ATTITUDES OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION TEACHERS TOWARD THEIR UNDERGRADUATE PREPARATIONS TO CONDUCT DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

By

MORRIS AUSTIN HERRON

Bachelor of Science
Western Carolina University
Cullowhee, North Carolina
1964

Master of Arts in Education
Western Carolina University
Cullowhee, North Carolina
1968

Certificate of Advanced Studies
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina
1973

Educational Specialist
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina
1974

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
Doctor of Education
May, 1984

ATTITUDES OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION TEACHERS

TOWARD THEIR UNDERGRADUATE PREPARATIONS

TO CONDUCT DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

PROGRAMS

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This assessment of attitudes toward undergraduate preparations of Distributive Education teachers from the National DECA Southern Region was similar to a study conducted in 1979 by Dr. Betty Heath Sipos in the Central Region. This study revealed what teachers felt were inadequacies and strengths of their undergraduate preparation programs.

I express my appreciation to the professionals who assisted me during my studies at Oklahoma State University. In particular, I wish to thank my adviser, Dr. Jerry G. Davis, for his invaluable guidance, involvement and moral support. To my committee chairperson, Dr. Waynne B. James, I offer my gratitude for hours spent in consultation, advisement, and review of the dissertation.

To committee members Dr. William E. Hodges, Dr. H. Gene Smith, and Dr. Walter L. Starks, I offer acknowledgement and thanks for suggestions made and time spent in the completion of the study.

I am grateful to Mr. Gene Warner, Oklahoma M/DE State Supervisor, for his direction and letter of support which was included with the introduction letters sent to other M/DE state supervisors. Mrs. Patricia Provo and Ms. Anne Hunt deserve recognition for an outstanding job of putting each page of the dissertation on word processing discs, and typing and personalizing each letter sent. For his personal counsel, understanding and encouragement, I am indebted to Dr. Martin Strand, my immediate supervisor and director at Foster Estes Vo-Tech Center, Oklahoma City.

Finally, to my dear wife, Elaine, who has worked many hours transporting copies, mailing questionnaires, and editing preliminary copies, I express my love. To my two sons, Ashley and Lee, for being understanding, considerate, and helpful, I express my love and appreciation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Distributive education, the study of marketing, distribution, merchandising, and management becomes increasingly important in the nation's schools as high technology catapults the American society into a state of even more technological advancement. As this technological transformation rapidly takes place, educators need to reassess the adequacy of educational preparation offered preservice distributive education teachers (Davis, 1983).

Teaching and coordinating a distributive education program, as in any vocational program, is more than just teaching. In addition to teaching the necessary attitudes, knowledges, abilities, and skills which enable students to achieve their career goals, a total distributive education program encompasses many activities such as community relations, coordination, guidance, career orientation, program planning, community surveys, managing individualized programs, evaluation, professional involvement, advising student organizations, and providing leadership (Davis, 1983).

The National Center for Vocational Education conducted a survey, Model Curricula for Vocational Teacher Education (Cotrell, 1972), in which 385 performance elements important to the successful performance of teachers by the programs studied were identified. Distributive education was one of the program areas included in the study. Assuming the study

results were valid, a salient question arises for marketing/distributive education (M/DE) teacher educators: Are colleges and universities which train M/DE teachers offering relevant learning experiences (James, 1983).

Sipos (1979) completed a dissertation study at Ohio State University which provided data to college and university teacher educators in the Central DECA Region. Focusing upon the question "What are the attitudes of distributive education teachers toward their undergraduate preparation to conduct distributive education programs?", the Sipos dissertation was a landmark study in this area. The Sipos study yielded usable findings in the Central Region and, therefore, should be patterned after the other three educational regions of the United States (Davis, 1983). This study was similar to after the Sipos study in the 24 states of the Southern Region.

Statement of the Problem

No research of marketing/distributive education teacher training programs for the Southern Region of the United States existed. There is a lack of information concerning beginning marketing/distributive education teachers' attitudes toward their teacher preparations.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study was to identify attitudes of teachers of marketing distributive education, concerning their undergraduate preparations to conduct M/DE. The questions researched were as follows:

1. What are the attitudes of distributive education teachers toward their teacher preparations to perform the tasks in the following functional areas: (a) program planning, (b) instructional planning,

(c) instructional execution, (d) instructional evaluation, (e) instructional management, (f) guidance, (g) school and community relations, (h) student organizations, (i) professional role and development, and (j) coordination?

2. Do teacher education programs provide teachers with the knowledge they need for teaching the M/DE technical areas identified in this Study?

3. What is the relationship between the attitudes of M/DE teachers toward their undergraduate teacher preparation programs and their undergraduate major advisers?

4. What is the relationship between the attitudes of M/DE teachers toward their undergraduate teacher preparation programs and their undergraduate grade point averages?

5. Do attitudes toward preparations to conduct programs differ between those who have graduated from distributive teacher education programs and those who have graduated from other types of programs, (e.g. business and office or general business with certification to teach M/DE)?

6. Do the attitudes toward preparation to conduct M/DE programs differ between those who conduct general cooperative distributive education programs and those who conduct other combinations of programs (i.e. specialized cooperative, general laboratory, specialized laboratory, general cooperative and laboratory, specialized cooperative and laboratory, general and specialized cooperative, general and specialized laboratory, general and specialized cooperative and laboratory, general with no related experiences, and specialized with related experiences)?

7. Do the teachers' ages make a difference in their attitudes toward their preparations to conduct M/DE programs?

8. Do the attitudes toward their preparations to conduct M/DE programs differ between male and female M/DE teachers?

Delimitations

This study was centered around the attitudes of distributive education teachers: (a) who were graduated from a four-year undergraduate program during the school year of 1981-82 at a university or college in the Southern Region, consisting of the following states: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virgin Islands, and Virginia; (b) who were certified to teach distributive education; and (c) who had taught for at least one year.

The primary consideration of this study was only that portion of the teacher education program in which the content was primarily controlled by the M/DE teacher educator. However, also included were technical courses acceptable to the major advisers which were often taught by business instructors. Excluded from this study were the general education and required education courses offered in undergraduate programs.

This study was not intended to evaluate a total undergraduate M/DE teacher preparation program, but to provide information to marketing/distributive education programs.

Limitations

The population of this study was dependent on the information provided by department of public instruction marketing/distributive education supervisors in the Southern Region of the United States. This study was limited to the extent and accuracy with which state M/DE supervisors

provided information pertaining to the M/DE teachers in their states.

The study was limited to the geographical area of the Southern Region states. The results can be generalized only to the identified population within this region.

Further, the teacher performance elements identified in Cotrell's study (1972) at the National Center for Vocational Education were used in this study. They were assumed as valid and important to the successful performance of vocational education teachers.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions were used:

Attitude. An organized predisposition to think, reason, feel, perceive, and behave toward a referent or cognitive object. It is an enduring structure of values and beliefs that predisposes the individual to behave selectively toward attitude referents which are categories, classes, or sets of phenomena: physical objects, events or behaviors (Kerlinger, 1973).

Attitude Scale. A scale consisting of statements to which a person is asked to respond in some exact way. The attitude scales provide an assessment of the degree of feeling that individuals may associate with some psychological object (Edwards, 1957).

Business and Office Education. Those occupations pursued by individuals in public or private enterprise or organizations which are related to the facilitating function of the office and include such activities as recording and retrieval of data, supervision and coordination of office activities, internal and external communication, and reporting of

information.

Cooperative Eduation. A method of instruction which requires alternating study in school with on-the-job training in an identified occupational objective is the job the student is being trained to perform. The student-trainee receives group instruction and individual or independent study of specific job competencies in a classroom setting. The student also receives on-the-job training in an approved training station.

Coordination. The process of organizing, developing, and maintaining effective relationships among all groups involved in the M/DE program to the end that the student receives the best possible preparation for a career in distribution (Crawford, 1967).

Distributive Education. A program of instruction in the selling, marketing, merchandising, distribution, and management of goods and services for those who have entered or those who are preparing to enter distributive occupations. The terms distributive education and marketing/-distributive education were used interchangeably in this study.

DECA. Distributive Education Clubs of America is the program of youth activity relating to DE and is designed to develop future leaders for marketing and distribution.

Marketing/Distributive Education Teacher Coordinator. Teachers of M/DE subjects who must be well grounded in the subject matter field of marketing, merchandising, and distribution of goods and services and have had previous experience in one or more distributive occupations. In addition, these individuals supervise cooperative training and/or project training (Organization and Operation, 1968).

Marketing/Distributive Teacher Education Program. A program which

prepares teachers in the technical and professional competencies to prepare personnel for distributive occupations. The program involves general education, general professional education, professional M/DE, and technical education courses.

Marketing/Distributive Education Technical Areas. Professional areas of specific skills, understanding, attitudes, and knowledges pertaining to M/DE teaching content such as advertising, human relations, operations, marketing, communications, display, product/service technology, economics, sales, management, merchandising, and business math (Crawford, 1967).

General Education. A broad type of education aimed at developing attitudes, abilities, skills, and behaviors considered desirable by society, but not necessarily preparing potential teachers for their desired teaching fields. It is that education needed by all students. In addition to being valuable for citizenship, it provides for personal and occupational development of the individual. It includes self-directed learning that is deliberate, logical, systematic, and sustained.

Likert Scale. A summative rating scale developed by Likert in which respondents are presented with statements on a survey instrument and are asked to indicate whether they "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," or are "undecided," to each of the statements on the instrument. The option representing the most favorable opinion is given five points and the least favorable option is given one point. The sum of the scores obtained on each item is the total score for the scale or subscale (Key, 1983).

Pedagogical Performance Requirements. The instructing and teaching behaviors required of vocational and technical education teachers

(Cotrell, 1972).

Performance Element. A statement of an observable behavior which describes what M/DE teachers will be doing as they function in their preofessional roles.

Professional Education. Any organized course in which content deals with the problems of education and has direct value to the teachers in their training roles (Good, 1945).

Southern Region. The region, as designated by the National Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA) which includes the following states: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia; it also includes the commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the possession of the Virgin Islands, which, for the purposes of this study, are referred to as states.

Vocational-Technical Education. Any form of education, training, or retraining which is designed to prepare persons to enter, continue, or advance in gainful employment in any recognized occupation. Excepted occupations are only those which are designated as professional or which require a baccalaureate or higher degree. Vocational-technical education includes such areas as technical education, agricultural education, office education, distributive education, trade and industrial education, and certain aspects of home economics education.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Research has been conducted in areas which have been valuable in structuring the preservice marketing/distributive teacher education program. However, very little research has been found which actually is concerned with how well marketing/distributive education teachers perceive themselves to be prepared to perform the jobs they supposedly are trained to do (Sipos, 1979).

To provide a research base for a study which analyzes teacher attitudes toward their undergraduate preparations to conduct distributive education programs was the primary purpose of this chapter. Secondarily, the literature review may offer insight into other research efforts in relation to the improvement of distributive teacher education programs.

Only one study, the doctoral study of Sipos (1979), was found to deal with teachers' perceptions of how well their undergraduate studies prepared them to teach M/DE. The review of the literature has provided the research from which Sipos developed the instrument utilized in her study. Other related studies and research determining tasks performed by M/DE teachers were reviewed. Studies measuring teacher attitudes toward preparations in other fields were also included.

A review of the literature indicated that many in the field of marketing/distributive teacher education were concerned with the composition of undergraduate preparation offerings targeted for future M/DE teachers.

This chapter investigated the opinions of those educators.

Shorr (1981) indicated that every undergraduate program for preparation of M/DE teachers should undergo continuous surveillance and appraisal in light of contemporary developments and innovations that may, or should, be reflected in it.

Marketing/Distributive education teacher education programs should evaluate curriculums, deleting outdated courses and updating courses data processing, for example which the M/DE teacher might find helpful while dealing with businessmen on the job (Coakley, 1969).

It is generally agreed, as indicated in Weatherford's 1974 study, that the preparation of marketing/distributive education teacher coordinators should be primarily on the undergraduate level. This opinion is reinforced by Dannenburg (1974) when he states that quality control should begin with well trained marketing/distributive education teacher coordinators. Teacher coordinators should be the products of comprehensive M/DE teacher education programs which offer acquisition of technical knowledge, professional background, and what is termed "the religion." Dannenburg's opinion reflects teacher development in many of the same areas as identified by Cotrell and others (1972). Dannenburg identifies areas such as teaching, staff relations, coordination, DECA, guidance, public relations, and records and reports.

A need exists to determine if M/DE graduates are mastering or at least achieving the level of proficiency needed for success in the field of distributive education (Davis, 1983). Should added emphasis be given to specific competencies needed by marketing and distributive education teachers, considering the trend toward competency-based education in all areas of teacher training? Ashmun and Larson (1970) concluded

that research on the competencies and behaviors necessary to be an effective teacher of marketing/distributive education and the structure of M/DE teacher education programs that would develop these competencies and behaviors are areas needing attention.

Research Base

The major study which provided a research base for this study was the Sipos study, conducted in 1979 as a dissertation study at Ohio State University. The Sipos study, used as a model in this study, analyzed teacher attitudes in the Central Region; whereas, this study analyzed the Southern DECA Region of the United States.

The major study providing a research base for the Sipos study was the Cotrell study (1972). It was conducted at the National Center for Vocational Education, Columbus, Ohio. Divided into four phases, the Cotrell study in Phase 1 determined pedagogical requirements for vocational-technical teachers and M/DE teacher coordinators. An occupational analysis was used in the second phase to determine teacher performance requirements. Fifty M/DE teacher-coordinators of distributive education were asked to rate the importance of each performance element in their own programs, as were the same number of teachers in cooperative programs of off-farm agriculture, wage earning home economics, office occupations, special needs, and trade and industrial education (Crawford, 1969).

The identification of 385 performance elements resulted, 91.8 per cent of which were classified as common to the six program areas surveyed. Cotrell concluded that all six program areas had very similar performance requirements for teachers in these areas. The 385

performance elements were categorized by Cotrell into 10 areas. These performance elements and 10 categories served as the primary basis for this study:

I. Program Planning, Development and Evaluation.
II. Planning of Instruction.
III. Execution of Instruction.
IV. Evaluation of Instruction.
V. Management.
VI. Guidance.
VII. School-Community Relations.
VIII. Student Vocational Organization.
IX. Professional Role and Development.
X. Coordination (Cotrell, 1972, p. 6).

Technical areas included in the original instrument and used in this study were determined by research conducted by Crawford in 1967: "A Competency Pattern Approach to Curriculum Construction in Distributive Teacher Education." The technical competencies identified by Crawford were clustered around the following nine areas: advertising, communications, display, human relations, mathematics, merchandising, product/service technology, operations and management, and selling.

The Crawford study identified 179 critical tasks of the teacher coordinator. It also identified 233 professional competencies required in accomplishing these critical tasks.

Distributive Education Related Studies

Cotrell's study served as a research base for two other studies in the distributive education field. One, a Nebraska state-funded research project (Burrow and Groneman, 1976), was concerned with purposes for occupational experiences and competencies which could be developed through occupational experiences of business, office, and distributive education teachers.

The modified delphi technique was used with a questionnaire sent to a randomly selected sample of distributive education state supervisors and teacher educators. A randomly selected sample of secondary and post-secondary distributive education teachers, state supervisors, and teacher educators later completed a validation of teaching competencies which could be developed through occupational experience.

Sixteen purpose statements of occupational experience and 39 competency statements were identified in the study. Competencies in the categories of coordination and professional role and development were determined as being most affected by occupational experience.

A study by Williams (1977) also utilized Cotrell's study as a research base. This study identified performance tasks of M/DE teacher coordinators, using a competency-based M/DE curriculum system, known as IDECC. Two instruments, developed through utilization of modified delphi techniques, were used in verifying the statements.

Of 149 performance tasks identified, 100 tasks qualified in terms of frequency and importance using the IDECC system. As the use of the IDECC system continues to increase, the development of satisfactory performance of these tasks will become an integral part of M/DE teacher education programs (Cotrell 1972).

Graziano in 1974 validated and ranked 75 professional competencies developed primarily from the 38 Ohio Center performance elements. Ranked highest in the Graziano study was the ability to select and develop instructional content (Sipos, 1979).

One needs only to consider a study by Willis (1954) to recognize that studies and research of educators spanning a period of three decades have been of some value (Davis, 1983). Through collection of data from

state plans, correspondence, and personal interviews, Willis discovered a great variation in certification requirements for distributive education teacher coordinators, a great variation in teacher education curriculum, a great variation between certification requirements and those recommended by a jury, and a great variation between secondary distributive education instructors. The study covered the six states of the U.S. Office of Education Region V, and surveying three populations areas; it included state supervisors, marketing/distributive teacher educators, and teacher coordinators.

Renshaw (1976) conducted a study to identify marketing and marketing-related knowledge needs of distributive education teacher coordinators and to assess the degree of importance and depth of knowledge needed for each of the knowledges. A modified delphi technique was used in measurements of results of the survey instruments. The study resulted in the "identification and assessment" of 394 basic marketing knowledge needs of secondary school distributive education instructors.

Shorr (1981) conducted a formal follow-up study of graduates of the undergraduate distributive education program of Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania from 1969 through 1979. The study attempted to determine the degree to which the distributive education teacher program was providing its graduates with the competencies needed to function as teacher coordinators and to ascertain the graduates' assessments of the Temple University marketing/distributive education program.

Graduates were asked to rate the degree to which they felt prepared to teach each of these instructional areas on their first job. Given a list of common DE instructional areas, they were asked to check "well prepared," "adequately prepared," and "poorly prepared" (Shorr, 1981).

Graduates felt adequately prepared in the M/DE instructional areas.

Studies of Attitudes Toward Teacher Preparation in Other Fields

McCullough (1966) conducted a study in which she investigated attitudes of beginning high school business teachers toward their undergraduate preparations in general education, professional education and their areas of specialization. A questionnaire, which was sent to 400 California beginning business teachers having less than two years experience, was returned by 282, with 154 considered usable.

McCullough concluded that: (a) In general, beginning business education teachers felt adequately prepared to enter the field. (b) Teacher education institutions were doing a better job in training to teach the skill subjects than they were in training to teach socioeconomic subjects. (c) Beginning business teachers were more critical of their professional education courses than they were of their general or specialized education courses. (d) Some of the teachers' most valuable experiences had been in methods courses and student teaching; however, they felt there was too much theory and not enough emphasis of the practical aspects. (e) California state institutions had prepared most of the business teachers both on the undergraduate level and graduate level. (f) Both methods and content courses were of utmost importance to the beginning business teacher.

In 1970, Meredith conducted a study to determine opinions of special education teachers from 13 western states concerning the adequacies of their undergraduate preparation programs. Meredith also attempted to determine the degree of influence which state certification requirements

exerted upon developers of teacher education programs.

Meredith's study utilized a stratified random sample, drawn by state, from the 13 western states of Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington and Wyoming. One thousand questionnaires were mailed, with a 49.4 per cent rate of return.

Meredith (1970) found no significant differences in opinions among special education teachers, considering the following variables:

1. the sex of the teacher,
2. the age of the teacher,
3. the type of exceptionality with which the teacher had worked,
4. the number of years the teacher had been in the field of special education,
5. whether or not the teacher had previously been a regular classroom teacher,
6. the number of years the teacher had taught a regular class,
7. the level at which the teacher had taught a regular class,
8. state requirements for teaching special education, and
9. the kind of certification held.

Meredith found that although 51 per cent of the respondents had received their preparations between the years of 1965 and 1969, no statistically significant difference existed in the attitudes of this group of teachers and teachers who had received their preparations prior to 1965. The teachers rated courses of psychology, methods and materials, practicum, and curriculum as being of great value, while they questioned the value of courses in arts and crafts. Most of the teachers recognized a need for at least a one-half day of student teaching for a full semester.

Overall, the teachers were evenly divided on their opinions of the adequacies of their undergraduate preparations.

Summary

The review of the literature has shown a concern by researchers about content of undergraduate teacher preparation curricula for distributive education teachers. Researchers are calling for more competency-based curricula (Davis, 1983).

Little research has been found which deals with how distributive education teachers perceive the adequacies of their undergraduate preparations, except for the Sipos study. The review of the literature considered research studies from which the original study instruments and methods were developed. The same instruments and methods were also utilized in this study. Other studies dealing with preparation criteria for teachers of marketing/distributive education were included.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter was to (1) show permission to conduct a similar study; (2) ensure questionnaire validity by utilizing a Southern Regional Panel of Experts; (3) describe the procedures used in determining the population and sample; (4) outline methods for collection of data; (5) elucidate the selection of the data-gathering instruments, including descriptions of their reliability; (6) state dependent and independent variables; and (7) describe the procedures for analyzing data.

Permission to Conduct a Similar Study

Telephone contact was made with Sipos at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, Virginia. A formal letter ensued, requesting permission to follow her 1979 doctoral dissertation study conducted at Ohio State University (Appendix A). Permission was granted to conduct a similar study using subjects from the Southern Region (Appendix B).

Vocational Education Panel of Experts

The questionnaires from the original Sipos doctoral study were submitted to a Southern Region Panel of Vocational Education Experts. A letter was attached to the questionnaires which asked the panel for

suggestions concerning questionnaire rewording and revision (Appendix C).

Respondents from the Panel of Vocational Education Experts reported by telephone response that the questionnaires were comprehensive and understandable. The questionnaires were sent in their original form to the participants of this study who were a randomly selected Southern Region sample of M/DE teacher coordinator subjects.

Population and Sample

The population of this study was 133 M/DE teacher coordinators located in the Southern Region of the United States.

The population was university and college graduates who were identified by departments of public instruction state supervisors of marketing/distributive education in the following 14 states of the Southern Region: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Southern Region population subjects were identified by the respective state supervisors of marketing and distributive education. The state departments of public instruction M/DE supervisors' names and addresses were determined by consulting the U.S. Office of Education Directory provided by Edward Nelson, Director of Marketing and Distributive Occupations, Washington, D.C. (Appendix D). This directory included teacher education personnel for marketing/distributive education.

A stratified random sample was drawn from this population. This sample consisted of 67 M/DE teacher coordinators.

The subjects randomly selected for this study met the following

criteria:

1. Participants must have graduated with a bachelor's degree during the academic year 1981-82.

2. Participants must have been certified to teach marketing/distributive education.

3. Participants must have taught marketing/distributive education for at least one year.

The endorsement of Francis Tuttle, Director of Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, and a letter of endorsement from Gene Warner, Oklahoma State Supervisor of Marketing and Distributive Education were then obtained. A letter of request and a copy of Warner's endorsement letter were sent to each Southern Region state supervisor of marketing/distributive education, asking for the names, home addresses, and school addresses of the identified population subjects (Appendix E). In addition, marketing/distributive education state supervisors were requested to approve an enclosed letter to be sent to their M/DE teacher coordinators (Appendix F). Copies of the survey instruments were included in the mailing to the M/DE state supervisors for their perusal (Appendix G).

Collection of Data

The initial contact letter was then sent to the identified M/DE teacher coordinator study participants (Appendix H), including a copy of the letter of support from respective state M/DE supervisors (Appendix F), asking them to complete the three survey instruments enclosed. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was enclosed for their convenience. Three weeks later, a follow-up letter (Appendix I) was mailed to

non-respondents. A self-addressed, stamped envelope, plus additional copies of the instruments were enclosed in the follow up letters. All remaining non-respondents were contacted directly by telephone six weeks after the initial questionnaires were mailed.

Selection of Insturments

A background information questionnaire (Appendix G) was used to verify the qualifications of the respondents as part of the identified population and to collect demographic data in relation to the following independent variables:

1. Undergraduate major,
2. Type of distributive education program conducted
    a. General or specialized
    b. Cooperative or in-school experience,
3. Undergraduate grade point average,
4. Male or female,
5. Age.

Method of Scaling

The Likert summated rating scale technique was utilized in developing both the "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Teacher Preparation" and the "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Major Adviser" scales. "Strongly agrees," "agrees," "disagrees," "strongly disagrees," and "undecided" were options offered respondents in indicating reactions to statements when the Likert method of scaling was used.

Scoring

Scale values on the Likert type scales range from one to five, with the five choices of response being weighted as follows:

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

Developing Statements

The following guidelines, identified by Babbie (1973) were utilized in constructing the items on each of the attitude scales. The guidelines are as follows:

1. When closed ended questions are used, response categories provided should be exhaustive, and the answer categories must be totally exclusive.
2. Items should be clear and unambiguous.
3. Avoid double barrel questions.
4. Respondents must be competent to answer.
5. The statements should be relevant to most respondents.
6. The researcher should provide clear, short items that will not be misinterpreted.
7. Avoid negative items.
8. Avoid "biased" items and terms (pp. 140-144).

Attitude Toward Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Scale

The preliminary "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Teacher Preparation" scale consisted of 120 items based on the Performance Based Vocational Technical Education modules. The 120-item "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Preparation" scale was derived from Cotrell's study (1972) conducted at the National Center for Vocational Education. The technical areas for marketing/distributive education utilized in this scale were identified in Crawford's study (1969), Competency Pattern Approach to Curriculum Construction in Distributive Teacher Education.

The preparation scale was divided into 11 subscales. Ten of these

subscales were based on the center's modules and evaluated the preparation, as perceived by the M/DE teachers, to perform tasks in the following functional areas: (a) program planning, (b) instructional planning, (c) instructional execution, (d) instructional evaluation, (e) instructional management, (f) guidance, (g) school and community relations, (h) coordination, (i) professional role and development, and (j) student vocational organizations (Sipos, 1979).

An eleventh subscale on the "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Teacher Preparation" scale consisted of the teachers' perceptions of their undergraduate preparations to teach technical knowledge. These were categorized into the following 12 areas: advertising, human relations, operations, marketing, commuications, display, product/service technology, economics, sales, management, merchandising, and business math.

Attitude Toward Major Adviser Scale

A second attitude scale was developed. This scale was to determine the attitudes of teachers toward their undergraduate major advisers in order to analyze the relationship between the attitudes of teachers toward their undergraduate preparations to conduct marketing/distributive education programs and their attitudes toward their undergraduate major advisers (Sipos, 1979).

Reliability

Johnson and McCabe's (1975) program "Item Analysis" was used in the original study and in this study to determine reliability. Equation Three, which performed an internal consistency analysis for scale reliability of Kuder and Richardson's formulas, was the basis for the

program. Equation Three formula derivatives calculated an item reliability for each question as well as the reliability for the overall instrument. The overall reliability for the "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Teacher Preparation" was .9866 with 48 respondents. The Major Adviser scale produced a .9466 reliability with 47 respondents. The reliability for the subscales on the preparation scale ranged from .8289 to .9656 (Sipos, 1979).

Item reliability was made by:

1. Summing all respondents' answers to each item,

2. Adding item totals together for grand totals,

3. Removing each item total from the grand total; therefore, calculating an unbiased item reliability.

Scale reliability was determined by calculating the variance in the total score which could be attributed to internal consistencies. This variance was expressed as a portion of the total variance of the total score.

Within this program, both the item reliability and the questionnaire reliability were reported as positive and less than 1.0. An item or questionnaire reliability of .3 or higher was acceptable (Johnson and McCabe, 1975). The outputs of this program were:

1. a summary of each respondent's test consisting of identification number, total score, mean response, and variance of response;

2. item analysis and test summary consisting of:

   a. for each item, the item number, mean response, total of responses, variance, and the individual item reliability;

   b. for the test, average score, variance, and the total test reliability as described above.

Variables

As in the Sipos study, the independent variables used in this study were:

1. type of undergraduate teacher preparation program;
2. type of distributive education program conducted,
    a. General or specialized,
    b. Cooperative or in-school experiences;
3. undergraduate grade point average;
4. male or female;
5. age.

The dependent variables for the Sipos study and this study were:

1. marketing/distributive education teachers' attitudes toward their undergraduate preparations to conduct M/DE programs; and
2. marketing/distributive education teachers' attitudes toward their undergraduate major advisers.

Procedures for Analyzing Data

Statistics were derived by utilizing programs from the statistical Analysis System (SAS) (Barr, Goodnight, Sall, and Helwig, 1976). The following were the research questions investigated in this study and the statistics utilized for each question.

1. What are the attitudes of M/DE teachers toward their teacher preparations to perform the tasks in the following functional areas: (a) program planning, (b) instructional planning, (c) instructional execution, (d) instructional evaluation, (e) instructional management, (f) guidance, (g) school and community relations, (h) student organizations, (i) professional role and development, and (j) coordination?

2. Do teacher education programs provide teachers with the knowledge they need for teaching the M/DE technical areas identified in this study?

The following statistics were utilized for questions one and two:

a. A frequency distribution was compiled to present the number of times each of the five choices was selected for an item on the "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Teacher Preparation" scale.

b. A percentage was calculated for the number of times each of the five choices was selected for items on the "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Teacher Preparation" scale.

c. A percentage was calculated for the total number of times each of the five choices was selected on the subscales and the overall "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Teacher Preparation" scale.

d. The mean response was calculated for each item on the "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Teacher Preparation" scale.

e. Each respondent's score was determined for the scale "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Teacher Preparation," plus the overall sum, mean response, and standard deviation for the scale.

f. Each respondent's total response for each subscale and the sums and means of all respondents for each subscale were computed.

3. What is the relationship between the attitudes of M/DE teachers toward their undergraduate teacher preparation programs and the attitudes of M/DE teachers have toward their undergraduate major advisers? The following statistics were used for question three:

a. A frequency distribution was calculated showing the number of times each of the five choices was selected for an item on the "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Major Adviser" scale.

b. A percentage was calculated for the number of times each of the five choices was selected for items on the "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Major Adviser" scale.

c. A percentage was calculated for the total number of times each of the five choices was selected on the "Attitudes Toward Undergraduate Major Adviser" scale.

d. The mean response was calculated for each item on the "Attitude Toward Major Adviser" scale.

e. Each respondent's score was calculated from the scale, "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Major Adviser," plus the overall sum and mean responses.

f. A Pearson product-moment correlation was computed to determine the relationship between teachers' attitudes toward their undergraduate preparations to conduct M/DE programs and their attitudes toward their undergraduate major advisers.

4. What is the relationship between the attitudes of M/DE teachers toward their undergraduate teacher preparation programs and their undergraduate grade point averages? The following statistics were used for this question:

a. A frequency distribution was calculated to show respondents' grade point averages.

b. A Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated to determine the relationship between the teachers' attitudes toward their undergraduate preparations to conduct M/DE programs and their grade point averages.

5. Do the attitudes toward preparations to conduct M/DE programs differ between those who have graduated from M/DE teacher education

programs and those who have graduated from other types of programs, (e.g. business and office or general business with certification to teach distributive education)? The following statistics were used for question five:

a. A frequency distribution was compiled to show the number of graduates who were graduated from different types of undergraduate programs. Mean responses were calculated for the types of graduates on their attitudes toward their undergraduate teacher preparations to conduct M/DE programs.

b. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used for this question. The output of the SAS computer program for ANOVA yielded the sources of variance, degrees of freedom, sums of squares, mean square, F value, and the probability level.

c. The "Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Variable Total" was utilized to control the Type I comparison error rate.

6. Do the attitudes toward undergraduate preparations to conduct M/DE programs differ between those who conduct general cooperative M/DE programs and those who conduct other combinations of programs. The following statistics were used for question six:

a. A frequency distribution was compiled to show the number of marketing/distributive education teachers who conduct general cooperative M/DE programs and those who conduct other combinations of M/DE programs. Calculations were made for the mean response of the respondents for the general cooperative programs. The mean response was also calculated on the attitudes toward their undergraduate preparations to conduct M/DE programs for those teachers who conduct other combinations of programs.

b. For question six, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was

used. The F value revealed any statistically significant difference in teacher attitudes toward their undergraduate preparations to conduct M/DE programs between those who conduct general cooperative programs and those who conduct other combinations of programs.

7. Do the teachers' ages make a difference in their attitudes toward their preparations to conduct M/DE programs? The following statistics were used for question seven:

a. A frequency distribution was compiled to show the frequency of age among M/DE teachers. The mean responses for their attitudes toward their undergraduate preparations to conduct M/DE programs were calculated by two age groups, 22-24 and 25-52 years.

b. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine any statistically significant difference in the mean attitudes of undergraduate preparations to conduct M/DE programs between teachers, ages]22-24 and teachers, ages 25-52.

8. Do the attitudes toward their preparations to conduct M/DE programs differ between male and female M/DE teachers? The following statistics were used for question eight:

a. A frequency distribution of male and female M/DE teachers was compiled. The mean responses of the respondents were calculated for males and females on their attitudes toward their undergraduate preparations to conduct M/DE programs.

b. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine any statistically significant difference between males and females in their attitudes toward their undergraduate preparations to conduct M/DE programs.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to identify attitudes of marketing/distributive education teachers, concerning their undergraduate preparations to conduct M/DE programs. The following sections include: (1) a description of the population, (2) response rates, (3) research questions and presentation of the data, and (4) a summary.

Description of Population

The population of the study was 1981-82 college/university graduates of M/DE programs from the National Distributive Education Clubs of America Southern Region. This population consisted of 133 M/DE teachers identified by the M/DE state supervisors of the National DECA Southern Region. A 50 percent stratified random sample was drawn from the identified population for each state. This sample was composed of subjects meeting the following criteria:

1. Participants must have graduated with a bachelor's degree during the academic year 1981-82.

2. Participants must have been certified to teach marketing/distributive education.

3. Participants must have taught marketing/distributive education for at least one year.

Response Rate

The questionnaires were mailed to 67 of the identified population of 133, using a 50 per cent stratified random sample, on September 6, 1983. A letter was included in the mailing of the questionnaires which asked the identified M/DE teacher coordinators to complete the study questionnaires. A letter of support from respective state supervisors, the questionnaires, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were enclosed for each respondent's convenience in returning the survey.

On October 1, 1983 a follow-up letter was sent to each non-respondent; on October 25, 1983 a follow-up phone call was made to each non-respondent. Of the 67 randomly selected sample subjects, 63 subjects returned the research questionnaires. One questionnaire was judged as unusable, leaving 62 questionnaires containing usable data, for a 92.5 per cent rate of return.

Research Questions and Presentation of Data

Each research question is presented in this chapter followed by the presentation of the research question data. Questions one and two are presented together, as both questions are investigated through the use of one instrument, the "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Teacher Preparation" scale.

1. What are the attitudes of M/DE teachers toward their teacher preparations to perform the tasks in the following functional areas: (a) program planning, (b) instructional planning, (c) instructional execution, (d) instructional evaluation, (e) instructional management, (f) guidance, (g) school and community relations, (h) student organizations, (i) professional role and development, and (j) coordination?

2. Do teacher education programs provide teachers with the perceived knowledge they need for teaching the M/DE technical areas identified in this study?

Frequencies, percentages, and means were calculated for each of the 120 items on the attitude toward preparation scale for each of the task statements on research questions 1 and 2. Under the Program Planning subscale, it was found in task statement # 7 (Developing goals and objectives) that 22.6 per cent of the respondents strongly agreed and 67.7 per cent of the respondents agreed that their teacher education programs provided the needed teaching prepartion (Table I).

It was also determined that 17.7 per cent of the subjects surveyed stated they strongly disagreed concerning their preparedness to evaluate local M/DE programs. This is indicated in task statement # 12 (Table I). In the subscale Instructional Planning, it was found in task statement # 3 (Developing lesson plans) that 45.2 per cent of the respondents strongly agreed and 48.4 per cent agreed that they felt prepared (Table I).

Instructional Execution subscale task statement # 2 (Lead class discussion) revealed that 27.4 per cent strongly agreed and 66.1 per cent agreed, totaling 93.5 per cent of the graduates who expressed competence in this area (Table I). In task statement # 20 (Team teaching), 27.4 per cent indicated disagreement and 11.3 per cent indicated strong disagreement that they felt prepared in this area.

In examining the subscale on School Community Relations, it was found that 33.9 per cent of the subjects strongly agreed with their preparations to maintain cooperative relationships with other educators as indicated in task statement # 10.

In the Coordination subscale contained under task statement # 4

TABLE I

SUBSCALE PERCENTAGE AND PERCENTAGES OF ITEM RESPONSES ON THE "ATTITUDE TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER PREPARATION" SCALE

	Subscales	Degree of Agreement SA %	A %	U %	D %	SD %
Program Planning						
	Task Statements					
1.	Plan community surveys.	6.5	43.5	12.9	24.2	12.9
2.	Conduct community surveys.	8.1	41.9	14.5	25.8	9.7
3.	Use information collected from community surveys.	8.1	41.9	17.7	21.0	11.3
4.	Report information collected from community surveys.	6.6	39.3	18.0	26.2	9.8
5.	Analyze findings collected from community surveys.	6.5	41.9	23.9	29.0	9.7
6.	Organize an advisory committee.	12.9	61.3	24.5	3.2	8.1
7.	Develop program goals and objectives.	22.6	67.7	8.1	0.0	1.6
8.	Develop a course of study for distributive education.	18.0	63.9	6.6	3.3	8.2
9.	Conduct student follow-up.	16.7	53.3	1.7	20.0	8.3
10.	Utilize a local advisory committee.	8.1	56.3	25.8	0.0	9.7
11.	Determine local long range plans for distributive education.	6.5	58.2	16.1	3.2	26.1
12.	Evaluate local distributive education programs.	6.5	51.6	21.0	3.2	17.7
13.	Conduct an occupational analysis.	11.3	21.0	35.5	17.7	14.5
	Subscale One: Total Percentages	10.6	49.4	15.8	13.6	10.6

TABLE I (Continued)

Subscales	Degree of Agreement SA %	A %	U %	D %	SD %
Instructional Planning					
Task Statements					
1. Determine student occupational interests.	17.7	62.9	9.7	4.8	4.8
2. Develop student performance objectives.	25.8	61.3	3.2	4.8	4.8
3. Develop lesson plans.	45.2	48.4	0.0	4.8	1.6
4. Develop a unit of instruction.	37.1	54.6	3.2	4.8	3.2
5. Select student instructional materials.	14.5	64.5	14.5	6.5	0.0
6. Obtain student instructional materials.	21.0	59.7	8.1	97.	1.6
7. Prepare teacher made instructional materials.	27.4	56.5	8.1	3.2	5.8
Subscale Two: Total Percentages	27.0	57.7	6.7	5.5	3.1
Instructional Execution					
Task Statements					
1. Direct field trips.	21.0	51.6	9.7	16.1	1.6
2. Lead class discussions.	27.4	66.1	3.2	1.6	1.6
3. Direct students in instructing other students.	11.3	50.0	12.9	21.0	4.8
4. Employ techniques of role playing.	22.6	61.3	4.8	8.1	3.2
5. Utilize simulation.	17.7	62.9	4.8	9.7	4.8
6. Direct student study.	12.9	66.1	12.9	8.1	0.0

TABLE I (Continued)

Subscales	Degree of Agreement SA %	A %	U %	D %	SD %
Instructional Execution (continued)					
Task Statements					
7. Direct student laboratory experiences (project method, simulation, etc.).	11.3	50.0	16.1	19.4	3.2
8. Direct students in applying problem solving techniques.	8.1	62.9	11.3	14.5	3.2
9. Use projects as a method of instruction.	21.0	59.7	8.1	9.7	1.6
10. Introduce a lesson.	35.5	59.7	1.6	3.2	0.0
11. Summarize a lesson.	33.9	59.7	3.2	3.2	0.0
12. Utilize oral questioning techniques in the classroom.	37.1	54.8	3.2	4.8	0.0
13. Employ reinforcement technqiues with students.	33.9	50.0	6.5	9.7	0.0
14. Provide instruction for low ability students.	11.3	41.9	22.6	19.4	4.8
15. Provide instruction for high ability students.	11.3	51.6	22.6	8.1	6.5
16. Present information through illustration.	15.5	75.8	0.0	9.7	0.0
17. Demonstrate a skill.	30.6	53.2	4.8	11.3	0.0
18. Explain a concept or principle.	23.0	68.9	1.6	6.6	0.0
19. Direct individualized instruction.	17.7	53.2	17.7	11.3	0.0

TABLE I (Continued)

Subscale	Degree of Agreement SA %	A %	U %	D %	SD %
Instructional Execution (continued)					
Task Statements					
20. Team teach.	9.7	21.0	30.6	27.4	11.3
21. Utilize guest speakers.	21.0	62.9	9.7	1.6	4.8
22. Illustrate with bulletin boards.	40.3	53.2	3.2	3.2	0.0
23. Utilize exhibits for illustrative purposes.	11.9	50.8	20.3	15.3	1.7
24. Operate an overhead projector.	46.8	38.7	1.6	11.3	1.6
25. Utilize an opaque projector.	45.2	32.3	4.8	16.1	1.6
26. Utilize audio visual aids such as films, slide tape presentations, etc., to present information.	46.8	45.2	1.6	3.2	3.2
27. Present information with a video tape machine.	32.3	42.9	9.7	12.9	3.2
28. Direct programmed instruction.	16.1	50.0	12.9	11.3	9.7
29. Utilize a chalkboard.	43.5	54.8	0.0	1.6	0.0
30. Use a flip chart.	32.3	45.2	12.9	9.7	0.0
Subscale Three: Total Percentages	25.0	53.1	9.3	10.3	2.5

TABLE I (Continued)

Subscale	Degree of Agreement SA %	A %	U %	D %	SD %
Instructional Mangement					
Task Statements					
1. Determine needed instructional materials.	11.3	61.3	4.8	19.4	3.2
2. Prepare a distributive education program budget.	11.3	30.6	12.9	35.5	9.7
3. Plan for yearly distributive education program supplies.	9.7	35.5	9.7	37.1	8.1
4. Maintain a filing system.	14.5	38.7	24.2	21.0	1.6
5. Provide safety instruction in a distributive education facility.	8.6	45.2	9.7	25.8	11.3
6. Provide safety instruction for on the job training.	8.1	37.1	21.0	25.8	8.1
7. Assist students in developing self discipline.	11.5	62.3	4.9	13.1	8.2
8. Organize a distributive education laboratory.	4.8	41.9	14.5	27.4	11.3
9. Manage a distributive education laboratory.	4.8	41.9	16.1	24.2	12.9
Subscale Four: Total Percentages	9.4	43.8	13.1	8.2	8.2

TABLE I (Continued)

Subscale	Degree of Agreement SA %	A %	U %	D %	SD %
Instructional Evaluation					
Task Statements					
1. Establish criteria for student performance.	17.7	58.1	9.7	11.3	3.2
2. Evaluate student attitudes.	11.3	74.2	4.8	8.1	1.6
3. Evaluate student knowledge.	22.6	67.7	3.2	4.8	1.6
4. Evaluate student skills.	16.1	69.4	4.8	8.1	1.6
5. Determine student grades in distributive education.	30.6	51.6	4.8	9.7	3.1
Subscale Five: Total Percentages	19.7	64.2	5.5	8.4	2.2
Guidance					
Task Statements					
1. Select appropriate student data-collecting instruments.	6.6	34.4	31.1	23.0	4.9
2. Gather student data through personal contacts.	14.8	49.2	16.4	13.1	6.6
3. Use student-teacher conferences as a learning experience for the students.	17.7	51.6	16.1	11.3	3.2
4. Provide career information.	24.2	58.1	4.8	6.5	6.5
5. Assist students in applying for employment.	43.5	43.5	3.2	4.8	4.8
6. Determine student grades in distributive education.	33.9	51.6	4.8	9.7	0.0
Subscale Six: Total Percentages	23.5	48.1	12.7	11.4	4.3

TABLE I (Continued)

Subscale	Degree of Agreement SA %	A %	U %	D %	SD %
School Community Relations					
Task Statements					
1. Develop a public relations plan for distributive education.	4.8	72.6	17.7	3.2	1.6
2. Give presentations to school and community groups to promote the distributive education program.	9.7	46.8	21.0	19.4	3.2
3. Develop a brochure to inform the school and community about distributive education.	17.7	58.1	14.5	8.1	1.6
4. Provide displays in the school and community on distributive education.	16.1	66.1	9.7	6.5	1.6
5. Prepare news releases to promote distributive education.	14.5	61.3	8.1	14.5	1.6
6. Develop television programs to promote distributive education.	3.2	21.0	25.8	43.5	6.5
7. Develop radio programs to promote distributive education.	3.2	33.9	22.6	35.5	4.8
8. Conduct an open house.	11.3	54.8	14.5	16.1	3.2
9. Provide service projects to the community.	9.7	61.3	12.9	14.5	1.6
10. Maintain a cooperative relationship with other educators (other teachers, teacher educators, etc.).	33.9	51.6	6.5	4.8	3.2

TABLE I (Continued)

Subscale	Degree of Agreement SA %	A %	U %	D %	SD %
School Community Relations (Continued)					
Task Statements					
11. Obtain feedback from the school and community concerning the distributive education program.	9.7	64.5	14.5	4.8	6.5
Subscale Seven: Total Percentages	12.1	53.8	15.3	15.6	3.2
Student Vocational Organization (DECA)					
Task Statements					
1. Develop a philosophy in regard to DECA.	19.4	51.6	11.3	12.9	4.8
2. Organize a DECA chapter.	19.4	46.8	14.5	12.9	6.5
3. Prepare students for leadership roles in DECA.	16.1	50.0	9.7	17.7	6.5
4. Assist student in developing a program of work (activities) for DECA.	14.5	37.1	12.9	25.8	9.7
5. Assist students in developing a budget for the DECA program of work.	11.3	33.9	11.3	30.6	12.9
6. Advise a DECA chapter.	19.4	54.8	8.1	8.1	9.7
7. Provide learning experiences for students through competition.	14.5	51.6	3.2	17.7	12.9
8. Implement competency based events.	14.5	35.5	12.9	22.6	14.5
Subscale Eight: Total Percentages	16.2	45.1	10.5	18.5	9.7

TABLE I (Continued)

Subscale	Degree of Agreement SA %	A %	U %	D %	SD %
Coordination					
Task Statements					
1. Establish guidelines for operating a cooperative distributive education program.	14.5	69.4	4.8	6.5	4.8
2. Identify prospective distributive education students.	17.7	64.5	9.7	3.2	4.8
3. Maintain student attendance records.	25.8	58.1	8.1	4.8	3.2
4. Obtain training stations.	21.0	67.7	8.1	1.6	1.6
5. Place students in training stations.	22.6	58.1	12.9	3.2	3.2
6. Develop the training ability of training station supervisors.	6.5	48.4	22.6	14.5	8.1
7. Supervise on-the-job training.	9.7	69.4	3.2	14.5	3.2
8. Evaluate students in training stations.	16.1	72.6	4.8	3.2	3.2
9. Provide cooperative related instruction.	17.7	64.5	11.3	3.2	3.2
10. Conduct an employer and employee appreciation event.	32.3	41.9	11.3	9.7	4.8
11. Display a knowledge of federal and state employment regulations.	9.7	46.8	11.3	24.2	8.1
12. Develop training plans.	21.0	51.6	14.5	4.8	8.1
13. Display a knowledge of unions.	3.2	30.6	24.2	29.0	12.9
Subscale Nine: Total Percentages	16.8	57.2	11.3	9.4	5.3

TABLE I (Continued)

Subscale	Degree of Agreement SA %	A %	U %	D %	SD %
Professional Role and Development					
Task Statements					
1. Establish a professional philosophy of education.	17.7	58.2	12.9	6.5	4.8
2. Select a suitable teaching position.	30.6	61.3	6.5	0.0	1.6
3. Keep up to date professionally (attend conferences, read professional journals, etc.).	37.1	59.7	1.6	0.0	1.6
4. Contribute professionally to the field of distributive education (serve on committees, hold offices in professional organizations, etc.).	19.4	59.7	9.7	6.5	4.8
5. Plan student teaching experiences.	11.3	43.5	19.4	17.7	8.1
6. Supervise student teachers.	14.5	35.5	22.6	16.1	11.3
Subscale Ten: Total Percentages	21.7	53.0	12.1	7.8	5.4

TABLE I (Continued)

Subscale	Degree of Agreement SA %	A %	U %	D %	SD %
Technical Knowledge					
Task Statements					
1. Advertising.	33.9	33.9	17.7	9.7	4.8
2. Human relations.	38.7	46.8	9.7	1.6	3.2
3. Operations.	11.3	54.8	14.5	9.7	9.7
4. Marketing.	46.8	37.1	4.8	4.8	8.1
5. Communications.	37.1	43.5	3.2	3.2	6.5
6. Display.	30.6	30.6	14.5	14.5	11.3
7. Product/Service Technology.	4.8	51.6	19.4	11.3	12.9
8. Economics.	30.6	48.4	8.1	3.2	9.7
9. Sales.	41.9	41.9	6.5	0.0	9.7
10. Management.	36.1	45.9	6.6	1.6	9.8
11. Merchandising.	19.4	48.4	11.3	8.1	12.9
12. Business mathematics.	38.7	33.9	9.7	4.8	12.9
Subscale Eleven: Total Percentages	30.8	43.1	10.5	6.3	9.3

(Obtain training stations), a 21.0 per cent strongly agree and a 67.7 per cent agree response was reported. The subscale Technical Knowledge and task statement # 4 (Marketing) indicated that 46.8 per cent of the respondents strongly agreed and 37.1 per cent agreed with their undergraduate preparations (Table I).

When examining the overall percentages for the subscale Instructional Planning, it was found that 27.0 per cent strongly agreed and 57.7 per cent agreed that they were prepared adequately (Table II). Respondents indicated in subscale # 11 (Technical Knowledge) that 30.8 per cent strongly agreed and 43.1 per cent agreed that their undergraduate teacher education programs had prepared them adequately. The strongly agree and agree categories were 19.3 per cent and 51.7 per cent, respectively, for the overall scale percentage on respondents' attitudes toward teacher preparations (Table II).

Thirty-nine of the respondents indicated agree for task statement # 8 (Develop a course of study for distributive education) and 11 indicated strongly agree in the subscale Program Planning. (Table III).

In the Instructional Planning subscale, the task statement # 3 (Develop lesson plans) obtained a mean response score of 4.3. This statement had one frequency of strongly disagree.

To operate an overhead projector (task statement # 24) in the Instructional Execution subscale frequencies were 29 (strongly agree) and 24 (agree) respectively. The mean of this item was 4.2

Within the Guidance subscale Task statement # 5 (Assist students in applying for employment) obtained a mean response of 4.2. For the Technical Knowledge subscale, the Human Relations task statement received the highest mean response of 4.2 and the task Statement # 7 (Product

TABLE II

ATTITUDE TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER PREPARATION SUBSCALES AND OVERALL SCALE
PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS FOR EACH RESPONSE CATEGORY

Subscale	Items N	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Undecided (Neutral) %	Diasgree %	Strongly Disagree %
1. Program Planning	13	10.6	49.4	15.8	13.6	10.6
2. Instructional Planning	7	27.0	57.7	6.7	5.5	3.1
3. Instructional Execution	30	25.0	53.1	9.3	10.3	2.5
4. Instructional Management	9	9.4	43.8	13.1	25.5	8.2
5. Instructional Evaluation	5	19.7	64.2	5.5	8.4	2.2
6. Guidance	6	23.5	48.1	12.7	11.4	4.3
7. School & Community Relations	11	12.1	53.8	15.3	15.6	3.2
8. School Vocational Organizations (DECA)	8	16.2	45.1	10.5	18.5	9.7
9. Coordination	13	16.8	57.2	11.3	9.4	5.3
10. Professional Role and Development	6	21.7	53.0	12.1	7.8	5.4
11. Technical Knowledge	12	30.8	43.1	10.5	6.3	9.3
Overall Scale Percentage	(N = 120)	19.3	51.7	11.2	12.0	5.8

TABLE III

FREQUENCIES AND MEANS OF ITEM RESPONSES ON THE "ATTITUDE TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER PREPARATION" SCALE

Subscales	Degree of Agreement SA N	A N	U N	D N	SD N	Total N	*Mean Responses
Program Planning							
Task Statements							
1. Plan community surveys.	4	27	8	15	8	62	3.1
2. Conduct community surveys.	5	26	9	16	6	62	3.1
3. Use information collected from community surveys.	5	26	11	13	7	62	3.1
4. Report information collected from community surveys.	4	24	11	16	6	61	3.1
5. Analyze findings collected from community surveys.	4	26	8	18	6	62	3.1
6. Organize an advisory committee.	8	38	9	2	5	62	3.7
7. Develop program goals and objectives.	14	42	5	0	1	62	4.1
8. Develop a course of study for distributive education.	11	39	4	2	5	61	3.9
9. Conduct student follow-up.	10	32	1	12	5	60	3.5
10. Utilize a local advisory committee.	5	35	16	0	6	62	3.5
11. Determine local long range plans for distributive education.	4	36	10	2	10	62	3.4
12. Evaluate local distributive education programs.	4	32	13	2	11	62	3.3
13. Conduct an occupational analysis.	7	13	22	11	9	62	3.0

TABLE III (Continued)

Subscales	Degree of Agreement SA N	A N	U N	D N	SD N	Total N	Mean Responses
Instructional Planning							
Task Statements							
1. Determine student occupational interests.	11	39	6	3	3	62	3.8
2. Develop student performance objectives.	16	38	2	3	3	62	4.0
3. Develop lesson plans.	28	30	0	3	1	62	4.3
4. Develop a unit of instruction.	23	32	2	3	2	62	4.1
5. Select student instructional materials.	9	40	9	4	0	62	3.9
6. Obtain student instructional materials.	13	37	5	6	1	62	3.9
7. Prepare teacher made instructional materials.	17	35	5	2	3	62	4.0
Instructional Execution							
Task Statements							
1. Direct field trips.	13	32	6	10	1	62	3.7
2. Lead class discussions.	17	41	2	2	1	62	4.2
3. Direct students in instruction of other students.	7	31	8	13	3	62	3.4
4. Employ techniques of role playing.	14	38	3	5	2	62	3.9
5. Utilize simulation.	11	39	3	6	3	62	3.8
6. Direct student study.	8	41	8	5	0	62	3.8

TABLE III (Continued)

Subscales	Degree of Agreement SA N	A N	U N	D N	SD N	Total N	Mean Responses
Instructional Execution (Continued)							
7. Direct student laboratory experiences (project method, simulation, etc.).	7	31	10	12	2	62	3.5
8. Direct students in applying problem solving techniques.	5	39	7	9	2	62	3.6
9. Use projects as a method of instruction.	13	37	5	6	1	62	3.9
10. Introduce a lesson.	22	37	1	2	0	62	4.3
11. Summarize a lesson.	21	37	2	2	0	62	4.2
12. Utilize oral questioning techniques in the classroom.	23	34	2	3	0	62	4.2
13. Employ reinforcement techniques with students.	21	31	4	6	0	62	4.1
14. Provide instruction for low ability students.	7	26	14	12	3	62	3.4
15. Provide instruction for high ability students.	7	32	14	5	4	62	3.5
16. Present information through illustration.	9	47	0	6	0	62	4.0
17. Demonstrate a skill.	19	33	3	7	0	62	4.0
18. Exaplain a concept or principle.	14	42	1	4	0	61	4.1
19. Direct individualized instruction.	11	33	11	7	0	62	3.8
20. Team teach.	6	13	19	17	7	62	3.0

TABLE III (Continued)

Subscales	Degree of Agreement SA N	A N	U N	D N	SD N	Total N	Mean Responses
Instructional Execution (Continued)							
21. Utilize guest speakers.	13	39	6	1	3	62	3.9
22. Illustrate with bulletin boards.	25	33	2	2	0	62	4.3
23. Utilize exhibits for illustrative purposes.	7	30	12	9	1	59	3.6
24. Operate an overhead projector.	29	24	1	7	1	62	4.2
25. Utilize an opaque projector.	28	20	3	10	1	62	4.0
26. Utilize audio visual aids such as films, slide tape presentations, etc., to present information.	29	28	1	2	2	62	4.3
27. Present information with a viedo tape machine.	20	26	6	8	2	62	3.9
28. Direct programmed instruction.	10	31	8	7	6	62	3.5
29. Utilize a chalkboard.	27	34	0	1	0	62	4.4
30. Use a flip chart.	10	28	8	6	0	62	4.0
Instructional Management							
Task Statements							
1. Determine needed instructional materials.	7	38	3	12	2	62	3.6
2. Prepare a distributive education program budget.	7	29	8	22	6	62	3.0

TABLE III (Continued)

Subscales	Degree of Agreement SA N	A N	U N	D N	SD N	Total N	Mean Responses
Instructional Management (continued)							
3. Plan for yearly distributive education program supplies.	6	22	6	23	5	62	3.0
4. Maintain a filing system.	9	24	15	13	1	62	3.4
5. Provide safety instruction in a distributive education facility.	5	28	6	16	7	62	3.1
6. Provide safety instruction for on the job training.	5	23	13	16	5	62	3.1
7. Assist students in developing self discipline.	7	38	3	8	5	61	3.6
8. Organize a distributive education laboratory.	3	26	9	17	7	62	3.0
9. Manage a distributive education laboratory.	3	26	10	15	8	62	3.0
Instructional Evaluation							
Task Statements							
1. Establish criteria for student performance.	11	36	6	7	2	62	3.8
2. Evaluate student attitudes.	7	46	3	5	1	62	3.9
3. Evaluate student knowledge.	14	42	2	3	1	62	4.0
4. Evaluate student skills.	10	43	3	5	1	62	3.9
5. Determine student grades in distributive education.	19	32	3	6	2	62	4.0

TABLE III (Continued)

Subscales	Degree of Agreement SA N	A N	U N	D N	SD N	Total N	Mean Responses
Guidance							
Task Statements							
1. Select appropriate student data-collecting instruments.	4	21	19	14	3	61	3.1
2. Gather student data through personal contacts.	9	30	10	8	4	61	3.5
3. Use student-teacher conferences as learning experiences for the students.	11	32	10	7	2	62	3.7
4. Provide career information.	25	36	3	4	4	62	3.9
5. Assist students in applying for employment.	27	27	2	3	3	62	4.2
6. Determine student grades in distributive education.	21	32	3	6	0	62	4.0
School Community Relations							
Task Statements							
1. Develop a public relations plan for distributive education.	3	45	11	2	1	62	3.8
2. Give presentations to school and community groups to promote the distributive education program.	6	29	13	12	2	62	3.4
3. Develop a brochure to inform the school and community about distributive education.	11	36	9	5	1	62	3.8

TABLE III (Continued)

Subscales	Degree of Agreement SA N	A N	U N	D N	SD N	Total N	Mean Responses
School Community Relations (continued)							
4. Provide displays in the school and community on distributive education.	10	41	6	4	1	62	3.9
5. Prepare news releases to promote distributive education.	9	38	5	9	1	62	3.7
6. Develop television programs to promote distributive education.	2	13	16	27	4	62	2.7
7. Develop radio programs to promote distributive education.	2	21	14	22	2	62	3.0
8. Conduct an open house.	7	34	9	10	1	62	3.5
9. Provide service projects to the community.	6	38	8	9	1	62	3.6
10. Maintain a cooperative relationship with other educators (other teachers, teacher educators, etc.).	21	32	4	3	2	62	4.1
11. Obtain feedback from the school and community concerning the distributive education programs.	6	40	9	3	4	62	3.7
Student Vocational Organization (DECA)							
Task Statements							
1. Develop a philosophy in regard to DECA.	12	32	7	8	3	62	3.7
2. Organize a DECA chapter.	12	29	9	8	4	62	3.6

TABLE III (Continued)

Subscales	Degree of Agreement SA N	A N	U N	D N	SD N	Total N	Mean Responses
Student Vocational Organization (DECA) (Continued)							
3. Prepare students for leadership roles in DECA.	10	31	6	11	4	62	3.5
4. Assist student in developing a program of work (activities) for DECA.	9	23	8	16	6	62	3.2
5. Assist students in developing a budget for the DECA program of work.	7	21	7	19	8	62	3.0
6. Advise a DECA chapter.	12	34	5	5	6	62	3.7
7. Provide learning experiences for students through competition.	9	32	2	11	8	62	3.4
8. Implement competency based events.	9	22	8	14	9	62	3.1
Coordination							
Task Statements							
1. Establish guidelines for operating a cooperative distributive education program.	9	43	3	4	3	62	3.8
2. Identify prospective distributive education students.	11	40	6	2	3	62	3.9

TABLE III (Continued)

Subscales	Degree of Agreement SA N	A N	U N	D N	SD N	Total N	Mean Responses
Coordination (continued)							
3. Maintain student attendance records.	16	36	5	3	2	62	4.0
4. Obtain training stations.	13	42	5	1	1	62	4.0
5. Place students in training stations.	14	36	8	2	2	62	3.9
6. Develop the training ability of training station supervisors.	4	30	14	9	5	62	3.3
7. Supervise on-the-job training.	6	43	2	9	2	62	3.7
8. Evaluate students in training stations.	10	45	3	2	2	62	4.0
9. Provide coop related instruction.	11	40	7	2	2	62	3.9
10. Conduct an employer and employee appreciation event.	20	26	7	6	3	62	3.9
11. Display a knowledge of federal and state employment regulations.	6	29	7	15	5	62	3.3
12. Develop training plans.	13	32	9	3	5	62	3.7
13. Display a knowledge of unions.	2	29	15	18	8	62	2.8
Professional Role and Development							
Task Statements							
1. Establish a professional philosophy of education.	11	36	8	4	3	62	3.8
2. Select a suitable teaching position.	19	38	4	0	1	62	4.2
3. Keep up to date professionally (attend conferences, read professional journals, etc.).	23	37	1	0	1	62	4.3

TABLE III (Continued)

Subscales	Degree of Agreement SA N	A N	U N	D N	SD N	Total N	Mean Responses
Professional Role and Development (Continued)							
4. Contribute professionally to the field of distributive education (serve on committees, hold offices in professional organizations, etc.).	27	37	6	4	3	62	3.8
5. Plan student teaching experiences.	7	27	12	11	5	62	3.3
6. Supervise student teachers.	9	22	14	10	7	62	3.3
Technical Knowledge							
Task Statements							
1. Advertising.	21	21	11	6	3	62	3.8
2. Human relations.	24	29	6	1	2	62	4.2
3. Operations.	7	34	9	6	6	62	3.5
4. Marketing.	29	23	3	2	5	62	4.1
5. Communications.	23	27	2	6	4	62	4.0
6. Display.	19	19	9	8	7	62	3.6
7. Product/Service Technology.	3	32	12	7	8	62	3.2
8. Economics.	19	30	5	2	6	62	3.9
9. Sales.	26	26	4	0	6	62	4.1
10. Management.	22	28	4	1	6	61	4.0
11. Merchandising.	12	30	7	5	8	62	3.5
12. Business mathematics.	24	21	6	3	8	62	3.8

* Mean Response = Total of weighted responses to items by category, divided by the number of responses.
Scoring weight of categories
Strongly Agree = 5 - Agree = 4 - Undecided = 3 - Disagree = 2 - Strongly Disagree = 1

Service Technology) obtained a mean of 3.2 which was the lowest mean for this subscale (Table III). When examining overall subscale means, it was found that the subscales on Instructional Planning, Instructional Execution, and Instructional Evaluation received means of 4.0, 3.9, and 3.9 respectively (Table IV). The overall scale mean was 3.7 for the 120 items responded to on the "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Teacher Preparation" scale.

3. What is the relationship between the attitudes of marketing/distributive education teachers toward their undergraduate teacher preparation progams and the attitudes of marketing/distributive education teachers toward their undergraduate major advisers?

A Pearson product moment correlation was computed, analyzing the relationship between the overall attitude toward undergraduate teacher preparation and the attitude toward the undergraduate major adviser. The respondents' scores were correlated for the "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Teacher Preparation" scale and the "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Major Adviser" scale. Sixty-two respondents' scores were used for this statistical analysis.

A coefficient of .56672 with a probability level of .001 (shown on Table V) was produced by this correlation. The correlation coefficient was statistically significant within the .05 alpha limit of confidence.

When examining item response percentages concerning attitudes toward undergraduate major advisers, it was determined that 56.5 per cent of the respondents strongly agreed with item # 1 (Cooperative) (Table VI). In responding to the Major Advisers Evaluation, it was found that item # 5 (Knowledgeable of his or her subject matter) and item # 7 (Respected by other instructors) were the only two items to receive any strongly

TABLE IV

OVERALL SCALE AND SUBSCALE SUMS, GROUP MEANS, NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS, NUMBER OF ITEMS, NUMBER OF TOTAL RESPONSES, AND MEANS ON THE "ATTITUDE TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE PREPARATION"

Subscale	Weighted Sums of Total Responses	Group Mean	Number of Respondents	Number of Items	Total Responses	Mean
1. Program Planning	2693.0	43.4	62	13	806	3.3
2. Instructional Planning	1737.0	28.0	62	7	434	4.0
3. Instructional Execution	7200.0	116.1	62	30	1860	3.9
4. Instructional Management	1785.0	28.8	62	9	558	3.2
5. Instructional Evaluation	1211.0	19.5	62	5	310	3.9
6. Guidance	1388.0	22.4	62	6	371	3.7
7. School & Community Relations	2429.0	39.2	62	11	682	3.6
8. School Vocational Organizations (DECA)	1684.0	27.2	62	8	496	3.4
9. Coordination	2987.0	48.2	62	13	806	3.7
10. Professional Role and Development	1406.0	22.7	62	6	372	3.8
11. Technical Knowledge	2822.0	45.1	62	12	744	3.8
Overall Scale	27342.0	441.0	62	120	7,400	3.7

TABLE V

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHERS' ATTTIUDES TOWARD THEIR UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER PREPARATIONS AND THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARD THEIR UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR ADVISERS

Number of Cases	Correlation Coefficient	Probability Level*
62	0.56672	0.0001

*An r of .250 or higher for an N of 62 is needed for statistical significance at the .05 level of confidence.

disagree responses.

The overall percentage of combined strongly agree and agree responses concerning the attitudes toward undergraduate major advisers was 87.9 per cent. The attitude toward knowledge subject manner in the strongly disagree area was 4.8 per cent (Table VI).

All 10 items of the attitude toward undergraduate major adviser evaluation were found to have means between 4.2 and 4.5 (Table VII). It was determined that 30 of the respondents strongly agreed and 28 of the respondents agreed with item #10 (Table VII).

4. What is the relationship between the attitudes of marketing/ distributive education teachers toward their undergraduate teacher preparation programs and their undergraduate grade point averages?

The range of each respondent's grade point average was determined by utilizing the background questionnaire information (Appendix G).

TABLE VI

ITEM RESPONSE PERCENTAGES CONCERNING "ATTITUDE TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR ADVISER"

Major Adviser Evaluation Statement	Degree of Agreement SA %	A %	U %	D %	SD %
1. Cooperative.	56.5	35.5	3.8	3.2	0.0
2. Interested in my needs.	43.5	43.5	8.1	4.8	0.0
3. Willing to meet with me when needed.	51.6	33.9	6.5	8.1	0.0
4. Well informed on the college or university policies.	45.2	35.5	14.5	4.8	0.0
5. Knowledgeable in his or her subject matter.	46.8	45.2	1.6	1.6	4.8
6. Respected by the students.	43.5	40.3	12.9	3.2	0.0
7. Respected by other instructors.	43.5	41.9	11.3	1.6	1.6
8. Willing to maintain open communication.	48.4	40.3	8.1	3.2	0.0
9. Receptive to my interests.	40.3	50.0	8.1	1.6	0.0
10. In his or her office enough hours for consultation and assistance.	48.4	45.2	4.8	1.6	0.0
Total Scale Percentages	46.8	41.1	8.1	3.4	0.6

TABLE VII

FREQUENCIES AND MEANS OF ITEM RESPONSES ON THE "ATTITUDE TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR ADVISER"

Major Adviser Evaluation Statement	Degree of Agreement SA %	A %	U %	D %	SD %	Total N	Mean Response
1. Cooperative	35	22	3	2	0	62	4.5
2. Interested in my needs.	27	27	5	3	0	62	4.3
3. Willing to meet with me when needed.	32	21	4	5	0	62	4.3
4. Well informed on the college or university policies.	28	22	9	3	0	62	4.2
5. Knowledgeable in his or her subject matter.	29	27	1	1	0	62	4.3
6. Respected by the students.	27	25	8	2	0	62	4.2
7. Respected by other instructors.	27	26	7	1	1	62	4.2
8. Willing to maintain open communication.	30	25	5	2	0	62	4.3
9. Receptive to my interests.	25	31	5	1	0	62	4.3
10. In his or her office enough hours for consultation and assistance.	30	28	3	1	0	62	4.3

Respondents incidated their grade point averages by marking one of the following grade point ranges: under 2.0, 2.0-2.50, 2.51-3.0, 3.01-3.50, or 3.51-4.0. All of the respondents' averages fell on or above 2.0 (Table VIII). It was found that 21.9 per cent fell within the 2.0-2.50 range and 25.8 per cent fell within the 2.51-3.00 range. The largest percentage of the respondents had a grade point average range of 3.01-3.50, with 33.9 per cent of the respondents falling within this range. The remaining 19.4 per cent of the respondents had a grade point average range of 3.51-4.00. The overall mean grade point average was 3.5, with a standard deviation of 1.04.

Grade point averages were correlated with the attitudes toward undergraduate preparations scores. No statistically significant relationship was revealed (Table IX).

5. Do the attitudes toward preparations to conduct marketing/distributive education programs differ between those who have graduated from marketing/distributive teacher education programs and those who have graduated from other types of programs, (e.g. business and office or general business with certification to teacher distributive education)?

The background questionnaire (Appendix G) gathered data concerning the type of undergraduate program the respondent completed. Fifty-three per cent of the respondents completed an undergraduate marketing/-distributive teacher education program (Table X). Other types of programs, including combination business and office and distributive education (24.2%), business and office education (3.2%), and other (19.4%) were completed by 46.8 per cent of the respondents.

Reported in Table XI are the means and standard deviations for each of the undergraduate programs: 1) combination business and office

TABLE VIII

FREQUENCY, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY, PERCENTAGE AND CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE OF GRADE POINT AVERAGES

Grade Point Average	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Under 2.0	0	0	0	0
2.0 - 2.50	13	13	20.96	20.96
2.51 - 3.0	16	29	25.80	46.77
3.01 - 3.50	21	50	33.87	80.64
3.51 - 4.0	12	62	19.35	100.00
		Mean Grade Point Average	3.52	
		Standard Deviation	1.04	

TABLE IX

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWAD THEIR UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER PREPARATIONS AND THEIR GRADE POINT AVERAGES

Number of Cases	Correlation Coefficient	Probability Level*
62	0.07835	0.5450

*An r of .250 or higher for an N of 62 is needed for statistical significance at the .05 alpha level of confidence.

TABLE X

FREQUENCY, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY, PERCENTAGE AND CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE OF UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS OR AREAS

Undergraduate Major	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Combination Business and Office and Distrubutive Education	15	15	24.2	24.2
Distributive Education	33	48	53.2	77.4
Business and Office Education	2	50	3.2	80.6
Other, Business Administration	12	62	19.4	100.0

education and distributive education, (2) distributive education, (3) business and office education, and (4) other. It was found that distributive education had the largest combined mean of 453.5, and that business and office education had the smallest overall mean of 268.0 (Table XI). The higher distributive education overall mean of 3.8 is the result of the respondents' indicating agreement to a greater extent than in the other programs.

The means and standard deviations when the programs were placed into two categories, distributive education and other, indicated an combined mean (453.5) for distributive education and combined mean of 426.8 for all other areas combined, with standard deviations of 56.42 and 79.37, respectively (Table XII).

TABLE XI

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF ATTITUDES TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER PREPARATIONS BY FOUR UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS OR AREAS

Undergraduate Major	N	Overall Mean	Combined Mean	SD
Combination Business and Office Education and Distributive Education	15	3.6	432.4	25.89
Distributive Education	33	3.8	453.5	56.42
Business and Office Education	2	2.22	268.0	2.83
Other	2	3.7	446.2	100.71

TABLE XII

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF ATTITUDES TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER PREPARATIONS IN DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION MAJOR AND ALL OTHER MAJORS

Undergraduate Major	N	Overall Mean	Combined Mean	SD
Distributive Education	33	3.8	453.5	56.42
Other Areas	29	3.6	426.8	79.37

The existence of any statistically significant difference in the groups' attitude toward their undergraduate teacher preparations was determined by calculating a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), using four groups of undergraduates (Table XIII). A statistically significant difference was found in attitudes toward undergraduate teacher preparations when analyzing the attitudes of four groups of undergraduate programs ($F = 5.77$; $df = 3/61$; $p = 0.0017$); this difference may be a result of a Type I comparison error rate because the cell sizes are not equal and do not contain five or more per cell (business and office had only two respondents). Therefore, a statistical analysis was made utilizing the "Duncan Multiple Range Test for Variable: Total." This test controls the Type I comparison error rate, not the experiment error rate. At an alpha level of 0.05 with 58 degrees of freedom (number of 61 minus three), the mean square equivalent is 3841.82 and the harmonic mean of cell sizes equals 5.88. When "Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Variable: Total" was utilized as part of the statistical analysis, no

TABLE XIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ATTITUDES TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER PREPARATION BY FOUR UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F - Value
Undergraduate Major	3	66456.49	22152.16	5.77*
Error	58	222825.90	3841.81	
Corrected Total	61	289282.00		

* Statistical significance at the .05 level, for df 3/61 critical value = 2.76.

statistically significant difference resulted between the undergraduate majors or areas of distributive education, other majors, business and office and distributive education, and business and office in their attitudes toward undergraduate prepartions. A statistically significant difference was found, however, when analyzing the attitudes of business and office majors' attitudes toward their undergraduate teacher preparations.

No statistically significant difference was found in the groups' attitude toward their undergraduate teacher preparations when calculating a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), using the two groups of undergraduates (Table XIV).

6. Do the attitudes toward undergraduate preparations to conduct M/DE programs differ between those who conduct general cooperative M/DE programs and those who conduct other combinations of programs?

The general cooperative type of marketing/distributive education program was the most frequently reported, with a variety of other combinations of types of programs also reported (Table XV). The other combinations of distributive education programs contained 10 different types of programs, varying in number between one and three. See Appendix J for a detailed listing of these combinations.

Forty-four (44) or 71.0 per cent of the respondents conducted a general cooperative program, with other combinations of programs conducted by 29.0 per cent of the respondents (Table XV). The general cooperative program was conducted more than all other combinations of programs.

Listed in Table XVI are the means and standard deviations for each of the two groups, teachers of general cooperative distributive education programs and teachers of other combinations of distributive education

TABLE XIV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ATTITUDES TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER PREPARATIONS BY GROUPS OF UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR AREAS

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*F - Value
Undergraduate Major	1	11050.44	11050.44	2.38
Error	60	278231.55	4637.19	
Corrected Total	61	289282.00		

* Statistical significance at the .05 level, for df 1/61 critical value = 4.00.

TABLE XV

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGES OF TYPES OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Type of Program	Frequency	Percentage
General Cooperative Distributive Education Program	44	71.0
Other Combinations of Distributive Education Programs	18	29.0
	62	100.0

TABLE XVI

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF ATTITUDES TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER PREPARATIONS BY TYPES OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Type of Program	N	Mean	Overall Mean	SD
General Cooperative	44	3.6	430.4	71.10
Other Combinations of Programs	18	3.9	464.8	57.72

programs. The highest overall mean of 464.8 was obtained byr the specialized combination group; a mean of 430.4 was recorded for teachers of the other general cooperative programs. The respondents indictated that their attitudes toward undergraduate teacher preparations by the specialized combinations group were more in agreement.

To determine if the difference between the attitudes of the two groups was statistically significant at the .05 alpha level, a one-way analysis of variance was computed. No statistically significant difference between the attitudes of teachers who conduct general cooperative programs and attitudes of teachers who conduct other combinations of programs was revealed ($F = 3.17$; $\underline{df} = 1.60$; $\underline{p} = 0.0800$) (Table XVII).

7. Do the teachers ages make a difference in their attitudes toward their preparations to conduct marketing/distributive education programs?

Reported in Table XVIII is a frequency distribution showing the ages of the respondents. Twenty-four, the most reported age, was given by 21 (33.9%) of the respondents. Only 45.2 per cent of the respondents were over the age of 24, leaving 54.8 per cent of the respondents age 24 or under. For statistical analysis, ages were blocked into two age groups, ages 22-24 and ages 25-52. The means and standard deviations for the attitudes toward undergraduate preparations were figured for each of the two groups, ages 22-24 and ages 25-52 (Table XIX). A higher mean attitude of 3.7 was reflected by the older age group, as compared to a mean of 3.6 for the group with ages 22 -24 (Table XIX).

To determine any statistically significant difference in the attitudes of the two groups, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted. No statistically significant difference was revealed by the F value at the

TABLE XVII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ATTITUDES TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER PREPARATIONS BY TYPES OF PROGRAMS

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*F - Value
Type of Program	1	14561.28	14561.28	3.17
Error	59	270686.62	4587.90	
Corrected Total	60	285247.93		

* Statistical significance at the .05 level, for df 1/60 critical value = 4.00

TABLE XVIII

FREQUENCY, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY, PERCENTAGES AND CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES OF AGES

Age	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
23	13	13	21.0	21.0
24	21	34	33.9	54.9
25	5	39	8.1	62.9
26	4	43	6.5	69.4
27	1	44	1.6	71.0
29	4	48	5.5	77.4
30	1	49	1.6	79.0
31	1	50	1.6	80.6
32	4	54	6.5	87.1
34	1	55	1.6	88.7
36	1	56	1.6	90.3
37	2	58	3.2	93.5
40	2	60	3.2	96.8
45	1	61	1.6	98.4
52	1	62	1.6	100.0

TABLE XIX

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF ATTITUDES TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER PREPARATIONS BY TEACHERS' AGE GROUPS

Age Range	N	Mean	Overall Mean	SD
22-24	34	3.6	435.6	41.65
25-52	28	3.7	447.5	92.26

.05 alpha level. ($F = 0.46$; $df = 1/61$; $p = 0.5022$) (Table XX).

8. Do the attitudes toward their preparations to conduct distributive education programs differ between male and female distributive education teachers?

The number of males participating in the study was 17, or 27.4 per cent of the total. The number of females participating in the study was 45, or 72.6 per cent of the total (Table XXI).

Means and standard deviations were computed for the male and female groups (Table XXII). It was found that males indicated a higher combined mean response (465.0) in their attitudes toward their undergraduate preparations than did the female respondents who had a combined mean of 431.9 (Table XXII).

To determine if the males showed a statistically significant more positive attitude toward their undergraduate preparations, a one-way analysis of variance was computed. The F value did not reveal a significant difference in attitude at the required 4.01 level ($F = 2.94$; $df = 1/61$; $p = 0.0918$) for an alpha level of .05 (Table XXIII).

Summary

Eighty-five items (71%) of the 120 item "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Teacher Preparation" scale had an overall mean response which fell between the strongly agree and agree range.

A statistically significant relationship was found between the teachers' attitudes toward their undergraduate preparations and toward their undergraduate major advisers.

No statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' attitudes toward their undergraduate preparations and their undergraduate

TABLE XX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ATTITUDES TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER PREPARATION BY AGE

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*F - Value
Age	1	2181.00	2181.00	0.46
Error	60	287100.99	4785.01	
Corrected Total	61	289282.00		

* Statistical significance at the .05 level, for df 1/61 critical value = 4.00

TABLE XXI

FREQUENCIES, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCIES, PERCENTAGES AND CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES OF MALES AND FEMALES

Sex	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Males	17	17	27.4	27.4
Females	45	62	72.6	100.0

TABLE XXII

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF ATTITUDES TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER PREPARATIONS OF MALE AND FEMALE DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION TEACHERS

Sex of Teacher	N	Overall Mean	Combined Mean	SD
Male	17	3.9	465.0	66.17
Female	45	3.6	431.9	68.38

TABLE XXIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ATTITUDES TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER PREPARATIONS BY SEX

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*F - Value
Sex	1	13491.20	13491.20	2.94
Error	60	275790.80	4596.51	
Corrected Total	61	289282.00		

* Statistical significance at the .05 level, for df 1/61 critical value = 4.00

grade point averages. The largest percentage of respondents (34%) had a grade point average in the 3.01-3.50 range.

No statistically significant difference was found in the attitudes toward the undergraduated teacher preparation programs between those who were graduated from marketing/distributive teacher education programs and those who were graduated from other types of undergraduate teacher preparation programs. Business and office graduates who were certified to teach distributive education did, however, have a statistically significant difference in their attitudes toward their undergraduate preparations to conduct M/DE programs.

Statistical analysis of attitudes of those teachers who conducted general cooperative marketing/distributive education programs and those who conducted other combinations of marketing/distributive education programs revealed no statistically signficant difference between the two groups. Those conducting the specialized combination programs had the highest overall mean (464.8); this indicated that the attitudes toward the undergraduate preparations of this group were more positive than those conducting other general cooperative programs (430.4).

For statistical analysis, ages were blocked into two groups, ages 22-24 and ages 25-52. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed between the two groups, with no resulting statistically significant difference in their attitudes toward their undergraduate preparations. A higher attitude mean was reflected by the older group.

Returned questionnaires revealed that 45 (72.6%) of the study participants were female. The male participants (27.4%) indicated a higher overall mean response (465.0) toward their undergraduate preparations than did females (431.9). A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) did not, however, reveal a statistically significant difference.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study. The following sections describe: (1) a summary of the study; (2) a conclusion of the findings; (3) recommendations for practice and further research.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify the attitudes of teachers of marketing/distributive education programs concerning their undergraduate preparations to conduct M/DE programs. The study was a similar study to a study conducted by Sipos (1979); whereas, the original study was in the Central Region of the United States, this study was conducted in the National DECA Southern Region. The survey instruments utilized in this sudy were the same instruments as used in the Sipos study, and were used to gather data from the Southern DECA Region concerning teacher attitudes toward their teacher education preparations.

The population for this study was drawn from the 14 Southern National DECA Region states: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virgin Islands, and Virginia. The population consisted of 1981-82 marketing/distributive education graduates who were certified to teach distributive education and had taught at least one

year. A population sample of 67 of the identified population of 133 was drawn, using a 50 per cent stratified random sampling procedure.

The questionnaire was sent to each subject, along with attitude scales, succeeded by two follow-up mailings. Sixty-three (94%) of the identified 67 subjects responded. Sixty-two (92.5%) of those 63 respondents met all specific criteria, and were used in this study.

The study was found to have a reliability for the "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Teacher Preparation" of .9866, and a reliability of .9466 on the "Attitude Toward Undergraduate Major Adviser" scale. The questionnaires and attitude scales were reviewed by a vocational panel of experts from the Southern Region for suggestions, and to rule on the instruments' validity for this study.

Conclusions

Based on the percentages, the respondents of this study agreed that they were adequately prepared by their undergraduate teacher preparation in all areas researched. There were no overall subscale areas concerning teacher preparation that fell into the disagree or strongly disagree categories. The teachers surveyed indicated they felt prepared in the technical areas to teach M/DE.

The teachers' attitudes toward the relationship between teacher preparation and their major advisers was positive. The relationship was statistically significant between teacher preparations and attitudes toward the major advisers.

There was no statistically significant relationship between sex, age, or types of programs conducted and the respondents' attitudes toward their teacher preparations. The respondents' attitudes toward their

undergraduate preparations were positive.

Recommendations

The investigator makes the following recommendations, based on the above findings:

1. A statistically significant relationship between the distributive education teachers' attitudes toward their undergraduate major advisers and their undergraduate teacher preparations was found. It is recommended that this relationship be further investigated.

2. It is recommended portions that this study be conducted utilizing the total population in each of the 14 Southern region states.

3. College or university teacher educators of marketing/ distributive education should review the findings of this study to evaluate their teacher education programs.

4. A statistically significant relationship between business and office undergraduate majors with certification in distributive education and their attitudes toward their undergraduate preparations to conduct marketing/distributive education programs was found. It is recommended that this relationship be further investigated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ashmun, Richard and Roger A. Larson. Review and Synthesis of Research in Distributive Education. 2nd Edition. Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education, The Center for Vocational Educaton, 1970.

Babbie, Earl R. Survey Research Methods. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company. Inc., 1973.

Barr, Anthony Jr., James H. Goodnight, Jane T. Helwig and John Paul Joll. Statistical Analysis System. Raleigh, NC: Sparks Press, 1976.

Burrow, Jim and Nancy Groneman. The Purposes of and Competencies Developed Through Occupational Experience for Vocational Education Teachers. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska, 1976.

Coakley, Carroll B., "Trends and Innovations in Distributive Education," Business Education Forum, Vol. 16, No. 6 (1969), p. 10-12.

Cotrell, Calvin J., W. A. Cameron, S. A. Chase, C. R. Doty, A.M. Gorman, and J. J. Molnar (a). Model Curricula for Vocational and Technical Teacher Education: Report No. III, Performance Requirements for Teacher Coordinators. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Vocational Education, 1972.

Crawford, Lucy C. A Competency Pattern Approach to Curriculum Construction in Distributive Teacher Education, Volumes I and V. Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, VA: U.S. Office of Education, 1967.

Dannenburg, Raymond A. "Quality Control in Distritutive Education: Michigan Feels the PUll of Accountability." American Vocational Association Jorunal, Vol. 49 (1974), p. 15.

Davis, Edward. Personal Correspondence. Reston, VA: National Office of Distributive Education, Executive Director, March, 1983.

Davis, Jerry G. Class notes. Professor, Occupational and Adult Education, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK. March, 1983.

Edwards, Allan L. Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957.

Good, Carter V., Editor. Dictionary of Education. New York, NY: McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc., 1945.

James, Waynne B. Class notes. Professor, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK. March, 1983.

Johnson, Joyce and June McCabe. Item Analysis. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Data Center, 1975.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Key, James P. AGED 5980 Research Design. Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK. March, 1983.

McCullough, Edith Lenore. "Opinions of Beginning High School Business Teachers Regarding Their College Preparation for Teaching." (Unpub. Ph.D., Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966.)

Meredith, Mary Elizabeth. "An Evaluation Study of Teacher Attitudes Toward Special Education Preparation Programs." (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, The University of Arizona, 1970.)

Nelson, Ed. Personal Correspondence. Washington, DC: United State Office of Education. Director of Marketing and Distributive Occupations. April, 1983.

Organization and Operation of a Local Program of Vocational Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1968.

Popham, James B. and Kenneth A. Sirotvik. Educational Statistics: Use and Interpretation. 2nd Edition. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers, 1973.

Renshaw, Paul Obert. "Basic Marketing and Marketing Related Knowledge Needs of Secondary School Distributive Education Instructional Personnel." (Unpub. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1976.)

Shorr, Eileen. "An Appraisal of the Undergraduate Distributive Education Program at Temple University Based on a Follow-up of the Graduates from 1969 through 1979." (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Temple University, 1981.)

Sipos, Betty Heath. "Attitudes of Distributive Education Teachers Toward Their Undergraduate Preparation to Conduct a Distributive Education Program." (Unpub. Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1979.)

Thompson, Varerie Darlene. "Teachers' Evaluation of Their Preparation to Teacher: A Survey of Selected New York City Public Schools." (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, St. John's University, 1971.)

Tuttle, Frances. Personal Correspondence. Stillwater, OK: State Department of Vocational and Technical Education. August, 1983.

Warner, Gene. Personal Correspondence. State Department of Vocational and Technical Education. Stillwater, OK. August, 1983.

Weatherford, John Wilson. Identification and Analysis of Issue in Distributive Education. Cincinnati, OH: South Western Publishing Co., 1974.

Williams, Terry M. "Identification of Performance Tasks for Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators Who Utilize the IDECC System." (Unpub. Ph.D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1977.)

Willis, Doris Emma. "An Evaluative Study of Teacher Training for Distributive Education Throughout the United States." (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1954.)

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

LETTER OF REQUEST TO CONDUCT SIMILAR STUDY

Morris A. Herron
736 S.W. 101 Street
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73139
April 10, 1983

Dr. Betty Heath
Division of Vocational
and Technical Education
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

Dear Dr. Heath:

This letter is to formally request permission to replicate your doctoral study, "Attitudes of Distributive Education Teachers Toward Their Undergraduate Preparation To Conduct a Distributive Education Program." As was discussed in our telephone conversation of January 10, whereas you conducted the study in the National DECA Central Region, I wish to replicate the study in the Southern Region.

Would you please have your office personnel to copy the entire study and mail it to me? Please enclose with it any ideas or suggestions you may have concerning replicating the study successfully.

Your permission and assistance are most appreciated. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Morris Herron

Morris A. Herron

mdb

APPENDIX B

PERMISSION TO CONDUCT SIMILAR STUDY LETTER

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL & TECHNICAL EDUCATION

April 18, 1983

Mr. Morris A. Herron
11225 South Date Street
Jenks, OK 74037

Dear Mr. Herron:

I am in support of your study to assess the attitudes of southern region MDE teachers in regard to their attitudes toward their undergraduate preparation to conduct an MDE program. I grant you permission to replicate my dissertation to accomplish this goal.

Good luck with this endeavor. Please share your results with me.

Sincerely,

Betty A. Heath
Assistant Professor
Marketing Education

bs

APPENDIX C

VOCATIONAL EDUCATIONAL PANEL OF EXPERTS LIST AND CONTACT LETTER

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PANEL OF EXPERTS LIST

Mr. Norman R. Dillard
Director of Teacher Certification
Teachers' Certification Section
State Department of Education
2500 North Lincoln
Oklahoma City, OK 73105

Dr. Delbert Hamm, Board Member
Vo-Tech District 22
6605 South Barnes
Oklahoma City, OK 73159

Mr. John Hopper, Superintendent
Drumright - Central Oklahoma AVTS
3 Court Circle
Drumright, OK 74030

Governor James Hunt
State Capitol
116 Jones Street West
Raliegh, North Carolina 27611

Mr. Lloyd Leveridge, President
Vo-Tech District 22 Board
2425 N. W. 119
Oklahoma City, OK 73120

General Melvin F. McNickle
1608 Norwood
Oklahoma City, OK 73120

Governor George Nigh
State Capitol
Oklahoma City, OK 73105

Senator Bernice Shedrick
State Capitol Building
Room 426
2300 North Lincoln
Oklahoma City, OK 73105

Dr. Frances Tuttle, Director
State Dept. of Vo-Tech Education
1515 West Sixth Avenue
Stillwater, OK 74074

Dr. Jane Vaughn
7133 N. W. 115
Oklahoma City, OK 73132

Dr. Phineas R. Youngs, IV
5th & Overbrook
Pona City, OK 74601

Morris A. Herron
736 S.W. 101 Street
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73139

August 10, 1983

Mr. Lloyd Leveridge, President
Vo-Tech District 22 Board
2324 N. W. 119
Oklahoma City, OK 73120

Dear Mr. Leveridge:

Your knowledge and expertise is needed. It is respectfully requested that you serve on an eleven-member panel, each chosen for his or her contributions to vocational education, providing input for my doctoral research. The dissertation concerns evaluation of undergraduate preparations to conduct distributive education programs. Please assist by testing the enclosed instrument.

The enclosed questionnaire will be sent to second-year teachers of distributive education in the 14 states of the Southern Region. Given these facts, please offer suggestions for any questions which you feel should be reworded for clarity, given other response choices, deleted, given more response space, and/or "localized" for the Southern Region. Are there additional questions or areas of concern that should be included in the survey?

If you need further information in responding, please call (405) 672-2371 or (405) 691-8141. Thank you for taking time from your busy schedule to provide input concerning this vocational education matter. Your efforts are deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Morris A. Herron

MH/slh

cc: Dr. Jerry Davis, Oklahoma State University
Dr. Wayne James, Oklahoma State University

Enclosures

APPENDIX D

NATIONAL DECA LISTING OF SOUTHERN REGION STATES AND SOUTHERN REGION M/DE STATE SUPERVISORS

DECA

April 6, 1983

Mr. Morris Herron
11225 S. Date St.
Jenks, OK 74037

Dear Mr. Herron:

As you requested over the phone this morning, I am sending you a list of all the states that National DECA places in our Southern Region.

The states are:

Alabama
Arkansas
Florida
Georgia
Louisiana
Mississippi
North Carolina
Oklahoma
Puerto Rico
South Carolina
Tennessee
Texas
Virgin Islands
Virginia

I hope this information will help in your dissertation. If we can be of any more help please do not hesitate to call again.

Sincerely,

M. Stacey Frederick
Publications Assistant

/msf

SOUTHERN REGION M/DE STATE SUPERVISORS

Mrs. Glenna Avriett
State Supervisor of M & DE
University of Central Arkansas
Conway, AR 72032
Mrs. Avriett

Ms. Carol Lynn Borshey
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 44064
Capitol Sttion
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
Ms. Borshey

Mr. James Bowers
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 771
Jackson, MI
Mr. Bowers

Mr. Marvin M. Brown
Secondary and Post Secondary Program
Office of Vocational Education
1752 Twin Towers East
Atlanta, Georgia
Mr. Brown

Ms. Merle Charles
Department of Education
P.O. Box 6630
St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00801
Ms. Charles

Mr. Tim Coffey
State Supervisor of M & DE
State Department of Education
924 Rutledge Office Building
Columbia, SC 29201
Mr. Coffey

Mr. John E. Frazier
Department of Education
Knott Building
Tallahasee, FL 32301
Mr. Frazier

Mr. James Horan
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 60
Richmond, VA 23216

Mr. Don Maloney
213 Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, TN 37219
Mr. Maloney

Mrs. Carmen H. Perez
Division of Vocational
and Technical Education
Department of Education
Box 759
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00919
Mrs. Perez

Mr. Horace C. Robertson
Division of Vocational Education
Department of Public Instruction
Room 566, Education Building
Raliegh, NC 27611
Mr. Robertson

Mrs. Irene Rockhill
State Supervisor of M & DE
Vocational and Adult Education
5032 Haley Center
Auburn University
Auburn University, AL 36489
Mrs. Rockhill

Mr. D. Gene Warner
State Department of Vocational
and Technical Education
1500 West Seventh Avenue
Stillwater, OK 74074
Mr. Warner

Mr. Norris D. Young
Texas Education Agency
201 East 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701
Mr. Young

APPENDIX E

CORRESPONDENCE TO STATE SUPERVISORS

Morris A. Herron
736 S.W. 101 Street
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73139

July 23, 1983

Mr. Horace C. Robertson
Division of Vocational Education
Department of Public Instruction
Room 566, Education Building
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Dear Mr. Robertson:

Your input is needed to facilitate an Oklahoma State University study on Distributive Education teacher preparation. The study will address how well D.E. teachers from the Southern Region feel prepared by their undergraduate studies to teach Marketing/D.E.; the study will provide information which can be used by colleges/universities designing D.E. curricula and by State Departments in determining certification guidelines.

Please use the enclosed form to indicate names, employment addresses and telephone numbers, and home addresses and telephone numbers for DE teachers in North Carolina who:

(1) were graduated from the National DECA Southern Region during 1981-82;

(2) are certified to teach Distributive Education, and

(3) have taught M/DE for at least one year.

(The results of this study will not be reported by institution or state.)

Enclosed is a letter from Mr. Gene Warner, Oklahoma M/DE State Supervisor, explaining and lending support to this research. I would very much appreciate your endorsing the other enclosed letter of support and returning it to me.

Please respond to this request. It is essential, if study deadlines are to be met, that you return this information to me by August 15.

Thank you for your assistance. A copy of the completed study will be provided at your request.

Sincerely,

Morris Herron

Morris A. Herron

slh

Enclosures

Vo-Tech OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION
FRANCIS TUTTLE, DIRECTOR • 1515 WEST SIXTH AVE., • STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74074 • A.C. (405) 377-2000

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 20, 1983

TO: Southern Region Marketing and Distributive Education State Supervisors

FROM: Gene Warner, State Supervisor
Oklahoma Marketing and Distributive Education

SUBJECT: Dissertation study being conducted by Morris Herron

Morris Herron is a Marketing and Distributive Education teacher-coordinator in Oklahoma. Morris will be conducting a study of how well Marketing and Distributive Education teacher-coordinators feel their universities have prepared them for teaching Marketing and Distributive Education. I would appreciate any assistance you could give Morris in obtaining a list of teacher-coordinators in your state that have taught Marketing and Distributive Education for one (1) year.

We believe this information could be helpful to the various supervisors as well as the teacher-educators in the southern region.

We appreciate your cooperation and maybe we can return the favor some time.

GW:ra

1981-82 GRADUATES WITH DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION CERTIFICATION

NAME	HOME ADDRESS	HOME PHONE #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL ADDRESS	SCHOOL PHONE #

STATE

STATE SUPERVISOR

NOTICE: Results will not be broken down by institution or state.

APPENDIX F

STATE SUPERVISOR LETTER OF SUPPORT

Ms. Merle Charles
Department of Education
P.O. Box 6630
St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00801

August 15, 1983

Dear M/DE Teacher:

You have been selected to participate in a Southern Region survey study. The enclosed survey will be used to determine how well teachers of Distributive Education feel prepared by their undergraduate studies to teach M/DE.

Results of the study will be beneficial to colleges and universities in designing D.E. curricula and to the State Departments in determining certification guidelines.

Therefore, with your anonymity assured, I urge you to complete and return the enclosed survey instrument to Mr. Morris Herron, who is conducting the study.

Sincerely,

Ms. Merle Charles

MC:gr

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Wyanne James
Dr. Jerry Davis
Mr. Morris Herron

APPENDIX G

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

BACKGROUND INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. When did you obtain your bachelor degree? (Indicate date)_____

2. When did you obtain your certification to teach distributive education? (Indicate date)_____

3. How long have you taught distributive education? (Give date started)_____

4. Are you teaching distributive education now? _____ Yes _____ No

5. What was your undergraduate major or area?

   _____ Combination business & office and distributive education

   _____ Distributive education

   _____ Business and office education

   _____ Other, please specify _____

6. Do you teach a general distributive education program or specialized distributive education program? (If both, check each one)

   _____ General _____ Specialized

7. Do you supervise a coop program? _____ Yes _____ No

8. Do you conduct a laboratory program? (In school program such as project method or simulated method) _____ Yes _____ No

9. Within what range was your overall undergraduate grade point average?

   _____ Under 2.0 _____ 2.0-2.50 _____ 2.51-3.0

   _____ 3.01-3.50 _____ 3.51-4.0

10. What sex are you? _____ Male _____ Female

11. What is your age? _____

DIRECTIONS

If you have not taught distributive education, please check this box and return the questionnaire and survey in the self-addressed envelop.

I have not taught distributive education.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

If you have taught distributive education please proceed:

Please complete all of the Background Information.

Respond to each item on the attitude scale, but select only one answer.

EXAMPLE:

As a result of the experiences in my undergraduate teacher preparation program, I have the ability to:

Develop a lesson plan. SA A U D SD

PLEASE DO NOT CIRCLE MORE THAN ONE RESPONSE.

EXAMPLE:

Develop a lesson plan. SA A U D SD

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

REMEMBER! When responding to the statements, you are reflecting your opinion in regard to how well your undergraduate program prepared you to perform the tasks. The instrument is not an evaluation of your ability to perform tasks which may have been learned through experiences other than your undergraduate teacher preparation program.

ATTITUDE TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER PREPARATION

As a result of experiences provided by your undergraduate teacher preparation program, to what degree do you think you are prepared to conduct a distributive education program?

Please circle the responses which best reflect your opinion.

SA-Strongly Agree A-Agree U-Undecided D-Disagree SD-Strongly Disagree

PROGRAM PLANNING	Circle one for each item				
As a result of the experiences in my undergraduate teacher preparation program, I have the ability to:					
1. Plan community surveys.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Conduct community surveys.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Use information collected from community surveys.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Report the information collected from community surveys.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Analyze findings from community surveys.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. Organize an advisory committee.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. Develop program goals and objectives.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. Develop a course of study for distributive education.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. Conduct student follow-up.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. Utilize a local advisory committee.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11. Determine local long range plans for distributive education.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. Evaluate local distributive education programs.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. Conduct an occupational analysis.	SA	A	U	D	SD

INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING	Circle one for each item				
As a result of the experiences in my undergraduate teacher preparation program, I have the ability to:					
1. Determine my students' occupational interests.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Develop student performance objectives.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Develop lesson plans.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Develop a unit of instruction.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Select student instructional materials.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. Obtain student instructional materials.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. Prepare teacher made instructional materials.	SA	A	U	D	SD

INSTRUCTIONAL EXECUTION	Circle one for each item				
As a result of the experiences in my undergraduate teacher preparation program, I have the ability to:					
1. Direct field trips.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Lead class discussions.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Direct students in instructing other students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Employ techniques of role playing.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Utilize simulation.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. Direct student study.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. Direct student laboratory experiences (project method, simulation, etc.).	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. Direct students in applying problem solving techniques.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. Use projects as a method of instruction.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. Introduce a lesson.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11. Summarize a lesson.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. Utilize oral questioning techniques in the classroom.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. Employ reinforcement techniques with students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
14. Provide instruction for low ability students.	SA	A	U	D	SD

As a result of experiences provided by your undergraduate teacher preparation program, to what degree do you think you are prepared to conduct a distributive education program?

Please circle the responses which best reflect your opinion.

SA-Strongly Agree A-Agree U-Undecided D-Disagree SD-Strongly Disagree

INSTRUCTIONAL EXECUTION continued	Circle one for each item				
15. Provide instruction for high ability students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
16. Present information through illustrations.	SA	A	U	D	SD
17. Demonstrate a skill.	SA	A	U	D	SD
18. Explain a concept or principle.	SA	A	U	D	SD
19. Direct individualized instruction.	SA	A	U	D	SD
20. Team teach.	SA	A	U	D	SD
21. Utilize guest speakers.	SA	A	U	D	SD
22. Illustrate with bulletin boards.	SA	A	U	D	SD
23. Utilize exhibits for illustrative purposes.	SA	A	U	D	SD
24. Operate the overhead projector.	SA	A	U	D	SD
25. Utilize the opaque projector.	SA	A	U	D	SD
26. Utilize audio visual aids such as films, slide tape presentations, etc., to present information.	SA	A	U	D	SD
27. Present information with a video tape machine.	SA	A	U	D	SD
28. Direct programmed instruction.	SA	A	U	D	SD
29. Utilize a chalkboard.	SA	A	U	D	SD
30. Use a flip chart.	SA	A	U	D	SD

INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT	Circle one for each item				
As a result of the experiences in my undergraduate teacher preparation program, I have the ability to:					
1. Determine needed instructional materials.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Prepare a distributive educational program budget.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Plan for yearly distributive education program supplies.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Maintain a filing system.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Provide safety instruction in a distributive education facility.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. Provide safety instruction for on-the-job training.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. Assist students in developing self discipline.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. Organize a distributive education laboratory.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. Manage a distributive education laboratory.	SA	A	U	D	SD

INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION	Circle one for each item				
As a result of the experiences in my undergraduate teacher preparation program, I have the ability to:					
1. Establish criteria for student performance.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Evaluate student attitudes.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Evaluate student knowledge.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Evaluate student skills.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Determine student grades in distributive education.	SA	A	U	D	SD

GUIDANCE	Circle one for each item				
As a result of the experiences in my undergraduate teacher preparation program, I have the ability to:					
1. Select appropriate student data-collecting instruments.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Gather student data through personal contacts.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Use student-teacher conferences as learning experiences for the students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Provide career information.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Assist students in applying for employment.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. Assist students in pursuing further education.	SA	A	U	D	SD

As a result of experiences provided by your undergraduate teacher preparation program, to what degree do you think you are prepared to conduct a distributive education program?

Please circle the responses which best reflect your opinion.

SA-Strongly Agree A-Agree U-Undecided D-Disagree SD-Strongly Disagree

SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONS	Circle one for each item				
As a result of the experiences in my undergraduate teacher preparation program, I have the ability to:					
1. Develop a public relations plan for distributive education.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Give presentations to school and community groups to promote the distributive education program.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Develop a brochure to inform the school and community about distributive education.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Provide displays in the school and community on distributive education.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Prepare news releases to promote distributive education.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. Develop television programs to promote distributive education.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. Develop radio programs to promote distributive education.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. Conduct an open house.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. Provide service projects to the community.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. Maintain a cooperative relationship with other educators (other teachers, teacher educators, etc.).	SA	A	U	D	SD
11. Obtain feedback from the school and community concerning the distributive education program.	SA	A	U	D	SD

STUDENT VOCATIONAL ORGANIZATION (DECA)	Circle one for each item				
As a result of the experiences in my undergraduate teacher preparation program, I have the ability to:					
1. Develop a philosophy in regard to DECA.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Organize a DECA chapter.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Prepare students for leadership roles in DECA.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Assist students in developing a program of work (activities) for DECA.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Assist students in developing a budget for the DECA program of work.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. Advise a DECA chapter.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. Provide learning experiences for students through competition.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. Implement competency based events.	SA	A	U	D	SD

COORDINATION	Circle one for each item				
As a result of the experiences in my undergraduate teacher preparation program, I have the ability to:					
1. Establish guidelines for operating a cooperative distributive education program.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Identify prospective distributive education students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Maintain students attendance records.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Obtain training stations.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Place students in training stations.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. Develop the training ability of training stations supervisors.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. Supervise on-the-job instruction.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. Evaluate students in training stations.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. Provide coop related instruction.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. Conduct an employer and employee appreciation event.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11. Display a knowledge of federal and state employment regulations.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. Develop training plans.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. Display a knowledge of unions.	SA	A	U	D	SD

As a result of experiences provided by your undergraduate teacher preparation program, to what degree do you think you are prepared to conduct a distributive education program?

Please circle the responses which best reflect your opinion.

SA-Strongly Agree A-Agree U-Undecided D-Disagree SD-Strongly Disagree

PROFESSIONAL ROLE AND DEVELOPMENT	Circle one for each item				
As a result of the experiences in my undergraduate teacher preparation program, I have the ability to:					
1. Establish a professional philosophy of education.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Select a suitable teaching position.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Keep up-to-date professionally (attend conferences, read professional journals, etc.).	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Contribute professionally to the field of distributive education (serve on committees, hold offices in professional organizations, etc.)	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Plan student teaching experiences.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. Supervise student teachers.	SA	A	U	D	SD

TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE	Circle one for each item				
As a part of my experiences in my undergraduate program, in my opinion, I have adequate knowledge for teaching the following areas:					
1. Advertising.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Human Relations.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Operations.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Marketing.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Communications.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. Display.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. Product/Service Technology.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. Economics.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. Sales.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. Management.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11. Merchandising.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. Business Mathematics.	SA	A	U	D	SD

ATTITUDE TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR ADVISER

As a result of the experiences provided by your undergraduate teacher preparation program, to what degree do you think you would rate your major adviser on the following characteristics?

Please circle the responses which best reflect your opinion.

SA-Strongly Agree A-Agree U-Undecided D-Disagree SD-Strongly Disagree

MAJOR ADVISER EVALUATION	Circle one for each item				
In my opinion, my major adviser in my undergraduate program was:					
1. Cooperative	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Interested in my needs.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Willing to meet with me when needed.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Well informed on the college or university policies.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Knowledgeable of his or her subject matter.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. Respected by the students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. Respected by other instructors.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. Willing to maintain open communications.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. Receptive to my interests.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. In his or her office enough hours for consultation and assistance.	SA	A	U	D	SD

Please place the background questionnaire and attitude survey in the self-addressed envelop and mail.

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX H

INITIAL CONTACT LETTER TO TEACHER COORDINATORS

September 6, 1983

Morris A. Herron, Administrator
Foster Estes Vo-Tech Center
9916 South Winston Way
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73139

Ms. Cathy Martin
M/DE Coordinator
Holt High School
3801 Alabama Ave.
Holt, AL 35404

Dear Ms. Martin:

You have been recommended by Mrs. Irene Rockhill, Alabama State M/DE Supervisor, to serve on a curriculum panel, which will provide information on teacher undergraduate preparation. The panel is composed of selected secondary M/DE instructors from the 14 states of the National DECA Southern Region.

As a member of the panel, you will participate in a study designed to evaluate the effectiveness of teacher undergraduate preparation. The results of the study are to be used as guidelines for curriculum choices, affecting future M/DE instructors.

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire, which should take only 20 minutes. This will be the only request of your time. Should anonymity allow you to be more frank in answering the questionnaire, please feel free to leave it unsigned. Curriculum panel member's or institution's names will not be identified in the study.

Since you have been recommended as a valuable research contributor, please complete and return the enclosed survey form promptly, avoiding the necessity of further letters and telephone calls to you in order to assure your input into the study. Thank you for contributing your expertise to this study.

Sincerely,

Morris A. Herron, Administrator
Foster Estes Vo-Tech Center

MH/pp

APPENDIX I

TEACHER COORDINATOR FOLLOW-UP LETTER

AND CORRESPONDENCE TO TEACHER COORDINATORS

Morris A. Herron, Administrator
Foster Estes Vo-Tech Center
736 S.W. 101 Street
Oklahoma City, OK 73139

October 1, 1983

Ms. Cathy Martin
M/DE Coordinator
Holt High School
3801 Alabama Ave.
Holt, AL 35404

Dear Ms. Martin:

On September 8, 1983 you received correspondence indicating you had been recommended by your state supervisor to serve on a panel of Distributive Education teachers. The only requirement for serving on this panel is to fill out a 20-minute questionnaire.

With more than two-thirds of the questionnaires returned, your response is needed. A second questionnaire and self-addressed, stamped envelope are enclosed for your convenience.

Input which only you can provide is needed to complete this study. The enclosed letter of support from Dr. Jerry G. Davis, Professor of Marketing and Distributive Education at Oklahoma State University, will hopefully convince you of the importance of this study.

Please complete and return the enclosed questionnaire today. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Morris A. Herron

MAH:slh

Enclosures

Oklahoma State University

SCHOOL OF OCCUPATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
CLASSROOM BUILDING 406
(405) 624-6275

September 28, 1983

Marketing and Distributive Education

Dear M/DE Educator,

You are urged to participate as a panel member in this Oklahoma State University study. The results of this study will be highly beneficial to university curricula designers and will facilitate the uniformity of Southern Region State Departments' of Public Instruction certification requirements.

Your professional participation is vital to the completion of this study, which should be beneficial to our profession. Again, may I encourage you to contribute to this Oklahoma State University M/DE endeavor.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jerry G. Davis
Teacher Educator
Marketing/DE

JGD/wr

APPENDIX J

OTHER COMBINATIONS OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Other combinations of distributive education programs:

General with no related experience (n = 2)

General laboratory (n = 2)

General cooperative and laboratory (n = 3)

Specialized with no related experience (n = 1)

Specialized cooperative (n = 2)

Specialized laboratory (n = 2)

Specialized cooperative and laboratory (n = 1)

Specialized and general cooperative (n = 2)

Specialized and general laboratory (n = 1)

Specialized and general cooperative and laboratory (n = 2)

VITA

Morris Austin Herron

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: ATTITUDES OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION TEACHERS TOWARD THEIR UNDERGRADUATE PREPARATIONS TO CONDUCT DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Bryson City, North Carolina, September 25, 1942, the son of W. P. and Edna Herron. Married to Elaine Whitworth Herron.

Education: Graduated from Swain County High School, Bryson City, North Carolina in 1960; received Bachelor of Science degree in Education from Western Carolina University in 1964; received Master of Arts degree in Eduation from Western Carolina University in 1968; received Certificate of Advanced Study degree from Applachian State University in 1973; received Education Specialist degree from Applachian State University in 1974; and completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1984.

Professional Educational Experience: Business Education teacher, Barnwell High School, Barnwell, South Carolina, 1965 to 1966; Distributive Education coordinator, East Montgomery High School, Troy, South Carolina, 1968 to 1969; Principal, Star Elementary School, Star, North Carolina, 1969 to 1972; Principal, Star Middle School, Star, North Carolina, 1972 to 1978; Distributive Education coordinator, Sapulpa High School, Sapulpa, Oklahoma, 1981 to 1983; Assistant Director, Foster Estes Vo-Tech Center, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1983 to present.