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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of student teaching as perceived by first year teachers, university supervisors and cooperating classroom teachers. The objectives of the study were as follows: 1) to describe student teaching in agricultural education as perceived by first year teachers, university supervisors, and cooperating classroom teachers, 2) to determine first year teachers' self-perceived preparedness for teaching vocational agriculture, 3) to identify perceptions of first year teachers of vocational agriculture regarding sources of self-perceived preparedness, and 4) to identify significant sources of variance in perceived preparedness explained by components of the preservice program and characteristics of first year teachers of vocational agriculture.

Data collected were obtained from questionnaires returned by 59 first year teachers, 52 university supervisors and 112 cooperating classroom teachers who were involved in the agricultural education student teaching programs in the AATEA Southern Region during the Fall of 1984 and Spring of 1985.

First year teachers rated their preparation for classroom and laboratory instruction the highest (mean = 3.81) using the scale of 1 = unprepared and 5 = very well prepared. Perceived preparedness for conducting adult education programs was rated the lowest (mean = 2.99). For all areas, first year teachers rated their preparation
between the categories of acceptable and well prepared.

There is a lack of uniformity of student teaching experiences among states in the southern region. Most experiences last for less than 12 weeks and approximately 40 percent of the students feel this time is too short.

Regardless of the length of student teaching the participants, which included students, university supervisors and cooperating teachers, are generally satisfied with the student teaching experience. The three groups perceived student teaching to be effective.

First year teachers perceived on-the-job/self study as making the highest contribution toward preparedness (mean = 3.56) based on a scale of 1 = no contribution to 5 = very high contribution. Yet, regression analysis revealed that the perceived contribution of university agricultural education courses was an important factor in teacher preparation. Sixty-one percent of the variance in perceived preparedness was explained by the perceived contribution of university agricultural education courses.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Student teaching is that time when college students gradually take over the duties and responsibilities of cooperating public school teachers. During this time student teachers attempt to apply the theories and methods learned in education courses. According to Andrews (1964), "This application of theory in the real world (classroom) helps the student teacher to begin to develop a teaching style" (p. 9).

Student teaching is a cooperative effort between student teachers, cooperating classroom teachers and university supervisors. Cooperating classroom teachers are the public school teachers who supervise the college students teaching their classes (Pfister, 1983). The university supervisor is a regular college staff member who is responsible for the supervision of the activities of student teachers and the relationship and conditions under which these students carry on their work (Pfister, 1983). To maximize the effectiveness of the student teaching experience, the three groups must work closely together and support each other. Cooperating teachers and university supervisors should provide a support system for the student teachers. One way of visualizing this support system is presented in Figure 1.

A theoretical basis for student teaching was suggested by Mead more than 50 years ago. According to Mead (1930), "Knowledge is not power until it is applied; before the
application is made, it is only potentiality. Facts, principles, and theories are useless unless applied to situations to which they are relevant" (p. 4). For a person preparing to teach, the most relevant experience is contact with real teaching.

Pfister (1983) describes student teaching as the most important "learning by doing" portion of the preservice teacher education program. Thus, it is important that student teachers be provided with appropriate and meaningful experiences during student teaching.

**Statement of the Problem**

What student teaching experiences lead to the most effective preparation of vocational agriculture teachers? A wide variety of methods of coordinating and length of time required in student teaching has always existed. Hutchinson (1961) found, in a national study, that student teaching in
agricultural education ranged from 3 weeks to 48 weeks. Twenty years later Kirts and Claycomb (1981) found that the range was 6 to 18 weeks with some of these programs involving all day and some only half-day experiences.

There is a lack of consistency in the minimum number of visits made by the university supervisor during student teaching. A minimum of three visits is recommended in The Standards for Quality Vocational Programs in Agricultural/Agribusiness Education, yet Kirts and Claycomb (1981) found that 25% of the university supervisors made less than three visits. After surveying Florida secondary school cooperating classroom teachers from all program areas, Rothman (1981) recommended that the university supervisors visit the student teacher weekly.

There is also a lack of agreement as to the need for certification of cooperating classroom teachers. A national survey by Haberman and Harris (1982) showed that forty-four states had no formal credentialing process for certifying classroom teachers to serve as supervisors of student teachers. Sixteen states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia required that a program or course related to supervision of student teachers be completed prior to or during a teachers service as a cooperating teacher. Only three states formally required cooperating teachers to have a masters degree. West Virginia and Kentucky were found to have the most extensive certification systems (Haberman & Harris, 1982).
Although there are variations in methods of coordinating and lengths of time required, "proponents and critics alike generally accept student teaching as the most important phase of teacher education, yet limited research has been done to actually measure the effectiveness of student teaching" (Cruickshank and Armaline, 1986, p. 35). Public and private organizations such as The Holmes Group and The Carnegie Forum recognize discrepancies in the quality of student teaching throughout the various states and see the improvement of student teaching as one of the most direct ways of improving the quality of teacher preparation (Jacobson, 1986). It is important that student teaching experiences be provided in the most effective manner possible for this critical phase of teacher preparation.

Evaluation of student teaching programs should be continuous and outcomes should be measured periodically (Pfister, 1983). Thus, the purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of student teaching in agricultural education in the Southern Region as perceived by first year teachers, university supervisors, and cooperating classroom teachers.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were as follows:

1. To describe student teaching in agricultural education as perceived by first year teachers, university supervisors, and cooperating classroom teachers.
2. To determine first year teachers' self-perceived preparedness for teaching vocational agriculture.

3. To identify the perceptions of first year teachers of vocational agriculture regarding sources of self-perceived preparedness.

4. To identify significant sources of variance in perceived preparedness explained by components of the preservice program and characteristics of first year teachers of vocational agriculture.

**Delimitation**

The study was delimited to those individuals involved in student teaching in vocational agriculture in the Southern Region of the United States in the Fall of 1984 and Spring of 1985.

**Significance of the Study**

In recent years several commissions and national groups such as The Carnegie Forum and Holmes Group have studied teacher education and have called for changes in the way teachers are prepared. This study provides valuable information to those in agricultural education by examining student teaching, a traditional component of vocational agriculture teacher preparation.

The study documents the practices used during agricultural education student teaching, provides data regarding the self-perceived preparedness of first year teachers, and identifies the extent to which major sources of preparation contribute to this preparedness. The overall
effectiveness of supervision by cooperating classroom teachers and university supervisors was determined and differences in opinion investigated.

Though the study was limited to the Southern Region of the United States, the findings pertaining to the perceived contribution of sources toward preparedness may be of value to teacher educators in agriculture across the country when attempting to evaluate the effectiveness of their programs.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

What factors contribute to the preparation and development of quality teachers? This question has been discussed and examined by a number of teacher educators and researchers. Jacko, (1977); Byler and Byler, (1984); Cruickshank and Armaline, (1986); Morrow and Lane, (1983); and Morris, (1980a) all contend that student teaching is the most crucial component of teacher development. Others (Van Patten, 1977 and Huling & Hall, 1982) believe that the quality of the preservice courses in the teacher education undergraduate program is the most important. Van Patten (1977) asserts that the first education course is the most important "since it was an introduction to the field of professional education and the first systematic contact the faculty had with prospective teachers" (p. 9).

In this chapter, factors considered important in developing a theoretical/conceptual framework for this study were examined. The following three general areas were reviewed:

1. A description of student teaching in agricultural education.
2. Qualities of the effective teacher of vocational agriculture.
3. Sources of preparedness for being an effective teacher of vocational agriculture.
Description of Student Teaching

In describing student teaching in agricultural education, the following questions were considered: What are the objectives of student teaching? Are desirable student teaching experiences being obtained through present student teaching assignments? How long should student teaching last to be most effective? How should student teaching be evaluated?

Objectives of Student Teaching

Student teaching is the major unifying experience of most teacher training programs. It is a time for the student teacher to explore, experiment, and 'put it all together' before becoming a professional. The future teacher attempts to identify and meet the expectations which come from self, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, students and society in general. Significant others direct and guide role behaviors as they assume the role of coach, either directly or indirectly (Jacko, 1977, p. 51).

Student teaching is based upon the belief that real education comes about through experience (Pfister, 1983). Student teaching provides the student an opportunity to plan an activity with children based upon previous vicarious and direct experiences, to perform the activity under the supervision of a skilled teacher, to evaluate the experience in light of purposes established in planning, and to evaluate the significance of the

The nature and value gained from student teaching is determined by the quality of the experience and how effectively these experiences are related to the purposes of student teaching (Dewey, 1938). "Student teaching can be considered a form of problem solving where a college student is given an opportunity to deal with problems arising from the experiences he or she comes in contact with during the student teaching program" (Pfister, 1983, p. 15).

Andrews (1964) divides the major objectives of student teaching into three types of goals as follows:

1. To provide for growth in professional and personal attributes, understanding and skills as a teacher.
2. To assist a student in determining if teaching is what he or she really wants to do and actually can do.
3. To allow the student teacher to demonstrate the abilities required to obtain a teaching certificate (p. 20).

Deering (1985) states that student teaching should be a "time to explore, a time to take chances, a time when student teachers can get their feet wet without fear of drowning..." (p. 114). "Student teaching, is, for many, a semisweet semester, a paradoxical potpourri of successes and failures" (Stout, 1982, p. 22).

Student teaching is considered by some as a "cloning
process" and is "like cooking in someone else's kitchen" (Olenoski, 1986). The student teacher is placed in an environment where complete control is not possible so the novice merely copies what the cooperating teacher has done in the past.

"The prospective teacher gets something from experience in the school which is not included in formal courses" (Hoy & Rees, 1977, p. 23). Waller (1967) describes this "elusive something" as "social insight". "Experience provides the prospective teacher with an understanding of the social situation of the classroom and the institutional milieu in which it is embedded" (Hoy & Rees, 1977, p. 23).

Desirable Student Teaching Experiences

Hutchinson (1961) surveyed teacher trainers and reported that the following areas of experience were necessary during student teaching:

1. Realizing the general philosophy and objectives of the school.
2. Developing favorable community and school relationships.
4. Planning the community program for vocational agriculture.
5. Organizing and using advisory councils.
6. Teaching all day groups.
7. Supervised farming programs.
8. Advising the Future Farmers of America Chapter.
9. Planning for and teaching young farmer and adult classes.

10. Administering the department (reports, records, etc.).

11. Promoting and publicizing the program.

12. Cooperating in non-school activities.

13. Evaluating the vocational agriculture program.


Olenoski (1986) reported that student teachers needed and desired more discussion and reflection time. It was suggested that this could be accomplished by group placement of student teachers and seminars between student teachers, cooperating classroom teachers and university supervisors.

Pfister (1983) identified the following seven categories of experiences as being appropriate during student teaching:

1. Experiences requiring a variety of teaching techniques.

2. Experiences with a variety of evaluation instruments.

3. Experiences in program management.

4. Experiences in student guidance.

5. Experiences in school-community relations.

6. Professional development activities.

7. Overall teaching experiences.

Pfister (1983) found that assignments for student teachers at The Ohio State University helped students to obtain the above experiences.
Bellah (1986) found that student teachers and first year teachers perceived themselves as well prepared in the following areas:

1. Demonstrate knowledge of subject matter
2. Make and follow lesson plans
3. Provide appropriate assessment and feedback to students
4. Work with individuals, small and large groups
5. Organize instruction to meet individual differences
6. Diagnose the needs of individual learners
7. Use appropriate discipline techniques (p. 1695-A).

Bellah also reported that 20% of student teachers and first year graduates did not perceive themselves as well prepared in managing a classroom and in promoting student self-motivation.

As indicated by Moss and Briers (1982) the experiences of student teachers can be affected by the time of the year (fall or spring) that the student teaching experiences are acquired. Classroom experience can be obtained during the public school year, but adult instruction as well as many FFA supervisory responsibilities are often seasonal in nature (Moss & Briers, 1982). For student teaching to meet its objectives, student teaching centers should be selected to offer student teachers a variety of experiences and responsibilities (Soldan, 1980).

Richardson (1987) found that college deans felt that micro-teaching should be part of all education courses and
continue through student teaching. Three-fourths of the college deans surveyed agreed that student teachers need experiences in the following 10 areas:

1. Program content
2. Learning and motivation
3. Human growth and development
4. Measurement and evaluation
5. Behavior management
6. Classroom organization and administration
7. Dealing with exceptional students
8. Educational technology
9. Multi-cultural education
10. Professional ethics. (p. 257-258)

The student teaching experiences and assignments must be designed to allow student teachers to develop their own teaching style. Parkay (1982) points out that "although field experience instills confidence about future effectiveness in the classroom, it also encourages student teachers to value styles of teaching that are more restrictive and custodial than those they valued before student teaching" (p. 705).

In a study dealing with the problems of beginning teachers of vocational agriculture in Iowa, Miller and Scheid (1984) found that first year teachers had a high rate of difficulty in the following areas: adult education, supervised occupational experience, classroom and teaching management, and advising the FFA. Miller and Scheid also
found that beginning teachers had a high rate of difficulty with the following items: developing a filing system, setting up a five year plan, completing needed paper work for vocational agriculture programs. The results of this study indicate that provisions should be made to ensure that student teachers receive experiences in adult education, supervised occupational experience and FFA. Student teachers should also observe how filing, long range plans and paper work are accomplished by the cooperating teachers.

Farrington (1981) found that beginning teachers in the Southern Region had the greatest problem with low achieving students and conducting young farmer and adult classes. Results of this study indicated that student teachers need experiences in the areas of student discipline and conducting young farmer and adult classes.

Pfister (1983) found 23 competencies deemed as necessary experiences for student teachers. According to Pfister (1983) and Saladaga (1981), the competencies in the area of pedagogy were rated as essential and accomplished satisfactorily by student teachers.

Many student teachers in agricultural education are not gaining practical experience in teaching adults and young farmers even though they may be faced with the tasks early in their careers (Kirts & Claycomb, 1981). Pfister found that two-thirds of the student teachers did not do any adult education work. This is of particular importance because the adult education program was identified as a "challenge

Rapp (1987) recommended that student teachers need additional experience in handling disrespectful students and found that this could be accomplished by placing student teachers in heterogeneous classrooms. Rapp's suggestion that support for beginning teachers be established within the school settings by the use of mentor programs and induction programs may indicate inadequate preparation during student teaching.

When Marso and Pigge (1987) compared perceived job expectations and realities of beginning teachers, they found that "reality shock" was present despite the fact that the beginning teachers had completed the student teaching requirement.

Length of Student Teaching

There is a lack of agreement as to the appropriate length of student teaching although a minimum of ten weeks of student teaching is recommended in The Standards for Quality Vocational Programs in Agricultural/Agribusiness Education (1977). A national study conducted by Kirts and Claycomb (1981) showed a variation in the length of student teaching in agricultural education ranging from 6 weeks to 18 weeks. There was also variation in the expected (not necessarily required) hours to spend teaching high school students ranging from a low of 20 hours to a high of 360 hours (Kirts
& Claycomb, 1981). Kirts and Claycomb (1981) also found that 36% of the agricultural education departments across the country required less than the 10 weeks recommended for student teaching. Johnson and Yates (1981) found that nationally student teaching ranged in length from 5 to 19 weeks.

Morris (1980b) pointed out that variations in time spent in student teaching were evident across the nation and even within states. In a study by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in 1963, it was reported that time spent in actual teaching during the student teaching experience varied from 14 to 80 clock hours (Morris 1980b). Johnston (1974) compared the effectiveness of teachers who had student taught for one quarter to those whose student teaching experience lasted one year and reported that no significant differences were found between length of student teaching and beginning teacher effectiveness. However, those teachers who had student taught for one year perceived their student teaching experiences to be more effective than did those teachers who had student taught for one quarter (Johnston, 1974).

Morris (1980a) surveyed principals of schools used for student teaching and reported that they believed a full semester of student teaching was optimal and would result in better teachers. Principals indicated that there were fewer problems under the full semester schedule of student teaching and that student teachers continued to improve in their
ability to teach (Morris, 1980a). Morris (1980b) also surveyed cooperating classroom teachers and found that full semester student teaching allowed student teachers to perform at a higher level than could be accomplished in eight weeks.

Scales (1984) recommended that student teaching experiences be extended for longer periods of time. Scales based this recommendation on the finding that length of student teaching was a predictor of student teacher perceptions as measured by The Purdue Student Teacher Opinionnaire. Pfister (1983) asked student teachers to list weaknesses of their student teaching program and found that 10 weeks of student teaching was not long enough. Queen and Grete (1982) found that first year teachers in North Carolina felt additional experiences like student teaching which started earlier and lasted longer would make their preservice training more valuable. Stewart (1984) used the Assessment of Performance in Teaching Observation Instrument to measure the performance of 112 Clemson University student teachers at the end of 6 weeks and again at 12 weeks of student teaching. Stewart found no significant improvement of skills in planning, instruction, management, attitude, and communication, at 12 weeks when compared with 6 weeks of student teaching. Research on the most appropriate length of student teaching is inconclusive.

**Evaluation of Student Teaching Effectiveness**

"The purpose of evaluating an instructional program is to provide the means for determining whether the program is
meeting its goals; that is whether the measured outcomes for a given set of instructional inputs match the intended or prespecified outcomes" (Tuckman, 1985, p. 3).

Morehead and Waters (1987) assert that the quality of the student teaching experience is determined "by the degree of collaboration and cooperation between the university and school district personnel" (p. 31). The model of student teaching that is used most often places the would be teacher under the supervision of a cooperating classroom teacher and a university supervisor. Student teachers, university supervisors and cooperating classroom teachers comprise the student teaching pyramid. Each person in the pyramid has a different and unique role to play if the student teaching experience is to be successful. Unfortunately, according to Ratzlaff and Grimmett (1985), this does not appear to be the case in practice. Previous research (Applegate & Lasley, 1982; Diem & Schnitz 1978; Kingen, 1985), found evidence of role confusion and role conflict within the student teaching pyramid. Ratzlaff and Grimmett (1985) state, "there appears to be a distinct lack of clarity and consensus about who will perform which tasks in the student teaching triad. In some cases, this has led to duplication of function, in others omission" (p. 2).

Beauchamp (1983) found that student teachers least appreciated their supervisors' "failing to clearly define their expectations of us" (p. 4). Flaquer-Gonzalez (1987) found that there was a significant difference between the
perceptions of expectations that student teachers and cooperating teachers had for the role of both the student teachers and the cooperating teachers.

Pfister (1983) concluded that student teaching should be evaluated by all those involved in the student teaching pyramid: cooperating classroom teachers, university supervisors, and student teachers. Evaluation should be a continuous procedure and outcomes should be measured periodically.

Carter (1981) found that methods of evaluating student teachers varied from state to state. Carter came to this conclusion after comparing methods of evaluating student teachers at the University of South Carolina with the evaluation model used in Georgia. Parkay (1982) stated, "Thus I believe that the current practice of student teaching must be reevaluated, if it is ever to encourage students to develop teaching styles that are more 'open' and 'humanistic'" (p. 705).

The literature reviewed indicated methods of evaluating student teachers varies from state to state. Close cooperation and collaboration between the university and the school districts used during student teaching are needed to ensure quality student teaching experiences. Previous research found evidence of role confusion and conflict within the student teaching pyramid. Are our present methods of evaluating and conducting student teaching resulting in effective teachers? If so, what are the qualities of an
effective teacher?

**Qualities of Effective Teachers of Vocational Agriculture**

In determining qualities of effective teachers, the following questions were considered: What are the characteristics of an effective teacher? What competencies are needed by vocational agriculture teachers?

**Teacher Effectiveness**

According to Hylton (1979), "Teacher effectiveness is the degree to which a teacher performs selected competencies deemed necessary for the conduction of effective programs of vocational education in agriculture/agribusiness" (p. 6). Key (1978) states, "A set of well thought out goals and objectives, stated in specific terms which help determine when they are accomplished is a most valuable basis for effective instruction (p. 164)". Warmbrod (1978) notes that high quality programs require,

first and foremost, a corps of competent teachers: that is, teachers who are experts in the technology and skills in the specialized areas of agriculture and related sciences; teachers who have the ability to apply and relate that knowledge and skill to the world of work generally and to occupations specifically; and teachers who have a high degree of professional expertise and skill in planning, teaching and evaluating educational programs (p. 269).

Rheault and Miller (1985) developed a profile of the effective vocational agriculture teacher by identifying
distinguishing behaviors and characteristics using selected teacher effectiveness criteria. The profile is summarized as follows:

1. Feels enthusiastic towards their work
2. Seeks ways to motivate students by providing opportunities for successful learning activities
3. Seek ways to involve parents of students in program related activities
4. Keep informed about your students with special health needs
5. Help students locate supplementary materials for subject matter content
6. Use long range plans to guide the improvement of their program (p. 19)

Rheault and Miller (1985) further characterized the effective vocational agriculture teacher as follows:

1. Has a high percentage of students with active supervised occupational experience programs
2. Holds membership in five professionally related organizations and usually holds at least one leadership position
3. Is a member of two civic organizations or clubs and usually has held at least one leadership position
4. Continues to complete formal education classes throughout his/her teaching career (p. 23).

Qualities of effective teachers have been described in the literature reviewed. Yet, competencies needed by
Teacher Competencies Needed

An examination of the literature related to competencies needed by vocational agriculture teachers revealed numerous sources (Shippy, 1981; Hylton, 1979; Everett, 1977; Rawls & Fatunsin, 1985; Saladaga, 1981 and Pfister, 1983) documenting similar necessary competencies. Professional competencies needed by beginning teachers of agriculture/agribusiness are generally divided into the following categories as proposed by Shippy (1981):

1. Program planning, development and evaluation
2. Planning of instruction
3. Execution of instruction
4. Evaluation of instruction
5. Student vocational organization
6. Supervised occupational experiences
7. Management
8. Guidance
9. School community relations
10. Professional role and development (p. 30).

Shippy's list of competencies did not include adult education course work. However, adult education work was listed in studies conducted by Saladaga and Pfister. The competency studies reviewed contained similar competencies, but less emphasis was placed on adult education and cooperative education programs in more recent studies.

Shippy (1981) stated that the Vocational Education Acts
of the 1960's and 1970's provided for broader areas of instruction in agriculture/agribusiness education for which many teachers had not been adequately prepared and that traditional teacher education programs needed to adopt new ideas and approaches to improve the quantity and quality of teachers they produce.

Saladaga (1981) surveyed Louisiana vocational agriculture teachers to determine perceived level of need and level of attainment of competencies. Saladaga concluded that very few competencies had a mean rating at the highest level of attainment. Yet, more than half of the competencies had mean ratings between essential and moderate level of need in Saladaga's (1981) study. Teachers perceived themselves as moderately competent according to Saladaga.

Stewart, Lighari and Cott (1983) found that administrators perceived SOE and adult education competencies to be less important than agriculture educators perceived them to be. Stewart et al. (1983) recommended that vocational agriculture teachers pay more attention to planning and organizing of instruction to gain additional support of administrators.

King and Miller (1985) found that Georgia vocational agriculture teachers had the greatest difficulties with competencies in the areas of young and/or adult farmers and the least difficulty with competencies in the area of classroom and laboratory instruction. Georgia teachers had the second highest level of difficulty in the area of
supervised occupational experience programs. King and Miller (1985) recommended including ways of working with students having special needs.

Bowen (1986) was concerned that student teachers lacked knowledge of technical agriculture because of rapidly changing technology. Bowen (1986) maintained that frustration results when teachers try to teach a subject without having received the proper prior preparation. "Few things can match the satisfaction that comes to a teacher who has that rare blend of enthusiasm, presentation skills, and subject matter competence needed to direct the learning process" (Bowen, 1986, p. 3).

Bowen (1986) was concerned by the virtual disappearance of young farmer and adult education programs and was alarmed by the fact that successful farmers were seeking advice from private agriculture consultants and experiment stations instead of local vocational agriculture teachers and county extension agents.

The literature reviewed revealed numerous sources documenting similar necessary competencies needed by vocational agriculture teachers. Concerns over lack of technical knowledge of student teachers due to rapidly changing agricultural technology raised by Bowen (1986) suggest possible weaknesses in sources of preparedness.
Sources of Perceived Preparedness

In determining the perceived sources of preparedness for teaching, the following questions were considered: What is the role and influence of education/agricultural education courses in preparing teachers? What is the role and influence of student teaching in preparing teachers? What is the role and influence of cooperating classroom teachers in preparing teachers? What is the role and influence of the university supervisor in preparing teachers?

Role of Education/Agricultural Education Courses

Shippy (1981) recommended that teacher educators periodically evaluate the professional competencies needed by beginning teachers of agriculture/agribusiness education so that the pre-service teacher preparation programs can be updated to meet changing needs. Teacher educators should now concentrate their research efforts toward using competency-based teacher education materials in preparing future teachers (Shippy, 1981).

Saladaga (1981) noted that vocational agriculture teachers were not receiving enough training in working with disadvantaged and minority groups. Teachers responding in Saladaga’s study indicated that their main source of self-perceived preparation was on-the-job/self study. Saladaga (1981) recommended workshops to train teachers in the use of advisory councils, work with the disadvantaged, and maintain student follow-up records.

Bowen (1986) discovered that "how to get and stay
current with technical agriculture" was by far the area of
greatest concern to prominent agricultural educators across
the United States. Technical competence of student teachers
was also voiced as a concern by Bowen.

Seiferth and Purcell (1979) conducted a study of student
teachers at Northern Illinois University, Southern Illinois
University and Indiana State University. They found that
student teachers felt least prepared and had the greatest
difficulty with the following items:

1. Dealing with student discipline problems
2. Finding enough time for individual instruction
3. Coping with student inability to follow
    instructions
4. Financial difficulty resulting from giving up a job
    to student teach
5. Handling racial problems in the classroom (p. 4)

Morrow and Lane (1983) stated, "to a degree, students' performances in the student teaching experience are measures of how well the teacher education program prepares students to meet the demands of classroom teaching" (p. 71).

According to Morrow and Lane, the instructional difficulties encountered by student teachers may be indicative of areas that teacher education programs may need to modify.

Huling and Hall (1982) identified dilemmas and concerns related to methods of operation of secondary schools and teacher preparation programs. These are summarized as follows:
1. Pre-service teacher preparation courses are often taught by new faculty, part-time faculty and graduate students. Graduate faculty are too busy with large graduate school enrollments.

2. Different methods courses taught by same person resulting in a great deal of overlap and repetition in the courses.

3. No student teaching experiences in minor area which is often a factor in the teacher being hired.

4. Lack of preparation or training to deal with concrete tasks, rather than dealing with general role responsibilities.

5. Training for working with parents is another area that was identified as lacking.

6. Lack of knowledge in practical information about student and teacher rights under the law.

7. Lack of training in dealing with the many non-academic interruptions in the secondary school day.

8. The "sink or swim" situation facing new teachers was driving many out of the profession.

9. Beginning teachers required to develop curriculum materials in areas outside of their major.

Huling and Hall (1982) found that teacher educators see a weakness in teacher preparation because of the fact that the teaching methods courses are sometimes taught by subject matter professors who may lack a background in teaching methods. Huling and Hall (1982) suggested the following
changes in teacher preparation: use more graduate faculty to teach undergraduate education courses, add apprenticeship or practicum experiences in more than the major area of study, use induction and mentor type program to help beginning teachers.

The literature reviewed indicates that both general education and agricultural education personnel have concerns regarding the quality of teachers and student teachers.

**Student Teaching as Preservice Preparation**

Jensens (1987) noted that student teaching directly and significantly influenced performance of teachers with three years of experience. It was also found (Jensens, 1987) that the cooperating teacher’s rating of student teaching performance was the best single predictor of the school supervisor’s rating of teachers after they are employed.

Baer and Foster (1974) maintain that one measure of the quality of an undergraduate teacher education program is the perceptions of its graduates. Bryant (1973) found that Texas A & I University graduates felt well prepared to enter the teaching profession and that knowledge of subject matter was their greatest strength while student discipline was described as their greatest weakness. University of Alabama teacher education graduates felt a lack of skill in classroom management and strongly desired more experiences similar to those of student teaching during their undergraduate program (Bates, 1974).
Lock (1977) recommended that universities coordinate more closely their training program with that of the public schools. According to Lock, the concepts and skills taught at the university must become the means by which student teachers can become effective instructional leaders.

Lock (1977) stated, "If a student teacher sees little relationship between his preservice training and the skills he needs in the classroom, then the preservice training, or the student teacher's perceptions, or both, need to be changed" (p. 39).

A survey was made of student teachers in the secondary education program at Western Kentucky University to determine attitudes regarding the student teaching experience. The findings showed that:

1. Most student teachers were highly positive in their rating of the student teaching experience although higher academic-achieving students gave it less favorable scores.

2. A high correlation existed between a student's previous grade point average and the student teaching grade.

3. The student teaching grade did not relate significantly to the rating given to student teaching experience (Hanes, Laman & Englebright, 1984, p. 4-5).

According to Wilson (1985), if student teaching is to be useful, the following four factors should be considered:
1. Profiles should be developed on the student teacher and the cooperating teacher before the student teacher is placed in order to match personalities, philosophical and disciplinary approaches.

2. Teacher education programs should emphasize classroom control and teaching style and familiarize prospective teachers with the theory and practice of positive/negative reinforcement.

3. Educators need to address the particular problems of urban schools, especially in the area of discipline and classroom control.

4. Competency tests should be developed for student teachers to determine their progress in the areas of classroom control and discipline.

Student teaching is not a successful experience unless it helps the prospective teacher become immediately effective in classroom control, and begin to develop a teaching style. These two goals are virtually inseparable, and if they are not achieved, not much teaching and learning can be expected (p. 2).

**Role and Influence of the Cooperating Classroom Teacher**

Stout (1982), Pfister (1983) and Funk and Long (1982) point out the importance of the cooperating classroom teachers on the development of the student teacher. "The cooperating classroom teacher has the most influence on the development of the student teacher because he provides emotional support and guidance" (Funk & Long, 1982, p. 63).
Eicher, Wood & Gullickson (1986) note that "student teachers perceive themselves as the cooperating teachers tell them they are" (p. 305). According to Costa and Garmston (1987), "The cooperating teacher can support student teachers in learning the thinking process of effective teaching by planning, interaction, reflection and projection" (p. 9).

Freeland (1979) found that student teachers would like time before their student teaching experience in order to visit with their cooperating teacher on an informal basis. This visit could be used to get acquainted, discuss teaching styles, establish duties and lines of communication.

Keeping the lines of communication open between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher is very important. Southall and King (1979) found a lack of communication between cooperating teachers and student teachers as the item most often leading to a situation which jeopardized the completion or success of the student teaching experience.

Scales (1984) stressed the importance of communication between the university supervisors and the cooperating classroom teachers and found that a certain level of communication was lacking between the student teachers, cooperating classroom teachers and the principal.

Lock (1977) found that student teachers had difficulties related to the amount of supervision provided by the cooperating classroom teachers. Some student teachers felt the cooperating classroom teacher gave them no help and
others over supervised by not allowing the student teachers to make their own decisions.

Lois Thies-Sprinthall (1984) found that classroom cooperating teachers are rarely educated for the role of supervising student teachers. A survey of all fifty states by Haberman and Harris (1982) revealed that forty-four states have no formal credentialing process for supervising teachers. This study further showed that twenty-four states had no legal requirements for serving as cooperating teachers and that of the remaining 26 states, only two required certification to serve as a cooperating teacher.

The advantages of certification of cooperating classroom teachers according to Morris, Pannel and Houston (1984) are:

1. Certification will provide a process for ensuring that cooperating classroom teachers possess the knowledge, skills and attitudes required for the responsibilities involved in this complex task.
2. Certification will provide a process for quality control in the selection of cooperating classroom teachers that does not exist in many situations.
3. Certification will add status to the role of the supervising teacher.
4. Certification will help to ensure that the quality of student teaching will improve.
5. Certification should help facilitate the transfer of new and innovative ideas from the preparation program into the classroom and vice versa.
6. Certification of cooperating classroom teachers would exert pressure on the teacher preparation programs to use the best prepared university supervisors and have them make more frequent supervisory visits.

7. Certification of cooperating teachers has the potential for improving teacher effectiveness and thereby learner achievement.

8. Certification would provide a vehicle whereby the state could begin to assume responsibilities for remuneration of supervising teachers (p. 10).

The primary method of choosing classroom cooperating teachers in the past has been from volunteers who have been recommended by the local school district and/or principal. This could be a potentially detrimental procedure as "some principals recommended teachers who were marginal hoping that the presence of a student teacher would improve the learning environment" (Morris et. al., 1984, p. 8).

Kelly and Kelly (1983) found that "cooperating classroom teachers enjoyed the experience of having student teachers, but felt it was insufficiently recognized or rewarded by the school district" (p. 1). Morris et al. (1984) supported this by stating that "cooperating classroom teachers compensation varied from no payment at all to a tuition waiver worth $490.00" (p. 9).

Byler (1981) conducted a study of the morale of student teachers based on the attitudes of their cooperating
teachers. A joint study was also conducted on the same subject in 1984 by Byler and Byler. Lower morale on the part of the student teachers was found when the cooperating classroom teacher had negative attitudes in the following areas:

1. Rapport with supervising teacher
2. Rapport with principal
3. Rapport with university supervisor
4. Teaching as a profession
5. School facilities and services
6. Professional preparation
7. Rapport with students
8. Rapport with teachers
9. Student teacher load
10. Teacher salary
11. Curriculum issues
12. Teacher status
13. Community support of education
14. Community pressures (Byler & Byler, 1984, p. 26)

"The cooperating teachers should be made aware of how their positive or negative attitudes influence the morale of their student teachers" (Byler & Byler, 1984, p. 27).

Spruce (1979) stated that the attitudes of the cooperating classroom teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers toward teaching as a profession. Hanes et al. (1984) found that Kentucky student teachers were concerned about being placed with cooperating teachers of
different temperament and philosophies than their own. Curtis (1985) made comments on the attitudes of teachers during the taping of an interview for a class on the history and development of vocational agriculture at Louisiana State University. He pointed out that recruiting efforts of university departments of agricultural education are being hampered by the attitudes of teachers presently out in the field and that hopefully, only cooperating classroom teachers with positive attitudes toward teaching as a profession will be used.

Queen and Gretes (1982) found that a majority of the first year teachers in North Carolina felt their cooperating teachers and college supervisors prepared them well during student teaching for their first classroom positions.

The literature reviewed indicated that the cooperating classroom teachers should support the student teachers' efforts prior to and during student teaching. The cooperating classroom teacher should meet with the student teacher before the student teaching experience begins to establish lines of communication. Research also indicated that the lines of communication are sometimes lacking. The cooperating classroom teachers should support the efforts of the student teacher by exhibiting good morale while observing and evaluating the student teacher.
Role and Influence of the University Supervisor

Zimpher, Devoss and Nott (1980) found that the university supervisor defines and communicates expectations for student teaching to the students and cooperating teachers, acts as a personal confident to the cooperating teacher and student teacher and helps to deal with problems with school principals.

While evaluating the student teaching program at The Ohio State University, Pfister (1983) found there was disagreement over the degree of influence the university supervisor has on the student teacher and that "student teachers working with certain university supervisors consistently demonstrated higher positive attitudes than student teachers working with other university supervisors" (p. 30).

The university supervisor is responsible for placing the student teacher in an appropriate department and guiding the student teacher through a successful teaching program. Andrews (1964) divides the role of the university supervisor into the following seven categories:

1. Liaison agent between college and school
2. Placement and planning
3. Relations with cooperating teachers
4. Supervision of student teachers
5. Evaluation of student teachers
6. Service to cooperating schools
7. Service to college (p. 64-65)
Andrews further described the responsibilities of the university supervisor as follows:

1. The university supervisor acts as a liaison agent between college and schools.

2. The university supervisor works as a public relations consultant visiting schools and teachers constantly searching for high quality schools and additional cooperating teachers.

3. The university supervisor should get acquainted with the cooperating teacher before the student teacher arrives and provide the cooperating teacher with professional and personal information on the student teacher and the nature of the assignment and its relation to the college curriculum.

4. The university supervisor should serve in a counselor relationship with student teachers before, during and after student teaching.

5. The university supervisor should assist the cooperating teacher in planning and carrying through a program of evaluation of the student teacher and developing the student teacher's self-evaluation.

6. The university supervisor assists the college in developing and modifying professional programs in response to problems and changing conditions in the schools and communities. (p. 64-67)
In a national study on the management of student teaching in agricultural education, Kirts and Claycomb (1981) found that 25% of the university supervisors made less than 3 visits to their student teaching centers although it is recommended in The Standards for Quality Vocational Programs in Agricultural/Agribusiness Education that university supervisors visit the student teaching center three times. In a study of effective supervisory behavior of college supervisors by Rothman (1981), secondary school cooperating classroom teachers from all program areas recommended that university supervisors visit the student teacher weekly and hold conferences with members of the student teaching pyramid (student teachers, cooperating classroom teachers and university supervisors). It was also recommended that university supervisors maintain strong ties with participating schools and that they keep the lines of communication open with the cooperating classroom teacher (Rothman, 1981).

Byler and Byler (1984) measured the morale of student teachers before and after student teaching and made the following recommendations:

1. An analysis of current teaching programs and procedures should be considered since the less positive factors involved the university preparation and supervision.

2. The university supervisor should present a positive attitude toward the professionalism of teaching and
they should try to transmit this attitude to cooperating teachers (p. 27).

During a case study of the relationship between student teachers and university supervisors, Konefal (1981) found that seminars were an important aspect of the academic and professional growth of the student teacher. The university supervisor-student teacher relationship was an important factor in the student teaching experience and feedback given student teachers by the university supervisor was important (Konefal, 1981).

Drake University graduates felt that student teaching was a major strength in their education experiences. Yet, these same students felt that a weakness of the student teaching program was a lack of supervision and advisement (Mickelson, 1984).

The literature reviewed indicates that the university supervisor should support the student teacher prior to, during, and after student teaching. The university supervisor should prepare both the cooperating classroom teachers and student teachers for the student teaching experience. During the time the student teacher is out in the school, the university supervisor should support the efforts of the cooperating classroom teachers and student teachers through observation, evaluation, and feedback. Following the student teaching experience the university supervisor should conduct follow up seminars involving cooperating classroom teachers and student teachers.
Summary

Cruickshank and Armaline (1986) pointed out, "proponents and critics generally accept student teaching as the most important phase of teacher education, yet limited research has been done to actually measure the effectiveness of student teaching" (p. 35). The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of student teaching in agricultural education as perceived by first year teachers, university supervisors, and cooperating classroom teachers.

Significant studies included in the review of literature were Kirts and Claycomb's 1981 national study of student teaching management in agricultural education and Pfister's 1983 study evaluating the student teaching program at Ohio State University.

Objectives of student teaching and desirable student teaching experiences were identified. Research results such as appropriate length for student teaching are inconclusive. There was agreement in the literature that student teaching programs should be evaluated periodically by the three groups comprising the student teaching pyramid. Previous research indicated that a lack of communication between the groups was the most frequent factor jeopardizing the completion of the student teaching experience.

The literature related to sources of preparation raised concerns about the technical competence of student teachers. Researchers also identified concerns related to methods of operation of secondary schools and teacher preparation programs.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Data were collected from first year teachers of vocational agriculture, university supervisors of student teaching and cooperating classroom teachers. Student teaching in agricultural education was described and evaluated. First year teachers rated their perceived preparedness for teaching and the contribution of three major sources of preparedness: university agricultural education courses, student teaching, and on-the-job/self study. Mean preparedness scores were calculated for each of the following areas of responsibility of a vocational agriculture teacher: program planning, classroom and laboratory instruction, Future Farmers of America (FFA), supervised occupational experience programs, public relations/advisory committees, and adult education. Ratings for preparedness were examined using multiple regression analysis to determine the variance in the total preparedness score explained by components of the preservice program and characteristics of the teachers.

Populations

Three target populations were identified as desirable sources of information for accomplishing the objectives of the study. The populations were comprised of individuals directly involved in agricultural education student teaching programs during the Fall, 1984, and Spring, 1985 semesters in the Southern Region of the United States. The states in the southern region are identified in the Constitution and Bylaws.
of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture. These states are: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia.

One population consisted of first year teachers employed during the 1985-86 school year who completed student teaching in the Fall of 1984 or Spring of 1985. The second population was comprised of all cooperating classroom teachers with whom the first year vocational agriculture teachers were placed as student teachers in the Fall of 1984 and Spring of 1985. The third population was all university personnel supervising the student teachers involved in this study.

The frames of the populations were established using the following procedure: The Directory of Agricultural Teacher Educators (1985) was used to determine the names and addresses of agricultural education department heads in the 42 institutions in the southern region. The 42 department heads identified university coordinators of the agricultural education student teaching programs at their institutions. Thirty-five coordinators of agricultural education student teaching supplied names and addresses of the first year teachers, university supervisors, and cooperating classroom teachers involved in the Fall, 1984, and Spring, 1985, student teaching programs at their institution.

Contact with coordinators of student teaching at each institution identified 117 graduates who were teaching during the 1985-86 school year. Fifty-nine university supervisors
and 157 cooperating classroom teachers who worked with first year teachers during their student teaching were also identified. Some of the student teachers were placed in multiple teacher departments and were supervised by more than one cooperating classroom teacher resulting in a larger number of cooperating teachers than student teachers.

The most current vocational agriculture teacher directory was obtained from each state supervisor of vocational agriculture to verify the accuracy of addresses of the first year teachers and cooperating classroom teachers.

**Instrumentation**

Three instruments were developed and used to collect the data for this study. The three instruments will be discussed separately in this section.

**First Year Teacher Questionnaire**

The first year teacher questionnaire was developed, validated and pilot tested to assess completeness and determine reliability. In the initial development of the instrument, a list of competencies that beginning teachers should be prepared to accomplish were developed by examining competency studies conducted by Hylton (1979), Everett (1977), Rawls and Fatunsin (1985), Shippy (1981), and Saladaga (1981).

First year teachers rated their self-perceived level of preparedness for each activity. The first year teacher questionnaire also contained sections pertaining to demographic information, the structure of student teaching,
and perceptions of its effectiveness. A copy of the first year teacher questionnaire is included in Appendix H.

First year teachers rated their degree of preparation for teaching using a Likert-type scale with 1 = unprepared and 5 = very well prepared for activities in the following areas: program planning, classroom and laboratory instruction, FFA, supervised occupational experience programs, public relations/advisory committees, and adult education.

First year teachers also indicated their perceptions of the contribution to their perceived preparedness from three sources: university agricultural education courses, student teaching, and on-the-job/self-study. A Likert-type scale with 1 = no contribution and 5 = very high contribution was used to collect the data for each source.

The first year teacher questionnaire was examined for content validity. Six agricultural education graduate students, 7 agricultural education student teachers, and 4 agricultural education faculty members at Louisiana State University reviewed the first year teacher questionnaire. Thirty-two first year graduates outside the southern region also completed the questionnaire as part of the validation process. Recommendations from these groups were used to modify the first year teacher questionnaire to increase the content validity of the instrument.

Data were collected as a pilot test to assess the reliability of the instrument from the 32 first year teachers.
from outside the southern region. The data were analyzed for internal consistency utilizing Cronbach's Alpha as a test for instrument reliability. The reliability of the Likert-type total preparedness scale from the pilot test of the first year teacher questionnaire was alpha = .91.

The pilot test participants were asked to indicate from a list of 5 sources, the most important source of preparedness. Based on the responses from the pilot test, 3 sources were included on the final instrument. First year teachers were asked to rate the level of contribution from each of the 3 sources on the final instrument.

The final instrument reliability was checked again using the data received from the first year graduates included in the study (N = 59). The reliability as measured by Cronbach's Alpha ranged from .94 to .98.

The following scale reliabilities were achieved:
1. Self perceived preparedness .97
2. Contribution of university agriculture education courses toward preparedness .98
3. Contribution of on-the-job/self study toward preparedness .94
4. Contribution of student teaching toward preparedness .97

University Supervisor Questionnaire

The university supervisor questionnaire was developed, examined for content validity and pilot tested to assess reliability. Six agricultural education graduate students
and 4 agricultural education faculty members at Louisiana State University reviewed the questionnaire. Fourteen university supervisors from outside the Southern Region of the United States also reviewed and completed the questionnaire. Recommendations from these groups were used to modify the university supervisor questionnaire to increase the validity of the instrument.

Data were collected as a pilot test of the instrument from the 14 university supervisors from outside the southern region. The data were analyzed for internal consistency utilizing Cronbach’s Alpha as a test for instrument reliability. The reliability of the Likert-type scale measuring level of agreement with statements pertaining to perceived effectiveness of student teaching from the pilot test was alpha = .80.

The questionnaire was used to obtain demographic information and data about the structure of student teaching and its perceived effectiveness. University supervisors indicated their level of agreement with statements measuring perceived effectiveness of the components of the student teaching triad using a Likert-type scale with 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. A copy of the university supervisor questionnaire is included in Appendix J.

Instrument reliability was checked again using data received from the 52 university supervisors included in the study. The reliability of the Likert-type scale measuring level of agreement with statements pertaining to perceived
effectiveness of student teaching was $\alpha = 0.59$. This low reliability may be due to the university supervisors perceiving the items on the questionnaire as two different scales.

**Cooperating Classroom Teacher Questionnaire**

The cooperating teacher questionnaire was developed, validated and pilot tested to assess reliability. The cooperating classroom teacher questionnaire was examined for content validity. Six agricultural education graduate students and 4 agricultural education faculty members at Louisiana State University reviewed the questionnaire. Additionally, 21 cooperating classroom teachers from outside the southern region reviewed and completed the questionnaire. Recommendations from these groups were used to modify the cooperating classroom teacher questionnaire to increase the validity of the research.

Reliability was not checked on the cooperating classroom teacher pilot test instrument because of a lack of continuous scale items. Significant revisions were made in the cooperating classroom teacher instrument which included the addition of opinion statements. Responses to these statements were analyzed for reliability using the data collected from 112 cooperating classroom teachers.

The questionnaire was used to collect demographic information and data on the structure of student teaching and its perceived effectiveness. Cooperating classroom teachers indicated their level of agreement with statements measuring
perceived effectiveness of the components of the student teaching triad using a Likert-type scale with 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. A copy of the cooperating classroom teacher questionnaire is included in Appendix K.

The data were analyzed for internal consistency utilizing Cronbach's Alpha as a test for instrument reliability. The reliability of the Likert-type scale measuring level of agreement with statements pertaining to perceived effectiveness of student teaching was alpha = .76.

Data Collection

Each population was sent the appropriate questionnaire through the mail. Accompanying the instrument was a cover letter explaining the purposes of the study and a pre-addressed stamped envelope for returning the questionnaire. Three weeks after each initial mailing, a second questionnaire and cover letter was mailed to non-respondents. A copy of cover letters mailed to the 3 groups are included in Appendix G.

Fifty-nine of the 117 (50.4%) first year teachers responded after two mailings of the questionnaire. A random sample of 30 (50%) non-respondents was telephoned and asked selected questions from the instrument. Responses to randomly selected questions from the first year teachers contacted by telephone were not significantly different from those responding by mail.

Fifty-two of the 58 (89%) university supervisors completed the questionnaire. It was discovered during data
collection that one university supervisor was deceased, thus reducing the frame of this group from 59 to 58. No follow up of non-responding university supervisors was attempted due to the 89% response rate.

One hundred twelve of the 157 (71%) cooperating classroom teachers responded after two mailings. A random sample of 12 (25%) non-responding cooperating classroom teachers was contacted by phone and administered the full questionnaire. Significant differences in phone versus mail respondents were found for 6 of the 19 items. The phone results were not included in the data analysis and limits to the generalizability of the responses from the cooperating classroom teachers should be noted.

Summary of Statistical Procedures by Objectives

The statistical procedures used to analyze the data for each of the major objectives of the study are listed as follows:

Objective one: Description of Agricultural Education Student Teaching in the Southern Region

The purpose of objective one was to describe student teaching in agricultural education as perceived by first year teachers, university supervisors, and cooperating classroom teachers. To accomplish this objective, frequencies, percentages and means were calculated for the responses to items describing components of the student teaching experience. First year graduates, university supervisors and cooperating classroom teachers indicated their level of
agreement with statements measuring the importance of student teaching.

First year graduates and cooperating classroom teachers rated overall effectiveness of university supervision during student teaching. First year graduates and university supervisors rated overall effectiveness of the cooperating classroom teachers used during student teaching. Means and standard deviations were calculated for the responses to the statements utilizing a Likert-type scale.

**Objective two: Self-Perceived Preparedness of First Year Teachers**

The purpose of objective two was to determine first year teachers' self-perceived preparedness for teaching vocational agriculture. To accomplish this objective, individual responses to items measuring perceived preparedness to perform activities were summed and averaged to obtain a mean preparedness score.

**Objective three: Contribution of Sources of Preparation**

The purpose of objective three was to identify the perceptions of first year teachers of vocational agriculture regarding sources of self-perceived preparedness. Responses from the first year teachers were summed and averaged to calculate mean contribution scores for preparedness from university agricultural education courses, on-the-job/self study and student teaching.
Objective four: Variance in Preparedness Scores

The purpose of objective four was to identify significant sources of variance in perceived preparedness explained by components of the preservice program and characteristics of the first year teachers of vocational agriculture. Stepwise multiple regression was used to examine the variance in the first year teachers' preparedness scores. The dependent variable was self-perceived preparedness and the independent variables were sources of preparedness, length of student teaching and selected personal and professional characteristics of first year teachers.

Pearson's zero order correlation coefficients were calculated to determine if relationships existed between the following variables and total preparedness: years of FFA membership, contribution to preparedness of university agricultural education courses, on-the-job/self study, and student teaching, hours of agricultural education, length of student teaching, number of university supervisor visits, high school years of vocational agriculture taken, effectiveness of university supervision and effectiveness of cooperating classroom teachers. A Kendall's Tau correlation coefficient was calculated to determine if a relationship existed between preparedness and the ordinal data of grade point average.

Identification of variables to include in the regression equation was accomplished in the following manner: The zero
order correlation coefficients were examined to determine those variables sufficiently correlated with perceived preparedness to be included in the regression equation. Variables accounting for less than 1% of the variation in perceived preparedness were not included in the regression analysis.

Summary

The results of the procedures used to analyze the data will be presented in the next chapter. Chapter IV will contain sections describing student teaching, self-perceived preparedness of first year teachers, contribution of sources of preparedness, and an examination of the variance in the preparedness scores.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Data are presented in this chapter from the three populations included in the study. The populations were comprised of those individuals directly involved in agriculture education student teaching programs during the Fall, 1984, and Spring, 1985 semesters from the AATEA Southern Region of the United States. The populations consisted of first year teachers employed during the 1985-86 school year who completed student teaching in the Fall of 1984 and Spring of 1985, cooperating classroom teachers with whom the first year vocational agriculture teachers were placed, and university personnel supervising student teachers involved in the study.

Characteristics of Respondents

First Year Graduates

Age of the first year graduates ranged from 23-52 with a mean age of 27.1 years and a standard deviation of 6.2. Ninety-three percent (55) of the respondents were male. First year graduates indicated that they completed from 8 to 38 semester hours of agricultural education courses. The mean number of hours of agricultural education taken was 21 with a standard deviation of 7.9.

Eighty-six percent of the first year graduates were enrolled in vocational agriculture during high school. The mean number of years of vocational agriculture taken prior to college was 3.2 and the range in years of vocational
agriculture taken prior to college was 0 to 5 years.

All of the respondents who were enrolled in vocational agriculture were members of the Future Farmers of America (FFA). Fifty-one out of 58 (88%) of the respondents belonged to their state vocational agriculture teachers' organization. As shown in Table 1, 98% (58) of the respondents indicated they had an undergraduate grade point average above 2.5. Sixty-one percent of the respondents reported an undergraduate grade point average of 3.0 or above.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade point average</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-3.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.49-3.0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.99-2.5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.49 or less</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Supervisors

University supervisors ranged in age from 31 to 68. The average age of the university supervisors was 47 with a standard deviation of 10.0. Ninety-eight percent (51) of the university supervisors were male.

University supervisors had supervised student teachers from 1 to 26 years with a mean of 13.8 years and standard deviation of 6.5. Respondents indicated the number of student teachers they had supervised during their professional career ranged from 4 to 750 students with a mean of 153 and standard deviation of 156.4. The mode was 200 students and the median was 100. Four percent of the university supervisors were graduate assistants, 20% were assistant professors, 29% were associate professors, and 47% were full professors. Ninety-six percent of the university supervisors had a doctoral degree and 4% had a master's degree.

Cooperating Classroom Teachers

The cooperating classroom teachers ranged in age from 28 to 62. The average age of the cooperating classroom teachers was 41 with a standard deviation of 8.1. All of the responding cooperating classroom teachers were male.

The cooperating classroom teachers had supervised student teachers from 1 to 29 years with a mean of 11.1 years and standard deviation of 6.4. The number of student teachers supervised during their professional career ranged from 1 to 119 with a mean of 13 and standard deviation of
13.5. The mode was 12 students and the median was 10.5. Fourteen percent of the responding classroom teachers had a bachelor's degree, 55% had a master's degree and 34% had attained a degree above the master's degree.

Description of Student Teaching Experiences

The reported length of student teaching for the first year teachers ranged from 6 to 18 weeks as indicated in Table 2. Table 2 also contains opinions of first year teachers regarding the desired length of student teaching. As indicated by the clustering of values above the diagonal, the majority of first year graduates believed that their student teaching should have lasted longer.

The average length of student teaching completed was 9.4 weeks with a standard deviation of 4.86. Eighty percent of the respondents completed less than 12 weeks of student teaching. Opinions as to how long student teaching should last ranged from 6 to 36 weeks with a mean of 12.79 weeks and a standard deviation of 4.86. Eighty-nine percent (51) of the respondents student taught all day. Eleven percent (6) of the respondents student taught for a half day.

Opinions as to how long student teaching should last were also obtained from university supervisors and cooperating classroom teachers. The university supervisors indicated student teaching should last 11 weeks (\( \bar{m} = 10.86 \)). The cooperating classroom teachers indicated student teaching should last 12 weeks (\( \bar{m} = 12 \)).
### Table 2

**Recommended Lengths of Student Teaching in Weeks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks of student teaching completed</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Numbers above and below diagonal represent number of respondents recommending that length.*
Perceptions from all three groups regarding the length of student teaching are shown in Table 3. Responses are divided for groups where student teaching was less than 12 weeks versus 12 or more weeks. Regardless of the length of student teaching, a majority of the respondents in all three groups indicated that the length was "about right". For example, 76.9% of the university supervisors who worked with student teachers less than 12 weeks believed that time was about right. An identical percentage, 76.9% of the university supervisors who worked with student teachers 12 weeks or more believed that time was about right.

The largest percentage of respondents (42.6%) indicating that the time spent in student teaching was too short was in the group of first year teachers who student taught for less than 12 weeks. Cooperating classroom teachers working with student teachers less than twelve weeks were in close agreement with the opinions of their student teachers. Thirty-nine percent of the cooperating classroom teachers supervising student teachers less than twelve weeks thought the time was too short.

The three groups believed that student teaching should be held during the spring semester for students to receive the most needed experiences. Seventy percent of the university supervisors, 65% of the cooperating classroom teachers, and 64% of the first year graduates indicated that student teaching should be during the spring semester.
Table 3
Agreement With Length of Student Teaching By Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Length of student teaching</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>less than 12 weeks</td>
<td>12 or more weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too short(^a)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.6(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too long</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too short</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too long</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating classroom teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too short</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too long</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Perceptions of appropriateness of length of student teaching
\(^b\)Percent of those student teaching less than 12 weeks
A wide range of responses was obtained when first year teachers were asked how many times the university supervisor visited them during student teaching. The number of reported university supervisor visits ranged from 1 to 19 visits with a mean number of visits of 3.3 (SD = 2.7). University supervisors indicated they made 2 to 8 visits to the student teaching site with a mean of 3.5 visits (SD = 1.0). Cooperating classroom teachers indicated that the university supervisor visited from 1 to 7 times with a mean of 3.0 visits (SD = 1.1) during student teaching. Collectively, considering the responses from the three groups, the average number of visits made by the university supervisors fell between 3.0 to 3.5 visits.

Courses reported by first year graduates as taught while student teaching are presented in Table 4. Eighty-five percent (50) taught Vocational Agriculture I, 73% (43) taught Vocational Agriculture II, 69% (41) taught Vocational Agriculture III, 44% (26) taught Vocational Agriculture IV, 36% (21) taught agricultural lab courses, and 5% (3) taught cooperative agriculture education courses. Twenty-seven percent of the first year graduates (16) taught other specialized courses which included: animal science, welding, power tools, electricity, building construction, crop production, exploratory agriculture, shop, greenhouse, agricultural mechanics, horticulture, Agriculture V and vocational center courses.
Table 4

Courses Taught During Student Teaching by First Year Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses taught</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture I</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture II</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture III</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture IV</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Lab</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Agricultural Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents may have taught a multiple of these courses. Therefore, percentages do not equal 100.

Effectiveness of Supervision, Coursework and Facilities

The overall effectiveness of university supervision, cooperating classroom teachers, education courses, technical agriculture courses and adequacy of facilities used during student teaching is reported in Table 5.

Responses of the three groups were analyzed by computing means for each of the selected aspects of the student teaching experience. A scale was developed by the researcher to allow for meaningful and consistent interpretation of the results of these mean scores.
### Table 5

**Effectiveness of Components of Student Teaching Experiences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>First year teachers</th>
<th>University supervisors</th>
<th>Cooperating teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD) (N=59)</td>
<td>Mean (SD) (N=52)</td>
<td>Mean (SD) (N=112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of university supervision</td>
<td>3.66 (1.20)</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>3.93 (.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of cooperating teacher(s)</td>
<td>4.46 (1.02)</td>
<td>4.08 (.62)</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of education courses in preparation for student teaching</td>
<td>2.95 (1.24)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of technical agriculture courses in preparation for student teaching</td>
<td>3.92 (.97)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of facilities of departments used for student teaching</td>
<td>4.15 (.83)</td>
<td>3.92 (.68)</td>
<td>4.14 (.72)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Means based on scale of 1=low and 5=high

*a*Not asked of this group.
The mean levels of effectiveness were interpreted using the values shown on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderately Low</th>
<th>Moderately Moderate</th>
<th>Moderately High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, the effectiveness of selected aspects of the student teaching experience were rated moderately high. The lowest rating ($m = 2.95$) was given by first year teachers concerning the effectiveness of general education courses in preparation for student teaching. The highest rating ($m = 4.46$) was given by first year teachers concerning overall effectiveness of the cooperating classroom teachers used during student teaching.

The university supervisors rated the effectiveness of the cooperating classroom teachers the highest ($m = 4.08$). The cooperating classroom teachers rated the effectiveness of the university supervision as moderately high ($m = 3.93$). The three groups rated the adequacy of the facilities of the vocational agriculture departments used during student teaching as moderately high. The cooperating classroom teachers rated the adequacy of the facilities the highest ($m = 4.14$).

**Evaluation of the Student Teaching Triad**

First year teachers, university supervisors and cooperating classroom teachers were asked to indicate their level of agreement with statements pertaining to the student teaching experience. Responses of the three groups were analyzed by computing means for each of the items. A scale
was developed by the researcher to allow for meaningful and consistent interpretation of the results of these mean scores and for all other mean scores measuring levels of agreement. The mean levels of agreement were analyzed and discussed using the values shown on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Teaching and Student Teachers**

Results concerning levels of agreement with statements pertaining to student teaching are found in Table 6. Overall, the three groups of respondents were pleased with the student teaching experience. Respondents generally agreed with the six positively worded statements and disagreed with the two negatively worded statements.

First year teachers agreed most strongly with the statement "student teaching was a positive experience" (m = 4.37). The first year teacher group also disagreed most strongly (m = 1.46) with the statement "student teachers learn very little from student teaching."

First year teachers, university supervisors and cooperating classroom teachers agreed with the statement "student teaching was the most valuable component of the teacher education program." The university supervisors responses to the statement "student teachers learn very little from student teaching" resulted in the lowest mean rating (m = 1.40) for this group. Responses from the cooperating classroom teacher group to the statement "student
Table 6

Level of Agreement With Statements Pertaining to Student Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=52)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=110)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating classroom teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching was a positive experience</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was pleased with student teaching experience</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching is the most valuable component of the teacher education program</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching experiences encourage student teachers to become teachers</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teachers were encouraged to try a variety of teaching methods by the cooperating classroom teachers</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
(Table 6 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>First year tchrs.</th>
<th>University supervisors</th>
<th>Cooperating classroom teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching is a realistic example of teaching</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teachers' work loads are too heavy</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teachers learn very little from student teaching</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means based on scale of 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=undecided, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree.

teachers learn very little from student teaching" resulted in the lowest mean of 1.44. All three groups disagreed with the statement "student teachers' work loads are too heavy."

University Supervision

An evaluation of university supervision of student teachers is presented in Table 7. Responses of the three groups were analyzed by computing means for each of the items.
Table 7  
Level of Agreement With Statements Pertaining to the University Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean (N=59)</th>
<th>Mean (N=52)</th>
<th>Mean (N=110)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The university supervisor(s) used constructive criticism when discussing the student teachers work</td>
<td>4.09 .79</td>
<td>- .70</td>
<td>4.16 .70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teachers had time to discuss their teaching problems with the university supervisor(s)</td>
<td>3.97 .98</td>
<td>- .65</td>
<td>4.16 .65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university supervisor(s) were a real help to the student teachers</td>
<td>3.83 1.10</td>
<td>- .70</td>
<td>4.10 .70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The length of the university supervisor(s) observation was sufficient for evaluating student teachers</td>
<td>3.80 1.10</td>
<td>4.04 .59</td>
<td>3.86 .97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
(Table 7 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>First year tchrs.</th>
<th>University supervisors</th>
<th>Cooperating teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The university supervisor(s) visited the student teaching centers often enough</td>
<td>3.78 (N=59)</td>
<td>3.73 (N=52)</td>
<td>3.81 (N=110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university supervisor's conferences were a real help to the student teachers</td>
<td>3.71 (N=59)</td>
<td>- (N=52)</td>
<td>4.07 (N=110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student teachers were at ease when the university supervisor(s) observed them</td>
<td>3.61 (N=59)</td>
<td>3.40 (N=52)</td>
<td>3.25 (N=110)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Mean based on scale of 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=undecided, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree.

*Not asked of this group*

Respondents generally agreed with the statements pertaining to the quality of university supervision during student teaching (means ranging from 4.16 to 3.61). First year teachers (m = 4.09) and cooperating classroom teachers (m = 4.16) agreed most strongly with the statement that "the university supervisors used constructive criticism when discussing the student teachers' work." University supervisors (m = 4.04), agreed most strongly with the
statement that the length of the university supervisors' observations was sufficient for evaluating student teachers. The first year teachers (m = 3.78), university supervisors (m = 3.78), and cooperating classroom teachers (m = 3.81) agreed with the statement "the university supervisor(s) visited the student teaching centers often enough."

First year graduates believed that they were at ease when the university supervisor visited (m = 3.61). The university supervisors (m = 3.40) and cooperating classroom teachers (m = 3.25) were undecided about the statement "the student teachers were at ease when the university supervisor(s) observed them."

The Cooperating Classroom Teacher

Means and standard deviations regarding levels of agreement with statements pertaining to the cooperating classroom teacher are presented in Table 8. Responses of first year teachers and university supervisors were analyzed by computing means for each item.

First year teachers and university supervisors agreed with the statements concerning recommending the cooperating classroom teachers previously used for student teaching to other student teachers and keeping the lines of communication open with the student teachers. First year teachers (m = 1.63) and university supervisors (m = 2.00) disagreed with the statement "the cooperating classroom teachers interfered with student teachers' control of the class."
Table 8

Level of Agreement With Statements Pertaining to the Cooperating Classroom Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean (SD) First year tchrs.</th>
<th>Mean (SD) University supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The cooperating classroom teacher(s) used should be recommended to other student teachers</td>
<td>4.41 (.97)</td>
<td>3.90 (.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cooperating classroom teacher(s) kept the lines of communication open with the student teachers</td>
<td>4.32 (.99)</td>
<td>4.02 (.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating classroom teacher(s) should be required to take a course on supervision of student teachers</td>
<td>2.71 (1.34)</td>
<td>3.44 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cooperating classroom teacher(s) interfered with student teachers' control of the class</td>
<td>1.63 (.83)</td>
<td>2.00 (.85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means based on scale of 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=undecided, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree.

The first year teachers (m = 2.71) and the university supervisors (m = 3.44) were undecided about the statement that the cooperating classroom teachers should be required to take a course on supervision of student teachers.
Preparation to Teach

First year teachers rated their degree of preparation for teaching vocational agriculture using a Likert-type scale with 1 = unprepared and 5 = very well prepared. Mean preparedness scores were calculated for each of the following areas: program planning, supervised occupational experience programs, classroom and laboratory instruction, FFA, public relations/advisory committees, and adult education.

A scale was used to allow for meaningful and consistent interpretation of the results of these mean scores. The mean levels of preparedness were interpreted for each area using the values shown on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unprepared</th>
<th>Poorly</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Very Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-----------</td>
<td>1-------</td>
<td>1----------</td>
<td>1----</td>
<td>1---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.49 2.49 3.49 4.49 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Planning

Mean preparedness scores for program planning were calculated by summing and averaging responses for the six items of the program planning scale. The overall mean for self-perceived preparedness in program planning was 3.30 as shown in Table 9.

First year teachers believed they were well prepared to determine student needs ($\bar{m} = 3.58$) and to develop written program plans ($\bar{m} = 3.54$). These first year vocational agriculture teachers also indicated acceptable preparation in overall program planning ($\bar{m} = 3.30$). The lowest rated item was for preparing departmental budgets ($\bar{m} = 2.73$).
Table 9

Perceived Preparedness for Program Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine student needs</td>
<td>3.5S</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop written program plans</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4 year course of study)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete required report forms</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the vocational agriculture/agribusiness program</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a summer program of work</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare departmental budgets</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program planning preparedness</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Overall Mean)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means based on scale of 1=unprepared, 2=poorly prepared, 3=acceptable preparation, 4=well prepared, 5=very well prepared. N = 59

Future Farmers of America

Table 10 contains the mean preparedness scores for FFA activities. The first year graduates perceived they were well prepared for advising the FFA chapter ($m = 3.63$).

Specifically, first year teachers believed they were well prepared to assist students in conducting FFA meetings ($m = 3.95$), orienting students to the FFA ($m = 3.88$), and participating in competitive activities ($m = 3.79$).
Table 10

**Perceived Preparedness for Advising the FFA Chapter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist students in conducting FFA meetings</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orient students to FFA</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist students in participating in competitive activities</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare students for leadership roles in FFA</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise students in advancing in degrees of FFA membership</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise students in developing a program of activities</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise students in the conduct of banquets</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist students in conducting fund raising activities</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness for advising FFA (Overall Mean)</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Means based on scale of 1=unprepared, 2=poorly prepared, 3=acceptable preparation, 4=well prepared, 5=very well prepared. N = 59

The respondents believed they were acceptably prepared to supervise FFA banquets (m = 3.39) and fund raising activities (m = 3.27).
Classroom and Laboratory Instruction

Mean preparedness scores for first year graduates in the area of classroom and laboratory instruction are presented in Table 11. Overall, first year teachers perceived they were well prepared \((\bar{m} = 3.81)\) for conducting classroom and laboratory instruction.

The first year teachers believed they were well prepared for using a variety of audio visual aids \((\bar{m} = 4.18)\), which was the highest rated activity. The first year teachers believed they had an acceptable level of preparation in maintaining an inventory of departmental equipment \((\bar{m} = 3.48)\) and a filing system \((\bar{m} = 3.37)\). Maintaining a filing system was the lowest rated activity.

Public Relations/Advisory Committees

First year graduates indicated they were well prepared to establish a good public relations program \((\bar{m} = 3.83)\) as indicated in Table 12. When asked how well they believed they were prepared to keep the community up-to-date through publicity, teachers indicated acceptable preparation \((\bar{m} = 3.44)\).

The self-perceived preparedness of the teachers to use advisory committees resulted in a mean rating of 3.15 (acceptable preparation). The values were summed and averaged to calculate an overall preparedness score for public relations/advisory committees. Overall, the teachers perceived their preparation as acceptable \((\bar{m} = 3.48)\).
Table 11

Preparedness for Classroom and Laboratory Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use variety of audiovisual aids</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for safety of students</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use variety of teaching techniques</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare daily lesson plans</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain instructional materials</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain student discipline</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide guidance to students</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate students to learn</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain school agriculture laboratories</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate student performance</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use techniques to develop student interest</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain an inventory of equipment</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a filing system</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness for classroom and laboratory instruction (Overall Mean)</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means based on 1=unprepared, 2=poorly prepared, 3=acceptable preparation, 4=well prepared, 5=very well prepared. N = 59
Table 12

**Perceived Preparedness for Public Relations/Advisory Committees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish a good public relations program</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep community up to date through publicity</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use advisory committees</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness for advisory committees/public relations (Overall Mean)</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means based on scale of 1=unprepared, 2=poorly prepared, 3=acceptable preparation, 4=well prepared, 5=very well prepared. N = 59

**Adult Education**

Table 13 contains the mean preparedness scores in the area of adult education. The first year vocational agriculture teachers indicated an acceptable level of preparedness for providing adult education ($m = 2.99$). First year teachers indicated an acceptable level of preparation for all four of the activities dealing with adult education programs. Of the six areas of responsibility, first year teachers perceived themselves least prepared for conducting adult education programs.
Table 13
Perceived Preparedness for Providing Adult Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use resource persons in the adult education program</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess needs of adults in community</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use teaching strategies appropriate for adults</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize an adult education program</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness for adult education</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Overall Mean)

Note. Means based on scale of 1=unprepared, 2=poorly prepared, 3=acceptable preparation, 4=well prepared, 5=very well prepared. N = 59

Supervised Occupational Experience (SOE)

First year teachers rated their preparedness in the area of supervised occupational experience as shown in Table 14. The resulting overall mean preparedness score for supervised occupational experience was 3.54 indicating that the first year teachers believed they were well prepared in this area.

Specifically first year teachers believed they were well prepared for the following SOE supervisory activities: make SOE visits on farms (m = 3.93) develop production SOE programs (m = 3.70), establish SOE programs (m = 3.68), assist students in keeping records (m = 3.63).
Table 14

Perceived Preparedness for Supervised Occupational Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make SOE visits on farms</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop production SOE programs</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish supervised occupational experience programs</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist students in keeping and analyzing records</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students select placement SOE sites</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise placement SOE programs</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide directed lab SOE programs</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness for SOE programs (Overall Mean)</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means based on scale of 1=unprepared, 2=poorly prepared, 3=acceptable preparation, 4=well prepared, 5=very well prepared. N = 59

The first year teachers believed they were acceptably prepared for supervising placement SOE programs ($m = 3.29$) and providing directed lab SOE programs ($m = 3.14$).

Overall perceived preparedness for teaching is summarized in Table 15. First year teachers rated their preparation for classroom and laboratory instruction the highest ($m = 3.81$).
Table 15

Overall Perceived Preparedness of First Year Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom and Laboratory Instruction</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Farmers of America</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised Occupational Experience</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations/Advisory Committees</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Planning</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Preparedness (Overall Mean)</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means based on scale of 1=unprepared, 2=poorly prepared, 3=acceptable preparation, 4=well prepared, 5=very well prepared. N = 59

Perceived preparedness for conducting adult education programs was rated the lowest (mean = 2.99). For all areas, the first year teachers rated their preparation between the categories of acceptable and well prepared.

Self-Perceived Sources of Preparedness

Sources of perceived preparedness for each of the six areas of teacher responsibility were determined. The contribution of university agricultural education courses, on-the-job/self study, and student teaching were calculated
as mean values. A scale was used to allow for meaningful and consistent interpretation of the results of these mean scores. The mean contribution scores for each of the six areas of teacher responsibility were interpreted using the following scale ranging from 1 = no contribution to 5 = high contribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No contribution</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Planning**

Sources of preparedness for the area of program planning are shown in Table 16. The contribution of university agricultural education courses, on-the-job/self study, and student teaching are indicated as mean values.

The perceived contribution of university agricultural education courses was the highest for the activity of developing written program plans ($m = 3.54$). The perceived contribution of on-the-job/self study was the highest for the following activities: evaluate agriculture education programs, complete report forms, maintain summer program of work, and prepare departmental budgets. The perceived contribution of student teaching was highest ($m = 3.72$) for the activity of determining student needs.

All three sources were rated as providing a moderate level of contribution toward overall preparedness for program planning. On-the-job/self study received the highest mean rating of 3.35 for contribution to program planning.
Table 16

Mean Contribution of Sources of Preparedness for Program Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Univ. ag. ed. courses</th>
<th>On-the-job/ self study</th>
<th>Student teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop written program plans</td>
<td>3.54 1.07</td>
<td>3.26 1.03</td>
<td>3.19 1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine student needs</td>
<td>3.29 .97</td>
<td>3.61 1.01</td>
<td>3.72 .94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate agriculture programs</td>
<td>3.22 1.01</td>
<td>3.54 1.03</td>
<td>3.27 1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete report forms</td>
<td>3.21 1.21</td>
<td>3.40 1.20</td>
<td>3.39 1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain summer program of work</td>
<td>3.17 1.24</td>
<td>3.22 1.21</td>
<td>2.81 1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare departmental budgets</td>
<td>2.09 .97</td>
<td>3.07 1.27</td>
<td>2.38 1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total contribution (Overall Mean)</td>
<td>3.07 .81</td>
<td>3.35 .81</td>
<td>3.14 .80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means based on scale of 1=no contribution, 2=little contribution, 3=moderate contribution, 4=high contribution, 5=very high high contribution. N = 59
Sources of preparedness for the responsibility of advising the FFA chapter are shown in Table 17. The contribution of university agricultural education courses, on-the-job/self study, and student teaching are indicated as mean values.

The contribution of on-the-job/self study was consistently rated the highest of the three sources in the area of advising the FFA chapter with means ranging from 4.16 to 3.72. First year teachers rated the contribution of university agricultural education courses as providing a moderate level of contribution for most of the activities in this area.

Student teaching was rated as having a high level of contribution for the following FFA activities: assist students in conducting FFA meetings ($\overline{m} = 3.51$), orient students to FFA ($\overline{m} = 3.62$), prepare students for leadership roles in FFA ($\overline{m} = 3.53$), and assist students in participating in competitive activities ($\overline{m} = 3.72$). Student teaching was rated as having a moderate level of contribution for the following FFA activities: supervise students in developing a program of activities ($\overline{m} = 3.38$), supervise students in advancing in degrees of FFA membership ($\overline{m} = 3.41$), supervise students in the conduction of banquets ($\overline{m} = 3.29$), and assisting students in conducting fund raising activities ($\overline{m} = 3.22$).
### Table 17

**Mean Contribution of Sources of Preparedness for Advising FFA**

**Chapter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Univ. ag. ed. courses</th>
<th>On-the-job/ self study</th>
<th>Student teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist students</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conduct FFA meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orient students</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to FFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise development of program of activities</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare students for leadership in FFA</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise student advancement in membership</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist students in competitive activities</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise students conducting banquets</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
The perceived contribution of university agricultural education courses ($m = 3.01$) and student teaching ($m = 3.49$) resulted in an overall mean contribution score in the moderate range. On-the-job/self study was rated as providing a high level of contribution toward overall preparedness for advising the FFA chapter. The overall mean contribution score for on-the-job/self study was 4.00.

**Classroom and Laboratory Instruction**

Sources of preparedness for the area of classroom and laboratory instruction are shown in Table 18. The contribution of university agricultural education courses, on-the-job/self study, and student teaching are presented as mean values.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Univ. ag. ed. courses</th>
<th>On-the-job/ self study</th>
<th>Student teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare daily lesson plans</td>
<td>4.10 (.93)</td>
<td>3.85 (.91)</td>
<td>1.85 (1.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use variety of audio visual aids</td>
<td>4.10 (1.01)</td>
<td>3.81 (1.02)</td>
<td>3.90 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain instructional materials</td>
<td>3.93 (1.17)</td>
<td>3.83 (1.05)</td>
<td>3.73 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use variety of teaching techniques</td>
<td>3.88 (1.18)</td>
<td>3.95 (.85)</td>
<td>3.76 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for safety of students</td>
<td>3.74 (1.24)</td>
<td>4.19 (.69)</td>
<td>4.02 (1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate students to learn</td>
<td>3.29 (1.24)</td>
<td>3.95 (.78)</td>
<td>3.64 (1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use techniques to develop student interest</td>
<td>3.29 (1.19)</td>
<td>3.70 (.88)</td>
<td>3.58 (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate student performance</td>
<td>3.24 (1.12)</td>
<td>3.95 (.75)</td>
<td>3.80 (.98)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
(Table 18 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Univ. ag. ed. courses</th>
<th>On-the-job/self study</th>
<th>Student teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain agriculture laboratories</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide guidance to students</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain student discipline</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain inventory of equipment</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain filing system</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total contribution (Overall Mean)</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Means based on scale of 1=no contribution, 2=little contribution, 3=moderate contribution, 4=high contribution, 5=very high contribution. \( N = 59 \)

The three sources were rated as providing a high level of perceived contribution for the following activities in the area of classroom and laboratory instruction (means of 4.19 to 3.74): prepare daily lesson plans, use variety of audio visual aids, obtain instructional materials, use variety of teaching techniques, provide for safety of students.

The contribution of on-the-job/self study and student teaching...
teaching were rated as providing a high level of contribution for the following six additional activities (means of 4.37 to 3.70): motivate students to learn, use techniques to develop student interest, evaluate student performance, maintain school agriculture education laboratories, provide guidance to students, and maintain student discipline.

University agricultural education courses were rated as providing a moderate level of contribution for the other eight activities in the area of classroom and laboratory instruction (means of 3.29 to 2.92).

The total contribution of the university agricultural education courses toward preparedness for classroom and laboratory instruction resulted in a mean rating of 3.46 (moderate contribution). On-the-job/self study ($m = 3.92$) and student teaching ($m = 3.69$) were rated as providing a high level of contribution to preparedness for classroom and laboratory instruction.

Public Relations/Advisory Committees

Sources of preparedness for conducting activities in the area of public relations/advisory committees are shown in Table 19. The contributions of university agricultural education courses, on-the-job/self study, and student teaching toward preparedness are indicated as mean values.

The three sources were rated as providing a high level of contribution toward establishing a good public relations program (means of 3.86 to 3.61).
Table 19

Mean Contribution of Sources of Preparedness for Conducting Public Relations/Advisory Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Univ. ag. ed. courses</th>
<th>On-the-job/self study</th>
<th>Student teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish good public relations</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep community up to date through publicity</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use an advisory committee</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total contribution (Overall Mean)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means based on scale of 1=no contribution, 2=little contribution, 3=moderate contribution, 4=high contribution, 5=very high contribution. N = 59

Student teaching was rated as providing the highest level of contribution (\(\bar{m} = 3.60\)) for "keeping the community up to date through publicity." University agricultural education courses were rated as providing the highest level of contribution (\(\bar{m} = 3.35\)) for preparedness in using advisory committees.
Overall, university agricultural education courses ($m = 3.44$) and student teaching ($m = 3.32$) contributed moderately to preparedness in the area of public relations/advisory committees. On-the-job/self study was rated as providing a high contribution to preparedness for conducting activities for public relations/advisory committees.

**Adult Education**

Sources of preparedness for conducting adult education programs are shown in Table 20. The contribution of university agricultural education courses, on-the-job/self study, and student teaching are indicated as mean values.

First year teachers consistently rated the contribution of university agricultural education courses to preparedness higher than the other two sources with mean ratings ranging from 3.29 to 3.07. All three sources of preparedness were rated as providing a moderate level of contribution for most adult education activities. Student teaching was rated as providing little contribution for the following activities: use teaching strategies appropriate for adults ($m = 2.41$) and organize an adult education program ($m = 2.37$).

Overall, university agricultural education courses, on-the-job/self study, and student teaching provided a moderate level of contribution to preparedness with means ranging from 2.56 to 3.16.
### Table 20

**Mean Contribution of Sources of Preparedness for Adult Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Univ. ag. ed. courses</th>
<th>On-the-job/ self study</th>
<th>Student teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use resource persons in the adult education program</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use teaching strategies appropriate for adults</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize adult education program</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess needs of adults in community</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total contribution (Overall Mean)</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Means based on scale of 1=no contribution, 2=little contribution, 3=moderate contribution, 4=high contribution, 5=very high contribution.  N = 59
Supervised Occupational Experience (SOE)

Sources of preparedness for supervised occupational experience are shown in Table 21. The contribution of the three sources are indicated as mean values.

First year teachers consistently rated the contribution of university agricultural education courses as moderate with means ranging from 3.46 to 2.97. The contribution of on-the-job/self study to preparedness was rated as high for all activities except providing directed lab SOE programs (m = 3.32) which was rated as a moderate contribution.

The contribution of student teaching was rated as high for four activities in this area dealing with production type SOE programs (means from 3.57 to 3.86). The contribution of student teaching was rated as moderate for the activities involving placement and directed lab SOE programs (means from 2.97 to 3.24).

Overall, university agricultural education courses (m = 3.22) and student teaching (m = 3.44) contributed moderately to preparedness in the area of SOE programs. On-the-job/self study was rated as providing a high contribution toward preparedness for conducting SOE programs with a mean rating of 3.76.

Sources of preparedness for each of the six areas of teacher responsibility are shown in Table 22. The contribution of university agricultural education courses, on-the-job/self study, and student teaching are indicated as mean values.
Table 21

Mean Contribution of Sources of Preparedness for Area of Supervised Occupation Experience (SOE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Univ. ag. ed. courses</th>
<th>On-the-job/ self study</th>
<th>Student teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish SOE programs</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop production SOE programs</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist students in keeping and analyzing records</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make SOE visits on farms</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students select placement SOE sites</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise placement SOE programs</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide directed lab SOE programs</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total contribution</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Overall Mean)</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means based on scale of 1=no contribution, 2=little contribution, 3=moderate contribution, 4=high contribution, 5=very high contribution. N = 59.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Univ. ag. ed. courses</th>
<th>On-the-job/ self study</th>
<th>Student teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom &amp; laboratory instruction</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations/advisory committees</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised occupational experience programs</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult ed.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program planning</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFA</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total contribution</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means based on scale of 1=no contribution, 2=little contribution, 3=moderate contribution, 4=high contribution, 5=very high contribution. N=59

The overall perceived contribution of university agricultural education courses was consistently rated as moderate by first year teachers (means from 3.01 to 3.46).
The highest perceived contribution considering all sources was from on-the-job/self study toward preparedness for FFA activities (m = 4.00). The contribution of on-the-job self/study was rated as high for all but two of the six areas of teacher responsibility. On-the-job/self study contributed moderately toward preparedness in the areas of program planning (m = 3.35) and adult education (m = 2.82).

The perceived contribution of student teaching toward preparedness was rated as high (m = 3.69) in the area of classroom and laboratory instruction. The contribution of student teaching toward perceived preparedness was rated as moderate for the other five areas of teacher responsibility.

All sources of preparation were rated as providing between a moderate and high contribution toward preparation for teaching vocational agriculture. On-the-job/self study was rated as providing the greatest overall contribution to preparation (m = 3.56). The total contribution of university agricultural education courses toward preparedness to teach resulted in a mean rating of 3.21. The total contribution of student teaching toward preparedness resulted in a mean rating of 3.28.

Factors Contributing to Teacher Preparedness

Correlations between perceived total preparedness and selected components of the preservice program and characteristics of the first year teachers are shown in Table 23.
Table 23

Relationship Between Total Preparedness and Selected Components of the Preservice Program and Teacher Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived contribution of agricultural education courses</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived contribution of student teaching</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of university supervisors</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived contribution of on-the-job/self study</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of cooperating teachers</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade point average</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of FFA membership</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of university supervisor visits</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years enrolled in vocational agriculture</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Variable Coefficient N Significance

| Hours of agricultural education | .04 | 54 | .798 |
| Length of student teaching      | .03 | 59 | .805 |

Note. Pearson correlation coefficients calculated for all variables except grade point average; Kendall's Tau was calculated for this ordinal level variable.

The following modified version of a scale offered by Best (1981) was used for interpreting the strengths of the correlations. Values of .00 to .19 are considered negligible; .20 to .39 indicates low correlation; .40 to .59 indicates moderate correlation; .60 to .79 indicates substantial correlation and .80 to 1.00 indicates high to very high correlation.

The highest correlation ($r = .84$) was between total preparedness and the perceived contribution of university agricultural education courses. Perceived preparedness was found to be moderately correlated with the factors: contribution of student teaching ($r = .57$) and effectiveness of university supervisors ($r = .53$).

There was a low correlation between total perceived preparedness and perceived contribution of on-the-job/self study ($r = .35$), effectiveness of cooperating classroom teachers ($r = .28$), and grade point average (Tau = -.24). In
this situation, the negative correlation indicates that the higher the grade point average, the less prepared the first year teachers perceived themselves.

There were negligible correlations of .13 to .03 between total perceived preparedness and number of university supervisor visits, years of FFA membership, years enrolled in vocational agriculture, hours of agricultural education taken, and length of student teaching.

Multiple regression analysis was used to determine the variance in the total preparedness score (dependent variable) explained by the following independent variables: contribution of university agricultural education courses, perceived contribution of student teaching, contribution of on-the-job/self study, number of university supervisor visits to student teaching sites, grade point average, years of FFA membership, perceived overall effectiveness of the cooperating classroom teachers used during student teaching, and the overall effectiveness of university supervision during student teaching. Eleven variables were considered but only those explaining at least 1% or more of the variance in preparedness were used in the regression analysis.

The variable that entered first in the stepwise regression was university agricultural education courses with an $R^2$ value of .61 as indicated in Table 24.
Table 24

Regression Analysis of Overall Preparedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>54.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>CUM $R^2$</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived contribution of agricultural education courses</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>90.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived contribution of student teaching</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>54.8*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution of on-the-job/self study</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of university supervisor visits</td>
<td>-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade point average</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of FFA membership</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of cooperating teachers</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of university supervisors</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  $N = 59$  
* $p < .05$

Sixty-one percent of the variance in the total preparedness score was explained by the contribution of university agricultural education courses. The contribution
of student teaching toward total preparedness entered in the second step of the regression analysis explaining an additional five percent of the variance in total preparedness. No other independent variables entered in the regression analysis. Sixty-six percent of the variance in total preparedness was explained by the total combined contributions of university agricultural education courses and student teaching.

Conclusions and recommendations based on these findings will be discussed in the next chapter. Chapter V will contain sections listing a summary of procedures, major findings, as well as conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of student teaching as perceived by first year teachers, university supervisors and cooperating classroom teachers. The objectives of the study were as follows:

1. To describe student teaching in agricultural education as perceived by first year teachers, university supervisors and cooperating classroom teachers.

2. To determine first year teachers' self-perceived preparedness for teaching vocational agriculture.

3. To identify the perceptions of first year teachers of vocational agriculture regarding sources of self-perceived preparedness.

4. To identify significant sources of variance in perceived preparedness explained by components of the preservice program and characteristics of first year teachers of vocational agriculture.

Procedures

The three populations for the study were comprised of the individuals directly involved in agricultural education student teaching programs in the AATEA Southern Region during the Fall of 1984 and Spring of 1985. One population consisted of first year teachers employed during the 85-86 school year. A second population was comprised of all
cooperating classroom teachers with whom these first year vocational agriculture teachers were placed for student teaching. The third population consisted of all university personnel supervising the student teachers involved in this study.

Data were collected by use of mail questionnaires. First year teachers rated their degree of preparation for teaching using a Likert-type scale with 1 = unprepared and 5 = very well prepared. Mean preparedness scores were calculated for each of the six areas of teacher responsibility and for overall total preparedness.

First year teachers also indicated the contribution to their perceived preparedness from three sources, university agricultural education courses, student teaching, and on-the-job/self study. A Likert-type scale with 1 = no contribution and 5 = very high contribution was used to collect the data for each source.

Information on the structure of the student teaching experience and its effectiveness was collected from all three populations in this study.

Fifty-nine of 117 or 50.43% of the first year graduates returned usable questionnaires. Fifty-two of 58 or 89% of the university supervisors returned usable questionnaires. One-hundred-twelve of 157 or 71% of the cooperating classroom teachers returned usable questionnaires.
Major Findings of the Study

The following is a summary of the major findings of the study:

1. The first year teacher respondents were predominately male (93%), had taken vocational agriculture in high school (86%), belonged to their state vocational agriculture teacher association (88%), and graduated with an undergraduate grade point average above 2.50 (98%).

2. The university supervisor respondents were predominately male (98%) and had received a doctorate (96%).

3. All of the cooperating classroom teacher respondents were male and most (89%) had attained an educational degree above the bachelors level.

Objective one: Description of Agricultural Education Student Teaching in the Southern Region

4. The length of student teaching ranged from 6 to 18 weeks with the average length being 9.4 weeks.

5. First year teachers indicated student teaching should last 13 weeks ($\bar{m} = 12.79$), university supervisors indicated student teaching should last 11 weeks ($\bar{m} = 10.86$), and cooperating classroom teachers indicated student teaching should last 12 weeks ($\bar{m} = 12$).

6. A majority of the respondents in all three groups indicated that the length of the student teaching program they were involved with was "about right".

7. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents student taught all day.
8. Seventy percent of the university supervisors, 65% of the cooperating classroom teachers and 64% of the first year teachers indicated student teaching should be held during the spring semester.

9. Education courses were rated as moderately effective \((\bar{m} = 2.95\) on a scale of 1 = low and 5 = high\) as preparation for teaching. This component of the preservice program was rated the least effective.

10. First year teachers \((\bar{m} = 4.31)\), university supervisors \((\bar{m} = 4.42)\), and cooperating classroom teachers \((\bar{m} = 4.47)\) agreed that student teaching was the most valuable component of the teacher education program. The scale was 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

11. University supervisors visited student teachers an average of 3 to 3.5 times.

12. First year teachers and cooperating classroom teachers rated the effectiveness of university supervision as moderately high \((\bar{m} = 3.66\) by first year teachers and \(\bar{m} = 3.93\) by cooperating classroom teachers\) on a scale of 1 = low and 5 = high.

13. First year teachers and university supervisors rated the effectiveness of cooperating classroom teachers as moderately high \((\bar{m} = 4.46\) by first year teachers and \(\bar{m} = 4.08\) by university supervisors\) on a scale of 1 = low and 5 = high.

14. The three groups of respondents rated the adequacy of the facilities used for student teaching as moderately high \((\text{means of 3.92 to 4.15 on a scale of 1 = low and 5 = high})\).
Objective two: Self-Perceived Preparedness of First Year Teachers

15. First year teachers perceived themselves as well prepared for providing classroom and laboratory instruction (\( m = 3.81 \)), advising the Future Farmers of America chapter (\( m = 3.63 \)), and conducting supervised occupational experience (\( m = 3.54 \)). Mean values are based on a scale of 1 = unprepared, 5 = very well prepared.

16. First year teachers perceived themselves as acceptably prepared for utilizing public relations/advisory committees (\( m = 3.48 \)), program planning (\( m = 3.30 \)), and providing adult education (\( m = 2.99 \)). Mean values are based on a scale of 1 = unprepared, 5 = very well prepared.

17. Overall, first year teachers considered themselves well prepared (\( m = 3.55 \)) for teaching vocational agriculture.

Objective three: Contribution of Sources of Preparation

18. University agricultural education courses were perceived to provide a moderate contribution toward preparedness to teach (\( m = 3.21 \) on a scale of 1 = no contribution and 5 = very high contribution).

19. On-the-job/self study was perceived to provide a high contribution toward preparedness to teach (\( m = 3.56 \) on a scale of 1 = no contribution and 5 = very high contribution).

20. Student teaching was perceived to provide a moderate contribution toward preparedness to teach (\( m = 3.28 \) on a scale of 1 = no contribution and 5 = very high contribution).
Objective four: Variation in Mean Preparedness Scores

21. The overall perceived contribution of university agricultural education courses explained the largest percentage (61%) of the variation of the mean preparedness scores.

22. The contribution of student teaching explained an additional 5% of the variation in overall preparedness.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher has drawn the following conclusions and recommendations. A follow-up of non-respondents indicated significant differences in phone versus mail respondents which limits the generalizability of the cooperating classroom teacher responses.

1. There is a lack of uniformity of student teaching experiences among states in the southern region. Variations in the length of student teaching completed ranged from 6 to 18 weeks. The number of university supervisory visits made during student teaching varied from 1 to 19 visits. Most experiences last for less than 12 weeks and approximately 40 percent of the students feel this time was too short.

2. Length of student teaching is not significantly related to perceived preparedness. This conclusion is based on the finding that there was a negligible correlation ($r = .03$) between length of student teaching and perceived preparedness.
3. Regardless of the length of student teaching, the participants (students, university supervisors and cooperating classroom teachers) are generally satisfied with the student teaching experience and perceive student teaching to be effective. This conclusion is based on the findings that the three groups agreed (means of 4.37 to 4.32) that student teaching was a positive experience based on a scale of 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. Utilizing the same scale, first year teachers (m = 4.36), university supervisors (m = 4.29), and cooperating classroom teachers (m = 4.17) agreed that they were pleased with the student teaching experience. In general, the effectiveness of the components of the student teaching experience were rated moderately high.

4. The overall effectiveness of the university supervision of student teachers is adequate. This conclusion is based on the finding that both the first year graduates, and cooperating classroom teachers rated the effectiveness of university supervision moderately high. The researcher recommends that the university supervisor visit the student teacher at least 3 times during the student teaching experience. In this study, university supervisors had visited their student teachers an average of 3 times which was judged as adequate.

5. The methods of selecting cooperating classroom teachers used during student teaching are adequate. This conclusion is based on the finding that both the first year teachers and
university supervisors rated the overall effectiveness of the cooperating classroom teachers moderately high. The researcher recommends that the procedures used for selecting cooperating classroom teachers for the 1984-85 student teaching experience in the southern region continue to be used.

6. The procedures being used for selecting student teaching centers are adequate. This conclusion is based on the finding that the adequacy of facilities used for student teaching was rated as moderately high by the three groups of respondents (means of 3.92 to 4.15 on a scale of 1 = low and 5 = high). It is recommended that the procedures used for selecting the facilities used for the 1984-85 student teaching experience continue to be utilized.

7. First year teachers perceive themselves well prepared for conducting the three major components of a total vocational agriculture program. This conclusion is based on the findings that first year teachers rated themselves as well prepared for classroom and laboratory instruction ($m = 3.81$), advising the Future Farmers of America chapter ($m = 3.63$), and conducting supervised occupational experience programs ($m = 3.54$) based on a scale of 1 = unprepared and 5 = very well prepared. The overall mean preparedness score was 3.55 on a scale of 1 = unprepared to 5 = very well prepared.

8. University agricultural education courses are an important source of perceived preparedness. This conclusion
is based on the finding that the overall perceived contribution of university agricultural education courses explained the largest percentage (61%) of the variation of the preparedness score.

9. Student teaching in the Southern Region of the United States is perceived to be effective for preparing teachers to teach vocational agriculture. This conclusion is based on the finding that the three groups rated the effectiveness of the components of the student teaching experience as moderately high. The researcher recommends that this study be replicated in the other AATEA regions of the United States to determine perceived effectiveness of student teaching.

A final recommendation is that additional studies be conducted to attempt to measure actual rather than perceived effectiveness of student teaching. A comparison could be made of the student teaching grade and the school principal's evaluation of the student teacher as a beginning teacher.
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APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER TO DEPARTMENT HEADS
October 16, 1987

Dear F2:

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree, I have undertaken a follow-up study of the 1984-85 university supervisors of student teachers. This study will not only reveal the perceived preparedness of first year teachers, but will also identify the major sources of preparedness of these teachers. The study will also determine the extent to which student teaching helped to prepare first year teachers. As a university supervisor of student teachers, you can contribute significantly to this evaluation by giving your appraisal of how well the cooperating classroom teachers helped to prepare student teachers.

Each questionnaire has been numbered for processing purposes. No names or schools will be mentioned in the study and all information will be held in strictest confidence. Please complete and return this questionnaire as soon as possible. A stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Curtis J. Borne
Department of Agricultural, Extension & International Education

In recent years several commissions and national studies have called for changes in our schools and in the way teachers are prepared. This study will provide valuable information to those of us in agricultural education as we evaluate a traditional component of teacher preparation, student teaching. You are the best source of information for conducting this evaluation; your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey V. Moss
Assistant Professor

Extension and International Education Department • Industrial and Technical Education Department • Vocational Agricultural Education Department
Home Economics Education and Business Education Department
APPENDIX B

SHORT QUESTIONNAIRE TO DIRECTORS OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION STUDENT TEACHING
The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine the actual population for my study of the effectiveness of student teaching from the viewpoint of the student teacher completer, teacher educator, and classroom cooperating teacher.

1. Please fill in name and address of director or person in charge of agricultural education student teaching at your institution.
   Name: __________________________________________
   Institution: ________________________________________
   Address: __________________________________________
   City, State, Zip Code: ________________________________

2. When is student teaching conducted at your institution? Fall, Spring, Both Fall and Spring.

3. The number of student teachers in Spring 1985 ________.

4. The number of student teachers in the Fall of 1984 ________.

5. The number of student teachers that went into teaching of vocational agriculture from Spring of 1985 ________.

6. The number of student teachers that went into teaching of vocational agriculture from Fall of 1984 ________.

7. Would you be able to supply me with names and current addresses of student teachers from Spring of 1985 and Fall of 1984 at a later date? Yes _______ No _______

8. The number of cooperating classroom teachers used in Spring of 1985 ________.

9. The number of cooperating classroom teachers used in Fall of 1984 ________.

10. Would you be able to supply names and addresses of classroom cooperating teachers used in the Spring of 1985 and Fall of 1984 at a later date? Yes _______ No _______

Please return this information with a copy of any student teaching program evaluation forms you might use in the self addressed stamped envelope provided.

Return to:
Curtis Bone
Dept. of Ag. Ext.
International Ed.
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, La. 70803
APPENDIX C

TELEPHONE FOLLOW-UP OF NON-RESPONDING DEPARTMENT HEADS
Hello. Is this ____________________________.

This is Curtis Borne, a graduate student at Louisiana State University. The purpose of this call is to request your assistance in determining the actual population for my proposed dissertation on the effectiveness of student teaching in the Southern Region of the United States.

This interview will be very brief and will only consist of ten short questions.

1. Are you the person directly in charge of the agricultural education student teaching program at your institution? If not, please transfer me to that person.

2. When is student teaching conducted at your institution? Fall, Spring, Both Fall and Spring.

3. The number of student teachers in Spring 1985 ______.

4. The number of student teachers in the Fall of 1984 ______.

5. The number of student teachers that went into teaching of vocational agriculture from Spring of 1985 ______.

6. The number of student teachers that went into teaching of vocational agriculture from Fall of 1984 ______.

7. Would you be able to supply me with names and current addresses of student teachers from Spring of 1985 and Fall of 1984 at a later date? Yes ______ No ______.

8. The number of cooperating classroom teachers used in Spring of 1985 ______.

9. The number of cooperating classroom teachers used in Fall of 1984 ______.

10. Would you be able to supply names and addresses of classroom cooperating teachers used in the Spring of 1985 and Fall of 1984 at a later date? Yes ______ No ______.

This is the conclusion of the interview and thank you very much for your time and cooperation.
APPENDIX D

LETTERS TO STATE SUPERVISORS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE
February 3, 1986

My name is Curtis Borne and I am a graduate student at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The purpose of this letter is to request your assistance in conducting the research for my Ph.D. dissertation in the area of effectiveness of student teaching in the Southern Region of the United States. The success of this endeavor depends heavily upon having the latest and most accurate and complete list of the addresses of the present teachers of vocational agriculture in your state.

Please send me your state's vocational agriculture teacher's directory (names and addresses) by February 15, 1986 in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. I must have the most recent directory so that I will have the names of schools and addresses of beginning teachers. I plan to use the first year teachers who completed student teaching in the Spring of 1985 and Fall of 1984 and the cooperating classroom teachers they were assigned to.

Thank you in advance for your help in the collection of the materials for this project. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Curtis J. Borne
Graduate Student
Louisiana State University
Department of Agricultural, Extension & International Ed.
Baton Rouge, La. 70803
APPENDIX E

COVER LETTER TO DIRECTORS OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS
March 12, 1966

My name is Curtie Borne and I am a graduate student at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The purpose of this letter is to request the names and addresses of first year teachers of vocational agriculture who completed student teaching at your institution in the Fall of 1964 and Spring of 1965. I am only requesting information on those graduates who entered teaching this past year, not all of your students that have completed student teaching in 1964-65.

In order to complete my proposed study on the effectiveness of student teaching, I also need the names and addresses of all university personnel who supervised the above student teachers and names and addresses of cooperating classroom teachers.

Thank you for agreeing to cooperate when I contacted you earlier. Please list the names and addresses requested on the enclosed forms and return in the self addressed envelope which is included for your convenience. Please return by March 20, 1966.

Sincerely,

Curtie Borne
Graduate Student
Louisiana State University

Encl.
APPENDIX F

FORMS FOR RETURNING NAMES AND ADDRESSES
**AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION**

**STUDENT TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS**

**FALL OF 1984**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Address of 1st year teacher(s)</th>
<th>Name &amp; Address of all university supervisors who supervised this teacher</th>
<th>Name &amp; Address of cooperating classroom teachers</th>
<th>Number of Weeks of Student Teaching Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return to: Curtie Borne  
Dept. of Agricultural Extension & International Education  
Louisiana State University  
Baton Rouge, La. 70803
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Address of 1st year teacher(s)</th>
<th>Name &amp; Address of all university supervisors who supervised this teacher</th>
<th>Name &amp; Address of cooperating classroom teachers</th>
<th>Number of Weeks of Student Teaching Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return to: Curtis Borne
Dept. of Agricultural Extension & International Education
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, La. 70803
APPENDIX G

COVER LETTERS MAILED WITH SURVEY INSTRUMENTS
February 11, 1967

Dear F2:

I have undertaken a follow-up study of the 1964-65 student teachers in the Southern States. This study will not only reveal the perceived preparedness of first year teachers, but will also identify the major sources of preparedness of these teachers. The study will also determine the extent to which student teaching helped to prepare first year teachers. As a former student teacher, you can contribute significantly to this evaluation by giving your appraisal of how well the student teaching program prepared you to teach.

Each questionnaire has been numbered for processing purposes. No names or schools will be mentioned in the study and all information will be held in strictest confidence. Please complete and return this questionnaire by March 1, 1968. A stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Curtis J. Borne
Department of Agricultural Extension & International Education

In recent years several commissions and national studies have called for changes in our schools and in the way teachers are prepared. This study will provide valuable information to those of us in agricultural education as we evaluate a traditional component of teacher preparation, student teaching. You are the best source of information for conducting this evaluation; your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey V. Moss
Assistant Professor
Dear "F2:

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree, I have undertaken a follow-up study of the 1984-85 cooperating classroom teachers used during student teaching. This study will not only reveal the perceived preparedness of first year teachers, but will also identify the major sources of preparedness of these teachers. The study will also determine the extent to which student teaching helped to prepare first year teachers. As a cooperating classroom teacher working with student teachers, you can contribute significantly to this evaluation by giving your appraisal of how well the university supervised student teachers.

Each questionnaire has been numbered for processing purposes. No names or schools will be mentioned in the study and all information will be held in strictest confidence. Please complete and return this questionnaire by June 1, 1987. A stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,
Curtis J. Bourne
Department of Agricultural Extension & International Education

In recent years several commissions and national studies have called for changes in our schools and in the way teachers are prepared. This study will provide valuable information to those of us in agricultural education as we evaluate a traditional component of teacher preparation, student teaching. You are the best source of information for conducting this evaluation; your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
Jeffrey W. Moss
Assistant Professor
November 4, 1985

My name is Curtis Borne and I am a graduate student at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The purpose of this letter is to request your assistance in conducting the research for my Ph.D. dissertation in the area of effectiveness of student teaching. The success of this endeavor depends heavily upon the cooperation of the teacher educators in charge of student teaching in agricultural education.

My present plans are to use the 40 institutions in the Southern Region of the U.S. that have agricultural education programs. In order to complete my proposal, I need information concerning the number of students who completed student teaching in the Fall of 1984 and Spring of 1985. I have enclosed a short questionnaire to collect the necessary information to determine the population for my research project. Please return the form by November 15, 1985 with a copy of any student teaching program evaluation forms you might use. A self-addressed stamped envelope is provided. If someone else in your department is in charge of student teaching please forward this request to him/her.

Hopefully, this research will provide information that will result in more effective student teaching practices. It is the intent of this study to point out the importance of the efforts of the classroom cooperating teacher, teacher educator and student teacher working together to produce the best possible teachers of the future.

Thank you in advance for your help in the collection of the material for this research project. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Curtis J. Borne
Graduate Student
Louisiana State University

Encl.
APPENDIX H

FIRST YEAR GRADUATES SURVEY INSTRUMENT
FIRST YEAR GRADUATES SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Directions: Please respond to the following items by circling, checking the appropriate response and/or filling in the blanks.

INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR STUDENT TEACHING COURSE

1. What was the length of your student teaching experience in weeks? _____ Weeks.

2. In your opinion, how many weeks should student teaching last in order to be most effective? _____ Weeks.

3. Did you student teach all day or half day? _____ All day _____ Half day

4. How many hours of actual classroom teaching experience should a student teacher be required to complete? (Check One)
   _____ 100 or less  _____ 101 to 200 hours  _____ more than 200

5. I taught the following courses during student teaching. (Check all that you taught)
   _____ Ag. I  _____ Ag. IV  _____ Other (Please list)
   _____ Ag. II  _____ Ag. Lab
   _____ Ag. III  _____ Co-op Ag.

6. The length of student teaching you experienced was? (Check One)
   _____ Too Short  _____ Too Long  _____ About Right

7. During which semester or quarter should student teaching be held for students to receive the most needed experience? (Check One)
   _____ Fall  _____ Spring  _____ Winter

8. How many times did your university supervisor visit you while you were student teaching? _____ Times

9. The overall effectiveness of the university supervision during student teaching was. (Rate low to high)
   1 2 3 4 5
   Low High

10. The overall effectiveness of the cooperating classroom teacher(s) during student teaching was. (Rate low to high)
    1 2 3 4 5
    Low High

11. The overall effectiveness of the education courses in preparation for student teaching was. (Rate low to high)
    1 2 3 4 5
    Low High

12. The overall effectiveness of the technical agriculture courses in preparation for student teaching was. (Rate low to high)
    1 2 3 4 5
    Low High

13. The overall adequacy of the facilities of the vocational agriculture department used for student teaching was. (Rate low to high)
    1 2 3 4 5
    Low High
**DIRECTIONS:** For each item below, indicate strong agreement (5) or strong disagreement (1) or the appropriate level between. Circle the number which best indicates your answer based on the following scale.

1. 1= (SD) for strongly disagree  
2= (D) for disagree  
3= (U) for undecided  
4= (A) for agree  
5= (SA) for strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers and Student Teaching:</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>(D)</th>
<th>(U)</th>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(SA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The student teaching experiences encourage student teachers to become teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student teaching is the most valuable component of the teacher education program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student teaching was a positive experience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I was pleased with the student teaching experience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student teachers learn very little from student teaching experience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student teachers were encouraged to try a variety of teaching methods by the cooperating classroom teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Student teachers' work loads are too heavy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student teaching is a realistic example of teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The University Supervisor:</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>(D)</th>
<th>(U)</th>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(SA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. The university supervisor visited the student teaching centers often enough.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The length of the university supervisor's observation was sufficient for evaluating student teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The student teachers were at ease when the university supervisor observed their teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The university supervisor(s) used constructive criticism when discussing the student teacher's work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The university supervisor(s) conferences were a real help to the student teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Student teachers had time to discuss their teaching problems with the university supervisor(s).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The university supervisor(s) were a real help to the student teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Cooperating Classroom Teacher:</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>(D)</th>
<th>(U)</th>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(SA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. The cooperating classroom teacher(s) kept the lines of communication open with the student teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The cooperating classroom teacher(s) used should be recommended to other student teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The cooperating classroom teacher(s) interfered with student teachers' control of the class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Cooperating classroom teacher(s) should be required to take a course on supervision of student teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
YOUR PREPARATION TO TEACH

DIRECTIONS: In Column I, please rate how well you feel you are prepared to perform the activities listed according to the following scale:

1= Unprepared 4= Well prepared
2= Poorly prepared 5= Very well prepared
3= Acceptable preparation

DIRECTIONS: In Column II, please indicate how much each source contributed to your preparedness, according to the following scale:

1= No contribution 4= High contribution
2= Little contribution 5= Very high contribution
3= Moderate contribution

EXAMPLE #1: (See Below)

On the job training and/or self study contributed very highly toward your ability to teach welding, the other sources did not contribute, and you are well prepared. For this example, you would mark the competency as shown below.

EXAMPLE #2: (See Below)

Student teaching contributed highly to your being very well prepared to teach how to vaccinate a calf and university ag. ed. courses and on the job training/self study contributed moderately. For this example, you would mark the competency as shown below.

| COLUMN I | COLUMN II
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREPARED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example #1 Teach Welding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example #2 Vaccinate a calf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Program Planning

1. Develop written program plans (Four year course of study) | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
2. Determine student needs | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
3. Prepare departmental budgets | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
4. Complete required report forms | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN I</th>
<th>COLUMN II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREPAREDNESS</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Program Planning (continued)

5. Maintain a summer program of work  
   1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
6. Evaluate the vocational agriculture/agribusiness program  
   1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5

B. FFA
1. Orient students to FFA  
   1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
2. Supervise students in developing a program of activities  
   1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
3. Prepare students for leadership roles in FFA  
   1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
4. Assist students in conducting FFA meetings  
   1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
5. Supervise students in advancing in degrees of FFA membership  
   1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
6. Assist students in participating in competitive activities  
   1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
7. Assist students in conducting fund raising activities  
   1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
8. Supervise students in the conduct of banquets  
   1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5

C. Classroom & Laboratory Instruction
1. Prepare daily lesson plans  
   1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
2. Use variety of teaching techniques such as lectures, field trips, resource persons, group discussion  
   1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
3. Use variety of audiovisual aids (slide projectors, filmstrip/overhead projectors, etc.)  
   1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
4. Obtain instructional materials  
   1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>C. Classroom &amp; Laboratory Instruction (continued)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Evaluate student performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Maintain student discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Maintain an inventory of departmental equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Maintain a filing system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Maintain school agricultural education laboratories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Provide for safety of students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Provide guidance to students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Motivate students to learn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Use techniques to develop student interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>D. Public Relations/Advisory Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Establish good public relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Keep the community up to date through publicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Use an advisory committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>E. Adult Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Assess needs of adults in the community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Organize an adult education program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Use resource persons in the adult education program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Use teaching strategies appropriate for adults</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Supervised Occupational Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish supervised occupational experience programs (SOE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop production SOE programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make SOE visits on farms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students select placement SOE sites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise placement SOE programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide directed lab SOE programs (on school campus and other community property)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist students in keeping and analyzing records</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION** - Please respond to the following questions by checking the appropriate response and/or filling in the blanks.

1. Your age: _______ Years
2. Sex: _______ Male _______ Female
3. Do you belong to your state vocational agriculture teacher's organization? ( ) Yes ( ) No
4. How many years were you enrolled in vocational agriculture/agribusiness in high school? _______ Years
5. How many years were you a member of the FFA? _______ Years
6. What was your overall undergraduate grade point average? (Please Check One)
   - 4.0 - 3.5
   - 3.49 - 3.0
   - 2.99 - 2.5
   - 2.49 or less
PLEASE RETURN TO: Curtis Borne
Agricultural Extension & International Education
Old Forestry Building
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, La. 70803-5422

THANKS FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY. YOUR HELP IS APPRECIATED!
APPENDIX I

TELEPHONE FOLLOW UP OF NON RESPONDING FIRST YEAR GRADUATES
TELEPHONE FOLLOW UP OF NON-RESPONDING FIRST YEAR GRADUATES

Hello. May I speak to ________________

This is Curtis Borre from Louisiana State University. The purpose of this call is to request your assistance in obtaining needed information for a study on the effectiveness of student teaching in the Southern Region of the United States.

This interview will be very brief and the information you give will be held in strict confidence.

Please rate the following question from a low of 1 to high of 5

1. The overall effectiveness of the cooperating classroom teacher(s) during student teaching was
   1  2  3  4  5
   low  high

For the next 4 questions indicate strong agreement (5) or disagreement (1) or the appropriate level between

2. The student teaching experiences encouraged student teachers to become teachers.
   1  2  3  4  5
   SD  D  U  A  SA

3. Student teaching is the most valuable component of the teacher education program.
   1  2  3  4  5
   SD  D  U  A  SA

4. Student teachers were encouraged to try a variety of teaching methods by the cooperating classroom teachers
   1  2  3  4  5
   SD  D  U  A  SA

5. Student teaching is a realistic example of teaching
   1  2  3  4  5
   SD  D  U  A  SA

Now I'm going to name 6 major areas in which vocational agriculture teachers work. Please indicate how well you feel your are prepared to work in these areas on a scale of 1 unprepared to 5 very well prepared.

6. How well do you feel prepared to orient students to the FFA?
   1  2  3  4  5
   unprepared  very well prepared
7. How much did the university agriculture education courses contribute to this preparedness on a scale of 1 no contribution to 5 very high contribution
   1 2 3 4 5

8. How much did the job/self study contribute to this preparedness
   1 2 3 4 5

9. How much did student teaching contribute to this preparedness
   1 2 3 4 5

10. How well are you prepared to supervise students in developing a program of activities?
    1 2 3 4 5

11. How much did agriculture education courses contribute to this preparedness?
    1 2 3 4 5

12. How much did the job/self study contribute to this preparedness
    1 2 3 4 5

13. How much did student teaching contribute to this preparedness
    1 2 3 4 5

14. How well do you feel prepared to assist students in conducting FFA meetings?
    1 2 3 4 5

15. How much did university agriculture education courses contribute to this preparation
    1 2 3 4 5

16. How much did the job/self study contribute to this preparedness
    1 2 3 4 5

17. How much did student teaching contribute to this preparedness
    1 2 3 4 5

18. How well do you feel prepared to maintain school agricultural education laboratories?
    1 2 3 4 5

19. How much did university agriculture education courses contribute to this preparedness
    1 2 3 4 5
20. How much did on the job/self study contribute to this preparedness?
   1  2  3  4  5

21. How much did student teaching contribute to this preparedness?
   1  2  3  4  5

22. How well do you feel prepared to use techniques to develop student interests?
   1  2  3  4  5

23. How much did agriculture education courses contribute to this preparedness?
   1  2  3  4  5

24. How much did on the job/self study contribute to this preparation?
   1  2  3  4  5

25. How much did student teaching contribute to this preparation?
   1  2  3  4  5
APPENDIX J

UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR'S SURVEY INSTRUMENT
UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR'S SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Directions: Please respond to the following items by circling, checking the appropriate response and/or filling in the blanks.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION
1. What college degree do you hold? ( ) Bachelors  ( ) Masters  ( ) Doctorate
2. Present position: ( ) Graduate Assistant  ( ) Assistant Professor  ( ) Associate Professor  ( ) Full Professor
3. Age: __________
4. Sex: ( ) Male  ( ) Female
5. How many semester hours of university agricultural education do you require in your undergraduate program? ______ Hours.
6. How many years have you supervised student teachers? ______ Years.
7. How many student teachers have you supervised as a university supervisor? ______ Student Teachers.

INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR STUDENT TEACHING COURSE
8. What was the length of the student teaching experience you supervised in weeks? ______ Wks.
9. In your opinion, how many weeks should student teaching last in order to be most effective? ______ Weeks.
10. Did the student teachers teach all day or half day? ______ All day  ______ Half day
11. How many hours of actual classroom teaching experience should a student teacher be required to complete? (Check One) ______ 100 or less  ______ 101 to 200 hours  ______ more than 200
12. The length of the student teaching experience was? (Check One) ______ Too Short  ______ Too Long  ______ About Right
13. During which semester or quarter should student teaching be held for students to receive the most needed experience? (Check One) ______ Fall  ______ Spring  ______ Winter
14. How many times did the university supervisor(s) visit the student teacher(s)? ______ Times
15. The overall effectiveness of the cooperating classroom teacher(s) during student teaching was. (Rate low to high)
   1 2 3 4 5
   Low  High
16. The overall adequacy of the facilities of the vocational agriculture departments used for student teaching was. (Rate low to high)
   1 2 3 4 5
   Low  High
**DIRECTIONS:** For each item below, indicate strong agreement (5) or strong disagreement (1) or the appropriate level between. Circle the number which best indicates your answer based on the following scale.

- 1= (SD) for strongly disagree
- 3= (U) for undecided
- 5= (SA) for strongly agree

1= (D) for disagree
2= (A) for agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers and Student Teaching:</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>(D)</th>
<th>(U)</th>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(SA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The student teaching experiences encouraged student teachers to become teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student teaching is the most valuable component of the teacher education program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student teaching is a positive experience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student teachers are generally pleased with the student teaching experience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student teachers learn very little from student teaching experiences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student teachers were encouraged to try a variety of teaching methods by the cooperating classroom teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The student teachers' work loads were too heavy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student teaching was a realistic example of teaching for student teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The University Supervisor:**

| 9. The university supervisor visited student teaching centers often enough. | 1    | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5    |
| 10. The length of the university supervisory observations was sufficient for evaluating student teachers. | 1    | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5    |
| 11. The student teachers were at ease when the university supervisor(s) observed their teaching. | 1    | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5    |

**The Cooperating Classroom Teacher:**

| 12. The cooperating classroom teachers kept the lines of communication open with the student teachers. | 1    | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5    |
| 13. The cooperating classroom teachers used should be recommended to other student teachers. | 1    | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5    |
| 14. The cooperating classroom teachers interfered with student teachers' control of the class. | 1    | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5    |
| 15. Cooperating classroom teachers should be required to take a course on supervision of student teachers. | 1    | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5    |
GENERAL COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

PLEASE RETURN TO: Curtis Borne
Agricultural,Extension & International Education
Old Forestry Building
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, La. 70803-5422

THANKS FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY. YOUR HELP IS APPRECIATED!
APPENDIX K

COOPERATING CLASSROOM TEACHERS SURVEY INSTRUMENT
The Effectiveness of Agricultural Education Student Teaching Programs

Student Teaching

Cooperating Teacher

University Supervisor

Cooperating Teacher

University Supervisor

Agricultural, Extension and International Education
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
COOPERATING CLASSROOM TEACHERS SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Directions: Please respond to the following items by circling, checking the appropriate response and/or filling in the blanks.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION
1. What college degree do you hold? ( ) Bachelors ( ) Masters ( ) Above Masters

2. Age: _______

3. Sex: ( ) Male ( ) Female

4. How many years have you been a cooperating classroom teacher? _______ Years.

5. How many student teachers have you supervised before _______ Student Teachers.

6. Method(s) of selection as cooperating classroom teacher for student teaching program:
   (Check all that apply)
   ( ) Volunteered ( ) Recommended by principal
   ( ) Attended certification course ( ) Other (list below)

INFORMATION ABOUT STUDENT TEACHING
7. What was the length of the student teaching experience you supervised in weeks? _______ Wks.

8. In your opinion, how many weeks should student teaching last in order to be most effective? _______ Weeks.

9. Did the student teachers teach all day or half day? _______ All day _______ Half day

10. How many hours of actual classroom teaching experience should a student teacher be required to complete? (Check One)
     _______ 100 or less _______ 101 to 200 hours _______ more than 200

11. The length of the student teaching experience was? (Check One)
     _______ Too Short _______ Too Long _______ About Right

12. During which semester or quarter should student teaching be held for students to receive the most needed experience? (Check One)
     _______ Fall _______ Spring _______ Winter

13. How many times did the university supervisor(s) visit the student teacher(s)? _______ Times

14. The overall effectiveness of the university supervision during student teaching was:
     (Rate low to high)
     _______ 1 2 3 4 5
     Low High

15. The overall adequacy of the facilities of the vocational agriculture departments used for student teaching was. (Rate low to high)
     _______ 1 2 3 4 5
     Low High
**DIRECTIONS:** For each item below, indicate strong agreement (5) or strong disagreement (1) or the appropriate level between. Circle the number which best indicates your answer based on the following scale.

1 = (SD) for strongly disagree
2 = (D) for disagree
3 = (U) for undecided
4 = (A) for agree
5 = (SA) for strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Teachers and Student Teaching</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>(D)</th>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(SA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The student teaching experiences encouraged student teachers to become teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student teaching is the most valuable component of the teacher education program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student teaching is a positive experience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My student teacher was pleased with the student teaching experience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student teachers learned very little from student teaching experiences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student teachers were encouraged to try a variety of teaching methods by the cooperating classroom teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The student teachers' work loads were too heavy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student teaching was a realistic example of teaching for the student teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University Supervisor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The university supervisor visited student teaching centers often enough.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The length of the university supervisory observations was sufficient for evaluating student teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The student teachers were at ease when the university supervisor(s) observed their teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The university supervisor(s) used constructive criticism when discussing the student teacher's work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The university supervisor's conferences were a real help to the student teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Student teachers had time to discuss their teaching problems with the university supervisor(s).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The university supervisor(s) were a real help to the student teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

PLEASE RETURN TO: Curtis Borne
Agricultural Extension & International Education
Old Forestry Building
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, La. 70803-5422

THANKS FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY. YOUR HELP IS APPRECIATED!
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