

MARKETING EDUCATION TEACHER PERCEPTIONS
REGARDING PROGRAM NAME CHANGE
IN OKLAHOMA

By

TRELLYS ANN ARNOLD

Bachelor of Science in Secondary Education
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1983

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1987

Thesis
1987
A759m
cop. 2



MARKETING EDUCATION TEACHER PERCEPTIONS
REGARDING PROGRAM NAME CHANGE
IN OKLAHOMA

Thesis Approved:

Clyde B. Knight

Thesis Adviser

Ernie W. Duque

Thelma D. Washington

Norman N. Dunham

Dean of Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Appreciation is expressed to all the Marketing Education Teacher-Coordinators in Oklahoma who completed the questionnaire. Special thanks is extended to Mr. Gene Warner, State Supervisor for Marketing Education and Dr. Clyde Knight, thesis adviser.

Acknowledgment is also due Ms. Thelma Washington and Dr. Cecil Dugger for their guidance and assistance while serving on the study committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	2
Research Questions	2
Need for the Study	2
Limitations.	3
Assumption	3
Definition of Terms.	3
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	5
Recognition and History of Program Name Change . .	5
Identifiable Problems.	8
Potential Growth and Expansion	9
Promotion and Marketing of Marketing Education . .	10
Summary.	11
III. METHODOLOGY	12
Selection of the Subjects.	12
Development of the Instrument.	12
Collection of Data	13
Analysis of Data	14
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA.	15
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	22
Summary.	22
Conclusions.	23
Recommendations.	23
Suggestions for Further Research	24
BIBLIOGRAPHY	25
APPENDIXES	27
APPENDIX A - DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT	28
APPENDIX B - LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.	31

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Program Name for 1985-1986 School Year.	16
II. Program Name for 1986-1987 School Year.	16
III. Change in Enrollment from the 1985-1986 School Year to the 1986-1987 School Year.	18
IV. Marketing Education Teacher-Coordiators Responses. . .	20

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Distributive Education/Marketing is a program designed to expose students to the marketing, merchandising, and management aspects of business. As in the name Distributive Education, one would think that the program was designed to teach students the aspects of distribution, whereas in reality the program only deals with the one unit of distribution in its curriculum.

A conference was held in Vail, Colorado which was attended by over 200 persons from teacher education, secondary vocational programs, state supervisors, and business, May 19-22, 1980. At this conference marketing professionals took an in-depth look and made recommendations regarding the future goal of Distributive Education/Marketing. After the Vail Conference, Distributive Education/Marketing personnel agreed that something needed to be done in the areas of development, image, promotion, growth, and leadership.

Statement of the Problem

The specific problem of this study was the lack of data concerning Marketing Education teacher-coordinators' perceptions regarding the program name change in Oklahoma. More specifically, it was the interest to investigate the perceived problems with the identity of Marketing Education.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine the perceived problems with the name of Marketing Education. Information from the study could give an indication as to whether a name change alone will alter the perception and identity of Distributive Education/Marketing.

Research Questions

1. Has a name change from Distributive Education/Marketing to Marketing Education caused students and the community to perceive the program in a more positive manner?
2. Has a name change caused increased enrollment and a more positive reception of the program?
3. Do Marketing Education teachers feel a name change has caused significant impact in their programs?

Need for the Study

Research has been conducted examining state supervisors' and teacher educators' attitudes toward a program name change, but there has been no research conducted investigating teacher-coordinators' attitudes or perceptions. Based on the fact that Oklahoma just recently, for the school year 1986-1987, has changed the name of the program from Distributive Education/Marketing to Marketing Education, a need for this study does exist. The name Marketing Education has been utilized by marketing teacher-coordinators across Oklahoma for recruitment and other purposes in the Spring of 1986. Based upon this use of the name, Marketing Education, the research questions will be investigated.

Limitations

A limitation of this study was the degree to which the respondents answered the questions in an honest and unbiased manner. Another limitation was not all Distributive Education/Marketing programs used the name Marketing Education for 1986-1987 enrollment purposes.

Assumption

The following assumption underlies this study:

It was assumed that the Marketing Education teacher-coordinators across Oklahoma expressed their true opinions.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions will be used.

Distributive Education/Marketing - A program which exposes students to the marketing, merchandising, and management aspects of business.

Marketing Education - The new name for the program previously called Distributive Education/Marketing, which exposes students to the marketing, merchandising, and management aspects of business.

State Supervisor - The chief supervisor of Marketing Education programs in the state.

Teacher-Educator - Professor and/or supervisor of Marketing Education in a teacher preparation program in an institution of higher learning.

Teacher-Coordinator - Marketing Education teacher-instructor in a secondary or area vocational-technical school.

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

Specialized Program - Marketing education program in one specific occupational area such as food service, hotel/motel, and fashion merchandising.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature in the following areas:

(1) Recognition and History of Program Name Change, (2) Identifiable Problems, (3) Potential Growth and Expansion, (4) Promotion and Marketing of Marketing Education, and (5) Summary.

Recognition and History of Program Name Change

Formal instruction in business and marketing is largely a twentieth century phenomena. Historically, according to Samson (1980, p. 14) "Training in business practices was largely done on the job and often as a paternal responsibility to prepare a son for success in a family business." Formal instruction in Marketing Education at pre-baccalaureate levels appears to have been shaped by three major influences: early retail and sales training, federal vocational education legislation, and U.S. Department of Education.

The first documented evidence of formalized education for marketing at pre-baccalaureate levels in this country appears in 1905. During that year, Mrs. Lucinda Wyman Prince, a certified high school teacher, expressed concern about the lowly condition of sales girls in retail organizations to the Women's Education and Industrial Union (WEIU) of Boston, an organization founded in 1880 to increase the efficiency of women workers. In cooperation with the WEIU, she initiated sales

training for girls who worked in Boston stores. She included units of psychology, principles of learning, good sales principles, and other aspects of the social sciences that she felt would be instrumental in facilitating the success of sales girls. She was able to convince Boston merchants that her trained sales girls could out-perform those who had not received such training, thus increasing store profits and employee and customer satisfaction. In 1907, Mrs. Prince convinced Filen's, a department store in Boston, to take her trained girls into their firm on a part-time basis. In 1908, she formally established the Union School of Salesmanship. As part of the educational methodology implemented by Mrs. Prince, students attended her school for five mornings a week and then worked in stores for wages during the remainder of the day. According to Hause (1969-1970), this was the origin of the cooperative, part-time vocational education program in the United States.

In 1921, the Boston Board of Education included "salesmanship" as a subject in one of its larger high schools and thus became the first public institution in this country to offer a course in marketing at the secondary level. Within ten years, seven of the nation's largest schools included courses similar to those designed by Mrs. Prince (Brown and Logan, 1956). All of these early offerings included, as part of their design, part-time employment in department stores.

Increased impetus for developing programs and courses similar to those of Mrs. Prince was provided through federal funds. Although the 1917 Smith-Hughes Act - the single legislation appropriating federal funds for vocational education - did not earmark funds for distributive education (the program name was not even in use then), the Act did

provide financial support for "increasing the civic consciousness and vocational intelligence of employed workers, including cooperative retail selling classes (Emick, 1936, p. 16). By 1933, there were 44 cities offering such classes.

Around 1935, the term Distributive Education (DE) was coined by Paul Systorm, Professor of Marketing at Columbia University, to describe courses in retailing, principles of selling, or advertising. Systorm (cited in Haas, 1941) defined DE as follows:

A type of training in education - occupational in nature, revolving around a group of skills, abilities, understandings, appreciations, judgments, and knowledges, integrated with such subjects as retail selling, principles of retailing, store operations and management, advertising, merchandising facts, and related subjects (p. 61).

In 1936, the U.S. Congress passed the George Dean Act, which appropriated funds specifically earmarked for Distributive Education. By specifically requiring individuals to be employed part-time as a condition for use of federal funds, the Act helped shape the image of DE as the program that places youngsters in local businesses. Subsequent legislation dropped this provision as a condition for accepting federal funds. However, the inclusion of earmarked funds for cooperative education in 1968 and, at the same time, removal of the specific program identity of Distributive Education as a vocational instructional program and cooperative education as an instructional plan or method.

Marketing Education should be used as the term to describe those programs now known as Distributive Education, Marketing and Distributive Education, Marketing and Distribution, and so forth. The term "marketing" accurately describes the content base for the programs (it is marketing that is taught not just distribution). The term is congruent with current business and economic literature, and it is the

term that is currently in use in most community colleges and universities to identify the department where marketing is taught. It is only those programs - primarily in high schools - receiving federal vocational education funds that are identified as distributive education. Unfortunately, the image of many of those programs is such that few businesses or colleges and universities consider them as part of the overall instructional framework for marketing education (Lynch, 1983).

Identifiable Problems

Nelson (1977) in a paper presented at the American Vocational Association Convention in Atlantic City discussed the name change to exude a more positive external image of Marketing Education, a nationally accepted restructuring and direction with uniform objectives and goals. However, according to Fitzhugh (1981) the identity and image of Marketing Education will be established through its actions, services and activities, and not through its name. He also stated that any effort to establish Marketing Education as a branch of marketing and strengthening its image would have to be national in its thrust.

Warner (1986) felt that the Marketing Education programs in Oklahoma will experience problems with the identity of the programs if teacher-coordinators do not promote and help develop an understanding of the new program name. He also expressed concern that teacher-coordinators may be lax in promoting the name Marketing Education, and instead just explain to businesses and the community that it is DE (Distributive Education). Warner (1986) did state that Marketing Education and Distributive Education are the same, but the teacher-coordinators need to develop a habit of using the term Marketing

Education. Marketing Education is a term more universal in its understanding, therefore, business and the community would accept and understand the purpose of the program better.

Potential Growth and Expansion

A publication of the U.S. Department of Education (1978) providing information on distributive education has set forth statements describing the program. In this publication, the mission statement reads as follows:

The mission of distributive education is to prepare competent workers for the major occupational area of marketing and distribution. Distributive Education provides sequenced instructional programs to help high school, post-secondary, and adult students learn to perform the various marketing functions in production, marketing, and service industries (p. 38).

More recently, in a publication from the National Center for Education Statistics (1981) entitled, "A Classification of Instructional Programs," marketing and distribution is described as follows:

A summary of groups of instructional programs that prepare individuals for occupations directed toward and incident to the flow of industrial and consumer goods in channels of trade, or the provision of services to consumers or uses. These programs are concerned with marketing, sales, distribution, merchandising, and management including ownership and management of enterprises engaged in marketing. Instructional programs prepare individuals to perform one more of the marketing functions, such as selling, buying, pricing, promoting, financing, transportation, storing, market research, and marketing management. In addition, instructional programs or services marketed, related communication skills and abilities and attitudes associated with human relations and private enterprise (p. 23).

It is important to note that in recent statements describing distributive education, the word "marketing" is infiltrating the descriptions. The term is gradually replacing the word "distribution" in program descriptions and definitions. According to Warner (1986) the

programs in Oklahoma will not experience significant growth from the name change alone, but will engender a better understanding of the purposes of the program from the name change. If a better understanding of the purposes of Marketing Education results from the name change then the growth and expansion of the program is a success.

Promotion and Marketing of Marketing Education

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

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

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

1. Identify the activities to be promoted.
2. Select the audience to be reached.
3. Identify methods of promotion.
4. Identify cost for implementing the plan.
5. Assign personnel responsible for promotion activities (either teacher, student, or advisory committee person) (p. 11).

Summary

Indeed, the perceptions that educators and business persons hold of Marketing Education vary widely. If Marketing Education is to become a truly viable delivery system of educated workers for and about marketing occupations, it is necessary that an appropriate mission statement is developed to which professional educators may adhere and that they may implement in local and state education agencies (Lynch, 1983).

The seminal work of Prince formed the basis, of two features of the program that continue to contribute to the present (confused) image of these programs: cooperative education and retail occupations. Federal legislation, such as the George Dean Act helped shape the philosophy and image of DE.

Finally, the U.S. Office of Education, through leadership provided by regional agents and subsequent efforts by DE program officers, has been most instrumental in the philosophical development of marketing education at pre-baccalaureate levels in this country. Working cooperatively with other federal and state agencies, business and industry, educational institutions, and supervisory personnel and through sponsored research and publications, the USOE "molded, directed, and guided distributive education to what it is today," (Meyer and Furtado, 1976, p. 15).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

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

Selection of the Subjects

A list of all 57 Marketing Education teacher-coordinators in Oklahoma was secured from the Marketing Education division of the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education. The 57 teacher-coordinators being used for this survey are instructors of Marketing Education. Those instructors in specialized areas will not be surveyed because the name change will not affect these programs. Since this is a relatively small number of teachers, the total population was used for this study, 91 percent returned useable questionnaires.

Development of the Instrument

The questionnaire used for this study was developed by the researcher. The first step was to identify a panel of experts consisting of research and design students. A questionnaire was then administered to this panel of experts who evaluated the questionnaire and made suggestions and/or corrections to be used in the final questionnaire which was administered to Marketing Education teacher-coordinators at the Vocational Conference at Oklahoma State University

in August of 1986.

The instrument was designed to collect information concerning Marketing Education teacher perceptions regarding the program name change. The respondents were asked to check on a Likert Scale their attitude toward 11 questions concerning their feelings toward Marketing Education and their program name.

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

1. Has a name change from Distributive Education/Marketing to Marketing Education caused students and the community to perceive the program in a more positive manner, according to teacher perceptions?

2. Has the name change caused increased enrollment and a more positive reception of the program?

3. Do Marketing Education teachers feel a name change has caused significant impact in their programs?

Collection of Data

The questionnaire was presented to all Marketing Education teacher-coordinators (57) across Oklahoma. In institutions with a specialized program such as fashion merchandising, food service, etc. a questionnaire was not administered. The name change will not affect the specialized programs, because they will retain their original program name.

The survey/questionnaire was administered at the summer conference for vocational educators in August, 1986. A total of 52 questionnaires were received by the researcher, representing a 91 percent return.

Analysis of Data

The data gathered for the study were analyzed by use of descriptive statistics. A numerical identification for each of the responses was determined as follows: strongly agree - 5.0; agree - 4.0; undecided - 3.0; disagree - 2.0; and strongly disagree - 1.0. These values were determined before the questionnaire was disseminated and the data collected and analyzed. Absolute values determined were as follows: strongly agree, 5.0 - 4.5; agree, 4.49 - 3.5; undecided, 3.49 - 2.5; disagree - 2.49 - 1.5; strongly disagree, 1.49-1.0.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceived problems with the name of Marketing Education in Oklahoma according to teacher-coordinators' attitudes. Respondents were asked to indicate their perceptions toward certain statements concerning Marketing Education. The respondents were asked a general information question concerning the official name of their program for the 1985-1986 school year. Table I contains the results of this question. That is, not all programs were using the new name.

The basis for the study is that in Oklahoma the program name for the 1986-1987 school year will be Marketing Education. Therefore, respondents were asked what their program name will be for the 1986-1987 school year. Table II indicated that program coordinators were not using the new name.

There were 43 respondents that answered the question concerning their program enrollment and how it has changed from the 1985-1986 school year to the 1986-1987 school year. The respondents were instructed to answer in numbers, those responding to this item did respond in numbers with the exception of one who responded that their enrollment for the 1985-1986 school year was (lower) for 1986-1987 (higher). Three of the respondents only indicated their enrollment for the 1986-1987 school year, while six respondents indicated their enrollment for the 1985-1986 school year. Thirty-three respondents

TABLE I
PROGRAM NAME FOR 1985-1986
SCHOOL YEAR

Program	Number
Distributive Education/Marketing	39
Distributive Education	4
Marketing Education	6
Others: Sales and Marketing	1
Cooperative Vocational Education	1

TABLE II
PROGRAM NAME CHANGE FOR 1986-1987
SCHOOL YEAR

Program	Number
Distributive Education/Marketing	4
Distributive Education	1
Marketing Education	45
Others: Marketing	1
Business Management	1

returned useable questionnaires. The data shows an overall increase in enrollment for the majority of the programs (see Table III).

The teacher-coordinators were asked how many years they had taught Marketing Education to gain some background information on this group. The average number of years taught according to the respondents was eight years.

To promote the new name of Marketing Education the respondents were asked what innovative techniques they would be using. The interesting answers to this question are as follows:

Display Window	3
Bulletin Boards	3
Brochures	1
News Articles	1
Pens with the New Name	1
Educate the Community	1
Letters to Employers	1
Promoting with Administration	1
Using the Name	1
Public Awareness	1
Posters	2
Student Career Day	1
Project with Chamber	1
Ads	1
Signs	1
DECA Week	1
Extensive Public Relations	1

TABLE III
CHANGES IN ENROLLMENT FROM THE 1985-1986
SCHOOL YEAR TO THE 1986-1987
SCHOOL YEAR

Enrollment	Programs	Average
Decrease of Enrollment	4	4 students per program
Increase of Enrollment	19	9 students per program
Same Enrollment	10	

Word of Mouth	1
Business Cards	1
Handouts	1
New Brochures	1
Marketing Education Approach	1
Memo to Faculty	1
Counselors	1
T-Shirts	1

Table IV gives the responses by these 52 Marketing Education teacher-coordinators to these 11 statements dealing with Marketing Education in Oklahoma. In all cases, the teacher-coordinators indicated their responses to statements involving the program name change to Marketing Education for the 1986-1987 school year. The respondents were instructed to answer by circling: SA-Strongly Agree; A-Agree; U-Undecided; D-Disagree; SD-Strongly Disagree.

An open-ended question was used at the close of the questionnaire to solicit teacher-coordinators additional comments concerning the image of Marketing Education. The answers to this question were:

Will improve program image and business community, students will better understand what the program is.

Administrators will be the main ones to be affected by the change. Marketing is a little more prestigious and administrators can identify better with that which will result in more credibility.

Did not teach DE last year. It will be 87-88 school year before the name change can be officially implemented at my school, because title changes, etc. must be submitted approximately one year in advance.

Since name change just went into effect--there isn't any way to answer a lot of these questions.

Could not answer 9, 10, and 11 due to the fact that I have

TABLE IV
MARKETING EDUCATION TEACHER-COORDINATORS RESPONSES

Item	SA	A	U	D	SD
1. Do you perceive the name change to Marketing Education from DE/Marketing favorably?	40	10	2	0	0
2. The name of the program makes no difference in enrollment.	6	3	12	18	13
3. The name change to Marketing Education will increase enrollment	11	22	14	3	2
4. The name change to Marketing Education will affect my program positively	14	26	8	24	4
5. The name of the program has a significant impact on the image it has in the community	17	27	6	1	1
6. Students easily understood the purposes of DE/Marketing	1	15	8	24	4
7. Do you feel that the students will better understand the purposes of <u>Marketing Education</u> ?	14	26	10	1	1
8. Do you feel that the community will better understand the purposes of the program with the name of Marketing Education?	24	19	7	1	1
9. Do you feel that the name change to Marketing Education will affect placements of students on-the-job training?	11	22	15	3	1
10. Has changing the name of the program increased receptiveness of students?	7	15	28	1	1
11. Has changing the name of the program increased receptiveness by the community?	7	17	26	1	1

not had time to research that area since the name change has just gone into effect at my school.

It will probably take a few years before we will notice the effect the name change has had on students and the community.

Should have done it yeas ago! I have always hated to call the program Distributive Education because it sounds so vo-techish which runs off kids in the comprehensive high schools. Marketing sounds professional. Kids do not know what Distributive means. I am so glad the name has changed and it definitely has affected my enrollment and understanding of my program.

DE/Marketing has been known and recognized and accepted that changing the name - even though positive, will not cause a major impact of change from business and students that are already familiar with the program.

It is hard to know what effect the name change will have until after this year. I have very high hopes about the positive affects of this change.

It has helped greatly in explaining what the program is all about.

A major difference will occur because of the name change.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The specific problem of this study was the lack of data concerning Marketing Education teacher-coordinators' perceptions regarding the program name change in Oklahoma. More specifically, it was the intent to investigate the perceived problems with the identity of Marketing Education.

The population for this study was 57 Marketing Education Teacher-Coordinators in Oklahoma. Of the 57 teacher-coordinators surveyed, 52 responded to the questionnaire.

The data gathering instrument was designed by the researcher and validated by a panel of experts. The data for the instrument was gathered through distributing the questionnaire at the Vocational Education Conference (Summer Conference) in Stillwater, August, 1986.

An analysis of responses revealed that teacher-coordinators perceived the name change to Marketing Education from Distributive Education/Marketing favorably. Teachers felt that the name change to Marketing Education will increase their enrollment and have a significant impact on the image it has in the community.

Due to the name change it is felt that the students and community will better understand the purposes of Marketing Education. Teachers were undecided about how the name change will affect student placement

on-the-job training, and if the name change will affect the receptiveness of the students and the community.

Conclusions

The following conclusions, based on the findings of this study, are accepted as valid for the population of this study at the time the investigation was conducted:

1. The name change from Distributive Education/Marketing to Marketing Education was favorable.
2. The name change to Marketing Education will increase enrollment.
3. The name of the program will have a significant impact on the image the program has in the community.
4. Students will better understand the purposes of Marketing Education.
5. The community will better understand the purposes of Marketing Education.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations are made.

1. The new name of Marketing Education should be promoted, it will have a positive affect on the program.
2. Promotional items, including pens with the new name, brochures, posters, and business cards, should be used to promote the name Marketing Education.
3. Through the use of the students organization, DECA, a marketing

campaign should be organized to promote the name Marketing Education.

Suggestions for Further Research

1. Further research should be conducted after the 1986-1987 school year regarding what effect the program name change had on on-the-job training placement.

2. Further research should be conducted after the 1986-1987 school year regarding how the name of the program affected receptiveness by students.

3. Further research should be conducted after the 1986-1987 school year regarding how the name of the program affected receptiveness by the community.

4. Further research should be conducted to determine if program enrollment was increased after the name change was implemented.

5. Further research should be conducted using students of the Marketing Education program as the population, to determine if they better understood the purposes of Marketing Education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, T. C. and Logan, W. B. "50 Years of Progress in Distributive Education." American Vocational Journal (December, 1956), pp. 56-57.
- Emick, G. O. Cooperative Training in Retail Selling to the Public Secondary Schools. Vocational Education Bulletin, No. 186. Washington, DC: U. S. Office of Education, 1936.
- Fitzhugh, H. Naylor. "Some Implications of the Name Change." Marketing and Distributive Educators' Digest, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Fall, 1981), pp. 5-7.
- Haas, K. B. Distributive Education. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1941.
- Haas, K. B. "The Origin and Early Development of Distributive Education, Parts I - III. DE Today (1969-1970), pp. 10-12.
- Heath, Betty. "Developing a Public Relations Plan for Your MDE Program." Marketing Educators News, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Spring, 1982), p. 11.
- Hutt, Roger W. and Paula Hocken. "Let's Market Our Marketing and DE Programs." Business Education Forum, Vol. 35, No. 5 (February, 1981), pp. 27-28.
- Lynch, R. L. "The Name Revisited: Marketing Education." Marketing Educator's News (Fall, 1983), pp. 19-21.
- Meyer, W. G. and Furtado, L. T. "A Historical Development of Distributive Education." in National Business Education Yearbook, No. 14. Reston, VA: National Business Education Association, 1976.
- National Center for Education Statistics. A Classification of Instructional Programs. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1981.
- Nelson, Edwin L. The Identity Crisis. (Paper presented at the American Vocational Association Convention, Atlantic City, New Jersey, December, 1977). Arlington, VA: American Vocational Association, 1977.

Samson, H. E. "Distributive Education--A Review." (Paper presented for a national conference on Directions in Marketing and Distributive Education, Vail, Colorado, 1980).

U. S. Department of Education. Distributive Education Programs. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

Warner, Gene. Personal Interview, Stillwater, Oklahoma, July, 1986.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

Marketing Education Program Image Survey

This survey deals with programs in Marketing Education across Oklahoma. For the school year 1986-1987 the official program name will be Marketing Education and this questionnaire is concerned with teacher perceptions of the program name change.

1. Name _____
2. Position or Title _____
3. What was the official name of your program for the 1985-1986 school year? (Please indicate by checking the correct blank)
 - Distributive Education/Marketing _____
 - Distributive Education _____
 - Marketing Education _____
 - Other (please indicate) _____
4. What will your program name be for the 1986-1987 school year? (Please indicate by checking the correct blank)
 - Distributive Education/Marketing _____
 - Distributive Education _____
 - Marketing Education _____
 - Other (please indicate) _____
5. To what extent has your program enrollment changed from the 1985-1986 to the 1986-1987 school year? (Please indicate in numbers)
 - 1985-1986 Enrollment _____ 1986-1987 Enrollment _____
6. Total number of years you have taught Marketing Education _____
7. What innovative techniques do you plan to use in promoting the new program name of Marketing Education? _____

Please respond to each of the following statements by circling the responses that most nearly express your feelings on each individual statement.

SA - Strongly Agree

A - Agree

U - Undecided

D - Disagree

SD - Strongly Disagree

1. Do you perceive the name change to Marketing Education from DE/Marketing favorably?..... SA A U D SD
2. The name of the program makes no difference in enrollment..... SA A U D SD
3. The name change to Marketing Education will increase enrollment..... SA A U D SD
4. The name change to Marketing Education will affect my program positively..... SA A U D SD
5. The name of the program has a significant impact on the image it has in the community..... SA A U D SD
6. Students easily understood the purposes of DE/Marketing..... SA A U D SD
7. Do you feel that the students will better understand the purposes of Marketing Education..... SA A U D SD
8. Do you feel that the community will better understand the purposes of the program with the name of Marketing Education..... SA A U D SD
9. Do you feel that the name change to Marketing Education will affect placements of students on-the-job training..... SA A U D SD
10. Has changing the name of the program increased receptiveness by students..... SA A U D SD
11. Has changing the name of the program increased receptiveness by the community..... SA A U D SD
12. Additional comments:

APPENDIX B
LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL

1602 Monticello, Apartment A
Woodward, OK 74501
June 20, 1986

Dear Colleague:

I am presently working on my Masters thesis concerning the image of Marketing Education and I need your help in answering the attached questionnaire.

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

Thank you so very much for your help.

Sincerely,

Trellys Arnold

TR/kp

VITA

Trellys Ann Arnold

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: MARKETING EDUCATION TEACHER PERCEPTIONS REGARDING PROGRAM
NAME CHANGE IN OKLAHOMA

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Lawton, Oklahoma, September 9, 1961,
the daughter of Rex and Sue Arnold.

Education: Graduated from Eisenhower High School, Lawton,
Oklahoma in 1979; received Associate of Science Degree
in Business Administration from Connors State College,
Warner, Oklahoma in 1981; received Bachelor of Science
Degree in Secondary Education from Oklahoma State
University in 1983; completed requirements for the
Master of Science Degree in Occupational and Adult
Education at Oklahoma State University in May, 1987.

Professional Experience: Teacher-Coordinator, High Plains
Area Vocational-Technical School, Woodward, Oklahoma,
1984-Present.

Professional Organizations: American Vocational Association;
Oklahoma Vocational Association; Marketing Education
Division; Marketing Education Association.