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ABSTRACT OF THESIS

CULTIVATING THE COMPASS: Examining the role of emotional appraisal and professional agency among stakeholders in Kentucky agricultural education.

Agricultural Education has been informed by four major areas including agricultural education (teaching and learning), educational policy, agricultural policy (industry collaboration) and research. Historically agriculture teachers have been removed from the policy process affecting their profession in these four areas (Thompson, 1963). A review of historical literature suggests that only twice have teachers been involved in the policy process. The purpose of this study was to examine the involvement levels of stakeholders in agricultural education across the state of Kentucky. Specifically, examining the emotional appraisal of specific issues in agricultural education and if the emotions of stakeholders influence their involvement in these issues (Sherer, 2005). The researcher found that the involvement level of stakeholders in Kentucky was consistent with the historical research suggesting that stakeholders including teachers are not actively engaged in policy affecting their profession. The researcher also found that stakeholders that appraised a specific issue with a joyous emotion (contentment) became more involved in a local agricultural education program than those apprehensive about the same issues. Recommendations for the profession and specific stakeholder groups have been provided by the researcher to attempt to engage stakeholders in the policies that affect their classroom and profession.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Background and Setting

Agricultural education has been a mainstay of American culture for centuries. In fact, it was integrated into the American education system as early as 1734 (Moore, 1987). Historically, agriculture was taught as a way to ensure survival and economic stability. However, the agricultural industry has shifted in the last 100 years and with that contemporary agricultural education has also changed drastically throughout the decades. In fact, the relevancy of agricultural education in contemporary society has often been challenged (Balschweid, Thompson & Cole, 1997). These changes have also influenced the course offerings in agricultural education programs. This is partially due to the shifts from community dependence on agricultural jobs and farming toward more dependence on off-farm or industrialized jobs (Roberts & Ball, 2009). This cultural shift contributes to the decline in agricultural literacy across the United States.

Societal Influence

Social changes and societal shifts regularly influence policies, as they often reflect the needs of our society (Thompson, 1973). According to Thompson (1973), social disparity between social norms “what was” and philosophical shifts “what really should be” grows the desire to bring the two more closely together. Stakeholders influence this process by attempting to make the necessary changes in society or often times by resisting them. Once the disparity between the social conditions becomes apparent, the process of public policymaking begins. Problems are conceptualized and addressed and brought to the government for solution. Governmental institutions formulate alternatives and select the solution that is best suited for the problem. These solutions are then executed (Sabatier,
Agricultural education has also been greatly affected by societal shifts in history.

As a result, the policies that affect agricultural education continually shift.

While several social groups (stakeholders) have influenced educational policy, four societal sectors have had the most impact on agricultural education. These four areas include: vocational education policy (career and technical education), educational policies (science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) core-content), agricultural businesses and industry, and finally the National FFA Organization (Balshweid, 2002; Moore 1987; Roberts & Ball, 2009; Thompson, 1973). Although each area is distinct, when combined they heavily influence the profession.

Agricultural education in Kentucky has historically reacted slowly toward societal shifts impacting agriculture (Chaliff, 2010). It seems as though a “one more thing” mentality has dominated the culture of teachers within the state (Hains, 2010). However, there is little research addressing stakeholder involvement within the context of agricultural education. In order to further explore this phenomenon, an overview of agricultural education policy is necessary to gain a deeper understanding of the complexities associated with the involvement of stakeholders in this process.

**Vocational and Career and Technical Education**

Throughout history, agricultural education has enjoyed a rich heritage. In fact, agricultural practices such as raw silk production, indigo production and grape culture were taught non-formally as early as 1734 in Savannah, Georgia (Moore, 1988). However, it was not until 1858 when more formal or classroom based agricultural education appeared (Moore, 1987). At this time, elementary schools in Massachusetts began to introduce the concept of integrating agriculture into the curriculum. Fifty years later the first public high school agriculture program began in Elyria, Ohio (Moore, 1987). By 1917, school based agricultural
education had flourished and was being taught in 3,181 public high schools. In fact, by then more than 30 states had passed legislation to encourage the teaching of agriculture in public school systems (Camp, 1987).

In 1914, more attention was being drawn toward agricultural education after the passing of the Smith-Lever Act. This Act established funding to develop the Cooperative Extension Services in conjunction with the land-grant college system (Camp, 1987). It was during the passing of the Smith-Lever Act that Charles Prosser, lobbyist for the National Society for Promotion of Industrial Education, reached an agreement with policy makers (Camp, 1987). As part of the agreement Prosser negotiated support for the Smith-Lever Act, but only if legislators would ensure that a commission would be created to evaluate the national need for vocational education in the secondary education system (Thompson, 1973). Once the bill was passed in 1914, President Woodrow Wilson requested the United States Congress establish a Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education (Camp, 1987). The responsibility of this commission was to determine if there was a need for legislation supporting vocational education in the public school systems. None of the stakeholders represented by this commission were directly (at the time of the commission) involved in secondary education. Many representatives had an interest in creating a more educated workforce. Only one representative had a specific agricultural appointment while the rest included congressmen and labor interest groups (Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, 1914; Thompson 1973). Individuals involved with the commission can be seen in Table 1.
Once the study was complete, the commission reported the following assertions about vocational education:

1. Vocational education was needed as a wise business investment. The National prosperity and happiness was at stake and without vocational education the markets of the world could not be maintained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commission Member Name</th>
<th>Position at time of appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hoke Smith- Chairman</td>
<td>Senator, Georgia- Lawyer, Chairman Senate Committee on Education, farmer and former Georgia Governor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Carroll S. Page</td>
<td>Senator, Vermont, Banker and Calf-skin dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dudley M. Hughes</td>
<td>Representative, Georgia- farmer and plantation owner, Chairman House Committee on Education, Member House Agriculture Committee (assisted in creating Georgia’s School of Agriculture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Simeon D. Fess</td>
<td>Representative, Ohio- Born on a farm, Professor and President Antioch College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mr. John A. Lapp</td>
<td>Director Indiana Bureau of Legislative Information, Indianapolis, Ind.; Secretary of Indiana Commission on Industrial Agricultural Education, 1912.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Miss. Florence M. Marshall</td>
<td>Director Manhattan Trade School, New York City; Member of the Massachusetts Factors Inspection Commission, 1910.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mr. Charles A. Prosser</td>
<td>Secretary National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, New York City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Vocational education would introduce into the educational system the aim of utility to take its place in dignity by the side of culture and by connecting education with life. Higher standards of living are the result of better education, which makes workers more efficient, thus increasing their wage earning capacity.

3. Vocational Education would indirectly, but positively, affect the aims and methods of general education by developing teaching processes for those who learn by doing rather than by book methods alone (Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, 1914).

Recommendations from this report were incorporated into the Smith-Hughes Bill (Thompson, 1973), and became the foundation for agricultural education. In 1917, the Smith-Hughes Act was passed. It placed national importance on vocational and agricultural education within the U.S. making it a top legislative priority (Camp, 1987). However, as noted this movement was influenced by stakeholders involved in industry not necessarily education.

After the passing of the Smith-Hughes Act, there were continued movements assessing the need for vocational education funding. Some of them were initiated by individuals within the teaching profession, while others were not. In 1936, President Roosevelt established a 24 person advisory committee to evaluate the federal funding for vocational education (Thompson, 1987). While the committee suggested several changes to vocational education, little credibility was attained and the suggestions were condemned by stakeholders within the teaching profession. This was primarily because the report was completed by individuals with limited understanding of the purpose and needs of vocational education (Thompson, 1973).
In the coming years, society continued to evolve. During this time a number of advisory committees were put in place to evaluate the need for vocational education. One of the first alterations was made by the committee that drafted the Vocational Education Act of 1963. This act was amended in both 1968 and 1976 to address the social demands for changes in vocational industry needs (Threeton, 2007). Also, in 1968, President Nixon appointed the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. The purpose of this council was to establish an evaluation protocol for vocational education. Members of this committee stressed the importance of societal needs of the profession, including changes in job supply and demand and the need for a qualified workforce (Thompson, 1973). However, similar to the initial commission established in 1914, the members of this council were not vocational education instructors, instead they were lawyers, presidential cabinet members and representatives from other special interest groups.

Then in 1984, the Carl D. Perkins Act was passed shifting the purpose of vocational education. During this time, more focus was being placed on meeting societal needs by producing a more productive workforce (Threeton, 2007). These societal shifts required the establishment of another commission in 1985. This group expanded the scope of vocational education by examining the purpose and structure of existing programs. Stakeholders, appointed to the commission by President Reagan, were the first commission to include a cross section of both teachers and industry representatives. These members included former high school social studies, home economics and agricultural education instructors, vocational education, agricultural education and educational psychology professors as well as three industry representatives (The Unfinished Agenda; the Role of Vocational Education in the High School, 1985). For the purposes of this study the researcher identified two primary themes from this commission’s findings. These themes showcase how societal shifts have
influenced agricultural education. The first pertains to the perception of vocational education in the 1980's. From 1981, to 1984 the relevancy of vocational education increased from 64% to 83%. However, it was still necessary to improve the perception of vocational education. It was important to promote it as an essential component of learning for all students, not just non-college bound students (Lotto, 1985; The Unfinished Agenda; the Role of Vocational Education in the High School, 1985).

One strategy to improve the perception of Vocational Education included collaboration among academic disciplines. Another strategy included changing the name from Vocational Education to Career and Technical Education (CTE). Agriculture is one concentration that falls under the CTE umbrella (Phipps & Osborne, 1988). The second theme focused on enhancing vocational education leadership (Lotto, 1985). Even though leaders existed at the local, state and national levels, it was reported that each group operated as a separate entity. In order to succeed they needed stronger communication and alliances.

While career and technical education has evolved to face a number of changes, little has been initiated by agricultural educators. It should be noted that of the five councils and committees highlighted, only once was an agriculture teacher mentioned as an important component to the decision making process (Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, 1914; Thompson, 1973; Threeton, 2007; The Unfinished Agenda; the Role of Vocational Education in the High School, 1985).

**Educational policy: Science, Technology, Engineering and Math Focus**

While traditional agricultural education prepared students for jobs in production agriculture, changes were recommended to enhance the rigor of the agricultural education by integrating more content in traditionally academic areas (Thompson, 1973). In 1985, a group commissioned by President Reagan clearly suggested that agricultural education should be
revised to meet societal demands in science and technology (The Unfinished Agenda; the Role of Vocational Education in the High School, 1985). More than 20 years later, attention was being directed towards these areas yet again. In 2006, American students ranked twenty first out of 30 in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) comparison in science literacy among students from developed countries, while also ranking twenty fifth out of 30 in math literacy (PISA, 2006). These scores spurred a surge of science and math integration into classrooms across the country.

The national emphasis on STEM (science, technology, engineering and math) concepts has greatly shifted the direction of educational policies. It has been a contributing factor for the implementation of rigorous content in schools to contribute to student learning and success (P21, 2011). Although the policies specifically addressed STEM related areas by supporting increasing science integration and courses, agriculture has also been affected. Because agriculture is a context for many of the sciences, the incorporation of these concepts into agricultural education is not a new concept but now more than ever, agriculture teachers were encouraged to integrate more scientific principles into their agricultural curriculum (Balshweid, 2002). Policy makers, educators and business and industry leaders have all been on the forefront of this movement for high quality teaching content into agricultural education (Warnick & Thompson, 2007).

Over the past decade the demand for increased rigor has changed the way teachers instruct core-content classes. Agricultural educators have specifically been called to address this problem by using agricultural and natural resources as a context for applying scientific processes and concepts in core-content areas (Connors & Elliot, 1994). One state-wide example of this effort was seen in Indiana in 2004-2005 with the implementation of the Advanced Life Science Course offerings (Balschweid & Hureta, 2008). On the national level,
the National Council for Agricultural Education collaborated with stakeholders to develop the first contextualized science curriculum for secondary agriculture teachers titled the Curriculum for Agriscience Education (CASE) (National Council for Agricultural Education, 2010).

Therefore, changes in educational policy have impacted the agriculture classroom in a number of ways. The previous example showcases the challenges that agricultural educators have faced in being responsive to the increasing emphasis on STEM integration. This response, however, was not made until 2007 when a movement from the stakeholders began to take root while the original recommendations were brought to the attention of the profession in 1985.

Agricultural Business and Industry

Since the inception of agricultural education, businesses, industry and commodity groups have played a substantial role in the formation of educational policies (Thompson, 1973). In fact, there has been much reliance on industries to provide a context for learning well as employment for students in agricultural education (Thompson, 1973; Threeton, 2007). Furthermore, industry groups have played an important role in keeping legislators informed of the relevancy of contemporary agricultural education. The American Farm Bureau organization is just one example of a group that provides key policy issues to state and national legislators each year in the form of resolutions in hopes of benefiting agricultural education (American Farm Bureau, 2011).

It is becoming increasingly more difficult to show the relevancy of agriculture in a society that is becoming more removed from its practices. A primary concern associated with decreasing agricultural literacy is the lack of emphasis being placed upon it within public education (Balshweid, Thompson, Cole, 1997). Although many agricultural groups have
made attempts to improve public’s perception of agriculture, there are other factors that contribute to its limitations, such as urbanization and less involvement in production agriculture (Terry & Lawver, 1995). Also, controversial issues such as food safety, animal rights and welfare and the environment tend to gain more media attention than those involved in traditional agriculture, leading to perception problems in the general public (Terry & Lawver, 1995). Although many stakeholders view agricultural education as an opportunity for youth to develop the skills and knowledge necessary to be successful in the agricultural industry, the shift in public perception greatly affects its application (Roberts & Ball, 2009).

Supervised Agricultural Experience Programs (SAEP) are another area of agricultural education influenced by agricultural businesses, industry and commodity groups. In 1917, the Smith-Hughes Act defined this concept as a component of experiential education. Section 10 of the Act states, “schools shall provide for directed or supervised practice in agriculture, either on a farm provided for by the school or other farm, for at least six months per year” (Smith-Hughes Act, 1917, Sec. 10). This set the stage for students to “learn by doing.” Today, SAEP’s are carried out by students who apply concepts and principals taught in the agriculture classrooms and connect them to real-world issues (SAE, 2010). These programs are vital to agricultural education as they provide students with real world application (Dyer & Williams, 1997). Changes in industry and technology have affected the types of supervised agricultural experiences in which students participate. Traditional forms of supervised agricultural experiences focused heavily on livestock and crop production. Although, now there are over 47 National FFA proficiency awards that reward outstanding SAE projects. These categories range from agricultural biotechnology research to food science placement and wildlife management entrepreneurship (National FFA Organization, 2011).
Research from agricultural colleges and businesses combined with changes in industry has established a foundation for change in agricultural education (Roberts & Ball, 2009). This is especially true for the classroom. For example, the term agrisience is now defined as, “the activities involved with the production of plants and animals and related supplies, services and mechanics, products, processing and marketing” (Burton & Cooper, 2007, p. 6). The content taught in classrooms is a mirrored image of the industry. Based on the review of the research, business and industry leaders have not been reliant on agricultural educators to assist in these changes. In fact, it is quite the opposite. Teachers have adjusted their curriculum based upon these changes but they are not seen as active agents of change.

The National FFA Organization

The final contributing component to agricultural education is the National FFA Organization (formerly Future Farmers of America). This organization was founded in 1928 for the purpose of bringing together agriculture teachers, students and agribusinesses to ensure support for agricultural education. Today, the organization is committed to, premier leadership, personal growth and career success (National FFA, 2011).

In 1950, the National FFA became a direct link for the profession to the United States Department of Education (USDE). It was at this time that the 81st Congress granted a federal charter to the National FFA Organization. This charter stated that FFA was an integral part of all agricultural education programs (National FFA Organization (FFA), 1998). One of the most influential components to the charter states that the governing body of the National FFA must consist of the Secretary of Education (or appointee) and other members of the Department of Education (Public Law 105-225). It is also mandated that the FFA be an integral part of the whole program of agricultural education at all levels including; federal,
state and local. This makes FFA unlike any other student organization under the umbrella of CTE, because it is directly connected by governance to the USDE.

The National FFA Organization creates a home for agricultural education within the USDE, but it is important to note that the organization is not exempt from being affected by societal changes. Even the name of the organization was changed from Future Farmers of America to the National FFA Organization in order to reach a broader student audience (National FFA, 1998).

Figure 1.1 showcases the direct and indirect impacts made on agricultural education from each of the four sectors. The influence of each area is distinct and shown in a visual representation in this model. To explore the model through the lens of CTE policies, an explanation is provided. The Vocational Education to Career and Technical Education policies were driven by legislators and labor interest groups. Their support helped establish CTE the Smith-Hughes and Carl D. Perkins Acts. These policies directed federal funding for CTE programs which in turn provides federal funding for agricultural education. This showcase of influence is similar for each of the areas identified in the model.
Even though these four sectors have impacted policy in agricultural education, educators have been seen as relatively inactive in their influence. However, they have not been completely absent. For example, the literature highlights the involvement from agriculture teachers in the 1985 Commission on Secondary Vocational Education. In order to move forward and address the societal changes that continually affect agricultural education, it is important to evaluate what perpetuates stakeholder involvement.

**Kentucky Agricultural Education**

Transitioning from a national scope of agricultural education to a more localized state level, the next section will focus on issues specific to Kentucky. Within the Commonwealth...
of Kentucky there have been two teacher-driven legislative movements that have impacted the profession. These two movements focused on 12-month employment contracts for Kentucky agriculture teachers and Kentucky FFA leadership and training center improvements. The first movement pertained to extended employment and was driven by a small group of agriculture teachers within the state (Chaliff, 2010). During this time, many school districts developed individual extended employment contracts to pay agriculture teachers for year-round employment for the work being done throughout the summer. However, some school districts were not willing to provide this same compensation. Consequently, this group gained support from industry and communicated with their legislators. With this support, legislators passed a government mandate for 12-month employment contracts for Kentucky agriculture teachers.

The second movement occurred in 2007 when Kentucky legislators allocated two million dollars from the Agricultural Development Board for the enhancement of the Kentucky FFA Leadership Training Center (Kentucky Revised Statues 157.360). This movement was spurred by poor quality restroom facilities and inadequate kitchen conditions at the training center. Teachers generated a strong support system through Kentucky Farm Bureau and other industry groups (Alvey, 2010). They were able to secure the funding necessary to update the FFA camp facilities. These two examples display Kentucky agriculture teachers actively engaged in policies affecting their profession (Chaliff, 2010). These two movements were influential in Kentucky but, to date, there has been limited involvement from teachers to address changes in the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) and Kentucky legislation, which impact classroom policies.

**Kentucky Council for Agricultural Education**

In the summer of 2010, a graduate student at the University of Kentucky was driven to discover a sustainable format for agricultural education in Kentucky. As a former teacher, she
saw varying activity among agriculture teachers within the state. The population of agriculture teachers ranged from inactive to very active in advocating for the profession. After conducting an in-depth literature review and several interviews with Kentucky stakeholders, five primary challenges associated with agricultural education emerged:

- **Agricultural literacy** - uninformed perceptions of agriculture and agricultural education (Frick, Birkenholz, Gardner and Machmes, 1995)
- **Professional internal identity** - lack of consistency and solidarity pertaining to purpose, vision and goals of agricultural education programs (Ross, 2010; Chaliff, 2010; Jackman, 2010)
- **Professional apathy** - stakeholders approach issues with reactivity or inactivity rather than proactively engaging the profession in community, state and national agendas (Ross, 2010)
- **Teacher attrition** - increasing numbers of teachers pursuing other professions after three years in the classroom (Kantrovich, 2007)
- **Lack of support and funding** - Poor administrative and community support are catalysts for teacher attrition (Boone & Boone, 2009)

After identifying these five factors, the researcher met with agricultural education stakeholders at the annual Kentucky Agricultural Education meeting in January of 2011. The specific stakeholders in attendance included, Kentucky Association of Agricultural Educators (KAAE) representatives, Kentucky State Agricultural Education staff, University representatives (including, Eastern Kentucky University, Murray State University and the University of Kentucky), and other teachers. At this time presented a proposal to develop a Kentucky Council for Agricultural Education that would provide sustainability. The group
accepted the proposal and appointed four founding committee members. This committee represented stakeholder groups present during the meeting and was comprised of, an active teacher, state staff member, university representative and student (council coordinator and researcher). The goals of this committee were to develop the by-laws and constitution that will serve as the framework for the council. This founding group of members developed the council with the following mission and objectives:

Mission The Kentucky Council for Agricultural Education will provide visionary leadership for the total program of agricultural education in Kentucky. With a purpose to meet the needs of students, schools and the agricultural industry in the 21st century through the innovation and direction for teaching and learning, research and advocacy.

Objectives

a. Offer innovative direction for the enhancement of teaching and learning in agricultural education in Kentucky

b. To engage in present and future research and development that will impact agricultural education in Kentucky

c. To serve as an advocate at the school, community and state level

d. Involve Kentucky agricultural industries in the planning and evaluating of quality educational programs and processes

e. Provide a grassroots forum for stakeholders in agricultural education to address issues and develop solutions to issues affecting agricultural education

f. Provide and maintain supporting resources for the enhancement of agricultural education
g. Identify and coordinate members to participate in task forces and meet the needs of agricultural education identified as the state agenda

After the KCAE development process was completed in July 2011, there was a continued lack of involvement among current practitioners. The researcher determined it was imperative to understand the reasons for the lack of involvement in order to continue to effectively develop and manage a grassroots movement. By understanding what factors drive stakeholder involvement leadership in these groups can begin to address them. For example, teacher educators can start addressing these factors in pre-service education and classroom training. Also, state staff members can assist in developing professional development sessions for teachers already active in the field.

The development of the KCAE was the motivating factor for this study. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to evaluate stakeholder priorities regarding issues facing agricultural education as identified by the KCAE founding committee. Also, the researcher sought to examine the role emotions play in the stakeholders’ perceived agency or ability to act within the profession.
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Agricultural education has been informed by four major areas including agricultural education (teaching and learning), educational policy, agricultural policy (industry collaboration) and research. These areas have been driven by the involvement of stakeholders within the profession. However, as the literature suggests, stakeholders become involved in policymaking in order to address the changing needs of the society (Thompson, 1973). One historical example was the need to establish an educated workforce. In 1914, both industry stakeholders and agriculturalists actively joined together to solidify agricultural education by taking part in the Commission to National Aid to Vocational Education. The stakeholders that were a part of this commission answered societal needs and placed a national importance on agricultural education with the creation of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917 (Thompson, 1973; Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, 1914; Camp, 1987). Another example is showcased in Kentucky’s history when agriculture teachers were actively engaged in a grassroots movement that proposed state-mandated 12-month extended employment contracts (Chaliff, 2010). The teachers were driven by the professional problems associated with their profession. As a result, teachers succeeded and actively joined together stakeholder groups to encourage legislators to value the development of the mandated contracts.

Both situations provide clear examples of stakeholder involvement. However, there were also times where involvement at both the state and national levels have been absent. These examples are highlighted throughout the history of agricultural education. One example includes the delayed reaction for the profession to develop high-level science concepts into agricultural education. Although few state-wide initiatives had been implemented after the initial recommendations occurred in 1985, a national curriculum initiative was not developed
until 2007. This phenomenon across agricultural education can best be explained utilizing appraisal theory.

**Theoretical Framework**

Appraisal theory can be best used to explain the way individuals interact in the world in which they live and how they evaluate the events in their life (Lazarus & Folkman, 1987). This process occurs when an individual appraises a specific event or stimulus in his/her life (Lazarus, 1991; Lazarus & Folkman, 1987; Sherer, 2005). Lazarus (1991) suggested that the process of appraising an event evokes emotions. The emotion an individual triggers is associated with his/her perceived ability to act. Within the context of this study, this is referred to as professional agency. A conceptual representation of this concept with application of this research is represented in Figure 2.1, utilizing the four areas of need as identified by the KCAE.
This model showcases appraisal theory through a set of fixed dimensions or criteria that are used in evaluating the significance of an event. Sherer (2005) enhanced appraisal theory by conducting an extensive review of studies to identify the dimensions of appraisal. These have been categorized into four major classes. For the purpose of this study the researcher has transitioned these classes to focus on an individual’s professional appraisal. These classes include the following:

1. Internal characteristics of an object or event, such as intrinsic interest, familiarity or attractiveness of the event.
2. The significance of an event to an individual’s own professional needs or goals
3. The compatibility of the event with the professional or personal standards, norms and values.

4. The individual’s ability to cope with the consequences of the event or to act on the event including his/her evaluation of his/her professional “agency”

The four dimensions of appraisal begin with evaluating an individual’s interest (priority) or familiarity in a specific event or the attractiveness of the event. The level of familiarity that an individual feels towards an issue can directly affect his/her level of interest in the area (Frijda, 1986). This concept also contributes to the person’s emotional appraisal of the event (Sherer, 2005). The second dimension is associated with the significance of the stimuli to the individual’s professional goals. People tend to make decisions based upon their personal background. This personal background is also connected to their professional goals. This background is then evaluated based on how it aligns with their values and the external influences of societal norms (Meyer & Turner, 2006; Lazarus, 1991; Zhu & Thagard, 2002). This leads to the third class of the appraisal the compatibility of the event with the individual’s values and societal norms. Therefore the level in which an individual sees common values and norms in a stimulus can influence his/her emotional appraisal towards it.

Emotions are evoked as individuals evaluate stimuli through these three classes (Sherer, 2005). While the emotions have been defined in a number of ways, there is no widely agreed upon definition for emotion. This is because the nature of emotions; components and classifications vary from each different perspective (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995). The researcher has defined emotions as short-lived experiences that produce a coordinated change in a person’s thoughts, actions and physiological responses (Robinson & Clore, 2001; Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995). These emotions are classified into six primary categories including; love, joy, surprise, anger, sadness and fear (Parrott, 2001).
In humans, emotions prompt us or create an urge or readiness for us to do something or act in a certain way (Oatley, Keltner & Jenkins, 2006). For example, anger can often times lead to acts of protest while fear can lead an individual to feel helpless. In contrast, emotions associated with joy can lead to professional leadership. It can then be concluded that human action (agency) is greatly affected by the emotions an individual may evoke based on his/her appraisal.

Emotions directly impact the fourth class as identified by Sherer (2005), which is the individual’s evaluation of his/her professional agency. Human agency has been explained as the perception that oneself or some other person is responsible for and/or in control of a situation (Smith & Ellsworth, 1988). Research has shown that individual agency is most impacted by negative emotions (Smith & Ellsworth, 1988; Tesser, 1990).

Appraisal of stimuli varies among individuals (Sherer, 2005). In a professional setting, this could also be applied to stakeholders groups. This can be explained most clearly through a hypothetical situation. The following situation uses agricultural policy as a stimulus. The specific issue includes proposed alterations to U.S. Farm Bill legislation, eliminating crop subsidies. An agricultural commodity group member (stakeholder) may be angry (emotion) towards this stimulus because it greatly affects the members of their organizations (priority). As a result, they are vocal about changes to the legislation by contacting their legislator (agency). This stakeholder appraisal can be visualized through Figure 2.2.
Figure 2.2. “The model of professional agency example: agricultural commodity group member appraisal of proposed Farm Bill legislation.”

The appraisal and perceived agency of this stimulus may change based on the stakeholder. For example, a university teacher educator (stakeholder) may not have a professional interest in crop production (priority), and feel content (emotion) with the changes and, therefore, choose not to communicate with their legislator (agency) because he/she is apathetic to the changes in the legislation. The appraisal of the university educator stakeholder may be best visualized below in Figure 2.3.
Figure 2.3 “The model of professional agency example: university teacher educator appraisal of proposed Farm Bill legislation.”

In summary, the four classes of a stimulus appraisal as outlined by Sherer (2005), will be used to evaluate an individuals’ evoked emotion towards a given stimulus and how that emotion affects his/her ability to act (agency). Research suggests that individuals appraise similar stimuli in very different ways, therefore, it will be important to examine all the stakeholder groups within this study (Sherer, 2005). Utilizing appraisal theory, the emotional appraisal and the perceived professional agency of stakeholders in agricultural education will be measured to determine what emotions prompt stakeholders to act.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Societal shifts and social conditions continue to impact the policy making process (Thompson, 1973). In fact, experts assert stakeholders in agricultural education have often been reactionary to the issues facing the profession (Boone & Boone, 2009; Thompson, 1973; Chaliff, 2010; Ross, 2010; Jackman, 2010). However, these visceral reactions are often too late to address proposed policy changes; therefore, many of the policies that affect agricultural education are at the hands of non teachers (Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, 1914; Thompson 1973; Threeton, 2007). Yet, when teachers have been proactive and engaged in the policy development process, positive things have occurred. For example, teachers led a grassroots movement in Kentucky to the mandate 12-month employment contracts from the government. This proactive example poses the following questions: What drives agriculture teachers to be involved in educational policies that affect their profession? Are they driven by their individual interest or emotions they may have towards these issues?

Addressing the issue of what specifically drives an individual’s involvement is necessary in order to understand their actions. One of the ways previously mentioned is an individual’s emotional response to a situation. There are several studies focusing on the emotional appraisal of events and how they differ from person to person. However, there is little research regarding the effect of emotional appraisal on human agency within agricultural education. In order to gain a deeper understanding of this need, the following purpose and objectives were developed.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to evaluate stakeholder priorities regarding issues facing agricultural education as identified by the KCAE founding committee. Also, the researcher sought to examine the role emotions play in the stakeholders’ perceived agency or ability to act within the profession.

Stakeholders in agriculture education as defined by KCAE founding committee:

1. Kentucky agriculture teachers;
2. Kentucky state agricultural education state staff members;
3. Kentucky teacher educators and university professors;
4. Kentucky FFA Alumni;
5. Kentucky agricultural industry educators; and
6. Kentucky agricultural education students (College Level).

Objectives

The following objectives were used to guide the researcher in this study;

1. Evaluate the extent to which the professional priorities of agricultural education stakeholders align with those outlined by the Kentucky Council for Agricultural Education, specifically in the following categories:
   a. Agricultural Education;
   b. Agricultural Policy (Industry Collaboration);
   c. Educational Policy; and
   d. Research.
2. Examine differences/similarities in stakeholder priorities regarding the five categories outlined by the Kentucky Council for Agricultural Education.
3. Determine stakeholder emotions towards KCAE established priorities.
4. Determine if emotional differences exist among stakeholder groups.
5. Examine the role emotions play in stakeholder’s perceived agency or ability to act within stakeholder involvement within the profession.

**Research Hypotheses**

The following research hypotheses were developed in order to effectively test the previously stated objectives.

H1- There are differences in the perceived professional interests of stakeholders based on their role within the profession.

H₀- No differences exist in the perceived professional interests of stakeholder groups in Kentucky Agricultural Education.

H2- There are differences in emotions towards issues in professional priorities among Kentucky Agricultural Education Stakeholders based on their stakeholder groups.

H₀- There are no differences in emotions towards KCAE established priorities among Kentucky Agricultural Education Stakeholders.

H3- The level of perceived professional agency of Kentucky Agricultural education stakeholders varies based on stakeholder group.

H₀- The level of perceived professional agency of Kentucky Agricultural education stakeholders does not vary based on the stakeholder group.

H4- The expressed emotions of stakeholders in Kentucky Agricultural education influences their perceived professional agency within the profession.
H₀- The expressed emotions of stakeholders in Kentucky Agricultural education does not influence their perceived professional agency within the profession.

**Significance of the Study**

While there is much research being applied to the emotional connection to motivation and action, there is little research specifically on agricultural education. It is very important that the needs of the stakeholders are met through the objectives of the Kentucky Council for Agricultural Education. Therefore, the researcher sought to identify the extent to which each stakeholder group is interested in the KCAE priorities and also identify which emotions can stimulate motivation to act or disengage in the process of developing the profession.

**Rationale for Research Methodology**

The objectives of this study call for the perspectives of a broad stakeholder population. Therefore, quantitative inquiry was used with a survey and questionnaire research design. A questionnaire was designed and implemented because it was cost effective and it had the ability to reach a wide range of participants (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001).

**Population of Inquiry**

The researcher sought to gain the perspectives of identified Kentucky Agricultural Education stakeholders, therefore a purposeful sampling technique was used. In this sampling technique, the researcher chose the most influential individuals to the purpose of the study (i.e. specific stakeholders in agricultural education). The population of this study included a wide range of stakeholders who influenced agricultural education. High school students were identified as a stakeholder group; however, their access to and awareness of the identified issues were seen as limited. Therefore, this stakeholder group was not included in the study.
The stakeholder groups, defined by the KCAE founding committee, and their populations are identified in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky agriculture teachers</td>
<td>N=250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky state agricultural education state staff members</td>
<td>N=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky teacher educators/university professors</td>
<td>N=9 (number of agricultural education teacher educators across five universities in Kentucky)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky FFA Alumni Members</td>
<td>N=68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky agricultural industry educators</td>
<td>N=16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky agricultural education students (Collegiate Level)</td>
<td>N=120- number of students enrolled Kentucky Agricultural Education Teacher Education Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>n=418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Commonwealth of Kentucky currently employs 250 agriculture teachers, three state staff members, nine teacher educators representing five state universities and over 1500 dues paying FFA Alumni members. However, the researcher could only obtain access to 68 FFA Alumni members using the state-wide list serve. This list serve only included 68 members because the FFA Alumni association did not have a database of contact information for the members. The sample included 16 individuals involved directly in industry education across all commodity groups. It also included 120 students enrolled in agricultural education at the undergraduate collegiate level. Purposeful sampling procedures were utilized to identify members and the researcher relied on stakeholder leaders and other groups to send the questionnaire via the respective listserv. All members of these groups were contacted and the sample size included 418 participants (Chaliff, 2011).
Data Collection

Instrument Design

A researcher-developed questionnaire (Appendix A) consisting of 29 questions covered the following dependent and independent variables. The dependent variables include the perceived level of professional agency in educational and agricultural policy making. (Table 3) The independent variables include the following:

1. Stakeholder role in the profession- teacher, university professor, FFA alumni member, state staff, college student and industry educator

2. Level of interest (priority)- Agricultural (teaching and learning), educational policy, agricultural policy and research

3. Emotions towards issues affecting the profession- love (passionate), joy (content), surprise (astonished), anger (aggravated), sadness (disappointed), fear (apprehensive)

The following instruments influenced the format and design of the questionnaire; the Davis Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI); the Appraisal of Life Events (ALE) scale; and the Personal Involvement Inventory (PII). These were chosen because they evaluated similar constructs. These constructs included emotional appraisal, individual interest and personal involvement (Davis, 1983; Ferguson, Matthews & Cox, 1999; Zaichkowsky, 1985; Murry, Lastovicka and Singh, 1994 & Flynn & Goldsmith, 1993).

The instrument was divided into four sections to measure adequately the established constructs. These include professional interests of stakeholders, emotional appraisal of issues facing Kentucky agricultural education, perceived level of professional agency towards these issues and demographic information in regards to their role within profession. An explanation
of each objective with detail of the questionnaire design and content is provided below. Objectives two and four utilize data gathered from previous objectives. Therefore, they will be omitted in this section but explained further in the data analysis component.

**Section One: Professional interests of stakeholders**

(Objective 1) Evaluate the extent to which the professional interests of agricultural education stakeholders align with those outlined by the Kentucky Council for Agricultural Education. Questions 1-12 of this instrument focused on the stakeholder’s professional level of interests in the following categories:

a. Agricultural Education (Questions 1, 3 & 11);

b. Agricultural Policy (Industry Collaboration) (Questions 4, 5 & 7);

c. Educational Policy (Questions 6, 9 & 12); and

d. Research (Questions 2, 8 & 10).

Similar to the IRI, this questionnaire used statements that are categorized and ranked. Once a participant completed the entire questionnaire, the information was calculated independently in an attempt to connect the stakeholder perceptions, individual perceptions and the intended measurement. Answers to the statements in this portion were given on a continuous scale. Subjects chose between predetermined responses to determine the value to which the respondent can most relate. The scale ranged from 1-5 and respondents were asked to choose to which extent they agree or disagree with the statement (1 being disagree and 5 being agree). This was used because it is the most effective technique for providing participants clarity in their level of agreement with the statements and also providing a continuous scale to analyze the data (Johnson, & Bhattacharayya, 2010).

**Section Two: Emotional Appraisal**
(Objective 3) Determine if differences in emotions exist towards Kentucky educational and agricultural issues which influence the profession exists among stakeholder groups.

Questions 13-16 of this questionnaire focused on the five primary areas of emotions including; love; joy; surprise; anger; sadness and fear. These emotions are associated with phrases that participants were asked to choose based on how they feel towards specific issues or scenarios. For the purpose of this study, the researcher chose terminology from a list of tertiary emotions as identified by Parrott (2001). Tertiary emotions are categorized into the list of primary emotions as explained in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2
*List of primary and tertiary emotions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Tertiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Passionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Astonished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Aggravated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>Displeasured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Modified from Parrot, 2001.*

Four statements were included in this section. For each statement the participant was asked to fill in the word that best describes the emotions they have towards the statement. This portion of the questionnaire used closed form questions with predetermined answers in order to allow respondents quicker response time and ease in recording (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001).

**Section Three: Perceived Professional Agency**
(Objective 4) Examine the role emotions play in stakeholder’s perceived agency or ability to act within stakeholder involvement within the profession. Questions 17-24 of this instrument focused on evaluating the perceived professional agency of the participants. Each participant was asked to rank his/her level of perceived involvement in six categories including:

1. Involvement in promoting community agricultural education program and FFA Chapter;
2. Involvement in local government;
3. Involvement in state government;
4. Involvement in federal government;
5. Involvement in state professional association; and
6. Involvement in national professional association.

Participants were asked to rank statements using a continuous scale. This scale ranged from 1-5 with 1 being no involvement and 5 being high involvement. Subjects chose between predetermined responses to determine to which value they can most relate in order to determine their own perceived involvement in the profession. Once they answered each question, there was an optional open-ended question. This question asked them to list examples of their involvement. These questions added depth and accuracy to the quantitative data (McMillian & Schumacher, 2001).

Section Four: Demographic information

Questions 25-29 are demographic questions used to identify participant professional roles. These questions were placed at the end of the questionnaire as personal demographics may be viewed as more sensitive information and the participant may not feel comfortable answering at the beginning. These questions can be seen in Appendix A in questions 25-29.
Validity

A panel of experts from the University of Kentucky reviewed the instrument to establish content validity. The panel included three Community and Leadership Department faculty members including a teacher educator in agricultural education, an adjunct professor and policy expert within the agricultural education industry, and an associate professor with expertise in survey design and evaluation. Upon review, the panel of experts determined that items were appropriate for measuring the established constructs (Ary, Jacobs & Razaveih, 2002).

The instrument was then pilot tested to establish face validity and test the ease of understanding. This pilot test was conducted by 58 University of Kentucky undergraduate students in a Community and Leadership Development course. Although pilot that participants were similar to the identified stakeholder groups, they were not part of the study population. Comment boxes were included on the questionnaire to receive feedback on the length of the instrument and for other comments or concerns participants may have had (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). Once feedback was received from the pilot participants, the instrument was returned to the panel of experts for final approval.

Instrument Facilitation

The questionnaire was posted on an online website for 24 days. In order to encourage the population to take part in the survey, an e-mail message was drafted describing the purpose of the survey, the objectives and a brief description of the instructions (Dillman, 2000). This questionnaire was posted to www.surveymonkey.com. This website was chosen because of the ease to use, the user and operator. It is important to note that it was assumed participants had access to and could effectively utilize the Internet.
The sample was purposely selected and accessed through state and university listservs. It is important to note that this was in an effort to reduce coverage error. Coverage error occurs when not all people in a population have an equal opportunity to be surveyed (Dillman, 2000). In the case of the FFA alumni, the entire number of participants was not accessed because a collective list of paid members was not available during the time of the study. Three e-mail reminders were sent to reduce non-response error. Reminders were sent on day 7, day 14 and day 22.

**Data Analysis**

**Objective 1**- Evaluate the extent to which the professional priorities of agricultural education stakeholders align with those outlined by the Kentucky Council for Agricultural Education.

A description of the level of professional interest stakeholders across four priorities of the KCAE, including, agricultural education, agricultural policy, educational policy and research were collected. The means of the interest levels across stakeholder groups were generated to provide a descriptive analysis of the overall groups.

**Objective 2**- Examine differences/similarities in stakeholder priorities regarding the five categories outlined by the Kentucky Council for Agricultural Education.

The second objective called for a comparison of the statistical means of interest levels across the list of stakeholders. The researcher compared possible differences in stakeholder interest based on the category mean as well as the categories across the stakeholder groups. The data was further evaluated by conducting an analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine if differences between means existed. Four one-way ANOVAs were calculated in order to create a calculated score for each group. Post hoc tests were completed to examine where
these specific differences seemed. These tests provided insight into the interest levels of stakeholder groups and identified possible differences between stakeholder groups.

**Objective 3 & 4** - Determine stakeholder emotions towards KCAE established priorities and determine if emotional differences exist among stakeholder groups.

The data relating to the third objective was analyzed by examining the emotional responses stakeholders have towards issues in the professional priorities listed above. This was accomplished by measuring the frequency of expressed emotions among stakeholder groups in response to council priority areas. Chi-Square analyses were used to determine if differences in frequencies of the response across stakeholder groups occurred by chance. This analysis was necessary to explore the frequency of expressed emotions to determine how stakeholders appraised specific situations.

**Objective 4** - Examine the role of emotions play in stakeholder’s perceived agency or ability to act within stakeholder involvement within the profession.

Data was evaluated using predictive statistics and a comparison of means across the levels of involvement (average and each specific involvement area). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine a difference of means. This was done in order to attempt to predict the individuals involvement based on emotions towards specific issues; therefore, seeking to explain behavior and involvement based on emotion.

**Role of the Researcher**

The researcher is a member of the Kentucky Council for Agricultural Education founding committee and is the presiding Chairman of the Council. In this capacity, she has served as the corresponding individual primarily responsible for the development and coordination of the organization.
Limitations of the Study

Limitations of this study could arise from the response rate of the questionnaire. By contacting numerous groups of stakeholders within the profession, it may be difficult to gain the total of feedback from each stakeholder group. This study could only be inferred to the desired population of stakeholders within agricultural education and is only applicable during the time of surveying due to the rate of change within the teaching profession and agricultural industry. The diverse population of the stakeholders within agriculture education also serves as a limitation to the study. This is a limitation because there are a number of individuals involved at numerous levels in agricultural education and many are inaccessible for the purpose of this study due to limited resources for organizations and lack of a membership database, as in the case of the FFA Alumni group.

Basic Assumptions

1. The stakeholders identified by the KCAE founding committee provide an adequate representation of the entities impacting the profession.

2. Stakeholders have answered questions on the questionnaire truthfully.
CHAPTER IV- FINDINGS

Respondents for this study included 132 Kentucky Agricultural Education stakeholders in the following areas: teacher, college student (identified as student), industry educator, university professors, state staff members; and FFA Alumni (Table 4.1). The highest percentage of participants were teachers at 40% and the smallest of the population is seen as state staff members making up only 3% of the total population. However 9.8% of participants did not identify which stakeholder group they were classified as and, therefore, their information was omitted from further data analysis. This decreases the usable number of participants to 119 or 28.5%.

Table 4.1
Response of stakeholder participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of stakeholder group population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Educator</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff Member</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective one- Evaluate the extent to which the professional priorities of agricultural education stakeholders align with those outlined by the Kentucky Council for Agricultural Education.

The research sought to evaluate the extent to which the professional priorities of Kentucky Agricultural Education stakeholders aligned with those outlined by the Kentucky Council for Agricultural Education with objective one. The questionnaire has a 5-point scale response format, where the participant chooses the level of agreement (5) or disagreement (1). The priorities included in this segment are agricultural education (teaching and learning), agricultural policy (industry collaboration), educational policy and research. Tables 7-10 showcase the mean responses to the stakeholder’s perceived levels of interests in each area. In each table the individual statement scores along with the overall mean scores have been provided for review to explore the specific statements and the stakeholder responses. Statements that had a (-) symbol after the statement indicate that the score was reversed in data analysis due to the statement being a negative response. These negative responses have already been transposed in the tables and data presented.

The researcher found all interest levels of stakeholders within agricultural education are above a 4.0 on a scale of 5.00. The mean scores for each area have been calculated and are included in tables identified in the Appendix as Appendix B. To showcase the mean scores they are as follows:

- Agricultural education teaching and learning- 4.07 on a scale of 5.00
- Agricultural Policy- 4.19 on a scale of 5.00
- Educational Policy - 4.29 on a scale of 5.00
- Research in agricultural education- 4.25 on a scale of 5.00
This indicates that the interest levels of stakeholders do align with this professional priority of the Kentucky Council for Agricultural Education.

**Objective two-** Examine differences/similarities in stakeholder priorities regarding the five categories outlined by the Kentucky Council for Agricultural Education.

Objective two compared the mean scores of all stakeholder groups in Kentucky Agricultural Education. The following tables summarize the mean scores in all four identified priority areas according to each of the stakeholder groups. In order to test for the perceived interest level of the four priority areas a series of ANOVAs (analysis of variance) was completed for each priority area. None of the priority areas showcased a statistical significance (p>.05) therefore the researcher accepted the null hypothesis stating that no differences exist in interest levels in the professional priorities among the stakeholder groups. These analyzes’ can be seen in tables in Appendix C.

Although the ANOVAs showcased no statistical significance for differences among the means, it is important for the Kentucky Council for Agricultural Education that the mean interest levels for stakeholders in all four areas are <3.0. Once again, this does showcase that the identified priority areas of the Kentucky Council for Agricultural Education do align with the perceived interest levels of the stakeholders in agricultural education.
Objective three: Determine stakeholder emotions towards KCAE established priorities. Objective three described the emotions of stakeholders towards issues in agricultural education (specifically towards priority categories). Tables 4.14-4.17, provide the frequency of the listed emotions towards each priority area in agricultural education including agricultural education teaching and learning, agricultural policy, educational policy and research. This portion of the questionnaire required participants to select the emotional response that best described their specific emotions to the issues given in agricultural education. The respondents chose from the six emotions as listed below.

Table 4.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotions expressed towards agricultural education teaching and learning</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passionate about</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content with</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished by</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated with</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed by</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive about</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data gathered from the 119 respondents showed that 31.1% expressed a passionate emotion towards issues in agricultural education teaching and learning as the stimulus. While 24.4% expressed aggravation and 22.7% expressed disappointment. This indicates that stakeholders primarily expressed these three emotions towards agricultural education. Examples of these issues include possible program closures, lack of community support and threats to teacher extended employment.
Table 4.15

*Emotions expressed towards agricultural policy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passionate about</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content with</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished by</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated with</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed by</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive about</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data gathered from the 119 respondents shows that 48.7% expressed a passionate emotion towards issues in agricultural policy as the stimulus, while 21.8% were apprehensive about agricultural policy and 13.4% were content with issues affecting these same policies. This indicates that the primary emotion expressed towards agricultural policy issues such as agricultural literacy, industry involvement and the U.S. Farm Bill was the positive emotion of passionate.

Table 4.16

*Emotions expressed towards educational policy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passionate about</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content with</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished by</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated with</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed by</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive about</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, the data gathered from the 119 respondents showcases that 48.7% expressed a passionate emotion towards issues in educational policy as the stimulus, while 26.1%
expressed contentment and 15.1% of the respondents were apprehensive about issues in educational policy. This data indicates that the stakeholders are again primarily passionate about issues affecting policy. Examples of these issues in educational policy include STEM integration, Career and College Readiness standards and funding through Perkins.

Table 4.17
*Emotions expressed towards research*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passionate about</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content with</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished by</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated with</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed by</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive about</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In examining the final priority, research, from the data provided by the 119 respondents 42% were content with issues in research as the stimulus, while 37% expressed a passionate emotion towards the same issues which include, the application of scholarly journals, publications and articles to their classroom and career. This indicates that stakeholders express primarily positive emotions towards research that affects their agricultural education classroom.

The results from the analysis of objective 3 showcase a wide variety of emotions towards the different priority areas presented in Kentucky agricultural education. The emotions expressed in each area are varied however passionate, aggravated, apprehensive and content were the most commonly expressed emotions.
Objective four- Determine if emotional differences exist among stakeholder groups.

When evaluating objective four, the researcher sought to determine if a difference existed in the frequency of emotions expressed towards issues in priority areas within agricultural education based on the role of the stakeholder group. Cross tabulations and Chi-Square analysis were used to compare the emotions expressed by stakeholder groups within each area in agricultural education. Stakeholder groups and emotional categories with less than 5 respondents were eliminated as it could falsify the data. As a result, only two stakeholder groups could be compared with the Chi-Square analysis.

When examining significant differences of the frequency of emotions expressed between teachers and students in agricultural education the researcher found that there was no significant difference. Although, slight differences existed among all stakeholders, Chi-Square analysis showed that there were no statistically significant differences (p value > .05) in agricultural policy and educational policy as seen in the tables in Appendix D. However, both areas of teaching and learning and research indicated significance. The first area of statistical significance is showcased in emotions expressed towards agricultural education (teaching and learning). The findings indicate that teachers are more likely to be passionate about issues in agricultural education teaching and learning than students and also significantly more disappointed by these same issues than students are. Similarly, a Chi-Square analysis of teachers and students that were passionate and content with research in agricultural education displayed a statistically significant result.

The Chi-Square analysis of the two emotions passionate and content in research in agricultural education indicates that teachers are more likely express emotional contentment with educational research than the students. Also, students are more likely to be passionate towards educational research than teachers. These results could be connected to their exposure
and/or involvement in research at the university level. Therefore, both of these results could lead to further studies examining the stakeholder’s emotional expression towards both teaching and learning and research in regards to their exposure to issues affecting it.

**Objective five**- Examine the role of emotions play in stakeholder’s perceived agency or ability to act within stakeholder involvement within the profession. Objective five examines the role emotions play in the perceived professional agency of stakeholders in Kentucky agricultural education. In order to adequately answer this objective an analysis of the perceived professional agency across the stakeholder groups was addressed. This portion of the questionnaire allowed respondents to select the perceived involvement they have in specific areas of agricultural education. This was established on a scale of one to five (one being no involvement and five being high involvement). Tables in Appendix E, showcase the mean scores of involvement among stakeholder groups in multiple areas of agricultural education including involvement in local agricultural education programs, local government, state government, national government, reading literature or e-mails relating to the profession, volunteering with the local agriculture education program, state professional associations and national professional associations. The average involvement scores across each stakeholder group is a compilation of the involvement levels in each of the areas of professional agency within the profession.

This data suggests that across the stakeholder categories the three highest areas of involvement include reading literature and e-mails relating to the profession with a mean score of 3.75; involvement in local agricultural program with a mean score of 3.63; and the third one is volunteering in the local program with a mean score of 3.03. The areas with the lowest levels of involvement include involvement in national government with a mean score
of 1.7; involvement in local government with a mean score of 1.8; and involvement with state
government with a mean score of 1.88.

An ANOVA test was run to identify possible differences in mean scores among
stakeholder groups based on levels of perceived professional agency. Any statistically
significant data was followed up with post hoc tests to identify where these differences exist.
These tests found that in local program involvement there was a statistically significant
difference of (p=.000). The post hoc tests showcased that teachers have a significantly higher
mean level of involvement than all other stakeholder groups.

Involvement in national government also showed a statistical significance (p=.006). Post
hoc tests revealed the alumni stakeholder group had more involvement than the teacher group.
When examining the involvement level of stakeholders in the state professional associations
there was a significant difference of (p=.001). This showcases that university professors, state
staff and industry groups all have more involvement in their state professional and industry
organizations than the alumni group.

Reading literature and e-mails relating to the profession also showcased a statistical
significance at (p=.034). This indicated that industry educators and university professors were
more likely than other groups to read e-mails.

The final area of significance exists in the level of involvement in national professional
associations with a statistical significance of (p=.025). The differences exist in industry
having more involvement than both the teacher and alumni groups at this level. Table
Detailed tables of data relating to the analysis of this objective can be seen in Appendix G.
Table 4.28  
**Significant involvement areas based on stakeholder roles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of involvement</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local program involvement</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in national government</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in state professional associations</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading literature and e-mails relating to the profession</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in national professional associations</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test the effects of emotions on perceived levels of professional agency, analysis of variance was utilized. This analysis found that there were no differences among groups in the level of involvement when all the categories of involvement were combined. To explore the possible effects of emotions on perceived professional agency in the priority areas, ANOVAs were utilized to analyze the variance in emotions and action. Each area of involvement and priority area was tested.

In a comparison of emotional responses of stakeholders to the level of their local program involvement, it is shown as having a statistical significance. It is important to note the significant interaction between local program involvement and stakeholders that are aggravated and apprehensive. Stakeholders that expressed aggravation towards issues in agricultural education teaching and learning were significantly more involved in their local program than those that expressed apprehension in agricultural education.

When analyzing the comparison of the emotions of stakeholders and the level of involvement, stakeholders have in reading literature and emails relating to their profession. It is important to note that the significant interaction between this involvement is between stakeholders that are passionate and aggravated. Stakeholders that expressed passion towards
issues in agricultural education teaching and learning were significantly more involved in reading literature and e-mails that related to their profession than those that expressed aggravation towards the same issues in agricultural education.

The final statistical significance exists among the emotions of stakeholders in issues relating to research for agricultural education and their level of local program involvement. It is important to note the significant interaction between local program involvement and stakeholders that are content and apprehensive. Stakeholders that expressed contentment towards issues relating to research in agricultural education were significantly more involved in their local program than those that expressed apprehension in the same issues.

**Research Hypotheses**

The research hypotheses used to analyze the objectives were revisited to determine whether the researcher accepted or rejected the null hypothesis. An overview of the hypotheses has been provided below with an explanation of the researcher’s findings.

**H1**- There are differences in the perceived professional interests of stakeholders based on their role within the profession.

**Hₒ**- No differences exist in the perceived professional interests of stakeholder groups in Kentucky Agricultural Education. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis for objective two indicating that there were no significant differences in the perceived professional interest levels of stakeholders based on their group.

**H2**- There are differences in emotions towards issues in professional priorities among Kentucky Agricultural Education Stakeholders based on their stakeholder groups.
H₀- There are no differences in emotions towards KCAE established priorities among Kentucky Agricultural Education Stakeholders. The researcher failed to accept the null hypothesis stating there are differences in emotions towards KCAE established priorities based on stakeholder groups.

H₃- The level of perceived professional agency of Kentucky Agricultural education stakeholders varies based on stakeholder group.

H₀- The level of perceived professional agency of Kentucky Agricultural education stakeholders does not vary based on the stakeholder group. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis stating that significant differences do exist across stakeholder groups within the perceived professional agency in specific areas in agricultural education.

H₄- The expressed emotions of stakeholders in Kentucky Agricultural education influences their perceived professional agency within the profession.

H₀- The expressed emotions of stakeholders in Kentucky Agricultural education does not influence their perceived professional agency. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis stating that the emotions of stakeholders in Kentucky Agricultural Education does influence their perceived professional agency in some specific areas.
CHAPTER V–CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

It is evident that secondary agricultural education has been influenced by numerous stakeholders. However, often the individuals that have made the most influence in the policies affecting the profession have not been traditional agricultural educators. It is noted that only once in the historical review of the agricultural education profession at the national level was an agriculture teacher involved in the policy making process (Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, 1914; Thompson, 1973; Threeton, 2007; The Unfinished Agenda; the Role of Vocational Education in the High School, 1985). Therefore, after the extensive review of literature focusing on the involvement of stakeholders in agricultural education nationally and in Kentucky the researcher intended to identify possible reasons for professional agency (high and low involvement) specifically in the areas outlined by the KCAE. One possible cause could be the emotions expressed toward the issues in agricultural education. Lazarus (1991) suggests that the emotions an individual evokes towards specific stimuli (issues in agricultural education) can affect his/her perceived ability to act (professional agency).

Data from this study clearly shows a similar situation to the historical movement of stakeholders, displaying that Kentucky agricultural education stakeholders are relatively inactive in government and professional organizations within their profession. Although they are inactive in these areas, this does not mean necessarily that they are inactive in their profession; rather they are primarily inactive in the policy process. But, it is important to identify the reasons for the low levels of involvement. In order to do this it is imperative that the researcher further evaluate the findings of this research based on the individual objectives while also using the model of professional agency.
Objective One

The four priorities of the Kentucky Council for Agricultural Education evaluated in this research include agricultural education (teaching and learning), agricultural policy, educational policy, and research. The mean interest levels of stakeholders were greater than four in all areas. The highest perceived interest level was in educational policy with 4.29 as the mean interest level across stakeholder groups. It can be concluded that the professional priorities set forth by the KCAE aligned with the interest levels of stakeholders in agricultural education in Kentucky. This may be partially due to the fact that the founding committee set forth to develop the professional priorities accurately represented four of the six areas of stakeholders defined by the council. This also indicated that the individuals that participated in the founding committee provided a representative voice for the stakeholders when it came to setting professional priorities.

Objective Two

With the second objective, the researcher sought to identify possible significant differences among interest levels across the stakeholder groups. However, no significant differences were present. Although differences did exist in the level of interests among these groups, there were none so significant that the role of the stakeholder could be linked to their specific interests in any of the four areas of professional priorities. Therefore, this indicates that the four areas of professional priorities outlined by the KCAE founding committee are aligned with the stakeholders in the profession meaning that the Council has the potential to serve as a representative group for Kentucky Agricultural Education.

Objective Three

To further explore the model of professional agency, it was necessary to identify what emotions stakeholders in agricultural education expressed towards issues in each of the
priority areas. In agricultural education across all stakeholder groups regarding issues affecting agricultural education it was interesting to see that 31.1% of stakeholders were passionate, 24.4% were aggravated, 22.7% were disappointed by them and 16.8% were apprehensive. This priority area received the widest range of emotions; however, none of the respondents were content with the issues facing agricultural education. This may be an indicator that based on the individuals appraisal of specific issues in agricultural education their background or personal experience may contribute more to their appraisal than any other priority area. The emotional appraisal can vary from each individual based on these areas and the stimuli (Sherer, 2005). Therefore, the differences in their interests and backgrounds could lead to varied emotional responses.

In the second priority area agricultural policy, stakeholders asserted that they were primarily passionate about the issues in agricultural policy with 48% of the respondents expressing this emotion. The second emotion most prominently expressed was apprehension at 21.8% and then contentment was the third highest expressed emotion at 13.4%. The apprehensive emotion expressed could possibly result from the lack of background knowledge, exposure or comfortability the stakeholder may have in issues relating to agricultural policy. This could also suggest that further research be explored on the level of exposure that agricultural educators have to issues in agricultural policy.

The third priority area, educational policy, reported similarly to the emotional appraisal of agricultural policy. The most expressed emotion reported was passion at 48%. Contentment was reported second at 26.1%. Apprehension was third at 15.1%. This close connection may conclude that stakeholders are passionate, apprehensive and content with policies that affect their profession. Therefore, they either love (passion), are happy with (content), or are scared (apprehension) of the policies influencing their job. This could indicate again that the
background knowledge or comfortability level of stakeholders may be a factor playing into their appraisal of these issues. It may be necessary to further explore the comfortability of stakeholders with the policy process (for both educational policy and agricultural policy). If stakeholders are truly unsure of how these policies affect their profession and classrooms they may be too scared to be involved in the process; therefore, their professional agency is decreased.

The final priority area is research. This area showcased two most commonly expressed emotions by stakeholders. Data showed that 42% of stakeholders are content with issues facing research in agricultural education and 31% of them are passionate about these same issues. These results conclude that stakeholders are seemingly happy with research and its application to their classrooms. However, this does not assess the ability of stakeholders to utilize or practice research within their classrooms.

**Objective Four**

Although there were presented differences in the emotional responses of stakeholders based on prompts regarding issues in agricultural education, there were two areas that showed a statistically significant response. The first area focused on the emotional responses (passionate and content) of teachers and students in research in agricultural education. This showcased that teachers were more likely content with issues in research than students. One possible reason for this could be the exposure of students to educational research at the university level or it could also be caused from a difference in perception of the research that affects the profession and classroom.

The second area of statistical significance was in the area of emotions expressed towards issues in agricultural education (teaching and learning). This indicated that teachers are more likely to be passionate and disappointed about issues in agricultural education teaching and
learning than students. This could be contributed to the fact that teachers have significantly more exposure to issues in agricultural education than students that may either have graduated from agriculture programs or that are in pre-service programs.

**Objective Five**

The fifth objective addressed the third part of the model of professional agency. This part of the model showcased the level of involvement stakeholders have within their profession. Appraisal theory was used to explain this connection between interest level, emotion and perceived professional agency (or ability to act). With this objective, the researcher determined the mean average involvement of stakeholders across the stakeholder groups, while also examining their perceived ability to act within each area of involvement as well. The mean levels of involvement across all stakeholder groups in were greater than four on a scale of one to five. The highest areas of involvement were in reading literature and emails relating to the profession at 3.75, working to promote local agriculture programs at 3.63, involvement in state associations and professional industry groups at 3.23 and involvement in volunteering for the local agriculture program at 3.03. The three areas of involvement that were recorded as lowest levels of involvement for stakeholders include involvement in national government at 1.71, involvement in local government at 1.81 and involvement in state government at 1.88. These mean levels of involvement are interpreted as the perceived professional agency of the stakeholders. It is important to note in the means that display the lowest levels of involvement were relating were to government at the local, state and national levels.

Once the data was broken down further to explore teacher involvement in government (at all levels) the researcher found that teachers were below the mean levels of involvement in both state government with only 1.81 and national government with 1.46. However, they were
only slightly higher than the mean score of all stakeholders with regards to involvement in local government (1.89). These results are similar to the historical findings of teacher’s involvement in government and policy affecting their profession. The groups most involved in government (at all levels) were industry, alumni and state staff members. This was also reflected in the literature in the historical overview of the contribution of stakeholders in agricultural education policies. It is concluded that educators are still primarily uninvolved in the policy making process that affects their profession.

The model of professional agency

The intent of the research objectives was to gather data to analyze the appraisal of stakeholders in agricultural education and how that appraisal affects their ability to act within the profession. In order to do this, a series of tests were conducted to identify statistically significant data that would indicate the emotional appraisal is connected to professional agency. Three areas indicated statistical significance. These included emotions in agricultural education and the involvement in local agricultural programs, emotions in agricultural education and involvement in reading literature and emails relating to the profession and the final area in emotions in research and the involvement in local agricultural programs.

The first area suggests that stakeholders that expressed aggravation towards issues affecting agricultural education teaching and learning were significantly more involved than those stakeholders that were apprehensive. This also indicates that individuals that are apprehensive about the issues in agricultural education teaching and learning are significantly less involved in their local program. For example, if a stakeholder appraises a situation as fearful and expresses apprehension towards issues in agricultural education he/she is less likely to have a high level of perceived professional agency than a stakeholders who is
aggravated with these same issues. These findings support literature suggesting emotions create a readiness to act or do something in a certain way (Oatley, Keltner & Jenkins, 2006).

This same idea was appeared in the second data set with statistical significance. The researcher found that individuals that are passionate about agricultural education teaching and learning are significantly more involved in reading literature and emails relating to their profession than those aggravated with it. This leads to a conclusion that stakeholders that appraise the stimuli of issues in agricultural education by expressing an emotion of love are more likely to be involved in reading about their profession than those that appraised those same issues with an expression of anger.

The third area shown to have statistical significance in appraising emotions is in the area of research in agricultural education. The researcher found that stakeholders that appraised these issues with a joyous emotion (contentment) were more involved in a local agricultural education program than those who were apprehensive about the same issues. This example highlights the apprehensive (fearful) emotion again. This leads the researcher to believe that if a stakeholder appraises an issue in one of the four priority areas of agricultural education, with a fearful emotion it can lead to the stakeholder having a lower level of perceived professional agency. Although, this research did not seek to identify specific areas of fear, it could be a contributing factor to the perceived low level of involvement teachers have in government (at all levels).

Another conclusion drawn from the findings is that the appraised emotion aggravation (anger) can lead to both more involvement and less involvement. When compared to love, anger shows to have significantly less perceived involvement in areas of reading literature and emails relating to the profession. This can indicate that stakeholders that are angry towards issues in agricultural education are less likely to read literature and e-mails than those
expressing love towards those same issues. This is consistent with Fredrickson’s (2001) 
broaden and build theory of positive emotions, which states that positive emotions can 
prompt an individual to develop a more wide range of thoughts and actions to a situation 
(Fredrickson & Branigan, 2011). These positive emotions also encourage the building of 
resources including building social resources (friendship and support), intellectual resources 
(knowledge) and psychological (resilience, optimism and creativity). In this specific context 
of research stakeholders are indicating that by expressing passion or love towards these issues 
it prompts them to broaden their scope of understanding by reading more literature and e-
mails relating to their profession. This is also observed in stakeholders that expressed passion, 
being more involved than those that were apprehensive. Both emotions of apprehension and 
aggravation are negative emotions. When expressed by stakeholders they both inhibit and 
prompt action. This is also reflected in literature when showcasing the fight or flight 
responses to negative emotions (Fredrickson & Branigan, 2011). Although negative emotions 
can prompt specific action tendencies, in high arousal situations (anxiety or fear) it can 
sometimes narrow the scope of attention for an individual making it difficult to see the entire 
situation (Tyler & Tucker, 1981). This can assist in explaining the relationship between the 
appraisal of fear (apprehension) and anger (aggravation). In this specific context, stakeholders 
are showcasing a fight reaction to their angry appraisal whereas those appraising the situation 
as fearful are fleeing from the same situation. This can conclude that both positive and 
negative emotions can impact Kentucky Agricultural Education stakeholders. While negative 
emotions may prompt a stakeholder to be involved in some levels as a way to fight back in a 
situation, these negative emotions can often prompt them to avoid the situation. Whereas, the 
positive emotions evoked by stakeholders encourage broadening their attention to the issues 
by gaining more social, intellectual and psychological resources. Most important to note is
that broadening their attention and resources does not necessarily warrant action on these same issues. Therefore, it is important to explore other possible causes for a perceived low professional agency.

**Implications & Recommendations**

The findings of this research are valuable to the Kentucky Agricultural Education profession for a number of reasons, the first relating to the KCAE and the professional priorities outlined by the founding committee. It is important to report that the professional priorities of the KCAE do align with the Kentucky agricultural educations stakeholder. This indicates that the purpose, objectives and members of the Council have the capabilities to represent the overall needs of the profession.

The second important finding for the profession is the emotional responses of stakeholders to the issues facing agricultural education and the relationship of the stakeholder professional agency. By exploring the emotions that the Kentucky stakeholders have towards each of the priority areas in agricultural education specifically for teachers and students (pre-service teachers) and state organizations, the Council and university professors can begin to understand the lack of involvement in specific areas of agricultural education (i.e. involvement in government at all levels and involvement in state and national associations). By understanding the effects both positive and negative emotions have on action, these groups can utilize the emotional responses by helping both students and teachers to increase involvement. Because both students and teachers expressed positive emotions towards educational and agricultural policy it is the responsibility of state professional associations, the Council, state staff and university professors to develop ways to help teachers and students broaden their resources socially and intellectually. This can then result in stakeholders independently broadening their own sense of psychological resources (optimism, creativity
Recommendations to increase the level of professional agency in teacher stakeholders

- State professional associations, the KCAE and state staff members need to provide increased development of teachers in their knowledge and social base for local, state and national government.
  - Social: Assist in providing teachers opportunities to meet and develop relationships with local, state and national policy makers, host an event with legislators at conferences, provide support by encouraging them to speak at schools across the state and train teachers on how to properly develop relationships with policy makers and what influence this can have on the profession.
  - Intellectual: Provide more professional development workshops and conferences for teachers to increase their knowledge base of public policy and government, increase exposure to public policy education through literature sent to teachers (e-mail and newsletters) and assist in training teachers on how to incorporate advocacy and public policy into their classroom content.

- State professional associations, the KCAE and state staff members need to provide increased development of teachers in their knowledge and social base for involvement and leadership with state and national professional associations.
  - Social: Increase exposure to KAAE and NAAE officers and membership by hosting social and informational events and providing
opportunities for members to develop relationships and support systems through these programs (mentoring program through KAAE).

- Intellectual: Increase exposure to KAAE and NAAE mission, purpose and opportunities (regional and national conferences, awards and programs), offer incentives for teachers to attend, and provide literature and e-mail information relating to the profession for teachers to read and gain knowledge.

Recommendations to increase the level of professional agency in student stakeholders

- State professional associations, the KCAE and university professors need to provide increased development of students in their knowledge and social base for local, state and national government.

- Social: Assist in providing students opportunities to meet and develop relationships with local, state and national policy makers, provide support by encouraging them to speak at universities across the state and train students on how to properly develop relationships with policy makers and what influence this can have on the profession.

- Intellectual: Offer a pre-service course to increase the student’s knowledge base of educational and agricultural policy and government. This can be taught in the context of agricultural education by faculty members or by a guest lecturer. Increase student’s exposure to public policy education through encouraging them to be involved in the policy process while an undergraduate or graduate student. Also assist in training students on how to incorporate advocacy and public policy into their future classroom content.
• State professional associations, the KCAE and state staff members need to provide increased development of students in their knowledge and social base for involvement and leadership with state and national professional associations.

  o Social: Increase student exposure to KAAE and NAAE officers and membership by hosting social and informational events and providing opportunities for students to develop relationships and support systems with current members. This could be done by hosting student social and workshops at state teacher’s conference and offering incentives and scholarships for students to attend national conferences.

  o Intellectual: Increase exposure to KAAE and NAAE mission, purpose and opportunities (regional and national conferences, awards and programs), offer incentives for students to attend, and provide literature and e-mail information relating to the profession for students to read and gain knowledge. Incorporate involvement and leadership in state and national associations into curriculum for the undergraduate education so that students are made aware of the opportunities and purpose for involvement.

**Recommendations for further research**

Recommendations for further research in this area include modifying the methodology to complete a more efficient way to administer the questionnaire. Though the overall response rate was not unsatisfactory, having a larger sample size to analyze the data would provide for a richer data set; therefore, allowing for more exploration of the connection between action and emotion. It would also be beneficial to conduct this same survey of stakeholders within
agricultural education in another state. The state comparisons could be chosen based on the perceived involvement of teachers in the policy process within that specific state. This could provide a different context for the research but more so explain the results through a comparative analysis and possible case study. It would also be a recommendation to follow up with stakeholders to identify some of the following information:

- How do stakeholders classify or define involvement (agency)?
- What is the perception of involvement in government?
- Are stakeholders (specifically teachers) apprehensive about government specifically? Does this apprehension prompt disengagement?
- Are stakeholders intimidated or uncomfortable participating in specific areas of their own profession?
- Is there a relationship between gender and/or number of years in the profession and the level of involvement?
- Is there a relationship between emotions towards issues and the number of years in the profession?
- Is there a relationship between number of years in the profession and the leadership roles or specific involvement that stakeholders have had?
Kentucky Agricultural Education Stakeholder Index

This survey is intended to gain feedback from the stakeholders involved in Kentucky agricultural education. Because of your involvement you have been identified as a stakeholder and therefore your feedback is essential to the future success of the state.

Section 1
The following statements inquire about your thoughts and feelings in a variety of situations relating to agricultural education. For each item, please indicate on a scale of one to five (where one is disagree and five is agree) please rate each of the following statements. Please thoroughly read each phrase before answering and try to be as honest as possible. Thank you.

ANSWER SCALE:

(strongly disagree) 1………….2…………3………….4…………..5 (strongly agree)

1.  It is important to provide teachers opportunities to develop innovative ideas for quality teaching in agriculture education.

(strongly disagree) 1………….2…………3………….4…………..5 (strongly agree)

2.  I find it difficult to relate research to the classroom and because of that don’t think that it is necessary to our profession.

(strongly disagree) 1………….2…………3………….4…………..5 (strongly agree)

1.  Promotion of our school programs at the local level are suffering and need improvement.

(strongly disagree) 1………….2…………3………….4…………..5 (strongly agree)

1.  Agricultural industries are important to the curriculum taught in our classrooms and they should be consulted on new technology, job opportunities and information.

(strongly disagree) 1………….2…………3………….4…………..5 (strongly agree)

1.  I find it difficult to believe that the opinions of all KY agricultural education stakeholders are important to furthering the profession.

(strongly disagree) 1………….2…………3………….4…………..5 (strongly agree)

6.  Funding programs within our state is essential in continuing to maintain a quality educational experience for our students.
1. Consulting industry educators and allowing their involvement in the direction of Kentucky’s agricultural education scares me.

8. Research is highly important to agricultural education because it provides direction and legitimacy.

10. I don’t feel that students learn differently or that their learning changes over time therefore I do not need to be made aware of new “trends” in education.

11. There is an adequate amount of funding and it is distributed equally to all agriculture programs and students in the state.

12. Current educational policies do not need to be changed because they already emphasize the importance of agricultural education in core content classes.
## Section 2- Emotions

The following statements inquire about your emotions in a variety of situations relating to agricultural education. For each item choose one category of emotion that best fits the described statements. Please be sure to read each statement in its entirety prior to choosing the emotional category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>13. I am ___________________ the challenges and problems agriculture teachers face in the state of Kentucky such as the treats to teacher extended employment and possible program closures due to lack of community support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>14. I am ___________________ the changes in the education system in Kentucky including the emphasis on science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) integration and College and Career readiness standards. Along with maintaining adequate Perkins funding for agricultural education programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>15. I am ___________________ educational research and its true impact on agricultural education and agricultural literacy. Including how scholarly journals, publications and articles apply to my professional career and/or classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>16. I am ___________________ agricultural literacy and how both agricultural industry leaders and the changes in the 2012 U.S. Farm Bill will assist in directing the decision making process for agricultural education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section 3- Involvement Perceived Agency**

The following statements inquire about your involvement in a variety of situations relating to agricultural education. For each item, indicate the extent to which you feel you are involved. Please thoroughly read each prompt before answering and be as honest as possible. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Scale (1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. To what extent are you involved with your local agriculture program per month? (For teachers please include what is above and beyond your expected job requirements).</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide examples of your involvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. To what extent are you involved a month with your local government?</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide examples of your involvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. To what extent are you involved a month with your state government?</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide examples of your involvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. To what extent are you involved a month with issues in the national government?</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide examples of your involvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. To what extent are you involved in reading literature, e-mails or news on issues relating to your profession per month?</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide examples of your involvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. To what extent are you involved in volunteering within your local community by advocating for issues that affect agricultural education per month?</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide examples of your involvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. To what extent are you involved in the state association related to your profession or industry?</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide examples of your involvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. To what extent are you involved in the national association related to your profession or industry?</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide examples of your involvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4- Background

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability and chose only one answer based on your current role in the profession.

25. What is your role in Kentucky Agricultural Education?
   a. Teacher
   b. Student (please specify major)
   c. Industry representative (if so, please list your title)
   d. University professor (please specify which department)
   e. State Staff
   f. Alumni

26. Are you
   a. Male
   b. Female

27. Please identify which leadership positions (if any) in which you may have held. Please specify which organization.
   a. Local community advisory board member
   b. Officer in local/county professional organization
   c. Board member in local/county professional organization
   d. Committee member in local/county professional organization
   e. Officer in state professional organization
   f. Board member in state professional organization
   g. Committee member in state professional organization
   h. Officer in national professional organization
   i. Board member in national professional organization
   j. Committee member in national professional organization

28. How many years you been involved in your current position in Kentucky Agricultural Education?

29. How many years total have you been involved in Kentucky Agricultural Education (this may include in a number of roles)?
APPENDIX B

Table 4.2

Means and standard deviations from stakeholders responding to professional priorities in agricultural education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Statement (Agricultural Education)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of our school agriculture programs at the local level are suffering and need improvement.</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to provide teachers opportunities to develop innovative ideas for quality teaching in agriculture education.</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an inadequate amount of funding for agriculture programs and students in the state (-).</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Education Total Mean Score</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.6517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statements with (-) symbol indicate score was reserved prior to data analysis

* scores on scale of one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree)
Table 4.3  
*Means and standard deviations from stakeholders responding to professional priorities in agricultural policy (industry collaboration)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural industries are important to the curriculum taught in our classrooms and their leaders should be consulted on new technology, job opportunities and information. It is difficult to think that the opinions of all KY agricultural education stakeholders are important to furthering the profession (-). Consulting industry educators and allowing their involvement in the direction of Kentucky’s agricultural education is unnecessary (-).</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Policy Total Mean Score</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.6308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statements with (-) symbol indicate score was reserved prior to data analysis
* scores on scale of one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree)*
Table 4.4

Means and standard deviations from stakeholders responding to professional priorities in educational policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Statement (Educational Policy)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding programs within our state is essential in continuing to maintain a quality educational experience for our students.</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislators do not understand the true purpose of agricultural education and need to be made aware of the importance of it in the education system.</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current educational policies do not need to be changed because they already emphasize the importance of agricultural education in core content classes (-).</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Educational Policy Mean Score 119 4.29 .565

*statements with (-) symbol indicate score was reserved prior to data analysis

* scores on scale of one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Statement (Research)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think that research is necessary to our profession because I find it difficult to</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relate to the classroom (-). Research is highly important to agricultural education because it provides direction and legitimacy.</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not need to be made aware of new “trends” in education because I don’t feel that students learn differently or that their learning changes over time (-)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Total Mean Score</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statements with (-) symbol indicate score was reserved prior to data analysis
* scores on scale of one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree)
### APPENDIX C

Table 4.6
*Mean Scores across stakeholder groups in Agricultural Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.0943</td>
<td>.70891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.0432</td>
<td>.55684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1263</td>
<td>.39587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7512</td>
<td>.88735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4150</td>
<td>.17000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.1107</td>
<td>.68688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.0729</td>
<td>.65178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7
*Mean scores across stakeholder groups in agricultural policy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.1253</td>
<td>.65093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.3016</td>
<td>.54678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2500</td>
<td>.61128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3338</td>
<td>.73442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3350</td>
<td>.60797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.1127</td>
<td>.73142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.1991</td>
<td>.63083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* scores on scale of one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree)

Table 4.8
*Comparison of mean scores across stakeholder groups in agricultural policy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>45.992</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46.958</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.9
Comparison of mean scores across stakeholder groups in agricultural education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.392</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>48.736</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50.128</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10
Mean scores across stakeholder groups in educational policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.2709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.3548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.2447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.2915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11
Comparison of mean scores across stakeholder groups in educational policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>37.515</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37.717</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.12

*Mean scores across stakeholder groups in research*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.2585</td>
<td>.59724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.2484</td>
<td>.60776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5013</td>
<td>.25419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3737</td>
<td>.62872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3325</td>
<td>.72214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.0680</td>
<td>.88334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.2584</td>
<td>.62764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* scores on scale of one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree)

Table 4.13

*Comparison of mean scores across stakeholder groups in research*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.334</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>47.305</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48.639</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX D

### Table 4.18

**Effect of position on the emotions expressed towards agricultural education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Emotions towards agricultural education</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passionate about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggravated with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disappointed by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Stakeholder group and emotional categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>6.489a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Valid Cases 72

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.22.

### Table 4.19

**Effect of position on emotions expressed in agricultural policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Emotions towards agricultural policy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passionate about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.089a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Valid Cases 54

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.54.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table
Table 4.20

*Effect of position on emotions expressed towards educational policy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Passionate about</th>
<th>Content with</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.082a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.45.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table 4.21

*Effect of position on emotions expressed towards research*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Emotions towards research in agricultural education</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Passionate about</td>
<td>Content with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>4.538a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.86.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table
### Table 4.22

*Perceived Professional Agency by Stakeholder group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Program Involvement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government Involvement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Government Involvement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Government Involvement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.22 (continued)

Perceived Professional Agency by Stakeholder group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Literature and Emails Relating to Profession</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteering in Local Program</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Association/Professional Industry Involvement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Association/Professional Industry Involvement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores are based on a scale of one (no involvement) to five (high involvement)
### APPENDIX F

#### Table 4.23

*Comparison of means for the professional agency of stakeholders in agricultural education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Program Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>62.922</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.584</td>
<td>10.244</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>138.810</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201.731</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Government Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.694</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>75.204</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.898</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Government Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>11.152</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.230</td>
<td>2.266</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>111.201</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122.353</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Government Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>12.629</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.526</td>
<td>3.499</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>79.406</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92.034</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading Literature and Emails Relating to Profession</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>15.479</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.096</td>
<td>2.505</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>138.394</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153.873</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.23 (continued)

Comparison of means for the professional agency of stakeholders in agricultural education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering in Local Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>14.188</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.838</td>
<td>2.068</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>153.677</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167.864</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Association/ Professional Industry Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>35.693</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.139</td>
<td>4.618</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>173.129</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208.822</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association/ Professional Industry Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>19.734</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.947</td>
<td>2.679</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>166.484</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186.218</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.24  
*Comparisons of local program involvement and stakeholder group, Tukey HSD*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Position</th>
<th>(J) Position</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>.958*</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>1.877*</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>1.502*</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>1.877*</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>1.644*</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>-.958*</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>-1.877*</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>-.919</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>-.375</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>-1.502*</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>-.544</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>-1.877*</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>-.919</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>-.375</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>-1.644*</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>-.686</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Position</th>
<th>(J) Position</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-.790</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>-.665</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>-.540</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>-.807*</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-.702</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>-.577</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>-.452</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>-.718</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-.702</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>-.577</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>-.452</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>-.718</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-.250</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>-.267</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>.807*</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Position</th>
<th>(J) Position</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-.899</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>-1.024</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>-1.440</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-1.060</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>-1.185</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>-1.602</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>-.542</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>1.858*</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>-.417</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>1.983*</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1.440</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1.602</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>2.400*</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>-.960</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>-.798</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-1.858*</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>-1.983*</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>-2.400*</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.
Table 4.27  
*Comparisons of national association involvement and stakeholder group, Tukey HSD*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>(I) Position</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-1.479*</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>-.854</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-1.230</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>-.605</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1.479*</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1.230</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>1.542*</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-.625</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-1.375</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>-.750</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>-.312</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-1.542*</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>-.917</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Staff</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.
### Table 4.29
Effect between agency in local programs and emotions towards issues in agricultural education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>17.790</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.448</td>
<td>2.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>183.941</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.614</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201.731</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.30
Effect between agency in local program and emotions towards issues in agricultural education detailed by emotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Emotions/AgEd</th>
<th>(J) Emotions/AgEd</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passionate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished</td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Astonished</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggravated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disappointed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apprehensive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.91</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.31
Effect between agency in reading literature and emails relating to the profession and emotions towards issues in agricultural education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>15.227</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.807</td>
<td>3.103</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>138.646</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153.873</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.32
Effect between agency in reading literature and emails relating to the profession and emotions towards issues in agricultural education detailed by emotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Emotions/AgEd</th>
<th>(J) Emotions/AgEd</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passionate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated</td>
<td>.83*</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated</td>
<td>-.83*</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.33
Effect between agency in local program involvement and emotions towards issues in research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>29.600</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.920</td>
<td>3.886</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>172.131</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201.731</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.34
Effect between agency in local program involvement and emotions towards issues in research detailed by emotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Emotions/Research</th>
<th>(J) Emotions/Research</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passionate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td>1.69*</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Astonished</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggravated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disappointed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.34 (continued)

Effect between agency in local program involvement and emotions towards issues in research detailed by emotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Emotions/Research</th>
<th>(J) Emotions/Research</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passionate</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>-1.69*</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Astonished</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Astonished</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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