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**Abstract**

This purpose of this study was to determine the perception of secondary educators involved in Future Farmers of Georgia (FFG) schools throughout the country of Georgia concerning their needs for furthering the existing framework of agricultural education. The researchers used a modified Delphi method to meet the aforementioned purpose of this study. The population for this study consisted of the high school agricultural education teachers and their administrators who were participating in the FFG Program (n=14). The teachers represented seven different school districts. Qualitative data collected from the probe (first round) was used to generate a series of 46 statements. In the second round participants were asked to rank the 46 statements using a five point Likert-type scale. Due to recent events in the Former Republic of Georgia, the third round could not be conducted. Therefore, the researchers concluded that the round two data would be used to meet the purpose and objectives of this study. Participants strongly agreed that the FFG program strengthens leadership skills among their students and students have become more involved in practical/labor activities. They also agreed that gaining knowledge and skills from the FFG program will improve the future development of agricultural education in the country. Participants also strongly agreed that improvement of schools’ materials, technology, and equipment are necessary to improve the FFG program. Participants were either neutral or agreed with the following statements: due to the FFG program, academic performance has been increased among students; and students have greater academic success in history and geography.
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Introduction

The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 began an era of change in many Eurasian countries. Several countries have made the transition into democracy successfully and have developed into self-sustaining entities in agriculture, industry, and trade (Bendersky, 2005). Unfortunately, Georgia has struggled to establish itself as a key player in world trade (Corso, 2009; Parr, Edwards, & Duncan, 2008). Although Georgia has been viewed as being progressive in their quest to implement a democratic government since the “Rose Revolution” of 2003 (Microsoft®, Encarta® Online Encyclopedia, 2009), economic development has been slow (USDA, 2006). The involvement in three armed conflicts in the years following the dissolution of the Soviet Union compounded the economical shortage felt in the country. According to the Microsoft Encarta Online Encyclopedia, “The country’s gross domestic product (GDP), which measures the total value of goods and services produced, declined between 1990 and 1995 by the greatest amount of any former Soviet republic” (2009, Economy of Georgia section, π1).

Further, recent deterioration of relations between Georgia and neighboring Russia due largely to the commitment of Georgian officials to reclaim the breakaway regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia has only worsened the economic disparity felt by many Georgian citizens (Chivers & Shanker, 2008).

Recent initiatives to improve economic standing in this country have included a concerted effort from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Through the Caucasus Agricultural Development Initiative (CADI), USDA’s Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) has implemented several strategies aimed at improving Georgia’s trade capacity and economic development in the agricultural sector (USDA, 2006). The specific objectives of the CADI are to: (1) “Promote private agribusiness development, (2) Build trade capacity, (3) Support market-based agricultural policies and institutions, and (4) Support the development of local institutions” (Johnston, n.d.). According to the USDA,

CADI (the Caucasus Agricultural Development Initiative) is one of many capacity building efforts the U.S. government and USDA in particular have spearheaded. This initiative focuses on economic development and trade capacity building in Armenia and Georgia. The aim is to raise agricultural growth and integrate these countries into global agricultural markets (2006, ¶3).

Agriculture is very important to the economy of Georgia. The relatively long growing season that Georgia enjoys contributes to the fact that the agricultural sector comprises 54% of the employment opportunities in the country (Microsoft®, Encarta® Online Encyclopedia, 2009).

One result of the effort toward helping Georgia establish itself as a viable player in the world economy is a network of institutions specializing in the education of students in the field of agriculture. This network includes eight K-12 schools that have implemented agricultural education as a part of their curriculum. These schools are referred to as “FFG schools” based on their interest in incorporating the newly-formed Future Farmers of Georgia into the agricultural education curriculum. In 2006, faculty of the University of Georgia (USA) assisted the aforementioned FFG schools in the development and implementation of curriculum appropriate for secondary agriculture students in the village schools of Georgia. This assistance included four days of professional development seminars that were conducted by two University of Georgia
faculty members during the fall of 2006. The participants in this faculty development initiative included 13 teachers and administrators who agreed to implement the newly developed curriculum and instructional methodology in their village school (Parr, Edwards, & Duncan, 2008). These faculty development seminars were followed by school visits from the seminar presenters in 2007.

Over the course of two weeks, faculty members from the University of Georgia (USA) travelled across the country and met with teachers and students in several of the village schools where agricultural education is now being taught. These visits provided the researchers with time for personal conversations with the teachers to determine the struggles that they were having with the implementation of the newly formed curriculum. Further, assistance for the first national FFG convention was provided in the summer of 2007 and additional leadership development workshops for students and teachers were provided in 2008. The agriculture teachers were very optimistic concerning the outlook for agricultural education in their country and committed to providing effective educational programs to further the agricultural knowledge and sustainability of the students whom they taught (Parr, Edwards, & Duncan, 2008).

Current efforts to establish and sustain viable secondary agricultural education programs include the construction of greenhouses on the grounds of several of the village schools. These facilities have been largely designed, funded, and built through the Georgia Rural Development Program (personal communication, N. Nugzar, April 18, 2007). This development is supported by earlier research conducted by Rothenberger and Stewart (1995) where the authors determined that the inclusion of a greenhouse in the curriculum of secondary horticulture students was conducive to the learning of selected principles. According to Rothenberger and Stewart, “In this study, students who received a greenhouse laboratory experience scored significantly higher on the knowledge test than did students who were taught the same lessons, without a greenhouse laboratory experience” (p.28). Further, the value of contextual, “hands-on” education has been supported by scholars across several educational disciplines including agriculture, mathematics, and science (Chiasson & Burnett, 2001; Enderlin & Osborne, 1992; Lancelot, 1944; Newcomb, 1995; Phipps & Osborne; 1988; Shinn et al., 2003).

While it is clear that the Georgian Ministry of Education is very serious about fully implementing agricultural education programs in the village schools of Georgia (GIPA, 2006; Parr, Edwards, & Duncan, 2008), the full extent of the needs that these programs are experiencing in terms of equipment, supplies, and training has yet to be determined.

Purpose and Objectives

This purpose of this study was to determine the perception of secondary educators involved in FFG schools throughout the country of Georgia concerning their needs for furthering the existing framework of agricultural education. Data collected from this Delphi study will assist faculty and Georgia Institute of Public Affairs (GIPA) staff in continuing to build and expand existing programs, and determine the future direction of FFG programming. The specific objectives for this study were as follows:

1. Determine the perceived equipment needs for local agricultural education programs.
2. Determine the perceived inservice training needs for agricultural educators.
3. Determine the perceived student benefits of the FFG curriculum and agricultural education programs.
Methods

The researchers used a modified Delphi method to meet the aforesaid objectives of this study. According to Imran (2008), the Delphi is useful where opinions of experts is needed but time, distance, and other factors make it unlikely that the panel can work together. The Delphi method works well when the goal is to improve one’s understanding of opportunities and problems associated with a program (Skylmoski, Hartman & Krahn, 2007). The following authors have used the Delphi method to identify trends, characteristics, and future programming of agricultural education (Buriak & Shinn, 1993; Roberts & Dyer, 2004; Trexler, Parr & Khanna, 2006; Vamadore & Iverson, 1991).

The population for this study consisted of the high school agricultural education teachers and their administrators who were participating in the FFG program (n=14). The teachers represented seven different school districts located throughout various regions of the country.

The first round instrument (probe) consisted of four statements that were first translated to Georgian by GIPA staff and then administered to the teachers and administrators during a leadership workshop conducted by faculty from the University of Georgia (USA). The statements were developed by a panel of experts (teacher educators) at the University of Georgia and GIPA staff. Statements were as follows: 1. In your opinion, how has the FFG program increased the academic performance of your students?; 2. In your opinion, what needs to be done to improve the FFG program at your school?; 3. How can the FFG program contribute to the future development of agricultural education in the Former Republic of Georgia?; and 4. In your opinion, what do you see as the future of FFG programs in the Former Republic of Georgia?

Qualitative data collected from the probe was used to generate a series of 46 statements. In the second round participants were asked to rank the 46 statements using a five point Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree). Quantitative data collected from round two was used to rank the statements and identify consensus amount the participants. Statements with a score meeting the minimum importance scale were to be included in the third round. Due to the recent invasion of Georgia by Russia, the third round could not be conducted. Therefore, the researchers concluded that the round two data would be used to meet the objectives of this study. Further research will be conducted when it is deemed safe to travel throughout the country.

Results, Products, and Conclusions

Of the 14 participants in the study, nine were female. All the participants held degrees of higher education from institutes in the country of Georgia. Years of agricultural education teaching experience ranged from one to seven; with 3.75 years as the mean. Fourteen percent of the participants held at least a bachelors degree; 79% held a masters degree; and 6% held a doctorate. Two participants were between the ages 25-34, eight were between the age of 45-54, and two were between the age of 55-64.

Participants strongly agreed that the FFG program strengthens leadership skills among their students and students have become more involved in practical/labor activities. Participants also strongly agreed that improvement of schools’ materials, technology, and equipment are necessary to improve the FFG program (Table 1). Participants were either neutral or agreed with the following statements: due to the FFG program, academic performance has been increased among students; and students have greater academic success in history and geography.
Table 1.
*Level of Agreement with Round Two Statements (n=14)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The FFG program strengthens leadership skills among students.</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements of schools’ materials are necessary to improve the FFG program.</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to share experience with US students would improve the FFG program.</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements of schools’ technology base are necessary to improve the FFG program.</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations in Georgian language regarding FFG work are necessary to improve the FFG program.</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional teacher training is needed to improve the FFG program.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural equipment and tools are needed to improve the FFG program.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to the FFG program, students have become more involved in practical/labor activities.</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to the FFG program, students use the gained knowledge and skills practically.</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support is necessary to improve the FFG program.</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving other schools in the FFG program would improve the FFG program.</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ motivation and teachers’ hard work are necessary to improve the FFG program.</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining knowledge and skills from the FFG program will improve the future development of agricultural education in Georgia.</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to the FFG program, motivation has increased among the students.</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FFG program helped the students enjoy working together.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FFG program allowed students to get familiar with novelties in agriculture.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FFG coordinator should have a salary.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round tables and discussions would help improve the FFG program.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant literature is needed to improve the FFG program.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By increasing the students interest in the field of agriculture, the FFG program contributes to the future of agricultural education in Georgia.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FFG program will play an important role in the further development of schools that are involved in the program.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FFG members from each school should meet at least yearly to share ideas and experiences regarding FFG activities.  

Due to the FFG program, student interest for English language has increased. Frequent contact with local farmers and field days are necessary to improve the FFG program. The FFG program plays an important role in agricultural education development in Georgia.  

Through the FFG program, agricultural development could develop life conditions in Georgia. The FFG program increases student knowledge and interest in the proper use of pesticides and fertilizers. Due to the FFG program, student interest and responsibility for projects has increased. Increasing the hours of labor activities in school would improve the FFG program. The FFG program helps students discover and plan their future careers at an earlier age.  

The FFG program increases students’ knowledge and interest in bees. The FFG program increases student knowledge and interest in landscape design. The FFG program increases student knowledge and interest in cultivating soil properly. The FFG program increases student knowledge and interest in producing a variety of plants. The FFG program will help students to implement new methods and technologies in agriculture.  

The FFG program increases student knowledge and interest in floriculture. Due to the FFG program, agricultural knowledge among students has increased. As more students and schools become involved, the FFG program will be the foundation for agricultural development in Georgia. The FFG program supports the whole village to gain modern knowledge of agricultural issues. The FFG program will help establish entrepreneurial foundations using existing resources. FFG students will improve agricultural education in Georgia by sharing their knowledge with future generations. Due to the FFG program, enthusiasm and interest in natural sciences and agriculture has increased. Development of livestock is necessary to improve the FFG program.
The FFG program has encouraged students to consider continuing studying or pursuing a career in agriculture after graduation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to the FFG program, academic performance has been increased among students.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to the FFG program, students have greater academic success in History and Geography.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree

**Recommendations, Educational Importance, Implications, and Applications**

Through this study, the researchers have gained a greater understanding of the knowledge and needs of FFG teachers who are participating in this new secondary agricultural education program. The findings are similar to studies conducted in the US regarding the impact agricultural education has on student performance (Balschweid, 2002; Chiasson & Burnett, 2001; Enderlin, Petrea, & Osborne, 1993; Rickets & Duncan, 2006; and Whent & Leising, 1988). The aforementioned authors have all found positive correlations between participation in an agricultural education program and academic success. As the FFG programs mature and expand, more teachers and students will witness the benefits of the curriculum and experiential learning – the foundation of agricultural education.

The participants strongly agreed that upgrades to course curriculum, materials, and technology are important to the future success of the FFG program. To assure sustainability of current and future FFG programs, the Georgian government along with international funding agencies must continue to support FFG programming to insure future development of agricultural education across the country.

Teacher training was very important \( M = 4.71, \ SD = .46 \) to the participants to ensure that FFG programs improve and grow. Teacher training and in-service opportunities have been determined to be an important component to the success of agricultural education programs in the US (Dobbins and Camp 2000; Joerger, 2002; Roberts and Dyer 2004). Educational leaders (university faculty and government officials) must continually determine the needs of teachers so as to offer the necessary in-service opportunities.

The results of this study show the perceived importance of the FFG program to agricultural educators in Georgia. Antidotal to the data, there are fifty five additional schools interested in developing their FFG programming and receiving training for the agricultural education teachers and students from the faculty of the University of Georgia (USA). These findings will provide a direction for further development and implementation of agricultural education programs at the eight FFG schools and help determine the current and future directions of this effort.
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