

Perceptions of FCCLA as Reported by Advising and Non-Advising Family and Consumer Sciences Teachers

Karen L. Alexander

Texas Tech University

Kimberlee Davis

Texas State University at San Marcos

Sharon R. Pierce

Texas Association Family, Career and Community Leaders of America

While Family, Career and Community Leaders of America (FCCLA) memberships and numbers of chapters have declined since 1966, family and consumer sciences (FCS) course offerings in Grades 9-12 have increased. The purpose of this study was to determine why FCS teachers in Texas high schools are not becoming advisers of FCCLA and affiliating chapters of FCCLA in schools. Family and consumer sciences teachers were surveyed to identify their perceptions of FCCLA and the potential barriers to establishing local chapters. The sample consisted of FCS teachers in Texas high schools (N = 405). Slightly more than half (n = 209) reported no participation in FCCLA. Some of the barriers examined included subjects' perceptions of time available for involvement in an FCCLA chapter, whether chapters were curricular or co-curricular, whether FCCLA met the needs of students, the details involved in managing a chapter, the organization's focus on competitions, and funding sources.

Introduction

Family, Career and Community Leaders of America (FCCLA) is one of eleven career and technical education student organizations (CTSOs) that are federally funded through the *Carl D. Perkins IV Career and Technical Education Act of 2005* (Association for Career and Technical Education, 2011). As such, FCCLA should be integral to every high school's family and consumer sciences (FCS) education program. According to the Association for Career and Technical Education (2011), CTSOs represent more than 1.5 million high school students across all organizations and are designed to enhance classroom instruction of career and technical education (CTE) programs.

There are four common organizational goals associated with all CTOSs:

- leadership development;
- academic and career achievement;
- professional development; and
- community service (Association for Career and Technical Education, 2011).

While addressing these four goals appears to be paramount to the success of any local FCS program, the affiliation of chapters and chapter members seems to be on a continual decline. Nationally, FCCLA organizational membership peaked in 1966 with 607,175 members. Since then, membership has experienced a decline to its current level of 227,000 members (FCCLA,

2013a). Likewise, Texas has lost membership over the previous decades. However, since 2005 the state affiliate's membership has held steady at approximately 18,000 members. In 2014-2015 school year, the membership increased to 19,335 with 553 chapters (FCCLA, 2013a). In contrast to the state FCCLA membership, there were approximately 7,235 FCS courses (Grades 9-12) taught in Texas in 2010-11 by 2,948 teachers (Davis & Alexander, 2013). Each of these teachers could be a chapter adviser and affiliate a chapter.

The purpose of this study was to identify reasons why FCS teachers in Texas are not affiliating members with FCCLA. Family and consumer sciences teachers were surveyed to identify their perceptions of FCCLA and the potential barriers to having local chapters. Specifically, this exploratory study addressed the following research questions:

1. What are the differences between FCS teachers who are FCCLA Chapter Advisors and those teachers who are not advisors in terms of their opinions regarding (a) barriers to implementation of FCCLA chapters, (b) campus scheduling conflicts, and (c) purpose(s) of FCCLA?
2. Does implementation of FCCLA during class time (i.e. "co-curricular") or after school (i.e. "extra-curricular") predict teachers' opinions regarding (a) barriers to implementation of FCCLA chapters, (b) campus scheduling conflicts, and (c) purpose(s) of FCCLA?
3. Do teachers' opinions of FCCLA regarding (a) the barriers to implementation of FCCLA chapters, (b) campus scheduling conflicts, and (c) purpose(s) of FCCLA predict whether a teacher is or is not willing to start a chapter?
4. Does the funding source of FCCLA chapter activities predict the programs in which chapters participate?

Review of Related Literature

Since its establishment in 1945, FCCLA—originally named Future Homemakers of America—was designed to be an integral component of the FCS curriculum. The mission of FCCLA is to promote personal growth and leadership development through FCS education (FCCLA, 2013b). Additionally, FCCLA is the only in-school student organization with the family as its central focus.

Because advising an FCCLA chapter is often an expected responsibility of FCS teachers, training to be a new adviser is provided in many FCS university teacher preparation programs. The *National Standards for Teachers of Family and Consumer Sciences* (National Association of Teacher Educators for Family and Consumer Sciences [NATEFACS], 2004) addresses the advising expectation through Standard 10, "integrate the Family, Career and Community Leaders of America student organization into the program to foster students' academic growth, application of family and consumer sciences content, leadership, service learning, and career development." Specifically, new teachers should be prepared to justify the use of FCCLA programs to foster the development of their students and integrate those FCCLA programs to enhance their students' learning of FCS (NATEFACS, 2007).

Benefits of FCCLA Membership

Research has shown that CTSOs, including FCCLA, add value to students' educational experiences. Alfred, Hansen, Aragon, and Stone (2006) conducted a longitudinal study of all CTSOs and the findings indicated that students who participated in CTSOs had higher levels of academic engagement, civic engagement, career self-efficacy, employment skills, and motivation than those who did not. The level of participation by students also mattered with regard to high

school success indicators. Students who participated in CTSO activities were found to have higher academic motivation, academic engagement, grades, and college aspirations when compared to students who did not participate in CTSO activities (Alfred et al., 2006). Further, Alfred et al. (2006) determined that participation in CTSO activities that were focused on professional development, competitive events, and community service had positive impacts on student success. Specifically, competitive events had significant positive effects on academic engagement and career self-efficacy.

In collaboration with the National Research Center for College & University Admissions, FCCLA conducted a national study of FCS teachers and FCCLA members in 2010. The sample included 87,994 students and was deemed representative of the FCS student community (FCCLA, 2011). Leadership, communication, social and relationship skills were benefits that nearly 40% of students thought they received from being members. The majority of students (56%) said that FCCLA/FCS had a positive or very positive impact on their academic performance.

Classroom Integration of FCCLA and Student Participation

Prior research indicated that CTSOs that were co-curricular rather than extra-curricular played a role in keeping adolescents in school (Plank, 2001; Plank, Deluca, & Estacion, 2005). For FCCLA, the level of integration may vary from adviser to adviser. Ninety-four percent of surveyed FCCLA advisers said they integrated FCCLA into at least some of their lesson plans; while nearly 42% said that they integrated FCCLA throughout their curricula (FCCLA, 2011). Sixty-three percent of the surveyed non-advisers integrated FCCLA into at least some of their lesson plans. Six percent of surveyed FCCLA advisers indicated they had not integrated FCCLA into their FCS courses. Sixty-six percent of surveyed FCCLA advisers reported that *Community Service* was the FCCLA program most integrated among the FCS classrooms. Around half of the surveyed FCCLA advisers integrated *Power of One* and *Career Connection* programs, and 45% of these advisers used the *Families First* program. Almost one-third of the FCCLA advisers integrated *Financial Fitness*, while 22% integrated *Dynamic Leadership*. Fewer than 20% of advisers integrated *Families Acting for Community Traffic Safety (FACTS)* or *Leaders at Work* in their FCS courses (FCCLA, 2011).

A large majority (72%) of surveyed FCS students reported that they did not participate in FCCLA activities and events (FCCLA, 2011). Students indicated other activities that vied for their attention as follows: sports (48%), other extracurricular activities (43%), academic or hobby clubs (19%), service clubs and honor societies (11%), and student government (4%). Fewer than 3% of students participated in other CTSOs.

FCCLA Chapter Adviser Challenges

Family, Career and Community Leaders of America advisers believed that the greatest problem facing their FCS programs was lack of time, while educators who were not FCCLA advisers said that lack of money was the primary issue (FCCLA, 2011). More than half of FCCLA advisers indicated that lack of money was a problem facing their FCS programs. Family and consumer sciences educators agreed that other factors, such as scheduling, curricular changes and lack of interest influenced their programs.

Methodology

Participants were solicited using two methods. The first method was implemented during the summer of 2011 at the Family and Consumer Sciences Teachers Association of Texas

(FCSTAT) Professional Development Conference. Approximately 700 attendees were asked to participate by filling out a paper and pencil form of the survey. Approximately 15% of them ($n=104$) took part. Then, in the fall of 2011 a solicitation via email was circulated by FCSTAT to its 3,000 members asking them to participate in an on-line version of the survey administered via SurveyMonkey ($n=301$). A total of 405 useable surveys were completed by current secondary FCS teachers, which constituted a response rate of approximately 14%. Data were analyzed with *IBM SPSS Version 21*.

The instrument used in this study was developed by two FCS teacher educators teaching in FCS teacher preparation programs in Texas along with the expert input of the current Texas FCCLA executive director. The instrument consisted of demographic items and limited choice items analyzed with descriptive statistics. The instrument also contained 26 Likert scale items that identified issues related to local chapter advising. These 26 items were generated from a focus group of current and past advisers. The focus group was convened by the current executive director for FCCLA to discuss issues related to advising FCCLA chapters.

Sample

Of the sample ($N = 405$), slightly more than half ($n = 209$) indicated they did not have a local FCCLA chapter (Table 1). Of those teachers self-reporting that they had a local chapter ($n = 229$), 114 reported the chapter as extra-curricular (after school) and 115 reported the chapter as co-curricular (during class time). While the total number of teachers ($n = 229$) reporting their chapter implementation style is larger than the total reporting advising a chapter, it is important to note that there is no clear explanation for this discrepancy. However, the respondents may have had a combination type chapter that utilizes time after school and during class to meet with members. The response option of “combination chapter” was not available on the instrument, and the respondents were not limited in their response options on this instrument item.

Further, some in the sample reported that they advise other CTSO organizations including Texas Association of Future Educators (TAFE), Future Farmers of America (FFA), and Skills USA. Sixty-four respondents indicated their willingness to start an FCCLA chapter with assistance.

Results

The 26 Likert scale items that identified opinions of FCCLA-related issues were analyzed with a mean analysis (Table 2). For those teachers who did not advise an FCCLA chapter, 45.9% either agreed or strongly agreed that advising a chapter takes too much time; whereas, teachers who sponsored a local chapter disagreed or strongly disagreed (58.6%) that advising a chapter takes too much time.

Opinions on the cost of advising a chapter were mixed. For the non-advising teachers, 48.8% either agreed or strongly agreed that FCCLA participation costs too much to operate, while 32.6% of this group either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the cost factor. The teachers who advised a chapter varied in their opinions on this item with 38.2% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that FCCLA costs too much money, while 31.6% either agreed or strongly agreed.

Table 1*Characteristics of the Sample (N = 405)*

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
FCCLA Chapter Advisor Status		
Current FCCLA Chapter Advisor	196	48.4
Not a Current FCCLA Chapter Advisor	209	51.6
Other CTSO Sponsorship		
TAFE	46	11.4
Skills USA	5	1.2
FFA	3	0.7
None	351	86.7
Willingness to Start a Chapter with Assistance		
Yes	64	15.8
No	146	36.0
Not applicable	195	48.1
FCCLA Implementation Style		
Extra-curricular	114	28.2
Co-curricular	115	28.4
Not Applicable	176	43.4

There was also disagreement within and between the groups of teachers regarding the lack of interest in FCCLA by their students. Specifically, teachers advising a chapter disagreed or strongly disagreed (41.8%) with the issue that students lacked interest in joining FCCLA, while 38.2 % of those teachers strongly agreed or agreed that their students lacked interest in joining a chapter, leaving 20% of the respondents undecided. Of those teachers who did not affiliate a chapter, 32.5% either strongly disagreed or disagreed that students lacked interest in the organization, and 47.4% either agreed or strongly agreed that students lacked interest, leaving 20.1% of the respondents undecided.

In other issues related to local implementation, both groups of teachers indicated that they knew how to start a chapter. However, those teachers who were not advising a chapter reported varying views on whether the following issues were barriers: (a) organization is confusing, (b) do not know how to implement a chapter within the regular school day, (c) organization is too focused on competition, i.e. STAR Events, (d) too many programs, process for participation is too complicated, (e) recent FCS state-level curriculum changes make implementation too difficult, and (f) lack of support from community. Conversely, the majority of those teachers who advised chapters disagreed that the latter issues were barriers to advising chapters.

One problematic issue agreed upon by both groups was that scheduling conflicts prevented student participation in FCCLA, and teachers advising a local chapter indicated that required academic courses prevented student participation (58.6%). Interestingly, the majority of non-advising teachers did not see academic course conflicts as an issue (53.6%).

Overall, both groups of teachers indicated that the organization met the needs of their students, reflected diversity, and the image of FCCLA was one of respect. Finally, the issues

that reflected the highest levels of agreement with both groups of teachers related to FCCLA promoting the eight purposes of the organization—the last eight items on Table 2 and Table 3.

Table 2

Opinions of Teachers Not Advising an FCCLA Chapter on Advising Issues

Issue	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Not Sure		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Takes too much time	13	6.2	55	26.3	45	22	77	36.8	19	9.1
Cost too much	10	4.8	58	27.8	39	19	62	29.7	40	19
Organization's membership lacks diversity	37	17.7	83	39.7	60	29	22	10.5	7	3.3
Programs do not meet the needs of the students I teach	39	18.7	77	36.8	42	20	40	19.1	11	5.3
Do not know how to start a chapter	47	22.5	95	45.5	29	14	21	10	17	8.1
Organization is confusing	26	12.4	76	36.4	50	24	46	22	11	5.3
Do not know how to implement FCCLA within the regular school day	23	11	67	32.1	37	18	65	31.1	17	8.1
School district administration will not support FCCLA activities	25	12	74	35.4	54	26	42	20.1	14	6.7
Too focused on competitions (STAR Events)	19	9.1	57	27.3	59	28	47	22.5	27	13
Too many programs	16	7.7	62	29.7	68	33	39	18.7	24	12
Process for participation is too complicated	17	8.1	54	25.8	54	26	61	29.2	23	11
FCS curriculum changes makes implementation difficult	19	9.1	47	22.5	59	28	64	30.6	20	9.6
Lack of support from community	14	6.7	46	22	76	36	59	28.2	14	6.7
Image of FCCLA is one of respect	4	1.9	17	8.1	46	22	78	37.3	64	31
Lack of interest by students	22	10.5	46	22	42	20	75	35.9	24	12
Required academic courses prevent student participation	59	28.2	53	25.4	0	0	64	30.6	33	16
Scheduling conflicts prevent student participation	8	3.8	31	14.8	40	19	79	37.8	51	24
Provides opportunities for personal development and preparation for adult life	3	1.4	6	2.9	19	9.1	90	43.1	91	44
Strengthens the family as a basic unit of society	6	2.9	11	5.3	44	21	83	39.7	65	31
Encourages democracy through cooperative action in the home and community	5	2.4	8	3.8	43	21	94	45	59	28

Encourages individual and group involvement in helping achieve global cooperation and harmony	3	1.4	11	5.3	38	18	101	48.3	56	27
Promotes greater understanding between youth and adults	0	0	19	9.1	42	20	102	48.8	46	22
Providing opportunities for making decisions and for assuming responsibilities	6	2.9	19	9.1	30	14	93	44.5	61	29
Promotes FCS and related occupations	3	1.4	8	3.8	34	16	102	48.8	62	30
Prepares for the multiple roles of men and women in today's society	4	1.9	15	7.2	36	17	92	44	62	30

Table 3

Opinions of FCCLA Chapter Advisers on Advising Issues

Issue	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Not Sure		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Takes too much time	22	11.2	93	47.4	19	9.7	53	27	9	4.6
Cost too much	12	6.1	63	32.1	32	16	53	27	9	4.6
Organization's membership lacks diversity	56	28.6	116	59.2	14	7.1	9	4.6	1	0.5
Programs do not meet the needs of the students I teach	58	29.6	105	53.6	10	5.1	16	8.2	7	3.6
Do not know how to start a chapter	99	50.5	72	36.7	13	6.6	9	4.6	3	1.5
Organization is confusing	40	20.4	91	46.4	16	8.2	37	18.9	12	6.1
Do not know how to implement FCCLA within the regular school day	51	26	83	42.3	11	5.6	43	21.9	8	4.1
School district administration will not support FCCLA activities	55	28.1	104	53.1	14	7.1	21	10.7	2	1
Too focused on competitions (STAR Events)	29	14.8	72	36.7	35	18	53	27	7	3.6
Too many programs	27	13.8	78	39.8	34	17	38	19.4	19	9.7
Process for participation is too complicated	25	12.8	83	42.3	22	11	47	24	19	9.7
FCS curriculum changes makes implementation difficult	29	14.8	71	36.2	34	17	50	25.5	12	6.1
Lack of support from community	24	12.2	84	42.9	37	19	42	21.4	9	4.6
Image of FCCLA is one of respect	0	0	12	6.1	32	16	92	46.9	60	31
Lack of interest by students	23	11.7	59	30.1	39	20	53	27	22	11
Required academic courses prevent student participation	0	0	51	26	30	15	82	41.8	33	17

Scheduling conflicts prevent student participation	6	3.1	34	17.3	14	7.1	101	51.5	41	21
Provides opportunities for personal development and preparation for adult life	6	3.1	4	2	6	3.1	69	35.2	111	57
Strengthens the family as a basic unit of society	3	1.5	9	4.6	28	14	81	41.3	75	38
Encourages democracy through cooperative action in the home and community	1	0.5	7	3.6	28	14	91	46.4	69	35
Encourages individual and group involvement in helping achieve global cooperation and harmony	5	2.6	10	5.1	24	12	94	48	63	32
Promotes greater understanding between youth and adults	0	0	17	8.7	16	8.2	95	48.5	68	35
Provide opportunities for making decisions and for assuming responsibilities	1	0.5	30	15.3	4	2	75	38.3	86	44
Promotes FCS and related occupations	1	0.5	9	32.7	18	9.2	104	53.1	64	9.2
Prepares for the multiple roles of men and women in today's society	0	0	12	6.1	21	11	94	48	69	35

Factor Analysis

Data concerning opinions of FCCLA-related issues were analyzed by factor analysis to determine commonality of the issues. The following criteria were used to determine the number of factors to rotate: (a) the a priori hypothesis that the measure was unidimensional, (b) the scree test, and (c) the interpretability of the factor solution. The scree plot indicated that our initial hypothesis of unidimensionality was incorrect. Based on the plot, three factors were rotated using the Promax with Kaiser Normalization procedure. Three items were eliminated based on their eigen values > 0.25 . The rotation solution of the remaining 23 items yielded three interpretable factors (Table 4): (a) barriers to the implementation of an FCCLA chapter, (b) whether school scheduling impaired the implementation of FCCLA chapters, and (c) statements relating to the purpose of FCCLA participation. As the factors were correlated, sums of squared loadings could not be added to obtain a total variance.

The skewness and kurtosis of the three factors were within a tolerable range for assuming a normal distribution, and examination of the histograms suggested that the distribution looked approximately normal (Table 5). Thus, the data were deemed suitable for parametric statistical analyses.

In answering the first research question, a one-way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of the three independent variables (a) the barriers to implementation of FCCLA chapters, (b) campus scheduling conflicts, and (c) the purpose(s) of FCCLA on the dependent variable— FCCLA Chapter Advisors and those teachers who are not advisors. Significant differences were found among the three independent variables on the dependent variable, Wilks's $\Lambda = 0.88$, $F(3, 401) = 18.08$, $p < 0.01$.

Table 4

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis Using Promax with Kaiser Normalization

Issues	Factors		
	Barriers	Purposes of FCCLA	School Schedules
Takes too much time	0.680	0.055	-0.066
Costs too much	0.596	0.063	0.071
Organization's membership lacks diversity	0.462	-0.146	-0.081
Programs do not meet the needs of the students I teach	0.503	-0.210	-0.021
Do not know how to start a chapter	0.382	0.008	-0.133
Organization is confusing	0.725	0.026	-0.045
Do not know how to implement FCCLA within the regular school day	0.432	0.028	0.016
Too focused on competitions (STAR Events)	0.657	0.067	0.024
Too many programs	0.740	0.071	-0.010
Process for participation is too complicated	0.817	0.098	0.025
FCS curriculum changes make implementation difficult	0.544	-0.054	0.174
Lack of support from community	0.403	-0.085	0.159
Required academic courses prevent student participation	-0.098	-0.026	0.871
Scheduling conflicts prevent student participation	0.084	0.056	0.775
Provides opportunities for personal development and preparation for adult life	0.048	0.556	-0.073
Strengthens the family as a basic unit of society	-0.093	0.649	0.049
Encourages democracy through cooperative action in the home and community	0.046	0.770	-0.047
Encourages individual and group involvement in helping achieve global cooperation and harmony	-0.025	0.716	0.011
Promotes greater understanding between youth and adults	-0.191	0.656	0.044
Provides opportunities for making decisions and for assuming responsibilities	0.203	0.728	0.124
Prepares for the multiple roles of men and women in today's society	-0.055	0.778	-0.016
Image of FCCLA is one of respect	-0.018	0.567	-0.111
Promotes FCS and related occupations	0.057	0.731	-0.033

To further explain the differences, a one-way ANOVA was conducted. Results of the ANOVA were significant for the barriers to implementation of FCCLA chapters, $F(1, 403) = 37.0, p < 0.01$, and the purpose(s) of FCCLA, $F(1, 403) = 7.09, p < .01$. However, the variable, campus scheduling conflicts was found to be non-significant, $F(1, 403) = 1.19, p = 0.28$.

To answer research question two, a one-way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of the three independent variables (a) the barriers to implementation of FCCLA chapters, (b) the purpose(s) of FCCLA, and (c) campus scheduling conflicts, on the dependent variable-- whether an FCCLA program is implemented as part of a class (i.e. “co-curricular”) or after school (i.e. “extra-curricular”). Significant differences were found among the three independent variables on the dependent variable, Wilks’s $\Lambda = 0.94$, $F(3, 225) = 4.71$, $p < 0.01$.

These differences were further analyzed with a one-way ANOVA. Results were significant for the barriers to implementation of FCCLA chapters, $F(1, 227) = 9.85$, $p < 0.01$. However, purpose(s) of FCCLA, $F(1, 227) = 0.39$, $p = 0.53$ and campus scheduling conflicts were found to be non-significant, $F(1, 227) = 0.13$, $p = 0.72$.

Table 5

Descriptive statistics of the factors: Barriers, FCCLA Purposes, and School Schedule (N=405)

Factor	# of items	M (SD)	Skewness	Kurtosis	Alpha
Barriers	12	39.6 (8.69)	0.157	-0.452	0.82
School Schedules	2	4.9 (2.07)	0.457	-0.468	0.83
Purposes of FCCLA	9	17.5 (5.94)	0.365	-0.278	0.90

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between whether a FCS teacher is willing to start a FCCLA chapter and the teacher’s opinions regarding each of the following: (a) barriers to implementation of FCCLA chapters, (b) the purpose(s) of FCCLA, and (c) campus scheduling conflicts. There was a significant negative correlation between willingness to start an FCCLA chapter and barriers to implementation of FCCLA chapters: $r = -0.27$, $n = 405$, $p = 0.00$. A significant positive correlation between willingness to start an FCCLA chapter and purposes was found: $r = 0.14$, $n = 405$, $p = 0.01$. There was no significant relationship between willingness to start an FCCLA chapter and campus scheduling conflicts: $r = 0.04$, $n = 405$, $p = 0.39$.

For the purposes of answering the fourth research question, the results are based upon the surveys submitted by those teachers who self-reported advising a chapter ($n=196$). A correlation was used to answer whether or not the funding source of FCCLA chapter activities predicts the programs in which chapters participate. First, the number and percentage of participation in FCCLA programs was determined (Table 6).

Second, the methods for funding chapter activities were determined as follows: fund raising ($n=224$, 96.1%), local school funds ($n=102$, 43.8%), private donations ($n=41$, 17.6%), and corporate or business donations ($n=27$, 11.6%). Finally, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationships between the nature of FCCLA Chapter funding of activities and the programs in which chapters participated (Table 7).

Table 6*FCCLA Program Participation*

Program	<i>N</i>	%
STAR Events		
Yes	129	65.8
No	67	34.2
<i>Career Connections</i>		
Yes	25	12.8
No	171	87.2
Community Service		
Yes	124	63.3
No	72	37.3
<i>Dynamic Leadership</i>		
Yes	14	7.1
No	182	92.9
<i>FACTS-Families Acting for Community Traffic Safety</i>		
Yes	43	21.9
No	153	78.1
<i>Families First</i>		
Yes	38	19.4
No	158	80.6
<i>Financial Fitness</i>		
Yes	24	12.3
No	172	87.8
Japanese Exchange		
Yes	3	2.5
No	193	98.5
<i>Leaders at Work</i>		
Yes	13	6.6
No	183	93.4
<i>Power of One</i>		
Yes	73	37.2
No	123	62.8
<i>STOP the Violence</i>		
Yes	44	22.4
No	152	77.6
<i>Student Body</i>		
Yes	42	21.4
No	154	78.6
Leadership Enhancement Opportunities		
Yes	100	51.0
No	96	49.0

Table 7*Correlations Between Measures*

Activities	Fund raising	Local school funds	Private donations	Corporate or business donations
STAR Events	0.20 **	0.25 **	0.26 **	0.20 **
<i>Career Connections</i>	0.09	0.00	0.16 *	0.15 *
Community Service	0.27 **	0.11	0.08	0.05
Dynamic Leadership	0.07	0.23 **	0.25 **	0.08
<i>FACTS - Families Acting for Community Traffic Safety</i>	0.02	0.25 **	0.33 **	0.31 **
<i>Families First</i>	0.12	0.16 *	0.27 **	0.18 *
<i>Financial Fitness</i>	0.09	0.20 **	0.30 **	0.30 **
Japanese Exchange	0.03	0.06	0.06	0.08
<i>Leaders at Work</i>	0.07	0.05	0.27 **	0.22 **
<i>Power of One</i>	0.10	0.31 **	0.29 **	0.18 *
<i>STOP the Violence</i>	0.03	0.31 **	0.33 **	0.30 **
<i>Student Body</i>	0.13	0.16 *	0.34 **	0.27 **
Leadership Enhancement Opportunities	0.21 **	0.20 **	0.18 **	0.10

Note. *p < .01, **p < .001

Discussion and Conclusions

The opinions regarding the barriers to advising FCCLA chapters were mixed between the two groups of teachers, and these findings were supported by the results of the ANOVA and Pearson product-moment correlations. The majority of the teachers who advise a chapter did not view the time it takes to advise a chapter as a major barrier. Many of those teachers may have learned how to effectively manage a chapter. For instance, the majority of advising teachers indicated that they knew how to implement a chapter within the regular school day. In contrast, the majority of the teachers who did not advise a chapter reported that they agreed or were unsure if the time involved was a major barrier to advising. For many teachers, the time involved with advising may be a deterrent to maintaining a chapter. Results of the national FCCLA survey cited earlier revealed that nearly half of non-advising teachers participated in an academic/hobby club which takes away available time for FCCLA.

There was a mixed perception by both groups of teachers that their students lacked interest in FCCLA. The results indicated that this perception was more evident with the non-advising teachers; however, a little over 38% of the advising teachers agreed that there was a lack of interest in FCCLA. Interest in FCCLA by the students could be impacted by the level of enthusiasm for FCCLA that is expressed by the teachers. Further, the interest level might also be impacted by the relevance that students apply to their current and future lives. If teachers are able to connect the benefits of membership to students' overall preparation for college and career opportunities, for instance, then students' interest levels in joining the organization might be more evident.

The majority of both groups of teachers agreed that FCCLA met the needs of their students and that they knew how to start a chapter. These are concerning results. If the organization meets the needs of students and the majority of teachers know how to start a chapter, then the question arises, why are not more teachers advising chapters? Some of the varying views on the issues identified below should be examined to help answer that question because the majority of those advising did not indicate that the following were barriers:

- organization is confusing,
- do not know how to implement a chapter within the regular school day,
- organization is too focused on competition, i.e. STAR Events,
- too many programs,
- process for participation is too complicated,
- recent FCS state-level curriculum changes make implementation too difficult, and
- lack of support from community.

While the descriptive statistics indicated that overall both groups of teachers agreed the organization promoted the eight purposes of FCCLA, the ANOVA revealed that there was a significant difference between the advising teachers and non-advising teachers with this variable. Further, there was a positive correlation between the variables willingness to start a chapter and the purposes of the organization. For those teachers who are willing to start a chapter, this finding may indicate that there is agreement that the organization is consistent in promoting and supporting its purposes.

To increase the number of chapters and student participation, issues related to scheduling might need to be addressed with the local counselors and school administration. The majority of those teachers who were advising agreed that issues such as enrollment in required academic courses, and the organization of the overall school schedule prevented student participation in local chapters.

There is a significant relationship between participation in STAR Events and all four types of funding for local chapter activities. The Texas-specific activity, Leadership Enhancement Opportunities (LEOs), had a significant relationship with each of three funding sources (fund raising, local school funds, and private donations). Both STAR Events and LEOs require a registration fee for participation and are therefore more expensive than all other activities. Because these activities require more funds for participation, advisers might seek all possible sources of funding to support the members' participation.

There was also a significant relationship between three sources of funding (local school funds, private donations, and corporate or business donations) and the chapter activities that are consideration peer education projects, e.g. *FACTS*, *Families First*, *Financial Fitness*, *STOP the Violence*, and *Student Body*. Interestingly, the variable, community service activities, was significantly correlated with fund raising, only. It is possible that chapters elect to use fundraising solely for community service because chapters are taking action to contribute to their communities, and other sources of funding may diminish the chapters' contributions.

Additionally, there was a significant correlation between the two activities that focus on career education (*Career Connection*, *Leaders at Work*) and private donations and corporate or business donations. These areas are connected to the career education experiences of FCCLA members including work-based learning, mentoring, job shadowing, internships, etc., and are more likely to be supported with business and industry partnerships. While it is impossible to be certain of the reasons for these relationships from this study, these relationships warrant further exploration in future studies focused on FCS and/or FCCLA.

Recommendations

Since the majority of teachers surveyed indicated that they knew how to start a chapter, professional development focused on FCCLA may be better received if it addresses some of the other barriers that teachers indicated are problematic such as the cost involved, complicated participation processes, and changes in state-level FCS curriculum. Support is also needed to help teachers show the relevance and/or benefits of the organization to potential members.

The results of chapter fundraising data can be helpful for local chapter advisers in planning a yearly budget for chapter activities and for justifying the need for local chapter fundraisers. School principals may be more willing to provide support for these fundraisers and/or additional financial support for local chapters if they know that two of the three most common activities for chapters require registration fees for participation.

Further, several implications can be applied to FCS teacher education programs. First, dedicating instructional time to understanding the history and relevance of FCCLA is critical to the development of new teachers because many new teachers may not be familiar with the organization or may not have had the opportunity to actively participate at the local level. Second, teacher education programs need to integrate FCCLA projects and activities in teacher preparation courses to expose future teachers to FCCLA and to model the importance of a co-curricular learning experience. Third, FCCLA connections should be reflected in local curriculum and lesson planning assignments and should be implemented during the student teaching and/or internship experience. Fourth, teacher preparation programs can promote attendance of university students at meetings such as National Cluster Meetings where pre-adviser trainings occur as well as their respective regional and state meetings where the students can volunteer to judge STAR Events and other competitive activities. Finally, teacher educators need to enthusiastically embrace the organization and stress that FCCLA is a resource for classroom instruction. These suggestions might result in more enthusiasm for advising a local chapter (Ambrose & Goar, 2009; DeBates & Pickard, 2008).

This was the first application of this instrument in a research study, and while the items were developed from a focus group, reviewed by a panel of FCS content experts, and reflect high levels of reliability (Table 4), further investigation of the instrument is recommended. This instrument could be used with other groups of FCS teachers and data could be compared on national or state levels.

A follow-up qualitative study could be helpful in providing more insight into the barriers to chapter advising. For instance, a focus group of teachers could help to identify where the participation process is too complicated and provide recommendations for streamlining guidelines. Other barriers could also be discussed in the focus group sessions.

Limitations

This study used the self-reported data from a convenience sample of FCS teachers in one state. Interpretation of results should be limited to this sample of teachers because it is not representative of the population of all FCS teachers. Further, caution should be used when interpreting the results of self-reported data. In this case, participants may have responded to the items in a way they felt was professionally acceptable rather than honestly responding to the items. The researchers have no way to determine the respondents' reasons for their responses with this instrument.

References

- Alfred, C., Hansen, D.M., Aragon, S. R., & Stone, J. R., III. (2006). Inside the black box: Exploring the value added by career and technical student organizations to students' high school experience. *Career and Technical Education Research*, 31(3), 121-155.
- Ambrose, W., & Goar, L. (2009). Student organization integration: Initiatives for positive youth development—the ultimate leadership experience. *Journal of Family Consumer Sciences Education*, 27, 65-83. Retrieved from <http://www.natefacs.org/Pages/v27standards5/v27standards5Ambrose.pdf>
- Association for Career and Technology Education. (2011). *Expanding career readiness through career and technical student organizations*. Retrieved from <https://www.acteonline.org/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=2116>
- Davis, K., & Alexander, K. (2013). Secondary family and consumer sciences programs in the state of Texas: A descriptive study of the teachers and courses. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences Education*, 31(1), 1-13. Retrieved from <http://www.natefacs.org/Pages/v31no1/v31no1Davis.pdf>
- DeBates, D., & Pickard, M. (2008). Student organization integration: Comparison of two models for implementing FCCLA in teacher preparation. *Journal of Family Consumer Sciences Education*, 26, 50-65. Retrieved from <http://www.natefacs.org/Pages/v26Standards3/v26Standards3DeBates.pdf>
- Family, Career and Community Leaders of America. (2011). *2011 Annual report: Cooperative research program*. Retrieved from http://www.aafcs.org/res/Essential_Tools/FCCLA_Annual_Report_2011.pdf
- Family, Career and Community Leaders of America. (2013a). *Annual membership report 2012-2013*. Retrieved from http://www.fcclainc.org/assets/files/pdf/membership/2012-2013_MembershipReport.pdf
- Family, Career and Community Leaders of America. (2013b). *Bylaws 2013*. Retrieved from <https://www.fcclainc.org/assets/files/2013%20Bylaws.pdf>
- National Association of Teacher Educators for Family and Consumer Sciences. (2004). *National standards for teachers of family and consumer sciences*. Retrieved from <http://www.natefacs.org/nationalstandards.htm>
- National Association of Teacher Educators for Family and Consumer Sciences (NATEFACS). (2007). *Expectation statements for the national standards for teachers of family and consumer sciences* (2nd Ed.). Working paper developed at the 2007 Family and Consumer Sciences Teacher Education Conference, Indianapolis, IN. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences Education*, 27, *National Teacher Standards* 5, 94-96. Retrieved from <http://www.natefacs.org/Pages/v27standards5/v27standards5ExpectationsStatements2007NSTFCS.pdf>
- Plank, S. B. (2001). A question of balance: CTE, academic courses, high school persistence, and student achievement. *Journal of Vocational Education Research*, 26(3), 279–327.
- Plank, S., DeLuca, S., & Estacion, A. (2005, October). *Dropping out of high school and the place of career and technical education: A survival analysis of surviving high school*. St.

Paul, MN: National Research Center for Career and Technical Education, University of Minnesota. Retrieved from <http://www.nrccte.org/sites/default/files/publication-files/droppingout-plank.pdf>

About the Authors

Karen L. Alexander is an Associate Professor and Program Director of Family and Consumer Sciences Education at Texas Tech University in Lubbock, Texas.

Kimberlee Davis is an Associate Professor of Consumer Affairs and Assistant Director of Undergraduate Studies and Online Education in the School of Family and Consumer Sciences at Texas State University in San Marcos, Texas.

Sharon R. Pierce is the State Advisor for the Texas Association Family, Career and Community Leaders of America in Austin, Texas.

Citation

Alexander, K. L., Davis, K. & Pierce, S. R. (2015). Perceptions of FCCLA as reported by advising and non-advising family and consumer sciences teachers. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences Education*, 32(1), 8-23. Available at <http://www.natefac.org/Pages/v32no1/v32no1Alexander.pdf>