TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISED OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS IN AREA I TEXAS VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS

By

DAN RAY HEMBREE

Bachelor of Science in Agriculture

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1967

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1983

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISED OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS IN AREA I TEXAS VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS

Thesis Approved:

James P. Key
Thesis Adviser

Wesley Hailey

Robert Terry

Norman D. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to express a sincere appreciation to the many persons who were involved in making this study possible.

Special gratitude is expressed to Dr. Jim Key and Dr. Robert Terry for their invaluable advice, assistance, encouragement, and patience. A special thanks is extended to these two gentlemen for their guidance and encouragement throughout the graduate program.

Appreciation is expressed to the teachers of Vocational Agriculture of Area I in Texas, for without their help this study would not have been possible. Additional thanks to Jay Eudy, Area I supervisor who made the high degree of response possible.

Thanks goes to the ELKS Class and their teacher Mr. Steve Haynes of Stratford High School, for their effort to adapt the questionnaire to the computer, and their aid in compiling data.

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Alva Hembree, for their assistance and inspiration. A very special and humble thanks is expressed to his wife Marian, and children Rusty and Melanie, for the many sacrifices they made and for their untiring assistance and encouragement and to whom this thesis is dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Vocational agriculture has made many changes both in its own program and in the progress of the agricultural industry since its inception through the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. These changes were broadened and strengthened with the agriculturally related occupations training programs established by the Vocational Education Act of 1963. These two major pieces of federal legislation are the primary basis for educating potential agricultural production and related agricultural employees for the future. In Texas, this has been accomplished by the development of Supervised Occupational Experience Programs for production students in general agriculture areas, SOEP employment for cooperative placement and training, and exploratory type experience for pre-lab students in areas such as agricultural mechanics, feedlot management, greenhouse management, etc. The Cooperative Training and the Pre-Lab training programs have received much attention and time as priorities have been set expanding and improving these SOE areas. However, with the reduced number of students returning to production agriculture and fewer opportunities due to financial barriers for those wishing to enter farming, it is felt less emphasis should be placed on training students in production agricultural.SOEP.

The time-tested primary objective of vocational agriculture is gainful employment; however, desirable secondary objectives such as development of responsibility, financial gain, and the work ethic have made significant contributions to the success of the total program. Unfortunately some SOEPs are developed primarily for exhibition purposes and have been managed by parents and instructors rather than students.

Statement of the Problem

Production SOE Programs require continuous evaluation concerning the emphasis we place on them. Is the program headed in a direction that best benefits both students and program? "The time is now" for the question to be asked. Does the local concept of SOEPs accomplish the desired goals set forth in the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, or have vocational agriculture instructors changed their interpretations of these goals?

Purpose

It was the primary purpose of this study to determine vocational agriculture instructors' perceptions of SOEPs and their implementation in the respective communities of Area I of the Texas Panhandle.

Objectives

The following objectives were formulated:

1. To determine general information regarding schools and school policies related to SOEPs in Area I.

2. To determine students' participation in and types of SOEPs in Area I.
3. To determine Area I teachers' perceptions of various aspects of SOEPs.

In order to achieve these objectives the definition of the following were at the outset developed to afford a common ground of understanding.

Terms

Vocational Agriculture - an educational program at the high school level providing training for students in production agriculture and agriculture related occupations.

FFA - Future Farmers of America - youth organization for students enrolled in vocational agriculture with the primary purpose of developing leadership, citizenship, and cooperation through participation in its programs and activities on the local, state, and national levels.

SOEP - Supervised Occupational Experience Program - a multipurpose enterprise or activity carried on by agriculture instructors for the purpose of enhancing the student's appreciation for and learning of modern agriculture. It is also to help prepare students for an agriculture or agriculture related occupation.

Production type SOEP or Production SOEP - These are SOEPs that deal more with production commercially of livestock and crops as opposed to single animal production for terminal exhibition (ie., Show heifers or commercial heifers and cows, show gilts or commercial sows and gilts, crop production, feeder cattle or wheat

pasture cattle, etc.

Exhibition SOEP - These SOEPs deal primarily with animals, crops, etc. raised singly or in limited numbers primarily for terminal exhibition (i.e., barrows, steers, wethers).

Cooperative SOEP - Refers to a cooperative work study program involving the student and instruction in the classroom and practical experience training from employment in a cooperating business. (These programs will not be considered in this study).

Scope and Limitations

The scope and limitations of the study include:

1. This study was limited primarily to trends in production agriculture SOEPs and not cooperative or pre-lab SOEPs.
2. A measure of perceptions and attitudes of vocational agriculture teachers to their SOEP programs.
3. Teachers from all vocational agriculture departments in Area I of Texas were asked to respond. Area I includes that area north of Lubbock in the Texas Panhandle.
4. Student's SOEPs included all vocational agriculture students enrolled in Vo. Ag. I, II, III, IV and Coop I and II, and Pre-labs with production or exhibition type SOEPs.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature available on SOEPs in general was fairly extensive. However, information on production type SOEPs specifically, as it related to increase in scope of the individual student's SOEP, was fairly limited. A general outline of topic areas for research was developed for review of the literature available. This outline consisted of four major topics. They were:

1. Legislation concerning SOEPs
2. Importance of SOEPs
3. Enhancing activities for the SOEP
4. Problems affecting SOEPs

These topic headings were considered separately in order to facilitate organization, clarity and understanding.

Legislation Concerning SOEP

The importance of SOEP can be traced back to 1917, with the passing of the Smith-Hughes Act (1917) stating:

> . . . that such schools shall provide for directed or supervised practice in agriculture, either on a farm provided for by the school or other farm, for at least six months per year, . . . (Sec. 10).

The law in this case does not offer the SOEP as an option, but as a requirement for better equipped and prepared students. With the

years of vocational agriculture program development, and the expanded scope of agriculture, occupational demands of agribusiness brought about the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Pub. L. 88-210, 1963). This law made provisions for teachers of vocational agriculture, to teach areas of agricultural related occupations in addition to agricultural production. Law makers perceived the values of work experience outside the classroom to compliment and correspond with classroom instruction to better equip the student for employment. This same basic concept started forty-six years previously by the Smith-Hughes Act (1917) was followed in drafting the 1963 piece of legislation. The reason is simple, it worked. Regulations to implement the 1963 law came in the form of Federal regulations in the Federal Register (40 F.R. 8081) and the Bulletin of Federal Vocational Education Acts (Burdine, 1978). These publications set guidelines or objectives for the training of students in occupational areas with emphasis on training to a competent level for employment, and coordination of the program by a qualified instructor under a state plan. The repeated emphasis on training by some type of SOEP by federal edicts need make us aware of the foresight and value of these laws in providing training of value to the future work force in the various vocational areas.

Importance of SOEP

A review of periodicals and journals of vocational agriculture leaves little doubt about SOEPs' importance as viewed by teachers, teacher educators and state department supervisors. Studies done by educators using populations of various groups of students and parents

show major importance placed upon successful SOEPs as a learning tool. Phipps (1980) author of a widely accepted text by teacher educators, defined SOEP as:

> . . . practical agriculture activities of educational value conducted by students outside of the class or on school released time for which systematic instruction and supervision are provided by teachers, parents, employers, or others (p. 234).

Williams (1980), Professor of Agricultural Education at Iowa State University and recognized author and authority on SOEPs, found that students perceived parents and vocational agriculture teachers highly responsible for the success of their SOEPs. The top five ways students perceived teachers provided the greatest assistance were:

1. Keeping records on SOE
2. Providing encouragement for SOE
3. Summarizing records for SOE
4. Learning skills in agriculture
5. Setting educational goals in agriculture (p. 24).

This places the teacher in a position to exercise motivational as well as, fundamental skills expertise in developing student's SOEP.

In Williams (1980, p. 24), students' perceptions of their parents role of greatest assistance in their SOEPs were:

1. Providing equipment for SOE
2. Locating a place for SOE
3. Learning skills in agriculture
4. Marketing agricultural products
5. Determining interest in agriculture

This would indicate students look to parents primarily to provide facilities and personal experience to aid them in their SOE programs.

In a study conducted in Iowa, Williams (1978) found that high school seniors of vocational agriculture ranking factors most important in developing their SOEP. The top ten factors were found to be:

1. My parents
2. My Vocational Agriculture Classes
3. The wages and or profits earned from SOE
4. The help given me by my vocational agriculture teacher(s)
5. The training or experience plan developed for my SOE
6. The goals established for my SOEP
7. My FFA Chapter activities
8. My fellow vocational agriculture students
9. The records I kept on my SOEP
10. The evaluation activities carried out by myself, my teacher(s), my employer(s), or others (p. 157).

From the same study, students also recognized the importance of SOE in developing secondary goals of occupational abilities. With mean ratings of the total sample from the top 10 of 38 items the first four items in rank order are:

1. Appreciate the importance of honest work
2. Develop acceptable personel and work habits
3. Establish and maintain working relationships with others
4. Maintain and use records and reports (Williams, 1978, p. 157).

Rawls (1980, p. 37) states: "Supervised occupational experience (SOE) is a way to provide vocational agriculture students with real life experiences essential for working agricultural occupations".

In his study, Rawls (1980) used a stratified random sample of parents of 1976-77 vocational agriculture students as his population and found the parents rated 39 of the 40 benefit variables above "average benefit" to the student.

Responses made to the various studies by students and parents would indicate a high level of importance placed by both groups on SOEPs and the vocational agriculture teacher's responsibilities in supervising SOEPs.

Lawrence and Mallilo (1981) researched the areas of vocational

agriculture in need of greatest improvement. A modified Delphi approach was used. Teacher educators of major landgrant institutions, state supervisors of vocational agriculture, and presidents of state vocational agriculture teachers associations within the continental United States were asked by letter for their opinions of what areas of the vocational agriculture program were in need of improvement. These results wereeedited by a local committee carefully maintaining the integrity of those opinions and 57 items were placed on a questionnaire for ranking. The questionnaire was mailed back to the population and with one followup letter an 83.8 percent return was achieved. The findings showed that half of the items appearing in the top twenty concerns pertained to only two aspects of vocational agriculture--supervised occupational experience programs and adult/young farmer education. Supervisors and teacher educators indicated greater need for improvement in quality, scope, and diversity of SOEPs, and in frequency and effectiveness of supervision than did the state presidents of vocational agriculture teachers associations.

Enhancing Activities of SOEPs

Not only do the SOEPs benefit students from an occupational training standpoint, or the secondary benefits of work attitudes and worker cooperation; it also has a reciprocal action with youth organizations that benefit both programs. In a study by Williams (1980) a correlation was drawn between the success of the SOEP as measured by advanced degrees in the FFA and parental assistance. He found from a study using as its population the 1977 Iowa high school seniors having achieved the FFA degrees of Chapter Farmer and State

Farmer, a larger amount of teacher assistance given to students attaining the higher FFA degrees. Since the higher degrees of FFA membership require a wider scope for the SOEP, it can be concluded that the two functions enjoy a simbiotic relationship.

Vaughn and Wagley (1979) teacher educators, from New Mexico State University, cited three activities to better the FFA program in a school system. The three activities, all having to do with SOEPs were:

1. Begin by requiring every student to have a SOEP
2. Make SOEP an integral part of your instructional program
3. Make sure that your SOEP instruction includes the development of occupational goals (p. 40).

Vaughn and Cano (1982) in a study of New Mexico vocational agriculture students and vocational agriculture teachers found of the variables identified, the one which had the strongest relationship with having a program with 100 percent student SOEPs is 100 percent FFA membership.

The properly structured SOEP will not only instruct the student toward an occupational objective, but it will achieve secondary work attributes and makes possible for the student rewards through the achievement of higher degrees, public speaking, and foundation awards through the FFA organization. Each program truly enhancing the other.

Problems Affecting SOEPs

With opinions of the various groups discussed previously it can be reasoned from a practical standpoint that SOEP is an important part of the vocational agriculture program. With such a unanimous opinion, what is the problem? The problem arises as we view the research being

carried out in the past few years show apparent declines in SOEPs and teacher emphasis of SOEPs. In a research study developed by Iverson (1980) Associate Professor, Teacher Education Auburn University, a ten percent stratified random sample was drawn from the graduates of 1973-74 graduates having completed vocational agriculture. Every tenth department was selected from each school district in the Southern Region. A questionnaire was sent each member of the sample with a follow-up in ten days to nonrespondents. At four weeks from the initial mailing a phone call interview was held with a ten percent random sample of the remaining nonrespondents. Data were received from 1252 respondents from ten states in the Southern Region (Oklahoma and Texas made up 42.6% of the respondents). Almost 58% held the Chapter Farmer degree and 64.3% had two or more years of SOEPs. No further education beyond high school was reported by 58.9%. One begins to see the problems arising from one of the conclusions of the study which states:

> A substantial number (40%±) of the 1974 graduates in the Southern Region failed to carry out a supervised occupational experience program each year they were enrolled (Iverson, 1980, p. 15).

Most of the sample contacted were committed to vocational agriculture and the FFA for several years, but not all progressed through the degree structure.

In a study conducted by Vaughn and Cano (1982) entitled "Factors Associated With Experimental Learning In New Mexico Agricultural Education Programs", a cluster sample technique was used to select twenty-five percent of the school in New Mexico for student responses. All vocational agriculture teachers across the state were sent a

questionnaire with a 96% response. The students were from the eleventh and twelveth grades. Most of the items on the test were above .90 accuracy and only two items fell below .70. It was found that over 60 percent of the teachers indicated that not all of their students had SOEP. Variables teachers perceived to hinder 100% SOEP student participation that weren't significantly related were;

1. Type of agricultural education program
2. Years of teaching experience
3. Provision of a school vehicle
4. Release time for SOEP visits
5. Amount of time spent on visits
6. Length of contract
7. Average number of visits per student
8. Distance teacher lived from school
9. Condition of school facilities
10. Other classes taught
11. Provision of facilities for student to use for SOEP
12. Cooperative project for student's SOEP (p. 146).

Those variables found to be significantly related with 100% SOEP student participation were:

1. 100% FFA membership
2. If the school allowed students to be removed if they do not have an SOEP
3. The number of vocational agriculture teachers in the school.
4. If a portion of the students grade depended on SOEP
5. If students were informed that they must have an SOEP
6. Amount of time spent on SOEP instruction
7. Percentage of students entering agricultural careers (p. 146).

Binkley (1977) best sums up the problem of teachers' apparent lack of use of SOEP by stating: "If we don't use experience programs, we will lose them; and if we lose them, we will lose the heart of our program in vocational agriculture" (p. 220).

Robert Bell (1977) seemed to have found an important part of SOEP supervision while interviewing a teacher highly successful in his SOEPs.

When asked to what he attributed the success of his program the teacher responded "farm visits, farm visits, farm visits." Supervision of the SOEPs is a necessity for student motivation and success.

In a study of head teacher educators and state directors of the Southern Region, Cheek (1979) concluded for results received that more emphasis by teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors should be placed on SOEPs.

Cheek (1979, p. 227) quoting Gilbertson states: "What ever your definition may be I suggest that this very important part of our vocational agriculture program is loosing freshness, vigor, and force."

Lack of interest and/or supervision of SOEPs by teachers is only one of several problems seen by various teachers. Competition of various sorts, which at one time were a means of motivation to an end have become an end in themselves. In editorial comments of September 1978 issue of The Agricultural Education Magazine, Key (1978) states,

> Sometimes it may seem we have created a monster of competition with which we have a great deal of difficulty living. When we pay outrageous prices for show animals, commit dishonest acts, or go to other extremes for the sake of winning, competition no longer is an incentive to learning, but has become a selfish end in itself (p. 52).

Some of these tendencies were found in a study conducted by Fletcher (1974) among student teachers and a random sample of teachers across the state of Oklahoma. When asked to rank influencial job characteristics for remaining in teaching the highest ranking of variables was "opportunity to continue work with livestock". Fifty eight point nine percent indicating it was a "very great" influence.

This response was followed by four rather closely related characteristics: (a) "opportunity to work with youth" with a score of 48.2% (b) "to achieve a broad knowledge of agriculture" with a percentage of 48.2; (c) "self-satisfaction to help educate student" with a percentage of 37.5; and (d) "the opportunity to advance professionally in agriculture." As educators our main goal should be the education of our students to a profeciency of job entry and the SOEPs should be used as tools to practically achieve this goal.

In a recent doctoral dissertation conducted by Smith (1982) again Oklahoma teachers were used as a population the 86.5 percent responding to a mailed questionnaire. In response to a yes or no question, 25.1 percent responded "no" to the question "Should a SOEP be mandatory for all students enrolled in vocational agriculture?" To a similar question on the department having written guidelines or policy outlining requirements of/for a SOEP which the students should fullfill, 31.7 responded "no". As is pointed out by much of the review of literature previously covered, these figures show a tendency away from SOEP as an essential part of the vocational agriculture curriculum. One of the most alarming findings of Smith (1982) came with the question "What approximate percentage of your out-of-class work time is spent preparing for or attending livestock shows?" The mean response was 23.78 percent of out-of-class. Seventy-eight percent of the teachers responded that they spent 20 percent or more of their out-of-class time preparing for or attending livestock shows. Respondents using 50 percent or more of their outside time to prepare or attend shows was 17.4 percent. Teachers ranking the areas of most student SOEP involvement placed livestock exhibition first and

commercial livestock production second with approximately 80 percent of the teachers placing them first or second in rank. In response to student involvement in year-round SOEP or continuing type SOEP programs the mean was 56.62 percent.

Summary

In summary, from the inception of the vocational agriculture program with the Smith-Hughes Act (Pub. L. 64-347, 1917) and following legislation emphasis has been placed on SOEP. Although the interpretation of these federal edicts falls upon the state agencies administering these programs, very little doubt is left as to the implication of SOEP requirements. Success of these programs over the years has strengthened and expanded vocational education into new areas.

This importance is shared also by parents and students as shown in the various studies reviewed. Career goals and additional secondary goals of work habits, cooperation, etc. all lend continuing credability to the SOEPs in the vocational agriculture program. Teacher educators, state supervisors, and teachers also feel the need not only of continuence of the SOEPs but need for expansion and improvement.

The activities and interactions of classroom instruction, SOEP supervision, and FFA activity participation all provide a motivational type environment in which the student can achieve career objectives and personal achievement. FFA and SOEP compliment and enhance each other and have a positive relationship to each other.

In recent times problems have arisen with SOEPs as teachers perceptions of the programs or values of the programs have changed. More emphasis on certain areas or less emphasis on the SOEPs as a whole have greatly endangered one of the most valuable tools the vocational agriculture teacher possesses. Using an approach similar to that of the Western Regional study (Vaughn, 1982) and the Oklahoma study (Smith, 1982) it was the purpose of this paper to determine the general status of Productive SOEPs in Area I of the state of Texas, in an effort to determine factors affecting and various needs of the program.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The primary purpose of this study was to determine teachers' perceptions of SOEPs and their implementation with the respective communities of Area I in the Texas Panhandle.

In order to collect and analyze data pertaining to this purpose it was necessary to accomplish the following tasks:

1. Determine the population of the study
2. Develop the instrument for data collection
3. Develop a procedure for data collection
4. Select methods of data analysis

The Study Population

The population for this study consisted of the vocational agriculture teachers from all vocational agriculture departments in Area I of the Texas Panhandle. Geographically this is the area of the Panhandle known as the "Cap Rock" Area or that area North of Lubbock.

Development of the Instrument

In formulating the statements selected for the survey instrument, the writer reviewed related literature and survey instruments developed by other researchers. In addition, personal suggestions from various teacher educators and vocational agriculture teachers

were given strong consideration. The instrument contained short answer items and statements requiring answers provided on an interval scale. Major topics included background of teacher respondents, school policy regarding SOEP, level of student participation, scope and kind of SOEPs, teachers' perceptions of SOE and ranking as to personal emphasis.

Procedure for Date Collection

The Area I supervisor was contacted for permission and cooperation concerning the distribution of the instrument. It was decided to contact all instructors in Area I at the Vocational Agriculture Teachers' Summer Conference held in Ft. Worth. Time was allotted by the area supervisor, in one of the area meetings to distribute the survey instrument (Appendix B, p. 73) and the cover sheet of instructions (Appendix A, p. 71). The survey instrument was distributed, answered, and collected during this time. As an incentive for completion and return of the instrument, a number previously attached to the instrument was removed and used as a drawing stub for door prizes consisting of seven "Uncle Henry" pocket knives. Because of the advantage of personal contact and immediate collection of data, it was perceived this method of collection was superior to mailed inquiries.

Data Analysis

Data collected from the instrument were analyzed and tabulated. Percentages, frequencies, rankings and means were the descriptive statistics used to describe the data collected. The Likert Scale,

Van Dalen (1979), was used to evaluate data from the definition of SOEPs as teachers perceive it. On page two of the questionnaire, Topic "C", question number one, numerical values were assigned to each category to facilitate calculation of mean values and establishment of real limits. The numerical values and real limits for each category are as follows:

Category	Numerical Values	Real Limits
Strongly Agree	3	3.0 to 2.49
Agree	2	2.5 to 1.49
Slightly Agree	1	1.5 to 0.00
No Opinion	0	0.0 to -1.49
Slightly Disagree	-1	-1.5 to -2.49
Disagree	-2	-2.5 to -3.00
Strongly Disagree	-3	

Topic "C", Teachers Perceptions question number four on the third page, used the following categories and real limits to establish response values. These values were used to facilitate calculation of mean values. The categories, values and real limits are as follows:

Category	Values	Real Limits
1	High	0.0 - 1.49
2	↓	1.5 - 2.49
3		2.5 - 3.49
4		3.5 - 4.49
5	Low	4.5 - 5.00

A copy of the cover sheet can be located in Appendix A and the questionnaire in Appendix B.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The presentation and analysis of data found in this chapter were a result of Area I teacher responses. Geographically, Area I (Texas Panhandle) covers approximately that area north of Lubbock, Texas. Responses were collected on the questionnaires, Appendix B, distributed at the summer vocational agriculture teachers conference held in Forth Worth. There are usually 136 teachers employed in Area I. Responses were collected from the 126 teachers under contract at the time of the survey. The difference of ten teachers was due to open positions in five of the single teacher departments, four of the two teacher departments and one of the four or more teacher departments. This gives a total response of 100% of those teachers under contract. Therefore all percentages given in the analysis of data are figured as percentages of respondents only.

Populations of towns having vocational agriculture departments were checked to view the variety of SOEPs of rural and urban areas. Divisions were made by number of teachers per department and all analysis of information was compared on this basis as well as on the basis of the total population.

Table I shows the populations of towns in Area I having vocational agriculture departments. Teachers in single teacher departments accounted for 44.44% of the respondents and the number of

TABLE I

POPULATIONS OF TOWNS OF TEACHERS IN AREA I OF TEXAS

	0-1500		1501-3000		3001-6000		6000-10,000		10,000-over		*NR		Total Teacher Grp.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Single Teacher Group	38	67.79	9	16.07	2	3.57	1	1.79	5	8.93	1	1.79	56	44.44
Two Teacher Group	5	8.77	19	33.33	14	24.56	8	14.04	11	19.30	0	0.00	57	45.23
Three Teacher Group	1	11.11	3	33.30	0	00.00	0	00.00	5	55.56	0	0.00	9	7.14
Four/More Teacher Group	4	100.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	0.00	4	3.17
Total Population	48	38.09	31	24.60	16	12.70	9	7.14	21	16.67	1	1.79	126	100.00

* NR - Non Response

teachers in each group. Single teacher departments in towns of less than 3,000 population made up 83.86% of all single teacher departments. In Area I, 38.09% of all teachers teach in communities of under 1,500 population. Towns of less than 3,000 population accounted for 62.69% of all the respondents.

Teachers teaching in two teacher departments accounted for 45.23% of the total population responding. The responses indicated 42.10% of the two teacher departments were located in towns of less than 3,000 population. The town size most commonly indicated seemed to be a combination of the 1,501-3,000 category and the 3,001-6,000 category with 57.89% of the teachers in two teacher departments represented.

Teachers employed in three teacher departments made up 7.14% of the total population. Of those responding, 55.56% taught in towns of 10,000 or more population. The second largest response was in the 1,501-3,000 range with 33.30%.

Teachers of departments with four or more teachers made up only 3.17% of the total population. These respondents were all from Cal Farley's Boys Ranch which is a school and orphanage for boys from broken homes or for boys having discipline problems. Most of the students are ages 7-18. Complete state approved educational facilities including a six teacher vocational agriculture teacher department in a rural farming environment provide a good learning and living experience for these students.

In analyzing the data from the totals of Table I it can be seen that 62.69% of all teachers of Area I teach in communities of 3,000 or less population.

In Table II the population was asked to give the number of students each had enrolled in vocational agriculture during the 1981-82 school year. Again the categories listed are single teacher, two teacher, three teacher, and four or more teachers.

In single teacher departments, 35.71% indicated they had between 30-39 students. The second largest percentage was 26.78% indicating student enrollment between 20-29. This constitutes a total of 62.49% of the single teacher departments consisting of student enrollment of 20-39 students each. The majority of the remaining single teacher departments, 26.78% indicated their student enrollment was from 40-59 students.

In two teacher departments, the largest percentage of students enrolled was in the range of 60-69 students per department making up 33.33% of the population. The second largest percentage indicated 24.56% of those responding had enrollments of 50-59 students. The third largest grouping consisted of 21.05% indicating 70-79 students enrolled. The total of these percentages with student enrollment between 50-79 for the 1981-82 school year was 78.94%.

Those teachers employed in three teacher departments responded most often with equal percentages in two groupings of student enrollment, 120-129 (22.22%) and 130-139 (22.22%). A total of responses indicating 100-139 students was 55.55%. One third, or 33.33%, of the responses ranged from 80-90 students enrolled.

The four or more teacher group, indicated that the students enrolled at Boy's Ranch was between 110 to 130. There seemed to be differences in numbers of student enrollment figures reported as indicated by multi-teacher department responses which did not agree

TABLE II

STUDENTS ENROLLED IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS DURING THE 1981-82 SCHOOL YEAR IN AREA I

Number of Students	Single		Two		Three		Four or More		Total Teacher	
	Resp.	%	Resp.	%	Resp.	%	Resp.	%	Resp.	%
1-9	2	3.58	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	2	1.58
10-19	4	7.16	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	4	3.17
20-29	15	26.78	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	15	11.90
30-39	20	35.69	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	20	15.87
40-49	7	12.50	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	7	5.55
50-59	8	14.31	14	24.52	1	11.11	0	00.00	23	18.25
60-69	0	00.00	19	33.31	0	00.00	0	00.00	19	15.07
70-79	0	00.00	12	21.01	0	00.00	0	00.00	12	9.52
80-89	0	00.00	7	12.26	2	22.22	0	00.00	9	7.14
90-99	0	00.00	3	5.26	1	11.11	0	00.00	4	3.17
100-109	0	00.00	1	1.75	1	11.11	0	00.00	2	1.58
110-119	0	00.00	1	1.75	0	00.00	1	25.00	2	1.58
120-129	0	00.00	0	00.00	2	22.22	1	25.00	3	2.38
130-139	0	00.00	0	00.00	2	22.22	1	25.00	3	2.38
* N.R.	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	1	25.00	1	.79
Total	56	100.00	57	100.00	9	100.00	4	100.00	126	100.00

* N.R. - Non Response

with teachers within the same department. Perhaps teachers were citing enrollments for different times of the year.

A comprehensive look at student enrollment by all departments indicated the largest response, 18.25%, was in the range of 50-59 students enrolled. In totaling some of the ranges it was found that 49.98% of all teachers indicated their student enrollment fell between 50 to 89 students. The second largest percentage similarly grouped was in the range of 20-49 students, 33.32%. This indicates that 83.3% of all teachers in Area I have student enrollments of between 30-89 students.

The teachers were asked to choose an appropriate description of job responsibilities concerning SOEP supervision. This was asked in order to find the SOEP supervision procedures employed by the teachers. The response data is recorded in Table III. The single teachers all chose option four which was "I supervise all SOEPs".

In the two teacher departments, 59.64% indicated both teachers jointly supervised all students SOEPs. The second greatest response indicated 26.31% of the teachers supervised the SOEPs of the students they taught in class.

The three teacher group also showed their responses to options one and three with 55.55% indicating they all jointly supervised all SOEPs. Option one made up the remainder of the group with 44.44% indicating they supervised the SOEPs of only the students they taught.

The teachers of the four or more teacher group all responded to option number two indicating each teacher had categorical supervision assignments in areas such as beef, sheep, swine, crop,

TABLE III

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR SOEP RESPONSIBILITIES

Categories	Single Teacher		Two Teacher		Three Teacher		Four/More Teacher		Total Teacher	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Each teacher supervises the SOEPs of the students he teaches.	00	00.00	15	26.31	4	44.44	0	00.00	19	15.07
2. SOEP categories such as Coop, crop, beef, sheep, swine, etc. are assigned to the supervision of specific teachers.	00	00.00	7	12.28	0	00.00	4	100.00	11	8.73
3. Teachers jointly supervise all students' SOEPs.	00	00.00	34	59.64	5	55.56	0	00.00	39	30.95
4. Single teacher department, I supervise all SOEPs.	56	100.00	00	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	56	44.44
5. Other *	00	00.00	1	1.75	0	00.00	0	00.00	1	.79
Total	56	100.00	57	100.00	9	100.00	4	100.00	126	100.00

* One teacher supervised SOEPs while both assist students with records and award applications

coop, etc.

A look at the teacher totals shows single teachers supervising all SOEPs made up 44.44% of the total population. Total teachers indicating they jointly supervised all student SOEPs was 30.95%. Of the total population 15.07% indicated they supervised the SOEPs of only the students they taught in class.

The teachers were asked about the requirement for an SOEP in order to be enrolled in vocational agriculture. Table IV shows the data for this question. Responses were made on a yes-no basis. Single teachers responded with 76.79% requiring some type of SOEP for enrollment in vocational agriculture. The two teacher group responded with 94.74% requiring SOEPs. The three teachers were 100% in requiring SOEPs for enrollment. As a total population 86.51% required SOEPs, while 11.90% did not. There were two nonrespondents.

In an effort to find how teachers used SOEPs as a teaching instrument, they were asked what percentage of the grade for the student was derived from the SOEP. Table V shows the data from these responses. The highest percentage (42.86%) of single teachers based 20% of the student's grade on the SOEP. Twenty five percent of the single teachers based 30% of the grade on the SOEP. A total of the three largest categories indicated that 85.72% of all single teachers base between 10% to 30% of the student's grade on his SOEP.

Similarly, the two teacher group indicated 20% of the student's grade as the most popular choice used by 40.35% of the teachers. A total of the three top options, 10%-30% of student's grade, based on the SOEP, included 78.95% of all teachers of the two teacher group. Three of the teachers marked "other" as an alternative, but

TABLE IV

THOSE TEACHERS REQUIRING SOEPS FOR STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN VO. AG.

* Single				Two				Three				Four/more				* Total			
Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
43	76.79	11	19.64	54	94.74	3	5.26	9	100	0	0	3	75	1	25	109	86.51	15	11.90

* Two teachers from the single teachers group did not respond.

TABLE V

THE PORTION OF THE STUDENT'S GRADE COMING FROM THE SOEP

	0	%	10	%	20	%	30	%	40	%	More	%	Bdline Pts.	%	Other	%	Total	%
Single Teacher Group	0	0.00	10	17.86	24	42.86	14	25.00	4	7.14	2	3.57	2	3.57	0	0.00	56	100.00
Two Teacher Group	1	1.75	6	10.53	23	40.35	16	28.07	4	7.02	2	3.51	2	3.51	3	5.26	57	100.00
Three Teacher Group No Response - 1 - 11.11%	0	0.00	0	00.00	3	33.33	4	44.44	1	11.11	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	9	100.00
Four or More Teacher Group No Response - 1 - 25%	1	25.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	1	25.00	0	00.00	0	0.00	1	25.00	0	0.00	4	100.00
Total of All Teacher Groups	2	1.59	16	12.70	50	39.68	35	27.78	9	7.14	4	3.17	5	3.97	3	2.38	126	100.00

No Response - 2 - 1.59%

Other: 2 - 1.59% No point values per se, but must have to pass

1 - .79% Additional points are given on semester grades

Bdline - Borderline points

did not make further comment on the questionnaire.

In the three teacher group, 44.44% indicated 30% of the student's grade was derived from the SOEP, while 33.33% indicated 20% of the student's grade came from the SOEP. This makes a total of 77.77% who based between 20-30% of the student's grade on the SOEP.

The highest response from the total population (39.68%) was made to the 20% of grade option. The 30% option received the next largest teacher response of 27.78%. A total of the three largest percentages indicated 80.16% of all teachers based from 10-30% of the students grade on the SOEP.

Table VI reports the percentage of student participation in SOEP if not required for enrollment in vocational agriculture. This was to determine what percentage of the students would participate if an SOEP was not required. A total of eleven single teachers responded on this question. Two teachers or 18.18% responded they still had 100% participation. This same percentage, 18.18%, was found in both categories of 80% and 85%. All of the single teachers not requiring SOEPs still had between 70-100% participation in student project programs.

Similarly all teachers in two teacher departments not requiring SOEPs indicated between 75% to 100% participation.

The three teacher group responded to this question indicating 80% participation in SOEPs.

As a total group all of those teachers not requiring SOEPs for student enrollment showed participation levels between 70% and 100% for their students.

TABLE VI

SOEP PARTICIPATION BY STUDENTS OF TEACHERS NOT REQUIRING SOEPS FOR ENROLLMENT

	Single		Two		Three		4 or more		Total	
% Part.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
100	2	18.18	2	40.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	4	23.53
99	1	9.09	1	20.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	2	11.76
95	1	9.09	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	1	5.88
90	1	9.09	1	20.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	2	11.76
85	2	18.18	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	2	11.76
80	2	18.18	0	00.00	1	100.00	0	00.00	3	17.65
75	1	9.09	1	20.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	2	11.76
70	1	9.09	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	1	5.88
Total	11	100.00	5	100.00	1	100.00	0	00.00	17	100.00

The percentages of students that lived in town are recorded in Table VII. It was found that in the single teacher group, 23.21% said 41-50% of their students lived in town. Seventeen point eighty five percent of the single teachers indicated that 0-10% of their students lived in town. Thirty seven point forty seven percent of the single teachers indicated that over 51% of their students lived in town.

Twenty four point fifty six percent of the two teacher group responding to the question indicated 41-50% of their students lived in town. Totaling ranges of students living in town, 40.34% of the teachers indivated 21-50% of their students lived in town. Similarly, 57.9% of the teachers indicated 51% or more of their students lived in town.

A look at the total population indicated the largest group of teachers (21.43%) said 41-50% of their students lived in town. In Area I, 70.64% of the teachers indicated 41% or more of their students lived in town.

Since such a large percentage of the students of Area I were reported to live in town the teachers were asked what percent of the students do not have adequate facilities at home to have an SOEP.

Table VIII shows the largest percentage shown in the single teacher group was 33.93% indicating 0-10% of their students did not have facilities for their SOEP. In totaling the responses it was found that 23.21% of the single teachers indicated over 50% of their students had no access to facilities for carrying on an SOEP.

Twenty six point thirty two percent of the teachers of the two teacher group responded that 41-50% had no facilities at home. The

TABLE VII

THE PERCENTAGE OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE STUDENTS OF AREA I LIVING IN TOWN

	0-10		11-20		21-30		31-40		41-50		51-60		61-70		71-80		81-90		91-100			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Total	%
Single Teacher Group	10	17.85	5	8.92	4	7.14	3	5.35	13	23.21	2	3.57	5	9.92	4	7.14	5	8.92	5	8.92	56	100.00
Two Teacher Group	1	1.75	0	0.00	4	7.01	5	8.77	14	24.56	6	10.53	5	8.77	9	15.79	8	14.04	5	8.77	57	100.00
Three Teacher Group	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	11.11	00	00.00	0	00.00	1	11.11	5	55.56	1	11.11	1	11.11	9	100.00
Four or More Teacher Group	4	All students live on the ranch																				
Total of All Teacher Groups	15	11.90	5	3.97	8	6.35	9	7.14	27	21.43	8	6.35	11	8.73	18	14.29	14	11.11	11	8.73	126	100.00

TABLE VIII

THE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS OF AREA I NOT HAVING ADEQUATE SOEP FACILITIES

	NR		0-10		11-20		21-30		31-40		41-50		51-60		61-70		71-80		81-90		91-100			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Total	%
Single Teacher Group	2	3.57	19	33.93	9	16.07	4	7.14	6	10.71	3	5.36	0	0.00	2	3.57	6	10.71	4	7.14	1	1.79	56	100
Two Teacher Group	2	3.51	5	8.77	4	7.02	6	10.53	5	8.77	15	26.32	1	1.75	3	5.26	4	7.02	6	10.53	6	10.53	57	100
Three Teacher Group	0	0.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	2	22.22	2	22.22	1	11.11	0	0.00	2	22.22	1	11.11	1	11.11	9	100
Four/More Teacher Group	0	0.00	4	100.00	Boys Ranch all students have access to ranch facilities																			
Total of All Teacher Groups	4	3.17	28	22.22	13	10.32	10	7.94	13	10.32	20	15.87	2	1.59	5	3.97	12	9.52	11	8.73	8	6.35	126	100

second largest response, 21.06%, indicated 81% or more of their students did not have facilities for SOEPs.

In the three teacher group, 44.44% indicated that 71% or more of their students did not have facilities for carrying on their SOEPs. All responses by this group was over the 30% range.

In the four or more teacher group all responses were made by Boy's Ranch teachers. Boy's Ranch provides facilities for all student's SOEPs.

As a total population, 22.22% of all teachers responded that 0-10% of their students did not have adequate facilities for carrying on their SOEPs. The second highest percentage was 15.87% indicating 41-50% of their students didn't have facilities for SOEPs.

Responses were sought as to the number of teachers indicating the school system or department provided facilities for the students SOEPs. On Table IX it was found that as a total group 82.54% of all teachers responding said they provided a school farm or other facilities for students' use in their SOEP. The two teacher group showed the largest percentage of positive answers with 92.98% of the teachers indicating facilities were provided for students. Single teachers indicated 73.22% provided SOEP facilities. The three teacher group indicated 66.66% provided facilities and 33.34% did not.

Since it is felt supervision of SOEPs is a vital part of the student's education and success in the project program, the teachers were asked if the school supported the SOEPs by providing transportation or compensation for SOEP visitation. Table X indicates 88.10% of the teachers responding said the school did

TABLE IX

THOSE TEACHERS IN AREA I PROVIDED FACILITIES BY THE SCHOOL FOR STUDENT'S SOEPS

Single				Two				Three				Four/More				Total			
Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
41	73.22	15	26.78	53	92.98	4	7.02	6	66.66	3	33.34	4	100	0	0	104	82.54	22	17.46

TABLE X

THOSE TEACHERS IN AREA I PROVIDED A VEHICLE OR COMPENSATION BY THE SCHOOL FOR SOEP SUPERVISION

Single				Two				Three				Four/More				Total			
Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
52	92.86	4	7.14	48	84.21	9	15.79	7	77.78	2	22.22	4	100	0	0	111	88.10	15	11.90

provide a vehicle or compensation for student SOEP visitation.

Teachers were asked to indicate what the school policies were on student SOEP visitation as to time allocation for instructors. Table XI indicates a yes or no response as to whether visitation time was alloted during the school day. Most of the response from each group was about the same with an overall group response of 88.89% saying "yes" time was alloted in the school schedule for SOEP visitation.

Teachers were asked what particular time of the day was allotted for SOEP visitation. The data is recorded in Table XII. Due to the wide variety of responses it was decided to group responses under categories of AM & PM, AM, PM, After school, None and No response. Single teachers made the largest response of 82.14% in the PM category. Five teachers made no response. The two teacher group indicated P.M. also for visitation by a percentage of 70.18%. The three teacher group showed 88.89% in the P.M. category. The four or more teacher group split their responses with 50% A.M. and 50% P.M. response. The total population listed P.M. its highest response group with 76.19%. There were nine teachers not responding.

Livestock shows account for a large part of student involvement in SOEPs in Texas. (Table XIII). The question asked teachers for response to the number of livestock shows the school administration allowed them to schedule each year. A combination of two categories indicated that 55.36% of the single teachers attended either two or three major stock shows per year. Major livestock shows are above the county level. The two teacher

TABLE XI

THOSE TEACHERS PROVIDED SCHOOL TIME FOR SOEP VISITATION

Single				Two				Three				Four/more				Total			
Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
51	91.07	5	8.93	50	87.72	6	10.53	8	88.89	1	11.11	3	75	1	25	112	88.89	13	10.32
				No Response 1			1.75									No Response 1			.79

TABLE XII

THE TIME SCHEDULED BY THE SCHOOL FOR TEACHER VISITATION OF SOEPS

	A.M. & P.M.		A.M.		P.M.		After School		None		No Resp.		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Single Teacher Group	3	5.36	1	1.79	46	82.14	0	00.00	1	1.79	5	8.93	56	100
Two Teacher Group	3	5.26	2	3.57	40	70.18	7	12.28	1	1.75	4	7.02	57	100
Three Teacher Group	0	0.00	0	00.00	8	88.89	1	11.11	0	0.00	0	0.00	9	100
Four/More Teacher Group	0	0.00	2	50.00	2	50.00	0	00.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	100
Total of All Teacher Groups	6	4.76	5	3.97	96	76.19	8	6.35	2	1.59	9	7.14	126	100

TABLE XIII

MAJOR LIVESTOCK SHOWS ATTENDED BY TEACHERS OF AREA I

	0		1		2		3		4		5		7		No Limit		No. Resp.		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Single Teacher Group	2	3.57	16	28.57	23	41.07	8	14.29	4	7.14	0	00.00	0	00.00	2	3.57	1	1.79	56	100
Two Teacher Group	2	3.51	8	8.77	6	10.53	22	38.60	7	12.28	1	1.75	1	1.75	12	21.05	1	1.75	57	100
Three Teacher Group	0	0.00	0	00.00	4	44.44	2	22.22	0	00.00	1	11.11	2	22.22	0	00.00	0	0.00	9	100
Four/More Teacher Group	0	0.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	2	50.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	2	50.00	0	0.00	4	100
Total of All Teacher Groups	4	3.17	21	16.67	33	26.19	32	25.40	13	10.32	2	1.59	3	2.38	16	12.70	2	1.59	126	100

group's highest response was 38.6% attending three major livestock shows. No limit to the number of shows attended was indicated by 21.05% of this group. Sixty six point sixty six percent of the three teacher group indicated they attended two or three shows per year. Seven stock shows per year was indicated by 22.22% of this group.

The responses in the four or more teacher group was split 50-50 between four stock shows per year and no limit by their administration as to the number of stock shows they could attend.

Total population responses to this question showed the highest response was pretty well even between two and three stock shows per year with a combined percentage of 51.59%. Sixteen of one hundred twenty six teachers (12.70%) indicated no limit to the number of stock shows they could attend. Most of the responses over two or three stock shows were made by teachers in multiple teacher departments.

Section B of the questionnaire dealt primarily with FFA activities. Since it is not legal to require membership in FFA of vocational agriculture students, but it is felt a necessary part of the overall program by most instructors, it was important to determine the percentage of vocational agriculture student membership in the FFA. Table XIV records the data of teachers responses to this question. It was found that 86.51% of the total population indicated 100% membership in FFA. Ninety percent or more membership was reported by 97.61% of the total population.

The population was requested to respond to the highest level of participation in the FFA's National Foundation Award Program.

TABLE XIV

VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE STUDENT MEMBERSHIP IN FFA

	No Resp.		80		90		95		96		98		99		100		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Single Teacher Group	0	0.00	1	1.79	1	1.79	1	1.79	0	00.00	2	3.57	1	1.79	50	89.29	56	100
Two Teacher Group	1	1.75	1	1.75	2	3.51	1	1.75	0	00.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	51	89.47	57	100
Three Teacher Group	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	11.11	2	22.22	2	22.22	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	44.44	9	100
Four/More Teacher Group	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	100.00	4	100
Total of All Teacher Groups	1	.79	2	1.59	4	3.17	4	3.17	2	1.59	3	2.38	1	.79	109	86.51	126	100

No Resp. - No response

As a total population, 19.05% participated at the Area level. The state level of the program was participated in by 16.67%. At the district level or above, 57.15% of the total population indicated participation. This information is recorded in Table XV. Ten teachers (7.94%) indicated no participation.

The number of Lone Star Farmer Degree applicants by teachers in Area I for the 1981-82 school year is recorded in Table XVI. The total population responded that 19.05% had four applicants in the designated time period. The next largest level of participation was 18.25% indicating they had two applicants. It was found that 63.49% of the respondents had at least one applicant and 34.11% had four or more Lone Star Farmer Degree applicants. A fairly large percentage 21.43% of the total population had no applicants, a large part of these resulting from single teacher responses totaling 33.93% of that particular group.

Due to large numbers of applicants and the years of inflation since the requirements for the Lone Star Farmer Degree were established, it is probable these standards will be revised in the next few years. Teacher responses were sought on how doubling or tripling the minimum monetary requirement would affect the number of applicants. Table XVII records these responses. As a total population the teachers indicated that very few applicants would be affected by doubling the minimum requirement. When compared to the percent of teachers reporting zero applicants for 1981-82, there would be 16% more teachers with no applicants if the requirements were doubled. There would be 34% more teachers with no applicants if the requirements were tripled.

TABLE XV

THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION IN THE NATIONAL FFA FOUNDATION AWARDS PROGRAM BY TEACHERS OF AREA I

	0		Local		Dist.		Area		State		Nat'l		No Resp.		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Single Teacher Group	6	10.71	19	33.93	12	21.43	8	6.35	8	6.35	1	1.79	2	3.57	56	100
Two Teacher Group	3	5.26	16	28.07	5	8.77	14	24.56	11	19.30	5	8.77	3	5.26	57	100
Three Teacher Group	0	00.00	1	11.11	3	33.33	1	11.11	2	22.22	0	0.00	2	22.22	9	100
Four/More Teacher Group	1	25.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	1	25.00	0	00.00	1	25.00	1	25.00	4	100
Total of All Teacher Groups	10	7.94	36	28.57	20	15.87	24	19.05	21	16.67	7	5.56	8	6.35	126	100

TABLE XVI

THE NUMBER OF LONE STAR FARMER DEGREE APPLICANTS OF AREA I FOR 1981-82

	0		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9		11		13		No Resp.		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Single Teacher Group	19	33.93	13	23.21	10	17.86	3	5.36	3	5.36	2	3.57	1	1.79	0	0.00	1	1.79	1	1.79	0	0.00	1	1.79	2	3.57	56	100
Two Teacher Group	7	12.28	7	12.28	10	17.54	6	10.53	18	31.58	2	3.51	0	0.00	1	1.75	0	0.00	2	3.51	1	1.75	2	3.51	1	1.75	57	100
Three Teacher Group	1	11.11	2	22.22	3	33.33	2	22.22	1	11.11	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	00.00	9	100
Four/More Teacher Group	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	2	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	50.00	4	100
Total of All Teacher Groups	27	21.43	22	17.46	23	18.25	11	8.73	24	19.05	4	3.17	1	.79	1	.79	1	.79	3	2.38	1	.79	3	2.38	5	3.97	126	100

TABLE XVII

THE NUMBER OF POSSIBLE LONE STAR FARMER APPLICANTS OF AREA I IF REQUIREMENTS WERE INCREASED

	Single				Two				Three				Four/More				Total			
No. Applicants Per Teacher	Dbl.	%	Trpl.	%	Dbl.	%	Trpl.	%	Dbl.	%	Trpl.	%	Dbl.	%	Trpl.	%	Dbl.	%	Trpl.	%
1	9	16.07	11	19.64	12	21.05	8	14.04	4	44.45	2	22.22	0	00	0	000	25	19.85	21	16.67
2	8	14.29	5	8.93	8	14.04	7	12.28	0	00.00	1	11.11	0	00	0	000	16	12.70	13	10.32
3	3	5.36	4	7.14	6	10.53	9	15.79	2	22.22	0	00.00	0	00	0	000	11	8.73	13	10.32
4	2	3.57	2	3.57	9	15.79	5	8.77	1	11.11	0	00.00	1	25	0	000	13	10.32	7	5.56
5	4	7.14	0	00.00	2	3.51	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00	0	000	6	4.76	0	00.00
6	2	3.57	0	00.00	2	3.51	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00	0	000	4	3.17	0	00.00
7	0	00.00	0	00.00	2	3.51	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00	0	000	2	1.59	0	00.00
9	1	1.79	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00	0	000	1	.79	0	00.00
10	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	2	3.51	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00	0	000	0	00.00	2	1.59
13	0	00.00	0	00.00	1	1.75	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00.00	0	00	0	000	1	.79	0	00.00
0	27	48.21	34	60.71	15	26.32	26	45.61	2	22.22	6	66.67	3	75	4	100	47	37.30	70	55.56

Dbl. - If requirements were doubled.
Trpl. - If requirements were tripled.

Record keeping is an important part of the student's SOEP. The topic next addressed dealt with the student's SOEP record system. This arises from a knowledge that some teachers may not record all a student owns due to either involvement in 4-H or to simplify record keeping. The data from responses is recorded in Table XVIII. In single teacher group 41.07% did not require all the student's owned to be his SOEP or to keep records on it. This figure was 31.58% in the two teacher group and 33.33% in the three teacher group. As a total population 34.92% of the teachers do not have students keep records on all he owns.

Dual membership and how teachers count SOEPs of Vocational Agriculture and 4-H projects is a possible problem area. Table XIX shows the data on this question. The single teacher group indicated 78.57% had separate SOEPs for each youth program. The two teacher group indicated 91.23% had separation. The three teacher group showed the lowest percentage with 66.67% having separation of 4-H and FFA projects. As a total population 80.95% had separate 4-H projects and FFA SOEPs. There were thirteen no responses accounting for 10.32% of the total population.

Section "C" of the questionnaire was developed to determine teachers' perceptions of various parts of their programs. Teachers were asked to give their perceptions of a given definition of supervised occupational experience program. Their responses can be seen in Table XX. The definition was divided into three parts each expressing a different facet of SOEPs. Each part of the definition will be dealt with separately.

TABLE XVIII

THE STUDENTS OF AREA I SHOWING ALL PROJECTS OWNED IN THE SOEP

Single				Two				Three				Four/More				Total			
Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
33	58.93	23	41.07	38	66.67	18	31.58	6	66.67	3	33.33	4	100	9	0	81	64.29	44	34.92

TABLE XIX

THE STUDENTS OF AREA I SEPARATING VO. AG. AND 4-H SOEPS

	Single				Two				Three				Four/More				Total			
	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
	44	78.57	5	8.93	52	91.23	4	7.02	6	66.67	2	22.22	0	0	0	0	102	80.95	11	8.73
No Resp.	7	12.50			1	1.75			1	11.11			4	100			13	10.32		

No Resp. - No response

TABLE XX

AREA I TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE DEFINITION OF SOEPS

	Strongly Agree 3.0 to 2.5		Agree 2.49 to 1.5		Slightly Agree 1.49 to .5		No Opinion .49 to -.49		Slightly Disagree -.5 to -1.49		Disagree -1.5 to -2.49		Strongly Disagree -2.5 to -3.0		Mean Value	Category
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Single Teacher Group																
1. ...carried on outside the classroom.	28	50.00	17	30.36	5	8.93	1	1.79	2	3.57	2	3.57	1	1.79	2.04	Agree
2. ...for learning of modern agriculture	18	32.14	25	44.64	9	16.07	2	3.57	2	3.57	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.98	Agree
3. ...prepare students for agri. or agri. related vocation.	20	35.71	25	44.64	9	16.07	2	3.57	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2.13	Agree
Two Teacher Group																
1. ...carried on outside the classroom.	27	47.37	23	40.35	3	5.26	0	0.00	1	1.75	2	3.51	1	1.75	2.14	Agree
2. ...for learning of modern agriculture	18	31.58	27	47.37	9	15.79	2	3.51	1	1.75	0	0.00	0	0.00	2.04	Agree
3. ...prepare students for agri or agri. related vocation.	16	28.07	28	49.12	9	15.79	3	5.26	1	1.75	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.96	Agree
Three Teacher Group																
1. ...carried on outside the classroom.	5	55.56	3	33.33	1	11.11	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2.44	Agree
2. ...for learning of modern agriculture	3	33.33	5	55.56	1	11.11	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2.22	Agree
3. ...prepare students for agri. or agri. related vocation.	3	33.33	5	55.56	0	00.00	1	11.11	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2.11	Agree

TABLE XX (Continued)

	Strongly Agree 3.0 to 2.5		Agree 2.49 to 1.5		Slightly Agree 1.49 to .5		No Opinion .49 to -.49		Slightly Disagree -.5 to -1.49		Disagree -1.5 to -2.49		Strongly Disagree -2.5 to -3.0		Mean Value	Category
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Four/More Teacher Group																
1. ...carried on outside the classroom.	3	75.00	1	25.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2.75	Strongly Agree
2. ...for learning of modern agriculture	1	25.00	2	50.00	1	25.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2.00	Agree
3. ...prepare students for agri. or agri. related vocation.	1	25.00	1	25.00	1	25.00	1	25.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.75	Agree
Total of All Teacher Groups																
1. ...carried on outside the classroom.	63	50.00	44	34.92	9	7.14	1	.79	3	2.38	4	3.17	2	1.59	2.13	Agree
2. ...for learning of modern agriculture	40	31.75	59	46.83	20	15.82	4	3.17	3	2.38	0	0.00	0	0.00	2.02	Agree
3. ...prepare students for agri. or agri. related vocation.	40	31.75	59	46.83	19	15.08	7	5.56	1	.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	2.03	Agree

The first part of the definition is "A SOEP may be considered a multipurpose enterprise or activity carried on outside the regular classroom by vocational agriculture students and supervised by vocational agriculture instructors". A scale from +3 to -3 was used to give a numerical value to response as well as the percentage of response. To the first part of the definition, 50% of the single teachers responded in the strongly agree category. The second largest response was to "Agree" with a 30.36% value. The two teacher group made its greatest response in the "Strongly Agree" column with 47.37% responding. Agree received 40.35% of the response. Three teacher respondents' greatest response was to "strongly agree" with 55.56%. The "agree" category received 33.33% of the response. The four teacher group had the largest percentage of response of any of the groups with 75% indicating they strongly agreed. As a percentage of the total population, responses to the first part of the definition was greatest in the two highest categories with 50% indicating "strongly agree", and 34.92% indicating agree. Calculation of means for each of the teacher groups' perceptions of the first part of the definition resulted in the following:

Single Teacher	2.04	Agree
Two Teacher	2.14	Agree
Three Teacher	2.44	Agree
Four or More Teacher	2.75	Strongly Agree
Total	2.13	Agree

The second part of the given definition was "It is used primarily to enhance the students appreciation for and the learning of modern

agriculture". Again respondents were asked to designate a degree of agreement or disagreement to the definition. The greatest response from the single teacher group was in the "agree" category with 44.64%. The second greatest response was 32.14% in the strongly agree category. The two teacher group responded most to the agree category also with 47.37%. The second greatest category was strongly agree with 31.58%. The three teacher group responded to the second part of the definition with 55.56% to "Agree".and 33.33% to strongly agree. The four teacher group's greatest response was to the agree category with 50%. Twenty five percent of the response was given to both strongly agree and to slightly agree. As a total population responses were greatest in the agree category with 46.83%. Strongly agree received 31.75% of the total response. Twenty percent of the response was given in the slightly agree category. Calculation of means resulting from responses to the second part of the definition resulted in mean scores of all the groups falling into the point range of 2.49-1.5 of the "Agree" category.

The third part of the definition, "It is also to help prepare the students for an agriculture or agriculture related vocation," was responded to by the single teachers' greatest response was with 44.64% marking "agree". The second largest response of this group was 35.71% to the strongly agree category. The two teacher groups' two largest responses were also to the agree and strongly agree, 49.12% and 28.07% respectively. Three teacher instructors also had similar opinions with 55.56% responding to agree and 33.33% responding to strongly agree. The four teacher group responded with 25% to each of the four highest categories. The total population responded to this definition with 46.83% in the agree category and 31.75% strongly agree. As an overall

view of this question the total population agreed to all parts of the definition. However, that part of the definition dealing with carrying on out of class experience projects in conjunction with classroom instruction received a slightly higher mean value than did the second and third parts of the definition.

The teachers were asked to rank in order eight terminal program objectives of an SOEP. The record of these responses are in Table XXI. As a total of the population, 43 of the respondents misunderstood the phrasing of the question and made incorrect responses by not ranking but giving a numerical value to each question. These responses were omitted. The correct responses were analyzed as a percentage of the total correct responses. Due to the diversity of responses this question was analyzed as a total population rather than in the individual teacher groups. A ranking of number one was given to "Character Building" by having the lowest sum of ranks total of 188. It was followed closely by "Enhance Classroom Instruction" with a sum of rank total of 221. The objective ranked third in importance by all teachers was "management skills". Ranked fourth "Provide a link between Vo. Ag. and FFA". The fifth ranked objective "FFA and Vocational Agriculture Department Recognition". Ranked sixth was by the total teacher group was "Establishment in Farming/Agribusiness". The seventh ranked objective was in "Financial Profit". An objective that was left to the teachers to specify, fourteen teachers responded. Some of the responses specified were as follows:

1. Record keeping
2. Competitive spirit or sportsmanship
3. Responsibility or dependability

TABLE XXI

AREA I TEACHERS' RANKING OF SOEP PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

	Ranking 1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		Sum of Ranks	Overall Rank
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Enhance classroom instruction	31	37.34	15	18.07	13	15.66	8	9.64	9	10.84	5	6.02	2	2.41	0	0.00	221	2nd
Provide link between Vo. Ag. and FFA	5	6.02	8	9.64	17	20.48	21	25.30	16	19.28	12	14.46	3	3.61	1	1.20	337	4th
Financial Profit	00	00.00	6	7.23	7	8.43	9	10.84	24	28.92	14	16.87	16	19.28	7	8.43	471	7th
Character Building	30	36.14	18	21.69	14	16.87	11	13.25	6	7.23	3	3.61	1	1.20	0	0.00	188	1st
Management Skills	11	13.25	24	28.92	23	27.71	12	14.46	6	7.23	3	3.61	1	1.20	0	0.00	236	3rd
FFA/Vo.Ag. Dept. Recognition	1	1.20	5	6.02	4	4.82	7	8.43	14	16.87	26	31.33	25	30.12	1	1.20	463	5th
Establishment in Farming/ Agribusiness	4	4.82	5	6.02	2	2.41	15	18.07	4	4.82	20	24.10	32	38.55	1	1.20	468	6th
Other *	00	00.00	3	3.61	3	3.61	00	00.00	1	1.20	00	00.00	3	3.61	4	4.82	73	8th

* Some of the responses specified were as follows:
1. Record keeping
2. Competitive spirit or sportsmanship
3. Responsibility or Dependability
4. Work skills
5. Meeting people by activities requiring travel

4. Work skills

5. Meeting people by activities requiring travel

Concerning the particular types of SOEPs the students carried on under each teacher, percentages were given by the teachers in each of nine categories with the total of each teacher to equal 100% of their total SOEP program. Average percentages were used to simplify interpretation of the date (Table XXII).

The category showing the largest response by the single teacher group was terminal livestock exhibition (54.91%). The average percent indicated by this group for commercial livestock production was 19.91%. Breeding livestock exhibition and commercial crop production both constituted an average of 9.02% of the single teachers total SOEP program.

The two teacher group indicated also terminal livestock production as the largest category with an average of 65.09%. Commercial livestock production (15.53%) followed in second place with commercial crop production receiving an average of 9.21%. Breeding livestock exhibition showed the next highest average percentage (7.89%) of inclusion the two teacher's SOEP program.

The three teacher group indicated an average of 73.56% of their total SOEP program was made up of terminal livestock exhibition type projects. The second largest average percent (13.89%) was indicated in the category of breeding livestock exhibition. Commercial livestock production constituted an average of 6.67% of the SOEP programs carried on by the three teacher group.

The highest average of all groups (73.75%) was recorded by the four or more teacher group in the category of terminal livestock

TABLE XXII

AVERAGE PERCENT OF DIFFERENT CATEGORIES OF SOEPS BY TEACHER GROUPS IN AREA I

Categories	Single Teacher Group	Two Teacher Group	Three Teacher Group	Four/More Teacher Group	Total of All Teacher Grps.
Commercial Livestock Production	19.91%	15.53%	6.67%	11.25%	14.01%
Terminal Livestock Exhibition	54.91%	65.09%	73.56%	73.75%	61.43%
Breeding Livestock Exhibition	9.02%	7.89%	13.89%	12.50%	8.97%
Commercial Crop Production	9.02%	9.21%	5.56%	00.00%	9.01%
Crops Exhibition	1.79%	.61%	.56%	00.00%	1.11%
Forestry	.09%	00.00%	00.00%	00.00%	.04%
Dairy	.63%	.53%	00.00%	2.50%	.60%
Horticulture	.18%	.09%	00.00%	00.00%	.12%
Other *	2.41%	1.05%	00.00%	00.00%	1.55%

*Items listed by teachers in the "other" column were:

1. Bees
2. Poultry
3. Rabbits
4. Gardens
5. Chickens
6. Goats

exhibition. It was followed by breeding livestock exhibition and commercial livestock production with averages of 12.5% and 11.25% respectively.

A definite similarity can be seen by each of the teacher groups. Terminal livestock exhibition had by far the largest response making up an average of 61.43% of the total SOEPs of Area I. Commercial livestock was said to be next making up an average of 14.01% of the total average program. Commercial crop production and breeding livestock exhibition fell close together with an average of 9.01% and 8.97% respectively. Teachers indicated these four categories collectively made up an average of 93.42% of the total average SOEP program of Area I.

In category nine, the respondents could specify other types of SOEPs. Nine teachers responded in this category indicating from an average 1.55% of their SOEPs fell into this category. The categories given by those teachers responding were of the following types:

1. Gardens
2. Poultry
3. Bees
4. Rabbits
5. Goats

The teachers were asked to give their perceptions of the amount of assistance given to their students in carrying out their SOEPs. Data is recorded in Table XXIII and Table XXIV. They were asked to respond to the amount of assistance they now provide in the various circumstances listed and the assistance they felt they should provide. The teachers were asked to evaluate their assistance by marking their

TABLE XXIII

THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS OF AREA I ON ASSISTANCE NOW PROVIDED TO STUDENTS' SOEPS

Categories	1		2		3		4		5			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Mean	Rank
1. Class time spent in planning and selecting SOEP.	8	6.35	20	15.87	39	30.95	32	25.40	27	21.43	3.40	7.0
2. Developing parental involvement in SOEP.	10	7.94	29	23.02	32	25.40	32	25.40	20	15.87	3.11	12.0
3. Correlating career goals with SOEP training.	15	11.90	29	23.02	52	41.27	20	15.87	10	7.94	2.85	13.5
4. Correlating SOEP with FFA Awards and/or activities.	7	5.56	19	15.08	27	21.43	44	34.92	29	23.02	3.55	6.0
5. Selecting/procuring livestock and crops.	12	9.52	11	8.73	20	15.87	36	28.57	47	37.30	3.75	2.0
6. Record keeping.	9	7.14	5	3.97	21	16.67	32	25.40	59	46.83	4.01	1.0
7. Developing long range plans for SOEP.	10	7.94	20	15.87	46	36.51	33	26.19	17	13.49	3.21	10.0
8. Providing transportation for SOEP activities.	10	7.94	13	10.32	30	23.81	30	23.81	43	34.13	3.66	3.0
9. Providing equipment.	15	11.90	13	10.32	21	16.67	32	25.40	45	35.71	3.63	5.0
10. Evaluation of SOEP.	5	3.97	15	11.90	36	28.57	33	26.19	37	29.37	3.65	4.0
11. Class time spent on management practices	6	4.76	20	15.87	48	38.10	30	23.81	22	17.46	3.33	8.0
12. Setting related educational goals.	10	7.94	26	20.63	46	36.51	26	20.63	18	14.29	3.13	11.0
13. Helping students physically expand SOEP.	26	20.63	27	21.43	32	25.40	22	17.46	19	15.08	2.85	13.5
14. Other (No. Resp. by 112 Teachers)	3	2.38	2	1.59	3	2.38	00	00.00	6	4.76	3.29	9.0

Range of Responses: Low Assistance 1 ⟶ 5 High Assistance

TABLE XXIV

THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS OF AREA I ON ASSISTANCE THAT SHOULD BE PROVIDED TO STUDENTS' SOEPS

Categories	1		2		3		4		5			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Mean	Rank
1. Class time spent in planning and selecting SOEP.	8	6.35	22	17.46	29	20.02	33	26.19	34	26.98	3.50	9.50
2. Developing parental involvement in SOEP.	8	6.35	12	9.52	25	19.84	40	31.75	38	30.16	3.63	4.00
3. Correlating career goals with SOEP training.	12	9.52	20	15.87	44	33.92	36	28.57	14	11.11	3.16	12.00
4. Correlating SOEP with FFA Awards and/or activities.	10	7.94	15	11.90	28	22.22	39	30.95	34	26.98	3.57	5.00
5. Selecting/procuring livestock and crops.	15	11.90	6	4.76	25	19.84	36	28.57	44	34.92	3.70	3.00
6. Record keeping.	13	10.32	5	3.97	12	9.52	23	18.25	73	59.94	4.10	1.00
7. Developing long range plans for SOEP.	11	8.73	10	7.94	33	26.19	42	33.33	30	23.81	3.56	6.50
8. Providing transportation for SOEP activities.	14	11.11	13	10.32	27	21.43	35	27.78	37	29.37	3.54	8.00
9. Providing equipment.	16	12.70	13	10.32	28	22.22	30	23.81	39	30.95	3.50	9.50
10. Evaluation of SOEP.	8	6.35	12	9.52	19	15.08	43	34.13	44	34.92	3.82	2.00
11. Class time spent on management practices.	6	4.76	15	11.90	31	24.60	50	39.68	24	19.05	3.56	6.50
12. Setting related educational goals.	4	3.17	19	15.08	47	37.30	31	24.60	25	19.84	3.43	11.00
13. Helping students physically expand SOEP.	17	13.49	20	15.87	39	30.95	28	22.22	22	17.46	3.14	13.00
14. Other (No Resp.)	3	2.38	1	.79	4	3.17	1	.79	3	2.38	3.00	14.00

Range of Answers: Low 12345 High

response on a scale from a low of 1 to a high of 5. A Likert Scale was used to give a numerical value to responses to simplify evaluation. Mean values were then used to rank the categories. In studying the data recorded in Table XXIII some interesting factors were discovered. Calculation of mean values indicated that in most instances teachers viewed themselves as currently doing a good job of assisting their students with the SOEPs. Teachers indicated the highest mean value (4.01) in the area of record keeping signifying they felt they were doing a more than adequate job with this SOEP subject area. Selecting and procuring livestock and crops ranked second as to assistance now provided. The third ranked category was providing transportation for SOEP activities. Evaluation of SOEP was the fourth ranked category followed closely by fifth ranked providing equipment with mean values of 3.65 and 3.63 respectively.

The assistance teachers felt they should provide students was somewhat different (Table XXIII). The highest mean value (4.10) was again given to record keeping. The evaluation of the SOEP was felt to be next in assistance needed. Selecting and procuring livestock and crops was ranked third. The fourth ranked category the teachers felt should be provided was developing parental involvement in the SOEP. Correlating the SOEP with FFA awards and/or activities was ranked fifth by the teachers as assistance that should be provided.

In comparing the assistance that is now provided, with the assistance the teachers felt should be provided, differences in the means were considered. The greatest difference came in the category of developing parental involvement, indicating teachers felt this area needed the greatest improvement. The need to improve the category of

developing long range plans for the SOEP received the next largest difference of mean values. Correlating career goals with SOEP training showed a similar large difference of mean values from assistance now provided to assistance the teachers felt they should provide. Setting related educational goals; helping students physically expand SOEPs; and class time spent on management practices respectively were felt by teachers to need some degree of improved assistance.

An interesting difference came to light when the means were compared. Teachers indicated a decrease in the amount of assistance they felt should be provided in three different categories. These were providing equipment, providing transportation for SOEP activities, and selecting and procuring livestock and crops respectively.

Question five, section C of the questionnaire dealing with a definition of a "productive" SOEP was deleted from consideration due to the large number of incorrect responses. This was the result of an evident misunderstanding of the instructions for correctly responding to the question.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine from Area I teacher's perceptions of their programs and general trends and implementation of SOEPs of students in the Texas Panhandle communities. The objectives of the study were as follows:

1. To determine general information regarding schools and school policies related to SOEPs in Area I.
2. To determine students' participation in and types of SOEPs in Area I.
3. To determine Area I teachers' perceptions of various aspects of SOEPs.

Summary

It was determined that about 90% of the teachers of Area I are employed in either single or two teacher departments. Over half of the communities in which vocational agriculture departments are located are of populations less than 3,000 population. Over half of the single teacher departments indicated an enrollment from 20-40 students per year. The two teacher departments indicated that approximately 79% had student enrollments of 50 to 80 students. About

half of the three teacher department showed enrollment levels of from 100-140 students. As a total group over 80% of the teachers in Area I have student enrollments of between 30-90 students.

About 75% of the teachers indicated they supervised all of the SOEPs. The remainder of the teachers either supervise their own students projects or supervise specific areas of SOEPs.

Over 85% of the teachers of Area I require an SOEP of their enrollees. Of those teachers not requiring SOEPs 85% indicated a voluntary student participation level from 70 - 100%.

Over 80% of the teachers indicated they considered the SOEP a valuable teaching tool by basing from 10% - 30% of the students grade on the SOEP.

In Area I about 70% of the teachers indicated 40% or more of their students lived in town. This finding would make it difficult for students without facilities to carry on a SOEP. About 48% of all teachers indicated that from 0 - 50% of their students did not have adequate facilities to carry on an SOEP. It was found that about 17% of the teachers responded that the school district did not provide facilities for an SOEP. Teachers indicated that about 88% were provided transportation or compensation for SOEP supervision and approximately the same percentage indicated that time during the school day was alloted by the school system for SOEP visitation usually in the afternoon.

About 50% of the teachers indicated that they attended two or three major livestock shows above the county level per year. Approximately 12% of the teachers indicated no limit to the number of livestock shows they were permited to attend.

Participation in FFA activities was found to be strong in Area I. Approximately 98% of those teachers responding indicated from 90 - 100% student membership in the FFA. The strongest level of participation by teachers was said to be on the district level with 57% participating. The levels above the district level showed less activity, but this is understandable since eleminations prevent some teams or individuals from competing further. Respondents indicated that about 64% had at least one State Farmer Applicant with 34.11% having four or more in 1981-82. Approximately 20% had no applicants. Doubling the State Farmer minimum requirements would cause an additional 16% of the teachers to have no applicants; however, by tripling the requirements an additional 34% of the teachers indicated they would have had no State Farmer applicants.

Teachers responded to questions on the recording of students' SOEPs with the following results. As a total population, about 35% of the teachers indicated they did not require a student to show all he owned as his SOEP. About 91% of the population indicated students involved in both vocational agriculture and 4-H were required to have separate SOEP projects.

Teachers perceptions of the definition of a SOEP were broken down as follows:

1. A SOEP may be considered a multipurpose enterprise or activity carried on outside the classroom by vocational agriculture students and supervised by vocational agriculture instructors. Approximately 85% of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed with this portion of the definition.

2. It is used primarily to enhance the student's appreciation for the learning of modern agriculture. Approximately 78% of the teachers either agreed or strongly agreed with this portion of the definition.
3. It is also to help prepare the students for an agriculture or agriculture related vocation. Approximately 79% of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

The teachers agreed more strongly with the first part of the definition than with the latter two.

The major objectives of the teachers were listed as follows (objectives listed according to teachers' ranking):

1. Character building
2. Enhance classroom instruction
3. Management skills
4. Provide a link between Vo. Ag. and FFA
5. FFA and Vo. Ag. Department recognition
6. Establishment in farming or agribusiness
7. Financial profit

The types of SOEPs carried on by students of Area I dealt mainly with livestock. The average percent of the SOEPs of a terminal livestock nature (barrows, steers, wethers, capons, etc.) was 61.43%. Commercial livestock projects made up an average percent of 14.01 of the SOEPs. Commercial crop production was said to make up an average percent of 9.01 of the SOEP programs. Breeding livestock for exhibition made up an average percent 8.97 of the total SOEP programs.

In response to the amount of assistance they perceived themselves to render currently and the amount of assistance they should render, most of the teachers indicated fairly high levels now rendered. "Record keeping" ranked highest on assistance rendered and which should be rendered. They indicated in most categories they felt they should render the same or slightly more assistance. For categories dealing with travel or transportation as related to SOEP, teachers indicated by mean values they should assist less than they are currently assisting. "Developing parental involvement in SOEP" showed the most marked need for improvement as indicated by the teachers. As a total group the teachers indicated a need for improving assistance in helping students secure land, credit, etc. in expansion of the SOEPs. "Developing long range plans for SOEP", "Correlating career goals with SOEP training", "Setting related educational goals", and "Helping students physically expand SOEP".

Conclusions

By analyzing data obtained and presented in this study, certain conclusions can be suggested concerning teachers perceptions of supervised occupational experience programs in Area I Texas vocational agriculture departments. The major conclusions obtained in this study are as follows:

1. Most of the departments in Area I are either one or two teacher departments consisting of student enrollments of from 30 to 90 students in communities of 3,000 or less populations. Many of the students live in town.

2. The majority of the teachers feel SOEPs are an important instructional tool indicated by requiring one for student enrollment.
3. The majority of the school districts are aware of the values of the SOEPs and thus provide facilities to students and transportation and school time to teachers for SOEP supervision.
4. A large percentage of students SOEPs are of a limited scope due to being exhibition type projects. "Productive" projects made up a markedly lower percentage of the overall program.
5. Participation in FFA activities is strong in Area I. State Farmer Applicants are high with the exception of a few single teacher departments.
6. The teachers perceptions of the SOEP definition given seemed strong for all portions.
7. Teachers felt that the major objectives of the SOEP should be ranked:
   a. Character building
   b. Enhance classroom instruction
   c. Management skills
   d. Provide a link between Vo. Ag. and FFA
   e. FFA and Vo. Ag. department recognition
   f. Establishment in farming or agribusiness
   g. Financial profit
8. Teachers indicated general satisfaction with the amounts of assistance provided to their students. They

indicated some increases in assistance are needed in "Developing parental involvement in SOEP" and with planning and goal setting related to their SOEPs. It was indicated in areas of transportation of SOEPs more was being done than needed to be done.

Recommendations

After completing this study the author would like to recommend the following:

1. The area supervisors and state staff should make an effort to see that a revived effort toward manditory requirement of SOEPs be made since approximately 15% of the teachers did not require them.
2. Since the indicated population of students without adequate facilities to carry on a SOEP is high in Area I, a continued effort by teachers and school districts to provide such facilities is necessary.
3. Since terminal livestock projects made up over 60% of the SOEPs of Area I, an effort on the part of the teachers to expand the type, size, and scope of the SOEPs is recommended.
4. Since the State Farmer Degree is the mark of a truly successful SOEP, more emphasis should be placed on the acquiring of this degree by all departments, but especially by those who showed no State Farmer for the 1981-82 school year.

5. Based on teacher responses, teacher assistance should be decreased in travel or transportation dealing with SOEPs, and increased in the areas of parental involvement, planning, and goal setting related to SOEPs.
6. Based on discrepancies in data received, it is recommended in further similar studies that new teachers be excluded from the population since detailed information may not be available to them prior to response to a survey instrument.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bell, Robert. "Do It All Year Long." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 49, No. 10 (April, 1977), p. 226.

Binkley, Harold R. "Supervised Occupational Experience Programs in Agriculture - A Must - And Standards For Them." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 49, No. 10 (April, 1977), pp. 219, 220, 238.

Burdine, Robert. "S.O.E. Programs In Agriculture - What and Why?" The Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 50, No. 12 (June 1978) pp. 271-272 - EJ 186362.

Cheek, Jimmy G. "Supervised Occupational Experience in the Southern Region." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 51, No. 10 (April, 1979), pp. 226-227.

Federal Register (40 F.R. 8081)

Fletcher, Lloyd Wayne. "Teacher and College Student Perceptions of Items Influential in the Decision to Teach Vocational Agriculture." (Unpub. M.S. thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1973.)

Iverson, Maynard. "The Role of Vocational Agriculture in the Occupational Success of Graduates - A Southern Region Study." The Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, Vol. XXI, No. 2 (July, 1980), pp. 11-20.

Key, James P. "Editorial Comments." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 51, No. 3 (September, 1978), p. 52.

Lawrence, Layle D., Anthony T. Mallilo. "Identification of Specific Areas of Vocational Agriculture Teaching in Need of the Greatest Improvement: A Modified Delphi Approach." The Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, Vol. XXII, No. 1 (March, 1981), pp. 24-28.

McMillion, Martin B., Martin K. Auville. "Factors Associated with the Success of Supervised Farming Programs of Virginia High School Students." The Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, Vol. XVII, No. 3 (November, 1976), pp. 9-13.

Phipps, L.J. Handbook on Agricultural Education in Public Schools. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1980.

Rawls, Willie. "Relationship Between Parent's Occupation and Selected Factors Related to Student Supervised Occupational Experience." The Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, Vol. XXII, No. 1 (March, 1981), pp. 35-40.

Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 - (Public Law 347, 64th Congress, 1917).

Smith, Steven Carl. "Teacher Perceptions of the Supervised Occupational Experience Programs in Oklahoma Vocational Agriculture Departments." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1982.)

Van Dalen, Deobold B. Understanding Educational Research, 4th Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1978.

Vaughn, Paul R., Leon A Wagley. "Using Supervised Occupational Experience Programs to Improve FFA Programs." The Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 52, No. 2 (August, 1979), p. 40, EJ 210480.

Vaughn, Paul R., Jamie Cano. "Factors Associated With Experiental Learning In New Mexico Agricultural Education Programs." Paper presented at the first Annual Western Region Agricultural Education Research Meeting, Austin, Texas, April, 1982.

Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 210, 88th Congress, 1963).

Williams, David L. "Relationships Between Vocational Agriculture Students' Supervised Occupational Experience and Selected Variables." The Journal of Vocational Education Research, Vol. II, No. 1 (Spring, 1977), pp. 17-28.

Williams, David L. "Supervised Occupational Experience." The Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 50, No. 7 (January, 1978), pp. 156-157, EJ 173033.

Williams, David L. "Students' Perceptions of Assistance Received From Parents and Teachers With Supervised Occupational Experience Programs." The Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, Vol. XXI, No. 2 (July, 1980), pp. 21-28.

APPENDIX A

COVER SHEET OF INSTRUCTIONS

Dear Fellow Vo. Ag. Teacher;

The attached questionnaire addresses one of the most important factors to Vocational Agriculture in Area I, throughout Texas and the Nation. From the inception of Vo. Ag. through the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, Supervised Occupational Training Programs (SOEPs) have received major emphasis in the training of future agriculturalists. However, very little research has been done concerning the overall success and teacher perception of the SOE program on the state level. This study is an effort in that direction. Please answer the questions as carefully and conscientiously as possible in order to contribute pertinent data that will truthfully reflect your ideas of a good SOE program. By supplying this type of information, ideas for improvement and general directions of the SOEPs may be found to benefit all vocational agriculture departments.

I know questionnaires take time, however I feel, as I'm sure you do, that Area I has quality SOEPs. Your time spent in answering this questionnaire may aid in identifying for solution some of the problems SOEPs are undergoing at the present time. Please share your ideas and difficulties.

Thank you

Dan Hembree

Dan R. Hembree

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENT

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES TOWARD VARIOUS ASPECTS OF PRODUCTION TYPE SUPERVISED OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS (SOEP) IN AREA I TEXAS VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS.

A. General Information and School Policy:

1. Please estimate the population of your community._____
2. How many students were enrolled in Vocational Agriculture in your department last year? _____
3. How many vocational agriculture teachers are in your department? _____
4. Choose the following option that best describes your department?
   _____(1) Each teacher supervises the SOEP's of the students he teaches.
   _____(2) SOEP catagories such as Coop, Crop, Beef, Sheep, Swine, etc. are assigned to the supervision of specific teachers.
   _____(3) Teacher's jointly supervise all students SOEPs.
   _____(4) Single teacher department, I supervise all SOEPs.
   _____(5) Other (explain)
5. Is a SOEP required for enrollment of students in Vo. Ag. in your department? yes _____ no _____
6. What part of the student's grade comes from their SOEP?
   0_____10_____20_____30_____40____more____Borderline Pts____
   Other (explain) _____
7. If SOEP is not required, estimate the percentage of student participation. _____
8. What percent of your Vo. Ag. students live in town? _____
9. What percent of your students don't have adequate facilities at home to have a SOEP? _____
10. Does the school provide facilities for these student's SOEPs? yes _____ no _____
11. Does the school provide you a vehicle (or compensate you for the use of yours) for visiting SOEPs? yes_____ no _____
12. Does the school provide visitation time for you during the school day? yes_____ no_____
13. What hour of the day is this time provided? _____
14. How many major livestock shows does your school allow your chapter to participate in annually? _____

B. Student Participation and Types of SOEPs

1. What percent of your vocational agriculture enrollment belongs to FFA? _____
2. At what level did your chapter participate this year in the national foundation awards program? 0_____local_____ dist._____area_____state_____nat'l_____
3. How many Lone Star Farmer Applicants did you submit this past year? _____
4. Estimate the number of Lone Star Farmer Applicants you would have had if:
   1) the minimum financial requirement had been doubled?_____
   2) the minimum financial requirement had been tripled?_____
5. Does each student's SOEP include all the (animals, crops, etc.) he owns? yes_____ no_____

6. Do the students that you have that are in both Vo. Ag. & 4-H have seperate SOEP for each youth program? yes_____no_____

C. Teacher Perceptions

1. Indicate the degree of agreement you have regarding the various parts of the following definition of a supervised occupational experience program.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	No Opinion	Slightly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
"A SOEP may be considered a multipurpose enterprise or activity carried on outside the regular classroom by vocational agriculture students and supervised by vocational agriculture instructors.....							
It is used primarily to enhance the student's appreciation for and the learning of modern agriculture.....							
It is also to help prepare the students for a agriculture or agriculture related vocation.....							

2. Rank in order from 1 (one) to 8 (eight) (No. 1 being most important), the following as to how you feel they would rate in relation to their importance as an SOEP Program Objective.

_____ Enhance Classroom instruction (hands on experience)
_____ Provide link between Vo. Ag. and F.F.A.
_____ Financial Profit
_____ Character Building
_____ Management Skills
_____ FFA/Vo. Ag. Dept. Recognition
_____ Establishment in Farming/Agribusiness
_____ Other (Specify)

3. List the percent of the categories in the list below making your SOEPs fall into all categories by percent of total SOEP Program. (Make sure your listings total 100%)

Categories

_____1) Commercial livestock production
_____2) Terminal Livestock Exhibition (Terminal animals - barrows, steers, wethers, etc.)
_____3) Breeding Livestock Exhibition (Breeding animals - Ewes, Rams, Boars, Gilts, Bulls, Heifers)
_____4) Commercial crop production
_____5) Crop Exhibition
_____6) Forestry
_____7) Dairy
_____8) Horticulture
_____9) Other (Specify)
_____ Total

4. Give each of the following statements a numerical value from one (1) to five (5) as increased importance is felt. Place a mark in the desired numberical response column. Answers in column "Assistance Now Provided" indicates the amount of assistance you feel you now provide your students SOEPs. Column "Assistance Should Provide" indicates the amount of assistance you feel you should (or feel obligated) to provide. Place rating marks in the appropriate box at the right. Range of answers Low 12345 High

	Response Columns: Assistance Now Provided					Assistance Should Provide				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1) Class time spent in planning and selecting SOEP.....										
2) Developing parental involvement in SOEP...										
3) Correlating career goals with SOEP..... training.										
4) Correlating SOEP with FFA Awards and/or... activities.										
5) Selecting/procuring livestock and crops...										
6) Record Keeping.....										
7) Developing long range plans for SOEP.....										
8) Providing transportation for SOEP..... activities.										
9) Providing equipment (facilities/trailers/ tools).....										
10) Evaluation of SOEP.....										
11) Class time spent on management practices..										
12) Setting related educational goals.....										
13) Helping students physically expand SOEP (find land for expansion, etc).....										
14. Other (Specify).....										

5. Rank in degree of importance to you the following definitions that best describe a productive SOEP (No. 1 being most important).

_____1) A SOEP that grows in scope each year

_____2) A SOEP that produces a product

_____3) A SOEP that develops responsibility despite size and scope.

_____4) A SOEP that achieves a higher quality of achievement each year.

VITA[2]

Dan Ray Hembree

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISED OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS IN AREA I TEXAS VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS

Major Field: Agricultural Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Shawnee, Oklahoma, June 13, 1945, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Alva Hembree.

Education: Graduated from Maud High School, Maud, Oklahoma in May of 1963; attended Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, and received the Bachelor of Science degree in July, 1967; completed requirements for the Master of Science Degree at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in July, 1983.

Professional Organizations: Member of Texas State Teachers Association, National Education Association, Texas Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association, American Vocational Association.