

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

MICHAEL KENT SWAN for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY in  
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION presented on April 12 , 1990.

Title: ADMINISTRATOR AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATOR  
PERCEPTIONS REGARDING SUMMER VOCATIONAL  
AGRICULTURE PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

*Redacted for Privacy*

Abstract approved by: Richard Lee Cole

Dr. Richard Lee Cole

The purpose of this study was to determine: 1) the ideal vocational agriculture summer program activities as perceived by teacher educators and state supervisors nationwide, and 2) if there were differences in perceptions towards vocational agriculture summer program activities among selected groups impacting vocational agriculture programs in the state of Oregon, as compared to the ideal summer activities program for the nation. A three section survey questionnaire was developed as the data collection instrument. Section I of the instrument sought the perceptions of all groups toward 38 summer program activities. Section II of the instrument asked the perceptions of all groups as to the number of days currently being allocated and the number of days which ideally should be allocated to the vocational agriculture summer program. Section III was used to collect demographic data from the respondents. The questionnaire was mailed with a cover letter to eight groups totaling 423

individuals who impacted vocational agriculture summer programs. These groups included teacher educators and state supervisors nationwide. From the state of Oregon, the groups were regional coordinators, vocational directors, advisory committee chairpersons, superintendents, principals, and vocational agriculture teachers.

Results revealed ten quality indicators of an ideal vocational agriculture summer program. They were: 1) attend annual summer update conference, 2) supervision of vo-ag students' home projects (SOE), 3) visit prospective vo-ag students and parents, 4) supervision of agricultural cooperative work experience students (CWE), 5) provide individualized instruction to students, 6) vacation/family, 7) maintain communication with school administration, 8) supervision of land lab/greenhouse facilities used by students, 9) develop future SOE/CWE sources, and 10) supervision and planning FFA activities. The number of days to be allocated to the ideal vocational agriculture summer program was identified as 50 days. The 50-day vocational agriculture summer program activities should be distributed in four major categories: 1) supervised occupational experience, 2) FFA, 3) teaching/recruitment, and 4) professional growth activities.

**Administrator and Vocational Educator  
Perceptions Regarding Summer Vocational Agriculture  
Program Activities**

**by**

**Michael Kent Swan**

**A THESIS**

**submitted to**

**Oregon State University**

**in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the  
degree of**

**Doctor of Philosophy**

**Completed April 12, 1990**

**Commencement June 1990**

APPROVED:

*Redacted for Privacy*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Professor of Vocational Education in charge of major

*Redacted for Privacy*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair of the Department of Postsecondary and  
Technological Education

*Redacted for Privacy*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the College of Education

*Redacted for Privacy*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented April 12, 1990

Typed by Michael K. Swan for Michael Kent Swan

## Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
I Introduction and Literature Review	1
Problem Statement	3
Purpose	6
Objectives	6
Definition of Terms	9
Legislation	12
Summer Portion of the Year-Round Community Based Vocational Agriculture Program	16
Research Regarding Summer Programs in Vocational Agriculture	22
Study and Accountability	31
Summary	32
II Methods and Procedures	34
Development of the Instrument	34
Testing of Items	35
Selection of Scale	37
Selection of Sample	38
Survey Response Rate Information	40
Collection of Data	43
Coding of Data	43
Analysis of Data	44
III Findings and Discussion	45
Demographic Data	47
Ideal Summer Program Activities	51
Analysis and Discussion - Objectives 1-4	81
Ideal Summer Program Activities Time Allocation	84
Summary of Findings	90
IV Summary, Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations	94
Summary	94
Conclusions by Objectives	96
Analysis of the Findings and Conclusions	103
Implications and Recommendations	105
Recommendations for Further Study	109

Bibliography	110
Appendix A Correspondence	116
Appendix B Survey Questionnaire	122
Appendix C Demographic Data	132
Appendix D ANOVA Summary	141
Appendix E LSD Tables	146
Appendix F Summer Program Activities	171
Appendix G Categories of Ideal Summer Program	174

## List of Tables

Table		Page
1-1	Oklahoma Study by Cepica (1977)	25
1-2	Rankings of Importance of Vocational Agriculture Summer Program Activities	27
2-1	Vocational Agriculture Summer Activities Program Summary of Survey Responses	40
2-2	Vocational Agriculture Summer Activities Program Survey Response Rate by Individual Groups	41
3-1	Highest Degree Earned/Obtained by Study Participants	50
3-2	Mean, Standard Deviations, and Mean Rankings of Summer Program Activities	51
3-3	Ideal Summer Program Activities Rank Order of Importance as Perceived by Teacher Educators (TE), and State Supervisors (SS)	57
3-4	Ideal Summer Program Activities Rank Order as Compared to the Rank Order of Importance by Regional Coordinators (RC), Vocational Directors (VD), Advisory Committee Chairpersons (AC), Superintendents (SU), Principals (PR), and Vocational Agriculture Teachers (TEA)	61
3-5	ANOVA Test Results on Individual Vocational Agriculture Summer Program Activities by Participant Groups	64
3-6	Rank Order of Major Category Areas by Regional Coordinators (RC), Vocational Directors (VD), Advisory Committee Chairpersons (AC), Superintendents (SU), Principals (PR), and Vocational Agriculture Teachers (TEA)	73
3-7	Ideal Vocational Agriculture Summer Program Quality Indicators as Identified by Teacher Educators (TE), and State Supervisors (SS)	75

3-8	Oregon Vocational Agriculture Summer Program Quality Indicators Identified by Groups in Oregon	77
3-9	Means of the Number of Days Currently Being Allocated To the Eight Major Categories of Vocational Agriculture Summer Program Activities	85
3-10	Means of the Number of Days Which Ideally Should be Allocated To the Eight Major Categories of Vocational Agriculture Summer Program Activities	87



## List of Appendix Tables

Table		Page
C-1	Current Summer Only Salary For Vocational Agriculture Teachers in Oregon	133
C-2	Length of Oregon Vocational Agriculture Teachers Summer Contract (# Days)	133
C-3	Number of Oregon Students on Vocational Agriculture SOE Programs or Involved in FFA Activities During the Summer Months	133
C-4	Develop a Summer Program of Activities and Submit to Their Administration and/or School Board	134
C-5	Vocational Agriculture Teachers Who Submit a Written Summary of Summer Activities to Their Administration and/or School Board	134
C-6	Total Years in Teaching and Administration by Regional Coordinators, State Supervisors, Vocational Directors, Advisory Committee Chairpersons, Superintendents, Principals, Teacher Educators, and Vocational Agriculture Teachers	135
C-7	Students Enrolled in School/Region K-12	136
C-8	Students Enrolled in Vocational Education in School/Region 9-12	136
C-9	Number of Approved Vocational Cluster Programs in The School/Region	137
C-10	Do Study Participants Reside In The Community of Their Employment	138

C-11	Land Laboratory Available to Vocational Program	139
C-12	Greenhouse Available to Vocational Program	140
D-1	Summary Results of ANOVA All Groups Inclusive (LSD at .05)	142
D-2	Activities Whose Mean Ratings Were Not Significantly Different Among The Eight Groups (ANOVA, LSD at .05)	143
D-3	ANOVA Comparison by Major Category on the Current Number of Days Allocated and Ideal Number of Days Allocated to the Vocational Agriculture Summer Program Activities	145
E-1	ANOVA Results Activity - Q1-2	147
E-2	ANOVA Results Activity - Q1-3	148
E-3	ANOVA Results Activity - Q1-4	149
E-4	ANOVA Results Activity - Q2-2	150
E-5	ANOVA Results Activity - Q2-3	151
E-6	ANOVA Results Activity - Q2-4	152
E-7	ANOVA Results Activity - Q2-5	153
E-8	ANOVA Results Activity - Q2-6	154
E-9	ANOVA Results Activity - Q3-2	155
E-10	ANOVA Results Activity - Q3-4	156
E-11	ANOVA Results Activity - Q4-1	157
E-12	ANOVA Results Activity - Q5-1	158
E-13	ANOVA Results Activity - Q5-2	159
E-14	ANOVA Results Activity - Q5-3	160
E-15	ANOVA Results Activity - Q5-5	161
E-16	ANOVA Results Activity - Q6-4	162

E-17	ANOVA Results Activity - Q6-5	163
E-18	ANOVA Results Activity - Q7-2	164
E-19	ANOVA Results Activity - Q7-3	165
E-20	ANOVA Results Activity - Q7-5	166
E-21	ANOVA Results Activity - Q8-1	167
E-22	ANOVA Results Activity - Q8-2	168
E-23	ANOVA Results Activity - Q8-3	169
E-24	ANOVA Results Activity - Q8-4	170
F-1	Ideal Summer Program Activities by Teacher Educators and State Supervisors Rank Order of Importance	172
G-1	Rank Order of Eight Major Categories of Ideal Summer Program Identified by Teacher Educators and State Supervisors	175

# **Administrator and Vocational Educator Perceptions of Summer Vocational Agriculture Program Activities**

## **Chapter I. Introduction and Literature Review**

Education in the United States today has often been solely knowledge-based. It has emphasized reading and discussion of topics such as reasons for conflict and "show-and-tell" about science, social science, and math. However, knowledge acquisition and skill development are not synonymous. In occupational preparation, skill development may become as important as knowledge acquisition, or knowledge acquisition may become dependant upon skill development in order for knowledge acquisition to be achieved. A skill is the "doing" part of the job (Reece, 1988). McMillion and Auville (1976) noted that learning through experience was a basic part of most vocational education programs. Kilpatrick (1953) indicated that learning through experience has been considered essential for effective and purposeful learning. In vocational education, where preparation for employment is a prime consideration, one must consider both knowledge accumulation and skill development through "doing" experiences. In reviewing the philosophy of vocational agricultural education, it was apparent that "learning by doing" was considered essential to learning (Morton, 1978). In a vocational agriculture class, one of the best times to involve students with skill activities of an agricultural nature is the summer. A heavily accelerated production effort and increased activity in subsequential services and supply businesses during

the summer months provide timely opportunities for education and skill development in agricultural education. Therefore, in vocational agricultural education, knowledge and skill development should not be restricted to the standard nine-month school year, but should continue the entire year, including the summer months (Camp, 1986).

### **Problem Statement**

Summer instructional programs have been the topic of many discussions throughout the past years in vocational agricultural education. Current economic conditions and resulting pressure from these conditions on schools, coupled with the educational reform movement and corresponding static or declining enrollments, have forced school administrators to look for ways to economize within the school operating budgets. One place many of these administrators have investigated for possible budget reductions has been the expensive "hands-on" vocational education programs, including vocational agricultural education. Many vocational agriculture teachers, teacher educators, and vocational supervisors are well aware of the importance of these programs and are concerned about subsequent budgetary and enrollment reductions.

Philosophical perspectives and research data are available regarding the importance of a 12-month vocational agriculture program. However, no research on summer program activities has been done since the occurrence of economic and social national events which could possibly alter perceptions about summer activity programs in vocational agriculture. Those events include an economic recession, the excellence in education movement, reduced student enrollments in vocational agriculture, increasing graduation requirements, and declining financial resources for schools. Research has not addressed the perceptions and

attitudes, concerning the value of vocational agriculture summer program activities, of significant groups such as: regional coordinators, vocational directors, and advisory committee chairpersons and their relationship to superintendents, principals, teacher educators, state supervisors, and vocational agriculture teachers.

Oregon is unique with its regional coordinator system. The regional coordinators of Oregon's vocational education system provide a communications link between the efforts of educational agencies from the Oregon Department of Education and the local school system. The state is divided into seventeen administrative regions which correspond roughly to the geographic boundaries of a community-college district. Based either in an educational service district (ESD) or a community college, the regional coordinator assumes many roles. The regional coordinator is a vocational planner, inservice resource person, community resource person, program developer, program facilitator, program evaluator, budget facilitator, and a visible communicator between the department of education, the education service districts, local districts, and community colleges.

It would be valuable to have a research study which compared the attitudes and perceptions of teacher educators, state supervisors, superintendents, regional coordinators, vocational directors, principals, advisory committee chairpersons, and vocational agriculture teachers. It would serve, first to identify the ideal vocational agriculture summer program

activities in times of economic constraint and emphasis on academic versus vocational achievement; and, second, to determine how many days participants of such a study would assign to the major summer program activity categories during this time of economic constraint and academic emphasis. In addition, this research could have value in identifying a philosophically ideal summer activities program and allow a comparison to the individual groups' perception of an ideal summer activities program by ranking the priority levels of each group, identifying the indicators of a quality vocational agricultural summer activities program, and determining possible areas of agreement and disagreement among the groups. These quality indicators would be determined by each group as those ranked as being of "High Importance" to the vocational agriculture summer program activities.

Research findings have supported the value of summer instructional programs in vocational agriculture and their importance to the local and national economies in the past. Regarding the importance of vocational agriculture summer activities programs, the current attitudinal perceptions of those in decision-making positions may differ from those in the classroom and the local community. It was the intent of this study to determine if such a difference existed.



## **Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to determine:

1. The ideal vocational agriculture summer program activities as perceived by teacher educators and state supervisors nationwide.
2. If there were differences in perceptions towards vocational agriculture summer program activities among selected groups impacting vocational agriculture programs in the state of Oregon, as compared to the ideal summer activities program for the nation.

## **Objectives**

The specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Identify components of the vocational agriculture summer program perceived to be important by study participants; separate teacher educator and state supervisor participants' composite scores and utilize these as the ideal activities prioritization for vocational agriculture summer programs.

2. Compare components to be included in a vocational agriculture summer program, as perceived by Oregon study participants, with the ideal vocational agriculture summer program nationwide.
3. Identify the quality indicators of the vocational agriculture summer program perceived to be important by study participants; separate teacher educator and state supervisor composite scores and utilize these as the ideal quality indicator prioritization for vocational agriculture summer programs.
4. Compare the quality indicators of a vocational agriculture summer program, as perceived by each group in the study, with the ideal quality indicators for vocational agriculture summer programs nationwide.
5. Identify perceptions regarding the number of days which are currently allocated to various components of the vocational agriculture summer program by each group studied.
6. Compare current time allocations by each group with perceptions of the ideal summer program time allocation, as identified by teacher educators and state supervisors.
7. Compare perceptions of the ideal time allocations for each

of the Oregon groups studied with the ideal time allocation perceptions of teacher educators and state supervisors.

The identified null hypothesis of this study was: there would be no perceptual differences, among the groups studied, (teacher educators, state supervisors, superintendents, regional coordinators, vocational directors, principals, advisory committee chairpersons, and vocational agriculture teachers), regarding ideal summer vocational agriculture program activities or time allocations.

## Definition of Terms

Agricultural Education: The broad instructional areas of vocational education in agriculture (Knebel and Richardson, 1982).

Extended Contract: Contract for teachers' employment beyond the regular academic school year.

Future Farmers of America (FFA): A national organization for students of vocational agriculture (Knebel and Richardson, 1982).

Principal: The person in charge, first in rank, authority, importance, a governing or presiding officer of a school building (Webster's New World Dictionary, 1983).

Regional Coordinator: A vocational planner, inservice resource person, community resource person, program developer, program facilitator, and a visible communicator between the Oregon Department of Education, the educational service districts, local school districts, and community colleges (Oregon Department of Education, 1986).

Supervised Occupational Experience (SOE): All of the planned practical activities conducted outside of scheduled class time in which students develop and apply agricultural knowledge and skills. The purpose is to help students develop practical skills needed for initial employment in an agricultural occupation (SOE Handbook, 1982).

Supervised Occupational Experience Program (SOEP): The specific learning experiences or programs planned for and conducted by an individual vocational agriculture student that contribute to the development of occupational competence (SOE Handbook, 1982).

Summer Program: Vocational agriculture instructional activities in addition to the regular academic school year (Phipps, 1980).

Superintendent: A person in charge of an institution, director (Webster's New World Dictionary, 1983).

Vocational Agriculture: Generally refers to the curriculum or program in agriculture designed to offer students at the secondary level the opportunity to explore and prepare for agricultural occupations. Includes agriculture, agribusiness, and natural resource occupations (Knebel and Richardson, 1982).

Vocational Director: The person in charge of vocational education and training intended to prepare one for an occupation in a trade (Oregon Department of Education, 1986).

Vocational Education: That part of education which makes an individual more employable in one group of occupations than in another (Evans and Herr, 1978).

## Legislation

Agricultural education in the early 1900's consisted primarily of classroom instruction. Many teachers and students were dissatisfied with exclusively classroom work and felt a need to take the classroom instruction a step further, enhancing it with related experience on the farm (Lee, 1982). Prosser and Quigley (1979) hypothesized that instruction without practice was insufficient. Therefore many agricultural educators developed this need for hands-on learning into the component which makes agricultural education truly vocational, the supervised occupational experience (SOE) program (Luft, 1982). The supervised occupational experience program thus became individualized instruction outside the classroom. Supervised occupational experience (which is a form of individualized instruction) combines knowledge learned in the classroom with real-life situations, increasing the possibility that students will learn and be better prepared for entry-level employment and advancement in the world of work (Arrington and McCracken, 1981).

Federal legislation was enacted to provide funds for the cost of summer salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects, and teachers of trade, home economics, and industrial subjects, and in the preparation of teachers of agriculture, trade, industrial, and home economics subjects through the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 (Public Law 64-347). This federal legislation, provided the opportunity for vocational

agriculture to receive the resources needed for extending the school year through the summer months. With the passage of the federal vocational education act in 1917 came the establishment of the principles of federal financial aid and cooperation with the states in promoting public vocational education in agriculture, trade, industrial subjects, and home economics. Luft (1982) emphasized in his research that the effort of Smith-Hughes was to allow schools to "... provide for directed or supervised practice in agriculture, either on a farm provided for by the school or another form, for at least six months per year..." which resulted in the extension of the school year for agricultural students to 12 months. Luft also noted that supervision should not end with the regular academic school year if the student was to gain the optimum advantages from practical experiences in agriculture. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 was interpreted by the Federal Board of Vocational Education in Bulletin No. 13 which stated that "... each school should be required to provide a properly qualified teacher who is employed for 12 months" (Federal Board of Vocational Education, 1918). The board noted that the 12 months were not meant to be spent entirely in the classroom, but rather that the teacher should be available during the growing season when the supervised occupational experience project work of the student was underway and that the teacher's vacation would be taken during the off-seasons or winter rather than during the summer (Federal Board of Vocational Education, 1918).



The first major changes in Federal vocational legislation occurred with the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law No. 88-210) and the subsequent amendments of 1968 (Public Law No. 90-576), 1972 (Public Law No. 92-318), and 1976 (Public Law No. 94-482) (Stenzel, 1982). The Vocational Education Act of 1963 authorized federal grants to states to assist them "to maintain, expand, and improve existing programs of vocational education, to develop new programs of vocational education, and to provide part-time employment for youths who need the earnings from such employment to continue their vocational training on a full-time basis" (Public Law No. 88-210). The act sought to ensure that persons of "all ages in all communities, urban and rural, of all states would have ready access to vocational training or retraining that was of high quality and realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment" (Phipps, 1980). The subsequent amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 were the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 and 1976. This federal legislation further emphasized the mandated aspects of vocational and technical education. The Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 held vocational education programs responsible for: eliminating gender discrimination and gender stereotyping/bias; urging the use of advisory councils for vocational education; requiring the evaluation of local vocational education programs; providing vocational education in job and content areas where there is a labor market need for prepared workers; and improving vocational education opportunities for

women. Additional aspects of vocational education introduced in the amendments were: cooperative vocational education programs; exemplary and innovative programs; vocational guidance and counseling; and special programs for the disadvantaged.

Today supervised occupational experience programs have expanded to include much more than farming. Realizing that more urban students were enrolling in vocational agriculture, the United States Office of Education in 1963 and 1968 designated seven program areas as part of the vocational instruction in high school: agriculture, health occupations, consumer homemaking, occupational home economics, office occupations, trade and industrial, and technical education. Expanded access in vocational education was again emphasized by the passage of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, an amendment to Public Law No. 88-210 (Public Law No. 98-524). This vocational education act increased vocational education opportunities for the following special target populations: individuals who were disadvantaged, those with limited proficiency in English, handicapped, incarcerated, displaced homemakers, and single parents. The Carl D. Perkins Act of 1984 required states to spend at least 22 percent of their basic grant monies on disadvantaged students (Kennedy, 1988).

### **Summer Portion of the Year-Round Community-Based Vocational Agriculture Program**

The agricultural industry, to which vocational agriculture teachers dedicate themselves, does not begin and end with the traditional nine-month academic school year (Stewart, 1970). The agricultural industry and the corresponding agribusinesses are continuous and year-round in nature with a major emphasis and rush of activity in the summer months (Luft, 1982). Many activities in the agricultural industry occur during the time of year when public schools are not in formal session. In order to prepare people with occupational skills in the agricultural industry, the vocational agriculture teacher must have students placed and working in the agriculture industry year-round (Lee, 1982). This requires that the vocational agriculture teacher be employed to supervise those students during the summer months (Horner, 1979). Since the extended contract and summer activities program in vocational agricultural education covers about 25 percent of the time spent in the year's work, it is important that a well-planned and supported summer program of operation be implemented (Hilton, 1981; Lee, 1982).

Community-based programs have a strong tradition of providing effective vocational education to special population groups. Bailis (1987), found that the community focus of the community-based programs enables teachers and administrators to relate to, know, and thus be more responsive to the needs of local special

populations. These community-based programs are more effective than their general education counterparts in organizing and developing such prevocational services as outreach and recruitment, intake and assessment, counseling and career guidance, and motivational programs (Bailis, 1987). To earn and maintain recognition as a community-based program, the vocational agriculture teacher must be visible, involved, and supportive of the agricultural activities within the community (Cepica and Stockton, 1980). Again, these activities are year-round which includes summer; therefore, the vocational agriculture teacher must be involved in the community, with agriculture, and with students year-round. Richardson (1982) found a major concern of administrators was accountability for the value of the time and finances expended by the school system during the summer months and their impact on the vocational agriculture program, agricultural industry, students enrolled in vocational agriculture education, and the community as a whole.

Vocational education in agriculture, rather than being a discipline, is a unique and identifiable program which combines the skills and technical content of various disciplines with the practical requirements of the world of work to prepare a person to succeed technically and socially (Stewart, 1987). Most other vocational education programs are largely based in school facilities (classroom and laboratories)(Lee, 1982). A vocational agricultural program is a community-based educational program (extended classroom) that depends on strong industry involvement

(Dewey, 1983). Instruction in the school classrooms and laboratories is merely the beginning of the comprehensive instructional process (Lee, 1982).

Vocational agricultural education serves a valuable role in secondary schools -- a role that general education cannot fill. The vocational agriculture program does so by providing a variety of experience-based opportunities that address all three domains of learning: cognitive, psychomotor, and affective (Dewey, 1983). It serves students with a wide range of backgrounds, interests, and capabilities. The vocational agriculture program incorporates many methods of academic and scientific skills with the goal of increasing individual productivity. Extended-day and extended-year educational activities complement a program sequenced to build on previous instructions. Vocational agriculture strives to provide specific knowledge and skills to the context of the industry of agriculture with the goal of providing a bridge between the classroom and an agricultural career (Dewey, 1983).

Therefore, it must be remembered that vocational agricultural education is a program, not just another class in the total educational system. By operational definition, a program is more than just a group of related classes (Richardson, 1982). Traditionally, the total program concept of providing a total program to all students, rather than separate individual courses, has been the hallmark and strength of vocational agricultural education over the years (Richardson, 1982).

Futurists are predicting, based on input from industrial

leaders, that the number-one issue for the year 2010 and beyond will be equity in the work place (Randolph, 1988). There are many equity issues to be addressed: gender, race, age, economic, handicapped, political, and others. Planners and leaders have coined the phrase "special populations" and "at-risk" to address some of these groups (Edmunds, 1988). The educational system is called upon to provide leadership in defining the populations to be served and to identify corrective measures to be taken.

Through vocational education programs some measurable instructional programs have been developed and implemented to evaluate the school's ability to hold these "special populations" or "at-risk" young people in the educational system (Edmunds, 1988). Tying vocational educational total program concepts to general education concepts helps students realize the value of obtaining a high school diploma.

Clearly, the vocational education total program concept has a role to play in efforts to solve the "special populations" problems. Rather than expecting all students to take the same courses, vocational education expands the students' choices. It offers students different ways to acquire and strengthen basic skills and different ways to pursue their individual interests. Vocational education also helps students see the importance of education for employment through CWE and SOE programs. Supervised occupational experience allows students to witness first-hand the relationship between learning and working. Vocational education is a vital and important educational strategy that should be a key

part of our national educational effort (Kennedy, 1988).

As the needs of the community change, so must the vocational agriculture program (Luft, 1982). The agricultural industry situation is ever changing to adapt to public concerns about adequacy of food supplies, fiber, animal feed, and the environment (Bailis, 1987). The agricultural producers and agri-businessmen of the United States today are among the finest trained, most highly skilled professional agriculturalists in the world (Clarke, 1986). The agriculturalists perform a balancing act with every management decision and with every agribusiness problem faced. Variables include high interest rates, the expense of labor, capital expenditures, machinery costs, marketing costs, production costs, and the cost of supplies. In order to keep abreast of changing situations, the agriculturalist continues to improve and update his/her own knowledge and skills within the agricultural industry. Vocational agriculture endeavors to begin the educational process necessary for new agriculturalists to emerge and stay abreast of their ever-changing industry (Luft, 1982).

A community-based vocational agriculture program must be focused on the industry of agriculture in the local area. Since agriculture as an industry is broad and diverse, programs in vocational agriculture also must show breadth and diversity and attract a wide range of students with varying capabilities and career goals in agriculture. The hands-on activities in the curriculum are designed and intended to provide students with skills they will use in agriculture, including all its related

occupations (Naisbett, 1982). Many of the instructional methods used, such as SOE, intensive training in expensive and realistic laboratories, and participation in technical skills contests, are difficult to justify apart from providing training for the agricultural industry (Stewart, 1970). The agricultural industry is at the forefront of the development and utilization of new technologies (Naisbett and Aburdene, 1985). Much of today's genetic and biological engineering is taking place in the field of agriculture. The new professionals and technicians for such work will require the skill and knowledge of applied agricultural sciences. Vocational agricultural programs which are based on a science model will need to continue giving emphasis to biological and chemical technologies (Rosenfeld, 1985).



## Research Regarding Summer Programs in Vocational Agriculture

Much has been written about quality summer programs in vocational agricultural education. Gardner (1961) found that 53.2 percent of the Idaho administrators surveyed believed that the summer program of vocational agriculture did justify employment for the teacher, while 27 percent said the summer program did not justify 12-month employment. Gardner also found that the positive attitude of the administration towards a 12-month contract increased as the years of experience an administrator had with vocational agriculture programs increased. Of the 36 summer activities listed in the Gardner study, the following ten were found to be "very important" by 111 administrators in Idaho:

1. Revising or preparing course of study materials.
2. Preparing curriculum for the coming year.
3. Building or reconditioning tools or equipment.
4. Securing reference materials for class.
5. Attending professional meetings.
6. Acquainting administrators with progress of the vocational agriculture program.
7. Reading professional journals.
8. Making regular supervisory calls.
9. Contacting prospective students.

10. Preparing news items for local and state papers.

Those activities considered to be "important" by the same 111 Idaho administrators included:

1. Ordering needed supplies and equipment.
2. Attendance at summer school.
3. Meeting with extension groups.
4. Planning FFA meetings.
5. Holding FFA meetings.
6. Participating in FFA district contests.
7. Holding regular conferences with school administrators.

In contrast, a similar study by Warfield (1966) showed that 61.5 percent of the 126 Washington State administrators surveyed were opposed to 12-month employment for the vocational agriculture teacher, while only 23.1 percent were in favor. Warfield also reported that many of these administrators felt that 10- or 11-month contracts were sufficient to do the job required of the vocational agricultural teachers. This study (similar to Gardner's 1961 report) indicated the perceived importance of specific summer activities. Seven of 40 activities rated as "very important" by administrators were as follows:

1. Supervise on-farm projects.
2. Assist students in selecting projects.
3. Prepare state and local reports.
4. Help students prepare livestock and crop exhibits.
5. Attend vocational agriculture training conferences.
6. Attend professional meetings.
7. Read professional materials.

Six summer activities were rated as "important" by the same Washington State administrators. They were:

1. Revise course of study.
2. Collect teaching materials and specimens.
3. Repair tools and equipment.
4. Plan and assist with community activities.
5. Have conferences with administrators.
6. Learn new farm and shop skills.

It was interesting to note that the Washington state administrators rated 23 of the 40 activities as having "no importance." The activities given a "no importance" rating but considered important in other studies were:

1. Conduct project tours.
2. Contact prospective students.
3. Supervise FFA meetings.
4. Attend FFA contests.
5. Supervise FFA activities dealing with community service and recreation.
6. Supervise FFA farm activities on land owned by the school.
7. Appear on TV or radio.
8. Attend summer school.
9. Conduct demonstration plots.

An Oklahoma study by Cepica (1977) showed the importance of the summer program as perceived by 345 participating teachers. (Table 1-1)

Table 1-1. CEPICA (1977) IMPORTANCE OF SUMMER PROGRAMS

Importance	N	Percent
Great	194	56.2
Much	127	36.8
Some	22	6.4
Little	2	.6
No Importance	0	0.0
Total	345	100.0

Ninety-three percent of the teachers saw the summer program as having "much" or "great importance" to the overall vocational agriculture program effort. Cepica did not survey the administrators of those teachers.

A Texas study by Cepica (1979a), similar to his Oklahoma project, examined teacher and administrator perceptions of summer program importance. Seventy-three percent of the teachers rated the summer program as "extremely" important while sixty percent of the administrators rated the summer program as being either "very" or "extremely" important to the success of the total program of vocational agriculture.

Recent research studies by Arrington (1984), Hilton (1981, 1979), and Cepica (1979a, 1979b) attempted to determine appropriate activities for summer programs in vocational agricultural education. Harris (1980), Cepica (1979c), and Ermis (1979) addressed the problems existing in summer programs of vocational agricultural education and offered suggestions to remedy these problems.

Perceptions of Iowa's vocational agriculture instructors and superintendents were identified by Hilton (1979). The 156 teachers and superintendents agreed upon the importance of the summer program with the teachers rating it as 12.09 on a 16-point expanded scale and the superintendents rating it as 11.92 on the same transformed scale. They also agreed that supervised occupational experience and FFA activities were the backbone of a successful summer program of activities. Structured teaching activities were not considered to be a part of a summer program by either group in the Iowa study.

Table 1-2 gives numerical rankings from two different reports for the importance of selected activities. These two studies

were:

1. Cepica's (1979a) report of Texas vocational agriculture teachers, superintendents, state supervisors, and teacher educators.
2. Hilton's (1979) study of Iowa vocational agriculture teachers and superintendents.

Table 1-2 RANKINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SUMMER PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Activity	STUDIES				
	CEPICA, 1979			HILTON, 1979	
	TEA	ADM	TE/SS	SUP	TE
SOEP	1	2	1	1	3
FFA	2	2	6	2.5	2
Visit Prospective Students	3	6	4	-	-
Program Planning	4	1	2	5	5
Public Relations	5	5	5	8	4
Professional Improvement	6	4	8	6	1
Facility and Equipment	7	3	7	-	-
Adult/Young Farmers	8	8	3	-	-
Records and Reports	9	9	9	4	6
Resource Improvement	-	-	-	2.5	7
Teaching	-	-	-	7	8

TEA=Teacher, ADM=Administration, TE/SS=Teacher Educator/  
State Supervisor, SUP=Superintendent

Amberson and Lantis (1976) conducted a study in Montana to determine the contributions of the summer program to the success of the total program of vocational agriculture at the high school level. They found that when varying lengths of summer employment were compared, 80 percent of the vocational agriculture teachers

were reported to be on less than a 12-month contract with 60 percent being employed for at least 11 months. Teachers employed over a longer period of time in the summer months benefitted the total program in the following ways: more visitations were made, more awards were received by the vocational agriculture students, a higher percentage of the vocational agriculture students were FFA members, and more time was spent by teachers supervising occupational experience projects. The Montana vocational agriculture teachers reported spending 35 percent of their time in the summer on supervised occupational experience related activities, 16.5 percent of the time on program planning activities, and 16 percent on professional improvement. The four summer activities considered most important by Montana teachers were:

1. Holding FFA meetings.
2. Reviewing and updating course content materials.
3. Attending professional meetings.
4. Making supervisory visits.

The Montana administrators rated "efficient and adequate management of the vocational agriculture program by the teacher" as the most important activity in the summer program.

Arrington and McCracken (1981) conducted a study to determine if a relationship existed between 12-month employment for vocational agriculture teachers in Central Florida and two factors

of program quality: FFA chapter activity and the scope of supervised occupational experience programs. They concluded that:

1. The effectiveness of supervised occupational experience programs was directly related to a 12-month contract for the vocational agriculture teacher.
2. Vocational agriculture teachers with 12-month contracts provided more personalized instruction as indicated by high degree of participation at fairs and more supervisory home visits.
3. Students in programs where the vocational agriculture teacher was employed for 12-months were more active in supervised occupational experience programs and were receiving a greater opportunity to develop skills in an occupational setting.

In a research report, Witt (1982) reported the perceptions of vocational agriculture teachers and their respective superintendents in North Dakota. Curriculum development and public relations were unanimously selected by the superintendents as activities that must be participated in by vocational agriculture teachers in the summer. The activity which ranked



lowest by the superintendents was the Washington Conference Program for FFA members.

### **Study and Accountability**

This study attempted to identify the contents of an ideal vocational agriculture summer activities program. This study also examined many potential activities of the vocational agriculture summer program to determine which might be priority items for all groups studied. Further, this study attempted to determine the number of days which should be allocated to each of the eight major categories of summer program activities during the summer program. Blezek (1977) indicated that if vocational agriculture teachers would use the research available to them, they would have an excellent guide in developing appropriate summer program activities. Agriculture teachers who examine this study (and similar resources) then plan their summer program activities taking into account the time and perceptual importance of each activity, should have little problem being accountable for their extended contract time.

## Summary

The review of literature covered several areas related to summer vocational agriculture education programs. Numerous articles and studies addressed perceptions of teachers, administrators, state supervisors, and others concerning appropriate activities for the summer program. A number of other studies reported what was actually done by teachers during the summer. One study addressed, specifically, the merit of the summer program in horticulture and agricultural mechanics programs as perceived by advisory committee members. Accountability for summer activities was the subject of numerous articles in the *Agricultural Education Magazine*. Early studies used teachers as recorders of what was actually taking place during the summer (Guiler, 1959); they did not concern themselves with the perceptions of teachers. Studies ranged from the use of eight very broad, general categories to the use of 63 specific summer program activities.

Agreement was highest with regard to one activity: supervision of occupational experience programs. This was almost always rated as the number one activity in importance and/or time spent by the vocational agriculture teacher. Other activities that were usually ranked high were program planning, professional improvement, and FFA.

None of these studies compared the amount of time which teachers and administrators perceived should be spent with the

amount of time they actually spent on summer program activities. None of these studies examined the input of regional coordinators or advisory committee chairpersons. Few of these studies have been completed since the full impact of the educational reforms and economic recession were felt.

## Chapter II. Methods and Procedures

It was the purpose of this study to determine: 1) the ideal vocational agriculture summer program activities as perceived by teacher educators and state supervisors nationwide; and 2) if there were differences in perceptions towards vocational agriculture summer program activities among selected groups impacting vocational agriculture programs in the state of Oregon, as compared to the ideal summer activities program for the nation. The procedures outlined in this chapter were followed to satisfy these purposes.

### Development of Instrument

Following the identification of the problem, a strategic plan was developed through which data pertinent to identifying and validating the summer program activities could be obtained. Eight groups were identified which were associated with vocational agriculture education and which exert an influence on the way vocational agriculture summer program activities were organized. The groups were: (1) superintendents, (2) regional coordinators, (3) vocational directors, (4) principals, (5) teacher educators, (6) state supervisors, (7) advisory committee chairpersons, and (8) vocational agriculture teachers. The input from the two nationwide groups, teacher educators and state supervisors, was used to identify the activities which were included and the number

of days which were allocated to each of the eight major categories of summer program activities. This would establish the ideal vocational agriculture summer activities program to be used for comparison with perceptions of the other six state of Oregon groups.

The input from the Oregon groups studied was used to identify activities which each group perceived as important in the vocational agriculture summer program activities, the number of days currently being allocated, and the number of days perceived as the ideal allocation in each of the eight major categories of summer program activities.

A questionnaire was developed using "A Vocational Agriculture Teacher's Guide To Planning Summer Programs" (Kotrlik, 1985; Camp, 1986) and the "Policies and Procedures Handbook for Oregon Vocational Agriculture Programs" (Oades and Deeds, 1978).

### Testing of Items

The questionnaire included the following eight major categories of vocational agriculture summer program activities: 1) agricultural organizations and associations, 2) departmental administration, 3) Future Farmers of America (FFA), 4) instructional improvement, 5) professional growth, 6) resource improvement, 7) supervised occupational experience (SOE), and 8) teaching/ recruitment. Thirty-eight specific summer program activities within the eight major categories were identified and

were included in Section I of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was tested for content validity and comprehensiveness using a panel of experts. The panel of experts consisted of a randomly selected group of Oregon vocational agriculture teachers, as well as western region state supervisors, and teacher educators in the western region of American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture (AATEA) who were not part of the study's sample. Their advice was received in July and August of 1988 (Appendix A). The questionnaire was then field tested for clarity of statements, directions, and intent by a randomly selected group of Oregon high school principals and vocational agriculture teachers whose schools had a vocational agriculture program, but who were not part of the study sample (Appendix A).

The Cronbach Coefficient Alpha test was used to determine reliability of section I and section II of the instrument; internal consistency was  $r = .9490$ . The alpha level for statistical testing in this study was set at .05 level for all tests.

The final questionnaire consisted of three sections with primary content as follows: (Appendix B)

Section I: Required respondents to assign a value to each item in a listing of vocational agriculture summer program activities in the identified eight categories for summer programs.

Section II: Required the respondents to allocate a number of days to each of the eight categories of summer program activities.

Section III: Required input regarding demographic data concerning the school, existing summer program, years of educational experience, facilities available to vocational agriculture program(s), and enrollment in school and vocational agriculture program.

Completion of the last page required input of the vocational agriculture teachers only. It included: SOE participation, teacher salary for the summer contract period, length of current summer contract, and reports submitted to administration concerning the summer vocational agriculture program activities.

### Selection of Scale

It was the objective of this investigation to determine the ideal vocational agriculture summer program activities as perceived by teacher educators and state supervisors, and to determine the perceptions of the vocational agriculture summer program activities in the state of Oregon, as compared to the ideal nationwide program. A summated rating scale was utilized to provide an index for placing each of the summer program activities in rank order. The summated rating scale used a one through seven



scaling (1-7). The responses indicated the level of importance which the respondents attached to each of the activities. The descriptors ("No Importance," "Moderate Importance," and "High Importance") were attached to the 7-point scale, thus insuring similar interpretations of the scale by all respondents. The scale was combined with the items listed on the questionnaire and served as the means whereby data were to be collected to satisfy the objectives of this study.

### **Selection of Sample**

The six statewide populations from the state of Oregon included vocational agriculture teachers, vocational directors, advisory committee chairpersons, principals, superintendents, and regional coordinators.

Cohen (1969,) identified a statistical method for determining an appropriate sample size from each group when random selection was employed. The Type 1 error with probability of .05 was selected for this study. A Type 1 error of .05 corresponds to a 20 percent probability of a Type 2 error, and Cohen suggested the use of a power factor of .80. The result of this calculation was a sample size of N = 56 superintendents, 17 regional coordinators, 21 vocational directors, 46 principals, 34 advisory committee chairpersons, 72 vocational agriculture teachers, 54 state supervisors, and 123 teacher educators for a total N = 423 (Cohen, 1969; Guilford and Fruchter, 1978).

All agricultural teacher educators whose major responsibility was teaching agriculture education courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels in the United States were identified by a panel of experts and became the population for this component of the study. A random sample of 123 was drawn from this population for the study. State supervisors were identified for participation in the study using a 1988-89 directory of state supervisors as published by the U.S. Department of Education. One representative from each state was randomly selected. A random selection of Oregon secondary superintendents, vocational directors, principals, advisory committee chairpersons, and vocational agricultural teachers was made using a random numbers table (Cohen, 1974). Superintendents, vocational directors, and principals were randomly selected from among those having a vocational agriculture program within the high school for which they had administrative responsibility. The vocational agriculture teachers and advisory committee chairpersons were randomly selected from a list of Oregon vocational agriculture program representatives who had not already been used to validate the study instrument. The total population of regional coordinators was used because of the limited number (17) of regional coordinators within the state of Oregon. All populations excluded members who had not completed one full year in their current position. Demographic data were collected from each group identified.

### Survey Response Rate Information

The composite response rate was 84.63 percent, which included 358 out of 423 questionnaires being returned, with five questionnaires being incomplete or unusable (Table 2-1).

Table 2-1 VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SUMMER ACTIVITIES  
PROGRAM SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES

<u>Summary of Survey Instruments</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Total instruments sent	423	100.0%
Total instruments returned	358	84.6%
Complete/Usable instruments	353	83.5%
Incomplete/Unusable instruments	5	1.4%

Table 2-2 outlines a summary of individual group response rates and percentages. The response rate of teacher educators was 91.9 percent and state supervisors was 88.9 percent, for a combined response rate of 91.0 percent (Table 3-2). The response from teacher educators and state supervisors represents each state in the United States which offers vocational agriculture education at the secondary level. Having representation from each state was important because these two groups were chosen to identify the ideal vocational agriculture summer program activities nationwide.

Table 2-2 VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SUMMER ACTIVITIES  
PROGRAM SURVEY RESPONSE RATE BY INDIVIDUAL  
GROUPS

Group	Questionnaires		Unusable	Response
	Mailed	Received		Rate
Vocational Agriculture Teachers	72	68	0	94.4%
Regional Coordinators	17	16	1	94.1%
Teacher Educators	123	113	0	91.9%
State Supervisors	54	48	0	88.9%
Principals	46	37	1	80.4%
Superintendents	56	39	0	69.6%
Advisory Committee Chairpersons	34	23	2	67.6%
Vocational Directors	21	14	1	66.7%

Groups were selected to participate in the study for the following reasons:

1. Random samples of superintendents, vocational directors, principals, advisory committee chairpersons, and vocational agriculture teachers were surveyed to determine their perceptions regarding the ideal vocational agriculture summer activities programs because they are directly involved with conducting, administering, or directing summer

program activities.

2. Regional coordinators were surveyed because they administer state vocational money in their respective districts and, therefore, directly impact program design and duration.
3. Random samples of teacher educators and one state supervisor from each state were surveyed to determine what they perceived should be included in an ideal vocational agriculture summer activities program. State supervisor means were weighted to provide parity between teacher educators and state supervisors for statistical analysis. Teacher educators work with preservice and inservice educational opportunities for vocational agriculture teachers and state supervisors administer grants and do program evaluations. Teacher educators are the ones who are instrumental in providing curriculum development/direction, curriculum content, and course variety offered at the secondary level. State supervisors provide overall leadership and guidance for future direction. Teacher educators and state supervisors consistently attend national meetings and bring back up-to-date information concerning vocational education programs.

### Collection of Data

A personalized letter to each individual asking for his/her help with the study, along with the questionnaire and a self-addressed return envelope, was mailed to the subjects in mid-January, 1989. A survey participant number was assigned to each questionnaire for survey follow-up purposes (Appendix B). A second personalized letter, questionnaire, and self-addressed return envelope was mailed to non-respondents three weeks after the first mailing. A random selection of 20 percent of the non-respondents was conducted three weeks after the second mailing. A random number generator within Statgraphics (1987), a statistical computer program, was employed to identify the non-respondents to be sampled. A telephone contact of non-respondents was then made to determine if there were any differences between respondents and non-respondents. No differences were found.

### Coding of Data

As each questionnaire was received it was scrutinized for missing data. Any questionnaire with large amounts of missing data was set aside and a telephone contact was made requesting the missing data. This was successful in three cases out of the five questionnaires with missing data.

Coding of the individual questions on the questionnaire was accomplished by imputing the data on an IBM microcomputer. Data

coding was checked for accuracy.

### **Analysis of Data**

Initial statistical analysis was performed on an IBM 4381 mainframe computer using SPSSx (SPSSx). Certain findings were checked with statistical analysis programs in Statgraphics (1987) on an IBM microcomputer.

### Chapter III. Findings and Discussion

The findings included in this chapter are presented in order of the study objectives, with a brief discussion about the findings for each objective. Demographic material concerning vocational agriculture programs has been placed in Appendix C.

The specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Identify components perceived to be important by study participants; separate teacher educator and state supervisor participants' composite scores and utilize these as the ideal activity prioritization for vocational agriculture summer programs.
2. Compare components to be included in a vocational agriculture summer program, as perceived by Oregon study participants, with the ideal vocational agriculture summer program nationwide.
3. Identify the quality indicators of the vocational agriculture summer program perceived to be important by study participants; separate teacher educator and state supervisor composite scores and utilize these as the ideal quality indicators prioritization for vocational agriculture summer programs.



4. Compare the quality indicators of a vocational agriculture summer program, as perceived by each group in the study, with the ideal quality indicators for vocational agriculture summer programs nationwide.
5. Identify perceptions regarding the number of days which are currently allocated to various components of the vocational agriculture summer program by each group studied.
6. Compare current time allocations by each group with perceptions of the ideal summer program time allocation, as identified by teacher educators and state supervisors.
7. Compare perceptions of the ideal time allocations for each of the Oregon groups studied with the ideal time allocation perceptions of teacher educators and state supervisors.

To accomplish these objectives, teacher educators and state supervisors were selected from across the United States. Superintendents, regional coordinators, vocational directors, principals, advisory committee chairpersons, and vocational agriculture teachers were selected from schools in the state of Oregon which had an agricultural curriculum in the 1988-1989 school year.

## Demographic Data

Significant demographic data reported here include: summer salary, summer contract length, number of supervised occupational experience students involved during the summer, number of students involved with FFA activities during the summer, written summer program planning, written summary of summer activities program, years of teaching and administrative experience, highest degree earned or obtained, living location, and facilities available to students during the summer. A complete summation of demographic data is presented in Appendix C.

The following demographic data were collected to describe the vocational agriculture teacher population: It was observed that the summer-only salary range was \$800.00 to \$8000.00, with an average of \$4184.63. The standard deviation was \$2115.05. The number of days of employment during the summer for vocational agriculture teachers in Oregon ranged from 6 to 90, with an average of 34.5 days and a standard deviation of 16.0 days. The majority, 97.1 percent, of the vocational agriculture teachers reported summer contract length in days available to them for summer program activities. Only 2.9 percent of the teachers reported having 12-month contracts. Ninety-seven percent of the Oregon school districts in this study determine summer contract based on days rather than months.

An average of 32.1 students were involved with supervised occupational experience programs (SOE) and FFA activities during

the summer, with a range of 10 - 75, and a standard deviation of 15.1.

Sixty-one percent of vocational agriculture teachers reported that they developed annual, written summer activities program and submitted it to their administrators or school board on an annual basis. Forty-six percent of the vocational agriculture teachers reported that they completed annual written summaries of their summer program activities, while 36.8 percent either never completed written summaries or did so only when requested.

State supervisors averaged 9.6 years of teaching experience, while the teacher educators averaged 18.9 years of teaching. Teacher educators reported having 3.9 years of administrative experience and state supervisors reported having 11.6 years of administrative experience. Vocational agriculture teachers reported 12.1 years of teaching experience and 0.67 years of administrative experience.

School district enrollment averaged 6637.1 with a range of 212.7 to 28,712.8 and a standard deviation of 9986.5. Vocational agriculture enrollment was reported by principals and vocational agriculture teachers as 71.0 students, with a range of 61.3 to 80.6 and a standard deviation of 13.7.

Seventy-five percent of the vocational agriculture teachers lived in the community in which they were employed. Seventy-six percent of the administrators (regional coordinators, vocational directors, superintendents, and principals) lived in the district in which they were employed.

The highest degree earned by vocational agriculture teachers was the Master of Education degree, with 62 of the 68 respondents either at the BS+ hours or masters degree level; this represented 91.2 percent of the study group (Table 3-1). Ninety-seven percent of the teacher educators had attained a doctoral degree, and 85.4 percent of the state supervisors had earned either a masters or doctoral degree. The educational experience of vocational directors was reported at the BS+ hours or masters degree level, 100.0 percent reporting in these two areas. Also attaining the masters degree level of educational experience were: regional coordinators 80.0 percent; superintendents, 82.1 percent; and principals, 86.1 percent. Advisory committee chairpersons reported that 76.2 percent had attained a BS degree.

Table 3-1 HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED/OBTAINED BY STUDY PARTICIPANTS

Group	N	BS	BS+	MA/MS	PhD	Median
Regional Coordinators	15	0	3	12	0	2.8
State Supervisors	48	1	6	33	8	3.2
Vocational Directors	13	0	4	9	0	2.7
Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	16	4	1	0	1.2
Superintendents	39	0	1	32	1	3.0
Principals	36	1	3	31	1	2.9
Teacher Educators	113	0	0	3	110	4.0
Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	6	34	28	0	2.5

Sixty-eight percent of vocational agriculture teachers had land laboratories, and 55.8 percent had greenhouses available for student use during the summer months. Information regarding facilities for student use was requested only of the vocational agriculture teachers.

### Ideal Summer Program Activities

Using the summated rating scale and its descriptors, as outlined in Chapter II, break points were identified thus locating each activity in one of three different categories: "No Importance" (0 - 2.49), "Moderate Importance" (2.50 - 5.49), and "High Importance" (5.50 - 7.0). A complete listing of all means, standard deviations, and rank order by all eight groups is provided in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2 MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND MEAN RANKINGS OF SUMMER PROGRAM ACTIVITIES  
(M = GROUP MEANS, SD = STANDARD DEVIATION, R = GROUP RANK OF ACTIVITY)

Activity		Groups							
		TE	SS	RC	VD	AC	SU	PR	TEA
Conduct Public Relations Program	M	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.3	3.8	4.5	4.3	5.1
	SD	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.8	2.0	1.8	1.7	1.3
	R	22	22	24	26	31	17	23	14
Prepare Publicity Materials	M	4.3	4.1	4.7	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.4	4.0
	SD	1.4	1.6	1.4	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.4
	R	32	30	32	36	35	36	34	32
Establish New Agricultural Resource Contacts	M	5.0	2.1	6.0	5.1	3.3	4.4	4.6	4.7
	SD	1.4	1.5	1.1	1.2	4.9	1.5	1.5	1.5
	R	18	15	8	18	36	18	17	23
Meet/Work With Advisory Committee	M	4.9	5.1	5.7	4.4	4.4	3.6	4.2	4.0
	SD	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.9	1.8	1.6
	R	25	16	11	24	18	31	27	31

Table 3-2 CONTINUED

Activity		TE	SS	Groups					
				RC	VD	AC	SU	PR	TEA
Supervise Summer use of Facilities by Community	M	3.6	4.0	4.3	3.8	2.8	3.2	3.2	2.8
	SD	2.0	1.9	2.0	1.5	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.1
	R	38	37	36	33	38	37	36	37
Upgrade Department Records	M	4.2	4.0	4.5	4.0	3.8	3.5	3.6	4.2
	SD	1.7	1.5	1.1	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.6
	R	35	33	34	28	32	34	33	28
Conduct Graduate Follow-Up Survey	M	4.6	4.2	4.1	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.9
	SD	1.4	1.6	1.8	1.8	1.6	1.8	1.6	1.7
	R	28	29	37	37	37	33	35	34
Vacation/Family	M	5.7	5.9	5.3	4.8	4.3	4.8	4.2	5.4
	SD	1.6	1.3	2.0	1.9	2.1	2.1	2.2	1.6
	R	6	4	16	21	20	10	26	8
Maintain Communications with School Administration	M	5.7	5.7	5.0	5.6	4.4	5.1	4.8	5.5
	SD	1.4	1.4	1.7	0.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.2
	R	7	10	25	9	16	6	12	6
Conduct Program Evaluation/Self-Assessment Long Range Planning	M	5.3	4.8	5.3	5.0	5.0	4.3	4.2	4.3
	SD	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.2	1.5	1.8	1.7	1.3
	R	16	21	17	19	8	21	24	27
Department Budget Formulation	M	4.3	4.0	4.1	3.0	4.4	2.9	3.1	2.7
	SD	1.7	1.7	1.9	2.0	1.6	1.9	1.8	2.0
	R	31	34	38	38	19	38	37	38
Supervision and Planning of FFA Activities	M	5.5	5.8	6.0	5.2	5.9	6.1	6.0	6.2
	SD	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.7	1.0	0.9	0.9	1.0
	R	11	6	7	14	1	1	2	2
Conduct Chapter Officer Retreat Leadership Camp	M	5.2	5.3	6.1	5.4	5.4	4.3	5.3	5.6
	SD	1.5	1.4	0.9	1.1	1.1	2.0	1.3	1.4
	R	17	13	5	12	4	22	5	5
Chapter Meetings/Outings	M	4.9	5.4	4.9	5.0	5.5	3.9	4.9	5.0
	SD	1.5	1.2	1.4	1.1	1.0	2.0	1.5	1.5
	R	23	12	28	20	2	27	10	15

Table 3-2 CONTINUED

Activity		TE	SS	Groups					
				RC	VD	AC	SU	PR	TEA
Attend County Fair/ State Fair/ Judging Contests	M	4.7	5.0	5.8	5.8	5.2	6.0	6.2	6.2
	SD	1.7	1.7	1.3	1.1	1.8	1.3	1.0	1.1
	R	27	17	10	6	5	3	1	1
Facilities Maintenance/ Renovation	M	4.3	4.0	5.1	5.6	3.5	4.5	4.2	5.0
	SD	1.8	1.8	1.3	0.9	2.0	1.7	1.6	1.3
	R	33	31	20	10	33	15	25	16
Safety Inspections/ Repairs	M	4.4	4.0	5.1	5.2	4.3	4.9	4.5	4.9
	SD	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.5	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.4
	R	30	32	21	15	22	8	19	19
Order Budgeted Supplies and Equipment	M	4.2	3.8	4.6	4.3	4.1	4.0	3.8	4.3
	SD	1.8	2.0	1.6	1.8	1.6	1.9	1.5	1.6
	R	34	36	33	27	27	26	31	25
Update Inventory	M	4.2	3.5	4.5	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.9	3.4
	SD	1.8	2.0	1.1	2.0	1.6	2.0	1.6	1.8
	R	36	38	35	34	30	29	30	35
Attend Annual Summer Update Conference	M	6.2	6.2	6.3	5.4	5.1	5.1	5.5	6.1
	SD	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.6	1.6	1.2	1.2
	R	1	1	4	13	7	5	4	4
Conduct Summer Workshops/ Training	M	5.4	4.7	5.0	4.4	4.2	3.9	4.4	4.1
	SD	1.4	1.7	1.3	1.4	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.9
	R	12	24	26	25	25	28	21	30
Participate in College Short Courses	M	5.5	4.4	4.7	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.7	4.3
	SD	1.4	1.8	1.3	1.5	1.7	1.6	1.3	1.7
	R	10	26	31	29	26	23	14	26
Attend Courses for Certification/ Update	M	5.4	4.9	5.2	3.5	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8
	SD	1.4	1.7	1.6	2.1	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.8
	R	14	19	18	35	13	11	13	21
Informal Inservice Activities	M	5.0	4.4	5.2	4.0	3.4	3.7	4.4	4.7
	SD	1.5	1.8	1.1	1.7	1.9	1.7	1.6	1.5
	R	21	28	19	30	34	30	22	22
Develop Vo-Ag Curriculum	M	4.8	4.6	5.8	4.7	5.0	4.8	4.9	4.9
	SD	1.5	1.8	1.0	1.9	1.7	1.4	1.5	1.4
	R	26	25	9	22	10	9	10	18



Table 3-2 CONTINUED

Activity		TE	SS	Groups		RC	VD	AC	SU	PR	TEA
Revise and Improve Curriculum	M	4.9	4.9	6.4	5.2	4.9	4.6	5.0	5.2		
	SD	1.6	1.8	0.8	1.4	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.2		
	R	24	20	1	16	11	13	8	11		
Develop Planning Calendar	M	5.0	4.7	5.4	4.6	4.7	4.3	5.2	5.3		
	SD	1.6	1.5	1.1	1.5	1.6	1.9	1.4	1.3		
	R	20	23	15	23	14	19	6	9		
Conduct Competency Studies	M	3.9	3.8	4.7	3.9	4.1	3.3	3.0	3.3		
	SD	1.6	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.8		
	R	37	35	29	32	28	35	38	36		
Update and Review Reference Materials	M	4.6	4.4	5.1	3.9	4.4	3.6	3.7	4.1		
	SD	1.6	1.6	1.2	1.9	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.5		
	R	29	27	23	31	15	32	32	29		
Supervision of Vo-Ag Students' Home Projects (SOE)	M	6.1	6.2	6.1	5.9	5.4	6.0	5.8	6.1		
	SD	1.4	1.3	1.2	0.9	1.4	1.1	1.3	1.2		
	R	2	2	6	4	3	2	3	3		
Supervision of Agricultural Co-op Work Experience Students (CWE)	M	6.0	5.9	6.4	5.6	5.0	5.1	4.5	5.5		
	SD	1.5	1.5	0.7	1.3	1.4	1.7	1.8	1.5		
	R	3	5	2	8	9	4	18	7		
Develop Future SOE/CWE Sources	M	5.6	5.8	5.4	5.6	4.8	4.2	3.9	5.1		
	SD	1.4	1.2	1.4	0.9	1.6	1.7	2.0	1.4		
	R	8	8	14	7	12	24	29	13		
Supervision of Land Lab/Green-house Facility used by Students	M	5.6	5.8	5.4	5.9	5.2	4.9	4.7	5.1		
	SD	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.8	1.6	1.8	1.7	1.7		
	R	9	7	13	2	6	7	15	12		
Student Recordkeeping	M	5.0	5.5	5.1	5.9	4.4	4.3	4.7	4.8		
	SD	1.6	1.4	1.6	1.1	2.0	1.6	1.5	1.5		
	R	19	11	22	3	17	20	16	20		
Provide Instructional Activities Adult & Youth	M	5.3	5.0	4.7	5.5	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.9		
	SD	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.3	1.7	1.6	1.8	1.7		
	R	15	18	30	11	21	25	28	33		

Table 3-2 CONTINUED

Activity		TE	SS	Groups					
				RC	VD	AC	SU	PR	TEA
Attend Formal Inservice Training	M	5.4	5.2	4.9	5.2	4.1	4.5	4.4	4.7
	SD	1.4	1.7	1.6	1.3	1.7	1.4	1.7	1.4
	R	13	14	27	17	29	16	20	24
Provide Individualized Instruction to Students	M	6.0	5.7	6.3	5.8	4.2	4.7	5.1	5.0
	SD	1.4	1.4	0.9	0.9	1.8	1.5	1.6	1.5
	R	4	9	3	5	24	12	7	17
Visit Prospective Vo-Ag Students and Parents	M	5.9	6.1	5.5	5.9	4.2	4.5	4.9	5.2
	SD	1.4	1.3	1.6	0.8	2.1	1.7	1.5	1.4
	R	5	3	12	1	23	14	9	10

TE = Teacher Educator, SS = State Supervisor,  
 VD = Vocational Director, AC = Advisory Committee  
 Chairperson, PR = Principal, SU = Superintendent,  
 TEA = Vocational Agriculture Teacher

Objective 1: Identify components of the vocational agriculture summer program perceived to be important by study participants; separate teacher educator and state supervisor participants' composite scores and utilize these as the ideal activities prioritization for vocational agriculture summer programs.

Forty-eight state supervisors and 113 teacher educators of agriculture responded to the three-section questionnaire concerning components of summer program activities in vocational agriculture. Activities rating of "High Importance" by these two groups were considered to be the ideal vocational agriculture

summer program list of activities. Table 3-3 lists in rank order those components of "High Importance" and "Moderate Importance" to the ideal vocational agriculture summer program of activities as perceived by state supervisors and teacher educators. Means of state supervisors were weighted so they would be equal in statistical value to the means of the teacher educators.

Table 3-3 IDEAL SUMMER PROGRAM ACTIVITIES RANK ORDER OF IMPORTANCE AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHER EDUCATORS (TE) AND STATE SUPERVISORS (SS)

Activity	Rank	Mean	SD	SE	% Rating Item Important	
					TE N=113	SS N=48
<u>High Importance</u>						
Attend annual summer update conference	1.5	6.2	1.3	.10	90.3	87.5
Supervision of vo-ag students' home projects (SOE)	1.5	6.2	1.4	.11	89.4	91.7
Visit prospective vo-ag students and parents	3.5	6.0	1.4	.11	79.6	85.4
Supervision of agricultural cooperative work experience (CWE)	3.5	6.0	1.5	.12	86.7	85.5
Provide individualized instruction to students	5	5.9	1.4	.11	79.6	70.8
Vacation/Family	6	5.8	1.5	.12	78.7	77.1
Maintain communications with school administration	8	5.7	1.4	.11	73.5	66.7
Supervision of land lab/greenhouse used by students	8	5.7	1.5	.12	76.0	83.3
Develop future SOE/CWE sources	8	5.7	1.4	.11	72.6	75.0
Supervision and planning of FFA activities	10	5.6	1.3	.10	65.5	75.1
<u>Moderate Importance</u>						
Conduct chapter officer retreat/leadership camp	11.5	5.3	1.4	.11	34.5	39.5

Table 3-3 CONTINUED

Activity	Rank	Mean	SD	SE	% Rating Important TE N=113	Item SS N=48
Attend formal inservice training	11.5	5.3	1.5	.12	29.2	17.1
Student recordkeeping	14	5.2	1.6	.13	35.4	33.4
Chapter meetings/ outings	14	5.2	1.4	.11	47.8	45.9
Attend courses for certification/update	14	5.2	1.5	.12	46.0	39.6
Provide instructional activities adult and youth	17	5.1	1.6	.13	33.6	27.1
Establish new agricultural resource contacts	17	5.1	1.4	.11	44.2	29.7
Conduct summer workshops/training	17	5.1	1.5	.12	37.2	41.6
Conduct program evaluation/ self-assessment/ long range planning	20	5.0	1.5	.12	34.5	52.2
Meet/work with advisory committee	20	5.0	1.5	.12	44.3	52.1
Participate in college short courses	20	5.0	1.5	.12	29.3	45.8
Revise & improve curriculum	23.5	4.9	1.7	.13	43.4	29.7
Conduct public relations program	23.5	4.9	1.5	.12	51.3	54.2
Develop planning calendar	23.5	4.9	1.6	.13	39.0	50.0

Table 3-3 CONTINUED

Activity	Rank	Mean	SD	SE	% Rating Important TE N=113	Item SS N=48
Attend county fair/ state fair/ judging contests	23.5	4.9	1.7	.13	39.7	31.3
Develop vo-ag curriculum	26.5	4.7	1.6	.13	49.6	43.8
Informal inservice activities	26.5	4.7	1.6	.13	46.0	54.2
Update and review reference materials	28	4.5	1.6	.13	51.4	52.1
Conduct graduate follow-up survey	29	4.4	1.5	.12	56.6	54.1
Safety inspections/ repairs	31.5	4.2	1.9	.15	36.3	45.9
Prepare publicity materials	31.5	4.2	1.5	.12	70.7	60.5
Department budget formulation	31.5	4.2	1.7	.13	40.7	58.3
Facility maintenance/ renovation	31.5	4.2	1.8	.14	40.7	47.9
Upgrade department records	34	4.1	1.6	.13	54.8	68.8
Order budgeted supplies and equipment	35	4.0	1.9	.15	40.7	45.9
Update inventory	36.5	3.9	1.9	.15	48.6	43.7
Conduct competency studies	36.5	3.9	1.7	.13	61.1	58.3
Supervise summer use of facilities by community	38	3.6	1.9	.15	47.0	50.1

Activities which focus on supervision of students, contact with prospective students, and professional improvement were rated as most important by teacher educators and state supervisors. These two groups also considered FFA activities as "very important". While family vacation was not a contracted activity, it was recognized as important to the well-being of the vocational agriculture teacher.

Objective 2: Compare components to be included in a vocational agriculture summer program, as perceived by Oregon study participants, with the ideal vocational agriculture summer program nationwide.

Table 3-4 lists the rank order of importance for vocational agriculture summer program activities by the six Oregon groups as well as the ideal which was established by the national sampling of teacher educators and state supervisors. Advisory committee chairpersons, administrators, and vocational agriculture teachers ranked the various FFA activities as being important on the other hand, other groups did not rank FFA activities as highly as did these three groups. All groups rated supervision of students' supervised occupational experience programs as having "High Importance."

Table 3-4 IDEAL SUMMER PROGRAM ACTIVITIES RANK ORDER AS COMPARED TO THE RANK ORDER OF IMPORTANCE BY REGIONAL COORDINATORS (RC), VOCATIONAL DIRECTORS (VD), ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS (AC), SUPERINTENDENTS (SU), PRINCIPALS (PR), AND VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS (TEA)

Activity	Ideal	RC	VD	AC	SU	PR	TEA
Attend annual summer update conference	1	4	13	7	5	4	4
Supervision of vo-ag students' home projects (SOE)	2	6	4	3	2	3	3
Visit prospective vo-ag students and parents	3	12	1	23	14	9	10
Supervision of agricultural co-op work experience (CWE)	4	2	8	9	4	18	7
Provide individualized instruction to students	5	3	5	24	12	7	17
Vacation/Family	6	16	21	20	10	26	8
Maintain communications with school administration	7	25	9	16	6	12	6
Supervision of land lab/greenhouse used by students	8	13	2	6	7	15	12
Develop future SOE/CWE sources	9	14	7	12	24	29	13
Supervision and planning of FFA activities	10	7	14	1	1	2	2
Conduct chapter officer retreat/leadership camp	11	5	12	4	22	5	5
Attend formal inservice training	12	27	17	29	16	20	24
Student recordkeeping	13	22	3	17	20	16	20



Table 3-4 CONTINUED

Activity	Ideal	RC	VD	AC	SU	PR	TEA
Chapter meetings/outings	14	28	20	2	27	10	15
Attend courses for certification/update	15	18	35	13	11	13	21
Provide instructional activities adult and youth	16	30	11	21	25	28	33
Establish new agricultural resource contacts	17	8	18	36	18	17	23
Conduct summer workshops/ training	18	26	25	25	28	21	30
Conduct program evaluation/ self-assessment/ long range planning	19	17	19	8	21	24	27
Meet/work with advisory committee	20	11	24	18	31	27	31
Participate in college short courses	21	31	29	26	23	14	26
Revise and improve curriculum	22	1	16	11	13	8	11
Conduct public relations program	23	24	26	31	17	23	14
Develop planning calendar	24	15	23	14	19	6	9
Attend county fair/ state fair/ judging contests	25	10	6	5	3	1	1
Develop vo-ag curriculum	26	9	22	10	9	11	18
Informal inservice activities	27	19	30	34	30	22	22

Table 3-4 CONTINUED

Activity	Ideal	RC	VD	AC	SU	PR	TEA
Update and review reference materials	28	23	31	15	32	32	29
Conduct graduate follow-up survey	29	37	37	37	33	35	34
Safety inspections/repairs	30	21	15	22	8	19	19
Prepare publicity materials	31	32	36	35	36	34	32
Department budget formulation	32	38	38	19	38	37	38
Facility maintenance/renovation	33	20	10	33	15	25	16
Upgrade department records	34	34	28	32	34	33	28
Order budgeted supplies and equipment	35	33	27	27	26	31	25
Update inventory	36	35	34	30	29	30	35
Conduct competency studies	37	29	32	28	35	38	36
Supervise summer use of facilities by community	38	36	33	38	37	36	37

The ANOVA procedure applied to the 38 summer program activities across all eight study groups resulted in the null hypothesis being retained in 14 cases and rejected in 24 cases (summary in Table 3-5, ANOVA charts in Appendix E).

Table 3-5 ANOVA TEST RESULTS ON INDIVIDUAL VOCATIONAL  
AGRICULTURE SUMMER PROGRAM ACTIVITIES BY  
PARTICIPANT GROUPS

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

Rank Order	Summer Program Activity	LSD Subsets	Groups
1	Attend Annual Summer Update Conference	5 4 6	8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers
		5	1. Regional Coordinators
		5 4 6 3	2. State Supervisors
		5 4 6 3	7. Teacher Educators
			5. Superintendents
			4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons
			6. Principals
			3. Vocational Directors

Table 3-5 CONTINUED

Rank Order	Summer Program Activity	LSD Subsets	Groups
3	Visit Prospective Vo-Ag Students and Parents	4 5 4 5 6 8 4 5 6 8	3. Vocational Directors 7. Teacher Educators 2. State Supervisors 4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons 5. Superintendents 6. Principals 8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers
4	Supervision of Agricultural Co-op Work Experience Students (CWE)	6 4 5 6 4 6 4 5	2. State Supervisors 1. Regional Coordinators 7. Teacher Educators 6. Principals 4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons 5. Superintendents
5	Provide Individualized Instruction to Students	4 4 4 5 8 4 5 8 4 5 8	6. Principals 3. Vocational Directors 2. State Supervisors 7. Teacher Educators 1. Regional Coordinators 4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons 5. Superintendents 8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers

Table 3-5 CONTINUED

Rank Order	Summer Program Activity	LSD Subsets	Groups
6	Vacation/Family	6 4 6 4	7. Teacher Educators 2. State Supervisors 6. Principals 4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons
7	Maintain Communications with Administration	4 4 6 4 6	8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers 7. Teacher Educators 2. State Supervisors 4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons 6. Principals
9	Develop Future SOE/CWE Sources	6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 4 8 6 5 4 8	8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers 1. Regional Coordinators 3. Vocational Directors 7. Teacher Educator 2. State Supervisors 6. Principals 5. Superintendents 4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons

Table 3-5 CONTINUED

Rank Order	Summer Program Activity	LSD Subsets	Groups
11	Conduct Chapter Officer Retreat/ Leadership Camp	5 5 5 5 5	6. Principals 7. Teacher Educators 2. State Supervisors 8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers 1. Regional Coordinators 5. Superintendents
12	Attend Formal Inservice Training	4 6 5 8 4 6 5 8	2. State Supervisors 7. Teacher Educators 4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons 6. Principals 5. Superintendents 8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers
13	Student Recordkeeping	5 5 6 5 6	7. Teacher Educators 2. State Supervisors 3. Vocational Directors 5. Superintendents 6. Principals
16	Provide Instructional Activities Adult and Youth	8 6 5 8 6 5 8 6 5	2. State Supervisors 7. Teacher Educators 3. Vocational Directors 8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers 6. Principals 5. Superintendents

Table 3-5 CONTINUED

Rank Order	Summer Program Activity	LSD Subsets	Groups
17	Establish New Agricultural Resource Contacts	4 5 6 4 5 4 5	1. Regional Coordinators 2. State Supervisors 7. Teacher Educators 4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons 5. Superintendents 6. Principals
18	Conduct Summer Workshops/ Training	5 5	2. State Supervisors 7. Teacher Educators 5. Superintendents
19	Conduct Program Evaluation/ Self-Assessment/ Long Range Planning	8 6 5 8 8	7. Teacher Educators 1. Regional Coordinators 2. State Supervisors 8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers 6. Principals 5. Superintendents
20	Meet/ Work with Advisory Committee	5 8 4 6 5 8 5 8	1. Regional Coordinators 2. State Supervisors 7. Teacher Educators 5. Superintendents 8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers

Table 3-5 CONTINUED

Rank Order	Summer Program Activity	LSD Subsets	Groups
21	Participate in College Short Courses	3 5 4 8 1 2 6	7. Teacher Educators 3. Vocational Directors 5. Superintendents 4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons 8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers 1. Regional Coordinators 6. Principals 2. State Supervisors
25	Attend County Fair/ State Fair/ Judging Contests	7 2 7 2 7 2	5. Superintendents 6. Principals 8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers 7. Teacher Educators 2. State Supervisors
27	Informal Inservice Activities	4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5	2. State Supervisors 8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers 7. Teacher Educators 1. Regional Coordinators 4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons 5. Superintendents



Table 3-5 CONTINUED

Rank Order	Summer Program Activity	LSD Subsets	Groups
28	Update and Review Reference Materials	5 5 6 5 6	2. State Supervisors 7. Teacher Educators 1. Regional Coordinator 5. Superintendents 6. Principals
29	Conduct Graduate Follow-up Studies	4 6 4 6 5 8	2. State Supervisors 7. Teacher Educators 4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons 6. Principals 5. Superintendents 8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers
31	Prepare Publicity Materials	5 6 5 6 5 6 3	2. State Supervisors 7. Teacher Educators 1. Regional Coordinator 5. Superintendents 6. Principals 3. Vocational Directors
32	Department Budget Formulation	8 5 8 5 8 5 8 5	2. State Supervisors 1. Regional Coordinators 7. Teacher Educators 4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons 8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers 5. Superintendents

Table 3-5 CONTINUED

Rank Order	Summer Program Activity	LSD Subsets	Groups
33	Facility Maintenance/ Renovation	4 4 2  4 4 2	5. Superintendents 8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers 1. Regional Coordinator 3. Vocational Directors 4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons 2. State Supervisors
37	Conduct Competency Studies	6 6 6 6	7. Teacher Educators 2. State Supervisors 4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons 1. Regional Coordinators 6. Principals

A summary of the results of ANOVA was presented in Table 3-5 represents those summer program activities which were found to be statistically different at the .05 level of significance. Using the LSD subsets, a determination was made regarding which groups were significantly different from other groups for each of the identified summer program activities. The summer program activities were listed in rank order according to the ideal summer program activities as identified by teacher educators and state supervisors nationwide. To interpret Table 3-5, an explanation of

the number one ranked vocational agriculture summer program activity, "attend annual summer update conference," will be provided. Vocational agriculture teacher perceptions of the importance of this activity differed significantly from superintendents, advisory committee chairpersons, and principals. Regional coordinators differed with superintendents. State supervisors differed from superintendents, advisory committee chairpersons, principals, and vocational directors. Teacher educators differed with superintendents, advisory committee chairpersons, principals, and vocational directors. This is a lengthy and complicated table. Careful study reveals areas of agreement and disagreement among groups who directly impact vocational agriculture summer programs. An analysis of this and subsequent tables was provided after the presentation of objective 4.

Table 3-6 identifies the rank order of the major categories, within which each of the 38 vocational agriculture summer program activities was placed, as identified by Oregon study participants in comparison to the ideal. The category ranking of the teacher educators and state supervisors was identified as the ideal program ranking and emphasizes the importance that these two groups place on supervised occupational experience, teaching/recruitment, and FFA activities during the summer months.

Table 3-6 RANK ORDER OF MAJOR CATEGORY AREAS BY REGIONAL COORDINATORS (RC), VOCATIONAL DIRECTORS (VD), ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS (AC), SUPERINTENDENTS (SU), PRINCIPALS (PR), AND VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS (TEA)

Area	Rank Order by Ideal Groups	RC	VD	AC	SU	PR	TEA	Total	Composite Rank by All Groups
SOE	1	2	1	2	2	3	2	12	2
Teaching/ Recruitment	2	4	2	5	3	4	4	22	3
FFA	3	1	3	1	1	1	1	8	1
Professional Growth	4	5	6	4	4	2	3	24	4
Department Administration	5	8	7	6	7	8	7	43	7
Resource Improvement	6	3	5	3	6	5	5	27	5
Agricultural Organizations/ Associations	7	6	8	8	8	7	8	45	8
Instructional Improvement	8	7	4	7	5	6	6	35	6

Several groups ranked the category FFA number one, but it was not identified as number one in the ideal summer program ranking. Supervised occupational experience (SOE) ranked number two by several groups and was identified as the number one category in the ideal summer program ranking. Table 3-6 would help decision makers place appropriate emphasis by category since most

vocational agriculture programs operate with limited resources.

**Objective 3:** Identify the quality indicators of the vocational agriculture summer programs perceived to be important by study participants; separate teacher educator and state supervisor composite scores and utilize these as the ideal quality indicator prioritization for vocational agriculture summer programs.

The following are the quality indicators of vocational agriculture teacher summer program activities, as identified by teacher educators and state supervisors, and were identified by a ranking of "High Importance", with means between 5.5 to 7.0. Both group results are listed in Table 3-7. Again state supervisor means were weighted to have equal impact on the ideal rating with teacher educator mean scores.

Table 3-7 IDEAL VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SUMMER PROGRAM  
QUALITY INDICATORS AS IDENTIFIED BY TEACHER  
EDUCATORS (TE) AND STATE SUPERVISORS (SS)

Ideal Rank Order	Activity	TE Rank	SS Rank
1.	Attend annual summer update conference	1	1
2.	Supervision of vo-ag students' home projects (SOE)	2	2
3.	Visit prospective vo-ag students and parents	5	3
4.	Supervision of agricultural co-op work experience students (CWE)	3	5
5.	Provide individualized instruction to students	4	9
6.	Vacation/Family	6	4
7.	Maintain communications with school administration	7	10
8.	Supervision of land lab/greenhouse facilities used by students	9	7
9.	Develop future SOE/CWE sources	8	8
10.	Supervision and planning FFA activities	11	6

Teacher educators ranked nine activities as "High Importance" thus labeling them as quality indicators, whereas state supervisors had ranked ten activities as "High Importance" to the summer program activities. Ten activities were identified as the ideal quality indicators for this study. The basis for the forgoing decision was that when the teacher educator and weighted

state supervisor individual statistics were combined for analysis, the means of ten items were identified as being in the "High Importance" area of this study.

Because these ten activities received a rank score which placed them in the "High Importance" category, they were considered to be the minimum a vocational agriculture program could accomplish during the summer and still be considered a quality program.

**Objective 4:** Compare the quality indicators of a vocational agriculture summer program, as perceived by each group in the study, with the ideal quality indicators for vocational agriculture summer programs nationwide.

Table 3-8 contains information regarding quality indicators as perceived by the Oregon participants in this study. The quality indicators are listed in rank order.

Table 3-8 OREGON VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SUMMER PROGRAM  
QUALITY INDICATORS IDENTIFIED BY GROUPS IN  
OREGON

Quality indicators (rated as "High Importance") as indicated by regional coordinators:

1. Revise and improve curriculum.
2. Supervision of agricultural cooperative work experience students (CWE).
3. Provide individualized instruction to students.
4. Attend annual summer update conference.
5. Conduct chapter officer retreat/leadership camp.
6. Supervision of vo-ag students' home projects (SOE).
7. Supervision and planning of FFA activities.
8. Establish new agricultural resource contacts.
9. Develop vocational agricultural curriculum.
10. Attend county fair/state fair/judging contests.
11. Meet/work with advisory committee.
12. Visit prospective vo-ag students and parents.

Quality indicators (rated as "High Importance") as indicated by vocational directors:

1. Visit prospective vo-ag students.
2. Supervision of land lab/greenhouse facilities used by students.



Table 3-8 CONTINUED

3. Student recordkeeping.
4. Supervision of vo-ag students' home projects (SOE).
5. Provide individualized instruction to students.
6. Attend county fair/state fair/judging contests.
7. Develop future SOE/CWE sources.
8. Supervision of agricultural cooperative work experience students (CWE).
9. Maintain communication with school administration.
10. Facilities maintenance/renovation.

Quality indicators (rated as "High Importance") as indicated by advisory committee chairpersons:

1. Supervision and planning of FFA activities.

Quality indicators (rated as "High Importance") as indicated by superintendents:

1. Supervision and planning of FFA activities.
2. Supervision of vo-ag students' home projects (SOE).
3. Attend county fair/state fair/judging contests.

Table 3-8 CONTINUED

Quality indicators (rated as "High Importance") as indicated by principals:

1. Attend county fair/state fair/judging contests.
2. Supervision and planning of FFA activities.
3. Supervision of vo-ag students' home projects (SOE).
4. Attend annual summer update conference.

Quality indicators (rated as "High Importance") as indicated by vocational agriculture teachers:

1. Attend county fair/state fair/judging contests.
2. Supervision and planning of FFA activities.
3. Supervision of vo-ag students' home projects (SOE).
4. Attend annual summer update conference.
5. Conduct chapter officer retreat/leadership camp.
6. Maintain communication with school administration.

---

The results of the ANOVA test procedure utilizing LSD subsets revealed that perceptions regarding six of the top ten quality indicators of summer program activities identified by teacher educators and state supervisors were significantly different from other groups surveyed. Those quality indicators which were significantly different among the groups were:

1. Attend annual summer update conference;
2. Visit prospective vo-ag students and parents;
3. Supervision of agricultural cooperative work experience students (CWE);
4. Vacation/family;
5. Maintain communication with school administration;
6. Develop future SOE/CWE sources;

Those quality indicators which were agreed to by all study participants were:

1. Supervision of vocational agriculture students' home projects (SOE);
2. Provide individualized instruction to students;
3. Supervision of land lab/greenhouse used by students;
4. Supervision and planning of FFA activities.

### Analysis and Discussion - Objectives 1-4

The following are some key points revealed by the ANOVA analysis and LSD subsets regarding vocational agriculture summer program activities:

1. Teacher educators and state supervisors appear to perceive vocational agriculture summer program activities similarly, but their perceptions are different from advisory committee chairpersons, superintendents, principals, and regional coordinators.
2. Regional coordinators appear to respond most differently from other groups with vocational backgrounds and understanding.
3. Vocational agriculture teachers, principals, and superintendents appear to be in agreement as to the three vocational agriculture summer program activities with the "Highest Importance," or priority.
4. Advisory committee chairpersons ranked only one summer program activity of "High Importance," was, supervision and planning FFA activities. A possible reason for this could be that FFA is one of the most visible components of the vocational agriculture program. This may also indicate that

vocational agriculture teachers hadn't informed or involved their advisory committee in planning the summer program of activities.

5. Attendance at county fair, state fair and judging contests rated as "High Importance" for all groups except teacher educators, state supervisors, and advisory committee chairpersons.
6. Of particular importance, given low enrollments of recent years, was that the visiting of prospective vocational agriculture students and parents did not rank as of "High Importance" to half of the groups surveyed. Groups not highly ranking this potential recruitment activity were the advisory committee chairpersons, superintendents, principals, and vocational agriculture teachers.
7. Teacher educators, state supervisors, vocational directors, and vocational agriculture teachers rated "maintaining communication with school administration" of "High Importance." Somewhat surprising was that superintendents and principals did not rank this activity of "High Importance".
8. Attendance at the annual summer update conference rated of "High Importance" to vocational agriculture teachers,

regional coordinators, state supervisors, and teacher educators, whereas, vocational directors, principals, superintendents, and advisory committee chairpersons did not rate vocational agriculture summer conferences of "High Importance". A decision should be made as to whether the summer conference, as a professional development activity, should be part of the summer contract for vocational agriculture teachers. Other teachers would like to be paid for professional development also, but is the nature of the extended contract for vocational agriculture teachers such that professional development can be included within the summer contract?

## **Ideal Summer Program Activities Time Allocation**

**Objective 5:** Identify perceptions regarding the number of days which are currently allocated to various components of the vocational agriculture summer program by each group studied.

A summary of the information collected from Section II of the questionnaire was provided in Tables 3-9 and 3-10. These tables display the means of the current time allocation and the ideal time allocation for the eight major categories of summer program activities as perceived by subjects in all of the eight groups surveyed. The means represent the number of days each group would allocate to each of the eight major categories.

In a comparison between the perceptions of days currently allocated and days ideally allocated to the eight major categories of vocational agriculture summer program activities, there was a dramatic difference between what was currently being allocated and what ideally should be allocated. It can be seen in Tables 3-9 and 3-10 that the current allocation of days was lower for every group than that considered ideal.

Table 3-9 MEANS OF THE NUMBER OF DAYS CURRENTLY  
BEING ALLOCATED TO THE EIGHT MAJOR CATEGORIES  
OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SUMMER PROGRAM  
ACTIVITIES

Activity	TE	SS	RC	VD	AC	SU	PR	TEA	M	SD
Agricultural Organizations and Associations										
	3.1	2.4	3.7	2.5	1.7	3.2	2.8	2.3	2.7	0.6
Department Administration										
	5.5	3.8	3.5	2.5	2.2	2.1	1.8	2.5	2.8	1.2
FFA										
	7.1	7.4	13.3	6.5	6.7	12.4	11.4	11.9	9.2	2.9
Instructional Improvement										
	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.2	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	3.2	1.2
Professional Growth										
	4.4	4.1	3.1	2.3	2.1	2.7	2.7	3.6	3.0	0.8
Resource Improvement										
	3.8	2.4	5.3	2.8	1.4	1.8	1.6	1.7	2.4	1.4
SOE										
	8.7	8.6	9.6	7.8	6.5	8.4	8.0	8.8	8.3	0.9
Teaching/Recruitment										
	3.1	3.9	3.3	4.1	1.7	1.9	1.5	1.4	2.4	1.1
Totals										
	40.3	37.0	46.5	32.6	24.5	35.0	22.1	34.5	33.4	8.3

Table 3-9 displays the means for the number of days perceived by each group to be actually spent on each of the eight major categories of the current vocational agriculture summer program



activities and the grand mean and standard deviation of this section of the study as reported by the study groups on the eight major categories.

The total number of days currently being allocated, as identified by teacher educators, was 40.3 days and, by state supervisors, was 37.0 days. Teacher educators and state supervisors combined allocated an average of 19.9 of their 38.6 days (or 41.2 percent) to two major categories, SOE and FFA. The other six groups in the study reported these same two major categories as receiving the greatest allotment of time during the summer program. Regional coordinators reported 49.2 percent; vocational directors, 43.9 percent; advisory committee chairpersons, 53.9 percent; superintendents, 59.4 percent; principals, 87.8 percent; and vocational agriculture teachers, 60.0 percent. Perceptions of the number of days currently being allocated to FFA was found to have the most variation among the eight categories.

**Objective 6:** Compare current time allocations by each group with perceptions of the ideal summer program time allocation, as identified by teacher educators and state supervisors.

In Table 3-10, data show the number of days which each Oregon group perceived ideally should be allocated to the eight major categories of the vocational agriculture summer program activities

Table 3-10 MEANS OF THE NUMBER OF DAYS WHICH IDEALLY SHOULD BE ALLOCATED TO THE EIGHT MAJOR CATEGORIES OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SUMMER PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Activity	Ideal	RC	VD	AC	SU	PR	TEA	M	SD
Agricultural Organizations/Associations									
	3.5	4.2	5.1	3.2	3.7	3.1	3.3	3.6	0.7
Department Administration									
	4.7	3.2	5.3	4.7	3.8	2.8	3.9	4.1	0.9
FFA									
	7.4	11.1	10.3	9.9	10.2	11.3	13.4	9.9	2.0
Instructional Improvement									
	4.9	5.9	6.1	3.9	4.3	3.0	4.7	4.6	1.0
Professional Growth									
	5.5	4.5	3.4	3.2	4.1	3.0	5.2	4.2	1.2
Resource Improvement									
	4.2	6.6	4.2	3.0	4.2	2.6	4.1	4.0	1.2
SOE									
	13.0	10.3	10.5	8.1	8.1	8.5	11.7	10.2	2.1
Teaching/Recruitment									
	6.9	5.0	6.4	3.6	4.0	2.4	4.0	4.6	1.7
Totals	49.9	50.8	51.2	39.5	42.3	36.7	50.2	45.8	6.1

as well as the composite teacher educator and state supervisor ideal rating, listed as the ideal.

Tables 3-9 and 3-10 provide data for a comparison of the current allocation of days with the ideal allocation of days for various categories of the vocational agriculture summer program. In comparing the total number of days available in the current program with the ideal vocational agriculture summer program, an increase from 38.6 days to 49.9 days was reported by teacher educators and state supervisors. This represents an increase of 11.3 days available to the vocational agriculture summer program. All groups reported an increase in the number of days which ideally should be allocated to vocational agriculture summer program activities. The groups reported increases in the allocation of days as: regional coordinators, 4.3 days; vocational directors, 18.6 days; advisory committee chairpersons, 15 days; superintendents, 7.3 days; principals, 14.7 days; and vocational agriculture teachers, 15.7 days.

All groups reported a similar emphasis in the allocation of days to the eight major categories of vocational agriculture summer programs. The major emphasis of the allocation of days in the ideal vocational agriculture summer program was placed on SOE and FFA. The six Oregon groups reported a decrease in the percentage of time allocated to SOE and FFA, but these two major areas were still reported as being the largest consumer of the days allocated to the summer activities program. The group with the largest decrease in the percentage of time allocated to SOE

and FFA was principals, with a decrease of 33.8 percent, but they reported that 54.0 percent of the time should be allocated to these two major categories.

Objective 7:        Compare perceptions of the ideal time allocations for each of the Oregon groups studied with the ideal time allocation perceptions of teacher educators and state supervisors.

Table 3-10 displayed the allocation of days for the ideal summer vocational agriculture activities program for each group studied. It also identified the ideal distribution of days by the composite teacher educator and state supervisor group which has been labeled the ideal allocation for the ideal data set.

It can be observed from the data in Table 3-10 that the eight groups emphasized the same two categories as most important, SOE and FFA. Teaching/recruitment, professional growth, and instructional improvement were the next three categories of importance to the vocational agriculture summer activities program. The least important categories to the summer activities program were department administration, resource improvement, and agricultural organizations and associations.

### Summary of Findings

The purpose of the study, to identify the ideal vocational agriculture summer program activities, was fulfilled by responses from teacher educators and state supervisors nationwide. The teacher educators and state supervisors nationwide placed an almost identical emphasis on ten summer program activities. The ideal summer program activities should be centered around SOE, FFA, teaching/recruitment, and professional growth activities.

Research questions of this study called for testing the similarities among the eight groups on the 38 vocational agriculture summer program activities. The ANOVA test procedure was employed as a statistical test procedure. Specific differences among means were examined by using the LSD technique at a .05 significance level. The null hypothesis was tested for each of the 38 summer program activities. The null hypothesis was retained for 14 of the 38 summer program activities and rejected for the remaining 24.

Further analysis was conducted on those activities where the null hypothesis was rejected. The analysis revealed the following for the vocational agriculture summer program activities:

1. The ten activities rated as "High Importance" were: 1) Attend annual summer update conference, 2) Supervision of vo-ag students' home projects (SOE), 3) Visit prospective vo-ag students and parents, 4) Supervision of agricultural

cooperative work experience (CWE), 5) Provide individualized instruction to students, 6) Vacation/Family, 7) Maintain communications with school administration, 8) Supervision of land lab/greenhouse used by students, 9) Develop future SOE/CWE sources, 10) Supervision and planning of FFA activities. These became the quality indicators.

2. The most important categories were: 1) SOE, 2) teaching/recruitment, 3) FFA, and 4) professional growth.
3. Observations regarding the responses of the various groups included:
  - a. Teacher educators and state supervisors appear to observe vocational agriculture summer program activities the same, but differently from advisory committee chairpersons, superintendents, principals, and regional coordinators.
  - b. Regional coordinators appear to respond most differently from other groups with vocational backgrounds and understanding.
  - c. Vocational agriculture teachers, principals, and superintendents appear to be in agreement as to the three vocational agriculture summer program activities

with the "Highest Importance," or priority.

- d. Advisory committee chairpersons ranked only one summer program activity of "High Importance," supervision and planning FFA activities.
- e. Attendance at county fair, state fair and judging contests rated as "High Importance" for all groups except teacher educators, state supervisors, and advisory committee chairpersons.
- f. Visiting of prospective vocational agriculture students and parents did not rank of "High Importance" to advisory committee chairpersons, superintendents, principals, and vocational agriculture teachers.
- g. Teacher educators, state supervisors, vocational directors, and vocational agriculture teachers rated "maintaining communication with school administration" of "High Importance". Superintendents and principals did not rank 'maintaining communication with school administration' of "High Importance".
- h. Attendance at the annual summer update conference rated of "High Importance" to vocational agriculture teachers, regional coordinators, state supervisors,

and teacher educators, whereas, vocational directors, principals, superintendents, and advisory committee chairpersons did not rank vocational agriculture teacher attendance at summer conferences of "High Importance."

The research questions regarding the number of days currently being allocated and the number of days which ideally should be allocated to vocational agriculture summer program activities showed a difference in time allocations for current verses ideal day commitments. All groups indicated an increase from current allocation to ideal allocation. Public school administrators tended to be more conservative with day allocations, both at current and ideal allotment levels, than did vocational agriculture teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors.

The data also revealed that the ideal vocational agriculture summer program activities, as identified by teacher educators and state supervisors, should consist of 50 days. The major emphasis of the summer program activities ideally should be directed towards SOE, FFA, teaching/recruitment, and professional growth activities.



## **Chapter IV. Summary, Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations**

### **Summary**

The purpose of this study was to determine: 1) the ideal vocational agriculture summer program activities as perceived by teacher educators and state supervisors nationwide, and 2) if there were differences in perceptions towards vocational agriculture summer program activities among selected groups impacting vocational agriculture programs in the state of Oregon, as compared to the ideal summer program activities for the nation.

Data were collected from 358 individuals representing the eight groups studied in January and February 1989. Subjects were randomly selected from two nationwide populations and six statewide populations. The ANOVA statistical test, descriptive statistics, frequencies, and multivariate analysis were the methods used to analyze the data for interpretation. A composite response rate of 84.6 percent was received from the eight groups: teacher educators (91.9 percent), state supervisors (88.9 percent), vocational agriculture teachers (94.4 percent), regional coordinators (94.1 percent), principals (80.4 percent), superintendents (69.6 percent), advisory committee chairpersons (67.6 percent), and vocational directors (66.7 percent).

It was observed that vocational agriculture teachers were currently employed an average of 33.4 days for the summer program

activities and that their mean salary was \$4014.72. The mean years of teaching experience for the Oregon vocational agriculture teachers studied an average of 12.1 years.

ANOVA tests among group means for Section I, Summer Programs Activity Survey, of the study questionnaire revealed that 14 of the 38 vocational agriculture summer program activities were not statistically different. The null hypotheses were retained for these 14 summer program activities.

Where the null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that a significant difference existed among the perceptions of some of the eight groups, further analysis was conducted utilizing the LSD test for homogeneous subsets at a .05 significance level.

### Conclusions by Objective

Objective 1: Identify components of the vocational agriculture summer program perceived to be important by study participants; separate teacher educator and state supervisor participants' composite scores and utilize these as the ideal activities prioritization for vocational agriculture summer programs.

Those vocational agriculture summer program activities to be used as the ideal quality indicators according to teacher educators and state supervisors were:

1. Attend annual summer update conference.
2. Supervision of vo-ag students' home projects (SOE).
3. Visit prospective vo-ag students and parents.
4. Supervision of agricultural cooperative work experience students (CWE).
5. Provide individualized instruction to students.
6. Vacation/Family.
7. Maintain communication with school administration.
8. Supervision of land lab/greenhouse facilities used by students.
9. Develop future SOE/CWE sources.
10. Supervision and planning of FFA activities.

**Objective 2:** Compare components to be included in a vocational agriculture summer program, as perceived by Oregon study participants, with the ideal vocational agriculture summer program nationwide.

Those components perceived, by the groups studied in the state of Oregon, as being important to the summer program activities were:

1. Attend annual summer update conference.
2. Supervision of vo-ag students' home projects (SOE).
3. Visit prospective vo-ag students and parents.
4. Supervision of agricultural cooperative work experience students (CWE).
5. Provide individualized instruction to students.
6. Maintain communication with school administration.
7. Supervision of land lab/greenhouse facilities used by students.
8. Supervision and planning of FFA activities.
9. Attend county fair/state fair/judging contests.
10. Conduct chapter officer retreat/leadership camp.
11. Revise and improve curriculum.
12. Develop vocational agricultural curriculum.
13. Student recordkeeping.
14. Facilities maintenance/renovation.
15. Establish new agricultural resource contacts.

# 16. Meet/work with advisory committee.

The rank order of the eight major categories of vocational agriculture summer program activities emphasized the importance of SOE, teaching/recruitment, and FFA. All groups placed emphasis on these categories and determined that these activities should be included in a quality vocational agriculture summer program.

Objective 3: Identify the quality indicators of the vocational agriculture summer programs perceived to be important by study participants; separate teacher educator and state supervisor composite scores and utilize these as the ideal quality indicator prioritization for vocational agriculture summer programs.

Those vocational agriculture summer program activity quality indicators perceived to be important by teacher educators and state supervisors were:

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Activity</u>
1.5	Attend annual summer update conference.
1.5	Supervision of vo-ag students' home projects (SOE).
3.5	Visit prospective vo-ag students and parents.
3.5	Supervision of agricultural cooperative work

- experience (CWE).
- 5 Provide individualized instruction to students.
- 6 Vacation/Family.
- 8 Maintain communication with school administration.
- 8 Supervision of land lab/greenhouse facilities used by students.
- 8 Develop future SOE/CWE sources.
- 10 Supervision and planning of FFA activities.

Objective 4. Compare the quality indicators of a vocational agriculture summer program, as perceived by each group in the study, with the ideal quality indicators for vocational agriculture summer programs nationwide.

Those quality indicators identified by Oregon participating groups which were statistically different from the ideal quality indicators were:

1. Attend annual summer update conference.
2. Visit prospective vo-ag students and parents.
3. Supervision of agricultural cooperative work experience students (CWE).
4. Vacation/Family.

5. Maintain communication with school administration.
6. Develop future SOE/CWE sources.

Those which were agreed to by all study participants were:

1. Supervision of vocational agriculture students' home projects (SOE).
2. Provide individualized instruction to students.
3. Supervision of land lab/greenhouse used by students.
4. Supervision and planning of FFA activities.

Objective 5: Identify perceptions regarding the number of days which are currently allocated to various components of the vocational agriculture summer program by each group studied.

The amount of time perceived to be allocated to the current program ranged from 22.1 days to 46.5 days. The days currently being allocated, as identified by the teacher educators and state supervisors' composite score, was found to be 38.6 days. Perceptions of the number of days currently being allocated to FFA was found to have the most variation among the eight categories. Superintendents and principals perceived 20.1 days of current allocation to vocational summer program activities.

Objective 6: Compare current time allocations by each group with perceptions of the ideal summer program

time allocation, as identified by teacher educators and state supervisors.

As identified by teacher educators and state supervisors nationwide, the ideal number of days which should be allocated to the summer program activities was 49.9 days. This compares with the perception of current time allocation by these two groups of 38.6 days. All other groups indicated similar increases from current allocation to ideal allocation. The smallest increase was identified by regional coordinators who perceived a current allocation of 46.5 days and allotted the ideal allocation of 50.8 days.

Objective 7: Compare perceptions of the ideal time allocations for each of the Oregon groups studied with the ideal time allocation perceptions of teacher educators and state supervisors.

Oregon groups allocating less than the number of days allocated in the ideal summer program (49.9 days) were: 1) advisory committee chairpersons (39.5 days), 2) superintendents (42.3 days), and 3) principals (36.7 days). All other groups reported allocation of days in excess of the number identified in the ideal summer program (49.9 days). Regional coordinators reported 50.8 days; vocational directors, 51.2 days; and



vocational agriculture teachers, 50.2 days.

All groups tend to support the view that SOE, teaching/recruitment, FFA, and professional growth should be the major part of the summer program activities, both in importance and allocation of days.

### **Analysis of the findings and conclusions**

1. Teacher educators and state supervisors appear to be observing vocational agriculture summer program activities the same, but different from advisory committee chairpersons, superintendents, principals, and regional coordinators.
2. Regional coordinators appear to respond most differently from other groups with vocational backgrounds and understanding.
3. Vocational agriculture teachers, principals, and superintendents appear to be in agreement as to the three vocational agriculture summer program activities with the "Highest Importance" or priority. Vocational agriculture teachers and principals actually ranked the top four in the same rank order of importance.
4. Advisory committee chairpersons ranked only one summer program activity of "High Importance," supervision and planning FFA activities.
5. It should be noted that attendance at county fair, state fair, and judging contests rated as "High Importance" for all groups except teacher educators, state supervisors, and

advisory committee chairpersons.

6. Of particular importance, given low enrollments of recent years, was that the visiting of prospective vocational agriculture students and parents did not rank of "High Importance" to half of the groups surveyed. Those groups being: advisory committee chairpersons, superintendents, principals, and vocational agriculture teachers.
7. Teacher educators, state supervisors, vocational directors, and vocational agriculture teachers rated "maintaining communication with school administration" of "High Importance." Somewhat surprising was that superintendents and principals did not rank this of "High Importance."
8. Attendance at the annual summer update conference rated of "High Importance" to vocational agriculture teachers, regional coordinators, state supervisors, and teacher educators. This was different from the rating of vocational directors, principals, superintendents, and advisory committee chairpersons.

### **Implications and Recommendations**

Since the primary reason for extending the contract of the vocational agriculture teacher is the supervision and/or instruction of students, it is important for teachers to maximize the time spent with students and the time spent on activities that are unique to the summer program activities. If this is done, the vocational agriculture teacher should be able to justify a summer program and a 50 day extended contract. No other reasons alone justify a summer program, unless the entire school operates in that manner.

Based upon the analysis, findings, and conclusions cited, the following implications and recommendations can be drawn regarding vocational agriculture summer program activities:

1. It is important for vocational agriculture teachers to maximize the time spent on activities that are unique to the vocational agriculture summer program. Time spent on activities for which other teachers are responsible was rated very low in importance.
2. Oregon vocational agriculture teachers' perceptions of summer program activities should emphasize more closely, the ideal summer program activities as identified by teacher educators and state supervisors nationwide.

3. A greater emphasis on communication between the Oregon groups may need to occur if the vocational agriculture teachers are to develop a highly effective summer program going into the 1990's. The study revealed that a lack of communication in the form of a written summer program of activities for the vocational agriculture teacher was apparent. Activities that are directed toward communication between these groups should be implemented. The many differences that existed in this study point out the need for better planning, communication, and implementation for vocational agriculture summer programs in order to serve the students during the summer.
4. Vocational agriculture teachers need to redirect the time spent on contest related activities to time training and supervising students in agricultural skills and competencies in SOE. They must also develop a comprehensive program of visiting prospective vo-ag students and parents to ensure enrollments in the future.
5. Vocational agriculture teachers need to place a greater emphasis on publicity of the summer program activities. They need to develop a plan which has the approval of the administration and school board prior to the start of the summer program. This plan must be presented to students, parents of vocational agriculture students, advisory

committee chairpersons, and regional coordinators prior to the end of the school year. At the conclusion of the summer, a written summary should be presented to the school administration, school board, and advisory committee. The report should list specific activities, days spent, and the number of students and parents involved or contacted within each of the summer program activities.

6. The vocational agriculture summer program activities ideally should be allocated 50 days. The vocational agriculture teachers should allocate most of their time to SOE, teaching/recruitment, FFA, and professional growth activities.
7. Oregon regional coordinators need to be informed of the results of this study at their statewide meeting in order to: 1) develop the conceptual ideal for a vocational agriculture summer program of activities, and 2) facilitate communication among school administrators, regional coordinators, and vocational agriculture teachers.
8. The results of this study should be presented at the Consortium of Secondary Administrators state meeting in order to: 1) develop the conceptual ideal for a vocational agriculture summer program of activities, and 2) facilitate communication among school administrators, regional

coordinators, and vocational agriculture teachers.

9. Regional coordinators should be encouraged to offer assistance to vocational directors in their conceptual development of an ideal vocational agriculture summer program.

### **Recommendations for Further Study**

1. A study on the changing mission, or the emphasis on change in program structure, may be in order. This study could be focused on the development of the agricultural science and technology activities that may enhance the vocational agriculture summer program activities (SAE versus SOEP).
2. A study to further develop specific summer program activities which need to be changed to accommodate current and future trends in the agricultural industry should be conducted.
3. A study to develop summer program activities to enhance the learning "About Agriculture" program and identify how the current summer program activities might be structured to facilitate this program, should be conducted.
4. This study did not include perceptions of members of boards of education or parents of vocational agriculture students. This additional information could be valuable in the future.



## Bibliography

Amberson, M. L. and Lantis, D. (1976). Summer Programs of Vocational Agriculture in Montana. The Agricultural Education Magazine, 48(12), 280.

Arrington, L.R. (1984). Teacher Summer Employment and the Activity Level of the FFA Chapter. Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, 25(1), 48-53.

Arrington, L.R. and McCracken, J.D. (1981). Relationships of Central Florida Vocational Agriculture Summer Employment to Supervised Occupational Experience Program Scope and FFA Chapter Activity Level. Paper presented at the Central Region Research Conference, Fargo, North Dakota, July 1981, 8-9.

Bailis, L.W. (1987). Community-Based Organizations and Vocational Education: The Path To Partnership. Information Series No. 319. Columbus: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education. The Ohio State University.

Blezek, A.C. (1977). Is Your Summer Program Showing? It Needs To. The Agricultural Education Magazine, 50(20), 41-41.

Camp, S.S. (1986). Summer Time Allocation in Vocational Agriculture Programs in the United States. Dissertation Abstracts International, 8625327. (University Microfilms No. 8625327).

Cepica, M.J. (1977). A Comparison of the Summer Programs of Oklahoma Vocational Agriculture Teachers and Administrator perceptions of Selected Aspects of the Summer Program. (Doctoral Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 5193A.

Cepica, M.J. (1979a). A Comparison of the Summer Programs of Vocational Agriculture Teachers and Administrator Perceptions of Selected Aspects of the Summer Program. Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, 20(1), 18-25.

Cepica, M.J. (1979b). Development of Guidelines for Summer Vocational Agriculture Programs in Texas. Lubbock: Texas Tech University, Department of Agricultural Education.

Cepica, M.J. (1979c). Publicizing and Communicating Summer Priorities. The Agricultural Education Magazine, 51(12), 274.

Cepica, M.J. and Stockton, J. (1980). Observations of Summer Programs of Vocational Agriculture. The Agricultural Education Magazine, 52(12), 4-5.

Clarke, N.P. (1986). Implications of the Biotechnology Revolution for Agriculture. 1986 Yearbook of Agriculture. Washington D.C.

Cohen, Jacob (1969). Statistical Power Analysis for Behavioral Sciences. New York: Academic Press, Inc.

Cohen, S. (Ed.) (1974). Education in the United States. New York: Random House.

Dewey, J. (1983). Experience and Education. New York: Collier Books.

Edmunds, N. (1988). Our Commitment to At-Risk Students. Vocational Education Journal, 63(6), 11.

Ermis, L. (1979). The 3-P's of an Effective Summer Program. The Agricultural Education Magazine, 51(12), 271, 285.

Evans, R.N. and Herr, E.L. (1978). Foundations of Vocational Education. (2nd edition). Ohio: Merrill.

Federal Board of Vocational Education, (1918). Agricultural Education Organization and Administration. (Bulletin No. 13, Agricultural Series, No. 1). Washington D.C. United States Government Printing Office.

Gardner, M.A. (1961). An Evaluation of the Summer Program in Vocational Agriculture by the Idaho School Administrators. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Idaho, Moscow.

Guiler, G.S. (1959). The Use of Professional Time During The Summer Months by Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Ohio. Dissertation Abstracts International, 20,1918. (University Microfilms No. 262350).

Guilford, J.P. and Fruchter, B. (1978). Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. (6th edition). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Harris, H.H. (1980). The Vocational Agriculture Summer Program Must Change to Meet Program Needs: Fact or Fable. The Agricultural Education Magazine, 52(12), 12-14.

Hilton, J.W. (1979). Perceptions of Vocational Agriculture Instructors and Superintendents Concerning Vocational Agriculture Summer Programs in Iowa. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 3703A. (University Microfilms No. 794229).

Hilton, J.W. (1981). Perceptions of Vocational Agriculture Instructors and Superintendents Concerning Vocational Agriculture Programs in Iowa. Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, 22(3), 29-35.

Horner, J.T. (1979). Acceptable and Unacceptable Summer Activities. The Agricultural Education Magazine, 51(12), 273.

Kennedy, E.M. (1988). When Students Drop Out, We All Lose. Vocational Education Journal, 63(6), 34-35.

Kilpatrick (1953) as quoted by Deyoe, G.P. (1953). Farming Programs in Vocational Agriculture. (2nd edition). Danville, IL: The Interstate.

Knebel, E.H. and Richardson, W. (1982). Terminology in Agricultural Education. Athens, Ga. AAVIM.

Kotrlik, J.W. (1985). Activities That Should Be and Are Included In Summer Programs of Vocational Agriculture in the United States. Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, 26(4), 9-15.

Lee, J.S. (1982). Year-Round Programs. The Agricultural Education Magazine, 52(12), 3-4.

Luft, V.D. (1982). Year-Round Programs In Vocational Agriculture - A Necessity. The Agricultural Education Magazine, 54(9), 13-14.

McMillion, M.B. and Auville, M.K. (1976). Factors Associated with The Success of Supervised Farming Programs of Virginia High School Students. State Department of Education of Virginia and College of Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, June 1976.

Morton, R.H. (1978). The Relationship Between the Quality of Supervised Occupational Experience Programs and Achievement of Students in Vocational Agriculture. Paper presented at The National Agricultural Education Research Meeting, Dallas, Texas, December 1978.

Naisbett, J. (1982). Megatrends. Warner Books, Inc.

Naisbett, J. and Aburdene, P. (1985). Reinventing The Corporation. Warner Books, Inc.

Oades, J.D. and Deeds, J. P. (1978). Policies and Procedures Handbook for Oregon Vocational Agriculture Programs. Department of Agricultural Education Vocational-Technical Education Division Oregon State University and Career and Vocational Education section Oregon Department of Education.

Oregon Department of Education (1986). Vocational Regional Coordinators Concept and Priority Duties. Division of Vocational Education, Associate Superintendent.

Phipps, L.J. (1980). Handbook on Agricultural Education in the Public Schools. (4th edition). Danville, Il: Interstate.

Prosser, C.A. and Quigley, T.H. (1979). Vocational Education in a Democracy. Chicago: American Technical Society.

Public Law No. 64-347,- S. 703, National Vocational Education Act (Smith-Hughes). Washington D.C.

Public Law No. 88-210,- H.R. 4955, Vocational Education Act of 1963. Washington D.C.

Public Law No. 90-576, Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 Act. Washington D.C.

Public Law No. 92-318, Education Amendments of 1972. Washington D.C.

Public Law No. 94-482, Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 Act. Washington D.C.

Public Law No. 98-524,- H.R. 4164, Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act. Washington D.C.

Randolph, W.J. (1988). Designing Instructional Programs for Special Populations. The Agricultural Education Magazine, 61(4), 12-13.

Reece, B.L. (1988). Developing Those Critical Human Relations Skills. Vocational Education Journal, 63(7), 44-45.

Richardson, W.B. (1982). Year-Round Instructional Programs. The Agricultural Education Magazine, 54(9), 4.

Rosenfeld, S.L. (1985). Vocational Agriculture: A Model For Educational Reform. Education Weekly.

SOE Handbook, (1982). National FFA Foundation.

SPSSx, (1986). Evenston, Il: SPSSx, Inc.

Statgraphics, (1987). Rockville, MD: STSC, Inc.

Stenzel, S. (1982). The NVATA Position on Year-Round Programs. The Agricultural Education Magazine, 54(9), 5-7.

Stewart, B.R. (1970). 12-Month Vocational Agriculture Programs. The Agricultural Education Magazine, 51(12), 269.

Stewart, D.W. (1987). Vocational Agriculture: A Unique Program That Should Be Retained. A Position Paper National Association of Supervisors of Agricultural Education.

Warfield, D.L. (1966). Summer Programs Activities of Vocational Agriculture in Washington. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Idaho, Moscow.

Websters New World Dictionary, 1983). New York: Simon and Schuster.

Witt, M.J. (1982). The Perceptions that North Dakota School Superintendents and Vocational Agriculture Teachers have toward The Summer Program in Vocational Agriculture. Unpublished Master's Report, North Dakota State University, Bismark, N.D.

## APPENDICES

## Appendix A

### Correspondence

July 12, 1988

Mr. Dale Crawford  
Culver High School  
P.O. Box 228  
Culver, Oregon 97734-0405

Dear Mr. Crawford

As an admired and respected leader in the education field you have been chosen to critique the enclosed survey questionnaire. The questionnaire is part of a doctoral study whose major focus is to determine the perceptions regarding the value of summer vocational agriculture program activities in Oregon. I am asking that you evaluate the enclosed survey to determine if it will fulfill the following purposes.

1. To determine the attitudinal perceptions of Superintendents, Regional Coordinators, Vocational Directors, Principals, and Vocational Agriculture Teachers towards various components of the summer vocational agriculture program activities.
2. To determine if perception differences exist among Superintendents, Regional Coordinators, Vocational Directors, Principals, and Vocational Agriculture Teachers for summer vocational agriculture program activities.
3. To derive from data what Superintendents, Regional Coordinators, Vocational Directors, Principals, and Vocational Agriculture Teachers perceive should be included in a complete summer vocational agriculture offering for programs in the State of Oregon.

Please feel free to make any changes you feel necessary to fulfill the requirements of the survey instrument. A return envelope has been provided for your convenience. Thank you for your time and help in developing this survey questionnaire.

Sincerely;

Mike Swan, Instructor  
Agricultural Education/General Agriculture  
125 Ballard Extension Hall  
Oregon State University  
Corvallis, Oregon 97331



July 15, 1988

Dr. Phil Zurbrick  
Department of Agricultural Education  
College of Agriculture  
University of Arizona  
Tucson, Arizona 85721

Dear Dr. Zurbrick

As an admired and respected leader in the education field you have been chosen to critique the enclosed survey questionnaire. The questionnaire is part of a doctoral study whose major focus is to determine the perceptions regarding the value of summer vocational agriculture program activities in Oregon. I am asking that you evaluate the enclosed survey to determine if it will fulfill the following purposes.

1. To determine the attitudinal perceptions of Superintendents, Regional Coordinators, Vocational Directors, Principals, and Vocational Agriculture Teachers towards various components of the summer vocational agriculture program activities.
2. To determine if perception differences exist among Superintendents, Regional Coordinators, Vocational Directors, Principals, and Vocational Agriculture Teachers for summer vocational agriculture program activities.
3. To derive from data what Superintendents, Regional Coordinators, Vocational Directors, Principals, and Vocational Agriculture Teachers perceive should be included in a complete summer vocational agriculture offering for programs in the State of Oregon.

Please feel free to make any changes you feel necessary to fulfill the requirements of the survey instrument. A return envelop has been provided for your convenience. Thank you for your time and help in developing this survey questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Mike Swan, Instructor  
Agricultural Education & General Agriculture  
Oregon State University

October 5, 1988

Mr. Zan Freeman, Principal  
St. Helens High School  
2375 Gable Road  
St. Helens, Oregon 97051-2998

Dear Mr. Freeman

We need your assistance, would you please help. You have been selected on a random draw basis to participate in the final validation and refinement of a research instrument that will help identify priority activities for vocational agriculture teacher summer programs. This is an important research activity at this time because of the very tight budgetary constraints.

Please complete the questionnaire, note any items that are unclear or confusing, make any suggestions that you feel would improve the questionnaire or the study, and return it immediately to us at Oregon State University.

Thank you very much for your time and assistance in this important task.

Sincerely

Mike Swan, Instructor

R. Lee Cole, Professor

January 16, 1989

Dear :

The tight budgetary times of the last eight years have caused us to focus on the identification of essential learning activities. The vocational agriculture teachers summer program has been one area to receive considerable attention. We would like your help in identifying the essential components of the vocational agriculture summer program. Since we are working with a rather small sample your input is important. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to us in the envelope provided by January 31, 1989.

The number on the instrument is for survey follow-up purposes only; data will be summarized in a nationwide report. The information will be kept confidential and no individual response by you or your school will ever be singled out for individual reporting or for response to any official.

Your time and effort are greatly appreciated. This could be a critical study for vocational agriculture summer programs in the nation. Please help.

Sincerely,

R. Lee Cole, Professor  
Agricultural Education

Mike Swan, Instructor  
Agricultural Education

February 14, 1989

Dear :

We have not yet received the questionnaire concerning your attitudes and perceptions of summer program activities in agricultural education. Your input is important and we would like to include it in the survey results. Please take time now to fill out the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope. Please return by March 3, 1989.

Your attitudes and perceptions are important and will have an impact on policy formation and agricultural program direction now and in the near future.

Thank-you for giving of your valuable time to this study and to the future of agricultural education.

Sincerely;

Lee Cole, Professor  
Agricultural Education

Mike Swan, Instructor  
Agricultural Education

## Appendix B

### Survey Questionnaire

## Section I SUMMER PROGRAMS ACTIVITY SURVEY No. \_\_\_\_\_

Please rate the identified activities under each of the following eight major summer program categories in order of their importance to the vocational agriculture program(s) with which you are associated. Circle the importance levels 1 being of no importance and 7 being of high importance to the vocational agriculture program(s).

No      Moderate      High  
Impt      Impt      Impt

1. AGRICULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS

-Conduct public relations program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Prepare publicity materials	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Establish new agricultural resource contacts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Meet/work with advisory committee	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Supervise summer use of facilities by community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Other, _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

-Upgrade department records	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Conduct graduate follow-up survey	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Vacation / Family	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Maintain communications with school administration	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Conduct program evaluation, self-assessment, long range planning	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Department budget formulation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Other, _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA (FFA)

-Supervision and planning of FFA activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Conduct chapter officer retreat, leadership camp	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Chapter meetings, outings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Attend county Fair, State Fair, Judging Contests	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Other, _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

#### 4. INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT

---

-Facility maintenance/ Renovation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Safety inspections, repairs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Order budgeted supplies and equipment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Update inventory	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Other, _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

#### 5. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

---

-Attend annual summer update conference	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Conduct summer workshops, training	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Participate in college short courses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Attend courses for certification/update	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Informal inservice activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Other, _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

#### 6. RESOURCE IMPROVEMENT

---

-Develop vocational agriculture curriculum	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Revise and improve curriculum	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Develop planning calendar	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Conduct competency studies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Order reference books and materials	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Update and review reference materials	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Other, _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

### 7. SUPERVISED OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE (SOE)

-Supervision of vocational agriculture students home projects (SOE)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Supervision of agricultural cooperative work experience student (CWE)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Develop future SOE/CWE sources	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Supervision of land labs/greenhouse facilities use by students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Student Recordkeeping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Other, _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

### 8. TEACHING / RECRUITMENT

-Provide instructional activities, adult and youth	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Attend formal inservice training	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Provide individualized instruction to students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Visit prospective vo-ag students and parents	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-Other, _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7



## Section II ALLOCATION OF HOURS/DAYS TO CATEGORIES

\* Complete BOTH column 1 and column 2 \*

1. Please list your perceptions as to the number of days actually being allocated to each of the eight identified categories, from part I of the survey, of summer activities of vocational agriculture program(s). List the number of days of the actual summer contract in the box above column 1. (column 1)

2. List, based on your own perceptions, the number of days which you think ideally should be allocated to each of the eight major categories, from part I of the survey, of summer activities of vocational agriculture program(s). The State Department of Education has identified 50 days as the ideal vocational agriculture teacher summer contract time allocation. (column 2)

\* Remember complete BOTH column 1 and column 2 \*

[ \_\_\_\_ days ]    [ 50 days ]

	<u>Column 1</u>	<u>Column 2</u>
Vocational Agriculture Summer program activities	Actually Being Allocated in Days	Ideally Should Be Allocated in Days
1. Agricultural Organizations and Associations	_____	_____
2. Departmental Administration	_____	_____
3. Future Farmers of America	_____	_____
4. Instructional Improvement	_____	_____
5. Professional Growth	_____	_____
6. Resource Improvement	_____	_____

7. Supervised  
Occupational  
Experience (SOE) \_\_\_\_\_

8. Teaching/ Recruitment \_\_\_\_\_

9. Other, \_\_\_\_\_

Other Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## Section III DEMOGRAPHIC

School/Region\_\_\_\_\_ Name (optional)\_\_\_\_\_

Directions: Please read and answer each of the following questions by placing an X or number in the space provided.

1. Identify the area of your current responsibility.

_____ Superintendent	_____ Regional Coordinator
_____ Vocational Director	_____ Principal
_____ Vocational Agriculture Teacher	

2. Total years you have been in education (teaching/administration).

_____ Teaching	_____ Administration
----------------	----------------------

3. What is the estimated student enrollment (K-12) in the school/region in which you are associated?

\_\_\_\_\_ Students Enrolled K-12

4. Do you live in the community of your employment?

_____ Yes	_____ No
-----------	----------

5. What is the highest college degree you have obtained?

_____ BS	_____ Masters
_____ BS + Credits	_____ PhD/EdD

6. Does your school have a school farm/lab for student use during the summer?

_____ Yes	_____ No	_____ Not sure
-----------	----------	----------------

7. Does your school have a greenhouse for student use during the summer?

_____ Yes	_____ No	_____ Not Sure
-----------	----------	----------------

8. How many students are enrolled in the vocational agriculture program in your school/region?

_____ Students Enrolled 9-12 (Unduplicated Number)
_____ Students Enrolled 9-12 (Duplicated Number)

9. How many approved vocational cluster programs are in your school/region?

\_\_\_\_\_ Approved Cluster Programs      \_\_\_\_\_ Not Sure

Would you like a copy of the results of this survey?

\_\_\_\_ Yes      \_\_\_\_ No

Superintendents, Regional Coordinators, Vocational Directors and Principals you are done with this survey. Thank you for your assistance.

Vocational Agriculture Teachers please continue to the next page.

**\*THE FOLLOWING TO BE COMPLETED BY VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS ONLY\***

10. Do you develop a summer program of activities and submit to your administration/board?

☐ Annually                      ☐ Occasionally  
☐ When Requested           ☐ Never

11. What is your current summer only salary. Separated from your total annual salary?

\_\_\_\_\_ Summer Only Salary

12. What is the length of your current summer contract in days or months?

\_\_\_\_\_ Days    \_\_\_\_\_ Months

13. Do you submit a written summary of summer activities [results, evaluation] to your administration/board?

☐ Annually                      ☐ Occasionally  
☐ When Requested           ☐ Never

14. How many students do you have on SOE programs or involved in FFA activities during the summer months?

\_\_\_\_\_ Students Involved

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Vocational Agriculture Teachers thank you for your assistance with this project.

Please Return Completed Questionnaire In Enclosed Envelop To:

Mike Swan, Instructor  
Agricultural Education  
125 Ballard Extension Hall  
Oregon State University  
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

## Appendix C

### Demographic Information

Table C-1 CURRENT SUMMER ONLY SALARY FOR VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS IN OREGON

Minimum	\$ 800.00
Maximum	\$ 8000.00
Average	\$ 4184.63
Standard Deviation	\$ 2115.05

Table C-2 LENGTH OF OREGON VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS SUMMER CONTRACT (# DAYS)

Minimum	6.0
Maximum	90.0
Average	34.5
Standard Deviation	16.0

Table C-3 NUMBER OF OREGON STUDENTS ON VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SOE PROGRAMS OR INVOLVED IN FFA ACTIVITIES DURING THE SUMMER MONTHS.

Minimum	10
Maximum	75
Average	32.1
Standard Deviation	15.1



Table C-4 DEVELOP A SUMMER PROGRAM OF ACTIVITIES AND  
SUBMIT TO THEIR ADMINISTRATION AND/OR SCHOOL  
BOARD.

	Frequency	%	SD
Annually	42	61.8	1.1
Occasionally	7	10.3	1.1
When Requested	11	16.2	1.1
Never	8	11.8	1.1

Table C-5 VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS WHO SUBMIT A  
WRITTEN SUMMARY OF SUMMER ACTIVITIES TO  
THEIR ADMINISTRATION AND/OR SCHOOL BOARD

	Frequency	%	SD
Annually	31	45.6	1.2
Occasionally	12	17.6	1.2
When requested	11	16.2	1.2
Never	14	20.6	1.2

**Table C-6** TOTAL YEARS IN TEACHING AND ADMINISTRATION  
BY REGIONAL COORDINATORS, STATE SUPERVISORS  
VOCATIONAL DIRECTORS, ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
CHAIRPERSONS, SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS,  
TEACHER EDUCATORS, AND VOCATIONAL  
AGRICULTURE TEACHERS

Group	N	Teach	SD	Admin.	SD
Regional Coordinators	15	10.1	4.7	8.5	4.4
State Supervisors	48	9.6	5.7	11.6	7.9
Vocational Directors	13	14.8	10.1	8.5	8.3
Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	4.3	9.6	1.0	2.6
Superintendents	39	8.9	7.2	11.9	7.9
Principals	36	10.1	5.8	9.8	6.8
Teacher Educators	113	18.9	8.6	3.9	6.8
Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	12.1	6.1	0.7	3.4

Table C-7 STUDENTS ENROLLED IN SCHOOL/REGION K-12

Group	N	School/Region (K-12)	SD
Regional Coordinators	15	14342.7	13732.1
State Supervisors	48	28712.8	98425.5
Vocational Directors	13	1946.9	1168.9
Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	1176.8	1574.6
Superintendents	39	2578.3	4725.4
Principals	36	2047.2	1811.6
Teacher Educators	113	212.7	2257.7
Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	2079.6	3118.5

Table C-8 STUDENTS ENROLLED IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN  
SCHOOL/REGION 9-12

Group	N	Voc. Education (9-12)	SD
Regional Coordinators	15	744.4	2011.6
State Supervisors	48	6793.9	13535.0
Vocational Directors	13	81.7	71.0
Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	50.8	66.8
Superintendents	39	68.3	63.8
Principals	36	61.3	37.2
Teacher Educators	113	NA	NA
Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	80.6	52.9

**Table C-9** NUMBER OF APPROVED VOCATIONAL CLUSTER PROGRAMS IN THE SCHOOL/REGION

Group	N	Mean	SD
Regional Coordinators	15	29.5	28.1
State Supervisors	48	22.4	57.6
Vocational Directors	13	6.1	2.3
Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	2.5	1.1
Superintendents	39	4.1	3.0
Principals	36	3.7	2.8
Teacher Educators	113	NA	NA
Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	3.4	2.6

Table C-10 DO STUDY PARTICIPANTS RESIDE IN THE  
COMMUNITY OF THEIR EMPLOYMENT

Group	N	Yes	%	No	%	Mean	SD
Regional Coordinators	15	11	73.3	4	26.7	1.3	0.5
State Supervisors	48	27	56.3	19	39.6	1.4	0.6
Vocational Directors	13	12	92.3	1	7.7	1.1	0.3
Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	20	95.2	1	4.8	1.0	0.3
Superintendents	39	31	79.5	8	20.5	1.2	0.4
Principals	36	24	66.7	12	33.3	1.4	0.5
Teacher Educators	113	109	96.5	4	3.5	1.0	0.2
Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	51	75.0	17	25.0	1.3	0.4

Table C-11 LAND LABORATORY AVAILABLE TO VOCATIONAL PROGRAM

Group	N	Yes	%	No	%	?	%	M	SD
Regional Coordinators	15	7	46.7	5	33.3	3	20.0	1.7	.8
State Supervisors	48	12	25.0	3	6.2	33	68.7	2.4	.9
Vocational Directors	13	8	61.5	5	38.5	0	0	1.4	.5
Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	19	90.5	2	9.5	0	0	1.0	.4
Superintendents	39	22	56.4	17	43.6	0	0	1.4	.5
Principals	36	24	66.7	12	33.3	0	0	1.3	.5
Teacher Educators	113	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	46	67.6	21	30.8	1	1.5	1.3	.5

Table C-12 GREENHOUSE AVAILABLE TO VOCATIONAL  
AGRICULTURE PROGRAM

Group	N	Yes	%	No	%	?	%	M	SD
Regional Coordinators	15	9	60.0	3	20.0	3	20.0	1.6	.8
State Supervisors	48	12	25.0	2	4.2	34	70.8	2.4	.9
Vocational Directors	13	9	69.2	3	23.1	1	7.7	1.4	.7
Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	13	61.9	7	33.3	1	4.8	1.4	.7
Superintendents	39	20	51.3	18	46.2	1	2.6	1.5	.6
Principals	36	21	58.3	14	38.9	1	2.8	1.4	.6
Teacher Educators	113	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	38	55.9	29	42.7	1	1.5	1.5	.5

## Appendix D

### ANOVA Summary



Table D-1 SUMMARY RESULTS OF ANOVA ALL GROUPS  
INCLUSIVE (LSD AT .05)

Activity	Null Hypothesis	Activity	Null Hypothesis
Q1-A	Accept <i>Retain</i>	Q5-A	Reject
Q1-B	Reject	Q5-B	Reject
Q1-C	Reject	Q5-C	Reject
Q1-D	Reject	Q5-D	Accept
Q1-E	Accept	Q5-E	Reject
Q2-A	Accept	Q6-A	Accept
Q2-B	Reject	Q6-B	Accept
Q2-C	Reject	Q6-C	Accept
Q2-D	Reject	Q6-D	Reject
Q2-E	Reject	Q6-E	Reject
Q2-F	Reject		
Q3-A	Accept	Q7-A	Accept
Q3-B	Reject	Q7-B	Reject
Q3-C	Accept	Q7-C	Reject
Q3-D	Reject	Q7-D	Accept
		Q7-E	Reject
Q4-A	Reject	Q8-A	Reject
Q4-B	Accept	Q8-B	Reject
Q4-C	Accept	Q8-C	Reject
Q4-D	Accept	Q8-D	Reject

Table D-2 ACTIVITIES WHOSE MEAN RATINGS WERE NOT SIGNIFICANTLY  
DIFFERENT AMONG THE EIGHT GROUPS (ANOVA, LSD AT .05)

Activity	TE		SS		RC		VD		AC		SU		PR		TEA	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Q1-A	5.0	1.5	4.8	1.5	5.0	1.5	4.3	1.8	3.8	2.0	4.5	1.8	4.3	1.7	5.1	1.3
Q1-E	3.6	2.0	3.9	1.9	4.3	1.9	3.8	1.5	2.8	2.0	3.2	2.3	3.2	1.9	2.8	2.1
Q2-A	4.2	1.7	4.0	1.5	4.5	1.1	4.0	1.9	3.8	1.7	3.5	1.7	3.6	1.5	4.2	1.6
Q3-A	5.5	1.4	5.8	1.2	6.0	1.1	5.2	1.7	5.9	1.0	6.1	0.9	6.0	0.9	6.2	1.0
Q3-C	4.9	1.5	5.4	1.2	4.9	4.4	5.0	1.1	5.5	1.0	3.9	2.0	4.9	1.5	5.0	1.5
Q4-B	4.4	1.9	4.0	1.9	5.1	1.7	5.2	4.5	4.3	1.8	4.9	1.7	4.5	1.8	4.9	1.4
Q4-C	4.2	1.8	3.8	2.0	4.6	1.6	4.3	1.8	4.1	1.6	4.0	1.9	3.8	1.5	4.3	1.6
Q4-D	4.2	1.8	3.5	2.0	4.5	1.1	3.7	2.0	4.0	1.6	3.7	2.0	3.9	1.6	3.4	1.8
Q5-D	5.4	1.4	4.9	1.7	5.2	1.6	3.5	2.1	4.7	1.4	4.7	1.6	4.7	1.6	4.8	1.8
Q6-A	4.8	1.5	4.6	1.8	5.8	1.0	4.7	1.9	5.0	1.7	4.8	1.4	4.9	1.5	4.9	1.4

Table D-2 CONTINUED

Activity	TE		SS		RC		VD		AC		SU		PR		TEA	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Q6-B	4.9	1.6	4.9	1.8	6.4	0.8	5.2	1.4	4.9	4.7	4.6	1.6	5.0	1.5	5.2	1.2
Q6-C	5.0	1.6	4.7	1.5	5.4	1.1	4.6	1.5	4.7	1.6	4.3	1.9	5.3	1.4	5.3	1.3
Q7-A	6.1	1.4	6.2	1.3	6.1	1.2	5.9	0.9	5.4	1.4	6.0	1.1	5.8	1.3	6.1	1.2
Q7-D	5.6	1.5	5.8	1.5	5.4	1.5	5.9	0.8	5.2	1.6	4.9	1.8	4.7	4.7	5.1	1.7

Table D-3 ANOVA COMPARISON BY MAJOR CATEGORY ON THE CURRENT NUMBER OF DAYS ALLOCATED AND IDEAL NUMBER OF DAYS ALLOCATED TO THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SUMMER PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Category		MSb	MSw	f (7,338)	p
Agriculture Organizations and Associations	C	12.02	8.85	1.36	.22
	I	81.18	14.05	5.78	.00
Department Administration	C	331.02	57.04	5.80	.00
	I	52.54	15.45	3.40	.00
FFA	C	30.09	11.26	2.67	.01
	I	47.01	10.55	4.46	.00
Instructional Improvement	C	30.25	56.67	0.53	.81
	I	46.12	9.07	5.08	.00
Professional Growth	C	9.20	11.25	0.82	.57
	I	23.91	13.32	1.80	.09
Resource Improvement	C	309.99	39.44	7.86	.00
	I	24.77	16.02	1.55	.15
SOE	C	64.05	10.08	6.35	.00
	I	31.14	21.35	1.46	.18
Teaching/Recruitment	C	167.85	56.36	2.98	.00
	I	120.58	26.65	4.53	.00

(C = Current Allocation, I = Ideal Allocation)

## Appendix E

### LSD Tables

Table E-1 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q1-2

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

### Summer Program Activity - Q1-2

#### Prepare Publicity Materials

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	41.5	5.9	2.6	.01
Within Groups	345	779.0	2.6		
Total	352	820.5			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
5 6	2. State Supervisors	48	4.1	1.6
5 6	7. Teacher Educator	113	4.3	1.4
5 6 3	1. Regional Coordinator	15	4.7	1.4
	5. Superintendents	39	3.3	1.7
	6. Principals	36	3.4	1.5
	3. Vocational Directors	13	3.4	1.9

Table E-2 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q1-3

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

### Summer Program Activity - Q1-3

#### Establish New Agricultural Resource Contacts

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	53.7	7.7	3.5	.00
Within Groups	345	746.3			
Total	352	800.0			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
4 5 6	1. Regional Coordinators	15	5.9	1.1
4 5	2. State Supervisors	48	2.1	1.5
4 5	7. Teacher Educators	113	5.0	1.4
	4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	3.3	4.9
	5. Superintendents	39	4.4	1.5
	6. Principals	36	4.6	1.5

Table E-3 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q1-4

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

#### Summer Program Activity - Q1-4

##### Meet/ Work with Advisory Committee

##### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	82.0	11.7	4.6	.00
Within Groups	345	874.7	2.5		
Total	352	956.7			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
5 8 4 6	1. Regional Coordinators	15	5.7	1.4
5 8	2. State Supervisors	48	5.1	1.4
5 8	7. Teacher Educators	113	4.9	1.5
	5. Superintendents	39	3.6	1.9
	8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	4.0	1.6



Table E-4 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q2-2

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

#### Summer Program Activity - Q2-2

#### Conduct Graduate Follow-up Studies

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	67.5	9.7	3.7	.00
Within Groups	345	889.9	2.6		
Total	352	957.4			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
4 6	2. State Supervisors	48	4.2	1.6
4 6 5 8	7. Teacher Educator	113	4.6	1.4
	4. Advisory Committee			
	Chairpersons	21	3.3	1.6
	6. Principals	36	3.4	1.6
	5. Superintendents	39	3.5	1.8
	8. Vocational Agriculture			
	Teachers	68	3.9	1.7

Table E-5 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q2-3

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

### Summer Program Activity - Q2-3

#### Vacation/Family

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	57.5	8.2	2.7	.01
Within Groups	345	1058.0	3.1		
Total	352	1115.5			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
6 4	7. Teacher Educators	113	5.7	1.6
6 4	2. State Supervisors	48	5.9	1.3
	6. Principals	36	4.2	2.2
	4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	4.3	2.1

Table E-6 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q2-4

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

#### Summer Program Activity - Q2-4

##### Maintain Communications with Administration

##### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	36.4	5.2	2.5	.02
Within Groups	345	716.5	2.1		
Total	352	752.9			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
4	8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	5.5	1.2
4 6	7. Teacher Educators	113	5.7	1.4
4 6	2. State Supervisors	48	5.7	1.4
	4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	4.4	1.8
	6. Principals	36	4.8	1.6

Table E-7 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q2-5

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

#### Summer Program Activity - Q2-5

Conduct Program Evaluation, Self-Assessment  
Long Range Planning

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	59.4	8.5	3.9	.00
Within Groups	345	755.6	2.2		
Total	352	815.0			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
8 6 5	7. Teacher Educators	113	5.3	1.5
8	1. Regional Coordinators	15	5.3	1.2
8	2. State Supervisors	48	4.8	1.5
	8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	4.3	1.3
	6. Principals	36	4.2	1.7
	5. Superintendents	39	4.3	1.8

Table E-8 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q2-6

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

### Summer Program Activity - Q2-6

#### Department Budget Formulation

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	121.4	17.3	5.1	.00
Within Groups	345	1164.8	3.4		
Total	352	1286.2			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
8 5	2. State Supervisors	48	4.0	1.7
8 5	1. Regional Coordinators	15	4.1	1.9
8 5	7. Teacher Educators	113	4.3	1.7
8 5	4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	4.4	1.6
	8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	2.7	2.0
	5. Superintendents	39	2.9	1.9

Table E-9 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q3-2

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

### Summer Program Activity - Q3-2

#### Conduct Chapter Officer Retreat, Leadership Camp

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	32.8	4.7	2.3	.03
Within Groups	345	710.5	2.1		
Total	352	743.3			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
5	6. Principals	36	5.3	1.3
5	7. Teacher Educator	113	5.2	1.5
5	2. State Supervisor	48	5.3	1.4
5	8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	5.6	1.4
5	1. Regional Coordinators	15	6.1	0.9
	5. Superintendents	39	4.3	2.0

Table E-10 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q3-4

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

#### Summer Program Activity - Q3-4

#### Attend County Fair, State Fair, Judging Contests

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	93.1	13.3	6.2	.00
Within Groups	345	740.9	2.1		
Total	352	834.0			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
7 2	5. Superintendents	39	6.0	1.2
7 2	6. Principals	36	6.2	1.0
7 2	8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	6.2	1.1
	7. Teacher Educators	113	4.7	1.7
	2. State Supervisors	48	5.0	1.7

Table E-11 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q4-1

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

### Summer Program Activity - Q4-1

#### Facility Maintenance/Renovation

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	46.2	6.6	2.4	.02
Within Groups	345	935.0	2.7		
Total	352	981.2			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
4	5. Superintendents	39	4.5	1.7
4 2	8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	5.0	1.3
4	1. Regional Coordinator	15	5.1	1.3
4 2	3. Vocational Directors	13	5.6	0.9
	4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	3.5	2.0
	2. State Supervisors	48	4.0	1.8



Table E-12 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q5-1

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

### Summer Program Activity - Q5-1

#### Attend Annual Summer Update Conference

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	61.6	8.8	5.1	.00
Within Groups	345	593.1	1.7		
Total	352	654.7			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
5 4 6	8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	6.1	1.2
5	1. Regional Coordinators	15	6.3	1.1
5 4 6 3	2. State Supervisors	48	6.2	1.3
5 4 6 3	7. Teacher Educators	113	6.2	1.3
	5. Superintendents	39	5.1	1.6
	4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	5.1	1.6
	6. Principals	36	5.5	1.2
	3. Vocational Directors	13	5.4	1.1

Table E-13 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q5-2

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

#### Summer Program Activity - Q5-2

##### Conduct Summer Workshops, Trainings

##### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	91.3	13.0	5.1	.00
Within Groups	345	875.7	2.5		
Total	352	967.0			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
5	2. State Supervisors	48	4.7	1.7
5	7. Teacher Educator	113	5.4	1.4
	5. Superintendents	39	3.9	1.6

Table E-14 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q5-3

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

#### Summer Program Activity - Q5-3

#### Participate in College Short Courses

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	89.2	12.7	5.3	.00
Within Groups	345	826.8	2.4		
Total	352	916.0			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
3 5 4 8 1 6 2	7. Teacher Educator	113	5.5	1.4
	3. Vocational Directors	13	4.0	1.5
	5. Superintendents	39	4.2	1.6
	4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	4.2	1.7
	8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	4.3	1.7
	1. Regional Coordinators	15	4.7	1.3
	6. Principals	36	4.7	1.3
	2. State Supervisors	48	4.4	1.8

Table E-15 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q5-5

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

#### Summer Program Activity - Q5-5

#### Informal Inservice Activities

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	69.2	9.9	3.9	.00
Within Groups	345	868.7	2.5		
Total	352	937.9			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
4 5	2. State Supervisors	48	4.4	1.8
4 5	8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	4.7	1.5
4 5	7. Teacher Educators	113	5.0	1.5
4 5	1. Regional Coordinators	15	5.2	1.1
	4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	3.4	1.9
	5. Superintendents	39	3.7	1.7

Table E-16 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q6-4

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

#### Summer Program Activity - Q6-4

#### Conduct Competency Studies

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	42.3	6.0	2.1	.04
Within Groups	345	965.6	2.8		
Total	352	1007.9			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
6	7. Teacher Educators	113	3.9	1.6
6	2. State Supervisors	48	3.8	1.8
6	4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	4.1	1.7
6	1. Regional Coordinators	15	4.7	1.5
	6. Principals	36	3.0	1.7

Table E-17 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q6-5

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

#### Summer Program Activity - Q6-5

##### Update and Review Reference Materials

##### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	39.0	5.6	2.2	.03
Within Groups	345	867.9	2.5		
Total	352	906.9			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
5	2. State Supervisors	48	4.4	1.6
5 6	7. Teacher Educator	113	4.6	1.6
5 6	1. Regional Coordinator	15	5.1	1.2
	5. Superintendents	39	3.6	1.7
	6. Principals	36	3.7	1.7

Table E-18 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q7-2

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

#### Summer Program Activity - Q7-2

Supervision of Agricultural Co-op Work Experience Students (CWE)

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	79.3	11.3	5.0	.00
Within Groups	345	783.8	2.3		
Total	352	863.1			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
6 4 5	2. State Supervisors	48	5.9	1.5
6 4	1. Regional Coordinators	15	6.4	0.8
6 4 5	7. Teacher Educators	113	6.0	1.5
	6. Principals	36	4.5	1.8
	4. Advisory Committee			
	Chairpersons	21	5.0	1.4
	5. Superintendents	39	5.1	1.7

Table E-19 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q7-3

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

### Summer Program Activity - Q7-3

#### Develop Future SOE/CWE Sources

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	101.6	14.5	6.6	.00
Within Groups	345	762.3	2.2		
Total	352	863.9			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
6 5	8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	5.1	1.4
6 5	1. Regional Coordinators	15	5.4	1.4
6 5	3. Vocational Directors	13	5.6	0.9
6 5 4 8	7. Teacher Educator	113	5.6	1.4
6 5 4 8	2. State Supervisors	48	5.8	1.2
	6. Principals	36	3.9	2.0
	5. Superintendents	39	4.2	1.7
	4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	4.8	1.6



Table E-20 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q7-5

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

### Summer Program Activity - Q7-5

#### Student Recordkeeping

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	37.8	5.4	2.2	.03
Within Groups	345	844.7	2.5		
Total	352	882.5			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
5	7. Teacher Educator	113	5.0	1.6
5 6	2. State Supervisors	48	5.5	1.4
5 6	3. Vocational Directors	13	5.9	1.1
	5. Superintendents	39	4.3	1.6
	6. Principals	36	4.7	1.5

Table E-21 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q8-1

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

#### Summer Program Activity - Q8-1

##### Provide Instructional Activities - Adult and Youth

##### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	102.3	14.6	5.4	.00
Within Groups	345	935.4	2.7		
Total	352	1037.7			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
8 6 5	2. State Supervisors	48	5.0	1.6
8 6 5	7. Teacher Educator	113	5.3	1.6
8 6 5	3. Vocational Directors	13	5.4	1.3
	8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	3.9	1.7
	6. Principals	36	3.9	1.8
	5. Superintendents	39	4.1	1.6

Table E-22 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q8-2

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal.  
Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

### Summer Program Activity - Q8-2

#### Attend Formal Inservice Training

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	58.2	8.3	3.6	.00
Within Groups	345	788.3	2.3		
Total	352	846.5			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
4 6 5 8	2. State Supervisors	48	5.2	1.7
4 6 5 8	7. Teacher Educator	113	5.4	1.4
	4. Advisory Committee			
	Chairpersons	21	4.1	1.7
	6. Principals	36	4.4	1.7
	5. Superintendents	39	4.5	1.4
	8. Vocational Agriculture			
	Teachers	68	4.7	1.4

Table E-23 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q8-3

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

#### Summer Program Activity - Q8-3

#### Prepare Publicity Materials

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	83.9	12.0	5.7	.00
Within Groups	345	723.3	2.1		
Total	352	807.2			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
4	6. Principals	36	5.2	1.6
4	3. Vocational Directors	13	5.8	0.9
4 5 8	2. State Supervisors	48	5.7	1.4
4 5 8	7. Teacher Educators	113	6.0	1.4
4 5 8	1. Regional Coordinators	15	6.3	0.9
	4. Advisory Committee			
	Chairpersons	21	4.2	1.8
	5. Superintendents	39	4.7	1.5
	8. Vocational Agriculture			
	Teachers	68	5.0	1.5

Table E-24 ANOVA RESULTS ACTIVITY - Q8-4

Activity with significantly different mean ratings as a result of ANOVA test procedure. LSD subsets at .05 level of significance.

Groups within subsets have means that are statistically equal. Groups in different subsets have means that are statistically unequal.

#### Summer Program Activity - Q8-4

#### Visit Prospective Vo-Ag Students and Parents

#### Analysis of Variance

LSD range for the .05 level is 2.78

Source	df	ss	ms	f	p
Between Groups	7	97.3	13.9	6.5	.00
Within Groups	345	742.7	2.2		
Total	352	840.0			

LSD Subsets	Groups	N	M	SD
4 5	3. Vocational Directors	13	5.9	0.8
4 5 6 8	7. Teacher Educators	113	5.9	1.4
4 5 6 8	2. State Supervisors	48	6.1	1.3
	4. Advisory Committee Chairpersons	21	4.2	2.1
	5. Superintendents	39	4.5	1.7
	6. Principals	36	4.9	1.6
	8. Vocational Agriculture Teachers	68	5.2	1.4

## **Appendix F**

### **Summer Program Activities**

Table F-1 IDEAL SUMMER PROGRAM ACTIVITIES BY TEACHER  
EDUCATORS AND STATE SUPERVISORS RANK ORDER  
OF IMPORTANCE

High Importance

Attend annual summer update conference  
Supervision of vo-ag students home projects  
Visit prospective vo-ag students and parents  
Supervision of ag. coop. work experience (CWE)  
Provide individualized instruction to students  
Vacation/Family  
Maintain communications with school administration  
Supervision of land lab/greenhouse used by students  
Develop future SOE/CWE sources  
Supervision and planning of FFA activities

Moderate Importance

Conduct chapter officer retreat, leadership camp  
Attend formal inservice training  
Student recordkeeping  
Chapter meetings - outings  
Attend courses for certification/update  
Provide instructional activities adult & youth  
Establish new agricultural resource contacts  
Conduct summer workshops, trainings  
Conduct program evaluation, self-assessment, LRP  
Meet/work with advisory committee  
Participate in college short courses

Table F-1 CONTINUED

Revise & improve curriculum  
Conduct public relations program  
Develop planning calendar  
Attend county fair, state fair, judging contests  
Develop vo-ag curriculum  
Informal inservice activities  
Update and review reference materials  
Conduct graduate follow-up survey  
Safety inspections, repairs  
Prepare publicity materials  
Department budget formulation  
Facility maintenance/renovation  
Upgrade department records  
Order budgeted supplies & equipment  
Update inventory  
Conduct competency studies  
Supervise summer use of facilities by community



## Appendix G

### Categories of Ideal Summer Program

Table G-1 RANK ORDER OF EIGHT MAJOR CATEGORIES  
OF IDEAL SUMMER PROGRAM IDENTIFIED BY  
TEACHER EDUCATORS AND STATE SUPERVISORS

Area	Mean TE	Mean SS	Combined Mean	SD	Rank Order
SOE	5.7	5.8	5.7	0.4	1
Teaching/ Recruitment	5.6	5.5	5.6	0.4	2
FFA	5.1	5.4	5.2	0.3	3
Professional Growth	5.5	4.9	5.2	0.6	4
Department Administration	4.9	4.7	4.9	0.8	5
Resource Improvement	4.6	4.5	4.6	0.4	6
Agricultural Organizations/ Associations	4.5	4.5	4.6	0.6	7
Instructional Improvement	4.3	3.8	4.1	0.2	8