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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background and Setting

Study and discussion of significant issues appear to be important in the development of agricultural education. Evidence also indicates that the profession has identified and discussed various alternative positions with regard to the issues. Subsequent adoption of certain positions has been one way that the profession has determined future directions.

The profession appears to have accepted a general definition of the terms issue and position in order to conduct discussions important to agricultural education. This common thread of understanding indicates that an issue is a matter of importance to agricultural education, the resolution of which has not been firmly settled, but could be described as having two or more alternative positions. A position appears to be generally understood as an exclusive viewpoint with regard to an aspect of an issue in agricultural education. Both these definitions will be operationally accepted for this study.

Advancement of agricultural education depends upon the continuous study and discussion of important issues (Scarborough, 1980; Swanson, 1980). Swanson (1980) stated:

There is no doubt that we [those individuals involved in the agricultural education profession] need to continually identify and
resolve the issues. To say that the issues have been identified and resolved for all time is to say that we have arrived at truth [which is not a logical conclusion].

Committees, conference activities, research studies, individual writings, legislation, and other activities have dealt with important issues in agricultural education (Stimson and Lathrop, 1942; Swanson, 1942; True, 1929). From the formative years of agricultural education to the present, a growing awareness of the need to succinctly identify and discuss relevant issues has challenged the profession.

Early developments in agricultural education between 1900 and 1930 were directly influenced by a study and discussion of important issues. The Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations, the United State Bureau of Education, and the National Education Association addressed issues which included:

What is the purpose of agricultural education?
At what grade level should instruction be given in agricultural education?
What clientele should be served by the agricultural education program?

An example of the way professional associations and governmental agencies dealt with these major issues is a study conducted by the Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations (Stimson and Lathrop, 1942). Recommendations of this study called for the establishment of college courses to train teachers of vocational agriculture, high school agricultural courses, and the purchase of agricultural textbooks, manuals, and equipment. The study also
suggested that colleges cooperate with state departments of education in the supervision of secondary agricultural departments.

Federal legislation in the form of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 identified positions with regard to the three previously stated issues. This Act described agricultural education as follows:

such education shall be to fit for useful employment, that such education shall be less than college grade, that such education be designed to meet the needs of persons over fourteen years of age who have entered upon or who are preparing to enter upon the work of the farm or of the farm home. (Smith Hughes Act, 1917)

Study and discussion of issues in agricultural education during early developments in the profession continue to the present day.

Swanson (1942) and Stimson and Lathrop (1942) cited the work of national committees and agencies of the federal government which identified and discussed salient issues of national priority. Phipps (1972) cited the 1963 Vocational Education Act as having a significant impact on agricultural education. The Act addressed such issues as:

Who should receive training in agricultural education?
Training in agricultural education should be for what occupations?
Should all students have supervised farming programs?

Positions pertaining to the previously stated issues were identified in the 1963 Vocational Act as follows:

Any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles or acts for agriculture may be used for vocational education in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in agricultural subjects, whether or not such occupation involves work on the farm or of the farm
home, and such education may be provided without directed or supervised practice on a farm. (Vocational Education Act, 1963) Subsequent vocational education acts have also adopted positions with regard to the important issues.

In addition to legislation, professional associations have studied and discussed significant issues challenging agricultural education (Gregory, 1929; Stenzel and Wall, 1973; Stimson and Lathrop, 1942). National, regional, and local professional conferences have provided forums for the identification and discussion of relevant issues of concern to the profession (Gregory, 1929, Stimson and Lathrop, 1942, Strogel and Wall, 1975; Swanson, 1942). Certain positions have usually been accepted from the various alternatives. A review of the literature indicated a sharp increase in such activities since 1975.

The most recent effort to identify issues in agricultural education on a national basis was the National Agricultural Education Seminar held in Kansas City, Missouri, July 15-17, 1980. The Seminar was a joint effort of the U.S. Office of Education and the Agricultural Education Division of the American Vocational Association involving 364 individuals from teacher education, supervision, secondary teaching, post secondary teaching, the agricultural industry, and others closely associated with agricultural education. The mission of the Seminar was to identify "trends, issues, and new directions affecting agricultural education for the remainder of the 20th century" (National Agricultural Education Seminar, 1980, p. 2). Thirty-two prioritized issues were identified during the conference in three topic areas which included:
agricultural education as a part of the public school system, 
the development of professional teachers for the public school 
system, and 
adult education as a part of the public school system.

During the National Seminar, discussion was devoted to identifying 
and describing future directions for the profession. As such, these 
discussions explored various positions with regard to the major issues. 
Other efforts denote a growing concern of the profession with regard to 
the issues in agricultural education.

The American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture (AATEA) 
has featured debates on eight issues in agricultural education in the 
Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture. 
In essence, the debaters have identified and supported various positions 
with regard to the selected issues.

A study by Shinn, Stewart, and Richardson (1975) entitled, "Concerns 
of the Agricultural Education Profession: Implications for Teacher 
Education," was authorized by the Agricultural Education Research 
Committee of the American Vocational Association to "focus on the 
perceived concerns of the profession as identified by supervisors, 
teachers, and teacher educators" (p. 1). Fourteen major areas of 
concern were identified in the study which provide clues for possible 
categories of research issues in agricultural education. Lawrence and 
Mallilo (1980) identified "specific areas/aspects of vocational 
agriculture teaching in need of the greatest improvement" (p.1). Twenty 
areas/aspects were reported by the researchers. Some of the twenty 
items could be perceived as issues and/or positions with regard to
agricultural education. These recent studies (Lawrence and Mallilo, 1980; Shinn, et al., 1976) demonstrate the desire of the profession to be more thorough and precise in monitoring perceptions with regard to major areas in agricultural education.

Considering the available data, issues exist which have importance to agricultural education in the areas of program purpose, clientele served, program content, supervised occupational experience/practice, the FFA, and what title should be used to describe the agricultural instructional program. These six areas are a part of the prioritized issues identified during the National Agricultural Education Seminar (1980) under the category "Agricultural Education as a Part of the Public School System". These areas were also inferred, if not stated in research studies (Lawrence and Mallilo, 1980; Shinn et al., 1976) and by articles in the *Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture*.

The need for identifying, studying, and discussing the alternative positions pertaining to important issues in agricultural education has present and historical support. Determining the perceptions of individuals and groups on alternative positions with regard to the issues facing the profession is an intriguing question which has not received an adequate, comprehensive, and systematic study. The complexity of the profession demands a more cogent, comprehensive study and discussion of relevant issues than in former years.

**Statement of the Problem**

The specific problem investigated was: To what extent are alternative positions concerning selected issues pertaining to the K-12
public school agricultural education program acceptable to agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors?

Objectives of the Study

The objectives were stated as subquestions. Groups of secondary teachers, teacher educators, and supervisors were purposefully selected to provide information regarding the research question. Issues concerning program purpose, clientele served, program content, supervised occupational experience/practice, the FFA, and program title were addressed. Specific questions investigated were:

1. What are the alternative positions on the selected issues as perceived by agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors?

2. What is the extent of acceptance of the alternative positions on the selected issues among agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors?

3. What are the perceptions of agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors regarding the importance of further study and discussion of the issues?

Need for the Study

The need for this study was based on four primary considerations. Two of these considerations were elaborated on in the preceding "Background and Setting" section of this chapter. Therefore, they will only be summarily addressed in this section.
Development of Agricultural Education

The history of agricultural education illustrates the importance of identifying and discussing positions pertaining to important issues in the development of the profession. Evidence of this phenomena is available from writers tracing the history of agricultural education, magazine and journal articles, conference proceedings, histories of the professional associations in agricultural education, the vocational education acts, and other sources. Gregory (1929); Stenzel and Wall (1973); Stimson and Lathrop (1942); True (1929); and others supported the concept stated in the opening sentence of this paragraph.

Present Concern

The National Agricultural Education Seminar (1980) and other efforts provide evidence of a growing concern within the profession to identify, study, and discuss positions with regard to important issues in agricultural education. Yet, limitations of these efforts indicated a need for further work. Prior to 1975 the writer found little evidence of comprehensive and systematic attempts to identify and discuss alternative positions pertaining to the issues in agricultural education. Efforts were informal and on a small scale. The National Agricultural Education Seminar (1980) specifically sought to identify issues in agricultural education on a national level. Positions with regard to the issues were not clearly defined by the work of the National Seminar.

Recent studies (Shinn et al., 1976; Lawrence and Mallilo, 1980) have implications for the identification of issues and positions in agricultural education. Debates on the issues in the Journal of the
American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture stimulated thought and discussion. Yet, these efforts were of limited scope leaving several unanswered questions pertaining to important issues in agricultural education.

Two additional considerations exist which have not been specifically addressed. These considerations provide additional evidence of the need for this study.

**Improvement of the Profession**

Identification of the alternative positions on the issues will improve meaningful debate and provide a basis for further research. Lee (1977) stated that issues presented in the *Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators and Agriculture* "stimulate professional discussion and enrichment" (p. 2). Obviously, various positions posited by the debaters spark interest in the readers. Graduate and undergraduate students in agricultural education could be stimulated to probe and gain additional insight through a study of the alternative positions on important issues. Similarly, practitioners within the profession including the opinion leaders could be challenged to formalize their beliefs with regard to the most important issues challenging agricultural education. Peterson and Persons (1979), former co-editors of the *Agricultural Education Magazine*, stated, "a vigorous debate and exchange of ideas [positions] will attract the thoughtful and innovative practitioners in agricultural education" (p. 128). Scarborough (1980) stated that the discussion of significant issues could focus attention on matters that are most important to the
profession. These matters could be defined as various positions on the issues.

Several writers (Fogel and Kleingartner, 1968; Greenwood, 1971; and Torrance, and White, 1975) in the fields of labor relations, business, and psychology believed that issues having "pro" and "con" positions serve as a catalyst for debate and further study. Although the previously stated views are expressly directed to professions other than agricultural education, the concepts appear to be applicable to agricultural education.

Finally, careful analysis of the alternative positions with regard to the issues should prevent the continued acceptance of the status quo when changes should be initiated. Swanson (1980) stated that many times we look at concepts in agricultural education as accepted when in fact they may very well be issues. If such areas remain unchallenged, progress and new developments in agricultural education could be thwarted. Warmbrod (1974) in discussing an issue in agricultural education proposed:

that we [those in agricultural education] begin to study the pros and cons of this issue, then formulate and test some feasible alternatives so that we are not caught in a position where our reaction is such that it substantiates the stereotype now held by some that agricultural educators are steadfast defenders of the status quo. (p. 10)

Future Direction

New knowledge generated by this study will be important to agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and
supervisors collectively by helping to chart future direction for the profession. Warmbrod (1979) stated:

The profession's actions cannot and should not be unilateral; our actions however bold and significant, must be in concert with other groups and agencies both within and outside of education that have a more than passing interest in public education generally and agricultural education specifically. (p. 161)

Determining the perceptions of agricultural secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors should help solidify appropriate future direction for agricultural education.

Woelfe (1929), secretary-treasurer of the first vocational agricultural teachers association wrote:

we [vocational teachers] must assume leadership and a willingness to work with other groups for this program of vocational agricultural education. In this, we shall develop a national consciousness and a professional spirit among our teachers which cannot help but prove of value in the program of vocational agricultural education.

(p. 14)

Likewise, identifying the acceptable positions with regard to important issues as perceived by selected representatives from secondary teaching, state supervision, and teacher education could challenge each group to unite around common goals.

The National Education Association (1934) initiated a study for the expressed purpose of bringing attention to the issues challenging education. Acceptance of one of these positions or a combination of several positions could provide important directions for the profession
for several years (National Education Association, 1934). A similar progression of events leading toward decision making would appear to be appropriate for agricultural education.

The identification and adoption of positions with regard to significant issues in agricultural education is an important prerequisite to determining future directions for the profession. Agricultural education cannot afford to entrust the future of the profession to positions evolving from ill-defined sources. Directions for the future will need to be decided upon after study and discussion of the important issues in agricultural education.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Issues in agricultural education were identified by the participants in the National Agricultural Education Seminar (1980). Nine issues were described which related to six major areas of agricultural education in the public school system. These areas were: program mission, clientele served, content of the program, supervised occupational experience/practice, the FFA, and program title. This study focused on major issues pertaining to the six previously stated areas as derived from the National Seminar and related literature.

This chapter includes (a) a description of the alternative positions on selected issues in agricultural education, (b) a discussion of potential methods for identifying and describing the alternative positions, and (c) an analysis of the Delphi technique as related to the present study. These categories provided an operational framework for the presentation of Chapter II.

Selected Issues and Alternative Positions in Agricultural Education

Issue Number One

What should be the purpose of agricultural education in the public school system in grades K-12?
Kahler (1980), while addressing the National Agricultural Education Seminar, referred to the mission [purpose] of agricultural education as follows:

Any educational program is based on certain social and educational precepts that are considered to be foundational to program development. If these precepts do not change over a period of time, one can fairly accurately describe a program mission. However, if they change, the mission must change accordingly. These unforeseen changes contribute to the hazards that are associated with describing a program mission...as we look to the mission of agricultural education, we challenge you to think with us in a sphere broader than we have in the most recent past. (p. 2)

These comments by Kahler seem to reflect the opinion of several leaders in the profession. Nontraditional as well as traditional viewpoints concerning the purpose of agricultural education are advocated in the literature.

Agricultural education in the early 1900's was described by the Smith-Hughes Act (1917) as providing training necessary for useful employment. Subsequent vocational education acts have also subscribed to this purpose, as have numerous leaders in agricultural education. In addition to the underlying purpose, a broader purpose has been proclaimed.

Vocational Education Amendments (1968) expanded the purpose of vocational education to include training or retraining to achieve stability or advancement in [vocational] employment. Carpenter and Rodgers (1970) stated that "much has been written by agricultural
educators about the need for providing students with a basis for upward mobility beyond their entry occupations in agriculture" (p.3). While employment and upward mobility appear to be important purposes of agricultural education, preparation for further education has been identified by some writers as an important purpose.

Edin (1979) in a Minnesota study found that 25.2 percent of 155 vocational teachers surveyed rated preparation for advanced training as the most important goal when compared with occupational exploration and placement in a job. In the same study, 50 percent of the students surveyed indicated that to prepare for a job or for further education was the most important reason for attending a secondary vocational center. Opportunities are available for advanced training at post secondary institutions, at four year colleges, in industry, and through other agencies. Thus, agricultural education at the secondary level for the purpose of preparation for advanced training appears to be a feasible alternative.

The purpose of vocational education in agriculture was expanded by the Vocational Education Amendments (1968) to include "programs to familiarize elementary and secondary students with the broad range of occupations for which special skills are required and the prerequisites for careers in such occupations". McCracken (1981) noted that "in the late 1960's the profession [agricultural education] adapted to the career education movement, by providing programs for career awareness" (p.5). Kahler (1980) and Phipps (1972) supported career education as a responsibility of agricultural education.
Kahler (1980) stated another purpose of agricultural education as "meeting the needs of those we teach." Warmbrod (1980) stated that agricultural education includes:

- the development of people, meeting the needs of students, teaching students, being concerned about the whole student, preparing people to think independently, to reason and make decisions, to be creative, and to be able to use knowledge and basic principles that they learn in other subjects. (p. 5)

Warmbrod (1980) noted that this concept was in contrast to the view that agricultural education is for the purpose of "training people for employment-skill development" (p. 5). Murray, Shry, Weber, and Arnston (1980) recognized development of human relation skills and attitudes as important purposes of agricultural education.

The concept that agricultural education is for the acquisition of knowledge and skills of an avocational nature has received some attention. Warmbrod (1980) called for removal of "the barrier between vocational and general education." Warmbrod and Phipps (1966) reported that agricultural education in the public schools was primarily an information or general education course prior to 1917. Federal funding limited to vocational classes has encouraged a reduction in the number of avocational types of classes. However, Phipps (1972) suggested that most secondary schools have a need to teach agricultural education as practical arts instruction.

Alternative positions identified by various writers (Kahler, 1980; Phipps, 1972; Warmbrod, 1980) and in vocational legislation concerning the purpose of agricultural education were summarized as follows:
1. for avocational or practical arts purposes.

2. orientation to and exploration of occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

3. preparation for advanced study of agriculture.

4. preparation for employment or self-employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

5. for upgrading and retraining of persons employed or self-employed in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

6. to develop the "whole student" by teaching independent thinking, decision making and creativity, leadership, citizenship, and developmental skills.

Issue Number Two

A second issue was the question of appropriate clientele to be served. The issue was stated as follows:

What clientele in the K-12 public school system should be served by agricultural education?

The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 defined the appropriate clientele group as "persons over 14 years of age who have entered upon or who are preparing to enter upon the work of the farm or of the farm home" (Smith-Hughes Act, 1917). The 1963 Vocational Education Act expanded the clientele served by agricultural education to include, "individuals who are preparing or who are already engaged in farm or non-farm agricultural occupations" (The Vocational Education Act, 1963).

An expanded clientele has been spoken about by many leaders in agricultural education. The Policy Committee of the Agricultural Education Division of American Vocational Association authorized a task
force to develop a policy statement on the Role of the Vocational Agriculture Teacher which described clientele groups served by agricultural education as "all of the people in the school area who are engaged in or are preparing to enter agricultural occupations" (Murray et al., 1980, p.4). The task force further defined the clientele as:

- secondary school students,
- postsecondary students,
- out-of-school youth,
- adults who wish full-time vocational and technical education in agriculture for entry into agriculture,
- employed youth and adults who need vocational technical education in agriculture to upgrade their occupational performances, and
- those youth and adults who because of social or economic handicaps cannot benefit from regular vocational-technical education programs in agriculture.

(Murray, et al. 1980, p.4)

Warmbrod (1980) noted that the profession has used the term K-12, yet at the same time continues to talk about a more limited clientele. Trotter (1977) and Hamlin (1962) stated that there has been a growing indication that agricultural educators have perceived a need for an early exposure to agricultural education for students at the elementary level. The extent to which agricultural education has served the needs of elementary students (grades K-6) in the public school system has been unclear.

Phipps (1972) identified the need for occupational exploration of careers in agriculture in grades seven and eight. Carpenter and Rodgers
(1970) noted the tendency to offer basic courses in principles of plant and animal sciences in the ninth and tenth grades with more specialized offerings in later years (p.3). Agricultural programs in grades seven and eight were a recent addition to traditional programs in grades 11 and 12. In particular, grades K-6, 7-8, 9-10, and 11-12 has been used to represent major groups of clientele which agricultural education has attempted to serve.

Meeting the agricultural education needs of adults as part of the secondary public school system has been a concern expressed by Miller (1979) and others. Miller (1979) stated:

The desire [for educational programs] is there on the part of the adults, the legislation supports the efforts, the state supervisors and university personnel encourage expansion, and now those on the cutting-edge [the teachers] need to accept the challenge of fulfilling these needs. (p. 119)

Warmbrod (1980) stated that "if agricultural education is to maintain its vitality in the 1980's, much more attention and resources must be given to adult education" (p 5). Several potential client groups appear to exist in the adult segment. Bender, McCormick, Woodin, Cunningham and Wolf (1972) identified avocational and vocational groups as prospective adult clientele for agricultural education. Miller (1979) referred to adult populations interested in sales and service, agricultural mechanics, horticulture, agricultural products, forestry and natural resources as well as production agriculture as potential clients of agricultural education. Love (1980) pointed out that older adults "have been neglected more than any other group we are attempting
to serve at the local level" (p.3). Alternative positions have existed concerning the responsibility of the secondary school system in meeting the needs of adults.

The responsibility of agricultural education in meeting the needs of rural, urban, and suburban students was identified by Hobbs (1980). Similarly, Warmbrod (1980) stated that agricultural education in the 1980's must be designed for urban and suburban programs. Implications have been that the profession has not yet resolved their responsibility to serve this segment of society.

Concern has also been expressed about special populations within grade levels. Love (1980) stated that "a dark cloud has been our failure to meet the needs of the handicapped and disadvantaged" (p. 3). Similarly, Rawls (1980) suggested that the profession must assume responsibility for the needs of the disadvantaged and handicapped. In addition, Public Law 94-482 mandated that vocational education meet the needs of the handicapped. Yet, questions have arisen about the extent to which the profession provides education to these special groups.

Traditionally, few female students have enrolled in agricultural education at the secondary level. More recently the number of females enrolling in the program has increased, although female enrollment continues to be much lower than male. The distribution of male and female enrollment among taxonomy areas of instruction has been unequal in areas such as in horticulture and production agriculture. Equitable and effective service to female students in agricultural education has been questioned. McCracken (1981) in writing about equity for the Encyclopedia of Educational Research concluded that "equity research
should continue in agricultural education. Such research should also examine other sub-population groups such as minorities and handicapped students" (p.36). Phipps (1980) called attention to the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 that mandated equal educational opportunity for male and female students.

Alternative positions concerning the clientele who should be served by agricultural education in the public school system in grades K-12 are summarized as follows:

1. students in grades K-6.
2. students in grades 7-8.
3. students in grades 9-12.
4. out-of-school youth employed in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.
5. adults employed in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.
6. rural students.
7. urban students.
8. suburban students.
9. in-school youth with social and economic handicaps.
10. out-of-school youth and adults with social and economic handicaps.
11. in-school male and female students regardless of agricultural occupational preference.
Issue Number Three

What should be the content of agricultural education in the public school system?

The 1963 Vocational Education Act, expanded the program content from production to non-production areas. Agricultural occupational areas were defined by the U.S. Office of Education. Proposed areas in which students were to receive agricultural instruction included:

1. agricultural production
2. agricultural supply and service businesses
3. agricultural mechanics businesses
4. agricultural products businesses
5. ornamental horticulture
6. agricultural resources
7. forestry
8. agricultural technology
9. agriculture related technology
10. agriculture, other

The literature did not reveal any comprehensive attempt by the profession to describe major content areas of agricultural education. Yet, numerous adaptations of the ten occupational areas have existed from state to state. Titles of "agricultural technology," "agriculture related technology", and other agricultural titles have been used by the profession to justify numerous programs. The extent of acceptance of the content areas of agricultural education have appeared to be somewhat unclear. The ten titles previously stated were considered as alternative positions with regard to the major issue.
Issue Number Four

What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should be required to conduct supervised occupational experience/practice programs?

The Smith-Hughes Act (1917) required all students enrolled in agricultural education to conduct supervised farming practices or programs. Legislation in 1963 stated "such education [agricultural education] may be provided without directed or supervised practice on a farm" (National Vocational Education Act, 1963). Thus, legislative action marked a departure from traditional program philosophies.

Research has indicated less emphasis on supervised occupational experience programs in recent years. A North Carolina study (Miller, 1980) revealed that vocational agriculture teachers expected only 58 percent of their students to have a supervised occupational experience program. Miller also found that less time was devoted to teacher supervision of supervised occupational experience in 1977 when compared with 1972. A recent study (Iverson, 1980) of program graduates in 10 southern states found that 40 percent of the students did not conduct a supervised occupational experience project during each year of their enrollment.

Lindsey (1978) suggested that limited opportunities for on-farm experience programs partially explained declining student participation in supervised occupational experience programs. A similar problem existed for off-farm experience programs. Horner (1979) stated:

The rapid growth in numbers of students in vocational agriculture, especially those with non-farm backgrounds, and the increasing
multiplicity of courses of short duration and expansion of instruction for off-farm agricultural occupations requiring more teacher supervision has caught the profession ill-prepared. As a result, SOE [Supervised Occupational Experience] programs, the element which makes education vocational, is non-existent with thousands of students. Survival of out-of-school SOE [supervised occupational experience] for all students each year (all year) seems doubtful. (p.7)

Martin (1979) stated "expectations that all students in a more diversified and enlarged program [of agricultural education] could have a truly meaningful non-school supervised occupational experience proved to be unrealistic" (p.155). Conversely, Moore (1979) stated that all vocational agriculture students should have a supervised occupational experience program. Discrepancy as to which students should conduct supervised occupational experience projects have been linked to the different experiences needed by production and non-production agricultural students.

The alternative positions on the issue were stated as, supervised occupational experience/practice should be required:

1. of all production agricultural students.
2. of all non-production agricultural students.

Issues Five and Six

Traditionally, all students in agricultural education have been expected to conduct a supervised occupational experience/practice program. The role of supervised occupational experience has been described by Lee (1980) as "an individually planned, continuous program
to develop the competencies needed for occupational entry by a student" (p. 3). Lee further stated that the profession must search for new, more responsive approaches to supervised occupational experience. The declining number of students conducting supervised occupational experience projects raised several questions which included appropriate types of supervised occupational experience. Two subissues were suggested from the review of the literature.

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for production agricultural students in the public school system?

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for non production agricultural students in the public school system?

Stimson introduced the "home project" to link agricultural instruction in the school to student experiences on the home farm. According to Stimson, the home project was a unit in farm production studied at school which was put into practice by students on their home farm under school supervision (Stimson, R.W. and Lathrop, R.W., 1942). These practices were usually of a single project nature. The Smith-Hughes Act (1917) stated that "directed or supervised practice in agriculture shall be provided either on a farm provided by the school or on another farm for a minimum of six months." Three types of activities have been generally accepted by the profession as a part of supervised farming programs.
Production projects:

A productive project is a business venture for experience and profit which as a minimum usually covers a period of time represented by a production cycle of a farm enterprise.

Improvement projects:

An improvement project is an undertaking which improves the real estate value of the farm, the efficiency of the farm business or of a farm enterprise, or the living conditions of the farm family.

Supplementary farm projects:

Supplementary farm practices are jobs outside of those already included as normal parts of a student's productive and improvement projects, which are undertaken by him for additional experience or skill or for improving the efficiency of the home farm.

(Deyoe, 1949, p. 54-56)

Supervised farming projects (enterprises) have usually been of an individual nature, however, group projects have sometimes been conducted. Group projects involved the class or a group of students from different classes in some type of cooperative activity (Deyoe, 1949).

Students who lacked an opportunity for supervised farm experience on a home farm have been encouraged to secure farm employment. Phipps (1972) referred to this practice as farm placement. Placement of this type was usually in the local community.
The Vocational Education Amendments of 1963 broadened the scope of agricultural education to include non-farm agricultural occupations. This event brought about the need for occupational experience/practice to parallel instruction of a non-farm nature. Phipps (1972) recognized placement in agri-business as legitimate experience/practice for students in non-farm instructional programs.

Hamlin (1949) stated that the term supervised practice was very broad as originally conceived. According to Hamlin, supervised practice could include:

- practice in our school farm mechanics shops, practice in cooperation and leadership in our chapters of the Future Farmers of America, and practice in speaking on agricultural subjects or in using parliamentary procedures in community meetings. (1949, p. i)

Phipps (1980) took a somewhat different view from Hamlin by stating that supervised practice must be outside of class.

Phipps (1980) considered exploratory experience as an important ingredient of supervised occupational experience programs for students studying agriculture. Phipps (1980) defined an exploratory experience as "a study-visit with workers in production agriculture, ornamental horticulture, forestry, conservation, agricultural services, agricultural processing, agriculture mechanics, or professional agriculture" (p. 202-203). The purpose of such an experience was to acquaint students with various areas in agriculture.

Cooperative education has been considered a legitimate type of supervised occupational experience/practice (Phipps, 1972; McCracken, 1981). Through this program, students were released from part of the
school day to engage in experience/practice activities, under the supervision of a school coordinator.

Alternative positions with regard to acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practices for students in production agriculture included:

1. production projects (supervised farming projects).
2. improvement projects.
3. supplementary farm projects.
4. group projects.
5. farm placement.
6. practice in the school laboratory or on the school grounds outside of class.
7. practice in the school laboratory or on the school grounds during class time.
8. exploratory experiences such as a "study-visit" with agricultural workers.
9. cooperative education programs where students are released from part of the school day.

Alternative positions with regard to acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practices for students in non-production agriculture included:

1. home projects of a non-production nature such as lawn care and the home vegetable garden.
2. placement in agribusiness.
3. group projects of a nonproduction agricultural nature.
4. experienced practice in the school laboratory or on the school grounds outside of class.
5. experienced practice in the school laboratory or on the school grounds during class time.
6. exploratory experiences such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.
7. cooperative education programs where students are released from part of the school day.

Issue Number Seven

What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the K-12 public school system should be required to become members of the FFA?

The FFA organization has been considered an integral part of an instructional program in agricultural education (Hampson, Newcomb, and McCracken, 1977). Researchers and leaders in agricultural education have questioned whether the organization has been appropriate for all clientele served by agricultural education.

Welton (1971) found that agricultural students perceived the FFA as primarily for students who planned to farm. Findings of the study suggested the importance of developing more appropriate activities for youth planning agribusiness careers, improving the image students have of the FFA, as well as changing contests and awards. Blackledge (1972) found that instructors who had a lower percentage of student FFA members had a greater percentage of female and non-farm students, conducted a more non-traditional program, and spent less time on the FFA. In a study by Pfister (1979) the aims and purposes of the FFA were less accepted by first-year vocational agriculture teachers in non-
traditional areas of vocational agriculture and by women. FFA members in Virginia compared to agricultural students who were non-members were more likely to attend rural schools, be children of farmers, and respect farmers and farming (Coffey, 1978).

Passage of the 1963 National Vocational Education Act expanded the mission of agricultural education to include non-production areas of instruction. Prior to this time, activities of the FFA were oriented to production agriculture students. Discrepancy between activities provided by the FFA and the needs of non-production agriculture students may have promulgated lack of student interest in the organization (Phipps, 1980).

The Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 indicated that all agricultural education students should participate in activities of the FFA. The counter argument was that only those students who were truly interested should become members and participate in the FFA.

Students enrolled in orientation to agriculture types of courses have been allowed to become members of the FFA in some states such as in Virginia. Some doubt exists concerning requiring FFA membership for this clientele group.

Alternative positions with regard to what agricultural education students should become FFA members were listed as follows:

1. all students in a production agriculture course of study.
2. all students in a non-production agriculture course of study.
3. all students in an orientation to agriculture course of study, such as 7th and 8th grade programs.
4. only those students who desire to become members.
Issue Number Eight

What activities of the FFA program are acceptable for in-class instructional time?

The FFA program has been defined in vocational legislation as an integral part of agricultural education, yet controversy has existed with regard to the acceptability of certain activities for in-class use. The use of class time to explain the FFA program and opportunities available to students has been generally accepted. Beyond this point, important questions have emerged.

Byers (1979) described how to best mesh the FFA and the instructional program as a significant problem. Byers (1979) further stated, "the teacher must decide what activities will encourage and promote the learning of agriculture by students" (p. 178). Thus, appropriate activities must be effectively selected and implemented to enhance the particular course of study (Bender, Taylor, Hansen, and Newcomb, 1979). Vaughn (1977) disagreed by suggesting that all activities of the FFA are appropriate for in-class use. Other writers in agricultural education have expressed similar differences of opinion concerning the use and the extent to which FFA activities should occupy time in the instructional program.

Discussion has been given to the appropriateness of particular aspects of the FFA for the in-class agricultural education program. Lee (1980) questioned the applicability of all FFA activities when he stated:

We must recognize that the FFA is an organization that is overwhelmed with production agriculture...FFA pageantry and
symbolism are rooted in production agriculture...There is a definite need to evaluate all existing FFA activities and change or omit those which do not have a rightful place in preparing youth for careers in agricultural industry. (p. 6)

A wide range of opinions with regard to this concern have been expressed.

Contests have occupied a prominent position in the FFA since the birth of the organization. Phipps (1980) stated that class time should be devoted to explaining and discussing contests that have been "judged worthy of consideration" as a means for "career exploration and development" in the instructional program (p. 293). Similarly, Byers (1978) stated that contests should grow out of the curriculum, be preceded by instruction, and be limited to contests applicable to class instruction. Mayfield (1978) indicated work on contests during class time should be limited to those contests which further develop agricultural competencies and stimulate motivation. Mayfield (1978) also recognized that "some instructors solely teach contests" (p. 54). Indications were that some agricultural instructors work with contests during class time that directly or indirectly relate to the particular course of study while other instructors limit in-class work with contests to those that directly relate to the instructional program.

Leadership development activities, according to Byers (1979), were acceptable in-class FFA activities. Bender et al. (1979) considered FFA activities as a means to improve student abilities in "leadership, cooperation, and citizenship" (p. 62). Development of competent leaders
in agriculture was identified by Phipps (1980) as an important part of all agricultural education programs.

The use of in-class time to prepare award applications and other related record keeping activities has been a point of controversy in the profession. Vaughn (1977) recognized that many teachers believe that FFA activities should not be conducted during class time. Vaughn (1977) referred to this idea as "ridiculous" (p. 87). Record keeping and award preparation are "powerful motivational and personal development techniques" (Vaughn, 1977, p. 87) which must be conducted in the classroom for students to receive the maximum benefits.

Considerable in-class instructional time is often needed for planning and conducting FFA chapter activities. Bender et al. (1979) stated that fund raising activities should be related to agriculture, of an educational nature, and operated according to sound business procedures.

Alternative positions with respect to aspects of the FFA program which should occupy in-class instructional time:

1. include planning any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.
2. include conducting any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.
3. include selected FFA activities which specifically relate to the particular course of study in which the student is enrolled.
4. include selected FFA activities which indirectly relate to the student's particular course of study.
5. include selected FFA activities which can be utilized without interfering with the content of the instructional program.

6. include preparation for judging contests of a nature that is directly related to the student's course of study only.

7. do not include preparation for judging contests.

8. include activities specifically selected to develop leadership, citizenship and cooperation.

9. include record keeping.

10. include preparation of individual awards.

11. include fund raising projects which use minimal class time that relate to agriculture, have educational value, and are conducted according to sound business practices.

Issue Number Nine

What title should be used to describe agricultural education programs in the public school system in grades K-12?

During recent years, various titles have been used to describe agricultural education in grades K-12. Phipps (1980) in the Handbook on Agricultural Education used "agricultural education and renewable natural resources" and "agricultural education" to describe the agriculture program. Smith-Hughes and other vocational education acts and amendments attached the word "vocational" to the title of the agricultural education program. Some have suggested that the vocational title is preferred by those who desire to limit the scope of agriculture to vocational education.

Conference brochures used during the National Agriculture Education Seminar (1980) used the title "agriculture/agribusiness/natural
resources education". The professional journal for secondary teachers of agricultural education carries the title "agricultural education". "Vocational agriculture" has been used by the FFA in published materials such as the FFA Student Handbook. "Vocational-technical education in agriculture" has been the title accepted by some members of the profession.

Titles have varied according to personal preferences. Titles ranged from simple two word descriptors to more elaborate titles. Alternative positions with regard to the most appropriate program title for agricultural education associated with the K-12 public school program which appear in related literature were stated as follows:

1. vocational agriculture.
2. agricultural education.
3. agriculture/agribusiness/natural resources education.
4. vocational-technical education in agriculture.
5. agricultural education and renewable natural resources.

Methods of Identifying Issues/Positions in Agricultural Education

Four major methods of identifying and describing issues and alternative positions in agricultural education have been evident. These methods included (a) individual perceptions written and spoken, (b) the work of committees in agricultural education, (c) a review and synthesis of related literature, and (d) research. These four methods have often been used in consort with one another.

Individually perceived issues/positions have frequently been identified and described in the form of written manuscripts, journal
articles, and speeches. Individuals have proclaimed issues/positions in the Agricultural Education Magazine, The Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, reports from the professional meetings of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture (AATEA), The National Association of Supervisors of Agricultural Education (NASAE), The National Vocational Agriculture Teachers' Association (NVATA), The Agricultural Education Division of AVA, and other sources. Significance of the issues and alternative positions appeared to vary according to internal and external factors relevant to the profession. Issues and positions identified by individuals were subject to the abilities and perceptions of their author.

Committees have frequently been utilized by the profession to identify and describe the issues and positions in agricultural education. A review of the literature suggested that a bulk of these committees have been operationalized by AATEA, NASAE, NVATA, the Agricultural Education Division of AVA, the federal government, and state governments.

In general, the effectiveness of a committee has been superior to the work of an individual (Beal, Bohlen, and Raudabaugh, 1962). The number of committee members directly affects the ability of a committee to resolve a problem.

As the size of the group is increased from 5 to 12, the degree of member consensus resulting from the discussion decreases when the time for discussion is limited.
Group members in the smaller groups will change their opinions more toward consensus than will those in the groups of 12 or more. As groups become larger than 12 there seems to be a trend toward factionalism. (Beal et al., 1962, p. 116)

Committees in agricultural education have most frequently utilized functional committees of limited size. The literature indicated that important reports concerning issues and positions in agricultural education have emerged from the work of committees.

The most recent review and synthesis of research in agricultural education was completed by Newcomb (1978). Contradicting research results and conclusions reported by Newcomb (1978) point to issues within the profession with various alternative positions. Positions with regard to these issues emerged as a result of the stated contributions of the review and synthesis which included:

- Determining the state of the art.
- Determining what has been accomplished in each area.
- Providing graduate faculty and students with a concise paper detailing information; identifying potential research problems, assessing the current literature, and deciphering the current mentality of research in this area.
- Locating findings which may apply to current problems at the local, state or university levels.

(Newcomb, 1978, p. 1, 2)

A review of related literature by the writer identified conflicts within the profession which were similar to those identified by Newcomb.
(1978) and additional conflicts which have emerged since 1978. A review of related literature and/or research appears to be a viable method of identifying alternative positions in the profession.

Research studies by Richardson, Shinn, and Stewart (1976) and Lawrence and Mallilo (1980) have implications for the present study. The objectives and methodology of these studies had particular relevance to this study.

Richardson et al. (1976) stated the research objective as follows: "To determine the major professional concerns about agricultural education as perceived by supervisors, teachers, and teacher educators" (p.1). Similarly, this study sought to identify positions with regard to selected issues in agricultural education from the same groups of respondents that Richardson et al. (1976) studied. With regard to methodology, Richardson et al. (1976) used two phases to answer the objective previously stated. "Concerns" were identified, listed, and categorized by areas through a researcher review of related literature. This list was revised in the second phase which sought to further refine and expand upon the original list. Responses were solicited from a select group of participants. The results were then tabulated and categorized to formulate the data gathering instrument for additional objectives of the study. In the present study, a similar sequence of procedures seemed to be appropriate.

Lawrence and Mallilo (1980) identified specific areas/aspects of vocational agriculture teaching in need of the greatest improvement. The population for the study consisted of "state supervisors of vocational agriculture, head teacher educators of each state's major
land-grant institution, and presidents of state vocational agriculture teachers' associations within the continental United States" (Lawrence and Mallilo, 1980, p. 1). As with the Richardson et al. (1976) study, the same groups appeared to be appropriate for this study. The Delphi approach was selected as the method for conducting the Lawrence and Mallilo study. Participants were asked to list five areas or aspects of vocational agriculture teaching in need of the greatest improvement. Identification of the areas/aspects was limited to data received from the mailing of one questionnaire without follow-up. Data were edited and combined into like items. In a second mailing respondents were asked to rate the importance of each area/aspect to the profession. In the present study, the Delphi was used to identify and describe positions with regard to important issues in agricultural education.

In summary, individual perceptions, the work of committees, and a review and synthesis of the literature were the appropriate methods for identifying and describing alternative positions with regard to important issues in agricultural education. Research by Richardson et al. (1976) and Lawrence and Mallilo (1980) had specific implications for this study through the use of Delphi and data collection procedures.

Delphi

Origin and Uses of the Delphi

The Delphi technique was developed by the RAND Corporation under the leadership of Olaf Helmer (Dalkey, 1968). The pioneer study sought to determine convergence of opinion among seven experts about a defense problem identified by the Air Force. Originally, the Delphi was used to
answer questions about the future when uncertainty and complexity surrounded the area of concern (Dalkey, 1968).

Hostrop (1975) summarized the sequence of events in the Delphi process as envisioned by Helmer. The description is given below:

1. Participants (who usually remain anonymous to one another) are asked to list their opinion on a specific topic in the form of brief written statements to prepared questionnaires, such as recommended activities or predictions for the future.

2. Participants are then asked to evaluate their total listing against some criterion, such as importance, chance of success, etc.

3. Next the statements made by the participants are received and are clarified by the investigator.

4. Each participant then receives the further refined list and a summary of responses to the items and, if in the minority, is asked to revise his opinion or to indicate reason(s) for remaining in the minority.

5. The statements made by the participants are again received by the investigator who further clarifies, refines, and summarizes the responses.

6. Each participant then receives the further refined topical list which includes both an updated summary of responses and a summary of minority opinions. Each participant is also given a final chance to revise his opinions.
7. Finally, the investigator receives the last round of the questionnaires which he then summarizes in a final report. The successive, individual, and independent process of requestioning each of the experts, combined with feedback supplied separately from each of the other experts, via the investigator, is designed to eliminate misinterpretation of the questions and the feedback, and to bring to light knowledge available to one or a few members of the group, but not to all of them.

(Hostrop, 1975, p. 68, 69)

Since the original conception of Delphi, researchers have suggested some modifications appropriate for a variety of uses (Linstone and Turoff, 1975). Modification of the Delphi was appropriate for this study.

Hostrop (1975) stated that the Delphi can provide the researcher with a more objective means to:

1. assess the range of ideas about goals and objectives.
2. give priority ranking of those goals and objectives.
3. establish the degree of consensus about the goals and objectives.

In general terms, the Delphi could assist an investigator in assessing the what is and what should be with regard to organizational conditions, goals, and objectives. Hostrop (1975) stated that "students and teachers [can] serve on Delphi panels which ask them what is and what should be" (p. 70). Within the field of education, the Delphi has been
used to determine what goals should be established (Cypert and Gant, 1972; Uhl, 1971).

Linstone and Turoff (1975) summarized potential uses of the technique based upon a review of studies which utilized Delphi. Past uses of Delphi which have implications for this study included:

delineating the pros and cons associated with potential policy options; gathering current and historical data not accurately known or available; examining the significance of...events; exploring...

options; distinguishing and clarifying...; and exploring priorities.

(Linstone and Turoff, 1975, p. 9)

Jillson (1975) used the Delphi to rate the order of importance of twelve issues stated in should/should not form.

Hostrop (1975) stated that "the Delphi technique is not a panacea for curing all of education's ills, nor is it a helpful method for making a quick decision" (p. 72). Careful consideration of the problem under investigation must be given before deciding upon the appropriate research technique (Parten, 1950). Linstone and Turoff (1975) presented a list of properties, one or more of which lead to the need for employing the Delphi.

1. The problem does not lend itself to precise analytical techniques but benefits can be derived from subjective judgments on a collective basis.

2. The individuals needed to contribute to the examination of a broad or complex problem have no history of adequate communication and may represent diverse backgrounds with respect to experience or expertise.
3. More individuals are needed than can effectively interact in a face-to-face exchange.

4. Time and cost make frequent group meetings infeasible.

5. Disagreements among individuals are so severe or politically unpalatable that the communication process must be referred and/or anonymity assured.

6. The heterogeneity of the participants must be preserved to assure validity of the results, i.e., avoidance of domination by quantity or by strength of personality [bandwagon effect].

(p. 4)

All the properties listed by Linstone and Turoff (1975) were applicable to the problem under investigation in this study.

The use of successive questionnaires has been an important property of the Delphi technique. The degree of consensus among individuals can be ascertained (Bunning, 1979), while, avoiding many of the potential problems identified by Linstone and Turoff (1975). Sweigert (1975) and others referred to the series of judgements obtained from questionnaires or other forms of communication as rounds of the Delphi. The rounds of the questionnaire according to Sweigert (1975):

elicit perceptions from participants, so that they [panel of participants] make a series of judgements, each successive one being made in the light of summary of the judgements of all participants on the previous round. This process is designed to produce increasing accuracy of judgments and increasing agreement among participants from round to round. (p. 4)
The feedback process was referred to as iteration. The primary reason for the iteration process was designed to accomplish convergence toward agreement among participants which was not possible with the one round traditional survey (Sweigert, 1975).

Each round of the study is designed to lead the respondents toward consensus on the issue under investigation. Feedback in terms of written and statistical data is designed to facilitate convergence. Statistical feedback can be depicted by histograms and scatterplots (Dybas, 1980). Written comments and statistical representation in the form of histograms and scatter plots appeared to be appropriate for the present study.

MacMillan (1975) identified three important features of the Delphi concerning the iterative process including: (a) anonymity of individual responses, (b) controlled feedback, and (c) a defined statistical presentation of group responses. Anonymity has been used to facilitate the equal sharing of responsibility within the group and to prevent the identification of the source of divergent opinion. Group pressure, therefore, will not inhibit responses. Resolution of conflicts will not be diverted from the important issue due to adversary or confrontation situations (MacMillan, 1975). Controlled feedback serves to focus for the group the emerging priority viewpoint without threatening the integrity of dissenting opinions (MacMillan, 1975). The bandwagon effect of agreeing with prominent authority figures and the pressures of persuasive oratory in face-to-face contact are replaced with the milder form of anonymous social pressure "as to the range of opinions held by the group" (Helmer, 1966, p. 85).
The number of rounds necessary to arrive at convergence of opinion may vary depending upon the nature of the study. Martino (1972) stated "in many cases, there is no advantage in going beyond two rounds" (p. 27). Dalkey (1975) stated that experience has shown that the technique seldom requires more than four rounds nor less than two rounds. The decision to terminate on a particular round must be made with regard to the degree of convergence on the previous round. A specific criteria for this determination does not appear to exist, but must be determined by the researcher.

Determination of convergence of opinion between rounds of the Delphi have been expressed in terms of shrinkage in the range of opinions on questions between rounds. Helmer (1966) measured the opinion spread by the width of the interquartile range. Helmer (1966) noted the median amount by which the range shrank between rounds one and two was about one-third of the width of the range. Dybas (1980) used histograms to depict frequency distributions of responses between rounds. A degree of latitude appears to exist in the choice of a method to display the data obtained from successive rounds of the study, depending upon the nature of the questions being asked. In the present study, histograms and scatter plots provided the most vivid indication of data to determine the extent of convergence.

In round one of the Delphi, participants are most frequently asked to list their opinion with regard to specific questions or statements. From information gathered in round one the investigator may edit, clarify, and reduce irrelevant material in preparation of a questionnaire for round two (Hostrop, 1975). Round one data is compiled
and resubmitted to the panel in statistical or written form as round two. Round two provides respondents an opportunity to reevaluate their reaction in round one considering the aggregate response of the panel. Each participant responds to the same questions addressed in round one. Panel participants can maintain the same position which was taken in round one or change their position in light of the new information. Sweigert (1975) stated that if panel members wish to take a position other than the central positions, they should defend their position. Dybas (1980) suggested that respondents should support the choice selected regardless of the position taken. Verbal commentary resubmitted for the next round was used to aid respondents as they analyzed views on all sides of the issues in this study.

Upon receipt of round two the researcher compiles the data and provides feedback to the respondents for round three, if the third round is deemed necessary. Written commentary obtained in round two is summarized along with statistical representations of the aggregate panel response. The feedback provides each panel member with information, in addition to personal perceptions they hold. Panel members are again asked to provide supportive commentary along with their responses in round three. The researcher must determine if an adequate degree of consensus has occurred, while at the same time considering those individuals who support dissenting points of view.

Data from round three are tabulated and a decision is made whether an additional round is necessary. Should a fourth round be necessary, the procedure should be similar to that followed in round three.
FIGURE 1

Delphi Study Procedure (Dybas, 1980, p. 45)

Identification and formulation of the question → Identification of potential participants → Initial Participant Contact

Formulation of expert and Delphi panel → Review of literature regarding the problem → Development of round one

Transmittal of round one for commentary → Feedback to researcher → Researcher review and compilation

Development of round two → Transmittal of round two to participants → Feedback to researcher

Researcher review and compilation → Development of round three → Transmittal of round three to participants

Feedback to researcher → Researcher review and compilation of final comments → Researcher decision to continue with an additional round

Yes → Development of additional round → Transmittal of additional round to participants

No → Report final results
Otherwise, a final report should be written and distributed to each panel member.

Since face-to-face contact between committee members does not occur (Dalkey, 1968), the researcher has a responsibility to bridge this gap. The researcher may contact panel members as deemed necessary during any round to clarify points. Panel members are also free to contact the researcher at any time to resolve procedural questions that might arise.

In essence, iteration of responses provides a process for successive refinement of the solution (see Figure 1). The Delphi, then, facilitates convergence of opinion without face-to-face contact among panel members. The accuracy of responses tends to increase with iteration (Dalkey, 1968). Movement toward convergence occurs principally between the first and second rounds. The researcher decision to bring closure to the rounds should be based upon analysis of the information available in light of the objectives of the study.

Careful consideration was given to the selection of a panel for this study. Participants had to have specialized expertise necessary to answer the research question.

Panel Selection

The Delphi technique is unlike traditional mail surveys which often solicit opinions from a sample of participants who have marginal qualifications to respond as an authority on the particular subject area (Hostrop, 1975). The opinions of those individuals who are knowledgeable and desire to participate are frequently solicited in the Delphi technique (Pfeiffer, 1969). Helmer (1966) stated:
Expert opinion must be called upon whenever it becomes necessary to choose among several alternative courses of action in the absence of an accepted body of theoretical knowledge that could clearly angle out one course as the preferred alternative. (p. 11)

Martino (1972) concluded that utilization of experts can be useful in areas where "progress may be more dependent on external social and economic factors than on the technological factors intrinsic to the field; and in fields where ethical or moral considerations may weigh heavily" (p. 22). Experts are used because:

information and the body of experience at their disposal constitute an assurance that they will be able to select the needed items of background information, determine the character and extent of their relevance, and apply these insights to the formulation of the required personal probability judgements. (Helmer and Rescher, 1960, p. 27)

Nash (1978) suggested that if the experts in the field under investigation hold the most powerful positions, it is likely that their opinions will come to pass since they have the power to make it so. Expert opinion in agricultural education could, therefore, provide insight into the perceptions of those individuals who have the power to initiate change.

The question of who should be considered expert with regard to a specific area of study is difficult to determine with certainty (Linstone and Turoff, 1975). Helmer and Rescher (1959) stated that the "expert" is one who:
has at his disposal a large store of (mostly inarticulated) background knowledge and a refined sensitivity to its relevance, through the intuitive application of which he is often able to produce trustworthy personal probabilities regarding hypotheses in this area of expertness. (p. 38)

Weaver (1971) attributes expert status to:

one who is objective, [who] take[s] into account new and discrepant information, and construct[s] logically sound deductions about the future based upon a thorough and disciplined understanding of particular phenomena and how they related. (p. 269)

Helmer (1966) considered what may be vaguely called reputation as a basis for selection of an expert.

In the absence of precise criteria to describe an expert, determining appropriate procedures for the selection process is an important aspect of the Delphi. Helmer (1967) stated that experts should be wisely selected. Helmer and Rescher (1960) concluded that knowledge is the most obvious criterion for expertise. Brockhoff (1975) stated that expert knowledge can be determined by demonstration or by recourse to third parties. Brockhoff (1975) further stated that accurate determination of expert status by third parties and by self-rating is not completely clear.

Justification for using either or both approaches to determine expert status is to provide a screen to remove any researcher selection bias and secure a pool of the experts in the area under investigation. In the present study, demographic data collected by a self-rated questionnaire permitted the researcher to check and describe the expert
status of panel members selected by the third party. As suggested by Helmer (1966), self-rating of expert status is most appropriately collected at the same time data are gathered to answer the research questions. Graphic illustration of expert panel selection as proposed by Dybas (1980, p. 4) was used for this study. (See Figure 2 for the expert selection process.) Dybas (1980) stated that "Filter 1 (the reputable unbiased or disinterested third party) removes researcher selection bias and Filter 2 (self-rating) serves to screen out disinterested and unqualified personnel" (p. 42).

**Size of The Panel**

The literature did not reveal specific criteria for determining sample size when using the Delphi technique. Early studies used small numbers of respondents. Project Delphi (COPES Report, 1973) used seven
experts. Norton (1970) involved 1185 individuals in 30 subgroups. Cypert and Gant (1971) identified a sample of 42 subjects. Brooks (1973) included approximately 100 participants. The number of participants varies considerably, according to the intent of the specific study. Bunning (1979) stated: "no guidelines exist that describe the most appropriate number of experts to select for the Delphi process" (p. 180).

Indications were that the sample should be large enough to obtain the amount of expertise necessary to effectively conduct the study. Beyond this number, the sample size should be held to a minimum to reduce cost and reduce an over abundance of data which becomes cumbersome and yields no additional information for the study. Considering the literature, 50 experts from each of the three groups including agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors were used in this study.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES

Introduction

A modified Delphi technique was the principle procedure used to conduct this study. Traditionally, the Delphi utilizes a type of instrumentation which asked an open-ended question. Due to the nature of this study and the availability of essential information, a structured instrument was developed by the researcher and refined by a panel of experts for use in the first round of the Delphi. During this aspect of the study, alternative positions with regard to selected issues were identified and/or revised, thus answering the first research question. Utilization of a modified Delphi technique produced the data needed to answer the remaining research questions.

This chapter describes the (a) Delphi panel selection process, (b) development of the instrument, (c) procedures for collecting data, and (d) an analysis of data.

Panel Selection Process

A purposefully selected sample of experts from the population of agricultural education teacher educators, secondary teachers, and state supervisors was identified. As suggested by Helmer (1975) respondents with expert status were utilized. For the purpose of this study, an expert, was an individual with an indepth knowledge and insight with
regard to the research question. Third parties were used to select potential respondents to guard against researcher selection bias. Only those potential respondents who were selected and who desired to participate were included in the panel. Due to the distinct features of the groups included in the study, separate procedures for selecting experts from the groups secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors were identified.

For the group of secondary teachers, each state president of the vocational agriculture teachers' association was asked to nominate a secondary agricultural education teacher from his state who could provide the most meaningful input into this study. State presidents were encouraged to give themselves equal consideration in the selection. (Refer to Appendix A for the form used to nominate expert secondary teachers.) The Directory of State Association Officers (1980), published by the National Vocational Agricultural Teachers' Association provided names and addresses of the state presidents.

Initial contact with the state presidents on May 5, 1981 included (a) a one-page cover letter, (b) self-addressed stamped return envelope, (c) an abstract of the study, and (d) a return form. This cover letter identified the purpose of the study, described the research methodology, and requested the name and mailing address of a teacher from their state who could provide the most meaningful input to this study. (See Appendix B for the letter). An enclosed form listed criteria for selecting experts and provided space for identifying the expert secondary teachers. State presidents were requested to return the completed form by May 15, 1981. (See Appendix A for the return form.)
Presidents were given additional information about the study via an abstract. (See Appendix C for the abstract.)

Communications with the state presidents and other correspondence soliciting assistance in this study included mints as a reward, self-addressed first class stamped envelopes, written material printed in easy to read type, and printed on good quality paper to improve response rate as suggested by Linsky (1975). Official stationery of The Ohio State University Department of Agricultural Education was used to link the study with a well known agency to encourage response. When the researcher received the desired information, respondents were mailed a letter of appreciation. (See Appendix B for each of two different copies of the letter of appreciation.)

Non-respondent state presidents were mailed a follow-up letter on May 27, 1981. (See Appendix B for a copy of the follow-up letter.) A return form was also enclosed identical to the previous mailing with the exception of a change to blue paper. On June 13, 1981 all non-respondents were contacted by phone and encouraged to provide the name of an expert via phone. In three cases the researcher was unable to talk directly to the state presidents. Up to three additional phone contacts were made for each of the three nonrespondents. At this point the researcher was convinced that all possible experts had been identified for secondary agricultural teachers. The total number of returns from state presidents of vocational agricultural teachers associations was 48 or 98.0 percent. Only 49 states were considered in the population since Hawaii did not have a state president listed. Of the 48 responses, 46 or 93.9 percent of the frame were deemed usable.
One unusable response did not arrive until 40 days after mailing of the first questionnaire. Another unusable response was identified as a state supervisor after round one of the Delphi was completed.

The population of teacher educators in agriculture was less than 500 individuals. Regional and national meetings and other activities of the profession provide teacher educators with an opportunity to become acquainted with the expertise of their constituents. In particular, the president of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture has an opportunity to associate with other leaders in teacher education. By virtue of this experience, the current and previous two AATEA presidents and president elect were asked to independently nominate 50 teacher educators who could provide the most meaningful input into the study. The fifty teacher educators receiving the highest number of votes were included in the panel.

Initial correspondence with the four AATEA presidents was mailed on May 8, 1981 and included (a) a one-page cover letter, (b) self-addressed stamped return envelope, (c) a form listing criteria for selecting expert teacher educators, (d) a voting ballot, and (e) an abstract of the study. The cover letter identified the purpose of the study, described the selected research methodology, and requested assistance in identifying 50 expert teacher educators. (See Appendix B for a copy of the letter.) The Directory of Agricultural Teacher Educators (Rogers, 1980) was included as a ballot on which respondents checked (✓) the 50 teacher educators perceived to be most expert with regard to the research question. A one-page description of criteria to consider in selecting the experts and directions for using the Directory as a ballot
were attached to the front of the *Directory of Agricultural Teacher Educators* (See Appendix A for the criteria sheet enclosed with the Directory.) An abstract was enclosed to acquaint subjects with the study. (See Appendix C for the abstract.) The same procedure to enhance response rate was used with teacher educators as was used with secondary teachers. Response was received from 4 or 100 percent of the third parties without need for follow-up. Letters of appreciation were mailed to the AATEA president, two past presidents, and president-elect on June 6, 1981. (See Appendix B for the letter of appreciation.)

Fifty-two teacher educators received two or more votes in the selection process. The researcher determined that one of the teacher educators selected had resigned at an effective date prior to the anticipated completion date for this study. This individual was dropped from the potential pool of experts. Of the remaining 51 teacher educators, those receiving three or four votes were included in the pool. Those receiving two votes were assigned a number. Numbers were selected from a table of random numbers until the sample of fifty teacher educators was selected.

The sample of state supervisors in agricultural education included all head state supervisors, purely by virtue of their position. Individuals in this position interface with state department officials, assistant state agriculture supervisors, and teachers of agricultural education. State supervisors should be privy to the most up-to-date data. *The Directory of State Officials with Responsibility for Programs of Vocational Education in Agriculture* (1981) provided the names and addresses of head state supervisors.
In summary, the potential pool for Delphi panel members included 46 secondary teachers, 50 teacher educators, and 50 state supervisors in agricultural education. Thus, a total of 146 subjects were purposefully selected as potential participants in the Delphi procedure outlined for this study.

**Instrument Development**

Development of an instrument to answer the primary research question involved (a) a researcher developed instrument and (b) review and refinement of the initial instrument by a panel of experts. The instrument contained a list of alternative positions with regard to the issues under investigation in the study.

As suggested by Kerlinger (1973) the researcher first reviewed related literature to determine essential information with regard to the research question. Kerlinger (1973) and Parten (1950) noted the desirability of identifying accurate information from a review of the literature instead of an expensive and time consuming research study. Parten (1950) noted that questions on the research questionnaire should be avoided if answers could be secured more accurately and effectively from other sources, unless a check on existing information or a search for new information is desired. An initial list of alternative positions with regard to the selected issues was identified by the researcher from the literature.

Complexity of social science, the rapidly changing agricultural industry, and the potential for researcher bias in the identification and description of positions on the issues created the need for a review
by a panel of experts. In addition, other possible positions may exist as suggested by Parten (1950).

Hostrop (1975) suggested the use of a disinterested third party to select a jury in order to avoid researcher selection bias. In such cases, quality of the panel is a function of the ability of the third party to select capable panel members. One of the most important criteria for the selection of the third party included a knowledge of the population in light of the research concern. The immediate past president of the Agricultural Education Division of the American Vocational Association, Dr. J. Robert Warmbrod, was selected to identify the jury.

Criteria for selection of jury members included a minimum of two individuals from each of the groups agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors who were most expert with regard to the research question. Dr. Warmbrod was personally contacted April 24, 1981 and asked to select the panel. (See Appendix D for a list of panel members.)

The number of jury members may vary depending upon the nature of the problem under investigation (Kerlinger, 1973). A jury of seven members in the present study: (1) provided sufficient diversity and scope of response; and (2) allowed the researcher to contact jury members by phone without exceeding the budget for the study. (See Figure 3 for a summary of the jury selection process.)

The seven potential panel members were mailed a packet of materials on May 1, 1981. The packet included (a) a cover letter, (b) a
The cover letter appealed to the potential respondents to participate in the study. An alturistic appeal to help improve the profession was directed to respondents as suggested by Parten (1950). The respondents were also informed of their perceived "expert" status in the profession. To indicate the source of the study, the cover letter was printed on official stationery from the Department of Agricultural Education, The Ohio State University (Parten, 1950). (See Appendix B for the cover letter.)

The questionnaire was developed for two purposes: (a) to obtain demographic data regarding the area and degree of expertise of the respondents and (b) to refine and/or add to the researcher developed instrument.

The questionnaire was carefully constructed to communicate the problem and type of response desired as suggested by Helmer (1966).
Factors identified by Pucel, Nelson, and Wheeler (1970) to enhance questionnaire response rate were considered as follows:

1. logical in question organization,
2. clear and unambiguous in wording,
3. non-repetitive and non-trivial,
4. as brief as possible,
5. attractively reproduced,
6. avoids the use of the word questionnaire,
7. keeps directions brief, clear and distinct, and
8. is printed on colored paper. (p. 2)

To enhance attractiveness and facilitate mailing, the questionnaire was developed and printed on goldenrod colored 60 wt. paper in an 8 1/2" x 11" booklet format. A panel of 5 graduate students at The Ohio State University reviewed the instrument for clarity prior to mailing. (See Appendix E for list of the graduate student review panel.) (See Appendix F for a copy of the questionnaire.)

Respondents were requested to complete and return the questionnaire by May 15, 1981 or to respond via phone when contacted by the researcher on May 12, 1981. The researcher arranged for telephone tape recording equipment to facilitate response via phone. All seven respondents chose to return the questionnaire by mail instead of responding by phone.

All panelists returned the completed questionnaire. A follow-up via phone to one panel member was necessary. Letters of appreciation were mailed to respondents May 26, 1981. (See Appendix B for a copy of this letter of appreciation.)
A revised list of position statements was formulated with regard to the issues investigated in the study based upon recommendations from the panel of experts. With revision as suggested by the panel of experts, the modified Delphi instrument was developed for round one. The purpose of this instrument was to gather the data needed to answer the primary research question.

Conventional use of the Delphi calls for an open ended questionnaire with unstructured responses (Hostrop, 1975; Linstone and Turoff, 1975). The nature of the present research required that a modified Delphi be used. Issue/position statements derived from the literature and refined by the panel of experts circumvented the need for an unstructured questionnaire. Thus, the researcher utilized the modified Delphi to explore additional important objectives for this study. On the first round of the Delphi, participants were asked to indicate their (a) agreement or disagreement with the position statements, and (b) support their reaction if they desired. (See Appendix G for a copy of the round one instrument.) (See Figure 4 for the round one instrument development process.)

Procedures for Collecting Data

Round One

A pool of potential participants for round one of the Delphi included 50 teacher educators, 50 state supervisors, and 47 secondary teachers of agricultural education. A packet of materials mailed to this pool of potential participants had two primary purposes: (a) to identify who was willing to participate in the study, and (b) to provide
necessary material for response to round one for those who agreed to participate.

Correspondence mailed to 147 experts on June 12, 1981 consisted of (a) a cover letter, (b) a copy of the instrument, (c) a stamped self-addressed return envelope, and (d) mints as a token of appreciation for considering and/or responding to round one.

The cover letter (a) described the nature of the study, (b) described the research technique, (c) described the selection process used to identify potential respondents, and (d) asked the potential respondents to participate in the study. (See Appendix B for a copy of the cover letter.)
Significant aspects of the study were communicated via the cover letter and a summary located in the round one instrument. Particular attention was given to the Delphi technique as applicable to the present study.

Prior to mailing, the instrument was pilot tested for clarity on five graduate students in agricultural education at the Ohio State University. (See Appendix E for a list of the instrument review panel.)

Respondents were directed to return the instrument in an enclosed self-adressed stamped envelope by June 24, 1981. Input in the Delphi should come from sincere dedicated respondents (Hostrop, 1975; Linstone and Turoff, 1975). Therefore, no follow-up mailing for nonrespondents was initiated.

Compilation for Round One

Expert response was monitored via a coded number on the instrument. On July 10, 1981 data collection was ended for round one. A total of 104 or 70.7 percent of the pool of experts agreed to participate in the study by responding to round one. All returned questionnaires were usable. Response from 12 subjects or 8.2 percent arrived after the cut-off date and were not included in the study. Thirty subjects or 20.5 percent failed to return a questionnaire. One expert from the group secondary teachers was identified as a state supervisor and removed from the study. Of the 104 subjects who agreed to participate in the study prior to the cut-off date, 32 or 30.8 percent were secondary agricultural teachers, 30 or 28.8 percent were state supervisors, and 42 or 40.4 percent were teacher educators. The 104 subjects constituted the Delphi panel for this study.
Results from round one were summarized and depicted in the round two questionnaire by the use of histograms and typed summary comments. The overall percent of group agreement and disagreement was reported along with histograms for each position statement. A red X marked on the histograms reported to each subject their previous response. Verbal comments as summarized for each position statement were recorded on the round two instrument as feedback to the respondents. For issues or positions where the researcher noted confusion among respondents, statements for clarification purposes were inserted in appropriate locations in the round two instrument. These statements were placed in boxes and prefaced by the statement, "note from the researcher". (See Appendix H for a copy of the round two questionnaire.)

Between round one and round two the primary responsibility of the researcher was to act as a facilitator for the respondents to share information and provide opportunity for reassessment of individual opinions.

Round Two

The round two questionnaire (a) described the overall group reaction from round one and (b) provided each subject with their previous response in agreement or disagreement. After considering this information, the respondents were asked to reevaluate their stance on the alternative positions. Respondents were free to change or retain their previous stance after considering the new data.

The round two mailing consisted of (a) a cover letter, (b) the round two instrument, (c) a stamped self-addressed return envelope, (d) a handwritten note from the researcher, and (e) two mints. (See Appendix B
for a copy of the round two cover letter.) The questionnaire was printed in the same booklet style as the previous round, but on light green colored paper. A change in instrument color permitted easy distinction between round one and round two instruments. Hand written notes from the researcher were included for two purposes (a) as an added incentive for response and (b) as a means to personally respond to individual questions asked by respondents. The same appeal for response used in round one was retained in round two. Procedures for returning the instrument were also identical to round one. Respondents were asked to return the questionnaire by August 3, 1981.

Prior to mailing, the instrument was pilot tested for clarity by six graduate students in agricultural education at the Ohio State University. (See Appendix E for a list of the instrument review panel.)

One follow-up letter was mailed on August 6, 1981 to extend the response period and encourage response. The researcher had reason to believe that some respondents were on vacation during the original response period. (See Appendix B for a copy of the round two follow-up letter.)

Expert response was monitored by a coded number on the instrument. On August 15, 1981 data collection was ended for round two. A total of 94 or 90.4 percent of the Delphi panel responded to round two. Four or 3.8 percent of the subjects responded after data collection was terminated. Of those responding prior to the termination of data collection 39 or 41.5 percent were teacher educators, 27 or 28.7 percent were state supervisors, and 28 or 29.8 percent were secondary teachers.
Compilation for Round Two

Round two data was tabulated and depicted according to same procedure used in round one.

According to Hostrop (1975), Linstone and Turoff (1975) the data should converge toward the majority opinion on round two more so than any other round. A third round of the Delphi was deemed necessary since the percent of respondents in agreement or disagreement with a majority of the position statements changed between round two and three. Additional movement was anticipated for round three.

Round Three

Round three was considered as the final round, based on the literature on the Delphi and results from round three. Previous research indicated that little additional movement toward convergence occurs after this round (Hostrop, 1975; Linstone and Turoff, 1975).

Material mailed to respondents in round three included (a) a cover letter, (b) the round three questionnaire, (c) a stamped self-addressed return envelope, (d) a personal note from the researcher, and (e) two mints. The instrument for round three contained the data from round two tabulated and depicted according to the same format used in the previous rounds and asked respondents to (a) indicate their agreement or disagreement with the position statement, (b) support their position if desired, (c) provide missing demographic information by utilizing an information sheet, and (d) indicate their perceptions concerning the overall importance of further study and discussion of the issue after considering data collected in the present study. The later objective was accomplished by using a four point rating scale with the descriptors
very important, moderately important, limited importance, and no further consideration needed. The round three instrument was blue in color to distinguish it from round two. (See Appendix B for a copy of the round three cover letter.) (See Appendix I for a copy of the round three questionnaire.) (See Appendix J for the demographic data form.)

Prior to mailing, the instrument was pilot tested for clarity by six graduate students in agricultural education at the Ohio State University. (See Appendix E for a list of the instrument review panel.)

Expert response was monitored by a coded number on the instrument. Follow-up letters were not mailed since the philosophy of the Delphi technique discourages soliciting response from unwilling subjects. No apparent extenuating circumstances occurred which necessitated additional contact with non-respondents.

On September 12, 1981 data collection was ended. The total number of respondents was 86 or 82.7 percent of the panel. All returns were deemed usable.

A check of non-respondents between round one and three indicated that the percent of agreement on the positions was similar to the pattern of respondents. Thus, movement toward consensus between rounds could not be attributed to drop-out of respondents representing a minority viewpoint.

Round Three Summary

A summary of round three and a thank you letter was prepared and mailed to Delphi panel members who completed all three Delphi rounds. (See Appendix B for a copy of the thank you letter.) (See Appendix K for a copy of the round three summary.)
Analysis of Data

Analysis of data for this study consisted of descriptive statistics. The categories "agree" and "disagree" were assigned the value of 1 and 2 respectively. The categories "very important", "moderate importance", "limited importance", and "no further consideration" were coded 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively with regard to further study and discussion of the issues. A numerical coding system was also developed for demographic data. These data were recorded on code sheets, cards were punched and verified, and analyzed by the Instructional Research Computer Center of the Ohio State University.

The computer program used in the statistical analysis was the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (NIE et al., 1975). This program produced frequency distributions; cross tabulations for the groups agricultural secondary teachers, state supervisors, and teacher educators; and descriptive statistics concerning the extent of consensus on the position statements. Supportive commentary was summarized by the researcher and reported as a list of descriptive phrases.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which alternative positions with regard to selected issues pertaining to the K-12 public school agricultural education program were acceptable to agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors.

The research questions investigated were:

1. What are the alternative positions on the selected issues as perceived by agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors?

2. What is the extent of acceptance of the alternative positions on the selected issues among agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors?

3. What are the perceptions of agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors regarding the importance of further study and discussion of the issues?

A seven member panel of experts which included two secondary teachers, two teacher educators, two state supervisors, and one member of the National Agricultural Education Advisory Council was selected by an independent third party. Panel members were contacted and asked to review the researcher developed instrument. This instrument contained positions with regard to selected issues in agricultural education. The
issues and position statements as revised by the seven member expert panel provided the answer to one of the research questions in this study and were used to develop the round one modified Delphi questionnaire.

One hundred and forty-six experts in agricultural education were identified as potential Delphi panel members. From this pool of experts, 104 or 71.2 percent of the possible subjects agreed to participate in each of three Delphi rounds. Panel members included 32 agricultural education secondary teachers, 42 teacher educators, and 30 state supervisors. Thus, 104 experts were the Delphi panel for the study.

Subjects responded via mailed questionnaires according to a modified Delphi technique. Three successive questionnaires were developed and mailed to the subjects. Data were collected from 104, 94, and 86 experts during rounds one, two, and three respectively. The percent of subjects responding was 100.0 percent, 90.4 percent, and 82.7 percent for rounds one, two, and three respectively.

The first part of this chapter describes the alternative positions with regard to selected issues in agricultural education. The latter part of the chapter is a presentation of the findings of the three round modified Delphi process. Data are summarized and displayed using frequencies, scatterplots, and summary statistics.

Identification of Alternative Positions Pertaining to Selected Issues in Agricultural Education

The first research question which the study addressed was: "What are the alternative positions on the selected issues as perceived by agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors?"
Issues and alternative positions were (a) identified from a review of related literature, (b) developed into an instrument format, and (c) submitted to a seven member expert panel for their input. (See Appendix F for the researcher developed instrument.) Issues and alternative position statements as revised by the seven member panel of experts provided the answer to the research question as previously stated.

Presentation of data is organized around (a) individual demographic data of the expert review panel and (b) reactions of the panelists to the researcher developed list of issues and alternative position statements.

**Review Panel Demographic Data**

Panel demographic data were important for verification of the expert status of panel members. The expertise of panel members was screened by two control measures (a) selection by a qualified independent third party and (b) self-rating by panel members. Demographic data obtained from the seven member panel of experts revealed considerable experience in and service to their respective areas of agricultural education. The distribution of subjects by group affiliation in agricultural education included two secondary teachers, two teacher educators, two state supervisors, and a member of the National Agricultural Education Advisory Council.

The mean number of years of education beyond high school among the seven experts was 6.6 years with a mean of 11.1 years of secondary teaching experience in agriculture. Teacher educators \((N = 2)\) reported a mean of 13 years of experience in their profession, while state supervisors \((N = 2)\) reported a mean of 10 years of experience in their
profession. All seven experts had been members of the National Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association and were current members of their affiliated professional association. Five of the seven experts had been either national or state officers in either the National Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association, American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, or the National Association of Supervisors of Agricultural Education.

Anonymity of individual jurors' demographic data promised by the researcher precludes more specific portrayal of the data. Demographic data confirmed expert status of the seven member panel.

Panel Reactions to the Researcher Developed List of Issues and Alternative Positions

An instrument containing researcher developed issues and associated alternative position statements was mailed to the seven member expert review panel. The primary purpose of this review process was to (a) refine the important alternative positions as stated and (b) identify and describe any additional important positions pertaining to the issues. Panelists were directed to check one of two categories, "refine" or "no refinement necessary", for each position statement. If refinement of the position statement was deemed necessary, panelist reported written revisions in space provided adjacent to each position. Data from the expert panel review process are reported in the following sections for each of the nine issues under investigation in this study. The complete list of issue and position statements as identified by the researcher and reviewed by the seven member expert review panel is presented in Figure 5 at the end of this section.
Issue number one. What should be the purpose of agricultural education in the public school system?

Two revisions were suggested by the review panel with regard to alternative positions pertaining to this issue. The alternative position, "in preparation for advanced study of agriculture," was deleted and two more specific position statements were added. The new statements were:

(1) in preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the postsecondary level.

(2) in preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the baccalaureate level.

The panel also suggested the following additional position: "to develop the abilities of individuals to be intelligent consumers of agricultural products". A total of eight position statements were identified for this issue.

Issue number two. What clientele should be served by agricultural education in the public school system?

Three revisions were reported for this issue. The position statements dealing with "social and economic handicaps" were revised to read "social, physical, and economic handicaps". The statement, "in-school male and female students regardless of agricultural occupational preference" was revised to read, "females seeking employment or self-employment in agriculture regardless of the type of agricultural occupational preference". Position statements dealing with "employment in agriculture" were revised to include "self-employment".
One additional position was described as, "out-of-school youth or adults who desire knowledge and skill in agriculture for personal reasons other than for employment or self-employment in agriculture". A total of 13 position statements were described by the researcher and review panel for this issue.

**Issue number three.** What should be the content of agricultural education in the public school system?

The panel suggested the deletion of two positions from the researcher developed list of positions. The position statements, "agricultural technologies" and "agriculturally related technologies" were considered too ambiguous and irrelevant to the K-12 public school agricultural program. Panel members cited the position statement, "other types of agriculture" as including those areas that might be described as "technologies or related technologies". "Horticulture" was added as an alternative position in addition to "ornamental horticulture". Panel members noted that in the agricultural industry, horticulture is not restricted to ornamentals in many states. The word, "businesses", was deleted from all position statements. Inclusion of this term was perceived as being unnecessary. "Renewable natural resources" was considered a more appropriate term than "agricultural resources". Examples were developed for three position statements to enhance clarity as suggested by panelists. A total of ten position statements were identified for this issue.

**Issue number four.** What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should be required to conduct supervised occupational experience/practice programs?
Panel members noted the potential for differences of opinion concerning vocational and avocational types of students. Therefore, a position statement, "of all students enrolled in non-vocational agricultural education programs" was added. The term "vocational student" was added to the position statements dealing with production and non-production types of students at the suggestion of the review panel. Concern was also expressed about occupational experience programs for nontraditional clientele. Two additional positions were described as:

(1) of all students receiving agricultural instruction in grades K-6.

(2) of all students enrolled in classes for orientation to agriculture, such as in grades 7 and 8.

Five position statements pertaining to the issue were described.

**Issue number five.** What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for production agriculture students in the public school system?

A position dealing with projects of an "entrepreneurial" nature was added to the list of position statements. One panel member noted controversy within the profession concerning whether projects should be limited to those specifically associated with the course of study in which the student is enrolled or whether any type of agricultural project should be acceptable. Therefore, the position statement, "projects related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled," was added. A total of 11 position statements were identified with regard to this issue.
**Issue number six.** What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for non-production agriculture students in the public school system?

Two additional position statements were identified with regard to this issue. The two position statements included:

(1) projects of an entrepreneurial [ownership] nature.
(2) projects related exclusively to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.

A total of nine position statements were identified with regard to this issue.

**Issue number seven.** What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should become members of the FFA?

One position statement regarding this issue was deleted and two positions were added as replacements. The purpose of the additions was to provide respondents a means to distinguish between vocational and avocational students with regard to the issue. The position statement, "only those students who desire to become members," was replaced with:

(1) only those vocational students who desire to become members.
(2) only those avocational students who desire to become members.

All other positions regarding this issue were restricted to vocational students as suggested by the review panel. A total of five position statements were identified which pertained to this issue.

**Issue number eight.** What aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system should occupy in-class instructional time?
A total of 11 position statements were identified by the researcher and retained by the review panel with minor editorial changes. No additional positions were identified by the panel.

**Issue number nine.** What title should be used to describe agricultural education programs in the public school system?

Three additional program titles were identified by the review panel including "vocational agriculture/agribusiness," "agricultural and natural resources education," and "agriculture/agribusiness education". Thus, a total of eight position statements was identified for this issue.

**Summary of Expert Panel Reactions to the Researcher Developed List of Issues and Alternative Positions**

The researcher with the assistance of a seven member expert review panel identified and described 79 alternative positions pertaining to nine selected issues in agricultural education. Essentially, the development process involved three steps. The researcher developed a list of position statements through a review of related literature. This list was refined by a seven member panel of experts. Suggestions from the panel of experts were then compiled by the researcher to formulate the final list of position statements. Thus, the research question as follows was answered: "What are the alternative positions on the selected issues as perceived by agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors?"

Figure 5 presents the 79 alternative positions identified through the review process. Clarification statements for certain positions were noted on the rounds one, two, and three questionnaires during a
subsequent part of this study. Clarification statements were used to answer questions posed by respondents and to clarify any respondent misconception as noted by the researcher. Thus, figure 5 includes clarification statements enclosed in parentheses and printed directly below the appropriate issue or position statement.

Issues and position statements emerging from this phase of the study provided information for development of the round one Delphi instrument.

Extent of Acceptance of the Alternative Positions by Secondary Teachers, Teacher Educators, and State Supervisors

The purpose of this section is to present data which answers the research question: What is the extent of acceptance of the alternative positions on the selected issues among agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors?

Data were gathered in response to the previously stated research question through the use of a modified Delphi technique. Issue statements and position statements identified and refined by the researcher and a panel of seven experts were developed into instrument format for the round one mailing. (See Appendix G for a copy of the round one instrument.) Forty-six secondary teachers, 50 teacher educators, and 50 state supervisors were identified as a potential pool of experts to respond to this phase of the study. All 146 experts were mailed a letter requesting their participation in the three round Delphi. Thirty-two secondary teachers, 42 teacher educators, and 30 state supervisors agreed to participate in the Delphi by responding to round one. Thus, the Delphi panel was established at this point in the study.
FIGURE 5

POSITIONS WITH REGARD TO SELECTED ISSUES IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Issue Number One:

What should be the purpose of agricultural education in the public school system?

Alternative Positions:

1. for general education of an avocational or practical arts nature.
2. for orientation to and exploration of occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.
3. in preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the post-secondary level.
4. in preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the baccalaureate level.
5. in preparation for employment or self-employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.
6. for upgrading and retraining employed or self-employed persons in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture. (This position should not be limited to the school day instructional program. Therefore, please consider out-of-school evening classes as a possibility as applicable to the secondary K-12 agricultural education program.)
7. to develop the "total individual" by teaching independent thinking, decision making, problem solving, creativity, leadership, citizenship, and other human qualities.
8. to develop the abilities of individuals to be intelligent consumers of agricultural products.

Issue Number Two:

What clientele should be served by agricultural education in the public school system?

Alternative Positions: (Alternative positions 1-13 are not intended to be mutually exclusive. For example, agreement with clientele being students in grades 9-10 does not mean that this is the only grade level that should be served. Rather, this would indicate that students in grades 9-10 should be a part of the clientele served by agricultural education.)
1. students in grades K-6.
2. students in grades 7-8.
3. students in grades 9-10.
4. students in grades 11-12.
5. out-of-school youth employed or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture. (This position should not be interpreted as limited to the school day instructional program. You should, however, consider this potential clientele group with regard to agricultural education programs at the secondary level.)
6. adults employed, self-employed or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture. (This position should not be interpreted as limited to the school day instructional program. You should, however, consider this potential clientele group with regard to agricultural education programs at the secondary level.)
7. out-of-school youth or adults who desire knowledge and skill in agriculture for personal reasons other than for employment or self-employment in agriculture. (This statement should not be interpreted as limited to the school day instructional program. You should, however, consider this potential clientele group with regard to agricultural education programs at the secondary level.)
8. rural students.
9. urban students.
10. suburban students.
11. in-school youth with social, physical, and economic handicaps.
12. out-of-school youth and adults with social, physical, and economic handicaps.
13. Females seeking employment in agriculture, regardless of the type of agricultural occupational preference.

Issue Number Three:

What should be the content of agricultural education in the public school system?
Alternative Positions: (We are trying to identify legitimate content for agricultural education programs nationally. Agreement or disagreement with each alternative position should not be governed by a local situation, but a perspective of agricultural education in the United States.)

1. agricultural production.

2. agricultural supply and service.

3. agricultural mechanics.

4. agricultural products.

5. ornamental horticulture. Example: floriculture and nursery management.

6. horticulture. Example: food production such as fruits and vegetables.

7. renewable natural resources.

8. forestry.

9. other types of agriculture such as small animal care and horse training.

Issue Number Four:

What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should be required to conduct supervised occupational experience/practice programs?

Alternative Positions:

1. of all vocational students enrolled in a production agriculture course of study.

2. of all vocational students enrolled in a non-production agriculture course of study.

3. of all students enrolled in non-vocational agricultural education programs. (This position statement refers to students who may be enrolled in agricultural classes for the purpose of general education or practical arts, not vocational agriculture.)

4. of all students enrolled in classes for orientation to agriculture such as in grades 7 and 8.

5. of all students receiving agricultural instruction in grades K-6.
Issue Number Five:

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a production agricultural program in the public school system?

Alternative Positions: (Agreement with alternative positions 1-4 does not imply exclusion of other positions. For example, agreement with supervised farming projects does not imply that this is the only acceptable supervised occupational experience practice. How you vote on the other positions will determine which positions are acceptable or unacceptable.)

1. supervised farming projects (enterprises).
2. home and/or farm improvement projects.
3. supplementary farm projects.
4. group (several students working together) projects related to production agriculture.
5. projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature.
6. projects related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled. Example: students enrolled in horticulture should have experience programs in horticulture; if in animal science the experience programs should be in animal science.
7. farm placement.
8. practice/experience in the school laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction.
9. practice/experience in the school laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm during class time.
10. exploratory experiences such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.
11. cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day.

Issue Number Six:

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in non-production agriculture in the public school system?
Alternative Positions: (Agreement with alternative positions 1-4 does not imply exclusion of other positions. For example, agreement with home projects does not imply that this is the only acceptable supervised occupational experience/practice. How you vote on the other positions will determine which positions are acceptable or unacceptable.

1. home projects of non-production nature such as lawn care and lawn mower maintenance.

2. placement in agribusiness.

3. group projects of a non-production agriculture nature.

4. projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature.

5. projects related exclusively to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled. Example: students enrolled in horticulture should have experience programs in horticulture; if in agribusiness, experience programs should be in agribusiness.

6. practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction.

7. practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm during class time.

8. exploratory experience such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.

9. cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day.

Issue Number Seven:

What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should be members of the FFA?

Alternative Positions: (Positions 1-5 pertaining to this issue are with regard to students in grades K-12 enrolled in the school day agricultural education program.)

1. all vocational students in a production agriculture course of study.

2. all vocational students in a non-production agriculture course of study.

3. all vocational students in an orientation to agriculture course of study, such as 7th and 8th grade programs.

4. only those vocational students who desire to become members.
5. Avocational students who desire to become members.

Issue Number Eight:

What aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system should occupy in-class instructional time?

Alternative Positions:

1. Planning any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.

2. Conducting any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities. (This position indicates that all FFA activities may legitimately be conducted during class time. If you perceive that these activities should be screened or selected on some criteria, you should disagree with the position.)

3. Selected FFA activities which directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.

4. FFA activities which may not directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled, but have educational value for the development of leadership, citizenship, and cooperation essential for success in agricultural occupations.

5. Selected FFA activities which can be utilized without taking time needed to teach content of the instructional program. (This position establishes teaching the technical competencies and skills in agriculture as the first priority of agricultural education. Instructional time devoted to FFA activities would be limited to selected activities that complement and enhance the teaching of technical skills and competencies.)

6. Preparation for judging contests of a nature that is directly related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.

7. Preparation for any judging contest.

8. Activities specifically selected to develop leadership, citizenship, and cooperation.

9. Record keeping for individual and chapter awards.

10. Preparation of individual award applications.

11. Fund raising projects which use minimal class time that relate to agriculture, have educational value, and are conducted according to sound business practices.

Issue Number Nine:
What title should be used to describe agricultural education programs in the public school system?

Alternative Positions:

1. vocational agriculture.
2. agricultural education.
3. agriculture/agribusiness/natural resources education.
4. vocational-technical education in agriculture.
5. agricultural education and renewable natural resources.
6. vocational agriculture/agribusiness.
7. agricultural and natural resources education.
8. agriculture/agribusiness education.

Round one, two, and three instruments solicited two types of reactions to each position statement. Respondents were invited to (a) indicate their agreement or disagreement with each position and (b) support their reaction with written commentary. Presentation of anonymous respondent commentary between rounds provided information for consideration by panelists in the reevaluation process.

Data collected from round one were summarized and reported in the round two instrument. (See Appendix H for the round two instrument.) On the round two instrument respondents were asked to reevaluate their stance on each position. Reevaluation was to be based on data collected from round one. The total attrition from round one to round two was 9.6 percent.

Data collected from round two were summarized and reported in the round three instrument. (See appendix I for the round three instrument.) Respondents were again asked to reevaluate their stance on
each position based on data collected from the previous round. The total attrition rate from round two to round three was 7.7 percent. Table 1 reports the total composition of the panel and the composition by the groups secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors for each of the Delphi rounds.

Much less panel attrition was recorded than anticipated by the researcher. Panel attrition was a concern because of instrument length which was 18 pages, 44 pages, and 58 pages for rounds one, two, and three, respectively. Of the initial panel of 104 experts, 82.7 percent responded to round two. The total attrition rates for rounds two and three were 9.6 percent and 8.6 percent, respectively. Table 2 reports attrition of the Delphi panel for the groups secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors. Approximately the same distribution of panel members in each of the three groups was maintained throughout

---

**Table 1**

Composition of the Delphi Panel for Each of the Three Rounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secondary Teachers</th>
<th>Teacher Educators</th>
<th>State Supervisors</th>
<th>Total Panel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>percent of total</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>percent of total</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
Attrition Rate of the Delphi Panel by Groups: Secondary Teachers, Teacher Educators, and State Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secondary Teachers</th>
<th>Teacher Educators</th>
<th>State Supervisors</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Cum. Freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n Cumulative</td>
<td>n Cumulative</td>
<td>n Cumulative</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Cum. Freq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the study. Since the Delphi technique was employed, slightly unequal balance between groups gave no individual or group an advantage in the decision and discussion process (Dybas, 1980).

With regard to panel movement toward consensus on the alternative positions, the greatest movement occurred between round one and round two. This phenomena is similar to that reported by other Delphi studies (Hostrop, 1975). Minimal additional movement toward consensus was obtained between round two and round three, as was anticipated. A fourth round was not deemed necessary, since minimal shift in panel perception was reported between rounds two and three. A summary of round three was prepared and mailed to respondents. (See Appendix K for the round three summary.) Attention is directed to Chapter 3 for a more detailed description of the research methodology for this phase of the study.
Presentation of the findings is organized around (a) panel demographic data and (b) reactions to the alternative positions.

The Delphi panel demographic data were important for verification of the expert status of panel members. In this section demographic data are reported in terms of experience in agricultural education and service to the profession.

Panel reactions are reported for the alternative positions pertaining to each of nine issues. Findings pertaining to each alternative position are reported in terms of (a) total panel agreement and disagreement with the position; (b) the extent of agreement with the position by the groups secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors; and (c) panel written commentary concerning the position.

Three cautions are noted concerning the findings presented in this section. First, questionnaires for rounds two and three reported the percent of panel member agreement, disagreement, and nonresponse for each position. Data presented in this chapter has been adjusted to discount non-respondents. Therefore, percentages reported in this section may not match percentages reported on questionnaires two and three. For example, the round three questionnaire reported 34.0, 63.8, and 2.1 percent of subjects in agreement, disagreement and as non-respondents, respectively with the position "for general education of an avocational or practical arts nature". Discounting non-respondents 34.8 percent of the panel members agreed with the position while 65.2 percent disagreed with the position. Secondly, a slight movement in the percent of agreement and disagreement for each position between rounds may be explained by the different number of
respondents for each round rather than a true shift of panel member opinion. The number of respondents was 104, 94, and 86 for rounds one, two, and three respectively. Thirdly, the discussion of the extent of agreement or disagreement among the groups secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors will focus on the majority viewpoint. For example, if 58 percent of the respondents disagreed with a position, the range of response among the groups will be discussed in terms of variability among respondents who disagreed with the position statement, rather than respondents who agreed with the position.

In general, findings which specifically answer the research question are summarized and presented in this section. Data concerning total group response and specific panel commentary by rounds are reported in questionnaires for rounds two, three, and the round three summary. (See Appendix H, I, and K for the round two and three questionnaires and the round three summary, respectively.)

Panel Demographic Data

The identification of experts with regard to the research question is important to the Delphi technique (Hostrop, 1975). The degree of panel member expertise for this study was confirmed by selections by independent third parties in the case of secondary teachers and teacher educators. State supervisors were considered experts by virtue of their position. Each respondent self-rated their individual expertise in terms of experience and service to agricultural education by response to a mailed questionnaire. (See Appendix J for a copy of the demographic data gathering instrument.)
The Delphi panel consisted of 104 subjects. Table 3 illustrates the years of formal education, work experience, and service to professional associations by panel members. Demographic data confirmed expert status of the panel members.

Findings Concerning Issue Number One: What Should Be the Purpose of Agricultural Education in the Public School System?

Findings with regard to each of the eight position statements pertaining to this issue are reported in this section. The reader is referred to Figure 6 on page 99 for a composite display of the extent of agreement by the total Delphi panel and by the groups secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors on the eight positions.

Position number one: for general education of an avocational or practical arts nature. Agreement with this position was expressed by 37.2 percent of the panel while 62.8 percent of the panelists disagreed. Panelists in disagreement with the position moved away from consensus 3.0 percent during round two and 2.4 percent during round three. Thus, the total panel movement away from consensus was 5.5 percent. The percent of disagreement with the position statement by groups ranged from 56.8 percent to 73.1 percent for teacher educators and state supervisors respectively.

Panelists in agreement with the position stated that the first priority of agricultural instruction should be vocational education; however, agricultural education should encompass instruction for homeowners, part-time agriculturalists, individuals seeking career information, and the general public who need an awareness level or basic
Table 3
Delphi Panel Members Degree of Expertise by Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Expertise</th>
<th>Work Experience</th>
<th>Professional Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal Education</td>
<td>Secondary Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teacher</td>
<td>30 1.8%</td>
<td>25 19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>42 3.0%</td>
<td>40 6.9 41 16.2 2 4.5 28 19.7 1 2.0 6 5.7 35 14.4 8 2.6 2 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>29 2.1%</td>
<td>23 12.1 2 11.9 25 13.8 21 24.5 5 2.2 12 3.4 1 2.0 22 13.7 9 2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** N indicates the number of respondents for each category.

*Based on 1 = bachelor of Science, 2 = Master of Science, 3 = Doctorate of Philosophy or Doctorate of Education.

*NVATA is the acronym for National Vocational Agriculture Teachers' Association.

*AAAPA is the acronym for American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture.

*NAASAE is the acronym for National Association of State Supervisors of Agricultural Education.
skills in agriculture. Some panel members noted that effective agricultural education programs of a practical arts nature are currently in existence.

A majority of panel members who disagreed with the position considered agricultural instruction as strictly vocational in nature, although exceptions were noted. Panelists stated that a departure from a vocational emphasis could result in a loss of program identity, vocational funding, instructional time needed for effective vocational instruction, and a decline in the number of students dedicated to agricultural career preparation. Panel commentary noted less reluctance to exclude avocational agricultural instruction if such instruction were given on a limited basis without vocational funding, as an introductory course, or as a minor part of existing programs during low enrollment cycles.

Position number two: for orientation to and exploration of occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture. Delphi panelists moved toward consensus by 3.5 and 3.2 percent during rounds two and three, respectively. At the end of round three 100.0 percent of the panel agreed with the position.

Panelists in agreement with this position noted that this purpose is practiced in existing programs and should be continued for student career orientation and for recruitment of an adequate agricultural labor force. Furthermore, panel members supported instruction of this nature in grades K through 12 for vocational and non-vocational courses, but emphasized the need for orientation and exploration during the first years of an agricultural instructional program.
Respondents who disagreed with the position during rounds one and two considered this purpose a function of career education. Some panelists also noted that exploration should occur prior to orientation.

**Position number three: in preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the postsecondary level.** Agreement with this position was expressed by 95.3 percent of the panel members, while 4.7 percent of the panelists disagreed. The change in the percent of panel member agreement toward consensus was 1.3 and 1.7 percent during rounds two and three, respectively, for a total of 3.0 percent. The percent of respondents in agreement with the position by groups ranged from 92.3 percent for state supervisors to 97.3 for teacher educators.

Commentary from panel members who were in agreement with the position stated that expanding agricultural technology creates the need for advanced training and/or specialization at the postsecondary level and that secondary and postsecondary programs should be articulated to effectively provide this function. Two cautions were noted by respondents who were in agreement with the position. First, they felt that preparation for postsecondary instruction should be an option, but not a primary purpose. Secondly, respondents doubted whether vocational funding should be provided for this purpose under present law.

Panel members who disagreed with the position stated that agricultural instruction in the public school system should emphasize job placement at the end of the 12th year and that students should receive "how-to-do-it" training instead of theoretical based instruction which is characteristic of preparatory programs for advanced training. Other, respondents in disagreement with the position recognized that
some "top students" should and would continue their education at the postsecondary level without agricultural education accepting this function as a stated purpose.

Position number four: in preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the baccalaureate level. During round three 84.9 percent of the respondents agreed with the position while 15.1 percent disagreed with the position. Panelists moved toward consensus 4.6 percent and 7.2 percent, respectively, during rounds two and three. Thus, the total panel movement was 11.8 percent. The extent of agreement with the position statement by groups ranged from 69.6 percent to 91.9 percent for secondary teachers and teacher educators, respectively.

Panel members who agreed with the position, stated that the agricultural education instructional program should motivate and prepare students to pursue a baccalaureate degree. Although a small number of secondary program graduates have traditionally obtained baccalaureate degrees, some panelists believed that this purpose should be emphasized in order to provide an adequate supply of professional agriculturalists. Panel members suggested changing the existing vocational legislation to permit accepting this purpose, but cautioned that preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the baccalaureate level should not become a primary purpose of agricultural education.

Respondents cited three basic reasons for disagreeing with this position which included: present vocational legislation does not provide for this purpose, only a small percent of secondary agricultural students will advance to the baccalaureate level, and the concept that agricultural education must be strictly vocational in purpose.
Position number five: in preparation for employment or self-employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture. Total panel consensus in agreement with this position was achieved during round one and maintained through round three. Panel members agreed with this purpose as a basic underlying principle of agricultural instruction in the secondary public school system.

Position number six: for upgrading and retraining employed or self-employed persons in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture. Agreement with the position was expressed by 97.6 percent of the respondents while 2.4 percent disagreed with the position. A change toward consensus in the percent of panel members who agreed with the position was 9.2 percent and 1.9 percent respectively at rounds two and three. Thus, panelists moved toward consensus 11.1 percent between rounds one and three. The extent of agreement with the position statement by groups ranged from 95.7 percent to 100.0 percent for secondary teachers and state supervisors, respectively.

Panelists who agreed with this position noted that adult programs are decreed by law, have proven themselves to be affective, complement the in-school secondary program, and are essential to meeting community agricultural education needs. Considering the future, panel members recognized the need to accommodate a growing number of adults as compared with other age groups, the need for adult instruction in energy conservation, and the need for updating skills in agricultural technologies including the non-farm areas. A portion of the panel stated that all agricultural education departments should have an adult program, while other panelists believed that every instructor should
teach adults. Other respondents were willing to support the position only when the effectiveness of the in-school secondary program is not hindered, adequate resources and teacher time is available, and teachers are adequately trained in the appropriate pedagogy and technical competencies. Another segment of panel members agreed with the position provided that this purpose is not served by a local community college.

Panel members who disagreed with the position considered this function as a responsibility of other education agencies and questioned the availability of teacher time and an adequate number of properly trained teachers.

Position number seven: to develop the "total individual" by teaching independent thinking, decision making, problem solving, creativity, leadership, citizenship, and other human qualities. Panel members moved toward consensus 6.6 percent and 2.7 percent, respectively, during rounds two and three, which accounted for a total shift of 9.3 percent. During round three 100.0 percent of the respondents agreed with the position.

Panel commentary in agreement with the position regarded developing the "total individual" as part of the purpose of all education and as an important prerequisite to entrance and advancement in agricultural occupations. Respondents considered the FFA as a means to accomplish this purpose.

Panel members in disagreement with the position in Delphi rounds one and two were concerned about trying to accomplish too much in the instructional program and becoming too closely associated with general education.
Position number eight: to develop the abilities of individuals to be intelligent consumers of agricultural products. Panelists moved toward agreement on the position 4.8 percent between rounds one and three with a shift of 2.6 and 2.2 percent during rounds two and three respectively. The range of agreement was from 61.5 percent for state supervisors to 78.4 percent for teacher educators. At the end of round three 72.1 percent of the panelists agreed with the position, while 27.9 percent disagreed.

Respondents who agreed with the position stated that agricultural education is diverse and must go beyond traditional concepts in order to meet the needs of the country in life style, diet, and food and fiber production; but, expressed concern about the availability of instructional time to accomplish this purpose. According to panelists, understanding agricultural skills would assist consumers in buying agricultural products, producers to grow marketable products, and agribusinessmen in marketing agricultural products. Some panelists thought that such instruction was appropriate for both vocational and avocational types of classes, while other panel members restricted their acceptance to one of the two types.

Panelists who were in disagreement with this position considered the development of consumer skills as nice to do, but not as important as teaching technical competencies. Instruction as a production or marketing input was considered to be an acceptable alternative by panelists, however, the position as stated was considered to be a responsibility of home economics or general education.
FIGURE 6
Extent of Agreement on the Alternative Positions with Regard to the Purpose of Agricultural Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. for general education of an avocational or practical arts nature.</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. for orientation to and exploration of occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. in preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the postsecondary level.</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. in preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the baccalaureate level.</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. in preparation for employment or self-employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. for upgrading and retraining employed or self-employed persons in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. to develop the &quot;total individual&quot; by teaching independent thinking, decision making, problem solving, creativity, leadership, citizenship, and other human qualities.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. to develop the abilities of individuals to be intelligent consumers of agricultural products.</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE.** A = Delphi panel, TE = Teacher educator panelists, SS = State supervisor panelists, ST = Secondary teacher panelists.
Findings Concerning Issue Number Two; What Clientele Should be Served by Agricultural Education in the Public School System?

Findings for the thirteen position statements pertaining to this issue are reported in the sections as follows. The reader is referred to Figure 7 on page 109 for a composite display of the extent of consensus on the thirteen positions pertaining to this issue. Figure 7 depicts the extent of agreement for the total Delphi panel and by the groups secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors.

Position number one: students in grades K-6. At the onset of reporting findings for this position, the researcher acknowledges an error in the percent of panelist agreement and disagreement with the position as reported on the round two questionnaire. The percent of panelists in agreement and disagreement with the position was reported as 87.5 percent and 12.5 percent, respectively. The percent of respondent agreement and disagreement with the position should have been reported as 26.9 percent and 67.3 percent, respectively, and 5.8 percent for non-respondents. This problem was not identified until after completion of data collection, thus, respondents were unaware of the error. The percent of agreement and disagreement were correctly reported to respondents in the round three questionnaire and summary round. The effect of the incorrect reporting on the percent of agreement and disagreement with the position on the round two questionnaire cannot be determined.

Given the conditions stated, the final round data indicated that 45.9 percent of the panel members agreed, while 54.1 percent disagreed with the position. Considering the extent of agreement as reported on
the questionnaires, respondents moved toward disagreement with the position 36.4 percent and 5.1 percent respectively during round two and three, which accounted for a shift of 41.5 percent between rounds one and three. The range of panelists who disagreed with the position was from 47.8 to 62.2 percent for secondary teachers and teacher educators, respectively.

Panel members who agreed with this position noted that students in grades K through 6 should receive less priority than students in grades 9 through 12. Panelists limited service to this clientele to instruction of a career awareness and exploration nature, units of instruction specifically designed for elementary teachers, the FFA Food For America Program, and agricultural field trips.

Panelists who disagreed with the position considered service to students in grades K through 6 more appropriate for career education or general education. Although panel members considered indepth instruction in agriculture impractical at this level, limited instruction in basic agricultural skills and career exploration were deemed acceptable.

Position number two: students in grades 7-8. Panel members moved toward consensus 4.3 percent and 3.0 percent during rounds two and three respectively, which accounted for a shift of 7.3 percent between rounds one and three. At round three 73.3 percent of the panelists agreed with the position while 26.7 disagreed. The percent of panelists in agreement with the position by groups ranged from 65.4 percent to 81.1 percent for state supervisors and teacher educators respectively.
Panel members agreed with serving students in grades 7 and 8 if the purpose of agricultural instruction at this level is limited to career awareness, exploration, and basic agricultural skill development. Some panelists did not consider agricultural instruction as vocational education at this level. Respondents noted that the instructional program could operate as a nine week introductory course in rotation with other vocational service areas.

Respondents who disagreed with the position felt that agricultural education at grades 7 and 8 should be provided in the form of career awareness and exploration by career education or general education. Panelists considered strengthening the 9-12 public school program as a challenge for the future, rather than serving an expanded clientele.

**Position number three: students in grades 9-10.** Panelists moved toward consensus 1.9 percent during round two which brought the panel to total agreement on the position.

Panelists who supported this position suggested that agricultural instruction should deal with the broad based core competencies and career awareness in grades 9 and 10. Some panel members considered instruction at this grade level as practical arts or avocational in nature.

Respondents who disagreed with the position during round one did not consider agricultural instruction at this grade level a high priority.

**Position number four: students in grades 11-12.** The final round of responses indicated that 98.8 percent of the respondents agreed, while 1.2 percent disagreed with the position. Panel movement toward consensus was .7 percent during round two and .1 percent during round
three. Thus, for all practical purposes, the panel movement of .8 percent was negligible. The percent of panelists who agreed with the position ranged from 97.3 percent for teacher educators to 100.0 percent for both state supervisors and secondary teachers.

Respondents who supported the position considered agricultural education at this level as specialization in agriculture.

Respondents who disagreed with the position were concerned that agricultural education not be limited to grades 11 and 12.

Position number five: out-of-school youth employed or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture. Panelists moved toward agreement on the position 7.1 percent during round two, but moved toward disagreement .2 percent during round three. Thus, panel members shifted toward consensus a total of 6.7 percent between rounds one and three. At the end of round three 94.2 percent of the panelists agreed with the position, while 5.8 percent disagreed.

The percent of panelists who agreed with the position ranged from 87.0 percent to 100.0 percent for the groups secondary teachers and teacher educators, respectively.

Panelists believed that out-of-school youth should be served by agricultural education if they are interested in a career in agriculture and if instructional time is available. Some panel members noted that the young farmer/adult program can most appropriately serve this clientele.

Respondents who disagreed with the position considered other education agencies such as postsecondary schools and the extension service as more appropriately meeting the needs of out-of-school youth.
Although in disagreement with the position, a segment of the panel noted willingness to serve this clientele if adequate teacher time was available.

Position number six: adults employed, self-employed, or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture. Agreement with the position was expressed by 95.3 percent of the Delphi panel, while 4.7 percent disagreed. Panelists moved 9.3 percent toward consensus during round two, but shifted away from consensus 1.5 percent during round three. Thus, the total panel movement toward consensus was 7.8 percent. The range of consensus by groups was from 91.3 to 97.3 percent for secondary teachers and teacher educators, respectively.

Some panelists in agreement with this position considered adult programs mandatory for a comprehensive local agricultural program, while, other panelists linked adult agricultural instruction to local community colleges. Another segment of the panel was willing to accept this position if the community college failed to meet adult education needs, provided an adequate number of teachers and funding were available to support this type of instruction.

Respondents in disagreement considered the position as a duplication of efforts provided by postsecondary institutions, the extension service, and other adult education agencies. Other panelists who disagreed faulted the position as being general education rather than vocational education.

Position number seven: out-of-school youth or adults who desire knowledge and skill in agriculture for personal reasons other than for employment or self-employment in agriculture. The final round data
indicated that 57.0 percent of the panelists agreed with the position while 43.0 percent disagreed with the position. Panel movement toward consensus was 6.8 percent during round two followed by additional 1.7 percent during round three. Panel members shifted toward consensus 8.5 percent between rounds one and three. The extent of round three panel member consensus in agreement with the position ranged from 50.0 percent to 65.2 percent for the groups state supervisors and secondary teachers, respectively.

Panel members who agreed with the position noted a need for tailoring the instructional programs to meet individual and community needs; and assuring the availability of adequate funding, instructional time, and enrollment space. Panelists expressed concern that teaching out-of-school youth and adults could adversely affect the in-school instructional program.

Respondents who disagreed with the position suggested the extension service or postsecondary institutions as more appropriate delivery agencies, unless local funding is provided specifically for this clientele group. Panelists were also concerned that the profession could not supply enough teachers to serve out-of-school youth and adults in addition to in-school youth.

Position number eight: rural students. Ninety-nine percent of the panelists were in agreement with the position after round one and all panelists (100.0 percent) agreed by the end of round two. Panelists noted that all students interested in agriculture should have an opportunity to enroll in agricultural education.
Position number nine: urban students. Panelists were in 99.0 percent agreement on this position during round one and moved to 100.0 percent agreement during round two. Panelists support of this position was contingent on student interest in an agricultural career and local employment needs.

Position number ten: suburban students. Agreement with this position was expressed by 98.8 percent of the panelists while 1.2 percent disagreed with the position. The extent of panel agreement increased .8 percent during round two, but decreased .2 percent during round three. Total panel member movement between rounds one and three was only .6 percent. The range of panel member consensus was from 97.2 percent for teacher educators to 100 percent for both state supervisors and secondary teachers.

Panel members in agreement with this position recognized the need to prepare students for agricultural employment opportunities in suburban areas.

Position number eleven: in-school youth with social, physical, and economic handicaps. Panel member agreement with the position was 100.0 percent at the end of round three. Between rounds one and three panelists moved toward consensus 5.9 percent. A change of 4.8 and 1.1 percent was reported during rounds two and three, respectively.

Conditions for acceptance of this position noted by panelists include students who are capable and interested in learning, instructional content for employment in agriculture, and teachers who have access to assistance from specialists. The panel also noted mandates in Public Law 94-142 which required that instructional programs
must be provided to this clientele. Respondents recommended further research and development in this area.

Commentary in disagreement with the position suggested that agricultural education cannot serve everyone and that individuals with social, physical, and economic handicaps can be best served by the specialists.

Position number twelve: out-of-school youth and adults with social, physical, and economic handicaps. Panel members moved toward consensus 3.3 percent during round two and 1.3 percent during round three. Panelists moved a total of 4.6 percent between rounds one and three and, thus, attained 100.0 percent agreement during round three. The extent of round three panel member agreement with the position by groups ranged from 52.2 percent to 91.7 percent for secondary teachers and teacher educators, respectively.

Panel members in agreement with this position limited the clientele to students interested in an agricultural career who are capable of learning without adversely affecting the regular in-school agricultural education program. Panelists also noted that adequate teaching resources must be provided.

Panelists commentary in disagreement with the position suggested that agricultural education is poorly equipped to serve this clientele in terms of teacher time, teacher expertise, and teaching resources. Respondents suggested that postsecondary institutions are better prepared to serve the severely handicapped.

Position number thirteen: females seeking employment or self-employment in agriculture, regardless of the type of agricultural
During the final round 98.8 percent of the respondents agreed with the position, while 1.2 percent disagreed with the position. The panel moved toward consensus 2.9 percent during round two, but moved away from consensus by .2 percent during round three which accounted for a 2.7 percent shift between rounds one and three.

The extent of round three panel member consensus in agreement with the position ranged from 96.0 percent for state supervisors to 100.0 percent for each of the groups teacher educators and secondary teachers.

Panelists who agreed with this position suggested that everyone should have equal access to the agricultural education program. Respondents noted that the profession should direct additional emphasis to this area.

Respondents who disagreed with the position noted that the position statement should have included minorities and other special groups with regard to equity.

### Findings Concerning Issue Number Three: What Should Be the Content of Agricultural Education in the Public School System?

The reader is referred to Figure 8 on page 114 for a composite display of the extent of consensus on each of the nine positions pertaining to this issue. Figure 8 portrays the extent of acceptance on the alternative positions for the total Delphi panel and by the groups secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors. Findings for each individual position are reported in the sections as follows.

Panelists who agreed with the positions pertaining to this issue consistently stated that acceptance of the position should be contingent on student interests, community employment needs, and the availability
FIGURE 7
Extent of Agreement on the Alternative Positions with Regard to the Clientele Served by Agricultural Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. students in grades K-6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. students in grades 7-8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. students in grades 9-10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. students in grades 11-12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. out-of-school youth employed or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. adults employed, self-employed or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. out-of-school youth or adults who desire knowledge and skill in agriculture for personal reasons other than for employment or self-employment in agriculture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. rural students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE. A = Delphi panel, TE = Teacher educator panelists, SS = State supervisor panelists, ST = Secondary teacher panelists.
9. urban students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 100.0%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE 100.0%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 100.0%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. suburban students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 98.8%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE 97.2%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. in-school youth with social, physical and economic handicaps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE 100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. out-of-school youth and adults with social, physical and economic handicaps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 79.8%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE 88.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 52.2%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 47.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. females seeking employment or self-employment in agriculture, regardless of the type of agricultural occupational preference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 100.0%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE 96.0%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE. A = Delphi panel, TE = Teacher educator panelists, SS = State supervisor panelists, ST = Secondary teacher panelists.
of adequate equipment, facilities, and training stations. The researcher emphasizes that these conditions were stated by panelists for each of the nine positions concerning this issue. They are reported at this point to avoid repeating these same comments nine different times. Other comments which concern particular positions as noted by panelists will be reported.

The first four positions with regard to this issue were accepted by all panelists. No additional commentary beyond that which has been previously stated was received for these positions.

Position number one: agricultural production.

Position number two: agricultural supply and service.

Position number three: agricultural mechanics.

Position number four: agricultural products.

Position number five: ornamental horticulture. Panel members moved toward consensus 2.9 percent during round two, which established 100.0 percent panel agreement. Panelists suggested that avocational as well as vocational students could benefit from this area of instruction.

Position number six: horticulture. A change in panel member agreement of 1.0 percent during round two established consensus.

Position number seven: renewable natural resources. Agreement with the position was expressed by 98.8 percent of the panel members, while 1.2 percent disagreed with the position. Panel members moved toward consensus .9 percent during round two, but drifted away from consensus .3 percent during round three. Thus, panelists shifted toward consensus .6 percent between rounds one and three. The extent to which round three panel members agreed with the position was from a low of 97.3
percent for teacher educators to a high of 100.0 percent for both the groups secondary teacher and state supervisors.

Panelists who disagreed with the position noted that renewable natural resources is often poorly designed as a course of study.

Position number eight: forestry. Panel members moved toward consensus 1.7 percent during round two, but drifted away from consensus .2 percent during round three, for a total shift of 1.5 percent between rounds one and three. At the end of round three 98.6 percent of the panelists agreed with the position, while 2.4 percent disagreed. The extent of round three panel member consensus in agreement with the position ranged from 95.5 percent to 100.0 percent for secondary teachers and state supervisors, respectively.

Commentary from the panel members who disagreed with the position stated that forestry was not important in some regions of the country.

Position number nine: other types of agriculture such as small animal care and horse training. Agreement with the position was expressed by 97.6 percent of the panel members, while 2.4 percent disagreed with the position. Panel members moved toward consensus .6 percent during round two and .8 percent during round three. Thus, panel members shifted toward consensus 1.4 percent between rounds one and three. The extent of round three panel member consensus on the position ranged from 95.5 percent to 97.3 percent for secondary teachers and teacher educators, respectively.

Panel members who agreed with this position stated that instruction in this type of agriculture is particularly relevant to urban areas and that the economic contributions of this sector of agriculture are
significant. Panelists noted that instruction could be integrated into existing units or packaged as self-contained units.

Panel member reactions in disagreement with the position considered this type of instruction primarily avocational and a responsibility of postsecondary education.

**Findings Concerning Issue Number Four: What Clientele Enrolled in Agricultural Education in the Public School System Should be Required to Conduct Supervised Occupational Experience/Practice Programs?**

Findings with regard to each of the five positions pertaining to this issue are reported in the sections as follows. A composite display of the extent of consensus on the five positions is depicted in Figure 9 on page 120. The extent of consensus is portrayed for the total panel and by the groups secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors.

**Position number one: all vocational students enrolled in a non-production agriculture course of study.** Agreement with the position was expressed by 98.8 percent of the panel members, while 1.2 percent disagreed with the position. Panel members moved toward consensus .5 percent and 3.1 percent during round two and round three, respectively, for a total of 3.6 percent. The extent of round three panel member agreement with the position ranged from 95.7 percent for secondary teachers to 100.0 percent for both teacher educators and state supervisors.

Panel members supported this position if teachers are given time for supervision during school hours, acceptable standards are established for experience programs, and the school provides experience projects.
FIGURE 8
Extent of Agreement on the Alternative Positions with Regard to the Content of the Agricultural Education Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. agricultural production.</td>
<td>A 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TE 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. agricultural supply and service.</td>
<td>A 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TE 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. agricultural mechanics.</td>
<td>A 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TE 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. agricultural products.</td>
<td>A 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TE 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ornamental horticulture.</td>
<td>A 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TE 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. horticulture.</td>
<td>A 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TE 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. renewable natural resources.</td>
<td>A 98.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TE 97.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. forestry.</td>
<td>A 97.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TE 97.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS 95.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST 95.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE. A = Delphi panel, TE = Teacher educator panelists, SS = State supervisor panelists, ST = Secondary teacher panelists.
Figure 8 Continued

9. other types of agriculture such as small animal care and horse training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE. A = Delphi panel, TE = Teacher educator panelists, SS = State supervisor panelists, ST = Secondary teacher panelists.
Panelists recommended that consideration be given to redefining acceptable occupational experience programs and to awarding credits or units toward high school graduation for occupational experience programs.

Panelists who disagreed with the position stated that too many students would be eliminated from the program given the stringency of the terms stated in this position.

Position number two: all vocational students enrolled in a non-production agriculture course of study. Panelists moved toward consensus 2.4 percent and 2.0 percent at rounds two and three, respectively, for a total of 4.4 percent. At the end of round three 97.7 percent of the panel members agreed with the position, while 2.3 percent disagreed. The extent of round three panel member consensus with the position ranged from 95.7 percent to 100.0 percent for secondary teachers and state supervisors, respectively.

Panel members who agreed with this position noted that practical application of instruction is essential; experience programs are more important for this group than for production agriculture students; experience programs should be individually tailored for each student, and that teacher summer employment should be provided to supervise experience programs. Panelists suggested that schools should assume responsibility for providing laboratories and other facilities for conducting experience programs. Respondents stated that the traditional definition of experience programs should be expanded to include various types of practical experiences, such as work placement and community service in a variety of settings. Panel members noted that experience
programs were more difficult to locate for non-production agriculture students than for production agriculture.

Panel commentary in disagreement with the position considered student experience programs as desirable, but not essential.

Position number three: all students enrolled in non-vocational agriculture education programs. During the final round of the Delphi 23.5 percent of the panel members agreed with the position while 76.5 percent disagreed. Panel members moved away from consensus and toward agreement with the position by 1.5 percent and 2.6 percent during rounds two and three, respectively. The total panel member shift away from consensus was 4.1 percent between rounds one and three. The extent of round three panel member consensus in disagreement by groups ranged from 73.9 percent to 80.8 percent for secondary teachers and state supervisors, respectively.

Supportive commentary by panel members noted that this practice could motivate student interest toward a vocational level and discourage the enrollment of uninterested students. Panelists stated that criteria for acceptable experience programs for avocational students enrolled in a non-production area of study should be more clearly defined.

Panel members who disagreed with the position stated that avocational courses should not be taught. Other panelists noted that occupational experience of limited scope for avocational students are desirable, but not essential. In general, panelists questioned the utility of experience programs where employment in agriculture was not planned.
Position number four: all students enrolled in classes for orientation to agriculture such as in grades 7 and 8. During the final round of data collection 23.8 percent of the panel members agreed with the position, while 76.2 percent disagreed. Panel members moved away from consensus by 0.1 percent during round two and by an additional 1.2 percent during round three for a total of 1.3 percent. The extent of disagreement on the position by the groups ranged from 72.7 to 77.8 percent for secondary teachers and teacher educators, respectively.

Panelists who supported this position stated that in-school or out-of-school experience programs at this level are acceptable. Panelists supported the practice as an important exploratory experience and as motivation for students to conduct projects broader in scope during grades 9 through 12. However, respondents considered experience programs in grades 7 and 8 less important than in grades 9-12.

Panel members who disagreed with the position found this practice as contributing to premature vocational tracking, inconsistent with an orientation and exploratory nature of agricultural instruction in grades 7 and 8, and inconsistent with the purpose of vocational education. Panelists in disagreement with the position did, however, recommend consideration of experience programs limited to the school laboratory or school grounds.

Position number five: of all students receiving agricultural instruction in grades K-6. During Delphi rounds two and three, panel members moved away from consensus by 2.8 and 2.3 percent, respectively, for a total shift of 5.1 percent. At the end of round three 12.0 percent of the panel members agreed with the position, while 88.0
percent disagreed. The range of the extent of disagreement by groups
during round three was from 80.0 percent to 91.7 percent for state
supervisors and teacher educators, respectively.

Panelists who agreed with the position supported experience programs
which are of an awareness or exploratory nature, including those
conducted in the school laboratory.

Comments from panelists who disagreed with the position ranged from
recommending that the scope of experience programs should be limited at
this level, to rejecting the concept completely.

Findings Concerning Issue Number Five: What Are the Acceptable Types of
Supervised Occupational Experience/Practice for Students Enrolled in a
Production Agriculture Program in the Public School System?

Findings for the position statements pertaining to this issue are
reported in the following text and by a composite representation in
Figure 10 on page 128. Figure 10 depicts the extent of acceptance on
the positions for the total panel and for the groups secondary teachers,
teacher educators, and state supervisors.

The extent of agreement by the total panel and groups within the
panel varied on the positions pertaining to this issue. However,
certain comments were repeated by the panelists for each of the 11
positions pertaining to this issue. Panel members who agreed with the
positions stated that all acceptable supervised occupational
experience/practice for students enrolled in a production agriculture
program should be related to student occupational goals, carefully
planned and supervised, and that adequate records of the experience
program should be documented.
FIGURE 9
Extent of Agreement on the Alternative Positions with Regard to the Clientele Who Should Conduct Supervised Occupational Experience/Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. all vocational students enrolled in a production agricultural course of study.</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. all vocational students enrolled in a non-production agriculture course of study.</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. all students enrolled in non-vocational agricultural education programs.</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. all students enrolled in classes for orientation to agriculture such as in grades 7 and 8.</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. all students receiving agricultural instruction in grades K-6.</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE. A = Delphi panel, TE = Teacher educator panelists, SS = State supervisors panelists, ST = Secondary teacher panelists.
Panelists who agreed with the positions "supervised farming projects," "home and/or farm improvement projects," "supplementary farm projects," and "group (several students working together) projects related to production agriculture" noted that any one of these experience/practices alone would not suffice for a comprehensive supervised occupational experience program; but, an appropriate combination of experience/practices. Panelists suggested that this combination should be developed according to the occupational goals of the student.

Presentation of the comments applicable to certain positions is reported at this point to avoid repetition in reporting findings for positions pertaining to this issue. Only additional panel member comments are reported for individual positions pertaining to the various positions.

**Position number one: supervised farming projects (enterprise).**

During round two 99.0 percent of the panelists agreed with the position. All panel members agreed during round three.

Panelists who disagreed with the position stated that all farming projects are not acceptable experience projects, only those that meet minimum qualifications.

**Position number two: home and/or farm improvement projects.**

Agreement with this position was expressed by 96.5 percent of the panel members while 3.5 percent disagreed with the position. Panel members moved toward consensus 1.5 percent and 1.9 percent at rounds two and three, respectively for a total of 3.4 percent. The range of agreement
with this position was from 88.5 percent for state supervisors to 100.0 percent for both teacher educators and secondary teachers.

Panel members who agreed with the position stated that improvement projects exclusively would not suffice for supervised occupational experience programs, but could be the only feasible alternative for some students. Student benefits derived from improvement projects listed by panel members in agreement with the position included development of knowledge, skills, and an appreciation for the work ethic.

Panel members who disagreed with the position considered improvement projects as outmoded and ill-suited for agricultural skill development.

**Position number three: supplementary farm projects.** Panel members moved toward acceptance of this position 5.1 percent and 2.9 percent at rounds two and three, respectively, for a total of 8.0 percent. At the end of round three, 96.5 percent of the panelists agreed with the position, while 3.5 percent disagreed. The extent of round three panel member consensus in agreement with the position ranged from 88.5 percent for state supervisors to 100.0 percent for each of the groups teacher educators and secondary teachers.

Panelists who disagreed with this position noted that the effectiveness of supplementary projects is too difficult to measure and that projects of this nature are outmoded.

**Position number four: group (several students working together) projects related to production agriculture.** Agreement with this position was expressed by 95.3 percent of the panelists, while 4.7 percent disagreed with the position. Panel member movement toward consensus was 1.5 percent at round two, but moved away from consensus .4
percent between round two and three. Thus, the total panel member shift toward acceptance was 1.1 percent between rounds one and three. The extent of agreement with the position by groups ranged from 92.3 percent for state supervisors to 100.0 percent for secondary teachers.

Agreement with the position was noted by panelists who stated that such projects provide needed flexibility to occupational experience programs, assist students in learning to work together, develop agricultural skills, and develop a positive work ethic. Panel members suggested that group projects are most effective when conducted on the school farm or in the school laboratory.

Panel members who disagreed with the position noted that responsibility and ownership are too difficult to determine. Competency records that accompany a student through educational levels were suggested as a more acceptable practice than group projects.

Position number five: projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature. All panelists agreed with the position during round one. Total agreement among panelists was maintained through round three.

Panel members considered projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature as a viable experience/practice that should be used more frequently.

Position number six: projects related to the speciality area in which the student is enrolled. Final round data indicated that 100.0 percent of the panel members responding agreed with the position. During round one of the Delphi, panel members moved toward consensus 3.7 percent followed by an additional shift of 1.1 percent during round three. All panel members agreed with this position during round three.
Some panel members who agreed with the position stated that projects of this nature are most desirable, while other panelists questioned the restrictive nature of this type of experience/practice. Panelists who disagreed with the position were unwilling to have such a policy rigorously enforced.

**Position number seven: farm placement.** Agreement with the position was expressed by 98.8 percent of the panel members, while 1.2 percent disagreed with the position. Panel members moved toward consensus .7 percent and 1.0 percent at rounds two and three, respectively for a total of 1.7 percent. The extent to which round three panel members agreed with the position ranged from 96.2 percent to 100.0 percent for secondary teachers and state supervisors, respectively.

Panel members in disagreement with the position suggested that the term "farm" was a misnomer, since placement could be in a nursery or greenhouse of a production nature.

**Position number eight: Practice/experience in the school laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction.** Panel members moved toward consensus .7 percent and 1.0 percent at rounds two and three, respectively for a total of 1.7 percent between rounds one and three. During the final round of this study, 98.8 percent of the panel members agreed with the position, while 1.2 percent disagreed. The range of panel member agreement with the position was from 96.2 percent for state supervisors to 100.0 percent for both the groups teacher educators and secondary teachers.

Panelists who agreed with the position suggested that this type of experience is especially suitable for urban students or students with
limited access to experience projects, but recognized the problems of expense and profit sharing. Panelists considered the practice as an excellent opportunity for students to develop skills and a positive work ethic during the school year or the summer months.

Panelists who disagreed with this position were concerned about liability problems and excessive demands on teacher time.

Position number nine: practice/experience in the school laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm during class time. Agreement with the position was expressed by 67.4 percent of the panel members while 32.6 percent disagreed with the position. Panel members moved toward consensus 2.0 percent and 2.9 percent at rounds two and three, respectively, for a total of 4.9 percent between rounds one and three. The extent of panelists agreement with the position ranged from 59.5 percent to 76.9 percent for teacher educators and state supervisors, respectively.

Panelists who agreed with the position supported the practice if adequate facilities and land are available to provide meaningful experiences that enhance, rather than interfere with the regular instructional program, improve agricultural skills, and develop a positive work. Panel members noted that the practice can be used effectively by agricultural education as it has been used by trade and industrial education and other vocational service areas. Some panel members, however, supported the position only as a last resort for students to acquire agricultural practice/experience.

Panel members who disagreed with the position stated that this practice did not meet criteria for a bonafide supervised occupational
experience program. In particular, panel members stated that this policy limits student opportunity to learn, could take time needed for the instructional program, is difficult to administer, and would not be specific to student individual career goals. Some panel members described this type of practice/experience as useful, but more appropriate for a class or laboratory experience than a supervised occupational experience program.

**Position number ten: exploratory experiences such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.** During round three 76.5 percent of the panel members agreed with the position while 23.5 percent disagreed with the position. Panel members moved toward consensus 5.0 percent and 2.3 percent during rounds two and three, respectively, for a total of 7.3 percent between rounds one and three. The extent of round three panel member agreement with the position ranged from 73.9 percent to 80.0 percent for secondary teachers and state supervisors, respectively.

Panel members noted that this practice develops skills, emphasizes the work ethics, and broadens student horizons. Some panelists thought that the experience/practices should be limited to exploratory classes and used only as a last resort.

Panel members who disagreed with the position stated that study-visits do not provide for skill development or hands-on experiences, and, thus, should only be considered supplemental to class instruction or as a minimal part of supervised occupational experience.

**Position number eleven: cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from school for a part of the day.** Panel members moved toward acceptance 2.6 percent during round
two, but moved away from acceptance .1 percent during round three for a total movement toward consensus of .6 percent. At the end of round three 97.7 percent of the panel members agreed with the position, while 2.3 percent disagreed. The range of agreement by groups in the Delphi panel was from 95.7 percent to 100.0 percent for the groups secondary teachers and state supervisors, respectively.

Panelists considered this practice as an economical, effective, and efficient method of providing a meaningful occupational experience/practice to develop agricultural skills and a positive work ethic. Panel members recommended that supervision time should be provided to agricultural instructors during the school day and that teachers and cooperative education supervisors develop close working relationships. Some panelists recommended that students should receive extra units (credits) toward graduation for their experience programs.

Panelists who disagreed considered the practice as contributing to a loss of instructional time needed to teach agricultural knowledge and skills and an invitation to an influx of undesirable students.

Findings Concerning Issue Number Six: What are the acceptable types of supervised occupation experience/practice for students enrolled in non-production agriculture in the public school system?

The extent of acceptance among the total Delphi panel and by the groups secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors for the positions pertaining to this issue is depicted in Figure 11 on page 136. Findings regarding each position statement are reported in the sections as follows.
FIGURE 10
Extent of Agreement on the Alternative Positions with Regard to the Type of Supervised Occupational Experience/Practice for Production Agriculture Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. supervised farming projects (enterprises).</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. home and/or farm improvement projects.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. supplementary farm projects.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. group (several students working together) projects related to production agriculture.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. projects related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled. Example: students enrolled in horticulture should have experience in horticulture; if in animal science the experience programs should be in animal science.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. farm placement.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. practice/experience in the school laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE. A = Delphi panel, TE = Teacher educator panelists, SS = State supervisor panelists, ST = Secondary teacher panelists.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 10 Continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **9. practice/experience in the**
| school laboratory, on the **school grounds, or farm during**
| class time. |
| **Agree** | **Disagree** |
| A | 67.4% | 32.6% |
| TE | 59.5% | 40.5% |
| SS | 176.9% | 23.1% |
| ST | 69.6% | 30.4% |

| **10. exploratory experiences such** |
| **as a study-visit with agricultural workers.** |
| **Agree** | **Disagree** |
| A | 76.5% | 23.5% |
| TE | 75.7% | 24.3% |
| SS | 180.0% | 20.0% |
| ST | 173.9% | 26.1% |

| **11. cooperative education programs** |
| **in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day.** |
| **Agree** | **Disagree** |
| A | 97.7% | 2.3% |
| TE | 97.3% | 2.7% |
| SS | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| ST | 95.7% | 4.3% |

**NOTE.** A = Delphi panel, TE = Teacher educator panelists, SS = State supervisor panelists, ST = Secondary teacher panelists.
The extent to which positions pertaining to this issue were accepted varied considerably. However, the panel members who agreed with the positions consistently stated that supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a non-production agriculture program should be well planned, supervised, related to student career objectives, and meet acceptable project standards. Since the previously stated comments apply to all the position statements pertaining to this issue, only additional panel member commentary will be reported for the following nine position statements.

**Position number one: home projects of a non-production nature.** Agreement with this position was expressed by 91.9 percent of the panel members, while 8.1 percent disagreed with the position. Panel members moved away from consensus .9 percent during round two, but moved toward acceptance .6 percent between rounds two and three. Thus, minimal panel member movement (.3 percent) toward consensus was reported between rounds one and three. The range of panel member agreement with the position by groups was from a low of 84.6 percent to a high of 100.0 percent for state supervisors and secondary teachers, respectively.

Some panelists who disagreed with the position considered home projects of a non-production nature avocational and inadequate for the development of student competencies needed in agricultural industry. These panelists suggested that such projects might suffice for improvement projects.

**Position number two: placement in agribusiness.** Panel consensus in agreement with the position was achieved during round one and was maintained through round three.
Panel members in agreement with this position recommended more frequent utilization of placement in agribusiness as a supervised occupational experience/practice.

**Position number three: group projects of a non-production agriculture nature.** Panel members moved toward consensus 6.5 percent and .6 percent at rounds two and three, respectively, which accounts for a total movement of 7.1 percent. At round three 95.2 percent of the panelists agreed with the position while 4.8 percent disagreed. The extent of round three panel member agreement with the position ranged from 94.6 percent to 96.2 percent for teacher educators and state supervisors, respectively.

Agreement with the position was expressed by panelists if specific competencies are developed, but questioned group projects as the sole type of experience/practice and their applicability in all circumstance.

Panel members who disagreed with the position considered group projects meaningful, but inadequate for occupational experience programs. Respondents noted that group projects are frequently too loosely defined and that documentation of student competency development is too difficult.

**Position number four: projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature.** Panel consensus on this position was achieved during round one and was maintained through round three.

Panelists who supported the position stated that projects of an entrepreneurial nature should be utilized more frequently if they are appropriate for individual students.
Position number five: Projects related exclusively to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled. Between rounds one and three, panel members moved toward acceptance 6.3 percent which was accounted for by a 3.3 and 3.0 percent shift during rounds two and three. At round three 96.5 percent of the respondents agreed with the position, while 3.5 percent disagreed. The range of agreement was from 91.3 to 100.0 percent for the groups secondary teachers and state supervisors, respectively.

Panel members in disagreement considered the position too restrictive, thus forcing students to become too specialized for realistic job placement opportunities.

Position number six: Practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction. Agreement with the position was expressed by 96.5 percent of panel members, while 3.5 percent disagreed with the position. Panel members shifted away from acceptance .3 percent at round two and an additional .3 percent at round three. The extent of agreement with the position by groups ranged from 96.2 percent for state supervisors to 97.3 percent for both state supervisors and teacher educators.

Panel members who disagreed with the position faulted the word "separate" in the position statement, stating that everything a teacher does is under contract and "in-school". Other panelists questioned the acceptability of out-of-school supervision under negotiated contracts.

Position number seven: Practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds or farm during class time. During round three of the Delphi 64.0 percent of panel members agreed with the position while 36.0
percent disagreed with the position. Panel members moved away from acceptance 8.3 percent at round two, but shifted toward acceptance 2.7 percent during round three for a total shift toward acceptance of 5.6 percent. The extent of agreement on the position by groups ranged from 54.1 to 80.8 percent for teacher educators and state supervisors, respectively.

Commentary from panelists who agreed with the position noted that this type of practice/experience should be differentiated from class activities, conducted as only one part of a comprehensive experience program, and limited to first year agricultural students. Panelists suggested that the quality of the experience was important, not when or where the experience occurred. Further research and study with regard to the position was recommended.

Panel members in disagreement with the position considered this type of activity as part of the in-class instructional program, which would provide limited hand-on experience removed from the reality of the real world. Other panelists were concerned about taking time from the in-school instruction program, but had less reservation if the student was enrolled in a two-to-three hour block program.

Position number eight: exploratory experiences such as a study-visit with agricultural workers. Panel members moved toward acceptance of the position 6.7 percent between rounds one and three with a 3.9 and 2.8 percent shift during rounds two and three, respectively. At round three 76.7 percent of the panelists agreed with the position while 23.3 percent disagreed. The extent of agreement with the position by groups
ranged from 73.9 to 78.4 percent for secondary teachers and teacher educators, respectively.

Panelists supported exploratory experiences at exploratory levels as a means to motivate students toward a vocational career and as a minor part of the total experience program. Respondents stated that a "study-visit" should include a variety of observations rather than continuous observation in the same career area.

Panel commentary by respondents in disagreement with the position opposed the lack of hands-on experiences and specific student competency development denoted by this practice. Some panelists perceived that the position would lead to the deterioration of occupational experience programs to an observation role. Other panelists noted that such experiences are more appropriate for career education than for agricultural education.

**Position number nine: cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day.** Agreement with this position was expressed by 97.7 percent of panel members, while 2.3 percent disagreed with the position. Panel member movement toward acceptance was 1.8 percent at round two, but drifted away from consensus .1 percent during round three. Thus, panel members shifted toward consensus 1.7 percent between rounds one and three. During the final round of the Delphi, the extent of agreement by groups ranged from 95.7 percent for state supervisors to 100.0 percent for secondary teachers.

Panelists who agreed with the position noted the problem of the seasonal nature of some experience programs. Respondents supporting the
position disagreed as to what grade level students should participate in this type of experience/practice.

Some panelists who disagreed with the position referred to cooperative education programs as a very narrow type of educational experience. Other panelists thought that such experiences would invite marginal students who would use the program as a means to leave school.

Findings Concerning Issue Number Seven; What Cleintele Enrolled in Agricultural Education in the Public School System Should Become Members of the FFA?

Findings for the position statements pertaining to this issue are reported in the following text and by a composite representation in Figure 12 on page 142. Figure 12 depicts the extent of acceptance on the positions for the total panel and for the groups secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors.

Position number one: all vocational students in a production agriculture course of study. Agreement with the position was expressed by 95.3 percent of the panel members, while 4.7 percent disagreed with the position. Panel members moved toward consensus 3.3 percent and .7 percent at rounds two and three, respectively, for a total of 4.0 percent between rounds one and three. The extent of round three panel member agreement with the position by groups ranged from 92.3 percent to 97.3 percent for state supervisors and teacher educators, respectively.

Panel members who agreed with the position stated that the FFA is an integral part of vocational agriculture and, therefore, membership in
**FIGURE 11**
Extent of Agreement on the Alternative Positions with Regard to the Type of Supervised Occupational Experience/Practice for Non-Production Agriculture Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Position</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Home projects of non-production nature such as lawn care and lawn mower maintenance.</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Placement in agribusiness.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group projects of a non-production agricultural nature.</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Projects related exclusively to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction.</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds or farm during class time.</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Exploratory experiences such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE.** A = Delphi panel, TE = Teacher educator panelists, SS = State supervisor panelists, ST = Secondary teacher panelists.
9. cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE. A = Delphi panel, TE = Teacher educator panelists, SS = State supervisor panelists, ST = Secondary teacher panelists.
the youth organization should be automatic in order to obtain full benefits from the agricultural instructional program. Respondents taking this viewpoint also recommended that student dues be discontinued. Other panel members agreed with the position in principle, but recommended that students should be motivated rather than forced to become members. Exceptions to the membership requirement noted by the panelists who agreed with the position included failure to meet requirements specified in the FFA constitution and religious beliefs.

Respondents who disagreed with the position supported the policy of voluntary membership rather than forced membership which they believed the position implied.

**Position number two: all vocational students in a non-production agriculture course of study.** During round three 95.3 percent of the panel members agreed with the position, while 4.7 percent disagreed with the position. Panel member movement toward consensus was 3.2 percent and 1.8 percent at rounds two and three, for a total of 5.0 percent. The range of agreement with the position by groups was from 92.3 percent to 97.3 percent for state supervisors and teacher educators, respectively.

Panel commentary in agreement with the position noted that the FFA is an integral part of vocational agriculture and, therefore, membership in the youth organization should be automatic in order to obtain full benefits from the agricultural instructional program. Respondents taking this viewpoint also recommended that student dues be discontinued.
Respondents noted many non-production types of activities that are available through the FFA.

Panel members in disagreement with the position stated that membership should be optional.

**Position number three: all vocational students enrolled in an orientation to agriculture course of study, such as 7th and 8th grade programs.** Between rounds one and three panel members moved toward consensus 12.7 percent, which was accounted for by a shift of 5.0 percent during round two followed by an additional movement of 7.7 percent during round three. At the end of round three 27.1 percent of the panel members agreed with the position, while 72.9 percent disagreed. The range of panel member disagreement with the position by groups was from 66.7 percent to 80.8 percent for teacher educators and state supervisors, respectively.

Commentary from panel members who agreed with the position stated that the FFA should be an integral part of the total curriculum, early involvement in the FFA could motivate students to higher achievements in the organization, and that FFA enrollment would increase. Some panelists suggested utilizing a junior FFA chapter to implement the intent of this position.

Commentary from respondents who disagreed with the position stated that the practice is prohibited in the FFA Constitution and that students would experience "burn-out" by the 11th and 12th grade. Some panelists suggested that students receive an orientation to the FFA program at this level, but considered membership optional.
Position number four: only those vocational students who desire to become members. Slight panel member movement of .5 and 1.5 percent was reported during rounds two and three, respectively. Thus, the panel moved toward acceptance only 2.0 percent between rounds one and three. At the end of round three 23.5 percent of the panel members agreed with the position, while 76.5 percent disagreed with the position. Round three panel member consensus in disagreement with the position ranged from 73.9 percent to 77.8 percent for the groups secondary teachers and teacher educators, respectively.

Commentary from panelists who agreed with the position stated that neither the students nor the program would benefit from mandatory membership. Affirmative reactions of the panel also noted that student membership should be motivated by the quality of the FFA program.

Panelists who disagreed with the position noted that young people must be brought into something before they can see the benefits. Similarly, other panelists considered student FFA membership as mandatory and working with all students through the FFA as a teacher responsibility.

Position number five: only those avocational students who desire to become members. Agreement with this position was expressed by 36.5 percent of the panel members, while 63.5 percent disagreed with the position. Panel member movement away from acceptance of the position was noticeably high when compared with other positions with a 10.4 and 3.2 percent shift during rounds two and three, respectively. Thus, the total panel member shift away from acceptance was 13.6 percent between rounds one and three. The range of round three panel member consensus
in disagreement with the position was 55.6 percent to 80.8 percent for the groups teacher educators and state supervisors, respectively.

Commentary from respondents who agreed with the position noted that the vocational intent of students is difficult to determine, the FFA has activities beneficial to all types of students, and that the FFA could help motivate avocational students toward a vocational interest. Panelists also recognized that many FFA officers were avocational students.

Some respondents who disagreed with the position stated that the FFA program should not provide membership to avocational students, while, other respondents considered FFA membership mandatory.

Findings Concerning Issue Number Eight: What Aspects of the FFA Program for Students Enrolled in the Public School System Should Occupy In-Class Instructional Time?

Findings for the 11 positions concerning this issue are reported in the following text. A composite presentation of the extent of acceptance of the positions is displayed in Figure 13 on page 150. The extent of acceptance is portrayed for the total Delphi panel and by the groups secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors.

Position number one: planning any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities. Analysis of the final round data indicated that 75.0 percent of the panel members agreed with the position, while 25.0 percent disagreed. Panel members moved toward acceptance 7.8 percent and .9 percent during rounds two and three, respectively for a total of 8.7 percent. The extent of round three panel member consensus in agreement
FIGURE 12
Extent of Agreement on the Alternative Positions with Regard to Clientele for FFA Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Description</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All vocational students in a production agriculture course of study.</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All vocational students in a non-production agriculture course of study.</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All vocational students enrolled in an orientation to agriculture course of study, such as 7th and 8th grade programs.</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Only those vocational students who desire to become members.</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vocational students who desire to become members.</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE. A = Delphi panel, TE = Teacher educator panelists, SS = State supervisor panelists, ST = Secondary teacher panelists.
with the position ranged from was 78.4 percent to 92.3 percent for teacher educators and state supervisors, respectively.

Commentary from panel members in agreement with the position considered the FFA an integral part of the agricultural curriculum, thus, legitimizing any learning activity. Other affirmative reactions to the position stated that planning FFA activities is an excellent means for developing leadership competencies, especially when all members of the class are involved.

Panelists who disagreed with the position maintained that planning FFA activities should be limited to those which relate to student occupational objectives, develop specific competencies, have instructional intent, and involve all class members.

**Position number two: conducting any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.** Agreement with the position was expressed by 54.7 percent of the panel members while 45.3 percent disagreed with the position. Panel members moved away from consensus 1.1 and 2.9 percent during rounds two and three, respectively, for a total shift away from consensus of 4.0 percent. The extent of round three agreement with the position by groups within the Delphi panel ranged from 45.9 percent to 69.2 percent for teacher educators and state supervisors, respectively.

Panelists who agreed with the position stated that the FFA is an integral part of the instructional program, but noted that some discretion should be used with regard to conducting appropriate activities.

Respondents who disagreed with this position stated that agricultural instruction should be given priority to FFA activities
during class. Some panelists questioned the educational value of many FFA activities and, thus, considered these activities more appropriate if conducted after school.

**Position number three:** selected FFA activities which directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled. Analysis of the final round data indicated that 96.5 percent of the panel members responding agreed with the position, while 3.5 percent disagreed with the position. Panel members moved toward agreement 4.4 percent and .8 percent during rounds two and three, respectively, for a total shift of 5.2 percent. At the end of round three 96.5 percent of the panel members agreed with the position, while 3.5 percent disagreed. Round three panel members who agreed with the position by groups ranged from 94.6 percent to 100.0 percent for teacher educators and state supervisors, respectively.

Panelists who agreed with the position noted that the FFA is an integral part of the curriculum, therefore, any activity would be appropriate. Other panelists suggested that all students should be involved in the selected activity.

Panel commentary in disagreement with the position stated that student experiences should not be limited by any criteria.

**Position number four:** FFA activities which may not directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled, but have educational value for the development of leadership, citizenship, and cooperation essential for success in agricultural occupations. At the end of round three 91.9 percent of the panel members agreed with the position. Panel member shift toward acceptance of 36.5 percent between
ronds one and three was extremely high when compared with other position statements. Movement toward consensus was 28.5 percent and 8.0 percent at rounds two and three, respectively. The extent of round three panel member agreement with the position ranged from 86.5 percent to 100.0 percent for the groups teacher educators and state supervisors, respectively.

Commentary from panelists in agreement with the position stated that the FFA is an integral part of the agricultural education program, therefore, any activity is appropriate. Panel members noted that most FFA activities are excellent for general leadership development and that specialization in high school is ill-advised. Although in agreement with the position, some panelists cautioned that FFA in-class activities should be discreetly selected.

Panel members who disagreed with the position noted that FFA activities must relate to the student specialty area of instruction to complement technical skill development, while providing for the development of leadership, citizenship, and cooperation.

Position number five: selected FFA activities which can be utilized without taking time needed to teach content of the instructional program. At the end of round three 95.3 percent of the panel members agreed with the position, while 4.7 percent disagreed. Panel members consistently moved toward acceptance 19.1 percent and 1.7 percent during rounds two and three, respectively, for a total shift of 20.8 percent. The range of agreement on round three by groups was 89.2 percent for teacher educators to 100.0 percent for both state supervisors and secondary teachers.
Panel members agreed with the position on the basis that the FFA is an integral part of the instructional program, but activities should be limited to those related to the instructional content.

Panel members in disagreement with the position stated that the FFA is an integral part of the agricultural education program, therefore, all activities are appropriate. Other panel commentary in disagreement with the position noted that any FFA activity takes valuable time from the instructional program.

**Position number six: preparation for judging contests of a nature that is directly related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.** Agreement with this position was expressed by 91.9 percent of the panel members while 8.1 percent disagreed with the position. Panel members moved toward consensus 2.3 percent at round two, but drifted away from consensus .7 percent between rounds two and three. Considering rounds one through three, panel members shifted toward consensus only 1.6 percent. By groups the range of agreement on the position was 86.5 to 100.0 percent for the groups teacher educators and secondary teachers, respectively.

Panel members who agreed with the position noted that the FFA is an integral part of the agricultural education program; however, judging activities are most appropriate when they involve all students, serve as a motivational tool, are non-repetitive in nature, and are presented as basic instruction.

Panel commentary in disagreement with the position questioned the notion of using class time for judging contest preparation, however, panelists were willing to use in-class time for introducing contests.
Position number seven: preparation for any judging contest. Panel members moved toward acceptance of the position 4.8 and 3.4 percent at rounds two and three, respectively, for a total of 8.2 percent. At the end of round three 36.0 percent of the panel agreed, while 64.0 percent of the panel disagreed with the position. The extent of disagreement with the position by groups ranged from 46.2 to 81.1 percent for state supervisors and teacher educators, respectively.

Generally, panelists agreed with the position if all students are involved in the activity, specific skills are taught, the activity is reserved for exploratory classes, and if student leadership, citizenship, and cooperation are developed.

Panel commentary in disagreement with the position noted that activities of this nature often involve only a few students, minimally relate to the instructional program, and utilize time needed for teaching technical subject matter.

Position number eight: activities specifically selected to develop leadership, citizenship, and cooperation. A change of panel member opinion to agreement with the position of 3.9 percent during round two established panel consensus which was maintained through round three.

Commentary by panelists in agreement with the position noted that all FFA activities should fulfill this role if they are well planned and maintained in the proper perspective.

Position number nine: record keeping for individual and chapter awards. At the end of round three 95.3 percent of the panel members agreed with the position, while 4.7 percent disagreed with the position. During rounds two and three, panel members moved toward acceptance 1.1
percent and 3.9 percent, respectively, for a total shift of 5.0 percent. The range of agreement on the position by groups was 89.2 percent for teacher educators to 100.0 percent for both state supervisors and secondary teachers.

Panel members expressed agreement with the position if the record keeping activities are conducted as part of the supervised occupational experience program, the FFA, or the instructional program. Some panelists noted that teachers should use discretion to minimize repetition of the activity.

Panel members who opposed acceptance of the position noted that the instructional program does not provide time for this activity.

Position number ten: preparation of individual award applications.

At the end of round three 70.9 percent of the panel members agreed with the position, while 29.1 percent disagreed. Panel members moved toward acceptance 7.3 percent at round two, but drifted away from consensus 1.1 percent between rounds two and three for a total shift toward acceptance of 6.2 percent. The extent of agreement with the position ranged from 54.1 percent to 87.0 percent for the groups teacher educators and state supervisors, respectively.

Panel members agreed with the position if all students are involved, teachers are trying to meet application deadlines, student skills are being developed, and if instruction can be individualized to meet student needs.

Respondents in disagreement with the position considered the activity an individual responsibility that should occupy class time only if all students are involved. Preparation of applications was perceived
perceived to interfere with teaching the technical content of the instructional program.

Position number eleven: fund raising projects which use minimal class time that relate to agriculture, have educational value, and are conducted according to sound business practices. Ninety-three percent of the panel members agreed with the position while 7.0 percent disagreed. During Delphi rounds one through three, panel members shifted toward acceptance 4.7 percent. Movement toward acceptance was 3.1 percent and 1.6 percent at rounds two and three, respectively. The extent of round three panel member agreement with the position ranged from 83.8 percent for teacher educators to 100.0 percent for both secondary teachers and state supervisors.

Panel commentary in agreement with the position noted that conditions within the statement referring to educational value and sound business practice make the position acceptable. Fund raising projects were perceived to be a means to develop business competencies, social skills, and to stimulate student interest in technical subject matter.

Panelists in disagreement with the position noted that FFA activities must be linked to the instructional program and that fund raising projects rarely meet this criteria.

Findings Concerning Issue Number Nine; What Title Should Be Used to Describe Agricultural Education Programs in the Public School System?

Findings with regard to this issue are present in text and in Figure 14 on page 156. Figure 14 depicts a composite display of the extent of consensus for the total Delphi panel and by the groups secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors.
FIGURE 13
Extent of Agreement on the Alternative Positions with Regard to Aspects of the FFA which Are Acceptable for In-Class Activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.</td>
<td>83.7% 16.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>192.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Selected FFA activities which can be utilized without taking time needed to teach content of the instructional program.</td>
<td>95.3% 4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conducting any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.</td>
<td>54.7% 45.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Preparation for judging contests of a nature that is directly related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.</td>
<td>91.9% 8.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Selected FFA activities which directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.</td>
<td>96.5% 3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Preparation for any judging contest.</td>
<td>36.0% 64.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FFA activities which may not directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled, but have educational value for the development of leadership, citizenship, and cooperation essential for success in agricultural occupations.</td>
<td>91.9% 8.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Activities specifically selected to develop leadership, citizenship, and cooperation.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE. A = Delphi panel, TE = Teacher educator panelists, SS = State supervisor panelists, ST = Secondary teacher panelists.
Figure 13 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. record keeping for individual and chapter records.</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. preparation of individual award applications.</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. fund raising projects which use minimal class time that relate to agriculture, have educational value, and are conducted according to sound business practices.</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE.** A = Delphi panel, TE = Teacher educator panelists, SS = State supervisor panelists, ST = Secondary teacher panelists.
**Position number one: vocational agriculture.** At the end of round three 60.0 percent of all panel members agreed with the position, while 40.0 percent disagreed. Panel members moved toward consensus 9.4 percent and 5.7 percent during rounds two and three, respectively, for a total shift toward consensus of 15.1 percent. The extent of agreement with the position by groups ranged from 52.0 percent for state supervisors to 67.6 percent for teacher educators.

Respondents who agreed with the position suggested that vocational funding patterns and tradition support vocational agriculture as a program title. Panel members also noted that "vocational agriculture" is descriptive of secondary, post secondary, adult, and agribusiness programs.

Commentary in disagreement with the position stated that vocational agriculture denotes instruction in grades 9-12 and production agriculture.

**Position number two: agricultural education.** At the end of round three 12.9 percent of the panel members agreed with the position, while 87.1 percent disagreed. Panel members shifted away from agreement 2.5 percent at round two, but moved toward acceptance 1.2 percent between round two and three. Thus, panel members shifted away from consensus 1.3 percent between rounds one and three. The extent of round three panel member disagreement with the position ranged from 83.8 percent for teacher educators to 95.7 percent for secondary teachers.

Respondents in agreement with the position "agricultural education" considered the term as an accurate description of agricultural instruction in grades K-12 and at the adult level. Affirmative panel
reactions noted that this title parallels other vocational service areas such as "distributive education" and "business education". Panel members who disagreed with the position suggested that the term denotes teacher education as used in the literature and is too narrow to describe the K-12 public school agricultural instructional program.

Position number three: agriculture/agribusiness/natural resources education. Panel members moved toward disagreement with the position 6.8 and 3.3 percent during rounds two and three, respectively, for a total shift of 10.1 percent. At the end of round three 100.0 percent of the panel disagreed with the position.

Commentary supporting the title "agriculture/agribusiness/natural resources education" considered the title as complete modern terminology applicable to agricultural instruction throughout the United States. Panel members who disagreed with the position considered the terminology too wordy, too broad in concept, and lacking in vocational orientation.

Position number four: vocational-technical education in agriculture. A panel member shift toward disagreement with the position of 2.9 percent at round two established consensus which was maintained through round three.

Panelists who agreed with the position "vocational-technical education in agriculture" commended usage of the vocational prefix. Panel reactions in disagreement with the position noted that the term was too long and the acronym V-TEA unacceptable.

Position number five: agricultural education and renewable natural resources. Total panel member consensus in disagreement with the
position was attained during round one and maintained through round three.

Panel members who disagreed with the position "agricultural education and renewable natural resources" noted that the term does not recognize instruction in related agricultural areas, is too long, and implies equal importance with regard to natural resources and agricultural education.

Position number six: vocational agriculture/agribusiness. At the end of round three 27.1 percent of the panel members agreed with the position, while 72.9 percent disagreed. Panel members shifted toward agreement with the position 2.2 percent during round two, but moved toward disagreement 1.2 percent during round three, for a total shift away from consensus of 1.0 percent. The extent of disagreement with the position by groups ranged from 60.9 percent for secondary teachers to 83.8 percent for teacher educators.

Respondents in agreement with the position, "vocational agriculture/agribusiness" noted that the title recognizes traditional agricultural instruction while broadening the content area. Panelists who disagreed with the position stated that "agribusiness" is part of vocational agriculture and should not be given separate recognition.

Position number seven: agricultural and natural resources education. A change in panel member opinion of 1.4 percent toward disagreement with the position during round two established consensus. Thus, 100.0 percent of the panel disagreed with the position at the end of round three.
Panelists in disagreement with the position noted that the title is too long, gives too much emphasis to natural resources, and does not give enough emphasis to agribusiness.

**Position number eight: agriculture/agribusiness education.** A shift in panel member opinion toward disagreement with the position of 2.9 percent at round two established consensus. Thus, all panelists disagreed with the position at the end of round three.

Panel member commentary in disagreement with the position "agriculture/agribusiness education" stated that the term lacks needed identification with vocational programs and implies an unrealistic distinction between agriculture and agribusiness.

Panelists Perceptions Concerning the Need for Further Study and Discussion of Selected Issues in Agricultural Education

Data were collected during round three of the Delphi to formulate response to the research question:

What are the perceptions of agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors regarding the importance of further study and discussion of the issues?

In Section E of the round three questionnaire, panelists were directed to (a) consider the extent of consensus in the study with regard to each issue and (b) determine the extent each issue should be further considered and studied by the profession. Response was indicated by checking a four point rating scale. This rating scale included the general descriptors, "very important", "moderate importance", "limited importance," and "no further consideration needed" which was coded 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively. In addition, each of the
FIGURE 14
Extent of Agreement on the Alternative Position with Regard to the Title of the Agriculture Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. vocational agriculture.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. agricultural education.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. agriculture/agribusiness/natural resources education.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. vocational-technical education in agriculture.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. agricultural education and renewable natural resources.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. vocational agriculture/agribusiness.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. agricultural and natural resources education.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. agriculture/agribusiness education.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE. A = Delphi panel, TE = Teacher educator panelists, SS = State supervisor panelists, ST = Secondary teacher panelists.
general descriptors were followed by a brief explanation to communicate the precise meaning of each descriptor. (See Appendix I for a copy of the round three questionnaire.)

Rating scale scores of 4, 3, 2, and 1 were used to calculate mean scores for each issue. These mean scores provided the basis for prioritizing the issues in terms of a need for further study and discussion by the profession. Table 4 portrays the issues, mean scores, frequencies by response categories, and priority rankings.
### Table 4

Frequencies, Mean Scores, and Priority Rankings Concerning the Need for Further Study and Discussion of Selected Issues in Agricultural Education among Delphi Panelists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>No further consideration needed</th>
<th>Limited Importance</th>
<th>Moderate Importance</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Priority Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should become members of the FFA?</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in non-production agricultural programs in the public school system?</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a production agricultural program in the public school system?</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What should be the purpose of agricultural education in the public school system?</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should be required to conduct supervised occupational experience/practice programs?</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What clientele should be served by agricultural education in the public school system?</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system should occupy in-class instructional time?</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What title should be used to describe agricultural education programs in the public school system?</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What should be the content of agricultural education in the public school system?</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The response categories were numerically coded as indicated.

1 = No further consideration needed
2 = Limited importance
3 = Moderate importance
4 = Extremely important
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which alternative positions on nine selected issues in agricultural education in the public school system were acceptable to groups within the profession including agricultural education teacher educators, secondary teachers, and state supervisors. The specific research questions which were addressed included:

1. What are the alternative positions on the selected issues as perceived by agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors?

2. What is the extent of acceptance of the alternative positions on the selected issues among agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors?

3. What are the perceptions of agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors regarding the importance of further study and discussion of the issues?

Procedures

The researcher purposefully selected and described nine issues in agricultural education concerning the areas of program purpose, clientele served, program content, supervised occupational experience, the FFA, and program title. Issues with regard to these areas were
derived from "prioritized issues" identified during the National Agricultural Education Seminar held in Kansas City, Missouri July 15-17, 1980.

Essentially, the procedures for this study employed three techniques including (a) a review of related literature, (b) review and refinement of a researcher developed list of issue and position statements by a jury of seven experts, and (c) a modified-Delphi technique.

The researcher reviewed related literature to identify and describe alternative positions pertaining to each of the nine selected issues in agricultural education. Issue and alternative position statements were then prepared in instrument format for review and refinement by a jury of seven experts in agricultural education. An independent third party was utilized to select the experts to control the threat of researcher selection bias. Jury members self-rated their expert status to verify their qualifications as jurors. Based upon input from the jury, the researcher compiled a list of 79 alternative position statements pertaining to the nine selected issues. Thus, the first research question was answered which also provided information needed to formulate the data gathering instrument to answer the remaining research questions.

A modified Delphi technique was selected as the most appropriate procedure to answer the final two research questions. Features of the Delphi including anonymity of individual response, controlled feedback, and defined statistical presentation of group responses were particularly appropriate for the present study.
Issues and alternative position statements identified and described by the researcher and jury in the first part of this study were developed into instrument format. This instrument was designed to elicit two types of responses with regard to each alternative position: (a) agreement or disagreement and (b) written commentary. Panelists were directed to respond to each alternative position in terms of "what should be" the positions of the agricultural education profession with regard to important issues identified in the study.

A pool of 50 teacher educators, 46 secondary teachers, and 50 state supervisors was identified as potential Delphi panelists who were expert with regard to the research question. Expert secondary teachers and teacher educators were selected by independent third parties, while expert state supervisors were selected by virtue of their position. All 146 members of the pool were (a) mailed the first questionnaire, (b) invited to participate in the three round Delphi process by responding to the enclosed questionnaire, and (c) asked to self-rate their expert status with regard to the research question. One hundred and four subjects responded with sufficient distribution among the groups secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors. Thus, at this point in the study, a Delphi Panel of 104 experts was confirmed. Of the original 104 subjects, 94 or 90.4 percent responded to round two and 86 or 82.7 percent continued through round three.

Data collected from round one was reported to Delphi panelists on the round two questionnaire by reporting (a) the percent of panelists in agreement and disagreement, (b) panelists individual response to each alternative position, and (c) a summary of panelists written comments.
Respondents were invited to reevaluate each alternative position after considering the new data. Specifically, panelists were asked to (a) indicate their agreement or disagreement with each alternative position and (b) provide written commentary in support of their stance.

A third Delphi round repeated the process described for round two with one addition. Panel members were asked to indicate their perception of the need for further study and discussion of each issue after considering the data collected in this study. Panel members indicated the need for additional study by checking a four point rating scale with the descriptors "very important," "important," "limited importance," and "no further study needed".

Round three data were tabulated and summarized. A summary of round three was prepared and mailed to Delphi panel members completing all three rounds of the Delphi. At this point data had been collected to answer all three research questions.

Summary of Findings

Positions with Regard to Important Issues in Agricultural Education

Seventy-nine alternative positions pertaining to nine selected issues in agricultural education were identified. The alternative positions were further clarified during the conduct of the study as questions were posed by the Delphi panel members. The researcher clarified certain positions by individual notes to respondents and by messages printed on the questionnaire. Figure 5 on page 80 provides a list of the issues and alternative position statements along with
The Extent Alternative Positions Pertaining to Selected Issues in Agricultural Education Were Accepted by Expert Agricultural Education Secondary Teachers, Teacher Educators, and State Supervisors.

Since data of this type had not previously been collected in agricultural education, no real basis was available for establishing an a priori percent of agreement which would represent general acceptance of a position by the profession. The researcher, however, recognized an obligation to highlight those positions for which there was total agreement or near total agreement and those positions for which there was major disagreement. Grouping the data by frequency categories provided the researcher with a means to summarize the findings. Data concerning the total panel response and response among teacher educators, secondary teachers, and state supervisors were important to summarizing the extent of acceptance of the positions.

Considering the total Delphi panel, fifty or 63.3 percent of the 79 positions received support from 95 to 100.0 percent of the panelists. Of the 50 positions, full panel consensus was attained on 23 or 29.1 percent of the total 79 positions. Panelists were in total agreement on 18 or 78.3 percent of the 23 positions, while all panelists disagreed with 5 or 21.7 percent of the 23 positions. Eleven, or 13.9 percent of the positions received less than 50.0 percent of the panelists' support. Alternative positions pertaining to each issue are listed in order in Table 5 with regard to the percent of agreement on the positions among the experts. Figure 15 displays the number of positions accepted by the
### TABLE 5

**POSITIONS ORDERED BY THE PERCENT OF ACCEPTANCE AMONG EXPERT PANEL MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What should be the purpose of agricultural education in the public school system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. for orientation to and exploration of occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. in preparation for employment or self-employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. to develop the &quot;total individual&quot; by teaching independent thinking, decision making, problem solving, creativity, leadership, citizenship, and other human qualities.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. for upgrading and retraining employed or self-employed persons in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. in preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the postsecondary level.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. in preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the baccalaureate level.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. to develop the abilities of individuals to be intelligent consumers of agricultural products.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. for general education of an avocational or practical arts nature.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What clientele should be served by agricultural education in the public school system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. students in grades 9-10.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. rural students.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. urban students.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue/Position</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. in-school youth with social, physical, and economic handicaps.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. students in grades 11-12.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. suburban students.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. females seeking employment in agriculture, regardless of the type of agricultural occupational preference.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. adults employed, self-employed, or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. out-of-school youth employed or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. out-of-school youth and adults with social, physical, and economic handicaps.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. students in grades 7-8.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. out-of-school youth or adults who desire knowledge and skill in agriculture for personal reasons other than for employment or self-employment in agriculture.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. students in grades K-6.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What should be the content of agricultural education in the public school system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. agricultural production.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. agricultural supply and service.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. agricultural mechanics.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. agricultural products.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ornamental horticulture. Example: floriculture and nursery management.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue/Position</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. horticulture. Example: food production such as fruits and vegetables.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. renewable natural resources.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. forestry.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. other types of agriculture such as small animal care and horse training.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should be required to conduct supervised occupational experience/practice programs?

| 1. all vocational students enrolled in a production agricultural course of study. | 86 | 98.8 |
| 2. all vocational students enrolled in a non-production agriculture course of study. | 86 | 97.7 |
| 3. all students enrolled in classes for orientation to agriculture such as in grades 7 and 8. | 84 | 23.8 |
| 4. all students enrolled in non-vocational agricultural education programs.      | 85 | 23.5 |
| 5. all students receiving agricultural instruction in grades K-6.                | 83 | 12.0 |

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a production agricultural program in the public school system?

| 1. supervised farming projects (enterprises).                                  | 84 | 100.0 |
| 2. projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature.                          | 86 | 100.0 |
| 3. projects related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled. Example: students enrolled in horticulture should have experience programs in horticulture; if in animal science the experience programs should be in animal science. | 85 | 98.8 |
Table 5 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. farm placement.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. practice/experience in the school laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. home and/or farm improvement projects.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. supplementary farm projects.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. group (several students working together) projects related to production agriculture.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. exploratory experiences such as a study-visit with agricultural workers</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. practice/experience in the school laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm during class time.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in non-production agriculture in the public school system?

1. placement in agribusiness. 86 100.0
2. projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature. 86 100.0
3. cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day. 86 97.7
4. projects related exclusively to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled. Example: students enrolled in horticulture should have experience programs in horticulture; if in agribusiness, experience programs should be in agribusiness. 86 96.5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. group projects of a non-production agriculture nature.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. home projects of non-production nature such as lawn care and lawn mower maintenance.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. exploratory experience such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm during class time.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should be members of the FFA?

1. all vocational students in a production agriculture course of study.       | 86 | 95.3                 |
2. all vocational students in a non-production agriculture course of study.   | 86 | 95.3                 |
3. avocational students who desire to become members.                          | 85 | 36.5                 |
4. all vocational students in an orientation to agriculture course of study, such as 7th and 8th grade programs. | 85 | 27.1                 |
5. only those vocational students who desire to become members.                | 85 | 23.5                 |

What aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system should occupy in-class instructional time?

1. activities specifically selected to develop leadership, citizenship, and cooperation. | 85 | 100.0                |
2. selected FFA activities which directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled. | 86 | 96.5                |
Table 5 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. selected FFA activities which can be utilized without taking time needed to teach content of the instructional program.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. record keeping for individual and chapter awards.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. fund raising projects which use minimal class time that relate to agriculture, have educational value, and are conducted according to sound business practices.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FFA activities which may not directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled, but have educational value for the development of leadership, citizenship, and cooperation essential for success in agricultural occupations.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. preparation for judging contests of a nature that is directly related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. planning any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. preparation of individual award applications.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. conducting any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. preparation for any judging contest.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What title should be used to describe agricultural education programs in the public school system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. vocational agriculture.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. vocational agriculture/agribusiness.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. agricultural education.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. agriculture/agribusiness/natural resources education.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. vocational-technical education in agriculture.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. agricultural education and renewable natural resources.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. agricultural and natural resources education.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. agriculture/agribusiness education.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panelists when the percent of acceptance was grouped by 5.0 percent intervals.

The variability on the extent of acceptance of the positions by the groups secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors was determined by the range. The difference between the extent of agreement on 39 positions among the groups secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors was less than 5.0 percent. These 39 positions accounted for 49.4 percent of the total 79 positions. Analysis of the data revealed another major group of 22 positions with a range of between 5.0 and 15.0 percent among teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors which accounted for 27.8 percent of all the positions. Another group of 13 positions, or 16.5 percent, had a range greater than 15 percent but less than 25.0 percent. Five, or 6.3 percent, of the positions had a range of 25.0 percent or greater among the groups secondary teachers, teacher educators, and secondary teachers. Table 6 portrays the range of agreement on the positions among teacher educators, state supervisors, and secondary teachers. In Table 6, the range was ordered from smallest to largest to highlight those positions.
FIGURE 15
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TABLE 6

POSITIONS PERTAINING TO EACH ISSUE ORDERED BY THE RANGE OF ACCEPTANCE AMONG TEACHER EDUCATORS, STATE SUPERVISORS, AND SECONDARY TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What should be the purpose of agricultural education in the public school system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. for orientation to and exploration of occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. in preparation for employment or self-employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. to develop the &quot;total individual&quot; by teaching independent thinking, decision making, problem solving, creativity, leadership, citizenship, and other human qualities.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. for upgrading and retraining employed or self-employed persons in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. in preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the postsecondary level.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. for general education of an avocational or practical arts nature.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. to develop the abilities of individuals to be intelligent consumers of agricultural products.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. in preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the baccalaureate level.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What clientele should be served by agricultural education in the public school system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. students in grades 9-10.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. rural students.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. urban students.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. in-school youth with social, physical, and economic handicaps.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue/Position</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. students in grades 11-12.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. suburban students.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Females seeking employment in agriculture, regardless of the type of agricultural occupational preference.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. adults employed, self-employed, or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. out-of-school youth employed or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. students in grades K-6.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. out-of-school youth or adults who desire knowledge and skill in agriculture for personal reasons other than for employment or self-employment in agriculture.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. students in grades 7-8.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. out-of-school youth and adults with social, physical, and economic handicaps.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What should be the content of agricultural education in the public school system?

1. agricultural production. | 86 | 0     |
2. agricultural supply and service. | 76 | 0     |
3. agricultural mechanics. | 86 | 0     |
4. agricultural products. | 83 | 0     |
5. ornamental horticulture. Example: floriculture and nursery management. | 81 | 0     |
6. horticulture. Example: food production such as fruits and vegetables. | 81 | 0     |
7. other types of agriculture such as small animal care and horse training. | 85 | 1.8   |
Table 6 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. forestry.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. renewable natural resources.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should be required to conduct supervised occupational experience/practice programs?

1. all vocational students enrolled in a production agriculture course of study. 86 4.3
2. all vocational students enrolled in a non-production agriculture course of study. 86 4.3
3. all students enrolled in classes for orientation to agriculture such as in grades 7 and 8. 84 5.1
4. all students enrolled in non-vocational agricultural education programs. 85 6.9
5. all students receiving agricultural instruction in grades K-6. 83 11.7

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a production agriculture program in the public school system?

1. supervised farming projects (enterprises). 84 0
2. projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature. 86 0
3. farm placement. 86 3.8
4. practice/experience in the school laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction. 86 3.8
5. projects related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled. Example: students enrolled in horticulture should have experience programs in horticulture; if in animal science the experience programs should be in animal science. 85 4.3
6. cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day. 86 4.3
What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in non-production agriculture in the public school system?

1. placement in agribusiness.  
2. projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature.  
3. practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction.  
4. group projects of a non-production agricultural nature.  
5. cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day.  
6. exploratory experience such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.  
7. home projects of non-production nature such as lawn care and lawn mower maintenance.  
8. projects related exclusively to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled. Example: students enrolled in horticulture should have experience programs in horticulture; if in agribusiness, experience programs should be in agribusiness.  
9. practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm during class time.

Table 6 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. exploratory experiences such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. group (several students working together) projects related to production agriculture.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. home and/or farm improvement projects.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. supplementary farm projects.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. practice/experience in the school laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm during class time.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in non-production agriculture in the public school system?

1. placement in agribusiness.  
2. projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature.  
3. practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction.  
4. group projects of a non-production agricultural nature.  
5. cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day.  
6. exploratory experience such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.  
7. home projects of non-production nature such as lawn care and lawn mower maintenance.  
8. projects related exclusively to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled. Example: students enrolled in horticulture should have experience programs in horticulture; if in agribusiness, experience programs should be in agribusiness.  
9. practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm during class time.
Table 6 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should be members of the FFA?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. only those vocational students who desire to become members.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. all vocational students in a production agriculture course of study.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. all vocational students in a non-production agriculture course of study.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. all vocational students in an orientation to agriculture course of study, such as 7th and 8th grade programs.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. avocational students who desire to become members.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system should occupy in-class instructional time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. activities specifically selected to develop leadership, citizenship, and cooperation.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. record keeping for individual and chapter awards.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. selected FFA activities which directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. selected FFA activities which can be utilized without taking time needed to teach content of the instructional program.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. preparation for judging contests of a nature that is directly related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FFA activities which may not directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled, but have educational value for the development of leadership, citizenship, and cooperation essential for success in agricultural occupations.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. planning any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. fund raising projects which use minimal class time that relate to agriculture, have educational value, and are conducted according to sound business practices.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. conducting any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. preparation of individual award applications.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. preparation for any judging contest.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What title should be used to describe agricultural education programs in the public school system?

1. agriculture/agribusiness/natural resources education.                      | 85 | 0     |
2. vocational-technical education in agriculture.                               | 85 | 0     |
3. agricultural education and renewable natural resources.                    | 85 | 0     |
4. agricultural and natural resources education.                               | 85 | 0     |
5. agriculture/agribusiness education.                                        | 85 | 0     |
6. agricultural education.                                                    | 85 | 11.9  |
7. vocational agriculture.                                                    | 85 | 15.6  |
8. vocational agriculture/agribusiness.                                       | 85 | 22.9  |

for which there was little variability among the groups and those positions for which there was a wide range of agreement among the groups. Figure 16 portrays the number of positions with regard to the variability of agreement among teacher educators, secondary teachers, and state supervisors when the range was grouped by 5.0 percent intervals.
FIGURE 16

NUMBER OF POSITIONS BY THE RANGE OF AGREEMENT AMONG EXPERT SECONDARY TEACHERS, TEACHER EDUCATORS, AND STATE SUPERVISORS

Number of Positions

Range among Groups Expressed by Percentage
In addition to indicating whether or not respondents agreed with the alternative positions, panelists also provided written commentary concerning their stance on the alternative positions. Generally speaking, panelists provided written commentary to emphasize their particular stance on a position, suggest certain modifications of the position statements, or to suggest a means to implement the position statements. Readers are referred to Chapter 4 for a summary of panel commentary with regard to each of the position statements. Questionnaires for rounds two and three and the round three summary report panelists' comments as summarized by the researcher. (See Appendix H, I, and K for a copy of the round two and three questionnaires and the round three summary, respectively.)

Summary of Findings Concerning the Need for Further Study and Discussion of Selected Issues in Agricultural Education

Priority rankings for the issues in need of further study and discussion were determined by mean scores. Four issues received a mean score near 2.5. Thus, the issues dealing with clientele served by the FFA, type of supervised occupational experience/practice needed by non-production and production agriculture students, and the purpose of agricultural education ranked 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively. The issues dealing with clientele who should conduct a supervised occupational experience/practice and program clientele ranked fifth and sixth with mean scores of 2.49 and 2.43, respectively. Three mean scores of 2.29, 2.16, and 1.78 were closely grouped to form the seventh, eighth, and ninth priority rankings, respectively. These issues dealt with the use
of in-class time for FFA activities, program title, and content of the program.

Conclusions

Since previous research had not been conducted in this area, no real basis was available for establishing a priori criteria for accepting the alternative positions. In the absence of a priori criteria for accepting the alternative positions, three categories of responses have been established to formulate conclusion statements with regard to the positions. Those positions on which 100.0 percent of the panelists agreed will be described as strongly supported, while those positions supported by between 95, but less than 100.0 percent of the panelists will be considered as generally supported. Positions on which less than 50.0 percent of the panel members agreed will be referred to as having little support. Based on the previously reported data and criteria, the following conclusions are offered:

1. The purposes of agricultural education which were strongly supported by the experts included preparation for employment or self-employment in agriculture, orientation and exploration, and the development of the "total individual". Purposes including preparation for advanced study at the postsecondary level and upgrading and retraining in agriculture were strongly supported. Little support was given to agricultural instruction for avocational purposes.

2. Students in grades nine and ten, rural and urban students, and in-school youth with social, economic, and physical handicaps were strongly supported as clientele who should be served by agricultural education. Positions generally supported included students in grades 11
through 12; out-of-school youth; adults employed, self-employed, or seeking employment; suburban students; and females. Panelists provided little support to agricultural instruction for students in grades K-6.

3. Content of the agricultural education program in the areas of agricultural production, supply and service, mechanics, products, and ornamental and general horticulture was strongly supported, while general support was given to the content areas of renewable natural resources, forestry, and other types of agriculture.

4. Clientele who should conduct supervised occupational experience/practices generally supported by the experts included production or non-production vocational agriculture students. Little support was given to experience/practices for students enrolled in non-vocational courses, orientation classes, and grades K through 6.

5. Acceptable supervised occupational experience/practice for production agriculture students which were strongly supported by the panelists included supervised farming projects and projects of an entrepreneurial nature. Home and/or farm improvement projects; supplementary farm projects; group projects related to production agriculture; projects related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled; farm placement; practice/experience in the school laboratory, on the school grounds or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction; and cooperative education programs were generally supported as acceptable supervised experience/practice for production agriculture students.

6. Experience/practice for non-production agriculture students strongly supported by panelists included placement in agribusiness and
projects of an entrepreneurial nature. Group projects of a non-production nature; projects related exclusively to the area of instruction in which the student is enrolled; practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction; and cooperative education programs were generally supported as acceptable experience/practice for non-production agriculture students.

7. Panelists generally supported the positions that all students in a production and non-production agricultural education program should be required to become FFA members. Positions which received little support from panelists concerning appropriate clientele for FFA membership included students enrolled in an orientation course, voluntary membership for vocational students, and avocational students.

8. FFA activities specifically selected to develop leadership, citizenship, and cooperation were strongly supported as appropriate in-class activities. However, only general support was given to selected FFA activities which directly relate to the instructional area, selected FFA activities which do not interfere with teaching the instructional content, and record keeping for individual and chapter records. Preparation for "any judging" contest were given little support.

9. "Agriculture/agribusiness/natural resources education," "vocational-technical education in agriculture," "agricultural education and renewable natural resources," "agricultural and natural resources education," and "agriculture/agribusiness education" were not supported by the panelists as a title to describe the agricultural education
program in the public school system. None of the program titles were strongly supported or generally supported, however, the title "vocational agriculture" was the most acceptable program title when compared to the other choices.

10. Expert teacher educators believed that a broader range of clientele were acceptable for FFA membership than did expert secondary teachers and state supervisors.

11. Considering groups in the Delphi panel, teacher educators were less willing to accept aspects of the FFA program as in-class activities than were secondary teachers and state supervisors.

12. The extent of consensus on a majority of the positions is very high among the experts in agricultural education. Yet, some of the experts supported some modifications or additions to the positions as stated through written commentary.

13. A pool of experts can be identified who possess the necessary experience, and knowledge and are willing to address the question of "what should be" with respect to major issues in agricultural education.

14. A modified Delphi technique as described in Chapter 3 proved to be a satisfactory method for accomplishing the purposes described in this study.

15. Through dialogue and discussion, agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors will move toward consensus on important positions which pertain to major issues in agricultural education.

16. The issues in greatest need of further study and discussion include clientele who should become FFA members, acceptable types of
supervised occupational experience/practice for non-production and production agriculture students, and the purposes of agricultural education in the public school system.

Recommendations

The recommendations listed in this section are based upon findings of this study and impressions gained by the researcher while conducting the study.

1. The agricultural education profession should consider developing a general philosophy with regard to major components of the agricultural education program applicable throughout the United States, while maintaining appropriate flexibility for local program adaptations. Positions on which the Delphi panel attained consensus in this study could provide a base upon which to build such a philosophy. For example, commentary from panelists in this study suggested that production agriculture supervised occupational experience programs should be (a) related to student occupational goals, (b) individually tailored for each student, (c) well planned, (d) supervised, and (e) contain more than one type of experience/practice such as supplementary practice, improvement practice, or production practices. Perhaps another list of descriptors could suggest components that are desirable, but not essential. Such philosophy statements could provide direction to the profession. Involving "experts" from teacher education, secondary teaching, and state supervision would be useful in establishing credibility for a philosophy guiding agricultural education.
2. The professional associations at the national level should consider providing continuing leadership to studying, discussing, and identifying acceptable positions of the profession with regard to important national issues in agricultural education.

3. State or regional professional associations should consider providing continuing leadership to studying, discussing, and identifying acceptable positions of the profession with regard to important state and regional issues in agricultural education.

4. The joint staff of teacher educators and state supervisors in each state should consider formulating positions which specifically address issues important to the future of agricultural education in the respective states. Adoption of the acceptable positions should be a result of a continuing study and discussion of the issues. These positions should have important implications for preservice and inservice teacher training programs and supervisory functions.

5. The agricultural education profession should develop specific efforts to continually study, discuss, and identify positions concerning important issues in agricultural education such as devoting space for articles in the professional publications and appointing committees through the Agricultural Education Division of AVA to address specific issues.

6. The agricultural education profession should address the question of "what should be", determine the most appropriate alternative positions, and exert the necessary energies and resources for adoption of these positions in legislation, state and local departments of education policy, and other internal and external policy making entities.
that impact upon the profession; rather than reacting to policies dictated by those outside the profession. In short, the profession should determine the most acceptable directions for agricultural education and work toward those ends.

7. Graduate and undergraduate students should utilize issue and position statements as focal points for discussion and further study.

8. Replication of this study or components of this study should be conducted periodically to (a) identify trends and (b) provide considerations for determining future direction in the agricultural education profession.

9. Issues important to agricultural education, in addition to those in this study, should be studied according to methodology employed in this research. Issues identified during the National Agricultural Education Seminar held in Kansas City, Missouri, July 15-17, 1980 is one source of additional issues.

10. Future researchers should consider panelists written commentary in this study to identify additional positions and to sharpen the focus of those positions already identified in this study. For example, even though 97.6 percent of the respondents supported “upgrading and retraining employed or self-employed persons” as a program purpose, certain modifications were suggested. Further clarification is needed concerning whether every agricultural instructor should teach adults, every department should fulfill this purpose, if this purpose is of less importance than maintaining an effective secondary in-school program, as well as other important factors concerning this position.
11. Future research concerning the issues addressed in this study should focus on those issues receiving the highest priority ranking such as appropriate clientele for FFA membership, acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for non-production and production agriculture students, and the purposes of agricultural education in the public school system.

12. Where there is a large amount of variability among teacher educators, secondary teachers, and state supervisors concerning the acceptance of a position, further study and discussion is recommended. Positions in this category include providing instruction for youth and adults with social, physical, and economic handicaps; accepting practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm during class time for non-production agriculture students to meet supervised occupational experience requirements; accepting avocational agricultural education students as bonafide FFA members; preparing individual award applications as a part of in-class instruction; and preparing students for any judging contest as a part of in-class instruction.
Appendix A

Nomination Forms for Expert Delphi Panel
Information Sheet

Selection Criteria for "Expert"
Secondary Teachers in Agricultural Education

Explanation

This sheet contains two items of information to assist you in selecting a teacher most qualified (expert) to participate in this study from the secondary agricultural education teachers in your state.

A. Criteria for selecting experts
B. Directions for using the enclosed ballot

Criteria for Selecting Experts

An expert in the present study is one who:

1. has background knowledge about agricultural education,
2. will be objective,
3. will be able to construct logically sound deductions about what alternative positions should be accepted with regard to issues in areas under investigation and
4. will be able to be futuristic in orientation, as well as reflective of the status quo.

Directions

Please write the name and address of your nominee in the space provided below and return in the self-addressed stamped envelope.

Name: __________________________________________
Address: _______________________________________

You may [ ] may not [ ] use my name when contacting the above nominee.

Thank you for your assistance!
**Information Sheet**

**Selection Criteria for "Expert" Teacher Educators in Agricultural Education**

**Explanation**

This sheet contains two items of information to assist you in selecting fifty teacher educators most qualified (expert) to participate in this study from the population of teacher educators in agriculture.

A. Criteria for selecting experts
B. Directions for using the enclosed ballot

**Criteria for Selecting Experts**

An expert in the present study is one who:

1. has background knowledge about agricultural education,
2. will be objective,
3. will be able to construct logically sound deductions about what alternative positions should be accepted with regard to issues under investigation and
4. will be able to be futuristic in orientation, as well as reflective of the status quo.

**Directions**

The *Directory of Agricultural Teacher Education* will be used as a voting ballot. Please place a check ( ) to the left of fifty teacher educators you consider to be expert. Please note the example below.

(   ) John Doe

**Note:** You should not be concerned with distribution among regions of the country or states. Your only consideration is, who is most expert with regard to the research questions.
Appendix B

Correspondence
Dear 

As president of the (personalized state) Vocational Agriculture Teachers' Association, I am sure that you are concerned about important issues challenging agricultural education. There are many important issues which agricultural education faces. A national study has been proposed to determine the extent to which alternative positions pertaining to selected issues in agricultural education are acceptable to the profession. These issues concern the areas of program purpose, clientele served, program content, supervised occupational experience/practice, the FFA and title of the program.

Your voluntary assistance with this study is essential as state president of the agriculture teachers' association and because of your knowledge of the qualifications of fellow teachers. I am asking for a few minutes of your time to nominate a teacher most qualified to participate in this study by:

1. considering yourself and other agriculture teachers in your state,
2. considering selection criteria on the enclosed form,
3. reviewing the enclosed abstract if you need additional information about this study and
4. returning the enclosed completed form by May 15, 1981, in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided.

Your nominee will be the only person contacted from (personalized state) to voluntarily participate in this study. In contacting this teacher, I request to use your name to encourage participation if given permission on the enclosed form.

I thank you in advance for your assistance and enclose mints as a token of my appreciation.

Sincerely yours,

H. Dean Sutphin

Enc.
June 16, 1981

Dear:

Some weeks ago I contacted you to assist in conducting a national study to identify positions of the agricultural education profession with regard to selected issues. The purpose of this letter is to personally thank you for submitting the name of a potential respondent from (personalized state).

As state president of the (personalized state) Vocational Agriculture Teachers' Association, I am sure efforts to lead your state association in addressing local, state and national issues create a very busy schedule. I sincerely appreciate the time you have given to assist with this study. I assure you that I will make every effort to make this study a significant contribution to the profession.

Again, thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

H. Dean Sutphin
June 16, 1981

Dear:

Some weeks ago I contacted you to assist in conducting a national study to identify positions of the agricultural education profession with regard to selected issues. The purpose of this letter is to personally thank you for submitting the name of a potential respondent from (personalized state). I am also appreciative of permission given to use your name when contacting this individual.

As state president of the (personalized state) Vocational Agriculture Teachers' Association, I am sure efforts to lead your state association in addressing local, state and national issues create a very busy schedule. I sincerely appreciate the time you have given to assist with this study. I assure you that I will make every effort to make this study a significant contribution to the profession.

Again, thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

H. Dean Sutphin
Dear:

As a former vocational agriculture instructor and state president of the (personalized state) Vocational Agriculture Teachers' Association, I realize your busy schedule. However, I am asking for a few minutes of your time to assist in a national study that could affect the future of agricultural education.

Approximately three weeks ago you should have received correspondence explaining this study which has the primary purpose of identifying positions of the profession with regard to selected issues in agricultural education. You were asked to nominate a secondary agriculture education instructor deemed most capable of serving as a respondent. To date, I have not received your response.

Enclosed is a return form and a self-addressed stamped envelope for your convenience. Please return the completed form by June 8, 1981. Your nomination is extremely important, since this person will be the only individual contacted to voluntarily participate in this study from (personalized state). If you have already responded to this request, please disregard this letter.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

H. Dean Sutphin
May 8, 1981

Dear:

As (personalized title) of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, I am sure that you are concerned about important issues challenging agricultural education. There are many important issues which agricultural education faces. A national study has been proposed to determine the extent to which alternative positions pertaining to selected issues in agricultural education are acceptable to the profession. These issues concern the areas of program purpose, clientele served, program content, supervised occupational experience/practice, the FFA and title of the program.

Your voluntary assistance with this study is essential as (personalized title) of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture and because of your knowledge of the qualifications of fellow teacher educators. I am asking for a few minutes of your time to nominate fifty teacher educators most qualified to participate in this study by:

1. Considering yourself and other teacher educators listed on the enclosed directory,
2. Considering selection criteria on the enclosed form,
3. Reviewing the enclosed abstract if you need additional information about this study,
4. Completing the enclosed ballot according to directions on the information sheet and
5. Returning the completed ballot in the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope by May 18, 1981.

Your nominees will be tabulated along with the (personalized title) of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture. Fifty teacher educators receiving the highest number of votes will comprise the sample for this study. These individuals will be contacted to solicit voluntary participation in this study.

I thank you in advance for your assistance and enclose mints as a token of my appreciation.

Sincerely yours,

H. Dean Sutphin

HDS:dbb
June 1, 1981

Dear:

Some weeks ago I contacted you to assist in conducting a national study to identify positions of the agricultural education profession with regard to selected issues. The purpose of this letter is to personally thank you for submitting the names of fifty teacher educators you consider to be most capable of responding to this study.

As (president, president elect, past president) of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture and a leader of agriculture education, I am sure that you have a very busy schedule. I sincerely appreciate the time you have given to assist with this study. I assure you that I will make every effort to make this study a significant contribution to the profession.

Again, thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

H. Dean Sutphin
May 1, 1981

Dear:

You are one of seven experts in agricultural education selected to represent viewpoints of the profession in the initial phase of a national study. The purpose of the study is to determine the extent alternative (possible) positions pertaining to selected issues in agricultural education are acceptable to various groups within the profession.

In this phase of the study, I am asking you to review, edit and/or add to a list of alternative positions as they pertain to selected issues in agricultural education identified by my review of related literature. Your response will be confidential and will only be used in developing a questionnaire to answer the primary research questions in a second part of this study. Although participation is voluntary, I urge you to participate in a study that can help shape the future of agricultural education.

Enclosed you will find:
(1) an abstract to better acquaint you with the study,
(2) a copy of the questionnaire for your response and
(3) a self-addressed stamped envelope for returning the questionnaire.

The commitment I am asking from you is to:
(1) complete the questionnaire,
(2) allow me to contact you by phone on the morning of May 12, 1981 to answer questions and/or tape record your response to the questionnaire.

If you prefer, you may return the completed questionnaire by May 15, 1981 instead of responding by phone. Should questions arise, please do not hesitate to call me collect at (614) 263-4763 prior to 9:00 AM each morning.

I thank you in advance for your cooperation in this study, and enclose mints as a token of my appreciation.

Sincerely,

Dean Sutphin
May 26, 1981

Dear:

Some weeks ago I contacted you to assist in conducting a national study to identify positions of the agricultural education profession with regard to selected issues. The purpose of this letter is to personally thank you for your assistance in identifying and describing alternative positions pertaining to the selected issues.

As a (personalized title) and a leader in agricultural education, I am sure that you have a very busy schedule. I sincerely appreciate the time you have taken from your schedule and the significant input given to this study. Your suggestions and those of colleagues will be used in developing the questionnaire for the first round of this national study which will utilize a modified Delphi technique. I assure you that I will exert every effort to make this study a significant contribution to the profession.

Again, thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

H. Dean Sutphin
Dear:

Many issues challenge agricultural education. The profession now needs to give their best thinking in order to arrive at a clear understanding of what positions "should be" accepted on important issues in agricultural education.

You have been selected by (name of president), president of the (name of state) Vocational Agriculture Teachers' Association as the teacher from (name of state) most capable of identifying acceptable positions. In addition to secondary teachers from the fifty states, selected agriculture teacher educators and state supervisors are being asked to voluntarily participate in this important study.

At the present time, I am asking you to complete and return the enclosed questionnaire by June 24. A self-addressed stamped envelope is provided for your convenience.

This study will utilize a modified Delphi technique. Therefore, I wish to alert you to two additional questionnaires which will be mailed to you following your response to this one. The second and third questionnaires will be mailed independently. Each questionnaire will:

a. summarize responses to the previous questionnaire,
b. report your previous response,
c. report a summary of comments in agreement and disagreement with each position and
d. ask you to review your response considering the new data.

Consideration of your confidential viewpoint and anonymous viewpoints of others should assist us in moving toward a more enlightened response to the questionnaire. Your response will remain strictly confidential and will only be used as summary data.

I thank you in advance for assistance with this study. Please enjoy the enclosed mints as a token of my appreciation.

I will eagerly await your response.

Sincerely,

H. Dean Sutphin
July 16, 1981

Dear:

Thank you for your response on what positions "should be" accepted by the profession with regard to selected issues in agricultural education. Based upon first round data collected, a second communication has been prepared.

The purpose of this communication is to:

1. reevaluate the alternative positions on the issues in light of information gathered on the first instrument.

2. provide you the opportunity to further clarify the reasons for taking a particular stance.

Care has been taken to summarize responses from the first communication which will allow you to compare your opinions with those of your colleagues. Although this has taken additional space, completion time should be comparable to the first communication.

Should you have questions regarding your role in this study or the procedures, please contact me collect at (614) 263-4763, Monday through Friday, 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon.

I am asking that you return the completed questionnaire by July 28, 1981, or the date you indicated on the first questionnaire. Again, thank you for your continued assistance.

Please enjoy the enclosed mints as a token of my appreciation for responding to this communication.

Sincerely yours,

Dean Sutphin
August 6, 1981

Dear:

Approximately three weeks ago you should have received a communication from me asking for your assistance in determining the positions of the profession pertaining to important issues in agricultural education. This study is important to the future of agricultural education.

In order for the study to be of maximum value it is important that individuals who responded to the first communication also respond to the second communication. To date the response rate has been excellent, however, I have not received your response. Summer vacations or other commitments may have prevented returning the correspondence by the deadline date. May I encourage you to complete and return the correspondence as soon as possible.

If you have already returned the correspondence, please disregard this request. Thank you so much for your cooperation in this study.

Sincerely,

Dean Sutphin
August 19, 1981

Dear:

Response from you and fellow expert agricultural teacher educators, state supervisors, and secondary teachers regarding important issues in agricultural education has been excellent. Your continued assistance is critical to obtaining maximum value from this study.

This final communication is necessary for further evaluation based upon interesting and important information given by you and fellow expert respondents. This information includes a summary of the total group agreement or disagreement with each position, a summary of supporting comments, and your previous response. Please note the addition of Section E as one of the few changes in this instrument from the previous communication. You should refer to the instrument for specific directions in responding to this communication.

Although the instrument appears rather long, your familiarity with the content and similarity of this instrument with the previous communication should minimize time needed for response. Please return the completed communication by September 3 in the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope.

Again, I personally thank you for your continued assistance. Mints are enclosed for your enjoyment while responding to this communication. I will anxiously await your reply.

Sincerely yours,

H. Dean Sutphin

Enclosure

EDS/bjj
October 19, 1981

Dear

For several months you have participated in a Delphi study to identify positions of the profession with regard to important national issues in agricultural education. Thanks to the dedication of you and your colleagues, this study has been completed.

Please find an enclosed summary of data collected during round three. I am extremely pleased to provide you with this information without asking for something in return.

I sincerely appreciate your assistance. I realize that the questionnaires for each of the three rounds took considerable time to complete. Hopefully, the results of this study will be useful to the profession.

Thanks so much!

Sincerely,

Dean Sutphin
DS/bj
Enclosure
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Study Abstract Used in Mailings
Abstract

POSITIONS WITH REGARD TO SELECTED ISSUES IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Introduction

On July 15-17, 1980 the Agricultural Education Division of the American Vocational Association and the U.S. Office of Education jointly sponsored a National Agricultural Education Seminar to identify trends, issues and new directions for agricultural education for the eighties and beyond. Thirty-two issues perceived to be of national priority were teachers, supervisors, post secondary teachers, members of the National Agricultural Education Advisory Council, persons from agricultural industry and other interested individuals. With regard to issues of national priority, results of the National Seminar and other evidence suggests that there is a need to: (a) determine various positions which pertain to the issues; (b) study the merits of the alternative positions; (c) determine the extent alternative positions should be accepted by the agricultural education profession; (d) involve major components of the profession including teacher education, secondary teaching and supervision in a study and discussion of the issues; and (e) establish a priority ranking as to what issues should be further studied and discussed by the profession. Determining the perceptions of individuals or groups on alternative positions pertaining to the priority issues challenging agricultural education is an intriguing
question which has not received adequate comprehensive and systematic study.

The primary purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which alternative positions on nine selected issues in agricultural education in public school system are acceptable to groups within the profession including teacher educators, secondary teachers and supervisors. The selected issues were derived from issues identified during the National Agricultural Education Seminar and concern program purpose, clientele served, program content, supervised occupational experience, co-curricular organizations and program title. The specific questions to be investigated are:

1. What are the alternative positions on the selected issues as perceived by agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors?

2. What is the extent of acceptance of the alternative positions on the selected issues among agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors?

3. What are the perceptions of agricultural education secondary teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors regarding the importance of further study and discussion of the issues?

Methodology

Alternative positions on selected issues will be determined by a review of related literature followed by a review by a seven member jury of experts. Jury members will be identified by an unbiased third party
deemed capable of selecting seven individuals most "expert" in identifying and describing alternative positions pertaining to the selected issues. The jury will respond to a researcher developed instrument by mail and/or a taped telephone conference according to respondent preference. Data will be tabulated to form a list of alternative positions with regard to selected issues, which will provide a basis for an instrument designed to answer the primary research question.

The researcher and jury developed instrument will be mailed to a purposive sample of one-hundred and fifty experts from the following groups: teacher educators, secondary teachers and state supervisors in agricultural education in the United States of America. Unbiased third party raters will identify fifty teacher educators and fifty secondary teachers deemed to be most expert in answering the research question. Head state supervisors of agricultural education from each of the fifty states will be selected purely by virtue of their position.

A modified Delphi technique will be used as the methodology to answer the primary research question. Features of the Delphi including anonymity of individual response, controlled feedback and defined statistical presentation of group responses should facilitate determination of a consensus of opinion among the "experts" in each of the previously mentioned groups.

In using the Delphi technique, three successive questionnaires are planned for this study. The first questionnaire will ask respondents to indicate whether they agree or disagree with each position statement and, if they choose, provide a written statement in support of their
perceptions. In a second questionnaire respondents will be feedback:
(a) their previous response; (b) a summary of the overall group
response; and (c) a summary of "pro" and "con" supporting comments
collected from the first questionnaire. Respondents will be asked to
respond in the same manner as in the first questionnaire in light of the
new data. A third questionnaire will feedback data collected from the
previous questionnaire and ask for the same type of response as the
second questionnaire. In the third questionnaire respondents will also
be asked to indicate their perception of the need for further study and
discussion of each issue by checking a four-point rating scale.

Data will be analyzed using descriptive statistics. Histograms,
scatter plots and mean scores will be used in summarizing the data.

Findings

The importance of study and discussion of priority issues
investigated in this study has been documented by two hundred and
sixty-four leaders in agricultural education during the National
Agricultural Education Seminar in Kansas City, Missouri, July 15-17,
1980. In the present study the findings will be limited to the
perceptions of a purposive sample of experts in agricultural education
who are in positions to influence policy within the profession.

Therefore, findings of this study will be highly significant to
agricultural education by providing a guide for future directions for
the profession. Specifically, findings of the present study will permit
the researcher to:
Appendix D

List of Seven Member Expert Panel
Seven Expert Panel Members

Tom Jones, Agricultural Instructor
Jim Guilinger, Agricultural Instructor
Paul Day, State Supervisor
Darrell Parks, State Supervisor
Jasper Lee, Teacher Educator
Gerald Fuller, Teacher Educator
Walter Jeskee, National Agricultural Education Advisory Council
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Pilot Test Instrument Review Panels
Pilot Test Panel

For the Instrument: "The Identification and Description of Alternative Positions with Regard to Nine Selected Issues in Agricultural Education"

Stacy Gartin
Larry Arrington
Rosemarie Conduff
Ed Osborne
David Harris
Round One Pilot Test Panel

Larry Arrington
Stacy Gartin
Rosemarie Conduff
David Harris
Ed Osborne
Round Two Pilot Test Panel

Stacy Gartin
Rosemarie Conduff
Ed Osborne
Susie Osborne
David Harris
Kamiar Kouzakanani
Round Three Pilot Test Panel

Stacy Gartin
Rosemarie Conduff
Ed Osborne
Susie Osborne
David Harris
Kamiar Kouzemanan
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Questionnaire Mailed to the Seven Member Expert Panel
THE IDENTIFICATION AND DESCRIPTION

of

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS WITH REGARD TO NINE
SELECTED ISSUES IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

by

Selected experts from agricultural education secondary teachers, supervisors, and teacher educators.
SECTION A
-DEMOGRAPHIC DATA-

Explanation
The purpose of Section A is to enable the researcher to accurately describe characteristics of the respondents in the study. This information will not be reported or correlated with any individual name or title during the conduct of the study or be a part of the final report of the study. Upon receipt of the questionnaire, the researcher will immediately separate sheets containing demographic data from the other part of the questionnaire. This will avoid associating any particular information with a respondent.

Directions
Please respond to the questions as follows by filling in the block or checking the appropriate category.

continued on next page
Address

Participant Address Label

Please strike out errors in address and enter corrections in the block to the right.

Corrected Address

Related Data

Phone Number: ____ ____ ____ Sex: O Male  O Female

Experience

Formal Education:
(Please check highest degree held)

- O Bachelors
- O Masters
- O Ph.D

Professional Experience:
(Please indicate total number of years for each category including present position)

- ____ Secondary Teacher
- ____ Teacher Educator
- ____ Agriculture Supervisor

Involvement in Professional Associations:
(Please check all appropriate with regard to past and present activities at the state or national level)

- O AATEA  O Member  O Officer
- O NVATA  O Member  O Officer
- O NASAE  O Member  O Officer

continued on next page
SECTION B
-REFINEMENT PROCESS-
Explanation

As you may already know, a National Agricultural Education Seminar was conducted July 15-17, 1980 to identify trends, issues and new directions that will affect agricultural education during the remainder of the 20th century. Agricultural education secondary instructors, postsecondary instructors, teacher educators, supervisors, and other interested individuals identified thirty-two priority issues in agricultural education during the Seminar. From this list of issue statements, six areas have been identified from which issues have been restated for the present study. For each issue the researcher has identified and described what appears to be the important alternative positions described in the related literature. The purpose of this phase of the present study is to (1) refine, if necessary, the important alternative positions as stated and (2) identify and describe any additional important positions.

Please keep in mind as you seek to identify and refine the various positions that we are looking for the important positions. Operationally, a position is defined as a singular manner or way of viewing an aspect of the agricultural education program. A multitude of intricate position

continued on next page
statements which focus on narrow aspects of the issue could quickly overburden this study. For example, within the issue of program purpose, the position has emerged that agricultural education should include preparation for advanced study. The position could be separated into numerous subpositions that describe location, number of hours of instruction, and teachers. However, the intent of the study is to identify the major positions that clearly relate to the issue statement. A position is considered to be important if the position clearly relates to the issue and if acceptance or rejection of the position would alter the local, state and/or national agricultural education program.

continued on next page
Direction

Please review each issue and the related position statements. Then, react in the following ways.

(1) Check the appropriate block to indicate if each alternative position is adequately stated or if further refinement is necessary to convey the intended message. The coding system given below will be used to determine if the position statement should be further refined.

R = Refine  NR = No Refinement Necessary

Please check your perception as indicated in the example below for each position statement.

O R  0 NR

(2) If the position statement needs refinement, strike out, add to, or make other revisions on the typed statement. You may also use the area provided to the right of each position as a place for your comments or revisions.

(3) Add any additional statements in the space provided at the end of each list of position statements. You may complete and return the questionnaire, or respond verbally as indicated in the cover letter. If you choose to respond verbally, you may wish to use the questionnaires as a work copy by making personal notes.

Caution: We are simply trying to identify a list of the important alternative positions that are stated clearly and concisely with respect to the issues. In no way are we trying to make a decision on whether the position should or should not be accepted by the profession at this point in the study.

continued on next page
## PURPOSE OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

### ISSUE

What should be the purpose of agricultural education in the public school system?

### ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

The purpose of agricultural education in the public school system should include the acquisition of knowledge and skills:

1. for avocational or practical arts purposes. O R
   O NR
2. for orientation to and exploration of occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture. O R
   O NR
3. in preparation for advanced study of agriculture. O R
   O NR
4. in preparation for employment or self-employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture. O R
   O NR
5. for upgrading and retraining of persons employed or self-employed in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture. O R
   O NR
6. to develop the "whole student" by teaching independent thinking, decision making, creativity, leadership, citizenship and other human characteristics. O R
   O NR

Please use this space to describe additional important positions with regard to the previously stated issue.

continued on next page
-CLIENTELE SERVED BY AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION-

ISSUE

What clientele should be served by agricultural education in the public school system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Clientele who should be served by agricultural education in the public school system should include:

1. students in grades K-6.
2. students in grades 7-8.
3. students in grades 9-10.
4. students in grades 11-12.
5. out-of-school youth employed in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.
6. adults employed in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.
7. rural students.
8. urban students.
9. suburban students.
10. in-school youth with social and economic handicaps

continued on next page
11. out-of-school youth and adults with social and economic handicaps.

12. in-school male and female students regardless of agricultural occupational preference.

Please use this space to describe additional important positions with regard to the previously stated issue.

---CONTENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION PROGRAM---

**ISSUE**

What should be the content of agricultural education in the public school system?

**ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS**

The content of agricultural education in the public school system should include:

1. agricultural production.  
2. agricultural supply and service businesses.  
3. agricultural mechanics businesses.  
4. agricultural products businesses.  
5. ornamental horticulture.

continued on next page
Please use this space to describe additional important positions with regard to the previously stated issue.

-SUPERVISED OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE/PRACTICE-

ISSUE

What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should be required to conduct supervised occupational experience/practice system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Supervised occupational experience/practices in agricultural education in the public school system should be required:

1. of all production agriculture O R
   students. O NR
2. of all non-production agriculture students.

Please use this space to describe additional important positions with regard to the previously stated issue.

-SUPERVISED OCCUPATION EXPERIENCE/PRACTICE-

ISSUE

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for production agriculture students in the public school system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for production agriculture students enrolled in the public school system include:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>supervised farming project (enterprises).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>improvement projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>supplementary farm projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>group projects related to production agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>farm placement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>practice in the school laboratory or on the school grounds (farm) outside of class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued on next page
7. practice in the school laboratory or on the school ground (farm) during class time.

8. exploratory experiences such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.

9. cooperative education programs where students are released from part of the school day.

Please use this space to describe additional important positions with regard to the previously stated issue.

ISSUE

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for non-production agriculture students in the public school system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in the non-production agriculture program include:

1. home projects of a non-production nature such as lawn care and the home vegetable garden.

2. placement in agribusiness.

3. group projects of a non-production agriculture nature.

4. practice in the school laboratory or on the school grounds outside of class.

continued on next page
5. practice in the school laboratory or on the school grounds during class time.  
6. exploratory experiences such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.  
7. cooperative education programs where students are released from part of the school day.

Please use this space to describe additional important positions with regard to the previously stated issue.

---FFA PROGRAM---

ISSUE

What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should be required to become members of the FFA?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Membership in the FFA should be required of:

1. all students in a production agriculture course of study.  
2. all students in a non-production agriculture course of study.  
3. all students enrolled in an orientation to agriculture course of study, such as 7th and 8th grade programs.

continued on next page
4. only those students who desire to become members. OR ONR

Please use this space to describe additional important positions with regard to the previously stated issue.

ISSUE

What aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system should be devoted to in-class instructional time?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Aspects of the FFA program which should occupy in-class instructional time:

1. include planning any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities. OR ONR

2. include conducting any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities. OR ONR

3. include selected FFA activities which specifically relate to the particular course of study in which the student is enrolled. OR ONR

4. include selected FFA activities which indirectly relate to the student's particular course of study. OR ONR

5. include selected FFA activities which can be utilized without interfering with the content of the instructional program. OR ONR

continued on next page
6. include preparation for judging contests of a nature that is directly related to the student's course of study.

7. do not include preparation for judging contests.

8. include activities specifically selected to develop leadership, citizenship and cooperation.

9. include record keeping.

10. include preparation of individual awards applications.

11. include fund raising projects which use minimal class time that relate to agriculture, have educational value and are conducted according to sound business practices.

Please use this space to describe additional important positions with regard to the previously stated issue.

continued on next page
ISSUE

What title should be used to describe agricultural education programs in the public school system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

The title of agricultural education programs in the public school system should be:

1. vocational agriculture. OR
   NR

2. agricultural education. OR
   NR

3. agriculture/agribusiness/ natural resources education. OR
   NR

4. vocational-technical education in agriculture. OR
   NR

5. agricultural education and renewable natural resources. OR
   NR

Please use this space to describe additional important positions with regard to the previously stated issue.

Thank you for your interest and support in completing the instrument.

Please mail me a copy of the study summary [ ] Yes [ ] No
Appendix G

Round One Delphi Questionnaire
ISSUES/POSITIONS
IMPORTANT TO THE FUTURE OF
AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION
Round I
INTRODUCTION

A National Agricultural Education Seminar was conducted July 15-17, 1980 to identify trends, issues and new directions that will affect agricultural education during the remainder of the 20th century. Agricultural education secondary instructors, postsecondary instructors, teacher educators, supervisors and other interested individuals identified thirty-two priority issues in agricultural education during the seminar. From this list of issue statements, six areas have been identified from which issues have been restated for the present study. These areas include program purpose, clientele served, program content, supervised occupational experience, the FFA and program title. The researcher in consultation with a panel of experts has identified and described what appears to be important alternative positions for each issue.

The alternative positions developed for your consideration are an attempt to address the question of what "should be" the position of the profession with regard to selected issues in agricultural education. Issues and alternative positions in this study concern only agricultural education in grades K-12 in the public school system.

This instrument contains two parts. Part I is designed to obtain minimal but essential demographic data. Part II provides participants with an opportunity to agree or disagree with each alternative position. Participants may also wish to support their decision on some or all the positions.

PART I

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Explanation

The purpose of Part I is to enable the researcher to accurately describe characteristics of the respondents in the study. This information will not be reported or correlated with any individual name or title during this study or in the final report. Upon receipt of the questionnaire, the researcher will immediately separate sheets containing demographic data from the other part of the questionnaire. This will avoid associating any particular information with a respondent.
**Directions**

Please respond to the questions as follows by filling in the block or checking the appropriate category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Related Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Education:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phone Number:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please check highest degree held)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Bachelor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Masters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Ph.D./Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Experience in Agriculture:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sex:</strong> 0 Male 0 Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please indicate total number of years for each category including present position)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involvement in Professional Associations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please indicate number of years of service with regard to past and present activities at the state or national level in appropriate categories below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member</strong></td>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AATAE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td><strong>Participant Address Label</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYATA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please review the above label and make corrections in this area.

-continue to next page-
PART II
ISSUES AND ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Explanation

Part II lists issues in the areas of program purpose, clientele served, program content, supervised occupational experience, the FFA and program title. Several alternative positions have been identified for each issue. These issues and alternative positions are limited to public school agricultural education programs in grades K-12.

Directions

Sections A, B and C have been labeled for each issue and alternative position statements in the questionnaire and in the example below. Please review each alternative position pertaining to the selected issues in Section A in terms of public school agricultural education programs pertaining to grades K-12. As you review each position, please react as follows:

a. Check the appropriate block in Section B to indicate if you agree or disagree that the alternative position "should be" accepted by the profession.

b. Use the box adjacent to each alternative position in Section C to support your agreement or disagreement with each position, if you desire. Completion of this box is optional.

Please note an example given below.

Section A
Section A contains an issue and several alternative position statements pertaining to the issue. Please review each position statement and respond to Section B. You may also wish to support the position taken in Section B by responding in Section C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE/POSITION</th>
<th>REACTION</th>
<th>SUPPORT OF REACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

The purpose of agricultural education in the public school system should include the acquisition of knowledge and skills:

1. For development of social skills.

   0 Agree
   0 Disagree

   Minor part of the program rather than a purpose
## Purpose of Agricultural Education

**Issue:**
What should be the purpose of agricultural education in the public school system?

**Alternative Positions**
The purpose of agricultural education in the public school system should include the acquisition of knowledge and skills:

1. For general education of an avocational or practical art’s nature.
2. For orientation to and exploration of occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.
3. In preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the postsecondary level.
4. In preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the baccalaureate level.
5. In preparation for employment or self-employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.
6. For upgrading and retraining employed or self-employed persons in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Position</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Support of Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For general education of an avocational or practical art’s nature.</td>
<td>O Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For orientation to and exploration of occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>O Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the postsecondary level.</td>
<td>O Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the baccalaureate level.</td>
<td>O Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In preparation for employment or self-employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>O Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For upgrading and retraining employed or self-employed persons in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>O Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you desire, you may support the positions you have taken. Your comments should be adjacent to the position statement to which you are referring.

---

- continue to next page -
### ISSUES/POSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE/POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. to develop the &quot;total individual&quot; by teaching independent thinking, decision-making, problem solving, creativity, leadership, citizenship and other human qualities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. to develop the abilities of individuals to be intelligent consumers of agricultural products.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE/POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. to develop the &quot;total individual&quot; by teaching independent thinking, decision-making, problem solving, creativity, leadership, citizenship and other human qualities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. to develop the abilities of individuals to be intelligent consumers of agricultural products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUPPORT OF REACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE/POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. to develop the &quot;total individual&quot; by teaching independent thinking, decision-making, problem solving, creativity, leadership, citizenship and other human qualities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. to develop the abilities of individuals to be intelligent consumers of agricultural products.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CLIENTELE SERVED BY AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

**ISSUE**

What clientele should be served by agricultural education in the public school system?

**ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS**

Clientele who should be served by agricultural education in the public school system should include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. students in grades K-6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. students in grades 7-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. students in grades 9-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. students in grades 11-12.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. students in grades K-6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. students in grades 7-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. students in grades 9-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. students in grades 11-12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-continue to next page-
Section A contains an issue and several alternative position statements pertaining to the issue. Please review each position statement and respond to Section B. You may also wish to support the position taken in Section B by responding in Section C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE/POSITION</th>
<th>REACTION</th>
<th>SUPPORT OF REACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. out-of-school youth employed or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. adults employed, self-employed or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. out-of-school youth or adults who desire knowledge and skill in agriculture for personal reasons other than for employment or self-employment in agriculture.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. rural students.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. urban students.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. suburban students.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. in-school youth with social, physical and economic handicaps.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. out-of-school youth and adults with social, physical and economic handicaps.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. females seeking employment or self-employment in agriculture, regardless of the type of agricultural occupational preference.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section B

Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking the appropriate block after each statement.

Section C

If you desire, you may support the positions you have taken. Your comments should be adjacent to the position statement to which you are referring.

***************
**ISSUE**

What should be the content of agricultural education in the public school system?

**ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS**

The content of agricultural education in the public school system should include:

1. **agricultural production.**
   - 0 Agree
   - 0 Disagree

2. **agricultural supply and services.**
   - 0 Agree
   - 0 Disagree

3. **agricultural mechanics.**
   - 0 Agree
   - 0 Disagree

4. **agricultural products.**
   - 0 Agree
   - 0 Disagree

5. **ornamental horticulture.**
   - ex. floriculture
   - 0 Agree
   - 0 Disagree

6. **horticulture.**
   - ex. food production, such as fruits and vegetables
   - 0 Agree
   - 0 Disagree

7. **renewable natural resources.**
   - 0 Agree
   - 0 Disagree

---

*continue to next page*
-issue continued from previous page-

Section A
Section A contains an issue and several alternative position statements pertaining to the issue. Please review each position statement and respond to Section B. You may also wish to support the position taken in Section B by responding in Section C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE/POSITION</th>
<th>REACTION</th>
<th>SUPPORT OF REACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. forestry.</td>
<td>O Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other types of agriculture such as small animal care and horse training.</td>
<td>O Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-SUPervised OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE/PRACTICE-

ISSUE

What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should be required to conduct supervised occupational experience/practice programs?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Supervised occupational experience/practices in agricultural education in the public school system should be required:

1. of all vocational students enrolled in a production agriculture course of study.     O Agree
   O Disagree

2. of all vocational students enrolled in a non-production agriculture course of study.   O Agree
   O Disagree

243
**Issue continued from previous page**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE/POSITION</th>
<th>REACTION</th>
<th>SUPPORT OF REACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. of all students enrolled in non-vocational agricultural education programs.</td>
<td>O Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. of all students enrolled in classes for orientation to agriculture such as in grades 7 and 8.</td>
<td>O Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. of all students receiving agricultural instruction in grades K-9.</td>
<td>O Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***************

**SUPPLEMENT OCCUPATION EXPERIENCE/PRACTICE**

**ISSUE**

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a production agriculture program in the public school system?

**ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS**

Acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in production agriculture program in the public school system should include:

| 1. | supervised farming projects (enterprises). | O Agree | |
|    | | O Disagree | |
| 2. | home and/or farm improvement projects. | O Agree | |
|    | | O Disagree | |
| 3. | supplementary farm projects. | O Agree | |
|    | | O Disagree | |
| 4. | group (several students working together) projects related to production agriculture. | O Agree | |
|    | | O Disagree | |

**-continue to next page-**
- issue continued from previous page -

**Section A**
Section A contains an issue and several alternative position statements pertaining to the issue. Please review each position statement and respond to Section B. You may also wish to support the position taken in Section B by responding in Section C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE/POSITION</th>
<th>REACTION</th>
<th>SUPPORT OF REACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. projects related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. farm placement.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. practice/experience in the school laboratory or on the school grounds/farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. practice/experience in the school laboratory or on the school grounds/farm during class time.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. exploratory experiences such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continue to next page -
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE/POSITION</th>
<th>REACTION</th>
<th>SUPPORT OF REACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SUPERVISED OCCUPATION EXPERIENCE/PRACTICE**

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in non-production agriculture in the public school system?

**ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS**

Acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a non-production agriculture program in the public school system should include:

1. Home projects of non-production nature such as lawn care, home vegetable garden and lawn mower maintenance.

   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree

2. Placement in agribusiness.

   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree

3. Group projects of a non-production agriculture nature.

   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree

4. Projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature.

   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree

5. Projects related exclusively to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.

   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree

6. Practice/experience in the laboratory or on the school grounds/farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction.

   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree

7. Practice/experience in the laboratory or on the school grounds/farm during class time.

   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree

---

*continue to next page*
Section A contains an issue and several alternative position statements pertaining to the issue. Please review each position statement and respond to Section B. You may also wish to support the position taken in Section A by responding in Section C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE/POSITION</th>
<th>REACTION</th>
<th>SUPPORT OF REACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0. mandatory experiences such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ISSUE**

What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should become members of the FFA?

**ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS**

Clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system who should become members of the FFA include:

1. all vocational students in a production agriculture course of study.
   - 0 Agree
   - 0 Disagree

2. all vocational students in a non-production agriculture course of study.
   - 0 Agree
   - 0 Disagree

3. all vocational students enrolled in an orientation to agriculture course of study, such as 7th and 8th grade programs.
   - 0 Agree
   - 0 Disagree

4. only those vocational students who desire to become members.
   - 0 Agree
   - 0 Disagree

---

-continue to next page-
---issue continued from previous page---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE/POSITION</th>
<th>REACTION</th>
<th>SUPPORT OF REACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. only those avocational students who desire to become members.</td>
<td>O Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***************

**FFA PROGRAM**

**ISSUE**

What aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system should occupy in-class instructional time?

**ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS**

Aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system which should occupy in-class instructional time include:

1. planning any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.
   - O Agree
   - O Disagree

2. conducting any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.
   - O Agree
   - O Disagree

3. selected FFA activities which directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.
   - O Agree
   - O Disagree

4. FFA activities which may not directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.
   - O Agree
   - O Disagree

5. selected FFA activities which can be utilized without taking time needed to teach content of the instructional program.
   - O Agree
   - O Disagree

6. preparation for judging contests of a nature that is directly related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.
   - O Agree
   - O Disagree

---continue to next page---
# Issue continued from previous page#

**Section A**
Section A contains an issue and several alternative position statements pertaining to the issue. Please review each position statement and respond to Section B. You may also wish to support the position taken in Section B by responding in Section C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE/POSITION</th>
<th>REACTION</th>
<th>SUPPORT OF REACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Preparation for any judging contest.</td>
<td>O Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Activities specifically selected to develop leadership, citizenship and cooperation.</td>
<td>O Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Record keeping for individual and chapter awards.</td>
<td>O Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Preparation of individual award applications.</td>
<td>O Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Fund raising projects which use minimal class time that relate to agriculture, have educational value and are conducted according to sound business practices.</td>
<td>O Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you desire, you may support the positions you have taken. Your comments should be adjacent to the position statement to which you are referring.

---

-continue to next page-
**ISSUE**

What title should be used to describe agricultural education programs in the public school system?

**ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS**

The title of agriculture programs in the public school system should be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. vocational agriculture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. agricultural education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. agriculture/agribusiness/natural resources education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. vocational-technical education in agriculture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. agricultural education and renewable natural resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. vocational agriculture/agribusiness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-continue to next page-
Section A contains an issue and several alternative position statements pertaining to the issue. Please review each position statement and respond to Section B. You may also wish to support the position taken in Section B by responding in Section C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE/POSITION</th>
<th>REACTION</th>
<th>SUPPORT OF REACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. agricultural and natural resources education.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. agriculture/agribusiness education.</td>
<td>0 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you desire, you may support the positions you have taken. Your comments should be adjacent to the position statement to which you are referring.

Thank you for your interest and support in completing this instrument.

A CONCERN ABOUT THE SECOND AND THIRD QUESTIONNAIRE

Since data collection for this study will occur primarily during the summer, the potential exists for mailing of the second and third questionnaire to coincide with summer vacations. Your responses to these questions will assist me in managing logistics of data collection.

I will be able to respond to the second questionnaire between the dates July 7-21.

0 Yes  0 No

If you answered "no" to the above question, what is the earliest date you would be able to respond after July 21? ____________
Appendix H

Round Two Delphi Questionnaire
ISSUES / POSITIONS
IMPORTANT TO THE FUTURE OF
AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION
round II
-REFLECTIONS FROM ROUND 1-

Participant Feedback

Excellent commentary provided by many participants concerning the alternative positions should be useful in resvaluation in the present instrument. Due to the extensive list of comments received, I have taken the liberty to paraphrase and consolidate responses in order to reduce instrument length and reading time. Hopefully, the intent of your comments has not been lost in this process.

You may desire to have some of your comments quoted verbatim in the next questionnaire regarding alternative positions of particular concern to you. Please enclose these selected comments in quotation marks to indicate your desire to have the particular comment stated directly as you have indicated.

On a few positions respondents were in 100 percent agreement on the first round. Commentary has been omitted on these items, since no further resvaluation is necessary.

Clarification

Consideration of written commentary suggests that comments by the researcher on certain alternative position statements would facilitate clarification and assist in moving toward consensus on the positions. My comments for clarification purposes are enclosed in a box and are prefaced by the statement "Note from the Researcher".

-DIRECTIONS FOR ROUND II-

This instrument contains:

1. your previously indicated stance in agreement or disagreement with each position,
2. a summary of the percent of group responses in agreement or disagreement with each position and unanswered items reported in the category "Undecided" (Because of rounding the percentages do not equal 100% in all cases),
3. consolidated and paraphrased supporting commentary,
4. a section to indicate your present agreement or disagreement with each position,
5. a section for supporting comments if you desire to so indicate and
6. notes from the researcher in appropriate locations to help clarify certain items.

You are asked to respond to sections A, B, C and D (in order) for each issue and position statement as indicated by the directions and example below as applicable to the K-12 Agricultural Education program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section A</th>
<th>Section B</th>
<th>Section C</th>
<th>Section D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A contains an alternative position pertaining to an issue under consideration. Please review this issue and position and move to Section B.</td>
<td>Please review data summarized from the first questionnaire depicted by a histogram. You should also note your response which is depicted by a red &quot;X&quot; and then move to Section C.</td>
<td>Supportive comments in agreement and disagreement with positions from the first questionnaire have been summarized below to aid you in resvaluating your position on the issue. Please consider this information and move to Section D.</td>
<td>Considering the data, please indicate your present position by checking the appropriate category. If you wish to support the position you are now taking, please use the block provided in Section C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXAMPLE

- PURPOSE OF AGRICULTURE -

ISSUE

What should be the purpose of agricultural education in the public school system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

The purpose of agricultural education in the public school system should include the acquisition of knowledge and skills:

Section A: Position Statement

1. for development of appropriate table grapes.

Section B: Response from Round 1

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position:

- People need to understand more about table grapes.
- Some courses should teach this: why not agriculture?

Section D:

Comments in Disagreement with the Position:

- Cuts into the amount of time needed for teaching technical agriculture skills.
- Young will live or fall on its ability to prepare individuals for work.

The purpose of the Delphi process is to facilitate group consensus. However, you are encouraged to express true convictions based on your knowledge and information collected in this study. When in the minority, supportive comments are particularly useful in communicating your rationale to colleagues.

PLEASE CONTINUE TO THE NEXT PAGE AND RESPOND AS EXPLAINED IN THE PRECEDING DIRECTIONS.
- PURPOSE OF AGRICULTURE -

**ISSUE**

What should be the purpose of agricultural education in the public school system?

**ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS**

The purpose of agricultural education in the public school system should include the acquisition of knowledge and skills:

**Section A1: Position Statement**

1. For general education of an avocational or practical arts nature.

**Section A2: Responses from Round I**

31.7% 68.3%

**Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position**

- People need to understand more about food production and the misconception about agriculture.
- All persons are touched by agriculture.
- Some courses should be designated specifically for this purpose. All ag ed courses must not necessarily be vocational.
- If students desire the content and space is available there is no reason to deny enrollment.
- Many persons are interested in agriculture; may not choose agriculture as a profession. Not necessarily requiring development of special courses, should recognize goals of different students who enroll in ag ed.
- Some students may be part-time farmers.
- The agriculture program should have a multi-purpose function, rather than exclusively a job-training model.
- Could be useful to students desiring a broad education.
- In many cases this is being done in our present programs.

**Section D: Comments in Disagreement with the Position**

- Vo-ag will live or fall on its ability to prepare individuals for work.
- Minor purpose.
- Students should have occupational intent in agriculture to be in the program.
- Program should be skill development aimed toward job entry competencies.
- Not enough funding even for vocational work.
- Not when utilizing vocational funds.
- Not at present, maybe in the future.
- This cuts into the amount of time available for vocational instruction.
- Should/could be accomplished on an individual basis or through FFA activities, but should not be a major purpose.
- Could result in vocational education being mainstreamed into general education.

**Section D: Present Response**

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree
Section A: Position Statement
2. for orientation to and exploration of occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position:
* Should be emphasized in the first year(s) of the agriculture program.
* The industry we serve needs people. We must create an awareness and interest in students concerning these opportunities.
* Purpose can be achieved in either non-vocational or vocational courses.
* Should be at the elementary and junior high levels.
* Basis for wise selection among occupational areas.
* Is keeping with a vocational purpose.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position:
* Not a major purpose of vocational agriculture.
* Purpose of career education rather than agriculture.
* Should not include exploration.

Section A: Position Statement
3. in preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the postsecondary level.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position:
* Should be an option although not a college prep course.
* If occupational interest in agriculture is to follow.
* Increasing technology creates the need for postsecondary education in many cases.
* We must articulate with postsecondary.
* An option for specialisation.
* Either in vocational or non-vocational courses.
* Primary purpose.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position:
* Not a primary purpose.
* Top students will advance anyway.

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

The purpose of agricultural education in the public school system should include the acquisition of knowledge and skills:

Section A: Position Statement

4. In preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the baccalaureate level.

Section B: Response from Round 1

73.1% 26.0% Undecided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Agree Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* If occupational talent in agriculture is to follow, we need soil scientists, agric. teachers, etc.
* Should not be a major emphasis, but should be a result of a specific interest of a student.
* Part of our mission.
* We may not talk about this dimension but it has been a part of our program for years.
* Must not have a "blocking" career ladder.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Going beyond scope of the program.
* Side benefit, not a primary purpose.
* This strategy tends to eliminate occupational preparation.
* Law does not provide for it.

Section A: Position Statement

5. In preparation for employment or self-employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

Section B: Response from Round 1

100%

WE ARE IN 100% AGREEMENT ON THIS POSITION, THEREFORE, NO FURTHER REEVALUATION IS NECESSARY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Agree Disagree
Section A: Position Statement
6. for upgrading and retraining employed or self-employed persons in occupations
   requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position:
* If not done by a local community college.
* If this does not interfere with the in-school secondary program.
* Major purpose of vo-ag which has been tried and proven.
* A strong adult program complements the high school program.
* Should be required of every department.
* Need more emphasis in this area.

Section D: Responses from Round 1

Section D: Present Response

Section B: Responses from Round 1

Note from the Researcher: This position should not be limited to the school day
* Instructional program. Therefore, please consider out of
* school evening classes as a possibility as applicable to
* the secondary K-12 agricultural education program.

Section C:
Comments in Disagreement with the Position:
* Responsibility of other education agencies.
* Teachers do not have necessary expertise.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position:
* Part of all education.
* Most important.
* Important for establishment in an agricultural career.
* Accomplished through the FFA.
* As a spin-off of the program.

Section B: Responses from Round 1

91.7% 7.1% 9.6% Undecided

Section D: Present Response

Comments

Section D: Present Response

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
The purpose of agricultural education in the public school system should include the acquisition of knowledge and skills:

8. to develop the abilities of individuals to be intelligent consumers of agricultural products.

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Everyone is associated with agriculture at least three times a day; e.g. could use the support of future taxpayers and voters.

* One of many useful purposes, but not necessarily a primary purpose.

* As a unit of instruction in the total program, but not as a course of instruction.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Should not become a strong consumer educational program.

* A responsibility of home economics.

* A thrust for general education.

* Only a minor part of the program, not worthy of being considered a purpose.

* An expected outcome, not a purpose.

* Only as a production or marketing input.
-CLIENTELE SERVED BY AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION-

ISSUE

What clientele should be served by agricultural education in the public school system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Clientele who should be served by agricultural education in the public school system should include:

Note from the Researcher:
Alternative positions 1-13 are not intended to be mutually exclusive. For example, agreement with clientele being students in grades 9-10 does not mean that this is the only grade level that should be served. Rather, this would indicate that students in grades 9-10 should be a part of the clientele served by agricultural education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section A: Position Statement</th>
<th>Section B: Response from Round 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. students in grades K-6.</td>
<td>87.52 12.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agree Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position</th>
<th>Section D: Comments in Disagreement with the Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* As an exploratory unit to aid elementary teachers.</td>
<td>* This is a job for career education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Not as a separate class, but with food for American or using the agric. teacher as a resource person.</td>
<td>* Too young for job training, limited to basic skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Career education.</td>
<td>* Only an exploratory career information, not as a course of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* As course or units of instruction designed specifically for this group.</td>
<td>* Not part of vocational intent of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Limited degree.</td>
<td>* Only in a very limited way; special activities such as field days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* If money is available after grades 9-12 are taken care of.</td>
<td>* This is a job for general education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* For teaching the basics of agriculture.</td>
<td>* Impractical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Only as a practical arts course separate from agricultural education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Clients who should be served by agricultural education in the public school system should include:

Section A: Position Statement

2. Students in grades 7-9.

Section B: Response from Round 1

65.4% 33.6% .9% Undecided

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Should have at least a minimum opportunity for career exploration in agriculture.
* Should include instruction in basic knowledge of agriculture.
* A must with declining enrollments.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* A job for career education.
* Too young for formal training.
* Not a responsibility of agricultural education; this is general education of a practical nature.
* Agricultural ed. at this level should be limited to career exploration of less than two years in duration.
* Systematic curriculum in all vocational programs is not currently available at these levels.
* If not limited to career exploration.
* Must concentrate on strengthening ag. at the upper levels.

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Section A: Position Statement


Section B: Response from Round 1

98.1% 1.9%

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Appropriate grade level for vocational ed.
* Appropriate grade level for broad based core competencies.
* Critical for a total program concept.
* Essential for students to make career choices.
* Very important, we are losing these grades in certain areas.
* Does not necessarily need to be vocational.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Not a major focus of the program.

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments
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Section A: Position Statement
4. students in grades 11-12.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
- Essential capstone for ag. ed. in K-12.
- Specialized options in ag. ed.
- Main thrust of vocational agricultural education.
- Essential; must realize that a four year program is not essential for every student.
- Should have occupational clusters in agricultural ed. at this level.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

Section A: Position Statement
5. out-of-school youth employed or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
- Although a secondary priority to in-school secondary students.
- The need exists; motivations change on graduation.
- Should be emphasized.
- Accomplished during evening classes using existing facilities.
- Young farmer programs should extend a great effort here.
- If not reached by a community college.
- In legislation.
- Only if release time is provided to the instructor.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

Section A: Position Statement
5. out-of-school youth employed or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
- Note from the Researcher: The position should not be interpreted as limited to the school day instructional program. You should, however, consider this potential clientele group with regard to agricultural education programs at the secondary level.
- Mo, unless teaching load is modified.
- Not in day program.
- Postsecondary/adult education agency responsibility.
- Technical schools are for this purpose.
- Duplicate responsibilities of the extension service.

Section D: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Clients who should be served by agricultural education in the public school system should include:

Section A1: Position Statement

6. adults employed, self-employed or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

Section C1:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Needs emphasis.
* Not as high a priority as in-school students.
* Accomplished during adult evening classes using existing facilities.
* Different models than we are now using are needed.
* If not reached by a local community college.
* Only if release time is provided.
* Needed service to community; in legislation.
* Young/Adult farmer programs should fulfill this function.

Section A1: Position Statement

7. out-of-school youth or adults who desire knowledge and skill in agriculture for personal reasons other than for employment or self-employment in agriculture.

Section C1:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* We can do this better than any other agency.
* Okay, but should not be vocationally funded.
* Provided adequate funds are available.
* Only if enrollment space and instructional time are available after regular vocational interests.
* Everyone needs some agricultural instruction.

Section B1: Response from Round 1

87.55 12.55

| Agree | Disagree |

Note from the Researcher:
This position should not be interpreted as limited to the school day instructional program. You should, however, consider this potential clientele group with regard to agricultural education programs at the secondary level.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* Must take care of vocational interests with present resources.
* Not vocational preparation.
* Minor aspect, unworthy of consideration.
* Unless local systems want to finance.
* Responsibility of postsecondary/adult education agencies.
* A community college function.

Section B1: Response from Round 1

48.11 51.08

| Agree | Disagree |

Note from the Researcher:
The statements should not be interpreted as limited to the school day instructional program. You should, however, consider this potential clientele group with regard to agricultural education programs at the secondary level.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* Must take care of vocational interests with present resources.
* Not vocational preparation.
* Minor aspect, unworthy of consideration.
* Unless local systems want to finance.
* Responsibility of postsecondary/adult education agencies.
* A community college function.

Section B1: Response from Round 1

48.11 51.08

| Agree | Disagree |

Note from the Researcher:
The statements should not be interpreted as limited to the school day instructional program. You should, however, consider this potential clientele group with regard to agricultural education programs at the secondary level.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* Must take care of vocational interests with present resources.
* Not vocational preparation.
* Minor aspect, unworthy of consideration.
* Unless local systems want to finance.
* Responsibility of postsecondary/adult education agencies.
* A community college function.
Section A: Position Statement

8. rural students.

Section B: Response from Round I

98.1% 96% 96% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Should serve all students
* If interested in agriculture.
* But not limited to these.
* Many viable occupations available in these areas.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Section A: Position Statement

9. urban students.

Section B: Response from Round I

97.1% 96% 1.92% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* If students have a vocational agriculture interest.
* Many viable occupations available in these areas.
* Little difference where students come from with social mobility today.
* Not enough farm kids to fill the job market.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
Clients who should be served by agricultural education in the public school system should include:

**Section A: Position Statement**

10. **Urban students.**

**Section B: Response from Round 1**

97.12% Agree, 1.92% Disagree, 0.95% Undecided

**Comments in Agreement with the Position**

* If students have a vocational interest in agriculture.
* Many viable occupations available in these areas.
* Not limited to any males or females.

**Comments in Disagreement with the Position**

**Section C: Comments**

- *If students have a vocational interest in agriculture.*
- *Many viable occupations available in these areas.*
- *Not limited to any males or females.*

**Section A: Position Statement**

11. **In-school youth with social, physical and economic handicaps.**

**Section B: Response from Round 1**

91.36% Agree, 5.61% Disagree, 2.93% Undecided

**Comments in Agreement with the Position**

* Assuming these students are preparing for agricultural careers.*
* Should be accepted without special treatment.*
* When students can function effectively and can benefit from the program.*
* Mandated by law (PL94-142).*
* If employment is available.*
* May be best equipped to help these students.*
* But should not become a dumping ground.*
* But need more development and research in this area.*
* But must provide necessary resources to teachers.*

**Comments in Disagreement with the Position**

* Cannot serve the needs of everyone; let's leave this group to the specialists.*

**Comments**

**Section D: Present Response**

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree
Section A: Position Statement

12. out-of-school youth and adults with social, physical and economic handicap.

Section B: Response from Round I

73.1% 24% 2.9% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section C1:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* If interested or engaged in agricultural occupations.
* Not as high a priority as in-school students.
* When students can benefit.
* If there is employment available.
* Accepted without special treatment.
* Agriculture is best equipped to help.
* Subject to legal school age.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Not unless they come up through the ag. program.
* Lack of training and instructional time.
* Would be better at postsecondary.
* Cannot serve the needs of everyone; lets leave this group to the specialists.

Section A1: Position Statement

13. Female seeking employment or self-employment in agriculture, regardless of the type of agricultural occupational preference.

Section B1: Response from Round I

93.1% 3% 2.9% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section C1:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* If their attitude is right.
* Women have proven themselves in agriculture.
* Men have had and will always have opportunity in agriculture.
* Mandated by law.
* As well as men.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Section D1: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments
What should be the content of agricultural education in the public school system?

The content of agricultural education in the public school system should include:

- Rote from the Researcher:
  
  We are trying to identify legitimate content for agricultural education programs nationally. Agreement or disagreement with each alternative position should not be governed by a local situation, but a perspective of agricultural education in the United States.

Section A: Position Statement

1. Agricultural production.

Section B: Response from Round 1

100% Agree

Section A: Position Statement

2. Agricultural supply and service.

Section B: Response from Round 1

99% Agree 0.96% Undecided

comments in agreement with the position

- Based on needs of the student and employment needs of the community.
- More emphasis needed in this area.
- Should be a specialization.
- When facilities, equipment, and training stations are available.
- As recommended by the local advisory council.
- As applied to sales.
Section A: Position Statement

3. agricultural mechanics.

Section A: Position Statement

4. agricultural products.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Depends on needs of the student and employment needs in the community.
* Should be a specialized program.
* When equipment, facilities and training stations are available.
* As suggested by the local advisory council.
* More emphasis is needed in this area.

Section A: Position Statement

5. ornamental horticulture, floriculture, nursery management.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position

* When meeting needs of students and employment needs of the community.
* Should be a specialized program.
* When equipment, facilities and training stations are available.
* As recommended by the local advisory council.

Section B: Response from Round I

WE ARE IN 100% AGREEMENT ON THIS POSITION. THEREFORE, NO FURTHER REEVALUATION IS NECESSARY.

Section B: Response from Round I

WE ARE IN 99% AGREEMENT ON THIS POSITION. THEREFORE, NO FURTHER REEVALUATION IS NECESSARY.

100% Agree Disagree

Section B: Response from Round I

WE ARE IN 99% AGREEMENT ON THIS POSITION. THEREFORE, NO FURTHER REEVALUATION IS NECESSARY.

99% Agree Disagree

Section B: Response from Round I

WE ARE IN 97.1% AGREEMENT ON THIS POSITION. THEREFORE, NO FURTHER REEVALUATION IS NECESSARY.

97.1% Agree 2.9% Disagree

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

The context of agricultural education in the public school system should include:

Section A: Position Statement

6. Horticulture, example, food production, such as fruits and vegetables

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Depending on needs of students and employment needs in the community.
* Should be a specialized program.
* Whenever equipment, facilities and training stations are available.
* As recommended by the local advisory council.

Section A: Position Statement

7. Renewable natural resources.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Based on needs of students and employment needs in the community.
* Should be a specialized program.
* Where adequate facilities, equipment and training stations are available.
* As recommended by the local advisory council.
* If not offered elsewhere in the school curriculum.

Section A: Response from Round I

99.9% Agree

Section B: Response from Round I

94.2% Agree

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments
Section A: Position Statement
8. Forestry.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Should be tailored to meet individual
  and employment needs in the community.
* As part of specialization in agriculture.

Section B1: Response from Round I
93.2% Agree 4.8% Disagree

Section D: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Section A: Position Statement
9. Other types of agriculture such as small
  animal care and horse training.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Based on individual needs and employment
  needs in the local community.
* These areas are often neglected, but
  provide billions of dollars of income.
* In some cases, could be part of animal
  science or other appropriate existing
  units of instruction.
* If it requires competence in the
  agricultural industry.
* Taught in the context of work and preparation
  for work, not as care for the family pet.
* Part of specialization in agriculture.
* Not limited to examples given.
* Particularly appropriate in urban areas.
* As recommended and supported by the local
  advisory councils.

Section B1: Response from Round I
93.2% Agree 4.8% 1.92% Undecided

Section D: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Comments

ISSUE

What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should be required to conduct supervised occupational experience/practice programs?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Supervised occupational experience/practices in agricultural education in the public school system should be required:

Section A: Position Statement
1. of all vocational students enrolled in a production agriculture course of study.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Makes the program truly vocational.
* Used as a means to remove uninterested students.
* Important; provides for practical application of the instruction.
* Schools should assume some responsibility for providing laboratory and facilities for the experience.
* Reason for 12 month employment of agricultural teachers.
* Should be appropriate for each student.

Section B: Response from Round 1
95.2% 4.8%

Section D: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree
Comments
Section A: Position Statement

2. of all vocational students enrolled in a non-production agriculture course of study.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
- Makes the program truly vocational.
- Gives the student experiences such as work placement, community service, etc.
- Locating appropriate experiences may be more difficult than for production agriculture.
- Important, this is a base upon which we build the instructional program.
- Provides opportunity for practical application of instruction.
- Required only if the school assumes responsibility for providing laboratories and facilities for the experience.
- Justification for 12 month employment of agriculture teachers.
- Should be appropriate for each student.

Section A: Position Statement

3. of all non-vocational students enrolled in agricultural education programs.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
- Could be a means to reduce enrollment.
- But optional.

Section B: Response from Round I

91.9% 6.7%

[ ] Agree [ ] Disagree

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Note from the Researcher:
This position statement refers to students who may be enrolled in agricultural classes for the purpose of general education or practical arts, not vocational agriculture.

Section B: Response from Round I

18.1% 76% 0.5% Undecided

[ ] Agree [ ] Disagree

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
### ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

**Supervised occupational experience/practices in agricultural education in the public school system should be required:**

#### Section A: Position Statement

4. of all students enrolled in classes for orientation to agriculture such as in grades 7 and 8.

#### Section C:

**Comments in Agreement with the Position**

- Type of experience would vary, but should be consistent with exploratory purpose at this level.
- At least a garden, group project or improvement project.
- Absolutely.
- If they are truly vo-ag programs.

#### Section D: Present Response

- **Agree**
- **Disagree**

5. of all students receiving agricultural instruction in grades K-6.

#### Section C:

**Comments in Agreement with the Position**

- Exploratory experience.
- If offered by the school.
- Necessary.

#### Section D: Present Response

- **Agree**
- **Disagree**

6. Should the instructional program for laboratory and exploratory experiences.

#### Comments in Disagreement with the Position

- Should not utilize the instructional program for laboratory and exploratory experiences.
- **Desirable, but optional.**
- Should not offer this group.
- Too young at this age level.
- Not consistent with orientation and exploration purpose.
- Not regular project, but limited experiences on school or home grounds.

---

**Supervised agricultural experience/practices in the public school system should only be provided by career education.**

#### Section A: Position Statement

**Section B: Responses from Round I**

- 22.1% 76.6% 1.3% Undecided

#### Section D: Present Response

- **Agree**
- **Disagree**

- **Comments**
ISSUE

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a production agriculture program in the public school system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a production agriculture program in the public school system should include:

- Nota from the Researcher:
  Agreement with alternative positions 1-4 does not imply exclusion of other positions. For example, agreement with supervised farming projects does not imply that this is the only acceptable supervised occupational experience/practice. How you vote on the other positions will determine which positions are acceptable or unacceptable.

Section A: Position Statement

1. Supervised farming projects (enterprises).

Section B: Response from Round 1

99% Agree

Agree Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- Major emphasis.
- When matched with student occupational goals.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

- Not all farming.

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
Section A: Position Statement

4. Group (several students working together) projects related to production agriculture.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Desirable but not demanded.
* Should be the first consideration in planning the experience program.
* If possible.

Section B: Response from Round I

Section D: Present Response

WE ARE IN 100% AGREEMENT ON THIS POSITION. THEREFORE, NO FURTHER REEVALUATION IS NECESSARY.

Section A: Position Statement

5. Projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Where individual projects are not possible.
* Not limited to this type of experience.
* When well planned and supervised.
* Especially on school farm and laboratory plots.
* Encourage exploration.
* Develop skills and emphasize work ethic.
* If related to occupational goals of the student.

Section B: Response from Round I

Section D: Present Response

Comment

Section A: Position Statement

6. Projects related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.

Example: Students enrolled in horticulture should have experience programs in horticulture; if in animal science the experience programs should be in animal science.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Outmoded, should use competency records that accompany students.

Section B: Response from Round I

Section D: Present Response

Comment

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a production agriculture program in the public school systems should include:

Section A: Position Statement

7. Farm placement.

Section B: Response from Round I

97.1% 3.0%
[ ] [ ]
Agree Disagree

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position

* If planned and supervised.
* If applicable to goals of the student.
* Appropriate to develop skills and emphasize work ethic.
* Need to use this issue.

Section D:

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Should include on and off farm.
* For pay only, student has no vested interest.

Section A: Position Statement

8. Practice/experience in the school laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction.

Section B: Response from Round I

97.1% 3.0%
[ ] [ ]
Agree Disagree

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position

* If appropriate for the student.
* Develop skills and emphasizes work ethic.
* For students not capable of having home project or otherwise participating in a supervised occupational experience program.
* Major option.
* Increasingly important in urban programs.
* During summer months to carry out projects started during the year.
* Should provide for sharing in the profits or pay for labor.
* If production project.

Section D:

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Supervision may be a problem because of liability suits.
9. Practice/experience in the school laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm during class time.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
- Although there may be a problem with facilities and land.
- Develops skills and emphasizes work ethic.
- If planned and supervised.
- If a meaningful experience.
- If related to student occupational goals.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
- Need meaningful "hands-on".
- Only a part of a comprehensive SOE program.

Section B: Responses from Round 1
- 61.8% Agree
- 38.2% Disagree

Section B: Responses from Round 1
- 69.2% Agree
- 30.8% Disagree

Section D: Present Responses

- Agree
- Disagree

Section D: Present Responses

- Agree
- Disagree

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a production agriculture program in the public school systems should include:

Section A1: Position Statement

11. Cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day.

Section C1: Comments in Agreement with the Position

- Develops skill and emphasizes work ethic.
- If a beneficial training program and not just a job.
- If related to student occupational goals.
- But difficult to arrange because of a lack of training stations.
- Economical and excellent way to go.
- Needs to be supervised by ag. instructor.
- More emphasis needed in this area.

Section B1: Response from Round 1

95.1% Agree

Section D1: Present Response

Comments
**SUPervised Occupation Experience/Practice**

**ISSUE**

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in non-production agriculture in the public school system?

**ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS**

Acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a non-production agriculture program in the public school systems should include:

Note from the Researcher:
Agreement with alternative positions 1-4 does not imply exclusion of other positions. For example, agreement with home projects does not imply that this is the only acceptable supervised occupational experience practice. How you vote on the other positions will determine which positions are acceptable or unacceptable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section A1: Position Statement</th>
<th>Section B1: Responses from Round 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. home projects of a non-production nature such as lawn care and lawn mower maintenance.</td>
<td>91.1% 7.7% 1.2% Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section C1**

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* If related to student career objectives.
* As a minimum requirement.
* If planned and supervised.
* For income.
* Varies in appropriateness.

**Section A2: Position Statement**

Section B2: Responses from Round 1

2. placement in agribusiness.

100%

Agree Disagree

Section D1: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

We are in 100% agreement on this position. Therefore, no further reevaluation is necessary.

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a non-production agriculture program in the public school systems should include:

Section A: Position Statement

3. group projects of a non-production agriculture nature.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- As a minimum requirement.
- Subject to acceptable scope and student’s career objectives.
- Okay in some cases but must be planned.

Section D: Present Response

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

- Too broad.

Section A: Position Statement

4. projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- Projects should be tailored to individual needs and occupational goals.
- Subject to acceptable scope.

Section D: Present Response

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

- May be too restrictive.
- Too specific.

Section B: Response from Round 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>85.6%</th>
<th>11.5%</th>
<th>2.9%</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section B: Response from Round 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section B: Response from Round 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>88.6%</th>
<th>9.5%</th>
<th>1.9%</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D: Present Response

Comments

WE ARE IN 100% AGREEMENT ON THIS POSITION. THEREFORE, NO FURTHER REEVALUATION IS NECESSARY.
Section A: Position Statement
6. Practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
- As a minimum requirement.
- Subject to acceptable scope and student career objectives.
- As long as it is non-production.

Section B: Response from Round 1
97.1% 2.9%
- Agree

Section D: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comment

Section A: Position Statement
7. Practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm during class time.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
- But not limited to this.
- If related to student occupational goals.
- For beginning students.

Section B: Response from Round 1
68.3% 29.8% 1.92% Undecided
- Agree

Section D: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comment

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a non-production agriculture program in the public school systems should include:

Section A: Position Statement

8. Exploratory experiences such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.

Section B: Responses from Round I

67.3% 28.3% 3.8% Undecided

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Acceptable at exploratory levels.
* Minor part of BOE.
* Good.
* If properly planned and supervised.
* If related to student occupational goals.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Section A: Position Statement

9. Cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day.

Section B: Responses from Round I

93.1% 3.8% 2.9% Undecided

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* If bona fide training program.
* Excellent.
* Must be related to student's career goal.
* Especially in grades 10 and 11.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Narrows student's education.

Comments
ISSUE

What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should become members of the FFA?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system who should become members of the FFA includes:

Section A: Position Statement
1. All vocational students in a production agriculture course of study.

Section B: Responses from Round 1

90.4% Agree  8.7% Disagree  0.9% Undecided

Agree  Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Integral part of the curriculum.
* Must be members to get the full benefit of vo-ag.
* May be unrealistic, but we must strive for 100%.
* All students are members when they enroll, there should not be dues or extra fees.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* Turn students off by saying "must".
* Probably 85-90%, but should provide the opportunity to all students.

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree  ( ) Disagree

Issue Continued on Next Page.
Clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system who should become members of the FFA include:

Section A: Position Statement
2. all vocational students in a non-production agriculture course of study.

Section B: Response from Round 1
89.4% 9.6% .96% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Integral part of the curriculum.
* Many opportunities in the FFA that should be used.
* All students should be expected to join.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

Section A: Position Statement
3. all vocational students enrolled in an orientation to agriculture course of study, such as 7th and 8th grade programs.

Section B: Response from Round 1
39.4% 39.6% .96% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* As a junior FFA chapter.
* Integral part of the total curriculum.
* Could result in an increased FFA membership.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* Should be optional.
* Not for orientation to agriculture students.
* Students get burned out by the 11th and 12th grade.
* 9-12 grade level only.
* They need something to look forward to.
* Prohibited in the FFA constitution.
Section A: Position Statement
4. Only those vocational students who desire to become members.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Because dues are required.
* Local membership should be required; state and national should be optional.

Section B: Response from Round I
25.60% 75.10% 1.90% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section D: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Section A: Position Statement
5. Vocational students who desire to become members.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* These may participate and be useful.

Section B: Response from Round I
21.00% 71.20% 7.70% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section D: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Section A: Position Statement
6. Vocational students who desire to become members.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* All students benefit from membership.
* Should be an integral part of the curriculum.
* Young people must be brought into something before they can see the benefit.
* Students should understand they are required to participate in the total program when they enroll.
* If voluntary, programs should not be on school time.
* This is a copout for teachers.

Section D: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments
ISSUE

What aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system should occupy in-class instructional time?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system which should occupy in-class instructional time include:

Section A1: Position Statement

1. Planning any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.

Section B1: Response from Round 1

73% 27%

Section C:

Agree Disagree

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- If integral part.
- Any learning activity.
- If all members of the class are involved.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

- Should be an activity that will relate to student occupational objectives.
- An activity that assists in developing a specific competency.

Section D1: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Section A2: Position Statement

2. Conducting any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.

Section B2: Response from Round 1

50.7% 41.3%

Section C:

Agree Disagree

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- This is a teacher option.
- FFA is an integral part, therefore any activity is a legitimate use of class time.
- There should be no separation between vo-ag and FFA.
- Limited extent.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

- Should be limited.
- Many activities should be scheduled outside of class time.
- Vocational instruction must have priority.

Section D2: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Note from the Researcher:

This position indicates that all FFA activities may legitimately be conducted during class time. If you perceive that these activities should be screened or selected on some criteria, you should disagree with the position.

Section E

Issue Continued on Next Page.
Section A: Position Statement

3. Selected FFA activities which directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
- FFA is an integral part of the curriculum.
- If truly related.
- If for all students, not just a few.

Section B: Response from Round I

Note from the Researcher:
- The intent of this position is that in-class FFA activities should be selected in consideration of the educational objectives of the instructional program. For example, this position suggests that horticulture students should not receive instructions for dairy judging during horticulture class.

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Section A: Position Statement

4. FFA activities which may not directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled, but have educational value for the development of leadership, citizenship, and cooperation essential for success in agricultural occupations.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
- Students need to see other aspects of agriculture.
- Need a broad background.
- Leadership development is essential.
- FFA is an integral part of the instructional program.
- If discretely selected.

Section B: Response from Round I

53.8% 43.3% 2.9% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system which should occupy in-class instructional time include:

Section A: Position Statement

5. selected FFA activities which can be utilized without taking time needed to teach content of the instructional program.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Experimental activities of the FFA are essential.
* FFA is an integral part of the program.
* If they tie in with the instructional unit being covered in class.

Section A: Position Statement

6. preparation for judging contests of a nature that is directly related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Only as a direct outgrowth at the instructional program.
* If all class members are involved.
* As a motivational tool.
* FFA is an integral part of the curriculum.
* The teaching aspect; not repetitive practice.
* Students must be adequately prepared.

Section B: Responses from Round I

Note from the Researcher:
This position establishes teaching the technical competencies and skills in agriculture as the first priority of agricultural education. Instructional time devoted to FFA activities would be limited to selected activities that complement and enhance the teaching of technical skills and competencies.

73.1% 25.0% 1.9% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section B: Responses from Round I

89.4% 9.6% 0.9% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments
Section A: Position Statement

7. preparation for any judging contest.

Section B: Response from Round 1

44.2% 55.8%


Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
* If all students are involved.
* In first years of agricultural education.
* Only when teaching skills, but not specifically for a contest.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

Section A: Position Statement

8. activities specifically selected to develop leadership, citizenship and cooperation.

Section B: Response from Round 1

94.2% 5.8% 1.9% Undecided


Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Hopefully all activities will accomplish this.
* A basic goal of vo-ag.
* Should be planned for all students.
* As part of the instructional program.
* Limited.
* Priority to vocational instructional activities; should be in proper perspective.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree


Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system which should occupy in-class instructional time include:

Section A: Position Statement

9. Record keeping for individual and chapter awards.

Section B: Response from Round I

69.4% 9.0% 16.6% Undecided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* If within reason and not repetitive.
* A part of supervised occupational experience and FFA.
* Limited part of the instructional program.
* Should include all students.
* To learn record keeping, not necessarily for awards preparation.

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Section A: Position Statement

10. Preparation of individual award applications.

Section B: Response from Round I

63.3% 34.6% 1.9% Undecided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* On a limited basis.
* FFA is an integral part of the program.
* Should provide "how-to" instruction and guidance.
* If all students are involved.

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments
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Section A: Position Statement
11. Fund raising projects which use minimal class time that relate to agriculture, have educational value, and are conducted according to sound business practices.

Section B: Response from Round I
87.5% 11.5% 1.0% Undecided
[ ] [ ]
Agree Disagree

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Minimal, to the extent it is a learning activity.
* Research has revealed a positive relationship between personal development and fund raising activities.
* Qualifiers in statement make this position acceptable.
* As part of the instructional time.
* Good way to develop business competencies.
* Strongly agree.
* Practical means of combining education and "self help".

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* FFA activities should be driven by the instructional program.
* A few exceptions, but not a general practice.
* The program is for instruction, not fund raising.

Section D: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree
Comments

PLEASE NOTE ON THE NEXT ISSUE THAT YOU ARE TO AGREE WITH ONLY ONE OF THE EIGHT POSITIONS
ISSUE

What title should be used to describe agricultural education programs in the public school system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

The title of agriculture programs in the public school system should be:

Section A1: Position Statement
1. vocational agriculture.

Section A1: Position Statement
2. agricultural education.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Vocational acts fund vocational programs including agriculture.
* If broadly defined.

Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Comprehensive term which can apply to the K-12 agriculture program.
* Can include vocational as a purpose.
* All encompassing title.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* Refers only to instruction in grades 9-12.
* Denotes agriculture production.
* Too many definitions of "vocational".
* Does not properly reflect agriculture and off-farm ag. occupations.
* Too limiting.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* Denotes production agriculture.
* Maybe someday when the program is administered under USDA - needs to be researched.

Section B1: Response from Round 1

19.8% Agree 33.7% Undecided

7.7% Agree

Note from the researcher:
Several respondents marked "agree" for more than one of the eight positions pertaining to this issue. Please select only one of the positions and mark "disagree" for the other seven positions.

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments
Section A1: Position Statement
3. Agriculture/agribusiness/natural resources education.

Section A2: Position Statement

Section B1: Response from Round I
6.7%

Section C1: Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Most complete and modern for today,
* Most suited to certain areas of the country.

Section C2: Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Too long,
* Too many different concepts conveyed,
* Wordy.

Section D1: Present Response

Section D2: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Issue Continued on Next Page.
The title of agriculture programs in the public school system should be:

Section A1: Position Statement
5. agricultural education and renewable natural resources.

Section B1: Response from Round 1
01

Section C1: Comments in Agreement with the Position

Section D1: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree
Comments

Section A1: Position Statement
6. vocational agriculture/agribusiness.

Section B1: Response from Round 1
17.32

Section C1: Comments in Agreement with the Position

Section D1: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree
Comments

* Must include the term "vocational".
* Brings together traditional and modern terminology.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree
Comments

* Too many different definitions of vocational.
* Implies a difference in the vocational nature of agriculture and agribusiness.
Section A1: Position Statement
7. agricultural and natural resources education.

Section B1: Response from Round 1
.96%

Agree Disagree

Section C1
Comments in Agreement with the Position

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
- Eliminates agriculture.
- Too long.
- Give equal emphasis to natural resources.

Section D1: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Section A1: Position Statement
6. agriculture/agribusiness education.

Section B1: Response from Round 1
1.92%

Agree Disagree

Section C1
Comments in Agreement with the Position

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
- Eliminates natural resources.
- Agribusiness is a controversial term.
- Refers to the word "including".
- Implies a difference in the two terms.

Section D1: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

THANK YOU FOR RESPONDING TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE STAMPED SELF ADDRESSED ENVELOPE PROVIDED.
Appendix I

Round Three Delphi Questionnaire
ISSUES/POSITIONS
IMPORTANT TO THE FUTURE OF
AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION
round III

final round
EXCELLENT COMMENTARY provided by many participants concerning the alternative positions should be useful in reevaluation in the present instrument. As in Round II, I have taken the liberty to paraphrase and consolidate responses in order to reduce instrument length and reading time. Hopefully, the intent of your comments has not been lost in this process.

Clarification

Comments for clarification purposes enclosed in a box and prefaced by the statement "Note from the Researcher" are repeated on this instrument as they appeared on Round II without any additions or deletions.

At this point in the study the only general question asked by respondents concerned the vocational/avocational nature of agricultural instruction. Specifically, some of you asked if the issue and positions should be limited to agricultural education of a vocational nature. The researcher has chosen not to impose this restriction. In an effort to truly explore various alternative positions, care has been taken not to inject any bias. Unless there are limitations specifically stated for a particular position, the frame of reference is: what should be the position of the profession in terms of agricultural instruction associated with the K-12 public school program? Respondents are free to state their own viewpoints concerning the issues and positions.

-DIRECTIONS FOR ROUND III-

The format for this instrument and the Round II communication is essentially the same. This should minimize the time needed to complete the instrument since you are already familiar with the format. Only two changes should be noted.

(1) Although 100% agreement or disagreement was reached on some additional positions during Round II, these positions will be repeated on Round III. Methodology for the Delphi Technique permits respondents from Round I to remain in the sample through Round III if there is reason to believe that they are willing participants. A few of you may have been unable to respond to Round II because of vacations, professional meetings or other commitments. Therefore, repeating these positions will assure that all respondents have had an opportunity to express their opinion.

(2) A special section has been added at the end of each list of alternative position statements pertaining to an issue. In this section (Section D) you are asked to rate the extent to which the issues should be further considered and studied.

For each position:

Section A contains an alternative position statement.

Section B reports:

1. Total group response from Round II expressed as a percent on the histogram. (Please note that items left blank or improperly coded are reported as "undecided").
2. Your stance from Round II in agreement or disagreement with each position indicated by a red "x" on the histogram.

Section C reports:

1. Paraphrased and consolidated comments in agreement and disagreement with positions.
2. Quotes from respondents who expressed a desire to be quoted.

Section D provides:

1. A space to indicate your present position by placing a check mark in the appropriate section.
   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree
2. A box for supporting comments if you desire to so indicate (as in Round II, enclose comments in quotation marks that you wish to have quoted verbatim in the summary report from Round III.)
You are asked to respond to sections A, B, C and D (in order) for each issue and position statement as indicated by the directions and example below.

**EXAMPLE**

**ISSUE**

What should be the purpose of agricultural education in the public school system?

**ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS**

The purpose of agricultural education in the public school system should include the acquisition of knowledge and skills:

**Section A: Position Statement**

1. Development of appropriate table graces.

**Section B: Response from Round 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position**

- People need to understand more about table graces.
- Some courses should teach this as part of agriculture.

**Section D: Comments in Disagreement with the Position**

- Costs into the amount of time needed for teaching technical agriculture skills.
- You will live or fail on its ability to prepare individuals for work.

**Section D: Present Response**

( ) Agree (✓) Disagree

Comments:

- Table graces do not directly relate to agriculture.

Directions Continued on Next Page
You should also respond to Section E which is located at the end of each list of position statements pertaining to a particular issue. You are asked to rate the extent to which the issue should be further studied and discussed. Place a check (✓) in the category which best describes your perspective considering the information collected in this study.

**EXAMPLE**

**SECTION E**

**Directions**

Please consider the extent of consensus in this study on the issue: "What should be the purpose of agricultural education in the public school system?"

Then respond to the question as follows: To what extent should the issue be further considered and studied by the profession at the present time?

Please indicate your response by checking the most appropriate block (✓) to the left of the possible responses.

**Response**

| ✓ | Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of critical importance to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education. |
| ✓ | Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of limited importance; that is, resolution of the issue would be helpful to the profession but would not significantly affect the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education at the present time. |
| ✓ | Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of moderate importance since resolution of the issue could enhance the agricultural education program and is important to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education. |

You are encouraged to express your true convictions on the various issues based on your knowledge and information collected in this study. Please feel free to use the comments section any time you wish to express your rationale to colleagues.

**PLEASE CONTINUE TO THE NEXT PAGE AND RESPOND AS EXPLAINED IN THE PRECEDING DIRECTIONS AND EXAMPLES.**
- PURPOSE OF AGRICULTURE -

What should be the purpose of agricultural education in the public school system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

The purpose of agricultural education in the public school system should include the acquisition of knowledge and skills:

Section A: Position Statement

1. for general education of an avocational or practical arts nature.

Section B: Responses from Round 2

34.0% 63.0% 2.1% Undecided

Agree  Disagree

Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position:

* People need to understand more about food production and the misconception about agriculture.
* All persons are touched by agriculture.
* Some courses should be designated specifically for this purpose. All ag. ed. courses must not necessarily be vocational.
* If students desire the content and are in available there is no reason to deny.
* Defining agricultural education as vocational agriculture is narrow and unwarranted. Many students are currently enrolled in vocational agriculture for this specific purpose.
* Agricultural education is broader than vocational agriculture. A school system should provide agricultural education of which vocational agriculture is a part.
* A minor purpose, but should be included.
* Agricultural educators should be multipurpose both general and vocational, especially in urban areas.
* Students who receive general education in agriculture may develop a vocational interest in the future.
* This will result in a larger enrollment.
* A good public relations technique - getting individuals involved who may not have considered agriculture as a career.
* May be of benefit to a large number of students who will be homesteaders, home gardeners, and leaders in the community.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position:

* Vo-ag will live or fall on its ability to prepare individuals for work.
* Minor purpose.
* Students should have occupational intent in agriculture to be in the program.
* Program should be skill development aimed toward job entry competencies.
* Vocational purpose does not eliminate students with vocational interests.
* Cannot be linked to vocational agriculture; could be general agricultural classes not funded or classified as vocational.
* Opens the door even further, thus agricultural classes could become a "dumping ground" in some schools.
* The major effort must be vocational under present funding.
* Only as a way of helping departments over a low cycle of enrollment.
* But, perhaps, in an introductory course.

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

The purpose of agricultural education in the public school system should include the acquisition of knowledge and skills:

Section A: Position Statement

2. For orientation to and exploration of occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position:

- Should be emphasized in the first year(s) of the agriculture program.
- Essential in occupational preparation.
- "Students currently use agricultural courses for this purpose. If this is not a stated purpose of programs K-12, then all vocational agriculture should be delayed to post high school."
- Can be a major recruitment aid.
- Basis for wise selection among occupational areas.
- We need to aid our students in decision making about careers.
- We must make career awareness vocational through learning by doing.
- A minor part of the program, but students must have an early orientation.
- Should be a part of all courses at each grade level.
- "We must advocate for agriculture; to assure the agriculture sector has an adequate supply of the most qualified graduates of high school."

Section B: Response from Round 2

96.08 3.28

Agree Disagree

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree  ( ) Disagree

Comments
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### Section A: Position Statement

#### 3. In preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the postsecondary level.

### Section C1

**Comments in Agreement with the Position**
- Should be an option although not a college prep course.
- Not a primary purpose, but a part of the program.
- Increasing technology creates the need for postsecondary education in many cases.
- "To help meet real needs of some students."
- An option for specialization.
- "This has over the years been a major positive outcome of the program."
- No limit should be placed as to the degree of preparation.
- Farmers and farm workers must continue to learn.
- In agreement with the concept of individualized instruction.
- Articulation with postsecondary is essential.
- But question if the law provides for this purpose.

### Section B: Response from Round 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>93.6% Agree</th>
<th>6.4% Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments in Disagreement with the Position**
- Not a primary purpose.
- Less than 50% of our students go to postsecondary schools after high school.
- Should not inhibit continuation of education but this is not a central mission of the program.
- Vocational education acts specify training for persons below the baccalaureate level.
- Logical by-product as top students are motivated; but purpose should be terminal job placement.

### Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

**Comments**

---

*Issue Continued on Next Page.*
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

The purpose of agricultural education in the public school system should include the acquisition of knowledge and skills:

Section A: Position Statement

4. In preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the baccalaureate level.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* "This has over the years been a positive outcome of vocational agriculture."
* As a part of individualized instruction,
* Should not be a major emphasis, but should be a result of a specific interest of a student.
* Part of our mission, but not a primary purpose.
* Since we need professionals as well as technicians in agriculture, we should prepare students for this area. Laws may need to be changed.
* It is basic for a person entering a four year program in any field of agriculture.
* This is preparing for employment in agriculture.
* As an integral part of the program, not an add-on.

Section B: Response from Round 3

77.7% 22.3%

Agree Disagree

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Most students are not capable of handling this.
* Side benefit, not a primary purpose.
* Should not inhibit continuation of education; but this is not a mission of the program.
* Since we need professionals as well as technicians in agriculture, we should prepare students for this area. Laws may need to be changed.
* This is preparing for employment in agriculture.
* As an integral part of the program, not an add-on.
Section A: Position Statement

5. In preparation for employment or self-employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

Section B: Response from Round 2

WE HAVE BEEN IN 100% AGREEMENT ON THIS POSITION SINCE ROUND ONE. THEREFORE, NO FURTHER EVALUATION IS NECESSARY.

Agree Disagree

Section A: Position Statement

6. For upgrading and retraining employed or self-employed persons in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position:

* If not done by a local community college.
* If this does not interfere with the in-school secondary program.
* "This is an adult program decreed by law."
* Needed for job education.
* If we are to serve the education role in agriculture in the community, it should include adult or continuing education as a part of that responsibility.
* We must meet community needs.
* If teachers are given appropriate time and supplies.
* More important than planning for basic level education.
* Failure to provide such a service has spoiled the effectiveness of some present programs. Adult work should be written into standards and required of all vo-ag teachers.
* Not being accomplished in the non-farm areas of agriculture.
* May not be part of the vo-ag teacher's job.

Section D: Present Response

Comments ( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Note from the Researcher:
This position should not be limited to the school day instructional program. Therefore, please consider out of school evening classes as a possibility as applicable to the secondary K-12 agricultural education program.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position:

* The teacher's load is too heavy at the secondary level.

Issue Continued on Next Page.
The purpose of agricultural education in the public school system should include the acquisition of knowledge and skills.

Section A: Position Statement
7. to develop the "total individual" by teaching independent thinking, decision making, problem solving, creativity, leadership, citizenship, and other human qualities.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
- Part of all education; most important.
- Work involves all three factors.
- Important for establishment in an agricultural career.
- Accomplished through the FFA.
- As a spin-off of the program.
- "If we aren't doing this we're in big trouble."
- "We are part of the total education of people."
- One of our most important jobs as educators.
- "Who does it better than us-ep?"

Section B: Response from Round 3
97.9% 2.1%

Agree Disagree

Section D: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Page 9
Section A: Position Statement

8. to develop the abilities of individuals to be intelligent consumers of agricultural products.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- Helps to sell our program; a needed life skill.
- Producers must understand agriculture from a consumer point of view.
- One of many useful purposes, but not necessarily a primary purpose.
- Agricultural education is broad and diverse and must go beyond some old traditional settings in order to grow and meet the needs of this country in life style, diet, and food and fiber production.
- Agribusiness people are also consumers of agricultural products.
- If individuals are to be competent in agricultural skills, they must relate those skills to consumers.
- Consumers of agricultural products are the mainstay of the agricultural industry.
- Important, but this may be approaching general education.
- Only as related to vocational training - a needed life skill.
- Agricultural education is an all encompassing title and should cover practical acts in agriculture.

Section B: Response from Round 2

69.1% 29.8% 1.1% Undecided

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

- Should not become a strong consumer education program.
- Not a purpose of vo-ag.
- Nice to do, but we can't do everything.
- Only a minor part of the program, not worthy of being considered a purpose.
- An expected outcome, not a purpose.
- Only as a production or marketing input.
- Students we do not have are the ones who need to be trained in this area.
- Vo-ag is not a consumer oriented program. While many units could have consumer orientation, it should not be a purpose to direct the focus at the consuming end.
- There are ever increasing technological aspects that need strengthening.

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
### SECTION E

**Directions**

Please consider the extent of consensus in this study on the issue: "What should be the purpose of agricultural education in the public school system?"

Then respond to the question as follows: To what extent should the issue be further considered and studied by the profession at the present time?

Please indicate your response by checking the appropriate block ( ) to the left of the possible responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is very important since resolution of the issue is of critical importance to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of limited importance; that is, resolution of the issue would be helpful to the profession but would not significantly affect the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education at the present time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of moderate importance since resolution of the issue could enhance the agricultural education program and is important to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No further consideration of the issues by the profession is needed at the present time; although some disagreement may exist, the profession is in general agreement with the majority viewpoint expressed in this study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ISSUE

What clientele should be served by agricultural education in the public school system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Clientele who should be served by agricultural education in the public school system should include:

Note from the Researchers:

Alternative positions 1-13 are not intended to be mutually exclusive. For example, agreement with clientele being students in grades 9-10 does not mean that this is the only grade level that should be served. Rather, this would indicate that students in grades 9-10 should be a part of the clientele served by agricultural education.

Section A: Position Statement

1. students in grades K-6.

Section B: Response from Round 2

50.0% Agree 57.9% Disagree 2.1% Undecided

Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position

- As an exploratory unit to aid elementary teachers.
- Okay, but should not be considered as vocational students.
- As awareness and exploratory.
- Career education.
- As courses or units of instruction designed specifically for this group.
- Limited degree - this would make our jobs easier in the higher grade levels.
- Food for America through the FFA could serve this group.

Section D: Comments in Disagreement with the Position

- This is a job for career education.
- Too young for job training, limited to basic skills.
- Only as exploratory career information, not as a course of study.
- Not part of vocational intent of the program.
- Under current funding this is not a viable function.
- This is a job for general education.
- Unpractical.
- If the program is truly vocational; this is not a legitimate clientele.
- But, could provide assistance at this level from time to time.

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Clientele who should be served by agricultural education in the public school system should include:

Section A: Position Statement

2. students in grades 7-8.

Section B: Responses from Round 2

68.1% 29.7% 3.2% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Agree in terms of career exploration.
* Recruitment makes this group a "must."
* An example is a 9-week rotation among vocational service areas of which agriculture is a part.
* Should not be considered vocational but could be considered agricultural education.
* This would help students make realistic decisions about enrollment in FFA or GSA.
* Should include conservation education, leadership education, animal health, consumer ed, and the basics in livestock and crop production.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* A job for career education.
* Too young for formal training.
* Not a responsibility of agricultural education, this is general education of a practical arts nature.
* Should be limited in scope such as a 6-week course.
* Inadequate funding.

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

[Blank]

[Blank]
Section A1: Position Statement


Section C1

Comments in Agreement with the Position
- Essential for students to get the maximum value from instruction in 11th and 12th grades.
- Critical for a total program concept.
- Appropriate grade level for broad based core competencies.

Section A1: Position Statement

4. Students in grades 11-12.

Section C1

Comments in Agreement with the Position
- Essential for education in K-12.
- Essential for continued growth and development.

Section B1: Response from Round 2

97.95 2.15

Agree Disagree

Section D1: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Clients who should be served by agricultural education in the public school system should include:

Section A. Position Statement

5. Out-of-school youth employed or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

Section C1

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* If the public school system doesn't help these individuals - who will.
* We are professionally responsible to serve a vocational role to all students who are interested.
* Accomplished during evening classes using existing facilities.
* Should extend a great effort here.
* If the program is a complete program of agricultural education.
* As originally written in the Smith-Hughes Act.
* Only if the teacher's load is properly adjusted.
* To meet the needs of the population shift to an older clientele.
* But, not with in-school youth.
* As a part of the young farmer/adult program.

Section B1. Response from Round 2

92.6% 5.3% 2.1% Undecided

Note from the Researcher:

The position should not be interpreted as limited to the school day instructional program. You should, however, consider this potential clientele group with regard to agricultural education programs at the secondary level.

Section D1. Present Response

92.6% 5.3% 2.1% Undecided

Comments

Note from the Researcher:

The position should not be interpreted as limited to the school day instructional program. You should, however, consider this potential clientele group with regard to agricultural education programs at the secondary level.

Comments

Note from the Researcher:

The position should not be interpreted as limited to the school day instructional program. You should, however, consider this potential clientele group with regard to agricultural education programs at the secondary level.
Section A: Position Statement
6. adults employed, self-employed or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

Section C:
Comments In Agreement with the Position
* Needs emphasis.
* But not as high a priority as in-school students.
* Need more manpower and time devoted to this area.
* An important part of the program which is receiving less emphasis.
* If not reached by a local community college.
* As a broad interpretation of ag. ed.
* As an integral part of the program; not an "add-on".
* Young/Adult farmer programs should fulfill this function.
* Involvement of adults will become a necessity as the speed-up of technological change occurs.

Section B: Response from Round 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note from the Researcher:
This position should not be interpreted as limited to the school day instructional program. You should, however, consider this potential clientele group with regard to agricultural education programs at the secondary level.

Comments In Disagreement with the Position
* Ag. Ed. should be confined to grades K-12.
* Anything beyond should be in the community college.
* "This is general adult education; not vocational education."

Section D: Present Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
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Section A1. Position Statement

7. out-of-school youth or adults who desire knowledge and skill in agriculture for personal reasons other than for employment or self-employment in agriculture.

Section C1

Comments in Agreement with the Position
- "Serving this clientele is essential if agricultural education is to be broader than vocational agriculture."
- Only as an adult education program.
- Provided adequate funds are available.
- Only if enrollment space and instructional time is available after serving.
- Everyone needs some agricultural instruction.
- Difficult to separate vocational and avocational students.
- This group needs instruction. Agricultural education can do it better than anyone.
- Should include students seeking avocational skills and help in making consumer decisions.
- Depends on the interests of the school and community.
- Important medium for gaining community support.
- This could lead to an increased interest in agriculture.
- The use of public money for this function is justifiable.
- Important with the "back-to-the-land" movement.
- OK, but not necessarily v-oc, ag teacher or with vocational funds.

Section B: Response from Round 2

Note from the Researcher:
The statements should not be interpreted as limited to the school day instructional program. You should, however, consider this potential clientele group with regard to agricultural education programs at the secondary level.

Agree Disagree
55.3% 44.7%

Section D: Present Response

Comments
Section A: Position Statement

8. rural students.

Section B: Responses from Round 2

90.9% Agree
1.1% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Should serve all students.
* If interested in agriculture.
* But not limited to these.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

Section D: Present Response

Comments

Section A: Position Statement

9. urban students.

Section B: Responses from Round 2

90.9% Agree
1.1% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* If students have a vocational agriculture interest.
* Many viable occupations available in these areas.
* Little difference where students come from with social mobility today.
* Not enough farm kids to fill the job market.
* Of less importance in practice because of limited placement opportunities.
* May be our new promising area.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
**ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED**

Citeaste who should be served by agricultural education in the public school system should include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section A1: Position Statement</th>
<th>Section B: Response from Round 2</th>
<th>Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position</th>
<th>Section D: Present Response</th>
<th>Section E: Comments in Disagreement with the Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Suburban students.</td>
<td>97.0% 1.1% 1.1% Undecided</td>
<td>* Anyone interested in agriculture from a vocational standpoint should be served.</td>
<td>( ) Agree ( ) Disagree</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Many visible occupations available in these areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In-school youth with social, physical and economic handicaps.</td>
<td>97.0% 1.1% 1.1% Undecided</td>
<td>* Assuming these students are preparing for agriculture careers.</td>
<td>( ) Agree ( ) Disagree</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* All but mentally handicapped - this requires special enterprises.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* When students can function effectively and can benefit from program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* If needs of the population are left to specialists, what will specialists teach? There must be some content taught.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* With help from the specialists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* It should not become a dumping ground.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* As with any student; only if they don't inhibit learning of other students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Opportunities must be open to all students; but vo-ag cannot become a dumping ground.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section A: Position Statement
12. out-of-school youth and adults with social, physical and economic handicaps.

Section B: Response from Round 2
77.1% 21.3% 1.1% Undecided

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* If interested or engaged in agricultural occupations.
* Not as high a priority as in-school students.
* With appropriate support service, funding and teacher time.
* With realistic limitations.

Section B: Response from Round 2
77.7% 21.3% 1.1% Undecided

Section C:
Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* Other agencies are better equipped to serve these individuals.
* Teachers are poorly equipped to serve these individuals.
* Special education (PL 94-142) is designed to serve this target population.
* Beyond the scope of most programs.
* Let's get existing programs up to staff before we serve this group.
* If they are now out of school, the problem may be so severe that specialist must coordinate. Agricultural teachers may be needed as a resource not as a primary problem solver.

Section A: Position Statement
13. Female seeking employment or self-employment in agriculture, regardless of the type of agricultural occupational preference.

Section B: Response from Round 2
97.9% 1.1% 1.1% Undecided

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* No sex bias - please. If students have a vocational interest, they should enroll in the program.
* We need to do a better job with sex equity.
* Vocational education is to train employees not gender.
* To do otherwise would not be legal.

Section B: Response from Round 2
97.9% 1.1% 1.1% Undecided

Section C:
Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* If guidelines have been followed - I fail to see why a special emphasis should be placed here.

Section D: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Issue Continued on Next Page.
**SECTION B**

**Directions**

Please consider the extent of consensus in this study on the issue: "What clientele should be served by agricultural education in the public school system?"

Then respond to the question as follows: To what extent should the issue be further considered and studied by the profession at the present time?

Please indicate your response by checking the appropriate block ( ) to the left of the possible responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is very important since resolution of the issue is of critical importance to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of limited importance; that is, resolution of the issue would be helpful to the profession but would not significantly affect the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education at the present time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of moderate importance since resolution of the issue could enhance the agricultural education program and is important to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>No further consideration of the issue by the profession is needed at the present time; although some disagreement may exist, the profession is in general agreement with the majority viewpoint expressed in this study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ISSUE**

What should be the content of agricultural education in the public school system?

**ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS**

The content of agricultural education in the public school system should include:

*Note from the Researchers:*

We are trying to identify legitimate content for agricultural education programs nationally. Agreement or disagreement with each alternative position should not be governed by a local situation, but a perspective of agricultural education in the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section A: Position Statement</th>
<th>Section B: Response from Round 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. agricultural production.</td>
<td>WE HAVE BEEN IN 100% AGREEMENT ON THIS POSITION SINCE ROUND ONE. THEREFORE, NO FURTHER EVALUATION IS NECESSARY.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section A: Position Statement</th>
<th>Section B: Response from Round 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. agricultural supply and service.</td>
<td>WE HAVE BEEN IN 100% AGREEMENT ON THIS POSITION SINCE ROUND ONE. THEREFORE, NO FURTHER EVALUATION IS NECESSARY.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section C:**

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Based on needs of the student and employment needs of the community.
* "Of major importance to the agricultural industry."
* Guidance of students into these courses and careers are badly needed.
* The number of farm students is declining.
* More programs are needed.

**Section D:**

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issue Continued on Next Page.
The context of agricultural education in the public school system should include:

Section A: Position Statement

1. agricultural mechanics.

Section B: Response from Round 2

WE HAVE BEEN 100% AGREEMENT ON THIS POSITION SINCE ROUND ONE. THEREFORE, NO FURTHER EVALUATION IS NECESSARY.

Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position

- Should be a specialized program.
- Should be a part of an agricultural cooperative training program.
- As suggested by the local advisory council.

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section A1: Position Statement</th>
<th>Section B: Response from Round 2</th>
<th>Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position</th>
<th>Section D: Present Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. ornamental horticulture,</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>Comments in Agreement with the Position</td>
<td>( ) Agree ( ) Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>examples: floriculture,</td>
<td></td>
<td>* When meeting needs of students and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and nursery management.</td>
<td></td>
<td>employment needs of the community,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Should be job oriented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. horticulture,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments in Disagreement with the Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>examples: food production,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such as fruit and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vegetables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments in Disagreement with the Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments in Agreement with the Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Depending on needs of students and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>employment needs in the community,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Should be a specialized program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

The content of agricultural education in the public school system should include:

Section A1: Position Statement
7. renewable natural resources.

Section C1
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Based on needs of students and employment needs in the community.

Section A1: Position Statement
9. forestry.

Section C1
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Should be tailored to meet individual and employment needs in the community.
  * Forestry is one of our most important renewable resources.

Section B1: Response from Round 3
91.9% 2.1%

Section D1: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree
Comments

Section B1: Response from Round 3
96.5% 2.1% 1.1% Undecided

Section D1: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree
Comments

Section B1: Response from Round 3

Section D1: Present Response

Comments
**Section A: Position Statement**

9. Other types of agriculture such as small animal care and horse training.

**Section B: Response from Round 2**

95.75 % 75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position**

- Based on individual needs and employment needs in the local community.
- These areas may be easily saturated.
- Good, especially for urban students.
- Taught in the context of work and preparation for work, not as care for the family pet.

**Section D: Comments in Disagreement with the Position**

- This should be a responsibility of post secondary education.

**Section E: Present Response**

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

---

**SECTION II**

**Directions**

Please consider the extent of consensus in this study on the issue: "What should be the content of agricultural education in the public school system?"

Then respond to the question as follows: To what extent should the issue be further considered and studied by the profession at the present time?

Please indicate your response by checking the appropriate block ( ) to the left of the possible responses.

**Response**

( ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is very important since resolution of the issue is of critical importance to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.

( ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of limited importance; that is, resolution of the issue would be helpful to the profession but would not significantly affect the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education at the present time.

( ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of moderate importance since resolution of the issue could enhance the agricultural education program and is important to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.

( ) No further consideration of the issues by the profession is needed at the present time; although some disagreement may exist, the profession is in general agreement with the majority viewpoint expressed in this study.
**-SUPERVISED OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE/PRACTICE-**

**ISSUE**

What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should be required to conduct supervised occupational experience/practice programs?

**ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS**

Supervised occupational experiences/practices in agricultural education in the public school system should be required:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section A: Position Statement</th>
<th>Section B: Responses from Round 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. of all vocational students enrolled in a production agricultural course of study.</td>
<td>95.7% Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Makes the program truly vocational.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Used as a means to remove uninterested students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Important, provides for practical application of the instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Schools should assume some responsibility for providing laboratory and facilities for the experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Reason for 1/2 month employment of agriculture teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Should be appropriate for each student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Use any/all possible ways to get practical experience for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* SOEP can occur anywhere; doesn't need to be traditional projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* May need to lose 1/2 of our enrollment in some cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Must provide each teacher time during the school-day for supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Although this may be a problem with existing credits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section D: Comments in Disagreement with the Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Would not have enough students for a program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* We would lose 1/2 of our enrollment if we enforced this position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* It is desirable but should not be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section D: Present Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( ) Agree ( ) Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: [Blank]
Section A: Position Statement

2. of all vocational students enrolled in a non-production agriculture course of study.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- Use as many resources as possible to get practical experience for students.
- This may be difficult, but learning by doing is important.
- If students have an occupational interest in agriculture.
- DOEP can occur anywhere - limits do not have to be established according to traditional projects.
- Provides opportunity for practical application of instruction.

Section D: Response from Round 1

95.7% Agree

Section E: Response from Round 2

96.0% Agree

Section D: Present Response

Comments

Section D: Present Response

Comments

Note from the Researcher:
This position statement refers to students who may be enrolled in agricultural classes for the purpose of general education or practical arts, not vocational agriculture.

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Supervised occupational experience/practices in agricultural education in the public school system should be required:

Section A1: Position Statement

4. of all students enrolled in classes for orientation to agriculture such as in grades 7 and 8.

Section A2: Position Statement

5. of all students receiving agricultural instruction in grades K-6.

Section C1

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- Type of experience would vary, but should be consistent with exploratory purpose at this level.
- "Supervised practice through laboratory instruction and activity centered projects increases the effectiveness of instructional programs."  
- ROEP is a teaching methodology, not a method of excluding students.
- Part of their orientation and establishment in agriculture.
- A lower priority than 9-12 and adults.
- Some type whether in-school or out-of-school.
- To start ROEP early prevents objections to ROEP's at higher grade levels.

Section D1: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Section B2: Response from Round 3

22.3% 76.6% 1.1% Undecided

Section C2

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- "Supervised practice through laboratory instruction and activity centered projects increases the effectiveness of instructional programs."
- Awareness and exploratory is important at this time and grade level.
- ROEP is a teaching methodology, not a method of excluding students.

Section D2: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Section B2: Response from Round 3

9.6% 89.4% 1.1% Undecided

Comments

Section C3

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- "Supervised practice through laboratory instruction and activity centered projects increases the effectiveness of instructional programs."
- Awareness and exploratory is important at this time and grade level.
- ROEP is a teaching methodology, not a method of excluding students.

Section D3: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments
SECTION E

Directions

Please consider the extent of consensus in this study on the issue: "What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should be required to conduct supervised occupational experience/practicu programs?"

Then respond to the question as follows: To what extent should the issue be further considered and studied by the profession at the present time?

Please indicate your response by checking the appropriate block ( ) to the left of the possible responses.

Response

( ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is very important since resolution of the issue is of critical importance to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.

( ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of limited importance; that is, resolution of the issue would be helpful to the profession but would not significantly affect the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education at the present time.

( ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of moderate importance since resolution of the issue could enhance the agricultural education program and is important to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.

( ) No further consideration of the issues by the profession is needed at the present time; although some disagreement may exist, the profession is in general agreement with the majority viewpoint expressed in this study.
**SUPERVISED OCCUPATION EXPERIENCE/PRACTICE**

**ISSUE**

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a production agricultural program in the public school system?

**ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS**

Acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a production agricultural program in the public school system should include:

- Supervised farming projects (enterprises).

---

**Section A: Position Statement**

1. Supervised farming projects (enterprises).

**Section B: Response from Round 2**

| 100.05 | Agree | Disagree |

---

**Comments in Agreement with the Position**

- Should use any/all ways to get practical experience for students.
- When matched with student occupational goals.
- This is a key to other areas of instruction and growth.

**Comments in Disagreement with the Position**

**Section D: Present Response**

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments: [Blank]
### Section A: Position Statement

2. home and/or farm improvement projects.

### Section B: Response from Round 2

| Agree | Disagree | 93.6% 5.3% 1.1% Undecided |

### Section C:

#### Comments in Agreement with the Position
- *Should be carefully planned, supervised and documented.*
- *Use any/all ways possible to get practical experience for students.*
- *"Only in addition to production enterprises or part of exploratory SOE.*
- *Development of knowledge and self-pride could occur.*
- *Some of these are not exemplary; but are the only suitable alternative for students.*

#### Comments in Disagreement with the Position
- *This does not provide for agricultural skill development.*
- *Outmoded as the Model T, this kind of thinking will kill us—ag, it's 1991 not 1917.*

### Section A: Position Statement

3. supplementary farm projects.

### Section B: Response from Round 2

| Agree | Disagree | 91.6% 6.1% |

### Section C:

#### Comments in Agreement with the Position
- *In conjunction with suitable production projects.*
- *When tied with student career goals.*
- *Only when projects are part of a written supervised plan for gaining or applying ag. skills, knowledge, or developing attitudes.*
- *Use any/all ways to get practical experience for students.*
- *Should be called "supplementary practice."*

#### Comments in Disagreement with the Position
- *Not an appropriate substitute for SOE.*
- *Outmoded; should talk about competencies developed in our instructional program.*

### Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

#### Comments

---

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a production agricultural program in the public school systems should include:

Section A1: Position Statement
4. A group (several students working together) projects related to production agriculture.

Section C1
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Use any/all ways to get practical experience for students.
* Needs emphasis and gives flexibility to opportunities and accomplishments.
* Students must learn to work together.
* Projects are completed by applied competencies.
* Excellent way to reach all groups.
* Encourage cooperation and exploitation.
* When individual projects are not available or practical.

Section A1: Position Statement
5. Projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature.

Section C1
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Use any/all ways to get practical experience for students.
* A vital; but a degree of latitude is advisable.

Section A2: Position Statement
6. Projects related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled. Examples: students enrolled in horticulture should have experience programs in horticulture; if in animal science the experience programs should be in animal science.

Section C2
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Use any/all ways to get practical experience for students.

Section D1: Present Response
WE HAVE BEEN IN 100% AGREEMENT ON THIS POSITION SINCE ROUND ONE. THEREFORE, NO FURTHER EVALUATION IS NECESSARY.

Comments

Agree Disagree

97.9 1.1 1.1 Undecided

Agree Disagree

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments
Section A1: Position Statement

7. Farm placement.

Section B1: Response from Round 2

96.05 2.15 1.15 Undecided

Agrava Diaagraa Commanta In Dlaagraamant wth th f o a lt lo on

A Oppoaaad to havin g th Ina tr u c tlo n o c c u r In ad d itio n to claa r o o m tim e.

Section C1: Comments in Agreement with the Position

Agree Disagree

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

A Should include placement in nursery, or greenhouse operation of a production nature.

Section A2: Position Statement

8. Practice/experience in the school laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction.

Section B2: Response from Round 2

96.05 2.15 1.15 Undecided

Agrava Diaagraa Commanta In Dlaagraamant wth th f o a lt lo on

A Oppoaaad to havin g th Ina tr u c tlo n o c c u r In ad d itio n to claa r o o m tim e.

Section C2: Comments in Agreement with the Position

Agree Disagree

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

A Opposed to having the instruction occur in addition to classroom time.

Issue Continued on Next Page.
### Section A1: Position Statement

9. Practice/experience in the school laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm during class time.

### Section B1: Response from Round 2

63.8% 35.1% 1.1% Undecided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments in Agreement with the Position**

- An appropriate place to acquire needed skills and competencies.
- As a last resort.
- Better than no experience at all.
- If a meaningful experience.
- If related to student occupational goals.
- If supervision is provided — should be during conference or planning period.
- Should not interfere with the regular instructional program.
- Okay, but this may reduce summer activities.
- An excellent teaching tool.
- Taking care of projects may occur at various times.

**Comments in Disagreement with the Position**

- Work should take place on student's time.
- This is a class activity; not SOE.
- Could take time needed for the instructional program.
- This is useful but does not qualify for SOE.
- This approach limits the student's opportunity to learn.
- Most difficult to administer fairly.

### Section A1: Position Statement

10. Exploratory experiences such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.

### Section B1: Response from Round 2

13.4% 25.5% 1.1% Undecided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments in Agreement with the Position**

- Only for the first agriculture class in which the student was enrolled and as a last resort.
- Could be a part of all student's SOE.
- Okay, but not acceptable as the only experience.
- If related to occupational goals.
- This is a sound learning experience when supervised properly.

**Comments in Disagreement with the Position**

- This implies an observation role on the part of students.
- A minimal part of SOE at best.
- Not vocational, need hands-on.
- Does not imply skill development.
- Supplemental to class instruction.
Section A: Position Statement

11. Cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day.

Section B1: Response from Round 2

95.75% 2.18% 2.18% Undecided

A: Agree
D: Disagree

Section C1: Comments in Agreement with the Position

- Students should be carefully selected.
- If a bona fide training program and not just a job.
- If related to student occupational goals.
- If supervision time is provided to the agricultural instructor during the school day.
- Needs to be supervised by ag. instructor.
- This is the best way of providing the students interested in agriculture occupations entry level competencies they will need.
- Must be close working relationship between the teacher and the coop coordinator.
- Student should be given extra units (credits) for this.

Section D1: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
SECTION 6

Directions

Please consider the extent of consensus in this study on the issue: "What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a production agriculture program in the public school system?"

Then respond to the question as follows: To what extent should the issue be further considered and studied by the profession at the present time?

Please indicate your response by checking the appropriate block ( ) to the left of the possible responses.

Response

(  ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is very important since resolution of the issue is of critical importance to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.

(  ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of limited importance; that is, resolution of the issue would be helpful to the profession but would not significantly affect the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education at the present time.

(  ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of moderate importance since resolution of the issue could enhance the agricultural education program and is important to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.

(  ) No further consideration of the issues by the profession is needed at the present time; although some disagreement may exist, the profession is in general agreement with the majority viewpoint expressed in this study.
ISSUE

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in non-production agriculture in the public school system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a non-production agricultural program in the public school systems should include:

[Note from the Researchers: Agreement with alternative positions 1-4 does not imply exclusion of other positions. For example, agreement with home projects does not imply that this is the only acceptable supervised occupational experience practice. How you vote on the other positions will determine which positions are acceptable or unacceptable.]

Section A: Position Statement

1. Home projects of a non-production nature such as lawn care and lawn mower maintenance.

Section C1

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- If related to student career objectives.
- Use any/all ways possible to get practical experience for students.
- Need to set high standards to develop work competencies.
- These are areas open for expansion by agricultural education.

Section B: Response from Round 2

89.4% 8.5% 2.1% Undecided

Agrae Disagree

Section D1: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Section A: Position Statement

2. Placement in agribusiness.

Section B: Response from Round 2

100%

Agrae Disagree

WE HAVE BEEN IN 100% AGREEMENT ON THIS POSITION SINCE ROUND ONE. THEREFORE, NO FURTHER EVALUATION IS NECESSARY.

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a non-production agricultural program in the public school systems should include:

Section A: Position Statement
3. Group projects of a non-production agricultural nature.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
• "Not adequate if the only type of SDE."
• Subject to acceptable scope and student's career objectives.
• Use any/all ways to get practical experience for students.
• Although hard to identify responsibilities and competencies.
• Small animals, community projects, safety projects, and other possibilities.
• Very broad, but okay under certain circumstances.

Section A: Position Statement
4. Projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature.

Section B: Response from Round 3
93.65 5.35 1.15 Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section D: Present Response
 WE HAVE BEEN IN 100% AGREEMENT ON THIS POSITION SINCE ROUND ONE. THEREFORE, NO FURTHER EVALUATION IS NECESSARY.
Section A: Position Statement

5. Projects related exclusively to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled. Example: students enrolled in horticulture should have experience programs in horticulture; if in agribusiness, experience programs should be in agribusiness.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Projects should be tailored to individual needs and occupational goals.
* Although experiences in similar areas are transferable.

Section A: Position Statement

6. Practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Must be adequately supervised.
* Subject to acceptable scope and student career objectives.

Section B: Responses from Round 2

5. Projects related exclusively to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled. Example: students enrolled in horticulture should have experience programs in horticulture; if in agribusiness, experience programs should be in agribusiness. 90.65% 6.4% 1.1% Undecided

[ ] Agree
[ ] Disagree

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Too restrictive; some students may not be able to meet this requirement but have excellent experience programs.
* "Students should not be too specialized as some agricultural teachers are."
* Placement opportunities necessitate a broader interpretation.

[ ] Agree
[ ] Disagree

Comments

Section A: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Section B: Responses from Round 2

6. Practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction. 95.75% 3.25% 1.1% Undecided

[ ] Agree
[ ] Disagree

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Someone needs to monitor development of specific competencies; there should not be anything sacred about school time.
* Nothing is separate from instruction and everything a teacher does in under contract and in-school.

[ ] Agree
[ ] Disagree

Comments

Section A: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
Alternative Positions Continued

Acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a non-production agricultural program in the public school systems should include:

Section A: Position Statement

7. Practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm during class time.

Section B: Response from Round 2

60.65% 30.35% 1.15% Undecided

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- Should be studied or researched.
- If related to student occupational goals.
- This is "hands on" instruction.
- As a class learning experience in addition to a student's individual out-of-class work.
- "School time experience ok, but do not call them SOE."

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

- Should require student's own time.
- Takes away from class time.
- Just doesn't give enough hands-on experience in most cases.
- This is part of the formal instruction program.
- Could lead to "devotionalization" of agricultural programs.
- "Should be considered if a 2-3 hour/day program."
- In-school experience does not let students see the reality of the practices in the agricultural industry.
- Experience during class time should be for class grade; and experience other than class time would be part of SOEP.

Section A: Position Statement

8. Exploratory experiences such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.

Section B: Response from Round 2

72.35% 25.35% 2.15% Undecided

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- Acceptable at exploratory levels.
- Minor part of SOEP.
- Good.
- If properly planned and supervised.
- If related to student occupational goals.
- Hopefully this will generate more interest in vocational agriculture.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

- Nothing else in the same as doing.
- In 10 years our SOEP would be nothing more than observation.
- Doubt that competencies are being taught.
- Part of career education program.

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

W
**Section A: Position Statement**

9. Cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day.

**Section C:**

**Comments in Agreement with the Position**

- If beneficial training program.
- Must be related to student's career goal.
- This should not be confused with "work-study" programs.
- The time and "seasonality" of some of these experiences require flexibility.
- Limited to the student's senior year.

**Section B: Response from Round 2**

96.0% 2.1% 1.1% Undecided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Section D: Present Response**

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

**Comments**

---

**SECTION E**

**Directions**

Please consider the extent of consensus in this study on the issue: "What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a non-production agriculture program in the public school system?"

Then respond to the question as follows: To what extent should the issue be further considered and studied by the profession at the present time?

Please indicate your response by checking the appropriate block ( ) to the left of the possible responses.

**Responses**

( ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is very important since resolution of the issue is of critical importance to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.

( ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of limited importance; that is, resolution of the issue would be helpful to the profession but would not significantly affect the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education at the present time.

( ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession could enhance the agricultural education program and is important to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.

( ) No further consideration of the issues by the profession is needed at the present time; although some disagreement may exist, the profession is in general agreement with the majority viewpoint expressed in this study.
ISSUE

What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should become members of the FFA?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system who should become members of the FFA includes:

Section A: Position Statement

1. All vocational students in a production agriculture course of study.

Section B: Response from Round 2

93.6% 5.2% 1.1% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- Integral part of the curriculum.
- Must be members to get the full benefit of v-ag.
- "Either FFA is or is not part of v-ag. If it is, enrollment in v-ag automatically results in membership (with no additional dues) with all students receiving the instruction and supervised practice relative to leadership, citizenship, etc."
- Leave membership voluntary, but encourage use by all.
- Should be done in a way to cause all students to want to be a member.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

- Should relate to the instructional program if classes is used.
- Should not want students who are unwilling to give 100%.
- Probably 85-90%, but should provide the opportunity for all students.

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments
Section A1: Position Statement

2. all vocational students in a non-production agriculture course of study.

Section C1:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
- Integral part of the curriculum.
- Many opportunities in the FFA that should be used.
- All students should be expected to join.
- *Either FFA is or is not part of vo-ag. If it is, enrollment in vo-ag automatically results in membership (with no additional dues) with all students receiving the instruction and supervised practice relative to leadership, citizenship, etc."
- The FFA has many non-production aspects which are appropriate to anyone.
- Best experience they will ever have.

Section A2: Position Statement

3. all vocational students enrolled in an orientation to agriculture course of study, such as 7th and 8th grade programs.

Section C2:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
- As a Junior FFA chapter.
- Integral part of the total curriculum.
- If 7th and 8th grade students are in a "vocational program" they should be members.
- If FFA is a good "meuse" for the program, it should be good for all.
- Should allow opportunity for training on a Junior level.
- Motivating.
- Joining the FFA must take place at an early age. Students are more apt to be involved at this stage of development.

Section B1: Response from Round 2

92.6% Agree 1.1% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section D1: Present Response

Comments

Section B2: Response from Round 2

34.0% Agree 1.6% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section D2: Present Response

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Clients enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system who should become members of the FFA include:

Section A1: Position Statement

4. only those vocational students who desire to become members.

Section C1:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- No organization gains by having members who do not want to be members.
- Youth activities should not be mandated to students.
- Don't require membership; but have a chapter.
- We should maintain membership on the FFA merit - not on requirements.
- Responsibility on advisor and officers to have program of work so students will want to join.
- Law would dictate students can't be forced to be members unless the school will provide for dues.

Section A2: Position Statement

5. vocational students who desire to become members.

Section C2:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- Those may participate and be useful.
- As long as they have been enrolled in a v-e-a-g program.
- Vocational students may change their intent once they are in the FFA.
- Anyone enrolled in the program is eligible; would have difficulty identifying vocational students.
- A number of past national officers would have been lost if this were not possible.

Section B1: Response from Round 2

24.5% 75.5% 2.1% Undecided

A: Agree  D: Disagree

Section B2: Present Response

Comments

( ) Agree  ( ) Disagree

Comments
## SECTION E

### Directions

Please consider the extent of consensus in this study on the issue: "What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should become members of the FFA?"

Then respond to the question as follows: To what extent should the issue be further considered and studied by the profession at the present time?

Please indicate your response by checking the appropriate block ( ) to the left of the possible responses.

### Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is very important since resolution of the issue is of critical importance to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is important since resolution of the issue would be helpful to the profession but would not significantly affect the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education at the present time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of moderate importance since resolution of the issue could enhance the agricultural education program and is important to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No further consideration of the issue by the profession is needed at the present time; although some disagreement may exist, the profession is in general agreement with the majority viewpoint expressed in this study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
-FFA PROGRAM-

ISSUE

What aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system should occupy in-class instructional time?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system which should occupy in-class instructional time include:

Section A: Position Statement

1. Planning any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.

Section B: Response from Round 2

81.5% 17.0% 1.1% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* FFA is an integral part of the curriculum.
* An excellent opportunity for developing competencies needed.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Should be an activity that will relate to student occupational objectives.
* An activity that assists in developing a specific competency.
* (Improper use of class time - in a class of 20 only 8-10 will actively help plan - not efficient use of class time.
* Only activities which have instructional intent should use class instructional time, not any FFA activity.
* "Any" is too broad.
* "We should be discrete - some activities are more appropriately handled after hours."
* Only so much time available in class.
Section A1: Position Statement

2. conducting any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.

Section B1: Response from Round 2

Note from the Researchers:
This position indicates that all FFA activities may be conducted during class time. If you perceive that the activities should be screened or selected on some criteria, you should disagree with the position.

Agree Disagree

Note from the Researchers:
This position indicates that all FFA activities may be conducted during class time. If you perceive that the activities should be screened or selected on some criteria, you should disagree with the position.

Agree Disagree

Section C1:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
- Should be kept in perspective.
- FFA is an integral part, therefore any activity is a legitimate use of class time.
- Part of vocational training.
- If FFA activities do not benefit student, they should not be a part of the FFA.

Section D1: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Section A1: Position Statement

3. selected FFA activities which directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.

Section B2: Response from Round 2

Note from the Researchers:
The intent of this position is that in class FFA activities should be selected in consideration of the educational objectives of the instructional program. For example, this position suggests that horticulture students should not receive instructions for dairy judging during horticulture class.

Agree Disagree

Section C2:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
- Need to be somewhat flexible, some horticulture students may wish to participate in dairy judging.
- If for all students, not just a few.

Section D2: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system which should occupy in-class instructional time include:

Section A: Position Statement

4. FFA activities which may not directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled, but have educational value for the development of leadership, citizenship, and cooperation essential for success in agricultural occupations.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- “These are the major educational purposes of the FFA.”
- Helpful in exploring agricultural occupations.
- Leadership development is essential.
- Leadership development is important for any agricultural occupational preparation.
- If discretely selected.
- Most student this age aren't ready to totally commit themselves to a specialty area.

Section E: Response from Round 3

83.0% 16.0% 1.0% Undecided

 Agree Disagree

Section B: Response from Round 3

93.0% 6.0%

 Agree Disagree

Note from the Researchers:
This position establishes teaching the technical competencies and skills in agriculture as the first priority of agricultural education. Instructional time devoted to FFA activities would be limited to selected activities that complement and enhance the teaching of technical skills and competencies.

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments
Section A: Position Statement

6. preparation for judging contests of a nature that is directly related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Only as a direct outgrowth of the instructional program.
* If all class members are involved.
* Only in major areas of study related to the instructional unit.

* "Preparation in the sense that it not include the 'training' of judging teams; but as basic instruction."

Section B: Responses from Round 2

92.6% Agree

Agree Disagree

Comments

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system should occupy in-class instructional time include:

Section A1: Position Statement

7. Preparation for any judging contest.

Section A2: Response from Round 3

39.4% 60.6%

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- If all students are involved.
- Only when teaching skills, but not specifically for a contest.
- If all students are involved and used as a competitive effort for selecting team members and improving skills.
- If it is a part of the FFA program of work - then class time should be used if needed.
- Part of the instructional program is to teach students to judge - but for judging is questionable.
- Particularly appropriate for exploratory years.
- To develop leadership, citizenship, and cooperation.
- The question of too much time per judging competition is questionable.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

- Only as a function of the agricultural instruction part of the curriculum.
- Introducing contests, yes; preparing team, no.
- All contests are not appropriate for all agricultural classes.
- Sometimes only involves a few students.

Section A1: Position Statement

8. Activities specifically selected to develop leadership, citizenship, and cooperation.

Section A2: Response from Round 3

100.0%

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- "These are the major reasons FFA is an integral part of the vo-ag program."
- A basic goal of vo-ag.
- The need for leadership development is increasing.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

- 

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

-
Section A1: Position Statement
9. record keeping for individual and chapter awards.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* If within reason and not repetitive.
* When record keeping is related to agribusiness management.
* Limited part of the instructional program.
* To learn record keeping, not necessarily for awards preparation.
* Record keeping is a part of the vo-ag program and FFA activities encourages better record keeping.

Section A1: Position Statement
10. preparation of individual award applications.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* On a limited basis.
* Mostly individualized instruction as part of regular SORF record book.
* Only in a how-to-do situation.
* If all students are involved.
* Teachers have to meet deadlines on some occasions.
* Completing applications is a skill needed by educated persons.

Section B1: Response from Round 2
90.4% 8.5% 1.1% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section B1: Response from Round 2
71.3% 27.1% 1.1% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section D1: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system should occupy in-class instructional time include:

Section A1: Position Statement

II. Fund raising projects which use minimal class time that relate to agriculture, have educational value, and are conducted according to sound business practices.

Section A2: Response from Round 2

90.4% 0.5% 1.1% Undecided

Agree Disagree

Section C1:

Comments In Agreement with the Position
- Depends on the nature and scope of the project.
- Appropriate to set aside 10-15 minutes each day for study and individual work.
- Fund raising can be instructional in many respects.
- If related to agriculture and has agricultural value.
- Dynamic way to stimulate interest.

Section C2:

Comments In Disagreement with the Position
- If it uses minimal class time, and only minimum time is justified, why use any at all?
- If it is done, it should not be practiced frequently.
- The program is for instruction, not fund raising.

Section D1: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

SECTION E

Directions

Please consider the extent of consensus in this study on the issue: "What aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system should occupy in-class instructional time?"

Then respond to the question as follows: To what extent should the issue be further considered and studied by the profession at the present time?

Please indicate your response by checking the appropriate block ( ) to the left of the possible responses.

Response

( ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is very important since resolution of the issue is of critical importance to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.

( ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of moderate importance since resolution of the issue could enhance the agricultural education program and is important to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.

( ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of limited importance; that is, resolution of the issue would be helpful to the profession but would not significantly affect the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education at the present time.

( ) No further consideration of the issue by the profession is needed at the present time; although some disagreement may exist, the profession is in general agreement with the majority viewpoint expressed in this study.
PLEASE INDICATE YOUR AGREEMENT WITH ONLY ONE OF THE EIGHT ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS FOR THE NEXT ISSUE.

YOU ARE TO SELECT THE MOST APPROPRIATE PROGRAM TITLE.

-TITLE OF THE AGRICULTURE PROGRAM-

ISSUE

What title should be used to describe agricultural education programs in the public school system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

The title of agricultural programs in the public school system should be:

Section A: Position Statement
1. Vocational agriculture.

Section B: Response from Round 2
33.2% 44.7% 2.1% Undecided

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Vocational agriculture for vocational classes but not for general agriculture classes.
* Why change an established trade name?
* Voc-ed should be all inclusive - secondary, post-secondary, adult, agribusiness, etc. Voc-ed does not mean production agriculture only.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* Not broad enough.
* Too general for the "hat" worn by the instructor.

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

Issue Continued on Next Page.
### Alternative Positions Continued

The title of agricultural programs in the public school system should be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section A1: Position Statement</th>
<th>Section B1: Response from Round 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. agricultural education.</td>
<td>13.05 04.05 2.18 Undecided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Section C:

**Comments in Agreement with the Position**

- If we are broader than vocational the response should be agricultural education.
- Broadest, clearest description of what we should be. This also parallels Distributive Ed., Home Economics, Business Ed., and other program titles.
- More flexible - less restrictive, more modern.
- A broad all inclusive term applicable to K-12 and adult programs.
- Simple and to the point.

**Comments in Disagreement with the Position**

- Denotes teacher education in the literature.

#### Section A2: Position Statement

3. agriculture/agribusiness/natural resources education.

#### Section C:

**Comments in Agreement with the Position**

**Comments in Disagreement with the Position**

- Need vocational in the title unless our responsibility is broader than vo-ag.

---

### Section Di: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

**Comments**

---

### Section D1: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

**Comments**
**Section A1: Position Statement**

4. vocational-technical education in agriculture.

**Section B1: Response from Round 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>00.06</th>
<th>97.05</th>
<th>2.15</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agree Disagree

**Section C:**

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- Need the prefix "vocational."

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

- Too long.
- "Says the same thing as vocational agriculture, just says it with more words."
- V-TEA is not catchy.

**Section A1: Position Statement**

5. agricultural education and renewable natural resources.

**Section B1: Response from Round 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>00.06</th>
<th>97.05</th>
<th>2.15</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agree Disagree

**Section C:**

Comments in Agreement with the Position

- Too long and poor English.
- AE-RRR is not handy.
- Imply equal importance with natural resources.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

- ( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

**Section D1: Present Response**

- ( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Issue Continued on Next Page.
ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

The title of agricultural programs in the public school system should be:

Section A1: Position Statement
6. Vocational agriculture/agribusiness.

Section B1: Response from Round 2
27.1% 70.2% 2.1% Undecided

Section C1
Comments in Agreement with the Position
- Best compromise; common usage makes the definition of "vocational" clear.
- This title will maintain ties to our traditional program, yet demonstrates a broader basis for our program. A greater amount of agribusiness must be emphasized.
- Agribusiness has all but dwarfed agricultural production in jobs and skills needed.

Section A1: Position Statement
7. Agricultural and natural resources education.

Section B1: Response from Round 2
99.0% 1.0% 0.0% Undecided

Section C1
Comments in Agreement with the Position
- Gives equal emphasis to natural resources.

Section D1: Present Response
( ) Agree ( ) Disagree
Comments
Section A1: Position Statement

8. agriculture/agribusiness education.

Section B: Response from Round 3

00.00 97.95 2.15 undecided

Section C1

Comments in Agreement with the Position

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

Section D: Present Response

( ) Agree ( ) Disagree

Comments

* Needs the word "vocational".

SECTION II

Directions

Please consider the extent of consensus in this study on the issue: "What title should be used to describe agricultural education programs in the public school system?"

Then respond to the question as follows: To what extent should the issue be further considered and studied by the profession at the present time?

Please indicate your response by checking the appropriate block ( ) to the left of the possible responses.

Response

( ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is very important since resolution of the issue is of critical importance to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.

( ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of limited importance; that is, resolution of the issue would be helpful to the profession but would not significantly affect the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education at the present time.

( ) Further consideration and study of the issue by the profession is of moderate importance since resolution of the issue could enhance the agricultural education program and is important to the survival and/or advancement of agricultural education.

( ) No further consideration of the issue by the profession is needed at the present time; although some disagreement may exist, the profession is in general agreement with the majority viewpoint expressed in this study.

-FINAL ROUND-

This is the final communication you will be asked to respond to in this study. If you desire a summary of Round III, please check the blank to the right. Thank you so much for assistance with this study.
Appendix J

Demographic Data Form
Presently, I have incomplete demographic information for you. This information is needed in order to summarize the professional experience of respondents in this study. Your response is confidential and will only be used in tabulating summary data.

Please complete this section only for the areas checked with a red pen and return the form along with the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Education:</th>
<th>Professional Experience in Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Please check highest years degree held)</td>
<td>(Please indicate total number of years for each category including your present position)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Bachelors</td>
<td>years Secondary Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Masters</td>
<td>years Teacher Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Ph.D./Ed.D.</td>
<td>years State Supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Involvement in Professional Associations:
(Please indicate number of years of service with regard to past and present activities at the state or national level in appropriate categories below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>______ years AATEA</td>
<td>______ years National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ years NVATA</td>
<td>______ years National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ years NASAE</td>
<td>______ years National ______ years State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ years State</td>
<td>______ years State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K

Round Three Delphi Summary
ISSUES/POSITIONS
IMPORTANT TO THE FUTURE OF
AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION
summary of round three
Round Three Summary

Purpose:

The summary has been prepared to communicate the final round extent of agreement on the alternative positions and panelists' comments pertaining to these positions.

Explanation:

Please note that the organization of this summary is similar to the previous questionnaires you have completed.

Section A contains the alternative positions.
Section B contains the final round percent of panel agreement.
Section C contains a summary of the panel member comments pertaining to a particular position.

Note from the Researcher:

May I express my deepest appreciation to you for your perseverance in assisting with this study. Your contributions were invaluable to the completion of this study. Hopefully, the findings of this study will be enlightening and useful to the agricultural education profession.
ISSUE
What should be the purpose of agricultural education in the public school system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS
The purpose of agricultural education in the public school system should include the acquisition of knowledge and skills:

Section A: Position Statement

1. for general education of an avocational or practical arts nature.

Section B: Response from Round 3

37.2%  62.8%

Agree  Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position:
* This could be helpful to some students, but should not be the major thrust.
* I believe this should be one purpose as long as there is not a lessening of effort on skill development for employment.
* We should not limit agricultural education to those purposes which are federally funded.
* Agree, however the major emphasis should be preparation for work.
* The purpose of agricultural education would allow this, but vocational agriculture would not.
* A large number of students may not farm, but will be home owners and gardeners.
* The number of farms is decreasing. Our area is not big enough for teaching single proficiencies.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position:
* Very minor part of vocational agriculture.
* One of the purposes, but stated too direct to accept.
* It is not possible to do everything! We should concentrate on doing the things we do best - that's to concentrate on the vocational aspects of agricultural education.
* Should prepare students for entry level skills.
* When vocational agriculture becomes general in nature it loses its uniqueness and will become one of the first to be pushed aside by the so-called academics.
* I recommend further discussion - an expanded purpose as identified by this position has merit provided it is phased in under well-trained and well-educated agriculture teachers.
* We need to keep our distance from general education. If we stray from the vocational aspect, vocational agriculture is dead. It may already be dying.
* Too much of a variation from our intended purpose.
* Early general avocational education dilutes and diverts serious vocational student accomplishment.
* Vocational agriculture is not for everyone, thus, it is not general education.
Section A: Position Statement

2. for orientation to and exploration of occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position:
* Logical theory to do in vocational programs.
* A decreasing farm population causes this to be essential for urban youth.

Section A: Position Statement

3. in preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the postsecondary level.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position:
* Advancement in agricultural technology just about demands this option be available.
* Not a primary purpose, but important for those that will continue their education.
* Should be handled individually in a vocational program. We don't want to scare away the true vocational student who isn't interested in truckloads of subject matter.
* The best farmers in our area have gone to college.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position:
* Quite desirable, but should not influence design or structure of curriculum. Curriculum must continue to focus on job readiness.
* Emphasis of this purpose tends to exclude intensive "how to do it" training in favor of theoretical basis.
Section A: Position Statement

4. in preparation for advanced study of agriculture at the baccalaureate level.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Vocational agriculture in high school can be one major factor in a person succeeding in receiving a B.S. degree in any field of agriculture.
* But not as a guiding purpose, be sure to maintain vocational emphasis.
* On an individualized basis.
* To maintain an adequate supply of professionals for the future, we may need to get more involved in this area.

Section A: Position Statement

5. in preparation for employment or self-employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

Section B: Response from Round 3

84.9% 15.1%

[ ] [ ]

Agree Disagree

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Not a major purpose, but quality programs may see a substantial number of students enter B.S. programs. This should not be a negative factor in program evaluation.
* Not all students will be able to attend college, nor will some students want the B.S. degree.
* The main purpose should be to prepare students for employment after high school.
* If they are prepared for job entry they can always go beyond. Too often we forget the job entry level.
* Some students need the two year course only.
Section A: Position Statement

6. for upgrading and retraining employed or self-employed persons in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position:

* Demographic data indicates this will be the major area in the future.
* Should be an integral part of vocational agriculture within public schools.
* If earmarked funds are provided for this activity.
* If adequate time is available.
* If not done by a local community college.
* It should be required of every vocational agriculture teacher, especially those on extended employment. Many have lost their extended employment for failures to provide services of this nature.
* May become more important in light of continued energy costs and needs in agricultural occupations.

Section B: Response from Round 3

97.6% 2.4%

Comments in Disagreement with the Position:

* As teachers are trained they really aren't prepared technically for this task. Maybe this is the time to change and make the agriculture teachers' job just for high school programs.

Section A: Position Statement

7. to develop the "total individual" by teaching independent thinking, decision making, problem solving, creativity, leadership, citizenship, and other human qualities.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Part of total education for all.
* Accomplished through FFA as an integral part of an instructional program. This is the best thing vocational agriculture/FFA has going.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

100.0%

Agree Disagree
Section A: Position Statement

8. to develop the abilities of individuals to be intelligent consumers of agricultural products.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position

* But what is going to be cut out to teach these units?
* As long as you say agricultural education, not vocational agriculture.
* Individuals become better producers through understanding the consumer side of the agriculture industry.
* Agriculture students are also major consumers. Much of the subject matter has a dual production/consumption orientation.
* Every student in the program is a consumer.
* How can you teach about growing quality plants and producing livestock without discussing prices and/or how quality is assessed, which is consumer education. This is a rational logical thing to do. It is an out-growth of the instruction.
* Could be over-emphasized.

Section B: Response from Round 3

72.1% 27.9%

Agree Disagree

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* An expected outcome, not a purpose: only as a production or marketing input.
* What has befallen consumer homemaking should be ample warning not to emulate.
ISSUE
What clientele should be served by agricultural education in the public school system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS
Clientele who should be served by agricultural education in the public school system should include:

Section A: Position Statement
1. students in grades K-6.

Section B: Response from Round 3
45.9% 54.1%

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Should be awareness and exploration only.
* Only on an exploratory basis.
* As an awareness program.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* This is a job for career education.
* Spreading the vocational agriculture teacher too thin can only detract from his/her ability to do the major jobs.
* Only as exploratory career information, not as a course of study.
* Students in grades K-6 should receive agricultural instruction from their regular teacher.
* We do not have adequate funding.
* Can't see how it fits into the purpose of vocational training.
Section A: Position Statement

2. students in grades 7-8.

Section C: Comments In Agreement with the Position

* Recruitment makes this group a "must". An example is a 9-week rotation among vocational service areas of which agriculture is a part.
* Only on an exploratory basis.
* Awareness and exploration. There could be some preparation for a few students.
* As a resource person for awareness and career orientation.
* Point of general education about the world of food production.
* We should compete with industrial arts.

Section B: Response from Round 3

73.3% 26.7%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Knowledge and attitudes related to agriculture should be integrated into career education. The agricultural education community may assist in curriculum development.
* We can't and we aren't doing a good job with the 9-12 grade levels. So, what makes people think we can handle grades 7 & 8.
* Our challenge for the future may very well be to hold on to what we have on the secondary level.
* For introductory purposes only.
* Inadequate funding.

Section A: Position Statement

3. students in grades 9-10.

Section C: Comments In Agreement with the Position

* Increasingly important with the demands new agricultural technology is placing upon students.
* Should be broad based at this point.
* Essential for students to get the maximum value from instruction in 11th and 12th grades.
* Critical for a total program concept.
* Appropriate grade level for broad based core competencies.

Section B: Response from Round 1

100.0% 0.00%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
Section A: Position Statement

4. students in grades 11-12.

Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Essential capstone for ag. ed. in K-12.
* Essential for continued growth and development.
* Career choices are being made at this point and courses should be structured to include career possibilities.

Section A: Position Statement

5. out-of-school youth employed or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Vocational agriculture in community colleges can be a legitimate reimbursed program.
* Not at the sacrifice of high school students.

Section B: Response from Round 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* This is a job for post secondary programs, not secondary.
* Inadequate funding.
* Would agree if the school system would hire enough teachers, instead of adding to the teacher load.
Section A: Position Statement

6. adults employed, self-employed, or seeking employment in occupations requiring knowledge and skill in agriculture.

Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Not at the sacrifice of high school students.
* All teachers need in-service training for this area.
* If there is adequate funding.

Section A: Position Statement

7. out-of-school youth or adults who desire knowledge and skill in agriculture for personal reasons other than for employment or self-employment in agriculture.

Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Secondary function - students must pay the cost.
* Provided it doesn't reduce time and emphasis needed for agriculture students in grades 9-14.
* Only as an adult education program.
* With local financing this opportunity should be made available.
* To gain their support for our program.

Section B: Response from Round 3

95.3% 4.7%

Agree Disagree

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Would agree if the school system would hire enough teachers instead of adding to the teacher load.
* We should serve 7-12 and young farmers and let the typical adult education be done by extension and/or industry.

Section A: Position Statement

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Would agree if the school system would hire enough teachers instead of adding to the teacher load.
* Our out-of-school group needs to have vocational direction only.
* There are some limits on what we can expect a teacher to do in the non-vocational fields.
* "My position can be changed to agree if I could believe that additional personnel would be made available to implement a program that would make this position possible - This would be great public relations."
* Not enough time to do everything.
Section A: Position Statement

8. rural students.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* But not limited to these.
* If they have an occupational objective in agriculture.
* Should serve all students, especially rural.

Section B: Response from Round 3

100.0%

| | Agree Disagree

Section A: Position Statement

9. urban students.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* All students who are interested should be served.
* If they have an occupational objective in agriculture.

Section B: Response from Round 3

100.0%

| | Agree Disagree

Section A: Position Statement

10. suburban students.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* If truly interested.
* If they have an occupational objective in agriculture.

Section B: Response from Round 3

98.8% 1.2%

| | Agree Disagree
Section A: Position Statement

11. In-school youth with social, physical and economic handicaps.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position:
* With help from specialists.
* If these students will benefit.
* If they have an occupational objective in agriculture.

Section A: Position Statement

12. Out-of-school youth and adults with social, physical, and economic handicaps.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position:
* Such clients should not be excluded, but it is questionable if serving this population should be a major thrust.
* With support from special education.
* If time permits, major focus should be on in-school portion.
* If they have an occupational objective in agriculture.

Section A: Position Statement

13. Females seeking employment or self-employment in agriculture, regardless of the type of agricultural occupational preference.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position:
* No sex bias - please.
* If they have an occupational objective in agriculture.

Section B: Response from Round 3

100.0%

11. Agree Disagree

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

79.8% 20.2%

12. Agree Disagree

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

98.8% 1.2%

13. Agree Disagree

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Teachers would need special training to do this, we would also need additional funding.
* Departments are not staffed or prepared for such programs.
* If they are now out of school, the problem may be so severe that specialists must coordinate. Agricultural teachers may be needed as a resource, not as a primary problem solver.

* Equity with respect to access to programs should be the issue not male, female, minority, etc.
CONTENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

ISSUE
What should be the content of agricultural education in the public school system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS
The content of agricultural education in the public school system should include:

Section A: Position Statement
1. agricultural production.

Section B: Response from Round 3
100%

Agree Disagree

Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Dependent on community needs.

Section C:

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

Section A: Position Statement
2. agricultural supply and service.

Section B: Response from Round 3
100%

Agree Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

Section A: Position Statement
3. agricultural mechanics.

Section B: Response from Round 3
100%

Agree Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
Section A: Position Statement

4. agricultural products.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Depends on community needs.

Section A: Position Statement
5. ornamental horticulture,
   example: floriculture, and
   nursery management.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Everyone will or probably will be
  homeowners and would benefit from
  this area.

Section A: Position Statement
6. horticulture.
   example: food production, such as
   fruits and vegetables

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Based on need.
  * Can be combined with forestry.

Section A: Position Statement
7. renewable natural resources.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

Section B: Response from Round 3

Agree Disagree

100.0%
Section A: Position Statement

8. forestry.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Determined by needs.
* Can include renewable natural resources.

Section A: Position Statement

9. other types of agriculture such as small animal care and horse training.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Where needed, especially some urban areas.
* These areas are changing and should receive consideration for now and the future.
* Based on needs.
* Specific to some areas.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* I do not see how these can be skills for job entry. Assuming small animals means pets and hence, training for a hobby.
ISSUE

What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should be required to conduct supervised occupational experience/practice programs?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS CONTINUED

Supervised occupational experience/practices in agricultural education in the public school system should be required:

Section A: Position Statement
1. of all vocational students enrolled in a production agricultural course of study.

Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position
* First of all, we need to forget about tradition and be flexible in our definitions of SOEP, many projects experiences could be acceptable/justified. Second, one alternative which needs more consideration is awarding additional units to those meeting predetermined standards (hours, etc). Some might receive an extra 1/2 unit; some an extra unit. This could help head off any enrollment drop.
* Without SOEP there is no vocational program.
* Should be appropriate for each student.
* Can be done with home farm, placement, or school lab.

Section B: Response from Round 3

98.8% 1.2%

Agree Disagree

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* Vocational agriculture teachers can give assistance to teachers of students in grades K-6.
Section A: Position Statement

2. of all vocational students enrolled in a non-production agriculture course of study.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Probably most important for this group.
* SOEP can occur anywhere; do not have to be a conventional project.
* "Excellent for skill development for some students, and it's not outmoded, either. What's outmoded is teachers who like to keep records and supervise projects."
* In varying degree of scope and intensity.

Section A: Position Statement

3. of all students enrolled in non-vocational agricultural education programs.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* If learning is to be accomplished, schools may have this option if a class of non-vocational agriculture is offered where a lab SOEP can be developed.
* All students enrolled in vo-ag should have an SOEP.
* Very appropriate for some students.
* SOE projects should be required, but of limited scope.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* These types of students should not be in vocational agriculture.
* Adequate resources are not available.
Section A: Position Statement

4. of all students enrolled in classes for orientation to agriculture such as in grades 7 and 8.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Agricultural education should be included as a part of career education for grades K-8. This instructional program may be conducted by a specialized teacher, however the teacher will usually be general science. SOE is appropriate for K-8 as a laboratory activity.
* If enrolled.
* From career exploration standpoint. Not true vocational student.
* SOEP is used to teach skills and also provide career choices.
* Group SOE's community service is BOAC.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* Not at this level.

Section A: Position Statement

5. of all students receiving agricultural instruction in grades K-6.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Vocational agriculture teachers should serve as a resource person for K-6 teachers only.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* Not vocational.
* Awareness “food for America” at this stage.
* Minimal at this level, limited to community service, landscaping, and group projects.
* Agricultural education should not occur at this level.
-SUPERVISED OCCUPATION EXPERIENCE/PRACTICE-

ISSUE

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a production agriculture program in the public school system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a production agricultural program in the public school system should include:

Section A: Position Statement

1. supervised farming projects (enterprises).

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Should always be used when practical.

Section A: Position Statement

2. home and/or farm improvement projects.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Only in conjunction with ownership, placement, or laboratory experience.
* Good SOEP for all students, even those with farm projects.
* Farm placement is more desirable.

Section B: Response from Round 3

100.0% Agree

96.5% Agree

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

3.5% Disagree

3.5% Disagree
Section A: Position Statement

3. supplementary farm projects.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Only in conjunction with ownership, placement, or laboratory experience.
* Use any type of project that will give experience.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Very poor - competencies through instructional programs are better.

Section A: Position Statement

4. group (several students working together) projects related to production agriculture.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Use all ways to get practical experience.
* If the project is large enough and the work is adequate.
* As a last resort.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* This does not constitute true SOE.
* Can not learn records, investment, and credit with this type of experience.

Section A: Position Statement

5. projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature.

Section B: Response from Round 3

95.3% 4.7%

Agree Disagree
Section A: Position Statement

6. projects related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled. Example: students enrolled in horticulture should have experience programs in horticulture; if in animal science the experience programs should be in animal science.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Some latitude is needed here.

Section A: Position Statement
7. farm placement.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Excellent SOEP but should be supervised.
* Should be included where appropriate to the individual.

Section A: Position Statement
8. practice/experience in the school laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Acceptable at exploratory levels.
* If well planned and supervised.

Section B: Response from Round 3

98.8% 1.2%
[ ] [ ]
Agree Disagree
Section A: Position Statement

9. practice/experience in the school laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm during class time.

Section B: Response from Round 3

67.42 32.62

Agree Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* This process works well for trade and industry and others.
* Skills should be taught and can be learned at any time.
* "Who cares when or where the experiences occur so long as students acquire skills."

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* No, SOE is individualized and personal because it is specific to one person's career goals in agriculture.
* Definition of SOE prohibits this.
* This is not a reasonable way to define occupational experience.
* A major segment of the work must be in the student's study period. It is better than no opportunity, as might occur in certain areas.
* This seems to be a laboratory exercise during class.

Section A: Position Statement

10. exploratory experiences such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Only for the first class in which the student was enrolled and as a last resort.
* Could be a part of all student's SOEP.
* Okay, but not acceptable as the only experience.
* Okay, if nothing else is available.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* "Visiting and observing is not the same as doing. While it has a place as a minor role in SOEP, certainly a program cannot be based on this kind of experience alone."
* This is part of the instructional program.

Section A: Position Statement

11. cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* It should be supervised and related to occupational goals.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* This would result in lost instructional time, thus, the cost is too great to justify this as SOE.
ISSUE

What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in non-production agriculture in the public school system?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a non-production agricultural program in the public school systems should include:

Section A: Position Statement

1. home projects of a non-production nature such as lawn care and lawn mower maintenance.

Section B: Response from Round III

91.9% 8.1%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Should use all means to get practical experience for students.
* Appropriate for some students.
* If planned as a learning experience.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* This will not provide an array of experience and skill development opportunities required for employment in agricultural industry; but may be an acceptable improvement project.
* This is avocational.

Section A: Position Statement

2. placement in agribusiness.

Section B: Response from Round 3

100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Appropriate for some students.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
Section A: Position Statement

3. group projects of a non-production agriculture nature.

Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position
* If areas of responsibility and competencies are carefully identified.

Section A: Position Statement

4. projects of an entrepreneurial (ownership) nature.

Section B: Response from Round 3

95.2% 4.8%

Agree Disagree

Section A: Position Statement

5. projects related exclusively to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.
Example: students enrolled in horticulture should have experience programs in horticulture; if in agribusiness, experience programs should be in agribusiness.

Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Yes, but allow for flexibility based on students' needs, interests, and access or opportunity for such experiences.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* Group projects are meaningful, but are not in the true spirit of SOE.

Section B: Response from Round 3

96.5% 3.5%

Agree Disagree

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* Students should have SOEP's related to curriculum. However, this should not preclude students having other SOEP's i.e. horticulture students with beef.
* Too restrictive; some students may not be able to meet this requirement, but have excellent experience programs.
Section A: Position Statement

6. practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm separate from scheduled in-school instruction.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Must be supervised.

Section B: Response from Round 3
96.5% 3.5%
Agree Disagree

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* Nice philosophy - has little chance of succeeding under negotiated contracts.

Section A: Position Statement

7. practice/experience in the laboratory, on the school grounds, or farm during class time.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* However, some could and probably should be after class time.
* Would result in good "hands on" instruction.
* Experiences should be the priority, not when.

Section B: Response from Round 3
64.0% 36.0%
Agree Disagree

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* This is part of the instructional program.
* SOE must be in addition to class time.

Section A: Position Statement

8. exploratory experiences such as a study-visit with agricultural workers.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Students should see persons working in the areas for which they are being trained. We're talking about a few visits - not continuous observation.

Section B: Response from Round 3
76.7% 23.3%
Agree Disagree

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* We're vocational, not observers.
Section A: Position Statement

9. cooperative education programs in agriculture where students are released from part of the school day.

Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position

* If a bona fide training program.

* Exceptions for religious or like reason.

* All students meeting the age requirement as described in the FFA constitution should be encouraged to join.

* Integral part of vocational agriculture.

Section B: Response from Round 3

97.7% 2.3%

Agree Disagree

Section B: Response from Round 3

95.3% 4.7%

Agree Disagree

FFA PROGRAM

ISSUE

What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should become members of the FFA?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system who should become members of the FFA include:

Section A: Position Statement

1. all vocational students in a production agriculture course of study.

Section C: Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Exceptions for religious or like reason.

* All students meeting the age requirement as described in the FFA constitution should be encouraged to join.

* Integral part of vocational agriculture.

Section B: Response from Round 3

95.3% 4.7%

Agree Disagree

Section B: Response from Round 3

95.3% 4.7%

Agree Disagree

* This could take every class hour of every day in a large active FFA chapter.
Section A: Position Statement

3. all vocational students enrolled in an orientation to agriculture course of study, such as 7th and 8th grade programs.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* As a non-chartered junior chapter.

Section A: Position Statement

4. only those vocational students who desire to become members.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* I'd like it this way, but I'm not sure it will work.
* This could be justified either way, but I believe it should be left up to the individual.
* Students may not know what they want until they have experienced it.
* Refer to the recent AVA Journal on student organizations.
* You can't make them pay dues, you can't make them participate. They rebel about participation in activities after school.

Section A: Position Statement

27.1% 72.9%

Section B: Response from Round 3

23.5% 76.5%

Section C:
Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* Not vocational agriculture, at this point this is illegal.
* Prohibited in FFA constitution.
* What will they do? How can it work?
* The FFA may be too vocational for 7th and 8th grades.

Section B: Response from Round 3

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* The FFA is an intra-curricular activity; vocational agriculture students miss important growth activities if they are not FFA members if the teachers do a good job.
* Should have 100% membership.
* All should be encouraged.
Section A: Position Statement

5. Vocational students who desire to become members.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* FFA should be valuable to this clientele also.
* All students in vocational agriculture should be FFA members.
* We have many students who will never farm or work on the farm.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* This clientele will not benefit unless they want to be members.
* This clientele should not be in the program.

Section B: Response from Round 3

36.5% 63.5%

Agree Disagree

ISSUE

What aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system should occupy in-class instructional time?

ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS

Aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system which should occupy in-class instructional time include:

Section A: Position Statement

1. Planning any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.

Section B: Response from Round 3

83.7% 16.3%

Agree Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Integral part, helps students work together.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* The word "any" creates a concern for agreement with this statement.
* Officer meetings should handle this problem along with chapter meetings.
Section A: Position Statement

2. conducting any FFA activity in the chapter program of activities.

Section B: Response from Round 3

54.7% 45.3%

 Agree  Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Should be kept in perspective.
* This is part of vocational training.
* Any activity within reason or class time constraints etc. If FFA is integral to vocational agriculture, then class time should be made available as appropriate.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* "Any" is too all-encompassing.
* Some activities could be more appropriate.
* Some work does not involve all members of a class.
* No, again, could monopolize too much class time and we are already accused of using the FFA too much.

Section A: Position Statement

3. selected FFA activities which directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.

Section B: Response from Round 3

96.5% 3.5%

 Agree  Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* No reason why they should not be FFA members, however, activities could be different than those for grades 9-12.
* For all students, not just a few.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

Section A: Position Statement

4. FFA activities which may not directly relate to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled, but have educational value for the development of leadership, citizenship, and cooperation essential for success in agricultural occupations.

Section B: Response from Round 3

91.9% 8.1%

 Agree  Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Leadership development is important.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* It's foolish to select activities outside specialty areas and devote class-time to them.
Section A: Position Statement

5. selected FFA activities which can be utilized without taking time needed to teach content of the instructional program.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Except leadership skills.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* "Any activity takes time needed to teach the content of the instructional program. Activities should be a part of the content."

Section A: Position Statement

6. preparation for judging contests of a nature that is directly related to the specialty area in which the student is enrolled.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* As an outgrowth of instruction.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* I'm against drilling for contests during classtime, this loses the value of FFA.
* Too easily overdone - get FFA Alumni to help.

Section A: Position Statement

7. preparation for any judging contest.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
*"Reasonable" is the key to this problem. * If all students are involved and instructional material relates to the total curriculum.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* Only if the contest is related to curriculum and is part of the objective. "Any" contest does not qualify.
* Need to be watched for over emphasis.
* Not all students are so inclined to participate.
Section A: Position Statement

8. activities specifically selected to develop leadership, citizenship, and cooperation.

Section B: Response from Round 3

100.0% Agree Disagree

Section A: Position Statement

9. record keeping for individual and chapter awards.

Section B: Response from Round 3

95.3% 4.7%

Agree Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* This is a matter of interpretation.
* Within reason.
* Budget amount of time discretely.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

Section A: Position Statement

10. preparation of individual award applications.

Section B: Response from Round 3

70.9% 29.1%

Agree Disagree

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* On a very limited basis.
* Can be for the benefit of all the class.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* This is an individual responsibility not a class project.
* Awards are usually based on extra effort; preparation of the application should be part of this extra effort.
* Class time is a premium; this should be done individually.
* Should be done individually; all students may not be candidates.
Section A: Position Statement

11. fund raising projects which use minimal class time that relate to agriculture, have educational value, and are conducted according to sound business practices.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position
* O.K., if properly evaluated and educationally sound.
* Very appropriate; but try to minimize the amount of time.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* If it uses minimal class time, and only minimum time is justified, why use any at all?
* The program is for instruction, not fund raising.

Section B: Response from Round 3

93.0%  7.0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Agree  | Disagree |
What title should be used to describe agricultural education programs in the public school system?

The title of agricultural programs in the public school system should be:

Section A: Position Statement
1. vocational agriculture.

Section B: Response from Round I
60.0% 40.0%

[ ] Agree [ ] Disagree

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Could go either direction on this.
* Like vocational agriculture our trade mark.
* Too many, vocational agriculture includes many vocations, thus, a greatly expanded curriculum with a common focus on earning a living. — Agricultural education is a second best name, however, this can denote knowledge about agriculture.

Comments in Disagreement with the Position
* We need new terminology to better reflect our business and to get rid of some traditional stereotypes.
* "Vocational agriculture does not include all agricultural education. If this name is selected, the purposes should be limited to 'vocational' purposes. This would also result in a more selective enrollment and more emphasis at adult and postsecondary levels with less emphasis at the high school level, particularly grades 9-10."
* Urban students feel left out in using this term.
* Not broad enough.
* Doesn't fit the course material.
* Does not include general and pre-vocational.
Section A: Position Statement

2. agricultural education.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

* Covers everything - vocational, agribusiness, forestry, landscaping, annuals, crops, grading of products, leadership, etc.

* "Perhaps we should look at other fields. For example; home economics is the general title for the field. Within home economics there are a variety of sub-program titles. Trade and Industry and Business Education also do this. Therefore, I feel we need Agricultural Education as the common denominator. Other titles could fall under the Agricultural Education program."

Section A: Position Statement

3. agriculture/agribusiness/natural resources education.

Section C:

Comments in Agreement with the Position

Comments in Disagreement with the Position

* Too long.
* Agribusiness is a vague term.

Section A: Position Statement

4. vocational-technical education in agriculture.

Section B: Response from Round 3

12.9% 87.1%

Agree Disagree
Section A: Position Statement
5. agricultural education and renewable natural resources.

Section A: Position Statement
6. vocational agriculture/agribusiness.

Section C:
Comments in Agreement with the Position
* Public believes vocational agriculture and agribusiness mean different things even though this is not true.
* Best compromise.

Section A: Position Statement
7. agricultural and natural resources education.

Section A: Position Statement
8. agriculture/agribusiness education.

Section B: Response from Round 3
100.0%

Section B: Response from Round 3
27.1% 72.9%

Section B: Response from Round 3
100.0%

Section B: Response from Round 3
100.0%
Section E in the round three questionnaire asked respondents to rate the need for further study and discussion of the issues after considering the data collected in this study. Response from the panel of experts is presented in table format.
## Frequencies, Mean Scores, and Priority Rankings Concerning the Need for Further Study and Discussion of Selected Issues in Agricultural Education among Delphi Panelists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>No further consideration needed</th>
<th>Limited Importance</th>
<th>Moderate Importance</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Priority Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What should be the purpose of agricultural education in the public school system?</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>2.529</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What clientele should be served by agricultural education in the public school system?</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>2.432</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What should be the content of agricultural education in the public school system?</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>1.701</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should be required to conduct supervised occupational experience/practice programs?</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>2.488</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in a production agricultural program in the public school system?</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>2.533</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What are the acceptable types of supervised occupational experience/practice for students enrolled in non-production agricultural programs in the public school system?</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>2.508</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What clientele enrolled in agricultural education in the public school system should become members of the FFA?</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>2.595</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What aspects of the FFA program for students enrolled in the public school system should occupy in-class instructional time?</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>2.293</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What title should be used to describe agricultural education programs in the public school system?</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>2.164</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The response categories were numerically coded as indicated,

1 = No further consideration needed  
2 = Limited importance  
3 = Moderate importance  
4 = Extremely important
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