

OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES FOR MULTIPLE-TEACHER
DEPARTMENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

by

DONALD EUGENE ELSON

B. S., Kansas State University, 1958

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1968

Approved by:


Major Professor

LD
2668
T4
1468
E48
C 2

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his appreciation to all of the individuals who contributed their time to this study. Special attention is given to Dr. R. J. Agan, Professor of Education, College of Education, Kansas State University, for his valuable assistance and guidance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the problem	3
Limitations	4
Definition of terms	5
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	7
III. DESIGN AND PROCEDURE	13
Method	13
Measurement	14
Population	15
IV. FINDINGS	17
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION .	62
Summary	62
Conclusions	67
Recommendation	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY	70
APPENDIX A	73
APPENDIX B	79

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. There Should be at Least Twenty-five Students Per Teacher in a Multiple- Teacher Department	20
II. There Should be at Least Thirty-five Students Per Teacher in a Multiple- Teacher Department	21
III. There Should be at Least Forty-five Students Per Teacher in a Multiple- Teacher Department	21
IV. An Additional Teacher Could be Justified Because of a High Demand for Young and/or Adult Farmer Classes	23
V. An Additional Teacher Could be Justified Because of a High Demand for Specialized Training of High School Students	25
VI. Teachers Should Have a Direct Role in the Development of Policies for a Multiple- Teacher Department	25
VII. Administrator Should Have a Direct Role in the Development of Policies for a Multiple-Teacher Department	27
VIII. State Supervisory Personnel Should Have a Direct Role in the Development of Policies for a Multiple-Teacher Department	27

TABLE	PAGE
IX. Teacher Educators Should Have a Direct Role in the Development of Policies for a Multiple-Teacher Department	29
X. Assignment of Teaching Duties Should be Made Through Cooperation of All Teachers and the Administrator	30
XI. Assigned Responsibilities of Each Teacher Should be in Writing	30
XII. Definite Assignment Should be Made as to Responsibility for Completing Reports . .	32
XIII. Publicity Concerning the Department Should be Assigned to One Teacher	33
XIV. Students Should be Grouped into Classes According to Vocational Objective	36
XV. Students Should be Grouped into Classes According to Year in School	36
XVI. Teachers Should Share Equal Responsi- bilities in all Classes	37
XVII. Teachers Should Teach in Specialized Areas.	37
XVIII. Teacher Should be Assigned a Particular Group of Students and Present All Material to That Group	39
XIX. One Common Grading System Should be Used by All Teachers	39

TABLE	PAGE
XX. Teacher Should Make Supervisory Visits to Only Those Students He Has in Class . . .	41
XXI. Supervisory Visits Should be Made by the Teacher with a Specialization in the Area Which Corresponds to the Students' Needs	41
XXII. Teachers Should Make Supervisory Visits as a Team to All Students in the Department.	42
XXIII. Each Teacher Should Have at Least One Hour Scheduled During the School Day for Visitation	44
XXIV. Each Teacher Should Have Responsibilities with Young and/or Adult Farmer Classes .	44
XXV. One Teacher Should be Assigned All Young and/or Adult Farmer Classes	46
XXVI. Multiple-Teacher Department Should Have More Than One FFA Chapter	46
XXVII. All the Duties of the FFA Advisor Should be Assigned to One Teacher	48
XXVIII. Training of Teams for Contest Should be the Responsibility of the Teacher with an Interest in the Particular Area . . .	48

TABLE	PAGE
XXIX. Advisory Councils are Necessary for Effective Operation of a Multiple- Teacher Department	49
XXX. Each Teacher in a Department Should Have a Separate Classroom	51
XXXI. One Shop is Sufficient for a Multiple- Teacher Department	51
XXXII. One Teacher Should be Responsible for Stocking Shop Supplies	53
XXXIII. Scheduling Use of Department Facilities and/or Equipment Should be a Shared Responsibility of the Teachers in the Department	53
XXXIV. One Teacher Should be Designated as Head Teacher	55
XXXV. Head Teacher Should be Teacher with Most Experience	57
XXXVI. Head Teacher Should be Selected by Adminis- trator with Approval of the Teachers in the Department	57
XXXVII. Head Teacher Should be Selected by the Teachers in the Department with the Approval of the Administrator	59

TABLE	PAGE
XXXVIII. Head Teacher Should Have Authority to Make Decisions within the Policies of the School	59
XXXIX. Head Teacher Should be the Chief Spokesman for the Department with No Authority to Make Final Decisions	61
XL. Head Teacher Should Receive Compensation for Added Responsibilities in Monetary Form or by Reducing His Teaching Load .	61

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

I. INTRODUCTION

The National Vocational Education Act of 1917 (Smith-Hughes Act) in its purposes provided education for persons over fourteen years of age who had entered upon or were preparing to enter upon the work of the farm.¹ Phipps continued by stating, "Instruction in vocational agriculture under the terms of the act shall in every case provide for directed or supervised practices in agriculture."²

The Smith-Hughes and other acts were amended by the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Phipps pointed out that the 1963 Act "opens a whole new 'box' of opportunities in vocational agriculture," for vocational agriculture was expanded to include knowledge and skills in any agricultural subject and did not require work or directed or supervised practice on the farm.³ Programs of greater scope resulted in the need for multiple-teacher departments according to

¹Lloyd J. Phipps, Handbook on Agricultural Education in Public Schools (Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1965), p. 17.

²Ibid., p. 18.

³Phipps, Loc. cit.

Spradlin.⁴

The unification of small rural high schools in Kansas was assumed by the author to be a second factor affecting vocational agriculture departments. Fuller indicated that unification resulted in creation of larger departments of vocational agriculture and the need for multiple-teacher departments.⁵

Scarborough pointed out that the development of a rationale and effective procedures by Agriculture Education for the organization and operation of multiple-teacher departments had been entirely too slow.⁶ The number of multiple-teacher departments in Kansas increased from five to eleven in the nine years the writer of this thesis was teaching vocational agriculture in Southwest Kansas. At the time of the writing of this thesis, another department had expanded into a multiple-teacher department, two departments were planning to add the second teacher, and one two-teacher department had expanded the staff to four teachers. With the

⁴Douglas William Spradlin, "Organizing the Two-Teacher Department," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 39:111, November, 1966.

⁵Robert Dean Fuller, "Delegation of Responsibilities in a Multiple-Teacher Department of Vocational Agriculture" (unpublished Master's thesis, The Ohio State University, Columbus, 1963), p. 61.

⁶Cayce Scarborough, "Tradition vs Specialization," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 39:27, August, 1966.

offering of vocational agriculture programs of greater scope, increased numbers of students, and unification of the small rural high schools in Kansas, it was assumed that the number of multiple-teacher departments would continue to increase.

The investigator, in conversation with C. C. Eustace, State Supervisor for Agricultural Education, Kansas State Board for Vocational Education, was informed that operational procedures for multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture had not been developed on a state-wide basis in Kansas.⁷ Mr. Eustace indicated that guidelines for the establishment and/or operation of multiple-teacher departments were needed on a state-wide basis. Research on the operational procedures of multiple-teacher departments was necessary before the guidelines could be developed.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study was designed (1) to compare the opinions of teachers and administrators with experience in multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in Kansas, the state supervisor of Agricultural Education in each state, and the head teacher educator of Agricultural Education in each college or university preparing vocational agriculture

⁷C. C. Eustace, State Supervisor for Agricultural Education, Kansas State Board for Vocational Education, by interview, November, 1967.

teachers concerning the organizational and operational procedures of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture; and (2) to make recommendations based upon this study for the development of guidelines for establishment and/or operation of multiple-teacher departments in Kansas. A null hypothesis was used which stated that there was no significant difference in the opinions of teachers, administrators, state supervisors, and teacher educators concerning the organizational and operational procedures of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture.

III. LIMITATIONS

This study was limited to those factors related to justification, administration, teacher load, student grouping, Future Farmers of America, and facilities of a multiple-teacher department of vocational agriculture.

The review of related literature was limited to that written in the period 1961 to 1968. This period included the two years preceding the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the years following the Act to the time of the writing of this thesis.

The population in the study included those teachers and administrators with experience in multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in Kansas. It was assumed that the state supervisors and head teacher educators

had direct experience in multiple-teacher departments or indirect experience while serving as supervisors or teacher educators.

IV. DEFINITION OF TERMS

The terms included in this section are those which had a meaning special to this study and did not necessarily have the same meaning in other situations.

Administrators. School official directly responsible for the multiple-teacher department of vocational agriculture in Kansas and those who had been directly responsible for those departments within the five years previous to the date of this study.

Multiple-teacher department. Any department of vocational agriculture employing two or more reimbursed teachers of vocational agriculture.

State supervisory personnel. Members of the state supervisory staff of Agricultural Education, State Board for Vocational Education, in each state.

Teachers. Those reimbursed teachers employed to teach in a multiple-teacher department of vocational agriculture in Kansas and those who had taught in such departments within the five years prior to this study.

Teacher educators. Members of the staff of a college or university directly responsible for the preparation of

teachers of vocational agriculture.

High demand. A definite need exists in the community for a particular type of program.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Following the review of related literature, the author of this thesis concluded that research in the operational procedures of multiple-teacher departments was limited in the number of studies conducted since 1961. A search was made in the library of the Agricultural Education Office, Kansas State University and Farrell Library, Kansas State University. A search of the indexes for volumes 34 to 40 of The Agricultural Education Magazine indicated eight articles written on this subject.¹ Research listed in The Agricultural Education Magazine included three Master's theses, two staff studies, and one doctoral thesis on multiple-teacher departments.²

¹"Index to The Agricultural Education Magazine," The Agriculture Education Magazine, 35:36-40, August-September 1962; 36:35-39, August, 1963; 37:39-43, August, 1964; 38:45-48, August, 1965; 39:36-38, August, 1966; and 40:59-61, September, 1967.

²Gene M. Love, "Studies in Progress - 1966-1967," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 39:228-231, April, 1967; Glenn Z. Stevens, "Studies in Progress in Agriculture Education," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 37:73-77, September, 1964; Glenn Z. Stevens, "Research Studies of Past Two Years Are Listed," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 37:143-147, December, 1964; Glenn Z. Stevens, "Research Studies Completed in 1964," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 37:318-322, June, 1965; Glenn Z. Stevens, "Research Studies Completed in 1965," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 39:84-89, October, 1966; Glenn Z. Stevens, "Agriculture Education Research Studies Completed in 1966," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 40:92-95, October, 1967; David F. Shontz, "Studies Completed in 1966-67," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 40:206-214, March, 1968.

Scarborough wrote that tradition could be the major obstacle in the transformation from the one-man vocational agriculture department to the multiple-teacher situation. In the multiple-teacher department, the most important advantage over the traditional one-man department was the opportunity to specialize.³ Specialization was also suggested by Fuller, Horton, and Jacoby.⁴

Horton further pointed out that the decision to expand the staff to include a second teacher should be based on the all-day enrollment; number of adult classes; and other factors, such as need for a specialist, needs of the community, opinion of present teacher, and opinion of the advisory council.⁵

The successful operation of any multiple-teacher department, as indicated by Horton, was based on careful planning and a high degree of cooperation between the teachers.⁶

Fuller wrote that the over-all plan of the department

³Cayce Scarborough, "Tradition vs Specialization," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 39:27, August, 1966.

⁴Robert Dean Fuller, "Delegation of Responsibilities in a Multiple-Teacher Department of Vocational Agriculture" (unpublished Master's thesis, The Ohio State University, Columbus, 1963), p. 73; J. C. Horton, "Organization of Multiple-Teacher Programs," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 39:30, August, 1966; Walter Jacoby, "Policies and Practices in the Administration of Multiple-Teacher Vocational Agriculture Departments in the United States" (unpublished Doctor's thesis, University of Connecticut, Storrs, 1961), p. 192.

⁵Horton, Op. cit., p. 31.

⁶Horton, Loc. cit.

should result from the combined efforts of the teachers, the administrator, and the state supervisor.⁷ Bass found that the majority of duties in a department were shared by the teachers, yet no significant differences existed in the degree of satisfaction reported between duties which were assigned and those which were shared.⁸ In all articles and studies reviewed, cooperation was considered one of the most, if not the most important factor in the successful multiple-teacher department.

All teachers within the department and the advisory council should have key roles in the development of the objectives and curriculum of the vocational agriculture department according to the study made by Jacoby.⁹

Although the amount of authority and extent of duties varied when a comparison was made of the studies reviewed, it was generally agreed that the over-all responsibility for the operation of the multiple-teacher department should be delegated to a "head teacher".

A major problem in the operation of a multiple-teacher

⁷Fuller, Op. cit., p. 65.

⁸B. C. Bass, "A Study of Teacher Load and Teacher Duty Assignment in Multiple-Teacher Departments of Vocational Agriculture in Virginia," (staff study, Department of Agriculture Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, 1965), p. 2.

⁹Jacoby, Op. cit., p. 194.

department had been the division of the teaching load. Fuller found that sixty-five of the teachers surveyed preferred both high school students and adult students.¹⁰ Bass indicated that team teaching at all levels was the desired method of instruction of forty-six of the teachers.¹¹ The majority of respondents in the study by Bass also indicated a sharing of the teaching load, although he found two teachers working full time with out-of-school groups.¹² Horton indicated that responsibilities should be shared equally, but that an exchange of classes by teachers was desirable.¹³ Other methods of dividing teacher load suggested by the studies included: (1) a teacher staying with a class throughout the entire vocational agriculture program; (2) one teacher assigned all shop work and the other, the technical agriculture; (3) one teacher responsible for all phases for two years and the second teacher responsible for all phases the remaining two years; and (4) one teacher responsible for day-school and the second teacher responsible for youth and adult farmer classes.

Jacoby suggested that the method by which students were to be assigned to classes would have an effect upon the method of dividing the teaching load of the teachers.¹⁴ Two

¹⁰Fuller, Loc. cit.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Bass, Op. cit., pp. 1-2.

¹³Horton, Op. cit., p. 30.

¹⁴Jacoby, Op. cit., p. 196.

methods suggested were by grade and by vocational objective.

The studies were in agreement that the teachers should visit the students, both day-school and adult, whom they had in class. Visitation of students according to the specialization of the teacher and all students visited by two or more teachers as a team were suggested as alternatives.

Horton and Spradlin both indicated the need for two Future Farmers of America chapters within the single multiple-teacher vocational agriculture department.¹⁵ With two chapters, more boys were given the opportunity to develop their leadership ability, competition between the chapters resulted in a larger number of activities being accomplished, and activities, such as the parent-son banquet, could still be a joint effort of both chapters. Three of the studies reviewed (Bass, Fuller, and Jacoby), held to the traditional one department-one chapter concept with the teachers sharing the responsibilities of advisor.

Studies by Horton and Woodin recommended that the addition of a second teacher in the vocational agriculture department should result in the expansion of the facilities.¹⁶

¹⁵Horton, Loc. cit.; Douglas William Spradlin, "Organizing the Two-Teacher Department," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 31:111, November, 1966.

¹⁶Horton, Op. cit., p. 31; Ralph J. Woodin, "Facilities for Multiple Teacher Departments," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 36:247, May, 1964.

Horton and Woodin both recommended that the multiple-teacher department have two classrooms and one large shop.

Spradlin, in the opinion of the writer of this thesis summarized all the studies reviewed when he pointed out that:

The successful organization of a two-teacher department depends on: (1) Cooperation between teachers involved; (2) Well defined program of objectives; (3) Objectives that meet the student's need first--community needs second; (4) Organizational structure that will enable objectives to be accomplished; and (5) Adequate facilities.¹⁷

¹⁷Spradlin, Loc. cit.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

I. METHOD

This study was designed to compare the opinions of teachers and administrators with experience in multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in Kansas, state supervisors of Agricultural Education in each state, and the head teacher educator in each college or university preparing teachers of vocational agriculture.

An opinionnaire was developed which contained forty items directly related to multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture.¹ The items were developed from the conclusions and recommendations made in the articles and studies reviewed by the investigator. The respondents were to indicate their opinions to the items on the mailed opinionnaire by checking agree, undecided, or disagree.

Valuable assistance was given the investigator by six men in agriculture education.² Recommendations for improving the survey instrument were made by each of the men.

Telephone calls to the non-respondents within the state of Kansas were made eleven days after the mailing of the

¹See Appendix A, p. 73.

²See Appendix B, p. 79.

survey instrument. No follow-up was attempted on non-respondents from out-of-state.

This study was further designed to make recommendations for the development of guidelines for operational procedures of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture. Conclusion, which were recommended for use in the development of guidelines for operational procedures of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture, were drawn by the investigator, based upon this study. To be established as a conclusion, a statement on the opinionnaire must have received an agree or disagree response, depending upon the original statement, from a majority (51.00 per cent) of all respondents and had no more than three pairs of population groups which exhibited significant differences of opinions concerning the statement.

II. MEASUREMENT

The response from each population group was tabulated according to frequency for each statement on the opinionnaire. Percentages were calculated, based on the total number of opinionnaires returned from each population group. Although a statement or statements were not answered according to instructions, they were included in the calculation of the frequencies and percentages and were classed as unusable.

The chi-square method of statistical analysis was used

to test the null hypothesis. A combined chi-square value was calculated for each statement. If the value indicated no significant difference in the opinions of the four groups of population, no further calculations were made concerning that particular statement. When the combined chi-square value did not support the null hypothesis, a chi-square value was calculated for each of the pairs of groups, i.e., (1) teachers and administrators, (2) teachers and supervisors, (3) teachers and teacher educators, (4) administrators and supervisors, (5) administrators and teacher educators, and (6) supervisors and teacher educators. Unusable answers were not included in the chi-square calculations.

III. POPULATION

The population consisted of all vocational agriculture teachers teaching in multiple-teacher departments in Kansas and those who had taught in such departments within the five years previous to the date of this study; the school administrator directly responsible for each of the multiple-teacher departments in Kansas and those who had been directly responsible within the five years previous to the date of this study; the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education, State Board for Vocational Education, in each state; and the head teacher educator in each college or university directly responsible for the preparation of teachers of vocational agriculture.³

³See Appendix B, p. 79.

The names and addresses of the teachers and administrators were obtained from lists provided by the Kansas State Board for Vocational Education.⁴ Present addresses of former teachers and administrators were obtained by the investigator through telephone calls to the school in which they were employed and by checking the files of the Alumni Office, Kansas State University. Directories distributed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, were used to obtain the names and addresses of the state supervisor of Agricultural Education in each state and the head teacher educator in each college or university.⁵

The population consisted of forty-one teachers, twenty-one administrators, forty-nine supervisors, and seventy-six teacher educators. Since each group was small, the sample surveyed was the same as the population.

If an individual was a former teacher, but at the time of the study was serving in one of the other categories included in this study, he was considered in that category and not as a teacher.

⁴Directory - 1967-1968, (Topeka: Kansas State Board for Vocational Education, 1967). (Mimeographed.)

⁵Directory - State Supervisors of Agriculture Education. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Washington: Office of Education, October, 1967); Directory - Agriculture Teacher Trainers. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Washington: Office of Education, October, 1967).

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This study was designed to compare the opinions of teachers and administrators with experience in multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in Kansas, the state supervisor of Agricultural Education in each state, and the head teacher educator of Agricultural Education in each college or university preparing teachers of vocational agriculture concerning the organizational and operational procedures of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture. This study was further designed to make recommendations based upon this study for the development of guidelines for establishment and/or operation of multiple-teacher departments in Kansas. It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference in the opinions expressed by teachers, administrators, state supervisors, and teacher educators concerning the organizational and operational procedures of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture.

An opinionnaire with possible answers of agree, undecided, and disagree was sent to forty-one teachers, twenty-one administrators, forty-nine supervisors, and seventy-six teacher educators. Returns were received from thirty-six or 88 per cent of the teachers, nineteen or 90.5 per cent of the administrators, forty-one or 84 per cent of the supervisors,

and fifty-eight or 76 per cent of the teacher educators. A total of 154 or 82.4 per cent of the 187 opinionnaires mailed to the population were returned.

The results of the opinionnaire were tabulated according to frequency. Percentages were calculated based on the number of opinionnaires returned. Forty-four respondents omitted statements or checked two responses to one statement. These responses were not usable in the study.

The chi-square method of statistical analysis was used to test the null hypothesis. A combined chi-square value was calculated for each statement. If the value indicated no significant difference in the opinions of the four groups of population, no further calculations were made concerning that particular statement. When the combined chi-square value did not support the null hypothesis, a chi-square value was calculated for each of the pairs of groups, i.e., (1) teachers and administrators, (2) teachers and supervisors, (3) teachers and teacher educators, (4) administrators and supervisors, (5) administrators and teacher educators, and (6) supervisors and teacher educators. Unusable answers were not included in the chi-square calculations.

The tables in this chapter include the frequency, percentage and chi-square values. Chi-square comparison values of the pairs were included in cases where there were three or more of the pairs rejecting the null hypothesis.

In an attempt to determine the number of students per teacher in a multiple-teacher department, three statements establishing minimum limits on the number of students were used in the opinionnaire. The first statement limited the number of students to at least twenty-five, the second statement limited the number of students to at least thirty-five, and the third statement limited the number of students to at least forty-five per teacher. The three statements were grouped together for discussion purposes in this chapter. Tables I, II, and III include the data collected on the three statements. When all respondents were considered together, a trend could be observed. A majority (52.9 per cent) in Table I agreed that there should be at least twenty-five students. In Table II, a plurality (44.2 per cent) disagreed that there should be thirty-five students and in Table III, a majority or 64.67 per cent of all respondents disagreed that there should be at least forty-five students per teacher. The statements on the opinionnaire were designed in such a way that if a respondent considered thirty-five students per teacher to be the ideal number of students, he should have checked agree to items one (25 students) and two (35 students) and checked disagree to item three (45 students). The statements were not answered properly by seven teachers, four administrators, twenty-one supervisors, and twenty-two teacher educators. Due to that fact, the results in

TABLE I

THERE SHOULD BE AT LEAST TWENTY-FIVE STUDENTS PER
TEACHER IN A MULTIPLE-TEACHER DEPARTMENT

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teacher	24	66.67	2	5.56	10	27.77
Administrators	12	63.16	1	5.26	5	26.32
Supervisors	13	31.70	0	0	24	58.54
Teacher Educators	29	50.00	6	10.34	18	31.04
Combined chi-square value was 16.91.*						

Chi-square Comparison Values

Groups	χ^2 value**
Teachers and Administrators	0
Teachers and Supervisors	10.97
Teachers and Teacher Educators	1.55
Administrators and Supervisors	7.95
Administrators and Teacher Educators	.94
Supervisors and Teacher Educators	10.46

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

** .05 level of significance was 5.99.

TABLE II

THERE SHOULD BE AT LEAST THIRTY-FIVE STUDENTS PER
TEACHER IN A MULTIPLE-TEACHER DEPARTMENT

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	Per		Per		Per	
	N	cent	N	cent	N	cent
Teachers	10	27.77	4	11.12	21	58.34
Administrators	5	26.32	2	10.52	11	57.90
Supervisors	20	48.79	3	7.32	15	36.58
Teacher Educators	29	50.00	11	18.79	14	24.14
Combined chi-square value was 15.29*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE III

THERE SHOULD BE AT LEAST FORTY-FIVE STUDENTS PER
TEACHER IN A MULTIPLE-TEACHER DEPARTMENT

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	Per		Per		Per	
	N	cent	N	cent	N	cent
Teachers	4	11.12	2	5.56	29	81.05
Administrators	4	21.05	0	0	14	73.69
Supervisors	15	36.58	5	12.20	20	48.78
Teacher Educators	17	29.31	6	10.34	32	55.18
Combined chi-square value was 10.87.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

Tables I, II, and III were not valid and further discussion of frequencies, percentages, and chi-square calculations were of no value to the study.

Teachers, supervisors, and teacher educators, as indicated in Table IV, expressed the opinion that an additional teacher could be justified for young and/or adult farmer classes. Table IV, further shows that there were no significant differences in the responses of the teachers, supervisors, and teacher educators. The administrators indicated a division in their opinions concerning the additional teacher for young and/or adult farmer classes. The combined chi-square value of 45.98 was considerably above the critical value of 12.59 at the .05 level of significance. Significant differences at the .05 level existed in the opinions when the administrators were compared with the other population groups. Of the total number of respondents, 78.6 per cent agreed with the statement. One supervisor did not submit an usable answer to the statement.

All population groups expressed a high degree of agreement (90.9 per cent) with the addition of a teacher to give specialized training to high school students, yet all groups expressed some indecision (7.5 per cent) with the statement as indicated in Table V. One supervisor expressed disagreement with the statement. Answers which were not usable were given by one supervisor and one teacher educator.

TABLE IV

AN ADDITIONAL TEACHER COULD BE JUSTIFIED BECAUSE OF A
HIGH DEMAND FOR YOUNG AND/OR ADULT FARMER CLASSES

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per	N	Per	N	Per
		cent		cent		cent
Teachers	31	86.61	4	11.11	1	2.28
Administrators	8	42.11	3	15.78	8	42.11
Supervisors	38	92.68	1	2.44	1	2.44
Teacher Educators	54	93.11	3	5.17	1	1.72
Combined chi-square value was 45.98.*						

Chi-square Comparison Values

Groups	X ² value**
Teachers and Administrators	15.28
Teachers and Supervisors	2.30
Teachers and Teacher Educators	1.28
Administrators and Supervisors	21.19
Administrators and Teacher Educators	26.67
Supervisors and Teacher Educators	.48

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

**0.05 level of significance was 5.99.

At the .05 level of significance, there were no significant differences in the opinions expressed by the four population groups.

Administrators and teacher educators were in complete agreement with the statement that teachers should have a direct role in the development of policies for a multiple-teacher department. As shown in Table VI, two teachers and two supervisors were undecided as to the role of the teacher. One supervisor disagreed that teachers should have a direct role in policy development. The chi-square analysis at the .05 level of significance supported the null hypothesis that there were no significant differences in the opinions as expressed by the four population groups. One supervisor did not present a usable answer to the statement. The statement received a response of agree from 96.2 per cent of the respondents.

The administrators responded 100 per cent agree to the statement that administrators should have a direct role in the development of policies for a multiple-teacher department. Five teachers were in disagreement with the statement as indicated in Table VII, while twenty-eight or 77.78 per cent of the teacher group agreed with the statement. There were no disagreement expressed by either the supervisors or the teacher educators. The combined chi-square value indicated significant differences of opinion. Significant differences

TABLE V

AN ADDITIONAL TEACHER COULD BE JUSTIFIED BECAUSE OF A
HIGH DEMAND FOR SPECIALIZED TRAINING OF
HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per	N	Per	N	Per
		cent		cent		cent
Teacher	35	97.72	1	2.28	0	0
Administrators	16	84.21	3	15.79	0	0
Supervisors	37	90.24	2	4.88	1	2.44
Teacher Educators	53	91.38	4	6.90	0	0
Combined chi-square value was 6.48.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE VI

TEACHERS SHOULD HAVE A DIRECT ROLE IN THE DEVELOPMENT
OF POLICIES FOR A MULTIPLE-TEACHER DEPARTMENT

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per	N	Per	N	Per
		cent		cent		cent
Teachers	34	94.44	2	5.56	0	0
Administrators	19	100.00	0	0	0	0
Supervisors	37	90.24	2	4.88	1	2.44
Teacher Educators	58	100.00	0	0	0	0
Combined chi-square value was 7.08.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

in opinions were evident when chi-square values were calculated comparing teachers and supervisors and teachers and teacher educators. No significant differences in opinions were shown between teachers and administrators, administrators and supervisors, administrators and teacher educators, or supervisors and teacher educators. All respondents presented satisfactory responses to the statement. A total of 92.9 per cent of the respondents agreed with the statement.

It is shown in Table VIII that 68.42 per cent of the administrators, 73.17 per cent of the supervisors, and 63.79 per cent of the teacher educators expressed agreement with the statement that state supervisory personnel should have a direct role in the development of policies for a multiple-teacher department. Teachers as a group were undecided concerning the role of the supervisor as indicated by 47.22 per cent of the responses, while 44.45 per cent were in agreement with the statement and 5.56 per cent were in disagreement. The critical value of 12.59 at the .05 level of significance was well below the combined chi-square value of 20.85. Significant differences in opinions were evident when comparison values were calculated for the teachers and supervisors and the teachers and teacher educators. One teacher and one supervisor did not respond with usable answers to the statement. A total of 62.5 per cent of all respondents agreed, 23.4 per cent were undecided, and 12.8 per cent disagreed with the statement.

TABLE VII

ADMINISTRATOR SHOULD HAVE A DIRECT ROLE IN THE
DEVELOPMENT OF POLICIES FOR A
MULTIPLE-TEACHER DEPARTMENT

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	28	77.78	3	8.34	5	13.88
Administrators	19	100.00	0	0	0	0
Supervisors	40	97.56	1	2.44	0	0
Teacher Educators	56	96.55	2	3.45	0	0
Combined chi-square value was 20.35.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE VIII

STATE SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL SHOULD HAVE A DIRECT ROLE IN
THE DEVELOPMENT OF POLICIES FOR A
MULTIPLE-TEACHER DEPARTMENT

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	16	44.45	17	47.22	2	5.56
Administrators	13	68.42	4	21.06	2	10.52
Supervisors	30	73.17	4	9.76	6	14.63
Teacher Educators	37	63.79	9	15.52	12	20.69
Combined chi-square was 20.85.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

The administrators responded with a 68.42 per cent majority in agreement with the statement that teacher educators should have a direct role in the development of policies for a multiple-teacher department as shown in Table IX. The teacher educators were divided as a group, with 39.65 per cent responding agree and 36.21 per cent responding disagree. The combined chi-square value was 23.16 as compared to the critical value of 12.59 at the .05 level of significance. Significant differences at the .05 level in opinions existed between the teachers and administrators, teachers and teacher educators, and administrators and supervisors. Two teachers did not present usable responses to the statement. The percentages of total responses to the statement were 38.8 per cent in agreement, 31.0 per cent undecided, and 28.8 per cent in disagreement.

All population groups expressed a high degree of agreement with the statement that the assignment of teaching duties should be made through the cooperation of all teachers and the administrator as presented in Table X. The null hypothesis was supported at the .05 level of significance. Three supervisors and three teacher educators did not respond with usable answers to the statement. A total of 89.0 per cent of all respondents agreed with the statement, 1.1 per cent were undecided, and 6.8 per cent disagreed.

Table XI indicates no significant differences at the

TABLE IX

TEACHER EDUCATORS SHOULD HAVE A DIRECT ROLE IN THE
DEVELOPMENT OF POLICIES FOR A
MULTIPLE-TEACHER DEPARTMENT

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per	N	Per	N	Per
		cent		cent		cent
Teachers	9	25.00	19	52.77	6	16.67
Administrators	13	68.42	2	10.52	4	21.06
Supervisors	9	21.95	15	36.58	17	41.47
Teacher Educators	23	39.65	14	24.14	21	36.21
Combined chi-square value was 23.16.*						

Chi-square Comparison Values

Groups	X ² value**
Teachers and Administrators	8.58
Teachers and Supervisors	5.12
Teachers and Teacher Educators	9.59
Administrators and Supervisors	12.28
Administrators and Teacher Educators	4.83
Supervisors and Teacher Educators	3.76

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

**05 level of significance was 5.99.

TABLE X

ASSIGNMENT OF TEACHING DUTIES SHOULD BE MADE THROUGH
COOPERATION OF ALL TEACHERS AND THE ADMINISTRATOR

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	33	91.67	0	0	3	8.33
Administrators	17	89.47	0	0	2	10.53
Supervisors	35	85.37	1	2.44	2	4.88
Teacher Educators	52	89.66	1	1.72	2	3.45
Combined chi-square value was 3.49.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE XI

ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITIES OF EACH TEACHER
SHOULD BE IN WRITING

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	25	69.45	8	22.22	3	8.33
Administrators	14	73.68	2	10.53	2	10.53
Supervisors	35	85.37	3	7.31	1	2.44
Teacher Educators	39	67.24	10	17.24	5	8.62
Combined chi-square value was 6.50.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

.05 level existed between the opinions of the four population groups concerning the statement that the assigned responsibilities of each teacher should be in writing. Of the 154 respondents, one administrator, two supervisors, and four teacher educators did not present usable answers to the statement. The per cent of total respondents in agreement with the statement was 73.9, while 14.3 per cent were undecided, and 7.5 per cent disagreed.

When considering the definite assignment of the responsibility for completing reports, the combined chi-square value, as presented in Table XII, for all population groups was 19.87, which indicated a significant difference at the .05 level in the expressed opinions. When chi-square comparison values were calculated for each of the pairs, teachers and supervisors and teachers and teacher educators were the two pairs which contained significant differences in opinions. Three of the supervisors and three teacher educators did not respond with usable answers. A majority or 89.0 per cent of all respondents were in agreement with the statement, 6.2 per cent were undecided, and 1.7 per cent disagreed.

The data presented in Table XIII indicates that 56.09 per cent of the supervisors agreed that publicity should be assigned to one teacher. Administrators were divided as a group in their opinions with 36.84 per cent agreeing, 36.84 per cent disagreeing, and the remaining 26.32 per cent

TABLE XII

DEFINITE ASSIGNMENT SHOULD BE MADE AS TO
RESPONSIBILITY FOR COMPLETING REPORTS

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	Per		Per		Per	
	N	cent	N	cent	N	cent
Teachers	28	77.77	7	19.45	1	2.78
Administrators	18	94.73	1	5.27	0	0
Supervisors	37	90.25	0	0	1	2.44
Teacher Educators	54	93.11	0	0	1	1.72
<u>Combined chi-square value was 19.87.*</u>						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE XIII
PUBLICITY CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT SHOULD BE
ASSIGNED TO ONE TEACHER

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	6	16.67	3	8.33	27	75.00
Administrators	7	36.84	5	26.32	7	36.84
Supervisors	23	56.09	5	12.20	10	24.40
Teacher Educators	24	41.38	6	10.34	25	43.11
Combined chi-square value was 22.19.*						

Chi-square Comparison Values

Groups	X ² value**
Teachers and Administrators	7.80
Teachers and Supervisors	18.23
Teachers and Teacher Educators	9.50
Administrators and Supervisors	3.06
Administrators and Teacher Educators	3.15
Supervisors and Teacher Educators	3.47

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

undecided. A plurality of 43.11 per cent of the teacher educators disagreed with the statement. A 75.0 per cent majority of the teachers disagreed. The null hypothesis was not supported since the calculated chi-square value was 22.19, as compared to a critical value of 12.59 at the .05 level of significance. When comparison values between pairs were calculated, significant differences in opinions were observed between teachers and administrators, teachers and supervisors, and teachers and teacher educators. A plurality or 44.8 per cent of all respondents disagreed with the statement, 37.8 per cent agreed, and 14.3 per cent were undecided.

No significant difference at the .05 level was indicated in the opinions of the four population groups concerning the grouping of students according to vocational objective as shown in Table XIV, when a combined chi-square value was calculated. Teachers, supervisors, and teacher educators presented a plurality of opinions in agreement, while the administrators presented a plurality in disagreement. Answers not usable for the statement included one administrator, four supervisors, and four teacher educators. A plurality of 44.1 per cent of all respondents were in agreement, 27.6 per cent were in disagreement, and 22.8 per cent were undecided in their opinions of the statement.

Students should be grouped into classes according to year in school was the expressed opinion of 58.33 per cent of

the teachers, 63.16 per cent of the administrators, 51.22 per cent of the supervisors, and 65.52 per cent of the teacher educators as presented in Table XV. A chi-square value of 2.38 indicated no significant difference in the opinions of the four groups. The combined per cent of all respondents in agreement was 59.6. Unusable answers were given by one administrator, five supervisors, and four teacher educators.

Significant differences existed in the opinions between administrators and supervisors and between the administrators and teacher educators concerning the statement that teachers should share equal responsibilities in all classes. When the chi-square value was calculated, combining the four population groups, the result was 10.68, which was below the critical value of 12.59 at the .05 level of significance as shown in Table XVI. When all respondents were grouped, 46.2 per cent disagreed, 27.6 per cent agreed, and 21.8 per cent were undecided concerning the equal sharing of responsibilities in all classes. Respondents not presenting usable answers to the statement included one administrator, three supervisors, and three teacher educators.

All population groups as shown in Table XVII, expressed a high degree of agreement with the statement that teachers should teach in specialized areas. The null hypothesis was supported at the .05 level of significance. Three supervisors and five teacher educators did not respond with usable

TABLE XIV

STUDENTS SHOULD BE GROUPED INTO CLASSES ACCORDING
TO VOCATIONAL OBJECTIVE

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	Per		Per		Per	
	N	cent	N	cent	N	cent
Teachers	21	58.33	6	16.67	9	25.00
Administrators	5	26.32	6	31.58	7	36.84
Supervisors	20	48.78	7	17.07	10	24.40
Teacher Educators	25	43.11	15	25.86	14	24.13
Combined chi-square value was 5.73.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE XV

STUDENTS SHOULD BE GROUPED INTO CLASSES ACCORDING
TO YEAR IN SCHOOL

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	Per		Per		Per	
	N	cent	N	cent	N	cent
Teachers	21	58.33	6	16.67	9	25.00
Administrators	12	63.16	3	15.79	3	15.79
Supervisors	27	51.22	7	17.07	8	19.51
Teacher Educators	38	65.52	8	13.79	8	13.79
Combined chi-square value was 2.38.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE XVI
TEACHERS SHOULD SHARE EQUAL RESPONSIBILITIES
IN ALL CLASSES

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	7	19.44	9	25.00	20	55.56
Administrators	9	47.37	5	26.32	4	21.05
Supervisors	8	19.51	9	21.95	21	51.22
Teacher Educators	14	24.14	8	13.79	33	56.90
Combined chi-square value was 10.68.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE XVII
TEACHERS SHOULD TEACH IN SPECIALIZED AREAS

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	35	97.22	1	2.78	0	0
Administrators	17	89.47	2	10.53	0	0
Supervisors	34	82.92	3	7.32	1	2.44
Teacher Educators	46	79.31	4	6.90	3	5.17
Combined chi-square value was 4.76.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

answers. A total of 87.2 per cent of all respondents agreed, 1.9 per cent disagreed, and 6.9 per cent were undecided concerning the statement.

The null hypothesis, as shown in Table XVIII, was supported concerning the statement that teachers should be assigned a particular group of students and present all materials to that group. When all responses were combined, 56.7 per cent disagreed, 17.6 per cent agreed, and 21.7 per cent were undecided. There were three supervisors and five teacher educators not giving usable answers to the statement.

Table XIX indicates all the groups had the opinion that one common grading system should be used by all teachers. The combined chi-square value was 7.76, which indicated no significant difference at the .05 level in the opinions of the groups. With all groups combined, 76.7 per cent of the respondents agreed with the statement. Answers not usable to the study were presented by one administrator, three supervisors, and three teacher educators.

Differences in opinions were evident as indicated in Table XX within each of the groups concerning the statement that the teacher should make supervisory visits to only those students he has in class. The teacher group indicated a majority (58.34 per cent) for disagreement, the administrators a plurality or 42.11 per cent for agree, while supervisors and teacher educators had a plurality or 41.46 per cent and

TABLE XVIII

TEACHER SHOULD BE ASSIGNED A PARTICULAR GROUP OF STUDENTS AND PRESENT ALL MATERIAL TO THAT GROUP

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per	N	Per	N	Per
		cent		cent		cent
Teachers	7	19.45	10	27.77	19	52.78
Administrators	3	15.78	5	26.33	11	57.89
Supervisors	6	14.63	7	17.07	25	60.98
Teacher Educators	12	20.69	9	15.52	32	55.17
Combined chi-square value was 2.83.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE XIX

ONE COMMON GRADING SYSTEM SHOULD BE USED BY ALL TEACHERS

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per	N	Per	N	Per
		cent		cent		cent
Teachers	28	77.77	2	5.56	6	16.67
Administrators	12	63.16	3	15.79	3	15.79
Supervisors	34	82.92	2	4.88	2	4.88
Teacher Educators	48	82.76	3	5.17	4	6.90
Combined chi-square value was 7.76.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

41.38 per cent, respectively, for disagree. With these differences, no significant differences at the .05 level existed between the groups. Nine responses including two administrators, four supervisors, and three teacher educators, could not be used. A total of 44.5 per cent of all respondents disagreed with the statement, while 32.3 per cent agreed and 16.8 per cent were undecided.

As presented in Table XXI, a combined chi-square value of 1.63 was calculated on the opinions concerning the statement that supervisory visits should be made by the teacher with a specialization in the area which corresponds to the students' needs. This value was considerably below the critical value of 12.59 at the .05 level of significance, indicating that there were no significant differences in the opinions of the four population groups. A majority or 59.00 per cent of all respondents agreed with the statement. Five supervisors and three teacher educators did not respond with usable answers.

In response to the statement that teachers should make supervisory visits as a team to all the students in the department, the four population groups as indicated in Table XXII, responded with significant differences in their opinions. The combined chi-square value was 28.80, which was considerably above the critical value of 12.59 at the .05 level of significance. When the opinions of the teachers and

TABLE XX

TEACHER SHOULD MAKE SUPERVISORY VISITS TO ONLY
THOSE STUDENTS HE HAS IN CLASS

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	7	19.44	8	22.22	21	58.34
Administrators	8	42.11	2	10.52	7	36.85
Supervisors	15	36.58	5	12.20	17	41.46
Teacher Educators	18	31.04	13	22.41	24	41.38
Combined chi-square value was 6.71.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE XXI

SUPERVISORY VISITS SHOULD BE MADE BY THE TEACHER
WITH A SPECIALIZATION IN THE AREA WHICH
CORRESPONDS TO THE STUDENTS' NEEDS

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	21	58.33	10	27.78	5	13.89
Administrators	11	57.90	5	26.32	3	15.78
Supervisors	25	60.97	6	14.63	5	12.20
Teacher Educators	34	58.62	12	20.69	9	15.52
Combined chi-square value was 1.63.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE XXII

TEACHERS SHOULD MAKE SUPERVISORY VISITS AS A TEAM
TO ALL STUDENTS IN THE DEPARTMENT

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	14	38.88	9	25.00	13	36.12
Administrators	9	47.37	2	10.52	7	36.85
Supervisors	4	9.76	4	9.76	31	75.60
Teacher Educators	6	10.34	7	12.07	42	72.42
Combined chi-square value was 28.80.*						

Chi-square Comparison Values

Groups	χ^2 value**
Teachers and Administrators	1.51
Teachers and Supervisors	14.73
Teachers and Teacher Educators	15.45
Administrators and Supervisors	11.56
Administrators and Teacher Educators	13.26
Supervisors and Teacher Educators	.23

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

** .05 level of significance was 5.99.

supervisors, teachers and teacher educators, administrators and supervisors, and administrators and teacher educators were calculated, a chi-square value above the critical value of 5.99 at the .05 level was determined, indicating significant differences in opinions. No significant differences were found in the opinions of the teachers and administrators and supervisors and teacher educators. A majority or 55.3 per cent of all respondents expressed disagreement with the statement. Unusable responses were given by one administrator, two supervisors, and three teacher educators.

All population groups expressed a high degree of agreement with the statement that each teacher should have at least one hour scheduled during the school day for visitation. No significant differences at the .05 level existed between the groups as indicated in Table XXIII. Responses not usable to the study were presented by one teacher, one administrator, three supervisors, and three teacher educators. When all responses were considered, 74.8 per cent agreed, 6.2 per cent disagreed, and 13.9 per cent were undecided.

As presented in Table XXIV, a majority or 52.77 per cent of the teachers and a majority or 57.90 per cent of the administrators expressed agreement with the statement that each teacher should have responsibilities with young and/or adult farmer classes. A plurality or 46.34 per cent of the supervisors agreed with the statement, while the teacher educators were divided in their opinions with twenty-two or

TABLE XXIII

EACH TEACHER SHOULD HAVE AT LEAST ONE HOUR
SCHEDULED DURING THE SCHOOL DAY
FOR VISITATION

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	28	77.77	6	16.67	1	2.78
Administrators	12	63.16	5	26.32	1	5.26
Supervisors	31	75.60	3	7.32	4	9.76
Teacher Educators	48	82.76	3	5.17	4	6.90
Combined chi-square value was 9.07.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE XXIV

EACH TEACHER SHOULD HAVE RESPONSIBILITIES WITH
YOUNG AND/OR ADULT FARMER CLASSES

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	19	52.77	6	16.67	11	30.56
Administrators	11	57.90	5	26.32	3	15.78
Supervisors	19	46.34	5	12.20	15	36.58
Teacher Educators	22	37.94	12	20.69	21	36.20
Combined chi-square value was 6.63.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

37.94 per cent in agreement and twenty-one or 36.20 per cent in disagreement. When a chi-square value was calculated, no significant difference at the .05 level existed in the opinions of the four population groups. Two supervisors and three teacher educators did not present usable answers. When all respondents were considered as a group, 48.7 per cent agreed, 29.8 per cent disagreed, and 19.0 per cent were undecided concerning each teacher's responsibility with young and/or adult farmer classes.

Pluralities for disagreement were expressed by the four population groups, as indicated in Table XXV, to the statement that one teacher should be assigned all young and/or adult farmer classes. No significant differences in opinions at the .05 level were indicated by the chi-square analysis. Three supervisors and three teacher educators did not present usable answers. When all respondents were considered, 48.5 per cent disagreed, 24.7 per cent agreed, and 23.7 per cent were undecided concerning the statement.

Significant differences at the .05 level did not exist between the opinions of the four population groups concerning the statement that multiple-teacher departments should have more than one F.F.A. chapter. Table XXVI indicates that a majority or 79.3 per cent of all respondents disagreed with the statement. Responses which were not usable, were presented by two supervisors and three teacher educators.

TABLE XXV

ONE TEACHER SHOULD BE ASSIGNED ALL YOUNG AND/OR
ADULT FARMER CLASSES

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	10	27.77	11	30.56	15	41.67
Administrators	2	10.52	3	15.79	14	73.69
Supervisors	12	29.27	10	24.39	16	39.02
Teacher Educators	18	31.04	14	24.14	23	39.65
Combined chi-square value was 7.36.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE XXVI

MULTIPLE-TEACHER DEPARTMENT SHOULD HAVE MORE
THAN ONE PFA CHAPTER

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	2	5.56	4	11.11	30	83.33
Administrators	2	10.53	2	10.53	15	78.94
Supervisors	5	12.20	3	7.32	31	75.60
Teacher Educators	6	10.35	3	5.17	46	79.31
Combined chi-square value was 2.25.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

The supervisors responded with a 48.78 per cent plurality in agreement with the statement that all duties of the F.F.A. advisor should be assigned to one teacher. The three remaining population groups, as shown in Table XXVII, responded with a majority in disagreement. Disagreement was expressed by 54.4 per cent of all respondents with no significant differences in opinions. Three administrators, one supervisor, and two teacher educators responded with unusable answers.

Table XXVIII indicates that the four population groups expressed a high degree of agreement with the statement that training of teams for contests should be the responsibility of the teacher with an interest in the particular area. The combined chi-square value of 4.72 was considerably below the critical value of 12.59 at the .05 level, indicating no significant differences in the opinion of the four groups. Responses from two administrators, one supervisor and two teacher educators were not usable. All respondents, when considered as a group, responded with 83.5 per cent agree, 7.0 per cent disagree, and 5.4 per cent undecided.

Table XXIX indicates that significant differences at the .05 level existed in the opinions of the four population groups concerning the necessity of advisory councils for the effective operation of a multiple-teacher department. When the chi-square comparison values were calculated for each of

TABLE XXVII

ALL THE DUTIES OF THE FFA ADVISOR SHOULD BE
ASSIGNED TO ONE TEACHER

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	12	33.34	1	2.78	23	63.88
Administrators	5	26.32	0	0	11	57.90
Supervisors	20	48.78	4	9.76	16	39.02
Teacher Educators	18	31.04	5	8.62	33	56.89
Combined chi-square value was 8.84.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE XXVIII

TRAINING OF TEAMS FOR CONTESTS SHOULD BE THE
RESPONSIBILITY OF THE TEACHER WITH AN
INTEREST IN THE PARTICULAR AREA

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	33	91.66	1	2.78	2	5.56
Administrators	16	84.21	1	5.26	0	0
Supervisors	33	80.48	2	4.88	5	12.20
Teacher Educators	45	77.58	5	8.62	6	10.35
Combined chi-square value was 4.72.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE XXIX

ADVISORY COUNCILS ARE NECESSARY FOR EFFECTIVE
OPERATION OF A MULTIPLE-TEACHER DEPARTMENT

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	14	38.89	12	33.34	10	27.77
Administrators	12	63.17	2	10.52	3	15.79
Supervisors	35	85.36	1	2.44	3	7.32
Teacher Educators	46	79.30	4	6.90	6	10.35
Combined chi-square value was 30.48.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

the pairs, significant differences existed between the opinions of teacher and supervisors and teachers and teacher educators. Teachers did not consider the advisory council as necessary as did the administrators, supervisors, and teacher educators. Of the 154 respondents, 106 or 66.7 per cent considered the advisory council necessary for effective operation of a multiple-teacher department. Two administrators, two supervisors, and two teacher educators did not give usable answers to the statement.

No significant differences existed at the .05 level in the opinions of the four population groups concerning the need for separate classrooms for each teacher in a multiple-teacher department. Agreement with the statement as shown in Table XXX, was expressed by 61.12 per cent of the teachers, 63.16 per cent of the administrators, and 50.00 per cent of the teacher educators. A plurality of 43.90 per cent of the supervisors were in agreement with the statement. When all groups were considered together, 54.5 per cent were in agreement, 28.2 per cent disagreed, and 10.7 per cent were undecided. Unusable responses were given by two administrators, three supervisors, and five teacher educators.

As presented in Table XXXI, a high degree of agreement with the statement that one shop is sufficient for a multiple-teacher department was expressed by each of the four population groups. No significant differences existed at the .05 level

TABLE XXX

EACH TEACHER IN A DEPARTMENT SHOULD HAVE A
SEPARATE CLASSROOM

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per	N	Per	N	Per
		cent		cent		cent
Teachers	22	61.12	4	11.11	10	27.77
Administrators	12	63.16	1	5.26	4	21.06
Supervisors	18	43.90	3	7.32	17	41.46
Teacher Educators	29	50.00	11	18.97	13	22.41
Combined chi-square value was 8.28.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE XXXI

ONE SHOP IS SUFFICIENT FOR A
MULTIPLE-TEACHER DEPARTMENT

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per	N	Per	N	Per
		cent		cent		cent
Teachers	27	75.00	3	8.33	6	16.67
Administrators	10	52.64	4	21.05	3	15.79
Supervisors	30	73.17	6	14.63	4	9.76
Teacher Educators	45	77.58	8	13.80	3	5.17
Combined chi-square value was 6.18.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

of significance. Five respondents, including two administrators, one supervisor, and two teacher educators, did not present usable responses. When total response was considered, 69.6 per cent of all respondents agreed with the statement.

A majority or 68.43 per cent of the administrators, 75.61 per cent of the supervisors, and 74.13 per cent of the teacher educators expressed agreement with the statement that one teacher should be responsible for stocking shop supplies as shown in Table XXXII. Teachers responded with a plurality or 47.22 per cent for disagreement and 41.67 per cent for agreement. The combined chi-square value was 15.78, indicating significant differences in opinions at the .05 level. When chi-square comparison values were calculated on pairs of groups, significant differences in opinions existed at the .05 level between the teachers and supervisors and the teachers and teacher educators. Sixty-five per cent of all respondents were in agreement with the statement. Responses received from one teacher, two administrators, one supervisor, and two teacher educators were not usable.

No significant differences at the .05 level were evident between the four population groups concerning scheduling use of department facilities and/or equipment as a shared responsibility of the teachers in the department. As presented in Table XXXIII, the administrators agreed 84.21 per cent with the statement, while 91.66 per cent of the teachers, 80.48

TABLE XXXII

ONE TEACHER SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR STOCKING
SHOP SUPPLIES

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per	N	Per	N	Per
		cent		cent		cent
Teachers	17	41.67	3	8.33	15	47.22
Administrators	13	68.43	2	10.52	2	10.52
Supervisors	31	75.61	0	0	9	21.95
Teacher Educators	43	74.13	5	8.62	8	13.80
Combined chi-square value was 15.78.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE XXXIII

SCHEDULING USE OF DEPARTMENT FACILITIES AND/OR
EQUIPMENT SHOULD BE A SHARED RESPONSIBILITY
OF THE TEACHERS IN THE DEPARTMENT

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per	N	Per	N	Per
		cent		cent		cent
Teachers	33	91.66	1	2.78	2	5.56
Administrators	16	84.21	0	0	0	0
Supervisors	33	80.48	4	9.76	2	4.88
Teacher Educators	49	84.48	1	1.72	6	10.35
Combined chi-square value was 8.10.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

per cent of the teacher educators agreed. Three administrators, two supervisors, and two teacher educators did not give usable answers.

Table XXXIV indicates that 92.68 per cent of the supervisors and 89.65 per cent of the teacher educators agreed that one teacher should be designated as head teacher in a multiple-teacher department. A majority or 69.45 per cent of the teachers and 63.17 per cent of the administrators agreed, but 16.67 per cent of the teachers disagreed and 13.88 per cent were undecided, while 10.52 per cent of the administrators were in disagreement and 10.52 per cent were undecided. These differences were found to be significant at the .05 level when the combined chi-square value was calculated. When chi-square comparison values were calculated for the pairs of groups, it was found that significant differences existed at the .05 level between the opinions of teachers and supervisors, teachers and teacher educators, and administrators and supervisors. In responding to the statement, three administrators, one supervisor, and two teacher educators gave unusable answers. A total of 78.7 per cent of all respondents agreed with the statement.

The remaining discussion of findings in this chapter was based on the 127 agree responses to the statement concerning the designation of a head teacher as shown in Table XXXIV. The agree responses included twenty-five teachers, twelve

TABLE XXXIV
 ONE TEACHER SHOULD BE DESIGNATED
 AS HEAD TEACHER

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	25	69.45	5	13.88	6	16.67
Administrators	12	63.17	2	10.52	2	10.52
Supervisors	38	92.68	2	4.88	0	0
Teacher Educators	52	89.65	2	3.45	2	3.45
<u>Combined chi-square value was 15.03.*</u>						

Chi-square Comparison Values

Groups	X ² value**
Teachers and Administrators	.18
Teachers and Supervisors	9.77
Teachers and Teacher Educators	8.85
Administrators - Supervisors	6.42
Administrators - Teacher Educators	3.91
<u>Supervisors - Teacher Educators</u>	<u>2.53</u>

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

** .05 level of significance was 5.99.

administrators, thirty-eight supervisors, and fifty-two teacher educators.

Concerning the statement that the head teacher should be the teacher with the most experience, 48.00 per cent of the teachers agreed with the statement as reported in Table XXXV, while 32 per cent disagreed and 20 per cent of the teachers were undecided. At the other extreme, the twelve administrators indicated 58.33 per cent disagreed and 33.34 per cent were undecided with one response not usable. While being divided on their opinions, a plurality of both supervisors (47.37 per cent) and teacher educators (44.23 per cent) disagreed with the statement. The null hypothesis was supported by chi-square analysis at the .05 level of significance. A plurality of 45.5 per cent of all respondents disagreed with the statement. One administrator, four supervisors, and two teacher educators did not respond with usable answers.

Eighty per cent of the teachers, 66.67 per cent of the administrators, 63.16 per cent of the supervisors, and 69.23 per cent of the teacher educators as shown in Table XXXVI expressed agreement with the statement that the head teacher should be selected by the administrator with the approval of the teachers in the department. No significant differences in opinions existed at the .05 level. The respondents, when considered as a group, responded with 69.8 per cent agree, 13.4 per cent disagree, and 13.6 per cent undecided. Five

TABLE XXXV

HEAD TEACHER SHOULD BE TEACHER WITH
MOST EXPERIENCE

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	12	48.00	5	20.00	8	32.00
Administrators	0	0	4	33.34	7	58.33
Supervisors	10	26.32	6	15.79	18	47.37
Teacher Educators	13	25.00	14	26.92	23	44.23
Combined chi-square value was 9.95.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE XXXVI

HEAD TEACHER SHOULD BE SELECTED BY ADMINISTRATOR WITH
APPROVAL OF THE TEACHERS IN THE DEPARTMENT

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	20	80.00	2	8.00	3	12.00
Administrators	8	66.67	3	25.00	1	8.33
Supervisors	24	63.16	3	7.89	6	15.79
Teacher Educators	36	69.23	7	13.46	9	17.31
Combined chi-square value was 3.43.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

supervisors did not present usable responses.

Disagreement with the statement that the head teacher should be selected by the teachers in the department with the approval of the administrator was expressed by 64.00 per cent of the teachers, 83.34 per cent of the administrators, 60.53 per cent of the supervisors, and 59.62 per cent of the teacher educators as presented in Table XXXVII. The combined chi-square value of 3.24 was considerably below the critical value of 12.59, indicating no significant differences in the opinions of the four population groups at the .05 level. Of the 127 responses, 66.9 per cent disagreed with the statement, 16.6 per cent agreed, and 14.0 per cent were undecided. Three supervisors and one teacher educator did not respond with usable answers.

As shown in Table XXXVIII, no significant differences existed at the .05 level in the opinions of the four population groups concerning the statement that the head teacher should have the authority to make decisions within the policies of the school. A majority of each of the four population groups agreed with the statement. Based on the answers of 127 possible respondents, a total of 88.6 per cent agreed with the statement. One supervisor did not give a usable response.

Although no significant differences existed at the .05 level in the opinions of the four population groups concerning the statement that the head teacher should be the chief

TABLE XXXVII

HEAD TEACHER SHOULD BE SELECTED BY THE TEACHERS IN THE DEPARTMENT WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	4	16.00	5	20.00	16	64.00
Administrators	1	8.33	1	8.33	10	83.34
Supervisors	8	21.05	4	10.53	23	60.53
Teacher Educators	11	21.15	9	17.31	31	59.62
Combined chi-square value was 3.24.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE XXXVIII

HEAD TEACHER SHOULD HAVE AUTHORITY TO MAKE DECISIONS WITHIN THE POLICIES OF THE SCHOOL

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	22	88.00	1	4.00	2	8.00
Administrators	10	83.34	0	0	2	16.66
Supervisors	33	86.85	3	7.89	1	2.63
Teacher Educators	50	96.16	1	1.92	1	1.92
Combined chi-square value was 8.08.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

spokesman for the department with no authority to make final decisions, differences did exist as noted in Table XXXIX. The teachers were divided as a group with 44.00 per cent agreed and 44.00 per cent disagreed. Twelve per cent of the teachers were undecided. A plurality or 41.67 per cent of the administrators agreed with the statement. Majorities for disagree were given by the supervisors (60.53 per cent) and the teacher educators (55.76 per cent). When all respondents were combined, a plurality of 48.4 per cent disagreed with the statement, 37.8 per cent agreed, and 8.8 per cent were undecided. One administrator, three supervisors, and two teacher educators gave unusable responses.

Table XL indicates that 92.00 per cent of the teachers and 91.67 per cent of the administrators agreed with the statement that the head teacher should receive compensation for added responsibilities in monetary form or by reducing his teaching load, while one or 4.00 per cent of the teachers and none of the administrators disagreed. Table XL shows that the supervisors and teacher educators agreed, but each group had three responses which disagreed. The chi-square analysis resulted in supporting the null hypothesis. A total of 88.0 per cent of all respondents agreed with the statement. Responses from one supervisor and two teacher educators were not usable.

TABLE XXXIX

HEAD TEACHER SHOULD BE THE CHIEF SPOKESMAN FOR THE
DEPARTMENT WITH NO AUTHORITY TO MAKE
FINAL DECISIONS

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	11	44.00	3	12.00	11	44.00
Administrators	5	41.67	2	16.66	4	33.34
Supervisors	11	28.95	1	2.63	23	60.53
Teacher Educators	19	36.54	2	3.85	29	55.76
Combined chi-square value was 7.40.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

TABLE XL

HEAD TEACHER SHOULD RECEIVE COMPENSATION FOR ADDED
RESPONSIBILITIES IN MONETARY FORM OR BY REDUCING
HIS TEACHING LOAD

	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Teachers	23	92.00	1	4.00	1	4.00
Administrators	11	91.67	1	8.33	0	0
Supervisors	31	81.58	3	7.89	3	7.89
Teacher Educators	45	86.54	2	3.85	3	5.76
Combined chi-square value was 2.23.*						

*.05 level of significance was 12.59.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

Teachers and administrators, with experience in multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in Kansas, the state supervisor of Agricultural Education in each state, and the head teacher educator of Agricultural Education in each college or university preparing teachers of vocational agriculture expressed their opinions concerning the operational procedures of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture on an opinionnaire which contained possible answers of agree, undecided, and disagree. The study was designed to compare the 154 responses of the four population groups by frequencies and percentages. A null hypothesis, which stated that there would be no significant differences in the opinions of the four groups was tested by use of the chi-square method of statistical analysis.

The findings of this study were summarized as follows:

(1) The findings pertaining to the minimum number of students per teacher in a multiple-teacher department were not valid because of improper responses to the statements on the opinionnaire.

(2) It was found that, although a majority of all respondents agreed that an additional teacher could be

justified because of a high demand for young and/or adult farmer classes, three pairs of the population groups had significant differences in their opinions. The four population groups agreed that an additional teacher could be justified because of a high demand for specialized training for high school students and that there were no significant differences in the opinions.

(3) A majority of the respondents agreed that teachers, administrators, and supervisors should have a direct role in the development of policies of a multiple-teacher department. No significant differences in opinions were evident concerning the teachers' role, but significant differences did exist in expressed opinions concerning the roles of administrators and supervisors. A slight plurality in agreement was received concerning the role of teacher educators in policy development and significant differences in opinions were evident.

(4) A majority of all population groups agreed, with no significant differences in opinions, that the assignment of teaching duties should be made through the cooperation of all teachers and the administrator and that those assignments should be in writing. Significant differences in opinions were expressed by the groups concerning the assignment of responsibilities for completion of reports, yet a majority of all respondents were in agreement with the statement. A plurality of all respondents were in disagreement that

publicity should be assigned to one teacher and significant differences existed in the opinions of the four population groups concerning the statement.

(5) The grouping of students by vocational objective and by year in school received responses with no significant differences in expressed opinions. A plurality of respondents agreed to vocational grouping, while a majority agreed to grouping of students by year in school.

(6) Teaching in specialized areas received a response of agree from a majority of the respondents. Disagreement was expressed by a majority of respondents to the teachers sharing equal responsibilities in all classes and to the assignment of a particular group of students to one teacher. No significant differences in opinions were evident in the three statements by chi-square analysis, when all population groups were combined. The four population groups expressed a high degree of agreement with no significant differences in opinions concerning one common grading system.

(7) It was agreed by a majority of the respondents, with no significant difference in opinions between groups, that supervisory visits should be made by the teacher with a specialization in the area of the student's needs and that at least one hour should be scheduled during the school day for the visits. The respondents, with no significant difference in opinions, disagreed that a teacher should make

supervisory visits to only those students he had in class. Significant differences did exist in the opinions when a majority of all respondents disagreed that teachers should make supervisory visits as a team.

(8) No significant differences in the opinions of the four population groups existed when a plurality agreed that each teacher should have responsibilities with young and/or adult farmer classes and a plurality disagreed that one teacher should be assigned all young and/or adult farmer classes.

(9) A majority of all respondents disagreed that there should be more than one F.F.A. chapter in a multiple-teacher department and that the duties of advisor should be assigned to one teacher. A majority agreed that training of teams should be the responsibility of the teacher with an interest in the particular area. No significant differences in the opinions of the four groups existed for the three statements.

(10) With significant differences in opinions, a majority of all respondents agreed that advisory councils were necessary for effective operation of a multiple-teacher department.

(11) Agreement, with no significant difference in opinion, was expressed by a majority of the respondents concerning separate classrooms for each teacher and one shop for the multiple-teacher department. The stocking of shop supplies

by one teacher and scheduling use of facilities and/or equipment as a shared responsibility received a majority of agree responses with no significant differences in opinions.

(12) Significant differences existed in the expressed opinions of the four population groups, yet a majority of the respondents agreed that one teacher should be designated as head teacher.

(13) Based upon the agree responses concerning the designation of a head teacher, a plurality of respondents disagreed that the head teacher should have the most experience. The respondents agreed that the head teacher should be selected by the administrator with the approval of the teachers and disagreed that the teachers in the department should select the head teacher. It was agreed by a majority of the respondents that the head teacher should have the authority to make decisions within the policies of the school. A majority of the respondents disagreed that the head teacher should be chief spokesman and have no authority to make decisions. The four population groups expressed a high degree of agreement with the statement that the head teacher should receive compensation for his added responsibilities. No significant difference in opinions was evident concerning the statements with reference to the duties of the head teacher.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were established from the findings of the study and were based statistically upon a majority (51.00 per cent) of respondents expressing either agreement or disagreement with the statement as it appeared on the opinionnaire and after analysis by chi-square, did not have more than three pairs of population groups which expressed significantly different responses to the statement.

(1) An additional teacher could be justified because of a high demand for young and/or adult farmer classes.

(2) A high demand for specialized training of high school students could justify an additional teacher.

(3) Teachers, administrators, and state supervisory personnel should all have a direct role in the development of policies for the multiple-teacher department.

(4) Assignment of teaching duties should be made through cooperation of all teachers and the administrator and should be in writing. A definite assignment should be made concerning reports.

(5) Students should be grouped according to year in school and taught by teachers specializing in particular areas.

(6) Supervisory visits should be made by the teacher with a specialization which corresponds to the student's needs. At least one hour should be scheduled during each school day

for visitation.

(7) A multiple-teacher department should not have more than one F.F.A. chapter and all duties of the advisor should not be assigned to one teacher. The training of teams should be the responsibility of the teacher with an interest in the particular area.

(8) Advisory councils are necessary for effective operation of multiple-teacher departments.

(9) Each teacher in a department should have a separate classroom, but one shop would be sufficient with one teacher responsible for stocking the shop supplies. Scheduling use of facilities and/or equipment should be a shared responsibility of the teachers in the department.

(10) One teacher should be selected as head teacher by the administrator with the approval of the teachers in the department. The head teacher should have the authority to make decisions within the policies of the school and should receive compensation for those added responsibilities in monetary form or by reducing his teaching load.

III. RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation resulting from this study was that a committee be formed to review the findings of this study. The committee, composed of two teachers and one administrator from multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in

Kansas, the state supervisor for Agricultural Education in Kansas, and the head teacher educator for Agricultural Education from Kansas State University, after reviewing the findings of this study, should develop a set of guidelines, based upon the conclusions of this study, for the establishment and/or operation of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in Kansas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bass, B. C. "A Study of Teacher Load and Teacher Duty Assignments in Multiple-Teacher Departments of Vocational Agriculture in Virginia." Unpublished Staff Study, Department of Agriculture Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, 1965.
- Directory - 1967-1968. Topeka: Kansas State Board for Vocational Education, 1967.
- Directory - Agriculture Teacher Trainer. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington: Office of Education, October, 1967.
- Directory - State Supervisors of Agriculture Education. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington: Office of Education, October, 1967.
- Fuller, Robert Dean. "Delegation of Responsibilities in a Multiple-Teacher Department of Vocational Agriculture." Unpublished Master's thesis, The Ohio State University, Columbus, 1963.
- Horton, J. C. "Organization of Multiple-Teacher Programs," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 39:30-35, August, 1966.
- "Index to The Agricultural Education Magazine," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 35:36-40, August-September, 1962; 36:35-39, August, 1963; 37:39-43, August, 1964; 38:45-48, August, 1965; 39:36-38, August, 1966; and 40:59-61, September, 1967.
- Jacoby, Walter. "Policies and Practices in the Administration of Multiple-Teacher Vocational Agriculture Departments in the United States." Unpublished Doctor's thesis, University of Connecticut, Storrs, 1961.
- Love, Gene M. "Studies in Progress - 1966-1967," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 39:228-231, April, 1967.
- Phipps, Lloyd J. Handbook on Agricultural Education in Public Schools. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1965.
- Scarborough, Cayce. "Tradition vs Specialization," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 39:27, August, 1966.

- Shontz, David F. "Studies Completed in 1966-1967," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 40:206-214, March, 1968.
- Spradlin, William Douglas. "Organizing the Two-Teacher Department," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 39:111, November, 1966.
- Stevens, Glenn Z. "Studies in Progress in Agriculture Education," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 37:73-77, September, 1964.
- _____. "Research Studies of Past Two Years Are Listed," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 37:143-147, December, 1964.
- _____. "Research Studies Completed in 1964," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 37:318-322, June, 1965.
- _____. "Research Studies Completed in 1965," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 39:84-89, October, 1966.
- _____. "Agricultural Education Research Studies Completed in 1966," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 40:92-95, October, 1967.
- Woodin, Ralph J. "Facilities for Multiple-Teacher Departments," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 36:247, May, 1964.

APPENDIX A

KANSAS VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT
Research Foundation of Kansas
Ramada Executive Building, Room 22
Topeka, Kansas 66607

March 25, 1968

Dear Sir:

Mr. C. C. Eustace, State Supervisor of Agriculture Education, Kansas State Board for Vocational Education, has requested me to conduct a survey aimed at developing a set of guidelines for the establishment and/or operation of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture. This research will also be used as my Master's thesis in Agricultural Education, Kansas State University.

You have been selected to receive the survey due to your experience with multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture. Since the number of individuals contacted is quite small, your response is very important.

Please take about ten minutes today to indicate your opinion concerning each statement on the opinionnaire and return to me in the enclosed envelope. All responses will be confidential as only final totals will be published. Each participant will receive a summary of this study.

Very truly yours,

Donald E. Elson
Research Assistant
Kansas RCU

**OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES FOR MULTIPLE-TEACHER
DEPARTMENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE**

Definition of Terms

Multiple-teacher department. Any department of vocational agriculture employing two or more reimbursed teachers of vocational agriculture.

Teacher. Those reimbursed teachers employed to teach in a multiple-teacher department of vocational agriculture.

Administrator. School official directly responsible for the multiple-teacher department of vocational agriculture.

State supervisory personnel. Members of the state supervisory staff of Agriculture Education, State Board for Vocational Education.

Teacher educators. Members of the staff of a college or university directly responsible for the preparation of teachers of vocational agriculture.

Indicate your opinion on each statement by checking (✓), Agree, Undecided, or Disagree.

- | | AGREE | UNDECIDED | DISAGREE |
|--|-------|-----------|----------|
| 1. There should be at least twenty-five students per teacher in a multiple-teacher department. | | | |
| 2. There should be at least thirty-five students per teacher in a multiple-teacher department. | | | |
| 3. There should be at least forty-five students per teacher in a multiple-teacher department. | | | |
| 4. An additional teacher could be justified because of a high demand for young and/or adult farmer classes. | | | |
| 5. An additional teacher could be justified because of a high demand for specialized training of high school students, i.e., work experience program, horticulture, etc. | | | |
| 6. The teachers should have a direct role in the development of policies for a multiple-teacher department. | | | |
| 7. The administrator should have a direct role in the development of policies for a multiple-teacher department. | | | |

	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE
8. State supervisory personnel should have a direct role in the development of policies for a multiple-teacher department.			
9. Teacher educators should have a direct role in the development of policies for a multiple-teacher department.			
10. Assignment of teaching duties should be made through cooperation of all teachers and the administrator.			
11. Assigned responsibilities of each teacher should be in writing.			
12. A definite assignment should be made as to responsibility for completing reports.			
13. Publicity concerning the department should be assigned to one teacher.			
14. Students should be grouped into classes according to vocational objective, i.e., production agriculture, college, etc.			
15. Students should be grouped into classes according to year in school, i.e., freshman, sophomore, etc.			
16. Teachers should share equal responsibilities in all classes, i.e., team teach.			
17. Teachers should teach in specialized areas.			
18. A teacher should be assigned a particular group of students and present all material to that group.			
19. One common grading system should be used by all teachers.			

33. Scheduling use of department facilities and/or equipment should be a shared responsibility of the teachers in the department.

34. One teacher should be designated as head teacher.

If you answered Agree to item 34, complete remainder of items. If Undecided or Disagree, omit remainder of items.

35. Head teacher should be teacher with most experience.

36. Head teacher should be selected by administrator with approval of the teachers in the department.

37. Head teacher should be selected by the teachers in the department with the approval of the administrator.

38. Head teacher should have authority to make decisions within the policies of the school.

39. Head teacher should be the chief spokesman for the department with no authority to make final decisions.

40. Head teacher should receive compensation for added responsibilities in monetary form or by reducing his teaching load.

	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE
33. Scheduling use of department facilities and/or equipment should be a shared responsibility of the teachers in the department.			
34. One teacher should be designated as head teacher.			
<u>If you answered Agree to item 34, complete remainder of items. If Undecided or Disagree, omit remainder of items.</u>			
35. Head teacher should be teacher with most experience.			
36. Head teacher should be selected by administrator with approval of the teachers in the department.			
37. Head teacher should be selected by the teachers in the department with the approval of the administrator.			
38. Head teacher should have authority to make decisions within the policies of the school.			
39. Head teacher should be the chief spokesman for the department with no authority to make final decisions.			
40. Head teacher should receive compensation for added responsibilities in monetary form or by reducing his teaching load.			

APPENDIX B

Individuals who gave recommendations for improving the
opinionnaire.

Howard Bradley, Professor
College of Education
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas

Larry Erpelding
College of Education
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas
(Graduate student and former
vocational agriculture teacher)

David Mugler, Assistant to
Dean of Agriculture
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas
(former vocational agriculture teacher)

Wilbur Rawson, Assistant Supervisor
Agricultural Education
State Board for Vocational Education
Topeka, Kansas

George Robinson, Director
Kansas Vocational Education Research
Coordinating Unit
Topeka, Kansas

Paul Stevenson, Associate Professor
Agriculture Engineering
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas

Teachers or former teachers of vocational agriculture in multiple-teacher departments in Kansas.

Coy Allen
Manhattan, Kansas

Ben Attebery
Paola, Kansas

John Baird
Winfield, Kansas

Larry Beat
Chapman, Kansas

Gary Cromwell
Animal Husbandry Dept.
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

Roy Cropp
Lawrence, Kansas

Jimmie Gatz
Alva, Oklahoma

Walter Gehlbach
K. U. Medical Center
Kansas City, Kansas

Norman Haigh
Parkin, Arkansas

Donald Hall
St. Francis, Kansas

Ted Hanchett
Enid, Oklahoma

Paul Heinan
Beloit, Kansas

James Housman
Columbus, Kansas

Oscar Ingram
Altamont, Kansas

Bernard Jacobson
Frankfort, Kansas

Gary Jarmer
Winfield, Kansas

Don Kastl
Beloit, Kansas

Dean Knewston
Columbus, Kansas

Stanley Larson
Lawrence, Kansas

Ben Leibbrandt
St. Francis, Kansas

Ira Mann
Garden City, Kansas

Duane McCune
Chapman, Kansas

Gary Parti
Caney, Kansas

Henry Payne
Altamont, Kansas

Dean Prochaska
Manhattan, Kansas

Richard Ramsdale
McPherson, Kansas

Galen Rapp
Whiting, Iowa

Leon Schmidt
Caney, Kansas

Gerald Schmitt
Dodge City, Kansas

Delbert Schrag
McPherson, Kansas

Dale Seibert
Garden City, Kansas

George Sherman
Louisburg, Kansas

Earl Simmons
Lawrence, Kansas

Damon Slyter
Paola, Kansas

Allen Straosta
Dodge City, Kansas

Robert Stephens
Louisburg, Kansas

Hollie Thomas
Purdue University
West Lafayette, Indiana

Richard Tredway
Arkansas City, Kansas

Earl Wright
Clay Center, Kansas

David Yates
Paola, Kansas

Michael Yocam
Paola, Kansas

Administrators or former administrators of vocational agriculture in multiple-teacher departments in Kansas.

Dale Brooks
Newton, Kansas

Bill Campbell
Paola, Kansas

Ralph Dellinger
Dodge City, Kansas

Brice Durbin
Columbus, Kansas

Ray Ebberts
Garden City, Kansas

H. F. Harrison
Reeds Springs, Missouri

Dr. Dan Kahler
Kansas City, Missouri

Franklin King
Columbia, Missouri

Dean Larsen
Louisburg, Kansas

S. A. Lindahl
Chapman, Kansas

Melvin Briley
Columbus, Kansas

William Medley
Lawrence, Kansas

Richard McKittrick
Manhattan, Kansas

Francis Norris
Altamont, Kansas

Dale Relihan
Chapman, Kansas

Bob Severance
Beloit, Kansas

Curtis Sides
Altamont, Kansas

Carl Sperry
St. Francis, Kansas

Richard Wall
Winfield, Kansas

Ron Wilson
El Dorado, Kansas

Neal Wherry
Lawrence, Kansas

State Supervisors of Agriculture Education, State Board for Vocational Education, in each state.

T. L. Faulkner
Montgomery, Alabama

C. W. Dalbey
Des Moines, Iowa

Carlos H. Moore
Phoenix, Arizona

W. C. Montgomery
Frankfort, Kentucky

George F. Sullards
Little Rock, Arkansas

Thomas Derveloy
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

D. E. Wilson
Sacramento, California

Wallace H. Elliott
Orono, Maine

Paul J. Foster
Denver, Colorado

Glenn W. Lewis
Baltimore, Maryland

Llewellyn L. Turner
Hartford, Connecticut

Philip Haight
Boston, Massachusetts

Frederic Myer
Dover, Delaware

Edwin W. St. John
Lansing, Michigan

C. M. Lawrence
Tallahassee, Florida

G. R. Cochran
St. Paul, Minnesota

J. L. Branch
Atlanta, Georgia

E. E. Gross
Jackson, Mississippi

T. Horii
Honolulu, Hawaii

Carl M. Humphrey
Jefferson City, Missouri

Ralph Edwards
Boise, Idaho

Max L. Amberson
Helena, Montana

Ralph Guthrie
Springfield, Illinois

B. E. Gingery
Lincoln, Nebraska

Delmar Johnson
Indianapolis, Indiana

J. R. Peddicord
Carson City, Nevada

Martin L. Mitchell
Concord, New Hampshire

George W. Lange
Trenton, New Jersey

L. C. Dalton
University Park, New Mexico

Harold L. Noakes
Albany, New York

V. B. Hairr
Raleigh, North Carolina

James E. Dougan
Columbus, Ohio

Byrle Killian
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Monty Multanen
Salem, Oregon

James C. Fink
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Rafael Muller
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico

Raymond C. Northup
Providence, Rhode Island

P. G. Chastain
Columbia, South Carolina

H. E. Urton
Pierre, South Dakota

Kenneth K. Mitchell
Nashville, Tennessee

George H. Hurt
Austin, Texas

Elvin Downs
Salt Lake City, Utah

Julian M. Carter
Montpelier, Vermont

Julian M. Campbell
Richmond, Virginia

Bert L. Brown
Olympia, Washington

W. H. Wayman
Charleston, West Virginia

Dale C. Aebischer
Madison, Wisconsin

Percy Kirk
Cheyenne, Wyoming

C. C. Eustace
Topeka, Kansas

Head teacher educator in each college or university preparing teachers of vocational agriculture.

Dr. R. W. Montgomery
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama

Dr. Grady W. Taylor
Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee, Alabama

Dr. L. W. Bonner
Alabama A & M College
Normal, Alabama

Dr. Floyd G. McCormick
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

Dr. Denver B. Hutson
University of Arkansas
Rayetteville, Arkansas

Mr. R. C. Haynie
Arkansas Agricultural,
Mechanical and Normal College
Pine Bluff, Arkansas

Mr. H. H. Burlingham
California State Polytechnic
San Luis Obispo, California

Dr. E. M. Juergenson
University of California
Davis, California

Dr. Ralph W. Canada
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado

Dr. W. Howard Martin
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut

Dr. Ralph P. Barwick
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware

Dr. W. R. Wynder
Delaware State College
Dover, Delaware

Mr. W. T. Loften
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Mr. B. B. Archer
Florida A & M
Tallahassee, Florida

Dr. Ralph H. Tolbert
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

Mr. McKinley Wilson
Fort Valley State College
Fort Valley, Georgia

Mr. H. A. Winner
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho

Dr. Lloyd J. Phipps
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Dr. John W. Matthews
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Dr. Ralph Benton
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois

Dr. Kenneth E. James
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Dr. James Clouse
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

Dr. Clarence E. Bundy
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

Dr. Harold Binkley
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

Dr. C. L. Mondart
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Dr. John H. Mitchell
University of Southwestern La.
Lafayette, Louisiana

Mr. C. H. Chapman
Southern University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Dr. V. R. Cardozier
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

Dr. Claude C. Marion
Maryland State College
Princess Anne, Maryland

Dr. Philip L. Edgecomb
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

Dr. Harold M. Byram
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Dr. Milo Peterson
University of Minnesota
St. Paul, Minnesota

Dr. O. L. Snowden
Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi

Dr. William C. Boykin
Alcorn A & M
Lorman, Mississippi

Dr. Gene Love
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri

Dr. Leo L. Knuti
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana

Dr. James T. Horner
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

Dr. Harold H. Christensen
University of Nevada
Reno, Nevada

Dr. William H. Annis
University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire

Dr. Charles Drowbaugh
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Dr. Leon A. Wagley
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico

Dr. Joe P. Bail
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Dr. C. Cayce Scarborough
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina

Dr. A. P. Bell
North Carolina Agricultural &
Technical State University
Greensboro, North Carolina

Mr. Ernest L. DeAlton
North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota

Dr. Ralph Bender
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Dr. Robert R. Price
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Dr. Henry A. Tenpas
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon

Dr. David R. McClay
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

Dr. Juan Robles-Arzuaga
University of Puerto Rico
Mayaguez, Puerto Rico

Dr. David F. Shontz
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, Rhode Island

Dr. Lowery H. Davis
Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina

Mr. B. F. Murvin, Jr.
South Carolina State College
Orangeburg, South Carolina

Dr. Hilding W. Gadda
South Dakota State University
Brookings, South Dakota

Dr. George W. Wieggers, Jr.
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

Dr. David Hamilton
Tennessee A & I
Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. Earl H. Knebel
Texas A & M
College Station, Texas

Dr. A. C. Hughes
East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas

Dr. Tollie R. Buie
Southwest Texas State College
San Marcos, Texas

Mr. F. B. Wines
Texas College of Arts and
Industries
Kingsville, Texas

Mr. T. L. Leach
Texas Technological College
Lubbock, Texas

Dr. J. C. Green
Stephen F. Austin College
Nacogdoches, Texas

Dr. Murray A. Brown
Sam Houston State Teachers
Huntsville, Texas

Dr. E. M. Norris
Prairie View A & M
Prairie View, Texas

Mr. Stanley S. Richardson
Utah State University
Logan, Utah

Mr. Garry R. Bice
University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont

Dr. John H. Rodgers
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Blacksburg, Virginia

Dr. M. A. Feilds
Virginia State College
Petersburg, Virginia

Dr. C. O. Loreen
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington

Dr. R. C. Butler
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia

Dr. Walter T. BJORAKER
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Dr. Charles DeNure
Wisconsin State University
Platteville, Wisconsin

Dr. Jack Ruch
University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming

Dr. R. J. Agan
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas

OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES FOR MULTIPLE-TEACHER
DEPARTMENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

by

DONALD EUGENE ELSON

B. S., Kansas State University, 1958

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1968

This study was designed (1) to compare the opinions of teachers and administrators with experience in multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in Kansas, the state supervisor of Agricultural Education in each state, and the head teacher educator of Agricultural Education in each college or university preparing vocational agriculture teachers concerning the organizational and operational procedures of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture and (2) to make recommendations based upon this study for the development of guidelines for establishment and/or operation of multiple-teacher departments in Kansas. A null hypothesis was used which stated that there was no significant difference in the opinions of teachers, administrators, state supervisors, and teacher educators concerning the organizational and operational procedures of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture.

The data for this study was obtained by a mailed opinionnaire. The sample consisted of forty-one teachers, twenty-one administrators, forty-nine supervisors, and seventy-six teacher educators. Eighty-two per cent of the sample responded. Statistical treatment of the data included frequency, per cent, and chi-square analysis.

The following conclusions were established from the findings of the study.

(1) An additional teacher could be justified because

of a high demand for young and/or adult farmer classes.

(2) A high demand for specialized training of high school students could justify an additional teacher.

(3) Teachers, administrators, and state supervisory personnel should all have a direct role in the development of policies for the multiple-teacher department.

(4) Assignment of teaching duties should be made through cooperation of all teachers and the administrator and should be in writing. A definite assignment should be made concerning reports.

(5) Students should be grouped according to year in school and taught by teachers specializing in particular areas.

(6) Supervisory visits should be made by the teacher with a specialization which corresponds to the student's needs. At least one hour should be scheduled during each school day for visitation.

(7) A multiple-teacher department should not have more than one F.F.A. chapter and all duties of the advisor should not be assigned to one teacher. The training of teams should be the responsibility of the teacher with an interest in the particular area.

(8) Advisory councils are necessary for effective operation of multiple-teacher departments.

(9) Each teacher in a department should have separate

classrooms, but one shop would be sufficient with one teacher responsible for stocking the shop supplies. Scheduling use of facilities and/or equipment should be a shared responsibility of the teachers in the department.

(10) One teacher should be selected as head teacher by the administrator with the approval of the teachers in the department. The head teacher should have the authority to make decisions within the policies of the school and should receive compensation for those added responsibilities in monetary form or by reducing his teaching load.

The recommendation resulting from this study was that a committee be formed to review the findings of this study. The committee, composed of two teachers and one administrator from multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in Kansas, the state supervisor for Agricultural Education in Kansas, and the head teacher educator for Agricultural Education from Kansas State University, after reviewing the findings of this study, should develop a set of guidelines, based upon the conclusions of this study, for the establishment and/or operation of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in Kansas.