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## CHAPIER I

## THE PROBIEM

## 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 techni-cal-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,

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 concerming 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 $60^{\prime}$ 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 cormuting 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.
$1_{\text {Richard }}$ W. Tinnell, "A Task Inventory of Technical Teachers in Oklahoma" (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1975). pp. 46-66.

## CHAPIER II

REVIEW OF LIIERAIURE

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: (l) 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.

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 consịderation 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 <br> 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?

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. 1

The following Tables are from Lorents:

TESTS FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN ACTIVITY
SCORES CAUSED BY TIME OF REPORTING WHEN NGHENS' FACULTY ACTIVITY AND OUTCOME SURVEY WAS USED

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

Degrees of Freedom $=83$

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

TEST FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN ACTIVITY SCORES CAUSED BY TIME OF REPORTING WHEN UNIVERSITY OF MECHIGAN'S AGADEMIC PERSONNEL ACIIVITIES REPORT WAS USED

| Activity* <br> Category | Mean \% <br> from early <br> reporting | Mean \% <br> from middle <br> reporting | T Value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Credit <br> Instruction | 54.14 | 50.95 | 0.60 |
| Non-credit <br> Instruction | 12.23 | 13.19 | -0.41 |
| Research and <br> Creative Activity | 18.91 | 17.64 | 0.27 |
| Service <br> Activity | 4.00 | 3.36 | 0.60 |
| Administrative <br> Activity | 4.93 | 8.60 | -1.36 |
| Professional <br> 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. ${ }^{4}$
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## CHAPIER 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 diuties: (l) 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-point-time-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 I
DUIIES AND NUNBER OF TASKS

|  | Duty | Number <br> of <br> Tasks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 1 | Preparing for Instruction | 27 |
| 2 | Executing Instruction | 30 |
| 3 | Evaluating Instruction | 29 |
| 4 | Administering Instructional Services | 22 |
| 5 | Managing Equipment and Facilities | 20 |
| 6 | Providing Student Services | 20 |
| 7 | Participating in Professional Development | 18 |
| 8 | Developing Instructional Programs | 20 |
| 9 | Particpating in Non-Instructional Activities |  |
|  |  | Total: |
|  |  | 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 | Bethany Nazarine College | 1 |
| 2 | Cameron University | 7 |
| 3 | Carl Albert Junior College | 1 |
| 4 | Connors State College | 2 |
| 5 | Eastern Oklahoma State College | 13 |
| 6 | El Reno Junior College | 1 |
| 7 | Langston University | 2 |
| 8 | Murray State College | 7 |
| 9 | Northeastern Oklahoma State University | 1 |
| 10 | Northeastern Oklahoma A\&M College | 10 |
| 11 | Northern Oklahoma College | 7 |
| 12 | Northwestern Oklahoma State University | 2 |
| 13 | Oklahoma State University School of Technology | 23 |
| 14 | Oklahoma State University Technical Institute | 14 |
| 15 | Oklahoma State Tech | 50 |
| 16 | Oscar Rose Junior College | 7 |
| 17 | Sayre Junior College | 1 |
| 18 | Seminole Junior College | 1 |
| 19 | Southeastern Oklahoma State University | 3 |
| 20 | Southwestern College | 2 |
| 21 | South Oklahoma City Junior College | 4 |
| 22 | Tulsa Junior College | 10 |
| 23 | Western Oklahoma State College | 2 |
| Total: 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
THE REVISED STUDY PARTICIPANTS ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Institution |  |  | Number of Participants |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 1 | Bethany Nazarine College |  | 1 |
| 2 | Cameron University |  | 7 |
| 3 | Carl Albert Junior College |  | 1 |
| 4 | Connors State College |  | 1 |
| 5 | Eastern Oklahoma State College |  | 8 |
| 6 | El Reno Junior College |  | 0 |
| 7 | Langston University |  | 1 |
| 8 | Nurray State College |  | 7 |
| 9 | Northeastern Oklahoma State University |  | 1 |
| 10 | Northeastern Oklahoma A\&M College |  | 10 |
| 11 | Northerm Oklahoma College |  | 5 |
| 12 | Northwestern Oklahoma State University |  | 2 |
| 13 | Oklahoma State University School of Technology |  | 18 |
| 14 | Oklahoma State University Technical Institute |  | 12 |
| 15 | Oklahoma State Tech |  | 50 |
| 16 | Oscar Rose Junior College |  | 5 |
| 17. | Sayre Junior College |  | 0 |
| 18 | Seminole Junior College |  | 0 |
| 19 | Southeastern Oklahoma State University |  | 3 |
| 20 | Southwestern College |  | 0 |
| 21 | South Oklahoma City Junior College |  | 4 |
| 22 | Tulsa Junior College |  | 3 |
| 23 | Western Oklahoma, State College |  | 0 |
| Total: $\overline{139}$ |  |  |  |

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 institu-. tion, 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

$1_{\text {Richard }}$ 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.

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
SUMINARY OF INSTRUNENIS MAIIED AND RETURNED WITH PERCENTAGE OF REIURN FROM EACH MAILING

|  | Tinnell Study Oct. 15 1974 |  | Percent | Group I thru IV <br> Nov. 30 thru Apr. 25 <br> $1974 . c \mid$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Institution | Number Mailed | Number Returned |  | Number Mailed | Number Returned | Percent |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 7 | 7 | 100 | 7 | 7 | 100 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 2 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 13 | 8 | 62 | 7 | 7 | 100 |
| 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 7 | 2 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| 8 | 7 | 7 | 100 | 7 | 4 | 57 |
| 9 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| 10 | 10 | 10 | 100 | 10 | 10 | 100 |
| 11 | 7 | 6 | 86 | 6 | 5 | 83 |
| 12 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| 13 | 23 | 18 | 78 | 18 | 14 | 78 |
| 14 | 14 | 12 | 86 | 12 | 7 | 58 |
| 15 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 50 | 44 | 88 |
| 16 | 7 | 4 | 67 | 4 | 4 | 100 |
| 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 19 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 2 | 66 |
| 20 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 21 | 4 | 4 | 100 | 4 | 4 | 100 |
| 22 | 10 | 3 | 30 | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| 23 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Totals: | 171 | 139 | 81.3 | 139 | 115 | 82.7 |

TABLE IV (Continued)

|  | Group I Nov. 1974 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Group II } \\ & \text { Jan. } 1975 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Group III Feb. 1975 |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Group IV } \\ \text { Apr. } 1975 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{c} \\ & \dot{1} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \& \quad 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \text { o- } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | U む 0 0 0 0 0 |  |  | $\pm$ $\vdots$ 0 0 0 0 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 1 | 50 | 1 |  | 100 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 1 |  | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 1 |  | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1 |  | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | 5 | 4 | 80 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 4 | 2 | 50 | 4 | 3 | 75 |
| 14 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 2 | 67 | 3 | 1 | 33 | 3 | 1 | 33 |
| 15 | 12 | 10 | 83 | 13 | 12 | 92 | 13 | 13 | 100 | 12 | 9 | 75 |
| 16 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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-l, "preparing for instruction, develop student safety procedures" provide us an example:

|  | Weighted Factor | Frequency | Total <br> 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 | 4 | 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:
$\left.\begin{array}{ccc}\begin{array}{c}\text { Weighted } \\ \text { Factor }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Present Study } \\ \text { Duty 9 Task 7 } \\ \text { No. of Responses }\end{array} & \end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { Tinnell Study } \\ \text { Duty 9 Task 7 } \\ \text { No. of Responses }\end{array}\right]$

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,
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:
$\left.\begin{array}{ccc}\text { Weighted } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Present Study } \\ \text { Factor }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Duty 2 Task 22 } \\ \text { No. of Responses }\end{array} \\ & & \end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { Tinnell Study } \\ \text { Duty 7 Task 8 } \\ \text { No. of Responses }\end{array}\right]$

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

|  | $\text { Responses }^{\mathrm{a}} \begin{gathered} \text { Tota } \mathrm{I}^{\mathrm{b}} \\ \text { Relative } \\ \text { Time } \end{gathered} \text { Product }^{\mathrm{c}} \text { Mean }{ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Develop student safety procedures | 84 | 190 | 15960 | 2.26 |
| 2. Identify library resources | 87 | 194 | 16878 | 2.23 |
| 3. Identify resource persons | 63 | 140 | 8820 | 2.22 |
| 4. Identify terminal evaluative criteria | 72 | 194 | 13968 | 2.69 |
| 5. Maintain an instructional materials file | 106 | 324 | 34344 | 3.06 |
| 6. Make mimeograph masters | 70 | 184 | 12880 | 2.63 |
| 7. Make photo (thermo) copy masters | 67 | 160 | 10720 | 2.39 |
| 8. Make spirit duplicator masters | 54 | 127 | 6858 | 2.35 |
| 9. Make visual aids | 94 | 256 | 24064 | 2.72 |
| 10. Operate a mimeograph machine | 58 | 115 | 6670 | 1.98 |
| 11. Operate a photo (thermo) copy machine | 57 | 123 | 7011 | 2.16 |
| 12. Operate a spirit duplicator | 49 | 111 | 5439 | 2.27 |
| 13. Organize lesson plans | 108 | 368 | 39744 | 3.41 |
| 14. Plan field trips | 85 | 206 | 17510 | 2.42 |
| 15. Prepare lecture outlines | 110 | 373 | 41030 | 3.39 |
| 16. Select course content | 106 | 347 | 36782 | 3.27 |
| 17. Select student projects | 105 | 351 | 36855 | 3.34 |
| 18. Select text books | 101 | 288 | 29088 | 2.85 |
| 19. Select training package | 69 | 178 | 12282 | 2.58 |
| 20. Select visual aids | 93 | 257 | 23901 | 2.76 |
| 21. Set up demonstrations | 101 | 305 | 30805 | 3.02 |
| 22. Set up laboratory equipment | 91 | 277 | 25207 | 3.04 |
| 23. Write course objectives | 104 | 306 | 31824 | 2.94 |
| 24. Write laboratory exercises | 92 | 280 | 25760 | 3.04 |
| 25. Write lesson objectives | 102 | 283 | 28866 | 2.77 |
| 26. Write student handout sheets | 109 | 344 | 37496 | 3.16 |
| 27. Write unit objectives | 86 | 222 | 19092 | 2.58 |

TABIE V (Continued)
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. Direet 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 |
| 8. 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 assistanee 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 solving103 | 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 projector | 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 |

TABLE V (Continued)
III Evaluating Instruction

| 1. Administer written tests | 110 | 360 | 39600 | 3.27 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2. Analyze tests for reliability | 91 | 242 | 22022 | 2.66 |
| 3. Analyze tests for validity | 87 | 233 | 20271 | 2.68 |
| 4. Check graduate performance with employer73 | 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 teeh-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 courses66 | 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 graduates56 | 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 |

TABLE V (Continued)
IV Administering Instructional Services

| 1. | Assign students to classes | 61 | 160 | 9760 | 2.62 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2. | Attend faculty meetings | 110 | 323 | 35530 | 2.94 |
| 3. | Collect fees | 38 | 78 | 2964 | 2.05 |
| 4. | Coordinate teaching in several programs 39 | 109 | 4251 | 2.79 |  |
| 5. Handle petty cash | 32 | 59 | 1888 | 1.84 |  |
| 6. | Identify prospective teachers | 48 | 113 | 5424 | 2.35 |
| 7. Interview prospective employees | 48 | 109 | 5232 | 2.27 |  |
| 8. Maintain attendance records. | 100 | 322 | 32200 | 3.22 |  |
| 9. Maintain counseling records | 54 | 137 | 7398 | 2.54 |  |
| 10. | Maintain financial records | 27 | 62 | 1674 | 2.30 |
| 11. Maintain follow-up records | 44 | 114 | 5016 | 2.59 |  |
| 12. | Maintain placement records | 45 | 127 | 5715 | 2.82 |
| 13. Maintain purchasing records | 48 | 133 | 6384 | 2.77 |  |
| 14. Make teaching assignments | 47 | 130 | 6110 | 2.77 |  |
| 15. Plan the budget | 44 | 116 | 5104 | 2.64 |  |
| 16. Prepare class schedules | 70 | 191 | 13370 | 2.73 |  |
| 17. Prepare promotional brochures | 56 | 144 | 8064 | 2.57 |  |
| 18. Prepare recruiting materials | 53 | 137 | 7261 | 2.58 |  |
| 19. Prepare travel claims | 67 | 121 | 8107 | 1.81 |  |
| 20. Recrit new students | 88 | 243 | 21384 | 2.76 |  |
| 21. Speify teacher qualifications | 45 | 103 | 4635 | 2.29 |  |
| 22. Supervise other teachers | 85 | 236 | 20060 | 2.78 |  |

V Managing Equipment and Facilities

| 1. Administer laboratory clean-up | 85 | 236 | 20060 | 2.78 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 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. $) 76$ | 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. Recomend 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. Slect 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 |

TABLE V (Continued)
VI Providing Student Services

| 1. | Administer counseling tests | 20 | 32 | 640 | 1.60 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. | Administer placement tests | 22 | 44 | 968 | 2.00 |
| 3 | Advise students about employment | 104 | 324 | 33696 | 3.12 |
| 4. | Advise students about further educati | on99 | 284 | 28116 | 2.87 |
| 5. | Advise students with personal problen | S 99 | 230 | 22770 | 2.32 |
| 6. | Advise students with scholastic problems | 101 | 276 | 27876 | 2.73 |
| 7. | Assess student academic ability | 65 | 190 | 12350 | 2.92 |
| 8. | Assist students in getting financial 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 | 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 |
| , | Write letters | 89 | 223 | 19847 |  |

VII Participating in Professional Development

1. Assist new teachers
2. Attend professional meetings
3. Conduct research
4. Participate in professional. .....
organizations
5. Participate in research studies
6. Participate in seminars
7. Practice new specialty skills
8. Read professional. journals
9. Read text books.
10. Read technical journals
11. Serve as an officer of an oranization
12. Take college courses
13. Take correspondence courses....
14. Take short courses.
15. Visit other schools.
16. Work in industry
17. Write professional articles.
18. Write technical journal articles

| 74 | 192 | 14208 | 2.59 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 104 | 290 | 30160 | 2.79 |
| 38 | 75 | 2850 | 1.97 |
| 98 | 277 | 27146 | 2.83 |
| 41 | 85 | 3485 | 2.07 |
| 81 | 192 | 15552 | 2.37 |
| 57 | 157 | 8949 | 2.75 |
| 104 | 295 | 30680 | 2.84 |
| 102 | 323 | 32946 | 3.17 |
| 100 | 294 | 29400 | 2.94 |
| 54 | 150 | 8100 | 2.78 |
| 81 | 226 | 18306 | 2.79 |
| 21 | 36 | 756 | 1.71 |
| 48 | 102 | 4896 | 2.13 |
| 83 | 210 | 17430 | 2.53 |
| 50 | 122 | 6100 | 2.44 |
| 23 | 44 | 1012 | 1.91 |
| 24 | 42 | 1008 | 1.75 |

TABLE V (Continued)
VIII Developing. Instructional Programs

|  | Adapt occupational surveys to local needs | 80 | 2720 | 2.35 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. | Analyze occupational clusters 37 | 83 | 3071 | 2.24 |
| 3. | Assess relevancy of program offerings 57. | 155 | 8835 | 2.72 |
| 4. | Conduct occupational needs surveys ... 33 | 69 | 2277 | 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 ...z. 49 | 106 | 5194 | 2.16 |
| 14. | Read curriculum research reports $\quad 57$ | 127 | 7239 | 2.23 |
| 15. | Read vocational education needs surveys72. | 168 | 12096 | 2.33 |
| 16. | Select programs to be offered. . 50 | 127 | 6350 | 2.54 |
| 17. | Sequence courses within the program 62 | 170 | 10540 | 2.74 |
| 18. | Serve on a curriculum committee 49 | 125 | 6125 | 2.55 |
| 19. | Write program objectives ... 63 | 167 | 10521 | 2.65 |
| 20. | Write proposals for funding. ..... . . 37 | 71 | 2627 | 1.92 |

## IX Participating in Non-Instructional Activities

| 1. Assist with institutional maintenance. | 55 | 138 | 7590 | 2.51. |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2. Attend civic club meetings | 67 | 159 | 10653 | 2.37 |
| 3. Attend school related social functions 100 | 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 commity 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 comittees.... | 72 | 195 | 14040 | 2.71 |
| 12. Sponsor student 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 |

[^0]
## 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
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
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.

Mean By Job Emphasis Period:

| November | 0.78165 | End of Semester |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| January | 0.83208 | First of Semester |
| February | 0.75309 | Mid Semester |
| April | 0.80704 | End of Semester |

Mean of Means:
$3.17387 \div 4=0.79347$
Total Mean:
$86.41551 \div 109=0.79280$
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 - - NGMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED PERFORNING EACH TASK IN GROUPS I, II, III, AND IV

|  | Duty-Task |  | Number <br> Respondinga <br> (N= 115) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |

aTotal number responding to a given task.

TABLE VII
TOP AND BOITOM DECIIE - - NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED PERFORNING EACH TASK IN GROUP I

|  | Duty-Task | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Number } \\ & \text { Responding } \\ & (N=29) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Per } \\ & \text { Cent } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-15 | Prepare lecture outlines | 27 | 93.1 |
| I-17 | Seleet student projects | 27 | 93.1 |
| II-10 | Give lectures | 27 | 93.1 |
| II-11 | Give students assistance in laboratory | 27 | 93.1 |
| II-22 | Present lessons with a chalkboard | 27 | 93.1 |
| IV-2 | Attend faculty meetings | 27 | 93.1 |
| I-13 | Organize lesson plans | 26 | 89.7 |
| I-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-1 | 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 | 4 | 13.8 |
| IX-6 | Collect tickets at school activities | 4 | 13.8 |
| VIII-7. | Adapt occupational surveys to local needs | 4 | 13.8 |
| VII-18 | Write-technical journal articles | 4 | 13.8 |
| VII-17 | Write professional articles | 4 | 13.8 |
| VI-18 | Select students for the program | 4 | 13.8 |
| VI-13 | Evaluate student selection data | 4 | 13.8 |
| IV-10 | Maintain financial records | 4 | 13.8 |
| III-5 | Conduct drop-out studies | 4 | 13.8 |
| VI-19 | Set student selection criteria | 3 | 10.3 |
| IX-10 | Sell activities tickets | 2 | 6.9 |
| VII-13 | 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 |

Total number responding to a given task.

## TABLE VIII

TOP AND BOITIOM DECIIE - - NUNIBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED PERFORVING EACH TASK IN GROUP II

|  | Duty-Task | $\begin{gathered} \text { Number } \\ \text { Respondinga } \\ (\mathrm{N}=29) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per } \\ & \text { Cent } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-15 | Prepare lecture outlines | 28 | 96.6 |
| I-23 | Write course objectives | 28 | 96.6 |
| I-25 | Write-lesson objectives | 28 | 96.6 |
| III-12 | Formulate multiple choice questions | 28 | 96.6 |
| VII-2 | Attend professional meetings | 28 | 96.6 |
| VII-8 | Read-professional journals | 28 | 96.6 |
| VII-9 | Read text books | 28 | 96.6 |
| I-13 | Organize lesson plans | 27 | 93.1 |
| I-16 | Select course content | 27 | 93.1 |
| I-21 | Set up demonstrations | 27 | 93.1 |
| I-26 | Write student handout sheets | 27 | 93.1 |
| II-8 | Employ oral questioning | 27 | 93.1 |
| II-10 | Give lectures | 27 | 93.1 |
| II-11 | Give students assistance in laboratory | 27 | 93.1 |
| II-14 | Present lessons by problem solving | 27 | 93.1 |
| II-25 | Present principles by demonstration | 27 | 93.1 |
| II-30 | Work problems before class | 27 | 93.1 |
| III-17 | Grade student projects | 27 | 93.1 |
| IV-2 | Attend faculty meetings | 27 | 93.1 |
| IV-8 | Maintain attendance records | 27 | 93.1 |
| VIII-20 | Write proposals for funding | 10 | 34.5 |
| II-1 | Coordinate a cooperative work program | 9 | 31.0 |
| II-29 | Teach extension classes | 9 | 31.0 |
| IV-3 | Collect fees | 9 | 31.0 |
| VI-19 | Set student selection criteria | 9 | 31.0 |
| VIII-4 | Conduct occupational needs survey | 9 | 31.0 |
| IX-5 | Collect money for charities | 9 | 31.0 |
| IX-6 | Collect tickets at school activities | 9 | 31.0 |
| IX-10 | Sell activities tickets | 9 | 31.0 |
| II-21 | Present lessons using video tape | 8 | 27.6 |
| IV-10 | Maintain financial records | 8 | 27.6 |
| VI-2 | Administer placement tests | 8 | 27.6 |
| VI-11 | Conduct home visits | 8 | 27.6 |
| VI-13 | Evaluate student selection data | 8 | 27.6 |
| VI-18 | Select students for the program | 8 | 27.6 |
| VII-17 | Write professional articles | 8 | 27.6 |
| VI-1 | Administer counseling tests | 7 | 24.1 |
| VII-18 | Write technical journal articles | 7 | 24.1 |
| IX-7 | Drive a school bus | 6 | 20.7 |
| VII-13 | Take correspondence courses | 5 | 17.2 |

[^1]TABLE IX
TOP AND BOTIOM DECILE - - NUNBER OF RESPONDENIS WHO REPORIED PERFORMING EACH TASK IN GROUP III

|  | Duty-Task | Number Respondinga $(\mathrm{N}=31)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Per } \\ & \text { Cent } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-13 | Organize lesson plans | 30 | 96.8 |
| I-26 | Write student handout sheets | 30 | 96.8 |
| II-10 | Give lectures | 30 | 96.8 |
| II-22 | Present lessons with a chalkboard | 30 | 96.8 |
| III-1 | Administer written tests | 30 | 96.8 |
| III-6 | Determine final grades | 30 | 96.8 |
| IV-2 | Attend faculty meetings | 30 | 96.8 |
| VI-3 | Advise students about employment | 30 | 96.8 |
| VII-8 | Read professional journals | 30 | 96.8 |
| VII-10 | Read technical journals | 30 | 96.8 |
| III-19 | Grade written tests | 29 | 93.5 |
| VII-2 | Attend professional meetings | 29 | 93.5 |
| I-5 | Maintain an instructional material file | 28 | 90.3 |
| I-15 | Prepare lecture outlines | 28 | 90.3 |
| I-16 | Select course content | 28 | 90.3 |
| I-17 | Select student projects | 28 | 90.3 |
| II-14 | Present lessons by problem solving | 28 | 90.3 |
| III-18 | Grade students class performance | 28 | 90.3 |
| IV-8 | Maintain attendance records | 28 | 90.3 |
| VI-6 | Advise students with scholastic problems | 28 | 90.3 |
| III-8 | Formulate case study problems | 10 | 32.3 |
| IV-5 | Handle petty cash | 10 | 32.3 |
| V-19 | Select laboratory (shop) space | 10 | 32.3 |
| VIII-1 | Adapt occupational surveys to local needs | - 10 | 32.3 |
| VIII-4 | Conduct occupational needs surveys | 10 | 32.3 |
| VIII-20 | Write proposals for funding | 10 | 32.3 |
| IV-10 | Maintain foinancial records | 8 | 25.8 |
| VI-18 | Select students for the program | 8 | 25.8 |
| VI-19 | Set student selection criteria | 8 | 25.8 |
| VII-13 | Take correspondence courses | 8 | 25.8 |
| IX-5 | Collect money for charities | 8 | 25.8 |
| VI-13 | Evaluate student selection data | 7 | 22.6 |
| VII-18 | Write technical journal articles | 7 | 22.6 |
| II-29 | Teach extension classes | 6 | 19.4 |
| VI-1 | Administer counseling tests | 6 | 19.4 |
| VI-2 | Administer placement tests | 6 | 19.4 |
| VII-17 | Write professional articles | 6 | 19.4 |
| IX-10 | Sell activities tickets | 6 | 19.4 |
| VI-11 | Conduct home visits | 5 | 16.1 |
| IX-7 | Drive a school bus | 5 | 16.1 |

[^2]TABLE X
TOP AND BOITOM DECILE - - NUMBER OF RESPONDENIS WHO REPORTED PERFORMING EACH TASK IN GROUP IV

|  | Duty-Task | $\begin{gathered} \text { Nmber } \\ \text { Respondinga } \\ (\mathrm{N}=26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Per } \\ & \text { Cent } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-13 | Organize lesson plans | 25 | 92.3 |
| I-15 | Prepare lecture outlines | 25 | 96.2 |
| I-16 | Select course content | 25 | 96.2 |
| I-23 | Write course objectives | 25 | 96.2 |
| II-10 | Give lectures | 25 | 96.2 |
| III-1 | Administer written tests | 25 | 96.2 |
| I-5 | Maintain an instructional material file | 24 | 92.3 |
| I-17 | Seleet-student projects | 24 | 92.3 |
| I-25 | Write lesson objectives | 24 | 92.3 |
| I-26 | Write student handout sheets | 24 | 92.3 |
| II-11 | Give-students assistance in laboratory | 24 | 92.3 |
| II-14 | Present lessons by problem solving | 24 | 92.3 |
| II-25 | Prepare principles by demonstration | 24 | 92.3 |
| II-26 | Supervise student laboratory work | 24 | 92.3 |
| II-30 | Work problems before class | 24 | 92.3 |
| III-6 | Determine final grades | 24 | 92.3 |
| III-9 | Formulate completion test questions | 24 | 92.3 |
| III-19 | Grade written tests | 24 | 92.3 |
| VI-3 | Advise students about employment | 24 | 92.3 |
| VI-4 | Advise students about further education | 24 | 92.3 |
| $\overline{\text { IV-3 }}$ | Collect fees | 8 | 30.8 |
| V-7 | Manage a tool room | 8 | 30.8 |
| V-17 | Select classrooms | 8 | 30.8 |
| VI-19 | Set student selection criteria | 8 | 30.8 |
| II-21 | Present lessons using video tape | 7 | 26.9 |
| IV-10 | Maintain financial records | 7 | 26.9 |
| V-19 | Select laboratory (shop) space | 7 | 26.9 |
| VI-2 | Administer placement tests | 7 | 26.9 |
| VI-11 | Conduct home visits | 7 | 26.9 |
| VI-13 | Evaluate student selection data | 7 | 26.9 |
| VII-3 | Conduct research | 7 | 26.9 |
| IX-6 | Collect tickets at school activities | 7 | 26.9 |
| IV-5 | Handle petty cash | 6 | 23.1 |
| VII-5 | Participate in research studies | 6 | 23.1 |
| VII-13 | Take correspondence courses | 6 | 23.1 |
| VII-18 | Write technical journal articles | 6 | 23.1 |
| VI-1 | Administer counseling tests | 5 | 19.2 |
| VII-17 | Write professional articles | 5 | 19.2 |
| IX-7 | Drive a school bus | 4 | 15.4 |
| IX-10 | Sell activities tickets | 4 | 15.4 |

[^3]TOP AND BOTIOM DECILE -- TOTAL RELATIVE TTME REPORIED SPENT ON EACH TASK IN GROUPS I, II, III, AND IV

|  | Duty-Task | Total ${ }^{\text {a }}$ <br> Relative Time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II-22 | Present lessons with a chaikboard | 418 |
| II-ll | Give students assistance in laboratory | 390 |
| 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 |
| I-13 | Organize lesson plans | 368 |
| III-1 | Administer written tests | 360 |
| II-6 | Direct student skill practice | 359 |
| I-17 | Select student projects | 351 |
| 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 |
| III-18 | Grade students class performance | 335 |
| II-8 | Employ oral questioning | 334 |
| III-17 | Grade student projects | 329 |
| I-5 | Maintain an instructional materials file | 324 |
| IV-3 | Collect fees | 78 |
| V-19 | Select laboratory (shop) space | 78 |
| VII-3 | Conduct research | 75 |
| II-21 | Present lessons using video tape | 72 |
| VIII-20 | Write proposals for funding | 71 |
| IX-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 |
| VI-13 | Evaluate student selection data | 54 |
| VI-2 | Administer placement tests | 32 |
| VII-17 | Write professional articles | 44 |
| VII-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 |
| IX-7 | Drive a school bus | 24 |

${ }^{2}$ Number responding multiplied by weighted factor (0-5) which indicated amount of time spent performing each task.

TABLE XII
TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - TOTAL RELATIVE TTVE REPORIED SPENT ON EACH TASK IN GROUP I

|  | Duty -Task | Totala <br> Relative Time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II-11 | Give students assistance in laboratory | 106 |
| II-22 | Present lessons with a chalkboard | 99 |
| II-26 | Supervise student laboratory work | 98 |
| I-15 | Prepare lecture outlines | 95 |
| II-10 | Give lectures | 95 |
| II-25 | Present principles through demonstration | 94 |
| I-13 | Organize lesson plans | 91 |
| I-17 | Select student projects | 87 |
| II-6 | Direct student skill practice | 87 |
| II-14 | Present lessons through problem solving | 81 |
| III-6 | Determine final grades | 81 |
| II-30 | Work problems before class | 80 |
| I-26 | Write student handout sheets | 76 |
| III-1 | Administer written tests | 76 |
| VII-9 | Read text books | 76 |
| I-16 | Select course content | 75 |
| II-8 | Employ oral questioning | 74 |
| I-5 | Maintain an instructional materials file | 73 |
| I-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-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 |
| IV-10 | Maintain financial records | 6 |
| IV-5 | Handle petty cash | 6 |
| VI-I | Administer counseling tests | 4 |
| VII-13 | Take correspondence courses | 3 |
| IX-10 | Sell activities tickets | 2 |
| IX-7 | Drive a school bus | 1 |
| VI-11 | Conduct home visits | 1 |
| VI-2 | Administer placement tests | 1 |

$\mathrm{a}_{\text {Number }}$ responding multiplied by weighted factor (0-5) which indicated amount of time spent performing each task.

TABLE XIII
TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - TOTAL RELATIVE TTIEE REPORTED SPENT ON EACH TASK IN GROUP II

|  | Duty-Task | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Relative Time } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II-11 | Give students assistance in laboratory | 107 |
| III-6 | Determine final grades | 103 |
| I-15 | Prepare lecture outlines | 102 |
| II-10 | Give lectures | 102 |
| III-19 | Grade written tests | 101 |
| II-26 | Supervise student laboratory work | 100 |
| I-13 | Organize lesson plans | 98 |
| I-26 | Write student handout sheets | 96 |
| I-16 | Select course content | 95 |
| III-17 | Grade student projects | 94 |
| II-25 | Present principles through demonstration | 94 |
| III-1 | Administer written tests | 93 |
| II-6 | Direct student skill practice | 93 |
| VII-9 | Read text books | 92 |
| II-8 | Employ oral questioning | 92 |
| VI-3 | Advise students about employment | 91 |
| II-30 | Work problems before class | 91 |
| III-12 | Formulate multiple choice questions | 90 |
| I-5 | Maintain an instructional materials file | 90 |
| III-18 | Grade students class performance | 90 |
| IX-9 | Prepare news releases | 20 |
| IV-10 | Maintain financial records | 19 |
| IV-5 | Handle petty cash | 18 |
| IX-5 | Collect money for charities | 18 |
| VI-2 | Administer placement tests | 17 |
| VI-18 | Select students for the program | 16 |
| VI-19 | Set student selection criteria | 16 |
| VIII-4 | Conduct occupational needs surveys | 16 |
| II-21 | Present lessons using video tape | 15 |
| VI-13 | Evaluate student selection data | 15 |
| VIII-20 | Write proposals for funding | 15 |
| IX-6 | Collect tickets at school activities | 15 |
| II-29 | Teach extension classes | 12 |
| VI-11 | Conduct home visits | 12 |
| VII-17 | Write professional articles | 12 |
| VI-1 | Administer counseling tests | 10 |
| IX-10 | Sell activities tickets | 9 |
| IX-7 | Drive a school bus | 8 |
| VII-13 | Take correspondence courses | 7 |
| VII-18 | Write technical journal articles | 7 |

TABLE XIV
TOP AND BOTTOM DECIIE - - TOTAL RELATIVE TIIE REPORTED SPENT ON EACH TASK IN GROUP III

|  | Duty-Task | Total ${ }^{a}$ <br> Relative Time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| III-6 | Determine final grades | 109 |
| III-19 | Grade written tests | 109 |
| II-22 | Present lessons with a chalkboard | 107 |
| III-18 | Grade students class performance | 106 |
| I-26 | Write student handout sheets | 104 |
| II-10 | Give lectures | 102 |
| IV-8 | Maintain attendance records | 101 |
| I-17 | Select student projects | 100 |
| I-13 | Organize lesson plans | 99 |
| II-14 | Present lessons through problem solving | 99 |
| III-1 | Administer written tests | 99 |
| I-16 | Select course content | 95 |
| IV-2 | Attend faculty meetings | 95 |
| VI-3 | Advise students about employment | 95 |
| VII-10 | Read technical journals | 95 |
| I-15 | Prepare lecture outlines | 93 |
| VII-9 | Read text books | 91 |
| VIII-8 | Identify appropriate program content | 88 |
| I-5 | Maintain an instructional materials file | 86 |
| VI-6 | Advise students with scholastic problems | 84 |
| IV-3 | Collect fees | 25 |
| V-19 | Select laboratory (shop) space | 24 |
| IX-9 | Prepare news releases | 24 |
| IV-10 | Maintain financial records | 23 |
| VIII-20 | Write proposals for funding | 23 |
| IV-5 | Handle petty cash | 22 |
| III-8 | Formulate case-study problems | 21 |
| VII-3 | Conduct research | 21 |
| II-29 | Teach extension classes | 20 |
| IX-5 | Collect money for charities | 20 |
| VI-13 | Evaluate student selection data | 19 |
| VII-18 | Write technical journal articles | 19 |
| IX-6 | Collect tickets at school activities | 19 |
| VI-2 | Administer placement tests | 17 |
| VII-13 | Take correspondence courses | 17 |
| VII-17 | Write professional articles | 16 |
| VI-1 | Administer counseling tests | 13 |
| VI-11 | Conduct home visits | 12 |
| IX-7 | Drive a school bus | 10 |
| IX-10 | Sell activities tickets | 10 |

${ }^{\text {Number }}$ responding multiplied by weighted factor ( $0-5$ ) which indicated amount of time spent performing each task.

TABLE XV
TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - TOTAL RELATIVE TTIVE REPORTED SPENT ON EACH TASK IN GROUP IV

|  | Duty-Task | Total ${ }^{\text {a }}$ <br> 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-1 | 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 | 71 |
| I-21 | Set up demonstrations | 70 |
| I-23 | Write course objectives | 68 |
| 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 |
| IV-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 |
| VII-18 | Write technical journal articles | 10 |
| VI-2 | Administer placement tests | 9 |
| VI-11 | Conduct home visits | 9 |
| VII-13 | Take correspondence courses | 9 |
| VII-17 | Write professional articles | 9 |
| VI-I | Administer counseling tests | 5 |
| IX-7 | Drive a school bus | 5 |
| IX-10 | Sell activities tickets | 5 |

$\mathrm{a}_{\text {Number }}$ responding multiplied by weighted factor (0-5) which indicated amount of time spent performing each task.

TABLE XVI

> TOP AND BOITOM DECIIE - - PRODUCTS OF THE NUNBER OF AFFTRMATIVE RESPONDENIS AND THE TOTAL RELATIVE TTIE SPENT ON THE TASK IN GROUPS I, II, III, AND IV

|  | Duty-Task |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | Product |
| II-22 | Present lessons with a chalkboard | 46816 |
| II-10 | Give lectures | 49000 |
| III-6 | Determine final grades | 42292 |
| II-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 |
|  |  |  |
| VIII-1 | Adapt occupational surveys to local needs | 2720 |
| VII-20 | Write proposals for funding | 2627 |
| II-21 | Present lessons using video tape | 2448 |
| VI-18 | Select students for the program | 2370 |
| IX-5 | Collect money for charities | 2340 |
| VIII-4 | Conduct occupational needs surveys | 2277 |
| IV-5 | Handle petty cash | 1888 |
| IX-6 | Collect tickets at school activities | 1829 |
| VI-19 | Set student selection criteria | 1885 |
| IV-10 | Maintain financial records | 1674 |
| II-29 | Teach extension classes | 1624 |
| VI-13 | Evaluate student selection data | 1404 |
| VII-17 | Write professional articles | 1674 |
| VII-18 | Write technical journal articles | 1008 |
| VI-2 | Administer placement tests | 968 |
| VII-13 | Take correspondence courses | 640 |
| VI-1 | Administer counseling test | 714 |
| VI-11 | Conduct home visits | 346 |
| IX-10 | Sell activities tickets | 384 |
| IX-7 | Drive a school bus |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[^4]TABLE XVII
TOP AND BOITOM DECILE - - PRODUCTS OF THE NUMBER OF AFFIRMATIVE RESPONDENIS AND THE TOTAL RELATIVE TIME SPENT ON THE TASK IN GROUP I

|  | Duty-Task | Producta |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II-11 | Give students assistance in laboratory | 2862 |
| II-22 | Present lessons with a chalkboard | 2673 |
| I-15 | Prepare lecture outlines | 2565 |
| II-10 | Give lectures. | 2565 |
| II-26 | Supervise student laboratory work | 2548 |
| II-25 | Present principles by demonstration | 2444 |
| I-13 | Organize lesson plans | 2366 |
| I-17 | Select student projects | 2349 |
| II-6 | Direct student skill practice | 2088 |
| II-30 | Work problems before class | 2080 |
| III-6 | Determine final grades | 2025 |
| I-26 | Write student handout sheets | 1976 |
| III-1 | Administer written tests | 1976 |
| II-14 | Present lessons through problem solving | 1944 |
| IV-2 | Attend faculty meetings. | 1836 |
| I-5 | Maintain an instructional materials file | 1825 |
| VII-9 | Read text books | 1824 |
| II-9 | Give homework assignments | 1820 |
| II-8 | Employ oral questioning | 1776 |
| I-21 | Set up demonstrations | 1752 |
| VIII-4 | Conduct occupational needs surveys | 50 |
| II-21 | Present lessons using video tape | 45 |
| VI-18 | Select students for the program | 44 |
| VIII-1 | Adapt occupational surveys to local needs | 44 |
| II-29 | Teach extension classes | 40 |
| III-5 | Conduct drop-out studies | 40 |
| IX-6 | Collect tickets at school activities | 40 |
| IV-5 | Handle petty cash | 30 |
| VII-17 | Write professional articles | 28 |
| VI-13 | Evaluate student selection data | 28 |
| IX-9 | Prepare news releases ... | 24 |
| IV-10 | Maintain financial records | 24 |
| VII-18 | Write technical journal articles | 24 |
| IV-19 | Set student selection criteria | 21 |
| VI-1 | Administer counseling tests. | 8 |
| VII-13 | Take correspondence courses | 6 |
| IX-10 | Sell activities tickets | 4 |
| VI-2 | Administer placement tests | 1 |
| VI-11 | Conduct home.visits | 1 |
| IX-7 | Drive a school bus | 1 |

[^5]TABLE XVIII
TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - PRODUCTS OF THE NUNBER OF AFFIRMATIVE RESPONDENIS AND THE TOTAL RELATIVE TINE SPENT ON THE TASK IN GROUP II

|  | Duty-Task | Producta |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II-11 | Give students assistance in laboratory | 2889 |
| I-15 | Prepare lecture outlines | 2856 |
| II-10 | Give lectures. | 2754 |
| I-13 | Organize lesson plans | 2700 |
| III-6 | Determine final grades | 2678 |
| III-19 | Grade written tests | 2652 |
| I-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 |
| III-17 | Grade student projects | 2565 |
| III-12 | Formulate multiple choice questions | 2548 |
| II-8 | Employ oral questioning | 2484 |
| VI-3 | Advise students about employment | 2484 |
| II-30 | Work problems before class | 2454 |
| III-1 | Administer written tests | 2444 |
| VII-8 | Read professional journals | 2436 |
| IV-8 | Maintain attendance records | 2430 |
| I-23 | Write course objectives | 2408 |
| I-25 | Write lesson objectives | 2352 |
| IV-3 | Collect fees | 198 |
| IV-5 | Handle petty cash | 198 |
| IX-5 | Collect money for charities | 162 |
| IV-10 | Maintain financial records | 152 |
| VIII-20 | Write proposals for funding | 150 |
| VI-19 | Set student selection criteria | 144 |
| VIII-4 | Conduct: occupational needs surveys | 144 |
| VI-2 | Administer placement tests | 136 |
| IX-6 | Collect tickets at school activities | 135 |
| VI-18 | Select students for the program | 128 |
| II-21 | Present lessons using video tape. | 120 |
| VI-13 | Evaluate student selection data | 120 |
| II-29 | Teach extension classes. | 108 |
| VI-11 | Conduct home visits. | 96 |
| VII-17 | Write professional articles | 96 |
| IX-10 | Sell activities tickets . | 81 |
| VI-1 | Administer counseling test | 70 |
| VII-18 | Write technical journal articles | 49 |
| IX-7 | Drive a school bus | 48 |
| 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 RESPONDENIS AND THE TOTAL RELATIVE TIME SPENT ON THE TASK IN GROUP III

|  | Duty-Task | Producta |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| III-6 | Determine final grades | 3270 |
| II-22 | Present lessons with a chalkboard | 3210 |
| III-19 | Grade written tests | 3161 |
| I-26 | Write student handout sheets | 3120 |
| II-10 | 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 |

[^6]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 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II-10 | Give lectures | 2250 |
| II-11 | Give students assistance in laboratory | 2232 |
| II-22 | Present lessons with a chalkboard | 2231 |
| III-1 | Administer written tests | 2200 |
| II-26 | Supervise student laboratory work | 2184 |
| II-25 | Present principles by demonstration | 2088 |
| III-6 | Determine final grades | 2064 |
| III-19 | Grade written tests | 2040 |
| I-15 | Prepare lecture outlines | 2025 |
| I-16 | Select course content | 1975 |
| II-30 | Work problems before class | 1968 |
| I-13 | Organize lesson plans | 1950 |
| II-8 | Employ oral questioning | 1886 |
| I-17 | Select student projects | 1872 |
| VI-3 | Advise students about employment | 1800 |
| I-5 | Maintain an instructional materials file | 1728 |
| II-14 | Present lessons through problem solving | 1704 |
| VI-4 | Advise students about further education | 1704 |
| I-23 | Write course objectives | 1700 |
| I-21 | Set up demonstrations | 1610 |
| VIII-4 | Conduct occupational needs surveys | 144 |
| IV-3 | Collect fees | 136 |
| VI-19 | Set student selection criteria | 136 |
| V-19 | Select laboratory (shop) space | 133 |
| V-17 | Select classrooms | 128 |
| IX-6 | Collect tickets at school activities | 105 |
| IV-10 | Maintain financial records | 98 |
| VI-13 | Evaluate student selection data | 91 |
| II-21 | Present lessons using video tape | 84 |
| VII-3 | Conduct research | 84 |
| IV-5 | Handle petty cash | 78 |
| VII-5 | Participate in research studies | 66 |
| VI-2 | Administer placement tests | 63 |
| VII-11 | Conduct home visits . | 63 |
| VII-18 | Write technical journal articles | 60 |
| VII-13 | Take correspondence courses | 54 |
| VII-17 | Write professional articles | 45 |
| VI-1 | Administer counseling tests | 25 |
| IX-7 | Drive a school bus | 20 |
| IX-10 | Sell activities tickets | 20 |

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

arotal relative time divided by responses.

TABLE XXII
TOP AND BOTTOM DECIIE - - REPORTED NEAN RELATIVE TIME SPENT PERFORNING EACH TASK IN GROUP I

|  | Duty-Task | Mean time ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II-11 | Give students assistance in laboratory | 3.93 |
| II-26 | Supervise student laboratory work | 3.72 |
| II-22 | Present lessons with a chalkboard | 3.67 |
| II-6 | Direct student skill practice | 3.63 |
| II-25 | Present principles by demonstration | 3.62 |
| I-15 | Prepare lecture outlines | 3.52 |
| II-10 | Give lectures | 3.52 |
| I-13 | Organize lesson plans | 3.50 |
| II-7 | Direct student project work | 3.39 |
| II-14 | Present lessons through problem solving | 3.38 |
| III-6 | Determine final grades | 3.24 |
| I-17 | Select student projects | 3.22 |
| III-18 | Grade students class performance | 3.17 |
| VII-9 | Read text books | 3.17 |
| I-16 | Select course content | 3.13 |
| III-17 | Grade student projects | 3.13 |
| II-2 | Demonstrate manipulative skills | 3.10 |
| II-8 | Employ oral questioning | 3.08 |
| II-30 | Work problems before class | 3.08 |
| I-21 | Set up demonstrations. | 3.04 |
| V-19 | Select laboratory (shop) space | 2.33 |
| III-25 | Rate other teachers. | 2.33 |
| IV-12 | Maintain placement records | 2.17 |
| VIII-4 | Conduct occupational needs surveys | 2.00 |
| VI-1 | Administer counseling tests | 2.00 |
| VI-16 | Provide disciplinary action | 2.00 |
| VIII-20 | Write proposals for funding | 1.83 |
| II-21 | Present lessons using video tape | 1.80 |
| VI-13 | Evaluate student selection data | 1.75 |
| VII-17 | Write professional articles | 1.75 |
| II-29 | Teach extension classes | 1.60 |
| IX-9 | Prepare news releases | 1.50 |
| VII-18 | Write technical journal articles | 1.50 |
| VII-13 | Take correspondence courses | 1.50 |
| IV-10 | Maintain financial records | 1.50 |
| IV-5 | Handle petty cash | 1.20 |
| IX-10 | Sell activities tickets | 1.00 |
| IX-7 | Drive a school bus | 1.00 |
| VI-11 | Conduct home visits | 1.00 |
| VI-2 | Administer placement tests | 1.00 |

aTotal relative time divided by responses.

TABLE XXIII

TOP AND BOTTOM DECIIE - - REPORTED MEAN RELATIVE TIME SPENT PERFORNING EACH TASK IN GROUP II

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

arotal relative time divided by responses.

TOP AND BOTYOM DECIIE - - REPORIED MEAN RFTLATIVE TIME SPENT PERFORNING EACH TASK IN GROUP III

|  | Duty-Task | Mean timea |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| III-18 | Grade students class performance | 3.79 |
| III-19 | Grade written tests. | 3.76 |
| III-6 | Determine final grades | 3.63 |
| IV-8 | Maintain attendance records | 3.61 |
| I-17 | Select student projects | 3.57 |
| II-22 | Present lessons, with a chalkboard | 3.57 |
| I-26 | Write student handout sheets. | 3.47 |
| II-14 | Present lessons through problem solving | 3.46 |
| II-10 | Give lectures | 3.40 |
| I-16 | Select course content | 3.39 |
| I-15 | Prepare lecture outlines | 3.32 |
| I-13 | Organize lesson plans | 3.30 |
| III-1 | Administer written test | 3.30 |
| VII-9 | Read text books | 3.25 |
| IV-2 | Attend faculty meetings | 3.17 |
| VI-3 | Advise students about employment | 3.17 |
| VII-10 | Read technical journals. | 3.17 |
| I-5 | Maintain an instructional materials file | 3.07 |
| I-23 | Write course objectives | 3.07 |
| VI-6 | Advise students with scholas.tic problems. | 3.00 |
| VII-18 | Provide disciplinary action | 2.98 |
| VI-13 | Administer placement tests | 2.71 |
| VIII-4 | Conduct occupational needs surverys | 2.70 |
| VII-17 | Write professional articles | 2.67 |
| VIII-2 | Analyze occupational clusters | 2.55 |
| II-1 | Coordinate a cooperative work program | 2.55 |
| IX-5 | Collect money for charities | 2.50 |
| VI-11 | Conduct home visits | 2.40 |
| V-19 | Select laboratory (shop) space | 2.40 |
| VIII-20 | Write proposals for funding | 2.30 |
| IV-3 | Collect fees | 2.27 |
| IV-5 | Handle petty cash | 2.20 |
| IX-9 | Prepare news releases | 2.18 |
| VI-1 | Administer counseling tests | 2.17 |
| VII-13 | Take correspondence courses | 2.13 |
| III-8 | Formulate case-study problems | 2.10 |
| IX-7 | Drive a school bus. | 2.00 |
| VII-3 | Conduct research | 1.91 |
| IX-6 | Collect tickets at school activities | 1.73 |
| IX-10 | Sell activities tickets | 1.67 |

[^8]TABLE XXV
TOP AND BOTTOM DECILE - - REPORTED MEAN RELATIVE TIIE SPENT PERFORNENG EACH TASK IN GROUP IV

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

aTotal relative time divided by responses.

KENDALL COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE

| Concordance | Chi Square | I.D. Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.000000 | 398.00000 | 25 |
| 0.958278 | 381.39429 | 31 |
| 0.945261 | 376.21387 | 136 |
| 0.920002 | 366.16064 | 153 |
| 0.900455 | 358.38086 | 108 |
| 0.894843 | 356.14746 | 110 |
| 0.892503 | 355.21606 | 79 |
| 0.888724 | 353.71191 | 150 |
| 0.887966 | 353.41040 | 157 |
| 0.887767 | 353.33105 | 164 |
| 0.886627 | 352.87744 | 154 |
| 0.886193 | 352.70483 | 131 |
| 0.883668 | 351.69995 | 134 |
| 0.883330 | 351.56519 | 95 |
| 0.879132 | 349.89453 | 138 |
| 0.878758 | 349.74585 | 118 |
| 0.878518 | 349.65015 | 75 |
| 0.877787 | 349.35938 | 165 |
| 0.877293 | 349.16235 | 59 |
| 0.871704 | 346.93799 | 48 |
| 0.869328 | 345.99243 | 37 |
| 0.868092 | 345.50049 | 71 |
| 0.867476 | 345.25562 | 97 |
| 0.864987 | 344.26465 | 8 |
| 0.862156 | 343.13818 | 26 |
| 0.858781 | 341.79492 | 24 |
| 0.856748 | 340.98560 | 137 |
| 0.856529 | 340.89844 | 170 |
| 0.854776 | 340.20093 | 116 |
| 0.852992 | 339.49097 | 51 |
| 0.852628 | 339.34595 | 28 |
| 0.850160 | 338.36377 | 22 |
| 0.849998 | 338.29907 | 30 |
| 0.849656 | 338.16309 | 29 |
| 0.848461 | 337.68750 | 27 |
| 0.847280 | 337.21753 | 14 |
| 0.847163 | 337.17090 | 168 |
| 0.847130 | 337.15747 | 87 |
| 0.846501 | 336.90723 | 119 |
| 0.845185 | 336.38354 | 125 |
| 0.842005 | 335.11792 | 6 |
| 0.841652 | 334.97729 | 156 |
| 0.839267 | 334.02832 | 117 |

TABLE XXVI (Continued)

|  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 0.838511 | 333.72729 | 99 |
| 0.836781 | 333.03857 | 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 | 1 |
| 0.821413 | 326.92212 | 67 |
| 0.820981 | 326.75024 | 66 |
| 0.816864 | 325.11157 | 169 |
| 0.815893 | 324.72534 | 74 |
| 0.814774 | 324.28003 | 144 |
| 0.813848 | 323.91162 | 140 |
| 0.812768 | 323.48145 | 123 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 0.780693 | 310.71558 | 142 |
| 0.780596 | 310.67700 | 124 |
| 0.780047 | 310.45850 | 158 |
| 0.778477 | 309.83374 | 146 |
| 0.775378 | 308.60034 | 12 |
| 0.775123 | 308.49878 | 21 |
| 0.773502 | 307.85376 | 135 |
| 0.769241 | 306.15771 | 161 |
| 0.768656 | 305.92480 | 128 |
| 0.756243 | 300.98438 | 4 |
| 0.752126 | 299.34595 | 171 |
| 0.749424 | 298.27051 |  |
| 0.748208 |  | 78687 |
|  |  | 10 |
|  |  |  |

TABLE XXVI (Continued)

| 0.745033 | 296.52295 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 0.743365 | 295.85913 | 122 |
| 0.742187 | 295.39014 | 149 |
| 0.72435 | 287.92700 | 121 |
| 0.722584 | 287.58838 | 52 |
| 0.722472 | 287.54346 | 127 |
| 0.720777 | 286.86914 | 139 |
| 0.719044 | 286.17944 | 82 |
| 0.703675 | 280.06250 | 107 |
| 0.681591 | 271.27295 | 32 |
| 0.662099 | 263.51514 | 65 |
| 0.659698 | 262.55981 | 45 |
| 0.640307 | 245.84222 | 94 |
| 0.620999 | 247.15759 | 90 |
| 0.60494 | 242.57866 | 155 |
| 0.50000 | 199.00000 | 103 |
| 0.500000 | 199.00000 | 115 |
| 0.484759 | 192.93394 | 50 |
| 0.168317 | 66.99022 | 109 |
|  |  | 133 |

TABLE XXVII
KENDALL COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE FOR GROUP I RESPONDENIS

| Concordance | Chi Square | I.D. Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.958278 | 381.39429 | 31 |
| 0.892503 | 355.21606 | 79 |
| 0.886193 | 352.70483 | 131 |
| 0.883330 | 351.56519 | 95 |
| 0.868092 | 345.50049 | 71 |
| 0.850160 | 338.36377 | 22 |
| 0.848461 | 337.68750 | 27 |
| 0.846501 | 336.90723 | 119 |
| 0.842005 | 335.11792 | 6 |
| 0.838511 | 333.72729 | 99 |
| 0.823351 | 327.69360 | 1 |
| 0.815893 | 324.72534 | 74 |
| 0.812768 | 323.48145 | 123 |
| 0.801212 | 318.88208 | 42 |
| 0.801048 | 318.81689 | 111 |
| 0.787610 | 313.46851 | 143 |
| 0.786592 | 313.06348 | 81 |
| 0.773502 | 307.85376 | 135 |
| 0.722584 | 287.58838 | 127 |
| 0.722472 | 287.54346 | 139 |
| 0.719044 | 286. 17944 | 107 |
| 0.640307 | 245.84222 | 90 |
| 0.620999 | 247.15759 | 155 |
| 0.500000 | 199.00000 | 115 |
| 0.500000 | 199.00000 | 50 |

TABLE XXVIII
KENDALL COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE FOR GROUP II RESPONDENTS

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Concordance | Chi Square | I.D. Number |
| 0.945261 | 376.21387 |  |
| 0.900455 | 358.38086 | 136 |
| 0.887767 | 353.33105 | 108 |
| 0.877293 | 349.16235 | 164 |
| 0.86328 | 345.99243 | 59 |
| 0.86156 | 343.13818 | 37 |
| 0.854776 | 340.20093 | 26 |
| 0.849998 | 338.29907 | 116 |
| 0.847163 | 337.17090 | 30 |
| 0.847130 | 337.15747 | 168 |
| 0.841652 | 334.97729 | 87 |
| 0.836781 | 333.03857 | 156 |
| 0.834231 | 332.02393 | 91 |
| 0.834132 | 331.98438 | 132 |
| 0.833504 | 331.73462 | 148 |
| 0.833465 | 331.71875 | 96 |
| 0.828841 | 329.87842 | 17 |
| 0.828333 | 329.67651 | 101 |
| 0.821413 | 326.92212 | 23 |
| 0.814774 | 324.28003 | 67 |
| 0.813848 | 323.91162 | 144 |
| 0.806641 | 321.04297 | 140 |
| 0.801183 | 318.87061 | 152 |
| 0.782849 | 311.57373 | 38 |
| 0.780596 | 310.67700 | 49 |
| 0.775378 | 308.60034 | 124 |
| 0.768656 | 305.92480 | 12 |
| 0.720777 | 286.86914 | 128 |
|  |  | 82 |

TABLE XXIX
KENDALL COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE FOR GROUP III RESPONDENIS

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Concordance | Chi Square | I.D. Number |
| 1.000000 | 398.00000 |  |
| 0.920002 | 366.16064 | 153 |
| 0.887966 | 353.41040 | 157 |
| 0.878518 | 349.65015 | 75 |
| 0.877787 | 349.35938 | 165 |
| 0.871704 | 346.93799 | 48 |
| 0.867476 | 345.25562 | 97 |
| 0.864987 | 344.26465 | 8 |
| 0.856748 | 340.98560 | 137 |
| 0.856529 | 340.89844 | 170 |
| 0.849656 | 338.16309 | 29 |
| 0.845185 | 336.38354 | 125 |
| 0.839267 | 334.02832 | 117 |
| 0.831627 | 330.98730 | 73 |
| 0.820981 | 326.75024 | 66 |
| 0.816864 | 325.11157 | 169 |
| 0.798479 | 317.79468 | 113 |
| 0.797962 | 317.58862 | 19 |
| 0.796499 | 317.00659 | 141 |
| 0.794319 | 316.13892 | 77 |
| 0.785082 | 312.46240 | 35 |
| 0.769241 | 306.15771 | 161 |
| 0.752126 | 299.34595 | 145 |
| 0.743365 | 295.85913 | 149 |
| 0.742187 | 295.39014 | 121 |
| 0.723435 | 287.92700 | 52 |
| 0.662099 | 263.51514 | 45 |
| 0.609494 | 242.57866 | 103 |
| 0.484759 | 192.93394 | 109 |
| 0.168317 | 66.99022 | 133 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## TABLE XXX

KENDALL COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE FOR GROUP IV RESPONDENIS

| Concordance | Chi Square | I.D。Number |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 0.894843 | 356.14746 |  |
| 0.888724 | 353.71191 | 110 |
| 0.886627 | 352.87744 | 150 |
| 0.883668 | 351.69995 | 134 |
| 0.879132 | 349.89453 | 138 |
| 0.878758 | 349.74585 | 118 |
| 0.858781 | 341.79492 | 24 |
| 0.852992 | 339.49097 | 51 |
| 0.852628 | 339.34595 | 28 |
| 0.847280 | 337.21753 | 14 |
| 0.835035 | 332.34399 | 114 |
| 0.830993 | 330.73511 | 40 |
| 0.810701 | 322.65869 | 47 |
| 0.806806 | 321.10889 | 162 |
| 0.800870 | 318.74609 | 166 |
| 0.792209 | 315.29907 | 34 |
| 0.780693 | 310.71558 | 142 |
| 0.70047 | 310.45850 | 158 |
| 0.778477 | 309.83374 | 146 |
| 0.756243 | 300.98438 | 4 |
| 0.749424 | 298.27051 | 72 |
| 0.748208 | 297.78687 | 171 |
| 0.745033 | 296.52295 | 122 |
| 0.703675 | 280.06250 | 32 |
| 0.681591 | 271.27295 | 65 |
| 0.659698 | 262.55981 | 94 |
|  |  |  |

## FOOINOTES

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

## CHAPIER 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. Brzezinskil in her study was concerned with improving questionnaire techniques by studying such items as: (l) 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 Rummell ${ }^{2}$ 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: Byers ${ }^{3}$ to avoiding holidays, Schaefer ${ }^{4}$ 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 Til |  |  | Present Study Groups |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ne |  | I | II |  | IV |
| I-5 | Maintain an instructional materials file |  | X | X |  | X | X |
| I-13 | Organize lesson plans | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| I-15 | Prepare lecture outlines | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| I-16 | Select course content | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| I-17 | Select student projects |  | X | X |  | X | X |
| I-21 | Set up demonstrations | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| I-23 | Write course objectives | X | X |  | X |  |  |
| I-25 | Write lesson objectives |  |  |  | X |  | X |
| I-26 | Write student handout sheets | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| II-8 | Employ oral questioning |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| II-11 | Give students assistance in laboratory |  | X | X | X |  | X |
| II-14 | Present lessons through problem solving | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| II-9 | Give homework assignments | X |  | X |  |  |  |
| II-10 | Give lectures | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| II-22 | Present lessons with a chalkboard | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| II-25 | Present principles by demonstration |  |  | X | X |  | X |
| II-26 | Supervise student laboratory work |  |  | X |  |  | X |
| II-30 | Work problems before class |  | X | X | X |  | X |
| III-1 | Administer written tests | X | X | X |  | X | X |
| III-6 | Determine final grades | X | X | X |  | X | X |
| III-9 | Formulate completion test questions |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| III-12 | Formulate multiple choice questions |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| III-17 | Grade student projects |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| III-18 | Grade written tests |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| III-19 | Grade students class performance | X | X | X |  | X | X |
| IV-2 | Attend faculty meetings | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| IV-8 | Maintain attendance records |  |  |  | X | X |  |
| VI-3 | Advise students about employment |  | X |  |  | X | X |
| VI-4 | Advise students about further education |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| VI-6 | Advise students with scholastic problems | X |  |  |  | X |  |
| VII-2 | Attend professional meetings | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| VII-4 | Participate in professional organizations | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| VII-8 | Read professional journals | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| VII-9 | Read text books | X | X |  | X |  |  |
| VII-10 | Read technical journals | X |  |  | X |  |  |

TABLE XXXII
BOITOM DECIE - - NUMBER OF RESPONDENIS WHO REPORTED PERFORMING EACH TASK COMPARED WITH THE TINNELL SITDY AND THE PRESENT STUDY


TABLE XXXIII
TOP DECIIE - - TOTAL RELATIVE TIIES REPORIED SPENT ON EACH TASK COMPARED WITH THE TINNEL工 STUDY AND THE PRESENT STUDY


TABLE XXXIV
BOITOM DECILE - - TOTAL RELATIVE TIMES REPORIED SPENT ON EACH TASK COMPARED WITH THE TINNELL STUDY AND THE PRESENT STUDY


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

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

TABLE XXXVI
BOTTOM DECIIE OF THE PRODUCT RANKINGS COMPARED WITH THE TINNEL工 STUDY AND THE PRESENT STUDY

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

TABLE XXXVII
TOP DECILE OF THE MEAN RANKTNGS COMPARED TO THE TINNELL STUDY AND THE PRESENT STUDY


TABLE XXXVIII
BOTTOM DECILE OF THE NEAN RANKINGS COMPARED WITH THE TINNELL STUDY AND THE PRESENT STUDY


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 four duty-tasks 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 foive) 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 live) 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
I II III IV V VI VII VIII IX
Top Decile
Number of Respondents Total Relative Time Product Mean

| 9 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 9 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 |

Bottom Decile

| Number of Respondents | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Relative Time | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| Product | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| Mean | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 5 |

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 roange.
In addition:
Top Decile Duty-Task Bottom Decile Duty-Task
$54 \& 5 \quad 5 \quad 4 \& 5$

Number of Responses Total Relative Time Product Mean

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $30 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $70 \%$ |
| $30 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| $25 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| $25 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $55 \%$ |

While Maureen Byers ${ }^{5}$ found that certain time periods were to be avoided, Lorents ${ }^{6}$ 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.
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APPENDIX A

THE INSTRUMENT

## task inventory

## OCCUPATIONAL

## EDUCATION



## 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.

## $0 \times 9104$

HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU TAUGHT IN YOUR PRESENT POSITION? $\qquad$ HOW MANY TOTAL YEARS HAVE YOU TAUGHT? $\qquad$

CHECK THE TYPE OF INSTITUTION THAT YOU WORK FOR: COMMUNITY-JUNIOR COLLEGE VOCATIONAL SCHOOL[]

TECHNICAL INSTITUTE 「! 4 YEAR COLLEGE (OR UNIV.) [ ]

CHECK ALL OF THE DEGREES THAT YOU HOLD AND GIVE THE MAJOR SUBJECTS

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CERTIFICATE | $\square]$ |  |
| ASSOCIATE | $\square$ |  |
| BACHELORS | $\square$ |  |
| MASTERS | $\square]$ |  |
| DOCTORATE | [] |  |

WHAT OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTY DO YOU TEACH?
HOW MANY YEARS OF NON-TEACHING EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE HAVE YOU HAD IN YOUR SPECIALTY? $\qquad$

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 ( $\sqrt{ }$ ) IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN LABELED TIME SPENT.

TIME SPENT MEANS THE RELATIVE TIME YOO 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


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


Please rate by TIMR 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

| Listed below is a duty and tasks which it includes，check all tasks which you perform． Add any tasks you do which are not listed， then rate the tasks you have checked． |  | Time Spent <br> 1．Very little <br> 2．Below average <br> 3．About average <br> 4．Above average <br> 5．Very much <br> check（ $\sqrt{ }$ ）the appropriate column |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| －DUTY－ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2．Attend civic club meetings |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3．Attend school related social functions |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4．Chaperon student activities |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5．Collect money for charities |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6．Collect tickets at school activities | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |
| 7．Drive a school bus |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8．Participate in community activities |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9．Prepare news releases |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10．Sell activities tifckets |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11．Serve on committees | \＄\％\％\％ |  |  |  |  |
| 12．Sponsor student clubs | \％等知 |  |  |  |  |
| 13．Visit with other teachers | \％ 外 |  |  |  |  |
| 14．Work as a consultant |  |  |  |  |  |
| OTHER TASKS |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Please rate by TIME SPENT rather than importance of task

## APPENDIX B

NCHEM'S-WICHE LEITERS


## National Center for Higher Education Management Systems

WESTERN INTERSTATE COMMSSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION<br>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: (a) to 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.

fyn
Enclosure


# 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 15, 1975
JAMES FURMAN Washinglinan Curmancil

GEORGE KALUDIS
GEORGE KALUDIS
Vice Chairman)
Vanderbilt University
RUTHERFORD H. ADKINS
FRED E. BALDERSTON
University of California
EDWIN W. BEACH
National Advisory Council Chairman
State of Callionia, MAX BICKFORD Kansas Board of Regents
ALLEN T. BONNELL
Community College of Philadelphia
RONALD W. BRADY LATTIE F. COOR Washington University
KENNETH CREIGHTON
II.PH A. DUNGAN

Ni. Jersey Depariment
i)
Ilikicr Education
ILAN FERGUSON
Englund Board of
Higher Education
JMMES F. colid.AITSCHECK
Valencia Community College
PAUI. E. GRAY
huscetts institute
of Technology FREEMAN HOLMER Oregon State System of
Highcr Educution
DOUGLAS MacLEAN ROBERT MAUTZ
State University System of
WILLIAM R. McCONNELL
New Mctioo Boart of
Educational Finance
DONALD MCNEIL University of Maine
JAMES L. MILLER, JR.
Universify of Michigan
THEODORE MITAU
Minnesota State College Roard
GORDON OSBORN
Central Administration
State University of New York
JAMES A. ROBINSON
Maralester College
KEITH W. STOEHR
Gateway Technical Institute
JACK F. TOLBERT
The Bryman-Medix School
MARVIN WACHMAN
Temple University
FRED WELLMAN
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

# DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION 

Lansing, Michigan 48902

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DR. GORTON RIETHMILLER President
JAMES F. O'NEIL
Vice President
DR. MICHAEL J. DEED 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 0, 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,


Educational Research Consultant


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,
Alexadulation
Alexander W. Astin Professor

AWA: Rsv

APPENDIX C

COVER LEITERS


## -KLAMOMA STATE UNIVERSITY - STILLMATER

Departmeni of Technical Education
74074
Classsoom Euilding 406
(405) $372.6{ }^{2} 11$ i, Ext. 6287

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.

Cordiallv,

Donald S. Phillips
Head, Technical Education
Oklahoma State University
Enclosures


## OKLAMOMA SYATE UNIVERSITY • STILLNHATER



Department of Technical Education
October 16, 1974

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 belifeve 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 professiorial 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

[^9]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
Oklahora State University

Enclosure

APPENDIX D

INSIITUTIONS 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 formulated a group of 171 technical-occupation instructors for the original 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.

# VITA <br> John Douglas Wilhoit, Jr. <br> Candidate for the Degree of <br> Doctor of Education 

## Thesis: THE EFFECT OF VARIATION IN JOB ENPHASIS ON TASK INVENIORY RESUUTS

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.


[^0]:    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.

[^1]:    $a_{\text {Total number }}$ responding to a given task.

[^2]:    aTotal number responding to a given task.

[^3]:    aTotal number responding to a given task.

[^4]:    $\mathrm{a}_{\text {Responses }}$ multiplied by the total relative time.

[^5]:    aResponses multiplied by the total relative time.

[^6]:    ${ }^{\text {a Responses }}$ multiplied by the total relative time.

[^7]:    aresponses multiplied by the total relative time.

[^8]:    arotal relative time divided by responses.

[^9]:    Enclosures

