THE EFFECT OF VARIATION IN JOB EMPHASIS

ON TASK INVENTORY RESULTS

By

JOHN DOUGLAS WILHOIT, JR. $^{\prime\prime}_{\prime\prime}$

Bachelor of Science Oklahoma State University Stillwater, Oklahoma 1960

Master of Science Oklahoma State University Stillwater, Oklahoma 1962

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College of the Oklahoma State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of DOCTOR OF EDUCATION December, 1975



THE EFFECT OF VARIATION IN JOB EMPHASIS

ON TASK INVENTORY RESULTS

Thesis Approved:

ull Thesis Adviser

the Graduate College Dean of

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Technical-occupation programs in the past two decades have become a very important portion of the curriculum offerings at the post-secondary level of education. Data collected from the instructors of these programs are used to make numerous educational administrative decisions. The purpose of this study was to determine what effect the variation in job emphasis had on the reliability of the data gathered by administering the task inventory to technical-occupation instructors at the post-secondary level.

Sincere appreciation is expressed to the members of the author's Graduate Advisory Committee for their continuous support, assistance, and contributions to this study: Dr. Donald S. Phillips, Chairman, Dr. Cecil W. Dugger, Dr. Harold J. Polk, Dr. Richard M. Robl, and Dr. Lloyd L. Wiggins. Appreciation is extended to Dr. Richard W. Tinnell and Dr. Charles H. Angle for the interest and encouragement which they gave me. Indebtness is acknowledged to the many post-secondary technical-occupation instructors who provided data for this study.

Special graditude is expressed to my wife, Rose Marie and children, John and Terry Lynn, for their sacrifices during the span of this study.

Acknowledgement is made to the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational-Technical Education and to the EPDA-552 Leadership Development Program in Vocational and Technical Education for helping make the study possible.

iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter			Page
I. THE PROBLEM	•	. • •	. 1
Introduction Statement of Problem		• • • • • •	1 2 3 4 5 5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	•	• •	, 8
The Instructor's View of Teacher's Tasks The Accuracy of Data Collected From Instructors at Various Times of Job Emphases The Effect the Period of Occupational Emphasis Has on the Data Collected	•	• •	10 11 13
III. METHODOLOGY	•		18
Introduction		• • • • • •	18 18 20 22 23 24
IV. RESULTS	•	• •	26
Questionnaire Results	•	••••	26 27 39
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	•	• •	, 70
Conclusions	•	• •	, 82
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	•	•••	. 86
APPENDIX A - THE INSTRUMENT	•	•••	, 88 .
APPENDIX B - NCHEM'S-WICHE LETTERS	•	• •	110

APPENDIX	С	-	COVER LETTERS	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	• .	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	115
APPENDIX	D	_	INSTITUTIONS	SUI	RVI	EYF	Ð	BY	r T	IN	NE	II	ı.	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	119

,

.

.

LIST OF TABLES

Table			Pa	age
I.	Duties and Number of Tasks	•	•	20 ,
II.	The Tinnell Study Participants	•	•	21
III.	The Revised Study Participants	•	•	22
IV.	Summary of Instruments Mailed and Returned With Percentage of Return from Each Mailing	•	•	28 -
v.	The Data for Each Task	•	•	33
VI.	Top and Bottom Decile Number of Respondents Who Reported Performing Each Task in Groups I, II, III, and IV	•	•	42
VII.	Top and Bottom Decile Number of Respondents Who Reported Performing Each Task in Group I	•	•	43
VIII.	Top and Bottom Decile Number of Respondents Who Reported Performing Each Task in Group II	•	•	44 -
IX.	Top and Bottom Decile Number of Respondents Who Reported Performing Each Task in Group III	•	•	45
Χ.	Top and Bottom Decile Number of Respondents Who Reported Performing Each Task in Group IV	•	•	46
XI.	Top and Bottom Decile Total Relative Time Reported Spent on Each Task in Groups I, II, III, and IV	•	•	47 -
XII.	Top and Bottom Decile Total Relative Time Reported Spent on Each Task in Group I	•	•	48 -
XIII.	Top and Bottom Decile Total Relative Time Reported Spent on Each Task in Group II	•	•	49
XIV.	Top and Bottom Decile Total Relative Time Reported Spent on Each Task in Group III	•	•	50
XV.	Top and Bottom Decile Total Relative Time Reported Spent on Each Task in Group IV	•	•	51

.

XVI.	Top and Bottom Decile Products of the Number of Affirmative Respondents and the Total Relative Time Spent on the Task in Groups I, II, III, and IV	52
XVII.	Top and Bottom Decile Products of the Number of Affirmative Respondents and the Total Relative Time Spent on the Task in Group I	53
XVIII.	Top and Bottom Decile Products of the Number of Affirmative Respondents and the Total Relative Time Spent on the Task in Group II	54
XIX.	Top and Bottom Decile Products of the Number of Affirmative Respondents and the Total Relative Time Spent on the Task in Group III	55
XX.	Top and Bottom Decile Products of the Number of Affirmative Respondents and the Total Relative Time Spent on the Task in Group IV	56
XXI.	Top and Bottom Decile Reported Mean Relative Time Spent Performing Each Task in Groups I, II, III, and IV.	57
XXII.	Top and Bottom Decile Reported Mean Relative Time Spent Performing Each Task in Group I	58 -
XXIII.	Top and Bottom Decile Reported Mean Relative Time Spent Performing Each Task in Group II	59
XXIV.	Top and Bottom Decile Reported Mean Relative Time Spent Performing Each Task in Group III	60
XXV.	Top and Bottom Decile Reported Mean Relative Time Spent Performing Each Task in Group IV	61
XXVI.	Kendall Coefficient of Concordance	62
XXVII.	Kendall Coefficient of Concordance for Group I Respondents	65
XXVIII.	Kendall Coefficient of Concordance for Group II Respondents	66
XXIX.	Kendall Coefficient of Concordance for Group III Respondents	67
XXX.	Kendall Coefficient of Concordance for Group IV Respondents	68
XXXI.	Top Decile Number of Respondents Who Reported Performing Each Task Compared With the Tinnell Study and the Present Study	73

. .

÷

•

XXXII.	Bottom Decile Number of Respondents Who Reported Performing Each Task Compared With the Tinnell Study and the Present Study	74
XXXIII.	Top Decile Total Relative Time Reported Spent on Each Task Compared With the Tinnell Study and the Present Study	75
XXXIV.	Bottom Decile Total Relative Time Spent on Each Task Compared With the Tinnell Study and the Present Study	76
XXXV.	Top Decile of the Product Rankings Compared With the Tinnell Study and the Present Study	77
XXXVI.	Bottom Decile of the Product Rankings Compared With the Tinnell Study and the Present Study	78
XXXVII.	Top Decile of the Mean Rankings Compared to the Tinnell Study and the Present Study	79、
XXXVIII.	Bottom Decile of the Mean Rankings Compared With the Tinnell Study and the Present Study	80

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The very existence of a post-secondary educational institution may depend upon the data supplied by its faculty. The increased importance of obtaining educational data for purposes of planning and decision making has placed more responsibility on post-secondary technical-occupation instructors. Inconsistent data acquired from the technical-occupation instructor may affect accreditation, program funding, finances, eligibility for special state and federal projects, teacher accountability, and other issues of major proportion.

Data in the past was generally prepared by only members of the administration; however, greater use is being made of data prepared by the individual faculty member. With this new role being assigned to the technical-occupation instructor, the question arises as to the dependability of the data. Does the technical-occupation instructor provide consistent data or are questionnaires and forms viewed by the instructor as something to be handled in a haphazard manner? Data acquired from the technical-occupation instructor must be consistent if it is to be of significant value in making pertinent administrative decisions.

With this new role assigned to the technical-occupation instructor, questions arise as to the dependability of the data. Can important decisions and future planning be made from this data? The technical-

occupation faculties of twenty-three institutions of higher education in Oklahoma were studied to determine the reliability of the data prepared by them.

Statement of Problem

The problem with which this study was concerned involved the lack of information regarding the variability of data obtained by a task inventory from post-secondary technical-occupation instructors administered under varying occupational emphasis during the school year. Although examination of the tasks performed by the technical-occupation instructor as viewed by the instructor was of extreme importance, the problem as viewed in this study was the consistency at various points of occupational emphasis with which the answers were given regarding these tasks. The difficulties that might arise from inconsistent data provided by the technical-occupation instructor could be a major concern.

Certain agencies require data to be provided to them by the technical-occupation instructor while he or she is operating under varying occupational emphasis during the academic year. The data provided must be consistent regardless of the conditions or time at which the data was retrieved. It is of extreme importance to know if the administering of a questionnaire under varying occupational emphasis during the academic year has an effect on the technical-occupation instructor's response to the questionnaire; or is the response reliable regardless of when the technical-occupation instructor completes it.

The types of Oklahoma post-secondary institutions that this problem affects are universities, junior colleges, community colleges, and technical institutions in their relationship with local Boards of Regents,

2

See.

Higher Education Accrediting Associations, State Regents for Higher Education, State Department of Vocational-Technical Education, United States Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, etc..

The instrument selected was designed to be of equal importance to each technical-occupation instructor regardless of teaching speciality. The instrument, Tinnell's "Occupational Education Task Inventory",¹ was used to obtain a measurement of the consistency of responses to the questions concerning time spent in performing the following duty catagories: preparing for instruction, executing instruction, evaluating instruction, administering instructional services, managing equipment and facilities, providing student services, participating in professional development, developing instructional programs, and participating in non-instructional activities.

In summary, the problem with which this study was concerned involved the lack of information regarding the variability of data obtained by a task inventory from post-secondary technical-occupation instructors administered under varying occupational emphasis at different times during the academic year.

Purpose of the Study

Occupational emphases of post-secondary technical-occupation instructors vary during the school year. The purpose of this study was to determine if the administering of a task inventory to a post-secondary technical-occupation instructor working under different conditions at different times of the academic year would have a significant affect on the results of the data collected. The occupational emphases times

selected for the investigation were: end of the fall semester, beginning of the spring semester, middle of the spring semester, and the end of the spring semester. This was to be compared with an identical questionnaire administered by Tinnell to a group of Oklahoma post-secondary technical-occupation instructors at the middle of the fall semester.

Need for the Study

Post-secondary education was in a state of crisis in the first half of this decade of the 70's. Enrollments had either stabilized or declined slightly. Coupled with this were the problems caused by inflation. In the decade of the 60's, institutions could make bad decisions based on unreliable data and still exist. That luxury no longer prevailed.

Instructors often view data preparation as a nusisance to be tolerated with as little effort as possible and not as a matter of prime importance to them individually or to their institutions. Out of the realization of this fact develops the need for stressing the importance of data preparation by the technical-occupation instructor through such means as in-service training, departmental meetings, individual conferences, and others.

If the best time-frame to collect data can be determined, then post-secondary institutions can obtain more reliable data.

Description of Study Participants

The study involved technical-occupation instructors from four types of Oklahoma post-secondary institutions. The following descriptions are provided to describe the participants who provided data for

this study:

"University Faculty" is the professor or instructor in an institution whose major emphases is the awarding of the baccalaureate degree who is teaching technical-occupation courses in either a two-year or four-year curriculum specifically selected for this study.

"Community College Faculty" is a full time instructor in a twoyear college specializing in the needs of commuting students who teaches technical-occupation courses in one of the curriculums specifically selected for this study.

"Junior College Faculty" is an instructor in a two-year college specializing in instruction for commuting and non-commuting students who teaches technical-occupation courses in one of the junior college curriculums specifically selected for this study.

"Technical Institute Faculty" is a teacher or instructor in an institution specializing in instruction for immediate employment teaching full-time technical-occupation courses in a curriculum involved in this study.

Hypothesis

There is no significant difference in the results of data obtained by the task inventory administered to the same technical-occupation instructors under varying occupational emphasis at different times during the academic year.

Assumptions

For the purpose of this study, the following assumptions were made:

- A. Instructor tasks vary from time to time through a semester (term). For example, at the beginning of a semester course planning is important; later execution of instruction overshadows planning; and near the end, student evaluation becomes the main focus.
- B. Current activities at any given time tend to dominate an instructor's immediate perception of his or her job. An instructor tends to place relatively more importance on the task at hand than on those of past or future.
- C. Instructors will respond to a task inventory in a manner which reflects their immediate perception of their job. Their responses will be given in light of the way they see their job at the time the instrument is completed.

FOOTNOTES

¹Richard W. Tinnell, "A Task Inventory of Technical Teachers in Oklahoma" (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1975). pp. 46-66.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A study involving the manner in which post-secondary technicaloccupation instructors' view their duty-task throughout the academic year requires some enlightment as to terminology and its use. Terms regarding the instructor and those tasks performed by him need to be defined as to their meaning, how they were used, why they were necessary, and why the interlacement provides an intricate part of the study. Therefore, it becomes of the utmost importance to provide the reader with the definitions of those terms at the outset of the study.

Good states that instructor's tasks is labor or study imposed by another, quite often in a definite quanity, or broadly stated, anything imposed upon the instructor by duty or necessity, undertaking or work.¹ Tinnell, in a task inventory, narrowed the investigation of instructors to nine duty areas: (1) preparing for instruction, (2) executing instruction, (3) evaluating instruction, (4) administering instructional services, (5) managing equipment and facilities, (6) providing student services, (7) participating in professional development, (8) developing instructional programs, and (9) participating in non-instructional activities.² The instrument used to provide the data for this study employed Tinnell's Task Inventory.

Good uses the term instructor interchangeably with teacher and so is the case in the text of this study. An instructor is one who imparts

knowledge in colleges and universities.³ The study will enlarge Good's statement to include technical institutes at the post-secondary level, namely, Oklahoma State University Technical Institute, Oklahoma City, and Oklahoma State Tech, Okmulgee.

The "Task Inventory", as provided by Tinnell, meets all the requirements of a research instrument; therefore, Good's Directory of Education definition of instrument will be used interchangeably with both questionnaire and task inventory. The purpose of the instrument was to gather the necessary data. Good refers to a data-gathering instrument as a form or outline used as a guide in gathering data; for example, a printed form such as a check list and/or a rating scale on which the research worker may record information or ratings from others.⁴ The research instrument, as previously stated, is often referred to as a questionnaire, which is a list of planned, written questions related to a particular topic, with space provided for indicating the response to each question. This is intended for a number of persons to reply, and is commonly used in normative-survey studies and in the measurement of opinions.

In reviewing the literature relating to how an instructor views tasks and the accuracy with which he provides data regarding those tasks at different time periods of occupational emphasis, it was necessary to divide the review of literature into three groups which will provide the structure of this chapter. They are: (1) the instructor's view of tasks, (2) the accuracy of the data collected from instructors at various times of occupational emphasis, and (3) the effect the period of occupational emphasis has on data collected.

The Instructor's View of Teacher's Tasks

According to DeVaughn, in a study conducted in Oklahoma to provide a validated list of teacher competencies for teachers to use in more efficient planning and teaching, technical-occupation teachers:

...rated eight of the thirteen items in the planning area as very important. They considered determining educational needs and goals of students, and selecting and developing instructional content for lessons, units and courses as being very important. All groups judged organizing the sequence of learning tasks and developing a variety of methods and techniques of teaching as being very important.

...of those items related to instructional methods, they considered demonstration, laboratory experiences, use of cues, and reinforcement of learning through positive reinforcement techniques as being very important. In addition they considered proper maintenance of facilities and equipment and the use of safety rules as being very important.⁵

While DeVaughn's study did not take into consideration the validity of instructors' data at various periods of occupational emphasis, it did provide an insight into some occupational emphases and their importance regarding how instructors view their tasks and the mutual interest of task in the two studies. It is of interest to note that:

Technical education teachers represented the only teacher group rating, 'participate in non-instructional school duties, i.e., PTA, chaperoning', as being little or no importance. Teachers of agriculture, business and office, distributive education, health, home economics, industrial arts and trade and industry considered the item important

...three items from the planning area in the ten percent. These items were 'select and develop instructional content for lessons, units and courses', 'develop a variety of methods and techniques of teaching', and 'determine and select tools and equipment necessary for learning experiences of students'

The ranked top ten percent of competencies rated technical education teachers is given in Table XI. It was interesting that they gave item number seven, 'select and develop instructional content for lessons, units and courses', from the planning area, the highest rating.

In addition, they ranked two other items from the planning area in the top ten percent. These items were 'identify competencies needed for students to possess to enable them to enter an occupational skill', and 'organize the sequence of learning tasks'.⁶

The importance rating given in the DeVaughn's study in planning data is supportive to the consistency of which the tasks are rated on the tasks inventory section of "preparing for instruction" of Tinnell's questionnaire as used in this study.

The Accuracy of Data Collected From Instructors

at Various Times of Job Emphases

In Schaefer's look at the technical-occupation teacher, he states:

As rapidly as occupational technology is changing today, how can we expect the teacher of agriculture, business, distributive, home economics, trade and industrial, and technical education to remain up-to-date in their technology? Have you ever sensed that some vocational-technical education content as being taught is obsolescent? That our teachers may come to us with six years of experience-one year repeated six times?⁷

If the questions asked by Schaefer are true, is it not likely that data collected from technical-occupation instructors during the teaching year can be viewed as having little accuracy due to their hectic environment of catch-up or fall farther behind? This could support the position that technical-occupation teachers view data collection as unimportant, time consuming and as something to be handled in a haphazard manner.

Simplicity and the ease of marking questionnaires may outweigh the haphazard manner so often referred to in the completion of questionnaires. Rummell however, recognizes that misuse does exist when he states: "The correspondence method (i.e., mailed questionnaires) has not only been the most popular in extent of usage in research work, but it has also been the most misused method".⁸ Rummell does not necessarily imply that the instructor, as in the case of this study, contributes to the misuse of the questionnaire but that researcher and respondent both can and often do contribute to the misuse of the questionnaire.

In Brzezinski's study "An Experimental Study of Techniques for Increasing Return Ratio in Mail Surveys", she presents the problems of question interpretation and "correct" intended respondent.

In forced choice questionnaire formats, good ranges of alternative answers are often not provided. The researcher cannot always be certain that a particular question is interpreted in the same way by every respondent. In fact, with mailed questionnaires he cannot even be certain that it was the intended respondent who completed and returned the form. Most survey researchers occasionally receive carefully completed questionnaires expressing strong opinions on the subject at hand, only to find written at the bottom something like 'Completed for Dr. Blank, who is on sabbatical this year'. One is left to worry about how many questionnaires were completed by persons less compulsive about mentioning the intended respondent's absence.⁹

Length of the questionnaire may also be a possible determining factor in the accuracy of the data collected from the instructor. The anonymity of the respondent may also produce questionable results; however, Brzezinski found that:

The one page questionnaires were no more effective in eliciting higher response rates than the three page questionnaires containing the same number of items.

...it would appear that researchers need not strain to limit the number of items [within the limits of 20 or 40 items at least] if adequate follow-up procedures are used.

There may be great practical significance in the knowledge that lack of anonymity does not decrease response rates of college and university professors on typical higher education questionnaires.¹⁰

The Effect the Period of Occupational Emphasis Has on the Data Collected

Research of the literature revealed very little information regarding the time of data collection or the effect task emphasis has on the data being collected; however, it seems logical that time dates such as filing income tax, popular weeks for vacation, national holidays, spring and fall school breaks, examination, etc., all must be viewed as obstacles for acquiring accurate, consistent data. If this is the case, time periods such as those listed above should be avoided in the collection of data from the vocational-technical instructor.

During a telephone conversation, Ms. Maureen Byers, of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, stated that WICHE used the common sense method. Although no specific study had been completed, WICHE avoided time periods such as the beginning of the school year, Thanksgiving Holiday, Christmas and New Year's Holiday, March 15 to April 15 tax filing period, weeks during which most schools are taking their spring break or Easter Holiday, and the three summer months of June, July, and August for acquiring data from faculties of Higher Education Institutions.¹¹

Through correspondence with James R. Topping (see appendix B) who is also with the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, part C of the pilot test of NCHEMS survey instrument and procedures was acquired. This instrument was tested by the University of Michigan to determine

if there is a significant difference in how faculty report their activities when the instrument was administered at the beginning or in the middle of the semester. In both cases of the NCHEMS study, the time period covered by the survey was one academic semester, whereas the present study covered both the Fall and Spring terms. The NCHEMS study investigated whether faculty perception of what they would do during the semester differed significantly from their perception of their activities once the semester was half over. The findings of the Michigan study were further substantiated in studies by Lorents:

This question of when to administer the instrument was answered quite clearly. Tables 1 and 2 concisely demonstrate that no differences existed between the administration of the survey instrument in the early part of the term versus the middle of the term when either NCHEMS' or the University of Michigan's survey instrument was used.

The possibility exists that asking faculty members at the end of a term to recall their activities might produce some genuine differences. These would be differences of retrospection versus prospective estimation. Nevertheless, the current evidence is that the time during the term when the estimate is required is irrelevent.¹²

The following Tables are from Lorents:

Activity* Category	Mean % from early reporting	Mean % from middle reporting	T Value
Credit Instruction	44.95	44.29	0.15
Non-credit Instruction	15.29	15.46	-0.05
Research and Creative Activ	20.78 ity	20.14	0.13
Service Activity	3.61	5.27	1.54
Administrative Activity	7.42	6.23	0.50
Professional Development	7.95	8.61	-0.47

TESTS FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN ACTIVITY SCORES CAUSED BY TIME OF REPORTING

WHEN NCHEMS! FACULITY ACTIVITY AND OUTCOME SURVEY WAS USED

Degrees of Freedom = 83

. . . .

* All activity categories are taken from the University of Michigan's Academic Activities Personnel Report.¹³

TEST FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN ACTIVITY SCORES
CAUSED BY TIME OF REPORTING WHEN UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN'S ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ACTIVITIES REPORT WAS USED

Activity* Category	Mean % from early reporting	Mean % from middle reporting	T Value
Credit Instruction	54.14	50.95	0.60
Non-credit Instruction	12.23	13.19	-0.41
Research and Creative Activ	18.91 ity	17.64	0.27
Service Activity	4.00	3.36	0.60
Administrative Activity	4.93	8.60	-1.36
Professional Development	5.79	6.26	-0.32

Degrees of Freedom = 84

* All activity categories are taken from the University of Michigan's Academic Activities Personnel Report.¹⁴

FOOTNOTES

¹Carter V. Good, <u>Directory of Education</u> (New York, 1959), p. 292.

²Richard W. Tinnell, "A Task Inventory of Technical Teachers in Oklahoma" (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1975), pp. 46-66.

³Good, p. 291.

⁴Carter V. Good, Directory of Education (New York, 1973), p. 510.

⁵Zed Farris DeVaughn, "Competencies Needed by Vocational and Technical Education Teachers as Rated by Selected Groups" (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1974), pp. 32-38.

⁶Ibid., pp. 41-55.

⁷Carl Schaefer, <u>A Rationale for Comprehensive</u> <u>Personnel Development</u> <u>in a State</u> (Ohio, 1972), pp. 3-4.

⁸J.F. Rummel, <u>An Introduction to Research Procedures in Education</u> (New York, 1958), p. 87.

⁹Evelyn J. Brzezinski and Blaine R. Worthen, <u>An Experimental Study</u> of <u>Techniques for Increasing Return Rates in Mail Surveys</u> (paper presented at American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1973), p. 3.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 24.

¹¹Maureen Byers, Personal Communication, April 2, 1975.

¹²Alden C. Lorents, Faculty Activity and Planning Models in Education (Minnesota, 1971), pp. 58-62.

¹³Ibid., p. 60.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 61.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The present study is an extension of a research effort conducted by Tinnell. The instrument developed and used by Tinnell was also used in this study. Respondents to the Tinnell study were also used in this study and the data obtained by Tinnell were compared to the data of this study. This chapter reports the methodology used in the study. The methodology implemented to achieve the purpose of the study can be divided into five catagories: (1) research design; (2) instrument; (3) respondents; (4) collection of data; and (5) statistical treatment.

Research Design

The study is a quasi-experimental design which allows the test of the hypothesis by reaching conclusions about the hypothesis. Through statistical analysis of the data, the results of the study can be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

Instrument

Data for the study were collected by a task analysis inventory. This inventory required the respondent to indicate on a five point scale their emphases on tasks in the following duties: (1) preparing for instruction; (2) executing instruction; (3) evaluating instruction;

(4) administering instructional services; (5) managing equipment and facilities; (6) providing instructional services; (7) participating in professional development; (8) developing instructional programs; and
(9) participating in non-instructional activities.

The instrument selected for the study was a task inventory prepared by Richard W. Tinnell.¹ A list of the duties and the number of tasks included with each duty is given in Table I. The inventory consisted of two hundred items with provisions for the respondent to write in other tasks that he or she might feel pertinent to the questionnaire. The respondent placed a check-mark beside those tasks which were performed and rated those tasks individually by the use of a five-pointtime-spent scale. The scale was rated by placing a check-mark in the appropriate column of: (1) very little time spent; (2) below average time spent; (3) about average time spent; (4) above average time spent; and (5) very much time spent. A copy of the inventory is included in the Appendix A.

TABLE	Ι
-------	---

DUTIES AND NUMBER OF TASKS

	Duty	Number of Tasks
123456789	Preparing for Instruction Executing Instruction Evaluating Instruction Administering Instructional Services Managing Equipment and Facilities Providing Student Services Participating in Professional Development Developing Instructional Programs Particpating in Non-Instructional Activities	27 30 29 22 20 20 18 20 14
		10tal: 200

Respondents

Technical-occupation instructors' from 23 post-secondary institutions participated in the original survey by Tinnell. For a list of institutions see Appendix D. One hundred thirty-nine Tinnell respondents were surveyed and answers were received from 115. Table II list the potential number of participants in the Tinnell study, while Table III indicates the actual number responding to the Tinnell study from each institution.

TABLE II

THE TINNELL STUDY PARTICIPANTS

	Institution	Number of Participants
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Bethany Nazarine College Cameron University Carl Albert Junior College Connors State College Eastern Oklahoma State College El Reno Junior College Langston University Murray State College Northeastern Oklahoma State University Northeastern Oklahoma State University Northers Oklahoma College Northwestern Oklahoma State University Oklahoma State University School of Technology Oklahoma State University Technical Institute Oklahoma State Tech Oscar Rose Junior College Sayre Junior College Seminole Junior College Southeastern Oklahoma State University Southwestern College South Oklahoma City Junior College Tulsa Junior College Western Oklahoma State College	1 7 1 2 13 1 2 7 1 10 7 2 23 14 50 7 1 1 3 2 4 10 2
	Tota	1: 171

Study Participants

The 139 technical-occupation instructors who participated in the Tinnell study (see Table III) were divided into four groups, three groups had 35 participants and the remaining group had 34 participants. In the eleven institutions with four or more participants, a random selection was made by taking every fourth name on the participant roll.

TABLE III

	Institution	Number of Participants
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 8 9 10 11 2 3 1 12 1 12 1 12 1 12 1 12 1 12	Bethany Nazarine College Cameron University Carl Albert Junior College Connors State College Eastern Oklahoma State College El Reno Junior College Langston University Murray State College Northeastern Oklahoma State University Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College Northern Oklahoma College Northwestern Oklahoma State University Oklahoma State University School of Technology Oklahoma State University Technical Institute Oklahoma State Tech Oscar Rose Junior College Sayre Junior College Southeastern Oklahoma State University Southeastern Oklahoma State University Southeastern Oklahoma State University Southeastern Oklahoma State University Southwestern College	1 7 1 8 0 1 7 1 10 5 2 18 12 50 5 0 0 3 0 4 3
23	western Uklanoma, State College To	tal: 139

THE REVISED STUDY PARTICIPANTS^a

^aThose who answered the Tinnell study and surveyed by this study.

Those institutions with one, two, or three participants presented a different problem. This was resolved by randomly aligning these participants with the participants from the larger institutions until the total group size (three with 35 and one with 34 participants) was reached. This selection procedure was chosen to eliminate any bias that might appear in the study due to instructor's major field, type of institution, number of years teaching experience, age, and sex of the participant.

Collection of Data

The periods selected for the respondents to complete the identical questionnaire as that used in the October, 1974 data collection by Tinnell were: (1) Group I, November 30, 1974; (2) Group II, January 15, 1975; (3) Group III, February 5, 1975; and (4) Group IV, April 25, 1975.

The respondent was urged to give careful consideration to each duty and tasks and to provide data for only those tasks actually performed. The respondent was discouraged from attempting any form of recall as to how the questionnaire was answered the first time and an explanation was given in a letter regarding the purpose of the second questionnaire being identical to the first. (See Appendix C for the letter of explanation.)

Although numbers were assigned to each questionnaire and respondent identity was available in most instances, no record of this data was employed or retained for the study.

Each respondent's reaction to the twice administered questionnaire provided data for analysis of consistency relevant to the tasks performed and the time spent on each task.

Statistical Treatment

The data retrieved from the Tinnell questionnaire and the data retrieved from one of the four time periods of occupational emphasis of this study were statistically analyzed by methods of percentages and the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance. The Kendall Coefficient of Concordance method was selected to measure the degree of consistency and amount of agreement with which an instructor answered the two hundred task questions in Tinnell's study compared to those same questions administered in this study, but administered at different time periods of job emphasis. The Kendall Coefficient of Concordance was calculated, and, in addition, a chi-square statistic was computed in order to determine the significance of the calculated Kendall Coefficient of Concordance.²

FOOTNOTES

¹Richard W. Tinnell, "A Task Inventory of Technical Teachers in Oklahoma" (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1975), pp. 46-66.

²Gary W. Folkers, "Kendall Coefficient of Concordance" (Unpub. Paper, Oklahoma State University, 1967), pp. 4-5.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Questionnaire Results

One hundred thirty-nine post-secondary technical-occupation instructors representing 18 Oklahoma institutions were requested to again complete a task inventory (see Appendix A) that they had previously completed in October, 1974. Four occupational emphasis periods were selected and the return for each selected period is given below.

On November 30, 1974, task analysis questionnaires were mailed to Group I study participants (34 participants). By January 15, 1975, thirty-one returns had been received for a 91.1 percent return; however, two which had been initially received were misplaced before the data could be recorded. This necessitated a revision of the number of returns to 29 (85.3 percent).

On January 15, 1975, task analysis questionnaires were mailed to Group II participants (35 participants). By February 18, 1975, thirty returns had been received for an 85.7 percent return. However, questionnaire number 103 was mailed by mistake to another institution and was completed and returned by an individual who was neither a participant of the study nor a technical-occupation instructor. This necessitated the removal of the task analysis questionnaire from the return and revised the number of returns to 29 (82.9 percent).

On February 5, 1975, task analysis questionnaires were mailed to

Group III participants (35 participants). By April 5, 1975, thirty-one (88.6 percent) had been received.

Task analysis questionnaires were mailed on April 25, 1975, to Group IV participants (35 participants). By May 15, 1975, twenty-six had been received for a 74.3 percent return. This represented the "shortest time frame (25 days) for returning questionnaires; however, all but one institution partially closed for the summer the second week in May. Two returns were received after May 15, 1975, but neither was considered as useable data, because of the above mentioned cut-off date.

Table IV is a summary of instruments mailed and returned and the percentage of return from each institution involved in the study. Two institutions, each with one occupational instructor, failed to return the questionnaire. The two of the original 18 institutions not responding represented only 11 percent of the total number. Of the 139 questionnaires mailed throughout the year, 115 were useable for an 82.7 percent return as compared to Tinnell's 81.3 percent.

Return Results

The data concerning the responses of each technical-occupation instructor responding to each duty-task that they performed was calculated. This procedure provided several methods by which the data on each duty-task could be analyzed and compared. Among these methods are the range and percentage of responses, total relative time spent on a particular duty-task, the product of time spent, and the mean of the time spent (see Table V).

The number of responses to the duty-task (see Table V) ranged from 16 to 112. This produces an extent of variation in the range of

TABLE IV

Tinnell Study Oct. 15 1974				Group I thru IV Nov. 30 thru Apr. 25 1974 1975		
Insti- tution	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Percent	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Percent
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	1 7 12 13 12 7 10 7 23 14 50 7 1 13 2 4	1 7 1 8 0 1 7 1 10 6 2 18 2 50 4 0 3 0 4	100 100 50 62 0 50 100 100 100 86 100 78 86 100 78 86 100 67 0 0 100 100 67 0 100 100 0 100 0 100 100 100 0 100 100 100 1000 1000 1000 1000 1	1 7 1 7 1 10 6 2 18 12 50 4 3 4	0 7 0 7 1 4 1 10 5 2 14 7 44 4 4 4 2 4	0 100 0 100 100 57 100 100 83 100 78 58 88 100 78 58 88 100
22 23	10 2	3	30 [.] 0	3	3	100
Totals:	171	139	81.3	139	115	82.7

SUMMARY OF INSTRUMENTS MAILED AND RETURNED WITH PERCENTAGE OF RETURN FROM EACH MAILING
	Gro Nov	oup I 197	4	Gro Jan	oup I 197	I 5	Grou Feb	ıp II 197	I 5	Gro Apr	oup IV 1975	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Institution	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Percent	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Percent	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Percent	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Percent
123456	1 2 0 0 2	0 2 0 0 2	0 100 0 0 100	0 1 0 0 1	0 1 0 0 1	0 100 0 0 100	0 2 0 3	0 2 0 0 3	0 100 0 0 100	0 2 1 1 2	0 2 0 0 2	0 100 0 100
56 7 8 90 11 12 13 14 156	0 2 1 2 1 0 5 3 12 1	0 2 2 0 4 3 10 1	0 100 100 0 0 80 100 83 100	1 2 2 1 5 3 13 1	1 0 2 1 5 2 12 0	100 50 0 100 100 100 100 67 92 0	0 1 3 1 4 3 13 1	0 1 3 1 2 1 3 1 3	0 100 100 100 100 50 33 100 100	0 2 0 3 2 0 4 3 12 1	0 0 0 3 2 0 3 1 9 1	0 0 100 100 75 33 75 100
18 19 20	1	l	100	l.	0	0	0	0	0	l	l	100
20 21 22 23	1 0	1 0	100 0	1	l l	100 100	1 1	1 1	100 100	1 1 *	1 1	100 100
Total	34	29	85.2	35	29	85.7	35	31	88.6	35	26	74.3

responses which is marginal, i.e., 96 for this study compared to 128 for Tinnell or a difference of 25 percent.

The total relative time spent performing each duty-task was calculated by taking the frequency the duty-task was performed times a weighted factor. Computation of the data for duty-task I-1, "preparing for instruction, develop student safety procedures" provide us an example:

Deve	Weighted Factor	Frequency	Total Relative Time
Done:			
not done	0	31	0
very little	1	31	31
below average	2	12	24
about average	3	32	96
above average	Ĩų d	6	24
very much	5	3	15
		115	190

The range of the total relative time spent on each duty-task was from 24 on duty 9 task 7 (drive a school bus); to 418 on duty 2 task 22 (present lessons with a chalkboard). This compares favorably with Tinnell's range on total relative time of five to 483 respectively on the identical duty-tasks.

The product of each duty-task was computed by multiplying the frequency (number of responses) times the total relative time. In doing this the number of zero responses (31 in the above) must be subtracted from the total frequencies (115) to provide the total useable frequencies (84). Multiplying this number (84) times the total relative time provides the product (15960). The range of products was from 384 on duty 9 task 7 (drive a school bus) to 46,816 duty 2 task 22 (present lessons with a chalkboard). Tinnell's range was from 20 on duty 9 task 7 (drive a school bus) to 60,858 on duty 2 task 22 (present lessons with a chalkboard). Again, a 25 percent variation between this study and Tinnell's occurs on products as was the case pointed out earlier on the range of responses.

The mean total time that the respondents spent performing each duty-task was calculated by dividing the total relative time (190 for duty-task I-1) by the number of respondents indicating that they performed the task (84). The results were compared to the Tinnell study for each task in the inventory. The range for the mean total time spent on individual tasks was from 1.50 on duty 9 task 7 (drive a school bus) to 3.85 on duty 2 task 26 (supervise student laboratory work). This compares with Tinnell's range of 1.25 (which was also identified as duty 9 task 7) to 4.0 (on duty 2 task 26 which again was the identical duty and task identified in both studies).

All results of these four methods of calculation are given on each duty-task in Table V. The number of zero, one, two, three, four, and five weighted responses were calculated for all tasks. The range of the results for the least number of affirmative responses were compared to the Tinnell results:

Weighted Factor	Present Study Duty 9 Task 7 No. of Responses	Tinnell Study Duty 9 Task 7 No. of Responses
0 1 2 3 4	99 12 2 1 0	134 3 1 0 0
5	1	0

As indicated above, on one duty-task in the present study, 99 of the 115 respondents did not perform the task compared to 134 of 139 respondents in the Tinnell study. Although a difference of 99 to 134 appears large,

31

it should be noted that the respondents for this study was 115 while the Tinnell study was 139, a difference of 24. The largest number of affirmative responses were also compared:

Weighted Factor	Present Study Duty 2 Task 22 No. of Responses	Tinnell Study Duty 7 Task 8 No. of Responses
0	3	6
1	4	17
2	7	32
3	36	56
4	33	22
5	32	5

In this study 112 of a possible 115 respondents indicated they performed a given task while in the Tinnell study 133 of 139 respondents indicated they performed a task.

TABLE V

THE DATA FOR EACH TASK

I Preparing for Instruction

		Responses ^a	Total ^D Relative Time	Product ^C	Mean ^d
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	Develop student safety procedures Identify library resources Identify resource persons Identify terminal evaluative crite Maintain an instructional material	84 87 63 eria 72	190 194 140 194	15960 16878 8820 13968	2.26 2.23 2.22 2.69
6. 7. 8.	file Make mimeograph masters Make photo (thermo) copy masters Make spirit duplicator masters Make visual aids	106 70 67 54 94	324 184 160 127 256	34344 12880 10720 6858 24064	3.06 2.63 2.39 2.35 2.72
10. 11. 12. 13.	Operate a mimeograph machine Operate a photo (thermo) copy mach Operate a spirit duplicator Organize lesson plans	58 11ne 57 49 108	115 123 111 368	6670 7011 5439 39744	1.98 2.16 2.27 3.41
14. 15. 16. 17.	Plan field trips Prepare lecture outlines Select course content Select student projects Select text books	85 110 106 105 101	206 373 347 351 288	17510 41030 36782 36855 29088	2.42 3.39 3.27 3.34 2.85
19. 20. 21. 22.	Select training package Select visual aids Set up demonstrations Set up laboratory equipment	69 93 101 91	178 257 305 277	12282 23901 30805 25207	2.58 2.76 3.02 3.04
23. 24. 25. 26. 27.	Write course objectives Write laboratory exercises Write lesson objectives Write student handout sheets Write unit objectives	104 92 102 109 86	306 280 283 344 222	31824 25760 28866 37496 19092	2.94 3.04 2.77 3.16 2.58

.

II Executing Instruction

1.	Coordinate a cooperative work program.	37	93	3441	2.51
2.	Demonstrate manipulative skills	89	291	25899	3.27
3.	Derive mathematical equations	67	170	11390	2.54
4.	Direct group discussions	86	261	22446	3.03
5.	Direct programmed instruction	48	137	6576	2.85
6.	Direct student skill practice	98	359	35182	3.66
7.	Direct student project work	89	317	28213	3.56
ġ.	Employ oral questioning	100	334	33400	3.34
9.	Give homework assignments	102	292	29784	2.86
10.	Give lectures	110	390	42900	3.55
11.	Give students assistance in laboratory	106	393	41658	3.71
12.	Implement rules of acceptable conduct	91	268	24388	2,95
13.	Implement safety procedures	83	249	20677	3.00
14.	Present lessons through problem solving	g103	347	35741	3.37
15.	Present lessons using analogies	75	225	16875	3.00
16.	Present lessons using audio tape	43	99	4257	2.30
17.	Present lessons using filmstrips	60	141	8460	2.35
18.	Present lessons using flip charts	41	83	3403	2.02
19.	Present lessons using models	79	214	16906	2.71
20.	Present lessons using photo slides	57	141	8037	2.47
21.	Present lessons using video tape	34	72	2448	2.12
22.	Present lessons using a chalkboard	112	418	46816	3.73
23.	Present lessons with motion pictures	73	185	13505	2.53
24.	Present lessons with overhead projecto	r 95	296	28120	3.12
25.	Present principles by demonstration	102	351	35802	3.44
26.	Supervise student laboratory work	98	378	37044	3.86
27.	Supervise field trips	81	191	15471	2.36
28.	Teach evening classes	67	194	12998	2.90
29.	Teach extension classes	29	56	1624	1.93
30.	Work problems before class	105	346	36330	3.30

III Evaluating Instruction

1. 2. 3.	Administer written tests Analyze tests for reliability Analyze tests for validity	110 91 87	360 242 233	39600 22022 20271	3.27 2.66 2.68
4	Check graduate performance with employ	rer73	184	13432	2.52
5.	Conduct drop-out studies	39	78	3042	2.00
6.	Determine final grades	109	388	42292	3.56
7.	Devise laboratory performance tests	82	251	20582	3.06
8.	Formulate case-study problems	40	97	3880	2.43
9.	Formulate completion test questions	94	269	25286	2.86
10.	Formulate essay test questions	81	194	15714	2.40
11.	Formulate multiple choice questions	89	240	21360	2.70
12.	Formulate matching test questions	98	288	28224	2.94
13.	Formulate tech-math problems	62 * *	185	11470	2,98
14.	Formulate true-false questions	89	287	25543	3.22
15.	Grade homework assignments	93	287	26691	3.09
16.	Grade laboratory reports	81	260	21060	3.21
17.	Grade student projects	96	329	31584	3.43
18.	Grade student class performance	95	335	31825	3.53
19.	Grade written tests	108	374	40392	3.46
20.	Have advisory committee evaluate cours	es66	167	11022	2.53
21.	Have students evaluate course content	87	196	17052	2.25
22.	Have students evaluate teacher	84	203	17052	2.42
23	Obtain program evaluation from graduat	es56	129	7224	2.30
24.	Prepare progress charts	61	165	10065	2.70
25.	Rate other teachers	41	82	3362	2.00
26.	Serve on self-study committees	46	112	5152	2.43
27.	Write a self-evaluation form	52	130	6760	2.50
28,	Write lesson objectives	91	258	23478	2.84
29.	Write student evaluation criteria	53	139	7367	2.62

				5	
1. 2. 3. 4. 56. 7. 8. 9. 10. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22.	Assign students to classes Attend faculty meetings Collect fees Coordinate teaching in several progra Handle petty cash Identify prospective teachers Interview prospective employees Maintain attendance records Maintain financial records Maintain financial records Maintain follow-up records Maintain follow-up records Maintain placement records Maintain placement records Maintain purchasing records Make teaching assignments Plan the budget Prepare class schedules Prepare promotional brochures Prepare travel claims Recruit new students Specify teacher qualifications Supervise other teachers	61 10 38 39 32 48 48 100 48 48 48 40 57 44 58 53 67 88 55 88 55	$ \begin{array}{r} 160 \\ 323 \\ 78 \\ 109 \\ 59 \\ 113 \\ 109 \\ 322 \\ 137 \\ 62 \\ 114 \\ 127 \\ 133 \\ 130 \\ 116 \\ 191 \\ 144 \\ 137 \\ 121 \\ 243 \\ 103 \\ 236 \\ \end{array} $	9760 35530 2964 4251 1888 5424 5232 32200 7398 1674 5016 5715 6384 6110 5104 13370 8064 7261 8107 21384 4635 20060	2.62 2.94 2.05 2.79 1.84 2.35 2.27 3.22 2.54 2.59 2.59 2.77 2.64 2.77 2.64 2.77 2.64 2.77 2.58 1.81 2.76 2.78
	V Managing Equipment and	Facil	ities		
1. 2. 3.	Administer laboratory clean-up Arrange for equipment storage Conduct the inventory	85 73 79	236 191 215	20060 13943 16985	2.78 2.62 2.72

IV Administering Instructional Services

⊥•	Administer laboratory clean-up	05	230	20060	2.0
2.	Arrange for equipment storage	73	191	13943	2.62
3.	Conduct the inventory	79	215	16985	2.72
4.	Control environment (light, heat, etc	c.)76	185	14060	2.43
5.	Evaluate available facilities	62	156	9672	2.52
6.	Maintain equipment	83	258	21414	3.11
7.	Manage a tool room	45	106	4770	2.36
8.	Order instructional supplies	93	264	24552	2.84
9.	Order laboratory equipment	84	226	18984	2.69
10.	Plan long range equipment needs	84	219	18396	2.61
11.	Prepare equipment budgets	53	146	7738	2.75
12.	Recommend library purchases	81	199	16119	2.46
13.	Repair damaged equipment	79	234	18486	2.96
14.	Review building construction plans	46	109	5014	2.37
15.	Schedule student laboratory time	77	211	16247	2.74
16.	Select audio-visual equipment	59	140	8260	2.37
17.	Select classrooms	45	113	5085	2.51
18.	Solicit contributions from industry	. 42	- 98	4116	2.33
19.	Select laboratory (shop) space	35	78	2730	2.23
20.	Write equipment specifications	67	179	11993	2.67

VI Providing Student Services

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	Administer counseling tests Administer placement tests Advise students about employment Advise students about further educati Advise students with personal problem Advise students with scholastic	20 22 104 Lon99 ns 99	32 44 324 284 230	640 968 33696 28116 22770	1.60 2.00 3.12 2.87 2.32
0.	problems	101	276	27876	2.73
7. 8.	Assess student academic ability Assist students in getting financial	65	190	12350	2.92
	aids	71	106	7526	1.49
9.	Conduct counseling sessions	55	137	7535	2.49
10.	Conduct a graduate follow-up program	49	114	5586	2.33
11.	Conduct home visits	21	34	714	1.62
12.	Contact prospective employers	69	186	12834	2.70
13.	Evaluate student selection data	26	54	1404 1404	2.08
14.	Interview prospective students	. 78	218	17004	2.79
15.	Place graduates with employers	64	182	11648	2.84
16.	Provide disciplinary action	45	89	4005	1.98
17.	Provide placement services	50	143	7150	2.86
18.	Select students for the program	30	79	2370	2.63
19.	Set student selection criteria	29	65	1885	2.24
20.	Write letters of recommendation	89	223	19847	2,51
	VII Participating in Professi	onal I	Developme	ent	
l.	Assist new teachers	74	192	14208	2.59
2.	Attend professional meetings	104	290	30160	2.79

		1.		T 1 T 0 0	
2.	Attend professional meetings	104	290	30160	2.79
3.	Conduct research	38	75	2850	1.97
4.	Participate in professional				
	organizations	98	277	27146	2.83
5.	Participate in research studies	41	. 85	3485	2.07
6.	Participate in seminars	81	192	15552	2.37
7.	Practice new specialty skills	57	157	8949	2.75
8.	Read professional journals	104	295	30680	2.84
9.	Read text books	102	323	32946	3.17
10.	Read technical journals	100	294	29400	2.94
11.	Serve as an officer of an oranization	54	150	8100	2.78
12.	Take college courses	81	226	18306	2.79
13.	Take correspondence courses	21	- 36	756	1.71
14.	Take short courses	48	102	4896	2.13
15.	Visit other schools	. 83	210	17430	2.53
16.	Work in industry	50	122	6100	2.44
17.	Write professional articles	23	44	1012	1.91
18.	Write technical journal articles	24	42	1008	1.75

VIII Developing Instructional Programs

				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
1.	Adapt occupational surveys to local	31	80	2720	2 25
2	Analyze occupational clusters	27	82	2071	یرد.∠ ارد د
2.	Analyze occupacional clusters	57	155	2075	
5.	Assess relevancy of program offerings	· 94 ·	- T00	0035	2.12
4.	conduct occupational needs surveys	- 33	69	2211	2.09
5.	Determine staff and faculty	·			
	requirements	48	116	5568	2.42
6.	Establish program goals	70	193	13510	2.76
7.	Examine curricula of other schools	. 70	170	11900	2.43
8.	Identify appropriate program content	73	207	15111	2.84
9.	Identify entry level skills	56	142	8094	2.54
10.	Make job analyses	. 52	111	5772	2.13
11.	Meet with advisory committees	83	. 203	16849	2.45
12.	Organize advisory committees	50	110	5500	2.20
13.	Plan advisory committee meetings	49	106	5194	2.16
14.	Read curriculum research reports	57	127	7239	2.23
15.	Read vocational education needs survey	s72	168	12096	2.33
16.	Select programs to be offered	50	127	6350	2.54
17 17	Sequence courses within the program	62	170	105/10	2.7/
⊥/• ⊐Q	Corres on a current culture correct the	102	105		
10.	Serve on a curriculum commutblee	49	125	10125	~~~
TÀ.	write program objectives	DЗ	Τ01	10521	2.05
20.	Write proposals for funding	- 37	71	2627	1.92

IX Participating in Non-Instructional Activities

l.	Assist with institutional maintenance	55	138	7590	2.51
2.	Attend civic club meetings	67	159	10653	2.37
3.	Attend school related social function	s100	273	27300.	2.73
4.	Chaperon student activities	71	164	11644	2.31
5.	Collect money for charities	36	. 65	2340	1.81
6.	Collect tickets at school activities	31	59	1829	1.90
7.	Drive a school bus	16	. 24	384	1.50
8.	Participate in community activities	78	199	15522	2.55
9.	Prepare news releases	36	66	2376	1.83
10.	Sell activities tickets	21	26	546	1.24
11.	Serve on committees address to be addressed	72	195	14040	2.71
12.	Sponsor students clubs	70	196	13720	2.80
13.	Visit with other teachers	93	282	26226	3.03
14.	Work as a consultant	50	102	5100	2.04

a Total number responding to a given task.

b Number responding multiplied by weighted factor (0-5) which indicated amount of time spent performing each task.

c Responses multiplied by total relative time. d Total relative time divided by response.

Ranking the Responses

The ranking of technical-occupation instructors' responses, as indicated in Table V, would be lengthy and the value of such would indeed be questionable. For this reason, only the rankings of those task in the top and bottom decile of the following four methods will be given:

- 1. The number of respondents who reported performing each task. (Table VI, VII, VIII, IX, X)
- 2. The total relative times reported spent on each task. (Table XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV)
- 3. The product of the number of affirmative respondents and the total relative time spent on the tasks. (Table XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX)
- 4. The reported mean relative time spent performing each task. (Table XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV)

Tables VI through X give the number of respondents reporting that they performed a particular task. The top portion of the table represents the top decile while the lower portion of the table is the bottom decile. Also given is the percentage of the ranking for the number of respondents indicating that they performed the task.

The top and bottom decile rankings of the total relative time spent performing each task is given in Table XI through XV. The top and bottom decile of the rankings of the product of the number of affirmative respondents and the total relative time spent on the tasks are given in Table XVI through XX. Similarly, Table XXI through XXV give the rankings of the reported mean total relative time spent performing each task.

The structure of Table VI through XXV was patterned after the Tinnell study to better facilitate a comparison of the two studies. There are many ways of viewing the results and many valuable conclusions could be gleaned from the data; however, the main objective of this study was to determine if a significant difference in the results of

39

data would be gained by administering a task analysis questionnaire to the same technical-occupation instructors under varying occupational emphasis at different times during the academic year. To permit analysis of the data XXXI through XXXVIII compare the top and bottom deciles of this study as presented in Tables VI through XXV to the findings of the Tinnell study. The conclusions and recommendations derived from these data will appear in the next chapter.

While the above material compared the data of this study with that of the Tinnell study and the data obtained in each of the four job emphasis periods in this study were compared with each other, another approach is to compare the way in which a given instructor answered the two identical task inventories. To determine the consistency with which a given occupation instructor answered the original and follow-up instruments (see Tables XXVII through XXX), the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance was employed.

For example, as can be observed in Table XXIV, one respondent completed both task analysis questionnaires in an identical manner, i.e., that each of the 200 questions were completed the same in February as in the initial (October) questionnaire. This produced a Kendall Coefficient of Concordance of 1.000000 and a Chi Square value of 398.00000. At the other extreme, a Kendall Coefficient of Concordance of 0.168317 and a Chi Square of 66.99022 was produced by a respondent as indicated in Table XXIX. It is interesting to note that both extremes were in the same month (February, Group III).

To permit determination of whether one job emphasis period has more effect than another job emphasis period on the manner in which a technical-occupation instructor provides data, a mean correlation

40

between the initial questionnaire and each of the four follow-up periods was developed. The mean of the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance between the initial questionnaire and the November questionnaire was 0.78165; January questionnaire, 0.83208; February questionnaire, 0.75309, and, April questionnaire, 0.80704. While the latter is interesting, the primary purpose of the study was to determine the best time to request data from the technical-occupation instructor - - or those times to avoid.

> End of Semester First of Semester Mid Semester End of Semester

Mean By Job Emphasis Period:

November	0.78165
January	0.83208
February	0.75309
April	0.80704

Mean of Means:

 $3.17387 \div 4 = 0.79347$

Total Mean:

86.41551 ÷ 109 = 0.79280

The range, 0.07899, of the job emphasis period means is from 0.83208 to 0.75309 which is very small when one considers the number of respondents with which the study dealt. The small range in the job emphasis group means indicates that the time period in which a given technical-occupation instructor provides data has no significance. Consistent data may be retrieved at any job emphasis period.

TABLE VI

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED PERFORMING EACH TASK IN GROUPS I, II, III, AND IV

	Duty-Task	Number Responding ^a (N= 115)	Per Cent
II-22 I-15 III-10 III-1 IV-2 I-26 III-6 I-13 III-19 I-5 I-16 II-11 I-23 VII-30 VII-2 VII-8 II-14 VII-9	Present lessons with a chalkboard Prepare lecture outlines Give lectures Administer written test Attend faculty meetings Write student handout sheets Determine final grades Organize lesson plans Grade written tests Maintain an instructional materials file Select course content Give students assistance in laboratory Select student projects Work problems before class Write course objectives Advise students about employment Attend professional meetings Read professional journals Present lessons by problem solving Read text books	112 110 110 110 109 109 109 108 108 106 106 106 105 105 105 104 104 104 104 104 104 104 103 102	97.4 95.7 95.7 95.7 94.8 93.9 93.9 92.2 92.2 92.2 92.2 91.3 90.4 90.4 90.4 90.4 89.6 88.7
IX-5 V-19 II-21 VIII-1 VIII-4 IV-5 IX-6 VI-18 II-29 VI-19 IV-10 VI-13 VII-13 VII-13 VII-13 IX-10 VI-1 IX-7	Collect money for charities Select laboratory (shop space) Present lessons using video tape Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Conduct occupational needs surveys Handle petty cash Collect tickets at school activities Select students for the program Teach extension classes Set student selection criteria Maintain financial records Evaluate student selection data Write technical journal articles Write professional articles Administer placement tests Conduct home visits Take correspondence courses Sell activities tickets Administer counseling tests Drive a school bus	36 35 34 34 33 32 31 30 29 29 27 26 24 29 27 26 24 23 22 21 21 21 21 20 16	31.3 30.4 29.6 29.6 28.7 27.8 27.0 26.1 25.2 23.5 22.6 20.0 19.1 18.3 18.3 18.3 18.3 17.4 13.9

TABLE VII

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED PERFORMING EACH TASK IN GROUP I

		Number	Per
•	Duty-lask	(N= 20)	Cent
T_15	Prenare lecture outlines	27	02 1
I-I7	Select student projects	27	1 20
	Give leatured	27	90•±
	Give students essistence in leberatory	27	93•⊥ 02 ¹ 1
	Give students assistance in indoratory	21	93.1
11-22	Present lessons with a chalkpoard	21	93.1
10-2	Attend laculty meetings	21	93.1
1-13	Organize lesson plans	26	89.7
1-26	Write student handout sheets	26	89.7
II - 9	Give homework assignments	26	89.7
II - 25	Present principles by demonstration	26	89.7
II - 26	Supervise student laboratory work	26	89.7
II - 30	Work problems before class	26	89.7
III - l	Administer written tests	26	89.7
VII-2	Attend professional meetings	26	89.7
I - 5	Maintain an instructional material file	25	86.2
III-6	Determine final grades	25	86.2
I - 16	Select course content	24	82.8
II-14	Present lessons by problem solving	24	82.8
III - 19	Grade written tests	24	82.8
VII-8	Read professional journals	24	82.8
		— ·	
VIII-2	Analyze occupational clusters	5	17.2
IV-5	Handle petty cash	5	17.2
II - 29	Teach extension classes	5	17.2
II - 21	Present lessons using video tape	5	17.2
IX - 9	Prepare news releases	. <u>4</u> .	13.8
TX-6	Collect tickets at school activities	<u>ц</u>	13.8
VTTT-1	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs	Д	13.8
VTT_18	Write technical journal articles	Ц	13.8
$V \perp \perp \perp \perp \cup$ $V \perp \perp \perp \perp \cup$	Write professional articles	т . Ц	13.8
$V \perp \perp - \perp i$ $V \perp - 18$	Select students for the program	т :	12.8
VI-10	Evaluate students for the program	4)i	1,2 8
VI-13	Mointain financial macanda	4.0	12.0
	Maintain linancial records	4 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	12.0
		4	13.0
VI-19	Set student selection criteria	3	T0.3
TX-TO	Sell activities tickets	2	6.9
VTT-T3	Take correspondence courses	2	6.9
VI-1	Administer counseling tests	2	6.9
IX - 7	Drive a school bus	1	3.4
VI-11	Conduct home visits	1	3.4
VI-2	Administer placement tests	1	3.4

TABLE VIII

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED PERFORMING EACH TASK IN GROUP II

Duty-Task	Number Responding ^a (N= 29)	Per Cent
 I-15 Prepare lecture outlines I-23 Write course objectives III-12 Formulate multiple choice questions VII-2 Attend professional meetings VII-8 Read-professional journals VII-9 Read text books I-13 Organize lesson plans I-16 Select course content I-21 Set up demonstrations I-26 Write student handout sheets II-8 Employ oral questioning II-10 Give lectures III-11 Give students assistance in laboratory II-14 Present lessons by problem solving II-25 Present principles by demonstration II-30 Work problems before class III-17 Grade student projects IV-2 Attend faculty meetings IV-8 Maintain attendance records 	28 28 28 28 28 28 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	96.6 96.6 96.6 96.6 96.6 96.6 93.1 93.3 93.3 93.3 93.3 93.3 93.3 93.3
 VIII-20 Write proposals for funding II-1 Coordinate a cooperative work program II-29 Teach extension classes IV-3 Collect fees VI-19 Set student selection criteria VIII-4 Conduct occupational needs survey IX-5 Collect money for charities IX-6 Collect tickets at school activities IX-10 Sell activities tickets II-21 Present lessons using video tape IV-10 Maintain financial records VI-2 Administer placement tests VI-13 Evaluate student selection data VI-18 Select students for the program VII-17 Write professional articles VI-18 Write technical journal articles VI-18 Take correspondence courses 	10 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	34.5 31.0 31.0 31.0 31.0 31.0 31.0 31.0 27.6 27.6 27.6 27.6 27.6 27.6 27.6 27.6

TABLE IX

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED PERFORMING EACH TASK IN GROUP III

Duty-Task	Number Responding ^a (N= 31)	Per Cent
 I-13 Organize lesson plans I-26 Write student handout sheets II-10 Give lectures II-22 Present lessons with a chalkboard III-1 Administer written tests III-6 Determine final grades IV-2 Attend faculty meetings VI-3 Advise students about employment VII-8 Read professional journals VII-10 Read technical journals VII-10 Grade written tests VII-2 Attend professional meetings I-5 Maintain an instructional material file I-15 Prepare lecture outlines I-16 Select course content I-17 Select student projects III-18 Grade students class performance IV-8 Maintain attendance records 	30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 29 29 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28	96.8 96.8 96.8 96.8 96.8 96.8 96.8 96.8
 VI-6 Advise students with scholastic problems III-8 Formulate case study problems IV-5 Handle petty cash V-19 Select laboratory (shop) space VIII-1 Adapt occupational surveys to local need VIII-20 Write proposals for funding IV-10 Maintain financial records VI-10 Maintain financial records VI-18 Select students for the program VI-19 Set student selection criteria VII-13 Take correspondence courses IX-5 Collect money for charities VI-13 Evaluate student selection data VII-18 Write technical journal articles II-29 Teach extension classes VI-1 Administer counseling tests VI-2 Administer placement tests VII-17 Write professional articles IX-10 Sell activities tickets VI-11 Conduct home visits IX-7 Drive a school bus 	s 28 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 7 7 6 6 6 6 6 5 5	90.3 32.3 32.3 32.3 32.3 32.3 32.3 32.3 32.3 25.8 25.8 25.8 25.8 25.8 25.6 19.4 19.4 19.4 19.4 19.4 19.4 19.4 16.1

TABLE X

Duty-Task	Nmber Responding ^a (N= 26)	Per Cent
 I-13 Organize lesson plans I-15 Prepare lecture outlines I-16 Select course content I-23 Write course objectives II-10 Give lectures III-1 Administer written tests I-5 Maintain an instructional material file I-17 Select student projects I-26 Write lesson objectives II-11 Give student handout sheets II-11 Give students assistance in laboratory II-26 Prepare principles by demonstration II-26 Supervise student laboratory work II-30 Work problems before class III-6 Determine final grades III-9 Formulate completion test questions III-19 Grade written tests 	25 25 25 25 25 25 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24	92.3 96.2 96.2 96.2 96.2 96.2 92.3 92.3 92.3 92.3 92.3 92.3 92.3 92
VI-4Advise students about further educationIV-3Collect feesV-7Manage a tool roomV-17Select classroomsVI-19Set student selection criteriaII-21Present lessons using video tapeIV-10Maintain financial recordsV-19Select laboratory (shop) spaceVI-2Administer placement testsVI-11Conduct home visitsVI-13Evaluate student selection dataVII-3Conduct researchIX-6Collect tickets at school activitiesIV-5Handle petty cashVII-13Take correspondence coursesVII-14Write technical journal articlesVI-15Administer counseling testsVI-16Write professional articlesVI-17Write professional articlesIX-7Drive a school busIX-10Sell activities tickets	24 8 8 8 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 6 6 6 6	92.3 30.8 30.8 30.8 26.9 26.9 26.9 26.9 26.9 26.9 26.9 26.9

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED PERFORMING EACH TASK IN GROUP IV

TABLE XI

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - TOTAL RELATIVE TIME REPORTED SPENT ON EACH TASK IN GROUPS I, II, III, AND IV

	Duty-Task	Total ^a Relative Ti	me
II - 22° TT_11	Present lessons with a chalkboard Give students assistance in laboratory	418	
11-10	Give lectures	393	
III-6	Determine final grades	388	
II - 26	Supervise student laboratory work	378	
III - 19	Grade written tests	374	
I - 15	Prepare lecture outlines	373	
	Organize lesson plans	368	
111 - 1 TT_6	Auminister written tests	300	
T - 17	Select student projects	309	
II - 25	Present principles through demonstration	351	
I - 16	Select course content	347	
II - 14	Present lessons through problem solving	347	
II-30	Work problems before class	346	
I - 26	Write student handout sheets	344	
LLL-LO TT 0	Grade students class performance	335	
	Employ oral questioning	334	
T-5	Maintain an instructional materials file	329	
⊥ −J		٦٦٢	
IV-3	Collect fees	78	
V-19	Select laboratory (shop) space	78	
VLL-3 TT 21	Conduct research Progent loggeng using tideo topo	(5 72	
VTTT_20	Write proposals for funding	71	
TX-9	Prepare news releases	66	
IX-5	Collect money for charities	65	
IV-10	Maintain financial records	62	
IV-5	Handle petty cash	59	
IX - 6	Collect tickets at school activities	59	
II - 29	Teach extension classes	56	
VL-L3	Evaluate student selection data	54	
$V \perp -2$ $V \perp -2$	Write professional articles	32 ルル	
VTT-18	Write technical journal articles	42	
VII-13	Take correspondence courses	36	
VI - 11	Conduct home visits	34	
VI-1	Administer counseling tests	32	
IX-10	Sell activities tickets	26	
1X - 7	Drive a school bus	24	

^aNumber responding multiplied by weighted factor (0-5) which indicated amount of time spent performing each task.

÷...

TABLE XII

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - TOTAL RELATIVE TIME REPORTED SPENT ON EACH TASK IN GROUP I

		······
	Duty -Task	Total ^a Relative Time
II–11	Give students assistance in laboratory	106
II <u>-</u> 22	Present lessons with a chalkboard	99
II - 26	Supervise student laboratory work	98
I - 15 · · ·	Prepare lecture outlines	95
TT 10	Give lectures	95
TT-25	Present principles through demonstration	94
T_13	Organize lesson nlans	01 1
T-17	Select student projects	87
тт_6	Direct student grill proties	87
	Progent leageng through problem goluing	07 87
	Determine finel meder	
TT 20	Merel mark lang before alage	01 01
11 - 30	WOI'K problems before class	00
1-20	write student handout sneets	70
	Administer written tests	76
VII-9	Read text books	76
Т — ТО и и	Select course content	75
11-8	Employ oral questioning	74
1-5	Maintain an instructional materials file	73
1-21	Set up demonstrations	73
III - 18	Grade students class performance	73
VIII-20	Write proposals for funding	11
VI - 18	Select students for the program	11
IX-6	Collect tickets at school activities	10
VIII <u>-</u> 4 🗠	Conduct occupational needs surveys	10
III - 5	Conduct drop-out studies	10
II - 21	Present lessons using video tape	9
II - 29	Teach extension classes	8
VII-17	Write professional articles	8
VI-19	Set student selection criteria	7
VI-13 .	Evaluate student selection data	7
IX-9	Prepare news releases	6
VII-18	Write technical journal articles	6
TV-10	Maintain financial records	6
TV - 5	Handle petty cash	6
VI-1	Administer counseling tests	4
VTT_13	Take correspondence courses	, २
TX-10	Sell activities tickets	2
TX _ 7	Drive a school bus	1
VT_11	Conduct home visits	1
VT_2	Administer placement tests	1
v ⊥= <u>۲</u>	TRUTTITO OCT PICOUNTO OCDOD	· -

^aNumber responding multiplied by weighted factor (0-5) which indicated amount of time spent performing each task.

.

TABLE XIII

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - TOTAL RELATIVE TIME REPORTED SPENT ON EACH TASK IN GROUP II

	1	2
	Duty-Task	Totala
		Relative Time
II - 11	Give students assistance in laboratory	107
III - 6	Determine final grades	103
I -1 5	Prepare lecture outlines	102
II -1 0	Give lectures	102
III - 19	Grade written tests	101
TT-26	Supervise student laboratory work	100
I - 13	Organize lesson plans	98
T-26	Write student handout sheets	96
T - 16	Select course content	95
TTT _ 17	Grade student projects	<u>q</u> ́4
TT-25	Present principles through demonstration	94
	Administer written tests	<u>á</u> s
TT-6	Direct student skill practice	
VTT-9	Bead text books	92
TT-8	Fundov oral questioning	92
VT-3	Advise students about employment	97
TT_30	Work problems before class	
TTT_12	Formulate multiple choice questions	20
T_5	Maintain an instructional materials file	90
TTT _ 18	Grade students class performance	90
TTT TO	didde boudenob crabb periormanee	20
TX_9	Prenare news releases	50
TV-10	Maintain financial records	19
TV-5	Handle petty cash	18
TX-5	Collect money for charities	18
VT_2	Administer placement tests	17
VT-18	Select students for the program	16
VT_10	Set student selection criteria	16
$VTTT_4$	Conduct occupational needs surveys	16
TT_21	Present lessons using video tane	15
VT-13	Evaluate student selection data	15
VTTT_20	Write proposals for funding	15
TX _ 6	Collect tickets at school activities	15
TT-29	Teach extension classes	12
VT_11	Conduct home visits	12
VTT_17	Write professional articles	12
VT-1	Administer counseling tests	10
TX-10	Sell activities tickets	
TX - 7	Drive a school bus	8
VII-13	Take correspondence courses	$\tilde{7}$
VII-18	Write technical journal articles	7

^aNumber responding multiplied by weighted factor (0-5) which indicated amount of time spent performing each task.

TABLE XIV

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - TOTAL RELATIVE TIME REPORTED SPENT ON EACH TASK IN GROUP III

	Duty-Task	Total ^a Relativo Time
TTT-6	Determine final grades	
	Grade written tests	109
TT_22	Present lessons with a chalkhoard	107
TTT_18	Grade students class performance	106
T_26	White student bandout sheets	10U
1-20	dive lectured	102
TT-10	Mointain attendance records	102
T 17	Soloot student projects	101
110 T 10	Company and a leader projects	T00
エ ー エラ エエニュル	Organize resson plans	99
⊥⊥ ⊥4 ┬┬┬ -	Present lessons through problem solving	99
	Administer written tests	99
1-10	Select course content	95
10-2	Attend faculty meetings	95
VI-3	Advise students about employment	95
VTT-TO .	Read technical journals	95
I-15	Prepare lecture outlines	93
V11-9	Read text books	91
VIII-8	Identify appropriate program content	88
I-5	Maintain an instructional materials file	86
V⊥ - 6	Advise students with scholastic problems	84
	Collect food	
TA-3	Collect lees	20
V - 19 TV 0	Brenero nova relegand	24
TV 10	rrepare news releases	24
TALT 30	Waite propagala for funding	∠ <u>)</u>
VIII-20	Wordle notty and	2) 22
	Formulate and study problems	22
	Conduct reasonab	21
VTT-2	Monch ortongion aloggog	21
11 - 29 TV E	Collect money for aborities	20
	Fuelyets student selection deta	20
VITI 18	Waite technical journal antialog	19
VII-IO	Collect tickets of school petivities	19
IN-O	Administer placement tosts	19 17
v エ ー と WTT_1 つ	Multituster, pracement rests	エ/ コワ
V J J	Lane Correspondence Courses	⊥/ ⊐
V / VT 7	Write professional articles	TO
V⊥ ~ ⊥ ™⊤ ┐┐	Aunitituster couriseitre tests	±3 10
V 1 – 1 1 TV 7	Conduct nome VISIUS	
TX 10	Drive a SCHOOL DUS	
TV-TO	DELL ACULVILLES LICKELS	

^aNumber responding multiplied by weighted factor (0-5) which indicated amount of time spent performing each task.

TABLE XV

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - TOTAL RELATIVE TIME REPORTED SPENT ON EACH TASK IN GROUP IV

		2
	Duty-Task	Totala
		Relative Time
II - 22	Present lessons with a chalkboard	97
II - 11	Give students assistance in laboratory	93
II - 26	Supervise student laboratory work	91
II - 10	Give lectures	90
III-l	Administer written tests	88
II - 25	Present principles through demonstration	87
III - 6	Determine final grades	86
III - 19	Grade written tests	85
II - 8	Employ oral questioning	82
II-30	Work problems before class	82
I-15	Prepare lecture outlines	81
I - 16	Select course content	79
I-13	Organize lesson plans	78
I-17	Select student projects	78
VI-3	Advise students about employment	75
I-5	Maintain an instructional materials file	72
II-14	Present lessons through problem solving	71
VI-4	Advise students about further education	
I-21	Set up demonstrations	70
I-23	Write course objectives	68
3		
IV-3	Collect fees	17
VI-19	Set student selection criteria	17
II - 29	Teach extension classes	16
V-17	Select classrooms	16
VIII-4	Conduct occupational needs surveys	16
IX - 6	Collect tickets at school activities	15
IV-10	Maintain financial records	14
ÍV - 5	Handle petty cash	13
VI-13	Evaluate student selection data	13
II - 21	Present lessons using video tape	12
VII-3	Conduct research	12
VII-5	Participate in research studies	11
VTT-18	Write technical journal articles	Ū.
VT-2	Administer placement tests	9
VT_11	Conduct home visits	<u>ģ</u>
VII-13	Take correspondence courses	9
VTT-17	Write professional articles	ģ.
VI-1	Administer counseling tests	5
IX-7	Drive a school bus	5
IX-10	Sell activities tickets	

^aNumber responding multiplied by weighted factor (0-5) which indicated amount of time spent performing each task.

TABLE XVI

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - PRODUCTS OF THE NUMBER OF AFFIRMATIVE RESPONDENTS AND THE TOTAL RELATIVE TIME SPENT ON THE TASK IN GROUPS I, II, III, AND IV

Duty-Task

Product^a

TT_22	Present lessons with a chalkhoard	116816
TI - 10	Give lectures	49000
6	Determine final grades	42292
TT-11	Give students assistance in laboratory	41658
I - 15	Prepare lecture outlines	41030
III–19	Grade written tests	40392
I - 13	Organize lesson plans	39744
III - 1	Administer written tests	39600
I - 26	Write student handout sheets	37496
II 26	Supervise student laboratory work	37044
I-17	Select student projects	36855
I 16	Select course content	36782
II - 30	Work problems before class	36330
II - 25	Present principles by demonstration	35802
II - 14	Present lessons through problem solving	35741
IV - 2	Attend faculty meetings	35530
II - 6	Direct student skill practice	35182
I - 5	Maintain an instructional materials file	34344
VI-3	Advise students about employment	33696
II - 8	Employ oral questioning	33400
	Adopt accurational gurgeours to local poods	2720
VIII-1	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs	2720
VIII-1 VIII-20 TT-21	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Write proposals for funding Present lessons using wideo tape	2720 2627 2008
VIII-1 VIII-20 II-21 VT-18	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Write proposals for funding Present lessons using video tape Select students for the program	2720 2627 2448 2370
VIII-1 VIII-20 II-21 VI-18 IX-5	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Write proposals for funding Present lessons using video tape Select students for the program Collect money for charities	2720 2627 2448 2370 2340
VIII-1 VIII-20 II-21 VI-18 IX-5 VIII-4	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Write proposals for funding Present lessons using video tape Select students for the program Collect money for charities Conduct occupational needs surveys	2720 2627 2448 2370 2340 2277
VIII-1 VIII-20 II-21 VI-18 IX-5 VIII-4 IV-5	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Write proposals for funding Present lessons using video tape Select students for the program Collect money for charities Conduct occupational needs surveys Handle petty cash	2720 2627 2448 2370 2340 2277 1888
VIII-1 VIII-20 II-21 VI-18 IX-5 VIII-4 IV-5 IX-6	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Write proposals for funding Present lessons using video tape Select students for the program Collect money for charities Conduct occupational needs surveys Handle petty cash Collect tickets at school activities	2720 2627 2448 2370 2340 2277 1888 1829
VIII-1 VIII-20 II-21 VI-18 IX-5 VIII-4 IV-5 IX-6 VI-19	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Write proposals for funding Present lessons using video tape Select students for the program Collect money for charities Conduct occupational needs surveys Handle petty cash Collect tickets at school activities Set student selection criteria	2720 2627 2448 2370 2340 2277 1888 1829 1885
VIII-1 VIII-20 II-21 VI-18 IX-5 VIII-4 IV-5 IX-6 VI-19 IV-10	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Write proposals for funding Present lessons using video tape Select students for the program Collect money for charities Conduct occupational needs surveys Handle petty cash Collect tickets at school activities Set student selection criteria Maintain financial records	2720 2627 2448 2370 2340 2277 1888 1829 1885 1674
VIII-1 VIII-20 II-21 VI-18 IX-5 VIII-4 IV-5 IX-6 VI-19 IV-10 II-29	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Write proposals for funding Present lessons using video tape Select students for the program Collect money for charities Conduct occupational needs surveys Handle petty cash Collect tickets at school activities Set student selection criteria Maintain financial records Teach extension classes	2720 2627 2448 2370 2340 2277 1888 1829 1885 1674 1624
VIII-1 VIII-20 II-21 VI-18 IX-5 VIII-4 IV-5 IX-6 VI-19 IV-10 II-29 VI-13	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Write proposals for funding Present lessons using video tape Select students for the program Collect money for charities Conduct occupational needs surveys Handle petty cash Collect tickets at school activities Set student selection criteria Maintain financial records Teach extension classes Evaluate student selection data	2720 2627 2448 2370 2340 2277 1888 1829 1885 1674 1624 1404
VIII-1 VIII-20 II-21 VI-18 IX-5 VIII-4 IV-5 IX-6 VI-19 IV-10 II-29 VI-13 VII-17	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Write proposals for funding Present lessons using video tape Select students for the program Collect money for charities Conduct occupational needs surveys Handle petty cash Collect tickets at school activities Set student selection criteria Maintain financial records Teach extension classes Evaluate student selection data Write professional articles	2720 2627 2448 2370 2340 2277 1888 1829 1885 1674 1624 1404 1404
VIII-1 VIII-20 II-21 VI-18 IX-5 VIII-4 IV-5 IX-6 VI-19 IV-10 II-29 VI-13 VII-17 VII-18	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Write proposals for funding Present lessons using video tape Select students for the program Collect money for charities Conduct occupational needs surveys Handle petty cash Collect tickets at school activities Set student selection criteria Maintain financial records Teach extension classes Evaluate student selection data Write professional articles Write technical journal articles	2720 2627 2448 2370 2340 2277 1888 1829 1885 1674 1624 1404 1674 1674 1008
VIII-1 VIII-20 II-21 VI-18 IX-5 VIII-4 IV-5 IX-6 VI-19 IV-10 II-29 VI-13 VII-17 VII-18 VI-2	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Write proposals for funding Present lessons using video tape Select students for the program Collect money for charities Conduct occupational needs surveys Handle petty cash Collect tickets at school activities Set student selection criteria Maintain financial records Teach extension classes Evaluate student selection data Write professional articles Write technical journal articles Administer placement tests	2720 2627 2448 2370 2340 2277 1888 1829 1885 1674 1624 1404 1624 1404 1674 1008 968
VIII-1 VIII-20 II-21 VI-18 IX-5 VIII-4 IV-5 IX-6 VI-19 IV-10 II-29 VI-13 VII-17 VII-18 VI-2 VII-13	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Write proposals for funding Present lessons using video tape Select students for the program Collect money for charities Conduct occupational needs surveys Handle petty cash Collect tickets at school activities Set student selection criteria Maintain financial records Teach extension classes Evaluate student selection data Write professional articles Write technical journal articles Administer placement tests Take correspondence courses	2720 2627 2448 2370 2340 2277 1888 1829 1885 1674 1624 1404 1674 1674 1008 968 756
VIII-1 VIII-20 II-21 VI-18 IX-5 VIII-4 IV-5 IX-6 VI-19 IV-10 II-29 VI-13 VII-17 VII-18 VI-2 VII-13 VII-13 VI-1	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Write proposals for funding Present lessons using video tape Select students for the program Collect money for charities Conduct occupational needs surveys Handle petty cash Collect tickets at school activities Set student selection criteria Maintain financial records Teach extension classes Evaluate student selection data Write professional articles Write technical journal articles Administer placement tests Take correspondence courses Administer counseling test	2720 2627 2448 2370 2340 2277 1888 1829 1885 1674 1624 1404 1674 1008 968 756 640
VIII-1 VIII-20 II-21 VI-18 IX-5 VIII-4 IV-5 IX-6 VI-19 IV-10 II-29 VI-13 VII-17 VII-18 VI-2 VII-13 VII-13 VI-1 VI-11	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Write proposals for funding Present lessons using video tape Select students for the program Collect money for charities Conduct occupational needs surveys Handle petty cash Collect tickets at school activities Set student selection criteria Maintain financial records Teach extension classes Evaluate student selection data Write professional articles Write technical journal articles Administer placement tests Take correspondence courses Administer counseling test Conduct home visits	2720 2627 2448 2370 2340 2277 1888 1829 1885 1674 1624 1404 1674 1674 1008 968 756 640 714
VIII-1 VIII-20 II-21 VI-18 IX-5 VIII-4 IV-5 IX-6 VI-19 IV-10 II-29 VI-13 VII-17 VII-18 VI-2 VII-13 VI-1 VI-11 IX-10	Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Write proposals for funding Present lessons using video tape Select students for the program Collect money for charities Conduct occupational needs surveys Handle petty cash Collect tickets at school activities Set student selection criteria Maintain financial records Teach extension classes Evaluate student selection data Write professional articles Write technical journal articles Administer placement tests Take correspondence courses Administer counseling test Conduct home visits Sell activities tickets	$\begin{array}{c} 2720\\ 2627\\ 2448\\ 2370\\ 2340\\ 2277\\ 1888\\ 1829\\ 1885\\ 1674\\ 1624\\ 1404\\ 1674\\ 1624\\ 1404\\ 1674\\ 1008\\ 968\\ 756\\ 640\\ 714\\ 546\end{array}$

^aResponses multiplied by the total relative time.

TABLE XVII

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - PRODUCTS OF THE NUMBER OF AFFIRMATIVE RESPONDENTS AND THE TOTAL RELATIVE TIME SPENT ON THE TASK IN GROUP I

	Duty-Task	Pr	oducta	
II-11 II-22 I-15 II-10 II-26 II-25 I-13 I-17 II-6 II-30 III-6 I-26 III-1 II-17 II-6 I-30 III-1 II-17 II-9 II-9 II-8 I-21	Give students assistance in laboratory Present lessons with a chalkboard Prepare lecture outlines Give lectures Supervise student laboratory work Present principles by demonstration Organize lesson plans Select student projects Direct student skill practice Work problems before class Determine final grades Write student handout sheets Administer written tests Present lessons through problem solving Attend faculty meetings Maintain an instructional materials file Read text books Give homework assignments Employ oral questioning Set up demonstrations		2862 2673 2565 2548 2444 2366 2349 2088 2080 2025 1976 1976 1976 1944 1836 1825 1824 1820 1776 1752	
VIII-4 II-21 VI-18 VIII-1 II-29 III-5 IX-6 IV-5 VII-17 VI-13 IX-9 IV-10 VII-18 IV-19 VI-18 IV-19 VI-1 VII-13 IX-10 VI-2 VI-11 IX-7	Conduct occupational needs surveys Present lessons using video tape Select students for the program Adapt occupational surveys to local needs Teach extension classes Conduct drop-out studies Collect tickets at school activities Handle petty cash Write professional articles Evaluate student selection data Prepare news releases Maintain financial records Write technical journal articles Set student selection criteria Administer counseling tests Take correspondence courses Sell activities tickets Administer placement tests Conduct home visits Drive a school bus		50 45 44 40 40 328 24 21 86 4 11 1	

^aResponses multiplied by the total relative time.

TABLE XVIII

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - PRODUCTS OF THE NUMBER OF AFFIRMATIVE RESPONDENTS AND THE TOTAL RELATIVE TIME SPENT ON THE TASK IN GROUP II

Producta Duty-Task II-11 Give students assistance in laboratory 2889 I**-**15 Prepare lecture outlines 2856 II-10 Give lectures 2754 I**-**13 2700 Organize lesson plans III**-**6 2678 Determine final grades III**-**19 2652 Grade written tests T-26 Write student handout sheets 2646 II**-**26 Supervise student laboratory work 2626 VII-9 Read text books 2604 I–16 Select course content 2592 2565 III-17 Grade student projects III**-**12 2548 Formulate multiple choice questions II-8 2484 Employ oral questioning VI-3 2484 Advise students about employment II-30 2454 Work problems before class 2444 III-1 Administer written tests VTT-82436 Read professional journals IV-8 Maintain attendance records 2430 I**-**23 2408 Write course objectives I**-**25 Write lesson objectives 2352 IV-3 Collect fees 198 IV--5 Handle petty cash 198 162 IX-5 Collect money for charities IV-10 152 Maintain financial records VIII-20 150 Write proposals for funding VI-19 Set student selection criteria 144 VIII-4 144 Conduct occupational needs surveys VI-2 Administer placement tests 136 IX**-**6 135 Collect tickets at school activities VT**-**18 128 Select students for the program II**-**21 120 Present lessons using video tape VI-13 Evaluate student selection data 120 108 II**-**29 Teach extension classes. VI-11 Conduct home visits 96 VII-17 Write professional articles 96 81 IX**-**10 Sell activities tickets VI-l Administer counseling test 70 VII-18 49 Write technical journal articles 48 IX-7 Drive a school bus VII-13 Take correspondence courses 35

aResponses multiplied by the total relative time.

TABLE XIX

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - PRODUCTS OF THE NUMBER OF AFFIRMATIVE RESPONDENTS AND THE TOTAL RELATIVE TIME SPENT ON THE TASK IN GROUP III

	Duty-Task	Producta
III-6	Determine final grades	3270
11-22	Present lessons with a chalkboard	3210
111-19	Grade written tests	3101
1-26	Write student handout sheets	3120
TT-T0	Give lectures	3060
I - 13	Organize lesson plans	2970
III - 1	Administer written tests	2970
III - 18	Grade student class performance	2968
IV-2	Attend faculty meetings	2850
VI - 3	Advise students about employment	2850
VII-10	Read technical journals	2850
IV-8	Maintain attendance records	2828
I - 17	Select student projects	2800
II - 14	Present lessons through problem solving	2716
I - 16	Select course content	2660
VII-8	Read professional journals	2640
I 15	Prepare lecture outlines	2604
VII-9	Read text books	2548
I 5	Maintain an instructional materials file	2408
VII-2	Attend professional meetings	2378
V-19	Select laboratory (shop) space	240
VI-18	Select students for the program	232
VII-3	Conduct research	231
VIII-20	Write proposals for funding	230
IV - 5	Handle petty cash	220
III-8	Formulate case-study problems	210
IX - 6	Collect tickets at school activities	209
VI-19	Set student selection criteria	200
IV-10	Maintain financial records	184
IX-5	Collect money for charities	160
VII-13	Take correspondence courses	136
VI-13	Evaluate student selection data	133
VII-18	Write technical journal articles	133
II - 29	Teach extension classes	120
VI-2	Administer placement tests	102
VII-17	Write professional articles	96
VI-1	Administer counseling tests	78
VI-11	Conduct home visits	60
IX-10	Sell activities tickets	60
IX-7	Drive a school bus	50

^aResponses multiplied by the total relative time.

TABLE XX

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - PRODUCTS OF THE NUMBER OF AFFIRMATIVE RESPONDENTS AND THE TOTAL RELATIVE TIME SPENT ON THE TASK IN GROUP IV

Duty-Task		Product ^a
II-10 II-11 II-22 III-1 II-26 III-25 III-6 III-19 I-15 I-15 I-16 II-30 I-13 II-8 I-17 VI-3 I-7 VI-3 I-5 II-14 VI-4 I-23 I-21	Give lectures Give students assistance in laboratory Present lessons with a chalkboard Administer written tests Supervise student laboratory work Present principles by demonstration Determine final grades Grade written tests Prepare lecture outlines Select course content Work problems before class Organize lesson plans Employ oral questioning Select student projects Advise students about employment Maintain an instructional materials file Present lessons through problem solving Advise students about further education Write course objectives Set up demonstrations	2250 2232 2231 2200 2184 2088 2064 2040 2025 1975 1968 1950 1886 1872 1800 1728 1704 1704 1704 1700 1610
VIII-4 IV-3 VI-19 V-19 V-17 IX-6 IV-10 VI-13 II-21 VII-3 IV-5 VII-5 VII-5 VII-5 VII-5 VII-11 VII-18 VII-13 VII-17 VI-1 IX-7 IX-10	Conduct occupational needs surveys Collect fees Set student selection criteria Select laboratory (shop) space Select classrooms Collect tickets at school activities Maintain financial records Evaluate student selection data Present lessons using video tape Conduct research Handle petty cash Participate in research studies Administer placement tests Conduct home visits Write technical journal articles Take correspondence courses Write professional articles Administer counseling tests Drive a school bus Sell activities tickets	144 136 136 133 128 105 98 91 84 84 78 66 63 63 63 63 63 60 54 45 25 20 20

^aResponses multiplied by the total relative time.

TABLE XXI

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - REPORTED MEAN RELATIVE TIME SPENT PERFORMING EACH TASK IN GROUPS I, II, III, AND IV

	Duty-Task	Mean time ^a
II-26 II-22 II-11 II-6 II-7 III-6 II-10 III-18 III-19 II-25 III-17 I-13 I-15 II-14 I-17 II-8 II-14 I-17 II-8 II-30 I-16 II-2 III-1	Supervise student laboratory work Present lessons with a chalkboard Give students assistance in laboratory Direct student skill practice Direct student project work Determine final grades Give lectures Grade students class performance Grade written tests Present principles by demonstration Grade student projects Organize lesson plans Prepare lecture outlines Present lessons through problem solving Select student projects Employ oral questioning Work problems before class Select course content Demonstrate manipulative skills Administer written test	"3.86 3.73 3.71 3.66 3.56 3.55 3.55 3.53 3.46 3.44 3.43 3.44 3.43 3.41 3.39 3.37 3.34 3.34 3.34 3.30 3.27 3.27
III-5 VI-2 I-10 VI-16 VII-3 II-29 VIII-20 VII-17 IX-6 IV-5 IX-9 IV-19 IX-5 VI-18 VII-13 VI-13 VI-11 VI-1 IX-7 VI-8 IX-10	Conduct drop-out studies Administer placement tests Operate a mimeograph machine Provide disciplinary action Conduct research Teach extension classes Write proposals for funding Write professional articles Collect tickets at school activities Handle petty cash Prepare news releases Prepare travel claims Collect money for charities Write technical journal articles Take correspondence courses Conduct home visits Administer counseling tests Drive a school bus Assist students in getting financial aids Sell activities tickets	2.00 2.00 1.98 1.98 1.97 1.93 1.92 1.91 1.90 1.84 1.83 1.81 1.81 1.75 1.71 1.62 1.60 1.50 1.49 1.24

^aTotal relative time divided by responses.

TABLE XXII

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - REPORTED MEAN RELATIVE TIME SPENT PERFORMING EACH TASK IN GROUP I

	Duty-Task	Mean time ^a
II-11 II-26 II-27 II-6 II-15 II-10 I-13 II-7 II-14 III-6 I-17 III-18 VII-9 I-16 III-17 II-2 II-8 II-30 I-21	Give students assistance in laboratory Supervise student laboratory work Present lessons with a chalkboard Direct student skill practice Present principles by demonstration Prepare lecture outlines Give lectures Organize lesson plans Direct student project work Present lessons through problem solving Determine final grades Select student projects Grade students class performance Read text books Select course content Grade student projects Demonstrate manipulative skills Employ oral questioning Work problems before class Set up demonstrations	3.93 3.72 3.67 3.63 3.62 3.52 3.52 3.50 3.39 3.38 3.24 3.22 3.17 3.17 3.17 3.13 3.13 3.10 3.08 3.04
V-19 III-25 IV-12 VIII-4 VI-1 VI-16 VIII-20 II-21 VI-13 VII-17 II-29 IX-9 VII-18 VII-13 IV-10 IV-5 IX-10 IX-7 VI-11 VI-2	Select laboratory (shop) space Rate other teachers Maintain placement records Conduct occupational needs surveys Administer counseling tests Provide disciplinary action Write proposals for funding Present lessons using video tape Evaluate student selection data Write professional articles Teach extension classes Prepare news releases Write technical journal articles Take correspondence courses Maintain financial records Handle petty cash Sell activities tickets Drive a school bus Conduct home visits Administer placement tests	2.33 2.33 2.17 2.00 2.00 2.00 1.83 1.80 1.75 1.75 1.60 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.20 1.00 1.00 1.00

^aTotal relative time divided by responses.

TABLE XXIII

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - REPORTED MEAN RELATIVE TIME SPENT PERFORMING EACH TASK IN GROUP II

	Duty-Task	Mean time ^a
II-11 III-6 III-19 II-26 II-10 II-6 II-7 I-3 I-15 I-26 III-1 III-18 I-16 III-17 II-25 I-5 II-8 VI-3 II-2 II-30	Give students assistance in laboratory Determine final grades Grade written tests Supervise student laboratory work Give lectures Direct student skill practice Direct student project work Organize lesson plans Prepare lecture outlines Write student handout sheets Administer written tests Grade students class performance Select course content Grade student projects Present principles by demonstration Maintain an instructional materials file Employ oral questioning Advise students about employment Demonstrate manipulative skills Work problems before class	3.96 3.92 3.88 3.78 3.72 3.72 3.70 3.64 3.63 3.62 3.60 3.56 3.52 3.48 3.46 3.41 3.41 3.41 3.41 3.40 3.37
VI-2 VI-18 IX-5 II-21 VI-13 IX-9 VI-19 VII-4 V-19 IX-6 IV-5 VI-11 VII-17 VII-20 VI-1 VII-13 II-29 IX-7 VII-18 IX-10	Administer placement tests Write technical journal articles Collect money for charities Present lessons using video tape Evaluate student selection data Prepare news releases Set student selection criteria Conduct occupational needs surveys Select laboratory (shop) space Collect tickets at school activities Handle petty cash Conduct home visits Write professional articles Write professional articles Write proposals for funding Administer counseling tests Take correspondence courses Teach extension classes Drive a school bus Write technical journal articles Sell activities tickets	2.13 2.00 2.00 1.88 1.88 1.82 1.78 1.75 1.67 1.64 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.43 1.40 1.33 1.33 1.00 1.00

^aTotal relative time divided by responses.

TABLE XXIV

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - REPORTED MEAN RELATIVE TIME SPENT PERFORMING EACH TASK IN GROUP III

	Duty-Task	Mean time ^a
III-18 III-19 III-6 IV-8 I-17 II-22 I-26 II-14 II-15 I-15 I-13 III-1 VII-9 IV-2 VII-3 VII-10 I-5 I-23 VI-6	Grade students class performance Grade written tests. Determine final grades Maintain attendance records Select student projects Present lessons with a chalkboard Write student handout sheets Present lessons through problem solving Give lectures Select course content Prepare lecture outlines Organize lesson plans Administer written test Read text books Attend faculty meetings Advise students about employment Read technical journals Maintain an instructional materials file Write course objectives Advise students with scholastic problems	3.79 3.76 3.63 3.61 3.57 3.47 3.46 3.40 3.39 3.32 3.30 3.30 3.25 3.17 3.17 3.17 3.07 3.07 3.00
VII-18 VI-13 VIII-4 VII-17 VIII-2 II-1 IX-5 VI-11 V-19 VIII-20 IV-3 IV-5 IX-9 VI-1 VII-13 III-8 IX-7 VII-3 IX-6 IX-10	Provide disciplinary action Administer placement tests Conduct occupational needs surverys Write professional articles Analyze occupational clusters Coordinate a cooperative work program Collect money for charities Conduct home visits Select laboratory (shop) space Write proposals for funding Collect fees Handle petty cash Prepare news releases Administer counseling tests Take correspondence courses Formulate case-study problems Drive a school bus Conduct research Collect tickets at school activities Sell activities tickets	2.98 2.71 2.70 2.67 2.55 2.55 2.50 2.40 2.40 2.30 2.27 2.20 2.18 2.17 2.13 2.10 2.00 1.91 1.73 1.67

^aTotal relative time divided by responses.

3

TABLE XXV

TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - REPORTED MEAN RELATIVE TIME SPENT PERFORMING EACH TASK IN GROUP IV

	Duty-Task.	Mean time ^a
II-22 II-11 II-26 II-25 II-10 III-6 II-8 III-19 III-1 II-30 I-17 I-15 I-16 VI-3 I-13 I-21 I-5 II-14 IX-13 II-6	Present lessons with a chalkboard Give students assistance in laboratory Supervise student laboratory work Present principles by demonstration Give lectures Determine final grades. Employ oral questioning Grade written tests. Administer written tests Work problems before class Select student projects Prepare lecture outlines Select course content Advise students about employment Organize lesson plans. Set up demonstrations. Maintain an instructional materials file Present lessons through problem solving Visit with other teachers Direct student skill practice	4.22 3.88 3.79 3.63 3.60 3.58 3.57 3.54 3.52 3.42 3.25 3.24 3.16 3.13 3.12 3.04 3.00 2.96 2.91 2.81
IX-6 IV-3 VI-19 V-18 IV-10 V-17 VI-13 VII-5 VII-17 II-29 VIII-4 II-21 VII-3 VII-18 VII-18 VII-13 VII-18 VII-13 VI-2 VI-11 IX-7 IX-10 VI-1	Collect tickets at school activities Collect fees Set student selection criteria Solicit contributions from industry Maintain financial records Select classrooms Evaluate student selection criteria Participate in research studies Write professional articles Teach extension classes Conduct occupational needs surveys Present lessons using video tape Conduct research Write technical journal articles Take correspondence courses Administer placement tests Conduct home visits Drive a school bus Sell activities tickets Administer counseling tests	2.14 2.13 2.13 2.11 2.00 2.00 1.86 1.83 1.80 1.78 1.71 1.71 1.71 1.67 1.50 1.29 1.29 1.25 1.25 1.00

aTotal relative time divided by responses.

TABLE XXVI

KENDALL COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE

Concordance	Chi Square	I.D. Number
$\frac{Concordance}{1.000000} \\ 0.958278 \\ 0.945261 \\ 0.920002 \\ 0.900455 \\ 0.894843 \\ 0.892503 \\ 0.88724 \\ 0.887966 \\ 0.887767 \\ 0.886627 \\ 0.886627 \\ 0.886193 \\ 0.883330 \\ 0.879132 \\ 0.878518 \\ 0.878518 \\ 0.877787 \\ 0.87758 \\ 0.87758 \\ 0.877787 \\ 0.877293 \\ 0.871704 \\ 0.869328 \\ 0.868092 \\ 0.868092 \\ 0.864987 \\ 0.862156 \\ 0.858781 \\ 0.856748 \\ 0.856748 \\ 0.856529 \\ 0.854776 \\ 0.852992 \\ 0.852628 \\ 0.852992 \\ 0.852628 \\ 0.850160 \\ 0.849998 \\ 0.849656 \\ 0.847280 \\ 0.847130 \\ 0.847130 \\ 0.846501 \\ 0.846501 \\ 0.956529 \\ 0.846501 \\ 0.847130 \\ 0.846501 \\ 0.956529 \\ 0.846501 \\ 0.847130 \\ 0.846501 \\ 0.84650$	$\begin{array}{l} \underline{Chi \ Square} \\ 398.00000 \\ 381.39429 \\ 376.21387 \\ 366.16064 \\ 358.38086 \\ 356.14746 \\ 355.21606 \\ 353.71191 \\ 353.41040 \\ 353.33105 \\ 352.87744 \\ 352.70483 \\ 351.69995 \\ 351.66519 \\ 349.89453 \\ 349.74585 \\ 349.65015 \\ 349.35938 \\ 349.16235 \\ 349.65015 \\ 349.35938 \\ 349.16235 \\ 346.93799 \\ 345.99243 \\ 345.50049 \\ 345.99243 \\ 345.50049 \\ 345.25562 \\ 344.26465 \\ 343.13818 \\ 341.79492 \\ 340.98560 \\ 340.89844 \\ 340.20093 \\ 339.49097 \\ 339.39.4595 \\ 338.36377 \\ 338.29907 \\ 338.16309 \\ 337.68750 \\ 337.17090 \\ 337.15747 \\ 336.90723 \\ \end{array}$	1.D. Number 25 31 136 153 108 110 79 150 157 164 154 131 134 95 138 131 134 95 138 118 75 165 59 48 37 71 97 8 26 24 137 170 116 51 28 22 30 29 27 14 168 87 119
0.842005 0.841652 0.839267	335.11792 334.97729 334.02832	6 156 117

0.000717	000 50500	
0.838511	333.72729	99
0.836781	333.03057	91
0.835035	332.34399	114
0.834231	332.02393	132
0.834132	331.98438	148
0.833504	331.73462	96
0.833465	331.71875	17
0.831627	330.98730	73
0.830993	330.73511	40
0.828841	329.87842	101
0.828333	329,67651	23
0.823351	327,69360	
0 821413	326,92212	67
	326 75024	66
0.81686/	225 11157	160
0.815802	22)•111)/ 2011 70501	
	224. (20)4	74 7 Juli
	324,20003	144
0.813848		140
0.812768	323.48145	T53
0.810701	322.65869	47
0.806806	321.10889	162
0.806641	321.04297	152
0.801212	318.88208	42
0.801183	318.87061	38
0.801048	318.81689	111
0.800870	318.74609	166
0.798479	317.79468	113
0.797962	317.58862	19
0.796499	317.00659	141
0.794319	316,13892	77
0.792209	315,29007	34
0.787610	313,46851	143
0.786592	313.06348	81
0.785082	312,46240	35
0.782849	311,57373	<u>Ц</u>
0 780693	310, 71558	1 4 2
0.780506	310 67700	104
0.7800	310 15850	158
0.778/77	200 8227/1	1/16
0.775278	208.6021	10
0.775102	200,00024	
0.772502	200.490/0 207 95276	
0.113002	JU1000010	±30
U. (09241 0. 769656		TQT
	305.92400	
0.756243	300.90430	- 4
0.752126	299.34595	145
0.749424	298.27051	72
0.748208	297.78687	171

0.745033 0.743365 0.742187 0.723435 0.722584 0.722472 0.720777 0.719044 0.703675 0.681591 0.662099 0.659698	296.52295 295.85913 295.39014 287.92700 287.58838 287.54346 286.86914 286.17944 280.06250 271.27295 263.51514 262.55981	122 149 121 52 127 139 82 107 32 65 45 94
0.720777	286.86914	82
0.719044	286.17944	107
0.681591	271.27295	65
0.662099	263.51514	45
0.659698	262,55981 245,84222	94
0.620999	247.15759	155
0.609494	242.57866	103
0.500000	199.00000	50
0.484759	192.93394	109
0.168317	66.99022	133
TABLE XXVII

KENDALL COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE FOR GROUP I RESPONDENTS

Concordance	Chi Square	I.D. Number
0.958278 0.892503 0.886193 0.883330 0.868092 0.850160 0.848461 0.846501 0.842005 0.838511 0.823351 0.815893 0.812768 0.801212 0.801048 0.787610 0.786592 0.773502 0.722584 0.722472 0.719044 0.640307 0.620999 0.500000	381.39429 355.21606 352.70483 351.56519 345.50049 338.36377 337.68750 336.90723 335.11792 333.72729 327.69360 324.72534 323.48145 318.88208 318.81689 313.46851 313.06348 307.85376 287.58838 287.54346 286.17944 245.84222 247.15759 199.00000 199.00000	$\begin{array}{c} 31\\ 79\\ 131\\ 95\\ 71\\ 22\\ 27\\ 119\\ 6\\ 99\\ 1\\ 74\\ 123\\ 42\\ 111\\ 143\\ 81\\ 135\\ 127\\ 139\\ 107\\ 90\\ 155\\ 115\\ 50\end{array}$

TABLE XXVIII

KENDALL COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE FOR GROUP II RESPONDENTS

Concordance	Chi Square	I.D. Number
0.945261 0.900455 0.887767 0.877293 0.869328 0.862156 0.854776 0.849998 0.847163 0.847130 0.841652 0.834231 0.834231 0.834231 0.833465 0.828841 0.828333 0.821413 0.814774 0.813848 0.806641 0.80183 0.782849 0.780596 0.775378 0.768656 0.720777	376.21387 358.38086 353.33105 349.16235 345.99243 343.13818 340.20093 338.29907 337.17090 337.15747 334.97729 333.03857 332.02393 331.98438 331.71875 329.87842 321.71875 329.87842 329.67651 326.92212 324.28003 323.91162 321.04297 318.87061 311.57373 310.67700 308.60034 305.92480 286.86914	$ \begin{array}{r} 136 \\ 108 \\ 164 \\ 59 \\ 37 \\ 26 \\ 116 \\ 30 \\ 168 \\ 87 \\ 156 \\ 91 \\ 132 \\ 148 \\ 96 \\ 17 \\ 101 \\ 23 \\ 67 \\ 144 \\ 140 \\ 152 \\ 38 \\ 49 \\ 124 \\ 12 \\ 128 \\ 82 \end{array} $

TABLE XXIX

KENDALL COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE FOR GROUP III RESPONDENTS

Concordance	Chi Square	I.D. Number
1.000000 0.920002 0.887966 0.878518 0.877787 0.871704 0.867476 0.86987 0.856529 0.849656 0.849656 0.845185 0.839267 0.831627 0.820981 0.798479 0.797962 0.796499 0.794319 0.785082 0.769241 0.752126 0.743365 0.742187 0.723435 0.662099 0.609494 0.484759 0.168317	398.00000 366.16064 353.41040 349.65015 349.35938 346.93799 345.25562 344.26465 340.98560 340.89844 338.16309 336.38354 334.02832 330.98730 326.75024 325.11157 317.79468 317.58862 317.00659 316.13892 312.46240 306.15771 299.34595 295.85913 295.39014 287.92700 263.51514 242.57866 192.93394 66.99022	$\begin{array}{c} 25\\ 153\\ 157\\ 75\\ 165\\ 48\\ 97\\ 8\\ 137\\ 170\\ 29\\ 125\\ 117\\ 73\\ 66\\ 169\\ 113\\ 19\\ 141\\ 77\\ 35\\ 161\\ 145\\ 149\\ 121\\ 52\\ 45\\ 103\\ 109\\ 133\end{array}$

TABLE XXX

KENDALL COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE FOR GROUP IV RESPONDENTS

Concordance	Chi Square	I.D. Number
0.894843 0.888724 0.886627 0.883668 0.879132 0.878758 0.858781 0.852992 0.852628 0.847280 0.835035 0.830993 0.810701 0.806806 0.800870 0.792209 0.780693 0.780047 0.778477 0.756243 0.749424 0.749208 0.745033 0.703675 0.681591 0.659698	356.14746 353.71191 352.87744 351.69995 349.89453 349.74585 341.79492 339.49097 339.34595 37.21753 32.34399 30.73511 322.65869 321.10889 318.74609 315.29907 310.71558 310.45850 309.83374 300.98438 298.27051 297.78687 296.52295 280.06250 271.27295 262.55981	$110 \\ 150 \\ 154 \\ 134 \\ 138 \\ 118 \\ 24 \\ 51 \\ 28 \\ 14 \\ 114 \\ 40 \\ 47 \\ 162 \\ 166 \\ 34 \\ 142 \\ 158 \\ 146 \\ 4 \\ 72 \\ 171 \\ 122 \\ 32 \\ 65 \\ 94$

FOOTNOTES

¹Richard W. Tinnell, "A Task Inventory of Technical Teachers in Oklahoma" (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1975), pp. 46-66.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The hypothesis of this study, as stated in Chapter I, was: There is no significant difference in the results of data obtained by the task inventory administered to the same technical-occupation instructors under varying occupational emphasis at different times during the academic year. In addition to this hypothesis, three assumptions were made:

- A. Instructor tasks vary from time to time through a semester (term). For example, at the beginning of a semester course planning is important: later executing of instruction overshadows planning; and near the end, student evaluation becomes the main focus.
- B. Current activities at any given time tend to dominate an instructor's immediate perception of his or her job. An instructor tends to place relatively more importance on the task at hand than on those of the past or future.
- C. Instructors will respond to a task inventory in a manner which reflects their immediate perception of their job. Their responses will be given in light of the way they see their job at the time the questionnaire is completed.

Interest in the above hypothesis was created by the necessity for using technical-occupation-faculty-prepared data in the completion of

forms used in requesting local, state, and federal approval and assistance and a need to determine how the faculty view the requirement of having to supply data: (1) Is it something to be ignored? (2) Is it something to be viewed as a necessary nuisance? or (3) Is the response determined by the time of year the data was requested?

A review of the literature revealed that very little attention has been given to determine the best time to request information which would be valid. Brzezinski¹ in her study was concerned with improving questionnaire techniques by studying such items as: (1) length of questionnaire, (2) number of questions, (3) lack of anonymity, and (4) development of questions that would have the same meaning to all respondents. The difficulty of marking the questionnaire was viewed by Rummell² as having an effect on its validity. Several of the earlier studies partially looked at the effect of the time period on a questionnaire's validity: Byers³ to avoiding holidays, Schaefer⁴ to avoiding stressful periods, and Topping to the selection of the best time period during the semester.

The present study was interested in finding the best time period for securing valid data from technical-occupation instructors. Two identical questionnaires were mailed to 139 instructors at 18 post-secondary institutions in Oklahoma. The 139 potential respondents were those instructors who had returned the Tinnell instrument in October (139 of 171 from 23 institutions). The 139 questionnaires were mailed in either November (Group I), January (Group II), February (Group III), or April (Group IV). The four time periods reflect different job emphasis periods: beginning of a semester (January), middle of a semester (February), and the end of the semester (November and April).

All of these results from the 115 who responded were compared to the Tinnell time period (October, middle of semester).

Although the questionnaire contains many interesting items, how each instructor viewed each duty-task presented in the task inventory is of no major interest to this study. The major emphasis was the consistency - - not the manner of answereing - - with which an instructor responded to the Tinnell study and the current study.

TABLE XXXI

TOP DECILE - - NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED PERFORMING EACH TASK COMPARED WITH THE TINNELL STUDY AND THE PRESENT STUDY

Duty-Task		1		Pr	esen Gro	t Stu ups	ıdy
		Tinnell Study	Comp.	I	II	III	IV
I5	Maintain an instructional materials						
	file		Х	Х		Х	Х
I-13	Organize lesson plans	X	Х	Х	Х	X	Х
I-15	Prepare lecture outlines	Х	X	Х	X	X	X
1-16	Select course content	Х	Х	Х	Х	X	X
1-17	Select student projects		Х	Х		Х	Х,
1-21	Set up demonstrations	X			X		
1-23	Write course objectives	Х	X		X		75
1-25 T 26	Write lesson objectives	77	35	75	X	77	X
1 ~ 20 TT 0	Write student handout sheets	X	Х	X	X	Х	Х
	Employ oral questioning		77	77	X		77
	Give students assistance in laborato.	ry	X	Y	X		X
⊥⊥━⊥4	riesent lessons through problem	v	v	v	v	v	v
TT O	Solving	· A v	A	A v	X	X.	A,
11 - 9 TT 10	Give loctures	A V	v	A v	v	v	v
TT-10	Give rectures	A V	X	A V	Χ	X	X
11-22	Present lessons with a chalkboard	X	X	A	77	X	77
11-25 TT 26	Present principles by demonstration			X	X		X
11-20 TT 20	Supervise student laboratory work		35	X	77		X
11-30	work problems before class	77	X	X	Х	77	X
	Administer written tests	X	X	X.		X	X
111-6	Determine final grades	X	X	X		Х	X
111-9	Formulate completion test questions						X
111-12	Formulate multiple choice questions				X		
	Grade student projects				Х		
111-18	Grade written tests	77				X	
111-19	Grade students class performance	X	X	X		X	X
11-2	Attend faculty meetings	Х	Х	Х	X	X	
1V-8	Maintain attendance records				Х	X	
V1-3	Advise students about employment		X			X	Х
VI-4	Advise students about further						
/	education						X,
VT - 0	Advise students with scholastic	77				77	
	problems	X	37	77	37	X	77
VII-2	Attend professional meetings	X	X	X	X	X	X
V_14	Participate in professional	77					
17TT 0	organizations	X	37	77	٦,-	77	
VTT-Q	Read professional journals	X	X	X	X	X	
VII-9	Read text DOOKS	X	X		X		
VTT-TO	Read technical journals	X			X		

TABLE XXXII

BOTTOM DECILE - - NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED PERFORMING EACH TASK COMPARED WITH THE TINNELL STUDY AND THE PRESENT STUDY

	Duty-Task			Pre	sent Grou	Stuc ps	ly
	Duby Labr	Tinnel Study	L Comp.	I	II	III	IV
II-1 II-21 II-29 III-5 III-8	Coordinate a cooperative work progra Present lessons using video tape Teach extension classes Conduct drop-out studies Formulate case-study problems	am X X X	X X	X X X	X X X	X X	
III-25 IV-3 IV-5 IV-10 V-1	Rate other teachers Collect fees Handle petty cash Maintain financial records Administer laboratory clean-up	X X X X X	Х	X X	X X	x x	X X X
V-7 V-17 V-19 VI-1 VI-2 VI-11 VI-13 VI-18 VI-19 VII-3	Manage a tool room Select classrooms Select laboratory (shop) space Administer counseling tests Administer placement tests Conduct home visits Evaluate student selection data Select students for the program Set student selection criteria Conduct research	X X X X X X X	X X X X X X X	X X X X X X	X X X X X X X	X X X X X X X X	X X X X X X X X X X
VII-5 VII-13 VII-17 VII-18 VIII-1	Participate in research studies Take correspondence courses Write professional articles Write technical journal articles Adapt occupational surveys to local	X X X X	X X X	X X X X	X X X	X X X X	X X X X
VIII-2 VIII-4 VIII-20 IX-5 IX-6 IX-7 IX-9 IX-10	Analyze occupational clusters Conduct occupational needs surveys Write proposals for funding Collect money for charities Collect tickets at school activities Drive a school bus Prepare news releases Sell activities tickets	X X X X X X	X X X	X X X X X	X X X X X X	X X X X X	X X X

TABLE XXXIII

TOP DECILE - - TOTAL RELATIVE TIMES REPORTED SPENT ON EACH TASK COMPARED WITH THE TINNELL STUDY AND THE PRESENT STUDY

	Duty-Task			Pre	resent Stu Groups		ly
		Tinnel] Study	Comp.	. , I	II	III	IV
I - 5	Maintain an instructional materials file		Х	Х	Х	Х	X
I-13 I-15 I-16 I-17 I-21	Organize lessons plans Prepare lecture outlines Select course content Select student projects Set up demonstrations	X X X X	X X X X	X X X X X	X X X	X X X X	X X X X X X
I-23 I-26 II-6 II-8	Write course objectives Write student handout sheets Direct student skill practice Employ oral questioning	X X	X X X	X X X	X X X	X	X X
II - 10 II-11	Give lectures Give students assistance in laboratory	X	X X	X X	X X	и Х и	X X
II-14	Present lessons through problem	Х	Х	Χ		Х	Χ
II-22 II-25 II-26 II-30 III-1 III-6 III-12	Present lessons with a chalkboard Present principles by demonstration Supervise student laboratory work Work problems before class Administer written tests Determine final grades Formulate multiple choice questions	X X X X X X	X X X X X X	X X X X X X	X X X X X X X		X X X X X X
III-17 III-18 III-19 IV-2 IV-8 VI-3 VI-4	Grade student projects Grade students class performance Grade written tests Attend faculty meetings Maintain attendance records Advise students about employment Advise students about further	X X X X	X X X	Х	X X X X	X X X X X X	X X X
VI-6	education Advise students with scholastic					X	
VII-9 VII-10 VIII-8	problems Read text books Read technical journals Identify appropriate program content	X		X	X	X X X	

TABLE XXXIV

BOTTOM DECILE - - TOTAL RELATIVE TIMES REPORTED SPENT ON EACH TASK COMPARED WITH THE TINNELL STUDY AND THE PRESENT STUDY

	Duty-Task			Present Study Groups					
	Duty-iask	Tinnel Study	Comp.	Ţ	II	III	IV		
II - 21	Present lessons using video tape	X	Х	Х	X		Χ		
II - 29	Teach extension classes	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х		
III-5	Conduct drop-out studies			Х					
III – 8	Formulate case-study problems					Х			
III - 25	Rate other teachers	Х							
IV-3	Collect fees		Х			Х	Х		
IV-5	Handle petty cash	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х		
IV-10	Maintain financial records	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х		
V-17	Select classrooms						Х		
V-19	Select laboratory (shop) space	Х	Х			X			
VI-1	Administer counseling tests	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Χ.		
VI-2	Administer placement tests	Х	Х	Х	Х	X	Х		
VI-11	Conduct home visits	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х		
VI-13	Evaluate student selection data	X	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х		
VI-18	Select students for the program	Х		Х	Х				
VI-19	Set student selection criteria	Х		Х	Х		Х		
VII-3	Conduct research		Х			Х	Х		
VII-5	Participate in research studies						Х		
VII-13	Take correspondence courses	Х	Х	Х	Х	X	Х		
VII-17	Write professional articles	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Χ.		
VII-18	Write technical journal articles	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х		
VIII–2	Analyze occupational clusters	Х							
VIII-4	Conduct occupational needs surveys			Х	Х		Х		
VIII-20	Write proposals for funding	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х			
IX-5	Collect money for charities		Х		Х	Х			
IX - 6	Collect tickets at school activities	з Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х		
IX-7	Drive a school bus	X	Х	Х	Х	Х	X		
IX-9	Prepare news releases		Х	Х	Х	Х			
IX-10	Sell activities tickets	Х	X	Х	Х	Х	Х		

TABLE XXXV

TOP DECILE OF THE PRODUCT RANKINGS COMPARED WITH THE TINNELL STUDY AND THE PRESENT STUDY

	Duty-Task			Pre	esent Grou	Stuc ps	y
		Tinnell Study	Comp.	I	II	III	IV
I - 5	Maintain an instructional materials	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Х	Х		X	Χ
I-13 I-15 I-16 I-17 I-21 I-23	Organize lesson plans Prepare lecture outlines Select course content Select student projects Set up demonstrations Write course objectives	X X X X X	X X X X	X X X X	X X X X	X X X X	X X X X X X
I-25 I-26 II-6 II-8 TT-9	Write lesson objectives Write student handout sheets Direct student skill practice Employ oral questioning Give homework assignments	x x	X X X	X X X X	X X X	X	X
II-10 II-11	Give lectures Give students assistance in	X X	X X	X X	X X	X	X X
II - 14	Present lessons through problem	X	X	Х		Χ	X
II-22 II-25 II-26	Present lessons with a chalkboard Present principles by demonstration	X	X X V	X X V	v	. X	X X V
II-30 III-1	Work problems before class Administer written tests	X X	X X	XX	X		X
III-6 III-12 III-17 III-17	Determine final grades Formulate multiple choice questions Grade student projects Grade students class performance	X	Х	Χ	X X X	X . 	X
III-19 IV-2 IV-8	Grade written tests Attend faculty meetings Maintain attendance records	X X	X X	X	X	X X X	X
VI-3 VI-4	Advise students about employment Advise students about further education		X		Х	Х	X X
VII-2 VII-8 VII-9 VII-10	Attend professional meetings Read professional journals Read text books Read technical journals	X X X	2. - 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2.	X	X X	X X X X	

TABLE XXXVI

BOTTOM DECILE OF THE PRODUCT RANKINGS COMPARED WITH THE TINNELL STUDY AND THE PRESENT STUDY

	Dut.v-Task			Pre	sent Grou	Stud ps	ly
	Dudy-Tabk	Tinnel] Study	Comp.	I	II	III	IV
II-18 II-21 II-29 III-5	Present lessons using flip charts Present lessons using video tape Teach extension classes Conduct drop-out studies	X X X	X X	X X X	X X	X	X
III-8 III-25 IV-3 IV-5	Formulate case-study problems Rate other teachers Collect fees Handle petty cash	X	X	X	X X	X	X X
IV-10 IV-19 V-17 V-19	Maintain financial records Prepare travel claims Select classrooms Select laboratory (shop) space	X	X	XX	X	X	X X X
VI-1 VI-2 VI-5	Administer counseling tests Administer placement tests Advise students with personal problems	X X X	X X	X X	X X	X	XX
VI-11 VI-13 VI-18 VI-19 VII-3 VII-5	Conduct home visits Evaluate student selection data Select students for the program Set student selection criteria Conduct research Participate in research studies	X X X X	X X X X	X X X	X X X X	X X X X X	X X X X X X
VII-13 VII-17 VII-18 VIII-1	Take correspondence courses Write professional articles Write technical journal articles Adapt occupational surveys to local needs	X X X	X X X X	X X X X	X X X	X X X	X X
VIII-4 VIII-20 IX-5	Conduct occupational needs surveys Write proposals for funding Collect money for charities	х	X X X	Х	X X X	X X	Х
IX-6 IX-7 IX-9	Collect tickets at school activities Drive a school bus Prepare news releases	s X X	X X	X X X	X X	X X	X X
IX-10	Sell activities tickets	Х	X	X	X	Χ	Χ

TABLE XXXVII

TOP DECILE OF THE MEAN RANKINGS COMPARED TO THE TINNELL STUDY AND THE PRESENT STUDY

	Duty-Task			Pre	sent Grou	Stuc ps	ly
		Tinnel. Study	Comp.	I.	II	III	IV
I - 5	Maintain an instructional materials				Х	Х	X
I-13 I-15 I-16 I-17 I-21 I-23 I-26 II-2 II-6 II-7 II-8 II-10 II-11	Organize lesson plans Prepare lecture outlines Select course content Select student projects Set up demonstrations Write course objectives Write student handout sheets Demonstrate manipulative skills Direct student skill practice Direct student project work Employ oral questioning Give lectures Give students assistance in	X X X X X X X X X X X X X	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X			X X X X X X X X X X
II - 14	laboratory Present lessons through problem	х	Х	Х		X	X
II-22 II-25 II-26 II-30 III-1 III-6	solving Present lessons with a chalkboard Present principles by demonstration Supervise student laboratory work Work problems before class Administer written tests Determine final grades	X X X X	X X X X X X	X X X X	X X X X X	X X X X	X X X X X X X
111-16 111-17 111-18 111-19 IV-2 IV-8 VI-3 VI-6	Grade laboratory reports Grade student projects Grade students class performance Grade written tests Attend faculty meetings Maintain attendance records Advise students about employment Advise students with scholastic	X X X X	X X X	XX	X X X X	X X X X X X X	X
VII-9 VII-10 IX-13	Read text books Read technical journals Take correspondence courses	X		X		X X	X

TABLE XXXVIII

BOTTOM DECILE OF THE MEAN RANKINGS COMPARED WITH THE TINNELL STUDY AND THE PRESENT STUDY

				Pre	sent Grou	Stuc ps	y
	Duty-Task	Tinnell	Comp	т	тт		777
T-2	Identify library resources	X	COIID	•	<u> </u>		<u> </u>
I - 3	Identify resource persons	X					
I-10	Operate a mimeograph machine	X	х				
TT - 1	Coordinate a cooperative work progr	am				Х	
II - 21	Present lessons using video tape			Х	Х	,	Х
TT - 29	Teach extension classes		х	x	x		x
TTT-5	Conduct drop-out studies		x				
ITT-8	Formulate case-study problems					х	
TTT - 25	Rate other teachers			х			
TV-3	Collect fees	х				х	Х
TV-5	Handle petty cash	X	х	Х	Х	X	
IV-10	Maintain financial records			X			Х
TV-12	Maintain placement records			X			
IV-18	Prepare recruiting materials		Х				
IV-19	Prepare travel claims		Х				
V-17	Select classrooms						Х
V-18	Solicit contributions from industry			•			Х
V - 19	Select laboratory (shop) space			Х	Х	Х	
VI-1	Administer counseling tests	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	X
VI 2	Administer placement tests	Х	Х	Х	Х		Х
VI-8	Assist students in getting financia	1 .	Х				
	aids						
VI-11	Conduct home visits	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х
VI - 13	Evaluate student selection data	Х		Х	Х	Х	Х
VI-16	Provide disciplinary action	Х	Х	Х			
VI - 18	Select students for the program				Х		
VI - 19	Set student selection criteria				Х		Х
VII-3	Conduct research		Х			X	Х
VII - 5	Participate in research studies						Х
VII - 13	Take correspondence courses	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х
VII - 14	Take short courses	Х					
VII - 17	Write professional articles	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х
VII - 18	Write technical journal articles	Х		Х	Х	Х	Х
VIII-2	Analyze occupational clusters	Х				X	
VIII-4	Conduct occupational needs surveys			Х	X	Х	Х
VIII-14	Read curriculum research reports	Х					
VIII–20	Write proposals for funding		Х	Х	Х	X	
IX-5	Collect money for charities	Х	Х		Х	X	
IX-6	Collect tickets at school activitie	s X	Х		X X	X	X
IX-7	Drive a school bus	Х	Х	X	Х	X	Х
1X - 9	Prepare news releases	~-	X	X	Х	X	
⊥X - ⊥0	Sell activities tickets	Х	Х	X	Х	X,	X

In Chapter IV, twenty-six tables were developed to give an insight into the various facets of this study. While this data is interesting, at the same time, it becomes very difficult to focus the data and gain an overview. Tables XXVII through XXXVIII summarize the data. Tables XXXI through XXXVIII give a comparison of the Tinnell study, a composite of this study and the four occupational emphasis periods: November, January, February, and April. Using those duty-tasks in the top decile of the Tinnell study as a basis of comparison, the following data was acquired for the number of respondents. In the top decile, Table XXXI, there was complete agreement (five of five) on six duty-tasks for 30 percent and near complete agreement (four of five) on six duty-tasks for 30 percent or a combined total of 60 percent. In the bottom decile, Table XXXII, there was complete agreement (five of five) on 10 dutytasks for 50 percent and near complete agreement (four of five) on 10 dutytasks for 20 percent or a combined total of 70 percent.

On total relative time in the top decile, Table XXXIII, there was complete agreement (five of five) on six duty-tasks for 30 percent and near agreement (four of five) on 11 duty-tasks for 55 percent or a combined total of 85 percent. In the bottom decile, Table XXXIV, there was complete agreement (five of five) on 13 duty-tasks for 65 percent and near complete agreement (four of five) on four duty-tasks for 15 percent or a combined total of 80 percent.

The top decile, Table XXXV, of the products provided complete agreement (five of five) on five duty-tasks for 25 percent and near agreement (four of five) on 11 duty-tasks for 55 percent or a combined total of 80 percent. In the bottom decile, Table XXXVI, there was complete agreement (five of five) on 11 duty-tasks for 55 percent and

near complete agreement (four of five) on four duty-tasks for 20 percent or a combined total of 75 percent.

In the bottom decile, Table XXXVIII, there was complete agreement (five of five) on eight duty-tasks for 40 percent and near complete agreement (four of five) on three duty-tasks for 15 percent or a combined total of 55 percent.

In summation:

		Duty Number of Times Duty Appears							
	_								
	Ι	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX
Top Decile									
Number of Respondents Total Relative Time Product Mean	9 8 9 8	9 9 10 11	6666	2222	0 0 0	3 3 2 2	524 2	0 1 0 0	0 0 0 1
Bottom Decile									
Number of Respondents Total Relative Time Product Mean	0 0 0 3	32 3 3 3 3	3333	334 6	4 2 3	6 6 7 8	5556	4 3 4	5555

Nine duty categories were presented in the task inventory. For the purpose of this study three basic assumptions were made. These focused on the fact that the time period of job emphasis and its surrounding events would have a definite effect on the manner in which technicaloccupation instructors view their various tasks.

Conclusions

As indicated in the data presented in Chapters IV and V and summarized above, these assumptions were not supported. The duty-task has more impact than the period of job emphasis. Note the consistency with which tasks are reported. For example: category I duties are presented in the top decile at 9, 8, 9, and 8. Similarly, in the bottom decile of category I duties are 0, 0, 0, and 3. The latter is the mean and as such reflects the extremes in range.

In addition:

	Top Decile	Duty-Task	Bottom Decile Duty-Task		
	5	4 & 5	5	4 & 5	
Number of Responses Total Relative Time Product Mean	30% 30% 25% 25%	60% 85% 80% 75%	50% 65% 55% 40%	2 70% 2 80% 2 75% 2 55%	

While Maureen Byers⁵ found that certain time periods were to be avoided, Lorents⁶ in his study which was based on one semester, found no difference existed between the beginning and middle of a semester. The findings of this study concur with Lorents and expand his findings in that no difference occurs throughout the academic year, i.e., the beginning, the middle, and the end of a semester. Data of the same degree of consistency is obtainable throughout the academic year.

As indicated in the duty-task rankings and the high results on the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance, a conclusion can be drawn that there is no significant difference in the results of data obtained by a task inventory administered to the same technical-occupation instructors under varying occupational emphasis at different times during the academic year. Therefore, this study fails to reject the hypothesis.

Data of the same consistency is available at any time it is retrieved during the academic year. Job emphases periods such as enrollment and early course planning periods, mid-semester and semester examinations, periods of heavy involvement in extra-curricular activities, and holidays and vacation periods are not serious factors in data retrieval. The data on which this study is based proves that technicaloccupation faculty will give consistent data - - good or bad - - regardless of when the data is requested.

Current activities do not dominate an instructor's immediate perception of his or her job. The consistency of the data strongly indicates that the retrieving of data - - good or bad - - is explained by individual differences rather than by current activities.

Job emphasis periods have no effect on data retrieved from postsecondary technical-occupation instructors in Oklahoma. Those deviations in the data are contributed to factors other than that of time periods.

Finally, it should be observed that the reliability and validity of the instrument used to collect the data was assumed to be sufficiently high as to make the results meaningful.

FOOTNÓTES

¹Evelyn J. Brzezinski and Blaine R. Worthen, <u>An Experimental Study</u> of <u>Techniques for Increasing Return Rates in Mail Surveys</u> (Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1973), p. 3.

²J.F. Rummel, <u>An Introduction to Research Procedures in Education</u> (New York, 1958), p.87.

3 Maureen Byers, Personal Communication, April 2, 1975.

⁴Carl Schaefer, <u>A Rationale for</u> <u>Comprehensive</u> <u>Personnel</u> <u>Development</u> <u>in a State</u>, (Ohio, 1972), pp. 3-4.

⁵Byers, Personal Communication.

⁶Alden C. Lorents, <u>Faculty Activity and Planning Models in Educa-</u> <u>tion</u> (Minnesota, 1971), pp. 58-62.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Byers, Maureen. Personal Conversation, April 2, 1975.

- DeVaughn, Zed Farris. "Competencies Needed by Vocational and Technical Education Teachers as Rated by Selected Groups." (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1947.)
- Folkers, Gary W. "Kendall Coefficient of Concordance." (Unpub. Paper, Oklahoma State University, 1967.)
- Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Guilford, J. P., and Benjamin Fruchter. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Lorents, Alden C. "Faculty Activity and Planning Models in Higher Education." (Unpub. PRIME Resource Coordinated by the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission, 1971.)
- Popham, W. James. Educational Statistics. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- Robin, Stanleys. "A Procedure for Securing Returns to Mailed Questionnaires." <u>Sociology</u> and <u>Social Research</u>, Vol. 50, No. 1 (October, 1956), pp. 24-35.
- Rummel, J. F. <u>An Introduction to Research Procedures in Education</u>. New York: Harper, 1958.
- Scheafer, CarT. <u>A Rationale for Comprehensive Personnel Development in</u> <u>a State</u>. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Ohio State University, 1972.
- Siegel, S. <u>Non-Parametric Statistics for the Behaviorial Sciences</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1952.
- Terry, David R. <u>Methological Study for Determining The Task Content</u> of <u>Dental Auxillary Education Programs</u>. Progress Report of Grant No. <u>MB00014-01</u> Office of Special Programs. Washington D.C.: Bureau of Health Manpower Education, National Institutes of Health, 1973.

Tinnell, Richard W. " A Task Inventory of Technical Teachers in Oklahoma." (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1975.)

Webster's New World Dictionary of American Language. College Edition. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1966.

.

APPENDIX A

THE INSTRUMENT

task inventory

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION



technical education forward moving

PURPOSE OF THE INVENTORY

THIS TASK INVENTORY IS DESIGNED TO HELP IDENTIFY THE KINDS OF TASKS THAT OCCUPATIONAL TEACHERS DO ON THEIR JOBS AND THE RELATIVE TIME THEY SPEND DOING THEM. SUCH INFORMATION CAN BE VERY HELPFUL IN PLANNING TRULY RELEVANT TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

COMPLETING THE INVENTORY FORM IS VERY EASY AND IT REQUIRES LESS THAN ONE-HALF HOUR TO DO. FIRST FILL IN THE PROFESSIONAL INFORMATION REQUESTED ON PAGE TWO. THEN READ THE INSTRUCTIONS AND EXAMINE THE EXAMPLE ON PAGE THREE. THE INSTRUCTIONS WILL TELL YOU HOW TO PROCEED WITH THE REMAINDER OF THE INVENTORY.

LASTLY, PLEASE RETURN THE WHOLE BOOKLET PROMPTLY.

PROFESSIONAL INFORMATION

OW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU TAUGHT IN YOUR PRESENT POSITION?
OW MANY TOTAL YEARS HAVE YOU TAUGHT?
HECK THE TYPE OF INSTITUTION THAT YOU WORK FOR:
COMMUNITY-JUNIOR COLLEGE
VOCATIONAL SCHOOL
TECHNICAL INSTITUTE
4 YEAR COLLEGE (OR UNIV.)
HECK ALL OF THE DEGREES THAT YOU HOLD AND GIVE THE MAJOR SUBJECTS
MAJOR
MAJOR CERTIFICATE
MAJOR CERTIFICATE
MAJOR CERTIFICATE
MAJOR CERTIFICATE ASSOCIATE BACHELORS MASTERS
MAJOR CERTIFICATE ASSOCIATE BACHELORS MASTERS DOCTORATE MAJOR
MAJOR CERTIFICATE
MAJOR CERTIFICATE
MAJOR CERTIFICATE ASSOCIATE BACHELORS MASTERS DOCTORATE MASTERS HAT OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTY DO YOU TEACH?
MAJOR CERTIFICATE ASSOCIATE BACHELORS MASTERS DOCTORATE MASTERS HAT OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTY DO YOU TEACH? NOW MANY YEARS OF NON-TEACHING EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE HAVE YOU HAD IN YOU

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE TASK INVENTORY

CAREFULLY READ EACH OF THE TASK STATEMENTS AND PLACE A CHECK MARK (\checkmark) IN THE CULUMN LABELED CHECK FOR EACH TASK WHICH YOU PERFORM ON YOUR PRESENT JOB.

AFTER CHECKING ALL THE TASKS WHICH YOU PERFORM, RATE ONLY THE TASKS YOU HAVE CHECKED BY PLACING A CHECK MARK (/) IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN LABELED TIME SPENT.

TIME SPENT MEANS THE <u>RELATIVE TIME</u> YOU SPEND ON THE TASK YOU ARE RATING, COMPARED WITH THE TIME YOU SPEND ON EACH OF THE OTHER TASKS YOU DO. IT DOES NOT IMPLY THE IMPORTANCE OF THE TASK TO YOUR JOB. SOME VERY IMPORTANT TASKS TAKE LITTLE TIME WHILE SOME UNIMPORTANT ONES REQUIRE A LOT OF TIME.

AT THE END OF ANY SECTION WRITE IN AND RATE ANY TASKS YOU DO WHICH ARE NOT LISTED.

EXAMPLE:

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION TASK INVENTORY



Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task

4



Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task



Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task



Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task



Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task



Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task



Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task



Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task

		Time Spent			
Listed below is a duty and tasks which is includes, check all tasks which you perform Add any tasks you do which are not listed then rate the tasks you have checked. 	Lt L, Check / If Dece	 Very little Below average About average Above average Above average Very much check (*) the appropriate column 			
	Dolle				
TASKS					
21. Specify teacher qualifications					
22. Supervise other teachers	-				
OTHER TASKS					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
	_				

Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task


Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task



Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task



Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task



Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task



Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task



Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task



Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task



Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task

20



Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task

NCHEM'S-WICHE LETTERS

APPENDIX B



BEN LAWRENCE

National Center for Higher Education Management Systems

WESTERN INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION P.O. Drawer P Boulder, Colorado 80302 (303) 449-3333 an equal opportunity employer

April 2, 1975

Dr. J. D. Wilhoit Chairman Division of Technology Northeastern Oklahoma A & M College Miami, OK 74354 **RE: TIMING OF MAIL QUESTIONNAIRES** Dear Dr. Wilhoit: NCHEMS has developed questionnaires in two areas: survey faculty activities and (b) to survey instructional outcomes of students who complete their program of study. I am enclosing some material that addresses the question "When is the appropriate time to administer a faculty questionnaire?" NCHEMS has not examined the similar questions for students although we recommend that the student questionnaire be administered approximately six weeks before the student leaves the institution. For further information regarding the appropriate time to administer student questionnaires, you might contact:

> Dr. Alexander Astin Graduate School of Education 320 Moore Hall University of California Los Angeles, CA 90024

I hope this material can be of some use to you.

Sincerely James R. Topping

1yh Enclosure

BOARD OF DIRECTORS JAMES FURMAN (Chairman) Illinois Board of Higher Education GEORGE KALUDIS (Vice Chairman) Vanderbilt University RUTHERFORD H. ADKINS Fisk University FRED E. BALDERSTON ersity of Cali EDWIN W. BEACH National Advisory Council Chairman State of California, Department of Finance MAX BICKFORD Kansas Board of Regents ALLEN T. BONNELL Community College of Philadelphia RONALD W. BRADY University of Illinois LATTIE F. COOR Washington University KENNETH CREIGHTON Stantord University RALPH A. DUNGAN w Jersey Department of Higher Education ALAN FERGUSON New England Board of Higher Education JAMES F. GOLLATTSCHECK Volencia Community College PAUL E. GRAY Massacl assets Institute of Technology FREEMAN HOLMER hegon Sine System of Higher Education DOUGLAS MacLEAN ROBERT MAUTZ State University System of Florida WILLIAM R. MCCONNELL New Merico Board of Educational Finance DONALD MeNEIL University of Maine JAMES L. MILLER, JR. G. THEODORE MITAU GORDON OSBORN Central Administration State University of New York JAMES A. ROBINSON University of West Florida KEITH W. STOEHR Gateway Technical Institute JACK E. TOLBERT The Bryman-Medix School MARVIN WACHMAN Temple University FRED WELLMAN

Hinos Con

JACQUELINE WEXLER

(a) to



National Center for Higher Education Management Systems

WESTERN INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION P.O. Drawer P Boulder, Colorado 80302 (303) 449-3333 an equal opportunity employer

BEN LAWRENCE

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

JAMES FURMAN (Chairman) Washington Council on Higher Education GEORGE KALUDIS (Vice Chairman) Vanderbilt University RUTHERFORD H. ADKINS Fisk University FRED E. BALDERSTON University of California EDWIN W. BEACH National Advisory Council Chairman State of California, Department of Finance MAX BICKFORD Kansas Board of Regents ALLEN T. BONNELL RONALD W. BRADY University of Illinois LATTIE F. COOR Washington University KENNETH CREIGHTON Stanford University RALPH A. DUNGAN New Jersey Department of Higher Education ALAN FERGUSON New England Board of Higher Education JAMES F. GOLLATTSCHECK Valencia Community College PAUL E. GRAY Massachusetts Institute of Technology FREEMAN HOLMER Oregon State System Higher Education DOUGLAS MacLEAN University of Houston ROBERT MAUTZ State University System of Florida WILLIAM R. McCONNELL New Mexico Board of Educational Finance DONALD McNEIL University of Maine JAMES L. MILLER, JR. University of Michigan G. THEODORE MITAU Minnesota State College Board GORDON OSBORN Central Administration University of New York JAMES A. ROBINSON Macalester College KEITH W. STOEHR Gateway Technical Institute JACK F. TOLBERT The Bryman-Medix School MARVIN WACHMAN Temple University FRED WELLMAN

April 15, 1975

Dr. J. D. Wilhoit, Chairman Division of Technology Northeastern Oklahoma A & M College Miami, Oklahoma 74354

Dear Dr. Wilhoit:

Please excuse the delay in responding to your question regarding questionnaires. I have only found one source to the question you pose. A former Colorado graduate student did a research paper on questionnaires. I have been unable to obtain a copy of it to review, but I have located her address. I am told she mails out copies on request for a minimal duplication cost. Her address is:

> Evelyn Brzezinski Research Evaluation and Assessment Service Michigan Department of Education Lansing, Michigan 48902.

I intend to write for a copy myself. You pose an interesting question, and I am curious to see what Evelyn has said regarding it. I hope this is helpful.

Sincerely yours.

Edward M. Myers Research Associate

EMM:cw

STATE OF MICHIGAN

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Lansing, Michigan 48902

JOHN W. PORTER Superintendent of Public Instruction STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DR. GORTON RIETHMILLER President JAMES F. O'NEIL Vice President DR. MICHAEL J. DEEB Secretary BARBARA A. DUMOUCHELLE Treasurer MARILYN JEAN KELLY ANNETTA MILLER WILLIAM A. SEDERBURG EDMUND F. VANDETTE GOV. WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN EX-Officio

Dear J.D. Wilhoit:

Thank you for your request for a copy of the paper written by Blaine R. Worthen and me, "An Experimental Study of Techniques to Improve Response Rates of Mailed Questionnaires." Unfortunately, we have no copies available for distribution. The document may be ordered, however, from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P. O. Drawer O, Bethesda, Maryland 20014. The order number is ED 078 088. The cost of the report on microfiche is \$.65; reproduced on paper (hard copy), the report costs \$6.58.

A summary of the report appears as part of the research paper series of the Laboratory of Educational Research, University of Colorado. The title of the paper is "An Experimental Study of Techniques for Increasing Return Rates in Mail Surveys (RP No. 64). That paper may be ordered for \$.75 from the Laboratory of Educational Research, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80302.

Thank you very much for your interest.

Sincerely,

J. Broggaske Evelyn J. Brzezinski

Educational Research Consultant

I am enclosing this paper. If you need more detailed information, I would puggest you request the full report from ERIC. EB



BERKELEY · DAVIS · IRVINE · LOS ANGELES · RIVERSIDE · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

COOPERATIVE INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

June 20, 1975

Mr. J. D. Wilhoit Chairman Division of Technology Northeastern Oklahoma A & M College Miami, Oklahoma 74354

Dear Mr. Wilhoit:

I am sorry to have delayed so long in replying to your letter of April 25. I am not sure there is any "best time" for administering questionnaires. Much depends on the people being surveyed and the nature of the survey.

As far as undergraduate students are concerned, there is clearly no better time than freshman orientation or registration. Any time after that, students are hard to find and much more reluctant to cooperate. As far as follow up studies of undergraduates are concerned, the late summer seems to be as good a time as any.

We have done several faculty surveys, although we have no sense of what is the best time to do such surveys. I suspect that the academic year is to be preferred over the summer, although I have no data bearing directly on this question.

I hope this information has been of some use.

Sincerely yours,

lexander aftin

Alexander W. Astin Professor

AWA:psv

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTERS

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY · STILLWATER

Department of Technical Education Classroom Evilding 406 (405) 372-6211, Ext. 6287

74074

October 16, 1974

Name Institution Address City, State, Zip Code

Dear (Name):

Enclosed are the task inventory booklets that J. D. Wilhoit discussed with you a short time ago.

We would sincerely appreciate it if you would distribute them to the appropriate faculty members. As you will note in the cover letter attached to each booklet, the faculty members are instructed to return them to you after completion. To make getting them back to us more convenient we are also enclosing a stamped return envelope.

We very much appreciate your help in collecting this data and hope it isn't overly troublesome.

Cordially,

Donald S. Phillips Head, Technical Education Oklahoma State University

Enclosures



OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY . STILLWATER

Department of Technical Education Classroom Building 406 372-421:, Ext. 4287 October 16, 1974 74074

Professor (Individual's Name) School of Technology Oklahoma State University

Dear Professor (Last Name):

We need your help! We are conducting a study that we believe you will find interesting and helpful to your profession. We are attempting to assemble and validate a list of jobs and tasks performed by professional occupational teachers.

The information we are seeking will be used in two current projects being conducted by J. D. Wilhoit and Dick Tinnell. We will use this information to revise existing teacher education curricula in order to improve the quality of training programs being offered for persons in our profession.

What we are asking for is a little of your time, and the results of your experience on the job; to review the enclosed task inventory for occupational teachers. Only you can tell us whether these lists are complete and accurate.

Please fill out the brief professional information page and follow the directions for checking and rating the tasks on the list. You will notice that the inventory booklet is numbered. The number is only for our use in follow-up and in accounting for the booklets. Your name will be held in the strictest confidence and will not be associated with the results.

We are depending on you to provide us with the necessary information for improving our teacher education program. Please complete the inventory TODAY and return it in the enclosed campus envelope.

It will take you about one-half hour.

Very sincerely,

Donald S. Phillips Head, Technical Education Oklahoma State University

Enclosures



OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY · STILLWATER

Department of Technical Education Classroom Building 406 (405) 372-0211, Ext. 6287

Early in October of this year, you cooperated with us in a Task Inventory Questionnaire. This instrument is being used to research several aspects of relevance to vocational-technical education. This task inventory questionnaire included with this letter is identical to the questionnaire you filled out earlier. No, it isn't a mistake. J. D. Wilhoit is appealing for your tolerance to assist in determining if the teachers' tasks are viewed differently during the course of the school year.

Please fill out the task inventory as though this is the first time you have seen it. Don't be concerned about how you filled it out in October. We are interested in the tasks as you now view them. Please do it as soon as you can, we promise to make this the last time.

Very sincerely,

Donald S. Phillips Head, Technical Education Oklahoma State University

Enclosure

APPENDIX D

INSTITUTIONS SURVEYED BY TINNELL

These institutions were:

1.	Bethany Nazarene College, Bethany, Oklahoma
2.	Cameron University, Lawton, Oklahoma
3.	Carl Albert Junior College, Poteau, Oklahoma
4.	Connors State College, Warner, Oklahoma
5.	Eastern Oklahoma State College, Wilburton, Oklahoma
6.	El Reno Junior College, El Reno, Oklahoma
7.	Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma
8.	Murray State College, Tishomingo, Oklahoma
9.	Northeastern Oklahoma State University, Tahlequah, Oklahoma
10.	Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College, Miami, Oklahoma
11.	Northern Oklahoma College, Tonkawa, Oklahoma
12.	Northwestern Oklahoma State University, Alva, Oklahoma
13.	Oklahoma State University School of Technology, Stillwater, Oklahoma
14.	Oklahoma State University Technical Institute, Oklahoma City, Okla.
15.	Oklahoma State Tech, Okmulgee, Oklahoma
16.	Oscar Rose Junior College, Midwest City, Oklahoma
17.	Sayre Junior College, Sayre, Oklahoma
18.	Seminole Junior College, Seminole, Oklahoma
19.	Southeastern Oklahoma State University, Durant, Oklahoma
20.	Southwestern College, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
21.	South Oklahoma City Junior College, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
22.	Tulsa Junior College, Tulsa, Oklahoma
23,	Western Oklahoma State College, Altus, Oklahoma
This	s formulated a group of 171 technical-occupation instructors for the
orię	ginal study. Five (22 percent) of the 23 institutions with seven
(four percent) of the 171 instructors, which was a very small percentage	

of the total respondents due to the size of the institutions involved, failed to respond to the first questionnaire. In addition to this nonresponse, 25 (19 percent) of the remaining 164 instructors from the remaining 18 institutions failed to return the original questionnaire. This deletion consequently left 18 institutions and 139 responding technical-occupation instructors surveyed in this study. John Douglas Wilhoit, Jr.

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE EFFECT OF VARIATION IN JOB EMPHASIS ON TASK INVENTORY RESULTS

Major Field: Vocational-Technical and Career Education

Biographical:

- Personal Data: Born in Enid, Oklahoma, July 7, 1928, the son of Douglas and Florence Wilhoit.
- Education: Graduated from Enid High School, Enid, Oklahoma, in 1946; received a Technology Certificate from the Oklahoma State University Technical Institute with a major in Drafting and Design Technology in May, 1951; received the Bachelor of Science degree from Oklahoma State University with a major in Technical Education in August, 1960; completed the requirements for the Master of Science degree with a major in Trade and Industrial Education in August, 1962; enrolled in graduate study at the University of Houston in 1964-65, University of Arkansas in 1967, and University of Tennessee in 1970; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1975.
- Professional Organizations: American Institute of Design and Drafting, American Technical Education Association, American Vocational Association, Certified Senior Engineering Technician, Higher Education Alumni Council Association, Oklahoma Council of Local Administrators, Oklahoma Education Association, Oklahoma Technical Society (life member), Oklahoma Vocational Association, Phi Delta Kappa.
- Professional Experience: Chief Draftsman, Westinghouse Air Brake, Failing Subsidiary, Enid, Oklahoma, from 1951-1959; Design and Drafting Instructor and Department Head, Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College from 1960-1971; Vocational-Technical Division Chairman and Assistant Dean for Vocational-Technical Education, Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College, Miami, Oklahoma, from 1971-1975.