XVII showed that twenty-six did not keep beef females. This difference may be due to farmers in the area studied getting started in the beef enterprise.

TABLE XVII

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN NUMBER OF BEEF FEMALES
USUALLY KEPT ON THE HOME FARM AND BEEF FEMALES
USUALLY KEPT IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Beef Females* Usually Kept on Home Farm	Frequency	Beef Females Usually* Kept in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	26	0	79
1 - 9	21	1 - 3	18
10 - 19	26	4 - 6	2
20 - 29	17	7 - 9	0
30 - 39	5	10 - 12	1
40 - 49	1		
50 - 59	1		
60 - 69	1		
70 - 79	1		
80 - 89	0		
90 - 99	0		
100 - 109	1		

Coefficient of Correlation = . 033

*Females kept for breeding stock

TABLE XVIII

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN BEEF ANIMALS PRODUCED AND SOLD
ON THE HOME FARM AND BEEF ANIMALS PRODUCED AND SOLD IN THE
SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Animals Produced* and Sold on Home Farm	Frequency	Animals Produced and* Sold in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	34	0	90
1 - 4	7	1	5
5 - 9	24	2	4
10 - 14	8	3	0
15 - 19	11	4	0
20 - 24	8	5	1
25 - 29	4		
30 - 34	1		
35 - 39	0		
40 - 44	1		
45 - 49	0		
50 - 54	2		

Coefficient of Correlation = . 145

*Animals born and raised to at least three months of age before selling.

Beef Purchased for Resale. Table XIX shows that there is a negative correlation that was not significant between animals purchased for resale on the home farm and animals purchased for resale in the supervised farming program.

TABLE XIX

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN BEEF PURCHASED FOR RESALE ON THE HOME FARM AND BEEF PURCHASED FOR RESALE IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Beef Purchased* for Resale On Home Farm	Frequency	Beef Purchased* for Resale in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	85	0	81
1 - 3	3	1	13
4 - 6	6	2	2
7 - 9	1	3	2
10 - 11	2	4	1
12 - 13	1	5	1
14 - 16	2		

Coefficient of Correlation = $-.028$

*Animals not born on the farm and resold in a year's time.

Eighty-one of the students of vocational agriculture did not have animals for resale in their supervised farming program. Eighty-five of the home farms did not purchase animals for resale. The writer found that most of those animals purchased for resale by farmers were feeders or stockers, while those purchased by the students were show animals.

Dairy Females. There was a significant correlation between dairy animals usually kept on the home farm and dairy animals kept for resale in the supervised farming program as shown by Table XX.

Forty-six of the home farms indicated keeping dairy females. Twenty-nine of the boys indicated they kept dairy females as part of their supervised farming program.

TABLE XX

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN DAIRY FEMALES USUALLY KEPT ON THE HOME FARM AND DAIRY FEMALES USUALLY KEPT IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Dairy Females* Usually Kept on Home Farm	Frequency	Dairy Females* Usually Kept in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	54	0	71
1 - 9	19	1 - 9	24
10 - 19	11	10 - 19	3
20 - 29	5	20 - 29	1
30 - 39	2	30 - 39	0
40 - 49	4	40 - 49	1
50 - 59	2		
60 - 69	2		
70 - 79	0		
80 - 89	0		
90 - 99	0		
100 -109	1		

Coefficient of Correlation = .612

*Animals of predominately dairy breeding kept for milk to be used at home or commercially at the present or future time.

Dairy Animals Produced and Sold. Table XXI shows there was no significant correlation between the animals produced and sold on the home farm and the animals produced and sold in the supervised farming program.

Seventeen of the home farms produced and sold dairy animals and six of the students in vocational agriculture produced and sold dairy

animals. The writer found during his interviews with farmers that most dairy calves are sold at birth. The small operators usually keep calves to sell. The one farmer that produced and sold sixty-five animals a year supplies herd replacements for other dairymen.

TABLE XXI

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN DIARY ANIMALS PRODUCED AND SOLD ON THE HOME FARM AND DAIRY ANIMALS PRODUCED AND SOLD IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Number of Animals* Produced and Sold on Home Farm	Frequency	Number of Animals* Produced and Sold in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	83	0	94
1 - 9	13	1	4
10 - 19	3	2	1
20 - 29	0	3	1
30 - 39	0		
40 - 49	0		
50 - 59	0		
60 - 69	1		

Coefficient of Correlation = .066

*Animals born as a part of the enterprise and sold after three months of age.

Female Swine. Table XXII shows a positive correlation that was highly significant. The negative correlation was between female swine usually kept on the home farm and female swine usually kept in the supervised farming program.

Sixty of the farmers kept female swine and thirty-nine of the students keep female swine as a part of their supervised farming program.

TABLE XXII

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN NUMBER OF SWINE
FEMALES USUALLY KEPT ON THE HOME FARM AND
SWINE FEMALES USUALLY KEPT IN THE
SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Number of Swine* Females Usually Kept on Home Farm	Frequency	Number of Swine* Females Usually Kept in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	40	0	61
1 - 3	41	1 - 3	29
4 - 6	14	4 - 6	9
7 - 9	1	7 - 9	0
10 - 12	1	10 - 12	0
13 - 15	2	13 - 15	1
16 - 18	0		
19 - 21	1		

Coefficient of Correlation = .763

*Swine kept for breeding purposes at the present or future time.

Swine Produced and Sold. Table XXIII shows there was a significant correlation between the number of swine produced and sold on the home farm and swine produced and sold in the supervised farming program.

Sixty of the home farms and thirty-three of the students produced and sold swine as a part of their enterprises.

Swine Purchased for Resale. Table XXIV shows there was no significant correlation between swine purchased for resale on the home farm and swine purchased for resale in the supervised farming program.

Twenty-eight of the students had swine for resale as a part of supervised farming program while only nine of the home farms have swine for resale. The writer noted that the students who had swine for resale may have them for show purposes.

TABLE XXIII

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN SWINE PRODUCED AND
SOLD ON THE HOME FARM AND SWINE PRODUCED AND
SOLD IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Number of Swine* Produced and Sold on Home Farm	Frequency	Number of Swine* Produced and Sold in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	40	0	67
1 - 14	30	5 - 9	17
15 - 29	20	10 - 14	6
30 - 44	4	15 - 19	3
45 - 59	3	20 - 24	2
60 - 84	2	25 - 29	2
85 - 99	0	30 - 34	1
100 - 114	0	35 - 39	0
115 - 129	0	40 - 44	1
130 - 144	0	45 - 49	0
145 - 159	1	50 - 54	0
		55 - 59	1

Coefficient of Correlation = .349

*Swine produced and sold within the enterprise.

TABLE XXIV

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN SWINE PURCHASED
FOR RESALE ON THE HOME FARM AND SWINE PURCHASED
FOR RESALE IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Number of Swine* Purchased for Resale on Home Farm	Frequency	Number of Swine* Purchased for Resale in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	91	0	71
1 - 49	8	1 - 3	24
50 - 99	0	4 - 6	3
100 - 149	0	7 - 9	0
150 - 199	1	10 - 12	1

Coefficient of Correlation = .163

*Swine purchased to be resold in a year's time.

Female Sheep. Table XXV shows there was significant correlation between female sheep kept on the home farm and female sheep in the supervised farming program.

Ninety-four of the home farms did not keep sheep for breeding purposes and ninety-five of the boys did not have sheep for breeding as a part of their supervised farming program.

TABLE XXV

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN FEMALE SHEEP
USUALLY KEPT ON THE HOME FARM AND FEMALE
SHEEP USUALLY KEPT IN THE SUPERVISED
FARMING PROGRAM

Number of Female* Sheep Usually Kept on Home Farm	Frequency	Number of Female* Sheep Usually Kept in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	94	0	95
1 - 19	1	1 - 4	4
20 - 39	3	5 - 9	1
40 - 59	1		
60 - 79	1		

Coefficient of Correlation = .230

*Female sheep for breeding purposes.

Sheep Produced and Sold. Table XXVI shows there was a significant correlation between sheep produced and sold on the home farm and sheep produced and sold in the supervised farming program.

Four of the home farms produced and sold sheep. Five of the students in vocational agriculture produced and sold sheep as a part of their supervised farming program.

TABLE XXVI

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN SHEEP PRODUCED
AND SOLD ON THE HOME FARM AND SHEEP PRODUCED
AND SOLD IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Number of Sheep* Produced and Sold on Home Farm	Frequency	Number of Sheep* Produced and Sold in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	96	0	95
1	1	4	1
20	2	7	1
60	1	10	2
		14	1

Coefficient of Correlation = .461

*Sheep produced and sold within the enterprise.

Sheep Purchased for Resale. Table XXVII shows there was a negative correlation that was not significant between sheep purchased for resale on the home farm and sheep purchased for resale in the supervised farming program.

TABLE XXVII

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN SHEEP PURCHASED
FOR RESALE ON THE HOME FARM AND SHEEP PURCHASED
FOR RESALE IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Number of Sheep* Purchased for Resale on Home Farm	Frequency	Number of Sheep* Purchased for Resale in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	99	0	95
7	1	1	2
		2	1
		8	1
		12	1

Coefficient of Correlation = -.016

*Sheep purchased to be resold in a year's time.

One of the home farms purchased sheep for resale and five of the students purchased sheep for resale as a part of their supervised farming program. Three of the students reported sheep purchased primarily for show purposes and two purchased feeder lambs for resale.

Poultry Females. Table XXVIII shows there was no significant correlation between poultry females usually kept on the home farm and poultry females usually kept in the supervised farming program.

Thirty-seven of the home farms kept poultry females and one per cent of the students had poultry females as a part of the supervised farming program.

TABLE XXVIII

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN POULTRY FEMALES
USUALLY KEPT ON THE HOME FARM AND POULTRY FEMALES
USUALLY KEPT IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM

Number of Poultry* Females Usually Kept on Home Farm	Frequency	Number of Poultry* Females Usually Kept in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	63	0	99
20 - 89	18	60	1
90 - 159	14		
160 - 229	1		
230 - 299	1		
300 - 369	1		
370 - 439	1		
440 - 509	0		
510 - 579	0		
580 - 649	0		
650 - 719	0		
720 - 789	1		

Coefficient of Correlation = .018

*Poultry for egg production.

Poultry Produced and Sold. Table XXIX shows there was a negative correlation of no significance between poultry produced and sold on the home farm and poultry produced and sold in the supervised farming program.

Ten of the farms produced and sold poultry and two of the students produced and sold poultry as a part of the supervised farming program.

TABLE XXIX

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN POULTRY PRODUCED
AND SOLD ON THE HOME FARMS AND POULTRY PRODUCED
AND SOLD IN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAMS

Number of Poultry* Produced and Sold on Home Farm	Frequency	Number of Poultry* Produced and Sold in Supervised Farming Program	Frequency
0	90	0	98
25 - 49	1	100	2
50 - 74	3		
75 - 99	1		
100 - 124	0		
125 - 149	1		
150 - 174	2		
175 - 199	0		
200 - 224	2		

Coefficient of Correlation = $-.048$

*Poultry hatched and sold within the enterprise.

Other Enterprises. Enterprises conducted on the home farms and not included in the supervised farming programs of the students are shown in Table XXX.

Hay was grown by forty-three of the home farms and pastures were on 100 of the home farms. Poultry purchased for resale was found on seven of the home farms.

TABLE XXX

ENTERPRISES CONDUCTED ON THE HOME FARM AND NOT
INCLUDED AS A PART OF THE SUPERVISED
FARMING PROGRAM

Enterprise	Number Farms Conducting Enterprise
Hay (Legume and Native)	43
Pasture	100
Poultry*	7

*Poultry purchased as chicks to be resold.

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter is presented a summary of the study and of the findings, conclusions based upon the findings, and recommendations related to future research needed in the field of supervised farming programs.

Summary

The writer selected twenty schools at random from the cross timbered section of Oklahoma. A visit was made to each school where five boys were selected at random from the sophomore, junior, or senior year in vocational agriculture. All of the boys lived on a farm.

Interviews were conducted in accordance with the prepared interview schedules shown in the Appendix. One hundred students of vocational agriculture in the cross timbered section of Oklahoma participated. The writer obtained information from the students concerning the enterprises conducted on the home farm. The names of the students were then used to obtain information on the enterprises included in their supervised farming program. The information from these sources was compiled and coefficients of correlation were calculated. A summary of the results of the calculations follows.

Plant Enterprises. Information regarding the coefficient of correlation existing between the home farm and the supervised farming

program was tabulated. A positive significant correlation was found to exist between the supervised farming program and the following home farm situations:

1. Total acres.
2. Acres owned.
3. Acres cropland.
4. Wheat.
5. Yield per acre of wheat
7. Other small grains.

Although there was a positive significance between the supervised farming programs and the home farm situations above, there was evidence of a small proportion of the students taking advantage of the opportunities offered on the home farm. The parents of all the students had farm land, but only thirteen students made use of this land for plant enterprises. Ninety-one parents owned a part of or all of their farms, yet only twelve students had supervised farming programs with plant enterprises. Ninety-two farms had cropland on them and only thirteen students had supervised farming. Wheat does have an acreage which might explain only five students having wheat while forty-three home farms had wheat. The yields of the students' wheat did compare favorably with the yields on the home farm. Thirty-three of the home farms had other small grains while only three students had other small grains as a part of their supervised farm training.

A negative significant correlation exists between acres of forage sorghum on the home farm and acres of forage sorghum in the supervised farming program. Eight of the home farms grew forage sorghum while one student had forage sorghum as a part of his supervised farming program.

An insignificant positive correlation existed between plant enter-

prises included in the supervised farming program and the following plant enterprises included in the operations of the home farms:

1. Acres rented.
2. Oats.
3. Yield per acre of oats.
4. Yield per acre of other small grains.
5. Grain sorghums.
6. Yield per acre of grain sorghums.

Out of forty-one of the home farms that rented a part or all of their land, five students had plant enterprises. Fifty-one of the home farms grew oats, while two students included oats in their supervised farming program. The students that grew oats had yields that compared with the higher yields reported on the home farms. The yields obtained by students having other small grains as a part of their supervised farming program were comparable with the yields reported on the home farms. Three students had grain sorghums in their supervised farming program while twenty-nine home farms reported grain sorghums. The yields of grain sorghums for the home farm and the supervised farming program were in the same range.

A negative correlation of no significance was found to exist between the plant enterprises in the students' supervised farming programs and the following plant enterprises found on the home farm.

1. Yield per acre of forage sorghum.
2. Corn.
3. Yield per acre of corn.

The yield per acre of forage sorghum in the supervised farming program was below the yield of that on the home farm. One student had corn as a part of his supervised farming program, while eleven home farms had corn as a plant enterprise. The yield per acre of corn included in

the supervised farming program was in the lower range of yield existing on the home farm.

Animal Enterprises. Information regarding the coefficient of correlation existing between animal enterprises on the home farm and the supervised farming program was tabulated. A positive significant correlation was found to exist between the supervised farming programs and the following home farm situations.

1. Dairy females usually kept.
2. Swine females usually kept.
3. Swine produced and sold.
4. Sheep females usually kept.
5. Sheep produced and sold.

Forty-six of the home farms usually kept dairy females and twenty-nine of the students had dairy females as a part of their supervised farming programs. Forty of the home farms usually kept female swine, while thirty of the students included female swine in their supervised farm program. Sixty of the home farms produced and sold swine while thirty-three of the students produced and sold swine as a part of the supervised farming program. Six of the home farms usually kept female sheep, while five of the supervised farming programs included female sheep as an enterprise. Five students produced and sold sheep, while four of the farms produced and sold sheep.

A negative significant correlation existed between swine females usually kept in the supervised farming program. Forty-six of the home farms usually kept swine, while twenty-nine of the students included female swine in their supervised farming program.

Animal enterprises on the home farm and supervised farming pro-

grams that had no significant correlation follow:

1. Beef females usually kept.
2. Beef produced and sold.
3. Dairy animals produced and sold.
4. Swine purchased for resale.
5. Poultry females usually kept.

Seventy-four of the home farms usually kept beef females as an enterprise while twenty-one of the students had beef females as a part of the supervised farming program. Seventeen of the home farms produced and sold dairy animals and six students produced and sold dairy animals as a part of their supervised farming program. Nine of the home farms purchased swine for resale and twenty-eight of the students purchased swine for resale. Thirty-seven of the home farms kept poultry females and one student kept poultry females as a part of his supervised farming program.

A negative insignificant correlation existed between animal enterprises in the supervised farming programs and the following animal enterprises on the home farm:

1. Beef purchased for resale.
2. Sheep purchased for resale.
3. Poultry produced and sold.

Twenty-one students purchased beef for resale as a part of the supervised farming program, while fifteen home farms purchased beef for resale. Five students purchased sheep for resale as a part of the supervised farming program, while one home farm purchased sheep for resale. Eight home farms produced and sold poultry, while two students had this enterprise as a part of their supervised farming program.

There were three enterprises that were found on the home farm which were not included in any of the interviewed students supervised farming

programs. These enterprises are as follows:

1. Hay (legume and native).
2. Pasture.
3. Poultry.

Forty-three of the home farms had native and/or legume hay. One hundred of the home farms had pasture land and seven of the home farms purchased poultry for resale.

Conclusions

The extent to which the student enrolled in vocational agriculture has been encouraged and directed in taking advantage of the opportunities offered on the home farm for supervised farm training is the problem that has been considered in this thesis. In solving this problem, one hundred students of vocational agriculture were interviewed and information regarding the home farm was obtained. The writer then obtained information regarding the supervised farming program from the Office of the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture.

The previous summary of the findings of this study allowed a positive significant correlation between the home farm and supervised farming programs in eleven of the enterprises and one enterprise had a negative significant correlation. Eleven enterprises showed no significant correlation between the home farm and supervised farming program. A negative correlation of no significance existed between six enterprises grown on the home farm and included in the supervised farming program. There were three enterprises grown on the home farm that were not a part of any supervised farming programs of the students interviewed.

Plant enterprises were a part of the supervised farming programs of only thirteen students, while animal enterprises were included in all of the students' supervised farming programs that were surveyed.

For the students to receive the full benefit of their supervised farming program on the home farm, guidance should be provided that will enable the students to acquire a more extensive farming program. The conclusion may be reached that vocational agriculture teachers should encourage and guide students into balanced supervised farming programs.

Teacher educators should provide in the agriculture education courses a more definite understanding of a supervised farming program. The supervised farming program should include both plant and animal enterprises that can be developed into a farming program over a period of time.

Recommendations

In addition to acquiring better balanced farming programs identified in this thesis by students of vocational agriculture, there may be other areas of the supervised farming program which students need to develop to a greater degree. There is need for further research to ascertain the extent to which students are taking advantage of the home farm for improvement practices and supplementary projects.

Another factor that may have influenced this study is the metropolitan areas near which the schools are located. Research of a similar nature may be needed to supplement this study for use on a state-wide basis.

The time spent by teachers in visiting the supervised farming programs may affect the nature of the supervised farming program. There is a need for research to ascertain the time being spent by vocational agriculture teachers who have students with well-balanced farming programs and time spent by teachers who have students with supervised farming programs of a narrow scope.

Since the supervised farming program is a vital part of the vocational education in agriculture further research is needed in the following areas: (1) the extent to which the students' improvements practices take advantage of opportunities offered on the home farm; (2) the extent to which the students' supplementary practices take advantage of opportunities offered on the home farm; (3) the effect of metropolitan areas on supervised farming programs; and (4) the effect of teacher visits on supervised farming programs.

It is also recommended that teachers of the cross timbered section make a careful analysis of the supervised farming programs of their students to ascertain if the student is taking full advantage of the opportunities offered on the home farm.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Deyoe, George P. Farming Programs in Vocational Agriculture. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printing Press, 1953, 25-29.
- Hamilton, J. R. "Seven Principles of Vocational Agriculture." Agricultural Education Magazine, XXX (February, 1958), 177.
- Knebel, Earl H. "An Analysis of Factors Contributing to Effective Programs of Vocational Agriculture." (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University), 164.
- Peterson, Miles J. "Farming Programs - A Critique." Agricultural Education Magazine, XXIX (March, 1957).
- Public Law No. 347, Sixty-Fourth Congress, Approved February 23, 1917.
- Snowden, Obed L. "Supervised Practice is Essential for Complete Learning." Agricultural Education Magazine, XXVI (September, 1953), 56.
- Snyder, Fred C. "Do Students' Farming Programs Lead to Establishment in Farming?" Agricultural Education Magazine, XXVIII (May, 1956), 246.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

PLANT ENTERPRISES GROWN ON THE FARM

Crop	Acres	Normal Yield/Acre
Wheat		
Oats		
Other Small Grains		
Grain Sorghums		
Forage Sorghums		
Legume Hay		
Native Hay		

Name _____ School _____

Tenure of Father:

Acres Owned _____ Acres Rented _____ Other _____

Size of Home Farm:

Total Acres _____ Acres Cropland _____

LIVESTOCK ENTERPRISES ON THE FARM

Enterprise	Number Females Usually Kept	Number Units Produced and Sold	Number Units Purchased for Resale
Beef			
Dairy			

Swine _____

Sheep _____

Poultry _____

Dairy: Grade A Milk _____ Grade C Milk _____ Cream _____

Poultry: Egg Production _____ Broilers _____

PRODUCTIVE ENTERPRISE PROJECTS CONDUCTED
BY THE STUDENT ON THE HOME FARM

Name _____ School _____

PLANT ENTERPRISES

Crop	Acres	Normal Yield/Acre
Wheat		
Oats		
Other Small Grains		
Grain Sorghums		
Forage Sorghums		
Legume Hay		
Native Hay		
Pasture		

LIVESTOCK ENTERPRISES

Enterprise	Number Females Usually Kept	Number Units Produced and Sold	Number Units Pur- chased for Resale
Beef			
Dairy			
Swine			
Sheep			
Poultry			

Dairy: Grade A Milk _____ Grade C Milk _____ Cream _____
Poultry: Egg Production _____ Broilers _____

APPENDIX B

DEPARTMENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE ATTENDED BY STUDENTS
PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY

- | | |
|----------------|----------------|
| 1. Moore | 11. Carney |
| 2. Choctaw | 12. Tryon |
| 3. Jones | 13. Guthrie |
| 4. Luther | 14. Mulhall |
| 5. Harrah | 15. Stillwater |
| 6. McLoud | 16. Perkins |
| 7. Meeker | 17. Ripley |
| 8. Prague | 18. Chandler |
| 9. Wellston | 19. Glencoe |
| 10. Drumwright | 20. Cushing |

APPENDIX C

THE COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN SWINE FEMALES USUALLY KEPT ON
THE HOME FARMS AND SWINE FEMALES USUALLY KEPT IN
THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAMS

Formula: $r = \frac{\sum xy}{\sqrt{(\sum x^2)(\sum y^2)}}$

x = swine females usually kept on home farms.

y = swine females usually kept in supervised farming programs.

r = coefficient of correlation

$$\sum xy = 392$$

$$\sum x^2 = 1410$$

$$\sum y^2 = 471$$

$$r = \frac{392}{\sqrt{(1410)(471)}}$$

$$r = \frac{392}{\sqrt{664110}}$$

$$r = \frac{392}{814.929}$$

$$r = .481$$

VITA

William Grandy Gibson

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN THE CROSS TIMBERED SECTION OF OKLAHOMA

Major Field: Agricultural Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born at Dermott, Arkansas, July 11, 1931, the son of Frank A. and Edna M. Gibson.

Education: Attended grade school in Dermott and Boydell, Arkansas; graduated from Dermott High School in 1949; attended Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College; received the Bachelor of Science Degree from Oklahoma State University of Agriculture and Applied Sciences, with a major in Agricultural Education, in January, 1958; completed requirements for the Master of Science in Agricultural Education in August, 1958.

Professional Experience: Entered the United States Navy in 1950 and received an honorable discharge in 1954.