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(ABSTRACT)

A major thrust for vocational education in the 1980s is the collaboration of schools with industry and other sectors of the community. The Building Our American Communities (BOAC) program was initiated in 1971 by the Future Farmers of America to involve agriculture students in their communities. Considerable financial and human resources have supported BOAC program operations for the past 13 years, yet there is a lack of knowledge as to who has been participating in the program, what resources have been utilized, and what outcomes have resulted.

The purpose of the study was to examine the BOAC program by describing community development activities, BOAC projects, and characteristics associated with selected students and advisors who participated in the 1983 BOAC
program relative to their FFA chapter, school, and community contextual situations with respect to program inputs and anticipated outcomes. The first four levels of Bennett and Nelson's (1975) evaluation hierarchy used by the Cooperative Extension Service served as a theoretical frame of reference for the study.

The population for this descriptive study included the 48 students and 46 advisors who attended the 1983 National Conference on Community Development. Three survey instruments were developed by the researcher. One for students and one for advisors elicited background and participation information. The third instrument was used to gather participants' FFA chapter, school, and community data. BOAC program statistical reports were also used as a data source. The data were analyzed using descriptive techniques.

Two major findings of this study were:

1. Benefits to FFA members and vocational agriculture programs represented the major program outcomes. These outcomes were increased citizen participation, increased human relation skills of members, and increased public awareness of the vocational agriculture program.

2. Students and advisors involved numerous individuals and groups in their projects which primarily improved the following community sectors: school/education, civic facilities, agriculture, and
recreation.

The BOAC program should be viewed as an excellent teaching tool for involving students in their communities. Future studies, using this one as a baseline data source, need to be conducted to determine BOAC program effects on program participants and nonparticipants.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Community development, as a process to improve the quality of life in America, has been an area of concern by educators, community development specialists, politicians, economists, sociologists, and the general public for many years. Community development is the "purposive efforts of a group of people to improve their social, economic, and cultural situation of which such should contribute to the overall public good." (Christenson and Robinson, 1980, p. 26)

The Farmers Home Administration (1970) traced the origins of community development to the cooperative activities of people who composed early tribal civilizations. Christenson (in Dillman and Hobbs, 1982) noted that concern for the community can be traced back to the early years of this country when rural problems reached alarming levels. The plight of early ruralities was highlighted in a report prepared by President Theodore Roosevelt's Commission on Country Life in 1908. During this time, rural sociologists began work which included the development and application of concepts and theoretical models for the purpose of improving the life and well-being of rural people (Dillman and Hobbs, 1982).

As the nature of communities changed from primarily agrarian to industrial, so did studies in community development change; the concept of urban community
development was introduced (Edison, 1979). Dillman and Hobbs (1982) emphasized that regardless of whether the community is classified as "rural" or "urban," community development has been and will continue to be a major means of problem solving in America.

Community Development

The term "community development" is often misused and needs to be distinguished from volunteerism and community service activities. Various articles from vocational education and agricultural education literature stress the importance of student and teacher involvement with community development but rarely mention the community development process, only the service activities conducted.

Christenson (in Dillman and Hobbs, 1982) stated that community development becomes even more important in this decade, because it can stimulate local initiative by involving people in the process of social and economic change. It builds channels of communication that promote solidarity and improve the social, economic, and cultural well-being of community residents. The notion of involving people in the community development process is reiterated by Kreitlow, Aiton, and Torrence (1965) who defined community development as the efforts of the community to identify its problems and to attempt to establish and reach goals.

Community development does not occur in and of itself,
according to Kreitlow and others (1965), who further stated that community development is dependent upon groups and individuals providing leadership to bring a community to action. The leadership reflects a "self-help" approach to community development or the process of people coming together, examining their situation, designing strategies to deal with the problems, and implementing plans to achieve some goals (Phifer, List, and Faulkner, 1980).

Volunteerism is an important factor in the community development process (Stam and Stinson, 1976). Smith (1981) stated that a volunteer is an individual who engages in behavior which is essentially (primarily) motivated by the expectation of psychic benefits. These benefits are a result of activities that have a market value greater than any remuneration received for such activities.

According to Cook (1979), community development is dependent upon effective citizen participation. Cook stated that effective citizen participation may contribute to the development of a healthy and stable community where goods and services are adequately and fairly distributed and where people have a sense of their collective efficacy, confidence, and power (1979). Volunteerism is a form of citizen participation. Community service activities often represent the avenue chosen by volunteers who wish to participate as concerned citizens of a community. Developing communities is expensive and time consuming. Therefore, many community officials now turn to the
voluntary associations to render services in order to accomplish goals which were previously impossible to reach in view of budgetary constraints. Voluntary associations account for $80 billion of the annual U.S. economy (Filer Commission, 1975).

Education’s Involvement

Educational institutions represent one sector of the population which may be involved in community activities. The literature alludes to education's political, economic, and social outcomes as a result of the school's community development and service activities. Several authors view the outcomes of citizen involvement in community development as having economic and political overtones, particularly as educators and students become involved with the community development process. According to the Report of the President's Science Advisory Committee Panel on Youth (Coleman, 1973), "Youth are becoming increasingly isolated by the schools, both from adults and from life experiences." (p. 23) He also indicated that youth working with others under the discipline imposed by a common task and purpose should provide a better direction to life and the motivation to learn how to implement it, thus broadening the concept of learning.

The concept of career education in the 1970’s spurred increased interest in developing school-community relationships according to Carey, Marshall, Miller, and Rosen (1977). They further indicated that school-community
relationships must be beneficial to all. Specifically, the student benefits from contacts with the world of work, and the community benefits from the increased participation of the school and the educational development of the program.

Lee (1982) supported the notion of community involvement through developing new working relationships with individuals in the agribusiness industry as there has been a shift in the 1980’s from "on-farm" to "off-farm" occupations. Lee (1981) and others contended that school-community relations are not only social but also economic.

Community development can provide government a rationale for working in partnership with community leaders to solve social and economic problems (Christenson in Dillman and Hobbs, 1982). Seivers (1982) noted that as administrators, teachers, and students work with outside agencies, in effect striving for program support, some political aspects of community development take place.

Emmerick (1975) charged teachers with the responsibility of involving students in community activities. He further stated that teachers along with students must go into the community to find real experiences. Some of these real experiences may include the development of social relationships with others in the community as well as the recognition of the community's economic needs through contacts with business and industry.

**Vocational Education’s Involvement**
McKenney (1976) reviewed several community-based activities for Distributive Education Clubs of America members. Examples from his work included shoplifting awareness seminars conducted in cooperation with the Chamber of Commerce and programs presented to the Jaycees and the Rotary. Price (1976) studied the community activities of home economics supervisors, teachers, and students as reported in an Ohio State Department of Education survey. He indicated that programs conducted by teachers and students included demonstrations at Girl Scout camps, kitchen safety demonstrations conducted in cooperation with the Cooperative Extension Service, and nutrition education programs for elementary school children.

Agricultural Education's Involvement

Vocational agricultural education has had a long standing tradition of community involvement. According to the Federal Board of Vocational Education's Sixth Annual Report (1922), "school boards are taking more interest in the [student's] work and are requiring of the men a larger amount of community service work." (p. 226)

Phipps (1972) listed community service as one of the eleven standing committees of the Future Farmers of America (FFA). He suggested that "All FFA members should be encouraged to render as much service as their time, ability, and facilities will permit." Phipps (1972) recommended that students participate in the Building Our
American Communities Program (BOAC) as a means through which to plan community service activities. The literature, however, largely reflects the FFA’s involvement in community service prior to the 1970 establishment of the BOAC program.

Stewart and Getman (1930) discussed the use of the agricultural and community survey. The survey was a useful technique for the identification of trends and rural community problems during the 1920’s.

Shugart (1959) reviewed vocational agriculture’s involvement in the Federal Government’s Food Production War Training Program which assisted vocational agriculture teachers in establishing community food canneries in 1942. Mullen (1959) stated that vocational agriculture students and their teacher established a seed treating and cleaning service for a Wisconsin community in 1940, and, that by 1947, they were serving 102 farmers annually in the community. Yates (1959) discussed the corn service activities of his vocational agriculture students, as well as their park improvement project and rat control program, as a means of improving the public image of the vocational agriculture program. Student teachers from North Carolina State University were required in 1959 to conduct a community needs research project during their student teaching program (Mayo, 1959).

Community service vs. community development.

Kreitlow, Aiton, and Torrence (1965) would have defined the
previously mentioned educational activities as community service rather than community development. They made the distinction that "community service involves activities conducted for others" whereas community development was defined by these authors as a process. Koneya (1978) emphatically stated that citizen participation as community service is not community development.

Biddle and Biddle (1965) pointed out that the community development process is a progression of events planned by the participants to serve goals they progressively choose. They further noted that the events point to changes in a group and in individuals that can be termed growth in social sensitivity and competence. Also, the essence of the process does not consist in any fixed succession of events, but it is the growth that occurs within individuals, within groups, and within communities. (p. 79)

Community development in agricultural education.
According to the National FFA Organization (1970), the Building Our American Communities (BOAC) program was established as a community development activity with the purposes to: (a) develop active, experienced and knowledgeable community leaders and citizens; (b) develop a rural-urban balance by expanding job opportunities, community services, and a better quality of living in rural communities; (c) improve the social and physical environment in the cities, towns, villages, and farm communities of rural America. The objectives of the BOAC
program are to have: (a) all students understand the principles and fundamentals of community development; (b) all students involved in planning and implementing a chapter BOAC project; and (c) youth development knowledge and skills in community leadership for the present and future; and (d) [all] become knowledgeable of and familiar with programs and resources of local, state, and federal agencies that help communities solve problems (National FFA, 1982b).

History of the BOAC Program

A Progress Report submitted by the National Future Farmers of America to Lilly Endowment, Inc. of Indianapolis, Indiana, revealed the following rationale for establishing the BOAC program:

As the agricultural education program broadened into the total agribusiness complex, and as the need for rural community development mounted, agricultural educators became more interested in placing greater emphasis on community development activities.

The Farmers Home Administration, a federal lending agency of the United States Department of Agriculture, suggested that one way to improve rural communities was a program to train and involve youth in the community development process. The end they suggested, would be stronger leadership for our communities of tomorrow. This leadership in turn would lead to a rural-urban balance which is in the national interest.

(National FFA, 1971, p.3)

The Farmers Home Administration believed that the community development youth education program could best be accomplished by the agriculture instructor. "His position in the community and his role as the instructor of a systematic, year round high school instructional program
qualifies him for this important youth leadership development program." (National FFA, 1971, p. 3)

The National FFA Board of Directors and the National FFA Board of Trustees approved the Building Our American Communities (BOAC) program as a special project of the National FFA Foundation in 1970 (National FFA, 1971). Lilly Endowment, Inc. was approved as the sponsor for the program for the calendar year 1971.

The Future Farmers of America sought the support of numerous individuals and agencies with the introduction of the BOAC program. The content of BOAC historical documents indicated that it was important for this youth community development program to establish relationships with politicians, government agencies, and the national teachers organizations if the program was to be successful. For example, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed on July 13, 1971, by the National Future Farmers of America, the U.S. Office of Education, National Vocational Agricultural Teachers Association, and the Farmers Home Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture. National FFA officers met with President Richard Nixon to explain the BOAC program to him. Senator James B. Pearson of Kansas lauded the efforts of the FFA in their establishment of a youth community development program (U.S.A., Congressional Record of the Senate, 24 July 1970). The BOAC program was officially announced at the 1970 FFA State Presidents' Conference Capitol Hill breakfast and the legislators'
support for the program was sought (National FFA, 1971).

Numerous types of instructional materials and audiovisuals have been developed to promote classroom community development instruction. The Farmers Home Administration (1970) published lesson plans entitled Build Our American Communities: A Community Development Program for High School and Young Adult Groups. A teacher’s manual and student’s manual entitled Community Development FFA Style were published in 1976 and revised in 1983. Sponsors have provided funding for three community development films in the past 13 years. Those included: "Hometown America," "The Game Plan: FFA Tackles Community Development," and "Consider the Possibilities." (National FFA, 1983a) A film and a slide presentation of yearly regional BOAC winners have also been sponsored each year. Five national workshops for agricultural educators were held in 1976 and 1977 to promote community development classroom instruction (National FFA, 1977). A recent grant will fund four regional BOAC workshops during the summer of 1984 (National FFA, 1983c).

The BOAC program is now sponsored by R. J. Reynolds Industries, Inc. of Winston-Salem, North Carolina. The annual budget has grown from the initial annual funding rate of slightly over $43,000 for 1971 to the current annual budget of $220,000+ for 1983. The financial inputs were budgeted to include personnel expenses as well as
costs of curriculum materials, applications/guide books publication, annual program reports, national banquet expenses, national conference expenses, research activities, and miscellaneous printing and distribution costs.

Human resources have increased as the BOAC program has grown. The direction of the BOAC program was assigned to one National FFA Program Specialist who also has responsibilities for directing the National FFA Contest program. In the past there has also been a staff intern, usually a college student assigned to the contest area, who assisted with the BOAC program. One secretary is assigned to the FFA Program Specialist.

The first National FFA BOAC Project Director for the Achievement in Volunteerism program was hired for a six-month period to plan and coordinate the 1983 National Conference on Community Development. This person has typically been a teacher educator in agricultural education. A conference director was also employed.

In addition to the National FFA staff, the national sponsor has provided one individual to conduct BOAC public relations activities in cooperation with local FFA chapters. This person also serves on the conference planning committee and attends numerous BOAC program planning meetings.

Personnel from the Farmers Home Administration, Office of Rural Policy Development--USDA, and the Department of
Education have also been provided to lend direction to the BOAC program. They have assisted with program planning, curriculum development, project evaluation, and other numerous BOAC activities.

A BOAC Research Committee chairman and research assistant were also supported on a consultation basis effective January, 1984. At least four other individuals serve on the research committee on a volunteer basis with expense allowances.

The expanded activities of the BOAC program now encompass three phases. Phase I includes the awards program as an incentive for chapters to conduct community development activities. Participants in the BOAC program report their accomplishments annually. The report assumes the form of an awards application which vocational agriculture teachers and their students complete and submit in order to qualify for the BOAC awards. They explain their project goals, objectives, procedures, and accomplishments. Completed applications are first evaluated on the area level. Each participating chapter which has completed 11 of the 16 community development competencies listed on the front of the application receives an area award. Applications of no more than 50% of the area award winners are forwarded to the state for award competition. At the state level, each chapter is ranked as a Bronze, Silver, or Gold award winner, depending upon the scope of its submitted program. Each chapter
receives a plaque for the first year of state participation and the appropriate bronze, silver, or gold spur for its plaque each year of state participation. The state winning chapter is awarded a Governor's Citation. Several states also present monetary awards to the three top BOAC chapters.

Each state FFA association may then submit for national consideration at least two applications but no more than 10% of the applications from all chapters in the state receiving the area award. National award winners are recognized at the National FFA Convention as Bronze, Silver, or Gold Emblem BOAC chapters. Each chapter receives a national plaque and appropriate award level spur for the plaque. The National FFA also selects a regional BOAC winner from each of the four FFA regions. One of these four is then selected as the National BOAC winner. The four BOAC regional winners each receive a check of $200.

Phase II, entitled Achievement in Volunteerism, was initiated for the purpose of recognizing individual FFA members for their accomplishments in volunteerism. FFA members participating in the BOAC program are eligible for the individual achievement award. Recognition is based on knowledge of community development, skills, attitudes, and involvement in the BOAC program. One individual may be recognized at the chapter level, and one is recognized at the state level. Each state has the opportunity to send a
student who has earned the outstanding Achievement in Volunteerism award and the respective FFA chapter advisor to the National Conference on Community Development held in Washington, D.C.

During that national conference, ten individuals are selected as national finalists. The selected state representatives are ranked one through ten by a national committee and awarded plaques and checks. The national individual winner receives $1,000, the second place individual receives $750, third place receives $500, and fourth through tenth place receive $400 each. The money is to be used by the individual's respective FFA chapter to further the chapter's community development program (National FFA, 1982a).

Phase III or Research was instituted in 1983. The purpose of the research stage is to describe the accomplishments of the BOAC program and to contribute to the improvement of the BOAC program (National FFA, 1983c).

Statement of the Problem

Over the past 13 years FFA members and their advisors have had the opportunity to participate in a program which is viewed as a major community development program for high school age students, specifically the Building Our American Communities (BOAC) program. The literature has substantiated the need for community development as a major means of problem solving in America. The National FFA Organization and numerous support agencies and sponsors
have provided resources and incentive awards for those vocational agriculture students and teachers who wish to participate in the BOAC program.

Although each BOAC program is important within the context of its school and community, many of them represent the best efforts of FFA members who conduct community development activities. However, in view of the program inputs, there is a lack of information which adequately describes the BOAC program participants, their perceptions of the value of resources and personal involvement, or the dimensions and outcomes of the community development programs which they are conducting. That lack of information is the central problem which this study was designed to address.

Purpose and Objectives of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the Building Our American Communities (BOAC) program by describing community development activities, BOAC projects and characteristics associated with selected students and advisors who participated in the 1983 BOAC program, relative to their FFA chapter, school, and community contextual situations with respect to program inputs and anticipated outcomes.

The following research questions were raised:

1. What was the level of participation in the 1983 BOAC program and at what levels were selected participants recognized?
2. What were the characteristics of selected BOAC projects?

3. How did selected advisors perceive the importance of teaching community development topics?

4. How were selected advisors, students, and others involved in conducting the community development programs and BOAC projects?

5. What were the demographic, academic, occupational, and leadership characteristics of students who were recognized as 1983 Achievement in Volunteerism national award recipients?

6. What were the demographic, occupational, and leadership characteristics of advisors whose FFA chapters were selected as participants in the National FFA Conference on Community Development?

7. What was the FFA chapter, school, and community contextual situation in which BOAC programs and projects were conducted?

8. What was the quality of the BOAC curriculum materials and audiovisuals according to the selected BOAC program participants?

9. What were the anticipated outcomes as perceived by the selected BOAC program participants?

Need for the Study

The BOAC program, as vocational agriculture's major community development effort, has been in effect for 13
years. The cumulative financial support of FFA Foundation sponsors during this time period has exceeded $1 million. The investment of individual and group time and resources over the past 13 years has been monumental with respect to the national, state, and local level FFA contributions. Research needs to be initiated which at least addresses in part the evaluative statements of need which Voth (1975a) posed:

We need to know whether or not community development efforts have had any of the effects they are purported to have. We need to know how these efforts are brought about. We need to know why they are not brought about if they are unsuccessful. Finally, we need to know something about the relationship between their costs and benefits so that we can make intelligent choices among alternatives. (p. 148)

Foremost, there is a need to explore the degree to which BOAC program participants are establishing authentic community development programs. How are they engaging in the community development process in view of the BOAC program objectives, or is this only a case of volunteers conducting community service activities?

Community development and educational literature are virtually void of research findings which focus on the BOAC program as a major community development effort. Opinion-based literature commends the value of the BOAC program. U.S. Agriculture Secretary John R. Block was quoted as saying:

Each year, the thousands of FFA members carrying out BOAC projects are responding to emerging issues of the 21st century, and preparing for the leadership they
will be called upon to deliver as adults.... They are investigating how their hometowns work, what the needs of their communities are and how to go about meeting those needs. (Bachman, 1982, p. 22)

The profession needs to know if this is true. It needs to know who is participating, what resources and materials have been utilized, which processes have been implemented, and what personal and community outcomes have resulted if intelligent program recommendations are to be made.

As was noted before, local chapter BOAC program accomplishments are documented on an annual awards application. From a review of the national BOAC award winning applications, the researcher found inconsistency in the detail of information reported due to the open-ended structure of the application. This study was needed to gather base-line data of the BOAC program participants and their programs.

Voth (1975a) stated that community development research is also needed to train a new generation of community development practitioners. Only 1,572 of the 8,348 FFA chapters, or 18.5%, participated in the BOAC program in 1982 (National FFA, 1982c). The present study gathered data beyond the scope of the BOAC application, from exemplary BOAC program participants. The information may be compiled to enlighten BOAC nonparticipants as to the realm of possibilities for community development activities within the context of varying community, school, teacher, and student situations.
The present study was important to the National FFA Organization and to the national BOAC program sponsor as the findings provided information revealing the utilization, applicability, and scope of the BOAC program by selected FFA chapters in each state. The findings of this study may lead to the improvement of the BOAC program, particularly in the area of identifying necessary inputs, successful BOAC FFA advisors' characteristics, community development teaching priorities, characteristics of outstanding students, and project processes and situations as well as BOAC project outcomes.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations of this study were as follows:

1. Definitions of community development activities vary among instructors of vocational agriculture and are not always classified consistently by participants.

2. The population was the group of 1982-1983 state representatives to the 1983 National Conference on Community Development. The analysis of data applies only to members of the selected population, and generalizations should not be made to all vocational agriculture teachers, students, and programs.

3. Participants in the National Conference on Community Development were supposed to be the state-winning chapter advisor and individual. However, four states exercised liberties in selecting their exemplary BOAC
program state representative, so the generalization that the population studied was state-winning BOAC chapter advisors and students cannot be made.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are being defined in order to clarify their use in this study:

**BOAC** -- Building Our American Communities. A national program approved by the National FFA Board of Directors in 1970 which focuses on the community development process and is designed to encourage FFA members to study the role of community leaders, local organizations, and local government (Lee, 1976, p. 1).

**FFA** -- The Future Farmers of America. A national organization of, by, and for students of vocational agriculture/agribusiness (National FFA, 1983b).

**National FFA Conference on Community Development** -- A national conference instituted in 1983 for each state individual BOAC winner and his or her respective vocational agriculture teacher/FFA advisor to attend for the purpose of participating in an educational program on leadership aspects of community development (National FFA, 1982a).

**Self-help** -- An approach to community development defined by Dillman and Hobbs (1982) as a process of people coming together, examining their situation and designing strategies to deal with problems and implement plans to achieve some goals (p. 268).
Summary

The importance of community development, as well as the distinction between community development as a process and community service as an activity, has been firmly established in the literature. Vocational education students, especially vocational agriculture students, have participated in community activities for a number of years. The outcomes of such participation may have been social, economical, or political. There is, however, a question as to whether the activities which were conducted were community service activities or part of a community development program.

In 1970, the Future Farmers of America approved the Building Our American Communities (BOAC) program as a special community development program for vocational agriculture students. The BOAC program has grown over the past 13 years to include three phases: a chapter awards incentive component, a phase which recognizes individual students for achievements in volunteerism, and a research phase. A lack of descriptive research information about the BOAC participants and their programs set the stage for this study which is expected to become one part of the third phase of the BOAC program.

The rationale for the study centered around four areas of need. First, community development programs need to be evaluated. Secondly, there is a lack of research evidence
as to the characteristics of participants and projects as well as to the outcomes of participation in the BOAC program. A need to develop instrumentation which would facilitate gathering base-line data of BOAC participants beyond the scope of the standard awards application was the third reason cited. Finally, only 18.5% of the FFA chapters in the nation participated in the BOAC program in 1982. Providing descriptive information to nonparticipants may enlighten them as to the realm of possibilities for participation. The information should also be useful to the National FFA organization and BOAC sponsor in order to further improve the program.

Thus, the purpose of the study was to examine the Building Our American Communities (BOAC) program by describing community development activities, BOAC projects, and characteristics associated with selected students and advisors who participated in the 1983 BOAC program relative to their FFA chapter, school, and community contextual situations with respect to program inputs and anticipated outcomes. The population for the study was the participants in the 1983 National FFA Conference on Community Development. Nine research questions were to be answered at the end of the study.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

From the review of literature, there appears to be no lack of opinion-based articles discussing the FFA's involvement with the BOAC program, but there exists a virtual vacuum of actual research studies conducted as to the outcomes of the BOAC program. Relevant to this study are literature and research which pertain to the community development process and community development evaluation. A review of studies which focused on the characteristics of volunteers, vocational agriculture students, FFA members, youth organizations, FFA advisors and community development curriculum, and communities provided a frame of reference.

The Community Development Process

Literature (Biddle & Biddle, 1968; Blakely, 1979; Christenson & Robinson, 1980; Warren, 1972) supports the FFA's contention that participants in the BOAC program are engaging in community development if, in fact, their total BOAC program reflects the instruction of and the involvement in the community development process. Generically, that process is described by the International Cooperation Administration as "a process of social action in which people of a community organize themselves for planning and action, define their common and individual needs and problems, make group and individual plans with a maximum of reliance upon community resources, and
supplement these resources when necessary with services and materials from governmental and nongovernmental agencies outside the community" (Warren, 1972, p. 311).

Voth (1975b) stated four components which characterize a community development program, none of which, taken by themselves, was essential to his definition. His four components included reference to a situation in which some group, usually locality based such as a neighborhood or local community, attempts to improve its social and economic situation through its own efforts, using professional assistance and perhaps also financial assistance from the outside, and involving all sectors of the community or groups to the maximum (p. 148).

Community development "process" objectives have to do with the quality of decision-making and problem-solving capabilities of the community, and they are sometimes regarded to be unquantifiable (Voth, 1975b, p. 635). Voth further stated that the community development process is often times complicated by the consideration of content objectives which involve concrete goals, such as a park or tree planting or obtaining some institution, service, or facility that a significant portion of the community desires.

The community development process for BOAC participants includes seven steps which were outlined by
Lee (1976) in *Community Development--FFA Style*. Those seven steps were:

1. defining your community
2. identifying community needs
3. selecting community development activities
4. gathering and analyzing information
5. exploring alternative solutions
6. organizing for action
7. evaluating the results

(p. 2)

The implication here is that the content or community development activity was the tangible result from engaging in community development process steps.

**Community Development Evaluation**

Traditionally, evaluation research has been aimed at making contributions to theory and/or demonstrating to administrators and policy makers the need for new or renewed budgetary allocations (Lackley, Peterson, and Pine, 1981, p. 84). The authors stated that rarely is evaluation conducted with the purpose of providing a learning experience for program participants. Furthermore, they stated that evaluation is a part of the community development process.

The case study methodology which Lackley, Peterson, and Pine used was not as germane to this study as was the notion that community development participants were capable of assessing their own immediate accomplishments and feelings. From the community development experience, participants said that they learned self-reliance (97%).
how government works, how to make use of outside resources and how many were necessary, and 83% said they developed a sense of community or a feeling of belonging (1981).

An evaluation of 29 community development programs in Illinois tested the hypothesis that community development programs have an effect upon process and content variables at the community level (Voth, 1975a). Scalogram Analysis (Guttman Scaling) was used to define the institutional structure of the community. The content variables were four scales which included a retail services scale, a rural services scale, a noneconomic services scale, and a health services scale. The process variables were voter participation and the number of candidates running for local office.

A stratified random sample of 32 nonprogram communities, 15 special program communities, and 14 full program communities was drawn from a universe of 207 incorporated places in an Illinois region. The findings indicated that community development programs are correlated with improvements in elite participation and in the scale of rural services, noneconomic services, and health services (Voth, 1975a).

Evaluating community development programs and their effects often times involves the use of a data base as was the case for the Miller, Voth, and Chapman (1984) study. They conducted a study to estimate the effects of community
resource development efforts on county quality of life in 75 counties of Arkansas from 1960 to 1980. Quality of life indicators were derived from secondary data available at the county level. Community development resource inputs were measured as factors or unobserved variables derived from the reports of the Cooperative Extension Community Resource Development personnel.

The methodology employed by the authors involved recent statistical techniques for the simultaneous estimation of measurement and structural models when multiple indicator unobserved variables are used. They concluded that few of the quality of life indicators were affected in the direction intended by the community development programs. Where effects were present, they were in narrowly defined social service areas, and no "social multiplier" effects were found. They did note that although it would be difficult, the study really needed to measure a broader range of impacts and to include detailed social services impacts and information about attitudes, community participation, etc. (pp. 37-66).

Volunteerism

According to Langston (1981), the 1970's witnessed an unprecedented growth of knowledge, new organizations, and expectations concerning volunteerism. The sociodemographic characteristics of volunteers indicate that the majority of volunteers have completed high school, earn $10,000 -
$14,999 annually (family of four), are ages 45 to 64, and are most active in small cities with populations of 10,000 to 50,000 people (Hougland and Christenson, 1982, p. 10). They further noted that those who participate in voluntary farm organizations value most highly political democracy, helping others, and individualism (1982, p. 11).

The 1975 General Social Survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Corporation (NORC) collected data which reflected the percentage of individuals surveyed who participated in voluntary organizations (Jenner, 1982). The 1975 survey showed that 8% of the sample reported membership in service clubs, 14% in school service groups, and 40% in church affiliated groups (p. 28).

Houghland and Christenson (1982) studied voluntary organizations in North Carolina. They found that young people, ages 24 or younger, represented only 6.5% of the voluntary sector (p. 10). Gidron (1978) found that the rewards for volunteers under 25, most of whom were students, were focused on a learning experience. Emmerick (1975) charged teachers with the responsibility of involving students in community activities in order to find real experiences. Specifically these real experiences should include the development of social relations with others in the community as well as the recognition of the community's economic needs with business and industry (Emmerick, 1975).
A recent survey involving a probability sample of 1,500 students in grades 7 through 12 was conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) (1983). The purpose was to determine the attitudes and activities of youth in the 1980's as compared to the data collected from the 1974 NASSP youth survey. A total of 87% of the students who responded were enrolled in public high schools, 11% attended private schools with religious affiliations, and 2% went to nonsectarian private schools. Quotas were established to ensure an appropriate representation of male and female respondents. The sample was representative of the national student population in geographic distribution, population density, and family income.

The study found that volunteer community service engaged 41% of the students in 1983 compared to almost 50% in 1974. This included 47% of the females as compared to 36% of the males. Fund raising activities were the kind of volunteer work most frequently cited by the students (27.8%), followed by hospital work (21.6%), environmental related (10.9%), church related (6.7%), and so forth through the 11 categories. There was no explicit indication that the activities were part of community development programs, part of co-curricular activities or intra-curricular activities.
Youth Organizations, Advisors, and Students

The NASSP (1983) study indicated that the most popular type of co-curricular activity was sports or student association with athletic teams and clubs (48.2% of all student respondents to the NASSP survey). Career-oriented clubs included 15.2% of the students and service/volunteer groups, 10.2%. Female-dominated organizations, such as choir, remained so while previously male-dominated activities, such as sports, now included large percentages of females.

For community activity involvement, the study found that 35% of all students were active in church/religious organizations, 11% in Boy/Girl Scouts, and 8.7% active in the 4-H. The findings also indicated that there was a disproportionate number of students with high grades, above a C average, who were active in these organizations.

Student respondents to the NASSP survey were also asked what their immediate plans were after high school. The immediate plan for a majority of the students (54.5%) was to attend a four-year college. There were 36.6% who indicated that they would get jobs, 14.8% planned to go to training/vocational schools, 14.8% planned to attend junior colleges, 13.3% planned to get married, 11.1% planned to join the armed forces, 9.4% said that they planned to travel, and .9% planned to join volunteer organizations.

Seibert (1975) conducted a study to determine the
relationship of selected characteristics to the success of vocational youth organizations. The three organizations surveyed were the Distributive Education Clubs of America, Future Business Leaders of America, and Future Farmers of America. Questionnaires were sent to twelve advisors in each of the twenty-four states. The states were randomly selected to be geographically representative.

Seibert concluded the following based upon statistical findings of the study:

1. The longer the organization had been in existence, the more effective it was in reaching its objective.

2. Organizations with higher numbers of male members were more effective in reaching their objectives.

3. Organizations that participated in state and national activities were more effective in reaching their objectives.

4. School administrators' levels of encouragement and financial support were positively and significantly correlated with the achievement of the organization's objectives.

5. The longer the advisor had sponsored a youth organization, the more effective it was in achieving its objectives.

Matterson and Carlson (1972) conducted a survey in Wisconsin to identify factors which affected participation in state FFA activities. Eighty instructors were randomly
selected. From the data analyzed, the following factors were found to correlate with high participation in state FFA activities.

1. Instructors had ten or more years of experience.
2. Instructors taught only vocational agriculture.
3. There were fewer than 100 students enrolled in vocational agriculture and most were FFA members.
4. The instructor had good rapport with the high school administration.
5. FFA members were well aware of the activities available.
6. A well-developed local program of FFA activities was possessed.
7. The instructors were satisfied with state assistance.

Vaughn (1976) conducted a study in New Mexico to identify some of the characteristics that were associated with the success of vocational agriculture teachers as FFA advisors. Teachers were divided into three groups based upon a chapter rating scale predetermined by the National FFA and the New Mexico State FFA Association. The three groups represented varying degrees of success in advising and supervising FFA chapter activities. Holding all other factors constant, Vaughn found no relationship between the success of the FFA advisor and the size of the community.

Herren (1982) conducted a study to determine those
factors associated with the success of those teams which participated in the 1981 National FFA Livestock Judging Contest. The population consisted of 135 contestants (FFA members) and their 45 advisors. Of those who actually participated in the study, 79 of the contestants were male and 30 were female. Forty-two of the advisors were males and 3 of them were female. Twenty-four teachers were from single teacher agriculture departments and 20 were from departments with as few as two teachers and as many as eight teachers. One teacher had less than a bachelor's degree, 30 had bachelor's degrees, 8 had master's degrees, and 5 had post-master's degrees. The mean number of years advisors had been teaching was 8.21. The average school size of the participants was 654.23 students with an average of 111.43 students enrolled in vocational agriculture.

Pearson Product Moment Correlations were calculated to determine the strength of relationships between the background variables and the contest score. A low negative relationship (-.23) between the advisor's years teaching experience and the contest team's score was found. There were negligible relationships (.00 to .20) found for school size and number of students in the department when correlated with team score, the measure of success.

Herren also asked the advisors and the students to rate the stated purposes of the FFA National Livestock Judging
Contest on a scale of 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Both advisors and students agreed that the basic purpose of the contest was to provide motivation for students to learn livestock evaluation. This purpose received the highest mean rating from both the advisors (4.36) and the students (4.22). Stated as benefits for participation, advisors rated first the learning experience for students, second, student social outcomes, and third, that a benefit was the prestige of winning.

Community Development Curriculum and Vocational Agriculture Teachers

A community development curriculum study was conducted by Barrick and Caplinger (1984) in Ohio to determine the importance of including selected community development topics in the vocational agriculture curriculum. From the random stratified sample of 108 vocational agriculture teachers, slightly over 80% responded.

Barrick and Caplinger reported the means and standard deviations of the topics as rated by the surveyed teachers. Of the eleven topics identified, the five topics which received the highest mean rating as to whether they should be included in the vocational agriculture curriculum were as follows:

1. Importance of agriculture in the community.
2. Identifying resources in the community.
3. Identifying community needs and problems.

5. Identifying influential people in the community.

In terms of descriptive information, the respondents to Barrick and Caplinger's study had taught vocational agriculture for 1 to 32 years with a mean number of 4.3 years. They had been teaching in their current school a mean number of 7.9 years. The mean number of students enrolled in grades 9 through 12 was 757, and the number of students in vocational agriculture was 79.2. A majority of the schools were comprehensive high schools (65%). Most of the advisors' communities were rural/small towns (77.8%); 13.6% were urban/large cities, and 8.6% were suburban. Agricultural areas which the advisors taught were as follows: production agriculture, 62.9%; agribusiness, 3.7%; mechanics, 3.7%; products processing, 1.2%; horticulture, 19.7%; natural resources, 6.2%; and unknown, 2.5%.

Claycomb and Petty (1983) conducted a three-year longitudinal study of the perceived needs for assistance of vocational agriculture teachers in 1979, 1980, and 1981. They found that as the teacher experience increased so did the desire for assistance in human relations within the classroom and the community.

A national study which investigated the seriousness of student misbehavior was conducted by Garrison (1982). The
demographics of the national sample of vocational agriculture teachers selected by Garrison was one of the few teacher characteristic profiles found among dissertation studies. There were 437 teachers in the sample drawn from the population of 12,726 vocational agriculture teachers.

Biographical information indicated that 94.5% of the teachers were male. The percentage of teachers ages 22-30 years was 34.4%, ages 31-40 was 34.4%, ages 41-50 was 16.5%, and ages 61-70 was 4.5%. The following was found for teachers’ levels of education: less than bachelor’s, 2.5%; bachelor’s, 49.5%; master’s, 29.4%; post-master’s, 17.9%; and doctor’s, 0.7%.

In terms of years teaching experience the following data were reported: 1 to 10 years, 63.6%; 11 to 20 years, 13.9%; 21 to 30 years, 13.3%; 31 to 40 years, 8.4%; and 41 to 49 years, 0.8%. Fifty-two percent of the teachers were from single teacher departments. There were 68.4% of the teachers who taught at school with a student enrollment of under 1,000, 25.7% were at schools with 1,000 - 2,000 students, and 6% were at schools that had over 2,000 students. A majority of their schools (54.0%) were in rural settings, 23.6% of the schools were located in urban areas, 14.8% of the schools were in urban fringes, and 7.6% of the schools were located in central cities (Garrison, 1982, p. 95).
Vocational Agriculture Students and FFA Members

National FFA statistics for 1981-1982 revealed that there were 618,145 students enrolled in secondary vocational agriculture during that academic year (National FFA, 1982c). Of these students, 77% or 475,924 were FFA members (p. 21).

Several data bases are currently being analyzed to determine the demographic characteristics of vocational agriculture students. The last published results were reported by the U.S. Department of Education for the fall of 1979. The distribution of students enrolled in agriculture at institutions with five or more vocational programs included 80.6% males and 19.4% females (USDE, 1979). By racial/ethnic group, there were 1.8% American Indian/Alaskan Native, 0.7% Pacific Islander, 11.5% Black not Hispanic, 2.7% Hispanic, and 83.3% White not Hispanic (1979, Table 7).

Preliminary 1980-1981 data from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) (1983b), indicated that there were 360,316 students enrolled in secondary vocational agriculture from schools with five or more vocational programs. The distribution of students included approximately 78% male and 17% female with the status of over 20,000 students unknown (USDE, 1979, Table 1321). They also noted that the following percentages of students were enrolled in specific
agriculture programs: agricultural production, 48.08%; agricultural supply/services, 6.02%; agricultural mechanics, 15.98%; agricultural products, 1.26%; horticulture, 17.75%; renewable natural resources, 3.26%; forestry, 2.74%; and other, 4.92% (USDE, 1983b, Table 1215). These data are reported by schools federally supported from the National Vocational Education Act (VEA). The data are still under review and serve only as a general estimate.

Burge and Cunningham (1984) identified agriculture as a male intensified vocational program based on their analysis of 1980 National Opinion Research Center (NORC) High School and Beyond base-year senior data. The data were derived from respondents selected as part of a two-stage probability sample of 1,015 high schools with 36 seniors selected from each school. Only those students who indicated occupational preparation in not more than one vocational area were used by Burge and Cunningham. The sample included 486 males and 42 females or approximately 8% who were enrolled only in agriculture (p.14).

No demographic data base specifically describing FFA members was available. A review of dissertations which included FFA member demographic data, limited as that information was, provided a source of FFA member characteristics.

Welton (1971) used a stratified random sample of 112
vocational agriculture departments across the United States to investigate FFA chapter programs and the characteristics of vocational agriculture students as they related to participation in FFA activities. One instrument was developed to elicit information about the vocational agriculture department and the FFA. A second instrument was administered to participating junior and senior FFA members in the selected departments. He obtained usable data from 2,773 student questionnaires.

Among other things, Welton found that members indicated that more appropriate activities to interest all members, an opportunity for more members to participate, and more awards and recognition programs were the major improvements needed by the FFA organization. He also found that 47% of the vocational agriculture departments were located in rural areas; 30% in small towns of 5,000 or less; 15% in cities of 5,000 to 50,000; 4% in residential suburbs; and 2% in residential areas of large cities. Welton also found that 73% of the departments were staffed by one teacher.

Demographic data on the students included the following:

1. Ninety-two percent of the total student enrollment were males.

2. Eighty-three percent were white, 9% black, and 8% other.
3. Thirty-four percent of the students' grades were mostly B's and 40% mostly C's.

4. Sixty-one percent of the students had occupational experience programs of livestock enterprises.

5. Eleven percent of the students had placement in production agriculture occupational experiences.

6. Twenty-six percent had no occupational experience activities.

7. On a scale of 0 to 40, the mean student socio-economic score was 23.78 based upon family possessions, education of parents, and parental occupation.

8. Eighty-three percent of the students participated in some school activity other than the FFA.

9. Percentages of students participating in community organizations included the following: 66% in church, 17% 4-H, 10% Scouts, 4% Junior Fair Board, 3% Junior Farm Bureau, 2% Junior Grange, 9% other, and 25% did not participate.

10. Seventy-two percent of the members did not hold a chapter office.

11. Forty-seven percent participated in FFA judging contests on the local levels, 17% had participated in state judging contests, and only 3% had participated on the national level.

12. Of the significant correlations between demographic characteristics and extent of participation in
the FFA, the highest relationships were reported for years in vocational agriculture, socioeconomic status, and the sex of the student. The lowest correlation shown was for grades in high school.

Ricketts (1982) conducted a study to determine the leadership and personal development abilities of high school seniors in superior FFA chapters, nonsuperior FFA chapters and nonvocational agriculture students in middle Tennessee. He surveyed 258 seniors in schools with four-year vocational agriculture departments. Leadership and personal development abilities were measured on a criterion-referenced test which was mailed to the cooperating schools. He found that students in superior and nonsuperior FFA chapters possessed more leadership and personal development abilities than nonagriculture students. However, vocational agriculture and nonvocational agriculture students from schools with superior FFA chapters also possessed higher leadership and personal development abilities than did students from schools with nonsuperior FFA chapters, leading him to conclude that the opportunities offered by some schools may be an influencing factor.

Townsend and Carter (1983) surveyed 426 high school seniors in Iowa to determine the relationship between participation in FFA activities and personal development competencies. This study was part of a larger one
conducted by Townsend (1981). Two instruments were administered which included the Personal Development Inventory (PDI) and the FFA Activity Participation Inventory. Scores were calculated which measured leadership, citizenship, and cooperation of respondents who completed the PDI and an FFA participation score was calculated from the activity inventory. Pearson correlations were used to statistically analyze the PDI trait scores and participation scores. T-tests were used to compare the unweighted FFA activities with the scale scores of leadership, citizenship, and cooperation (Townsend, 1981).

They found the correlation between the personal development competencies and weighted FFA participation score to be positive and significant for leadership only. Mean scores were calculated for participation and nonparticipation groups for each FFA activity. Thus T-tests were used to determine differences between the two groups' PDI scores for individual activities. For community service activities, 325 students answered "yes" to participation in such activities. Positive, significant T-values were found for the leadership and citizenship traits indicating that participants in the community service activities scored significantly higher on the PDI than did nonparticipants (Townsend & Carter, 1983, p.22).
Communities

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) (1983) compiled a report which reviewed the status of communities. During the 1970's, rural population grew from 53.6 million to 59.5 million or by 11.9% (U.S. Census, 1980, p. 1-14). A survey conducted by Research Analysis Corporation attempted to ascertain the residential preference of Americans in 1976. They found that 36% preferred rural areas, 30% small towns, 25% suburbs, and 8% cities (USDA, 1983).

The USDA (1983) indicated that from 1960 to 1970 the percent of population change, representing an increase in numbers of people, in metropolitan areas was 17% and 4.4% for nonmetropolitan areas. From 1970 to 1980, the population in metropolitan areas had increased by an additional 9.8%. In nonmetropolitan areas, the increase was 15.8%. During the same period, the percent of population in nonmetropolitan counties adjacent to standard metropolitan areas increased by 17.4% and in nonmetropolitan nonadjacent counties, it was 14.0%. Nonadjacent counties with a city of 10,000 people or more increased their population by 14.5%, and counties with no cities of 10,000 increased 13.6%.

During the 1970's employment in the U.S. rose at an annual rate of 2.1%. In rural America it was 2.3% compared with 1.9% annual growth rate in metropolitan areas. Towns
of 2,500 or less averaged 3.3% employment growth. In 1981, the USDA (1983) indicated that agriculture, forestry, and fisheries occupations contributed 3% of rural income; 21.8% was from manufacturing; 16.6% government jobs; 16.5% wholesale and retail; 17% services; 5% combined transportation, communication, and public utilities occupations; 4.4% construction; and 2% mining. The USDA estimates that in 1983 the rural income average was only 80% of the urban income average, $19,225 compared to $24,478.

The most cited or most urgent issues facing rural communities according to the USDA (1983) are the need for improved facilities and services, better assistance to rural governments, better housing and more jobs in the private sector. Numerous other issues were also listed as points of future concerns for rural communities. Among these were included: increased incentives for health practitioners to locate in rural areas, tax credits for voluntary community service, federal control of rural land, toxic waste and pollution, rural historic preservation, strengthened farmers' cooperatives, concentration on renewable resources, and "human capital" enhancement through education and jobs.

Summary

The community development process involves several steps, and these were supported by various authors. It is
important that local community members take the initiative to determine what their communities need and that they develop a plan of action, including concrete activities, to achieve their goals. Resources within and outside the community may be helpful.

Evaluating the impact of community development efforts is difficult to measure and often the expected results are not discovered as Miller, Voth, and Chapman (1984) concluded. It is possible to detect some effect of the programs in narrowly defined social service areas. Rather than focusing on community impact perhaps more research should be focused on determining the effects on specific social services and the community development participants. Such was the case for one study cited.

Volunteers for the most part are middle aged adults in the medium average-family-income bracket. When youth are involved as volunteers, there is a small percentage of them. The primary benefit from their volunteer efforts is the educational experience. The majority of their experiences are derived from fund raising and hospital volunteer work.

Various studies have been conducted to determine the relationship of selected characteristics to the success of youth organizations. Experience of the FFA advisor, the rapport with administration, and active participation in state and national activities appeared to be important
characteristics of the successful chapters. The success of the FFA advisor was not related to the size of the community according to Vaughn (1976).

Only one study determined vocational agriculture teachers' opinions as to whether community development topics should be taught in the vocational agriculture classroom. Teachers were generally in agreement that the topics should be taught.

Demographic characteristics of vocational agriculture students indicated that the students were primarily white males. Walton's 1971 study elaborately described the characteristics of FFA members at that time. The students were predominantly white males, from rural backgrounds, with average academic abilities. Socioeconomic status was one of the most influential variables in determining student FFA participation.

There is some evidence that participation in the FFA does result in students developing some leadership abilities. Positive effects of participation in community activities which resulted in students acquiring citizenship traits are rarely discussed in the literature, and when they are, those effects are minimal.

The population of rural communities over the past 10 years has grown. However, the number of people engaged in agricultural industries appears to be in a decline as compared to other industries in the community. The greatest
needs of rural communities include the need for improved facilities and services, better assistance to rural governments, better housing, and more jobs in the private sector.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

A descriptive research design was used in this study. The purpose of descriptive research in the literal sense is to describe systematically the facts and characteristics of a given population or area of interest, factually and accurately (Isaac and Michaels, 1983). Characteristically, descriptive research is the accumulation of a data base that is solely descriptive. It does not necessarily seek nor explain relationships, test hypotheses, make predictions, nor get at meanings and implications although research aimed at these more powerful purposes may incorporate descriptive methods (Isaac and Michaels, 1983, p. 46). Authorities are not in agreement as to what constitutes "descriptive research" and often broaden the term to include all forms of research other than historical and experimental.

In the broad sense, the term "survey studies" is often used in reference to descriptive research. Isaac and Michaels state that the purposes of survey studies include: "a) to collect detailed factual information that describes existing phenomena; b) to identify problems or justify current conditions and practices; c) to make comparisons and evaluations; d) to determine what others are doing with similar problems or situations and benefit from their experience in making future plans and decisions" (1983,
p.46). Survey research techniques were chosen for this study in order to describe a selected population. As this was a study of a population, the use of statistical procedures and inferences made to the universal population were limited.

Theoretical Framework

Bennett and Nelson (1975) proposed the use of hierarchies to the Extension Service for the purpose of evaluating community development programs and activities. The assumption is made that the lower levels cause, or bring about, the higher levels. The seven levels stated by Bennett and Nelson are (a) inputs, (b) activities, (c) people involvement, (d) reactions, (e) "KASA" or knowledge, attitudes, skills, aspiration, (f) practice change, and (g) end results. The first four of the seven levels provide a conceptual frame of reference for this study.

The first level requires the acknowledgement of the program's existence as a result of various inputs. Those inputs could be manpower, money, or in-kind contributions in one or more phases of community development (Bennett and Nelson, 1975). From the discussion in Chapter 1, including the historical perspective and program sponsorship, the existence of the BOAC program was substantiated by virtue of the initial program inputs.

Level one inputs made the activities of level two
possible. Thus participation which entails conducting activities as part of the program was the second level for evaluation (Bennett and Nelson, 1975). FFA members and their advisors constituted the participants in the BOAC program who conducted the activities. Those activities could include programs in leadership development, community surveys, teaching, consultation, various services, and projects. The extent of participation in the BOAC program by FFA chapters was ascertained from the National FFA Statistics (1982c, 1983a). The type of projects and activities conducted were determined from this study's data.

Activities got people involved and reflected the third level of Bennett's (1972) hierarchy. Applicable to the BOAC program was the assessment of the extent of members' and advisors' participation in the chosen project activities, as well as an assessment of the nature and degree of involvement by others. Personal and situational characteristics of the participants were also determined at this stage.

The involvement of people in activities resulted in the fourth level for evaluation. Bennett (1972) called that fourth level "reactions." In the case of this study, the reactions included the like or dislike of educational materials as well as the reactors' opinion of the anticipated outcomes from conducting BOAC projects. The
anticipated outcomes could have involved what members learned, how members benefitted, or how the schools and communities benefitted. The analysis of short term outcomes was accomplished by asking advisors to rank the project outcomes, several of which specified benefits to students. Students were also asked to identify those community development tasks which they felt most capable of doing after participating in the BOAC program.

As Bennett and Nelson (1975) pointed out, level four reactions are not proven changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills, or aspirations. The postulated outcomes or effects in level four set the stage for levels five through seven evaluation. That evaluation is beyond the scope of this study as an experimental type design utilizing a statistical sample and experimental/control groups would be required. Also, revised instrumentation administered in the future would be more appropriate to determine learning and career effects upon participants. The results of this study could serve as a first year data base for such a longitudinal study.

Survey Research Design and Methodology

Descriptive research procedures were used to assess the characteristics of students and advisors who conducted selected 1983 BOAC projects as well as to describe their BOAC projects, FFA chapters, schools, and communities. Surveys were administered in person by the researcher at a
national meeting of the participants in the study.

Voth (1975b) identified the first step in conducting community development evaluation as the delineation of a population of communities or of groups. Thus, in accordance with the opinions of Borg (1981) and Van Dalen (1979), the utilization of descriptive survey research procedures in this type of study facilitate the collection of detailed factual information that describes existing phenomena. The descriptions result in knowing something about the characteristics of the subjects before trying to study more complex research questions.

The Population

Participants in the study were chosen by virtue of their selection to attend the National FFA Conference on Community Development in 1983. Each state was to send the state winning BOAC chapter's representative for the Achievement in Volunteerism award and the respective FFA chapter advisor.

Four states did not send their first place BOAC winning chapter representative but had to select another exemplary BOAC chapter to send a representative from the state. In two cases, the chapter advisor was not able to attend, so a state agricultural education supervisor and a parent accompanied the two students to the conference. Data from these two adults were not used in compiling advisor data. However, it was possible for these two
individuals to assist students in completing the community survey. Two states did not send representatives to the conference. Thus the population studied consisted of representatives from 48 states, specifically 46 FFA advisors and 48 FFA members (see Appendix A).

Instrumentation

Three survey instruments were developed by the researcher and used to collect data for the study (see Appendix B). The first was a survey for students to complete which described their demographic, economic, academic, social, leadership involvement, and occupational characteristics. Advisors were asked to complete a second survey instrument which elicited demographic information; teaching history; social, economic, and leadership involvement characteristics; community development curriculum perceptions and evaluation; and BOAC project involvement.

The third survey instrument was completed by the advisor or accompanying adult with the assistance of the student from that FFA chapter. The purpose was to obtain information about the local community, the FFA chapter, school, and BOAC project.

The following procedure was followed to develop the instrumentation:

1. A review of literature was conducted to identify instrumentation used in related sociology, community
development, and vocational education data base studies.

2. Some of the items were selected from existing instruments including items used by Ricketts (1982), Townsend (1981), Townsend and Carter (1983), and Welton (1971) who utilized surveys to describe characteristics of FFA members, advisors, and chapters, as well as to determine student and advisor leadership participation indices within the context of their FFA chapters, schools, and communities. Items were also selected from the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972 (NORC, 1972), High School and Beyond questionnaires (NORC, 1980), and U. S. Census surveys (1983). Other items were written to address the research questions based upon community development literature contributed by Barrick and Caplinger (1984), Clouse and Cary (1983), Lee (1976), Maesen (1976), and Warren (1965).

3. Three survey instruments were developed by assigning items to three categories: students, advisors, and community - chapter - BOAC project.

4. The first survey instrument drafts were reviewed by two agricultural education teacher educators (one being a specialist in community development) and the national BOAC research chairperson who is a rural sociologist. Item additions, revisions, and deletions were made based upon these three experts' recommendations.

5. The second draft was reviewed for content validity
by five agriculture teacher educators from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

6. The third draft was field tested in August of 1983 by three vocational agriculture teachers and 10 students who had participated in the BOAC program. They were asked to respond to each item and note questions on unclear or offensive items.

7. A revised fourth draft of each survey instrument was submitted during August and September of 1983 to a third panel of experts which included: a national FFA program specialist, the BOAC program assistant, the national BOAC research chairperson, and two agriculture teacher educators, one being an expert in community development. Three members of this panel had served on the previous review panels.

8. The instruments were further revised based upon this panel's recommendations, and a final set of instruments was developed.

Data Sources and Collection

Data were collected from the participants at the 1983 National FFA Conference on Community Development. Time was provided during a specific conference session for the collection of data. The researcher contacted people for three days during the conference who had not completed their surveys during the conference allotted time in order to achieve an improved return rate. Other sources of data
for the study included the National FFA BOAC program statistics summary for 1971 through 1983 (National FFA, 1983a) and records of FFA chapter participation and awards levels since 1971 from the National FFA computer center (National FFA, 1984).

Three survey instruments were completed. Students completed one survey to provide data regarding program enrollment, years in vocational agriculture, academic standing, personal and family background, occupational history and goals, leadership activities, and outcomes of their community development involvement. A second survey was completed by FFA chapter advisors. Data from this survey provided information regarding the advisor's personal and family background, occupational history, perception of the importance of teaching community development topics, BOAC project involvement, and evaluation of community development teaching materials.

Advisors, except in the two cases explained earlier, along with the students completed a third survey which elicited information about the community, school, FFA chapter, and BOAC project. Specifically, data were collected regarding the following: the elements of the community; school size and type; FFA chapter size and participation levels; the BOAC project years of involvement, scope of group and individual involvement, category of project, project determination process, project
outcomes, and project publicity outlets.

Student responses were received from 46 or 95.83% of the student participants. Forty-three of the 46 advisors returned usable surveys for a 93.47% return rate. Community surveys were completed by 45 participating advisors with the assistance of their students for a return rate of 93.75%.

Data Analysis and Presentation

Participants were requested to record their responses to a majority of the items on a computer optical scanning sheet to facilitate data analysis. Data were processed by the Virginia Tech computer center using Frary's (1983) Comprehensive Questionnaire Analysis Program (CQAP). Measures of central tendency including the mean, mode, and median, as well as frequencies and percentages were reported for each item.

Survey instrument items which required the participant to write his/her response on the instrument were coded by the researcher and analyzed by using the Introstat 2.1 statistical package (1982). Measures of central tendency were determined for each variable as well as frequencies and percentages.

Because communities greatly vary, it was necessary to employ a process called "social structural differentiation" (MacCannell in Blakely, 1979, p. 48) in order to determine the type of community in which the BOAC project was
conducted. The process involves using Guttman Scales with index numbers assigned from community attributes (Voth, 1981). The measure of a community’s structure and quality of life focuses on its complexity as indicated by types of institutions and services offered. The development of this technique was extensively researched by Young and Young (1967, 1974). The rationale includes the notion that as a community develops or acquires additional services, the complexity of the community increases. Indicators of low complexity such as having an elementary school or lumber yard are found in the least differentiated communities. As communities become more differentiated, more services are found. Thus the researcher may categorize the community as low, medium or high in complexity.

Ten services were adapted from the scalogram used by Fujimoto (1977). His scale had a coefficient of reproducibility equal to 0.932 and a coefficient of scalability equal to 0.652. The coefficient of reproducibility developed by Guttman (1950) indicates the proportion of all figures (zeros and ones) in the array of responses which are not errors. Guttman recommended that .90 should be used as a minimum acceptable value. The coefficient of scalability is a measure of the percentage of reduction in error of estimation. The coefficient represents a score for the "best" array or possible arrangement of responses. Menzel (1953) in Voth (1981)
suggests that a coefficient of scalability of .60 to .65 appropriately corresponds to a coefficient of reproducibility of about .90 (p. 38).

The ten services used in the present study for determining community complexity included a lumber yard or lumber store, dentist, department store, new auto dealer, movie theatre, medical specialist, airport, taxi service, college or university, and vocational technical center. The coefficient of reproducibility was 0.94 and the coefficient of scalability was 0.72. The number of services which were reported for the communities in this study determined the community complexity on a scale of 1 (low) to 10 (high). Communities classified as "low" had 0, 1, or 2 of the services. "Medium" complex communities had 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 services and "high" complex communities had 9 or 10 services (see Appendix C).

Summary

Descriptive research procedures were used in this study. The selection of descriptive research techniques facilitated the collection of detailed information which described systematically the facts and characteristics of the given population.

The population for the study consisted of the participants in the 1983 National FFA Conference on Community Development. This included representatives from 48 states, specifically 46 FFA advisors and 48 FFA members.
Three survey instruments were developed by the researcher and used to collect data for the study. FFA advisors and students each completed their own personal data survey and together, the advisor and student completed community-FFA chapter-BOAC project surveys. Data were collected at the national conference. Responses were received as follows: students' survey return rate, 95.83%; advisors' survey return rate, 93.47%; and student/advisors' community survey return rate, 93.75%.

Two computer programs were used to facilitate data analysis. Measures of central tendency including the mean, median and mode as well as frequencies and percentages were computed for each item.
CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The primary purpose of the study was to examine the Building Our American Communities (BOAC) program by describing community development activities, BOAC projects and characteristics associated with selected students and advisors who participated in the 1983 BOAC program, relative to their FFA chapter, school, and community contextual situations with respect to program inputs and anticipated outcomes. The research questions established for this study and the analyses of the findings are presented in this chapter which has been divided into four sections. These four sections represent Bennett and Nelson's (1975) first four levels of evaluation which provided a conceptual frame of reference for the study.

The National FFA BOAC program statistics (1982c, 1983a) and FFA chapter participation records (1984) from the National FFA Organization provided one source of input and participation data for the study. Three survey instruments were developed by the researcher to collect data. The first one was a survey for students to complete which described their demographic, economic, academic, social, leadership involvement, and occupational characteristics. Advisors were asked to complete the second survey which also elicited background information as well as information pertaining to their community
development curriculum and BOAC project involvement. The third survey was completed by the advisor or the accompanying adult with the assistance of the student from that FFA chapter. The purpose was to obtain information about the local community, the FFA chapter, school, and BOAC project.

The surveys were administered by the researcher to 48 students, 46 advisors, and two other adults who attended the 1983 National FFA Conference on Community Development. Nonrespondents were followed up at the conference. Student responses were received from 46 or 95.83% of the student participants. Forty-three of the 46 advisors returned usable surveys for a 93.47% return rate. Community surveys were completed by 45 of the participating advisors with the assistance of their students for a return rate of 93.75%. The analyzed data will be reported as measures of central tendency including the mean, median, and mode as well as frequencies and percentages when appropriate.

Level 1: Inputs

Inputs from the National FFA Organization and National FFA Foundation sponsors resulted in the BOAC programs initiation and existence. The specific allocations of the budget were reviewed in chapter one of this study. In order to establish a point of departure, a summary of those findings from the National FFA records is presented here. The initial funding level for the BOAC program
during calendar year 1971 was slightly over $43,000. The BOAC program currently operates on an annual budget of $200,000+. The financial inputs were budgeted to include personnel expenses as well as costs of curriculum materials, applications/guide books publication, annual reports, national banquet expenses, national conference expenses, and miscellaneous printing and distribution costs. Other financial and in-kind contribution by others will be reflected in level 3.

Level 2: Participation and Activities

Participation and recognition

Research question no. 1. What was the level of participation in the 1983 BOAC program and at what levels were selected participants recognized?

A total of 3,481 different FFA chapters have participated at least once in the BOAC program. A total of 19,202 awards have been presented since the program started in 1971. In 1983, 1,617 FFA chapters participated in the BOAC program at the area level. In other words, that was the number which submitted applications for review at the area level. The following numbers of awards were presented to participating FFA chapters in 1983: 244 State Gold, 260 State Silver, 263 State Bronze, 23 National Gold, 55 National Silver, and 107 National Bronze.

Fifty chapters were invited to participate in the National Conference on Community Development. Of these, all 50 received area awards and 49 of them received state
gold awards. One participating conference chapter was a substitute for the state winner and did not receive a state rating. The 48 FFA chapters participating in the conference received the following 1983 national ratings: 14 National Gold, 14 National Silver, and 18 National Bronze. One participating chapter's rating was unknown, and one was not rated nationally according to the FFA Center's records.

The 48 conference chapters had participated in the BOAC program from 1 to 13 years with the mean number of years being 5.71. The mode was 5 and the median was 5 for years of program participation.

Project activities

Research question no. 2. What were the characteristics of the selected BOAC projects?

The chapters used two major procedures for determining their 1983 community development project. Eighty-two percent surveyed chapter members to identify needed projects, and 82% of the chapters held discussions with key informants. Fifty-eight percent of the chapters conducted community surveys, but only 22% used secondary data, such as census data, in determining needed projects. For 89% of the chapters, the 1983 BOAC project was part of their long-range community development plan.

The majority of BOAC projects were categorized by the respondents as being school improvement or educational projects (64%)(see Table 1). Fifty-eight percent of the projects involved civic construction projects, 53% were
agricultural improvement projects, 53% were recreational projects, and 51% were also categorized as school grounds improvement projects. Respondents were permitted to classify their projects in more than one category.

**Instructional activities**

Research question no. 3. How did selected advisors perceive the importance of teaching community development topics?

Teaching community development was part of the curriculum for 84% of the advisors. Only one advisor out of the 40 who responded to this item indicated that no community development topics were taught. Thirty-seven advisors indicated the number of hours they spent teaching community development and supervising community development projects. Less than 50 hours were spent by 43.2% of the advisors. Fifty to 99 hours as well as 150 to 199 hours were spent by 13.5% of the advisors. One hundred to 149 hours were devoted to community development by 8.1% of the advisors, and 200 to 249 hours were given by 5.4% of the advisors. There were 16.2% of the advisors who spent 300 or more hours teaching community development topics and supervising the project activities.

The degree to which teachers believed community development topics should be included in the vocational agriculture curriculum is indicated in Table 2.
Table 1

**Descriptive Categories for 1983 BOAC Projects**

(N=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School improvement/education</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School grounds improvement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation improvement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational project</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior citizen project</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped facility/service</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural improvement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic construction project</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development project</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical restoration project</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Responses may include more than 1 category.
On a scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree, advisors agreed to strongly agree that all 12 topics which were identified from the manual Community Development--FFA Style should be included. Those topics viewed as being most important to include were: the importance of agriculture in the community, with a mean of 5.52; publicizing BOAC projects, with a mean of 5.48; identifying resources in the community, mean of 5.33; and identifying community needs and problems, with a mean of 5.24.

The actual percentage of advisors who said that they taught a specific community development topic is displayed in Table 3. One hundred percent of the advisors taught the importance of agriculture in the community and taught identifying community needs and problems. Advisors (97.68%) taught students how to identify available resources in the community, and 93.02% taught the student how to publicize BOAC projects. Only 83.28% of the advisors taught the definition of community, and only 83.72% taught exploring alternative solutions to the problem.

Participants were asked to indicate if participation in the BOAC program reduced the time which they spent teaching technical agriculture. Fifty-eight percent of the advisors responded "yes," and 42% said "no." From those who answered "yes" to the question, their written justification was most often that participation in
Table 2

Topics Relating to Community Development Which Should Be Included in the Vo-Ag Curriculum as Perceived By FFA Advisors (N=42)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics rated by advisors ranked by means</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Importance of agriculture in the community</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Publicizing BOAC projects</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identifying resources available in the community</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identifying community needs and problems</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluating program effectiveness in the community</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Deciding upon solutions/planning programs</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mobilizing resources and implementing solutions</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Exploring alternative solutions to the problem</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gathering and analyzing data about the problems</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Definition of community development</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Identifying influential people in the community</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Definition of community</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale = 6 strongly agree disagree strongly agree disagree
Table 3  
**Percentage of Advisors Teaching Specific Topics Relating to Community Development** \( (N=40) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Agriculture in the community</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying community needs and problems</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying resources available in the community</td>
<td>97.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicizing BOAC projects</td>
<td>93.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding upon solutions/ planning programs</td>
<td>90.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilizing resources and implementing solutions</td>
<td>90.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of community development</td>
<td>88.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating program effectiveness in the community</td>
<td>88.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering and analyzing data about problems</td>
<td>88.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying influential people in the community</td>
<td>86.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring alternative solutions to the problem</td>
<td>83.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of community</td>
<td>83.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOAC required time; therefore, something else in their program had to be cut. Those who answered "no" to the question, indicated that they either would not permit time to be taken from their technical material teaching or that the BOAC program fit into their curriculum; therefore, it did not reduce the time they spent on other material.

Level 3: Involvement

Advisor and student involvement

Research question no. 4. How were selected advisors, students, and others involved in conducting the community development programs and BOAC projects?

Advisors indicated they were required to assume a leadership role in three major areas in order to get the projects accomplished. As indicated in Table 4, they assumed a leadership role in contacting community support individuals or groups (74%), in evaluating the project (74%), and in arranging field trips to scout potential projects (72%). Only 47% found it necessary to assume a leadership role in making BOAC presentations. The assumption was made if the advisor did not have to assume a particular leadership role, students assumed the responsibility.

FFA member involvement was reported for 42 of the BOAC projects. As shown in Table 5, a range of 12 to 258 students were involved in conducting the projects with a total of 3,062 students involved in conducting these
Table 4
Advisor's BOAC Project Involvement (N=43)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor's project leadership role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>&quot;yes&quot;%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contacting community support</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual/groups</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the project</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field trip arrangements to scout projects</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying potential projects</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing financial support</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing BOAC state and national reports</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicizing the BOAC project</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically working on the project</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making BOAC presentations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Multiple responses could be indicated.
### Table 5

**Involvement of FFA Members in BOAC Projects (N=42)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Number of FFA members involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours contributed</th>
<th>(N=42)</th>
<th>(N=41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Includes extreme</td>
<td>Without extreme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>24 to 68,000</td>
<td>24 to 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>907.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean project hours</td>
<td>3,373.45</td>
<td>1,754.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of all project hours</td>
<td>141,685</td>
<td>73,685.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
exemplary projects. The total number of hours contributed by all members working on a single project, or project "man hours," ranged from 24 hours to 68,000 hours. Total "man hours" contributed by the 3,062 members was 141,685 hours with 988 hours representing the median and 3,373.45 hours the mean number of hours required to complete the projects. The mean number of "man hours" per student required to complete an average single project was 46.27 hours. The research committee determined that for a project to require 68,000 hours in one year was suspect in comparison with the other total project hours reported. Recalculation of member involvement excluding the 68,000 hours contributed by 136 members is also displayed in Table 5.

Involvement of others

The involvement of organizations and other individuals is depicted in Table 6. A total of 129 community organizations were involved in 40 of the BOAC projects. For 38 of the projects reported, 5,738 people other than FFA members contributed a total of 36,869 hours.

Financial contributions

Forty-three respondents reported BOAC project funding levels. Funding levels ranged from $0 to $802,000 with $2,200 representing the median funding level. As can be observed from Table 7, eleven of the projects did not
Table 6

**Number of Organizations, Other People and Hours Involved in the 1983 BOAC Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of community organizations (N=40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total groups</td>
<td>129.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Hours contributed (N=38) People involved |                      |
| Mean                                     | 970.24               |
| Total                                    | 36,869.00            |
|                                          | 151.00               |
|                                          | 5,738.00             |
Table 7
Funding for 1983 Exemplary BOAC Projects (N=43)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding distribution ($)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>800,000 to 850,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 to 250,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 to 30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 20,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 to 5,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 2,500</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 1,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Funding levels are represented for projects which spanned more than one year.
require any funding. Twelve FFA chapters invested greater than $25 but not more than $2,500 in BOAC projects. Seven chapters invested $2,500 but not more than $5,000, four chapters invested $5,000 but not more than $10,000 in projects, five chapters invested $10,000 but not more than $20,000 in projects, and two chapters invested $20,000 but not more than $30,000. Two chapters invested between $100,000 and $250,000, while one chapter's project represented slightly over $800,000 in funding.

It should be noted that these figures represent the total investment of dollars in the exemplary projects. In some instances the value of in-kind contributions such as property and materials was included. In some cases, project's phases spanned more than one year. Of the four BOAC projects selected as national regional winners, one did not utilize explicit dollar funding. Forty-three FFA chapters reported that they had collectively contributed $74,995 and utilized $1,293,625 from other funding sources in conducting 1983 BOAC projects for a total investment in 1983 of $1,368,620.

Fourteen of the FFA chapters solicited funding for BOAC projects from civic/business organizations, seven chapters received contributions from individuals in their communities, six received contributions from the school and six from agricultural organizations in the community. Two chapters used specific projects to raise funds for their BOAC projects, while 22 chapters utilized monetary grants
from various local, county, state, and national organizations and government sectors.

Characteristics of the student participants

Research question no. 5. What were the demographic, academic, occupational, and leadership characteristics of students who were recognized as 1983 Achievement in Volunteerism national award recipients?

Students who were recognized as the 1983 National FFA Achievement in Volunteerism recipients ranged in age from 16 years old to 20 years old. Of the students who completed the survey, 36.9% were 17 years old, and 28.3% were 18 years old. The age distribution of the student participants is displayed in Table 8. Eighty percent of the students were male, and 20% were female. All the students who attended the conference were white.

Sixty-seven percent of the students were from families who were engaged in farming, 28% worked in agriculture-related occupations, and 5% were from families whose work was not related to agriculture. Of 25 students whose families were engaged in farming, 92% reported their farms were individual/family owned, 9% were rented, and 9% were corporations. Twenty-seven students reported the size of the farms. Twenty-six percent were under 50 acres, 30% of the farms were 50 to 179 acres, 11% were 180 to 259 acres, 7% were 260 to 499 acres, and 15% were 500 to 999 acres. Only 4% were 1,000 to 1,999 acres and 7% were over
Table 8

Frequency and Percentage of Ages of FFA Members Who Attended the Conference (N=46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member’s Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2,000 acres. Family net income was reported by 15 students. The following numbers of families per income bracket were reported: $7,500 to 9,999 (1); 10,000 to 14,999 (2); 15,000 to 19,999 (3); 20,000 to 24,999 (5); 25,000 to 29,999 (2); 35,000 to 39,999 (1); and 40,000 to 49,999 (1).

Six agricultural program areas were represented by the students. Prominent programs of enrollment were agricultural production (42%), agricultural mechanics (21%), agribusiness (16%), horticulture (14%), and natural resources (4.6%). Two percent of the students were enrolled in grade 10, 13% in grade 11, while 46% of the students were in grade 12. There were 26% of the students who had graduated from high school and were enrolled in post-secondary education programs, and 13% who had graduated from high school and were working.

In terms of high school academic achievement, 21.7% earned mostly A’s, 26.1% earned about half A’s and half B’s, 30.4% of the students earned mostly B’s, 17.4% earned about half B’s and half C’s while 4.3% earned mostly C’s. The mean grade point average reported by 27 students was 3.41 on a 4 point scale (4.0=A). Table 9 displays the immediate educational and occupational goals of the 46 students as well as whether the student believes the goal will be achieved. Fifty percent plan to attend four-year colleges or universities, 17.39% are undetermined, 15.22% plan to attend technical colleges for specific vocational
Table 9

Student Participants' Goals and Perceived Chances of Achieving the Goals (N=46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate educational occupational goals</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After high school graduation plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job and no further education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend technical college for a specific vocation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four year college or university</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chances of achieving the goal</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% sure to achieve it</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% sure to achieve it</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only 50% sure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain if can achieve it</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have no idea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
training, 10.87% plan to attend community colleges, and 6.52% plan to get jobs and not seek further education. Eighteen or 39.13% of the students were 100% sure of their chances of achieving their goal.

When asked to specifically state their occupational goals, 55.80% of the students listed goals related to agriculture. At the time of the survey, 46% of the students had jobs related to agriculture, 26% had employment in areas other than agriculture, and 28% did not respond. Twenty percent of the students worked after school at farms or ranches. Eleven percent worked during school at farms or ranches while 11% also worked after school for agribusinesses. Seven percent worked during school at agribusinesses. Nineteen students did not respond to this item. The greatest percentage of students (33%) earned less than $1,000 per year while 28% of the students earned $1,000 to $2,499.

The students indicated that collectively they were involved in 15 organizations in addition to the FFA. During their high school careers, 32.6% of the students had held four to six leadership positions in the activities, 23.9% had held one to three, and 21.7% had held seven to ten leadership positions. Eleven to 14 leadership positions were held by 10.9% of the students, 6.5% held 15 to 18, and 4.3% held no leadership position in high school. Almost half of the students participated in athletic activities.
Fifty percent of the students had been or were currently the FFA Chapter Presidents, and 76% of them were BOAC chairpersons. The students were most active in FFA judging contests, six had been or were currently state FFA officers, and none were national FFA officers. Twenty-eight of the students' male guardians and 33 of the students' female guardians had not held leadership positions in community organizations.

Characteristics of advisor participants

Research question no. 6. What were the demographic, occupational, and leadership characteristics of advisors whose FFA chapters were selected as participants in the National FFA Conference on Community Development?

The ages of advisors who were chosen to attend the National Conference on Community Development ranged from 21 to 62 with the mean age being 34.16 years. Forty of the advisors were males, and three were females. All but one of the advisors were white. Forty-nine percent of the advisors had completed bachelor's degrees, 44% had completed master's degrees, 5% had completed post-master's work, and one (2%) was a high school graduate only.

Advisors had been teaching vocational agriculture from 0 to 35 years with the mean number of years teaching being 10.14, the median was nine years, and the mode was three years. Advisors had been teaching vocational agriculture at the same school an average of eight years. Twelve-month
contracts were held by 66.7% of the advisors.

Fifty-one percent of the 43 advisors said they "loved teaching and would not quit" while 49% said they "enjoyed it but would consider another occupation." Forty percent of the advisors had second jobs other than teaching, all of which were related to agriculture.

Thirty-seven of the advisors indicated that collectively they had served 79 times in 19 different leadership positions in community and professional organizations. They belonged to 9 professional organizations, 22 agriculture organizations, 14 civic clubs or community boards, 5 fraternal/social organizations, and 4 veterans organizations.

Characteristics of the FFA chapters, schools, and communities

Research question no. 7. What was the FFA chapter, school, and community contextual situation in which BOAC programs and projects were conducted?

FFA chapters which were recognized as exemplary BOAC FFA chapters ranged in size from 10 members to 409 members with a median of 80 and mean of 108 members. Chapter membership was predominantly male (77.41%). In terms of race, 91.34% of the FFA members were white, 3.29% were black, 1.34% Hispanic, and 4.03% were classified as other. The number of students enrolled in vocational agriculture ranged from 23 to 357 per school with a median of 97 students and a mean of 108 students. The demographics of
the FFA chapters in relation to numbers of students enrolled in vocational agriculture from the participating schools are displayed in Table 10.

A high level of participation in FFA activities was indicated by the number of FFA activities and highest award recognition level. Besides participating in the BOAC program, 25 chapters were awarded national recognition for participation in the chapter contest program, 17 for the national safety program, 13 for participation in national judging contests, and 10 for involvement with national proficiency awards. Sixty-four percent of the advisors indicated that participation in the BOAC program did not reduce the time spent on other activities or result in their eliminating other FFA activities. Their justification was that the BOAC program complemented many of the other activities in which they were participating. The justification for many of the 36% who said they cut activities due to participation in BOAC indicated that the BOAC program represented an additional activity and that there was only so much time; therefore, something had to be cut.

Selected BOAC projects (49%) were conducted by agriculture programs located in regular high schools. Thirty-eight percent of the projects were conducted in comprehensive high schools offering five or more vocational programs and 13% of the projects were conducted in
Table 10
FFA Membership and Vocational Agriculture Enrollment in the Selected Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students (N=43)</th>
<th>FFA members</th>
<th>Vo ag students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 409</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                          | 23 to 357   | 97             |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex and race/ethnic origin</th>
<th>FFA members (N=41)</th>
<th>Vo ag students (N=42)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>77.41</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>22.59</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Race                       | %                   | %                      |
| White                      | 91.34               | White                  | 88.96                  |
| Black                      | 3.29                | Black                  | 3.56                   |
| Hispanic                   | 1.34                | Hispanic               | 2.14                   |
| Other                      | 4.03                | Other                  | 5.33                   |
| Total                      | 100.00              | Total                  | 99.99                  |
vocational technical centers or area schools. Fifty-three percent of the BOAC projects were directed by one-teacher agriculture departments and 29% by two-teacher departments. Four percent each were from three-, four-, and five-teacher departments, and two percent had nine and two percent had 10 or more agriculture teachers in the school. Rural organizations were the predominate type of youth organization in the schools and/or community as displayed in Table 11.

School size as indicated by student population is depicted in Table 12. Twenty percent of the BOAC projects were conducted in schools with less than 250 students; 18% of the schools had 250 to 499 students; 16% had 500 to 749 students; 11% had 750 to 999 students. Also, 16% of the schools had 2,000 or more students. As displayed in Table 12, the predominant youth organizations in the school and/or community were the FFA (98%), 4-H (91%), and FHA/HERO (80%).

The communities which the 1983 exemplary BOAC projects served were predominately rural/small towns (56%). Twenty-two percent were rural county seats, four percent were central cities, and 18% were suburban. The schools in which the projects were conducted served one or more counties (38%), a city or town (50%), and part of a metropolitan area (12%). The population of the communities
Table 11

Youth Organizations in the School and/or Community

(N=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFA</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHA/HERO</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy Scouts</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl Scouts</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBLA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIASA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Multiple responses to categories could be indicated.
Table 12

**Population of Students in the Selected Schools**

*(N=44)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 250</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 to 499</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 749</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750 to 999</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 to 1249</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250 to 1499</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 1749</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750 to 2000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2000</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Percentage does not total 100% due to rounding.
represented included the following major categories: less than 2,500 people (26.7%); 2,500 to 5,000 people (15.5%); 5,000 to 10,000 people (13.3%); 10,000 to 50,000 people (28.9%); 50,000 to 100,000 (6.7%); and over 100,000 (8.9%). Fifty-six percent of the communities had increased in population in recent years, 38% stayed the same, and 7% decreased.

The average family income of 49% of the communities was medium ($15,000 - $24,999) and 33% were low/medium ($7,500 - $14,999). Nine percent had low family average incomes ($7,500 or less), and nine percent had high average family incomes ($35,000 or more). The predominant race of 43 of the communities was white (82.87%). Seventy-three percent of the respondents indicated that their communities could be categorized as farm oriented. They also indicated that their communities could be categorized as a small business oriented (78%).

Fifteen of the communities were low on the community index scale. This was based upon their not having any or a combination of the two basic services: lumber yard and dentist. Fifteen of the communities were classified as medium in complexity based upon their having, for the most part, the two basic services plus a combination of the next six. Those six services included: department store, new auto dealership, movie theatre, medical specialist, airport, and taxi service. The fifteen communities which were high in complexity had a college/university and/or
vocational technical high school as well as a combination of most of the other eight community services (see Appendix C).

**Level 4: Reactions to Anticipated Outcomes**

**Curriculum materials and audiovisuals evaluation**

Research question no. 8. What was the quality of the BOAC curriculum materials and audiovisuals according to the selected BOAC program participants?

Thirty-seven advisors evaluated the BOAC teaching and audiovisual materials on a scale from 1 = very poor to 5 = very good. The teacher and student manuals, *Community Development--FFA Style* and the BOAC Chapter Action Guide, both received mean ratings of 4.00 or good. The film *Hometown America* received the highest mean rating, 4.51. The *BOAC Regional and National Winners* film received a mean rating of 4.44 followed by *Consider the Possibilities* (mean 4.35) and *The Game Plan: FFA Tackles Community Development* (mean 4.32). From the frequencies of ratings displayed in Table 13, 17 advisors indicated that they were unfamiliar with the film, *The Game Plan: FFA Tackles Community Development*. This film was not listed in several of the FFA resource manuals; thus its availability to teachers and students was questionable.
Table 13

Evaluation of BOAC Teaching and Audiovisual Materials (N=37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Ave.</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Not familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFA Style Handbook</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOAC Chapter Action Guides</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Guide to FFA Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFA Activity Handbook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFA Student Handbook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hometown America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Game Plan: FFA Tackles CD*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the Possibilities*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOAC Regional and National Winners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *N=36.
Outcomes of the BOAC programs

Research question no. 9. What were the anticipated outcomes as perceived by the selected BOAC program participants?

Project outcomes. The reporting chapters indicated that the general public (95%), youth organizations (91%), and teenagers (91%) were the major benefactors of the BOAC projects (see Table 14).

Three special-interest groups were cited the fewest times as major benefactors of the BOAC projects. Specifically, 58% of the projects were of direct benefit to young farmers and senior citizens, and 44% were beneficial to handicapped citizens.

Respondents were asked to rank the importance of nine hypothetical BOAC project outcomes with one being the outcome of most importance and nine being the outcome of least importance. As indicated in Table 15, the three most important outcomes represented benefits to FFA members and the vocational agriculture program. Increasing citizen participation of FFA members (3.63) was first, increasing the public awareness of the vocational agriculture program (3.71) was second, and improving FFA members' human relations skills (4.19) was third. Outcomes which represented benefits to the school and community were ranked fourth through ninth.
Table 14

*Bene\factors of the 1983 BOAC Projects (N=45)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General public (a)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth organizations/FFA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators (a)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFA Alumni</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business people (a)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreationalists (a)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Farmers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior citizens</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: (a)N=44.*

Multiple responses to items were possible.
Table 15
Ranking of the Importance of BOAC Outcomes (N=41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Increased citizen participation of FFA members</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Increased public awareness of vo ag program</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Improved human relations skills, FFA members</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Increased citizen participation of others in community</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Improvement of school/community facility</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Economic development in the community</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Conservation/development of natural resources</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Improved community social/health services</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Improved agricultural income</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scale: 1 = most important to 9 = least important
Increasing public awareness of the vocational agriculture program was facilitated through publicity efforts related to the BOAC project. Publicity outlets utilized by 39 FFA chapters for informing the public of BOAC activities included the following outlets and means: newspapers, mean number of articles, 3.46; civic club presentations, mean number, 3.44; radio programs and announcements, 1.64; school board meetings, 1.51 meetings; school assemblies, 1.00; and television programs and spot announcements, 0.85. Other publicity outlets included the use of balloons, posters, displays, and fliers (or bulletins).

Learning outcomes. Table 16 depicts the 11 community development tasks students were to master as a result of learning about community development and performing community development activities. One hundred percent of the students indicated that they could define a community and define community development. Ninety-eight percent could explain the importance of agriculture in their communities, and 96% could identify community problems and needs. Thirteen percent of the students indicated that they could not explore problem alternatives/solutions, publicize the community development project, or evaluate program effectiveness in the community.
Table 16
Community Development Competencies/Tasks of Students (N=46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Can do the task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define a community</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define community development</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain ag importance in community</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify community problems and needs</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather and analyze data about the problem</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify community resources</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide upon solution/plan program</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify community influential people</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore problem alternatives/solutions</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicize the CD project</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate program effectiveness in community</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilize resources and implement solutions</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Multiple responses were possible.
Summary

The findings of the study were presented in four sections of this chapter. The first section was Level 1 or Inputs contributing to the establishment of the BOAC program. Data which described the National FFA Foundation sponsors support as well as human resource support from the National FFA Organization were summarized.

The second section was Level 2 or participation and activities of those involved in the BOAC program. This included the levels of recognition of participants and degree of participation as well as project activities of the 1983 selected BOAC participants.

Level 3 included a description of the involvement of individuals and groups in the BOAC program—specifically the involvement of the selected students, advisors, and others in the 1983 BOAC program. The characteristics of these individuals were described as well as their FFA chapters, schools, and communities.

The reaction to anticipated outcomes was described at Level 4. Advisors evaluated curriculum and audiovisual materials provided in the BOAC program. Advisors also reacted to outcomes of the program as they perceived them affecting students, the vocational agriculture program, school, and community. Students reported their learning accomplishments in terms of which community development tasks they believed they were presently capable of doing.
CHAPTER 5:
CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study was undertaken in order to examine the National FFA Building Our American Communities (BOAC) program by describing selected community development activities, BOAC projects, and characteristics associated with selected students and advisors, their FFA chapters, schools, and communities. Nine research questions were stated. The questions were organized according to the first four levels of Bennett and Nelson's (1975) evaluation hierarchy. Data were collected via three survey instruments which were administered to 48 students and 46 advisors who attended the National Conference on Community Development in Washington, D.C., in September of 1983.

The conclusions of the study are based upon the findings presented in Chapter 4. They may not be generalized to the entire vocational agriculture population. However, comparisons of this select group's characteristics may be made relative to the literature reviewed. Recommendations are based upon the findings and conclusions.

Conclusions

The findings of this study warrant the following conclusions regarding the scope of the National FFA Building Our American Communities program, the nature of
selected activities and projects, the characteristics of
selected participants, and the anticipated outcomes from
participation.

1. In terms of 1983 financial returns to
communities, forty-three FFA chapters alone returned $6.00
of financial and in-kind contributions for every $1.00 of
input invested by the national program sponsor in the
entire BOAC program. Thus, the investment is worthwhile as
it stimulates local FFA initiative.

2. Selection as an FFA chapter which conducted a
national outstanding BOAC project is not necessarily
contingent upon years of participation in the BOAC program.
Therefore, the fact that a chapter has not participated in
the past should not deter the chapter from participating
and does not limit their potential for conducting a quality
project.

3. The selected 1983 projects contributed to the
improvement of rural facilities/services, renewable
resources, agricultural/economic development, historical
restoration, and enhanced "human capital" through
education. Therefore, as the USDA (1983) cited the need
for improvement in many of these areas, BOAC program
activities did contribute to problem solving in rural
communities.

4. Fund-raising activities and hospital work
represent almost 50% of overall youth volunteer activities
in society in general. In addition a greater number of those activities are conducted by females (NASSP, 1983). BOAC activities are generally not of that general nature, and most BOAC participants are males. Therefore, the selected BOAC participants and their projects represent a unique contribution to volunteerism when compared to general student volunteer activity trends.

5. The BOAC program as executed by the selected FFA members and advisors is an authentic community development program. Participants, to a varying degree, assessed their community needs, planned for action, involved others and resources, conducted activities, and evaluated their projects.

6. Teaching the community development process is a relevant and important part of the vocational agriculture curriculum. Advisors reported that community development topics were important to teach and that the topics were actually taught.

7. By advisors taking a more active leadership role than students in the "process" objectives of the the BOAC program, such as contacting support groups, evaluating the project, and identifying potential projects, the students' opportunities to master decision-making skills were reduced.

8. Students were taking a more active leadership role than advisors in making BOAC presentations. Therefore, as advisors permitted students to take this
leadership role, the implication is that students are capable of communicating the scope and accomplishments of their BOAC program to the public.

9. The selected students indicated that they cooperated with numerous individuals and groups for project support. Thus, participation in the BOAC program results in student interaction with people beyond the boundary of the local FFA chapter.

10. Selection as a national exemplary BOAC project is not necessarily dependent on external funding beyond the resources provided by the national sponsor. However, almost 75% of the projects did involve external funding, thus implying that financial scope is an important consideration for projects recognized at the national level.

11. Vocational agriculture and the FFA are dominated by white, male students (Burge and Cunningham, 1984; Herren, 1982; USDE, 1984; Welton, 1971). Therefore, the fact that the majority of the selected student BOAC participants studied was white and male does not indicate discrimination on the part of the BOAC program but rather that the large percentage of white male participants is a consequence of the distribution of students in vocational agriculture.

12. While there were exceptions to the type of characteristics possessed by the student participants in this study, the fact remains that 79% of the students were older - grade 12 or as graduates, 78% earned mostly B’s or
better, and 72% had held at least 4 or as many as 18 leadership positions during their high school careers. Thus, the student leadership and/or representation of the state exemplary BOAC projects is assumed by the FFA members who are older, more experienced, and more academically talented than FFA members on the average.

13. There is no evidence that student occupational experience makes any contribution to conducting a nationally recognized BOAC project. However, with 72% of the selected students working in their communities, it is reasonable to conclude that student interaction with others in the community contributes to the student’s knowledge of the community and the opportunity for identifying potential support resources for their BOAC programs.

14. The demographic and occupational characteristics of advisors in this study were proportionally similar to characteristics found in the national profile of vocational agriculture teachers which Garrison reported (1982). Therefore, the fact that an advisor possesses particular demographic or occupational experience characteristics should not deter him/her from participating in the BOAC program and does not limit the possibility for advising a nationally recognized BOAC program.

15. Advisor community and professional organization involvement is not necessarily a prerequisite to advising exemplary BOAC programs. However, the selected advisors did report active community and professional organization
involvement, thus implying that advisor community involvement may have been beneficial to obtaining resource support for the respective BOAC program.

16. Percentages reported by the participants as to their type of agriculture program, type of school, and number of members in the FFA chapter were similar to percentages reported in other studies. Therefore, neither the type of program, size of school, nor number of members in the FFA chapter should deter an FFA chapter which has not previously participated in the program from participating nor should the situation limit a chapter’s capability for conducting a nationally recognized BOAC program.

17. Almost as many of the selected national BOAC projects were conducted in rural/small towns with less than 2,500 people to 10,000 people, as were conducted in communities with populations of 10,000 to over 100,000 people. Therefore, the fact that an FFA chapter is located in a particular size community should not deter a chapter from participating in the BOAC program nor limit the opportunities for conducting a quality BOAC project in that community.

18. As most of the selected advisors were familiar with and able to rate the quality of the nationally provided BOAC curriculum and audiovisual materials, the use of such materials should be considered when planning a BOAC program if meeting national FFA standards is of concern to
the chapter.

19. While the selected advisors indicated that project benefits to the community were important, they ranked the outcomes higher which represented benefits to students and to the agricultural education program. Therefore, the selected advisors implied that their purpose for participating in the BOAC program was first driven by the need to involve students in a program which provided a personal development/learning activity and, secondly, by the desire to improve the agricultural education program image.

20. With 85% or more of the selected students indicating that they could perform each of the 12 community development tasks, the BOAC program provided an opportunity for learning about the community development process. The degree to which the students are able to perform those tasks cannot be ascertained from this study.

21. The activities of BOAC participants in this study reflect an attempt to meet the intent of community development through the use of volunteers conducting community service activities. The project activities complemented by instructional activities enhanced the opportunity for students to learn the community development process and the agricultural needs of their communities.

Discussion and Implications

Program Inputs

The Building Our American Communities (BOAC) program
represents a major national effort to involve high school vocational agriculture students and their teachers in an educational experience which includes community development activities. Voth (1975b) noted that community development evaluation was needed in order to determine something about the relationship between the costs of the efforts and benefits so that intelligent choices could be made among alternatives. However, he also stated that the "process" objectives or those having to do with the quality of decision making and problem solving were often regarded to be unquantifiable, therefore difficult to measure.

The investment of the National FFA Organization and FFA Foundation sponsor must be viewed as "seed money" which encourages local FFA chapter participation. Input dollar figures can be quantified, as can the number of activities and who is conducting those activities. Gidron (1978) found that the rewards for volunteers under 25, most of whom were students, were focused on the learning experience. It is difficult to place a dollar figure on the educational and social value of the experiences which the BOAC program can potentially generate in order to determine cost effectiveness.

Several other aspects of the BOAC program investment must also be considered in terms of financial returns. If the students from this study had been paid a minimum of $3.35 per hour for each student's average of 46.27 volunteer hours, that would have amounted to $474,623.77
for the 3,062 students who were involved in conducting the 48 selected projects in this study. If the 36,869 hours contributed by others had been multiplied by the $3.35, their work would have been worth another $123,511.15. Adding the "volunteers' salaries" to the actual $1,368,620 utilized by the local chapters in 1983, the total investment for the reporting chapters approaches $2 million ($1,966,754.50).

The BOAC program national level investments supported the activities of 1,565 other FFA chapters in 1983 besides the 48 chapters included in this study (National FFA, 1982c). Those other chapters' time and financial investments may not have been as much on the average as the selected chapters. On the other hand, the chapters included in this study represented only 3% of all those that participated in the 1983 BOAC program; thus, the potential inputs from all participants to communities nationally is monumental.

Participation Levels

The 1,617 FFA chapters which participated in the BOAC program during 1983 represented approximately 18% of the total number of FFA chapters (National FFA, 1982c). The fact remains that an FFA chapter may be conducting community development activities and may be using the BOAC resource materials but simply not completing the awards application for recognition of their accomplishments. Therefore, the total scope of participation is difficult to
measure from the national records. Given that the BOAC materials are mailed to all FFA chapters, it is probably reasonable to speculate that more than 18% of the FFA chapters participate to some degree in a given year.

From the review of the National FFA BOAC participation records (National FFA, 1984), it was evident that the participating chapters varied from year to year. One must consider that participation is only recorded if a chapter submits a BOAC award application for area award consideration. The number of participating years recorded for the chapters participating in this study varied from 1 to 13 years. The accomplishments of those who did participate need to be well publicized, especially noting the context in which those activities had occurred. As the participation levels and scopes are shared with others, the hope is one which Voth (1975b) noted—specifically, that a new generation of community development practitioners would be trained or at least motivated to conduct activities in their own situations. The profession needs to know that among those chapters recognized on a national level, it is possible to conduct a quality BOAC program in the first year of participation as well as in the thirteenth year.

There are several other situations with regard to participation that may be occurring. Chapters may be conducting community service activities as part of their annual FFA program of activities, such as those which
Phipps (1972) suggested, or are engaging in community service activities, such as the ones discussed by McKenney (1976), Price (1976), Shugart (1959), and Stewart and Gettman (1930). Isolated activities, however, do not constitute a community development program (Koneya, 1978; Kreitlow, Aiton, and Torrence, 1965).

The activities conducted by other FFA chapters may not involve the planning and procedures that qualify them for participation in the BOAC awards program, i.e. they may not complete 11 of the 16 necessary steps to qualify for the area award as was not the case for the participants in this study. The application items are related to the community development steps which Lee (1976) and Clouse and Cary (1983) identified as process steps to complete when conducting a community development program, not isolated service activities. Two questions now remain. Does the qualification requirement for being recognized as a BOAC program participant via completion of at least 11 of 16 community development steps reduce the number of participants in the program? If it does, should a lower level of participation be accepted for the program in exchange for a report that the FFA chapter has engaged in the community development process? Based on the accomplishments and activities of the chapters in this study, meeting qualifications for the area award may have resulted in students experiencing a more educational and well-rounded community development program.
Time and priorities may also be a factor. Philosophy varies from advisor to advisor with some perceiving FFA activities to be intracurricular and others who view it totally as extracurricular. From this study, data supported the notion that even among the selected advisors representing nationally recognized BOAC programs, there was almost a 50-50 split as to whether participation in the BOAC program resulted in their reducing teaching time on technical materials. However, when participation in the BOAC program was compared to participation in other FFA activities, almost two-thirds of the advisors indicated that they did not have to cut other FFA activities in order to have time for BOAC participation.

The implication is that advisors perceive the applicability of the BOAC program and the placement of the BOAC program in the curriculum differently. Viewing the BOAC program as a potential extra activity places it on the "list of other things to do," and it may not get done or other activities have to be cut in order to "get it done." On the other hand, for those who did not reduce teaching time or the number of other FFA activities, the implication is that the BOAC program was incorporated into the existing program. Students may also perceive the BOAC program as an optional activity to include in their FFA program. From year to year, different students may place a different emphasis on whether participation in the BOAC program is important.
Problems are always created when the emphasis for participation is placed on winning an award. The National FFA Livestock Judging Contest data which Herren reported (1982) revealed the purpose of the contest which received the highest mean rating had to do with learning, the second related to social benefits, and the third highest purpose for participating in the contest was the prestige of winning. The philosophy of the BOAC program is that every participating chapter is recognized with a material award, the area award, if the time is taken to complete the application. The purpose of the award is to motivate participation. For chapters, and now for individuals, the element of competition encourages progress through the various stages of award recognition for participation in the BOAC program.

Advisors are thus faced with an ethical issue: should the chapter fully participate, including the completion of the awards application, because of potential benefits to students and to communities regardless of the award outcome, or should they only fully participate when the chances of the chapter "winning an award" are probable? The selected advisors from this study indicated that student personal benefits represented the major outcome from participation. From a teacher's point of view, there are always those unfortunate cases where the potential for winning weights the participation decision. In terms of the individuals in this study, the implication is that
their participation was driven by student benefits rather than by the other outcomes. Of course the purpose of this study was not to prove motivation for participation. However, as one investigates and describes the national participation records and also derives anticipated outcomes from nationally recognized BOAC participants, implications do surface. They are of consideration as recommendations related to participation are formulated.

Activities

The categories of the selected BOAC projects warrant some discussion. A project could have been classified in one category or in as many as 11 categories. The categories were validated as part of the instrumentation, and the items relating to the categories were developed from the review of community development literature. Subjectivity is involved as one assesses and selects the types of categories in which community development projects might be classified. The respondents should have been able to select at least one category appropriate to their project. On the other hand, a respondent’s project may have been very broad in nature and addressed several of the categories. For this reason, one cannot conclude that a majority of the projects were school/educational projects, but rather one must conclude that a majority of the projects addressed the school improvement/education category. Many of the projects in this category may have also pertained to other categories.
One basis for determining whether the projects addressed relevant community development issues, especially issues facing agriculture since the BOAC program is founded in agricultural education, involved comparing the types of BOAC projects conducted to the community needs reflected by the rural issues outlined by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) (1983). Among the most urgent issues facing rural communities was the need for improved facilities and services. Other concerns which the USDA listed reflected a need for tax credits for voluntary community service, rural historic preservation, strengthened farmer’s cooperatives, concentration on renewable resources, and “human capital” enhancement through education and jobs.

Many of the expressed needs were addressed by the BOAC projects. Sixty-four percent of the projects were categorized as school improvement/education along with 51% which addressed school grounds improvement. It appears that the BOAC projects are making some contributions to education and educational facilities in the communities. Fifty-eight percent of the reported activities involved civic construction projects, 36% involved natural resource development, 53% recreational projects, and 18% historical restoration. A total of 53% of the projects related to agricultural development, and 36% related to economic development. The reader should note that projects can fit into multiple categories. It is difficult to determine
from this study how much impact the particular project had on the community, but it may be concluded that the projects addressed important issues facing rural communities.

Edison (1979) introduced the notion of urban community development. Fifty-six percent of the respondents classified their communities as rural/small towns; however, 44.5% of the projects were conducted in communities of over 10,000 people.

As Dillman and Hobbs (1982) note, it is difficult to make the distinction between rural and urban in the 1980's due to the rapid movement of residences from one type of area to another. They further emphasized, though, that regardless of whether the community is classified as "rural" or "urban," community development has been and will continue to be a major means of solving community problems. Many of the "urban" concerns are probably similar to the ones expressed by the USDA such as need for improved facilities, economic development, and enhanced human capital. What is implied from all this is that almost half of the selected BOAC programs are being conducted in communities other than the traditional small/rural town which may have been the predominant agricultural setting 10 years ago. An investigation of the BOAC program's utility in urban areas could result in interesting research findings.

Teaching community development topics was perceived as being important by the study's selected participants as
well as by the sample of teachers in the Barrick and Caplinger (1984) study. Teaching the importance of agriculture in the community appears to be perceived as the most important topic to teach as both the sampled respondents in the Barrick and Caplinger study and the selected participants of this study rated it the highest of the 12 topics. One hundred percent of the selected participants in this study also said that they taught the importance of agriculture in the community. The need to investigate the importance of agriculture in the community is noted in the BOAC curriculum materials (Clouse and Cary, 1983; and Lee, 1976). The implication is that the curriculum materials may be useful in the vocational agriculture classroom regardless of whether the agriculture program is a BOAC participant or not.

Further inservice activities should help teachers discover how the BOAC program materials can facilitate their teaching about agriculture in the community as well as how the BOAC program may be incorporated into already existing aspects of their programs. The possibilities for application are numerous including encouraging students to conduct profitable supervised occupational experience programs while at the same time addressing a community need. Numerous laboratory and shop skills could be refined as students engage in agriculturally related community projects.
Involvement

Coleman (1973) quoted the Report of the President's Science Advisory Committee on Youth which indicated that youth were being isolated by the schools, both from adults and from life experiences. Emmerick (1975) charged teachers with the responsibility of involving youth in community activities--specifically, going into the community to derive real experiences: experiences like developing social relationships with others and recognizing the communities' economic needs through contacts with business and industry. The selected students in this study were involved with others in their communities in a number of ways. The average number of groups involved with each project was three, while the average number of people other than FFA members and advisors involved was 151 per project. Funds for the projects were solicited from individuals in the community, civic/business organizations, agricultural organizations, and from various levels of government agencies. It is reasonable to conclude from the selected group's BOAC activities that they were in fact gaining exposure to parts of the real life experiences arising in their communities.

Lee (1981) supported the belief that community-school relations were not only social but also economical. There were 46% of the selected students who worked in jobs related to agriculture, and 26% who worked nonagriculturally related jobs. There are not any obvious
connections between the student’s work experience and the BOAC project. However, Emmerick (1975) contended that student involvement in the community results in the recognition of the community’s economic needs through contacts with business and industry. The students’ experiences in the community may have contributed to their learning about the economic needs of the community as well as the kind of resources that were available in their communities. The BOAC program provided them with a means through which to do something about those community needs and to utilize community resources. It should be noted, however, that only 36% of the selected projects were categorized as economic development projects.

The leadership roles which the advisors reported their having to take in order to get the project completed is of some concern. The objectives of the BOAC program are very student outcome specific. Also, the nature of the BOAC program should promote student problem solving and decision-making skills. Townsend and Carter (1983) reported that youth who participated in community service activities scored significantly higher on the Personal Development Inventory than did nonparticipants. The implication from the selected advisors in this study is that students should have more active leadership roles in all phases of the BOAC program if they are to be the true benefactors of the experience.

From the results of this study, it is evident that
criteria for state award selection and national recognition did not include the advisor's age or years teaching experience, the student's background, the FFA chapter size, school or community type, the agricultural education taxonomy, years of BOAC participation, or the dollars invested in the project. Allowances appeared to have been made for each situation as long as the activities were appropriate to that situation. Literature supports the belief that such criteria are poor predictors of success, if success in the case of this study is interpreted as the fact that all the participants were exemplary programs in each of their states and were recognized on the national level.

For example, Herren (1982) found that the relationship between team score, or the measure of success for participants in the National FFA Livestock Judging Contest, and teacher's years of experience was negative and low. Seibert (1975) concluded that the longer an advisor had sponsored a youth organization the more effective the organization was in achieving its objectives. Matterson and Carlson (1972) found that there was a correlation between high participation in state FFA activities and the experience of advisors, specifically 10 years experience. But as Garrison (1982) noted, 63.6% of the respondents studied from a vocational agriculture teacher national sample had 1 to 10 years teaching experience. For the present study, the mean number of teaching years was 10.14
years and 8 years at the same school. The implication here is that nationally recognized programs can be advised by individuals who have 0 to 35 years of teaching experience. There does not seem to be anything magical about "10 years" other than that the profession is heavily weighted in the direction of younger teachers.

A similar argument prevails for the students who were studied. The trends that were detected in the characteristics of participants are more logically attributed to the trends in vocational agriculture. There simply are more white males, more production agriculture students, and at least half as many agriculture programs located in high schools with five or fewer vocational programs as in the federally reported schools having five or more vocational programs. The U.S. Department of Education statistical reports (1979, 1983a, 1983b, 1984) indicate that at least 70% of the students are male and 83% white. In 1971, Welton's (1971) national sample of FFA members who were vocational agriculture students revealed 94% male students and 83% white. The fact that 80% of the selected students in the present study were males does not indicate that the BOAC program is attractive only to males. An interesting note, however, is that the NASSP (1983) indicated that a greater number of youth volunteers were females. The BOAC program is utilizing a nontraditional youth volunteer.

The selected participants represented six agricultural
program areas. The proportion of students from each of these areas was proportional to the national program enrollments. For example, 48.08% of the vocational agriculture students are enrolled in production agriculture (USDE, 1983a, 1983b) and 42% of the selected students in this study were enrolled in production agriculture. Nationally, 17.75% of all vocational agriculture students are enrolled in horticulture; 17.75% of the selected students in the present study were enrolled in horticulture. Although it may have been coincidental, it appears that quality BOAC projects are proportionally conducted in and selected from the agriculture service areas.

A majority of the students were older and did earn mostly B's or better. The grade levels of FFA members may range from junior high school levels to three years past high school graduation. In Welton's (1971) national sample, 34% of the students earned mostly B's, and 40% earned mostly C's. It appears that the student participants in this study were older and above average academically. While age and academic ability may not be important to selection as a national BOAC program representative, they may be influential factors for the student's ultimate recognition in the BOAC program. At the Conference on Community Development, students are expected to articulate their BOAC activities to a panel of judges who determine the top 10 BOAC individual finalists for the
Achievement in Volunteerism Award (National FFA, 1982a). Speculation is that at the national level, participation by the "average student" or the "younger student" will be the exception.

The concern of the researcher for this study is that describing the select population of students and advisors who represent the exemplary BOAC program from each state will result in misinterpreted data, particularly if generalizations are made as to "who wins" in the BOAC program. There are numerous exceptions to be found among the national "winners" as reflected by reported ranges and percentages. While there were some trends found among the selected advisors and students, the implication exists that the BOAC program is one FFA activity that can be conducted in numerous situations by various FFA chapters. As the Achievement in Volunteerism program matures, research may isolate personal characteristics that contribute to a student's national recognition as this program judges the student and his/her activities, not the total scope of the chapter community development program.

Outcomes

As teachers in this study noted, the major benefit of participation in the BOAC program is the opportunity it provides for student learning and development. Participation should be a learning experience as Emmerick (1975) noted and Herren (1982) found. It is, however, commendable that the projects these students conducted
addressed major issues posed by the United States Department of Agriculture when there are paid professionals who coordinate similar activities in order to solve community problems.

Communities or at least the school benefit to some degree from the student activities. Seivers (1982) noted that as administrators, teachers, and students work with outside agencies, in effect they strive for program support and the politics of community development take place. It was interesting that the second highest rated BOAC program outcome indicated by the selected advisors in this study was "increased public awareness of the vocational agriculture program." What students are doing as volunteers represents "a behavior that is motivated by the expectation of psychic benefits of some kind as a result of activities that have had a market value greater than any renumeration received for such activities" (Stam and Stinson, 1976, p. 24). It would be difficult to argue that the BOAC publicity would be anything but positive for the student and the agriculture program. The fact that publicity for participation in the BOAC program has been identified as a valuable outcome of the program should be made known to others.

Voth (1975a) found there to be a positive correlation with community development programs and the index of community services. Fifteen of the selected projects in this study were conducted in communities with none to two
services, 15 were conducted in communities with as many as eight services, and 15 projects were conducted in communities with as many as 10 services. Projects probably were helpful to all the communities, but at least some had the potential for making substantial contributions because a number of the respective communities lacked so many of the services found in the others.

Warren (1972) quoted the International Cooperation Administration in defining community development to be "a process of social action in which people of a community organize themselves for planning and action, define their common and individual needs and problems, make group and individual plans with maximum reliance on community resources and supplement these resources when necessary with services and materials from government and nongovernmental agencies outside the community" (Warren, 1972, p. 311). The multitude of data collected from the selected BOAC participants supports the notion that they cooperatively engaged in planning and executing community development programs. National and local FFA resources were used; community resources and resources from beyond the community were used. Community development process steps were taught, and activities were conducted to provide practical application. The outcomes benefitted the overall public but more importantly benefitted students.

Whether participation has affected long term change such as student attitude toward community involvement, or
whether participation has resulted in students assuming community leadership positions, must be left for future study. In perspective, participation in the BOAC program may only be one factor in the realm of numerous other experiences which affect long-term learning and activities. The positive contention is that BOAC participation will in part influence future student behavior in their communities.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made in view of the findings and conclusions with implications to national, state, and local FFA organizations:

1. National level financial and human resource support for the BOAC program should be continued in order to provide a nationally coordinated structure which includes incentive awards for program participants and community development materials for all FFA advisors and students. The national investment should continue to be multiplied by local initiatives which produce educational, social, and economic returns to students and the local community.

2. Acknowledgement of program participants' achievements should be continued as a means through which others are informed of the reported accomplishments.

3. FFA chapters should continue to address their local community's needs by conducting appropriate projects. However, if BOAC program participants expect the activities
to complement the vocational agriculture instructional program and FFA program, then they should carefully scrutinize their priority of activities in order to select the activities that involve the most students in solving agricultural community problems.

4. The National FFA Organization should encourage teacher education institutions to consider initiating or to continue conducting preservice and inservice activities which complement the national organization's effort to provide more teachers with instruction as to what the community development process is, how to go about teaching it, and how the community development program can contribute to the personal development of students and the positive image of the vocational agriculture program.

5. Advisors should continue assisting students throughout the community development process encouraging them to take active leadership roles in all phases of the program.

6. Advisors and students should continue to act as catalysts for local community development efforts. Specifically, this should include their continued and increased involvement of others in the projects.

7. State FFA Associations should continue to support participation in the BOAC program and encourage more of their local chapters to participate in order to extend the benefits to more agriculture programs, to students and teachers from various personal backgrounds and school
situations as well as to maximize services to many different types and sizes of communities.

8. Distribution of community development curriculum materials and audiovisuals to all FFA chapters should be continued. However, teacher inservice activities need to be conducted in order to introduce more teachers to the utilization and applicability of these products.

9. The primary purposes of the BOAC program should continue to reflect the program's appropriateness as an excellent teaching tool which motivates students to learn about the community development process and the needs and resources of their communities. The major outcome emphasized should be the students' opportunity to develop community leadership and human relations skills through working with others to achieve mutual goals. The importance of the actual project should be stressed but should be only secondary to the students' learning experience.

The following recommendations for future research are warranted by the number of questions that have resulted from the findings of this study:

1. A national study should be conducted in order to compare the community development efforts of FFA chapters which participate and do not participate in the BOAC program.

2. A study should be conducted which focuses on evaluating the national usage and quality of the BOAC program's curriculum materials and audiovisuals which are
made available to all FFA chapters.

3. Research efforts should be directed to the refinement of the instrumentation to facilitate studying a national sample of BOAC participants and nonparticipants.

4. Studies should be conducted which incorporate naturalistic research methods, such as case studies, to investigate the BOAC program's effect on the local level.

5. A longitudinal study which investigates the long term effects on students who have participated in the BOAC program as well as the effects projects have had on communities should be supported for the future.

6. Future research efforts should include a complete evaluation of the BOAC program. Given Bennett and Nelson's (1975) evaluation hierarchy, the first four levels should be readdressed, while naturalistic and longitudinal studies would facilitate evaluating the BOAC at the "KASA" (knowledge, attitudes, skills, aspirations) level, the practical change level, and the end results level.

A Closing Thought

This study has provided the National FFA Organization and the BOAC program sponsor with an initial investigation of the BOAC program. The history of the BOAC program and the programs inputs have been summarized. The levels of participation, types of activities, and degree of involvement for a selected group of participants have been described. Extensive instrumentation has been developed.

It is now appropriate to revise the instrumentation
and to design research studies which will contribute to the complete national evaluation of the BOAC program based on more complex questions. Some of these questions include:

a) To what degree are FFA chapters using the BOAC materials, conducting activities, and simply not reporting their activities via the BOAC awards program application process?

b) Is there a difference in the quality and quantity of community development activities conducted by BOAC participants and nonparticipants?

c) What long term effects has the BOAC program had on participants and their communities?

d) What changes must the BOAC program adopt, if any, in order to increase its applicability to various situations across the country?

Several positive outcomes of the BOAC program, such as the reported effects on students, vocational agricultural programs, and communities, have been substantiated with this study. Even though time is a valuable commodity for vocational agriculture teachers and students, a national study of program participants and nonparticipants should place in perspective the value of the time commitment for BOAC participation in view of the benefits that participation returns to students, vocational agriculture programs, and communities.
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APPENDIX A

STATES FROM WHICH PARTICIPANTS RESPONDED
## States from Which Participants Responded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: States = 48, Student Survey (S) = 46, Advisors (A) Survey = 43, Community (C) Survey = 45
APPENDIX B

SURVEYS USED IN THE STUDY
SURVEY OF STUDENT PARTICIPANTS IN THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

1. Please print your name and the date on the opscan form.

2. Your ID number is your social security number which is useful for follow-up research. Print your number in the ID boxes and blacken in the appropriate numbered circles.

3. Form E = Student

4. Use the "seat no." blanks as your state code:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Group indicates your FFA Region. Group 1 = Central, Group 2 = Eastern, Group 3 = Southern, Group 4 = Western.

6. Please mark on the opscan sheet the number of your response for each numbered item. Write in the answer to any item on the questionnaire which has a blank provided or requests additional information.

EXAMPLE:

1. What is your current grade level? 1. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

2. Graduated and working or looking for work

3. Graduated and in college or technical school
1. In which vocational agricultural program are you enrolled?
   1. Agribusiness
   2. Ag production
   3. Ag processing
   4. Horticulture
   5. Natural Resources
   6. Forestry
   7. Ag mechanics
   8. Sales and services
   9. Exploratory ag

2. How many years have you been enrolled in vocational agriculture not counting this school year?
   1. less than 1
   2. 1
   3. 2
   4. 3
   5. 4
   6. 5

3. What is your current grade level?
   1. 7
   2. 8
   3. 9
   4. 10
   5. 11
   6. 12
   7. graduated and working or looking for work
   8. graduated and in college or technical school

4. What is your age?
   1. 12
   2. 13
   3. 14
   4. 15
   5. 16
   6. 17
   7. 18
   8. 19
   9. 20

5. What is your sex?
   1. male
   2. female

6. What is your race/origin?
   1. White (Caucasian)
   2. Black
   3. Hispanic
   4. American Indian
   5. Other (specify) ________________

7. Which of the following best describes your grades in high school?
   1. Mostly A
   2. About half A and half B
   3. Mostly B
   4. About half B and half C
   5. Mostly C
   6. About half C and half D
   7. Mostly D
   8. Mostly below D

Write in your grade point average if you know it?
   _______________ (A = ___________ points)

8. Have you taken a college entrance examination?
   1. yes
   2. no

   If yes, which ones have you taken?

9. Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT)
   1. yes
   2. no

   Please list your scores if you know them

   ___________________________ Math   ___________________________ Verbal

10. Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)
    1. yes
    2. no

    Scores: ___________________________ Math   ___________________________ Verbal
11. ACT test
1. yes
2. no
Scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Which of the following people live in the same household as you? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY AND SKIP #12 ON THE OPSCAN SHEET)
1. I live alone
2. Father
3. Other male guardian (step-father or foster father)
4. Mother
5. Other female guardian (step-mother or foster mother)
6. Brothers and sisters (including half and step)
7. My spouse
8. My children/child
9. Grandparents
10. Other relatives

What is your father's or male guardian's major occupation or job title? (write in)

a. __________________________________________________________

What are some of his main duties?

b. __________________________________________________________

What do they make or do where he works?
c. __________________________________________________________

13. Is he currently employed or unemployed?
1. employed
2. unemployed

14. Is he currently retired?
1. yes
2. no

What is your mother's or female guardian's major occupation or job title? (write in)

a. __________________________________________________________

What are some of her main duties?

b. __________________________________________________________

What do they make or do where she works?
c. __________________________________________________________

15. Is she currently employed or unemployed?
1. employed
2. unemployed

16. Is she retired?
1. yes
2. no

17. Is your family currently involved in agricultural work other than farming?
1. yes
2. no

If your family is currently involved in farming, please answer questions 18 through 21; if no, skip these questions and numbers on the opscan form.

18. What is the size in acres of your family farm?
1. under 50 acres
2. 50 to 179
3. 180 to 259
4. 260 to 499
5. 500 to 999
6. 1000 to 1999
7. 2000 or more

19. What is your farm's primary tenure status?
1. Individual/family owned
2. Rented
3. Partnership with others
4. Corporation

20. What is the primary farm type?
1. Livestock (specify kind) ______________________________________
2. Crops (specify kind) _______________________________________
3. Horticulture _______________________________________________
4. Fruit and vegetable _________________________________________
5. Mixed general farming _______________________________________
6. Other ____________________________________________________

21. Does your family have other sources of income to supplement the farm income?
1. yes
2. no
What category best represents your family’s total net income? (circle one)
A. less than $7,500
B. $7,500 to 9,999
C. $10,000 to 14,999
D. $15,000 to 19,999
E. $20,000 to 24,999
F. $25,000 to 29,999
G. $30,000 to 34,999
H. $35,000 to 39,999
I. $40,000 to 44,999
J. $45,000 to 49,999
K. over $50,000

22. Do you currently have a job related to agriculture?
1. yes
2. no
If no, skip to 26

23. If yes, which of the following describes your work situation?
1. During school hours supervised farm or ranching program
2. During school hours supervised agribusiness placement
3. Both 1 and 2
4. After school farming or ranch work
5. After school agribusiness work
6. Both 4 and 5
7. A combination of 1, 2, 4, and 5 (specify which) ________________________

24. During the school year, how many hours per week do you usually work on the agriculturally related job?
1. 1 to 4
2. 5 to 14
3. 15 to 21
4. 22 to 29
5. 30 to 34
6. 35 or more

25. During the summer, how many hours per week do you usually work on the agriculturally related job?
1. 1 to 4
2. 5 to 14
3. 15 to 21
4. 22 to 29
5. 30 to 34
6. 35 or more

26. What category best describes your annual income from your job during the past year ending June 30?
1. less than $1,000
2. $1,000 to 2,499
3. $2,500 to 3,999
4. $4,000 to 5,499
5. $5,500 to 6,999
6. $7,000 to 8,499
7. $8,500 to 9,999
8. $10,000 or more

27. Are you employed with a business other than agribusiness or farming?
1. yes
2. no

28. Is this non-agricultural work your primary source of job related income?
1. yes
2. no

What is your occupation or job title? Please list all that you have:

Agricultural and ag-related

________________________________________________________________________

Non-agricultural

________________________________________________________________________

29. What are your immediate educational/occupation goals? (What you plan to do after graduation)
1. To find a job and seek no further education
2. To attend a technical college for training in a specific vocation
3. To attend a community college (requiring less than 4 years to graduate or less than a 4 year degree program)
4. To attend a 4 year college or university, seeking a professional degree
5. Undetermined at this time

30. My occupational goal for the future includes my becoming a/an __________________________
   (write in job title)
   I would like my main occupational duties to include __________________________
31. How good do you feel your chances are of achieving your future occupational goal?
1. 100% sure I'll achieve it
2. 75% sure I'll achieve it
3. only 50% sure I'll achieve it
4. uncertain if I can achieve it
5. I have no idea if I can achieve it

If you do not reach this goal, what work do you realistically think you will do?

32. Do your parents or guardians support your future occupational goal?
1. yes
2. no
If no, please share why they do not support your occupational goal: ______________________

For items 33 to 48, please mark a "1" for all activities or organizations in which you are actively involved; mark a "2" if you were not involved

33. Varsity athletic teams
34. Other athletic teams - in or out of school
35. Cheerleaders, pep club, majorettes
36. Debating or drama
37. Band or orchestra
38. Chorus or dance
39. Hobby clubs - photography, electronics, computer, etc.
40. Honorary clubs - National Honor Society
41. School newspaper, magazine, yearbook
42. School subject matter clubs - science, art, history
43. Student council, student government
44. Vocational education organizations - FFA
45. Youth organization in the community - nonagricultural, Scouts, YMCA, YWCA
46. Youth organization in the community - agricultural, 4-H, Fair board
47. Church activities including youth groups
48. Junior achievement

49. For the activities/organizations listed from 33 through 48, how many leadership positions have you held during your high school career?
1. none
2. 1 to 3
3. 4 to 6
4. 7 to 10
5. 11 to 14
6. 15 to 18

Please list up to 5 honors or awards that you have received: (write in) ______________________

50. How many years have you been a member of the FFA?
1. 0
2. 1
3. 2
4. 3
5. 4
6. 5
7. 6
8. 7 or more

For items 51 through 60, mark a "1" for all chapter offices that you have held in the FFA; mark a "2" if you did not hold the office.

51. President
52. Vice-president
53. Secretary
54. Treasurer
55. Reporter
56. Sentinel
57. Student Advisor
58. BOAC chairman
59. Other chairman (specify) ______________________________________
60. Other offices (specify) ______________________________________

For items 61 through 70, mark a "1" for all FFA activities which you have participated in beyond the chapter level; mark a "2" if you did not participate beyond the chapter level.

61. Prepared public speaking
62. Extemporaneous speaking
63. Parliamentary procedure
64. FFA judging contests
65. Proficiency awards
66. District/region/federation officer
67. State officer
68. National officer
69. International programs
70. Washington Leadership Conference
For items 71 through 82, mark a "1" if you can do the task and a "2" if you cannot do the task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Define a community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define Community Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain the importance of agriculture in the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify community problems and needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather and analyze data about the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify influential people in the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify resources available in the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore alternative solutions to the problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide upon solutions and plan programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilize resources and implement solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicize the community development project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate program effectiveness in the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are interested in knowing if your parents or guardians are active in community organizations. Please list the 3 major or most important community leadership positions held by your parents or guardians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father Leadership Positions</th>
<th>Mother Leadership Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We hope to follow the careers of our BOAC winners. Consequently, we anticipate contacting you in the future. Please complete the following so that we will be able to locate you in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Name</th>
<th>Parent/Guardian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Permanent Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone ( )</td>
<td>Phone ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other contact Person's Name (Vo Ag teacher perhaps)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone ( )</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phone ( )
1. Please print your name and the date on the opscan form.

2. Your ID number is your social security number which is useful for follow-up research. Print your number in the ID boxes and blacken in the appropriate numbered circles.

3. Form D = Advisor survey

4. Use the "seat no." blanks as your state code:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Group indicates your FFA region. Group 1 = Central, Group 2 = Eastern, Group 3 = Southern, Group 4 = Western.

6. Please mark on the opscan sheet the number of your response for each numbered item. Write in the answer to any item on the questionnaire which has a blank provided or requests additional information.

EXAMPLE:

1. Were you a member of the FFA in high school? 1. yes 2. no
SURVEY OF ADVISORS ATTENDING THE
NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

(Write in your response for the first six questions)

What is your age? ____________ (years)
What is your sex? ________________ (male or female)
What is your race/origin? ____________ (White, Black, Hispanic, American Indian, Other)
How many total years have you taught as of July 1, 1983? ________________
How many years have you taught vocational agriculture as of July 1, 1983? ________________
How many years have you taught vocational agriculture in your present school? ________________

1. Why type of teaching certificate do you hold?
   1. 1 year temporary
   2. 2 year provisional
   3. 4 year provisional
   4. 5 year collegiate
   5. 8 year professional
   6. permanent
   7. vocational industrial certificate
   8. other (specify) ________________

2. What is the length of your present teaching contract?
   1. 9 months
   2. 10 months
   3. 11 months
   4. 12 months

3. What is the highest degree of educational level you have attained?
   1. high school graduate
   2. two year post secondary associate
   3. bachelors degree
   4. masters degree
   5. post masters/EdS/CAGS
   6. doctorate

4. Were you a member of the FFA in high school?
   1. yes
   2. no

5. What is your marital status?
   1. never married
   2. married and living with spouse
   3. other

6. How many people, including yourself, are living in your household?
   1. 1
   2. 2
   3. 3
   4. 4
   5. 5
   6. 6
   7. 7
   8. 8
   9. 9
   10. 10 or more

7. What is your annual teaching income?
   1. 10,000 or less
   2. 10,000 to 13,999
   3. 14,000 to 16,999
   4. 17,000 to 19,999
   5. 20,000 to 22,999
   6. 23,999 to 25,999
   7. 26,000 or more

8. How do you rate your teaching job satisfaction?
   1. Love it and would not quit
   2. Enjoy it but would consider another occupation
   3. Tolerate it and plan to quit
   4. Tolerate it and plan to continue teaching
   5. Dislike teaching and actively seek other employment

For questions 9 through 18, fill in a "1" for any work experience you had prior to teaching; fill in a "2" if you have no work experience in this area.

9. farming
10. agricultural sales and services
11. machinery sales and services
12. seed and fertilizer sales
13. horticulture
14. natural resources
15. extension service
16. credit/loan agency
17. Other
18. none
19. Do you have an income generating job other than teaching?
   1. yes
   2. no

20. If yes to 19, please specify your job title and what you do:
    Job title: __________________________
    What you do/responsibilities: __________________________

For items 21 through 34, please mark a "1" for any of the courses that you teach and a "2" for each you do not teach:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>21. agribusiness</th>
<th>22. production ag</th>
<th>23. ag science I and II</th>
<th>24. horticulture</th>
<th>25. natural resources</th>
<th>26. forestry</th>
<th>27. environmental science</th>
<th>28. ag sales and services</th>
<th>29. ag machinery service</th>
<th>30. ag mechanics</th>
<th>31. small animal care</th>
<th>32. exploratory ag</th>
<th>33. farm management (adult)</th>
<th>34. other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Is community development part of your vocational agriculture instructional program?
   1. yes
   2. no

36. If yes, approximately how many hours per year do you devote to teaching the community development process and supervising community development projects?
   1. less than 50
   2. up to 99
   3. 100 to 149
   4. 150 to 199
   5. 200 to 249
   6. 250 to 299
   7. more than 300

Please circle your response to indicate your opinion of which community development topics should be taught in your vocational agriculture curriculum and at which grade level you presently teach the topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE TOPIC SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN MY VO. AG. CURRICULUM</th>
<th>AT WHAT GRADE LEVEL ARE YOU CURRENTLY TEACHING THIS TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Definition of community</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Definition of community development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Importance of ag in the community</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Identifying community problems and needs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Gathering and analyzing data about problems</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Identifying influential people in the community</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Identifying resources available in the community</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Exploring alternative solutions to the problems</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Deciding upon solutions and planning programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Mobilizing resources and implementing solutions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Publicizing BOAC projects</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Evaluating program effectiveness in the community</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For items 37 through 46, mark a "1" for all BOAC community development tasks in which you had to take a leadership role in order to get the project completed; "2" if the task did not require your leadership.

37. identifying potential projects
38. arranging field trips to scout out potential projects
39. contacting community support individuals/organizations
40. making BOAC presentations
41. securing financial support
42. physically working on the project
43. evaluating the project
44. completing the BOAC state and national application
45. publicizing the project
46. other (specify)

47. In terms of my involvement with the chapter BOAC project, I would describe my role as:
1. Assigning students to project activities and supervising closely to insure quality work.
2. Permitting capable students to handle all the responsibilities of the project.
3. Working closely with students as they generated ideas and fulfilled commitments to the project.
4. Working harder than most students to insure that a quality project would be completed.

48. Does participation in the BOAC program result in your reducing the time spent teaching technical agriculture?
1. yes
2. no
Please comment:

49. Does participation in the BOAC program reduce the amount of time spent on other chapter activities or require the elimination of other potential projects from your FFA program?
1. yes
2. no
Please comment:

Of the BOAC teaching materials available, please rate them according to the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>very poor</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>very good</th>
<th>not familiar with it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Community Development FFA Style&quot; handbooks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOAC Chapter Action Guides</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Guide to FFA Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFA Activity Handbook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFA Student Handbook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hometown America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Game Plan: FFA Tackles Community Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the Possibilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOAC Regional and National Winners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list the major community organizations to which you belong (ag, civic, fraternal, political, educational); indicate the approximate number of hours you devote to the organization each year, and the highest leadership position you have held.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>hrs/yr</th>
<th>Leadership position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Please print your name and the date on the opscan form.

2. Your ID number is your social security number which is useful for follow-up information. Print your number in the ID boxes and blacken in the appropriate numbered circles.

3. This is FORM C

4. Use the "seat number" blanks as your State Code:

   Alabama   001   Montana   026
   Alaska    002   Nebraska  027
   Arizona   003   Nevada    028
   Arkansas  004   New Hampshire 029
   California 005   New Jersey  030
   Colorado  006   New Mexico  031
   Connecticut 007   New York  032
   Delaware  008   North Carolina 033
   Florida   009   North Dakota 034
   Georgia   010   Ohio      035
   Hawaii    011   Oklahoma   036
   Idaho     012   Oregon    037
   Illinois  013   Pennsylvania 038
   Indiana   014   Rhode Island 039
   Iowa      015   South Carolina 040
   Kansas    016   South Dakota 041
   Kentucky  017   Tennessee  042
   Louisiana 018   Texas      043
   Maine     019   Utah      044
   Maryland  020   Vermont    045
   Massachusetts 021   Virginia  046
   Michigan  022   Washington 047
   Minnesota 023   West Virginia 048
   Mississippi 024   Wisconsin  049
   Missouri  025   Wyoming   050

5. Group Indicates your FFA Region. Group 1 = Central, Group 2 = Eastern, Group 3 = Southern, Group 4 = Western

6. Please mark on the opscan sheet the number of your response for each numbered item. Write in the answer to any item in the questionnaire which has a blank provided or requests additional information.

EXAMPLE:

1. What is the population of your community?
   1. less than 2,500
   2. 2,500 to 5,000
   3. 5,000 to 10,000
   4. 10,000 to 50,000
   5. 50,000 to 100,000
   6. 100,000 or more

   1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10
SURVEY OF PARTICIPANTS ATTENDING THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

For this survey, "community" is that area in which your school serves or is located.
Does your school serve: (circle one)
   a. 1 or more counties (as an area school)
   b. a city or town
   c. part of a metropolitan area (surburb)
If "c", what is the population of the metropolitan area? __________________________

PART I: COMMUNITY (as previously defined)

1. What is the population of your community?
   1. less than 2,500
   2. 2,500 to 5,000
   3. 5,000 to 10,000
   4. 10,000 to 50,000
   5. 50,000 to 100,000
   6. 100,000 or more

2. Has the population of your community stayed about the same, decreased or increased over the past 10 years?
   1. stayed about the same
   2. decreased
   3. increased

3. Do most young people who originate in your community eventually settle in your community?
   1. yes
   2. no

What percentage of the population of your community is White (Caucasian), Black, Hispanic or some other race/origin?
   A. White __________ %
   B. Black __________ %
   C. Hispanic __________ %
   D. American Indian __________ %
   E. Other __________ %

How many of each type of school is located in your community?
   A. elementary
   B. middle school
   C. jr. high school
   D. high school
   E. technical center (High school) _______

F. technical college
G. community college
H. college
I. university

4. What is the student population of the school in which your agricultural program is located?
   1. less than 250
   2. 250 to 499
   3. 500 to 749
   4. 750 to 999
   5. 1000 to 1249
   6. 1250 to 1499
   7. 1500 to 1749
   8. 1750 to 2000
   9. 2000 or more

5. What is the average educational level of adults in your community?
   1. low (less than high school graduation)
   2. medium (high school graduate and some post high school education)
   3. high (primarily college graduates)

6. Does your school offer adult vocational education classes?
   1. yes
   2. no

7. In which type of school is your vocational education program located?
   1. comprehensive high school (5 vocational areas or more)
   2. regular high school (limited vocational courses)
   3. vocational technical center or area school

For items A through P, please write in the number of teachers assigned to each of the agricultural program areas in your school. If there is not a teacher for the program area, write in "0".

A. I am the only teacher and teach
B. agribusiness
C. production agriculture
D. ag science I and II
E. horticulture
F. natural resources
G. forestry
H. environmental sciences
J. ag sales and services
K. ag mechanics
L. small animal care
M. exploratory ag
N. farm management (adult)
O. other
P. other
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8. How many agricultural teachers are in your school? (mark the number on the opscan sheet; mark 10 - 10 or more teachers)

9. Which of the following categories classifies your community?
   1. Retirement community
   2. University or college
   3. Farm oriented community
   4. Single industry town
   5. Manufacturing center
   6. Military base town
   7. Recreational center
   8. Small business community
   9. Corporate business center

10. How would you describe the community environment in which your school is located?
   1. rural/small town
   2. rural county seat
   3. central city (inside the incorporated limits of a metropolitan center)
   4. suburban (community, primarily residential, outlying but close to a large city)

11. For questions 19 through 25, mark a "1" for all types of transportation that tie your community to the outside; "2" if it does not.
   19. Interstate high way
   20. State routes
   21. County roads
   22. Rail
   23. Airport (minor)
   24. Airport (major)
   25. Bus

12. Has your community been involved in any organized community development activities in the past 10 years (e.g. rural development, urban renewal, obtain new industry, etc.)?
   1. yes
   2. no

13. What is the average family income for your community?
   1. low ($7,500 or less)
   2. low medium ($7,500 - $14,999)
   3. medium ($15,000 - $24,999)
   4. high medium ($25,000 - $34,999)
   5. high ($35,000 or more)

14. For questions 28 through 37, please mark a "1" for any of the businesses or services that are in your community; "2" if they are not.
   28. Lumber yard or lumber store
   29. Dentist
   30. New car dealer
   31. Department store
   32. Taxi service
   33. Medical specialist (pediatrician)
   34. Movie theatre
   35. Hospital
   36. Airport
   37. College or university

15. What is the average size farm in your community in acres?
   1. under 50
   2. 50 to 179
   3. 180 to 259
   4. 260 to 499
   5. 500 to 999
   6. 1000 to 1999
   7. 2000 or more

PLEASE WRITE YOUR ANSWERS ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE REMAINING ITEMS OF PART I.

A. What percent of your community's population are farmers? ________________________

B. What is the average net farm income of these families? ________________________

C. What percentage of farms in your community are owned by individuals, owned in partnerships, are corporations, or are organized under some other structure?
   Individual/family ________________________
   Partnership ________________________
   Corporation ________________________
   Other ________________________

D. What are the 5 major farm commodities produced in your community?
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
E. What are the 5 major non-agricultural industries which are located in or near your community? Estimate the number of people the industries employ and rate the employee's average salary as high, medium, or low.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th># Employed</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Please list the 5 major agricultural industries or agribusinesses which are located in or near your community. Estimate the number of people the industries employ and rate the employees average salary as high, medium, or low.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th># Employed</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part II: BOAC PROJECT INFORMATION

Please mark your answer on the opscan sheet unless you are requested to write in the answer in blanks on this questionnaire.

How many years has your chapter been recognized for participation in the BOAC program since 1971? (write in)

- Area award [ ]
- State award [ ]
- Regional winner [ ]
- National (bronze, silver, or gold) award [ ]

If this year's BOAC project has received funding, please indicate the source of funding and the amount of dollars spent. (write in)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DOLLARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No funding was used [ ]

39. Did students from all the vocational agricultural areas in your school work on the BOAC project?

1. yes [ ]
2. no [ ]

If no, which major vocational agricultural program areas conducted the BOAC project? (write in)

For items 40 through 51, which categories best describe the major activities in your BOAC project (mark "1" if the category applies, "2" if it does not).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1 yes</th>
<th>2 no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>school improvement/educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>school grounds improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>transportation improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>recreational project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>senior citizen project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>handicapped facility development or service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>natural resources development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>agricultural improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>civic construction project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>economic development project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>historical restoration project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For items 52 through 63, please mark a "1" (yes) for any of the groups of people to which your project benefits were directed; mark a "2" (no) if the group did not benefit from the project.

52. Youth organizations including the FFA
53. FFA Alumni
54. Young Farmers
55. Senior Citizens
56. Handicapped Individuals
57. Children

For items 64 through 74, please mark a "1" for any of the youth organizations which are in your school or community; "2", if they are not.

64. Future Farmers of America (FFA)
65. Future Homemakers of America (FHA/HERO)
66. Vocational Industrial Clubs of America (VICA)
67. Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA)
68. Future Business Leaders Association (FBLA)
69. American Industrial Arts Students Association (AIASA)
70. Girl Scouts
71. Boy Scouts
72. 4-H
73. Other (specify)
74. Other (specify)

For items 75 through 94, please mark a "1" if any of the following community organizations are in your community; "2" if they are not.

75. FFA Alumni
76. Young Farmers Organization
77. Farm Bureau
78. Other agricultural organizations (specify)
79. Other (specify)

Other Community Organizations

80. Rotary
81. Lion's Club
82. Women's Club
83. Garden Club
84. League of Women Voters
85. YMCA
86. YMCA
87. Chamber of Commerce
88. Ruritans
89. Kiwanis
90. VFW
91. Moose Lodge
92. Elks
93. Shriners
94. Other (specify)

For items 52 through 94, please write in the names of agencies/or organizations that were involved in planning and/or executing your BOAC project and indicate the extent to which they were involved. (list only the top 5 organizations)

Agencies or Organization Approximate # Hours Spent Approximate # People Involved

How many FFA members were involved in the project and how many total hours were spent by all members involved?

Number of Members __________ Total hours of members work __________

How did you go about determining that this year's project was a community need?

95. Community survey
96. Survey of chapter members
97. Discussion with key informants (business leaders, political leader)
98. Use of secondary data (census data, telephone books, etc.)
99. The project was identified as part of a long range plan
100. Other (specify)

101. In conducting the project, were there any major controversies?

1. yes
2. no

If yes, were the issues over whether or not the project was feasible, technically, economically, socially, politically, or morally right?

Feasibility
Technically right
Economically right
Politically right
Morally right
Other (specify)
102. Was the vocational agriculture advisory committee/council involved with the BOAC project?
1. yes
2. no
3. We have no agricultural advisory committee/council

Please indicate the number of publicity outlets employed in the BOAC project: (write in)
Newspapers (# different papers)
TV
Radio
School assemblies
Civic club presentations
School board meetings
Other (specify)

Please rank from 1 (most important) to 9 (least important) the order of importance of major BOAC project outcomes.

Ranking
1. Improvement of school or community facilities
2. Improvement in community social and health services
3. Increased citizen participation of FFA members
4. Increased labor participation of others in the community
5. Improvement of human relations skills of FFA members
6. Economic development of the community
7. Improvement of agricultural income
8. Conservation or development of natural resources
9. Increased public awareness of the vocational ag program

PART III. CHAPTER INFORMATION (PLEASE WRITE YOUR RESPONSE ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE)

1. Are you the chapter advisor who directed the BOAC project?
1. yes
2. no

2. How many vocational agricultural students are currently enrolled in your ag program?

3. How many members are currently in your FFA chapter?

4. Please indicate the approximate number for the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Number students in the FFA</th>
<th>Number of Voc. Ag Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. males in the FFA/in Voc. Ag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. females in the FFA/in Voc. Ag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. white students in the FFA/in Voc. Ag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. black students in the FFA/in Voc. Ag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. hispanic students in the FFA/in Voc. Ag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. other minorities in the FFA/in Voc. Ag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Voc. ag students with SOE programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. students engaged in the following types of supervised occupational experiences:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed laboratory experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. students with non-agricultural work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. last year’s graduates who are working in an agricultural related occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Which income category best represents the majority of your students’ family income?
a. low
b. low medium
c. medium
d. high medium
e. high

6. Please indicate if your chapter has participated in any of the following activities (write yes or no). Also indicate at which level your chapter has received its highest level of recognition for participating in the activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PARTICIPATED (yes or no)</th>
<th>HIGHEST RECOGNITION LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Judging contests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Proficiency awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Extemporaneous speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Prepared public speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Parliamentary procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Chapter award program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Chapter safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. FFA Energy challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. How many years has your chapter participated in the following activities/programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>YEARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Food For America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. American Institute of Cooperatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Washington Leadership Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. National SOE Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. International Programs (how many members)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. In the past 10 years, how many State Farmers has your chapter had?

How many American Farmers? __________________________
APPENDIX C

COMMUNITY SCALING
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of reduction in error of estimation &quot;best array&quot; score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient of Scalability = 1 - 27/(450 - 354) = .72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes: Coefficient of Reproducibility = 1 - 27/450 = .94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of all 0 &amp; 1 which are not errors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vo/Tech     = Vocational/Technical School
Col/Univ    = College or University
Taxi        = Taxi Service
Airport     = Airport
Med/Spec    = Medical Specialist
Movie       = Movie Theatre
New Auto     = New Auto Dealership
Dept. Store = Department Store
Dentist     = Dentist
Lumber      = Lumber Yard or Lumber Store
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