

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THE SUPERVISED  
OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS IN  
OKLAHOMA VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE  
DEPARTMENTS

By

STEVEN CARL SMITH

Bachelor of Science in Agriculture  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1977

Master of Science  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1979

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
July, 1982

Thesis  
1982D  
S661 t  
Cop. 2



TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THE SUPERVISED  
OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS IN  
OKLAHOMA VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE  
DEPARTMENTS

Thesis Approved:

*James P. Key*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser  
*Robert Terry*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Robert P. Wettemann*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Wesley Holley*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Norman N. Burkhardt*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
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. Robert Terry and Dr. James Key for their invaluable advice, assistance, and encouragement. A special thank you is extended to Dr. Wes Holley and Dr. Robert Wettemann for their guidance and encouragement throughout the development of the study.

Appreciation is also expressed to the staff of the State Department of Vocational Agriculture Education and the vocational agriculture instructors in Oklahoma, for without their help this study would not have been possible.

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Carl W. Smith, for their assistance and inspiration. A very special and humble thanks is expressed to his wife, Janet, and children Brad, Jaye and Katie for the many sacrifices they made and for their untiring assistance, encouragement and love and to whom this thesis is dedicated.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	7
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	8
Objectives of the Study. . . . .	8
Scope of the Study . . . . .	9
Definition of Terms. . . . .	10
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE. . . . .	12
Importance of SOEPs. . . . .	13
The Changing Status of SOEPs . . . . .	16
Suggested Models for SOEPs . . . . .	19
Factors Influencing Successful SOEPs . . . . .	22
Summary. . . . .	24
III. DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF THE STUDY . . . . .	27
The Study Population . . . . .	27
Development of the Instrument. . . . .	28
Analysis of Data . . . . .	29
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	33
Introduction . . . . .	33
Definition of SOEP . . . . .	34
Necessity of SOEPs . . . . .	35
SOEP Departmental Characteristics. . . . .	38
SOEP Visitations . . . . .	42
Areas of Student Involvement . . . . .	48
SOE Program Objectives . . . . .	55
Assistance Provided Student SOEPs. . . . .	55
Assistance Which Should Be Provided SOEPs. . . . .	60
Student Involvement in SOEPs . . . . .	63
FFA Awards and Degrees . . . . .	65
Planned Emphasis . . . . .	65

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . .	69
Summary of the Study . . . . .	69
Purpose of the Study. . . . .	69
Specific Objectives of the Study. . . . .	69
Rationale for the Study . . . . .	71
Design and Conduct of the Study . . . . .	72
Findings of the Study . . . . .	73
Conclusions and Recommendations. . . . .	77
Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .	84
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	85
APPENDIX . . . . .	88

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Oklahoma Vocational Agriculture Teacher Agreement with Specific Components of a Definition of Supervised Occupational Experience Programs. . . . .	36
II. Teacher Opinion Regarding the Necessity of SOEPs for Agricultural Education. . . . .	37
III. Selected Characteristics Related to SOEPs in Oklahoma Vocational Agriculture Departments. . . . .	39
IV. Teacher perceptions of Possible Vocational Agriculture Departmental Policies Toward SOEPs . . . . .	41
V. Summary of Teacher Responses to Questions Regarding SOEP Visitations . . . . .	43
VI. Teacher Ranking of the Areas of Most Student SOEP Involvement . . . . .	49
VII. Teacher Ranking of SOEP Areas in Which Students Should be Involved. . . . .	52
VIII. Spearman Rank-order Correlation. . . . .	54
IX. Teacher Rankings of the Importance of Selected SOE Program Objectives. . . . .	56
X. Teacher Perceptions of the Amount of Assistance They Provide Their Students' Supervised Occupational Experience Programs . . . . .	59
XI. Teacher Perceptions of the Amount of Assistance They Should Provide Their Students' Supervised Occupational Experience Programs. . . . .	62
XII. Pearson Product-moment Correlation . . . . .	63
XIII. Student Involvement in Year-round SOE Programs . . . . .	64

Table	Page
XIV. Teacher Perception of the Effectiveness of FFA Degrees and Awards in Promoting Student Involvement in SOEP's. . . . .	66
XV. Teachers' Planned Emphasis of Student Involvement in SOEP's. . . . .	67



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

A record 507 state high school students--who collectively own \$7.9 million in farm land and agriculture projects--were awarded the State Farmer Degree Wednesday at the State Future Farmers of America convention (Long, 1982, p. 1).

This sentence started the lead paragraph in a newspaper article which reported on the 56<sup>th</sup> annual meeting of the Oklahoma FFA. Although the purpose of the article was to point out the highlights of the convention, this one sentence indirectly made reference to probably the most important aspect of vocational agriculture and the FFA; the supervised occupational experience program (SOEP).

Supervised occupational experience programs had their primal beginning with the Smith-Hughes Act which mandated six months of supervised or directed practice on a farm for students of vocational agriculture. The aim of this requirement was " . . . to fit for useful employment. . . " (P. L. 264, 1917, p. 1) the vocational agriculture student for agricultural occupations on the farm. This requirement was a major component of the guidelines for the new high school vocational agriculture programs initiated by the act.

The importance of an SOEP is still realized today. Indeed, the Policies and Procedures Manual (1932) for Oklahoma

Vocational Agriculture departments states that "all students enrolled in vocational agriculture ...must have plans for an SOEP" (p. 45).

The SOEP, also termed 'supervised farming program', 'experiential program' or 'supervised farm practice', has remained the heart of vocational agriculture curricula for 65 years. The objective of these programs include:

1. The enhancement of classroom instruction.
2. The better understanding of any agricultural occupation chosen by the student.
3. An opportunity for the student to grow into an agricultural occupation through the acquisition of technical agricultural knowledge and/or agricultural land, facilities or livestock.
4. Providing a vehicle for the accumulation of experience in performing tasks required by an agricultural occupation.

These programs are individually designed through a cooperative teacher/student effort to provide a necessary link between classroom instruction and the realities of agriculture. It has been demonstrated that these programs are necessary, in fact, mandatory, for the adequate education of agriculture-oriented youth (Binkley, 1977; Miller, 1980). According to Binkley,

There can be no adequate training in agriculture that does not have its foundation in participation in the tasks for which the abilities are needed (p. 220).

The excerpt from the article which began this chapter exemplifies the goal of these programs and the relative success of SOEPs in achieving these goals. Students of vocational agriculture complete the curriculum with not only a classroom knowledge of modern agriculture, but also realistic experience and hopefully a substantial accumulation of real property to begin or work toward the agricultural occupation of their choice.

These programs are not initiated and carried on solely by the student. The help of vocational agriculture teachers, parents and the school administration supplement the efforts of the student.

The teacher plays a substantial role by providing the student with information and guidance conducive to the determination of what type of program is best suited to the student's objectives which he has set for himself. The teacher may now assist in working with the student and his parents in setting up the program by actively making his experience and expertise available for securing necessary funds, facilities, or services.

Once the program is firmly established, the teacher strives to insure its success through advisement, promoting the use of modern farm practices, and help and cooperation in securing services (labor, transportation, etc.) necessary for the program's continuation. The teacher also provides student motivation by promoting activities in the FFA, which have been developed to give the student opportunities to fine

tune necessary skills used in agriculture and to show off skills or products he has developed/produced with his supervised occupational experience program.

The teacher also utilizes the SOEP to become acquainted with the student's family and homelife. With this knowledge and the SOEP, the teacher will be more adequately informed to relate and present information to the student in such a manner which is perceived as more relevant and therefore worth learning.

The parents' involvement is also substantial. They must provide the encouragement and support necessary for success. A student must have recognition, understanding, approval and support from his parents or he begins to wonder about the value of this program that his teacher is promoting. Financial help may also be needed from the parents until a return of some kind can be realized from the SOEP. If the student is involved in other activities or possibly away on an FFA trip, parents may offer help through providing labor required periodically during the student's absence.

The cooperation of school officials is vital. The success of a student's SOEP may depend upon the school officials' recognition of the need by the teacher for time out of the regular classroom for supervision of these programs. Cooperation is also necessary for the effective planning and use of field trips and time out of school by the students for related, as well as essential, FFA activities.

A school farm is becoming increasingly vital. School

administrations are realizing this and have been quite helpful, even enthusiastic about fulfilling this need.

There are many types of SOEPs but they can be categorized into a few groups (Key, 1977; Lee, 1980). The first involves the students owning and managing agricultural enterprises such as livestock, crops, or agribusinesses. The students actively invest their own money, time and labor in planning, directing and marketing the product of their toil. Each phase of the operation is joint effort involving not only the student but also the parents and vocational agriculture teacher.

The second method of providing supervised occupational experience opportunities places the student in an agricultural operation which he/she does not own but performs many of the same duties as though he did; similar to an apprenticeship. Under this program, the student may work in agribusiness, on a farm, or on facilities provided by the school. The students are usually paid for their efforts but the main purpose remains to provide the student with on-the-job training; an education that can not be obtained in the classroom. In Oklahoma, this type of program is referred to as Vocational Agricultural Occupational Training (VAOT). Many states prefer the term cooperative occupational education denoting the assistance of another party; the students' employer.

The last type is the simulated SOEP. Here the student is provided the opportunity to utilize school facilities in the classroom, shop, or laboratory to gain experience in

performing tasks found in the agricultural industries. Again, the student is closely supervised and directed by the vocational agriculture instructor.

Through most of the history of high school vocational agriculture, the majority of SOEPs have been of the ownership type. Recently, though, this has changed due to the astronomical cost of beginning an agriculture enterprise, the urbanization of agricultural communities and resultant influx of agriculturally inexperienced students in high school programs. The most significant change in recent years, which also has a great effect on vocational agriculture in general and SOEPs in specific is the complex differentiation and specialization of agriculture industries. Many students are no longer feeding livestock or raising crops but are becoming involved in agriculture mechanics, processing, public relations and journalism, supplies and services, and horticulture (Dillon, 1977).

The factors and characteristics discussed in this chapter, which make up the supervised occupational experience programs, provide students the advantage of conducting programs which are tailor made for each student and the distinctive traits which make him unique, special and set apart from the rest. At the same time, because of this attribute, there are no formal guidelines for the program's development, scope, or requirements concerning SOEPs for high school vocational agriculture programs. This results in a wide variation in the types of programs which can be found in the country;

indeed, within a particular vocational agriculture department.

#### Statement of the Problem

In Oklahoma, many varieties of student SOEPs exist. And the requirements by the teacher for involvement in an experiential program are as varied as the teachers themselves. Contributing to the diversity of SOEPs in the state are many variables which affect a students SOEP such as financing, parental/teacher help and guidance, community influences, student background, and student expectations of the program.

There have been no recent studies of the factors affecting SOEPs in Oklahoma or the assessment of their status. In relation to SOEPs, many questions need to be asked, including; scope, type of program, students' attitudes, and teacher attitudes and requirements of the students in their departments.

Due to the immense differences which abound in supervised occupational experience programs today, it would not be feasible to try to determine effects of all variables upon these programs in one study. However, because of the importance of the vocational agriculture teacher in the development and conduct of SOEPs, it would seem logical to begin to approach this area through a determination of teacher perceptions, attitudes and other selected attributes of the teacher which may have an influence upon the kinds and characteristics

of programs currently in operation in Oklahoma vocational agriculture departments today.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine Oklahoma vocational agriculture teacher perceptions of selected aspects of the supervised occupational experience programs in Oklahoma and the resulting influence upon the characteristics of these programs.

#### Objectives of the Study

In order to accomplish the purpose of this study, the following objectives were set forth:

1. To determine the degree to which Oklahoma vocational agriculture instructors agree to various components of a definition of supervised occupational experience program.
2. To determine teacher perceptions of the necessity of these programs for adequate education in the field(s) of agriculture.
3. To determine selected characteristics of vocational agriculture departments which may have an effect on experience programs now in operation.
4. To determine teacher perceptions of possible departmental policies regarding SOEPs.
5. To determine selected characteristics of SOEP visitations by vocational agriculture instructors.



6. To determine the areas of most SOEP involvement, teacher perceptions of where this involvement should be, and the association between the two.
7. To ascertain teacher perceptions of the relative importance of selected SOE program objectives.
8. To determine and compare the amount of assistance provided by teachers to their students' programs and the amount of assistance the teachers feel they are obligated to provide.
9. To determine the amount of student involvement in year-round supervised occupational experience programs.
10. To solicit teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of FFA degrees and awards in promoting student involvement in these programs.
11. To determine the teachers planned emphasis of student involvement with experiential programs in the future.

#### Scope of the Study

This study attempted to survey the perceptions of all high school vocational agriculture teachers in the state of Oklahoma. No attempt was made to differentiate between the perceptions of teachers with different educational levels, years teaching experience, or professional success, etc. Farm business management and special program instructors were not included in the study population.

It was assumed that the instrument used for collection of the data would adequately determine the perceptions of the study population regarding supervised occupational experience programs. The questionnaire was administered at the teachers' respective Professional Improvement meetings or mailed to those who were not in attendance during this administration.

It was believed that there would be no difference in the sincerity of teacher responses between those mailed questionnaires and those who were personally administered the questionnaire.

#### Definition of Terms

Smith-Hughes Act of 1917--The legislative act which provided for a continuing appropriation for vocational education in agriculture, trade and industrial, and homemaking education.

Supervised occupational experience programs (SOEP)--May be considered a multi-purpose 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 students' appreciation for and the learning of modern agriculture, and to help prepare the students for an agricultural vocation. May be referred to as 'experiential programs', 'supervised farm training' or 'supervised farm practice'.

Vocational agriculture--Refers to high school programs offering courses designed to train students for careers in production agriculture and other agriculture related fields.

Vocational agriculture teacher--State certified personnel employed by local school districts to direct programs designed to meet the needs of students desiring occupations in agriculture and to assist in helping adults of the community in meeting their needs in the area of agriculture.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A review of related literature was conducted by the author to better acquaint him with the numerous areas related to and affecting the characteristics of supervised occupational experience programs. To insure a well-rounded review of available literature, attention was particularly paid to the specific aspects of the importance of supervised occupational experience programs (SOEP), their changing status, suggested models for SOEPs, and factors influencing effective SOEPs.

The collection of information presented in this chapter was located through the use of an ERIC search (Educational Resources Information Center) and the On-line computer services. An intensive hand search was also conducted.

The information obtained was useful in determining methodology, areas of investigation, and other aspects which would reflect the reason for the exhibition of certain characteristics of SOEPs. This information is presented in topical headings to facilitate clarity, organization and understanding. This review does not comprise an exhaustive list of related studies and articles.

### Importance of SOEPs

"The 'heart and backbone' of a vocational agriculture curriculum is the supervised occupational experience program" (Peterson and McCreight, 1973, p. 245). SOEPs are the key to making vocational agriculture vocational. Vocational agriculture programs, coupled with the Future Farmers of America organization, are built around the supervised occupational experience program.

Peterson and McCreight(1973) stressed the importance of SOEPs by outlining that these programs:

1. Are an extension of classroom instruction for farm, ranch or off-farm agricultural occupations.
2. Encourage the use of approved practices.
3. Promote closer cooperation and relationships between agribusiness and teachers.
4. Inform teachers about situations of students.
5. Make effective teaching in a real life situation.
6. Help students see a need for relevance of instruction.

Lee (1980) stated that nothing takes the place of learning about the real world like learning in the real world. And that SOEPs are the vehicle by which the 'real world learning' takes place.

Employers typically ask prospective employees about what experience they have had. A student who has maintained an SOEP can point to these experiences and explain that not only does he have the technical knowledge but he has also put it to use with his SOEP. In essence, yes he does have

experience. The experiences gained from experience programs may not be on the scale in which the employer is involved, but they do provide a base from which the student can build, and provide the employer with justification for hiring the applicant.

Vocational agriculture programs have been traditionally successful at producing technically skilled individuals (Polson, 1980). But with the incorporation of supervised occupational experiences and FFA into the students' educational program, the affective domain is further developed along with the cognitive domain. The skills he refers to which enhance the development of the cognitive domain are interpersonal skills (communication, attitude to employer/company and cooperation), conceptual skills (responsibility, common sense, work habits) and self-assessment skills (pride, ambition, dependability, etc.)

Rawls (1977), in a study involving parents of vocational agriculture students, found that SOEPs also contributed to the development of the affective domain. He reported on 40 benefits of SOEPs in the areas of work attitude, occupational development and human relations.

Student success was analyzed on an achievement test against the quality of their SOEPs (Morton, 1980). He observed a positive correlation between achievement test scores, and:

1. Quality scores of SOEPs ( $p < .01$ );
2. Opportunity to engage in SOEPs ( $p < .001$ )

3. The number of years completed in vocational agriculture ( $p < .001$ ).

These results prompted Morton to conclude that learning by doing is important for the successful education of vocational agriculture students and higher quality SOEPs are likely to result in greater learning achievement.

Williams (1977) conducted a study to determine the importance of SOEPs in selected areas as perceived by vocational agriculture students enrolled in production agriculture in Iowa. His results reflected differences according to the type of experience program conducted by the student; ownership, placement or simulated. However, relatively high importance ratings for all occupational skills and a lack of significant difference between 25 of the 38 variables studied between the three SOEP groups suggest that ownership, placement and simulated SOEPs are equally effective in developing skills which are important in agricultural occupations. The two highest rated occupational skills common among the three SOEP types were 1) the importance of honest work and 2) the development of acceptable personal and work habits.

Williams also concluded from these results that the different types of experience programs would be effective in developing different occupational characteristics best suited for a particular student. In other words, the three program types do not necessarily develop the same work attitudes and characteristics.

Over fifty percent of the students studied from the

Southern Region were agriculturally employed (Iverson, 1980). The majority of these former vocational agriculture students also agreed upon numerous benefits derived from vocational agriculture and their SOEPs which aided them later in life.

A study by Kruckenberg and Williams (1980) of employers participating in placement programs in Iowa revealed that 1) 100% of the employers felt that the program was beneficial to their business and would employ students in the future, and 2) sixty percent of former placement students were employed in agricultural occupations and an additional thirty percent were continuing their education beyond high school.

Parents perceived 39 of 40 SOEP variables to be "above average" benefit to students (Rawls, 1978). The variable not rated above average was "Improving school attendance until graduation." The parents felt that their sons and daughters derived from their SOEPs work attitude, occupational development and human relationship skills.

#### The Changing Status of SOEPs

The early history of vocational agriculture provided for supervised occupational experience through student involvement in production projects at home in connection usually with parental involvement and supervision. But time has changed agriculture and the emphasis and characteristics of SOEPs. Tulloch (1973) cited some factors causing this change and what effect they have on the types of SOEPs offered today.



Teachers are required to teach more students with less funds for supervision. Additional duties are also given the teacher, such as; homerooms, class sponsorships, bus and hall duty. Outside 'moonlighting' activities reduce the amount of time teachers have for their students. And the growing diversity of modern agriculture has caused many teachers to lack technical expertise and confidence in certain areas of instruction.

Students currently enrolling in vocational agriculture have weaker agricultural backgrounds. Other activities such as athletics and television take time away from programs such as those associated with vocational agriculture. And increasingly affluency provides students with less desire to try to earn money through SOEPs.

Agriculture itself has an influence in that production agriculture is becoming more specialized. There are fewer opportunities for people to become involved in animal (Pope, 1980; Lee, 1980) and crop production which leads to the emphasis of more specialized areas of agriculture and ag-related enterprises. Programs must now be designed for the student interested in a career in horticulture of landscaping, fertilizer development and application, or farm implement sales or repair.

A study by Dillon (1977) outlines the change found in supervised occupational experience programs in Nebraska over seven years. SOEPs with an emphasis in production consisted of 90.1% of the total in 1969-70 but this type of program

decreased to 60.7% by 1975-76. Agriculture supplies and service increased from 3.4% to 9.1% over the same time span and agriculture mechanics, ornamental horticulture and agriculture processing showed changes from 2.5% to 17.2%, .43% to 2.7% and 2.6% to 2.7%, respectively.

Binkley (1977) expressed concern in 1975 that the number of supervised occupational experience programs was declining to a new low. This information prompted a study by Miller (1980) who reported the following in regard to North Carolina vocational agriculture programs:

1. 34% of SOEPs were rated as 'weak' or 'very weak' by the teachers compared to 25% rating programs as 'strong' or 'very strong'.
2. 58% of the students develop an SOEP.
3. Opportunities for simulated SOE in school facilities were rated 'inadequate' or 'not available' by a majority of the teachers.
4. Over one half of the teachers reported making regular student visitations but one half of the students received no more than one visit per year.
5. Reimbursement for travel was inadequate to cover costs of home visitations.
6. The amount of school time available for home visitations has been reduced since 1972.

Martin (1979) stated these views on why the change in SOEPs in general:

1. Current emphasis dictates proficiency in job

performance as well as proficiency in farming.

2. Experiences from facilities for simulated supervised occupational experience are inferior to those of farms or agricultural firms.
3. Agricultural diversity tests teacher talents.
4. All students may no longer be perceived as farmers to be.
5. More institutions now offer programs involving experiences similar to those of vocational agriculture.

Lawrence and Mallilo (1981) conducted a survey of state supervisors, head teacher educators of major land grant institutions and presidents of state vocational agriculture teacher associations. This population agreed through a modified Delphi approach that no improvement was needed in the areas of; SOEPs as an integral part of the instructional program; year-round instruction and supervision in SOEPs; expansion of SOEPs in off-farm areas through placement and cooperative education; planning, developing, growth and scope of SOEPs; and using the summer employment for supervision of experience programs.

#### Suggested Models for SOEPs

The changes in agriculture and resulting influences upon vocational agriculture and supervised occupational experience programs have prompted numerous recommendations for standards and guidelines for the implementation and

conduct of experiential programs. Some of these are discussed below.

Binkley (1977), after observing the changes in SOEPs he came in contact with on a tour of various states in 1977, presented a two phase set of standards. Students enrolled in vocational agriculture I or II would be required a minimum number of 50 labor hours in one or all of the following areas:

1. Production projects (crops and livestock).
2. Placement for farm experience.
3. Home improvement projects.
4. Supplementary experiences in agriculture.
5. Group activity projects.

Juniors and Seniors would be required a minimum of 500 labor hours in either production agriculture, agribusiness or a specialized and diversified area of agriculture.

Peterson and McCreight (1973) stated the continuation of supervised training be of one of the four primary types; supervised farming or ranching, laboratory programs, farm placement, and supervised cooperative programs. Each of these types would also be coordinated with activities in home improvement and occupational skills development.

Certain components must exist before a program could be successful in placement programs (Johnson, 1977). These included:

1. The student must have an interest in and a vocational need for such training.

2. The selection of a training station must be based upon realistic facts concerning working conditions and career opportunities.
3. The training must be pertinent to entrance and progression within the career area.
4. The student must eventually obtain employment that is satisfactory to him.

An agricultural educator who plans to implement an agriculture work study program should ask: Is the program worth the added effort? Is the program a sound educational endeavor? And will the benefits to the student, agriculture program and school be worthwhile (Woodard, 1977).

For an SOEP to be successful, the teacher should be capable of assuming many roles (Reakes and Welton, 1977). First, the teacher should be a 'teacher'. He should be current in his agricultural knowledge and fulfill his responsibility to check student progress toward program objectives. Second, the teacher is a 'coordinator' of classroom and laboratory activities. Other roles recommended included those of a 'crusader', 'planner', 'catalyst' and 'public relations expert'.

The SOEP should be the target of the remainder of the program (Hamblen, Brown and Wyatt, 1977). Support from the community, family and school coupled with instruction in agricultural science and mechanics should be geared to relate to and enhance student SOEPs.

## Factors Influencing Successful SOEPs

Successful supervised occupational experience programs are dependent upon a multitude of variables. These variables may originate from the students, teachers, parents, schools, communities or other extraneous variables.

Arrington (1981) measured the relationship of selected variables with the scope of SOEPs. He determined the relationship between SOEP scope and length of teacher contract, the student living in a rural environment, the teacher having had high school vocational agriculture, teacher assistance with fairs and shows, and the number of supervisory visits to be .66, .51, .27, .30 and .45; respectively.

Morton (1980) also found a relationship ( $p < .01$ ) between achievement test scores of vocational agriculture students on an agricultural exam and teacher supervisory visits.

McMillion and Auville (1976) found a positive relationship between SOEP success and assistance provided by the teacher during fairs and shows, extent to which the teacher informed the school administration of FFA activities, the teacher's vocational agriculture training in high school, the nearness of the student to the teacher's home location and the number of nonacademic school duties performed by the teacher. A negative relationship existed between SOEP success and the teacher having a part-time job.

The amount of assistance received from the teacher by the student has a positive effect upon the success of SOEPs.

Students felt that teachers provided the greatest assistance in the areas of recordkeeping, encouragement, summarizing records, learning agricultural skills and setting agricultural educational goals (Williams, 1977).

These same students perceived parental assistance greatest in providing equipment, locating a place to maintain an SOEP, learning agricultural skills, marketing products and determining interest in agriculture.

The least amount of assistance received from the teacher as perceived by the students was in the areas of financing, providing equipment, locating a place for SOEPs, selecting crops, and selecting supplies.

Net income may also be considered an indicator of program quality. But a study by Dillingham (1979) showed no relationship between net income and the characteristics of 1) production agriculture teachers, 2) programs, 3) communities, 4) methods of program development and 5) teachers' perceptions of the values of supervised projects. This prompted Dillingham to recommend that criteria be developed and validated which can be evaluated by vocational agriculture teachers to improve supervised occupational experience programs.

Over sixty percent of New Mexico vocational agriculture teachers reported that not all of their students conducted SOE programs. Reasons given by the teachers for this were: 1) students live in town; 2) students' lack of finances, facilities, interest, motivation; 3) school policy and

new students in the department. This same study also found a strong positive relationship between the level of student involvement with SOE programs and 1) FFA membership, 2) number of teachers in the department, 3) amount of time spent on SOEP instruction, and 4) SOEPs as a requirement for enrollment.

### Summary

Supervised occupational experience programs are the foundation on which vocational agriculture is built. They are what make vocational agriculture vocational in nature. These programs provide opportunities for students to apply what they learn in the classroom, experience what their chosen agricultural occupation will demand of them and provide a useful background knowledge which will make them more desirable to prospective employers.

Experience programs are a necessary component which all other aspects of vocational agriculture curricula should be built around. And the FFA is also structured to enhance the activities students are involved in with their individual programs.

The types and nature of SOEPs have been changing over the past twenty or so years. Agriculture has become more diversified and specialized. An increasing number of students enrolled in vocational agriculture are from urban sectors and not directly involved in farming and ranching. These students still wish to become part of American



agriculture, but because of the astronomical expense involved in starting the traditional production enterprise, they are becoming interested in the more specialized aspects of agriculture.

With the existence of these conditions, supervised occupational experience programs are also reflecting change. More students are structuring their programs around such areas as horticulture, agriculture mechanics and agribusiness.

Also, the diversity of vocational agriculture departments and teachers add to the variation found among SOEPs. There are no recognized standards for the requirements or characteristics of SOEPs.

Many models have been suggested for the administration and structure of SOEPs and their relationship to the rest of the vocational agriculture curriculum. These models can not and should not remove the characteristic individualism which is offered the student and his SOEP.

Relatively few studies have dealt with the characteristics or perceptions of supervised occupational experience programs. But some studies have reported a decreased interest on the part of instructors to maintain emphasis in experiential programs. They also reflect a decreased perception as to the importance of these programs by these teachers.

Other studies have reported that former students regard their experiences and the benefits received from experience programs very highly. And recognized leaders in the field

of vocational education, in general, and vocational agriculture in specific, still feel that supervised occupational experience programs should be stressed and the quality of these programs maintained or even improved. Studies of parents and businessmen tend to demonstrate the same attitudes as these former students and vocational education leaders.

Supervised occupational experience programs vary in nature according to the ideas of teachers, students, parents and school officials. Because of the importance of SOEPs, their variability and the recent, almost dramatic, changes in these programs, studies need to be designed and implemented to determine the aspects, perceptions and future of them. This is a very broad area and one study can not accomplish all of these objectives. Therefore, numerous studies must be used which can approach the subject from different angles.

## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF THE STUDY

The primary purpose of the study was to determine Oklahoma vocational agriculture teacher perceptions of selected aspects of the supervised occupational experience programs in Oklahoma. The methodology used as determined by the purpose and the specific objectives outlined previously in the study.

To collect and analyze data pertaining to the above stated purpose and specific objectives of the study, it was necessary to accomplish the following tasks:

1. Determination of the population from which the most appropriate data was to be collected.
2. Development of an appropriate vehicle for the collection of data pertinent to the study.
3. Determination of a suitable means of contacting the study population for the solicitation of data.
4. Determination of proper procedures for analyzing collected data.

#### The Study Population

The population of this study included all certified teachers of vocational agriculture in Oklahoma high schools

in the school year 1981-1982. All Oklahoma teachers were used to insure validity and because of the variation found in the types of SOEPs in various regions of the state and within each high school vocational agriculture department. There were 451 teachers in this population, of which 390, 86.5%, responded to the study. Farm business management and special program instructors were not included in this study.

#### Development of the Instrument

A written questionnaire was determined to be the most appropriate vehicle for data collection although other alternatives were considered including; personal interviews, telephone surveys and reviews of information collected by the Agriculture Division of the State Department of Vocational Technical Education in Oklahoma.

The items selected for inclusion in the questionnaire were considered for appropriateness and relevancy to the study, and suitability for this type of collection. A review of related literature also provided insight into topic areas of concern which were worthy of investigation and should be included on the questionnaire. The literature also provided information regarding the type of approach which has been successful in the acquisition of data for a study of this type. Each item was reviewed and modified if necessary by the author, Agricultural Education Staff at Oklahoma State University, and the Staff of the Agriculture Division at the State Department of Vocational Technical Education.

The format of the questionnaire and the design of the questions contained were developed using guidelines set forth by Hoppe and Parsons (1974). Some of the guidelines used were:

1. The questions should be worded concisely and clearly (p. 62).
2. When using categories, the range should cover all responses possible (p. 24).
3. Questions need to be worded so that they are neutral, not loaded (p. 65).
4. The sequence of questions should be such that the flow of information is natural (p. 51).

The questions were designed and grouped to fulfill the objectives of the study. Types of responses solicited by the questions included 'yes' or 'no', Likert-type scales (Kerlinger, 1973), very short subjective fill-in-the-blank responses and ranking questions.

The data were collected at the teachers' professional improvement meetings with the questionnaire being administered by Vocational Agriculture State Department District Supervisors. A questionnaire was mailed to any teachers who did not attend the meeting in which peers were administered the instrument.

A reproduction of the three page questionnaire and the accompanying cover letter may be found in the appendix of this study.

#### Analysis of Data

Responses to questions involving a Likert-type scale were assigned a numerical value from zero to six. Numerical ranges of each category are listed in Chapter IV in

conjunction with the respective questions for which they were used. Responses to 'yes' or 'no', and ranking type questions were described according to the number and percentage of teachers making the same response to that particular question. An overall mean ranking was also calculated for the appropriate areas ranked. Responses to fill-in-the-blank questions were combined into groups with other similar responses received with means and standard deviations also being calculated. Correlations are also provided for information relative to the various inquiries regarding teacher assistance with SOEPs and student involvement in different areas of SOE programs.

Some optional short essay type questions were asked solely to produce information which could enlighten the author on responses received to other questions and will be discussed in the Summary Chapter. These responses were not statistically analyzed but may be found listed in the appendix.

Descriptive statistics were utilized since it was attempted to survey the entire population and there was no sampling involved (Oliver and Hinkle, 1981). Although completed questionnaires were not obtained from all 451 teachers, it was determined to use descriptive statistics for several reasons. It was felt that descriptive statistics with 86.5% of the population responding would describe the population more accurately than a smaller sample utilizing inferential statistics. Questionnaires received from

respondents after the cut-off date for the reception and analysis of data were not substantially different from those previously obtained. These data were later incorporated into the overall calculations. Also, sampling procedures were not utilized and a randomized sample is a basic assumption for the utilization of inferential statistics (Kerlinger, 1973).

Percentage, mean, standard deviation and correlations were calculated using the following equations (Linton and Gallo, 1975; Snedecor and Cochran, 1967):

- 1) Percentage (%)

$$\frac{\text{number of similar observations}}{\text{total number of observation to that question}}$$

- 2) Mean ( $\bar{X}$ )

$$\frac{\text{sum of assigned numerical responses of each category}}{\text{total number of responses to that particular question}}$$

- 3) Standard deviation (s)

$$\sqrt{\frac{\sum (X - \bar{X})^2}{N}}$$

Where X= value of individual observation

$\bar{X}$ = mean for that question

N= number of responses for that question

$\Sigma$ : sum of

- 4) Spearman rank-order correlation ( $r_s$ )

$$1 - \frac{6(\sum d^2)}{N^3 - N}$$

Where d= each items rank on the first question minus its rank on the second question

## 5) Pearson Product-moment correlation (r)

$$r = \frac{\sum (X - \bar{X})(Y - \bar{Y})}{\sqrt{\sum (X - \bar{X})^2 \sum (Y - \bar{Y})^2}}$$

Where X= each raw score on  
the first question

Y= each raw score on  
the second question

$\bar{X}$ = mean of responses  
to first question

$\bar{Y}$ = mean of responses  
to second question

$\sum$ = sum of



## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine Oklahoma vocational agriculture teacher perceptions of selected aspects of the supervised occupational experience programs in Oklahoma. And the objective of this chapter is to describe the data which was collected in order to accomplish this goal.

It was attempted to survey 451 vocational agriculture teachers in the state of Oklahoma through the administration of a questionnaire at the teachers' respective professional improvement group meetings. This number excludes farm business management and special programs instructors. Through this route it was only possible to obtain 267 completed questionnaires. However, another 123 questionnaires were received from subsequent mailings of the instrument to teachers who for various reasons were not able to attend their P. I. meetings and complete the questionnaire at those opportunities. Therefore, the total return was 86.5%, or 390 completed questionnaires.

To facilitate reading and the understanding of this information, the data were grouped and arranged in a logical progression based on the study objectives.

The statistics reported include the number of teachers responding identically to a question (N), the percentage (%), and in most cases, the mean and standard deviation were also calculated. Correlations were also calculated for the questions on assistance and program area involvement.

#### Definition of SOEP

To get a feeling of teacher attitudes regarding supervised occupational experience programs, it was felt that to first obtain perceptions of what these programs are would be helpful. To reach this end, the teachers were asked to respond to a three part definition of supervised occupational experience programs with their responses recorded on a Likert-type scale indicating the degree of agreement with a specific part of a given definition.

Numerical values were assigned to each category to facilitate calculation of mean values and standard deviations.

The ranges for each category are as follows:

<u>Range</u>	<u>Category</u>
0 - .49	Strongly Disagree
.50 - 1.49	Disagree
1.50 - 2.49	Slightly Disagree
2.50 - 3.49	No Opinion
3.50 - 4.49	Slightly Agree
4.50 - 5.49	Agree
5.50 - 6.00	Strongly Agree

Data presented in Table I show the results of responses of the teachers regarding their agreement with a definition of supervised occupational experience programs.

Part A of the definition was concerned with the idea that SOEPs are to be carried on outside the regular classroom. The category receiving the greatest number of responses was that of 'strongly agree'. The mean value for this question was 5.11 indicating that on the average, the teachers 'agree' with this statement. A standard deviation of 1.32 indicates a wide range in the consensus of the agriculture teachers.

Part B had a mean of 5.01 with the responses having the lowest standard deviation of 1.07 in this question. This indicates that the mean attitude of the teachers is that they 'agree' that supervised occupational experience programs are used to enhance the students' learning of vocational agriculture.

A mean of 4.83 and a standard deviation of 1.22 for part C reflects that the teachers 'agree' that SOEPs help prepare students for an agricultural vocation.

#### Necessity of SOEPs

The teachers were asked whether they felt that experience programs are necessary for the adequate education of students in the field(s) of agriculture. Table II shows that 378 teachers, or 97.2% of those responding to the questionnaire, feel SOEPs are necessary. Only 11 teachers felt these programs were not needed.

TABLE I

OKLAHOMA VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHER AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC COMPONENTS OF  
A DEFINITION OF SUPERVISED OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS

- A. A supervised occupational experience program (SOEP) may be considered a multi-purpose enterprise or activity carried on outside the regular classroom by vocational agriculture students and supervised by vocational agriculture instructors.

Strongly Agree		Agree		Slightly Agree		No Opinion		Slightly Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean	Std. Dev.
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
202	52.7	105	27.4	41	10.7	11	2.9	8	2.1	9	2.3	7	1.8	5.11	1.32

- B. It is used primarily to enhance the students' appreciation for and the learning of modern agriculture.

Strongly Agree		Agree		Slightly Agree		No Opinion		Slightly Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean	Std. Dev.
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
167	43.8	125	32.8	52	13.6	29	7.6	6	1.6	-	-	2	0.5	5.01	1.07

- C. And it is used to help prepare the students for an agricultural vocation.

Strongly Agree		Agree		Slightly Agree		No Opinion		Slightly Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean	Std. Dev.
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
146	39.0	96	25.6	84	22.4	30	8.0	15	4.0	2	0.5	2	0.5	4.83	1.22

TABLE II  
TEACHER OPINION REGARDING THE NECESSITY OF  
SOEPs FOR AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

---

QUESTION: Do you feel that SOEPs are necessary for the adequate education of students in the field(s) of agriculture?

Yes		No	
N	%	N	%
378	97.2	11	2.8

---

### SOEP Departmental Characteristics

Table III contains data relevant to the operation of SOE programs in most departments. Part A asked if facilities were provided by the school for the students' utilization in the conduct of their experience programs. Two-hundred-seven, or 53.1% of the teachers indicated the school's provision for a school farm, greenhouse or similar facility.

One-hundred-eighty-seven, 49.5%, of the teachers reported that a program existed within their departments whereby a student might participate in or initiate an experience program. This question related to such projects as an animal chain.

Over 97%, or 377 teachers, reported that they were provided a pickup for their use in visiting student projects. The schools may not necessarily provide a pickup 'per se', but may instead compensate the teacher for the use of his private vehicle. This differentiation was not brought out in the study however.

Part D of Table III illustrates the degree of reimbursement received by the teachers for expenses incurred while working with student programs; including fairs, shows, contests, business trips, etc. Of the responding teachers, 32.6% reported total reimbursement with 25.6%, 22.8% and 19.0% reporting that most, some or none of their expenses were compensated for by the school, respectively.

### Departmental Policies Regarding SOEPs

Table IV outlines teacher responses in relation to their

TABLE III  
 SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO SOEPs IN OKLAHOMA  
 VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS

- 
- A. Does the school provide some type of facilities for students to utilize for their SOEPs (school farm, greenhouse, etc.)?

Yes		No	
N	%	N	%
207	53.1	183	46.9

- B. Does your program provide some type of project, such as a animal chain, where students might initiate or participate in an SOEP?

Yes		No	
N	%	N	%
187	49.5	191	50.5

- C. Does the school provide you with a vehicle (or compensate you for using yours) to be used for SOEP visitations?

Yes		No	
N	%	N	%
377	97.7	9	2.3

- D. Of any expenses you incur while working with SOEPs (including shows, contests, etc.), how much are you reimbursed by the school?

All		Most		Some		None	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
127	32.6	100	25.6	89	22.8	74	19.0

---

perception of selected departmental policies toward experiential programs. Of the teachers responding, 265, 68.3%, indicated that their respective departments should have a written policy outlining student requirements for a supervised occupational experience program which the student would be expected to fulfill.

As for a mandatory supervised training program, 292 teachers, 74.9%, stated that the programs should be required of all students enrolled in vocational agriculture courses.

Part C of Table IV deals with the amount, if any, of a student's grade in vocational agriculture which would be dependent upon their involvement in a supervised occupational experience program. Eight teachers, 2.0% of those responding to the question, said none of the grade should be based on the student's program. Of these eight teachers, four of them also said that an SOEP should not be required of students enrolled in vocational agriculture.

Of the teachers, 8.2%, 24.9%, 40.3% and 18.7% said the supervised occupational experience program should comprise 10%, 20%, 30%, or 40% of the student's grade, respectively.

The teachers were also provided the opportunity to indicate whether grades from supervised programs should be used as bonus for borderline students only. This choice was indicated by 3.2% of the respondents.

A write-in option was offered also. Here two teachers stated that they favored 25% of a student's grade being determined from their SOEP and eight teachers favored 50%.



TABLE IV  
TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF POSSIBLE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE  
DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES TOWARD SOEPs

- A. Should your department have a written policy outlining requirements of/for an SOEP which your students must fulfill?

Yes		No	
N	%	N	%
265	68.3	123	31.7

- B. Should an SOEP be mandatory for all students enrolled in vocational agriculture?

Yes		No	
N	%	N	%
292	74.9	98	25.1

- C. What percentage of a students grade should be dependent upon his/her involvement in an SOEP?

Percentage of grade	N	%
0	8	2.0
10	32	8.2
20	97	24.9
30	157	40.3
40	73	18.7
Bonus for borderline students only	12	3.2
Other		
25	2	0.8
50	8	2.0

<u>Mean</u> (Excluding 'Bonus')	<u>Std. Dev.</u>
26.8%	9.98%

The mean teacher response to this proposal of a grading system based on the students' supervised occupational experience program was 26.8% with a standard deviation of 9.98%.

#### SOEP Visitations

Four questions were asked of the teachers about selected characteristics of supervised occupational experience program visitations. The first question, outlined in part A of Table V, was designed to determine the approximate percentage of out-of-class work time spent by the teacher supervising student SOEPs. The mean response was 51.71% with a standard deviation of 22.99% indicating a very wide range of values. The lowest percentage of time was reported by nine teachers with 10%; the highest, 100%, by nine teachers.

The greatest number of responses were made in the categories of 30%, 50% and 75% with 40, 94 and 45 teachers, respectively.

The second question dealing with the area of SOEP visitations sought to determine when or how teachers decided when to visit a student. Specific reasons were not desired, however, it was felt that the categories of 'scheduled', 'as-needed', or 'casual' visits would cover the majority of reasons.

The teachers were expected to respond to all three categories with a total of the three amounting to 100%. Because of some teachers not doing this or because their responses

TABLE V  
 SUMMARY OF TEACHER RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS  
 REGARDING SOEP VISITATIONS

A. Approximately what percentage of your out-of-class work time is spent supervising SOEPs?

<u>Percentage</u>	<u>Distribution</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
10	9	2.2
15	13	3.4
20	23	6.0
25	25	6.5
30	40	10.4
35	4	1.0
40	25	6.5
45	-	-
50	94	24.4
55	-	-
60	34	8.8
65	7	1.8
70	7	1.8
75	45	11.7
80	28	7.2
85	8	2.1
90	11	2.8
95	4	1.0
100	9	2.3

Mean= 51.71%

Std. Dev.= 22.99%

TABLE V (Continued)

B. Approximately what percentage of your visits are made on a regularly scheduled basis, 'as-needed' basis, or casual basis?

Responses (%)	Scheduled		'As-needed'		Casual	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0	69	18.0	62	16.1	113	29.5
5	6	1.6	7	1.8	18	4.7
10	44	11.5	20	5.2	60	15.7
15	6	1.6	4	1.0	4	1.0
20	38	9.9	27	7.0	62	16.2
25	22	5.7	17	4.4	37	9.7
30	25	6.5	45	11.7	25	6.8
35	4	1.0	4	1.0	6	1.6
40	24	6.3	38	9.9	21	5.5
45	-	-	-	-	-	-
50	60	15.6	81	21.0	25	6.5
55	-	-	-	-	-	-
60	24	6.3	22	5.7	-	-
65	-	-	2	0.5	-	-
70	9	2.3	6	1.6	3	0.8
75	21	5.5	11	2.9	-	-
80	10	2.6	21	5.4	2	0.5
85	2	0.5	-	-	-	-
90	9	2.3	7	1.8	2	0.5
95	-	-	-	-	2	0.5
100	11	2.9	11	2.9	2	0.5
Mean (%) :		34.5		37.5		18.1
Std. Dev. (%) :		28.1		26.6		19.0

TABLE V (Continued)

---

C. What is the average (approximate) amount of time spent with the students' SOEP per visit? (Excluding travel time.)

<u>Minutes</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
10	13	3.5
15	36	9.8
20	48	13.1
25	4	1.1
30	168	45.9
35	7	1.9
40	17	4.6
45	27	7.4
50	4	1.1
55	4	1.1
60	32	8.7
90	2	0.5
120	4	1.1

Mean= 32.5 Minutes

Std. Dev.= 16.2 Minutes

TABLE V (Continued)

---

D. What approximate percentage of your out-of-class work time is spent preparing for or attending livestock shows?

<u>Percentage</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
0	-	-
5	12	3.1
10	37	9.6
15	35	9.1
20	49	12.7
25	73	19.0
30	25	6.5
35	16	4.2
40	52	13.5
45	19	4.9
50	23	6.0
50+	44	11.4

Mean= 23.78% \*

\*Excluding 50+ responses.

Std. Dev.= 12.04%

---

did not total 100%, the mean value of the three categories did not total 100%. Any response category left blank was considered as a response of zero percent.

The category receiving the highest mean value was 'as-needed' with 37.5% and a standard deviation of 26.6%. Sixty-two teachers, 16.6%, reported 0% in this category with the greatest number of teachers, 81, or 21.0%, reporting 50% of their visits being prompted on an 'as-needed' basis.

'Scheduled' visits received the second highest mean of 34.5% with a standard deviation of 28.1%. Sixty-nine teachers, 18.0%, said none of their visits were regularly scheduled while 60, or 15.6% of the teachers reported that 50% of their visits were regularly scheduled.

Referring to 'casual' visits by teachers, the mean was 18.1% with standard deviation of 19.0%. One hundred-thirteen teachers reportedly are not prompted to visit students through this method. The greatest number of responses in this area were for 10% and 20%, 60 and 62 teachers, respectively.

Part C, Table V, concerned the average amount of time each teacher spent with his students and their programs per visit. The mean time spent was 32.5 minutes with a standard deviation of 16.2 minutes. One-hundred-sixty-eight, or 45.9% of the teachers reported spending approximately 30 minutes per visit. This was the most popular response. Four teachers, 1.1%, reportedly spent 120 minutes per visit. All responses were to exclude travel time to and from the student's residence.

The last question concerning SOEP visitations related to the amount of time spent preparing for or attending livestock shows. No teachers reported using none of their time for livestock shows. The mean was 23.78% with a standard deviation of 12.04%. Forty-four teachers, 11.4%, reported devoting over 50% of their out-of-class work time to livestock shows. These teachers were not included in the calculation of the mean.

#### Areas of Student Involvement

The questions in this area were of the ranking type to determine the areas of most involvement by students with their experience programs. The teachers were also asked to rank these selected areas according to their perception of the involvement students should have in them. Numerical values were assigned each rank for calculations. The greatest degree of involvement being 1.0. These data are presented in Tables VI and VII.

The teachers reported the majority of their students were involved in livestock exhibition with a mean rank of 1.73, followed by commercial livestock production, mean rank 2.14. Both had similar standard deviations of 1.05 and 1.15, respectively.

Agricultural mechanics was ranked third, 2.86 mean rank, with a substantial difference between it and commercial livestock production in second, and commercial crop production which was ranked fourth with a mean ranking of 4.14.



TABLE VI  
TEACHER RANKING OF THE AREAS OF MOST STUDENT SOEP INVOLVEMENT

A. Commercial livestock production.

Rank														Mean Rank	Std. Dev.
1		2		3		4		5		6		7			
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
103	27.9	160	43.3	72	19.5	25	6.7	7	1.9	-	-	2	0.5	2.14	1.15

B. Livestock exhibition.

Rank														Mean Rank	Std. Dev.
1		2		3		4		5		6		7			
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
215	57.8	82	22.0	46	12.4	23	6.2	4	1.1	-	-	2	0.5	1.73	1.05

C. Commercial crop production.

Rank														Mean Rank	Std. Dev.
1		2		3		4		5		6		7			
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
2	0.5	7	1.9	76	20.4	135	36.6	86	23.1	29	7.8	-	-	4.14	.83

D. Crop exhibition.

Rank														Mean Rank	Std. Dev.
1		2		3		4		5		6		7			
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
-	-	8	2.5	26	8.0	54	16.7	145	44.8	67	20.7	24	7.4	4.95	.99

TABLE VI (Continued)

E. Ag mechanics.

Rank														Mean Rank	Std. Dev.
1		2		3		4		5		6		7			
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
39	10.8	96	26.6	141	39.0	58	16.1	17	4.7	10	2.8	-	-	2.86	1.13

F. VAOT.

Rank														Mean Rank	Std. Dev.
1		2		3		4		5		6		7			
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
4	1.6	22	8.5	31	12.0	47	18.2	30	11.6	99	38.4	25	9.7	4.84	1.56

G. Others.

	N	Mean ranking of responses
Agribusiness	38	5.3
Horticulture	14	3.7
Leadership	3	2.3
Skills	4	4.0
Processing	2	4.0
FFA	2	4.0

VAOT and crop exhibition were ranked fifth and sixth with similar mean rankings of 4.84 and 4.95, respectively.

Write-in areas of student involvement, number of teachers indicating these areas and the mean ranking of these areas (according only to those teachers responding in this manner) are also included on Table V. Agribusiness was listed most often with 38 teachers responding with a mean of 5.3. Horticulture followed in number of responses with 14 and a mean of 3.7. Leadership, although listed by only three teachers, had a mean of 2.3. Others listed here included skills, processing, and FFA.

When asked to rank these same selected categories according to where the most student involvement should be, the overall ranking remained the same with the exception of the reversal of livestock exhibition and commercial livestock production in first and second places. These data are shown in Table VII.

It is of interest to note the difference between the mean ranking of livestock exhibition and commercial livestock production in Tables VI and VII. The magnitude of these differences indicates that the teachers feel that commercial livestock production should maintain a substantially higher priority over livestock exhibition as an area of involvement for students with their SOEPs.

Another difference between teacher perceptions regarding the ranking of areas of student SOEP involvement can also be noticed. Although the mean rank of the other areas besides

TABLE VII

## TEACHER RANKING OF SOEP AREAS IN WHICH STUDENTS SHOULD BE INVOLVED

## A. Commercial livestock production.

Rank														Mean Rank	Std. Dev.
1		2		3		4		5		6		7			
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
193	57.1	89	26.3	41	12.1	9	2.7	4	1.2	-	-	2	0.6	1.67	.97

## B. Livestock exhibition.

Rank														Mean Rank	Std. Dev.
1		2		3		4		5		6		7			
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
114	33.9	97	28.8	44	13.1	56	16.6	26	7.7	-	-	-	-	2.36	1.30

## C. Commercial crop production.

Rank														Mean Rank	Std. Dev.
1		2		3		4		5		6		7			
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
9	2.9	51	16.3	57	16.9	82	26.2	70	22.4	44	14.1	-	-	3.91	1.42

## D. Crop exhibition.

Rank														Mean Rank	Std. Dev.
1		2		3		4		5		6		7			
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
6	2.0	4	1.4	24	8.2	45	15.4	137	46.9	61	20.9	15	5.1	4.87	1.15

TABLE VII (Continued)

E. Ag mechanics.

Rank														Mean Rank	Std. Dev.
1		2		3		4		5		6		7			
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
23	7.4	78	25.1	115	37.0	61	19.6	27	8.7	7	2.2	-	-	3.04	1.14

F. VAOT.

Rank														Mean Rank	Std. Dev.
1		2		3		4		5		6		7			
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
3	1.2	21	8.3	26	10.3	57	22.5	23	9.1	107	42.3	16	6.3	4.82	1.49

G. Others.

	N	Mean ranking of responses
Agribusiness	2	3.0
Horticulture	4	3.3

commercial livestock production and livestock exhibition remained essentially the same, the teachers placed a greater degree of importance, or higher preference for involvement in commercial crop production and crop exhibition, indicated by a comparatively higher mean ranking. There was less agreement which is reflected in a larger standard deviation. By the same token, agricultural mechanics dropped in the perceptions of its importance as an area of student involvement while VAOT remained constant.

Write-in, or subjective responses received from teacher, which were most often mentioned, included agribusiness and horticulture. Others written in were; leadership, skills, processing and FFA.

A Spearman rank-order correlation was calculated between the rankings of student involvement and teacher perceptions of areas of where student involvement should lie. This can be found in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII  
SPEARMAN RANK-ORDER CORRELATION

---

Variable 1: Current areas of student supervised occupational experience program involvement.

Variable 2: Teacher perception of where student SOEP involvement should be.

$$r_s = .978$$


---

The correlation of .978 indicates an almost perfect association between the area of student SOEP involvement reported by the teachers and the importance of these areas relative to one another as perceived by these same teachers. In other words, the greater the importance a teacher places on an area of student involvement, the more students which will become involved in that area. The reverse is also true.

#### SOE Program Objectives

The highest ranking in the selected supervised occupational experience program objectives by the teachers was that of the enhancement of classroom instruction and hands-on experience with a mean rank of 1.96 and a standard deviation of 1.38. This mean was substantially higher than that of the second place ranking which was viewed by the teachers to be that of 'character building' which had a mean of 2.48. Following in the third position was that of development of management skills with a mean of 2.74.

The fourth, fifth, and sixth ranked programs as perceived by the teachers were those of establishment in farming/agribusiness, 4.19; financial profit, 4.22; and FFA/vocational agriculture department recognition, 4.75; respectively.

Write-in responses by the teachers were student responsibility, one teacher; and self-discipline, four teachers.

#### Assistance Provided Student SOEPs

This part of the questionnaire was designed to ellicit

TABLE IX

## TEACHER RANKINGS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF SELECTED SOE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

## A. Classroom and experience. (Enhance classroom instruction, 'hands-on' experience.)

1		2		3		4		5		6		7		Mean Rank	Std. Dev.
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
216	58.4	49	13.2	46	12.4	29	7.8	25	6.8	3	0.8	2	0.5	1.96	1.38

## B. Financial profit.

1		2		3		4		5		6		7		Mean Rank	Std. Dev.
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
17	4.7	33	9.0	58	15.9	83	22.7	93	25.5	79	21.6	2	0.5	4.22	1.43

## C. Character building.

1		2		3		4		5		6		7		Mean Rank	Std. Dev.
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
90	24.9	109	30.2	98	27.1	34	9.4	23	6.4	7	1.9	-	-	2.48	1.25

## D. Management skills.

1		2		3		4		5		6		7		Mean Rank	Std. Dev.
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
15	13.8	126	34.1	108	29.3	44	11.9	33	8.9	7	1.9	-	-	2.74	1.21



TABLE IX (Continued)

E. Establishment in farming/agribusiness.

Rank												Mean Rank	Std. Dev.		
1		2		3		4		5		6				7	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
9	2.5	36	10.0	53	14.8	89	24.8	122	34.0	46	12.8	4	1.1	4.19	1.30

F. FFA/Vo. Ag. department recognition.

Rank												Mean Rank	Std. Dev.		
1		2		3		4		5		6				7	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
26	7.3	23	6.5	19	5.3	60	16.9	52	14.6	168	47.3	7	2.0	4.75	1.62

G. Others.

	N	Mean ranking of responses
Student responsibility	1	1.0
Self-discipline	4	1.5

responses from the teachers as to their perceptions of the amount of assistance they provide student supervised occupational experience programs in selected areas. The teachers were asked to rate the assistance they provide on a semantic differential.

Numerical values were then assigned each of the categories of responses to facilitate an objective calculation of a mean value for each variable. The ranges for each category are as follows:

<u>Range</u>	<u>Category</u>
0 - .49	No Assistance
.50 - 1.49	Slight Amount of Assistance
1.50 - 2.49	Small Amount of Assistance
2.50 - 3.49	Modest Amount of Assistance
3.50 - 4.49	Moderate Assistance
4.50 - 5.49	Large Amount of Assistance
5.50 - 6.00	Great Amount of Assistance

Data for this area of questioning are presented in Table X. The number of responses received from the teachers was significantly lower for this question and the following related question pertaining to assistance the teachers thought they should provide, as compared to all other parts of the questionnaire.

In none of the selected areas did the mean value of the teachers indicate a great amount of assistance rendered the students. However, there were several areas included in

TABLE X

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THE AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE  
THEY PROVIDE THEIR STUDENTS' SUPERVISED  
OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS

Area	Great Amount		Large Amount		Moderate Amount		Modest Amount		Small Amount		Slight Amount		None		Mean	Std. Dev.
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Development of incentive for SOEP . . . . .	69	20.4	130	38.6	89	26.3	38	11.3	9	2.8	2	0.6	-	-	4.61	1.06
Planning of SOEP . . . . .	57	16.4	114	34.1	108	32.2	49	14.5	9	2.8	-	-	-	-	4.50	1.02
Selection of proper 'type' SOEP . . . . .	74	21.9	116	34.4	90	26.6	42	12.5	11	3.4	4	1.3	-	-	4.44	1.14
Identify skills to develop with SOEP . . . . .	60	18.1	76	22.9	107	32.1	70	21.0	20	6.0	-	-	-	-	4.26	1.16
Developing parental agreements . . . . .	74	22.2	65	19.4	72	21.6	82	24.8	24	7.3	11	3.5	4	1.3	4.09	1.46
Determining approved practices to use with SOEP . . . . .	45	13.0	122	35.9	90	26.3	67	19.5	11	3.4	6	1.9	-	-	4.30	1.18
Locating a place to keep SOEP . . . . .	78	23.8	64	19.6	89	27.0	50	15.1	29	9.0	14	4.2	4	1.3	4.16	1.49
Encouragement to pursue FFA awards and degrees . . . . .	83	25.3	94	28.9	96	29.5	42	13.0	6	1.9	4	1.3	-	-	4.59	1.13
Developing long-range plans for SOEP . . . . .	46	13.2	87	25.9	96	28.7	78	23.3	27	8.2	2	0.6	-	-	4.11	1.18
Developing budgets for SOEP . . . . .	29	8.6	68	20.0	94	27.8	89	26.3	36	10.6	20	5.9	2	0.6	3.70	1.34
Financing SOEP . . . . .	40	11.9	62	18.6	79	23.6	72	21.4	36	10.6	24	7.2	22	6.6	3.51	1.67
Selecting/procuring livestock and crops . . . . .	108	32.3	100	30.1	76	22.3	40	12.0	9	2.8	-	-	-	-	4.77	1.11
Making business arrangements (purchases/sales... ) . . . . .	72	21.4	80	23.9	96	28.6	60	17.9	14	4.1	9	2.8	4	1.3	4.27	1.35
Providing equipment (facilities/trailer/tools... ) . . . . .	76	22.7	114	34.1	58	17.4	69	20.5	11	3.5	6	1.9	-	-	4.46	1.25
Managing SOEP . . . . .	54	15.8	64	18.9	125	36.5	52	18.3	22	6.5	9	2.8	4	1.2	4.05	1.31
Determining size of SOEP . . . . .	36	10.9	78	23.8	105	31.8	67	20.3	20	6.1	9	2.8	13	4.2	3.88	2.22
Recordkeeping . . . . .	105	31.0	80	23.8	92	27.3	29	8.8	22	6.6	2	0.6	6	1.9	4.55	1.38
Marketing products of SOEP . . . . .	47	13.8	89	26.3	112	33.2	60	17.9	25	7.5	2	0.6	2	0.6	4.20	1.20
Provide counseling on reinvestment of profit . . . . .	60	18.1	96	28.9	94	28.2	94	28.2	14	4.1	6	1.9	-	-	4.61	1.33
Provide transportation for SOEP activities . . . . .	90	27.1	98	29.6	96	29.0	36	10.8	7	2.2	2	0.6	2	0.6	4.64	1.15
Evaluation of SOEP . . . . .	96	29.2	87	26.3	87	26.3	54	16.3	6	1.9	-	-	-	-	4.64	1.12
General decision making . . . . .	32	9.5	120	36.1	82	24.7	85	25.3	6	1.9	4	1.3	4	1.3	4.17	1.17
Setting related educational goals . . . . .	53	15.9	103	30.2	87	25.5	74	21.8	16	4.7	4	1.2	2	0.6	4.24	1.22

the category of a 'large amount' of assistance. The highest rated of these was that of 'selecting/procuring livestock and corps' with a mean of 4.77 and one of the lower standard deviations of 1.11; indicating a great deal of agreement between the teachers.

Other areas of assistance included here were evaluation, 4.64; transportation, 4.64; incentive to develop an SOEP, 4.61; reinvestment of profit, 4.61; encouragement to pursue FFA degrees and awards, 4.59; recordkeeping, 4.55; and the planning of an SOEP, 4.50.

The areas of 'planning' and 'incentive' reflected the greatest amount of agreement among the teachers with standard deviations of 1.02 and 1.06, respectively.

The areas in which the teachers felt they provided the least assistance fell in the category of 'moderate'. Among others included here, the two lowest were 'budgets for SOEPs', 3.7; and 'financing SOEPs', 3.51. There was a larger variation in the area of teacher attitudes toward financing which is exhibited in the standard deviation of 1.67.

#### Assistance Which Should Be Provided

##### Student SOEPs

This question was of the same design as the previous question. The format was identical and the data treated similarly.

The teachers were asked the amount of assistance which they should (or felt obligated) to provide student experience

programs. The teachers felt they owed the greatest amount of assistance to the student in the areas of the development of incentive, 4.89; selecting/procuring livestock and crops, 4.85; planning, 4.84; and evaluation, 4.73. All of these means fell in the category of 'large amount' of assistance. These data are found in Table XI.

The areas where teachers felt least obligated to provide assistance, as compared to other areas, were 'locating a place to keep SOEP', 4.19; managing SOEP, 4.16; and financing, 3.88. Again, with financing, the teachers demonstrated less unity of opinion as this area had the largest standard deviation with 1.65.

Between the previous question and this one dealing with assistance to supervised experience programs, only three areas failed to show increased means reflected in the amount of assistance which should be provided. These areas and the amount of decrease in overall mean were 'providing equipment', .12; 'providing transportation', .26; and 'providing counseling on the reinvestment of profit', .09. This reflects the attitude that the teachers perceive themselves as offering more assistance in these areas than they feel obligated. And this compares to the perception that they are not offering as much assistance as they should in the other selected areas.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to determine association between these two questions and the result is shown in Table XII.

TABLE XI

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THE AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE THEY  
SHOULD PROVIDE THEIR STUDENTS' SUPERVISED  
OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS

Area	Great Amount		Large Amount		Moderate Amount		Modest Amount		Small Amount		Slight Amount		None		Mean	Std. Dev.
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Development of incentive for SOEP . . . . .	105	32.6	127	39.5	54	16.8	24	7.6	9	3.1	2	0.7	-	-	4.89	1.06
Planning of SOEP . . . . .	94	30.2	122	40.0	65	20.7	20	6.4	9	3.1	2	0.7	-	-	4.84	1.06
Selection of proper 'type' SOEP . . . . .	85	26.8	117	37.5	81	25.4	24	7.7	4	1.3	2	0.7	2	0.7	4.76	1.08
Identify skills to develop with SOEP . . . . .	90	28.8	94	30.2	87	27.8	32	10.2	9	3.1	-	-	-	-	4.41	1.12
Developing parental agreements . . . . .	103	32.9	85	27.1	83	26.4	32	10.2	8	2.4	4	1.4	4	1.4	4.67	1.29
Determining approved practices to use with SOEP . . . . .	76	23.8	108	33.8	72	22.5	52	16.2	11	3.6	-	-	-	-	4.61	1.12
Locating a place to keep SOEP . . . . .	71	21.9	81	25.2	79	24.9	50	15.6	21	6.3	7	2.3	11	3.6	4.19	1.51
Encouragement to pursue FFA awards and degrees . . . . .	121	39.0	83	26.7	67	21.6	30	9.6	7	2.4	2	0.7	-	-	4.22	1.32
Developing long-range plans for SOEP . . . . .	80	24.9	110	34.1	81	24.9	36	11.1	14	4.3	2	0.7	-	-	4.62	1.13
Developing budgets for SOEP . . . . .	65	19.9	90	27.7	83	25.4	53	19.2	16	4.9	7	2.3	2	0.7	4.29	1.30
Financing SOEP . . . . .	58	17.7	76	24.1	58	18.4	76	24.1	21	6.3	9	3.0	20	6.3	3.88	1.65
Selecting/procuring livestock and crops . . . . .	110	35.5	95	30.4	68	21.6	27	8.5	9	3.1	2	0.7	-	-	4.85	1.13
Making business arrangements (purchases/sales...) . . . . .	78	24.6	80	25.2	69	21.8	52	16.3	18	5.6	6	2.0	4	1.3	4.37	1.40
Providing equipment (facilities/trailer/tools...) . . . . .	76	23.9	72	22.6	76	23.9	78	24.6	12	3.7	2	0.7	2	0.7	4.34	1.28
Managing SOEP . . . . .	58	18.3	81	25.6	84	26.6	58	18.3	23	7.0	11	3.7	2	0.7	4.16	1.37
Determining size of SOEP . . . . .	87	27.3	81	25.6	58	18.3	65	20.3	9	2.7	11	3.7	7	2.3	4.34	1.50
Recordkeeping . . . . .	85	30.4	75	26.6	73	25.9	29	10.3	15	5.3	2	0.8	2	0.8	4.61	1.27
Marketing products of SOEP . . . . .	68	21.0	92	28.5	87	26.9	50	15.4	8	2.6	12	3.6	6	2.0	4.31	1.39
Provide counseling on reinvestment of profit . . . . .	87	26.9	96	29.8	70	21.6	52	16.1	10	3.0	2	0.7	6	2.0	4.52	1.35
Provide transportation for SOEP activities . . . . .	101	31.1	67	20.6	72	22.3	50	15.4	12	3.6	18	5.6	4	1.3	4.38	1.52
Evaluation of SOEP . . . . .	105	33.0	99	31.0	58	17.7	45	14.0	9	3.0	4	1.3	-	-	4.73	1.21
General decision making . . . . .	58	18.0	103	31.7	78	24.2	61	18.9	14	4.2	2	0.7	7	2.3	4.29	1.32
Setting related educational goals . . . . .	78	24.8	103	32.6	58	18.5	54	17.1	16	5.0	2	0.6	4	1.3	4.48	1.32

TABLE XII  
PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION

---

Variable 1: Teacher assistance currently provided student supervised occupational experience programs.

Variable 2: Teacher assistance which should be provided supervised occupational experience programs.

$$r = .655$$

---

The correlation .655 indicates that a moderate to high association is reflected between the amount of assistance provided student SOEPs and the amount which teachers feel they should provide. This means that as teachers feel that students need more assistance in a given area, they tend to provide more. Conversely, if less assistance is needed, the less which is provided. This can also be interpreted to mean that as more assistance is provided, the more assistance the teachers feel the students need.

#### Student Involvement in SOEPs

The teachers were asked with this question to fill in the approximate percentage of students conducting a year-round supervised occupational experience program. These data are contained in Table XIII.

Four teachers, 1.1%, reported only 5% of their students conducting year-round programs. Twenty teachers, 5.2% said

TABLE XIII  
STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN YEAR-ROUND SOE PROGRAMS

---

<u>Percentage of students</u>	<u>Distribution</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
5	4	1.1
10	14	3.6
15	8	2.1
20	11	2.9
25	8	2.1
30	23	6.0
35	4	1.0
40	40	10.4
45	4	1.0
50	76	19.8
55	6	1.6
60	39	10.2
65	6	1.6
70	31	8.1
75	23	6.0
80	30	7.8
85	15	3.9
90	17	4.4
95	5	1.3
100	20	5.2

Mean= 56.62%

Std. Dev.= 26.33%

---



100% of their students conducted continuous programs.

The most common response was made by 76 teachers, 19.8%, who said 50% of their students were involved in this type of program. The overall mean for this question was 56.62% with a standard deviation of 26.33%.

No attempt was made by the writer to determine the percentage of students whose programs were of a sporadic nature.

#### FFA Awards and Degrees

Teachers related their perceptions of the effectiveness of FFA degrees and awards in promoting student involvement in supervised occupational experience programs on a four point scale ranging from ineffective to very effective. These data are contained in Table XIV.

The mean rating for FFA was 1.88 or being perceived as 'effective' as a promoter for experience programs.

One-hundred-thirty-nine teachers, or 35.9%, rated FFA as being 'very effective'; 162 teachers, 41.9%, 'effective'; and 78 teachers, 20.1%, as 'somewhat effective'. Only eight teachers 2.1%, regarded FFA as being ineffective in promoting or motivating students in their involvement with SOEPs.

#### Planned Emphasis

Table XV shows that when the teachers were asked what their future emphasis would be in regards to supervised occupational experience programs, 171 teachers said they would increase their emphasis, 209 said they would maintain

TABLE XIV  
 TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF FFA  
 DEGREES AND AWARDS IN PROMOTING STUDENT  
 INVOLVEMENT IN SOEPs

---

Distribution by Degree of Perceived Effectiveness \*

<u>Very Effective</u>		<u>Effective</u>		<u>Somewhat Effective</u>		<u>Ineffective</u>	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
139	35.9	162	41.9	78	20.1	8	2.1

Mean= 1.88 (Effective)

Std. Dev.= .79

\* Category Ranges

1.0-1.49	Very effective
1.5-2.49	Effective
2.5-3.49	Somewhat effective
3.5-4.00	Ineffective

---

TABLE XV  
TEACHERS' PLANNED EMPHASIS OF STUDENT  
INVOLVEMENT IN SOEPs

---

<u>Planned Emphasis</u>	<u>Distribution</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Increase	171	44.5
Decrease	4	1.0
Maintain	209	54.5

Consensus: Maintain or Increase student involvement.

---

their current level and only four teachers planned to decrease the emphasis of these programs in their departments.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter was to present a summary review of the study problem and its setting, the design and conduct of the study, and the major findings. Also presented are conclusions and recommendations which were based upon analysis and summarization of data collected and upon observations and impressions resulting from the design and conduct of the study.

#### Summary of the Study

##### Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions and attitudes of vocational agriculture teachers toward supervised occupational experience programs. Other selected characteristics of these programs were also sought.

The population of this study consisted of all certified vocational agriculture instructors teaching in Oklahoma high schools during the school year 1981-1982. Of these 451 teachers, 390 responded to the study.

##### Specific Objectives of the Study

In order to accomplish the purpose of this study, the

following objectives were set forth:

1. To determine the degree to which Oklahoma vocational agriculture instructors agree to various components of a definition of supervised occupational experience program.
2. To determine teacher perceptions of the necessity of these programs for the adequate education in the field(s) of agriculture.
3. To determine selected characteristics of vocational agriculture departments which may have an effect on experience programs now in operation.
4. To determine teacher perceptions of possible departmental prolicies regarding SOEP's.
5. To determine selected characteristics of SOEP visitations by vocational agriculture teachers.
6. To determine the areas of most SOEP involvement, teacher perceptions of where this involvement should be, and the association between the two.
7. To ascertain teacher perceptions of the relative importance of selected SOE program objectives.
8. To determine and compare the amount of assistance provided by teachers to their students' programs and the amount of assistance the teachers feel they are obligated to provide.
9. To determine the amount of student involvement in year-round supervised occupational experience programs.

10. To solícite teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of FFA degrees and awards in promoting student involvement in these programs.
11. To determine the teachers planned emphasis of student involvement with experiential programs in the future.

### Rationale for the Study

This study was prompted by recent articles and studies which reported that supervised occupational experience programs in many states were being de-emphasized. At the same time, the philosophy was commonly held that these same programs were no longer essential for preparing vocational agriculture students for their chosen vocation in agriculture. These observations are in direct conflict with the beliefs, opinions and research findings of the past.

As studies regarding various concepts, perceptions and characteristics of supervised occupational experience programs in Oklahoma are somewhat sparse, it was felt that a survey of vocational agriculture teachers would shed some light on the current status of experiential programs in this state. Information about supervised training programs may be obtained from many sources, but since vocational agriculture teachers are probably the most deeply involved and knowledgeable in regard to project programs, they would be the place to initiate a series of studies on this topic. This view, as well as the idea of the necessity

to know current aspects of these programs, was shared by the State Department of Vocational Agriculture Education and the faculty of the Agricultural Education Department at Oklahoma State University.

### Design and Conduct of the Study

Following a review of literature related to the problem and the determination of the need for the study, the major tasks in the design of the study were (1) the determination of the study population, (2) development of a data collection instrument and technique for its distribution, (3) collection of the data, and (4) analysis of the findings.

The population for this study was 451 certified vocational agriculture teachers in Oklahoma who were teaching during the school year 1981-1982. The questionnaire was administered at professional improvement meetings in the months of April, May and June by the district supervisors of the State Department of Vocational Agriculture. A mailed questionnaire was used to secure information from teachers who were unable to attend their respective P. I. meeting. Three hundred ninety completed questionnaires were obtained for a return of 86.5%.

Areas of information to be collected were determined through a review of related literature and current concerns or needs of the State Department of Vocational Agriculture and the Agricultural Education faculty at Oklahoma State University.



Upon collection of the data, they were analyzed using descriptive statistical techniques. Chapter IV contains a detailed discussion of the data and tables are also presented.

### Findings of the Study

This study was concerned with the compilation of information regarding the perceptions of vocational agriculture teachers toward supervised occupational experience programs. Also, information was collected concerning selected aspects of several characteristics of SOEPs in these teachers' departments. The objectives of this study were used as a basis for the organization of the major findings. These findings are reported as follows.

Definition of Supervised Occupational Experience Programs. The teachers agreed that a definition of supervised occupational experience programs should (1) be carried on outside the regular classroom, (2) enhance the students' appreciation for and the learning of modern agriculture, and (3) prepare the students for an agricultural vocation.

Necessity of SOEPs. Three-hundred-seventy-eight teachers believe that supervised occupational experience programs are necessary for the adequate education of students in the field(s) of agriculture. Only eleven teachers did not agree to the need of these programs.

Selected Characteristics of SOEPs. A slight majority of teachers, 53.1%, reported that their school provided some

type of facilities for students to utilize for their SOEPs such as a school farm or greenhouse. The teachers reporting a project, such as an animal chain, where students might initiate or participate in an SOEP numbered 187, 49.5%.

Only nine teachers of 386 said that they did not have a pickup furnished which was to be used for SOEP visitations. Concerning expenses incurred while working with SOEPs, 127 teachers said all expenses were reimbursed by the school, 100 reported most were reimbursed, 89, some reimbursement, and 74 reported none.

Departmental Policies Toward SOEPs. Two-hundred-sixty five teachers stated that their departments should have a written policy outlining requirements of/for an SOEP which their students must fulfill in order to enroll in vocational agriculture. One-hundred-twenty-three teachers disagreed.

A majority of the teachers, 74.9%, agreed that an SOEP should be mandatory for students to enroll in vocational agriculture courses.

In relation to the amount of a student's grade which should be dependent upon his/her involvement in an SOEP, there was a wide range of opinion but the most common response was that of 30%. One-hundred-fifty-seven teachers, 40.3%, indicated as such. The mean value reported was 26.8%.

Student SOEP Involvement. The amount of student involvement in different areas of supervised occupational experience programs as determined by an overall mean frequency response

showed a ranking of (1) livestock exhibition, (2) commercial livestock production, (3) agricultural mechanics, (4) commercial crop production, (5) VAOT, (6) crop exhibition.

When asked where student SOEP involvement should lie, the teachers ranked the areas as follows: (1) commercial livestock production, (2) livestock exhibition, (3) agricultural mechanics, (4) commercial crop production, (5) VAOT, and (6) crop exhibition. The correlation between these two question areas was .963.

SOE Program Objectives. The teachers believed the ranking of SOE program objectives to be: (1) enhancement of classroom instruction, (2) character building, (3) development of management skills, (4) establishment in farming/agribusiness, (5) financial profit, and (6) FFA/Vo. Ag. departmental recognition.

Assistance Provided Student SOEPs. Areas of assistance in which the teachers believed to be the most abundant included selecting/procuring livestock, evaluation, transportation, incentive, counseling on reinvestment of profit, encouragement to pursue FFA degrees and awards, record-keeping, and the selection and planning of supervised occupational experience programs.

The areas in which the teachers felt they provided the least assistance were developing budgets and helping to finance these programs.

Assistance Which Should Be Provided. The teachers felt

that they owed the greatest amount of assistance to the student in areas of incentive, selection and procurement of livestock, and planning and evaluation. They felt the least assistance should be in the areas of locating a place to maintain an SOEP, management, and financing.

According to mean values between these two areas concerned with assistance, there was a correlation of .655. Also, these means reflected a tendency for the teacher to provide slightly less assistance than which they felt was necessary.

Student Involvement. The teachers reported a mean value of 56.62% of their students maintaining a year-round continuous program supervised experience. They reported a range from 5% to 100%.

SOEP Visitations. Approximately one-half, 51.71%, of the teachers out-of-class work time is spent supervising SOEPs and that 23.78% of this same time is spent preparing for or attending livestock shows.

Reportedly the teachers spend an average of 32.5 minutes with the students' SOEP per visit. And 34.5% of the visits are made on a regularly scheduled basis; 37.5% on an 'as-needed' basis; and 18.1% on a casual basis.

Teachers' Planned Emphasis. One-hundred-seventy-one teachers said they plan to increase their emphasis in SOEPs while 209 planned to maintain their present level and four teachers plan to decrease their emphasis in this area.

FFA Awards and Degrees. The teachers reporting the effectiveness of FFA awards and degrees for the encouragement of students to become involved in supervised experience programs to be 139 teachers, very effective; 162, effective; 78, somewhat effective; and 8 said that they were ineffective.

Subjective Comments. The teachers were asked for subjective comments regarding (1) problems as to why students do not have an SOEP and (2) what can be done to enhance the quantity or quality of the SOEPs in their schools. A summary of their responses may be found in the appendix. As a whole, though, the majority of the comments received for both questions pertained to areas of financing or the high cost of initiating and maintaining experience programs, student motivation, parental interest in these programs, or locating a place to keep an SOEP which could be corrected with school farms. Many teachers said that they felt that an SOEP should be an enrollment requirement before a student would be allowed to attend vocational agriculture classes.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

By analyzing data obtained and presented in this study, certain conclusions and recommendations can be suggested concerning teacher perceptions of supervised occupational experience programs. The major conclusions and recommendations formulated from this study are as follows:

1. Oklahoma teachers agreed that supervised occupational experience programs 1) are carried on outside the regular classroom, 2) enhance student appreciation for and the learning of modern agriculture, and 3) prepare students for a vocation in agriculture. Because of this agreement, it would appear experiential programs in Oklahoma are structured so that they possess these characteristics. If so, this type of structuring should continue because for a student to receive maximum benefit from his SOEP it should conform to all three statements, which serve to maintain the vocational nature of high school vocational agriculture courses. The SOE programs that do not follow this guide may just be forcing the student to fulfill only a departmental requirement and are not providing the opportunities for which they were intended.
2. Because of the experiences and opportunities provided by SOEPs, they are necessary for the adequate education of students in agriculture. This was indicated by the belief of the teachers that these programs enhance classroom instruction and provide 'hands-on' experience.
3. Approximately one-half of the teachers indicated that their students have access to school farms or animal chains. These programs may be providing urban students with facilities to use which would enhance opportunities to become involved in experience programs and

remove major obstacles which prevent some students from participating. Teachers should encourage their school administration and other supporters to provide these facilities and projects since an increasing number of students enrolling in vocational agriculture are from urban backgrounds. This would tend to reduce some of the restrictions facing SOEPs such as locating a place for, or the financing of these activities.

4. Nine teachers stated that transportation was not provided so that they could work with SOEPs and over 65% said they received only partial reimbursement for expenses incurred while on SOEP-related activities. This could have an adverse effect upon the quality/quantity characteristics of experience programs. Schools should reimburse these teachers for their expenses as the teachers need not be financially penalized for doing their job. Schools should also continue to provide agriculture teachers transportation to help insure the adequate supervision of student projects maintained away from the school.
5. There is a wide variation in the teachers perceptions as to how much, if any, of a student's grade should be based upon his involvement with an SOEP. Since grades can be a major form of motivation to high school students, and teachers vary considerably in

the amount of contribution which is made by SOEPs to the students' grades, this could result in differences found in the observed quality of these programs between vocational agriculture departments. Any contribution to the students academic grade by his SOEP should be the prerogative of the teacher. However, the students should be made aware of the evaluative criteria by which this contribution will be calculated. In other words, how will the degree of student involvement in, or the quality or quantity of the program be measured. This reasoning could tend to increase the quality of supervised programs and the amount of student involvement as a result of heightened student understanding of grading procedures and increased incentive on the part of these students.

6. A majority of teachers agreed that their departments should have a written policy outlining requirements and guidelines for SOEPs and that they be required of all students of vocational agriculture. This would clarify any questions about the programs which might be held by the students, parents and/or administrators. This could increase program quality in that every student would know what would be required of them in this area. Care should be taken to avoid the loss of individuality offered students by these programs. This could be a result of policies



which may be restrictive in their design or enforcement.

7. The areas of most student SOEP involvement were livestock exhibition and commercial livestock production; first and second, respectively. The teachers also said that these areas should be reversed in their relative extent of student involvement. This could mean that livestock exhibition is overemphasized or that an increase in commercial livestock production is needed. Livestock exhibition should be reduced in importance but not to the extent to which student motivation or educational opportunities are adversely effected. Should commercial livestock production, or any other area, increase its extent of student involvement without a coupled decrease in other areas, the teachers should be aware that it could have a negative effect upon the time they have available for supervising individual students.
8. An average of 32.5 minutes spent with each student per SOEP visitation was reported by the teachers. Considering other teacher duties and the total number of students supervised, it would appear to be adequate providing the visits are frequent enough. As much time as possible spent visiting with the program is desireable and teachers need to keep this in mind when scheduling visits. The program itself may

not require the total allotted time, but the teacher-student relationship is a major consideration which deserves this time also.

9. Most assistance is provided the students' SOEPs by the teacher in the areas of selecting and procuring livestock, transportation during SOEP activities, and program evaluation. This is to be expected since most experience programs involve caring for livestock. However, more assistance could be beneficial to the student in areas such as financing, budgets, record-keeping, planning, and identification of skills to be developed. The teachers have recognized, though, that a student does not need the same amount of assistance in all areas and compensates for these differences. Consistently, though, the teachers state that they are not providing the students all the assistance the teachers feel they need. This may reflect an impossibility on the part of the instructor to do everything for every student; or that they recognize the assistance which is received by the student from other sources, such as parents and friends. The teacher should determine if the student will receive assistance elsewhere before he knowingly fails to provide it himself.
10. Over one-fourth of teacher out-of-class time is spent preparing for or attending livestock shows. This is not unexpected given the amount of SOEP involvement

The teacher should, however, realize the importance of other areas and attempt to direct his time as well as his students to these worthwhile areas.

11. FFA degrees and award programs were felt to be effective in promoting student involvement in SOEPs. FFA provides opportunities for the student to show-off what he has learned and produced with his program. The awards are recognition for a job well done; serving as motivation to the student. This motivational aspect of the FFA should be realized and used extensively by the vocational agriculture instructor to insure continued promotion of the supervised occupational experience program.
12. Vocational agriculture teachers in Oklahoma reported that they plan to increase, or at least maintain, the amount of student involvement in supervised programs. They also said that only about one-half of their students maintain continuous year-round SOEPs. As indicated by this study, the teachers realize the importance of these programs to the students' education and pursuit of occupational goals. The programs also provide justification for twelve month teacher contracts. For these reasons it is recommended that the teachers set a priority for the involvement of all students in intensive supervised training from which they may benefit from in the summer months as well.

### Recommendations for Further Research

The writer recommends subsequent studies by agricultural educators in Oklahoma investigate the following areas in regard to supervised occupational experience programs:

1. Perceptions of the benefits of these programs held by:
  - a) Vocational agriculture students
  - b) Former vocational agriculture students
  - c) Parents of vocational agriculture students
  - d) School administrators
  - e) Employers of former vocational agriculture students.
2. Determination of the types and specific characteristics of programs conducted in Oklahoma.
3. Assistance needed by students in conducting experience programs as perceived by the students themselves and their parents.
4. Perceptions of the benefits derived from livestock exhibition held by teachers, parents, etc.
5. The relationship of supervised occupational experience programs to student achievement in such areas as leadership, community involvement, FFA awards and degrees, and ultimate employment opportunities and successes, and academic achievement.
6. Criteria used by teachers to determine student involvement in SOEPs, and quality/quantity measures of these programs.

## A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arrington, Larry R. "Relationship of Length of Vocational Agriculture Teacher Contract to Supervised Occupational Experience Program Scope and FFA Chapter Activity Level." (Unpublished paper presented at the Eighth Annual National Agricultural Education Research Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia, December, 1981.) Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida, 1981.
- Binkley, Harold R. "Supervised Experience Programs in Agriculture--A Must--And Standards for Them." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 49, No. 10 (April, 1977), 219.
- Christensen, V. E. "Factors Influencing Acquisition and Retention of Learning in Vocational Agriculture. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1964).
- Dillingham, John M. "The Association of Selected Characteristics with the Average Net Income from Supervised Project Programs of Production Agriculture Students in Texas High Schools". (Unpublished paper.) Mimeo. Lubbock, Texas: Texas Tech University, 1979.
- Dillion, Roy D. "The Changing Face of Supervised Occupational Experience programs." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 49, No. 10 (April, 1977), 223.
- Hamblen, B., H. A. Brown and W. L. Wyatt. "Is Your Agriculture Program Based on This Model?" Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 52, No. 11 (May, 1980), 3.
- Herzog, A. R. and J. G. Bachman. "Effects of Questionnaire Length on Response Quality." Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 45 (Winter, 1981), 549.
- Hoppe, E. W. and R. J. Parsons. Questionology. First Edition. Salt Lake City, Utah: Brigham Young University, 1974.
- Hylon, R. M. "A Study of the Self-Perceived Teacher Effectiveness of Vocational Agriculture Teachers in the Southern Region of the U. S." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1979.)

- Iverson, M. "The Role of Vocational Agriculture in the Occupational Success of Graduates--A Southern Region Study." Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, Vol. 21, No. 2 (July, 1980), 11.
- Johnson, J. M. "Effective Occupational Experience Programs." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 49, No. 10 (April, 1977), 236.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. Second Edition. New York: Nolt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Key, James P. "Supervised Experience--Essential." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 49, No. 10 (April, 1977), 219.
- Kruckenbug, D. W. and D. L. Williams. "What Research Has to Say--Attitudes Toward Experiential Programs." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 52, No. 11 (May, 1980), 14.
- Lawrence, L. D. and A. T. Mallio. "Identification of Specific Areas of Vocational Agriculture Teaching in Need of the Greatest Improvement: A Modified Delphi Approach." Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, Vol. 22 (March, 1981), 24.
- Lee, J. S. "Experiential Programs Can Help Answer the Big Question." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 52, No. 11 (May, 1980), 3.
- Linton, M. and P. S. Gallo. The Practical Statistician: Simplified Handbook of Statistics. First Edition. California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Col., 1975.
- Long, Geri. "OSU Sponsors FFA Conference." The Daily O'Collegian, Vol. 87, No. 145 (April 23, 1982), 1.
- Martin, W. H. "Supervised Occupational Experience Programs." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 51, No. 7 (January, 1979), 154.
- McMillion, M. B. and M. K. Auville. "Factors Associated with the Success of Supervised Farming Programs of Virginia High School Students." Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, Vol. 17, No. 3 (November, 1976), 9.

- Miller, T. R. "The Changing Status of Supervised Occupational Experience in Vocational Agriculture in North Carolina." Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, Vol. 21 (March, 1980), 13.
- Morton, Raymond H. "The Relationship Between the Quality of Supervised Occupational Experience Programs and Achievement of Students in Vocational Agriculture." Journal of Vocational Education Research, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Spring, 1980), 19.
- Oliver, J. D. and D. E. Hinkle. "Selecting Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Education Research." (Paper presented at the Eighth Annual National Agricultural Education Research Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia, December, 1981.) Blacksburg, Virginia: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1981.
- Peterson, R. L. and M. G. McCreight. "Are Supervised Occupational Experience Programs Really That Important?" Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 45, No. 11 (May, 1973), 245.
- Policies and Procedures Manual. Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, Division of Vocational Agriculture Education, 1932.
- Polson, Karl O. "Developing the Affective Domain Through Supervised Occupational Experience." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 52, No. 11 (May, 1980), 17.
- Pope, L. S. "The Future of Animal Agriculture." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 53, No. 4 (October, 1980), 5.
- Rawls, Willie. "An Analysis of Benefits Derived from Supervised Occupational Experience Programs." Journal of American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, Vol. 23 (March, 1982), 31.
- Rawls, Willie. "Parental Involvement in Supervised Occupational Experience." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 54, No. 5 (November, 1981), 17.
- Rawls, Willie and D. L. Williams. "Parental Assistance in Providing Supervised Occupational Experience Through Vocational Agriculture Programs." Journal of Vocational Education Research, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Spring, 1977), 17.

- Reakes, G. L. and R. F. Welton. "Teacher Roles in Experiential Programs." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 49, No. 10 (April, 1977), 227.
- Smith-Hughes Act, 1917. Public Law 347. 64<sup>th</sup> Congress.
- Snedecor, G. W. and W. G. Cochran. Statistical Methods. Sixth Edition. Iowa: Iowas State University Press, 1967.
- Tulloch, Rodney W. "Better SOEPs Through Instruction." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 45, No. 11 (May, 1973), 282.
- Vaughn, P. R. and J. Cano. "Factors Associated with Experiential Learning in New Mexico Agricultural Education Programs." (Unpublished paper presented at the Western Region Agricultural Education Research Meeting-Proceedings, Austin, Texas, April, 1982.) Santa Fe, New Mexico: New Mexico State University, 1982.
- Williams, D. L. "Experiential Learning in Agricultural Education." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 52, No. 11 (May, 1980), 4.
- Williams, D. L. "Relationships Between Vocational Agriculture Students' Supervised Occupational Experience and Selected Variables." Journal of Vocational Education Research, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Spring, 1977), 17.
- Woodard, J. A. "Agricultural Work Experience Programs at the Secondary Level." Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 49, No. 10 (April, 1977), 224.



APPENDIX

Summary of Subjective Comments by Vocational Agriculture  
Teachers Regarding Supervised Occupational  
Experience Programs

- A) The major problem associated with why students do not conduct a supervised occupational experience program.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Teachers Responding</u>
1. Financial investment too great.	180
2. No place to keep SOEP.	112
3. Lack of student motivation.	83
4. Low parental interest.	62
5. Lack of student time.	4
6. Other interests in FFA.	4
7. Sports.	4
8. No transportation to school farm	2

- B) What can be done to enhance the quantity or quality of supervised occupational experience programs.

<u>Solution</u>	<u>Teachers Responding</u>
1. School farm.	84
2. Availability of financing.	71
3. SOEP as an enrollment requirement.	33
4. Increased parental interest.	22
5. Increased student motivation.	12
6. Support from other teachers and admin.	11
7. Increased teacher time/student.	11
8. More devotion to visitations.	8
9. Remove professional lvstk. exhibitors.	7




---

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER**


---

 Department of Agricultural Education  
 (405) 624 7129

74078

April 2, 1982

To Oklahoma Vocational Agriculture Instructors,

Oklahoma has long been one of the leaders in all areas of vocational agriculture. Included in these areas is that of the supervised occupational experience program.

There has been much literature published from other states regarding various aspects of the types of programs their teachers conduct. From reviewing this literature it became apparent that there are many various ideas about the SOEP's and their characteristics from state to state.

The literature pertaining to Oklahoma vocational agriculture SOEP's is sparse at best. This study should reveal the types and characteristics of, as well as, attitudes towards SOEP's in Oklahoma. It will not be used as an evaluation of your program but merely a review of your concepts of the SOEP's and various characteristics of the programs.

It is for these reasons that we are asking you to participate in this study. We are sure that the information you provide will be of utmost value not only in substantiating the requirements of a quality program, but also in helping ourselves and others in improving the preparation of our students for a future in agriculture.

Thanks for your help,

 Steve Smith  
 Graduate Assistant  
 Ag. Ed., O.S.U.



 Dr. Robert Terry, Head  
 Dept. of Ag. Ed.  
 Oklahoma State University



 Mr. Ralph Dreessen, State Supervisor  
 Okla. Dept. of Vocational Agriculture  
 Education  
 Stillwater, Oklahoma



IX. Regarding SOEP visitations;

Approximately what percentage of your out-of-class work is spent supervising student SOEP's? \_\_\_\_\_%

Approximately what percentage of your visits are made on a regularly scheduled basis (   %), 'as needed' basis (   %), or casual basis (   %)?

What is the average (approximate) amount of time spent with the students' SOEP per visit? (Excluding travel time.) \_\_\_\_\_ Minutes

What approximate percentage of your out-of-class work time is spent preparing for or attending livestock shows?

0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 50+, (Circle one.)

X. In the future, do you plan to increase, decrease, or maintain the level of involvement of your students in supervised occupational experience programs?

INCREASE      DECREASE      MAINTAIN      (Circle one.)

XI. What approximate percentage of your students carry on a SOEP continuously, year-round? \_\_\_\_\_%

XII. A. In the left-hand column, RANK the following supervised experience areas according to the percentage of your students currently involved in each.  
 B. In the right-hand column, RANK these areas according to the involvement you feel students should have in each. (Rank from 1 to 7, with #1 being the greatest percentage of involvement.)

CURRENTLY		SHOULD HAVE
_____	Commercial livestock production	_____
_____	Livestock exhibition	_____
_____	Commercial crop production	_____
_____	Crop Exhibition	_____
_____	Ag Mechanics	_____
_____	VAOT	_____
_____	Others (Specify) _____	_____

XIII. RANK, from 1 to 8, the following as to how you feel they rate in relation to their importance as an SOEP Program Objective. (#1 being most important.)

- \_\_\_\_\_ CLASSROOM & EXPERIENCE  
enhance classroom instruction, 'hands-on' experience, provide link between Vo. Ag. & FFA
- \_\_\_\_\_ FINANCIAL PROFIT
- \_\_\_\_\_ CHARACTER BUILDING  
build independent and resourceful character & leadership within school & community, increase work ethic
- \_\_\_\_\_ MANAGEMENT SKILLS  
recordkeeping, decision-making, etc.
- \_\_\_\_\_ ESTABLISHMENT IN FARMING/AGRIBUSINESS
- \_\_\_\_\_ FFA/VO. AG. DEPARTMENT RECOGNITION
- \_\_\_\_\_ OTHER (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

XIV. If you have students without an SOEP, what seems to be the major problem as to why they don't? \_\_\_\_\_

XV. If needed, what needs to be done to enhance the quantity or quality of SOEP's in your school? \_\_\_\_\_

XVI. Indicate in the scales below A) the amount of assistance you feel you now provide your students' SOEP's, and B) the amount of assistance you feel you should (or feel obligated) to provide.

AREA	ASSISTANCE NOW PROVIDED		ASSISTANCE FELT SHOULD BE PROVIDED	
	Great Amount	None	Great Amount	None
Development of incentive for SOEP . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Planning of SOEP . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Selection of proper 'type' SOEP . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Identify skills to develop with SOEP . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Developing parental agreements . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Determining approved practices to use with SOEP . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Locating a place to keep SOEP . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Encouragement to pursue FFA awards and degrees . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Developing long-range plans for SOEP . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Developing budgets for SOEP . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Financing SOEP . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Selecting/procuring livestock & crops . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Making business arrangements (purchases/sales...)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Providing equipment (facilities/trailer/tools...)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Managing SOEP . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Determining size of SOEP . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Recordkeeping . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Marketing products of SOEP . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Provide counseling on reinvestment of profit . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Provide transportation SOEP activities . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Evaluation of SOEP . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
General decision-making . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Setting related educational goals . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other (Specify) _____ . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____ . . . . .	_____	_____	_____	_____

2  
VITA

Steven Carl Smith

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THE SUPERVISED OCCUPATIONAL  
EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS IN OKLAHOMA VOCATIONAL  
AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS

Major Field: Agricultural Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Fort Smith, Arkansas, September  
16, 1952, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Carl W. Smith.

Education: Graduated from Edmond High School, Edmond,  
Oklahoma, in May, 1970; attended Northeastern  
Oklahoma A & M at Miami, Oklahoma, from August,  
1970 through May, 1971; received Bachelor of Sci-  
ence in Agriculture degree from Oklahoma State  
University in 1977 with a major of Animal Science;  
received the Master of Science degree from Okla-  
homa State University in 1979 with a major in  
Agricultural Education; completed requirements for  
the degree of Doctor of Education in July, 1982,  
at Oklahoma State University.

Professional Experience: Vocational Agricultural In-  
structor, Yale High School, Yale, Oklahoma, July,  
1978 to June, 1981; Graduate Research Assistant  
for the Department of Agricultural Education at  
Oklahoma State University, September, 1981 to  
July, 1982.

Professional Organizations: Member of National and  
Oklahoma Vocational Agriculture Teachers Associa-  
tions, American Vocational Association and  
Oklahoma Education Association.