

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CURRICULUM BY THE GRADUATES
OF THE DIVISION OF BUSINESS OF OKLAHOMA
PANHANDLE STATE UNIVERSITY

By

RUSSELL SPENCE EDENBOROUGH

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma Panhandle State University
Goodwell, Oklahoma
1966

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1967

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1975

MAY 12 1976

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CURRICULUM BY THE GRADUATES
OF THE DIVISION OF BUSINESS OF OKLAHOMA
PANHANDLE STATE UNIVERSITY

Thesis Approved:

Harold A. Conrad

Thesis Adviser

Walter L. Starks

Thomas A. Casman

Charles O. Hopkins

D. D. Burton

Dean of the Graduate College

938925

PREFACE

I wish to extend special thanks to Dr. Harold Coonrad, who served as chairman, for his time and valuable assistance in the writing and editing of the manuscript. I also wish to extend special thanks to Dr. Charles O. Hopkins who was very helpful in the development of the study and the conduct of the research.

I am grateful to the other members of my committee--Dr. Thomas Karman and Dr. Walter Starks--for serving ably on my behalf.

I also want to express a note of appreciation to my wife, Judy, for her invaluable aid and assistance to me; and to my two boys, Rusty and Roger, for their patience with me while I completed the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Problem	2
Need for the Study	3
Purpose of the Study	4
The Statement of the Problem	5
Research Questions	5
Limitations of the Study	5
Methodology	6
Definitions	7
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
Higher Education Curriculum Revision	9
Past Follow-Up Studies	11
Studies Using the Delphi Technique	13
Summary	16
III. PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY	18
Population	18
Procedure of the Study	20
Analysis of the Data	22
Summary	34
IV. ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF THE DATA	36
Introduction	36
Total Group Rankings	37
Comparison of Individual Sub-Group Responses to Total Group Responses	38
Summary	80
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	83
Summary	83
Findings	85
Conclusions	87
Recommendations	90
Implications	96

Chapter	Page
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	97
APPENDIX A	99
APPENDIX B	103
APPENDIX C	112
APPENDIX D	120
APPENDIX E	133
APPENDIX F	139

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Class Population and Sample Size	19
II. Number of Sample Responses by Year to Correspondence Sheet Number Two	23
III. Number of Sample Responses by Business Major Field to Correspondence Sheet Number Two	24
IV. Number of Sample Responses by Present Occupations to Correspondence Sheet Number Two	25
V. Consolidation of Statement One Responses--Areas of Study in the Field of Business	27
VI. Consolidation of Statement Two Responses--Areas of Study Outside the Field of Business	30
VII. Consolidation of Statement Three Responses--Weaknesses That Exist in the Division of Business	32
VIII. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the 1964-1968 Year of Graduation Group on Statement One	39
IX. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the 1969-1973 Year of Graduation Group on Statement One	40
X. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Accounting Majors Group on Statement One	41
XI. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Business Administration Major Group Responses on Statement One	43
XII. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Business Education Major Group Responses on Statement One	44

Table	Page
XIII. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Accounting Occupation Group Responses on Statement One	45
XIV. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Farming Occupation Group Responses on Statement One	46
XV. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Management Occupation Group Response on Statement One	48
XVI. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Sales Occupation Group Responses on Statement One	49
XVII. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Secretarial Occupation Group Responses on Statement One	50
XVIII. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Teaching Occupation Group Responses on Statement One	51
XIX. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Miscellaneous Occupation Group Responses on Statement One	53
XX. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the 1964-1968 Year of Graduation Group Responses on Statement Two	54
XXI. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the 1969-1973 Year of Graduation Group Responses on Statement Two	55
XXII. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Accounting Major Group Responses on Statement Two	56
XXIII. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Business Administration Major Group Responses on Statement Two	57
XXIV. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Business Education Major Group Responses on Statement Two	58
XXV. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Accounting Occupation Group Responses on Statement Two	60

Table	Page
XXVI. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Farming Occupation Group Responses on Statement Two	61
XXVII. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Management Occupation Group Responses on Statement Two	62
XXVIII. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Sales Occupation Group Responses on Statement Two	63
XXIX. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Secretarial Occupation Group Responses on Statement Two	64
XXX. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Teaching Occupation Group Responses on Statement Two	65
XXXI. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Miscellaneous Occupation Group Responses on Statement Two	67
XXXII. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the 1964-1968 Year of Graduation Group Responses on Statement Three	68
XXXIII. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the 1969-1973 Year of Graduation Group Responses on Statement Three	69
XXXIV. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Accounting Major Group Responses on Statement Three	69
XXXV. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Business Administration Group Responses on Statement Three	70
XXXVI. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Business Education Major Group Responses on Statement Three	71
XXXVII. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Accounting Occupation Group Responses on Statement Three	73
XXXVIII. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Farming Occupation Group Responses on Statement Three	74

Table	Page
XXXIX. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Management Occupation Group Responses on Statement Three	75
XL. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Sales Occupation Group Responses on Statement Three	76
XLI. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Secretarial Occupation Group Responses on Statement Three	78
XLII. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Teaching Occupation Group Responses on Statement Three	79
XLIII. A Comparison of the Rankings of the Top Half of the Total Group and the Miscellaneous Group Responses on Statement Three	80
XLIV. Present Business Curriculum	91
XLV. Proposed Curriculum for Business Majors	93
XLVI. Statement One--Group Rankings of Total Responses	121
XLVII. Statement Two--Group Rankings of Total Responses	125
XLVIII. Statement Three--Group Rankings of Total Responses	129
XLIX. Statement One--Group Rankings of Consolidated Responses	134
L. Statement Two--Group Rankings of Consolidated Responses	136
LI. Statement Three--Group Rankings of Consolidated Responses	138
LII. Analysis of the Sample	140

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The history of higher education in the United States is replete with changes in the curriculum of the various institutions. From the rigid trivium and quadrivium of early American higher education to the more practical and specialized courses of today, higher education has evolved in one form or another.

Today, there are decisions to be made concerning the future of the higher education curriculum. A college or university that does not change its curriculum to meet the changing demands of today's world and today's students will soon stagnate or find itself replaced by an institution that does fulfill the changing demands. There are historical precedents for this. A prime example occurred in the first half of the nineteenth century. The private liberal arts colleges of that time refused to significantly alter or update their courses in order to allow for a more practical or vocationally oriented curriculum. The result was the rise of the technical institute and state supported universities which soon were larger than the private liberal arts colleges.

Each college and university is located in a distinct geographical location. Some of the colleges and universities serve a local area, some a regional area, some a state area, and some the national area. Panhandle State University, by its location, is a regional college. The nearest public four-year college is located some one hundred and

twenty miles to the south. Its location in the Panhandle of Oklahoma necessitates service not only to the Panhandle area but also to the surrounding areas of Texas, Kansas, Colorado, and New Mexico.

Background of the Problem

Oklahoma Panhandle State University is a four-year, state-supported institution located at Goodwell, Oklahoma. It has a present enrollment of almost 1,000 students, of which approximately 300 are enrolled in the Division of Business, which offers four majors: Accounting, Business Education, Secretarial Science, and Business Administration.¹

The purposes of the Business Division at Panhandle State University are to meet the demands of the following: (1) those who wish to prepare for the accounting profession; (2) those who wish to prepare for secretarial positions; (3) those who wish to teach business subjects in high schools; (4) those who wish some introductory training in the distributive field; and (5) those who are interested in obtaining general business training which will assist them to live intelligently in the modern world of business.²

The enrollment of Panhandle State University and of the Division of Business has remained fairly constant over the ten-year period surveyed. The enrollment in 1964 was approximately 800 total students with 200 business majors.

Some changes occurred in the Business Division over the ten-year period. A limited amount of equipment in the form of calculators,

¹Panhandle State University Catalog, 1972-1974 (Goodwell, 1972), p. 27.

²Ibid., p. 40.

electric typewriters, and other office machines was acquired. It was not until after the ten-year period--the fall of 1973--that significant changes in equipment occurred. The faculty of Oklahoma Panhandle State University Business Division has increased over the ten-year period. Approximately two and one-half instructors were teaching business in 1964. In 1968 an additional two and one-half instructors were added, bringing the total to five instructors. At this same time, the curriculum was also broadened. The accounting major was approved in the fall of 1968, and the first graduates from the program emerged in 1970. (See page 91 for the present courses required for business students in their particular majors.)

Need for the Study

In today's rapidly changing world, there is a need for some systematic method of determining the important areas of the curriculum and the revisions that need to be made in these areas. It is also important for an educational institution to be able to readily determine its weaknesses so that it may attempt to correct them.

Like many other colleges and universities throughout the country, Panhandle State University has no systematic method for revising its curriculum. Revisions may be made impulsively, as a result of someone's looking at changes that other colleges have made and stating that "If it's good enough for them, it's good enough for us." A review of the literature shows that there have been few attempts to determine whether the changes that are made are helpful, harmful, or relevant to the end result of the educational process--the graduate.

It has been stated that the graduates of the specific colleges or universities should be in a position to help determine the type of curriculum that best serves the needs of the student population, but that the graduates of the institutions are often overlooked when a college or university is revising its curriculum.³ While the leaders of an institution may believe that they themselves are qualified to identify and revise the important areas of the curriculum, they are unable to view the institution from the unique vantage point of a former student. The former student knows what he was taught and knows whether or not this experience had any relevance to him. Lewis B. Mayhew, a respected authority in the area of higher education, has addressed himself to this problem with the following statement:

A college should accumulate evidence over a period of years as to what its graduates are doing, what parts of the curriculum they say benefited them most, and what changes in the curriculum they believe would be appropriate.⁴

It seems obvious, therefore, that there is a real need for curriculum revision, and that the opinions of the graduates of the institutions should be included in this revision.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to achieve a consensus of the graduates of the Business Division of Oklahoma Panhandle State University as to what constitutes important areas of study within and without the field

³Jack Nelson, "Follow-Up Study of Graduates," Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Spring, 1964), p. 111.

⁴Lewis B. Mayhew, The Collegiate Curriculum, Southern Regional Educational Board, Research Monograph No. 1 (Atlanta, 1966), p. 7.

of business, as well as to achieve a consensus of these graduates as to significant weaknesses that exist within the Business Division.

The Statement of the Problem

What areas of study do the graduates of the Business Division of Oklahoma Panhandle State University believe are important in their present occupations, and what do these graduates believe are the most significant weaknesses that exist in the Business Division of Panhandle State University?

Research Questions

A random sample of the business graduates from Oklahoma Panhandle State University for the ten-year period, 1964 to 1973, was asked the following questions:

1. What areas of study in the field of business are important for a graduate in your position to know?
2. What areas of study outside the field of business are important for an individual in your position to know?
3. What are weaknesses that you believe exist in the Business Division at Panhandle State University?

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to a 25 percent random sample from a population consisting of the Business Division graduates of Oklahoma Panhandle State University from the years of 1964 through 1973. Any inferences drawn from this study were, therefore, limited to the population and are applicable only to the particular school in question.

A further limitation of the study involves the arbitrary consolidation of the responses by the writer.

Methodology

To achieve a general consensus, the Delphi Technique was utilized in the study. The Delphi Technique was developed by the Rand Corporation some twenty years ago in their "think tank" in Santa Monica, California.⁵ Although this technique was developed mainly as a forecasting model, many today see it as a way to encourage consensus or convergence of opinion.⁶

The Delphi Technique eliminates committee activity and replaces it with consecutive questionnaires, or correspondence sheets, each one building on the previous one, and designed to elicit a final congruence or consensus among the respondents.

The use of the Delphi Technique eliminates some of the disadvantages of the committee. Among the disadvantages that are eliminated are the obvious difficulties of time scheduling and the limited size of a workable committee. Many of the disadvantages of committees arise from psychological factors such as an unwillingness to back down from announced positions, personal like or dislike among committee members for the opinions of certain individuals, and the "bandwagon effect." These psychological disadvantages are eliminated by the use of the Delphi Technique because the committee members, or respondents, do not

⁵Robert C. Judd, "Delphi Method: Computerized 'Oracle' Accelerates Consensus Formation," College and University Business, Vol. 49 (September, 1970), p. 30.

⁶Philip Winstead and Edward Hobson, "Institution Goals: Where To From Here," Journal of Higher Education, Vo. 42 (November, 1971) p. 669.

come in contact with one another and are not aware of the various responses of the other respondents.⁷

Definitions

Graduates: This term is used to denote individuals who graduated from Oklahoma Panhandle State University with a bachelor's degree in any of the various areas of business from May, 1964, through May, 1973.

Areas of study within the field of business: This refers to any course, part of a course, or combination of courses which are now a part (or would become a part were they to be offered) of the Business Division's curriculum at Oklahoma Panhandle State University. For example, accounting is offered at Oklahoma Panhandle State University and is, therefore, considered to be an area of study within the field of business. Computer data processing is not offered at Oklahoma Panhandle State University but would be under the control of the Business Division if it were to be offered; therefore, it is also considered to be an area of study within the field of business.

Areas of study outside the field of business: This refers to any course, part of a course, or combination of courses which are not now a part (or would not become a part were they to be offered) of the Business Division's curriculum at Oklahoma Panhandle State University.

Year of graduation groups: This refers to the two five-year groups of graduates, the 1964-1968 group and the 1969-1973 group.

⁷Robert C. Judd, "Forecasting to Consensus Gathering," College and University Business, Vol. 53 (July, 1972), p. 35.

Business major field groups: This refers to the major field of the graduates in the Business Division of Panhandle State University-- Accounting, Business Administration, Business Education, and Secretarial Science.

Occupations groups: This refers to the seven occupational groups that were identified in the study--Accounting, Farming, Management, Sales, Secretarial, Teaching, and Miscellaneous.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Higher Education Curriculum Revision

According to Dressel, the term "curriculum" may refer to specific courses of an institution or it may refer to the entire range of an educational experience.¹ Accordingly, one may choose to take the narrow approach to the problem or a wider approach when considering curriculum revision.

Regardless of the approach chosen, there is documentation available to support the viewpoint of curriculum revision. Dressel has stated that without any periodic revision of the curriculum, courses tend to increase without any apparant rationale, and that most courses and curriculums are added without sufficient information and evaluation.²

Not only is this costly, but it may also lead to general student dissatisfaction with the curriculum. Recent events on campuses throughout the land indicate a great amount of student unrest. Shoben has indicated that this may be, at least in part, due to the curriculum. He states that many students do not believe the traditional curriculum

¹Paul L. Dressel, College and University Curriculum, 2nd edition (Berkeley, 1971), p. 229.

²Ibid., p. 234.

is pertinent to the student's needs, concerns, or personal development.³ It is evident, therefore, that curriculum revision should occur within a college or university.

Mayhew believes that the curriculum should be periodically revised. He also believes that graduates of the institutions should have a voice in this re-evaluation as they are in a position to know if the courses they have taken are relevant, and if not, what other areas of instruction might provide relevance.⁴

Nelson agrees with Mayhew by stating that the graduate is perhaps the single most important factor in determining the adequacy and effectiveness of a program. However he states that the graduate of an institution is often overlooked when a college is revising its curriculum.⁵

Weisman reinforces the belief that graduates are important to curriculum revision by stating that the alumni of a college should be the best suited source of information for the determination of the more stable and long range effects of an instructional program.⁶

An early attempt at curriculum revision which included the use of graduates occurred in the State of Wisconsin in 1913. Here, the legislature of that state directed the University of Wisconsin and all

³Edward Shoben, Students, Stress and the College Experience (Washington, D.C., 1966), pp. 15-23.

⁴Mayhew, p. 7.

⁵Nelson, p. 111.

⁶Weisman Seymour, Alvin Snadowdsky, and Estelle Alpert, "Alumni Feedback and Curriculum Revision," Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. 18, No. 2 (Spring, 1970), p. 120.

other colleges in the state to submit a self-study plan which was to include a follow-up study of the colleges' and universities' alumni.⁷

It is evident that the use of graduates in determining the effectiveness of a school and its curriculum is still very appropriate. The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools has indicated recently that follow-up studies of alumni may provide useful data for evaluative purposes.⁸

If one accepts the proposition that the alumni of an institution can be an important tool in curriculum revision, one also must recognize that the proposition carries with it an inherent danger that may hinder follow-up studies in many institutions. This danger is a fear that a study which includes the use of follow-ups of graduates will uncover gross inadequacies and situations potentially threatening to individuals. However, Beaty has indicated that this is not the case.⁹

Past Follow-Up Studies

One of the earliest large-scale studies of business graduates was conducted by the American Association of Schools of Business in 1940. This association prepared a questionnaire and sent it to the member schools for distribution to their graduates. The findings, which were not startling, indicated that the graduates believed the courses they

⁷William H. Allen, Self Surveys By Colleges and Universities (Yonkers Hudson, 1917), p. 365.

⁸North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Guide for the Evaluation of Institutions of Higher Education (Chicago, 1970, p. 21.

⁹Edgar Beaty, "Follow-Up of Teacher Education Graduates as a Basis for Institutional Improvement," Peabody Journal of Education, Vol. 46, No. 5 (March, 1969), pp. 298-300.

had taken while in college were of value to them in their present occupations.¹⁰

A study conducted in 1971 by Edgeworth at Florida State University attempted to determine the attitudes of a selected number of its 1963 through 1967 graduates. The participants in the study were limited to the top ten percent of the business graduates of that institution for the five-year period of time. The response, 147 out of 183, or approximately eighty percent, was excellent. The high response was probably due to the selection of only the top ten percent of the class. An interesting finding was that a substantial number of graduates, one-third, indicated that several required subject areas in business were of little or no benefit to their careers. This study has the rather serious limitation of a select group of participants in so far as it relates to curriculum revision.¹¹

The years of 1964 through 1969 were selected by Houghton for a study of the business graduates of Southern Oregon College. An interesting part of this study involved the request that students list specific weaknesses that they believed to exist in the program. The study, which included all 237 graduates of the business division for that time period, found that the graduates believed courses should be more practical and that professors with stronger business backgrounds should be hired.¹²

¹⁰Russell Stevenson, "The Survey of Schools of Business," American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Meeting (Austin, April 18, 19, 20), p. 27.

¹¹H. C. Edgeworth, "Curriculum Feedback," Collegiate News and Views, Vol. XXIV, No. 4 (May, 1971), p. 13.

¹²Edward Houghton, "A Follow-Up Study of the Business Graduates of Southern Oregon College, 1964-1969" (Doctors Thesis, Oregon State University, 1971), Dissertation Abstracts, 32, No. 2A (1972), 1749.

These studies indicated that several evaluations, which have included the use of graduates, have taken place over a number of years. Each new study provides information and findings that are of value to the particular institution under study, and, to some extent, all colleges and universities.

The major weakness that runs through all of the curriculum studies appears to be in the design of the questionnaire, which in all cases was constructed by the researcher. Even a competent researcher may not be able to identify all of the areas that the graduates would select. An open-ended questionnaire that allows the graduates to formulate their own areas of importance and identify potential weaknesses could possibly alleviate this problem.

This process may be solved by the use of the Delphi Technique. While this method has not been used in the revision of a curriculum by graduates, it has been used with some success in various other areas of education.

Studies Using the Delphi Technique

Hopkins, Ritter, and Stevenson used this technique with success in determining the goals of vocational-technical education in Oklahoma for the 1970's. The study involved sending Delphi Correspondence Sheets to selected local, state, and national authorities who were to respond to a question pertaining to the areas in which the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education should concentrate its resources and energies during the decade of the 1970's. The first correspondence sheet was answered by sixty-one percent of the respondents. The information from Correspondence Sheet Number One was categorized, and a

second correspondence sheet was sent asking the participants to rank the statements on an 11-point continuum. This correspondence sheet received a ninety percent response. The statements contained in Correspondence Sheet Number Two were ranked, and this formed the basis for Correspondence Sheet Number Three. Correspondence Sheet Number Three was sent to the respondents asking them to review the rankings and raise or lower any of the factors that they felt were ranked incorrectly. In the opinion of the researchers, the Delphi Technique created an awareness of factors or areas that should be considered in planning vocational and technical education in Oklahoma for the next decade. As a result of this study, the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education was able to make plans for the 70's.¹³

Collins also used the Delphi Technique in a study to determine Oklahoma's adult education needs. To accomplish this goal, the Delphi method was used to gather opinions for individuals who were considered to have some degree of expertise in the adult education area. Individuals selected consisted of adult education teachers, administrators, and state supervisors of vocational and technical programs, as well as participants from other governmental agencies and some private agencies. The participants were to respond to the first correspondence sheet which consisted of seven open-ended statements concerning needs for adult vocational and technical education programs. After consolidation of the responses received from the first correspondence sheet, a second correspondence sheet was sent which consisted of these responses and

¹³Charles O. Hopkins, Kenneth L. Ritter, and William W. Stevenson, Delphi: A Planning Tool (Stillwater, 1972).

requested that the respondents rank these responses to each of the statements on an 11-point continuum. A third mailing was made to indicate to the respondents the total group's rankings and to see if any of the respondents wanted to change their rankings. This study was successful in arriving at a consensus about what should be done relative to adult vocational and technical education in Oklahoma.¹⁴

In an attempt to identify changes in American education, the Institute of Government and Public Affairs at the University of California in Los Angeles used the Delphi Technique. After the study was completed, Adelson reports that the results were very instructive, whatever their validity, and that the procedures were looked upon by almost all of the participants as potentially very useful in educational planning at all levels.¹⁵

A study that was completed by Cyphert and Gant used the Delphi Technique as an opinion questionnaire to elicit preferences from the faculty at the School of Education at the University of Virginia, student leaders in the College of Education, leaders of Parent-Teachers Associations, School Board Associations, State Boards of Educations, selected members of the Virginia State Legislature, and the United States Legislature, labor union officials, and selected teacher educators from across the nation. The purpose of the study was to attempt to determine what these groups believed the curriculum and the future

¹⁴Billy Dee Collins, "A Systematic Approach to Oklahoma's Adult Education Needs" (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1971).

¹⁵Marvin Adelson, "Planning Education for the Future: Comments on a Pilot Study," American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 10, No. 7 (March, 1967), p. 27.

of the College of Education ought to be. Significant agreement from groups was reached by the use of the Delphi Technique.¹⁶

These studies differ from the original purpose of the Delphi Technique in a significant way. In these studies the respondents are asked to focus upon what they would like to see happen rather than on what they believe is likely to happen, or upon forecasting, which was the primary use for which the procedure was developed. Although the Delphi Technique was originally intended as a forecasting tool, Weaver believes that it seems to have more promise for educational purposes as a planning tool which can help in determining priorities that various members of an organization or institution might have.¹⁷

Summary

Most of the studies dealing with curriculum revision by the use of graduates pertain to follow-up studies that have been made of graduates. The emphasis of these studies pertains to present occupations of the graduates.

Some of these studies have also dealt with important areas of the curriculum. All of the studies surveyed reached definite conclusions as to what the graduates believed to be important, and most found that graduates believe that the curriculum to which they were exposed in their particular colleges was significant to them.

¹⁶F. R. Cyphert and W. L. Gant, "The Delphi Technique: A Tool for Collecting Opinions in Teacher Education" (Paper presented at AERA Symposium, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March 4, 1970).

¹⁷W. Timothy Weaver, "The Delphi Forecasting Method," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. XXV (January, 1971), pp. 267-271.

None of the studies surveyed utilized the Delphi Technique in gathering the opinions of the graduates. All of the studies utilized one questionnaire in which the graduate was to rate various areas of study that were important to him, and which had been selected by the researcher.

Various studies were surveyed that used the Delphi Technique. Although none of the studies pertained specifically to graduates' revisions of the curriculum, all the studies were involved with planning or determining areas of priority within the field of education.

Findings were available which led to the conclusion that the Delphi Technique is a viable tool for determining education priorities which could include curriculum revision by graduates.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

Population

The graduates of the Business Division of Oklahoma Panhandle State University from May, 1964, to May, 1973, were selected as the population. The selection of the population from a ten-year time span was made in order to help insure a representative group in terms of those just entering the job market as well as those well established in their various occupations. The names and addresses were obtained from records of the Division Head. In order to update some of the addresses, files of the Alumni Office of Oklahoma Panhandle State University were consulted. In some cases, it was possible to contact relatives of the graduate. As a last resort, the records of the Office of the Registrar were utilized in order to obtain the last-known mailing address of a graduate.

In order to insure a representative sample of the population from each of the ten graduating classes, the total population of each class was listed. A 25 percent random sample was then taken from each class. A table of random digits was used to reduce to a minimum the possible bias with respect to the population members selected.¹

¹C. Mitchell Dayton, The Design of Educational Experiments (New York, 1970), pp. 379-383.

Table I indicates the population of each class and the sample taken from that class.

TABLE I
CLASS POPULATION AND SAMPLE SIZE

Year	No. of Graduates	Sample Selected
1964*	23	6
1965	27	7
1966	30	8
1967	29	7
1968	43	11
1969	44	11
1970	50	13
1971	40	10
1972	56	14
1973	50	13
Totals	392	100

*To be read: In the 1964 graduating class of business students, there were 23 students and six were selected for the study.

Procedure of the Study

With the assistance of various members of the business faculty at Oklahoma Panhandle State University, broad questions were formulated which, it was believed, would elicit responses from the one-hundred prospective participants in regard to their perceptions of an effective curriculum.

Three separate mailings of the Delphi Correspondence Sheets were necessary to gather the information. The following is an explanation of these correspondence sheets and of the mechanics involved in constructing and administering them.

Correspondence Sheet Number One

The information contained in the first mailing consisted of: (1) a cover letter of introduction and explanation from the writer and the Head of the Business Division; (2) Correspondence Sheet Number One, which was the instrument used to collect the graduate's responses; and (3) a self-addressed envelope for easy return. A follow-up letter was mailed to those graduates who had not responded within two weeks from the mailing of the first letter (See Appendix Z).

Included as a part of Correspondence Sheet Number One was a space for the participant to list his present occupation. This information was needed for analysis of the graduate's responses by occupation.

Correspondence Sheet Number One did not have a space for the graduate's name. It was believed that an anonymous response would possibly be more objective. In order to be able to identify the graduates who responded, each Correspondence Sheet was coded. Two weeks after the

follow-up letter was mailed, responses had been received from 80 (80 percent) of the 100 graduates included in the sample.

With the responses from Correspondence Sheet Number One, the information was available for the construction of Correspondence Sheet Number Two.

Correspondence Sheet Number Two

The responses from Correspondence Sheet Number One were analyzed and placed on Correspondence Sheet Number Two in as nearly the original form as possible. In some cases it was necessary to alter the responses somewhat for reasons of clarity and grammar and to avoid possible embarrassment to anyone.

The second mailing contained: (1) a cover letter from the writer which explained the procedure for each graduate to follow; (2) Correspondence Sheet Number Two, which was the instrument used to rank the graduate's responses; and (3) a self-addressed stamped envelope. A follow-up letter was mailed to those graduates who had not responded within two weeks from the mailing of the first letter (See Appendix B).

Correspondence Sheet Number Two was mailed, along with a letter of explanation, to the 80 graduates who responded to Correspondence Sheet Number One. The graduates were requested to rank each of the items included on Correspondence Sheet Number Two on an 11-point continuum, according to the degree of importance that they attached to each response.

Two weeks after mailing Correspondence Sheet Number Two, a follow-up letter was sent to graduates who had not yet responded. By the end of another two weeks, responses had been received from 72 (90 percent)

of the graduates remaining in the study. Seventy of these responses were usable.

Correspondence Sheet Number Three

The total group's responses to Correspondence Sheet Number Two were averaged and placed in rank order. These rankings were the basis of Correspondence Sheet Number Three.

The final mailing contained: (1) a cover letter from the writer which explained the procedure for each participant to follow and (2) Correspondence Sheet Number Three, which was the instrument used to determine if the group had reached a consensus (See Appendix C).

Correspondence Sheet Number Three was mailed to the 72 graduates that had responded to Correspondence Sheet Number Two. The graduates were requested to examine the rankings and to indicate any changes in rankings that they believed should be made. If the graduates did not believe that changes needed to be made, they were not to return this correspondence sheet.

Analysis of the Data

Sub-Division of the Sample

Prior to an analysis of the data, it was necessary to sub-divide the total group into sub-groups. Three major sub-classifications were determined. These sub-classifications were (1) year of graduation, (2) business major, and (3) present occupation. Within each of these sub-classifications, two or more sub-groups were identified.

Year of Graduation Groups. Table II indicates the distribution of the graduates by year of graduation as indicated by the responses to Correspondence Sheet Number Two.

TABLE II
NUMBER OF SAMPLE RESPONSES BY YEAR TO
CORRESPONDENCE SHEET NUMBER TWO

Year	Number of Graduates
1964*	3
1965	3
1966	5
1967	4
1968	6
1969	9
1970	12
1971	8
1972	11
1973	9
Total	70

*To be read: Three graduates responded to Correspondence Sheet Number Two from the 1964 sample.

The graduates from the graduating years of 1964 through 1968 formed the basis for the first sub-group within this sub-classification. The graduates from the graduating years of 1969 through 1973 formed the basis of the second sub-group. In all, 21 graduates responded to Correspondence Sheet Number Two from the 1964-1968 sub-group, and 49 graduates responded from the 1969-1973 sub-group.

Business Majors Groups. The second sub-classification consisted of the various business major fields. Table III indicates the business major fields represented and the number of graduates within each of the sub-groups.

TABLE III
NUMBER OF SAMPLE RESPONSES BY BUSINESS MAJOR
FIELD TO CORRESPONDENCE SHEET NUMBER TWO

Business Major	Number in Sample
Accounting	15
Business Administration	40
Business Education	15

*To be read: Of those who responded to Correspondence Sheet Number Two, fifteen were accounting majors.

Present Occupations Groups. The information for these sub-groups was taken from the graduates' responses to Correspondence Sheet Number

One. Table IV indicates the occupations and the number of graduates within each occupation.

TABLE IV
NUMBER OF SAMPLE RESPONSES BY PRESENT OCCUPATIONS
TO CORRESPONDENCE SHEET NUMBER TWO

Present Occupation	Number in Sample
Accounting*	13
Farming	10
Management	9
Sales	8
Secretarial	9
Teaching	13
Miscellaneous	8

*To be read: Of those who responded to Correspondence Sheet Number Two, thirteen were engaged in an accounting occupation.

The miscellaneous group consisted of the following occupations: housewives--3, computer programmers--2, graduate students--1, laborers--1, and truckers--1.

Consolidation of Responses

The responses gathered from Correspondence Sheet Number One and listed on Correspondence Sheets Two and Three had some areas of overlap.

In order to allow the graduates to be able to identify their responses, these areas of overlap were allowed to remain.

However, to effectively compare and analyze the data, it was necessary to eliminate areas of overlap. With the help of the business faculty at Oklahoma Panhandle State University, each response was analyzed. The responses were then grouped into like areas. Each like area, or consolidated response, was then ranked. For ranking purposes, an original response that was considered to be the most representative of the consolidated response was used. For example, personnel management, industrial psychology, and public and human relations were all original responses that had been listed on the correspondence sheets. These responses were grouped into a consolidated response that was termed "personnel management." It was believed that the personnel management original response was the most representative of the three original responses; therefore, it was used as the ranking response. The personnel management's average was compared to the other ranking responses, and a rank was obtained for the personnel management consolidated response.

Table V indicates the results of the consolidation process for areas of study in the field of business. Table VI indicates the results of the consolidation process for areas of study outside the field of business. The results of the consolidation process for weaknesses that exist in the Division of Business are illustrated in Table VII.

After consolidation, the total group's consolidated responses were then ranked from those with the lowest averages--the most important, to those with the highest averages--the least important, for each of

TABLE V
 CONSOLIDATION OF STATEMENT ONE RESPONSES--AREAS
 OF STUDY IN THE FIELD OF BUSINESS

Original Response	Consolidated Response	Ranking Response
Bookkeeping Agricultural Accounting	Bookkeeping	Bookkeeping
Business Law	Business Law	Business Law
Business Correspondence Business English	Business Correspondence	Business Correspondence
Personal Income Tax Business Income Tax Estate Planning	Income Tax Accounting	Personal Income Tax
Cost Accounting Inventory Control Managerial Accounting	Cost Accounting	Cost Accounting
Business Math Business Statistics	Business Math	Business Math
Typewriting	Typewriting	Typewriting
Theory of Accounting Intermediate Accounting CPA Review Auditing Governmental Accounting	Accounting Theory	Theory of Accounting
Office Machines Office Training	Office Machines	Office Machines
Personnel Management Industrial Psychology Public and Human Relations	Personnel Management	Personnel Management
Finance	Finance	Finance

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

Original Response	Consolidated Response	Ranking Response
Principles of Management Business Organizations Business Planning Management Information Systems Office Management Small Business Management	Principles of Business Management	Principles of Management
General Economics Credit and Collections Money and Banking	General Economics	General Economics
Introduction to Business Business History	Introduction to Business	Introduction to Business
Marketing and Sales Analysis Merchandising and Display Retailing Salesmanship Transportation and Distribution Advertising Real Estate	Marketing	Marketing and Sales Analysis
Current Problems in Business	Current Problems	Current Problems in Business
Agri-Business	Agri-Business	Agri-Business
Data Processing Computer Science Programming Computer Key punch Operation	Computer Data Processing	Data Processing
Consumer Economics Insurance Stockmarket and Commodities Analysis	Consumer Economics	Consumer Economics

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

Original Response	Consolidated Response	Ranking Response
Shorthand Stenography Medical and Legal Terminology	Shorthand	Shorthand
Methods of Teaching Business	Methods	Methods of Teaching Business

TABLE VI
 CONSOLIDATION OF STATEMENT TWO RESPONSES--AREAS
 OF STUDY OUTSIDE THE FIELD OF BUSINESS

Original Response	Consolidated Response	Ranking Response
English Journalism	English	English
Mathematics	Mathematics	Mathematics
Speech Drama	Speech	Speech
Psychology--general	Psychology	Psychology--general
Current Events (Political and Social)	Current Events	Current Events (Political and Social)
Speed Reading Interpretive Reading	Reading	Speed Reading
Agricultural Economics Agricultural Finance	Agricultural Economics	Agricultural Economics
Education Audio Visual Education Educational Psychology Educational Tests and Measurements Physical Education School Administration School Law and Finance	Education	Education
Philosophy and Logic	Philosophy and Logic	Philosophy and Logic
Natural Science Biology Chemistry Ecology and Conservation Geology	Natural Science	Natural Science
Marriage and Family Living Drug Abuse Education Etiquette and Social Manners	Marriage and Family Living	Marriage and Family Living

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

Original Response	Consolidated Response	Ranking Response
Social Science Sociology Government History	Social Science	Social Science
Physical Education Athletics	Physical Education	Physical Education
Agronomy, General Crop Production Farm Management Grain Marketing Land Management Soil Chemistry	Agronomy	Agronomy, General
Foreign Language	Foreign Language	Foreign Language
Animal Science, General Animal Nutrition Feedlot Management Livestock Evaluation Livestock Management	Animal Science	Animal Science, General
Industrial Arts Drafting General Mechanics Photography and Printing	Industrial Arts	Industrial Arts
Library Science	Library Science	Library Science
Music	Music	Music
Arts and Crafts Textiles	Arts and Crafts	Arts and Crafts

TABLE VII
 CONSOLIDATION OF STATEMENT THREE RESPONSES--WEAKNESSES
 THAT EXIST IN THE DIVISION OF BUSINESS

Original Response	Consolidated Response	Ranking Response
Students need more practical experience	Students need more practical experience	Students need more practical experience
Not enough job interviews on campus	Not enough job interviews	Not enough job interviews on campus
Not enough courses Not enough upper level courses Poor class scheduling Too many students in some classes No introduction to business literature No mid-management courses	Not enough courses	Not enough courses
Not enough instructors Not enough specialized instructors	Not enough instructors	Not enough instructors
Not a large enough budget	Not a large enough budget	Not a large enough budget
Some outdated teaching methods Students do not know what teachers expect Standardized exams used in some classes There are too many unnecessary reports Some classes do not meet regularly Grading scale is too high in some classes Not enough demands on students Not enough class discussion Not enough business field trips Not enough guest lectures Not enough research	Poor teaching methodology	Some outdated teaching methods

TABLE VII (CONTINUED)

Original Response	Consolidated Response	Ranking Response
Inadequate and insufficient equipment	Inadequate and insufficient equipment	Inadequate and insufficient equipment
Textbooks are outdated	Textbooks are outdated	Textbooks are outdated
Lack of scholarships available in business	Lack of scholarships available	Lack of scholarships available in business
Courses are uninteresting Courses are unrelated to the real world Classes are designed for large corporations Not enough lecture time in some courses Repetition in many course areas Not enough prerequisites for some courses	Poor construction of courses	Courses are uninteresting
Not enough qualified instructors Instructors are unstimulating Instructors need refresher courses	Unqualified instructors	Not enough qualified instructors
Counseling is weak	Counseling is weak	Counseling is weak

the three areas under study. This same procedure was followed for each of the sub-groups which had been identified (See Appendix D).

Comparison of the Data

The top half of each sub-group's consolidated responses was compared with the top half of the total group's consolidated responses. Material differences in ranking were believed to have occurred if there was a variation in ranking of a specific consolidated response between the sub-group and the total group of five for the first two areas under study--Areas of Study Within the Field of Business and Areas of Study Outside the Field of Business. A difference of four was considered to be material for the third area under study--Weaknesses in the Division of Business--because of the smaller number of consolidated responses for this area. These material variations were noted, and a possible explanation for the variation was given when possible.

Summary

The population used in this study consisted of 392 graduates from the Business Division of Oklahoma Panhandle State University from the years 1964 through 1973. One hundred graduates (25 percent of the population) were randomly selected to receive the correspondence sheets. The purpose of the correspondence sheets was to determine areas within and without the field of business that the graduates believe are important to them in their present occupations and to identify what they believe are important weaknesses in the Division of Business at Oklahoma Panhandle State University.

There were 80 (80 percent of the original sample) responses to Correspondence Sheet Number One, 70 (90 percent of the responses to Correspondence Sheet Number One) responses to Correspondence Sheet Number Two, and 6 (11 percent of the responses to Correspondence Sheet Number Two) responses to Correspondence Sheet Number Three. The data for analysis were taken from Correspondence Sheet Number Two since no significant changes occurred from the Correspondence Sheet Number Three responses.

The responses to Correspondence Sheet Number Two were consolidated into like areas and ranked in order of importance. Various sub-groups were also identified and their responses ranked. The total group's top half of the responses were compared to the top half of the responses of the various sub-groups for similarity and material variations.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to obtain opinions from the graduates of the Business Division at Oklahoma Panhandle State University on the curriculum of that institution. Specifically, opinions were elicited from graduates concerning: (1) areas of study within the field of business; (2) areas of study outside the field of business; and (3) weaknesses that exist in the Division of Business. These opinions were then utilized to propose recommendations which could possibly aid in the revision of the curriculum of the Division of Business at Oklahoma Panhandle State University.

This chapter presents the analysis of the data and reflects the differences in rankings completed by specific sub-groups as compared to the rankings by the total group for each of the three areas under study. The specific sub-groups compared with the total group were: (1) 1964-1968 Year of Graduation sub-group; (2) 1969-1973 Year of Graduation sub-group; (3) Accounting Majors sub-group; (4) Business Administration Majors sub-group; (5) Business Education Majors sub-group; (6) Accounting Occupation sub-group; (7) Farming Occupation sub-group; (8) Management Occupation sub-group; (9) Sales Occupation sub-group; (10) Secretarial Occupation sub-group; (11) Teaching Occupation sub-group; and (12) Miscellaneous Occupation sub-group. The

analysis appears by statement: (1) Statement One--Areas of study within the field of business; (2) Statement Two--Areas of study outside the field of business; and (3) Statement Three--Weaknesses in the Business Division.

Total Group Rankings

A listing of the rankings by the total group and by the various sub-groups of all the consolidated responses is included in Appendix E. The information is summarized in the paragraphs which follow.

Statement One--Areas of Study Within the Field of Business

It is the consensus of the total group that business law and bookkeeping are of equal importance as areas of study. Ranking next in importance is business correspondence, followed by income tax, accounting, cost accounting, and business math. Typewriting, accounting theory, office machines, personnel management, and finance complete the top half of the rankings.

Statement Two--Areas of Study Outside the Field of Business

The total group ranks English, math, and speech respectively as the most important areas of study. Psychology and current events are ranked next, followed by reading, agricultural economics, education, philosophy and logic, natural science, and marriage and family living to complete the top half of the rankings.

Statement Three--Weaknesses in the
Business Division

"Students need more practical experience" is the single most important weakness mentioned by the total group. Ranking two, three, and four are "Not enough job interviews," "Not enough courses," and "Not enough instructors," "Not a large enough budget" and "Poor teaching methodology" are ranked five and six to complete the top half of the consolidated responses in this area.

Comparison of Individual Sub-Group Responses
to Total Group Responses

Comparisons were made between rankings of the top half of the responses of the total group and the rankings of the top half of the responses of the various sub-groups for purposes of identifying notable variations for each of the three areas under study. Substantial variations are identified and a conceivable explanation for the variation is presented when possible. A substantial variation was believed to exist when there was a variation between the total group and the individual sub-group of five or more ranks for the first two areas under study and four or more ranks for the area of study that was concerned with weaknesses in the division.

Statement One--Areas of Study Within the
Field of Business

For the areas of study within the field of business, several variations were observed. The following paragraphs and tables explain and indicate the results for this area.

1964-1968 Year of Graduation Group. As Table VIII indicates, there are no major variations in ranking between the top half of the responses of the total group and the top half of the responses of the 1964-1968 year of graduation group.

TABLE VIII

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE 1964-1968 YEAR
OF GRADUATION GROUP ON STATEMENT ONE

Response	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the 1964-1968 Year of Graduation Group	Ranking Difference
Bookkeeping*	1.5	2	.5
Business Law	1.5	3	1.5
Business Correspondence	3	1	2
Income Tax Accounting	4	5	1
Cost Accounting	5	6	1
Business Math	6	7	1
Typewriting	7	4	3
Accounting Theory	8	11	3
Office Machines	9	8	1
Personnel Management	10	9	1
Finance	11	12**	1
General Economics	13**	10	3

*To be read: Bookkeeping is ranked 1.5 by the total group and 2 by the sub-group. There is a difference of .5 between the two rankings.

**Not included in the top half of this group

1969-1973 Year of Graduation Group. Table IX indicates that there are no large variations between the ranking by the 1969-1973 graduates and the ranking by the total group.

TABLE IX

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE 1969-1973 YEAR
OF GRADUATION GROUP ON STATEMENT ONE

Response	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the 1969-1973 Year of Graduation Group	Ranking Difference
Bookkeeping	1.5	2	.5
Business Law	1.5	1	.5
Business Correspondence	3	3	0
Income Tax Accounting	4	4	0
Cost Accounting	5	6	1
Business Math	6	5	1
Typewriting	7	9	2
Accounting Theory	8	7	1
Office Machines	9	8	1
Personnel Management	10	10	0
Finance	11	11	0

Accounting Major Group. There are three major ranking variations between the total group and the accounting major group in the top half of the responses to statement one as indicated by Table X.

TABLE X

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP
HALF OF THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE
ACCOUNTING MAJORS GROUP
ON STATEMENT ONE

Response	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Accounting Major Group	Ranking Difference
Bookkeeping	1.5	7	5.5
Business Law	1.5	2	.5
Business Correspondence	3	5	2
Income Tax Accounting	4	1	3
Cost Accounting	5	10	5
Business Math	6	6	0
Typewriting	7	8	1
Accounting Theory	8	3	5
Office Machines	9	4	5
Personnel Management	10	9	1
Finance	11	14*	3
Principles of Management	12*	11	1

*Not included in the top half of this group

Bookkeeping is ranked as considerably less important by the accounting major group than by the total group. On the other hand, accounting theory is ranked substantially lower by the accounting major group than by the total group. The apparent inconsistency in ranking may be due, at least in part, to the use of the term "bookkeeping." The accounting major group may believe that "bookkeeping" is a term that applies to the recording phase of accounting. The higher ranking of cost accounting by the accounting major group may be a result of the majority of this group not working in manufacturing companies, which are the primary users of cost accounting. The lower ranking of office machines by the accounting major group may be due to the use of machines in their occupations.

Business Administration Major Group. As Table XI indicates, there are no major variations in rankings between the total group and the business administration major group.

Business Education Major Group. There are six major variations between the rankings of the business education major group and the total group in the top half of the responses to statement one, as indicated on Table XII. Business law, income tax accounting, and finance are ranked as considerably less important by the business education major group than by the total group. These rankings indicate that the business education major group does not perceive these areas to be of as much importance as does the total group. On the other hand, the rankings given by the business education major group to shorthand, typewriting, and office machines indicate a high degree of importance attached to these responses by this group.

TABLE XI

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF
OF THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE BUSINESS
ADMINISTRATION MAJOR GROUP
RESPONSES ON STATEMENT ONE

Response	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Business Administration Group	Ranking Difference
Bookkeeping	1.5	2	.5
Business Law	1.5	1	.5
Business Correspondence	3	3	0
Income Tax Accounting	4	6	2
Cost Accounting	5	4	1
Business	6	5	1
Typewriting	7	9	2
Accounting Theory	8	10	2
Office Machines	9	13*	4
Personnel Management	10	8	2
Finance	11	7	4
General Economics	13*	11	2

*Not included in the top half of this group

Accounting Occupation Group. As illustrated in Table XIII, there are three material differences in rankings between the accounting occupation group and the total group.

TABLE XII

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE BUSINESS EDUCATION
MAJOR GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT ONE

Response	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Business Education Group	Ranking Difference
Bookkeeping	1.5	2.5	1
Business Law	1.5	7	5.5
Business Correspondence	3	4	1
Income Tax Accounting	4	9	5
Cost Accounting	5	5	0
Business Math	6	8	2
Typewriting	7	1	6
Accounting Theory	8	10	2
Office Machines	9	2.5	6.5
Personnel Management	10	12*	2
Finance	11	19*	8
Introduction to Business	14*	11	3
Shorthand	20*	6	14

*Not included in the responses of the top half of this group

Bookkeeping is ranked as considerably less important by the accounting occupation group than by the total group. Accounting theory is ranked as the most important response by the accounting

occupation group. These response rankings may indicate that the accounting occupation group is involved in the analysis phase of accounting rather than the recording phase. The low rankings that the accounting occupations gave to office machines indicates a high degree of reliance on the use of office machines.

TABLE XIII

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE ACCOUNTING OCCUPATION
GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT ONE

Response	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Accounting Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
Bookkeeping	1.5	11	9.5
Business Law	1.5	2	.5
Business Correspondence	3	7	4
Income Tax Accounting	4	6	2
Cost Accounting	5	4	1
Business Math	6	5	1
Typewriting	7	9	2
Accounting Theory	8	1	7
Office Machines	9	3	6
Personnel Management	10	10	0
Finance	11	13*	2
Principles of Management	12*	8	4

*Not included in the top half of this group

Farming Occupations Group. As revealed by Table XIV, the farming occupations group is the most dissimilar group when compared to the total group of all the sub-groups.

TABLE XIV

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE FARMING OCCUPATION
GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT ONE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Farming Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
Bookkeeping	1.5	5	3.5
Business Law	1.5	3	1.5
Business Correspondence	3	11	8
Income Tax Accounting	4	2	2
Cost Accounting	5	4	1
Business Math	6	7	1
Typewriting	7	17*	10
Accounting Theory	8	15*	7
Office Machines	9	18*	9
Personnel Management	10	13*	3
Finance	11	6	5
Introduction to Business	14*	10	4
Marketing	15*	9	6
Agri-Business	17*	1	16
Consumer Economics	19*	8	11

*Not included in the top half of this group

Business correspondence, typewriting, accounting theory, and office machines are ranked higher by the farming occupation group than by the total group. Considerably lower rankings are given to finance marketing, agri-business, and consumer economics by the farming occupation group. These differences are probably due to the nature of the farming occupation.

Management Occupation Group. As revealed by Table XV, there are three major variations in the rankings of the top half of statement one between the total group and the management occupation group.

Typewriting and office machines are ranked considerably higher by the management occupation group than by the total group. These rankings indicate a lack of use of these skills by managers. The low ranking given to agri-business by the management occupation group may be a result of the fact that many of the people in this sub-group are employed in an agriculturally related business.

Sales Occupation Group. As indicated by Table XVI, four major variations in ranking occur between the total group and the sales occupation group. With the exception of bookkeeping, all of the accounting areas are ranked higher by the sales occupation group than by the total group. This ranking difference indicates that the sales occupation group is not as involved with accounting as are the other groups. Marketing is ranked substantially lower by the sales occupation group. This variation in ranking is to be expected due to the nature of the occupation.

TABLE XV

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE MANAGEMENT OCCUPATION
GROUP RESPONSE ON STATEMENT ONE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Management Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
Bookkeeping	1.5	2	.5
Business Law	1.5	2	.5
Business Correspondence	3	4.5	1.5
Income Tax Accounting	4	6.5	2.5
Cost Accounting	5	4.5	.5
Business Math	6	2	4
Typewriting	7	12*	5
Accounting Theory	8	8.5	.5
Office Machines	9	16*	7
Personnel Management	10	8.5	1.5
Finance	11	6.5	4.5
Introduction to Business	14*	10	4
Agri-Business	17*	11	6

*Not included in the top half of this group

TABLE XVI

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE SALES OCCUPATION
GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT ONE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Sales Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
Bookkeeping	1.5	3.5	2
Business Law	1.5	1.5	0
Business Correspondence	3	1.5	1.5
Income Tax Accounting	4	10	6
Cost Accounting	5	15*	10
Business Math	6	8	2
Typewriting	7	5	2
Accounting Theory	8	14*	6
Office Machines	9	6.5	2.5
Personnel Management	10	6.5	3.5
Finance	11	9	2
Principles of Management	12*	11	1
Marketing	15*	3.5	11.5

*Not included in the top half of this group

Secretarial Occupation Group. Between the total group and the secretarial occupation group there are five material variations in ranking among the top half of the responses to statement one. These variations are indicated in Table XVII.

TABLE XVII

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE SECRETARIAL OCCUPATION
GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT ONE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Secretarial Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
Bookkeeping	1.5	4	2.5
Business Law	1.5	8	6.5
Business Correspondence	3	7	4
Income Tax Accounting	4	5	1
Cost Accounting	5	11	6
Business Math	6	9	3
Typewriting	7	1	6
Accounting Theory	8	6	2
Office Machines	9	3	6
Personnel Management	10	10	0
Finance	11	20*	9
Shorthand	20*	2	18

*Not included in the top half of this group

Typewriting, office machines, and shorthand are all ranked significantly lower by the secretarial occupation group than by the total group. This ranking difference is undoubtedly due to the use of these skills in the occupation. On the other hand, business law, cost accounting, and finance are ranked substantially higher by the secretarial

occupation group. These are areas in which the secretarial occupation group is probably not involved to a great extent.

Teaching Occupation Group. As indicated in Table XVIII there are seven substantial variations in ranking between the teaching occupation group and the total group to the responses on statement one.

TABLE XVIII

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF THE
TOTAL GROUP AND THE TEACHING OCCUPATION
GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT ONE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Teaching Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
Bookkeeping	1.5	4	2.5
Business Law	1.5	3	1.5
Business Correspondence	3	1	2
Income Tax Accounting	4	10	6
Cost Accounting	5	5	0
Business Math	6	8.5	2.5
Typewriting	7	2	5
Accounting Theory	8	13.5*	5.5
Office Machines	9	6	3
Personnel Management	10	15*	5
Finance	11	17*	6
General Economics	13*	8.5	4.5
Introduction to Business	14*	7	7
Current Problems	16*	11	5

*Not included in the top half of this group

Typewriting, introduction to business, and current problems are ranked lower by the teaching occupation group than by the total group. The reason for these lower rankings may be that these areas are taught by many in the teaching occupation group. Income tax accounting and accounting theory are ranked substantially higher by the teaching occupation group than by the total group. Personnel management and finance are also ranked higher. It is conceivable that a lack of teaching subjects in these areas is responsible for the higher rankings.

Miscellaneous Occupation Group. This group's composition of heterogeneous occupations makes it futile to attempt to explain differences between this group and the total group. Table XIX indicates the rankings of this sub-group and the total group.

Statement Two--Areas of Study Outside the
Field of Business

As indicated in the paragraphs and tables that follow, there are many variations between rankings by the total group and the various sub-groups in the areas of study outside the field of business.

1964-1968 Year of Graduation Group. As Table XX indicates, there are no substantial variations in the rankings of the top half of the responses between the 1964-1968 year of graduation group and the total group.

TABLE XIX

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE MISCELLANEOUS
OCCUPATION GROUP RESPONSES ON
STATEMENT ONE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Miscellaneous Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
Bookkeeping	1.5	2	.5
Business Law	1.5	6	4.5
Business Correspondence	3	1	2
Income Tax Accounting	4	9	5
Cost Accounting	5	8	3
Business Math	6	12*	6
Typewriting	7	7	0
Accounting Theory	8	5	3
Office Machines	9	4	5
Personnel Management	10	3	7
Finance	11	16.5*	5.5
General Economics	13*	10.5	2.5
Computer Data Processing	18*	10.5	7.5

*Not included in the top half of this group

1969-1973 Year of Graduation Group. As indicated in Table XXI,
no substantial variations in ranking of the responses of the top

half of statement two occur between the total group and the 1969-1973 graduates.

TABLE XX

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE 1964-1968 YEAR OF
GRADUATION GROUP RESPONSES ON
STATEMENT TWO

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the 1964-1968 Year of Graduation Group	Ranking Difference
English	1	1	0
Mathematics	2	2	0
Speech	3	4	1
Psychology	4	5	1
Current Events	5	6	1
Reading	6	3	3
Agricultural Economics	7	8	1
Education	8	7	1
Philosophy and Logic	9	12*	3
Natural Science	10	9	1
Physical Education	13*	10	3

*Not included in the top half of the responses of this group

TABLE XXI

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE 1969-1973 YEAR OF
GRADUATION GROUP RESPONSES ON
STATEMENT TWO

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the 1969-1973 Year of Graduation Group	Ranking Difference
English	1	1	0
Mathematics	2	2	0
Speech	3	3	0
Psychology	4	4	0
Current Events	5	5	0
Reading	6	6	0
Agricultural Economics	7	7	0
Education	8	11*	3
Philosophy and Logic	9	8	1
Natural Science	10	10	0
Marriage and Family Living	11*	9	2

*Not included in the top half of this group

Accounting Major Group. There are no large variations between the total group and the accounting major group in the rankings of the top half of the responses to statement two. Table XXII compares these two groups.

TABLE XXII

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE ACCOUNTING MAJOR
GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT TWO

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Accounting Major Group	Ranking Differences
English	1	1	0
Mathematics	2	2	0
Speech	3	5	2
Psychology	4	4	0
Current Events	5	3	2
Reading	6	7	1
Agricultural Economics	7	6	1
Education	8	11*	3
Philosophy and Logic	9	8	1
Natural Science	10	14*	4
Marriage and Family Living	11*	9	2
Agronomy	14*	10	4

*Not included in the top half of this group

Business Administration Major Group. There is one major variation between the business administration major group and the total group in the top half of the responses to statement two. Education is ranked higher by the business administration major group. This variation may

be due to a lack of teachers in this sub-group. Table XXIII compares the two groups.

TABLE XXIII

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
MAJOR GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT TWO

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Business Administration Major Group	Ranking Difference
English	1	3	2
Mathematics	2	1	1
Speech	3	2	1
Psychology	4	5	1
Current Events	5	7	2
Reading	6	4	2
Agricultural Economics	7	6	1
Education	8	13*	5
Philosophy and Logic	9	11	2
Natural Science	10	8	2
Marriage and Family Living	11*	9	2

*Not included in the top half of this group

Business Education Major Group. There are three major variations in rankings of the top half of the responses to statement two as indicated in Table XXIV.

TABLE XXIV

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE BUSINESS EDUCATION
MAJOR GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT TWO

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Business Education Major Group	Ranking Difference
English	1	1	0
Mathematics	2	3	1
Speech	3	4	1
Psychology	4	6	2
Current Events	5	5	0
Reading	6	7	1
Agricultural Economics	7	16*	9
Education	8	2	6
Philosophy and Logic	9	8	1
Natural Science	10	12*	2
Social Science	12*	9	3
Foreign Language	15*	10	5

*Not included in the top half of this group

The low ranking of education by the business education major group is probably due to this group's orientation in education. In addition, foreign language received a substantially lower ranking by the business education major group. The high ranking of agricultural economics may indicate that the business education major group does not use this area.

Accounting Occupation Group. As illustrated in Table XXV, education is ranked substantially higher by the accounting occupation group than by the total group.

Farming Occupation Group. The farming occupation group varies more from the total group than any of the other sub-groups, as illustrated by Table XXVI.

Agricultural economics, agronomy, animal science, and industrial arts are ranked substantially lower by the farming occupation group than by the total group. On the other hand, English, reading, psychology, and philosophy and logic are ranked higher by the farming occupation group. These differences are understandable in view of the nature of the farming occupation group's work.

Management Occupation Group. As indicated in Table XXVII there are two material variations between the management occupation group and the total group on the top half of the responses to statement two.

Agronomy is ranked substantially lower by the management occupation group than by the total group. This ranking variation may be a result of the fact that many in this sub-group are in an agricultural related management occupation. Education is ranked higher by the management occupation group than by the total group.

TABLE XXV

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF
OF THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE ACCOUNTING
OCCUPATION GROUP RESPONSES ON
STATEMENT TWO

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Accounting Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
English	1	2	1
Mathematics	2	1	1
Speech	3	3	0
Psychology	4	5	1
Current Events	5	4	1
Reading	6	6	0
Agricultural Economics	7	7	0
Education	8	16*	8
Philosophy and Logic	9	8	1
Natural Science	10	12*	2
Marriage and Family Living	11*	10	1
Physical Education	13*	9	4

*Not included in the top half of this group

TABLE XXVI

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF
OF THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE FARMING
OCCUPATION GROUP RESPONSES ON
STATEMENT TWO

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Farming Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
English	1	6.5	5.5
Mathematics	2	4	2
Speech	3	5	2
Psychology	4	14*	10
Current Events	5	8	3
Reading	6	12.5*	6.5
Agricultural Economics	7	1	6
Education	8	10.5	2.5
Philosophy and Logic	9	17*	8
Natural Science	10	6.5	3.5
Marriage and Family Living	11*	10.5	.5
Agronomy	14*	2	12
Animal Science	16*	3	13
Industrial Arts	17*	9	8

*Not included in the top half of this group

TABLE XXVII

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF
OF THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE MANAGEMENT
OCCUPATION GROUP RESPONSES ON
STATEMENT TWO

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Management Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
English	1	1	0
Mathematics	2	2	0
Speech	3	3	0
Psychology	4	5	1
Current Events	5	8	3
Reading	6	4	2
Agricultural Economics	7	6	1
Education	8	14*	6
Philosophy and Logic	9	12*	3
Natural Science	10	10.5	.5
Marriage and Family Living	11*	7	4
Physical Education	13*	10.5	2.5
Agronomy	14*	9	5

*Not included in the top half of this group

Sales Occupation Group. The only substantial variation that occurs in the top half of the responses between the sales occupation group and the total group is the lower ranking of physical education by the sales

occupation group. The explanation for this difference is not readily available. Table XXVIII indicates the rankings of the top half of the responses of these two groups.

TABLE XXVIII

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE SALES OCCUPATION
GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT TWO

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Sales Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
English	1	2	1
Mathematics	2	3	1
Speech	3	1	2
Psychology	4	5	1
Current Events	5	7	2
Reading	6	4	2
Agricultural Economics	7	8	1
Education	8	9.5	1.5
Philosophy and Logic	9	12.5	3.5
Natural Science	10	9.5	.5
Physical Education	13*	6	7

*Not included in the top half of this group

Secretarial Occupation Group. Agricultural economics is ranked substantially higher by the secretarial occupation group than by the total group. The fact that this group is composed entirely of women may be at least partly responsible for this variation. Table XXIX indicates the rankings of the top half of statement two for these two groups.

TABLE XXIX

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE SECRETARIAL
OCCUPATION GROUP RESPONSES ON
STATEMENT TWO

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Secretarial Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
English	1	1	0
Mathematics	2	2	0
Speech	3	5	2
Psychology	4	3	1
Current Events	5	4	1
Reading	6	7	1
Agricultural Economics	7	14*	7
Education	8	6	2
Philosophy and Logic	9	8	3
Natural Science	10	13*	3
Marriage and Family Living	11*	9.5	1.5
Social Science	12*	9.5	2.5

*Not included in the top half of this group

Teaching Occupation Group. As indicated by Table XXX there are two material variations in the rankings of the top half of the responses to statement two between the teaching occupation group and the total group.

TABLE XXX

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE TEACHING OCCUPATION
GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT TWO

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Teaching Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
English	1	1	0
Mathematics	2	4	2
Speech	3	2	1
Psychology	4	5.5	1.5
Current Events	5	5.5	.5
Reading	6	7	1
Agricultural Economics	7	14*	7
Education	8	3	5
Philosophy and Logic	9	8	1
Natural Science	10	10	0
Social Science	12*	9	3

*Not included in the top half of this group

Education is ranked substantially lower by the teaching occupation group than by the total group, while agricultural economics is ranked higher by the teaching group than by the total group. These variations in ranking are understandable when the nature of the sub-group's occupation is examined.

Miscellaneous Occupation Group. As indicated by Table XXXI agricultural economics is ranked significantly higher by the miscellaneous occupation group than by the total group.

Statement Three--Weaknesses Within the
Division of Business

Concerning weaknesses in the Division of Business, several variations between the rankings of the total group and the sub-groups are present. The following paragraphs and tables explain the results for this area.

1964-1968 Year of Graduation Group. As indicated in Table XXXII "Not enough courses" is ranked substantially higher by the 1964-1968 year of graduation group than by the total group. This is not readily explainable since there were fewer courses offered at the time that this group was in college than at the time the other year of graduation group was in college.

1969-1973 Year of Graduation Group. As Table XXXIII indicates there are no substantial differences in the rankings of the top half of the responses to statement three between the total group and the 1969-1973 year of graduation group.

TABLE XXXI

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF
OF THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE MISCELLANEOUS
OCCUPATION GROUP RESPONSES ON
STATEMENT TWO

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Miscellaneous Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
English	1	1	0
Mathematics	2	3	1
Speech	3	2	1
Psychology	4	4	0
Current Events	5	5.5	.5
Reading	6	7	1
Agricultural Economics	7	14.5*	7.5
Education	8	8	0
Philosophy and Logic	9	5.5	3.5
Natural Science	10	12*	2
Marriage and Family Living	11*	9	2
Social Science	12*	10	2

*Not included in the top half of this group

TABLE XXXII

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE 1964-1968 YEAR OF
GRADUATION GROUP RESPONSES ON
STATEMENT THREE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the 1964-1968 Year Graduation Group	Ranking Difference
Student need more practical experience	1	2	1
Not enough job interviews	2	1	1
Not enough courses	3	8*	5
Not enough instructors	4	3	1
Not a large enough budget	5	5	0
Poor teaching methodology	6	6	0
Inadequate and insufficient equipment	7*	4	3

*Not included in the top half of this group

Accounting Major Group. There are no significant differences between the total group and the accounting major group in the top half of the responses to statement three. Table XXXIV reveals the rankings of the top half of the responses for these two groups.

TABLE XXXIII

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF THE
TOTAL GROUP AND THE 1969-1973 YEAR OF GRADUATION
GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT THREE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the 1969-1973 Year of Graduation Group	Ranking Difference
Students need more practical experience	1	1	0
Not enough job interviews	2	3	1
Not enough courses	3	2	1
Not enough instructors	4	6	2
Not a large enough budget	5	4	1
Poor teaching methodology	6	5	1

TABLE XXXIV

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF THE
TOTAL GROUP AND THE ACCOUNTING MAJOR GROUP
RESPONSES ON STATEMENT THREE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Accounting Major Group	Ranking Difference
Students need more practical experience	1	1	0
Not enough job interviews	2	4	2
Not enough courses	3	6	3
Not enough instructors	4	2	2
Not a large enough budget	5	5	0
Poor teaching methodology	6	3	3

Business Administration Major Group. As indicated in Table XXXV no substantial differences exist between the top half of the responses of the total group and the business administration major group on statement three.

TABLE XXXV

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE BUSINESS
ADMINISTRATION GROUP RESPONSES
ON STATEMENT THREE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Business Administration Group	Ranking Difference
Students need more practical experience	1	1	0
Not enough job interviews	2	2	0
Not enough courses	3	3	0
Not enough instructors	4	4	0
Not a large enough budget	5	7*	2
Poor teaching methodology	6	5	1
Inadequate and insufficient equipment	7*	6	1

*Not included in the top half of this group

Business Education Major Group. Between the business education major group and the total group, there are four major variations in rankings in the top half of the responses to statement three. These rankings are shown in Table XXXVI.

TABLE XXXVI

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE BUSINESS EDUCATION
MAJOR GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT THREE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Business Education Major Group	Ranking Difference
Students need more practical experience	1	1	0
Not enough job interviews	2	4	2
Not enough courses	3	6	3
Not enough instructors	4	8*	4
Not a large enough budget	5	2.5	2.5
Poor teaching methodology	6	10*	4
Inadequate and insufficient equipment	7*	2.5	4.5
Lack of scholarships available	9*	5	4

*Not included in the top half of this group

"Not enough instructors" and "poor teaching methodology" are ranked considerably higher by the business education major group than by the total group, indicating a general satisfaction with both the number and quality of instructors. "Inadequate and insufficient equipment" is ranked lower by the business education major group than by the total group. The lack of electric typewriters and other office machines is probably responsible for this ranking. In addition, "lack of scholarships available" is ranked lower by the business education major group than by the total group.

Accounting Occupation Group. As indicated by Table XXXVII two major variations in ranking of the responses of the top half of statement three exist between the accounting occupation group and the total group.

"Students need more practical experience" is ranked substantially higher by the accounting occupation group than by the total group. Evidently, this particular sub-group believes that practical experience rapidly loses its value when the student begins working. The accounting occupations group ranked "not enough courses" higher than did the total group. This ranking variation could be due to the 12 courses of accounting that the division offers.

Farming Occupation Group. As indicated in Table XXXVIII there are more variations between this sub-group and the total group than any of the other sub-groups.

TABLE XXXVII

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE ACCOUNTING OCCUPATION
GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT THREE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Accounting Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
Students need more practical experience	1	5	4
Not enough job interviews	2	1	1
Not enough courses	3	7*	4
Not enough instructors	4	2	2
Not a large enough budget	5	3	2
Poor teaching methodology	6	4	2
Inadequate and insufficient equipment	7*	6	1

*Not included in the top half of this group

"Textbooks are outdated" is ranked substantially lower by the farming occupation group than by the total group. "Poor construction of courses" is also ranked lower by the farming occupation group than by the total group. These low rankings may be due to the totally different nature of this group's occupation. The knowledge that they were going to farm could explain the high ranking given to "not enough job interviews" by the farming occupation group. In addition, "not enough instructors"

is ranked substantially higher by the farming occupation group than by the total group. This variation in ranking is not readily explainable.

TABLE XXXVIII

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE FARMING OCCUPATION
GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT THREE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Farming Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
Students need more practical experience	1	2.5	1.5
Not enough job interviews	2	6	4
Not enough courses	3	1	2
Not enough instructors	4	10*	6
Not a large enough budget	5	8*	3
Poor teaching methodology	6	5	1
Textbooks are outdated	8*	2.5	5.5
Poor construction of courses	10*	4	6

*Not included in the top half of this group

Management Occupation Group. As indicated in Table XXXIX "lack of scholarships available" is ranked substantially lower by the management occupation group than by the total group.

TABLE XXXIX

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE MANAGEMENT OCCUPATION GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT THREE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Management Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
Students need more practical experience	1	1	0
Not enough job interviews	2	2	0
Not enough courses	3	3	0
Not enough instructors	4	6	2
Not a large enough budget	5	7*	2
Poor teaching methodology	6	8*	2
Textbooks are outdated	8*	5	3
Lack of scholarships available	9*	4	5

*Not included in the top half of this group

Sales Occupation Group. Three substantial variations in the ranking of the top half of the responses to statement three occur between the sales occupation group and the total group. Table XL shows the rankings of these two groups to the responses of statement three.

TABLE XL

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE SALES OCCUPATION
GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT THREE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Sales Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
Students need more practical experience	1	2	1
Not enough job interviews	2	5	3
Not enough courses	3	4	1
Not enough instructors	4	6.5	2.5
Not a large enough budget	5	11*	6
Poor teaching methodology	6	1	5
Poor construction of courses	10*	6.5	3.5
Unqualified instructors	11*	3	8

*Not ranked in the top half of this group

"Poor teaching methodology" and "unqualified instructors" are ranked substantially lower by the sales occupation group than by the total group. These low rankings indicate a general dissatisfaction by this sub-group with the overall quality of teaching in this division. On the other hand, "not a large enough budget" is ranked higher by the sales occupation group than by the total group.

Secretarial Occupation Group. As indicated by Table XLI the secretarial occupation group differs substantially from the total group in three responses in the top half of statement three.

"Not enough job interviews" is ranked substantially higher by the secretarial occupation group than by the total group. The demand for secretaries has remained high in the area and this factor may be the reason for the ranking difference. The high ranking by the secretarial occupation group of "not enough instructors" indicates a satisfaction with the number of instructors. However, the low ranking of this sub-group of "poor teaching methodology" indicates a dissatisfaction with teaching methods.

Teaching Occupation Group. "Not enough courses" is ranked higher by the teaching occupation group than by the total group. This sub-group is evidently satisfied with the number of courses offered in the division. Table XLII illustrates the rankings of these two groups for the top half of the responses to statement three.

TABLE XLI

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE SECRETARIAL
OCCUPATION GROUP RESPONSES ON
STATEMENT THREE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Secretarial Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
Students need more practical experience	1	1	0
Not enough job interviews	2	10*	8
Not enough courses	3	3.5	.5
Not enough instructors	4	9*	5
Not a large enough budget	5	5	0
Poor teaching methodology	6	2	4
Inadequate and insufficient equipment	7*	3.5	3.5
Textbooks are outdated	8*	6.5	1.5
Lack of scholarships available	9*	6.5	2.5

*Not included in the top half of this group

Miscellaneous Occupation Group. "Not enough courses" and "poor teaching methodology" are ranked substantially higher by the miscellaneous occupation group than by the total group. In addition, "unqualified instructors" is ranked lower by the miscellaneous occupation group

than by the total group. Table XLIII indicates the top half of the responses for statement three.

TABLE XLII

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE TEACHING OCCUPATION
GROUP RESPONSES ON STATEMENT THREE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Teaching Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
Students need more practical experience	1	4	3
Not enough job interviews	2	1	1
Not enough courses	3	7*	4
Not enough instructors	4	4	0
Not a large enough budget	5	2	3
Poor teaching methodology	6	9*	3
Inadequate and insufficient equipment	7*	4	3
Lack of scholarships available	9*	6	3

*Not included in the top half of this group

TABLE XLIII

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE TOP HALF OF
THE TOTAL GROUP AND THE MISCELLANEOUS
GROUP RESPONSES ON
STATEMENT THREE

Responses	Rankings by the Total Group	Rankings by the Miscellaneous Occupation Group	Ranking Difference
Students need more practical experience	1	1	0
Not enough job interviews	2	2	0
Not enough courses	3	9.5*	6.5
Not enough instructors	4	3	1
Not a large enough budget	5	6.5	1.5
Poor teaching methodology	6	11*	5
Inadequate and insufficient equipment	7*	4	3
Lack of scholarships available	9*	6.5	2.5
Poor construction of courses	10*	5	5

*Not included in the top half of this group

Summary

There is a high degree of agreement among the various sub-groups as to what constitutes important areas within each of the three statements.

The greatest amount of significant variation occurs in statement one, which asked the respondents to list areas of study in the field of business that were important in their present occupations. Due to the wide differences in occupations and the different business skills required to carry out these occupations, variations in these areas are to be expected.

Even with the variations in statement one, there is significant agreement. In group one (year of graduation) there is only one response that appears in the top half of the total group that does not appear in the top half of the two sub-groups. Group two (business majors) has four individual responses from among the top half of the responses of the total group that do not appear in the top half of all of the sub-group's responses. Group three (present occupation), with a total of seven sub-groups, has only fourteen individual responses that appear in the total group's responses but do not appear in the top half of all of the sub-groups' responses.

Statement two asked the respondents to list areas of study outside the field of business that have proven to be important in their present occupations. Group one (year of graduation) has only one response from the two sub-groups that does not appear in the total group's top half of the responses. There are six responses that appear in the top half of various sub-groups of group two (business major) but do not appear in the top half of the total group's responses. Group three (present occupation) has only eleven responses that appear in the various sub-groups and not in the total group's responses.

Statement three asked the respondents to give areas of weaknesses in the Division of Business. There is one response among the two sub-groups in group one (year of graduation) that does not place in the top half of the responses of the total group. Group two (business majors) has three responses in the top half of the responses of the total group. Group three (present occupations) has twelve responses that appear in the top half of the various sub-groups but do not appear in the top half of the total group's responses.

These findings indicate that substantial agreement exists among all of the respondents concerning the three areas under study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to elicit opinions from the graduates of the Division of Business at Oklahoma Panhandle State University in areas that would allow a plan for curriculum revision to be formulated. The proposed curriculum revision possibly would aid in the education of future graduates of the Business Division at this college.

A consensus was reached by the participating graduates on several areas that are important in curriculum revision. Through the use of the Delphi Technique, the three following areas were explored: (1) areas of study within the field of business that are of importance to the graduates in their present occupations; (2) areas of study outside the field of business that are of importance to the graduates in their present occupations; and (3) weaknesses that the graduates believe to exist within the Business Division at Oklahoma Panhandle State University.

A random sample of one hundred graduates over a ten-year period, 1964 to 1973, was selected to receive the three separate correspondence sheets necessary for the Delphi Technique. The first correspondence sheet was mailed to these graduates in order to elicit responses on statements that were made on each of the three areas under study.

When the first correspondence sheet was returned, the responses were used in the construction of Correspondence Sheet Number Two (See

Appendix B). These responses were placed on Correspondence Sheet Number Two in as nearly the original form as possible in order that the participating graduates would be able to recognize their original responses and to insure the greatest objectivity possible in the study. Some of the responses had to be edited to eliminate personal references and to insure the clarity of the response. These changes were nominal, however, and it is not believed that they affected the objectivity of the study.

Correspondence Sheet Number Two was mailed to the eighty graduates who had responded to the first correspondence sheet. Upon the return of the second correspondence sheet, the responses were tabulated and placed in rank order. These rank orders, in each of the three areas under study, were the basis of Correspondence Sheet Number Three (See Appendix C).

Correspondence Sheet Number Three was mailed to the seventy-two respondents of Correspondence Sheet Number Two. The respondents were asked to examine the rankings, and if they believed that a change in the rankings of any of the items should be made, they were to list the item and the new ranking that they believed it deserved on the space provided. They were also to state the reasons for the change in rankings that they made. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents to Correspondence Sheet Number Two did not return Correspondence Sheet Number Three, therefore indicating their overall approval of the rankings.

Upon receiving the results of Correspondence Sheet Number Three, the responses of each of the three areas were consolidated into like groups. As stated earlier, it was realized that there were areas of overlap among the responses, but in order to avoid a loss of objectivity and to insure that the respondents would be able to identify their

original response, a consolidation was not made at that time. Consolidation of the first area--areas of study within the field of business--reduced the number of responses from 55 original responses to 22 consolidated responses. The second area--areas of study outside the field of business--was reduced from 52 original responses to 20 consolidated responses. The third area--weaknesses that exist in the Division of Business--had 39 original responses and 12 consolidated responses. The consolidated responses in each of the three areas were then ranked by using an original response which most closely resembled the consolidated response.

The top half of the rankings of the consolidated responses for each area of study was then utilized as a basis for conclusions and recommendations.

Findings

The purpose of this study was to identify areas of importance to graduates in order to arrive at a plan for curriculum revision in the Business Division of Oklahoma Panhandle State University. Accordingly, the findings are summarized in these broad areas.

Statement One--Areas of Study Within the Field of Business

1. Many of the areas that are taught in the Division of Business at Panhandle State University are important in the graduates' occupations. In particular, accounting, business law, and business correspondence were considered important to the business graduates.

2. There is a consensus of opinion as to the importance of the skill subjects of typewriting and office machines.
3. Business math is considered an important area of study by the graduates.
4. Personnel management and finance are believed to be important areas of study by the graduates.

Statement Two--Areas of Study Outside the
Field of Business

1. English, mathematics, psychology, natural science, philosophy and logic, and speech, general education subjects required for the business major, are believed to be important areas of study by the total group and by the majority of the sub-groups.
2. Two areas of study outside the field of business which are not taught at Oklahoma Panhandle State University are thought to be important areas of study by the graduates. These areas are current events and reading.

Statement Three--Weaknesses Within the
Division of Business

1. The graduates believe that students should receive more practical experience.
2. The graduates believe that the job placement situation at Oklahoma Panhandle State University is inadequate.

3. There is general agreement by the total group that there are not enough courses or enough instructors in the Business Division at Panhandle State University.
4. The graduates believe the budget of the Business Division at Panhandle State University is not large enough.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the analysis of the Delphi data relative to what the graduates view as important areas for curriculum revision and improvement in the Business Division at Oklahoma Panhandle State University.

Conclusion One

Accounting principles should continue to include elements that provide a knowledge of bookkeeping principles and cost accounting based on the total groups' ranking of bookkeeping and cost accounting.

Conclusion Two

Business law should continue to be required of all business majors. This is supported by the low ranking by the total group of business law.

Conclusion Three

Business correspondence should continue to be required of all business majors based on evidence of the total groups' low ranking of business correspondence.

Conclusion Four

Consideration should be given to requiring all students who major in business to complete an income tax accounting course. At the very least, income taxes should be covered in the accounting principles course to the extent that students would become familiar with the basics of the tax system. This is evidenced by the low ranking given to income taxes by the total group.

Conclusion Five

Personnel management should replace the presently required principles of management course as a result of the lower ranking of personnel management than principles of management.

Conclusion Six

Current political and economic events should be introduced into the social science areas, wherever possible, in order to allow the students an opportunity to become cognizant of recent events. This is supported by the low ranking of current events by the total group.

Conclusion Seven

Agricultural economics should be required for accounting and business administration majors, as evidenced by the low rankings of this response by the accounting and business administration majors sub-groups.

Conclusion Eight

The general education requirements for natural science and philosophy and logic should be continued since the total group gave low rankings to these responses.

Conclusion Nine

Although not in the top half of the total group's responses, both physical education and social science are ranked in the top half of several of the various sub-groups and, therefore, should be retained as a part of the general education requirements. This is supported by the fact that four of the sub-groups ranked social science in the top half of the rankings and five of the sub-groups ranked physical education in the top half of the rankings.

Conclusion Ten

Business students should be encouraged to take courses in the areas outside of business that would be of value to their proposed occupations. This is evidenced by examining the present occupation sub-groups and noting that each of these occupations have certain responses that are ranked low. For example, the farming occupation sub-group ranked agricultural economics as the most important area of study outside the field of business.

Conclusion Eleven

Implementation of methods by which the business major could gain some practical experience in his proposed occupation should be made.

the low ranking given by the total group to the response, "students need more practical experience" supports this conclusion.

Conclusion Twelve

The job placement center at Panhandle State University should be strengthened based on the low ranking of the total group to the response "not enough job interviews."

Conclusion Thirteen

There are not enough instructors or courses at Panhandle State University, as evidenced by the low rankings of the total group to these responses.

Conclusion Fourteen

The faculty of the Business Division at Panhandle State University should re-examine its teaching methodology to ascertain whether improvements can be made. This is supported by the low ranking of the total group of the response "poor teaching methodology."

Recommendations

The present program is illustrated in Table XLIV. It is presented as a prelude to the proposed recommendations.

Relative to Areas of Study Within the Field of Business

The Business Division at Oklahoma Panhandle State University should examine its requirements for the various majors within the field of

TABLE XLIV

PRESENT BUSINESS CURRICULUM

Required Courses for All Business Majors		Additional Courses for Accounting Majors		Additional Courses for Business Administration Majors		Additional Courses for Business Education Majors	
<u>Non-Business Courses</u>	<u>Credit Hours</u>	<u>Non-Business Courses</u>	<u>Credit Hours</u>	<u>Business Courses</u>	<u>Credit Hours</u>	<u>Business Courses</u>	<u>Credit Hours</u>
Orientation	1	College Algebra	3	Introduction to Business	2	Introduction to Business	2
English	6	<u>Business Courses</u>		Elective Courses in Business	20	Methods of Teaching Business	3
Humanities	4	Finance	3	<u>Minor in any Field</u>	18	Shorthand	6
Mathematics	3	Principles of Management	3	<u>Electives in any Field</u>	13	Typewriting	3
Natural Science	8	Statistics	3			Elective Courses in Business	9
Physical Education	5	Cost Accounting	3			<u>Professional Education</u>	24
Social Science	6	Financial Acctng.	3			<u>Minor in any Field</u>	9
Speech	3	Additional Courses from the following:				(plus nine hours counted from general education area)	
General Education Electives	11	Financial Acctng.					
<u>Business Courses</u>		Managerial Acctng.					
Accounting		Income Tax Acctng.					
Principles	6	Advanced Cost Acctng.					
Business		Advanced Theory of Acctng.	18				
Correspondence	3	<u>Minor in any field</u>	18				
Business Law	6						
Economics	6						
Typewriting	3						
	<u>71</u>		<u>54</u>		<u>53</u>		<u>56</u>

business. The following specific recommendations are based upon an analysis of the data. Table XLV indicates how the curriculum will appear if the recommendations are accepted.

All Majors. All majors should be required to continue taking the following courses: (1) accounting principles, (2) business law, (3) business correspondence, (4) finance, (5) typewriting, and (6) general economics. In addition, personnel management should be substituted for principles of management and introduction to business should be discontinued as a requirement for all majors.

Accounting Majors. In addition to the general areas mentioned, the following areas of study should be required for all accounting majors: (1) income tax accounting, (2) cost accounting, (3) accounting theory, and (4) office machines.

Business Administration Majors. In addition to the areas of study to be required of all business students, cost accounting and business statistics should be required of all business administration majors. Since business administration majors tend to enter more diverse occupations than either the accounting or business education majors, a considerable percent of the business courses should be optional. This would allow some degree of specialization for these students in areas in which the business administration students are interested. For example, those who believe they may be entering the sales field might want to take courses in the marketing area.

Business Education Majors. In addition to the areas required of all business majors, the following areas of study within the field

TABLE XLV

PROPOSED CURRICULUM FOR BUSINESS MAJORS

Required Courses for All Business Majors		Additional Courses for Accounting Majors		Additional Courses for Business Administration Majors		Additional Courses for Business Education Majors	
<u>Non-Business Courses</u>	<u>Credit Hours</u>	<u>Non-Business Courses</u>	<u>Credit Hours</u>	<u>Non-Business Courses</u>	<u>Credit Hours</u>	<u>Non-Business Courses</u>	<u>Credit Hours</u>
English	6	Agricultural Economics	3	Agricultural Economics	3	Foreign Language	3
Marriage and Family Living	3	College Algebra	3				
Mathematics	3	<u>Business Courses</u>		<u>Business Courses</u>		<u>Business Courses</u>	
Natural Science	4	Business Statistics	3	Cost Accounting	3	Office Machines	3
Philosophy and Logic	4	Office Machines	3	Business Statistics	3	Introduction to Business	2
Physical Education	4	Income Tax Acctng.	3	Elective Business Courses	9	Shorthand	6
Psychology	3	Cost Accounting	6			Methods of Teaching Business	3
Social Science	9	Financial Acctng.	6	<u>Minor in any Field</u>	18		
Speech	3	Auditing	3				
Speed Reading	3	Advanced Acctng.	6	<u>Practical Experience</u>	8	<u>Professional Education</u>	24
<u>Business Courses</u>		<u>Minor Awarded in Business Administration</u>	0	<u>Electives in any Field</u>	8	<u>Minor in any Field</u>	12
Accounting Principles	6	<u>Practical Experience</u>	8				
Business Correspondence	3	<u>Electives in any Field</u>	8				
Business Law	6						
Finance	3						
Economics	6						
Personnel Management	3						
Typewriting	3						
	<u>72</u>		<u>52</u>		<u>52</u>		<u>53</u>

of business should be required of all business education majors:

(1) methods of teaching business education, (2) introduction to business, (3) office machines, and (4) shorthand.

Relative to Areas of Study Outside the
Field of Business

The following specific recommendations are made for the various business majors relative to those areas of study outside the field of business.

All Majors. The following areas of study outside the field of business should be required of all business majors: (1) English, (2) mathematics, (3) speech, (4) psychology, (5) reading, (6) philosophy and logic, (7) natural science, (8) marriage and family living, (9) social studies with emphasis on current events, and (10) physical education.

Accounting Majors. In addition to the areas required of all business students, agricultural economics should be required of all accounting majors.

Business Administration Majors. In addition to the areas of study required of all business students, agricultural economics should be required of all business administration majors.

Business Education Majors. In addition to the areas of study required of all business majors outside the field of business, education, library science, and foreign language should be required of all business education majors.

Proposed Occupations. Elective areas of study outside the field of business should be available to allow those students who are interested in various occupations to take courses relative to these occupations. For example, those students who are interested in agriculture could take additional courses in the area of agriculture.

Relative to Weaknesses that Exist in the
Field of Business

It is recommended that the following changes be made to strengthen the Business Division at Oklahoma Panhandle State University.

1. Implement more opportunities for practical experience for students. This could be accomplished through the establishment of a supervised work program in conjunction with local businesses. One business major group already has a program similar to this. Those who are in the teacher education program are required to practice teach for eight weeks. It would be advisable to establish eight-week training programs of this type for all business majors. The remaining eight weeks of the semester in which the work experience would be gained could be utilized by implementing regular business courses on campus. If this program proves to be impractical to implement at this time, every effort should be made to place students in part-time jobs where they could gain practical experience.
2. Have more job interviews on campus. Currently, there is no full-time person charged with the placement center responsibility and consequently those who are responsible do not have the time to actively seek job opportunities for graduates. If

possible, the college should hire a full-time person for this job. If this is not possible, the Business Division should take the responsibility for the business majors.

3. Obtain a larger budget. With five full-time instructors and one half-time instructor, the Business Division is unable to offer more courses in the business area. A larger budget should be given to this division, which enrolls approximately 300 students, in order that more instructors could be employed.
4. Improve teaching in certain areas of the division. Division meetings in which improvement of teaching is discussed could be of value. Using student ratings of the instructors could also help identify weaknesses. The college should approve some type of plan that would allow faculty members to return to school to up-date their training and thus improve their teaching skills.

Implications

It is realized that all of the recommendations cannot be put into effect at once. Some of the recommendations and conclusions are beyond the area of control of the Business Division and would require approval from higher sources within the university. Many of the recommendations are tied to increased financial support and are under the control of the legislature.

It is believed that implementation of as many of the recommendations as possible would have a positive effect on the future graduates of the Business Division at Oklahoma Panhandle State University.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adelson, Marvin. "Planning Education for the Future: Comments on a Pilot Study." American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 10, No. 7 (March, 1967), 27.
- Alford, Harold J. Continuing Education in Action. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968.
- Allen, William H. Self Surveys by Colleges and Universities. Yonkers Hudson: World Book Co., 1917.
- Beaty, Edgar. "Follow-up of Teacher Education Graduates as a Basis for Institutional Improvement." Peabody Journal of Education, Vol. 46, No. 5 (March, 1969), 298-300.
- Collins, Billy Dee. "A Systematic Approach to Oklahoma's Adult Education Needs." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1971).
- Cyphert, F. F. and W. L. Gant. "The Delphi Technique: A Tool for Collecting Opinions in Teacher Education." Paper presented at AERA Symposium, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March 4, 1970.
- Dayton, Mitchell C. The Design of Educational Experiments. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Dressel, Paul L. College and University Curriculum, 2nd Edition. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1971.
- Edgeworth, H. C. "Curriculum Feedback." Collegiate News and Views, Vol. XXIV, No. 4 (May, 1971), 13.
- Hopkins, Charles O., Kenneth L. Ritter, and William W. Stevenson. Delphi: A Planning Tool. Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, 1972.
- Houghton, Edward. "A Follow-Up Study of Business Graduates of Southern Oregon College, 1964-1969." (Doctor's Thesis, Oregon State University, 1971.) Dissertation Abstracts, 32, No. 2A (1972), 1749.
- Judd, Robert C. "Delphi Method: Computerized 'Oracle' Accelerates Consensus Formation." College and University Business, Vol. 49 (September, 1970), 30.

- Judd, Robert C. "Forecasting to Consensus Gathering." College and University Business, Vol. 53 (July, 1972), 35.
- Mayhew, Lewis B. The Collegiate Curriculum, Southern Regional Educational Board, Research Monograph No. 1. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1966.
- Nelson, Jack. "Follow-Up Study of Graduates." Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Spring, 1964), 111.
- North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Guide for the Evaluation of Institutions of Higher Education. Chicago, Illinois: Commission on Institutes of Higher Education, 1970.
- Panhandle State University Catalog, 1972-74. Goodwell, Oklahoma: Panhandle State University, 1972.
- Shoben, Edward. Students, Stress and the College Experience. Washington, D.C.: U. S. National Student Association, 1966.
- Snelling, Rodman. "The Impact of a Personalized Mail Questionnaire." Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 63 (November, 1969), 126-129.
- Stevenson, Russell. "The Survey of Schools of Business." American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business. Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Meeting, Austin, April 18, 19, 20.
- Weaver, Timothy W. "The Delphi Forecasting Method." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 25 (January, 1971), pp. 267-271.
- Weisman, Seymour, Alvin Snadowsky, and Estelle Alpert. "Alumni Feedback and Curriculum Revision." Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. 18, No. 2 (Spring, 1970), 120.
- Winstead, Philip and Edward Hobson. "Institutional Goals: Where To From Here." Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 42 (November, 1971), pp. 269-277.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE

SHEET NUMBER ONE

(PANHANDLE STATE UNIVERSITY LETTERHEAD)

November 9, 1973

Mr. John Doe
Sterling High School
Sterling, CO 80751

Dear Mr. Doe:

The Business Division at Panhandle State University is currently in the process of analyzing its curricular programs. In an attempt to insure that all possible sources of information are analyzed, one hundred business graduates from the years 1964 to 1973 are being asked to assist in this process. Russell Edenborough, Assistant Professor of Accounting, will be in charge of gathering and analyzing this data.

The Delphi Technique has been chosen as the method to obtain the desired information. This technique is intended to get opinions from persons without bringing the individuals together. Three separate mailings--the first is enclosed--will be used to gather and finalize your opinion.

We hope you will agree to participate in this effort to improve the Business Division at Panhandle State University.

Sincerely,

Clarence Hammers, Chairman
Division of Business

Russell Edenborough
Assistant Professor of Accounting

jP

Enclosure

CORRESPONDENCE SHEET NO. 1

Present Occupation _____

Please list up to five possible areas of study in the field of business that you believe would be important for an individual in your position to know. No particular order of importance is required.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

Please list up to five possible areas of study outside the field of business that you believe would be important for an individual in your position to know. No particular order of importance is required.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

Please list up to five possible weaknesses that you believe exist in the Division of Business at Panhandle State University. No particular order of importance is required.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

*Please place the completed questionnaire in the self-addressed stamped envelope. You will receive correspondence sheet #2 in the near future.

(PANHANDLE STATE UNIVERSITY LETTERHEAD)

November 27, 1973

Mr. John Doe
Sterling High School
Sterling, CO 80751

Dear Mr. Doe:

Recently, you received a correspondence sheet and a letter requesting your assistance in improving the Business Division at Panhandle State University. If you have not already done so, we would appreciate your response by December 7. For your convenience, another correspondence sheet and a self-addressed stamped envelope are enclosed.

As stated in the first letter, this correspondence sheet is the first of three correspondence sheets that you will receive. The next one will consist of the major factors that you and others have identified as important on the first correspondence sheet. Using the list you will be asked to rank each item in terms of importance to you. This second correspondence sheet will be mailed to you as soon as the results of the first correspondence are tabulated.

Your participation in this study is very important to the success of the project and I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for your time and effort in improving the Division.

Sincerely,

Russell Edenborough
Assistant Professor of Accounting

JP

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE

SHEET NUMBER TWO

(PANHANDLE STATE UNIVERSITY LETTERHEAD)

January 9, 1974

Mr. John Doe
Sterling High School
Sterling, CO 80751

Dear Mr. Doe:

Thank you for completing the first of three correspondence sheets that we are analyzing in order to effect improvements in our Division. Your assistance in completing correspondence sheet two by January 25 will help insure the continued success of this project.

The enclosed correspondence sheet contains the major factors from each of the three areas in which you were asked to assist. In order that we can determine what a person in your position believes are the most important factors, we are asking you to rank each factor on a scale. The scale has a range from (1)-most important, to (11)-least important. If we have somehow missed a factor that you consider important, please list the factor on the back of the correspondence sheet and give it the rank that you believe it deserves.

Again, I want to express my appreciation for your time and continued assistance in this project.

Sincerely,

Russell Edenborough
Assistant Professor of Accounting

jp

Enclosure

(PANHANDLE STATE UNIVERSITY LETTERHEAD)

January 26, 1974

Mr. John Doe
Sterling High School
Sterling, CO 80751

Dear Mr. Doe:

Recently you received a correspondence sheet from us. The success of this project depends on the cooperation of all of the participants. If you have not already done so, we would appreciate your response as soon as possible.

The enclosed correspondence sheet contains the major factors from each of the three areas in which you were asked to assist. In order that we can determine what a person in your position believes are the most important factors, we are asking you to rank each factor on a scale. The scale has a range from (1)-most important, to (11)-least important. If we have somehow missed a factor that you consider important, please list the factor on the back of the correspondence sheet and give it the rank that you believe it deserves.

Again, I want to express my appreciation for your time and continued assistance in this project.

Sincerely,

Russell Edenborough
Assistant Professor of Accounting

jp

Enclosure

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE

SHEET NUMBER THREE

(PANHANDLE STATE UNIVERSITY LETTERHEAD)

February 25, 1974

Mr. John Doe
Sterling High School
Sterling, CO 80751

Dear Mr. Doe:

The study has been very successful and your cooperation has been very important in its success. As the last step in your participation, a ranking of the factors for each of the three areas under study is included. Please examine these rankings and if you believe that some of the factors should be ranked significantly higher or lower, please list the factors in the space provided and indicate the ranks that you believe they deserve. If you believe the rankings to be substantially correct, you need not return the correspondence.

On behalf of the entire business faculty at Panhandle State University, I would like to take this opportunity to express our sincere appreciation for your time and cooperation. The information that you have provided will be analyzed in considerable detail. We will attempt to determine what various occupation groups, age groups, and major field groups believe are important factors in the three areas under study.

Sincerely,

Russell Edenborough
Assistant Professor of Accounting

jp

Enclosure

CORRESPONDENCE SHEET NO. 3

Below are the factors that you and others ranked in respect to their importance as areas of study in the field of business. Since the factors were ranked on an 11 point continuum ranging from most important (1), to least important (11), the factors with the lowest group averages are considered as most important and appear first in the ranked order.

RANK NO.	FACTOR	GROUP AVERAGE
1.5	Bookkeeping	2.357
1.5	Business Law	2.357
3.	Business Correspondence	2.536
4.	Intermediate Accounting	2.652
5.	Personal Income Tax	2.914
6.	Public & Human Relations	2.971
7.	Cost Accounting	3.072
8.	Business Math	3.100
9.	Typewriting	3.200
10.	Business Income Tax Law	3.257
11.	Theory of Accounting	3.356
12.	Office Machines	3.371
13.	Business English	3.400
14.	Managerial Accounting	3.435
15.	Personnel Management	3.500
16.	Office Management	3.543
17.	Auditing	3.543
18.	Finance	4.000
19.	Office Training	4.014
20.	Principles of Management	4.114
21.	Money & Banking	4.171
22.	CPA Review	4.200
23.	Small Business Management	4.286
24.	General Economics	4.357
25.	Business Planning	4.371
26.	Credit & Collections	4.386
27.	Introduction to Business	4.400
28.	Business Statistics	4.457
29.	Inventory Control	4.486
30.	Marketing & Sales Analyses	4.500
31.	Current Problems	4.522
32.	Insurance	4.571
33.	Agricultural Accounting	5.000
34.	Agricultural Business	5.043
35.	Management Information System	5.130
36.	Data Processing	5.143
37.	Stock Market & Commodities	5.186
38.	Salesmanship	5.271
39.	Real Estate	5.329
40.	Business Organization	5.357

RANK NO.	FACTOR	GROUP AVERAGE
41.	Consumer Economics	5.429
42.	Computer Science Program	5.600
43.	Estate Planning	5.868
44.	Advertising	5.706
45.	Government Accounting	5.786
46.	Retailing	5.800
47.	Merchandising & Display	6.232
48.	Computer Key punch Operation	6.286
49.	Transportation & Distribution	6.314
50.	Medical & Legal Terminology	6.429
51.	Industrial Psychology	6.457
52.	Shorthand	6.786
53.	Stenography	6.857
54.	Methods	6.971
55.	Business History	7.412

Rank No. _____ should be changed to Rank No. _____
Reason for ranking change

Rank No. _____ should be changed to Rank No. _____
Reason for ranking change

(Use back of page for additional changes if necessary)

CORRESPONDENCE SHEET NO. 3

Below are the factors that you and others ranked in respect to their importance as areas of study outside the field of business. Since the factors were ranked on an 11 point continuum ranging from most important (1), to least important (11), the factors with the lowest group averages are considered as most important and appear first in the ranked order.

RANK NO.	FACTOR	GROUP AVERAGE
1.	English	2.551
2.	Mathematics	2.768
3.	Speech	3.145
4.	Psychology, General	4.261
5.	Current Events	4.312
6.	Speed Reading	4.333
7.	Government	4.420
8.	Etiquette and Social Manners.	4.623
9.	Agricultural Finance.	5.014
10.	Land Management	5.217
11.	Agricultural Economics.	5.232
12.	Farm Management	5.493
13.	Feedlot Management.	5.609
14.	Ecology and Conservation.	5.652
15.	Education	5.691
16.	Philosophy and Logic.	5.739
17.	Grain Marketing	5.926
18.	History	5.928
19.	Natural Science	5.957
20.	Marriage and Family Living.	6.015
21.	Drug Abuse Education.	6.043
22.	Sociology	6.164
23.	Educational Psychology	6.217
24.	Interpretive Reading.	6.261
25.	Livestock Management.	6.304
26.	Social Science	6.319
27.	Biology	6.478
28.	School Law and Finance	6.529
29.	Physical Education.	6.551
30.	Livestock Evaluation.	6.565
31.	Agronomy	6.797
32.	Chemistry	6.826
33.	General Mechanics	6.841
34.	Crop Production	6.855
35.	Journalism	6.897
36.	Athletics	6.913
37.	Foreign Language.	6.942
38.	Animal Science	6.986
39.	Geology	7.014
40.	School Administration	7.188

RANK NO.	FACTOR	GROUP AVERAGE
41.	Industrial Arts	7.246
42.	Library Science	7.261
43.	Soil Chemistry	7.319
44.	Animal Nutrition	7.348
45.	Educational Tests and Measurements	7.435
46.	Audio Visual Education	7.551
47.	Drafting	7.768
48.	Music	7.797
49.	Photography and Printing	7.841
50.	Textiles	8.304
51.	Arts and Crafts	8.324
52.	Drama	8.956

Rank No. _____ should be changed to Rank No. _____
Reason for ranking change

Rank No. _____ should be changed to Rank No. _____
Reason for ranking change

(Use back of page for additional changes if necessary)

CORRESPONDENCE SHEET NO. 3

Below are the factors that you and others ranked in respect to their importance as possible weaknesses in the Business Division at Panhandle State College. Since the factors were ranked on an 11 point continuum ranging from most important (1), to least important (11), the factors with the lowest group averages are considered as most important and appear first in the ranked order.

RANK NO.	FACTOR	GROUP AVERAGE
1.	Students need more practical experience	2.735
2.	Not enough job interviews on campus	3.103
3.	Not enough courses	3.588
4.	Not enough instructors	3.647
5.	Not a large enough budget	3.838
6.	Some out dated teaching methods	3.864
7.	Inadequate and insufficient equipment	3.896
8.	Not enough upper level courses	4.000
9.	Not enough specialized instructors	4.088
10.	Not enough class discussion	4.118
11.	Some courses are very weak	4.162
12.	Not enough guest lectures	4.191
13.	Not enough demands on students	4.463
14.	Courses unrelated to "real world"	4.471
15.	Textbooks are out dated	4.485
16.	Instructors need refresher courses	4.500
17.	Instructors are unstimulating	4.515
18.	Lack of scholarships available	4.676
19.	Courses are uninteresting.	4.822
20.	Not enough business field trips	4.833
21.	Repetition in many course areas.	4.912
22.	There are too many unnecessary reports	4.971
23.	Not enough qualified instructors	5.015
24.	Standardized exams are used in some classes.	5.279
25.	Counseling is weak	5.294
26.	No Mid Management Program	5.388
27.	Poor class scheduling	5.485
28.	Not enough lecture time	5.500
29.	Not enough lab work.	5.597
30.	Not enough research required	5.676
31.	Important course frequently waived	5.940
32.	Students do not know what teachers expect.	6.000
33.	Classes designed for large corporations.	6.348
34.	Too many students in some courses.	6.529
35.	Some teachers are prejudiced	6.735
36.	Not enough prerequisites for some courses.	6.765
37.	No introduction to Business Literature	6.838
38.	Grading scale too high	7.279
39.	Some classes do not meet regularly	7.456

Rank No. _____ should be changed to Rank No. _____
Reason for ranking change

Rank No. _____ should be changed to Rank No. _____
Reason for ranking change

(Use back of page for additional changes if necessary)

APPENDIX D

GROUPED RANKING OF FACTORS

TABLE XLVI

STATEMENT ONE--GROUP RANKINGS OF TOTAL RESPONSES

Rank	Response	Grouping One (Year of Grad.)		Grouping Two (Major)			Grouping Three (Present Occupation)					Total Ave.		
		1964- 1968	1969- 1973	Acctg.	Bus. Adm.	Bus. Ed.	Acctg.	Farm- ing	Mgmt.	Sales	Sec.		Teach- ing	Misc.
1.5	Bookkeeping	2.048	2.490	3.400	2.175	1.800	3.385	2.100	2.333	2.875	1.778	1.923	1.875	2.357
1.5	Business Law	2.238	2.408	2.600	2.125	2.733	2.307	1.500	2.333	2.500	3.111	1.846	3.275	2.357
3.	Business Correspondence	1.952	2.815	3.067	2.425	2.133	2.923	3.400	2.444	2.500	3.000	1.667	1.750	2.536
4.	Intermediate Accounting	2.619	2.667	3.067	2.615	2.333	1.923	2.222	3.667	4.500	2.444	2.154	3.625	2.652
5.	Personal Income Tax	2.762	2.980	2.200	3.100	3.133	2.846	1.400	3.000	4.500	2.333	3.077	3.625	2.914
6.	Public & Human Relations	3.381	2.796	2.933	3.025	2.867	3.538	3.100	2.556	3.625	2.556	2.462	3.000	2.971
7.	Cost Accounting	2.952	3.125	3.733	3.026	2.533	2.538	2.000	2.444	5.500	4.111	2.308	3.500	3.072
8.	Business Math	3.190	3.061	3.267	3.075	3.000	2.692	2.800	2.333	4.000	3.444	3.000	3.875	3.100
9.	Typewriting	2.476	3.490	3.467	3.675	1.667	3.308	5.300	4.667	3.500	1.000	1.769	3.375	3.200
10.	Business Income Tax Law	3.333	3.224	3.067	3.025	4.067	2.231	1.600	4.222	3.750	4.222	3.692	3.625	3.257
11.	Theory of Accounting	3.857	3.143	2.600	3.700	3.200	2.077	4.700	3.222	5.125	2.333	3.385	3.250	3.356
12.	Office Machines	3.429	3.347	2.933	4.100	1.800	2.462	5.500	5.222	3.625	1.444	2.846	2.875	3.371
13.	Business English	2.952	3.592	4.133	3.325	2.867	3.615	3.800	3.667	4.500	2.222	2.615	3.750	3.400
14.	Managerial Accounting	4.333	3.083	2.733	3.745	3.333	2.692	3.100	3.333	4.375	3.444	3.333	4.375	3.435
15.	Personnel Management	3.524	3.490	3.533	3.375	3.800	3.308	4.300	3.222	3.625	3.889	3.462	2.625	3.500
16.	Office Management	3.571	3.531	3.667	3.700	3.000	3.538	5.700	2.778	3.250	3.000	3.308	3.000	3.543

TO LOCATE MATERIAL IN THE LIBRARY
 use the first 3 numbers of the Call Number
 and see the other side of this slip.

TABLE XLVI (CONTINUED)

Rank	Response	Grouping One (Year of Grad.)		Grouping Two (Major)			Group (Present)							
		1964- 1968	1969- 1973	Acctg.	Bus. Adm.	Bus. Ed.	Acctg.	Farm- ing	Mgmt.	Sa.				
17.	Auditing	5.048	3.531	3.400	3.950	4.667	2.000	3.300	4.000	7.00				
18.	Finance	4.048	3.980	4.867	3.350	4.867	3.769	2.100	3.000	4.37				7.000
19.	Office Training	3.619	4.187	4.200	4.625	2.200	3.769	6.100	5.111	4.750	2.222	2.538	4.250	4.014
20.	Principals of General Management	4.286	4.041	4.267	4.050	4.133	3.308	4.700	4.778	4.500	4.444	3.538	4.125	4.114
21.	Money & Banking	3.952	4.265	4.933	3.900	4.133	4.923	2.500	4.444	4.625	5.111	3.231	4.750	4.171
22.	CPA Review	4.381	4.122	3.667	4.550	3.800	3.385	4.900	5.222	6.250	3.444	3.769	3.000	4.200
23.	Small Business Management	3.857	4.469	5.333	4.225	3.400	6.308	3.300	4.111	3.375	4.222	2.769	5.875	4.286
24.	General Economics	3.619	4.673	5.667	3.900	4.267	5.000	3.400	5.444	4.625	5.667	3.000	3.750	4.357
25.	Business Planning	5.524	4.265	5.067	4.025	4.600	4.231	4.800	4.333	4.125	5.222	4.000	4.250	4.371
26.	Credit & Collections	4.429	4.367	5.533	4.350	3.333	5.077	4.500	4.556	4.750	4.667	3.154	4.250	4.386
27.	Introduction to Business	4.190	4.490	4.333	4.750	3.533	5.154	3.300	4.222	6.375	4.222	2.923	5.375	4.400
28.	Business Statistics	4.923	4.245	4.733	4.475	4.133	3.615	5.500	4.556	5.500	4.333	3.692	4.750	4.457
29.	Inventory Control	4.619	4.429	4.133	4.750	4.133	3.462	3.900	4.333	5.625	5.111	3.769	6.375	4.486
30.	Marketing & Sales Analyses	4.048	4.694	5.667	4.125	4.333	5.538	3.300	5.333	2.875	6.111	3.385	5.000	4.500
31.	Current Problems	4.571	4.500	5.133	4.385	4.267	4.615	4.555	5.000	5.000	5.444	3.154	4.500	4.522
32.	Insurance	3.667	4.959	5.800	4.300	4.067	5.538	2.500	5.444	4.250	5.556	2.846	6.625	4.571

Author Beware the Diet Doctor
 Title READ DIGEST 5.74
FAT AMERICANS MY TIMES F
 (Journal) FAT FADDIST, BEWARE! RISK
STAPLE PAPER TIME D 16
 Oklahoma State University Library

TABLE XLVI (CONTINUED)

Rank	Response	Grouping One (Year of Grad.)		Grouping Two (Major)			Grouping Three (Present Occupation)						Total Ave.	
		1964- 1968	1969- 1973	Acctg.	Bus. Adm.	Bus. Ed.	Acctg.	Farm- ing	Mgmt.	Sales	Sec.	Teach- ing		Misc.
33.	Agricultural Account- ing	5.333	4.857	4.467	5.150	5.133	5.154	1.700	4.556	7.625	6.000	4.692	6.125	5.000
34.	Agricultural Business	5.095	5.025	5.133	4.725	5.800	5.231	1.300	4.778	7.500	6.111	5.077	6.000	5.043
35.	Management Information Systems	4.952	5.208	5.067	4.897	5.800	4.750	3.200	6.778	5.125	6.333	5.000	5.125	5.130
36.	Data Processing	5.429	5.020	4.267	5.825	4.200	3.538	7.900	4.667	7.625	5.667	3.923	3.750	5.143
37.	Stock Market & Commodities	5.000	5.265	5.733	4.900	5.400	6.000	1.900	5.556	5.375	7.778	3.769	6.750	5.186
38.	Salesmanship	3.857	5.878	7.267	4.800	4.533	7.462	3.800	6.444	3.250	6.556	3.385	5.875	5.271
39.	Real Estate	4.857	5.531	7.200	4.750	5.000	7.615	1.900	5.889	5.875	7.000	3.846	5.250	5.329
40.	Business Organization	5.381	5.347	5.133	5.175	6.067	4.385	6.300	5.111	5.500	6.556	5.385	4.500	5.357
41.	Consumer Economics	4.619	5.776	7.267	4.950	4.867	6.923	2.800	6.778	6.125	6.889	3.231	6.000	5.429
42.	Computer Science Programming	5.905	5.469	4.067	6.375	5.067	3.769	7.700	5.444	7.625	7.333	4.538	3.875	5.600
43.	Estate Planning	5.619	5.714	6.467	5.500	5.400	6.077	2.500	6.667	7.250	6.222	4.615	7.500	5.686
44.	Advertising	4.350	6.271	7.071	5.385	5.267	7.000	5.200	6.000	4.286	7.333	3.692	6.750	5.706
45.	Government Accounting	6.571	5.450	5.533	5.750	6.133	3.154	4.400	7.667	9.375	6.778	5.154	6.000	5.786
46.	Retailing	4.857	6.204	8.133	5.275	4.867	8.000	4.300	7.111	3.500	7.222	3.846	6.500	5.800
47.	Merchandising & Display	4.857	6.833	8.133	5.821	5.400	8.500	6.300	7.333	3.125	7.000	4.154	7.125	6.232
48.	Computer Keypunch Operation	6.286	6.286	5.600	6.975	5.133	5.615	7.900	5.778	7.500	7.444	4.615	5.875	6.286

TABLE XLVI (CONTINUED)

Rank	Response	Grouping One (Year of Grad.)		Grouping Two (Major)			Grouping Three (Present Occupation)						Total Ave.	
		1964- 1968	1969- 1973	Acctg.	Bus. Adm.	Bus. Ed.	Acctg.	Farm- ing	Mgmt.	Sales	Sec.	Teach- ing		Misc.
49.	Transportation & Distribution	4.905	6.918	7.933	5.725	6.267	6.923	4.900	7.000	5.500	8.556	4.385	7.750	6.314
50.	Medical & Legal Terminology	6.476	6.408	6.933	6.725	5.133	7.231	4.800	7.667	8.250	5.000	5.077	7.750	6.429
51.	Industrial Psychology	4.905	7.122	7.400	6.600	5.133	6.923	6.400	8.889	7.000	6.889	4.077	5.750	6.457
52.	Shorthand	5.857	7.184	8.133	7.825	2.667	9.308	8.100	9.333	8.000	1.333	4.154	7.375	6.786
53.	Stenography	5.905	7.265	7.933	8.100	2.467	9.077	9.100	9.111	7.875	1.889	4.077	7.000	6.857
54.	Methods	5.905	7.429	8.267	7.625	3.933	8.000	6.700	9.778	8.750	5.222	3.769	7.875	6.971
55.	Business History	6.950	7.604	7.867	7.231	6.933	7.692	5.900	9.000	8.286	8.500	5.538	8.250	7.412

TABLE XLVII

STATEMENT TWO--GROUP RANKINGS OF TOTAL RESPONSES

Rank	Response	Grouping One (Year of Grad.)		Grouping Two (Major)			Grouping Three (Present Occupation)					Total Ave.		
		1964- 1968	1969- 1973	Acctg.	Bus. Adm.	Bus. Ed.	Acctg.	Farm- ing	Mgmt.	Sales	Sec.		Teach- ing	Misc.
1.	English	2.350	2.633	2.133	2.875	2.071	2.462	4.800	1.889	3.000	1.111	2.417	2.000	2.551
2.	Mathematics	2.550	2.878	3.000	2.650	2.929	2.385	3.500	2.222	3.375	2.000	2.917	3.250	2.768
3.	Speech	2.750	3.306	4.067	2.850	3.000	3.462	4.500	2.778	2.000	4.000	2.667	2.250	3.145
4.	Psychology, General	4.450	4.163	3.933	4.550	3.786	3.615	7.300	4.556	4.250	3.333	3.333	3.625	4.261
5.	Current Events	4.500	4.244	3.600	4.900	3.429	3.538	5.300	5.444	5.875	3.667	3.333	3.750	4.312
6.	Speed Reading	2.700	5.000	5.200	4.150	3.929	4.615	6.600	3.222	3.625	4.556	3.333	4.250	4.333
7.	Government	5.200	4.306	5.533	4.150	4.000	4.462	3.700	5.222	5.250	4.556	4.167	3.750	4.420
8.	Etiquette and Social Manners	4.650	4.612	3.867	5.350	3.357	4.462	5.600	4.333	5.875	5.444	2.833	4.500	4.623
9.	Agricultural Finance	5.050	5.000	4.533	4.675	6.500	5.615	1.100	3.778	6.500	6.222	5.833	6.250	5.014
10.	Land Management	5.800	4.980	6.133	4.700	5.714	6.231	1.700	3.778	7.625	6.000	5.250	6.250	5.217
11.	Agricultural Economics	5.500	5.122	5.000	4.850	6.571	5.615	1.400	4.556	6.625	6.556	5.917	6.250	5.232
12.	Farm Management	5.850	5.367	6.867	4.675	6.357	6.615	1.500	4.889	7.500	5.889	5.917	6.250	5.493
13.	Feedlot Management	5.900	5.490	6.067	5.150	6.429	5.538	2.200	4.889	7.000	7.222	6.167	6.750	5.609
14.	Ecology and Conser- vation	6.550	5.286	5.533	5.775	5.429	6.154	3.500	6.222	7.500	5.444	6.167	4.500	5.652
15.	Education	4.900	6.149	6.533	6.462	2.643	7.385	6.500	6.778	7.000	4.333	2.750	5.286	5.691
16.	Philosophy and Logic	6.050	5.612	5.667	6.300	4.214	5.615	8.100	6.444	7.250	4.778	4.333	3.750	5.739

TABLE XLVII (CONTINUED)

Rank	Response	Grouping One (Year of Grad.)		Grouping Two (Major)			Grouping Three (Present Occupation)						Total Ave.	
		1964- 1968	1969- 1973	Acctg.	Bus. Adm.	Bus. Ed.	Acctg.	Farm- ing	Mgmt.	Sales	Sec.	Teach- ing		Misc.
17.	Grain Marketing	6.650	5.745	5.933	5.462	7.214	5.833	1.400	5.444	7.875	7.667	6.833	7.000	5.926
18.	History	5.700	6.020	7.400	5.325	4.643	7.154	4.500	7.444	8.000	5.444	4.333	4.875	5.928
19.	Natural Science	5.900	5.980	7.533	5.450	5.714	6.846	4.800	6.000	7.000	6.333	5.000	6.000	5.957
20.	Marriage and Family Living	6.650	5.857	5.733	5.950	6.500	6.385	6.500	5.333	7.250	5.667	5.500	5.500	6.015
21.	Drug Abuse Education	6.300	5.939	5.467	6.800	4.500	6.692	6.000	6.667	7.125	3.222	6.667	5.375	6.043
22.	Sociology	6.950	5.830	6.786	6.385	4.929	7.308	6.556	5.333	7.375	5.333	5.333	5.375	6.164
23.	Educational Psychology	4.750	6.816	6.667	7.175	3.000	7.385	8.000	7.556	7.750	4.444	2.417	6.375	6.217
24.	Interpretative Reading	5.750	6.469	6.667	6.875	4.071	5.308	7.900	6.222	8.125	7.333	4.500	5.375	6.261
25.	Livestock Management	7.200	6.122	6.933	5.825	7.000	7.000	2.400	5.444	7.500	6.000	7.417	6.625	6.304
26.	Social Science	6.000	6.449	7.333	6.500	4.714	7.385	6.600	7.444	7.125	5.667	4.417	5.750	6.319
27.	Biology	6.250	6.571	7.333	6.125	6.571	7.615	3.700	8.000	7.125	7.000	6.417	5.250	6.478
28.	School Law and Finance	5.650	6.896	7.133	6.950	4.538	7.308	7.600	8.222	7.750	5.556	4.182	5.125	6.529
29.	Physical Education	5.950	6.796	6.000	6.600	7.000	6.308	7.800	6.000	4.500	8.111	6.833	5.875	6.551
30.	Livestock Evaluation	6.600	6.551	7.867	5.850	7.214	7.846	2.300	5.556	7.750	8.778	6.500	7.375	6.565
31.	Agronomy	6.550	6.898	7.533	6.150	7.857	7.308	1.900	5.889	7.750	9.556	7.750	7.625	6.797
32.	Chemistry	7.050	6.735	7.400	6.725	6.500	7.538	4.200	8.111	7.500	7.556	6.583	6.375	6.826
33.	General Mechanics	6.950	6.796	7.533	6.325	7.571	6.154	4.200	7.444	8.625	9.444	6.667	6.125	6.841

TABLE XLVII (CONTINUED)

Rank	Response	Grouping One (Year of Grad.)		Grouping Two (Major)			Grouping Three (Present Occupation)						Total Ave.	
		1964- 1968	1969- 1973	Acctg.	Bus. Adm.	Bus. Ed.	Acctg.	Farm- ing	Mgmt.	Sales	Sec.	Teach- ing		Misc.
34.	Crop Production	6.900	6.837	8.000	6.075	7.857	7.231	2.200	6.667	7.375	9.000	7.833	7.875	6.855
35.	Journalism	6.900	6.896	7.800	7.325	4.538	7.231	8.900	7.667	6.875	7.375	4.333	6.375	6.897
36.	Athletics	6.900	6.918	6.200	7.150	7.000	6.000	7.400	6.778	5.625	8.667	8.167	5.875	6.913
37.	Foreign Language	6.850	6.979	6.867	7.650	5.000	6.462	7.900	8.111	8.750	6.222	5.667	6.125	6.942
38.	Animal Science	6.900	7.020	7.933	6.325	7.857	7.615	2.800	6.556	8.250	9.778	7.667	6.250	6.986
39.	Geology	7.050	7.000	8.067	6.625	7.000	7.231	5.300	7.222	8.625	8.222	6.333	6.625	7.014
40.	School Administration	6.500	7.469	7.933	7.675	5.000	8.231	9.000	9.111	8.375	5.333	4.500	6.000	7.188
41.	Industrial Arts	7.300	7.224	8.867	6.625	7.286	7.231	5.400	7.556	8.625	9.889	6.000	6.750	7.246
42.	Library Science	6.400	7.612	8.400	7.575	5.143	7.385	9.200	8.889	7.750	6.222	5.083	6.750	7.261
43.	Soil Chemistry	7.250	7.347	9.467	6.425	7.571	9.000	3.300	6.333	8.500	9.333	6.833	8.000	7.319
44.	Animal Nutrition	6.700	7.612	8.133	6.750	8.214	8.231	2.600	7.222	7.500	10.111	8.000	7.750	7.348
45.	Educational Tests & Measurements	6.350	7.878	7.667	8.100	5.286	7.846	8.500	9.111	9.000	5.667	4.917	8.000	7.435
46.	Audio Visual Education	5.700	8.306	8.267	8.000	5.500	8.000	9.800	8.222	8.000	7.222	4.833	7.250	7.551
47.	Drafting	7.500	7.918	8.067	7.875	7.286	8.308	8.300	7.222	7.000	9.556	6.583	7.625	7.768
48.	Music	7.300	8.020	7.867	8.450	5.929	8.154	10.200	8.667	7.625	6.889	6.500	6.500	7.797
49.	Photography and Printing	6.900	8.265	8.933	8.100	5.929	8.538	9.400	8.667	7.500	8.667	4.750	8.000	7.841

TABLE XLVII (CONTINUED)

Rank	Response	Grouping One (Year of Grad.)		Grouping Two (Major)			Grouping Three (Present Occupation)						Total Ave.	
		1964- 1968	1969- 1973	Acctg.	Bus. Adm.	Bus. Ed.	Acctg.	Farm- ing	Mgmt.	Sales	Sec.	Teach- ing		Misc.
50.	Textiles	7.200	8.755	10.000	8.325	6.429	9.615	8.400	8.333	8.750	8.222	6.583	8.250	8.304
51.	Arts and Crafts	7.550	8.830	8.733	8.795	6.571	8.923	9.400	8.667	8.500	8.222	6.750	7.857	8.324
52.	Drama	8.850	9.191	9.067	9.718	6.714	9.462	10.500	10.899	9.000	8.667	6.500	7.857	8.956

TABLE XLVIII

STATEMENT THREE--GROUP RANKINGS OF TOTAL RESPONSES

Rank	Response	Grouping One (Year of Grad.)		Grouping Two (Major)			Grouping Three (Present Occupation)						Total Ave.	
		1964- 1968	1969- 1973	Acctg.	Bus. Adm.	Bus. Ed.	Acctg.	Farm- ing	Mgmt.	Sales	Sec.	Teach- ing		Misc.
1.	Students need more practical experience	2.650	2.771	3.333	2.711	2.200	3.231	3.333	2.667	2.286	2.222	2.846	2.125	2.735
2.	Not enough job interviews on campus	2.550	3.333	3.867	2.895	2.867	2.154	4.000	2.889	3.714	5.667	2.000	2.250	3.103
3.	Not enough courses	4.300	3.292	4.333	3.447	3.200	3.769	3.000	3.444	3.286	3.556	3.538	4.500	3.588
4.	Not enough instructors	2.700	4.042	3.400	3.489	3.533	2.385	5.111	4.778	3.857	5.000	2.846	2.375	3.647
5.	Not a large enough budget	3.650	3.917	4.200	4.237	2.467	3.077	4.778	4.778	5.426	4.000	2.462	3.625	3.838
6.	Some outdated teaching methods	3.650	3.957	3.733	3.946	3.786	3.083	3.889	5.111	2.000	3.333	4.417	5.000	3.864
7.	Inadequate and insufficient equipment	3.500	4.064	4.933	4.054	2.467	3.462	4.375	6.111	4.286	3.556	2.846	3.375	3.896
8.	Not enough upper level courses	3.900	4.042	4.533	3.921	3.667	3.769	5.333	4.111	4.286	4.556	3.692	2.500	4.000
9.	Not enough specialized instructors	4.150	4.063	4.133	4.263	3.600	3.231	6.000	4.889	3.286	3.889	4.000	3.500	4.088
10.	Not enough class discussion	3.300	4.458	6.200	3.632	3.267	5.692	3.222	5.222	3.286	4.444	3.462	2.750	4.118
11.	Some courses are very weak	4.500	4.021	4.667	3.800	4.600	3.231	4.556	4.778	2.714	3.444	5.154	5.000	4.162
12.	Not enough guest lectures	3.550	4.458	5.600	3.947	3.400	5.769	4.889	2.556	4.571	6.333	2.769	2.250	4.191

TABLE XLVIII (CONTINUED)

Rank	Response	Grouping One (Year of Grad.)		Grouping Two (Major)			Grouping Three (Present Occupation)						Total Ave.	
		1964- 1968	1969- 1973	Acctg.	Bus. Adm.	Bus. Ed.	Acctg.	Farm- ing	Mgmt.	Sales	Sec.	Teach- ing		Misc.
13.	Not enough demands on students	4.316	4.521	5.000	4.189	4.600	4.615	5.111	4.111	4.571	5.250	4.000	3.750	4.463
14.	Courses unrelated to "real world"	3.500	4.875	6.067	3.868	4.400	5.692	3.222	6.778	2.571	4.222	4.308	3.500	4.471
15.	Textbooks are out dated	3.950	4.708	5.733	4.500	3.200	5.615	3.333	4.444	4.000	4.222	3.769	5.875	4.485
16.	Instructors need refresher courses	3.700	4.833	5.133	4.526	3.800	4.846	5.111	7.333	2.143	4.111	4.000	3.375	4.500
17.	Instructors are unstimulating	4.100	4.826	5.714	4.676	3.000	5.417	4.125	6.556	3.000	3.333	3.846	5.000	4.515
18.	Lack of scholarships available	4.500	4.750	4.800	5.263	3.067	4.000	7.778	4.222	6.857	4.333	3.231	3.625	4.676
19.	Courses are uninteresting	4.700	4.875	6.533	4.421	4.133	6.077	3.667	6.556	3.857	4.444	4.769	3.500	4.822
20.	Not enough business field trips	4.158	5.106	6.200	5.028	3.000	5.692	5.125	4.556	6.286	5.000	2.917	4.875	4.833
21.	Repetition in many course areas	4.150	5.229	6.267	4.500	4.600	5.769	4.111	5.333	4.143	5.556	4.231	5.000	4.912
22.	There are too many unnecessary reports	5.350	4.813	5.733	4.579	5.200	5.692	5.000	5.667	3.571	4.333	5.154	4.875	4.971
23.	Not enough qualified instructors	5.000	5.021	4.466	4.658	3.600	4.000	5.222	6.000	3.143	6.111	6.078	4.000	5.015
24.	Standardized exams are used in some classes	5.800	5.063	7.133	4.605	5.133	5.462	5.556	4.333	4.857	5.444	6.154	4.500	5.279

TABLE XLVII (CONTINUED)

Rank	Response	Grouping One (Year of Grad.)		Grouping Two (Major)			Grouping Three (Present Occupation)						Total Ave.	
		1964- 1968	1969 1973	Acctg.	Bus. Adm.	Bus. Ed.	Acctg.	Farm- ing	Mgmt.	Sales	Sec.	Teach- ing		Misc.
25.	Counseling is weak	4.750	5.521	6.200	4.658	6.000	5.231	4.778	6.222	4.426	7.222	4.692	4.500	5.294
26.	No Mid Management Program	4.100	5.936	7.143	5.395	4.067	5.833	6.667	4.333	5.000	6.556	3.615	6.375	5.388
27.	Poor class scheduling	4.750	5.792	6.400	5.632	4.200	6.462	6.222	5.111	4.286	6.222	3.846	6.375	5.485
28.	Not enough lecture time	5.350	5.563	6.867	5.184	4.933	6.385	5.333	5.000	5.857	6.000	5.000	4.750	5.500
29.	Not enough lab work	4.211	6.146	7.400	5.263	4.571	6.308	5.667	6.000	5.426	6.889	4.167	4.750	5.597
30.	Not enough research required	5.200	5.875	6.000	5.737	5.200	5.615	7.667	6.444	4.571	7.333	4.615	3.250	5.676
31.	Important course frequently waived	6.000	5.915	6.333	6.216	4.867	6.462	6.375	6.778	5.571	5.889	5.308	5.125	5.940
32.	Students do not know what teachers expect	6.050	5.979	6.533	6.289	4.733	6.769	4.889	5.222	7.143	6.333	5.308	6.625	6.000
33.	Classes designed for large corporations	6.600	6.217	7.214	5.947	6.571	6.692	6.556	4.333	7.000	7.667	6.583	5.286	6.348
34.	Too many students in some courses	6.300	6.625	7.800	5.974	6.000	6.846	5.556	6.222	6.856	8.444	6.077	5.750	6.529
35.	Some teachers are prejudiced	6.900	6.666	7.400	6.842	5.800	7.308	4.444	7.333	6.857	5.889	6.846	8.375	6.735
36.	Not enough prerequisites for some courses	5.600	7.250	8.867	6.289	5.866	8.308	7.667	5.222	5.857	8.667	5.154	6.250	6.765
37.	No introduction to Business Literature	6.050	7.167	7.667	7.184	5.133	6.462	7.556	7.889	6.857	7.889	5.308	6.750	6.838

TABLE XLVIII (CONTINUED)

Rank	Response	Grouping One (Year of Grad.)		Grouping Two (Major)			Grouping Three (Present Occupation)						Total Ave.	
		1964- 1968	1969- 1973	Acctg.	Bus. Adm.	Bus. Ed.	Acctg.	Farm- ing	Mngt.	Sales	Sec.	Teach- ing		Misc.
38.	Grading scale too high	7.450	7.208	6.733	7.920	6.200	7.077	5.444	9.111	7.714	7.111	6.692	8.375	7.279
39.	Some classes do not meet regularly	7.400	7.479	8.000	7.342	7.200	6.846	8.222	6.778	7.857	9.333	6.769	7.000	7.456

APPENDIX E

STATEMENTS ONE, TWO, AND THREE--GROUP RANKINGS
OF CONSOLIDATED RESPONSES

TABLE XLIX

STATEMENT ONE--GROUP RANKINGS OF
CONSOLIDATED RESPONSES

Rank	Response	Grouping One (Year of Grad.)		Grouping Two (Major)			Grouping Three (Present Occupation)						
		1964- 1968	1969- 1973	Acctg.	Bus. Adm.	Bus. Ed.	Acctg.	Farm- ing	Mgmt.	Sales	Sec.	Teach- ing	Misc.
1.5	Bookkeeping	2	2	7	2	2.5	11	5	2	3.5	4	4	2
1.5	Business Law	3	1	2	1	7	2	3	2	1.5	8	3	6
3.0	Business Correspondence	1	3	5	3	4	7	11	4.5	1.5	7	1	1
4.0	Income Tax Accounting	5	4	1	6	9	6	2	6.5	10	5	10	9
5.0	Cost Accounting	6	6	10	4	5	4	4	4.5	15	11	5	8
6.0	Business Math	7	5	6	5	8	5	7	2	8	9	8.5	12
7.0	Typewriting	4	9	8	9	1	9	17	12	5	1	2	7
8.0	Accounting Theory	11	7	3	10	10	1	15	8.5	14	6	13.5	5
9.0	Office Machines	8	8	4	13	2.5	3	18	16	6.5	3	6	4
10.0	Personnel Management	9	10	9	8	12	10	13	8.5	6.5	10	15	3
11.0	Finance	12	11	14	7	19	13	6	6.5	9	20	17	16.5
12.0	Principles of Management	15	12	11	12	14	8	16	12	11	13	16	13
13.0	General Economics	10	15	17	11	16	15	12	18	12	16	8.5	10.5

TABLE XLIX (CONTINUED)

Rank	Response	Grouping One (Year of Grad.)		Grouping Two (Major)			Grouping Three (Present Occupation)						
		1964- 1968	1969- 1973	Acctg.	Bus. Ad.	Bus. Ed.	Acctg.	Farm- ing	Mgmt.	Sales	Sec.	Teach- ing	Misc.
14.0	Introduction to Business	14	13	13	17	11	16	10	10	17	12	7	16.5
15.0	Marketing	13	16	18	14	18	18	9	17	3.5	18	13.5	15
16.0	Current Problems	16	14	15	15	17	14	14	15	13	15	11	14
17.0	Agri-Business	18	18	16	16	21	17	1	11.5	18	19	21	18.5
18.0	Computer Data Processing	19	17	12	19	15	12	20	12	19	17	19	10.5
19.0	Consumer Economics	17	19	19	18	20	19	8	19	16	17	19	10.5
20.0	Shorthand	20	20	20	21	6	21	21	20	21	2	20	20
21.0	Methods of Teaching Business	21	21	21	20	13	20	19	21	21	14	18	21

TABLE L
STATEMENT TWO--GROUP RANKINGS OF
CONSOLIDATED RESPONSES

Rank	Response	Grouping One (Year of Grad.)		Grouping Two (Major)			Grouping Three (Present Occupation)						
		1964- 1968	1969- 1973	Acctg.	Bus. Adm.	Bus. Ed.	Acctg.	Farm- ing	Mgmt.	Sales	Sec.	Teach- ing	Misc.
1	English	1	1	1	3	1	2	6.5	1	2	1	1	1
2	Mathematics	2	2	2	1	3	1	4	2	3	2	4	3
3	Speech	4	3	5	2	4	3	5	3	1	5	2	2
4	Psychology	5	4	4	5	6	5	14	5	5	3	5.5	4
5	Current Events	6	5	3	7	5	4	8	8	7	4	5.5	5.5
6	Reading	3	6	7	4	7	6	12.5	4	4	7	7	7
7	Agricultural Economics	8	7	6	6	16	7	1	6	8	14	14	14.5
8	Education	7	11	11	13	2	16	10.5	14	9.5	6	3	8
9	Philosophy and Logic	12	8	8	11	8	8	17	12	12.5	8	8	5.5
10	Natural Science	9	10	14	8	12	12	6.5	10.5	9.5	13	10	12
11	Marriage and Family Living	15	9	9	9	14	10	10.5	7	12.5	9.5	12	9
12	Social Science	11	12	13	14	9	16	12.5	15	11	9.5	9	10

TABLE L (CONTINUED)

Rank	Response	Grouping One (Year of Grad.)		Grouping Two (Major)			Grouping Three (Present Occupation)						
		1964- 1968	1969- 1973	Acctg.	Bus. Adm.	Bus. Ed.	Acctg.	Farm- ing	Mgmt.	Sales	Sec.	Teach- ing	Misc.
13	Physical Education	10	13	10	15	17	9	15	10.5	6	16	18	11
14	Agronomy	14	14	15	10	20	14	2	9	15.5	18	20	19
15	Foreign Language	16	15	12	18	10	11	16	17	20	11.5	13	13
16	Animal Science	17	16	17	12	19	18	3	13	17	19	19	14.5
17	Industrial Arts	18	17	20	16	18	13	9	16	19	20	15	17.5
18	Library Science	13	18	18	17	11	16	18	20	15.5	11.5	11	17.5
19	Music	19	19	16	19	13	19	20	18.5	14	15	16	16
20	Arts and Crafts	20	20	19	20	15	20	19	18.5	18	17	17	20

TABLE LI

STATEMENT THREE--GROUP RANKINGS OF
CONSOLIDATED RESPONSES

Rank	Response	Grouping One (Year of Grad.)		Grouping Two (Major)			Grouping Three (Present Occupation)						
		1964- 1968	1969- 1973	Acctg.	Bus. Adm.	Bus. Ed.	Acctg.	Farm- ing	Mgmt.	Sales	Sec.	Teach- ing	Misc.
1	Students need more practical experience	2	1	1	1	1	5	2.5	1	2	1	4	1
2	Not enough job interviews	1	3	4	2	4	1	6	2	5	10	1	2
3	Not enough courses	8	2	6	3	6	7	1	3	4	3.5	7	9.5
4	Not enough instructors	3	6	2	4	8	2	10	6	6.5	9	4	3
5	Not a large enough budget	5	4	5	7	2.5	3	8	7	11	5	2	6.5
6	Poor teaching methodology	6	5	3	5	10	4	5	8	1	2	9	11
7	Inadequate and insufficient equipment	4	7	9	6	2.5	6	7	10	9	3.5	4	4
8	Textbooks are outdated	7	8	10	9	7	11	2.5	5	8	6.5	8	12
9	Lack of scholarships available	9	9	8	12	5	8	12	4	12	6.5	6	6.5
10	Poor construction of courses	10	10	12	8	11	12	4	12	6.5	8	11	5
11	Unqualified instructor	12	11	7	10	9	9	11	9	3	11	12	8
12	Counseling is weak	11	12	11	11	12	10	9	11	10	12	10	9.5

APPENDIX F

ANALYSIS OF THE SAMPLE

TABLE LII
ANALYSIS OF THE SAMPLE

Group One Year of Graduation	Group Three--Present Occupation						
	Acctg.	Farming	Management	Sales	Teaching	Sec.	Misc.
1964-1968	0	2	2	5	10	1	1
1969-1973	13	8	7	3	3	8	7

Group Two Business Major	Group Three--Present Occupation						
	Acctg.	Farming	Management	Sales	Teaching	Sec.	Misc.
Business Education and Secretarial Science	0	0	0	1	10	4	0
Business Administration	4	10	7	6	3	3	7
Accounting	9	0	2	1	0	2	1

VITA

Russell Spence Edenborough

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: AN ANALYSIS OF THE CURRICULUM BY THE GRADUATES OF THE DIVISION
OF BUSINESS OF OKLAHOMA PANHANDLE STATE UNIVERSITY

Major Field: Business Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Hooker, Oklahoma, December 31, 1944, the son
of N. H. Edenborough and Mildred D. Edenborough.

Education: Graduated from Guymon High School, Guymon, Oklahoma,
in May, 1960; received the Bachelor of Science degree in
Business Administration from Panhandle State University in
May, 1966; received Master of Science degree in Business
Education from Oklahoma State University in July, 1967;
completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree
in Business Education at Oklahoma State University in May,
1975.

Professional Experience: Business instructor at Walsh High School,
Walsh, Colorado, 1967-1968; Instructor in Accounting for
Panhandle State University, Goodwell, Oklahoma, 1968-1972;
Graduate Research Assistant for the Oklahoma State Department
of Vocational and Technical Education, Stillwater, Oklahoma,
1972-1973; Assistant Professor in Accounting at Panhandle
State University, Goodwell, Oklahoma, 1972-1975.

Professional Organizations: Delta Pi Epsilon, Beta Gamma Sigma,
and Oklahoma Education Association.

