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INTRODUCTION

Effective teachers have existed within our culture throughout civilization. Names such as Socrates, Aristotle, Dewey and Mann come to the forefront when listing great teachers from years past (18). It is also true that less effective teachers have eternally been a part of our cultural development. Based on this premise, educational researchers have had within them an on-going quest to discover valid and reliable criteria which distinguish the effective from the less effective teacher.

As practiced today, the judging of effective teaching is not in all cases based on sound, research-supported criteria nor is it limited to examination by seasoned scholars and researchers. For many people, the judging of greatness in teaching is an annual event. Teacher associations, chambers of commerce, civic organizations and graduating classes all come together to identify their "Teacher of the Year," "Best Teacher," "Master Teacher," and "Outstanding Young Educator."

With such an abundance of honored educators, one would tend to believe that effective teaching criteria would be well-documented and quite available. A few educators, however, find it somewhat embarrassing to admit that this is not the case and that the profession as a whole is relatively incapable of agreeing upon what it is that constitutes an effective teacher. In 1963, Getzels and Jackson (12) enumerated the fact that the first problem plaguing researchers studying teacher effectiveness is the problem of defining what is meant by the
term "effective."

After conducting a thorough examination of 289 empirical studies of teacher effectiveness, Medley offered this definition of effective teaching (22, p. 17):

Teachers are not hired to cram information into students' heads to be retained just long enough to enable them to pass objective tests. Teachers are hired to educate children, to produce important, lasting changes in their behavior, not short-term changes in test scores. Teachers are supposed to teach children to read, to communicate, to reason, to become happy, productive, responsible members of this democracy. In accomplishing these things, it may be necessary also to teach them a great deal of content, most of which they will forget almost immed­iately.--And it is the teachers who produce permanent changes in pupils who deserve to be called effective.

Additional knowledge about teacher effectiveness has come through persistent effort on the part of countless researchers. However, many of the early studies failed to isolate the determining factors of teaching effectiveness. As early as 1929, Barr (2) noted the difficulty in selecting variables which influence classroom effectiveness. Almost 20 years later, it was reported by Barr (3) that most of the difficulties encountered in his early research were still not resolved. He asserted that the complexity of the teaching task made it difficult to identify single characteristics that influence teacher effectiveness.

As late as 1963, Getzels and Jackson summarized research in the field of teacher effectiveness as follows (12, p. 574):

Despite the critical importance of the problem (of teacher effectiveness) and a half century of prodigious research effort, very little is known for certain about the nature and measurement of teacher personality and teaching effec­tiveness. The regrettable fact is that many of the studies so far have not produced significant results.
With all the contradictions and inconsistencies associated with past studies of teacher effectiveness, it has not deterred continuing efforts by educators and researchers to seek meaningful information related to teacher effectiveness.

The proliferation of process-product studies involving teacher effectiveness in the late 1960s produced evidence that at least some aspects of teaching style or classroom environment were related to pupil learning. Researchers in teacher effectiveness had finally found a method that identified criteria for determining teacher effectiveness.

Some of the first behavior patterns distinguishing effective from ineffective teaching were reported by Rosenshine and Furst (29). They were clarity, variability, enthusiasm, task-oriented or businesslike, criticism, teacher indirectness, student opportunity to learn criterion materials and use of structuring comments.

Since that time, definite behavioral patterns of effective teachers, when helping students grow in cognitive and affective skills, have been revealed by researchers (22).

Researchers at Iowa State University, working on the School Improvement Model (SIM) project (7), have identified a complete array of recommended teacher performance areas, criteria response modes and standards. The teacher performance criteria were the end result of many years of investigating and refining effective teaching research. The accumulation of such a thorough list of teacher performance criteria, which includes 176 criteria descriptors, provides even the beginning researcher with a strong base upon which to delve into teacher
Although current research, such as that done by the School Improvement Model (SIM) project, has provided researchers with a much better understanding of effective teacher behaviors, many vital questions still remain unanswered. One such question is whether or not teacher effectiveness is specific to the kind of student taught and the kind of outcome desired. Are effective vocational agriculture teachers, for example, similar to effective teachers of disadvantaged pupils such as those identified by Medley (22)? Very little research has been done to substantiate claims made by educators in response to the above question. Until attempts are made to identify who effective teachers are, as is the case with vocational agriculture teachers, the question cannot be answered.

With increasing pressure being asserted on secondary vocational programs within the United States today, due in part to the resurgence of the "back to basics movement" (24), the time is right to begin efforts to identify effective vocational agriculture teachers and the behaviors which differentiate them as being more effective. The results of such an investigation could be used by educators in a number of important ways as expressed by Farrell (10): (1) teachers can increase their effectiveness through knowledge of the characteristics and behaviors which influence teaching efficiency; (2) those entering the field will be aware of the qualities necessary for effective teaching; and (3) teacher-training institutions could use such information in the selection and teaching of future educators.
Currently, the effective vocational agriculture teacher has been identified as being effective based on the testimony of expert opinion or personal experience. Very few, if any, of these perceived views have been supported by research conducted in the field. With the availability of 179 validated criteria descriptors related to teacher effectiveness as identified by the School Improvement Model (SIM) project, certainly more sophisticated attempts could be made by researchers to identify behaviors of effective vocational agriculture teachers.

The purpose of this study was to create a profile of the effective vocational agriculture teacher by identifying distinguishing behaviors using selected teacher effectiveness descriptors. The specific objectives of this research were to:

1. Determine effectiveness groups of vocational agriculture teachers from twelve north central states using research-supported teacher effectiveness criteria.
2. Identify teacher effectiveness behaviors which distinguish vocational agriculture teachers responding most like established teacher effectiveness criteria from vocational agriculture teachers responding least like established criteria.
3. Identify demographic characteristics associated with vocational agriculture teachers responding most like established teacher effectiveness criteria and vocational agriculture teachers responding least like established criteria.
LITERATURE REVIEW

A review of literature was conducted to provide the theoretical framework for this study. The review consisted of two major divisions: (1) a review of popular writings related to effective teachers and (2) a review of research studies related to effective teachers.

Related Literature

Although the problem of identifying effective teacher behaviors and characteristics has recently surfaced as a major issue among educators, the problem is not by any means unique to this time period. In 1949, noted teacher effectiveness researcher David Ryans (31) discussed many of the same issues being debated today in his article, "The Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness." In the article, Ryans states that the ultimate basis for judging teaching effectiveness is through "teacher behavior" (the teacher's performance of his or her functions). The problem Ryans had was defining what these teacher functions encompassed because of the varying educational philosophies and viewpoints of the time. He pointed out that some educators believed that a teacher's responsibilities were broad in scope and included a wide range of curricular, extra-curricular and community functions, whereas others believed that a teacher's functions were more limited in scope. Ryans summed up his discussion on the functions of effective teaching as follows (31, p. 692):

It may be said, then, that teaching is effective to the extent that the teacher is able to provide ways and means that are favorable to the development of understandings, work habits,
desirable attitudes, and adequate personal adjustment on the part of the pupils or students.

In 1950, the Committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness (26) was established by the American Educational Research Association to study the problems inherent with teacher effectiveness criteria. Six months after its formation, the committee members had come to a consensus that to define the effective teacher as a unitary concept was impossible and that the concept of an "ideal" teacher should also be forgotten. The committee members recognized that teacher effectiveness criteria could differ radically depending on the culture, level, method and curriculum taught by the teacher. The committee also recognized that even effective teachers within the same general field of study could differ markedly from each other.

The problem encountered by the Committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness was not that it lacked knowledgeable people on the committee which included noted teacher effectiveness researchers such as Arvil Barr, N. L. Gage, H. H. Remmers and David Ryans. The real fault of the committee was that it was trying to provide the final answer to a problem area which was still in the conceptualization stage of development. The committee did not have a single research supported criterion on which it could base any solid conclusions.

Thirteen years after the committee's demise, B. J. Biddle (6) described the difficulties still being encountered with the assessment of teacher effectiveness. In his writings, Biddle explained that the problem originated from the impossibility to isolate the effects of one
teacher from the influence of others. Every time a trait was identified as being an indicator of teacher effectiveness, it was found that students responded individually to the trait, dependent on the teacher. He concluded that researchers should not attempt to identify characteristics of teacher effectiveness since each student responds differently to each teacher. Instead, he suggested, as an alternative, students should be matched to the character and personality of each teacher.

Up to this point in time, teacher effectiveness criteria had evolved from the study of teacher personality traits to the study of student-teacher interactions. The focus of attention had changed with regard to the method being used to identify effective teacher criteria, but the results had not significantly changed from the past.

Donald Medley provided an excellent synopsis of the evolution of the concept of teacher effectiveness as it had occurred up to 1979 in his article, "The Effectiveness of Teachers." In the article, he states (22, p. 12):

At first, effectiveness was perceived as the consequence of certain personality traits or characteristics possessed by the teacher. . . . Later, effectiveness was seen not so much as a function of characteristics of the teacher but of the methods of teaching used. . . . Then, effectiveness was seen as mainly dependent on the climate the teacher created and maintained in the classroom. More recently, effectiveness has been viewed as mastery of a repertoire of competencies, and finally, there has been increasing emphasis on the ability to deploy these competencies appropriately, that is, on professional decision making.

In the early part of the century, personality traits of the teacher were associated with teacher effectiveness and were selected on the
basis of expert judgment. The problem with this practice was that there were no real criteria by which the experts could judge effectiveness of teachers. Since that time, particularly since the early seventies, real knowledge has accumulated and been summarized concerning effective teacher criteria.

By 1976, investigators at Iowa State University had identified clusters of categories which could be used to rate a teacher's performance (33). Teacher performance clusters identified included productive teaching techniques, positive interpersonal relationships, organized-structured classroom management, intellectual stimulation and desirable out-of-class behaviors. The teacher performance criteria which were identified were the direct result of many years of examination and refinement of effective teaching research (20).

The criteria identified by investigators at Iowa State University concerning effective teacher criteria provided researchers with a stable base from which to operate regarding future teacher effectiveness studies. Although researchers are only beginning to comprehend the complexities of an effective teacher, they can now be more sure of themselves using existing findings that are based on better evidence than had previously been available (4).

The identification of effective teachers has been an on-going concern of researchers throughout this century, but never has it received so much attention from the general populace than at the present time. Much of this renewed interest can be attributed to the National Commission on Excellence in Education's report (24) in 1983 on the quality
of education in America. In its report, "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform," the commission recommended that teacher salary, promotion, tenure and retention decisions be tied to an effective evaluation system. This system would then be used to reward superior, encourage average and either improve or terminate poor teachers.

The commission further recommended that school boards, administrators and teachers work together to develop career stages for teachers. The career stages mentioned in the report included the beginning instructor, the experienced teacher and the master teacher.

The commission's recommendations concerning teaching, along with their many other recommendations, had an immediate impact upon the way school boards and lawmakers viewed the present system of treating all teachers as equals in regard to teaching effectiveness. Within a few months after the report, "master teacher" plans were being mentioned throughout the country. The problem was that neither the commission nor the "master teacher" planners had identified the criteria that would distinguish master teachers (most effective teachers) within the educational system. Lawmakers are currently struggling with this dilemma as they try to follow the commission's recommendations on identifying and rewarding the most effective teachers.

Much of the popular writings concerned with effective teacher criteria were aimed at teachers in general with little regard for the grade level taught or the subject matter presented by the teacher. The question which arises is, "Do all effective teachers exhibit similar
behaviors regardless of what they teach or to whom they teach?" Some work has been done in this area, but still much is unknown. Until further research is completed dealing with effective teachers of specific subject matter areas and grade levels taught, the answer to the question cannot be stated with any certainty.

The effective vocational agriculture teacher has been discussed by many writers, but as is the case with teachers in general, not all agree upon the criteria that makes them effective.

In an article entitled "Effecting Desired Changes," G. W. Hamby (13) listed four factors as being basic to effective vocational agriculture teaching based on discussions with state directors, area supervisors and instructors involved with vocational agriculture. These factors included: (1) adequate pre-service, on-the-job, and in-service preparation, (2) positive communications between teacher and students, (3) ability to motivate students, and (4) consideration of the individual success of each student.

In comparison, Sidney Long (17), a vocational agriculture teacher, listed seven factors considered necessary for effective vocational agriculture teaching. They were: (1) you must enjoy the teaching process, (2) use variety in your teaching, (3) recognize the individual needs of students, (4) always be prepared for class, (5) develop a positive attitude within students towards learning, (6) maintain proper discipline, and (7) earn the respect of your students.

In contrast to this, George Nowadnick (25), a high school principal, suggested that to be a successful vocational agriculture teacher,
one should do the following: (1) participate in teacher associations, (2) be involved in the total school, (3) be a public relations person, (4) update and know trends in your field, (5) evaluate for improvement, and (6) work on improving teaching skills and awareness. Many of the points raised by Hamby, Long and Nowadnick could very well be valid ways to identify effective vocational agriculture teachers; however, they are based on expert opinion and past experience, not reliable research-supported criteria. Since the vast majority of popular writings related to effective vocational agriculture teachers is of this nature, an attempt to provide further clarification of current writings will not be made. The three articles cited, however, do present an operational base upon which vocational agriculture teachers are presently judged as being effective. Only criteria supported by research as being valid and reliable were used in this study. Related Research

Research attempting to identify teacher effectiveness criteria has been conducted since the late 1800s; however, it was not until 1960 that a study was presented which earned the respect of many authorities involved in teacher effectiveness research. This study, known as the Ryans Study (30), conducted teacher effectiveness research on 6,000 teachers in 1,700 schools and 450 school systems. The study involved approximately 100 separate research projects over a period of six years. It was considered, at the time, the most comprehensive attempt ever undertaken to identify and evaluate teacher effectiveness
characteristics.

As a part of the Teacher Characteristic Study directed by Ryans, three groups of teachers were identified. One group was comprised of teachers having observer ratings one standard deviation or more above the mean on each of three central classroom behaviors. The second group was comprised of teachers with observer ratings near the mean and the third group had observer ratings one or more standard deviations below the mean. As reported by Ryans, the major differences between the high and low groups of teachers were as follows (30, pp. 397-398):

There was a general tendency for high teachers to: be extremely generous of other persons; . . . participate in social groups; enjoy pupil relationships; prefer non-directive (permissive) classroom procedures; manifest superior verbal intelligence; and be superior with respect to emotional adjustment. On the other hand, low teachers tended generally to: be restrictive and critical in their appraisals of other persons; prefer activities which did not involve close personal contacts; express less favorable opinions of pupils; manifest less high verbal intelligence; show less satisfactory emotional adjustment; and represent older age groups.

Included among the hundreds of variables and relationships reported by Ryans was the positive correlation between the size of the school in which a teacher works and the characteristics usually associated with effective teachers. It should be noted that most of the information presented by Ryans was collected by carefully trained observers in classroom observations. The findings of these observers represent correlates of teacher classroom behavior and in fact do not demonstrate causation.
Research efforts after the Ryans study slowly changed from the study of teacher characteristics to that of teaching methods and the classroom climate created by the teacher.

Within this time-frame, it became apparent to researchers that rational research in teacher effectiveness must focus on what the teacher does (teacher behavior) as well as pupil learning (teacher effectiveness) (22). This type of research, known as "process-product research" which involves the systematic observation of classroom teaching behaviors, led to a dramatic increase in our knowledge of teacher effectiveness. From a review of fifty process-product studies in 1971, Rosenshine and Furst (28) presented evidence that at least some teacher behaviors were related to student achievement. The variables showing the strongest support towards distinguishing effective and ineffective teaching included: clarity, variability, enthusiasm, task-oriented and/or business-like behaviors, and student opportunity to learn criterion material. A limitation to the variables presented by Rosenshine and Furst was that the variables were the result of studies conducted in classrooms with normal children and focused on general teaching behaviors.

It was hoped by Rosenshine that the general teaching behaviors identified would be effective across all subject areas and types of curriculum. Through further research conducted on the five variables, it was determined that in fact they were effective across the subject areas at the secondary level. The variables such as clarity of presentation and enthusiasm were found to be less important in primary grades (27).
Although the identification of these variables by Rosenshine provided a breakthrough in teacher effectiveness research, they do not provide the final answer to identifying effective teachers. As noted by Gage and Berliner (11), it is not the single variable that is important but the interplay of variables with each other. Research in teacher effectiveness needs to incorporate a multivariate approach to understanding the overall effect of individual variables.

Researchers in recent years have included teacher effectiveness criteria as a part of larger, multidimensional studies involving the evaluation and improvement of instruction within the total school system. One such project, the School Improvement Model project (19), was conducted by researchers at Iowa State University. Included as a part of the School Improvement Model project were four main components: teacher performance evaluation, administrator performance evaluation, student achievement measurement and staff development.

The teacher performance component of the project utilized criteria drawn from the research base on effective teaching. After many years of investigating and refining teacher effectiveness research, a complete array of recommended teacher performance areas, criteria response modes and standards were identified (7).

The performance areas identified in the study included: productive teaching techniques; organized structured class management; intellectual stimulation; positive interpersonal relations; and desirable out-of-class behavior. Included in the performance areas were 21 teacher effectiveness criteria and 176 criteria descriptors. The project also
provided a listing of selected references on effective teaching behaviors which supported the use of the criteria. The accumulation of state-of-the-art teacher effectiveness criteria provided by the School Improvement Model has made it possible for future researchers in teacher effectiveness research to establish a stable base upon which to proceed.

Another major accumulation of teacher effectiveness research findings was provided by Marilynn Kash and Gary Borich (15). In their report, eleven major areas of teacher effectiveness criteria were summarized. These areas included: (1) time management, (2) pupil's attending behaviors and teacher effectiveness, (3) direct and indirect teaching methods, (4) teacher questioning practices, (5) teacher praise, (6) evaluative feedback, (7) teacher controlling behaviors, (8) task structuring, (9) teacher talk and student talk, (10) classroom management practices, and (11) teacher practices to pupil self-concept.

Included as a part of each major heading was a summary of findings abstracted from correlational research studies. Twenty-six research-supported correlates, either positively or negatively related to teacher effectiveness, were provided for review. As noted by Kash and Borich (15), even though the findings were not from experimental studies, previous reviews on similar data suggested that it was possible to draw conclusions from correlational data based on an emerging consensus of replicated results from a variety of comprehensive sources. The findings summarized by Kash and Borich, in most cases, relate quite favorably to the criteria provided by the School Improvement Model project.
Most of the studies conducted on teacher effectiveness criteria dealt solely with the in-class behaviors of teachers and did include any indirect measures such as professional or personal activities which may affect their performance. The problem with using indirect measures in assessing a teacher's performance was noted by Mitzel when he wrote (23, p. 1484), "In a sense they are pseudo criteria, for their relevance depends upon an assumed or conjectured relationship to other criteria, either process or product." The use of indirect measures in teacher effectiveness research, despite their theoretical limitations, has been validated conceptually in an article by Jean A. King (16). In the article, King uses two measures suggested by McNeil and Popham (21) for discriminating criterion which validated the use of indirect measures in teacher performance evaluation. Although research supporting such claims is not found in great abundance, it does exist, as supported by the School Improvement Model findings.

Research related to effective vocational agriculture teachers and the behaviors which make them effective is quite easily summarized for there has been little work done in this area. Only one study could be found which directly related characteristics of teaching excellence to vocational agriculture teachers. The study, conducted by Hedges and Papritan (14) at Ohio State University, identified eight characteristics of teaching excellence in relation to vocational agriculture teachers. The eight essentials for teaching excellence in vocational agriculture were as follows: (1) keep technically up-to-date, (2) be motivated, (3) be interested in the student, (4) set directions, (5) evaluate
The study involved vocational agriculture teachers from Ohio who were considered to be "master teachers" and were nominated by teacher educators and state supervisors of vocational agriculture in Ohio. The target population consisted of fourteen teachers who received three or more nominations. Seven of the master teachers identified were randomly selected to participate in the study. The participants in the study were provided with an opinionnaire asking for the completion of the following statement, "I feel teaching excellence in vocational agriculture involves ____________." The eight essentials of teaching excellence provided in the report were selected through content analysis of the returned opinionnaires.

The small sample size and the possible biases involved in the selection of the original participants severely limits the generalities which can be drawn from this study. It should also be noted that the essentials of teacher excellence were considered to be common if four of the seven respondents mentioned them in their reply to the question, which minimally constitutes a majority of consensus.

Teacher effectiveness research has been an ongoing concern of educational researchers throughout this century. Until 1960, very few criteria had been identified as being valid and reliable measures of identifying effective teachers. The early researchers sought personality traits of effective teachers selected on the basis of
expert judgment. Very little usable knowledge concerning teacher effectiveness was obtained through this method.

During the late sixties and early seventies, real knowledge was gained in the area of teacher effectiveness. The proliferation of process-product research provided a needed boost to the identification of teacher effectiveness criteria.

Reviews of teacher effectiveness research such as those provided by Kash and Borich (15), The School Improvement Model project (19), and Medley (22) have given researchers a solid base upon which to proceed with future teacher effectiveness research. Although the available criteria on effective teachers does not provide the final answer to all effectiveness questions, researchers can now be more sure of themselves using existing findings which are based on better evidence than has previously been available.

Studies related to effective teaching behaviors of vocational agriculture teachers have been very limited. Only one study was found which directly related to this study. In the study, eight essentials of effective vocational agriculture teachers were identified. The generalizations which can be drawn from this study, however, are severely limited because of the overall weakness of the design of the study.

A trend has been established to incorporate teacher effectiveness criteria into larger, multidimensional studies on school improvement. As noted by Gage and Berliner (11), it is not the single variable that
is important but the interplay of variables with each other. This concept played an important role in the design of this study.
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The primary purpose of this study was to create a profile of the effective vocational agriculture teacher by identifying distinguishing behaviors using selected teacher effectiveness descriptors. The following methods and procedures were used to accomplish this purpose.

Design

The design for this study utilized descriptive survey methodology. The purpose of the descriptive survey studies, considered a method of systematic data collection, is to collect information that permits the researcher to describe the characteristics of persons or educational processes (8). As noted by Borg and Gall (8), survey research is a distinctive research methodology and accounts for a substantial proportion of the research done in the field of education.

John Best described the characteristics of descriptive research studies as follows (5, p. 106):

1. They are nonexperimental, for they deal with the relationships between nonmanipulated variables in a natural, rather than artificial, setting. Since the events or conditions have already occurred or exist, the researcher selects the relevant variables for an analysis of their relationships.
2. They involve hypothesis formulation and testing.
3. They use the logical methods of inductive-deductive reasoning to arrive at generalizations.
4. They often employ methods of randomization so that error may be estimated when inferring population characteristics from observations of samples.
5. The variables and procedures are described as accurately and completely as possible so that the study can be replicated by other researchers.

Researchers must be cognizant of the limitations to descriptive
survey research, however, if properly employed and cautiously interpreted, descriptive survey research can be a useful methodology for the development of knowledge (5). Borg and Gall (8) listed four of the most frequently made errors by researchers in survey research. They included: (1) not formulating clear, specific objectives for their research, (2) relating data-gathering procedures to objectives in only a general way and thereby failing to get quantitative data specific to the problem, (3) selecting the sample on the basis of convenience instead of attempting to obtain a random sample, and (4) analyzing survey data one variable at a time instead of analyzing relationships, longitudinal changes, and comparisons between groups.

Population

Vocational agriculture teachers from twelve north central states served as the population for this study. The twelve states from which the population was selected included: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. These states combine to form the central region of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture. The population was restricted to secondary vocational agriculture teachers listed in the 1984 Agriculture Teachers Directory (1) published by Chas. M. Henry Printing Company. The total population consisted of 3212 secondary vocational agriculture teachers.
Sample

The researcher desired to collect specific data on two groups of respondents. One group consisted of respondents who utilized, to a high degree, effective teacher behaviors in their teaching practices. The second group consisted of respondents who utilized effective teacher behaviors in their teaching practices to a much lower degree than the first group. The researcher desired approximately 50 respondents in each of the two groups to insure a sample of sufficient size to meet the purpose of the study.

In order to obtain the two sample groups meeting the specifications desired for the study, a larger sample of vocational agriculture teachers was surveyed. A sample of 330 teachers was determined as being adequate to provide the necessary number of respondents to each of the two specific sample groups desired.

The sample size of 330 vocational agriculture teachers was determined by dividing the number of respondents desired in the specific sample groups by a factor of 0.3. The factor approximated the percentage of respondents expected to be found, under normal circumstances, one or more standard deviations away from the group mean in either direction.

All respondents whose total response score was one or more standard deviations in either direction of the mean response score for the total sample were selected for the two specific sample groups mentioned at the start of the Sample discussion.

It was decided at the onset of the study that nonrespondents from
the sample of 330 vocational agriculture teachers would be replaced by substitutes. The researcher desired an actual number of 330 respondents available for analysis. An additional 220 teachers were selected as substitutes based on an estimated 60 percent return rate from both the original sample group and the substitutes.

A systematic sampling technique was used to obtain the sample from the target population. Systematic sampling is appropriate to use if a population can be accurately listed, or is finite. If this condition is met, the use of systematic sampling provides what approximates a random sample (5).

In this study, a sample size of 330 teachers was selected from the target population of 3212 teachers. By dividing the total population by the desired sample size, it was determined that every ninth teacher from the listing would be selected. By randomly selecting a number from a box containing individual pieces of paper numbered one through nine, it was determined that the eighth person from the beginning of the list would be used as the starting point for the selected sample.

The selection of the substitutes was determined in exactly the same manner as the original sample. In selecting the substitutes, every fifteenth teacher was selected, starting from the second name on the list.

Nonrespondents were replaced by substitutes from the same state whenever possible. It was assumed that this method of substitution would more closely match the nonrespondents than would a substitute
from the entire population. Only substitutes needed to replace non-
respondents were used in the study. All substitutes used in the study
were selected before any data had been analyzed.

It should be mentioned that whenever substitutes are used in a
survey, as noted by Chapman (9), appropriate care should be taken to
insure the following: (1) accurate records are kept on which units are
substituted, (2) data records obtained from substitute units are identi­
fied, (3) the level of substitution is reported, and (4) substitutes
are treated as nonresponse cases when calculating the survey response
rate.

Using the data acquired from the respondents and designated sub­
stitutes, 103 teachers met the qualifications desired for the two
specific sample groups related to the use of effective teacher behaviors
in actual teaching practices. Fifty-three teachers were included in the
group of respondents who utilized, to a high degree, effective teacher
behaviors in their teaching practices and 50 respondents comprised the
group who used effective teacher behaviors in their teaching practices
to a much lower degree than the first group.

Instrumentation

Two instruments were developed for use in the study. The first
instrument, containing forty teacher behavior statements, was designed
to be completed by all vocational agriculture teachers selected for the
original sample including the teachers selected as substitutes. The
second instrument was designed to collect demographic information from
the specifically selected respondents or designated substitutes. The teachers selected to complete the second instrument were chosen based on their total response score to the forty behavior statements on the first instrument. Copies of the instruments are presented in Appendix A. The development of the instruments is described in the following paragraphs.

**The Vo Ag Teacher Profile Survey**

The Vo Ag Teacher Profile Survey was used to assess the teacher behaviors exhibited by respondents based on their actual teaching practices. Responses from the survey were also used to separate respondents into similar groups based on a total response score calculated from the forty teacher behavior statements.

A list of teacher performance areas and teacher effectiveness criteria identified by the School Improvement Model project (7) served as the basis for the development of the instrument. A listing of the performance areas, teacher effectiveness criteria and descriptors provided by the School Improvement Model project is provided in Appendix B.

The five teacher performance areas identified by the School Improvement Model project were modified to better meet the objectives of the study. The five teacher performance areas used in the study included: (1) productive teaching techniques, (2) organized, structured class management, (3) positive interpersonal relationships, (4) professional responsibilities, and (5) personal characteristics. The original list of 176 criteria descriptors provided by the School Improvement Model
project was also refined and updated to include a final listing of 115 criteria descriptors. The modified list of teacher performance areas, teacher effectiveness criteria and descriptors used in the study is provided in Appendix C.

Teacher effectiveness studies and reviews which were published after 1981 were used to update and refine the original criteria descriptors provided by the School Improvement Model project. A listing of selected references which support the use of the criteria is provided in Appendix C.

From the modified list of criteria descriptors, forty-two behavior statements were formulated by the researcher for review. The instrument was reviewed by departmental faculty and graduate students for face validity. Based upon recommendations of these groups, the instrument was revised to include only forty teacher behavior statements. Upon revision, the instrument was administered to five vocational agriculture teachers not included in the sample for clarification of instructions and verification that the statements asked would provide for an appropriate range of responses. The pre-test provided evidence that the instructions were clear and that the statements provided for a wide range of responses.

The final instrument consisted of forty teacher behavior statements. Fourteen of the statements were related to productive teaching techniques; seven statements pertained to organized, structured class management; ten statements related to positive interpersonal relationships; four statements related to professional responsibilities; and
five statements pertained to personal characteristics.

Respondents were asked to respond to each of the statements based upon their actual teaching practices using the following scale:

Never Rarely Sometimes Usually Always
/-------/-----/-------/-------/-------/-------/-------/
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Included as a part of the Vo Ag Teacher Profile Survey were two questions which sought demographic information from the respondents. The questions included information on the years of teaching experience and the average number of students taught per day by the respondent.

Vo Ag Teacher Profile Survey: Demographic data

The second instrument was used to collect specific demographic information on selected respondents and designated substitutes. The questions on the survey were formulated from a review of literature and the researcher's own personal insight as to what data would provide for a more meaningful profile of the effective vocational agriculture teacher.

The instrument was reviewed by departmental faculty and graduate students for face validity. Based upon the recommendations of these groups, the instrument was revised and finalized for the study.

Eighteen questions on the instrument sought demographic information from the respondents in the following general areas: personal background, school setting, vocational agriculture program offered, professional activities, civic activities and educational activities. Also included in the instrument was a question asking whether or not
the respondent desired a summary of the study when it was completed.

Collection of Data

The Vo Ag Teacher Profile Survey, along with a cover letter (see Appendix A) and self-addressed, stamped envelope were mailed to the vocational agriculture teachers, including substitutes, on January 30, 1985. Since follow-up procedures would not be used and the cover letter requested that respondents return the instrument at their earliest convenience, the cut-off date for receiving the instrument was established as March 1, 1985.

A total of 211 instruments were returned by teachers from the original sample of 330 within the established cut-off date. Three of the instruments returned were blank because the teacher had either retired or left the teaching profession. With the elimination of the three blank instruments, 63 percent of the instruments were properly completed and usable.

A total of 142 instruments were received from the 220 substitutes sampled within the established cut-off time. One instrument was deemed unusable because the respondent worked solely with adults and could not respond to all of the statements. Excluding the one nonusable return, a response rate of 64.1 percent was achieved from the substitutes.

Twelve nonrespondents (10%) from the original sample were selected for a follow-up to determine if significant differences existed between respondents and nonrespondents. The follow-up procedure consisted of a second mailing of the teacher profile instrument and a cover letter (see
Appendix A) explaining the need for the information. From the follow-up procedure, nine usable instruments were received. A telephone follow-up to the three nonrespondents revealed that two of the nonrespondents were no longer employed at the school and one declined to participate in the study.

One hundred twenty-two substitutes were used to replace nonrespondents from the sample group which yielded a substitution rate of 37 percent for the study.

The second instrument, the demographic data survey, along with a cover letter, a summary sheet of the profile survey, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were mailed to selected respondents and designated substitutes on March 15, 1985.

On April 12, 1985, a follow-up mailing consisting of a cover letter, survey instrument and self-addressed, stamped envelope was sent to nonrespondents. From the two mailings, a total of 98 instruments were returned out of the original 103 sent, which resulted in a 95 percent return rate. A follow-up of the five nonrespondents was not conducted since the researcher had information on the nonrespondents from the profile survey instrument completed earlier.

Analysis of Data

The data collected from the respondents were transferred by the researcher to disk storage on the AS/6 computer of the Iowa State University Computation Center. All analysis and manipulation of data were accomplished using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
The following paragraphs provide a brief overview of the analysis procedures used in the study. A more detailed coverage of the analysis procedures used in the study is provided in the Findings chapter.

The forty teacher behavior statements used in the first instrument were analyzed for consistency using the SPSSX subprogram RELIABILITY. A reliability alpha coefficient was also calculated for each of the five teacher performance areas included as a part of the forty teacher behavior statements.

Data modification and transformation in the study were accomplished by using the SPSSX procedures COMPUTE and RECODE. A total response score for each of the respondents was calculated through use of these procedures.

The SPSSX procedure entitled FREQUENCIES was used to obtain group means, standard deviations and frequency counts on all items of both instruments. The SPSSX REPORT procedure was used to provide the researcher with a listing of specifically selected variables associated with each respondent.

Inferential analysis used in the study included only t-tests. The t-tests were primarily used to test for significant differences between the two specific teacher effectiveness groups identified in the study when comparing their mean response scores for each of the forty teacher behavior statements and performance areas.
FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to create a profile of the effective vocational agriculture teacher. To accomplish this purpose, vocational agriculture teachers from twelve north central states were selected to participate in the study. Responses from the teachers completing the Vo Ag Teacher Profile Survey were used to determine a high and low teacher effectiveness group. Respondents who were categorized into one of the teacher effectiveness groups received a second survey instrument which sought demographic information in six general areas. Results of data analysis are presented in the following five areas:

1. Analysis of instrumental reliability;
2. Analysis of respondent, substitute and nonrespondent differences;
3. Selection of teacher effectiveness groups;
4. Analysis of teacher performance areas; and
5. Descriptive analysis of teacher effectiveness groups.

Analysis of Instrument Reliability

An instrument consisting of forty teacher behavior statements was used in the study. The forty teacher behavior statements included in the instrument were classified under five teacher performance areas. The five teacher performance areas included: 1) productive teaching techniques, 2) organized, structured class management, 3) positive interpersonal relationships, 4) professional responsibilities, and 5) personal characteristics. Responses to all five performance areas
were combined to determine a total response score for each respondent. The teacher performance areas and the specific behavior statements classified under each area are found in Appendix D.

Cronbach's alpha coefficient of reliability was calculated for each of the five teacher performance areas using SPSSX procedure RELIABILITY (32). A composite reliability coefficient for the entire instrument was also calculated using Cronbach's alpha. The reliability coefficients for all the performance areas were above the .62 level as presented in Table 1. The composite reliability coefficient (.82) was computed using all forty teacher behavior statements from the instrument. Based upon the composite reliability coefficient and the subsequent performance area reliability coefficients, the behavior statements used in the study were considered to be acceptable for group measurement.

Table 1. Reliability coefficients for vocational agriculture teacher profile survey instrument

| Teacher performance areas                           | Number of items | Reliability coefficient|^a|
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Productive teaching techniques                      | 14              | 0.708                  |
| Organized, structured class management              | 7               | 0.653                  |
| Positive interpersonal relationships                | 10              | 0.796                  |
| Professional responsibilities                      | 4               | 0.640                  |
| Personal characteristics                            | 5               | 0.622                  |
| Composite of areas                                  | 40              | 0.818                  |

^aCronbach's alpha.
Comparison of Respondent and Nonrespondent Differences

A sample of 330 vocational agriculture teachers were selected to complete the Vo Ag Teacher Profile Survey. Another 220 vocational agriculture teachers were selected as substitutes, to be used in cases of nonresponse from the original sample of 330 teachers. To determine if significant differences existed between respondents of the original sample group and substitutes, SPSSX procedure T-TEST was used. The calculated means, standard deviations and t-values are recorded in Table 2. The sample respondents and substitutes were found to be similar in all areas at the .01 alpha level.

A comparison between the sample respondents and nonrespondents was also made using the same procedure as described in the respondent/substitute comparison. The calculated means, standard deviations and t-values are recorded in Table 2. The respondents and nonrespondents were found to be significantly different at the .01 alpha level for two items. The nonrespondent group had a mean response of 4.6 to the statement, "Do you ask for constructive feedback from students to help improve your exams?" The respondent group had a mean of 5.6 to the same statement. The nonrespondents were also significantly different in the mean number of years they had taught (4.7) when compared to the respondents' mean years of teaching of 13.2 years.

Selection of Teacher Effectiveness Groups

A total of forty teacher behavior statements were completed by each respondent. Thirty-two of the statements were positively
Table 2. Means, standard deviations and t-values of respondent, substitute and nonrespondent groups by Vo Ag Teacher Profile Survey items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>t-value respond-</th>
<th>t-value respond-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents (N=208)</td>
<td>Substitutes (N=122)</td>
<td>Nonrespondent (N=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide written comments on exams.</td>
<td>5.40 ± 1.63</td>
<td>5.12 ± 1.63</td>
<td>5.11 ± 1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use learning activities which are designed to achieve stated objectives for the course.</td>
<td>7.03 ± 1.28</td>
<td>7.08 ± 0.98</td>
<td>7.11 ± 1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Need to further explain assignments to students after giving them directions.</td>
<td>4.64 ± 1.50</td>
<td>4.70 ± 1.55</td>
<td>4.11 ± 1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Motivate your students by providing opportunities for successful learning activities at each student's ability level.</td>
<td>6.30 ± 1.25</td>
<td>6.25 ± 1.56</td>
<td>6.56 ± 1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. By-pass school policy when conditions warrant the action.</td>
<td>6.28 ± 1.90</td>
<td>6.47 ± 1.90</td>
<td>6.56 ± 1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Motivate students by challenging them to higher scholastic expectations.</td>
<td>6.89 ± 1.31</td>
<td>6.93 ± 1.26</td>
<td>6.89 ± 1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Use lectures to teach most of the course information.</td>
<td>4.95 ± 1.56</td>
<td>4.93 ± 1.42</td>
<td>5.67 ± 1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Relate current lessons to past lessons</td>
<td>7.07 ± 1.20</td>
<td>6.88 ± 1.34</td>
<td>6.89 ± 0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aMean.  
^bStandard deviation.
### Table 2. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Ask for constructive feedback from students to help you improve exams.</td>
<td>M^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD^b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Consider the overall school curriculum when selecting course materials for your courses.</td>
<td>5.64 5.58 4.56</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>3.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.93 1.75 0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Design educational activities for the class as a whole rather than for individual students.</td>
<td>5.78 5.76 5.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.99 1.97 1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Seek the advice of experts in the subject area of the courses you teach.</td>
<td>3.62 3.62 4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.41 1.23 1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Periodically evaluate your performance.</td>
<td>6.61 6.42 5.89</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.54 1.67 1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Need to clarify information to students having trouble reading your writing on the blackboard.</td>
<td>6.72 6.53 5.67</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.53 1.55 1.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Adjust the physical arrangements of the classroom to provide for a variety of learning activities.</td>
<td>5.48 5.68 6.11</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 1.94 1.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Confront students when they are not doing their assigned task.</td>
<td>5.82 5.75 5.33</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.84 1.85 1.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Use long range plans to guide the improvement of your program.</td>
<td>7.53 7.48 8.00</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.20 1.13 0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Use textbooks for most of the printed information provided to students.</td>
<td>7.09 6.79 7.44</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.59 1.43 1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Allow students in your courses to help establish classroom rules and procedures.</td>
<td>5.19 5.21 5.56</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.73 1.69 1.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.53 4.39 4.78</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.08 2.03 2.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significantly different at .01 alpha level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Help students locate supplementary materials for subject matter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Establish a given set of rules and procedures to manage student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Feel students in your classes can be trusted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Set aside time to provide individual help to students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Constructively criticize students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Encourage friendly and respectful relationships with your</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Use sarcasm to counteract student remarks when appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Use humor within your classes as long as it is kept in its</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proper perspective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Categorize students by their needs (cultural, academic,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intellectual, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Share your teaching methods with other teachers in your school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Keep informed about your students with special health needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. Complete written reports required by your school within the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specified time limit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Start your classes at the times they are scheduled to start.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Keep abreast of new developments within your subject area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Feel enthusiastic towards your work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Consider yourself a patient person when dealing with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Take in stride the changing situations occurring within the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Recognize students for their efforts which are worthy of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praise.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>7.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Develop course activities which reflect &quot;lifelike&quot; situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Seek ways to involve parents of students in program-related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Feel that you are capable of handling all the challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associated with your work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many years have you taught including this year?</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>13.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>t-value respondent/substitute</th>
<th>t-value respondent/nonrespondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the average number of students you teach per day at the present time?</td>
<td>M\textsuperscript{a} 53.54 52.84 57.89</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD\textsuperscript{b} 25.65 22.77 29.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
correlated to the effective teacher. Eight of the forty statements were negatively correlated to the effective teacher.

Responses to the eight negatively related statements, which included statement numbers 3, 5, 7, 11, 14, 18, 26, and 28 (see Appendix D), were recoded to align all statement responses in a positive direction. If, for example, a respondent answered with a "1" to a negatively correlated statement, meaning they never used the negative behavior, the response was recoded to represent an actual response score of "9". After recoding, it was assumed that teachers who were using the behaviors to a high degree in their actual teaching practices were more effective as teachers than those who were not using the behaviors to a high degree.

A total response score for each respondent was calculated by adding up the response values (includes recoded responses) for each of the forty teacher behavior statements. The possible value range for the total response score was from 40 to 360. The actual range of total response scores was 182 to 313.

The frequency of total response scores, which are depicted in Figure 1, very nearly represent the frequency of scores expected under normal circumstances. Since this was the case, it was acceptable that all total response scores located one or more standard deviations in either direction of the group mean response score would be used as the cutoff point for the two effectiveness groups desired in the study.

Using this procedure, it was determined that the high group would include total response scores ranging from 282 to 313. The low
Figure 1. Frequency of total response scores by respondents

Numbers refer to midpoints.
group included total response scores ranging from 182 to 237. The two teacher effectiveness groups, each with 49 respondents, formed the core for information collected in the remainder of the study.

Analysis of Teacher Effectiveness Groups by Performance Areas

The high and low teacher effectiveness groups were analyzed for differences between mean scores among the five teacher performance areas. Using SPSSX procedure T-TEST (32), significant differences were found between the two groups in all five performance areas, as noted in Table 3.

It was expected that significant differences would exist between groups concerning teacher performance area mean scores since the teachers were placed in each group based on their total response score for the forty behavior statements making up the performance areas. The two performance areas with the largest differences between groups included productive teaching techniques ($t$-value = 23.52) and positive interpersonal relationships ($t$-value = 16.46).

A comparison of differences between groups by individual statements within each performance area was also conducted. The comparison revealed that 35 of the 40 teacher behavior statements were significantly different at the .01 alpha level. A listing by performance area of the statements which were found not to be significantly different is provided in Table 4. Of the five nonsignificantly different statements, at least one statement was classified under each of the
Table 3. Means, standard deviations and t-values of teacher effectiveness groups by teacher performance areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=49)</td>
<td>(N=49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive teaching techniques</td>
<td>M&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; SD&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>-23.62&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized, structured class</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>-12.96</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>-16.46</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>-8.15</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>-10.91</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Mean.  
<sup>b</sup> Standard deviation.  
<sup>c</sup> t-value of 2.575 significantly different at .01 alpha level.
Table 4. Nonsignificantly different teacher behavior statements by teacher effectiveness groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area/statement</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (N=49)</td>
<td>High (N=49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive teaching techniques/design educational activities for the class as a whole rather than for individual students.</td>
<td>M^a 3.40, SD^b 1.20</td>
<td>M^a 4.08, SD^b 1.57</td>
<td>-2.47, 0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized, structured class management/need to clarify information to students having trouble reading your writing on the blackboard.</td>
<td>5.34, 1.93</td>
<td>5.87, 2.07</td>
<td>-1.34, 0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use textbooks for most of the printed information provided to students.</td>
<td>5.50, 1.84</td>
<td>5.25, 1.68</td>
<td>0.73, 0.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive interpersonal relationships/categorize students by their needs.</td>
<td>5.04, 1.58</td>
<td>4.53, 1.88</td>
<td>1.50, 0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional responsibilities/by-pass school policy when conditions warrant the action.</td>
<td>6.06, 1.87</td>
<td>6.51, 2.10</td>
<td>-1.15, 0.253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aMean.

^bStandard deviation.
teacher performance areas except the personal characteristics area.

Descriptive Analysis of Effectiveness Groups

Demographic information was collected for both high and low teacher effectiveness groups so that comparisons could be made in reference to the effective teacher. Demographic information was collected under the following general areas: personal background of teacher, school setting, vocational agriculture program offered, professional activities, civic activities, and educational activities. Comparisons made for all variables included in the Demographic Survey were considered to be significantly different if the t-values were 1.96 or higher (.05 alpha level).

Personal background

The average age of teachers in each of the effectiveness groups is illustrated in Figure 2. The difference in means was analyzed and resulted in a t-value of 2.81. There was a highly significant difference between the mean age of each group.

Figure 2. Mean age of teachers by teacher effectiveness group
The number of years of high school vocational agriculture completed by respondents of each effectiveness group is depicted in Figure 3. A t-value (0.77) was calculated for this variable which revealed no significant difference between the two groups.

Data were also collected on the number of years each respondent had resided on a farm. The average number of years of farm residence for teachers of each effectiveness group is provided in Figure 4. A t-value of 2.49 was calculated for this variable, revealing a significant difference between the two groups.

The mean number of years that teachers from each effectiveness group had resided in their present location was also found to be significantly different (t-value = 2.28). The mean number of years of residence is illustrated in Figure 5.

The average number of years of teaching experience by each of the effectiveness groups is depicted in Figure 6. A t-value (1.97) was calculated for this variable which revealed a significant difference between groups.

School setting

The type of students served by the schools in which the respondents from each effectiveness group taught are illustrated in Figures 7 and 8. As can be seen by these figures, the two effectiveness groups were very similar with regard to the type of students served by the schools in which the respondents taught vocational agriculture classes.
Figure 3. Number of years of high school vocational agriculture completed by respondents of each teacher effectiveness group.
Figure 4. Mean years of farm residence by teacher effectiveness group

Figure 5. Mean years of residence at present location by teacher effectiveness group

Figure 6. Mean years of teaching experience by teacher effectiveness groups
Figure 7. Type of students served by schools at which low teacher effectiveness group members taught vocational agriculture classes

Figure 8. Type of students served by schools at which high teacher effectiveness group members taught vocational agriculture classes
The average number of secondary students enrolled in the schools of effectiveness group respondents is provided in Figure 9. No significant difference was observed between groups when a t-value (0.59) was calculated for the variable. The size of school in which respondents taught ranged from as few as 37 secondary students to a high of 2100 secondary students.

![Figure 9. Mean number of secondary students enrolled in schools served by teacher effectiveness groups](image)

**Vocational agriculture program offered**

The type of classes offered by the vocational agriculture teachers within each effectiveness group are illustrated in Figures 10 and 11. The two effectiveness groups are very similar in comparison to the types of classes offered by teachers within each group.

Adult classes were taught by only 38.8 percent of the low teacher effectiveness group teachers, whereas 59.2 percent of the high effectiveness group teachers offered some type of adult class. The type of adult classes taught by teachers in each of the effectiveness groups is depicted in Figures 12 and 13.

Other program related variables in which t-values were calculated
Figure 10. Types of classes offered by low teacher effectiveness group members

Figure 11. Types of classes offered by high teacher effectiveness group members
Figure 12. Types of adult classes offered by low teacher effectiveness group members

Figure 13. Types of adult classes offered by high teacher effectiveness group members
to determine any significant differences between groups included the following: amount of preparatory time available during the normal school day, percent of total workload involved with FFA activities, number of students enrolled in vocational agriculture classes, and percent of students having active supervised occupational experience programs. The results of these calculations are provided in Table 5.

Table 5. Means, standard deviations and t-values of selected program related variables by teacher effectiveness groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of preparation time in minutes available during the normal school day.</td>
<td>Mean(^a)</td>
<td>59.59</td>
<td>55.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard deviation SD(^b)</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>20.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total workload involved with FFA activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.65</td>
<td>22.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>15.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students enrolled in vocational agriculture classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.71</td>
<td>53.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.83</td>
<td>35.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of students having active supervised occupational experience programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.10</td>
<td>81.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.53</td>
<td>27.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Mean.
\(^b\)Standard deviation.
*Significantly different at the .05 alpha level.

Only the means for the variable dealing with the percent of students having active supervised occupational experience programs were found to be significantly different.
Professional activities

Respondents from each of the effectiveness groups were asked to provide information concerning the number of professionally related organizations of which they were a member. The average number of professionally related organizations in which memberships were held by teacher effectiveness group members is illustrated in Figure 14. A t-value of 2.03 was calculated for the variable, suggesting that there was a significant difference between groups.

![Figure 14. Mean number of professionally related organizations in which teacher effectiveness group members held memberships](image)

Respondents from each group were also asked to provide the number of leadership positions they have held within each of the professionally related organizations. Figure 15 depicts the average number of leadership positions held by members of each effectiveness group. The two group means were found to be significantly different (t-value = 3.54).

Along with the number of leadership positions held within professionally related organizations, respondents were asked to indicate the title of the highest position they had held. Respondents from both
Figure 15. Mean number of leadership positions held within professionally related organizations by teacher effectiveness groups

groups were very similar when compared by the type of position held within the professional organizations with one exception. That exception was that the high teacher effectiveness group had two members who had served in leadership positions at the national level, while the low teacher effectiveness group did not have any members serve above the state level.

Civic activities

Respondents from each of the teacher effectiveness groups were asked to provide information concerning the number of civic organizations or clubs of which they were a member. The average number of civic organizations or clubs to which members of the teacher effectiveness groups held membership is provided in Figure 16. A t-value of 3.82 was calculated for the variable revealing there was a significant difference between groups.

Respondents from each group were also asked to provide the number of leadership positions they have held within each of the civic organizations or clubs. Figure 17 illustrates the average number of leadership
Figure 16. Mean number of civic organizations or clubs in which teacher effectiveness group members held memberships

![Bar chart showing the mean number of organizations or clubs](image)

Figure 17. Mean number of leadership positions held within civic organizations or clubs by teacher effectiveness groups

![Bar chart showing the mean number of leadership positions](image)

positions held by members of each teacher effectiveness group. The two group means were found to be significantly different (t-value = 2.70).

Along with the number of leadership positions held within civic organizations or clubs, respondents were asked to provide the title of the highest position they had held within these organizations. The low teacher effective group had 49 percent of its members who had not held a leadership position within a civic organization or club. Twenty-seven percent of the low effectiveness group members had served as president of one or more civic organizations. The high teacher
effectiveness group had 47 percent of its members who had served as president to one or more civic organizations or clubs. Only 31 percent of the high effectiveness group members had not held a leadership position within a civic organization or club.

Educational activities

Respondents from each teacher effectiveness group were asked to provide the number of credit hours of formal education they had completed since receiving their bachelor of science degrees. Since credit hours were provided in the form of semester and quarter credits, all quarter credit hours were recalculated to represent an equal number of semester hours of formal education completed by members of each teacher effectiveness group. A t-value of 2.30 was calculated for the variable, indicating that there was a significant difference between groups.

![Figure 18. Mean number of semester hours of formal education completed by teacher effectiveness groups since completing their bachelor of science degree](image)

Respondents from each group were also asked to provide the number of workshops, field days and seminars they had participated in during
the last two years. Table 6 provides the calculated means, standard deviations and t-values for each of these variables by teacher effectiveness group. The t-values calculated for group means concerning the number of workshops, field days and seminars attended in the last two years were all significantly different at the .05 and .01 alpha levels.

Summary of Major Findings

The following section provides a brief summary of the major findings of this study. They include:

1. A marked difference existed between vocational agriculture teachers concerning their use of effective teacher behaviors
in actual teaching practices. Based on a total response score to forty teacher behavior statements, vocational agriculture teachers had calculated teacher effectiveness scores ranging from 182 to 313.

2. The high teacher effectiveness group had significantly higher mean scores for all five teacher performance areas used in the study.

3. Teacher effectiveness groups were similar concerning responses to five of the eight negatively correlated teacher behavior statements.

4. Personal background variables concerning the age of the respondent, years of teaching experience, years of farm residence and years of residence at their present location were all significantly higher for the high teacher effectiveness group.

5. Twenty percent more of the high teacher effectiveness group members were teaching some type of adult class when compared to the low effectiveness group members.

6. The percent of students having active supervised occupational experience programs was significantly higher for the high teacher effectiveness group.

7. Memberships in professional and civic organizations along with leadership positions held within these organizations were significantly higher for teachers of the high effectiveness group.

8. Teachers from the high effectiveness group had completed significantly more formal education credits since receiving their
bachelor of science degrees than had low effectiveness group members.
DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to profile the effective vocational agriculture teacher by identifying distinguishing behaviors using selected teacher effectiveness descriptors. The overall design of the study proved to be a very effective way to ascertain reliable information concerning effective vocational agriculture teachers.

Strengths of the study included the methods used to separate teachers into effectiveness groups and the follow-up procedures used once the teachers were classified into these groups. Another strength of the study was the design of the instruments used to collect the data. Both instruments used in the study were one page in length and required a minimal amount of time and effort to be completed by the respondents.

The overall study could have been strengthened by a more intense effort to secure responses from the original sample group before replacements were used. A 63 percent response rate, however, was considered very acceptable for a one-time mailing. Another procedure which could have strengthened the overall design of the study, if time and funds had permitted its use, would have been the incorporation of a third instrument into the study. The third instrument could have provided more specific information and support to the original instruments' findings regarding teacher effectiveness behaviors used by vocational agriculture teachers. It should be noted that the original instrument used to collect information on teacher effectiveness
behaviors did provide conclusive evidence that major differences existed between teacher effectiveness groups.

A major problem in fulfilling the purpose of the study was the lack of any readily available instruments or methodologies specifically designed to identify the effective vocational agriculture teacher. Reviews of past research and popular writings revealed that a stable base of effective teacher criteria has been identified for teachers in general. Although effective teacher criteria available for use by researchers leave much to be desired in terms of universal acceptance and specificity to pedagogical disciplines, they are based on findings which provide better evidence of validity than have previously been available.

An important concept used in the design of the study involved the idea that it is not the single variable that is important in identifying effective teachers, but the interplay of many variables with each other. The forty teacher behavior statements and 20 demographic questions used in the study were formulated based on this concept.

The descriptive research methodology utilized in the study was designed to describe common behaviors and characteristics inherent with effective vocational agriculture teachers and not to demonstrate causality among variables. It should be emphasized that not all effective teachers would be expected to conform to any one specific behavior described within the effective teacher profile. Some teachers may excel in one teacher performance area while disregarding certain effective teacher criteria in another area; yet, the combined effect
of their behaviors would cause them to be profiled as an effective teacher.

A major assumption involved with satisfying the first objective of the study, which sought to determine effectiveness groups of vocational agriculture teachers, was based on the premise that effective teachers use more of the effective teacher behaviors to a higher degree than do less effective teachers. Selected research-supported teacher effectiveness criteria served as the basis for determining teacher effectiveness groups used in the study. A total response score was calculated for each respondent by adding together the responses to the forty teacher behavior statements. A high total response score indicated that the respondent was using to a high degree the effective teacher behaviors in his/her actual teaching practice.

Under normal circumstances it would be expected that total response scores for the 330 respondents would approximate a normal, bell-shaped curve with regard to distribution. Few teachers would be found at each extreme with a large group falling near the mean response score. This proved to be the case when total response scores were examined for distribution. A skewness of -0.11 was calculated for the total response score distribution.

Since the total response score distribution approximated normal circumstances, it was accepted that one standard deviation in either direction of the mean response score would be used as the separation point for high and low teacher effectiveness groups. This same
procedure was used by Ryans (30) in 1960 to distinguish three groups of teachers as a part of the much acclaimed teacher characteristics study. Although this methodology of distinguishing teacher effectiveness groups worked quite satisfactorily, perhaps the use of another method such as using natural breaks in total response score distributions could provide even more exacting differences between teacher effectiveness groups.

A composite reliability coefficient for the forty teacher behavior statements used in the study was calculated at .82. A reliability coefficient was also calculated for each of the five teacher performance area subscales making up the forty item instrument. In all areas, the subscale reliability coefficients were not as high as the composite reliability coefficient. The subscale reliability coefficients ranged from .62 to .80.

Through the use of OPTIONS 9 of the SPSSX procedure RELIABILITY (32), it was determined that all eight negatively correlated teacher behavior statements used in the study had a negative effect on subscale reliability coefficients. Since the reliability coefficients reflect the extent to which an instrument is free of error variance, it can be assumed that the eight negatively correlated statements reflect a higher degree of error variance than the other statements. As noted by Borg and Gall (8), error variance can be defined as the sum effect of the chance differences between persons that arise from factors associated with a particular measurement. These factors could include wording of the statements, order of the statements, mood of
the respondent and content that is used. Considering the type of information sought and the variability among respondents, the reliability coefficients were considered very acceptable for a newly designed instrument.

Increases in instrument reliability could be made, however, through the rewording of negatively correlated behavior statements or the deletion of high error variance statements replaced by statements which more closely relate to other subscale statements.

Objective two of the study sought to identify effective teacher behaviors which distinguished the high teacher effectiveness group from the low teacher effectiveness group. Responses to the forty teacher behavior statements used in the study, comprised of five teacher performance areas, were used to accomplish this objective.

For all teacher performance areas, highly significant differences were noted when t-values were calculated between groups. This was somewhat expected, however, because the groups were originally formed based on the degree of their responses to the forty teacher behavior statements. Performance areas showing the greatest differences between groups dealt with the teaching techniques used by the teachers and the interpersonal relationships found between the teacher and students.

Mean scores for the productive teaching techniques performance area revealed that the high teacher effectiveness group members (mean = 6.92) usually used the teacher effectiveness behaviors in their actual teaching practices. Low teacher effectiveness group members (mean =
only sometimes used the same teacher effectiveness behaviors in their actual teaching practices. The mean scores for the positive interpersonal relationships performance area revealed that the high teacher effectiveness group (mean = 7.43), more often than usual, used the teacher effectiveness behaviors listed in the instrument. The low teacher effectiveness group members used these same behaviors (mean = 5.77) somewhere between sometimes and usually in their actual teaching practices.

Another instrument, consisting of additional teacher effectiveness criteria statements related to each of the five teacher performance areas, would have been beneficial in providing more conclusive evidence to support the original instrument findings if additional time and funds were available.

T-values were also calculated on individual statement mean scores within each performance area by teacher effectiveness groups. Mean scores for 35 of the 40 teacher behavior statements were found to be significantly different at the .01 alpha level. All five of the individual statements which were not found to be significantly different were negatively correlated teacher effectiveness criteria statements. This suggests that a majority of the low effectiveness group teachers were not less effective because they were using negatively correlated teacher behaviors in their actual teaching practices, but rather that they were using the positive teacher behaviors to a lesser degree than were the high teacher effectiveness group members.

The third objective of the study sought to identify demographic
characteristics associated with the effective vocational agriculture teacher. A total of 20 selected demographic questions in six general areas were used to accomplish this objective. The six general areas of questioning included: personal background of the teacher, school setting, vocational agriculture program being offered, professional activities, civic activities and educational activities.

The average age of high teacher effectiveness group members (mean = 40.0) was significantly different from the average age of low teacher effectiveness group members (mean = 34.5). This difference should not be construed to mean that the older a teacher is, the more effective he/she will become. The difference could be associated with the fact that, in general, effective teachers have been exposed to more experiences because of their age. Even this suggestion is somewhat deceiving when the range in ages of respondents from the high teacher effectiveness group is considered (23 years to 61 years).

Significant differences were also found between groups concerning years of teaching experience, years of farm residence and years of residence at their present location. In all three variables, a higher group mean was recorded for the high teacher effectiveness group when compared to the low teacher effectiveness group.

The mean years of teaching experience by group members would be expected to be significantly different since it was highly correlated to the mean age of group members which was calculated as being significantly different between groups. It should be noted that a significant difference between respondents and nonrespondents was observed.
concerning years of teaching experience. The most plausible reason for this occurrence is that less experienced teachers may not have felt qualified to complete an instrument on effective teacher criteria until they were coaxed into completing the instrument by a second follow-up mailing. It should also be noted that total response scores calculated for each of these groups were nearly identical.

Significantly higher means for both the years of farm residence and years of residence at the present location by the high teacher effectiveness group members suggest two plausible reasons for this occurrence. The first is that increased experience and exposure to real agriculture problems related to classroom instruction indirectly affected the teacher's overall performance. The second reason would suggest that having a more thorough knowledge of community resources and contact persons within the community indirectly affected the teacher's overall effectiveness.

The only variable in which personal background information was sought that did not have a significant difference between group means was the years of high school vocational agriculture completed by respondents. Low effectiveness group members, in fact, had a higher group mean (2.9 years) than did high teacher effectiveness group members (2.7 years).

Demographic information collected on the school setting provided no significant differences between teacher effectiveness groups. Both groups were very similar in the types of students served by the schools in which they were employed. Approximately 90 percent of the schools,
for both respondent groups, served either mostly rural students or a combination of rural and urban students. Calculations made on the total number of secondary students enrolled in schools served by each respondent group also revealed no significant difference. The high teacher effectiveness group, however, did have a higher group mean (451) than did the low teacher effectiveness group (405).

The types of vocational agriculture classes being offered by both teacher effectiveness groups were very similar. A high majority of respondents in both groups were offering full year Vo Ag I through Vo Ag IV classes or a combination of semester and full year classes.

Because of the nature of the data collected, a significant difference between groups was not calculated concerning the teaching of adult classes. Approximately 39 percent of the low teacher effectiveness group members taught some type of adult class in comparison to 59 percent of the high teacher effectiveness group members teaching some type of adult class. This difference suggests that the high teacher effectiveness group members are more involved with adults of the community, sharing in their experiences and keeping technically up-to-date, which in turn indirectly affected their overall performance as a teacher.

No significant differences were found between group means concerning the amount of preparatory time a teacher had during the normal school day, the number of students enrolled in vocational agriculture classes taught by the respondents and the percentage of the respondents' workload associated with FFA activities. The latter finding could help
dispell the belief that a vocational agriculture teacher needs to spend an inordinate amount of time on FFA activities to be considered an effective teacher.

A significant difference was noted between groups concerning the percent of students enrolled in vocational agriculture classes having active supervised occupational experience programs. Seventy percent of the low teacher effectiveness groups' students had active supervised occupational experience programs in contrast to 82 percent for the high teacher effectiveness group. It could be hypothesized that high teacher effectiveness group members stressed the importance of supervised occupational experience programs more than did low teacher effectiveness group members. Supervised occupational experience programs provide a means for the effective teacher to get to know his/her students on an individual basis which in turn demonstrates their interest in the students' overall development. The low teacher effectiveness group members could be doing these same things, but to a significantly lower degree than the high group members.

Significant differences between groups were revealed with regard to the total number of professional and civic organizations to which respondents held membership. In both cases, the high teacher effectiveness group members belonged to more organizations than did the low effectiveness group members. This suggests that the high teacher effectiveness group members were more active professionally and civicly than were the low effectiveness group members. When coupled with the fact that significant differences were also noted between groups
concerning the number of leadership positions held within these organizations, this suggestion becomes even more plausible. High teacher effectiveness group members served, on the average, in two more professionally related leadership positions than did low teacher effectiveness group members. The overall affect of this variable is reflected in increased effectiveness as a teacher.

The mean number of formal education credits completed by respondent groups was found to be significantly different. Low teacher effectiveness group members completed an average of 22 semester credits after completing their bachelor of science degree while high teacher effectiveness group members had completed an average of 31 semester credits. Although part of this difference could be explained by the increased age of the high teacher effectiveness group members, it could also suggest that continued formal education does indirectly affect a teacher's effectiveness as a teacher. In support of this finding, significantly higher means were also noted for high teacher effectiveness group members concerning the numbers of workshops, field days, and seminars they had participated in during the last two years.

Profile of the Effective Vocational Agriculture Teacher

Observations made in this section of the study are based on data collected from 49 teachers from twelve north central states who were considered to be highly effective as vocational agriculture teachers. Points raised about the effective vocational agriculture teacher will be discussed using generalities rather than specifics. The researcher
was fully aware that exceptions to these generalities would commonly be expected. The observations made, however, do provide what is believed to be a reasonable account of the distinguishing behaviors associated with the effective vocational agriculture teacher. Figure 19 provides a graphic profile of the effective vocational agriculture teacher which corresponds to the 31 behavioral profile points raised in the following written profile section. Through analysis of data, based on actual teaching practices and up-to-date demographic information, the following written profile of the effective vocational agriculture teacher is revealed.

Profile of Demographic Characteristics

The effective vocational agriculture teacher:

1. Is older than the average vocational agriculture teacher and has a proportionate amount of teaching experience to go along with the increased age.

2. Is presently living on a farm or has lived on a farm, usually for more than 10 years.

3. Has been a resident of the community in which he/she teaches for at least four years but usually has resided in the present location much longer than this.

4. Usually has had a minimum of at least one year of high school vocational agriculture, but it is not significant if he/she did not complete any vocational agriculture while in high school.

5. Teaches in a school which serves mostly rural students or a
combination of rural and urban students. The number of secondary students enrolled in the school makes no difference.

6. Teaches in a program which offers full year Vo Ag I through Vo Ag IV classes or a combination of semester and full year classes.

7. Will more often than not teach some type of adult class which may include subject areas other than adult or young farmer classes. It is just as likely that he/she will be teaching a general adult evening class.

8. Spends approximately 22 percent of his/her total workload related to FFA activities which is slightly less than the average vocational agriculture teacher, although not significantly less.

9. Has a very high percentage of students with active supervised occupational experience programs.

10. Is a member of five professionally related organizations on the average and more often than not has held at least one leadership position within these organizations.

11. Is a member of two civic organizations or clubs on the average and more often than not has held at least one leadership position within these organizations or clubs.

12. Continues to complete formal education classes throughout his/her teaching career.

Profile of Teacher Behaviors

Productive teaching behaviors

The effective vocational agriculture teacher:

1. Nearly always develops course activities which reflect "lifelike"
situations, relating current lessons to past lessons.

2. Utilizes learning activities which are designed to achieve predetermined objectives for the course, taking into account the overall school curriculum in doing so.

3. Motivates students by providing successful learning activities at each student's ability level, yet continually challenges the students to even higher scholastic expectations.

4. Evaluates his/her performance and accepts honest feedback from students for continued improvement.

5. Very often provides written comments on exams to facilitate student learning.

6. Will sometimes need to further explain assignments to students even after directions are given.

7. Uses lectures to convey course information less than 50 percent of the time.

8. More often than not will design educational activities for the class as a whole rather than for individual students.

9. Very often seeks the advice of experts in the subject matter he/she teaches.

10. Almost always helps students locate supplementary materials to subject matter content being covered in class.

Organized, structured class management

The effective vocational agriculture teacher:

11. Almost always will utilize long range plans to guide improvement
of the vocational agriculture program.

12. Establishes a given set of rules and procedures to manage student behavior.

13. More often than not will allow for student input when establishing classroom rules and procedures.

14. Purposely adjusts and rearranges the classroom to provide for a variety of learning activities within the classroom.

15. Almost always confronts students when they are not doing their assigned task.

16. Usually presents information on the blackboard which can be read by all students.

17. Sometimes uses textbooks to provide most of the printed information given to students.

Positive interpersonal relationships

The effective vocational agriculture teacher:

18. Always encourages friendly and respectful relationships with students, feeling students within his/her class can be trusted.

19. Rarely uses sarcasm in the classroom.

20. Constructively criticizes students for further educational improvement.

21. Keeps informed about students needing special assistance while willingly provides time to any student needing help.

22. Will almost always seek ways to involve parents of students into program related activities.
23. Usually shares teaching ideas and methods with other teachers in the school.

24. Will sometimes categorize students by their needs (cultural, academic, intellectual, etc.).

25. Almost always recognizes students for their efforts which are worthy of praise.

Professional responsibilities

The effective vocational agriculture teacher:

26. Demonstrates that he/she is a responsible person by completing duties in a timely manner.

27. Keeps abreast of new developments within his/her profession through participation in workshops, field days and seminars.

28. Rarely by-passes school policy even if conditions warrant the action.

Personal characteristic behaviors

The effective vocational agriculture teacher:

29. Usually displays personality traits such as humor and patience which promote positive interaction with students.

30. Almost always feels enthusiastic towards his/her work.

31. Feels capable of handling any of the challenges associated with his/her work and copes easily with the changing situations occurring within the classroom environment.
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^Negative correlated teacher behaviors.

^Numbers refer to teacher behavior profile items described in the Profile of Teacher Behaviors subsection of this chapter, presented in sequence as they appear in the text.

Figure 19. A profile of the effective vocational agriculture teachers' use of teacher effectiveness behaviors
Figure 19. Continued
CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions related to the study objectives were formulated.

Vocational agriculture teachers can reliably be classified into teacher effectiveness groups based upon the degree to which they use selected teacher effectiveness behaviors in their actual teaching practices. Respondents were found to be very normally distributed concerning their use of teacher effectiveness behaviors.

Vocational agriculture teachers who were classified as being highly effective had significantly higher mean response scores to all five teacher performance areas used in the study than did the low teacher effectiveness group members. It can be concluded that vocational agriculture teachers who use effective teacher behaviors to a high degree do so across the realm of teacher performance areas.

Through individual analysis of the 32 positively correlated teacher behavior statements used in the study, it was determined that the high teacher effectiveness group members had significantly higher response means to all 32 statements when compared to low teacher effectiveness group members. It can be concluded that positively correlated teacher behaviors significantly distinguish high teacher effectiveness group members.

High and low teacher effectiveness groups used negatively correlated teacher effectiveness behaviors to approximately the same degree. Analysis of the eight negatively correlated teacher behavior statements
used in the study revealed that five of the statement group means were not significantly different. It can be concluded, generally, that negatively correlated teacher behaviors do not significantly distinguish high teacher effectiveness group members from low teacher effectiveness group members.

Vocational agriculture teachers who were classified as being highly effective had significantly higher mean scores for the following demographic variables: age of the respondent, years of teaching experience, years of farm residence, years of residence at their present location, percent of students having supervised occupational experience programs, the number of professional and civic organizations in which they held membership, the number of leadership positions held within professional and civic organizations, and the hours of formal education credits they had completed since receiving their bachelor of science degrees. The percent of respondents who were teaching adult classes was also noted as being higher for the high teacher effectiveness group members, although no significant difference was calculated because of the nature of the data collected.

Vocational agriculture teachers who were classified as being highly effective were not significantly different from the low teacher effectiveness group members in their responses to the following demographic variables: years of vocational agriculture completed while in high school, amount of preparatory time available during the normal school day, number of students enrolled in the vocational agriculture program, percent of total workload related to FFA activities, and
number of secondary school students enrolled in the school at which they taught. No differences were noted between groups concerning the type of classes being offered and the type of students being served when data were compared visually by the researcher for these variables.

Recommendations

The findings of this research identified teacher behaviors and demographic characteristics associated with vocational agriculture teachers who were considered to be highly effective. A profile of the effective vocational agriculture teacher was completed using the findings related to these highly effective teachers. The following recommendations, based on these findings, should be taken into consideration by any person interested in the overall improvement and effectiveness of vocational agriculture, especially high school administrators, teacher educators and state supervisors of agricultural education, and vocational agriculture teachers.

Vocational agriculture teachers should be made aware of teacher behaviors which can positively or negatively affect their effectiveness concerning relations with students, parents, school staff and the community. Exposure to the forty teacher behavior statements used in the study would make for a convenient starting point for this recommendation.

Teachers of vocational agriculture should maintain contact with adults of the community by teaching adult classes to community residents whenever possible.
Teacher educators and state supervisors of agricultural education should continue to emphasize the need for continued formal education and professionally related activities by vocational agriculture teachers.

Vocational agriculture teachers should emphasize that students in their classes conduct worthwhile, experience-centered programs. These programs provide the means for the teacher to become better acquainted with students on an individual basis.

Vocational agriculture teachers should be encouraged to become actively involved in civic organizations and clubs as soon as possible after their arrival into a new community. They should also be encouraged to remain teaching in that community, if at all possible, since length of residence within a community was found to be significantly higher for teachers considered to be highly effective.

Vocational agriculture teachers should use the effective vocational agriculture teacher profile, provided in this study, as a self-evaluation instrument to assess their overall effectiveness as a teacher in comparison to teachers considered to be highly effective.

High school administrators should use the effective vocational agriculture teacher profile to help assess the overall effectiveness of the vocational agriculture teachers within their schools. It is recommended that the profile be used as a part of a teacher assessment process, but not as the sole instrument since the profile represents the attempts of only one study to support its use.
Recommendations for Further Research

Studies should be conducted in other areas of the United States which duplicate this study. These studies should be used to determine if vocational agriculture teachers from other states are consistent with the findings of this study.

Researchers conducting similar investigations should continue to update and revise the teacher effectiveness criteria used in this study to reflect the state-of-the-art concerning research-supported teacher effectiveness behaviors.

The effective vocational agriculture teacher profile developed in this study should be field tested for validity. By direct observation of vocational agriculture teachers in the field, refinements to the profile can be made. The refined instrument could be used by vocational agriculture teachers as a self-evaluation instrument or by high school administrators who supervise and evaluate vocational agriculture teachers.
SUMMARY

Educational researchers have had within them an on-going quest to discover valid and reliable criteria which can be used to distinguish the effective from the less effective teacher. Through persistent effort on the part of countless researchers, a stable base of teacher effectiveness criteria has emerged. Efforts to identify who effective vocational agriculture teachers are and the behaviors which differentiate them as being more effective have, however, been negligible. Very little can be done to improve the less effective vocational agriculture teacher until efforts are made to identify behaviors and characteristics of the effective vocational agriculture teacher.

The purpose of this study was to create a profile of the effective vocational agriculture teacher by identifying distinguishing behaviors using selected teacher effectiveness descriptors. The specific objectives of this research were to:

1. Determine effectiveness groups of vocational agriculture teachers from twelve north central states using research-supported teacher effectiveness criteria.

2. Identify teacher effectiveness behaviors which distinguished vocational agriculture teachers responding most like established teacher effectiveness criteria from vocational agriculture teachers responding least like established criteria.

3. Identify demographic characteristics associated with vocational agriculture teachers responding most like established teacher
effectiveness criteria and vocational agriculture teachers responding least like established criteria.

Vocational agriculture teachers from twelve north central states served as the population for this study. A systematic sample of 330 teachers was selected to participate in the study. Another 220 vocational agriculture teachers were selected as substitutes to be used in cases of nonresponse from the original sample of 330 teachers. Only substitutes needed to replace nonrespondents were used in the study.

Two instruments were developed for use in the study. The first instrument consisted of forty teacher behavior statements and two demographic questions. The instrument was sent to all vocational agriculture teachers selected to participate in the study to include the 330 teachers in the original sample and the 220 substitutes. A total of 208 instruments were properly completed and returned from the original sample of 330 teachers giving a response rate of 63 percent. One hundred twenty-two substitutes were used to replace nonrespondents from the original sample group, which yielded a substitution rate of 37 percent.

Respondents were asked to complete each of the forty teacher behavior statements used in the first instrument based on their actual teaching practices. Each statement required the respondent to answer using any whole number from 1 (never) to 9 (always). A composite reliability coefficient of .82 was calculated using the responses to all forty teacher behavior statements used in the first instrument.

Responses to the forty teacher behavior statements were added
together to provide a total response score for each respondent. Responses to the eight negatively correlated teacher effectiveness behaviors were recoded to align all responses in a positive direction before adding them to the total response score. The assumption made was that teachers having a high total response score were more effective since they were using the teacher effectiveness behaviors to a high degree in their actual teaching practices. Teachers having a low total response score were considered to be less effective.

Teachers who had total response scores falling one standard deviation or more, in either direction, of the mean total response score were selected for further analysis in the study. A positive standard deviation of one or more placed a respondent in the high teacher effectiveness group, while a negative standard deviation of one or more placed a teacher in the low teacher effectiveness group.

Members of the two teacher effectiveness groups were sent a second instrument designed to collect specific demographic information. Fifty-three teachers comprised the high teacher effectiveness group and 50 teachers made up the low teacher effectiveness group. Complete and usable returns were received from 98 of the effectiveness group members, yielding a 95 percent return rate. Forty-nine usable returns were received from each group.

The forty teacher behavior statements used in the first instrument were categorized under five teacher performance areas. The performance areas included: productive teaching techniques; organized, structured class management; positive interpersonal relationships; professional
responsibilities; and personal characteristics.

Through analysis, it was determined that the high teacher effectiveness group members differed significantly from the low teacher effectiveness group members in all five teacher performance areas. Only five of the individual statement mean scores were found not to be significantly different between groups at the .01 alpha level.

Demographic information collected with the second instrument was categorized under six general areas. The areas included: personal background, school setting, vocational agriculture program, professional activities, civic activities, and educational activities. Significantly higher means were found for the high teacher effectiveness group members in four of the five personal background items. These items included age of the respondent, years of teaching experience, years of farm residence and years of residence at the present location. School setting items did not significantly differentiate between effectiveness group members. Only one item was found to be significantly different between groups in regard to the vocational agriculture program being offered. High teacher effectiveness group members had a significantly higher percentage of students with active supervised occupational experience programs. Professional, civic and educational activities were all found to be significant in terms of differentiating teacher effectiveness group members.

It can be concluded that the effective vocational agriculture teacher uses, to a high degree, teacher effectiveness behaviors in all teacher performance areas. The demographic characteristics associated
with the effective vocational agriculture teacher reveal that there are several characteristics which seem to indirectly affect the teacher's overall effectiveness. A profile of the effective vocational agriculture teacher resulted from these findings.
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APPENDIX A. COVER LETTERS AND INSTRUMENTS
January 30, 1985

Dear

Are you a "Master Teacher" of vocational agriculture? Can you identify fellow vocational agriculture instructors who you consider to be "Master Teachers?" If so, what traits or characteristics did you consider when identifying these individuals? What exactly is it that separates the effective from the less effective teacher?

The Agricultural Education profession has been asking these questions for many years. Little is known about who effective vocational agriculture teachers are and what makes them effective. Based on these assumptions, I am asking for 15 minutes of your time to provide information on what you actually do as a teacher which I will then use to develop a composite profile of the effective vocational agriculture instructor.

You were selected for this study from a master list of more than 3200 vocational agriculture instructors from 12 North Central States. Your valuable input is needed as we seek ways to identify characteristics of the effective vocational agriculture instructor.

The information that you provide will be held in strict confidence and will only be presented in the form of group summary. You will not be identified with any of the responses. The forms have been coded only to aid in processing.

I would very much appreciate your response at your earliest convenience. A self addressed, stamped envelope has been included to aid you in returning the completed form.

With your help, we can begin to build a profile of the effective vocational agriculture instructor which will greatly benefit the agricultural education profession. Thanks for your cooperation and assistance on this important educational project. If you have any questions concerning the study, please call me at 515/294-1320.

Sincerely,

Keith W. Rheault
Instructor

Alan A. Kahler
Professor

KWR/AAK/dv
Enclosure
March 1, 1985

Dear

Several weeks ago, a questionnaire was mailed to you entitled "Vo Ag Teacher Profile Survey." The purpose of the questionnaire was to develop a profile of the effective vocational agriculture teacher based on actual teaching practices of vocational agriculture teachers.

I know that this is a very busy time of year for you, however, I am once again asking for your assistance in completing the questionnaire. The information that you can provide is important and will greatly enhance the results of the overall project.

I have included another copy of the questionnaire for your convenience. I would very much appreciate your efforts in completing and returning the questionnaire at your earliest convenience. Thanks for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Keith Rheault
Adjunct Instructor
March 15, 1985

Dear

I would like to thank you for completing and returning the teacher profile survey that I sent to you about one month ago. The information provided by you will be most helpful in preparing an accurate profile of the effective vocational agriculture instructor. If you are interested, I have enclosed a copy of the teachers profile survey with a listing of mean responses for each question on the survey.

I do have one more favor to ask of you, however, because of the uniqueness of your initial responses. From the original sample of 550 vocational agriculture teachers surveyed, you have been selected for the final phase of this study. The final phase of the study will be used to collect demographic data in three areas to complete the composite profile of vocational agriculture instructors from 12 North Central States.

The enclosed demographic survey will provide the necessary input for a more complete picture of vocational agriculture teachers from 12 North Central States. I am asking you for ten more minutes of your valuable time to complete the enclosed demographic survey form.

As in the original survey, the information that you provide will be held in strict confidence and will be presented in the form of group summary. You will not be identified with any of the responses.

I would very much appreciate your response at your earliest convenience. A self addressed, stamped envelope has been included to aid you in returning the completed form.

Through your help it will be possible to build a profile of the effective vocational agriculture instructor which in turn will greatly benefit the Agricultural Education profession.

Thanks again for your cooperation and assistance on this important educational project. If you have any questions concerning the study, please call me at 515/294-1320.

Sincerely,

Keith W. Rheault
Adjunct Instructor

Alan A. Kahler
Professor

KWR/AAX/dv
Enclosure
April 12, 1985

Dear

Several weeks ago, a follow-up questionnaire was mailed to you as a continuation of the Vo Ag Teacher Profile Survey you had completed in Early February. The purpose of the follow-up questionnaire was to seek demographic data related to your school and your vocational agriculture program.

I know that this is a very busy time of year for you and that my request of your valuable time in completing the questionnaire could be a burden. However, I am once again asking for your assistance in completing the questionnaire. As of right now, almost all the vo ag teachers included in the follow-up have completed and returned the questionnaire. The information that you can provide is important and will greatly enhance the results of the overall project along with its meaning to the Agricultural Education profession.

I have included another copy of the questionnaire for your convenience. I would very much appreciate your efforts in completing and returning the questionnaire at your earliest convenience. Your assistance is greatly appreciated. Thanks.

Sincerely,

Keith Rheault
Adjunct Instructor
**VO AG TEACHER PROFILE SURVEY**

**DIRECTIONS:** Based upon your actual teaching practices, please respond to each of the 40 statements using the scale below. You may use any whole number from 1 (Never) to 9 (Always) when responding. Enter your response in the blank provided before each of the statements. Keep in mind that your responses should represent what you actually do as a teacher rather than what you believe you should be or should not be doing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXAMPLE:**

**AS A TEACHER, DO YOU:**

3. Set aside time to provide individual help to students.

23. Set aside time to provide individual help to students.

24. Constructively criticize students.

25. Encourage friendly and respectful relationships with your students.

26. Use sarcasm to counteract student remarks when appropriate.

27. Use humor within your classes as long as it is kept in its proper perspective.

28. Categorize students by their needs (cultural, academic, intellectual, etc.).

29. Share your teaching methods with other teachers in your school.

30. Keep informed about your students with special health needs.

31. Complete written reports required by your school within the specified time limit.

32. Start your classes at the times they are scheduled to start.

33. Keep abreast of new developments within your subject area.

34. Feel enthusiastic towards your work.

35. Consider yourself a patient person when dealing with others.

36. Take in stride the changing situations occurring within the classroom environment.

37. Recognize students for their efforts which are worthy of praise.

38. Develop course activities which reflect "lifelike" situations.

39. Seek ways to involve parents of students in program related activities.

40. Feel that you are capable of handling all the challenges associated with your work.

**INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS:**

**DIRECTIONS:** Please answer the following questions by entering your response in the blank provided before each of the statements.

1. How many years have you taught including this year?

2. What is the average number of students you teach per day at the present time?

**THANK YOU!**
VO AG TEACHER PROFILE SURVEY

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

DIRECTIONS: Please answer the following questions by checking the appropriate response or by filling in the blank to describe your present characteristics.

1. How many secondary school students are enrolled in the school at which you teach?
   _______ Number of Students

2. Your program offers: (Please check one answer)
   _______ Full year Vo Ag I through Vo Ag IV classes
   _______ All semester type classes
   _______ A combination of semester and full year classes
   _______ Other types of classes (i.e. modular, full day block, 9 week classes)

3. Do you teach any type of adult courses?
   _______ No
   _______ Yes, Please specify type and numbers enrolled. (i.e. Adult farmer- 18)

4. The school in which you teach serves: (Check One)
   _______ Mostly urban students
   _______ A mix of urban and rural students
   _______ Mostly rural students

5. How much preparatory time do you have during your normal school day? (Not including lunch break)
   _______ Minutes

6. Approximately what percent of your total work load is related to FFA activities?
   _______ Percent of time

7. How many students are enrolled in your vocational agriculture program?
   _______ Number of Students

8. Approximately what percent of these students have active supervised occupational experience programs?
   _______ Percent of Students

9. What is your age?
   _______ Years

10. How many years of vocational agriculture did you complete while in high school?
    _______ Years

11. How many years have you resided on a farm?
    _______ Years

12. How many professionally related organizations are you a member of?
    _______ Number of Organizations

13. How many leadership positions have you held within these professional organizations?
    _______ Number of Leadership Positions
    ___________________________ Title of highest position held

14. How many credit hours of formal education have you completed since your B.S. degree?
    [Circle one]
    _______ Number of (Semester/Quarter) credit hours

15. During the last two years, how many times have you participated in the following: (Please list number of times attended)
    _______ Workshops
    _______ Seminars
    _______ Field Days

16. How many civic organizations or clubs are you a member of?
    _______ Number of organizations

17. How many leadership positions have you held within these civic organizations?
    _______ Number of Leadership Positions
    ___________________________ Title of highest position held

18. How many years have you resided in your present community?
    _______ Number of years

19. Do you desire a summary of the study when it is completed?
    _______ No
    _______ Yes
APPENDIX B. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT MODEL PROJECT MATERIALS

I. Productive Teaching Techniques

A. Demonstrates ability to communicate effectively with students.

The teacher . . .

1. Summarizes effectively.
2. Gives assignments that are clear, concise, and reasonable.
3. Speaks clearly.
4. Puts ideas across logically.
5. Uses correct grammar and vocabulary suited to the students.
6. Communicates learning objectives to the students.
7. Uses a variety of verbal and nonverbal techniques.
8. Praises, elicits, and responds to students questions before proceeding.
10. Presents accurate and complete content information.
11. Uses appropriate tone of voice.

B. Demonstrates ability to inspire and/or motivate students.

The teacher . . .

1. Clearly, positively, and continuously communicates challenging scholastic expectations to students.
2. Presents class activities which simulate current situations outside the school, whenever possible or appropriate.
3. Responds positively to students, especially when requests for help are made.
4. Encourages questions and discussions during class time.
5. Stimulates students by choosing proper materials and techniques.
6. Gives feedback to students.
7. Shows enthusiasm for teaching.
8. Uses methods to stimulate creative expression.
9. Stimulates creative thinking.
10. Demonstrates ability to motivate previously distinterested pupils.

C. Demonstrates ability to utilize a variety of teaching techniques.

The teacher . . .

2. Provides models for study and practice.
3. Utilizes lessons and activities which develop the students'
understanding of a nonsexist society.
5. Changes techniques as the teaching/learning situation requires.
6. Relates current lessons to previous learning.
7. Provides opportunities for students to explore problems.
8. Provides opportunities for students to weigh alternatives.
9. Provides opportunities for students in decision-making.
10. Provides opportunities for student inquiry.
12. Provides opportunities for questioning.
13. Provides opportunities for planning.
14. Provides opportunities for analyzing.
15. Provides opportunities for summarizing.
16. Provides opportunities for outlining.
17. Provides opportunities for generalizing.
18. Provides opportunities for evaluating.
19. Provides opportunities for speculating.
20. Provides opportunities for hypothesizing.
22. Acts as conveyor of information only as needed, keeping lecturing or telling within bounds.

D. Uses a variety of evaluative methods which provide students with specific feedback.

The teacher . . .

1. Utilizes information from the cumulative record file in helping students to progress educationally.
2. Utilizes counselors and/or support personnel to help interpret test data.
3. Solicits and accepts honest feedback from students.
4. Knows and understands concepts of diagnosis and prescription.
5. Gives written comments as well as points or scores.
6. Returns test results as quickly as possible.
7. Makes opportunities for one-to-one conferences.
8. Prepares and administers both subjective and objective tests on materials that have been taught and grades students' progress.
9. Maintains the relationships between objectives and tests.
10. Administers district-constructed criterion-referenced tests, standardized tests, and makes appropriate use of results.

E. Demonstrates understanding of processes involved in selection of learning content.

The teacher . . .

1. Uses knowledge of individual students to design educational experiences.
2. Utilizes current events and unexpected situations for their
educational value when appropriate to subject area.
3. Organizes activities with student involvement.
4. Provides extra help and enrichment activities.
5. Designs units and lessons in which content is clear, logical, and sequential.
6. Presents subject matter which is appropriate to the abilities of the students.
7. Presents subject matter which is appropriate to interests of students.
8. Uses learning activities designed to achieve stated objectives.
10. Establishes objectives for cognitive domain.
11. Establishes objectives for psychomotor domain.
12. Prepares lesson plans which reflect school organization curriculum guide.
13. Assigns work (oral and written) to students which requires application of what they have been taught.
14. Displays a thorough knowledge of curriculum and subject matter.

F. Identifies learning styles, rates of learning, and capabilities of students.

The teacher...
1. Uses a variety of cognitive levels in questioning strategies.
2. Groups students for instruction who have common needs.
3. Displays materials that are coordinated with the learning experiences.

G. Effectively uses available materials and resources.

The teacher...
1. Uses multi-sensory approaches (i.e., tactile, visual, auditory) to learning.
2. Explains or demonstrates with the use of instructional materials.
3. Seeks and uses advice of experts in content area.
4. Is resourceful in finding and using supplementary materials to aid instruction.

H. Prepares appropriate evaluation activities.

The teacher...
1. Surveys students as a group and consults with them individually.
2. Uses individual and group observation.
3. Interprets standardized test data accurately to students.
4. Administers standardized tests properly.
5. Interprets test and evaluation data to parents completely.
6. Utilizes a program of self-evaluation.
7. Makes methods of evaluation clear and purposeful.
8. Uses pre- and posttests.

II. Organized, Structure Class Management

A. Demonstrates a competent level of knowledge and skill in organizing the physical and human elements in the educational setting.

The teacher . . .

1. Insures that materials and information can be read or seen by the students.
2. Assesses the situation in a discerning manner and knows how and when to change setting.
3. Delegates appropriate responsibilities and tasks to students.
4. Exhibits appropriate seating arrangements.
5. Adjusts physical arrangements and modifies noise levels in order to provide for a variety of learning styles.
6. Maintains a functional and attractive classroom environment.
7. Maintains a classroom which shows evidence of active student participation.
8. Selects activities appropriate to the physical attributes of the work area.

B. Demonstrates evidence of personal organization.

The teacher . . .

1. Makes contact when students not on task.
2. Uses class time efficiently.
3. Maintains proper care of instructional equipment and materials.
4. Maintains balance among various subject areas and within the subject itself.
5. Maintains classroom organization for efficient learning materials distribution.
6. Gauges pupil understanding during the lesson as a guide to pacing.
7. Shows evidence of long- and short-range planning.
8. Incorporates into daily planning content from previous levels for reinforcement and anticipates content from future grade levels to insure continuity and sequence.
10. Establishes classroom procedures that are flexible within an over-all plan.
11. Makes materials readily available to the students.
12. Provides adequate plans and procedures for substitute teachers.

C. Organizes pupils' resources and materials for effective instruction.

The teacher . . .

1. Promotes an environment which encourages positive peer group interaction.
2. Allows students to share responsibility for establishing and carrying out classroom rules and procedures.
3. Makes use of the physical school environment to support current learning activities.
4. Encourages students to utilize a variety of reference and print/nonprint materials.
5. Is helpful to students having difficulty with the subject.

D. Demonstrates ability to manage the noninstructional human dynamics in the educational setting.

The teacher . . .

1. Maintains a classroom atmosphere conducive to good health and safety.
2. Follows and expects students to use democratic procedures, which show consideration for the rights of others.
3. Manages discipline problems in accordance with administrative regulations, school board policies, and legal requirements.
4. Keeps accurate accounting of student attendance utilizing the process established by the school.
5. Establishes and clearly communicates parameters for student classroom behavior.
7. Manages disruptive behavior constructively.
8. Demonstrates fairness and consistency in the handling of student problems.
9. Maintains a good order without compulsion.
10. Endeavors to find and eliminate causes of undesirable behavior.

III. Intellectual Stimulation

A. Reacts with sensitivity to the needs and feelings of others.

The teacher . . .

1. Provides opportunities for successful learning experiences for each pupil at his/her ability level.
2. Encourages active student participation while recognizing the instructional value of his/her own silence.
3. Recognizes that a student's emotional problems affect his/her learning potential.
4. Actively supports the efforts of each student.

B. Promotes students' self-discipline and responsibility.

The teacher . . .

1. Helps students develop efficient learning skills and work habits.
2. Creates a classroom climate in which pupils develop initiative and assume a personal responsibility for learning.

IV. Positive Interpersonal Relations

A. Demonstrates sensitivity in communicating with students.

The teacher . . .

1. Is readily available to all students.
2. Acknowledges the rights of others to hold differing views or values.
3. Gives criticism which is constructive, praise which is generous.
4. Makes an effort to know each student as an individual.
5. Shows trust in students.
6. Uses discretion in handling confidential information and difficult situations.
7. Is a willing listener.
8. Communicates with students sympathetically, accurately and with understanding.
9. Respects individuals' rights.
10. Encourages relationships that are mutually respectful and friendly.
11. Willingly gives of time to provide for individual academic and personal help.
12. Uses and appreciates humor in proper perspective.

B. Promotes self-awareness and a positive self-concept in students.

The teacher . . .

1. Provides opportunities for all pupils to achieve recognition for constructive behavior.
2. Provides opportunity for student to have voice in decision making.
3. Provides opportunity for each student to meet success regularly.
4. Promotes students' self-control.
5. Promotes positive self-image in students.

C. Expresses concern for all students regardless of cultural, academic, or intellectual status.

The teacher . . .

1. Displays nonsexist, multicultural attitudes in teaching style.
2. Demonstrates understanding and acceptance of different racial groups.
3. Demonstrates understanding and acceptance of different ethnic groups.
4. Demonstrates understanding and acceptance of different cultural groups.
5. Demonstrates understanding and acceptance of different religious groups.
6. Demonstrates understanding and acceptance of different lifestyles.
7. Avoids stereotyping.

D. Demonstrates effective interpersonal relationships with community, administration, and fellow teachers.

The teacher . . .

1. Makes use of support services as needed.
2. Shares ideas, materials and methods with other teachers.
3. Informs administrators and/or appropriate personnel of school-related matters.
4. Enhances community involvement with school.
5. Cooperates with parents in the best interest of the students.
6. Supports and participates in parent-teacher activities.
7. Works well with other teachers and the administration.
8. Provides a climate which opens up communication between the teacher and parent.

E. Demonstrates awareness of needs of students.

The teacher . . .

1. Shows awareness of needs and ability to deal with handicapped students.
2. Shows sensitivity to physical development of students.
3. Is aware of special health needs of students.
4. Recognizes and deals appropriately with substance abuse by students.
V. Desirable Out-of-Class Behavior

A. Demonstrates professionalism.

The teacher . . .

1. Responds appropriately to parental concerns.
2. Completes duties promptly.
3. Carries out professional duties expected of a teacher.
4. Has regular attendance.
5. Has a keen sense of responsibility.
6. Is punctual.
7. Provides accurate data to the school, area, and district as requested for management purposes.
8. Completes duties accurately.

B. Shows professional growth.

The teacher . . .

1. Strives to improve classroom performance.
2. Keeps abreast of developments in subject area.
3. Demonstrates commitment by participation in professional activities, e.g., professional coursework.
4. Demonstrates commitment by membership in professional organizations.
5. Demonstrates awareness of current events and cultural trends.
6. Takes advantage of opportunities to learn from colleagues, students, parents, and community.
7. Establishes goals and initiates activities aimed at professional growth and development.
8. Attends professional meetings (i.e., faculty meetings, conferences, staffing, screening, teacher student, inservice) promptly and courteously.

C. Assumes responsibilities outside of the classroom as they relate to school.

The teacher . . .

1. Assumes necessary noninstructional responsibilities.
2. Exercises reasonable responsibility for student management throughout the entire building.
3. Helps integrate school activities with community needs.

D. Demonstrates evidence of professional ethics through support of school regulations and policies.
The teacher . . .

1. Exercises discretion in dealing with confidential materials regarding students.
2. Exhibits ethical conduct associated with such factors as a sense of fairness and the ability to work cooperatively with other school, community, and district personnel.
3. Adheres to authorized policies.
4. Selects appropriate channels for resolving concerns/problems.
5. Participates in the development and review of school policies and regulations.
6. Strives to stay informed regarding policies and regulations applicable to his/her position.
APPENDIX C. MODIFIED CRITERIA AND REFERENCES

Teacher Performance Areas, Criteria and Descriptors

I. Productive Teaching Techniques

A. Demonstrates ability to communicate effectively with students.

The teacher . . .

1. Gives assignments that are clear, concise and reasonable.
2. Communicates learning objectives to the students.
3. Praises, elicits and responds to student questions before proceeding.
5. Presents accurate and complete content information.

B. Demonstrates ability to inspire and/or motivate students.

The teacher . . .

1. Clearly, positively, and continuously communicates challenging scholastic expectations to students.
2. Presents class activities which simulate current situations outside the school, whenever possible or appropriate.
3. Responds positively to students, especially when requests for help are made.
4. Creates a classroom climate in which pupils develop initiative and assume a personal responsibility for learning.
5. Provides feedback to students.
6. Uses methods to stimulate creative expression and thinking.
7. Provides opportunities for successful learning experiences for each pupil at his/her ability level.

C. Demonstrates ability to utilize a variety of teaching techniques.

The teacher . . .

1. Constructs new instructional materials to meet local needs.
2. Provides models for study and practice.
3. Changes techniques as the teaching/learning situation requires.
4. Relates current lessons to previous learning.
5. Provides opportunities for students to explore problems.
6. Provides opportunities for questioning, planning, analyzing and summarizing.
7. Provides opportunities for generalizing, evaluating and hypothesizing.
8. Acts as conveyor of information only as needed, keeping lecturing or telling within bounds.

D. Uses a variety of evaluative methods which provide students with specific feedback.

The teacher . . .

1. Solicits and accepts honest feedback from students.
2. Utilizes counselors and/or support personnel to help interpret test data.
3. Utilizes information from the cumulative record file in helping students to progress educationally.
4. Gives written comments as well as points or scores.
5. Makes opportunities for one-to-one conferences.
6. Prepares and administers both subjective and objective tests on materials that have been taught, grading student progress.
7. Maintains a relationship between course objectives and tests.

E. Demonstrates understanding of processes involved in selection of learning content.

The teacher . . .

1. Selects learning content congruent with prescribed curriculum.
2. Uses knowledge of individual students to design educational experiences.
3. Displays a thorough knowledge of curriculum and subject matter.
4. Helps students develop efficient learning skills and work habits.
5. Utilizes current events and unexpected situations for their educational value when appropriate to subject area.
6. Provides extra help and enrichment activities.
7. Presents subject matter which is appropriate to the abilities of the students.
8. Uses learning activities designed to achieve stated objectives.
9. Establishes objectives for cognitive, affective and psychomotor domain.

F. Identifies learning styles, rates of learning and capabilities of students.

The teacher . . .

1. Provides opportunity for individual differences.

G. Effectively uses available time, materials and resources.

The teacher . . .
1. Uses multi-sensory approaches (i.e., tactile, visual, auditory) to learning.
2. Seeks and uses advice of experts in content area.
3. Resourceful in finding and using supplementary materials to aid instruction.

H. Prepares appropriate evaluation activities.

The teacher . . .

1. Interprets test and evaluation data to parents completely.
2. Utilizes a program of self-evaluation.

II. Organized, Structured Class Management

A. Demonstrates a competent level of knowledge and skill in organizing the physical and human elements in the educational setting.

The teacher . . .

I. Delegates appropriate responsibilities and tasks to students.
2. Adjusts physical arrangements and modifies noise levels in order to provide for a variety of learning styles.
3. Maintains a classroom which shows evidence of active student participation.
4. Insures that materials and information can be read or seen by the students.

B. Demonstrates evidence of personal organization.

The teacher . . .

1. Makes contact when students not on task.
2. Uses class time efficiently.
3. Shows evidence of long and short range planning.
4. Shows evidence of adequate lesson preparation and organization of work with objectives clearly in mind.
5. Establishes classroom procedures that are flexible within an overall plan.
6. Makes materials readily available to the students.

C. Organizes pupils' resources and materials for effective instruction.

The teacher . . .

1. Allows students to share responsibility for establishing and carrying out classroom rules and procedures.
2. Encourages active student participation while recognizing the instructional value of his/her own silence.
3. Makes use of the physical school environment to support current learning activities.
4. Encourages students to utilize a variety of reference and print/nonprint materials.

D. Demonstrates ability to manage the noninstructional human dynamics in the educational setting.

The teacher...

1. Maintains a classroom atmosphere conducive to good health and safety.
2. Sets high standards for student behavior.
3. Manages disruptive behavior constructively.
4. Demonstrates fairness and consistency in the handling of student problems.
5. Maintains good order without compulsion.
6. Establishes and clearly communicates parameters for student classroom behavior.
7. Selects appropriate channels for resolving concerns/problems.

III. Positive Interpersonal Relationships

A. Demonstrates sensitivity in communicating with students.

The teacher...

1. Acknowledges the rights of others to hold differing views or values.
2. Gives criticism which is constructive, praise which is generous.
3. Makes an effort to know each student as an individual.
4. Shows trust in students.
5. Is a willing listener.
6. Encourages relationships that are mutually respectful and friendly.
7. Willingly gives of time to provide for individual academic and personal help to any student.
8. Recognizes that a student's emotional problems affect his/her learning potential.

B. Promotes self-awareness and a positive self-concept in students.

The teacher...

1. Provides opportunities for all pupils to achieve recognition for constructive behavior.
2. Provides opportunity for each student to meet success regularly.
3. Promotes students' self-control.
4. Promotes positive self-image in students.

C. Expresses concern for all students regardless of cultural, academic, or intellectual status.

The teacher . . .
1. Displays nonsexist/multicultural attitudes in teaching style.
2. Avoids stereotyping.

D. Demonstrates effective interpersonal relationships with school personnel and community.

The teacher . . .
1. Makes use of support services when needed.
2. Shares ideas, materials, and methods with other teachers.
3. Informs administration of school-related matters.
4. Enhances community involvement with school.
5. Cooperates with parents in the best interest of the students.
6. Works well with other teachers and the administration.
7. Provides a climate which opens up communication between the teacher and parent.

E. Demonstrates awareness of student with special needs.

The teacher . . .
1. Shows awareness of needs and ability to deal with handicapped students.
2. Is aware of special health needs of students.
3. Recognizes and deals appropriately with substance abuse by students.
4. Shows awareness of needs and ability to deal with students having learning disabilities.

IV. Professional Responsibilities

A. Demonstrates employee responsibilities.

The teacher . . .
1. Completes duties promptly.
2. Has regular attendance.
3. Has a keen sense of responsibility.
4. Is punctual.
5. Completes duties accurately.
6. Provides accurate data to the school, area, and state as requested for management purposes.

B. Shows professional growth.

The teacher . . .

1. Strives to improve classroom performance.
2. Keeps abreast of developments in subject area.
3. Demonstrates commitment by participation in professional activities.
4. Demonstrates commitment by membership in professional organizations.
5. Takes advantage of opportunities to learn from colleagues, students, parents and community.
6. Establishes goals and initiates activities aimed at professional growth and development.

C. Demonstrates evidence of professional ethics.

The teacher . . .

1. Exercises discretion in dealing with confidential materials regarding students.
2. Exhibits ethical conduct when working cooperatively with other school and community personnel.
3. Adheres to authorized policy.

V. Personal Characteristics

A. Shows enthusiasm towards work.

The teacher . . .

1. Displays an interest in his/her work which is contagious to students and co-workers.

B. Expresses a positive perception of self.

The teacher . . .

1. Believes that he/she is capable and competent to cope with life's challenges and problems.
2. Views himself/herself as being a worthy person.
3. Able to confront his/her feelings and behaviors with a minimum of distortion and defensiveness.
4. Identifies with other people (happy when they are happy, sad when they are sad).
C. Express creativity in work.

The teacher . . .

1. Adapts to new situations and ideas.
2. Develops course materials and teaching techniques which are unique and fit the situation.
3. Is open to and respectful of imaginative ideas.

D. Displays personality traits which promote positive interaction with others.

The teacher . . .

1. Uses and appreciates humor in proper perspective.
2. Displays patience in dealing with others.

Selected References Supporting the Use of Criteria


APPENDIX D. TEACHER BEHAVIOR STATEMENTS CATEGORIZED BY TEACHER PERFORMANCE AREAS

A. Productive teaching techniques

1. Provide written comments on exams.
2. Use learning activities which are designed to achieve stated objectives for the course.
3. Need to further explain assignments to students after giving them directions.
4. Motivate your students by providing opportunities for successful learning activities at each student's ability level.
5. Motivate students by challenging them to higher scholastic expectations.
6. Use lectures to teach most of the course information.
7. Relate current lessons to past lessons.
8. Ask for constructive feedback from students to help you improve exams.
9. Consider the overall school curriculum when selecting course materials for your courses.
10. Design educational activities for the class as a whole rather than for individual students.
11. Seek the advice of experts in the subject area of the courses you teach.
13. Help students locate supplementary materials for subject matter content.
14. Develop course activities which reflect "lifelike" situations.

B. Organized, Structured Class Management

15. Need to clarify information to students having trouble reading your writing on the blackboard.
16. Adjust the physical arrangements of the classroom to provide for a variety of learning activities.
17. Confront students when they are not doing their assigned task.
18. Use long range plans to guide the improvement of your program.
19. Use textbooks for most of the printed information provided to students.
20. Allow students in your courses to help establish classroom rules and procedures.
21. Establish a given set of rules and procedures to manage student behavior.

Denotes negatively correlated teacher behavior statements.
C. Positive, Interpersonal Relationships

22. Feel students in your classes can be trusted.
23. Set aside time to provide individual help to students.
24. Constructively criticize students.
25. Encourage friendly and respectful relationships with your students.
26. Use sarcasm to counteract student remarks when appropriate.
28. Categorize students by their needs (cultural, academic, intellectual, etc.).
29. Share your teaching methods with other teachers in your school.
30. Keep informed about your students with special health needs.
32. Complete written reports required by your school within the specified time limit.
33. Keep abreast of new developments within your subject area.
37. Recognize students for their efforts which are worthy of praise.
39. Seek ways to involve parents of students in program-related activities.

D. Professional Responsibilities

5. By-pass school policy when conditions warrant the action.
31. Start your classes at the times they are scheduled to start.
32. Keep abreast of new developments within your subject area.

E. Personal Characteristics

27. Use humor within your classes as long as it is kept in its proper perspective.
34. Feel enthusiastic towards your work.
35. Consider yourself a patient person when dealing with others.
36. Take in stride the changing situations occurring within the classroom environment.
40. Feel that you are capable of handling all the challenges associated with your work.

^Denotes negatively correlated teacher behavior statements.