

ATTITUDES OF MARKETING/DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION  
STATE SUPERVISORS AND TEACHER EDUCATORS  
TOWARD PROGRAM NAME CHANGE

By

NELDA BLOOM

Bachelor of Arts  
University of Missouri at Kansas City  
Kansas City, Missouri  
1974

Master of Science  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1977

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  
July, 1984



ATTITUDES OF MARKETING/DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION  
STATE SUPERVISORS AND TEACHER EDUCATORS  
TOWARD PROGRAM NAME CHANGE

Thesis Approved:

*Larry G. Davis*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser  
*Arch B. Alexander*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Ken St. Clair*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Ernie W. Suggs*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Clyde B. Knight*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Norman J. Durbin*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express her gratitude and sincere appreciation to her adviser, Dr. Jerry Davis for help and valuable suggestions during this study, to Dr. Lloyd Wiggins, Dr. Arch Alexander, Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, and to Dr. Clyde Knight for their committee help.

The writer especially owes credit to her son, Eric, without whose love, patience, understanding and help, the many hours spent in school would have been impossible. To friends, Barbara Lyon and Callie Atteberry for listening and giving suggestions, thanks are due. To Judy DeVaughn and Janet Sloan for help in typing the instrument and rough draft, much appreciation is due. To the teacher educators and state supervisors of the Marketing/Distributive Education Programs across the United States and its territories who participated in the questionnaire, a sincere thanks.

To Dr. Richard Dodder and Dr. Bill Warde much appreciation for patience and help in the statistical analysis.

To the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational Technical Education, much appreciation is given for instilling in the writer a desire to continue on in education.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	3
Research Questions . . . . .	3
Purpose of Study . . . . .	3
Need for the Study . . . . .	4
Limitations . . . . .	5
Assumptions . . . . .	5
Definitions of Terms . . . . .	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	7
Recognition of Need for a Change . . . . .	7
Identifiable Problems . . . . .	8
Growth and Expansion . . . . .	14
Trends . . . . .	18
Promotion and Marketing . . . . .	23
Summary . . . . .	25
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	26
Selection of Subjects . . . . .	26
Development of the Instrument . . . . .	26
Collection of Data . . . . .	28
Analysis of Data . . . . .	28
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	29
Respondents . . . . .	29
Analysis of Overall Response . . . . .	30
Summary . . . . .	45
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY . . . . .	47
Summary . . . . .	47
Findings . . . . .	48
Conclusions . . . . .	50
Recommendations . . . . .	51
Recommendations for Further Study . . . . .	51
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	53

Chapter	Page
APPENDIXES . . . . .	56
APPENDIX A - PANEL OF EXPERTS . . . . .	57
APPENDIX B - TEACHER EDUCATOR QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	59
APPENDIX C - STATE SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	62
APPENDIX D - FOLLOW UP POSTCARD . . . . .	65
APPENDIX E - COVER LETTER AND MAILING LIST . . . . .	67

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Degree Level by Frequency and Percentage of State Supervisors and Teacher Educators in M/DE . . . . .	31
II. Official Name of Programs in States and Teacher Education Programs by Number and Percent . . . . .	31
III. Official Name of Programs at Teacher Education Institutions as reported by Teacher Educators and State Supervisors .	33
IV. Number of Programs Changed During the Past Four Years by Frequency and Percent . . . . .	35
V. Name Preferred for M/DE Programs by Teacher Educators and State Supervisors if Not Already Changed by Frequency and Percent . . . . .	36
VI. Decrease or Increase of Enrollment for the Past Four Years Reported by State Supervisors and Teacher Educators . . .	37
VII. Distribution of Response to Public Relations Promoting a Better Understanding of M/DE Programs . . . . .	39
VIII. The Program Name Makes a Difference in the Program as Responded to by State Supervisors and Teacher Educators .	41
IX. State Supervisors and Teacher Educators Responses to Whether Other Educators Understand Purposes of the M/DE Program . . . . .	42
X. State Supervisors and Teacher Educators Responses to the Name of the Program Undergoing Changes . . . . .	43
XI. Analysis of Variance of Programs with Increased Enrollment as Reported by Respondents Who Felt Their Program Had a Favorable Image . . . . .	44
XII. Analysis of Variance of Programs with Increased Enrollment Where Respondents Felt the Name Change Made a Difference in Gained Enrollment . . . . .	44

Table	Page
XIII. Analysis of Variance on Enrollment Increase and Respondents Attitude Concerning Where a Program Emphasis Should Be Made at the College Level . . . . .	46

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

By 1980, leaders in Marketing and Distributive Education (M/DE) had become so concerned with the identity problem of M/DE that they gathered in Vail, Colorado, for a conference meeting on "Directions for the 1980's" (Vail Conference). Position papers were presented concerning the state of the art in M/DE, discussion groups were organized among those attending, and an in-depth study of four areas was conducted. The conference was attended by over 200 persons from teacher education, secondary vocational programs, state supervision and business. It was held at Vail, Colorado, May 19-22, 1980.

Four areas of perceived problems were presented in a document by Samson (1980) entitled, "National Conference on Marketing and Distributive Education: "Directions for the 1980's." The four areas discussed in the document were: (1) Identity and Image, (2) Program Development, (3) Leadership Development, and (4) Power and Influence. The document spoke of a need for uniformity of direction, marketing of the program (M/DE), and a need for leadership development.

It was strongly recommended that program evaluation, promotion of the programs, leadership development, and setting of goals and objectives be a continuing effort since a failure to change and grow with business and industry had created the present perceived problems with identity of M/DE (Warner, 1983). Out of the Vail Conference came the statement that



business and industry did not identify Marketing and Distributive Education as a strong marketing discipline and the program itself was not being perceived as Marketing and Distributive Education personnel had expected.

In 1979, Nero, a student in Marketing and Distributive Education at the University of Minnesota in a college paper, identified the following problems affecting the image of M/DE as:

1. Lack of visibility and recognition.
2. Lack of fully accepted common goals.
3. Lack of unified promotional campaign.
4. Ineffective communications.

Peterson (1981) at the University of Minnesota wrote that the George-Dean Act of 1936 created Distributive Education as an adult program to help those who were unemployed to train for employment in distributive occupations as well as to develop skills of those already employed in those occupations. She further stated that by the 1960's the direction of the program had changed significantly and marketing had been accepted as the discipline taught, rather than retailing. She also wrote that the Vocational Amendment of 1968 changed Distributive Education from a program-based curriculum to a people-based curriculum allowing it to now serve everyone.

In 1975 Hruska and Adams wrote that a study in New Hampshire involving cooperative students saw the program as general preparation for employment and advocated a change to a more career education type format, pulling almost completely away from the marketing aspect. It may have been this conception which stimulated the organization and theme for the 1980 conference in Vail on "Directions for the 1980's."

After the Vail Conference, Marketing/Distributive Education personnel agreed that something must be done in the areas of development, image, promotion, growth and development, and leadership. Personnel felt that working with this concept in mind they should be able to establish a definite image of M/DE. The image would be more in line with industry's perceptions and ideas of what an M/DE program should be.

#### Statement of the Problem

There was a lack of information concerning the M/DE state supervisors' and teacher educators' attitudes toward a name change for their programs. There was also a lack of information concerning possible program enrollment caused by a program name change.

#### Research Questions

1. Would a name change from Distributive Education to a more descriptive name cause students, educators, and the community to perceive the program in a more positive manner?
2. Have those programs which have already made a name change experience increased enrollment and a more positive reception of their programs?
3. Of those programs which have made a name change in the last four years, has enrollment increased, decreased or remained unchanged?
4. Do teacher educators and state supervisors feel a name change itself can cause a significant impact in their programs?

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify the perceived problems

with the identity of M/DE due to the name as it exists. Information from this study could give an indication as to whether a name change alone would alter the perception and identity of a program in marketing and Distributive Education.

#### Need for the Study

The Vail Conference of 1980, in examining the areas of identity and image as well as program development, leadership development and power, and influence showed that there was a definite feeling among M/DE personnel and that there was an image and identity problem. As a result of the conference, recommendations were made that definite steps should be taken involving everyone from local to national level. All levels should be involved in formulating uniform goals and objectives, developing acceptable programs through continual evaluation and designing a national promotional campaign which would structure and promote M/DE as a branch of marketing. Ways should be found to offer the student course content that are not found in any other cooperative program. These students could aid in the promotion of a positive program image which would promote student recruitment and retention.

Many of the proposed recommendations have been accomplished and a new assessment of identity perceptions three years later could add information concerning the present status of directions. A study of this kind with an emphasis on a nationally accepted name change would provide motivation for renewed leadership development and establish clearer goals and objectives for all M/DE personnel (Warner, 1983).

### Limitations

Limitation of this study was the degree to which the respondents answered the questions in an honest and unbiased manner. A further limitation was that only state supervisors and teacher educators were surveyed and that opinions and attitudes of teacher-coordinators at the high school level were not examined.

### Assumptions

1. It is assumed that teacher educator and state supervisor attitudes and observations would represent teacher coordinator attitudes.
2. It is assumed that increasing enrollments and perceptions of M/DE programs are important and a vital concern to all M/DE personnel.
3. It is assumed that teacher educator and state supervisor responses would be honest and straightforward.

### Definition of Terms

State Supervisor - Supervisor of M/DE Programs whether it is a separate program or a part of some other program or programs at the state level.

Teacher-Educator - Professor and/or supervisor of M/DE teacher preparation in an institution of higher learning.

Teacher-Coordinator - M/DE teacher-instructor in a secondary or area vocational school.

Program Evaluation - Examination of M/DE program at local, state or college level to ascertain whether it meets certain criteria.

Community College - A two-year junior college where two years

leading to a Bachelor's Degree may be taken or technical education or adult education may be taken to prepare for a specific skill.

Specialized Program - M/DE program in one specific occupational area such as food services, hotel/motel, fashion merchandising, etc.

Handicapped - Crippled or disabled, something that places a person at a disadvantage. The student who is disabled in some way.

Disadvantaged - Being in an unfavorable position - underprivileged. The student who does not have the advantages of other students in the same position.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter was designed to review the major studies related to identity and image crises in Marketing/Distributive Education; and has been divided into six sections. These sections are: (1) Recognition of a need for change, (2) Identifiable problems, (3) Growth and Expansion, (4) Trends, (5) Promotion and marketing of M/DE and (6) Summary.

#### Recognition of Need for a Change

Harris (Ed.) (Fall 1981) provided a list of items which he felt M/DE needed to address. They were:

1. Expand programs to serve more students.
2. Attract more teachers from business and industry.
3. Acquaint youth, parents, counselors with marketing careers.
4. Provide teachers with more materials and marketing labs to improve instruction.
5. Establish cooperative relationships with CETA and other personnel.
6. Provide programs in order to reach the disadvantaged and the handicapped (p. 40).

Ashum (1982) wrote that the only way to live with declining enrollments and cutbacks was to take a "systems" approach and set realistic goals for programs, use what is on hand effectively, and ensure that activities related to goals for the desired results. According to Nelson (1977), M/DE survival will depend on how M/DE is perceived by others and how committed M/DE personnel are to its development. M/DE must serve the diverse needs of its clients and refrain from appealing only to those

who represent the best qualified among applicants for M/DE programs. Nelson further related in the paper that he felt a concern for the identity of M/DE that it was not consistent throughout the professional community. He referred to a survey of M/DE personnel made in 1977 which indicated that nearly 50 percent would support a name change. Fitzhugh (1981) related the movement toward a name change as a desire within the profession to upgrade identity and image that would highlight its marketing base. Hruska and Adams (1975) did not seem to be concerned with a name change since their interpretation of a study done in New Hampshire indicated that M/DE was not perceived strongly with a marketing image by those surveyed. They, therefore, advocated moving away from a marketing skills identity to a heavy career education format. Lynch (1982) in explaining the rationale for changing the name of his program, mentioned a possible barrier to the name change was a lack of comfort with the new name or any other new name.

#### Identifiable Problems

The Vail Conference in 1980 provided the greatest opportunity in the history of M/DE for personnel on all levels to meet together with involved businessmen to discuss what the real concerns were and to make recommendations for changes which would establish a M/DE image with which the profession and others could identify (Warner, 1983).

The document produced by Samson and others (1980) listed twelve recommendations for implementation strategies from group discussion at the conference. The people attending the conference felt that if these recommendations were followed that a national identity or image of M/DE would evolve to better describe the program (Warner, 1983).

The twelve recommendations from the conference presented by Samson are:

1. Creating a national plan for M/DE.
2. Designing a national promotional program.
3. Stressing free enterprise.
4. Setting up a national center with and office and support staff as professional spokespersons for M/DE.
5. Holding meetings to implement recommendations from the conference.
6. Encouraging states to establish goals for their programs.
7. Insuring that programs meet or exceed national standards.
8. Developing programs to utilize and involve business personnel.
9. Stressing continuing education for M/DE teachers.
10. Programs be evaluated using criteria developed by M/DE leadership.
11. Promoting an increase of activity in adult education.
12. Stressing continual professional development opportunities for every M/DE teacher in the history, goals and objectives, and the present and future of M/DE.

Samson (1980) suggested that some implementation of these recommendations would be simple while others would be more difficult and complex. He felt that problems with implementing these recommendations would occur from a lack of state and local leadership taking action. He also felt that teacher educators seemed reluctant to face problems with the effectiveness of teacher preparation.

Samson (1980) in the same document, discussed and identified contributors to the problem of the M/DE program reaching its potential



as: an inability to attract and retain students, a lack of liaison with the community, a lack of teachers and a lack of national objectives, organization, and correlation.

The Vail Conference confirmed that there was no uniformity of direction in M/DE and that no nationally accepted goals and objectives existed. One recommendation was that a set of clearly identifiable goals and objectives be designed which would be supported and accepted by all levels -- local, state, and national. According to Samson (1980), there was also a need to create an identity which would clearly present the program as it was meant to be in a positive way on all levels. The group recommended that this could be done through evaluations on all levels by criteria set up by all M/DE personnel as well as business and industry. Input of business and industry through advisory committees and adjunct teaching in the classroom would help establish this image. The conference also felt there was a great need to promote and sell the program. There was an indication that those who taught and promoted the marketing process were not applying it through advertising campaigns, personal contacts and legislator influence. According to Warner (1983), conference participants also felt that there was a great need for leadership development nationwide. Strategies for implementing a plan were written by Samson (1980) in a conference report. The leadership development program was designed to promote leadership development on local, state, and national levels in order to achieve a group of thought leaders who could speak for M/DE among teacher coordinators, state and national leaders, and business and industry.

Some implementation strategies for identified problems and recommended approaches were discussed by Samson (1980) in the document report.

Some of these suggestions were:

1. K-12 M/DE career education efforts.
2. Revision of teacher-pupil ratios to encourage increased enrollments.
3. Encouragement of internship programs.
4. Seeking grant money to reach minorities, the handicapped, and women.
5. Workshops for M/DE personnel to provide knowledge of all levels of M/DE.

Samson (1980) both addressed the need for a closer liaison with business and industry. The following factors might be conducive to this liaison:

1. A full-time executive director of M/DE.
2. A resource file of community representatives.
3. Activities of M/DE personnel in other marketing organizations.
4. A correlation of business needs with capabilities of the M/DE profession.

Samson further recommended improvements in the area of teacher education. These recommendations were:

1. Evaluation of teacher educators by nationally adopted criteria.
2. Intensive recruiting efforts by teacher educators.
3. Liaison between marketing departments and marketing students.
4. Working to improve salaries and benefits of M/DE teachers.
5. Working to improve the M/DE image.
6. Working on an inquiry of why M/DE teachers enter and leave the field.
7. Working on attracting teachers from business and industry.

8. Exploring shared time with business and industry.
9. Utilizing retired marketing people.

In the Vail Conference report (1980), Samson further recommended that to combat the lack of uniformity the following is needed: (a) competency based instructional materials at all levels, (b) a task force to evaluate and provide direction, (c) flexibility, (d) creative materials with common objectives, (e) utilization of curriculum now existing, and (f) an increase in specialized offerings.

Nelson (1977) and Fitzhugh (1981) both discussed a name change to exude a more positive external image of M/DE, a nationally accepted restructuring and direction with uniform objectives and goals. An effort for expansion through reaching new groups was discussed by Sparks (1982), handicapped, minorities, disadvantaged; Holder and Carlisle (1980), specialized programs; and Price (1982b), adults.

According to Fitzhugh (1981), the identity and image of M/DE will be established through its actions, services and activities, not through its name. He also stated that any effort to establish M/DE as a branch of marketing and strengthening its image would have to be national in its thrust.

Samson (1980) viewed M/DE training as a lifelong process in the Vail Conference report, and he looked at extending the M/DE philosophy from kindergarten through adulthood. He further stated that working cooperatively with other vocational areas M/DE could prepare students with vocational marketing career goals for not only entry level jobs but also provide mid-level and even higher level management job skills.

In the area of development, Samson further stated that insufficient funding could be combated by more public relations on the benefits and

utility of M/DE. He also suggested that public image might be aided by gaining more legislative and group support and a national public information office could best accomplish this task. The conference report by Samson (1980) further suggested in implementation strategies that in order to reach more students or clients, M/DE should attempt to serve more diverse groups. In addressing "territorial" claims, he further suggested that M/DE work with other vocational areas, CETA, training centers and junior high career exploration programs to provide entrepreneurship training.

In addressing leadership development at the Vail Conference in (1980), Samson and others recommended implementation of an ongoing leadership development program. It was suggested in the report by Rowe that this involve a local, state, and national commitment to a master plan and national goals and objectives as well as recommending that a national director be utilized. He suggested publication of more leadership articles which might be motivational and helpful to M/DE personnel to enhance leadership development.

Trapnell (1981), in the conference report, discussed methods for establishing a power and influence base. She stated that it was important that M/DE have strong group support and more input and influence with legislators. It is only through this support that she felt M/DE could gain any power as an organization.

Klaurens (1982) in discussing the MDEA organization, which became a reality in Atlanta at AVA 1981, refers to this fact. The organization was recommended by the Vail Conference and would bring together teachers,

teacher educators, and state supervisors in a unified organization to be more efficient and effective.

#### Growth and Expansion

The Vail Conference report by Samson (1980) discussed three areas of growth potential: (1) adult education training, (2) specialized programs, (3) the handicapped and disadvantaged. They also listed the areas of other vocational programs, career education in the primary school, and working with CETA and other training groups. Price (1982a) wrote of the possibility of growth in the adult education area as he discussed M/DE teacher involvement in adult training and development as a means of expansion. Sparks (1980) advocated expansion to reach the special needs of people such as the handicapped, the disadvantaged, minorities and bilingual by involving them in M/DE programs. Holder and Carlisle (1980) discussed expansion by creating specialized programs in specific areas of M/DE and training in mid-management in these specific market areas in the community colleges.

Sarkees and Hill (1983) addressed the involvement of special needs students in the M/DE program and viewed it as a challenge which the M/DE teacher should be able to meet. They felt that the M/DE teacher already possessed the tools to work with special needs students, since they used individualized study. The M/DE teacher should be able to easily adapt this tool to the special student. They discussed some methods and techniques which would help the M/DE teacher to be successful with these students, such as peer tutoring, positive reinforcement, involving these special students in DECA, maximizing demonstrations and visuals, and varying evaluation techniques. They felt that the M/DE teachers

could handle this well, but would need some special training for working with special students such as working with the building teachers trained to work with special students or taking special university level classes which would prepare them for this challenge.

Price (1982a) also discussed working with special students as an area of expansion. He related that ten percent of all school age students have some handicap and less than one percent identified as handicapped in 1979 were enrolled in M/DE programs. His rationale for M/DE involvement is that vast numbers of these people pass through their formative years with no vocational direction and never know the feeling of prospering because they work and take pride in that work. Price discussed the barrier of M/DE teachers voluntary involvement with special needs students. He mentioned the fact that counselors, administrators and other students could perceive the M/DE program as a dumping area for these handicapped, disadvantaged, etc., and cause a loss of regular student enrollment. Price (1982a) further discussed as a barrier, the fact that M/DE students are presently drawn from the middle-class and are usually academically average, he felt that M/DE cannot continue to limit its vision to these few, but must reach toward the special student.

Sparks (1980) wrote of her concern for the special needs student. She related that when she offered to work with them herself, she was told that the curriculum was too complex for them. She wrote:

The exceptionally bright students were attracted to my program only after a change in the name of the course to Marketing and Distributive Education, with a description listing 19 occupational clusters for career objectives (p. 9).

Sparks also listed ways M/DE programs might appeal to and serve the

handicapped or disadvantaged student as:

1. Modifying instruction to meet the needs of all students.
2. Using a variety of learning activities so that all could participate.
3. Use of more individualized instruction.
4. Stressing areas of specialized instruction to individual students.

Sparks like Price listed the M/DE teacher as a possible barrier to involvement of the special student in the M/DE program. Since the M/DE teacher is aspiring for recognition, which they may be able to acquire with the average and above students regularly enrolled in M/DE classes, these special students may be seen by the teachers as preventing the victories. She felt that teachers might feel they could not enter competitions with these special needs students, this would deny them the recognition which they worked for, and they would not wish to enroll them voluntarily in the M/DE program.

Trapnell (1982) discussed as areas of M/DE expansion, adult education, specialized programs and the special needs individual. She stated that in order to survive and grow, M/DE must reach especially to the adult client. Ninety percent of those individuals served in the 1930's by M/DE were adults. She also discussed the need to serve those with more varying ability levels and listed the gifted and talented. She listed special needs students and included the following: gifted and talented, bilingual, disadvantaged, handicapped, immigrants, senior citizens, unemployed, incarcerated and liberal arts graduates. Trapnell (1982) felt that the expansion of the M/DE program to include these clients was most important. She emphasized that the curriculum must be

flexible and creative in order to meet the needs of all these diverse groups and as to what might be acceptable for one of the above groups might not be workable at all with another. Price (1982b) referred to M/DE as an area for helping adults achieve self-fulfillment, as well as helping them to become productive members of society. He stated that M/DE could be of great service to adults and that neglecting this area for growth would be instrumental in failing to reach its mission.

Specialized M/DE programs as an expansion area are a definite target for growth according to Holder and Carlisle (1980). They referred to a survey of state and territory supervisors where 54 percent of the 52 people surveyed felt there was a definite move toward M/DE program specialization. The writers also indicated that secondary programs were moving from general to more specific and identified the problem of finding occupationally experienced teachers. In another article, Holder and Cox (1980) discussed one Texas community college's move toward specific programs rather than general marketing and that this particular school showed an increase in enrollment in one year from 4,072 to 7,233. They felt this change in emphasis was what industry really desired and what caused more students to enroll in the programs because specialized programs better fit their career needs.

Cooperation with other vocational areas such as agriculture, home economics, technical education, trade and industrial, and health occupations in supplying the marketing skills needed for their career choices is discussed by Potter (1982). Nelson (1977) and the Vail Conference writers, Samson (1980) also addressed working with these vocational areas to supply their marketing or entrepreneurship needs. Samson (1980) talked of expansion by exposing marketing careers to students from



kindergarten through 12th grade, and Gleason (1983) discussed M/DE curriculum and also recommended this ongoing exposure as one way to insure program interest.

Samson (1980) and Trapnell (1982) both recommended cooperation with CETA and other training groups as another area of expansion. Hruska and Adams (1975), however, had recommended moving away from the marketing discipline entirely to a career education emphasis as the way for survival and growth.

### Trends

According to Best (1984), there are several different trends which have occurred in M/DE during the last few years. These include:

1. A striving for cohesiveness within the M/DE profession.
2. Recommendations for continual evaluation and updating of M/DE programs.
3. A reorganizing and restructuring in some states.
4. Working closer with business through advisory committees and an effort by M/DE to better meet the needs of industry.
5. Organization of more specialized M/DE programs.
6. Further expansion of M/DE into adult education.
7. Closing of programs, some of which had been very successful at one time.

Lynch (1982) wrote about the identity of M/DE in "The Name Revisited: Marketing Education." He presented rationale for the name change emphasizing the relationship of the name to the discipline and how it is actually taught in the M/DE program. He said that the name told prospective M/DE customers little about its products and services.

Fitzhugh (1981) stated that a name change might improve the external image of the program, but that a longer name and abbreviated initials could cause confusion. He further said that the name need not be descriptive but should identify, and that marketing, personal selling, and some type of mass communication were necessary for any identity acceptance. Hruska and Admas (1975) stated that the New Hampshire survey on identity showed business and M/DE professionals identified the M/DE program as a general career education program and not a branch of marketing.

Nero (1979) viewed the identity crisis as the fact that M/DE educators had failed to communicate a formulated and unified purpose (goals/objectives) to its various audiences. Nelson (1977) advocated that M/DE work with other vocational areas such as agriculture, home economics, trade and industrial and health occupations with an emphasis on training plans. He felt that using training plans would help to establish M/DE identity. He stated that the use of these vocational training plans would prevent employers from seeing M/DE students as simply part time help but rather as young people training for a career. He also credited DECA with helping to establish M/DE identity since its requirements for competency-based competitions had paved the way for M/DE competency-based curriculum. One area Nelson discussed as a contributor to the loss of M/DE identity was the loss of M/DE as a separate entity in some states where it had been absorbed or reorganized into other departments.

The trend toward a continual evaluation acceptable to everyone was discussed by Wubenna (1982), "Fifty-seven Program Standards Identified as Very Important-A Peer Review." Research was conducted to examine

acceptability of an instrument on evaluative criteria for M/DE programs in secondary schools. This study was an attempt to examine what items M/DE teachers viewed as important in program evaluation. From a list of 288 items, fifty-seven were selected as highly important to program operation. The evaluation items examined the nature of the program offerings, physical facilities, instructional staff, instructional activities and instructional materials. The results of this study produced an instrument which can be used for M/DE program evaluation, "Distributive Education Program Evaluation: An Aid for Use with Section 4-4, Evaluative Criteria for the Evaluation of Secondary Schools, Fifth Edition."

Powell (1983) says,

The marketplace is in continual change, the M/DE program must have strong organizational structure and constant evaluation procedures to continue to produce quality students which employers will want (p. 33).

He stated further that organizational structure as well as course offerings must be evaluated, and that M/DE teachers should work to incorporate more marketing-oriented courses in secondary schools and at the university level.

Reorganizing and restructuring was not something M/DE personnel could always control. Best (1984) and Nelson (1977) mentioned one of the areas contributing to identity loss as: reorganization of vocational departments in many states due to reduced staff, thereby absorbing M/DE personnel in other vocational areas and causing M/DE to lose its identity. Gleason (1983) stated: "Many states no longer have an identifiable M/DE" (p. 2). He also made the statement that he felt the program would be identified by its curriculum content and that this content should be marketing. He stated further that M/DE programs

consisting of career education, consumer education, human relations, income tax preparation, etc. should be restructured to reflect the true M/DE identity. Gleason also stated his fears of an intense involvement with microcomputers as a further distraction to M/DE curriculum, because he felt microcomputer programming had no place in a marketing curriculum. He stated that he also felt that the future of M/DE was contingent upon each individual instructor's willingness to address the needs of M/DE curriculum at the local level.

Samson (1983) addressed the challenge of declining enrollment in M/DE in community colleges. He felt that the narrow, specialized structure of most of the college course offerings in M/DE is one factor which prohibits the effectiveness and expansion of these M/DE programs. Another challenge to the community college was the shortage of occupationally experienced faculty. He stressed the fact that prospects in specialized programs are unlimited, since the future needs for students with skills in mid-management M/DE training would be numerous.

Holder and Carlisle (1980) also discussed specialization of M/DE programs as being motivation for student enrollment. They described one Texas community college which increased its enrollment from 4,072 to 7,233 in a one year period due to the change in emphasis from general M/DE to specialty programs. Powell (1982) viewed the low employment rate of M/DE students as being the results of educators having been too narrow in what they teach. He says that M/DE had been promoted only as training for retail, wholesale, and service occupations. He advocated it change now to survive and to do so it must incorporate more marketing-oriented courses at both the high school and university level. Failing to change

course curriculum in this manner would not allow M/DE to meet future business needs, and he felt these needs would be met only in the specialty programs.

Potter (1981) wrote of a survey which had been done in 1981 of state supervisor structure. This survey had showed fewer state supervisors identified with M/DE than one which had been done in 1972. This particular survey indicated that 27 M/DE supervisors had business and office backgrounds, that 32 had responsibilities in other areas, 17 were in cooperative education, four were multi-occupational and three were CETA supervisors. She indicated that this survey showed that many M/DE supervisors were not from M/DE backgrounds, thus M/DE image and identity might not be important to them, and it was absorbed by business and office, cooperative education, CETA, etc.

The Vail Conference indicated a need for a closer liaison with industry according to Samson (1980). He felt it essential that M/DE involve industry by working more closely with it in advisory committees and adjunct teaching involvement. Harris (1983) discussed the need for working more closely with industry as it becomes more automated with electronic catalogs, scanners, and teller machines. Hagimeir (1982) discussed the necessity for stronger involvement of advisory committees. She advocated using them to help evaluate programs and curriculum, as speakers on field trips, and in assisting with DECA projects. Price (1982b) suggested teacher involvement with industry by helping industry as consultants, shoppers and in market research. He felt that helping industry in this manner would promote a more favorable image of the teacher and the program in the business community. Heath (1982) suggested using advisory people by involving them in the publicity and

promotion planning of the M/DE program, by having them assume responsibility for some of the M/DE program promotion.

The trend toward specialized programs and expansion into adult education is discussed in the development and growth section of this review of literature, but the trend toward closing of some programs or absorption by other vocational programs is serious because these absorptions cause a loss of the M/DE identity. Warner (1983) feels that most programs close either because of lack of administrative support or poor teachers. Both Warner and Best (1984) felt that politics in administration and lack of enrollments in area schools force closing of M/DE programs, but that most M/DE programs which are closed in secondary schools are closed due to poor or disinterested teachers who do not recruit or promote the M/DE program properly. Both Warner (1983) and Best (1984) expressed a feeling that projecting and maintaining the M/DE image was the total responsibility of the teacher/coordinator and with them lay the greatest responsibility for the M/DE image.

#### Promotion and Marketing

The expressed need for marketing of M/DE was recommended by several writers in this review of literature. Samson (1980), Hagimeir (1982), Hutt and Hocken (1981) and Heath (1982) all indicated that promotion of the program should not only consist of publicity, public relations, and intense campaigns but also strong personal local efforts. Hagimier (1982) stated that to survive, M/DE must do an effective marketing job to both administration and the community. She stated:

The program which has an outstanding reputation within the school and community will continue to be offered even when matching funds and reimbursement are not offered (p. 20).

She further suggested ways to insure this support such as:

1. Developing recruiting techniques that work and using them faithfully.
2. Having a sound curriculum that teaches the fundamentals of marketing.
3. Inviting the principal to accompany the teacher on coordination visits.

Hagimier (1982) suggested other methods of maintaining administrative support such as, being sure the principal sees coordination reports, knows about appearances at civic organizations, and understands student time use. She further suggested the teacher cultivate a parent booster club since, "they will protect you if you are doing a good job" (p. 21). Hagimier also advocated that everything be publicized. She said that the teacher should take photos of students on the job, guest speakers, displays, DECA activities, sales demonstrations, and she suggested the best way to publicize all this is to put the newspaper editor on the advisory committee of the local M/DE program. Another suggestion from Hagimier (1982) was that the M/DE teacher write a weekly article for the paper and make a conscious effort of involvement with other school faculty as a part of the team.

Hutt and Hocken (1981), "Let's Market our Marketing and Distributive Education Programs," stated that M/DE personnel teach the marketing mix but fail to practice it themselves. They said that the market mix of products, price, place, and promotion could readily be applied to M/DE, but M/DE personnel were not doing it. They identified the product as M/DE students, price as the value of the training, place as the right training station, and promotion as the selling of M/DE. They used this

marketing mix to promote M/DE and to present the M/DE image.

Plans for developing a public relations plan were given by Heath (1982). She said that unless everyone understood the program, the M/DE mission would not be clear to people in school and community. She further stated that a written plan for public relations is needed. This would allow the school and community to become more knowledgeable of the program and its activities. As others become more aware of the M/DE program needs, they would become more aware of what they could do to help the M/DE program.

Heath (1982) listed the five basic steps to designing a publicity plan as:

1. Identify the activities to be promoted.
2. Select the audience to be reached.
3. Identify methods of promotion.
4. Identify cost for implementing the plan.
5. Assign personnel responsible for promotion activities (either teacher, student or advisory committee person.)

#### Summary

The literature suggested that there are problems with the identity and image of M/DE and in order to improve this image, M/DE personnel on local, state and national levels must become involved. It appeared from the literature that M/DE must market itself better and develop some ongoing strategies for leadership development and program evaluation. There was also an indication of support in the literature for a national center and staff to direct and work for power and influence for M/DE nationwide.



## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses (1) the selection of the population, (2) the development of the instrument, (3) the method used for data collection, and (4) data analysis.

#### Selection of the Subjects

The subjects selected for this study were teacher educators and state supervisors of Marketing/Distributive Education (MDE) programs in the states and territories offering M/DE. The number of state supervisors was equal to the number of states and territories containing M/DE programs, a total population of 56 state supervisors was used for the study in contrast to random sampling.

The sample of 107 educators surveyed were selected from the total population of the M/DE teacher education programs offered at teacher education institutions.

#### Development of the Instrument

The questionnaire used for this study was researcher developed. The first step was to identify leaders in the field of M/DE for use as a panel of experts (See Appendix A). A questionnaire was then developed and mailed to this panel of experts who evaluated the questionnaire and

made suggestions and/or corrections to be used in the final questionnaire which was mailed to state supervisors and teacher educators across the country (See Appendixes B and C). The panel of experts consisted of teacher educators, state supervisors and teacher coordinators.

The questionnaire was then field tested by selected state supervisors, teacher educators and teacher coordinators in the states of Ohio, Nebraska, Minnesota and Oklahoma. The instrument was designed to collect information concerning the attitudes of teacher educators and state supervisors on image and identity, enrollment, and curriculum in M/DE. Two different versions of the instrument were used. One version was applicable to the teacher educators at colleges or universities while the other instrument was addressed to the state supervisors of states and territories. The respondents were asked to check on a Likert Scale their attitude toward 15 questions concerning their feelings toward M/DE and their program name as it presently exists.

The instrument was designed to gather information concerning the following research questions:

1. Would a name change from Distributive Education to a more descriptive program name cause students, educators and the community to perceive the program in a more positive manner?
2. Of those Marketing/Distributive Education programs which have already made a name change in the last four years, has enrollment increased, decreased or has remained unchanged?
3. Do teacher educators and state supervisors feel a name change itself can cause a significant impact in their programs?

### Collection of Data

The questionnaire was mailed to all M/DE state and territory supervisors (56) and to teacher educators (107) selected from each institution with a M/DE teacher education program across the country. In institutions with more than one teacher educator the questionnaire was mailed to the department head if known, if not a random sampling was taken so that each institution received only one copy of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was then mailed to the state and territory supervisors, and the teacher educators in M/DE teacher education institutions.

The survey/questionnaires were mailed on February 2, 1984. By March 1, 125 questionnaires had been returned, then a follow-up postcard was mailed to those who had not responded (See Appendix D). A total of 128 questionnaires were returned to the researcher; 81 useable questionnaires were mailed by state and territory supervisors. The percentage of teacher educators returning useable questionnaires was 79 percent; and, the percentage of state and territory supervisors returning useable questionnaires was also 76 percent. Of the 128 questionnaires returned, three were deemed invalid.

### Analysis of Data

The data gathered for the study were analyzed by use of Chi Square and Analysis of Variance. Program information was listed by frequencies and percentages.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study was concerned with the identity and image of Marketing/Distributive Education (M/DE) programs in teacher-education institutions and in state M/DE programs as perceived by teacher educator and state supervisors of M/DE. This chapter presents (1) response rate, (2) respondent data and (3) analysis of the data.

#### Respondents

A total of 163 questionnaires were mailed to teacher educators and state supervisors of Marketing/Distributive Education programs in the United States and its territories. These questionnaires varied only in the differences in wording for teacher educators at colleges and state supervisors.

There were 128 questionnaires returned which represented a 77 percent return rate for the 163 questionnaires mailed. Three questionnaires were found to be unuseable and thus were not included in the analysis. The useable returned questionnaires from teacher educators constituted a 79 percent return rate, this was 84 questionnaires returned from a possible total number of 107 mailed. The state supervisors return rate was also 79 percent with 44 questionnaires returned out of a possible 56. There were three unuseable questionnaires from teacher educators leaving

a total of 81 useable teacher educators questionnaires for a 76 percent return rate. This made an overall rate of 76.6 percent for the study.

#### Analysis of Overall Response

The responses were divided into two groups with state supervisors identified as Group I and teacher educators identified as Group II throughout the analysis.

The degree level by frequency and percentage of state supervisors and teacher educators is shown in Table I. The highest percentage of state supervisors hold masters degrees (29) with the higher number of teacher educators holding EdD degrees (43) followed by PhD degrees (28). The remaining 10 hold some other degree. This data shows that the majority of state supervisors hold masters degrees while the majority of teacher educators hold doctorates in education as shown in Table I.

The five different name categories for programs in M/DE are listed and the number responding to each name category is shown in Table II. The majority of programs or 77.42 percent rate were called Marketing/Distributive Education, with the next most predominant program name being Distributive Education with 10 of these being university programs and three being state programs for a total of 13. Five respondents indicated their programs are called Marketing Education, four are called Distributive Education/Marketing and six have a different name from those asked on the survey (See Table II).

It was found that state supervisors responded that 31 M/DE programs were listed as separate programs, where 12 M/DE programs were combined with other types of vocational programs. The programs in which the M/DE

TABLE I  
DEGREE LEVEL BY FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF STATE SUPERVISORS  
AND TEACHER EDUCATORS IN M/DE

	B.S.		M.S.		Ed.D.		Ph.D.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
State Supervisors	6	4.96	29	23.96	5	4.13	2	1.65	42*	34.71
Teacher Educators	1	0.83	7	5.79	43	35.54	28	23.14	79**	65.29
Total	7	5.79	36	29.75	48	39.67	30	24.79	121	100.00

\*Two state supervisors of M/DE did not respond to this question.

\*\*Two teacher-educators of M/DE did not respond to this question.

TABLE II  
OFFICIAL NAME OF PROGRAMS IN STATES AND TEACHER EDUCATION  
PROGRAMS BY NUMBER AND PERCENT

	M/DE		DE/M		ME		DE		Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
State Supervisors	32	25.81	2	1.61	2	1.61	3	2.42	4	3.23	43*	34.68
Teacher Educators	64	51.61	2	1.61	3	2.42	10	8.06	2	1.61	81	65.32
Total	96	77.42	4	3.23	5	4.03	13	10.48	6	4.84	124	100.00

\*One state supervisor did not respond to this question.

programs were found to be combined are as follows.

1. Business Education
2. Occupational Education
3. Office and Related Programs
4. Vocational Education
5. Cooperative and Marketing Education
6. Bureau of Program Services
7. Marketing Education
8. Fashion/Merchandising/Marketing and Retailing
9. Business/Marketing

The M/DE programs were combined most frequently with Business Education with this occurring eight times and M/DE combined with all other programs only two or less times.

The frequency of the official names of M/DE programs at the teacher education institutions showed that the majority of the respondents indicated that Distributive Education (32) is still the name used by the teacher educators in their programs, closely followed by Marketing/Distributive Education (26) (See Table III).

Name distribution is shown by the responses of the groups where the name is used in the teacher education institutions as responded to by teacher educators and state supervisors. A percentage of 44.02 of the institutions go by the official name of Marketing/Distributive Education while 33.90 percent use Distributive Education. It is also noted that 11.86 percent use the official name Marketing Education while 7.63 percent use some other name and only 2.54 percent use Distributive Education/Marketing.

TABLE III

OFFICIAL NAME OF PROGRAMS AT TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS  
AS REPORTED BY TEACHER EDUCATORS AND  
AND STATE SUPERVISORS

	<u>M/DE</u>	<u>DE/M</u>	<u>ME</u>	<u>DE</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
State Supervisors	26	1	1	8	1	37*
Teacher Educators	26	2	13	32	8	81
Total N =	52	3	14	40	9	118
% =	44.07	2.54	11.86	33.90	7.93	100.00

\*Seven state supervisors of M/DE did not know the official name of M/DE programs at their state universities or teacher educator institutions.



The frequencies of program name changes during the past four years show 124 respondents to this question. Fifty-two stated there had been no program name change in the past four years, while 72 responded that they had a name change at some time during the past four years (See Table IV).

It was found that 55.56 percent of the teacher education programs or a total of 40 have changed the name of the program during the past four years while 41 programs have made no name change. At the state supervisor level a total of 32 state programs have changed the name of its M/DE program during the past four years. The data shows 11 programs made no change while 12 programs have had a name change during the past three years (See Table IV).

A frequency list is presented concerning what name was preferred by those who had not changed the name of the program during the past four years. Of the ten state supervisor respondents who had not changed the name, the most preferred name was Distributive Education/Marketing (DE/M) with six respondents favoring that name (See Table V). Teacher educators responding were found to prefer Marketing/Distributive Education (17) and Marketing Education (17). It was found that no teacher educator or state supervisor preferred the name Distributive Education/Marketing, that a total of 19 respondents preferred M/DE, 23 preferred ME, seven preferred DE and four preferred some name other than the four given (See Table V).

The teacher educators reported 28 programs with 10 percent or more decrease, and 22 percent of the programs had no change. Twenty programs had 10 percent or more increase, with three of these showing 100 percent increase and one program 300 percent increase (See Table VI). The total

TABLE IV  
NUMBER OF PROGRAMS CHANGED DURING THE PAST FOUR YEARS  
BY FREQUENCY AND PERCENT

	<u>No Change</u>	<u>1 Year</u>	<u>2 Year</u>	<u>3 Year</u>	<u>4 Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	
						N	%
State Supervisors	11	5	7	12	8	32*	44.44
Teacher Educators	41	8	13	8	11	40	55.56
Total	52	13	20	20	19	72	100.00

\*One state supervisor did not respond to this question.

TABLE V

NAME PREFERRED FOR M/DE PROGRAMS BY TEACHER EDUCATORS AND  
STATE SUPERVISORS IF NOT ALREADY CHANGED BY  
FREQUENCY AND PERCENT

	Name Change Already or No Preference	M/DE		ME		DE		Other*		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
State Supervisors	33	2	3.77	6	11.32	2	3.77	0	0.8	10	18.87
Teacher Educators	38	17	32.08	17	32.08	5	9.43	4	7.55	43	81.13
Total	71	19	35.85	23	43.40	7	13.20	4	7.55	52	100.00

\*Distributive Education/Marketing as a program name received no  
selections and is not presented in the table.

TABLE VI  
 DECREASE OR INCREASE OF ENROLLMENT FOR THE FAST FOUR YEARS  
 REPORTED BY STATE SUPERVISORS AND TEACHER EDUCATORS

	<u>Number Reported</u>	<u>Decrease/Increase by Percent</u>
State Supervisors	1	-30
	4	-20
	1	-15
	1	-12
	4	-10
	2	- 8
	2	- 7
	2	- 5
	14	
	1	+ 4
	3	+ 5
	1	+10
	1	+25
	1	+30
	1	+75
Teacher Educators	1	-100
	1	- 75
	1	- 60
	13	- 50
	1	- 35
	3	- 30
	3	- 25
	2	- 20
	3	- 10
	22	
	3	+ 10
	1	+ 12
	2	+ 15
	3	+ 20
	1	+ 25
	1	+ 27
	1	+ 40
	4	+ 50
	3	+100
	1	+300

number of respondents who showed an increase in enrollment was 35, the total number who showed a decrease was 56. No change in enrollment was found in 36 programs (See Table VI).

Concerning the percentage of change in student enrollment in the past four years it was found that state supervisors reported that 14 programs have no change in enrollment, while 17 programs were found to have a percentage decrease in enrollment (See Table VII). Eleven programs were found to have decreased by 10 percent or more in enrollment as reported by state supervisors. The largest increase percentage was found in four respondents who reported a 10 percent increase and four respondents who reported a 50 percent increase in enrollment.

The responses of teacher educators and state supervisors on whether better public relations would improve the understanding of the purpose and meaning of the M/DE program is shown in Table VII. It was found that the responses of both teacher educators and state supervisors either agreed or strongly agreed that a strong public relations program would improve the understanding of the program by others.

Responses on the Likert Scale were coded: (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree and (5) Strongly Agree. A total of 54 respondents Agree and 52 Strongly Agree that a strong public relations program would promote a better understanding of the M/DE program (See Table VII).

On the question of whether the name of the program makes any difference, teacher educators and state supervisors responses are found in Table VIII. State supervisors tended to agree that a name did make a difference while teacher educators tended to feel it did not as shown in the strongly agree column, 17 state supervisors strongly agreed while

only three teacher educators strongly agree.

Teacher educators responded that they did not feel the name of a program made a difference in the program with 49 either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that the name made a difference in enrollment. Most of the state supervisor respondents either agreed or strongly agreed (36) that the name of the program made a difference (See Table VIII).

A large number of both groups felt that most educators did not understand the M/DE programs. A total of 69 from both state supervisors and teacher educators disagreed and eight strongly disagreed that other educators understood the M/DE program (See Table IX). Only one respondent strongly agreed that other educators understood the purposes of the program (See Table IX).

Eleven state supervisors said their program names had not changed during the past four years, 41 teacher educators said theirs had not changed making a total of 52 which had not changed during the past four years (See Table X). Thirty-two state supervisors responded that the names of their programs had changed during the past four years while 40 teacher educators responded that their program names had been changed for a total of 72 name changes during the past four years (See Table X).

An analysis of variance was conducted on programs with increased enrollment where respondents felt the program had a favorable image. A significance F value of 2.88 at the .05 level was found (See Table XI).

In Table XII an analysis of variance was conducted on programs with increased enrollment where the respondents felt the name of the program caused a gain in enrollment.

TABLE VIII  
THE PROGRAM NAME MAKES A DIFFERENCE IN THE PROGRAM AS RESPONDED TO  
BY STATE SUPERVISORS AND TEACHER EDUCATORS

	<u>Strongly Disagree</u> 1	<u>Disagree</u> 2	<u>Undecided</u> 3	<u>Agree</u> 4	<u>Strongly Agree</u> 5	<u>Total</u>
State Supervisors	.0	4	3	19	17	43*
Teacher Educators***	17	32	13	15	3	80**
<hr/> Total	<hr/> 17	<hr/> 36	<hr/> 16	<hr/> 34	<hr/> 20	

\*One state supervisor did not answer this question.

\*\*One teacher educator did not answer this question.

\*\*\*Teacher educators response was based on the programs name as it relates to enrollment.

TABLE IX  
STATE SUPERVISORS AND TEACHER EDUCATORS RESPONSES TO WHETHER OTHER  
EDUCATORS UNDERSTAND PURPOSES OF THE M/DE PROGRAM

	<u>Strongly Disagree</u> 1	<u>Disagree</u> 2	<u>Undecided</u> 3	<u>Agree</u> 4	<u>Strongly Agree</u> 5
State Supervisors	5	28	7	2	0
Teacher Educators	3	41	13	24	1
	—	—	—	—	—
Total N = 124	8	69	20	26	1
% = 99.2	6.45	55.64	16.13	20.97	0.01

Percentage does not equal 100 percent due to rounding.



TABLE X  
STATE SUPERVISORS AND TEACHER EDUCATORS RESPONSES TO THE  
NAME OF THE PROGRAM UNDERGOING CHANGES

	<u>No Change</u>	<u>Name Did Change in Past Four Years</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>State Supervisors</u>			
Frequency	11	32	43*
Expected Frequency	18.0	25.0	
Cell $\bar{X}$	2.7	2.0	
<u>Teacher Educators</u>			
Frequency	41	40	81
Expected Frequency	34.0	47.0	
Cell $\bar{X}$	1.5	1.1	
Total	52	72	

df 1, .05  $\geq$  .007

\*One state supervisor did not respond to the question.

TABLE XI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PROGRAMS WITH INCREASED ENROLLMENT  
AS REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS WHO FELT THEIR PROGRAM  
HAD A FAVORABLE IMAGE

<u>Source</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F Value</u>
Model (Favorable Image)	4		5091.0964	2.88
Error	104	183866.8984	1767.9509	
Total	108	204231.2844		
P>F 0.0263				

TABLE XII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PROGRAMS WITH INCREASED ENROLLMENT  
WHERE RESPONDENTS FELT THE NAME CHANGE MADE A  
DIFFERENCE IN GAINED ENROLLMENT

<u>Source</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F Value</u>
Model	4	17043.3280	4260.8320	2.37
Error	104	187187.9563	1799.8841	
Total	108	204231.2844		
P>F 0.0575				

In Table XIII an analysis of variance was conducted concerning the enrollment increase and the respondents attitude concerning whether a change of program emphasis should be made at the college level. It was found significant at the .05 level with an F value of 2.73. A significant number of the respondents felt that the emphasis of the program at the college level needed to be changed.

#### Summary

Seventy-two programs had changed the name of their program within the last four years and 52 programs did not change their program name. Most of the respondents preferred either Marketing/Distributive Education or Marketing Education.

TABLE XIII  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON ENROLLMENT INCREASE AND RESPONDENTS  
ATTITUDE CONCERNING WHERE A PROGRAM EMPHASIS SHOULD  
BE MADE AT THE COLLEGE LEVEL

<u>Source</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F Value</u>
Model	4	19651.5346	912.8836	2.73
Error	101	182034.3239	1802.3200	
Total	105	201685.8585		
P>F 0.334				

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This chapter presents a summary, findings, conclusions, recommendations, and recommendations for further study. There was a lack of information concerning the M/DE state supervisors' and teacher educators' attitudes toward a name change for their programs. There was also a lack of information concerning possible program enrollment caused by a program name change.

#### Summary

This study was designed to obtain teacher educator and state supervisor responses to a name change in the Marketing/Distributive Education Program. The purpose of the study was to identify the perceived problems with the identity of M/DE due to the name as it exists.

A questionnaire was developed to obtain data from state supervisors and teacher educators involved in the M/DE programs nationwide. The total number of questionnaires mailed was 163 with 128 returned or 79 percent responded. Three of the questionnaires were found to be unuseable leaving a total of 125 for a 76.6 percent return rate.

There were four research questions which were examined in this study:

1. Would a name change from Distributive Education to a more

descriptive name cause students, educators and the community to perceive the program in a more positive manner?

2. Have those programs which have already made a name change in the last four years, has enrollment increased, decreased or remained unchanged?

3. Of those programs which have made a name change in the last four years, has enrollment increased, decreased or changed?

4. Do teacher educators and state supervisors feel a name change itself can cause a significant impact on their program?

### Findings

In demographic data, it was found that the majority of state supervisors held masters degrees while teacher educators tended to hold doctorates.

It was found that most programs tended to be called Marketing/Distributive Education or Marketing and Distributive Education.

It was found that on a state level, 31 programs were still listed as M/DE programs while 12 were combined with some other area usually with business. One state supervisor did not respond.

In the survey of teacher education institutions it was found that most still go by the name Distributive Education (32) with Marketing/Distributive Education next (26). Twenty-three responded they use some other name.

In the survey of how many programs had changed their names during the past four years it was found that state supervisors responded eleven had not changed, five had changed during the past year, seven had changed during the last two years and 12 changed during the past

three years and eight during the past four years. Teacher educators responded that 41 programs had made no name change, that eight had changed during the past year, 13 changed during the past two years, eight changed during the past three years and eleven had changed during the past four years.

A survey of which name was preferred by those which had not changed the name of the program during the past four years showed a preference for Marketing Education followed by Marketing/Distributive Education.

A survey of increase or decrease in enrollment showed that both groups tended to report more increases percentage than decreases percentage in enrollment, however the largest number of respondents reported no change in their enrollment during the past four years.

In the survey of attitudes toward public relations improving the image of the program most respondents in both groups felt a strong public relation program would aid in the understanding of the purposes and meaning of M/DE. In surveying groups as to whether the name of the program made a difference in its perception, state supervisors tended to feel that the name did make a difference while teacher educators felt that it made no difference.

In surveying both groups concerning whether the M/DE program purposes was understood by other educators, it was found that the majority of both groups felt it was not.

Of programs which had changed their names during the past four years, a total of 72 responded that the name had changed during the past four years while 52 had made no change.

An analysis of variance conducted on programs which had increased in enrollment and the respondents who felt the program had a positive

image was found to be significant. It was also found significant that those whose programs which had increased in enrollment felt the name had an impact on the image across the state. The respondents also felt that there should be a change of emphasis in the program at the college-university level.

### Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn as a result of this study:

1. The majority of programs on the state level are named M/DE with 31 of 43 respondents verifying this.
2. That M/DE and DE are the names of most teacher education programs with 32 named M/DE and 26 named DE. Twenty-three use some other name.
3. That 72 programs had changed the name of their program during the past four years while 52 made no change.
4. That most respondents prefer the name Marketing Education or Marketing/Distributive Education if they have not already changed the name of their program.
5. That both groups felt that a better public relations effort would help the understanding of purposes and meaning of M/DE.
6. That state supervisors felt the name of the program makes a difference in its perception in the community while teacher educators did not feel it makes a difference in their institution.
7. Both groups felt other educators did not understand the purpose of the M/DE program.
8. Of the programs which had an increase the respondents felt that the program had a positive image and the name of the program affected its



perception across the state.

9. That respondents whose program had increased in enrollment felt that there should be a change in emphasis of the program at the college level.

### Recommendations

As a result of this study the following recommendations are suggested:

1. That to improve the image and perception of M/DE programs the names be changed to either Marketing Education or Marketing/Distributive Education.

2. That effort towards a public relations promotion be made from a national level in order to promote a better understanding of the M/DE program purposes and meaning to both community and other educators.

3. That teacher educators examine the emphasis of the program at the college-university level and make an evaluation of what should be changed.

### Recommendations for Further Study

As a result of this study the following recommendations regarding further study are made:

1. What are individual teacher coordinators doing to promote a positive image of M/DE in the community?

2. What are the state supervisors doing to promote a positive image of M/DE in the community?

3. What are teacher educators doing to evaluate their programs on course emphasis and public relations?

4. What marketing strategies might be the most effective in the promotion of M/DE?

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ashmun, Richard D. "A 'Systems' Look at Marketing and Distributive Education." Marketing Educators News, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Spring 1982), p. 17.
- Best, Ted (Former State Supervisor M/DE). Personal Interview, Stillwater, Oklahoma, January 25, 1984.
- Davis, Jerry (Teacher Educator, Oklahoma State University). Personal Interview, Stillwater, Oklahoma, October 14, 1983.
- Fitzhugh, H. Naylor. "Some Implications of the Name Change." Marketing and Distributive Educators' Digest, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Fall 1981), pp. 5-7.
- Gleason, Jim. "Marketing: A Curriculum Crisis?" IDECC Ideas (Spring 1983), pp. 1-2.
- Gordon, Alice K. Conceptual Framework for Curriculum Decisions in Education for Marketing and Distribution Careers. Washington, D.C., Bureau of Occupational & Adult Education (DHEW/OE), March 1976.
- Hagimier, Malaine. "Survival Tactics in Marketing and Distributive Education." Marketing Educator's News, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Fall 1982), pp. 20-21.
- Harris, E. Edward (Ed.) MDE Digest, Fall 1981, p. 40.
- Harris, E. Edward. "For Marketing Educators, It's Time to Respond To Change." Marketing and Distributive Educators' Digest, Vol. 8, No. 2 (Spring 1983), p. 6.
- Heath, Betty. "Developing a Public Relations Plan for Your MDE Program." Marketing Educators News, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Spring 1982), p. 11.
- Holder, Doyle and Laurelyn Carlisle. "Trends in Marketing and Education: A National Assessment." NADET News, Vol. 21, No. 2 (Winter 1980), pp. 5-7.
- Hruska, Jack and Rafael Adams. "New Hampshire Study Indicates DE Identity Crisis." Business Education Forum, Vol. 30, No. 2 (November 1975), pp. 24-26.
- Hruska, Jack. "Distributive Education: A Promise in Search of A Cause." American Vocational Journal, Vol. 50, No. 8 (November 1975), pp. 82, 84-85.

- Hutt, Roger W. and Paula Hocken. "Let's Market Our Marketing and DE Programs." Business Education Forum, Vol. 35, No. 5 (February 1981), pp. 27-28.
- Klaurens, Dr. Mark K. "MDEA-United We Stand." Marketing Educator's News, Vol. 1, No. 2, (Winter 1982), p. 8.
- Knight, Clyde. Introduction to Trade and Industrial Education. Mimeo Stillwater, Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, 1977.
- Lynch, Richard L. "The Name Revisited: Marketing Education." Marketing Educator's News, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Fall 1982), pp. 19-20.
- Nelson, Edwin L. The Identity Crisis. (Paper presented at the American Vocational Association Convention, Atlantic City, New Jersey, December 1977),
- Nero, W. "Distributive Education Identity Crisis/Public Relations." Mimeo, St. Paul, Minnesota, University of Minnesota, 1979.
- Peterson, Shari L. "Historical Perspectives of the Identity and Image of Distributive Education." Mimeo, St. Paul, Minnesota, University of Minnesota, 1981.
- Potter, Marian. "MDE: Reaching Out For Growth." Marketing Educator's News, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Fall 1982), pp. 19-20.
- Powell, Karl. "Marketing MDE Programs Creatively." The Balance Sheet (September/October 1983), pp. 33-35.
- Price, William T. Jr. "Marketing and Distributive Education Teacher Involvement in Adult Training and Development." Marketing and Distributive Educators' Digest, Vol. 8, No. 2 (Spring 1983), pp. 22-24.
- Price, William T. Jr. "Making Marketing and Distributive Education Programs Accessible to the Handicapped." Marketing and Distributive Educators' Digest, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Spring 1982a), pp. 16-19.
- Price, William T. Jr. "Instructing the Adult Learner in Marketing and Distributive Education." Marketing and Distributive Educators' Digest, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Fall 1982b), pp. 29-35.
- Samson, Harlan E. Directions for the 1980's. National Conference on Marketing and Distributive Education; Vail, Colorado, May 19-22, 1980, Marketing and Distributive Education, Raston, Virginia: 1980.
- Samson, Harland E. "Marketing and Distributive Education." VOCED (September 1983), pp. 51-52.
- Sarkees, Michelle D. and Joe E. Hill. "A Special Challenge for Marketing and Distributive Education." The Balance Sheet, Vol. 65, No. 2 (November/December 1983), pp. 37-39.

- Smith, Gary. "Providing More Marketing Courses Through Independent Study." Marketing & DE Today, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Fall 1981), pp. 18-22.
- Sparks, Gertrude C. "Distributive Education and the Disadvantaged." NADET News, Vol. 21, No. 2 (Spring 1980), pp. 9-10, 15, 18-19.
- Trapnell, Gail. "Client Groups to be Served in Marketing and Distributive Education." Marketing and Distributive Educators' Digest, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Fall 1981), pp. 5-7.
- Warner, Gene (State Supervisor M/DE). Personal Interview, Stillwater, Oklahoma, October 12, 1983.
- Wray, Ralph D. "Adult Distributive Education: A Neglected Component?" Business Education Forum, Vol. 30, No. 5 (February 1976), pp. 22-24.
- Wubben, Dennis. "Fifty-Seven Program Standards Identified as Very Important-A Peer Review." Marketing and Distributive Educators' Digest, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Spring 1982), pp. 8-14.

## APPENDIXES

## APPENDIX A

### PANEL OF EXPERTS

## PANEL OF EXPERTS

TEACHER EDUCATORS

Dr. Thomas White

Dr. Steven Eggland

Dr. Mary Klaurens

Dr. Jerry Davis

Dr. Jimmy Thrash

STATE SUPERVISOR

Gene Warner

TEACHER COORDINATORS

Dr. Phineas Young

Dr. Jimmy Baker

Mr. Syd Reed



APPENDIX B

TEACHER EDUCATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

# **MARKETING/DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM IMAGE SURVEY**

This survey deals with programs in Marketing and Distributive Occupations (M/DE). The name may differ from state to state, questions being asked concern only those in your state and the name of your program will be referred to as "Program."

Four of the names being considered are: Marketing/Distributive Education; Distributive Education/Marketing; Marketing Education; Distributive Education and a space for Other if needed.

1. Name \_\_\_\_\_ Degree BS \_\_\_\_\_ MS \_\_\_\_\_ EDD \_\_\_\_\_ PHD \_\_\_\_\_
2. Position or Title \_\_\_\_\_
3. What is the Official name of your Program at the state level?  
 Marketing/Distributive Education \_\_\_\_\_ Marketing Education \_\_\_\_\_  
 Distributive Education/Marketing \_\_\_\_\_ Distributive Education \_\_\_\_\_  
 Other \_\_\_\_\_
4. What is the official name of your Program at the teacher training institution?  
 Marketing/Distributive Education \_\_\_\_\_ Marketing Education \_\_\_\_\_  
 Distributive Education/Marketing \_\_\_\_\_ Distributive Education \_\_\_\_\_  
 Other \_\_\_\_\_
5. Has the name of your Program been changed in the last 1 2 3 4 years? (Please Circle Appropriate Year If It Has Been Changed)
6. If the name of the Program has not been changed in the last 4 years what Program name would you prefer?  
 Marketing/Distributive Education \_\_\_\_\_ Marketing Education \_\_\_\_\_  
 Distributive Education/Marketing \_\_\_\_\_ Distributive Education \_\_\_\_\_  
 Other \_\_\_\_\_
7. If the name of your Program has been changed, what was it before the change?  
 Marketing/Distributive Education \_\_\_\_\_ Marketing Education \_\_\_\_\_  
 Distributive Education/Marketing \_\_\_\_\_ Distributive Education \_\_\_\_\_  
 Other \_\_\_\_\_
8. To what extent has your Program enrollment changed in the last 4 years?  
 Increased \_\_\_\_\_% Decreased \_\_\_\_\_% No Change \_\_\_\_\_

Please Circle the Appropriate Number  
Indicating Your Feeling About the  
Following:

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
1. The Program has a favorable image in the institution.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Better Public relations would aid in the understanding of purposes and meaning of the Program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. The name of the Program makes no difference in enrollment.	5	4	3	2	1
4. The name of the Program makes no difference in image.	5	4	3	2	1
5. The name of the Program makes no difference in acceptance by the institution.	5	4	3	2	1
6. The Program's continued existence depends on better marketing of itself and it's product.	5	4	3	2	1
7. The name of the Program has a significant impact on the image it has across the state.	5	4	3	2	1
8. People in the institution easily understand the purposes of the Program.	5	4	3	2	1
9. Other educators easily understand the purposes of the Program.	5	4	3	2	1
10. Students easily understand the purposes of the Program.	5	4	3	2	1
11. The emphasis of the Program at the college level needs to be changed.	5	4	3	2	1
12. The course of study used in Program needs to be changed to more fully meet occupational demands.	5	4	3	2	1
13. A nationally adopted course of study for Program should be encouraged.	5	4	3	2	1
14. More emphasis should be placed on specialized Programs not cooperative in nature.	5	4	3	2	1
15. Changing the name of the Program would increase receptiveness by students, the institution and other educators.	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX C

STATE SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

# MARKETING/DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM IMAGE SURVEY

This survey deals with programs in Marketing and Distributive Occupations (M/DE). The name may differ from state to state, questions being asked concern only those in your state and the name of your program will be referred to as "Program."

Four of the names being considered are: Marketing/Distributive Education; Distributive Education/Marketing; Marketing Education; Distributive Education and a space for Other if needed.

1. Name \_\_\_\_\_ Degree BS \_\_\_\_\_ MS \_\_\_\_\_ EDD \_\_\_\_\_ PHD \_\_\_\_\_

2. Position or Title \_\_\_\_\_

3. What is the Official name of your Program at the state level?

Marketing/Distributive Education \_\_\_\_\_ Marketing Education \_\_\_\_\_  
Distributive Education/Marketing \_\_\_\_\_ Distributive Education \_\_\_\_\_  
Other \_\_\_\_\_

4. Is the Program listed as a separate vocational program in your state, or is it combined with another instructional area? (Example: Business & Office)

Separate \_\_\_\_\_ Combined \_\_\_\_\_

5. If the program is combined with another area what is the area?

\_\_\_\_\_

6. What is the official name of your Program at the teacher training institution?

Marketing/Distributive Education \_\_\_\_\_ Marketing Education \_\_\_\_\_  
Distributive Education/Marketing \_\_\_\_\_ Distributive Education \_\_\_\_\_  
Other \_\_\_\_\_

7. Has the name of the Program been changed in the last 1 2 3 4 years? (Please circle appropriate number)

8. If the name of the Program has not been changed in the last 4 years, what name would you prefer?

Marketing/Distributive Education \_\_\_\_\_ Marketing Education \_\_\_\_\_  
Distributive Education/Marketing \_\_\_\_\_ Distributive Education \_\_\_\_\_  
Other \_\_\_\_\_

9. If the name of your Program has been changed, what was it before the change?

Marketing/Distributive Education \_\_\_\_\_ Marketing Education \_\_\_\_\_  
Distributive Education/Marketing \_\_\_\_\_ Distributive Education \_\_\_\_\_  
Other \_\_\_\_\_

10. To what extent has your Program enrollment changed in the last 4 years?

Increased \_\_\_\_\_% Decreased \_\_\_\_\_% No Change \_\_\_\_\_

Please Circle the Appropriate Number  
Indicating Your Feeling About the  
Following:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The Program has a favorable image in the community.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Better public relations would aid in the understanding of purposes and meaning of the program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. The name of the Program makes no difference.	5	4	3	2	1
4. The image of the Program is a direct reflection of the image of the program coordinator.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Coordination of OJT activities provides a primary positive public relations tool for the Program.	5	4	3	2	1
6. The Program's continued existence depends on better marketing of itself and its product.	5	4	3	2	1
7. The name of the Program has a significant impact on the image it has across the state.	5	4	3	2	1
8. People in the community easily understand the purposes of the Program.	5	4	3	2	1
9. Other educators easily understand the purposes of the Program.	5	4	3	2	1
10. Students easily understand the purposes of the Program.	5	4	3	2	1
11. The emphasis of the Program at the college level needs to be changed.	5	4	3	2	1
12. The course of study used in the Program needs to be changed to more fully meet occupational demands.	5	4	3	2	1
13. A nationally adopted course of study for Program should be encouraged.	5	4	3	2	1
14. More emphasis should be placed on specialized Programs not cooperative in nature.	5	4	3	2	1
15. Would changing the name of the Program increase receptiveness by students, community and other educators.	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD

Dear Colleague:

A few weeks ago I mailed a questionnaire to you asking for your help in a survey concerning the image and identity of Marketing/Distributive Education.

If you have not already returned this to me, would you please take a few minutes and fill in the blanks and put it in the mail today. I believe this is a very important project for M/DE in general and will appreciate any help which you can give me.

Very truly yours,

Nelda Bloom



APPENDIX E

COVER LETTER AND MAILING LIST

P.O. Box 1631  
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078  
January 27, 1984

Dear Colleague:

I am presently working on my doctoral dissertation concerning the image of Marketing/Distributive Education and I need your help in answering the enclosed questionnaire.

I would appreciate your participating in this and any specific comments you wish to make are welcome.

Thank you so very much for your help.

Sincerely,

Nelda Bloom

m1m	Dr. Harold W. Williams	m1m	Dr. Ray J. Grandfield
m2m	209 Petrie Hall	m2m	
m3m	Auburn University	m3m	
m4m		m4m	
m5m	Auburn, AL 36830	m5m	Delaware State College
m6m		m6m	Dover, DL 19901
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. Dale Dean	m1m	Dr. Leroy Buckner
m2m	College of Education	m2m	
m3m	Area of Curriculum and Instruction	m3m	
m4m	University of Alabama	m4m	
m5m	P. O. Drawer R	m5m	Florida Atlantic University
m6m	University, AL 35486	m6m	Boca Raton, FL 33432
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. Roger Hutt	m1m	Dr. G. E. (Pat) Patterson
m2m	College of Business Administration	m2m	
m3m	Arizona State University	m3m	
m4m		m4m	College of Education
m5m		m5m	University of South Florida
m6m	Tempe, AZ 85287	m6m	Tampa, FL 33620
mm		mm	
m1m	William H. Antrim	m1m	Dr. William Wilkinson
m2m	Box 401	m2m	
m3m	College of Education	m3m	
m4m	University of Arizona	m4m	
m5m		m5m	University of North Florida
m6m	Tucson, AZ 85721	m6m	Jacksonville, FL 32216
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. Joe Arn	m1m	Dr. Lester Sanders
m2m	Burdick Building	m2m	
m3m	Room 318	m3m	
m4m	University of Central Arkansas	m4m	College of Education
m5m		m5m	University of Georgia
m6m	Conway, AR 72032	m6m	Athens, GA 30601
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. William Winnett	m1m	Dr. Barbara Wilkie
m2m	Department of Education	m2m	Vocational and Career Development
m3m	San Francisco State University	m3m	Urban Life Building
m4m	1600 Holloway Avenue	m4m	Georgia State University
m5m		m5m	University Plaza
m6m	San Francisco, CA 94132	m6m	Atlanta, GA 30303
mm		mm	
m1m	Bob Welch	m1m	Dr. James D. Morris
m2m	School of Business	m2m	Curriculum & Instruction
m3m	University of Northern Colorado	m3m	College of Education
m4m		m4m	University of Hawaii
m5m		m5m	WA-2 224B, 1776 University Ave.
m6m	Greeley, CO 80639	m6m	Honolulu, HI 96822
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. Don Richardson	m1m	Dr. James A. Bikkie
m2m	Vocational Education Department	m2m	Department of Vocational Education
m3m	Colorado State University	m3m	College of Education
m4m		m4m	
m5m		m5m	University of Idaho
m6m	Fort Collins, CO 80523	m6m	Moscow, ID 83843
mm		mm	
m1m	A. Todd Sagraves	m1m	Dr. William Warberg
m2m	Central Connecticut State College	m2m	Department of Business Education
m3m	1615 Stanley Street	m3m	
m4m		m4m	Boise State University
m5m		m5m	1907 University Drive
m6m	New Britain, CT 06050	m6m	Boise, ID 83725
mm		mm	

m1m	Dr. David Graf	m1m	Dr. Dennis Wubbena
m2m		m2m	Dept. of Bus. Ed. and Office Adm.
m3m		m3m	
m4m		m4m	
m5m	Northern Illinois University	m5m	University of Northern Iowa
m6m	Dekalb, IL 60115	m6m	Cedar Falls, IA 50613
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. Robert E. Nelson	m1m	Dr. Kenneth Hoffman
m2m	Business Education Department	m2m	
m3m		m3m	
m4m		m4m	
m5m	University of Illinois	m5m	Emporia State University
m6m	Urbana, IL 61803	m6m	Emporia, KS 66801
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. Roger Luft	m1m	Dr. Alberta Chapman
m2m	Dept. of Vocational Education Studies	m2m	School of Business
m3m		m3m	
m4m		m4m	
m5m	Southern Illinois University	m5m	Murray State University
m6m	Carbondale, IL 62901	m6m	Murray, KY 42071
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. Ralph Wray	m1m	Dr. Randy Wells
m2m	Dept. of Bus. Ed. and Admin. Services	m2m	Distributive Education
m3m		m3m	
m4m		m4m	
m5m	Illinois State University	m5m	University of Louisville
m6m	Normal, IL 61761	m6m	Louisville, KY 40208
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. Ronald Vaughn	m1m	Dr. Richard Ayres
m2m	Business Education Department	m2m	Dept. of Management and Marketing
m3m		m3m	211 Grise Hall
m4m		m4m	
m5m	Western Illinois University	m5m	Western Kentucky University
m6m	Macomb, IL 61455	m6m	Bowling Green, KY 42101
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. Dayton Chase	m1m	Teacher Education,
m2m	Business Education Department	m2m	Marketing/Distributive Ed.
m3m		m3m	
m4m		m4m	
m5m	Eastern Illinois University	m5m	Southeastern State University
m6m	Charleston, IL 61920	m6m	College Station
mm		mm	Hammond, LA 70401
m1m	Dr. Robert Schultheis	m1m	Dr. Tommy Johnson
m2m	Department of Business Education	m2m	
m3m		m3m	
m4m		m4m	
m5m	Southern Illinois University	m5m	Northwestern State University
m6m	Edwardsville, IL 62025	m6m	Natchitoches, LA 71457
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. Ralph E. Mason	m1m	Dr. Ken Rachal
m2m	School of Business	m2m	
m3m		m3m	
m4m		m4m	
m5m	Indiana State University	m5m	Nicholls State University
m6m	Terre Haute, IN 47809	m6m	University Station
mm		mm	Thibodaux, LA 70301
m1m	Dr. Rodney Davis	m1m	Dr. Wells Cook
m2m	Dept. of Bus. Ed. and Office Adm.	m2m	Business Education Department
m3m	Whitinger Building	m3m	
m4m		m4m	
m5m	Ball State University	m5m	Central Michigan University
m6m	Muncie, IN 47306	m6m	Mt. Pleasant, MI 48858
mm		mm	

m1m Dr. Jack Humbert  
 m2m Adrian Trimpe Distributive Education Building  
 m3m  
 m4m  
 m5m Western Michigan University  
 m6m Kalamazoo, MI 49001  
 mm  
 m1m Dr. Robert Poland  
 m2m College of Education  
 m3m 317 Erickson Hall  
 m4m  
 m5m Michigan State University  
 m6m East Lansing, MI 48824  
 mm  
 m1m Charles Crissy  
 m2m DECA Project Consultant  
 m3m Bus. Ed. and Adm. Services Dept.  
 m4m Sill Hall Annex  
 m5m Eastern Michigan University  
 m6m Ypsilanti, MI 48197  
 mm  
 m1m Dr. Richard Ashmun  
 m2m Vocational Technical Education Building  
 m3m 1954 Buford  
 m4m  
 m5m University of Minnesota  
 m6m St. Paul, MN 55108  
 mm  
 m1m Dr. Mary K. Klaurens  
 m2m Vocational Technical Education Building  
 m3m 1954 Buford  
 m4m  
 m5m University of Minnesota  
 m6m St. Paul, MN 55108  
 mm  
 m1m Dr. Marilyn Stinson  
 m2m College of Business  
 m3m  
 m4m  
 m5m Saint Cloud State College  
 m6m St. Cloud, MN 56301  
 mm  
 m1m Dr. Grace Guemple  
 m2m  
 m3m  
 m4m  
 m5m Moorhead State University  
 m6m Moorhead, MN 56560  
 mm  
 m1m Jim Gregar  
 m2m Mankato State University  
 m3m P.O. Box 51  
 m4m  
 m5m  
 m6m Mankato, MN 56001  
 mm  
 m1m Dr. James Patton  
 m2m Drawer NU  
 m3m  
 m4m  
 m5m Mississippi State University  
 m6m Mississippi State, MI 39762  
 mm

m1m Dr. Clifton L. Smith  
m2m Marketing Education Program  
m3m College of Education - Room 205  
m4m 6th and Stewart Roads  
m5m University of Missouri  
m6m Columbia, MO 65211  
mm  
m1m Dr. William Garber  
m2m  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m Central Missouri State University  
m6m Warrensburg, MO 64093  
mm  
m1m Norman Millikin  
m2m School of Business  
m3m Reid Hall  
m4m  
m5m Montana State University  
m6m Bozeman, MT 59717  
mm  
m1m Dr. Steven A. Eggland  
m2m Division of Marketing Teacher Education  
m3m Center for Vocational Teacher Education  
m4m 311 Teachers College  
m5m University of Nebraska  
m6m Lincoln, NB 68588  
mm  
m1m Charles Mitchell  
m2m New Hampshire College  
m3m 2500 North River Road  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m Manchester, NH 03104  
mm  
m1m Dr. Joseph Hecht  
m2m  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m Montclair State College  
m6m Upper Montclair, NJ 07043  
mm  
m1m Dr. Albert Sternberg  
m2m Rider College  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m Lawrenceville Road  
m6m Trenton, NJ 08648  
mm  
m1m James Robinson  
m2m Trenton State College  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m Trenton, NJ 08625  
mm  
m1m Ray Gormley  
m2m Eastern New Mexico University  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m Station 11  
m6m Portales, NM 88130  
mm

m1m Dr. Bertha Wakin  
m2m State University of New York at Albany  
m3m School of Education  
m4m  
m5m 1400 Washington Avenue  
m6m Albany, NY 12222  
mm  
m1m Dr. Michael Bronner  
m2m Program of Bus. Ed.  
m3m SEHNAP  
m4m New York University  
m5m Washington Square  
m6m New York, NY 10003  
mm  
m1m Dr. Gregory W. Gray  
m2m Dept. of Business Studies  
m3m State University College at Buffalo  
m4m  
m5m 1300 Elmwood Avenue  
m6m Buffalo, NY 14222  
mm  
m1m Professor Charlotte Raphaelson  
m2m College of Human Development  
m3m 201 Slocum Hall  
m4m  
m5m Syracuse University  
m6m Syracuse, NY 13210  
mm  
m1m Dr. Philip Atkinson  
m2m Bernard M. Baruch College  
m3m City University of New York  
m4m  
m5m 17 Lexington Avenue  
m6m New York, NY 10010  
mm  
m1m Dr. William McKeough  
m2m Mason Hall  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m Hofstra University  
m6m Hempstead, NY 11550  
mm  
m1m Dr. Jean Boyce  
m2m SUNY at Oswego  
m3m College of Technology Branch at Utica/Rome  
m4m  
m5m 811 Court Street  
m6m Utica, NY 13502  
mm  
m1m Professor James Miles  
m2m Nazareth College of Rochester  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m 4245 East Avenue  
m6m Rochester, NY 14610  
mm  
m1m Dr. William H. Durham  
m2m School of Technology  
m3m East Carolina University  
m4m  
m5m 305 Rawl Building  
m6m Greenville, NC 27834  
mm

m1m Dr. Stephen R. Lucas  
m2m Dept. of Bus. and Marketing and Dist. Ed.  
m3m Room 440  
m4m School of Business  
m5m The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
m6m Greensboro, NC 27412  
mm

m1m Dr. Thomas Allen, Jr.  
m2m Department of Business Education  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m Appalachian State University  
m6m Boone, NC 28608  
mm

m1m Dr. Robert Fritz  
m2m Division of Bus. Economics--Bus. Ed.  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m Fayetteville State University  
m6m Fayetteville, NC 28301  
mm

m1m Dr. Donald Kohns  
m2m Department of Bus. and Voc. Ed.  
m3m Gamble Hall  
m4m University Station  
m5m University of North Dakota  
m6m Grand Forks, ND 58202  
mm

m1m Dr. Thomas White  
m2m The Ohio State University  
m3m 288 Arps Hall  
m4m  
m5m 1945 North High Street  
m6m Columbus, OH 43210  
mm

m1m John D. Mattingly  
m2m Kent State University  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m 412 Education Building  
m6m Kent, OH 44240  
mm

m1m Kenneth Green  
m2m Bowling Green State University  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m 313 Hayes Hall  
m6m Bowling Green, OH 43402  
mm

m1m Dr. Jimmie Thrash  
m2m School of Education  
m3m

m4m  
m5m Central State University  
m6m Edmond, OK 73034  
mm

m1m Dr. Jerry G. Davis  
m2m College of Education  
m3m 412 Classroom Building  
m4m  
m5m Oklahoma State University  
m6m Stillwater, OK 74078  
mm



m1m	Dr. Joseph Hlebichuk	m1m	Dr. Carolyn Mitchell
m2m	Dept. of Bus. and Distributive Ed.	m2m	Manning Hall
m3m		m3m	Room 410-A
m4m		m4m	
m5m	Oregon State University	m5m	Memphis State University of Tennessee
m6m	Corvallis, OR 97331	m6m	Memphis, TN 38152
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. Lorraine Skaff	m1m	Dr. Carroll B. Coakley
m2m	Taylor Hall 127	m2m	Vocational Technical Education
m3m		m3m	Claxton Annex
m4m		m4m	
m5m	Southern Oregon State College	m5m	University of Tennessee
m6m	Ashland, OR 97520	m6m	Knoxville, TN 37916
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. Marvin Hirshfeld	m1m	Dr. Don Wilkinson
m2m	287 Ritter Hall Annex	m2m	
m3m	13th and Columbia Avenue	m3m	
m4m		m4m	
m5m	Temple University	m5m	East Tennessee State University
m6m	Philadelphia, PS 19122	m6m	Johnson City, TN 37601
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. Irvin Iwler	m1m	Dr. Jim Steward
m2m	4K30 Forbes Quadrangle	m2m	P.O. Box 235
m3m	230 South Bouquet Street	m3m	
m4m		m4m	
m5m	University of Pittsburgh	m5m	Middle Tennessee State University
m6m	Pittsburgh, PA 15260	m6m	Murfreesboro, TN 37132
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. Bernard Moreau	m1m	Dr. Fairchild H. Carter
m2m	McElheny Hall	m2m	Behavioral Science and Bus. Ed.
m3m		m3m	College of Business Administration
m4m		m4m	
m5m	Indiana University of Pennsylvania	m5m	North Texas State University
m6m	Indiana, PA 15701	m6m	Denton, TX 76203
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. Clay V. Sink	m1m	Dr. Dan Smith
m2m	College of Bus. Administration	m2m	Department of Business Administration
m3m		m3m	
m4m		m4m	
m5m	University of Rhode Island	m5m	Angelo State University
m6m	Kingston, RI 02881	m6m	San Angelo, TX 76901
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. Leonard F. Maiden	m1m	Bill Speary
m2m		m2m	College of Technology BST
m3m		m3m	197 B Technology Building
m4m		m4m	4800 Calhoun
m5m	University of South Carolina	m5m	University of Houston
m6m	Columbia, SC 29208	m6m	Houston, TX 77004
mm		mm	
m1m	Dr. Samuel Greer	m1m	Dr. Claudia Satterwhite
m2m	School of Consumer Science and	m2m	Dept. of Vocational Education
m3m	Allied Professions	m3m	2020 New Education Building
m4m		m4m	
m5m	Winthrop College	m5m	Southwest Texas State University
m6m	Rock Hill, SC 29730	m6m	San Marcos, TX 78666
mm		mm	
m1m	Hugo Carlson	m1m	Dr. William A. Stull
m2m	Division of Business Education	m2m	UMC 35
m3m		m3m	
m4m		m4m	
m5m	Northern State College	m5m	Utah State University
m6m	Aberdeen, SD 57401	m6m	Logan, UT 84321
mm		mm	

m1m Dr. Gary R. Smith  
m2m 359 Jessie Knight Building  
m3m Department of Bus. Ed.  
m4m  
m5m Brigham Young University  
m6m Provo, UT 84602  
mm  
m1m Barbara Foley  
m2m Business Education Department  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m Castleton State College  
m6m Castleton, VT 05735  
mm  
m1m Dr. Richard L. Lynch  
m2m Marketing Education  
m3m College of Education  
m4m Lane Hall  
m5m Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
m6m Blacksburg, VA 24061  
mm  
m1m Dr. Thomas A. Hephner  
m2m Distributive Education Program  
m3m Vocational Technical Education  
m4m School of Education  
m5m Virginia Commonwealth University  
m6m Richmond, VA 23284  
mm  
m1m Dr. Vivien K. Ely  
m2m Distributive Education Program  
m3m Vocational Technical Education  
m4m School of Education  
m5m Virginia Commonwealth University  
m6m Richmond, VA 23284  
mm  
m1m Dr. John M. Patterson  
m2m Distributive Education Program  
m3m Dept. of Voc. and Tech. Education  
m4m School of Education  
m5m Old Dominion University  
m6m Norfolk, VA 23508  
mm  
m1m Les Bolt  
m2m Distributive Education Program  
m3m Center for Vocational Education  
m4m School of Education and Human Services  
m5m James Madison University  
m6m Harrisonburg, VA 22807  
mm  
m1m Dr. Bill Syhlman  
m2m School of Business and Administration  
m3m 316 Kingston Hall  
m4m  
m5m Eastern Washington University  
m6m Cheney, WA 99004  
mm  
m1m Dr. Blaine R. Wilson  
m2m Dept. of Bus. Ed. and Adm. Management  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m Central Washington University  
m6m Ellensburg, WA 98926  
mm

m1m Dr. LeVene A. (Lee) Olson  
m2m Distributive Education Program  
m3m College of Education  
m4m  
m5m Marshall University  
m6m Huntington, WV 25701  
mm  
m1m Dr. Harland E. Samson  
m2m Box 39  
m3m Education Building  
m4m 1000 Bascom Mall  
m5m University of Wisconsin  
m6m Madison, WI 53706  
mm  
m1m Dr. James R. Stone III  
m2m 112-B Teacher Education Building  
m3m 225 No. Mills Street  
m4m Dept. of Continuing and Vocational Ed.  
m5m University of Wisconsin  
m6m Madison, WI 53706  
mm  
m1m Dr. A. Gary Searle  
m2m 326 Harvey Hall  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m University of Wisconsin-Stout  
m6m Menomonie, WI 54751  
mm  
m1m Dr. Richard F. James  
m2m 4011 Carlson Building  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
m6m Whitewater, WI 53190  
mm  
m1m Dr. James Zancanella  
m2m Education Hall  
m3m College of Education  
m4m  
m5m University of Wyoming  
m6m Laramie, WY 82071  
mm  
m1m  
m2m  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m  
mm  
m1m  
m2m  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m  
mm

m1m Mrs. Nina L. Gaskin  
m2m MacFarland Supervisory Unit  
m3m Room 161  
m4m 4400 Iowa Avenue  
m5m N. W.  
m6m Washington, D. C. 20011  
mm  
m1m John E. Frazier  
m2m Department of Education  
m3m Knott Building  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m Tallahassee, FL 32301  
mm  
m1m Marvin M. Brown  
m2m Division of Secondary Programs  
m3m Office of Vocational Education  
m4m 1752 Twin Towers East  
m5m  
m6m Atlanta, GA 30334  
mm  
m1m Floy Baker  
m2m Division of Postsecondary Programs  
m3m Office of Vocational Education  
m4m 1752 Twin Towers East  
m5m  
m6m Atlanta, GA 30334  
mm  
m1m Mr. Yukio Toyama  
m2m Occupational Development Section  
m3m 941 Hind Iuka Drive  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m Honolulu, HI 96821  
mm  
m1m Mrs. Kristin Johnson-Crowe  
m2m State Board of Vocational Education  
m3m Len B. Jordan Building  
m4m 650 West State Street  
m5m  
m6m Boise, ID 83720  
mm  
m1m Mrs. Gerry B. Gaedtka  
m2m 100 North First Street  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m Springfield, IL 62777  
mm  
m1m Melanie K. Devitt  
m2m Division of Vocational Education  
m3m Room 229  
m4m State House  
m5m  
m6m Indianapolis, IN 46204  
mm  
m1m Ronald D. Jarchow  
m2m Instructional Services Section  
m3m Career Education Division  
m4m Department of Public Instruction  
m5m Grimes State Office Building  
m6m Des Moines, IA 50319  
mm

m1m Mrs. Irene H. Rockhill  
m2m State Department of Education  
m3m Room 811  
m4m  
m5m State Office Building  
m6m Montgomery, AL 36130  
mm  
m1m George F. Genz  
m2m Department of Education  
m3m Pouch F  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m Juneau, AK 99811  
mm  
m1m Bob Bendotti  
m2m Instructional Assistance  
m3m Unit/Vocational Education  
m4m Arizona Department of Education  
m5m 1535 West Jefferson Street  
m6m Phoenix, AZ 85007  
mm  
m1m Mrs. Glenna Avriett  
m2m Room 307-D  
m3m Department of Education  
m4m  
m5m Capitol Mall  
m6m Little Rock, AR 72201  
mm  
m1m Gary E. Thompson  
m2m California State Department of Education  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m 721 Capitol Mall  
m6m Sacramento, CA 95814  
mm  
m1m John Mills  
m2m Chancellor's Office  
m3m California Community Colleges  
m4m 1107 9th Street  
m5m  
m6m Sacramento, CA 95814  
mm  
m1m Dr. Marj P. Leaming  
m2m State Board for Community Colleges  
m3m and Occupational Education  
m4m Centennial Building - 2nd Floor  
m5m 1313 Sherman  
m6m Denver, CO 80203  
mm  
m1m Ronald J. DeGregory  
m2m State Dept. of Education  
m3m Box 2219  
m4m Graduate Center  
m5m Room 410  
m6m Hartford, CT 06145  
mm  
m1m Doyle I. Owen  
m2m John G. Townsend Building  
m3m State Dept. of Public Instruction  
m4m P.O. Box 1402  
m5m  
m6m Dover, DE 19903  
mm

m1m Richard P. Russell  
m2m Vocational Education  
m3m Kansas State Department of Education  
m4m 120 East 10th Street  
m5m  
m6m Topeka, KN 66612  
mm  
m1m William T. Jeffrey  
m2m Bureau of Vocational Education  
m3m 2134 Capital Plaza Tower  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m Frankfort, KY 40601  
mm  
m1m Carol Lynn Borskey  
m2m State Department of Education  
m3m P.O. Box 44064  
m4m Capitol Station  
m5m  
m6m Baton Rouge, LA 70804  
mm  
m1m Ralph L. Bickford  
m2m Bureau of Vocational Education  
m3m Department of Educational & Cultural Services  
m4m State House Station #23  
m5m  
m6m Augusta, ME 04333  
mm  
m1m Richard C. Kiley  
m2m Division of Vocational Education  
m3m State Department of Education  
m4m 200 W. Baltimore Street  
m5m  
m6m Baltimore, MD 21201  
mm  
m1m Elaine Cadigan  
m2m Bureau of Program Services  
m3m Division of Occupational Education  
m4m 1385 Hancock Street  
m5m  
m6m Quincy, MA 02169  
mm  
m1m Dr. Carl A. Woloszyk  
m2m Vocational-Technical Education Service  
m3m Michigan Department of Education  
m4m P.O. Box 30009  
m5m  
m6m Lansing, MI 48909  
mm  
m1m Patrick E. DiPlacido  
m2m Vocational Technical Division  
m3m Department of Education  
m4m 550 Cedar Street  
m5m  
m6m St. Paul, MN 55101  
mm  
m1m James Bowers  
m2m State Department of Vocational Education  
m3m P.O. Box 771  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m Jackson, MS 39205  
mm

m1m Jack Bitzenburg  
m2m P.O. Box 480  
m3m Jefferson Building  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m Jefferson City, MO 65101  
mm  
m1m Redina Berscheid  
m2m Office of Public Instruction  
m3m State Capitol Building  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m Helena, MT 59620  
mm  
m1m Gregg Christensen  
m2m Division of Vocational Education  
m3m 301 Centennial Mall South  
m4m P.O. Box 94987  
m5m  
m6m Lincoln, NB 68509  
mm  
m1m Dr. Charles A. Stamps  
m2m Vocational and Continuing Education  
m3m Nevada Department of Education  
m4m Capitol Complex  
m5m  
m6m Carson City, NV 89710  
mm  
m1m Donald H. Peterson  
m2m Division of Vocational-Technical Education  
m3m Department of Education  
m4m 105 Loudon Road  
m5m  
m6m Concord, NH 03301  
mm  
m1m Marvin Rosenberg  
m2m Division of Vocational Education  
m3m Department of Education  
m4m 225 West State Street  
m5m CN 500  
m6m Trenton, NJ 08625  
mm  
m1m Darrell Jones  
m2m Department of Education  
m3m Education Building  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m Santa Fe, NM 87501  
mm  
m1m Millie Frandino  
m2m Bureau of Business, Health, and Service Programs  
m3m Division of Occupational Education Instruction  
m4m State Education Department  
m5m 99 Washington Avenue  
m6m Albany, NY 12234  
mm  
m1m Horace C. Robertson  
m2m Division of Vocational Education  
m3m Department of Public Instruction  
m4m Room 566  
m5m Education Building  
m6m Raleigh, NC 27611  
mm

m1m Dr. R. Jean Overton  
 m2m Occupational Program Services  
 m3m Department of Community Colleges  
 m4m Room 20  
 m5m Education Building  
 m6m Raleigh, NC 27611  
 mm  
 m1m Leonard F. Pokladnik  
 m2m State Board for Vocational Education  
 m3m 15th Floor  
 m4m Capitol Building  
 m5m  
 m6m Bismarck, ND 58505  
 mm  
 m1m Dr. Bernard C. Nye  
 m2m Division of Vocational Education  
 m3m State Office Building  
 m4m Room 915  
 m5m 65 South Front Street  
 m6m Columbus, OH 43215  
 mm  
 m1m Dr. Gene Warner  
 m2m State Department of Vocational  
 m3m and Technical Education  
 m4m 1515 W. Sixth Avenue  
 m5m  
 m6m Stillwater, OK 74074  
 mm  
 m1m H. Dean Herman  
 m2m State Department of Education  
 m3m 700 Pringle Parkway S.E.  
 m4m  
 m5m  
 m6m Salem, OR 97310  
 mm  
 m1m E. H. Blyler  
 m2m Department of Education  
 m3m 333 Market Street  
 m4m P.O. Box 911  
 m5m  
 m6m Harrisburg, PA 17108  
 mm  
 m1m Mrs. Carmen H. Perez  
 m2m Division of Vocational and Technical Education  
 m3m Department of Education  
 m4m Box 759  
 m5m  
 m6m Hato Rey, PR 00919  
 mm  
 m1m Robert N. Forest  
 m2m Department of Education  
 m3m Roger Williams Building  
 m4m Hayes Street  
 m5m  
 m6m Providence, RI 02908  
 mm  
 m1m Tim Coffey  
 m2m Office of Vocational Education  
 m3m State Department of Education  
 m4m 924 Rutledge Building  
 m5m  
 m6m Columbia, SC 29201  
 mm



m1m Dan Hoff  
m2m Division of Vocational and Technical Education  
m3m Richard F. Kneip Building  
m4m 700 N. Illinois  
m5m  
m6m Pierre, SD 57501  
mm  
m1m Don Maloney  
m2m 213 Cordell Hull Building  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m Nashville, TN 37219  
mm  
m1m Norris D. Young  
m2m Texas Education Agency  
m3m 201 E. 11th St.  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m Austin, TX 78701  
mm  
m1m Wayne Taylor  
m2m Division of Post-Secondary Programs  
m3m Texas Education Agency  
m4m 201 East 11th Street  
m5m  
m6m Austin, TX 78701  
mm  
m1m Dr. Gary M. Lloyd  
m2m Utah State Office of Education  
m3m 250 East 500 South  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
mm  
m1m Richard Oates  
m2m Division of Vocational-Technical Education  
m3m State Department of Education  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m Montpelier, VT 05602  
mm  
m1m James Horan, Jr.  
m2m State Department of Education  
m3m  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m Richmond, VA 23216  
mm  
m1m Ms. Merle Charles  
m2m Department of Education  
m3m P.O. Box 6630  
m4m  
m5m  
m6m St. Thomas, VI 00801  
mm  
m1m Jack Ray  
m2m Division of Voc., Technical, and Adult Ed.  
m3m Superintendent of Public Instruction  
m4m Old Capitol Building  
m5m FG-11  
m6m Olympia, WA 98504  
mm

m1m Richard G. Moe  
 m2m State Board for Community College Education  
 m3m 319 7th Avenue  
 m4m  
 m5m

m6m Olympia, WA 98504  
 mm

m1m Ed Suddath  
 m2m Bureau of Vocational, Technical,  
 m3m and Adult Education  
 m4m State Capitol Building No. 6  
 m5m

m6m Charleston, WV 25305  
 mm

m1m Marie J. Burbach  
 m2m State Department of Public Instruction  
 m3m 125 S. Webster  
 m4m P.O. Box 7841  
 m5m

m6m Madison, WI 53707  
 mm

m1m William E. Marotz  
 m2m Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education  
 m3m 7th Floor - HF SOB  
 m4m 4802 Sheboygan Avenue  
 m5m P.O. Box 7874  
 m6m Madison, WI 53702  
 mm

m1m Dr. Keiji G. Okano  
 m2m Department of Education  
 m3m Hathaway Building  
 m4m

m5m  
 m6m Cheyenne, WY 82002  
 mm

m1m  
 m2m  
 m3m  
 m4m  
 m5m  
 m6m

mm  
 m1m  
 m2m  
 m3m  
 m4m  
 m5m  
 m6m

mm  
 m1m  
 m2m  
 m3m  
 m4m  
 m5m  
 m6m

mm  
 m1m  
 m2m  
 m3m  
 m4m  
 m5m  
 m6m

mm

VITA

Nelda Bloom

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: ATTITUDES OF MARKETING/DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION STATE SUPERVISORS  
AND TEACHER EDUCATORS TOWARD PROGRAM NAME CHANGE

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born at Springfield, Arkansas, January 25, 1933,  
the daughter of Ray and Juanita McKaskle Clark.

Education: Graduated from Conway High School, Conway, Arkansas,  
in 1950; attended Arkansas State Teachers College, Conway  
for one year; received Bachelor of Arts Degree in History  
and Education from the University of Missouri at Kansas City,  
in 1974; received Master of Science in Trade and Industrial  
Education from Oklahoma State University in 1977; completed  
requirements for the Doctor of Education in Occupational and  
Adult Education at Oklahoma State University in July, 1984.

Professional Experience: Worked as secretary and administrative  
assistant for seven years after completing business college.  
Returned to college as a part-time student. Worked at  
Southeast High School in Kansas City, Missouri, one year after  
completing college. Moved to Oklahoma in 1975 and taught  
business and science in Sand Springs, Oklahoma; then worked  
as an ICE coordinator for four years. Left teaching for six  
months and worked as an administrative assistant for Discovery-  
land Outdoor Theater. Began teaching in 1980 as a Distributive  
Education instructor at McLain High School in Tulsa. Presently  
employed at Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and  
Technical Education as a Curriculum Specialist in Cooperative  
and Adult Education.