

Collaboration Between Science and Agriculture Teachers

Lee G. Stephenson
Grace High School, Grace, Idaho

Brian K. Warnick
Rudy S. Tarpley
Utah State University

Abstract

The focus of this descriptive study was to determine the type and frequency of collaborative activities occurring between agriculture teachers and science teachers who taught in schools with agricultural education programs. Additional foci of this study included determining the extent to which science and agriculture teachers value collaborative practices, identifying factors that facilitate collaboration, and identifying barriers inhibiting collaboration. While results indicate that most science and agriculture teachers hold positive attitudes concerning the potential for collaboration, reported collaborative activities between the groups was limited, with science teachers indicating less collaboration occurring than agriculture teachers. The large majority of science teachers indicated that they have not attended workshops demonstrating agriscience integration and both groups identified lack of preparation time as the most significant barrier inhibiting collaboration. Moreover, both groups indicated that close proximity of facilities, teacher commitment, teacher attitude toward science and agriculture, frequent professional interaction, and administrator support facilitate collaboration.

Introduction/Theoretical Framework

Over the past decade much attention and discussion has been given to the “integration” of agricultural education with academic subjects, especially in the areas of science and mathematics. Roberson, Flowers, and Moore (2001) stated that “vocational and academic integration is a marriage of both types of curricula in order to teach the many skills necessary for students' future successes” (p. 31). Educational reforms of the Perkins Act encourage academic and vocational teacher collaboration for pedagogy revision, multidisciplinary integration, and creating real-life learning experiences (Lankard, 1992). Researchers have concluded that professional collaboration is an essential component of successful schools (L. Leonard & P. Leonard, 2003; P. Leonard & L. Leonard, 2001; Little, 1982). Dormody (1993) declared, “Isolationism can lead to wasteful duplication of effort and resources and lost opportunities” (p. 58). Furthermore, Farley and Taylor (2004) conjectured that “If we continue to teach all skills in isolation, we can only reinforce the idea that we acquire different skills for use in different subject areas” (p. 8). Therefore, creating educational models that integrate academic and agricultural education is of concern.

Whent (1994) stated, “The potential for collaboration between agriculture and science teachers is tremendous” (p. 17). Although, many researchers have echoed this statement, little

evidence of effective collaboration has been observed (Conroy & Walker, 2000; Dormody, 1992, 1993; Eisenman, Hill, Bailey, & Dickinson, 2003; Farley & Taylor, 2004; Hernandez & Brendefur, 2003; Inger, 1993; Layfield, Minor, & Waldvogel, 2001; Leonard, 2002; L. Leonard & P. Leonard, 2003; P. Leonard & L. Leonard, 2001; Little, 1982; Osborne & Dyer, 1998; Roberson et al., 2001; Scott & Smith, 1987; Warnick, Thompson, and Gummer 2003, 2004; Whent, 1994; Wicklein & Schell, 1995). Dormody (1993) called for teachers to eliminate barriers and establish collaborative relationships. Prior research has shown that agriculture and science departments most often reported sharing equipment and supplies while instructional materials and ideas were least shared (Dormody, 1992, 1993; Little 1982; Osborne & Dyer, 1998). Whent (1994) further indicated that a significant factor hindering resource sharing was teacher unfamiliarity of curriculum and resource similarities. Research has consistently concluded that vocational programs have encouraging attitudes toward academic integration and recognize collaborative integration benefits (Balschweid & Thompson, 2002; Conroy, 1999; Conroy & Walker, 2000; Eisenman et al., 2003; Knobloch & Martin, 2002; Layfield et al., 2001; Osborne & Dyer, 1998; Roberson et al., 2001; Rudd & Hillison, 1995; Schmidt, 1992; Shelley-Tolbert, Conroy, & Dailey, 2000; Thompson, 1998; Thompson & Balschweid, 1999, 2000; Warnick et al., 2003, 2004; Whent, 1994; Wilson, Kirby, & Flowers, 2002; Wilson & Flowers, 2002).

Researchers have identified administrators as having a crucial role in effective collaboration (Austin & Baldwin, 1992; Hernandez & Brendefur, 2003; L. Leonard & P. Leonard, 2003; Roberson et al., 2001; Scott & Smith, 1987; Wicklein & Schell, 1995). Additionally, adequate administrator support was found to be directly correlated to successful integration (Conroy & Walker, 2000; Thompson, 1998; Thompson & Balschweid, 1999, 2000). However, a lack of teacher and administrator commitment to complete tasks has been observed (Conroy, 1999; Farley & Taylor, 2004; L. Leonard & P. Leonard, 2003; Wicklein & Schell, 1995).

Conroy and Walker (2000), Dormody (1993), Inger (1993), Scott and Smith (1987), and Whent (1994) posited that territorial issues often physically separate, socially divide, and limit multidisciplinary collaboration. Furthermore, agricultural education is often tagged as inferior and nonacademic, therefore hindering collaboration between departments (Inger, 1993; Shelley-Tolbert et al., 2000). Subsequently, when barriers were removed, interdisciplinary collaboration and integration was found effective (Conroy & Walker, 2000; Eisenman et al., 2003; Inger, 1993; Schmidt, 1992).

Past experiences, personal training, and knowledge of subject matter have been shown to influence teacher adoption of new curriculum and collaboration (Balschweid & Thompson, 2002; Conroy, 1999; Conroy & Walker, 2000; Dormody, 1993; Inger, 1993; Knobloch & Martin, 2002; Layfield et al., 2001; Rudd & Hillison, 1995; Thompson, 2001; Thompson & Balschweid, 1999, 2000; Wilson & Flowers, 2002; Wilson et al., 2002; Warnick et al., 2003, 2004). Balschweid and Thompson (2002), Thompson and Balschweid (1999) (2000), Thompson and Schumacher (1998), and Wilson et al. (2002) reported findings indicating lack of agriscience workshops as a major barrier to integration. Additionally, time was found to be a significant barrier to teacher integration and collaboration (Conroy, 1999; Conroy & Walker, 2000; Eisenman et al., 2003;

Farley & Taylor, 2004; Inger, 1993; Leonard, 2002; L. Leonard & P. Leonard, 2003; P. Leonard & L. Leonard, 2001; Little, 1982; Roberson et al., 2001; Sadowski, 1995; Schmidt, 1992; Scott & Smith, 1987; Thompson 1998; Whent, 1994). These researchers have suggested that administrators schedule adequate planning time for developing collaboratively integrated curriculum.

“Together teachers have the organizational skills and resources to attempt innovations that would exhaust the energy, skill, or resources of an individual teacher” (Inger, 1993, p. 2). Successful collaboration of science and agricultural education is a noble task. Collaborative efforts have the potential to foster decision making skills, cognitive skills, and critical thinking skills as well as to enhance student comprehension of scientific principles by linking science with real-world applications. However, few researchers have provided plausible collaboration models for science and agriculture teachers to effectively broaden curricula and augment knowledge transfer for improved student learning, retention, and application. Thus, additional research identifying effective collaboration models for science and agriculture teachers has been highly recommended (Hernandez & Brendefur, 2003; Osborne & Dyer, 1998; Warnick et al., 2003, 2004; Wicklein & Schell, 1995).

Purpose/Objectives

The purpose of this study was to determine current levels of science and agriculture teacher collaboration and to explore factors facilitating collaboration in secondary schools. More specifically, the study was intended to address the following objectives:

1. Determine to what extent science and agriculture teachers value collaborative practices;
2. Determine the type and frequency of collaboration occurring between science and agriculture teachers;
3. Identify factors that facilitate collaboration;
4. Identify barriers inhibiting collaboration; and
5. Identify demographic characteristics of agriculture and science teachers in schools with agricultural education programs.

Methods/Procedures

Descriptive survey methods were used to explore all secondary science teachers (N = 312) who taught in schools with agricultural programs and all secondary agriculture teachers (N = 81) during the 2005-2006 school year in one western state. Science teachers employed at schools with no agricultural program were not included in the population. The state educational offices provided the researchers with a current database containing the name and address of each science and agriculture teacher. Generalizing the study results beyond the identified population should be done with caution.

The literature identified no survey instrument that suitably matched the objectives of this study. Instruments in related literature were reviewed providing guidelines for adapting the Integrating Science Survey Instrument developed by Thompson and Schumacher (1998). To

ensure every participant would accurately interpret and willingly respond wording of each statement was adjusted specifically for participants by creating two forms of the questionnaire, one for agriculture teachers and one for science teachers (Dillman, 2000). Evidence of face and content validity was acquired by a panel of experts consisting of university agricultural teacher educators and state supervisors of agricultural education. Internal consistency for the science form was measured at $\alpha = 0.88$ and the agriculture form was measured at $\alpha = 0.91$ using Cronbach's alpha to estimate the reliability of the instrument.

Data were collected using Dillman's "Tailored Design" methods (2000). A prenotice letter was sent to participants one week prior to the survey. Questionnaire packets containing a detailed cover letter, a token of appreciation, and a stamped, self addressed return envelope were sent the third week of October. Thank-you/reminder postcards expressing appreciation to respondents and encouraging nonrespondents to reply were sent one week after the questionnaires. Replacement survey packets were sent to nonrespondents three weeks after the initial survey mailing. Useable responses were received from 157 science teachers (50.3%) and from 63 agriculture teachers (77.8%). A t -test was used to control for non-response error by comparing early and late respondents. The summed responses of the 105 early respondents were compared to the summed responses of the 115 (52.3%) late respondents which indicated no statistically significant difference between early and late respondents, $t(217) = -1.641, p = .108$ (two tailed) (Linder, Murphy, & Briers, 2001).

The instrument consisted of five parts. Part one addressing the value of collaboration, part three addressing factors facilitating collaboration, and part four addressing barriers inhibiting collaboration requested subjects to respond to statements utilizing five-point summated scale scores with a 1 representing strongly disagree, 2 for disagree, 3 for neutral, 4 for agree, and 5 for strongly agree. Part two asked subjects to respond to statements concerning types and frequency of collaboration occurring utilizing a four-point summated scale score indicating 1 for never, 2 for seldom, 3 for sometimes, and 4 for often. Part five called for subjects to report demographic information. Data collected from the instrument were entered into Microsoft Excel and imported into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 13.0 and analyzed. Data from objectives one, two, three, four, and five were analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations). To simplify reporting, frequencies and percentages for strongly agree and agree were collapsed into agree and those for strongly disagree and disagree were collapsed into disagree. The four point scale was individually reported as never, seldom, sometimes, and often. Responses by question and construct from science and agriculture teachers were compared using the Mann-Whitney U Test. The test was chosen because of the ordinal nature of the data (summated scale responses) and the independence of the sample groups (Mertens, 1997). The alpha level for statistical significance was set *a priori* at .05.

Results/Findings

Research objective one sought to determine the extent science and agriculture teachers value collaboration (Table 1). Science (77.7%) and agriculture (84.1%) teachers collectively agreed that collaboration allows students to understand the relationship of science and

agriculture. The majority of science (77.1%) and agriculture (81.0%) teachers signified that collaboration reduced separation between teachers. Both groups (77.7% science; 79.4% agriculture) agreed that collaboration broadens school curricula. Additionally, 72.0% of science teachers and 77.8% of agriculture teachers concurred that collaboration enhances student comprehension of scientific concepts. Some disagreement was signified by 76.2% of agriculture and 64.3% of science teachers responding positively that collaboration improves student learning.

Table 1
Extent to which science and agriculture teachers value collaboration

Question	Science	Agriculture	Mann-Whitney
	A / DA	A / DA	<i>U</i> <i>p</i> value
Collaboration is an appropriate use of teachers' time	65.0 / 8.3	68.3 / 3.2	<i>U</i> = 3959.0 <i>p</i> = .607
Collaboration broadens school curricula	77.7 / 3.2	79.4 / 3.2	<i>U</i> = 3996.0 <i>p</i> = .664
Collaboration reduces separation between teachers	77.1 / 1.9	81.0 / 4.8	<i>U</i> = 3724.5 <i>p</i> = .418
Collaboration will improve student learning	64.3 / 1.9	76.2 / 3.2	<i>U</i> = 3464.5 <i>p</i> = .049
Collaboration makes learning more meaningful to students	68.2 / 2.5	60.3 / 6.4	<i>U</i> = 3764.5 <i>p</i> = .282
Collaboration enhances student comprehension of scientific concepts	72.0 / 2.5	77.8 / 1.6	<i>U</i> = 3857.5 <i>p</i> = .392
Collaboration allows students to understand the relationship of science and agriculture	77.7 / 1.3	84.1 / 3.2	<i>U</i> = 3859.0 <i>p</i> = .382

Note: A = agree, DA = disagree. Strongly agree and agree are collapsed into the agree column and strongly disagree and disagree are collapsed into the disagree column.

Research objective two aimed to determine the type and frequency of collaboration currently occurring. Eleven statements were statistically significant addressing the frequency of collaboration between the groups (Table 2). Statistically significant statements included attending workshops; attending departmental meetings; joint lesson planning; team teaching; observing teachers teach; developing assignments that reinforce science or agriculture; guest lecturing; sharing integrated curriculum; sharing equipment and supplies; asking for assistance; and offering equipment, supplies, facilities, etc. The majority of science teachers reported that they had never guest lectured (82.8%); team taught (80.3%); attended workshops (77.1%); observed agriculture teachers teach (65.5%); jointly planned lessons (65.0%); and attended

agricultural departmental meetings (65.0%). Fewer signified that they had seldom asked for assistance (27.4%); shared instructional techniques (26.1%); offered equipment, supplies, facilities, etc. (24.2%); and solved disciplinary problems (23.6%). They reported sometimes offering equipment, supplies, facilities, etc. (26.1%); sharing instructional techniques (24.2%); asking for assistance (21.0%); and sharing science curriculum (21.0%). Furthermore, few science teachers reported they had often shared equipment and supplies (14.6%); shared facilities (12.7%); offered equipment, supplies, facilities, etc. (9.6%); shared science curriculum (7.6%); shared equipment and supplies (5.7%); and attended agricultural departmental meetings (5.1%).

Table 2
Science and agriculture teachers' frequency of collaboration

Question	Never Sci / Ag %	Seldom Sci / Ag %	Sometimes Sci / Ag %	Often Sci / Ag %	Mann-Whitney <i>U</i> <i>p</i> value
Attending workshops	77.1 / 9.2	8.9 / 20.6	10.2 / 22.2	0.6 / 7.9	<i>U</i> = 3277.0 <i>p</i> = .000
Attending departmental meetings	65.0 / 39.7	17.8 / 22.2	8.9 / 19.0	5.1 / 19.0	<i>U</i> = 3257.0 <i>p</i> = .000
Joint lesson planning	65.0 / 49.2	16.6 / 20.6	10.8 / 15.9	4.5 / 12.7	<i>U</i> = 3795.0 <i>p</i> = .010
Team teaching	80.3 / 71.4	13.4 / 11.1	2.5 / 11.1	0.6 / 6.3	<i>U</i> = 4136.5 <i>p</i> = .026
Guest lecturing	82.8 / 71.4	9.6 / 15.9	3.2 / 9.5	0.6 / 3.2	<i>U</i> = 4027.0 <i>p</i> = .009
Observing teachers teach	65.6 / 47.6	20.4 / 33.3	9.6 / 14.3	1.3 / 4.8	<i>U</i> = 3796.5 <i>p</i> = .006
Solving disciplinary problems	51.6 / 44.4	23.6 / 25.4	19.1 / 19.0	3.2 / 11.1	<i>U</i> = 4263.5 <i>p</i> = .148
Developing assignments that reinforce sci/ag	61.1 / 34.9	19.7 / 15.9	14.0 / 34.9	1.9 / 14.3	<i>U</i> = 3014.5 <i>p</i> = .000
Sharing integrated curriculum	64.3 / 34.9	17.2 / 30.2	12.7 / 23.8	3.2 / 11.1	<i>U</i> = 3229.0 <i>p</i> = .000
Sharing science/ agriculture curriculum	46.5 / 34.9	21.7 / 28.6	21.0 / 30.2	7.6 / 6.3	<i>U</i> = 4222.5 <i>p</i> = .148
Sharing instructional techniques	41.4 / 31.7	26.1 / 25.4	24.2 / 36.5	0.6 / 7.9	<i>U</i> = 4152.0 <i>p</i> = .092
Sharing equipment and supplies	36.9 / 22.2	21.7 / 20.6	24.8 / 30.2	14.6 / 20.7	<i>U</i> = 3780.0 <i>p</i> = .008

Sharing facilities	49.7 / 47.6	16.6 / 19.0	19.1 / 15.9	2.7 / 17.5	$U = 4666.0$ $p = .635$
Asking for assistance	46.5 / 20.6	27.4 / 34.9	21.0 / 30.2	3.2 / 14.3	$U = 3267.5$ $p = .000$
Offering equipment, supplies, facilities, etc	36.9 / 22.2	24.2 / 27.0	26.1 / 28.6	9.6 / 20.6	$U = 3733.5$ $p = .013$

The majority of agriculture teachers reported that they had never guest lectured (71.4%), team taught (71.4%), joint lesson planned (49.2%), attended collaborative workshops (49.2%), observed science teachers teach (47.6%); and shared facilities (47.6%). Fewer reported they seldom asked for assistance (34.9%), observed science teachers teach (33.3%), shared integrated curriculum (30.2%), and shared agriculture curriculum (28.6%). They reported sometimes sharing instructional techniques (35.6%), developing science reinforcing assignments (34.9%), sharing equipment and supplies (30.2%), asking science teachers for assistance (30.2%), and sharing agriculture curriculum (30.2%). Furthermore, some agriculture teachers reported they often shared equipment and supplies (27.0%); offered equipment, supplies, facilities, etc. (20.6%); attended science departmental meetings (19.0%); shared facilities (17.5%); developed science reinforcing assignments (14.3%); and asked for assistance (14.3%).

Research objective three was designed to identify factors facilitating collaboration. Four statements were statistically significant including science teachers' attitude toward agriculture, administrators that actively observe and evaluate teachers, participating in agriscience workshops, and reorganizing curriculums to synchronize with science or agriculture. A larger percentage of agriculture teachers (76.2%) than science teachers (58.0%) agreed that participating in agriscience workshops develops collaborative relationships that increase collaboration (Table 3). In addition 60.5% of science and 69.8% of agriculture teachers agreed that synchronizing science/agriculture curriculum with agriculture/science curriculum promotes collaboration.

A majority of science (84.1%) and agriculture teachers (79.4%) agreed that close proximity of facilities promotes collaboration. Additionally, 82.2% of science and 85.5% of agriculture teachers agreed that teacher commitment was essential. Both groups, (81.5% science; 79.4% agriculture) agreed that providing incentives facilitates collaboration. Many science (75.8%) and agriculture (88.9%) teachers indicated that agriculture teacher attitudes toward science influenced collaboration. Moreover, 88.9% of agriculture and 77.1% of science teachers indicated that science teacher's attitudes toward agriculture promote collaboration. Both science (79.6%) and agriculture (82.5%) teachers agreed that administrators allocating resources promotes collaboration. Furthermore, 75.2% of science teachers and 77.8% of agriculture teachers agreed that administrators that schedule ample collaboration time promote collaboration. Approximately three-fourths of agriculture (76.1%) and science (75.8%) teachers agreed that frequent interaction with science/agriculture faculty stimulates collaboration.

Table 3
Factors facilitating science and agriculture teacher collaboration

Question	<u>Science</u>	<u>Agriculture</u>	Mann-Whitney
	A / DA	A / DA	<i>U</i> <i>p</i> value
The agriculture teacher's attitude toward science	75.8 / 3.8	88.9 / 1.6	<i>U</i> = 4357.0 <i>p</i> = .155
The science teacher's attitude toward agriculture	77.1 / 6.3	88.9 / 1.6	<i>U</i> = 4059.5 <i>p</i> = .032
The agriculture teacher's scientific knowledge	65.0 / 10.2	69.8 / 3.2	<i>U</i> = 4582.0 <i>p</i> = .611
The science teacher's agricultural knowledge	63.1 / 9.6	73.0 / 1.6	<i>U</i> = 4249.5 <i>p</i> = .163
Administrators that schedule ample time	75.2 / 8.3	77.8 / 11.1	<i>U</i> = 4609.0 <i>p</i> = .727
Administrators that allocate resources	79.6 / 7.6	82.5 / 7.9	<i>U</i> = 4737.0 <i>p</i> = .860
Administrators that outline expectations	63.1 / 10.8	69.8 / 12.7	<i>U</i> = 4585.0 <i>p</i> = .574
Providing incentives	81.5 / 3.8	79.4 / 4.8	<i>U</i> = 4753.5 <i>p</i> = .888
Close proximity	84.1 / 1.9	81.0 / 3.2	<i>U</i> = 4671.5 <i>p</i> = .781
Having common preparation	64.3 / 7.0	60.3 / 9.5	<i>U</i> = 6477.0 <i>p</i> = .740
Frequent professional interaction	75.8 / 5.1	76.1 / 4.8	<i>U</i> = 4655.0 <i>p</i> = .683
Agriculture teachers with science credentials	65.0 / 7.0	55.6 / 6.3	<i>U</i> = 4567.5 <i>p</i> = .676
Reorganizing sci/ag curriculum to synchronize with ag/sci	60.5 / 9.6	69.8 / 7.9	<i>U</i> = 3921.5 <i>p</i> = .035

Note: A = agree, DA = disagree. Strongly agree and agree are collapsed into the agree column and strongly disagree and disagree are collapsed into the disagree column.

Research objective four sought to identify barriers inhibiting collaboration (Table 4). Both science (82.8%) and agriculture (77.8%) teachers indicated that lack of preparation time

was the most significant barrier. A larger number of science teachers (73.2%) compared to agriculture teachers (57.1%) indicated that lack of common preparation was noteworthy. Approximately two-thirds of agriculture teachers (66.7%) and half of science teachers (51.6%) agreed that lack of equipment was significant. Moreover, the majority of science (70.7%) and agriculture (57.1%) teachers concurred that their lack of awareness of similarities in agriculture and science curriculum inhibited collaboration.

Two-thirds (65.1%) of agriculture teachers and one-fourth (24.4%) of science teachers identified concerns of superiority ranking of academic departments. Agriculture teachers (52.4%) agreed that territorial competition hindered collaboration. Furthermore, 49.2% of agriculture teachers signified a concern of losing SAE and FFA programs. Fewer science teachers (29.3 %) than agriculture teachers (41.35%) agreed that increased years of teaching experience reduced teacher willingness to collaborate.

Table 4
Barriers inhibiting science and agriculture teacher collaboration

Question	Science	Agriculture	Mann-Whitney
	A / DA	A / DA	<i>U</i> <i>p</i> value
Lack of adequate funding	59.9 / 12.1	50.8 / 11.1	<i>U</i> = 4373.0 <i>p</i> = .259
Lack of common teacher preparation time	73.2 / 6.3	57.1 / 17.5	<i>U</i> = 3964.5 <i>p</i> = .023
Lack of preparation time	82.8 / 5.7	77.8 / 9.5	<i>U</i> = 4381.0 <i>p</i> = .256
Lack of appropriate facilities	54.1 / 19.7	63.5 / 17.5	<i>U</i> = 4273.0 <i>p</i> = .169
Lack of appropriate equipment	51.6 / 19.7	66.7 / 17.5	<i>U</i> = 4040.0 <i>p</i> = .050
Lack of administrative support	45.9 / 20.4	46 / 30.2	<i>U</i> = 4608.0 <i>p</i> = .597
Lack of awareness of available resources	57.3 / 14.0	61.9 / 20.6	<i>U</i> = 4763.5 <i>p</i> = .949
Lack of awareness of curriculum similarities	70.7 / 13.4	57.1 / 27.0	<i>U</i> = 3976.5 <i>p</i> = .028
Lack of agriscience workshops	66.2 / 8.3	55.6 / 12.7	<i>U</i> = 4048.5 <i>p</i> = .055
Lack of teacher commitment	59.2 / 19.1	54.0 / 12.7	<i>U</i> = 4659.5 <i>p</i> = .742
Increased years of experience reduce willingness to collaborate	29.3 / 37.6	41.3 / 23.8	<i>U</i> = 3920.0 <i>p</i> = .026
Misconceptions and superiority ranking of academic departments	24.2 / 38.9	65.1 / 7.9	<i>U</i> = 2195.5 <i>p</i> = .000
Territorial competition	33.1 / 36.9	52.4 / 17.5	<i>U</i> = 3230.5 <i>p</i> = .000
Concern of losing SAE and FFA	19.7 / 21.7	49.2 / 26.9	<i>U</i> = 3600.0 <i>p</i> = .005

Note: A = agree, DA = disagree. Strongly agree and agree are collapsed into the agree column and strongly disagree and disagree are collapsed into the disagree column.

Research objective five sought to identify demographic characteristics of participants

(Table 5). The average agriculture teacher was 39.9 years old ($SD = 11.2$) with 12.5 years of teaching experience ($SD = 9.6$) and had taught 11 years at their current school ($SD = 8.7$). Two-thirds of agriculture teachers (67.0%) have participated in 2.2 inservice workshops that integrated science ($SD = 2.8$). The majority were male (84.1%) raised on a farm/ranch/dairy (65.1%) or in a rural area (17.5%). At the time of the study approximately half of the agriculture participants were living on a farm/ranch/dairy or rural area (47.6%). The mass of agriculture teachers (84.2%) enrolled in agricultural education and participated in FFA (77.8%) and 4-H (60.3%).

The average science teacher in a school with an agricultural education program was 47.8 years old ($SD = 10.96$) with 13.5 years of teaching experience ($SD = 9.38$) and had taught 10.2 years at their current school ($SD = 8.91$). Nearly one out of every five science teachers (19.0%) have participated in an average of .55 workshops demonstrating how to integrate agriculture ($SD = 2.0$). The majority were male (56.0%) raised in a town/city (51.0%) or on a farm/ranch/dairy or rural area (46.5%). At the time of the study the majority of science respondents were living in a town/city (68.2%). The majority of science teachers did not participate in agricultural education (77.7%) and fewer participated in FFA (13.4%) and 4-H (28.7%).

Table 5
Science and agriculture teacher demographics

Demographic variable		Science teachers	Agriculture teachers
Years of teaching experience		M = 13.47 (SD = 9.38)	M = 12.52 (SD = 9.63)
Years taught at current school		M = 10.22 (SD = 8.91)	M = 11.00 (SD = 8.69)
Participation in inservice workshops/course(s)		M = 19.00 (SD = .39)	M = 67.00 (SD = .51)
Number of in inservice workshops/course(s)		M = 0.55 (SD = 2.0)	M = 2.22 (SD = 2.77)
Number of students enrolled in the school		M = 1345.78 (SD = 705.06)	M = 1058.15 (SD = 688.37)
Age		M = 41.77 (SD = 10.96)	M = 39.87 (SD = 11.16)
Gender	Male	56.0%	84.1%
	Female	31.2%	14.3%
Type of area grew up in	Farm/ranch/dairy	32.5%	65.1%
	Rural/non farm	14.0%	17.5%
	Town/city	51.0%	15.9%
Type of area currently living	Farm/ranch/dairy	14.0%	27.0%
	Rural/non farm	13.4%	20.6%
	Town/city	68.2%	49.2%
Years enrolled in agricultural education	None	77.7%	14.3%
	1	10.8%	4.8%
	2	1.9%	6.3%
	3	1.3%	12.7%
	4 or more	5.7%	60.4%
Participation in FFA	Yes	13.4%	77.8%
	No	84.1%	19.0%
Participation in 4-H	Yes	28.7%	60.3%
	No	68.2%	39.7%

Conclusions/Implications

Many science and agriculture teachers hold positive attitudes concerning the potential of collaboration. Science and agriculture teachers collectively agreed that collaboration; (a) broadens school curricula, (b) reduces separation between teachers, (c) enhances student comprehension of scientific concepts, and (d) allows students to understand the relationship and importance of science and agriculture in today's society. These findings concur with studies conducted by Dormody (1993), Eisenman et al., (2003), Inger (1993), Leonard (2002), Roberson et al., (2001), Warnick et al., (2004), and Whent (1993).

Study results indicated that effective collaboration is limited which supports previous research (Conroy & Walker, 2000; Dormody, 1992; Farley & Taylor, 2004; Hernandez & Brendefur, 2003; Inger, 1993; Layfield et al., 2001; Leonard, 2002; L. Leonard & P. Leonard, 2003; P. Leonard & L. Leonard, 2001; Little, 1982; Osborne & Dyer, 1998; Roberson et al., 2001; Scott & Smith, 1987; Warnick et al., 2003, 2004; Whent, 1994; Wicklein & Schell, 1995). Science teachers indicated less collaboration occurring than agriculture teachers. The majority of science and agriculture teachers concurred that they had never or seldom guest lectured, team taught, or attended workshops. Furthermore, groups identified offering equipment, supplies, facilities, etc; sharing equipment and supplies; and sharing instructional techniques as collaborative activities occurring, coinciding with findings by Dormody (1992, 1993), Little (1982), and Osborne and Dyer (1998). The results of this study indicate that agriculture teachers were more willing to offer equipment, supplies, and facilities and ask for assistance than science teachers.

The large majority of science teachers indicated that they have not attended workshops demonstrating agriscience integration, also coinciding with prior research (Balschweid, 2002; Balschweid & Thompson, 2002; Conroy, 1999; Conroy & Walker, 2000; Dormody, 1992, 1993; Eisenman et al., 2003; Farley & Taylor, 2004; Inger, 1993; Knobloch & Martin, 2002; Layfield et al., 2001; Leonard, 2002; L. Leonard & P. Leonard, 2003; P. Leonard & L. Leonard, 2001; Little, 1982; Osborne & Dyer 1998, 2000; Roberson et al., 2001; Rudd & Hillison, 1995; Schmidt, 1992; Shelley-Tolbert et al., 2000; Thompson, 1998, 2001; Thompson & Balschweid, 1999, 2000; Thompson & Schumacher, 1998; Warnick et al., 2003, 2004; Wicklein & Schell, 1995; Wilson & Flowers, 2002; Wilson et al., 2002) recommending that agriscience inservice workshops be designed to enhance teachers' skills and to promote collaboration.

Similar to prior research, both groups identified lack of preparation time as the most noteworthy barrier inhibiting collaboration (Conroy, 1999; Conroy & Walker, 2000; Eisenman et al., 2003; Farley & Taylor, 2004; Inger, 1993; Leonard, 2002; L. Leonard & P. Leonard, 2003; P. Leonard & L. Leonard, 2001; Little, 1982; Roberson et al., 2001; Sadowski, 1995; Schmidt, 1992; Scott & Smith, 1987; Thompson 1998; Whent, 1994). The findings indicated that both groups were unaware of similarities in curriculum, therefore supporting Whent's (1994) research. Research showed that territorial issues physically separate, socially divide, and limit multidisciplinary collaboration, sustaining research by Conroy and Walker (2000), Dormody (1993), Inger (1993), Scott and Smith (1987), Shelley-Tolbert et al. (2000), and Whent (1994). Moreover, both groups indicated the following facilitators of collaboration: administrators that

allocate time and resources, providing incentives, close proximity of facilities, teacher commitment, teacher's attitude toward science and agriculture, and frequent professional interaction.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the researchers recommend that teacher education programs in agriculture instill positive perceptions toward collaborating with academic teachers. This can be accomplished through the implementation of collaborative projects with preservice science teachers. Inservice workshops should be designed and delivered to enhance teachers' agriscience skills and to promote collaboration between science and agriculture teachers. Workshops should be focused on training teachers to implement agriscience curriculum.

Further analysis of the data from this study be conducted to determine correlations and relationships of demographic variables as they pertain to teachers' frequency and willingness to collaborate. Further research to investigate personal and environmental factors that facilitate and establish effective collaboration between science and agriculture teachers should be conducted. Additional research to examine territorial contention and competition between academic departments and agriculture departments is recommended. Research should focus on resolving misconceptions and superiority inculcations of academic departments and agriculture departments. It is recommended that a qualitative case study of teachers that collaborate be conducted to determine the predictors of agriculture and science teachers who are currently collaborating. A study to determine which model(s) of science and agriculture teacher collaboration achieves effective results should also be conducted. Results of that study should then be used to determine methods to be emphasized in teacher training workshops and in preservice teacher education.

References

- Austin, A. E., & Baldwin, R. E. (1992). *Faculty collaboration: Enhancing the quality of scholarship and teaching*. Washington DC: George Washington Univ. School of Education and Human Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED347958)
- Balschweid, M. A. (2002). Teaching biology using agriculture as the context: Perceptions of high school students. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 43*(2), 56-67.
- Balschweid, M. A., & Thompson, G. W. (2002). Integrating science in agricultural education: attitudes of Indiana agricultural science and business teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 43*(2), 1-10.
- Conroy, C. A. (1999). Identifying barriers to infusion of aquaculture into secondary agriscience: Adoption of a curriculum innovation. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 40*(3), 1-10.
- Conroy, C. A., & Walker, N. J. (2000). An examination of integration of academic and

- vocational subject matter in the aquaculture classroom. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 41(2), 54-64.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Dormody, T. J. (1992). Exploring resource sharing between secondary school teachers of agriculture and science departments nationally. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 33(3), 23-31.
- Dormody, T. J. (1993). Predicting modeling of resource sharing between secondary school agriculture teachers and science departments. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 34(1), 51-59.
- Eisenman, L., Hill, D., Bailey, R., & Dickinson, C. (2003). The beauty of teacher collaboration to integrate curricula: Professional development and student learning opportunities. *Journal of Vocational Education Research*, 28(1), 85-104.
- Farley, A. M., & Taylor, P. C. (2004, December). A ten-year journey towards teacher collaboration and integrated curriculum: A story of leadership. Proceedings of the Annual Australasian Association for Research in Education Conference. Melbourne, Australia.
- Hernandez, V. M., & Brendefur, J. L. (2003). Developing authentic, integrated, standards based mathematics curriculum: More than just an interdisciplinary collaborative approach. *Journal of Vocational Education Research*, 28(3), 259-283.
- Inger, M. (1993, December). Teacher collaboration in secondary schools. Center Focus No. 2. National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Retrieved July 20, 2005, from <http://vocserve.berkeley.edu/centerFocus/>
- Knobloch, N. A., & Martin, R. A. (2002). Teacher characteristics explaining the extent of agriculture awareness activities integrated into the elementary curriculum. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 43(4), 12-23.
- Lankard, B. A. (1992). Integrating academic and vocational education: Strategies for implementation. *ERIC Digest No. 120*.
- Layfield, K. D., Minor, V. C., & Waldvogel, J. A. (2001). Integrating science into agricultural education: a survey of South Carolina teachers' perceptions. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual National Agricultural Education Research Conference*, New Orleans, LA.
- Leonard, L. (2002). Schools as professional communities: Addressing the collaborative challenge. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning*, 6(17). On-line at: <http://www.ucalgary.ca/~iejll>

- Leonard, L., & Leonard, P. (2003). The continuing trouble with collaboration: Teachers talk. *Current Issues in Education* [On-line], 6(15). Available: <http://cie.ed.asu.edu/volume6/number15/>
- Leonard, P., & Leonard, L. (2001). The collaborative prescription: Remedy or reverie? *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4(4), 383-399.
- Linder, J. R., Murphy, T. H., & Briers, G. E. (2001, December). The handling of nonresponse in agriculture education. *Proceedings of the Twenty-eighth Annual National Agricultural Education Research Conference*. New Orleans, LA.
- Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American educational Research journal*, 19(3), 325-340.
- Mertens, D. M. (1997). *Research Methods in Education and Psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Osborne, E. W., & Dyer, J. E. (1998). Attitudes of Illinois high school science teachers toward educational programs in agriculture. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 39(1), 8-16.
- Osborne, E. W., & Dyer, J. E. (2000). Attitudes of Illinois agriscience students and their parents toward agriculture and agricultural education programs. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 41(3), 50-59.
- Roberson, D. L, Flowers, J., & Moore, G. E (2001). The status of integration of academic and agricultural education in North Carolina. *Journal of Career and Technical Education*, 17(1), 31-45.
- Rudd, R. D., & Hillison, J. H. (1995). Teacher characteristics related to the adoption of agriscience curriculum in Virginia middle school agriculture education programs. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 36(2), 19-27.
- Schmidt, J. B. (1992, October). Collaborative efforts between vocational and academic teachers: Strategies that facilitate and hinder the efforts. Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED351526)
- Scott, J. J., & Smith, S. C. (1987). Collaborative schools. Eugene, OR: Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED290233)
- Shelley-Tolbert, C. A., Conroy, C. A., & Dailey, A. L. (2000). The move to agriscience and its impact on teacher education in agriculture. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 41(4), 51-61.
- Sadowski, M. (1995). Moving beyond traditional subjects requires teachers to abandon their

- comfort zones. *The Harvard Education Letter*, 11(5), 34-38.
- Thompson, G. W. (1998). Implications of integrating science in secondary agriculture education programs. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 39(4), 76-85.
- Thompson, G. W. (2001). Perceptions of Oregon secondary principals regarding integrating science into agricultural science and technology programs. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 42(1), 49-59.
- Thompson, G. W., & Balschweid, M. A. (1999). Attitudes of Oregon agricultural science and technology teachers toward integrating science. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 40(3), 21-29.
- Thompson, G. W., & Balschweid, M. A. (2000). Integrating science into agriculture programs: Implications for addressing state standards and teacher preparation programs. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 41(2), 73-80.
- Thompson, G. W., & Schumacher, L. G. (1998). Selected characteristics of the National FFA Organization's Agriscience Teacher of the Year Award winners and their agriscience programs. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 39(2), 50-60.
- Warnick, B. K., Thompson, G. W., & Gummer, E. S. (2003, December). Integrating science into the agricultural education curriculum: Do science teachers and agriculture teachers agree? Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual National Agricultural Education Research Conference. Orlando, FL.
- Warnick, B. K., Thompson, G. W., & Gummer, E. S. (2004). Perceptions of science teachers regarding the integration of science into the agriculture education curriculum. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 45(1), 62-73.
- Whent, L. (1994). Factors influencing resource sharing between agriculture and science teachers participating in the agriscience program. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 35(3), 11-17.
- Wicklein, R. C., & Schell, J. W. (1995). Case studies of multidisciplinary approaches to integrate mathematics, science, and technology education. *Journal of Technology Education*, 6(2), 59-76.
- Wilson, E. & Flowers, J. (2002). Secondary educators' confidence in teaching agricultural biotechnology after training. *Journal of Natural Resources and Life Science Education*, 31, 131-135.
- Wilson, E., Kirby, B., & Flowers, J. (2002). Factors influencing the intent of North Carolina agricultural educators to adopt agricultural biotechnology curriculum. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 43(1), 69-81.