

Introduction and Purpose

- School Administrator Support is an important factor in the success of ag programs.
- Gap in modern literature on how principals perceive FFA Activities.
- Principal / teacher relationships effect teacher performance, job satisfaction, and longevity (Thomas, 1997; Martin, et al., 1986).
- FFA Activities are a substantial portion of ag programs.
- There is a need to understand current perceptions of FFA Activities.

Framework

- Principal's attitude is important due to their everyday management roll (Shoemaker, 1972).
- Communication is vital for principles to make good decisions pertaining to ag programs (Martin, Nwozuzu, & Gleason, 1986).
- School leaders can affect learning outcomes of students directly and indirectly (Pitner, 1988).
- How principles can impact ag programs fit well within educational leadership theory model (Rayfield & Wilson, 2009).

References

- Dillman, D.A., Smyth, J.D., & Christian, L.M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method*. (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Foster, R.M., & Riensenberg, L.E. (1985). Factors indicating VoAg/FFA program quality as perceived by Idaho VoAg instructors and principals. *Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture*, 26(3), 19-27. doi:10.5032/jaates.1985.03019
- Fraenkel, J.R., Wallen, N.E., & Hyun, H.H. (2015). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (9th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Kalme, N., & Dyer, J.E. (2000). Perceptions of Iowa secondary school principals toward agricultural education. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 42(4), 116-124. doi:10.5032/jae.2000.04116
- Lindner, J.R., Murphy, T.H., & Briers, G.E. (2001). Handling nonresponse in social science research. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 42(4), 43-53. doi:10.5032/jae.2001.04043
- Martin, R.A., Nwozuzu, E., & Gleason, A. (1986). Perceived communications and support linkages of high school principals and vocational agriculture teachers. *Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture*, 27(1), 18-26. doi:10.5032/jaates.1986.01018
- Mattox, K.E. (1974, December). Why teachers quit. *Agricultural Education Magazine*, 47(6), 140-142.
- Pitner, N. (1988). The study of administrator effects and effectiveness. In N. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research in educational administration* (pp. 99-122). New York: Longman.
- Rayfield, J., & Wilson, E. (2009). Exploring principals' perceptions of supervised agricultural experience. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 50(1), 70-80. doi:10.5032/jae.2009.01070
- Roberts, T.G., Harder, A., & Brashears, M.T. (Eds). (2016). *American Association for Agricultural Education national research agenda: 2016-2020*. Gainesville, FL: Department of Agricultural Education and Communication.
- Shoemaker, R. G. (1972). Images and perceptions of vocational agriculture programs in Mississippi. (Research Series 2). Mississippi State University and Mississippi Department of Education. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED069908.pdf>
- Thomas, V. (1997). *What research says about administrators' management style, effectiveness, and teacher morale*. (Report No. ERIC-41-1569). 4-10.

Are Ag Teachers communicating more effectively than they have in the past?



Methodology

- Cross-sectional descriptive survey design (Fraenkel et al., 2015).
- Data collected from principals and teachers at schools in Texas ($n = 285$).
- Instrument designed by researchers, part of larger study
- Content & face validity established by panel of experts
- Reliability - Pilot test using principals and teachers not in study ($N = 32$); Chronach's alpha of 0.88
- Online survey asked participants to rate importance of 21 (pre-selected) items on 5-point Likert.
- Responses emailed using Dillman's (2014) design.
- 26.76% of principals responded ($n = 76$), 30.18% teachers ($n = 86$) out of 285 contacted.
- No differences between early & late responders (Linder et al. 2001)
- One-way ANOVA, assumptions met Field (2018).

Findings

- Principals and teachers differed significantly on **only two** of the twenty-one FFA activities.
- Teachers perceived the following, as significantly more important:
 1. State Level FFA Meetings / Conventions ($f_{(1, 160)} = 5.42, p = .021, \eta^2 = .03$)
 2. Area Level FFA Meetings / Conventions ($f_{(1, 160)} = 4.07, p = .045, \eta^2 = .02$)
- Having Chapter FFA Officers held the highest level of importance for both.

Conclusions / Implications

- Perceived level of importance for each FFA activity was relatively high, comparatively (Mattox, 1974; Foster & Riensenberg, 1985; Shoemaker, 1972).
- Ag educators may be communicating the importance of program activities more effectively.

Comparing Principal and Agricultural Education Teacher Perceptions of the Importance of FFA Activities

Cele Stone, William Doss, & Dr. John Rayfield – Texas Tech University